[Shri M. C. Shah.] These estimates include Rs. 13·84 crores for scheme included in the Second Five Year Plan, representing the target envisaged for the first year of the Plan. This has been assessed, for the residuary area of the former Travancore-Cochin State, on the basis oi the original budget estimates of that State, and similarly, for the Malabar district, on the basis of the estimates for that district in the budget estimates of the Madras State.

3ir, the total requirements of the State are thus estimated at Rs. 10'42 crores, which are proposed to be met by loans from the Centre, Rs. 3 ■ 77 crcres, sale of State holdings of Government securities, Rs. 2 crores, running down of the State cash balance, Rs. 2.55 crores and the balance of Rs. 2.1 crores from the net receipts under Other Debt and Remittance Heads.

The amounts of expenditure, both on revenue and on capital account, as also of disbursements of loans, for which a vote is being sought, are those authorised under the States Reorganisation Act. The final results of the year are likely to show some savings, which will help to improve the State's budgetary position for 1957-58.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE ENTRAL GOVERNMENT ON RAILWAYS FOR 1956-57

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI JAG.TIVAN RAM) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants for Expenditure of the Central Government on Railways for the year 1956-57.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30.

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

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

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

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, before we adjourned for lunch I was trying to point out that our representative to the United Nations has spoiled a very good case by a lengthy speech. I would go a step further and say that although we are fully agreed about the stand that the Indian Government has taken with regard to Kashmir at the present moment, the same cannot be said of the past policy of our Government. I want to know why the Indian Government and the Prime Minister referred the question of Kashmir, which was entirely in Indian territory once it had acceded, to the United Nations. An internal matter should never have been referred to the United Nations. What right did the Indian Government have to agree to a cease-fire line with Pakistan when Pakistan was saying that they were not involved? They were raiders not belonging to a friendly neighbouring country but just freebooters. We should never have agreed to cease fire. I should like to know from :)ur Government why they offered to hold a plebiscite. Sir, in a democracy of our type, the States can opt in but they cannot opt out. Once they have joined, once Kashmir has joined the Indian Union, they cease to have any right to go out of the Indian Union. Therefore I submit that the whole attitude of the Government of India and of our Prime Minister in the matter of Kashmir has been a series of blunders. The result of that series of blunders is that we have created this difficulty for ourselves and then our representative makes matters worse by his bad advocacy.

Sir, the Press in India and the leaders of the Congress Party have tried to din day in and day out into the ears of India citizens and the

Indian people that the prestige of our country is very high, that we are respected in the world and that we are going to become the leaders of world opinion. Sir, only in the third week of December when our Prime Minister went to the U.S.A. he was welcomed, and very wholeheartedly welcomed, in that country, and yet only a month after that a resolution is brought in the United Nations Security Council against the stand of India on the Kashmir issue. Is it the attitude of a friendly nation? Is it right, when we are a member of the Commonwealth, that every Commonwealth country votes against India in the matter of Kashmir? Why is it that we continue in the Commonwealth? Our Prime Minister has to give a reply to this question as to why we are continuing in the Commonwealth. Why should we accept any sort of aid from the U.S.A. which has taken up a hostile attitude against us? Why should we be beggars before the entire world? If we want to have our second Five Year Plan, we should tap our own resources. We should stand on our own legs and not go begging to every country for aid. If we beg from other countries, how can we raise our head high and take up a firm stand in the Security Council?

Sir, we will have another occasion to discuss this subject. I will now come to the economic problems of our country on which the President's Address is mostly silent. I maintain Sir, that the tall claim made by the seconder of the motion that the progress in India during the last ten years had been phenomenal stands condemned.

But before I go to that point I have another amendment about Goa, 'but regret to note that the Government have not taken steps for the early incorporation of Goa in the Indian Union'. Sir, two or three years back there was a widespread public movement for the liberation of Goa. The people did not want any help from the Government; they would have liberated Goa by their own efforts— unarmed men marching into Goa. But our Government promised that Goa would be liberated very shortly, that diplomatic action was being taken and that Goa would be incorporated in the Indian Union very soon. But three years have passed and nothing has happened. If we go on like that, the foreign colonial powers will have a foothold in India which is very bad for the security of our country. The sooner we get rid of the colonial footholds in India the better for our country.

Now, Sir, I come to the position of foreign exchange and here I find that the hon. seconder of the motion has made a very curious proposition that we are short of foreign exchange, we should sell our raw iron ore and coal to foreign countries to earn foreign exchange. If the hon. Member had suggested— and we have plenty of yellow metal, that is, gold—that we should collect the entire gold in the country and export it, we could have agreed to it—but coal and iron ore are more important and more /alu-able to our country than even gold. We should not export good quality iron ore or coal in order to earn foreign exchange. That was colonial economy—export of raw materials, export of essential articles. It is a very wrong economy and I am surprised that the hon. the seconder of the motion should have made a suggestion of this type. Sir, there is a better method of conserving foreign exchange. During the war years we built up huge sterling balances. Those balances were Rs. 1200 crores and India's share of it came to nearly I Rs. 800 crores. We have not made | the best use of those sterling balances. The foreign concerns have got a stranglehold on our economy, on our industry and on our production and when we ask the Government to give us correct figures, they say different

[Shri Kishen Chand] things. When they are trying to show that foreign investments are very small, they say it is only about Rs. MOO or Rs. 400 crores but sometimes when the Reserve Bank people issue statistics they give figures only up to 1932 and say that it comes to about Rs. 400 crores. During the last five years there has been further foreign investment in our country. The foreign concerns are earnthg very huge profits on these investments in India and nearly Rs. 50 crores are going out, ire being repatriated every year from our country as their share of profits. Then by selling the capital assets at three times or four times their price, they are taking out part of the capital assets from the country. Then there are several thousands of European employees in these concerns who .ire getting very fat salaries and they make huge savings. On an average a foreign employee of these foreign concerns earns about Rs. 3,000 a month and if he sends out about half that amount you can imagine the total amount of money going out, as there are about 7,000 or 8,000 employees of this type. Sir, in this way we are losing foreign exchange every year. I estimate that about Rs. 70 to Rs. 80 crores are going out either as profits on foreign investments in India or as foreign capital or as the savings of foreign employees in our country. While we are trying to cut down our imports and trying to increase our exports, we are not tapping this source. If we tap this source, we can save Rs. 80 crores a year and the second Plan will get Rs. 400 crores which is more or less the uncovered deficit in the second Five Year Plan.

Our sterling balances earn only about If per cent in their country. We earn only 1? per cent, while they on a much smaller investment in our country earn 15 to 20 per cent. I am sure Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will later on give you exact figures and statistics to prove that these foreign concerns are earning at least 20 per cent and taking out such big amounts from our ■country. What is a goo*i solution for economising on our foreign exchanges? Should we follow the method suggested by Mr. Humayun Kabir, that we should export iron ore and coal from our country? Or will it be a better method that we acquire these foreign concerns for a fair amount out of our sterling balances at the prices which prevailed in 1947—not at the prices which prevail in 1957, because this is a temporary appreciation of their assets. If we do that, we shall have to pay a very small amount out of our sterling balances. We shall have sufficient amount left in our sterling balances to meet the needs of foreign exchange and yet we will be saving all this continuous drain year after year from our country.

A poor country is industrialised differently. Ours is a poor country, but in our policy of industrialisation we are trying to imitate the more advanced countries of the West. We are following their policy. In the U.S.A. and in Europe, in industry progress is made by a greater utilisation of capital. Their policy is capital-consuming. They want to save human labour and in order to save human labour they want to highly mechanise all processes of industry. In order to reduce one labourer they may spend a lakh of dollars, just to save one labourer and to mechanise one process in an industry while in our country, where human labour is cheap, where there is plenty of it, we should not go in for the western methods of industrialisation. Our method should be different, and if we follow different methods we will solve our problem to some extent.

Sir, I have sent in another amendment, that in spite of the Government's assertion regarding increase in food productions, Government have failed to arrest the rise in food and cloth prices without corresponding increase in wages and without benefiting the agriculturist by a better return for his produce. The Indian Government stands condemned on this point. The food prices are slowly and gradually increasing. I do not

know what jugglery is followed by our Government. They say food production is going up. Sometimes they say it is going up by 15 per cent, sometimes by 20 per cent and according to the Plan and the assertion of the Prime Minister it should go up by 40 per cent. The food production is going up by 15 per cent, 20 per cent, 25 per cent, while the population has not increased by more than 1 1/4 per cent every year. During the last three years you will find that food prices have gone up by nearly fifty per cent. I come from a State which is rice-consuming and it is common experience that two years back in the free market rice was selling at three seers a rupee. Today it is selling at If seers a rupee. In Delhi you can study the price of wheat. Today if you go to the market—I went only yesterday and found that you cannot get even two seers of wheat for a rupee. The hon. Minister will say that we have opened fair price shops. I do not know where they exist and if we go to a fair price shop, probably if he gets sixteen bags he will sell one bag or two bags at the fair price. The rest of the bags go into the black-market and they are sold at a high price, while the people have to stand in a queue. I am telling you that though the President has asserted that conditions are improving in our country, they are really deteriorating. That is why we express regret on that Address. Just now the discussion is not about methods of improving the situation. Just now it is a statement of fact. We are discussing the Address of the President and in that Address it has been stated that the food position is improving. I am trying to point out to you that the food position is not improving. What are its causes? It can be remedied, but different methods will have to be adopted. It will be a long story if I go into the details as to how the food position can be improved, how the prices can be brought down. Suffice it to say that at present the food prices are going up and it is an act of omission by the Indian Government. Regarding prices of cloth, in one breath we say that the price of cloth is going up because the production has fallen short and then in another breath we say mill production is going up tremendously. We have reached a record for the year 1956, as mill cloth production has been very high. There is the Ambar Chaxkha programme. There is the handloom cloth programme. Production of handloom cloth has also nearly doubled and yet the price of cloth is going up. What is the result? What is the common man in our country going to think of the Plan and think of the management by our government when he finds that the food price and the cloth price is rising and every living condition is becoming dearer and dearer every day without any increase in his wages? I would have been very much satisfied if this increase in food prices had been transferred to the poor cultivator. I would have appreciated it because 80 per cent of our countrymen live in the villages. If he got the benefit of the higher price I will have no grievance, because at least he would be getting the benefit. But if the agriculturist does not get the benefit, if the urban population has to pay heavily for it—and a few middlemen, a few people who can either get control of the fair price shops or in any other manner corner the foodgrain stocks, where is the benefit? How do you justify the acts of the Government? I submit that now the hon. Minister has started a new .plea. We are going to have warehouses. Let us see how they work. Will they also result in an increase in the food prices, as the fair price shops have led to an increase in food prices?

Then, Sir, I come to the last point. It is the growing unemployment in the country. Why do we have planning? Why do we have industrialisation of the country? The only purpose is to see that not only it produces consumer goods, but it finds employment, an hon. Member suggests export Of raw materials. It will be a contradiction. We want to industrialise our country and use all I our raw materials and convert them

[Shri Kishen Chand.] into finished products so that in that process we find employment for millions of our countrymen. The First Five Year Plan is over. The first year of the Second Five Year Plan is also over and unemployment is going on increasing, unemployment on a scale never imagined in any other country of the world. There is unemployment in the rural areas where 80 per cent of the rural population does not get work for more than hundred days in a year and that also on very low wages. Then, there is unemployment in the urban areas. Unemployment amongst our educated men is colossal. The hon. Minister will say that the population is going on increasing. Population is increasing at the rate of 1 1/4 per cent, and if efforts are made possibly there may be some reduction in the increase in population, but that rate will continue. And if that is the excuse of the Government, our country will never be able to improve its standard of living. We will have somehow or other to find jobs at a faster rate than the increase in population and unless we can do that we will never solve the problem of unemployment in our country. The Government has not tackled it in the proper way and unless it is tackled in the proper way we will not be able to solve this problem. I have tried to read through the President's Address very carefully and tried to find out a ray of hope in the whole Address but, it may be my misfortune, I have failed to find any. I find, Sir, that is a repetition year after year of the same old platitudes, of the same old stories of continuous progress in the country, while the facts are the reverse. The living conditions and the standard of life of the common man are slowly going down, are becoming worse and worse. An hon. Member, the seconder of the motion, said that our national wealth has gone up from Rs. 9,000 crores to Rs. 11,000 crores. Of course he said immediately that the per capita income has increased from something like Rs. 270 to Rs. 287, that means an increase of 17. Of course it is a very glorious figure, Rs. 17 per year. That means Re. 1 or Rs. 1/6 a month, and he was very proud of it. Another hon. Member asked him a question whether this calculation has been made on the same price level.— because the prices are going up, and if you calculate on the basis of the^ 1952 prices and say that the national income was Rs. 9,000 crores and then, if you calculate the same national income four years later at a higher price level, the result will be certainly a greater increase. Rs. 9,000 crores should have really become on account of increase in prices 12,000 crores, but it has only become Rs. 11,000 crores. This subtle difference is not pointed out. Some time back statistics were collected which have been published by the Congress Government, by the Indian Government, and the"statistics show that in the urban population of Delhi and Calcutta more than 55 per cent have been forced to lower their standard of living because their income has gone down. Only in the case of 6 per cent of the population of Calcutta and Delhi has the income shown any increase in the rest of the cases it has gone down.

This is the picture before you, Sir, and with this picture if we pay lip sympathy and offer our thanks to our President, we will not be doing justice to our country, we will not be doing any service to our country. We have got to face the facts, and I do recommend that my amendments be accepted by the House and they be added to the Motion of Thanks to express the real conditions prevailing in our country so that efforts may be made for the improvement of the lot of the common man.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard the speeches from the other side of the House, and these speeches have been devoted mainly to paying tributes to the Address of the President. That is the customary practice with the party in power in this country, and one wishes that the Members opposite would take a little pain in order to point out just where things have gone wrong, how to improve matters.

Instead of doing that we have always found them dittoing almost everything that is said in the Address. I do not know to what extent this contributes to the discussions or for the matter of that to the formulation of the policies of the Government.

Now, Sir, in the very beginning of the Address reference is made to the general elections. In my amendments also I have included that topic as the first item, and it is as follows: —

> "but regret that the Address does not take note of the improper use of the State apparatus and the Governmental machinery by the ruling party for furthering its electoral ends."

I know that this subject is a little provocative specially after the elections, but I would like hon. Members to ponder over the submissions that I make in this connection with a view to finding out and ascertaining to what extent things have gone wrong in this direction. I would be very sorry if what I say is taken as if I am making certain points against the ruling party with a view to seeking certain narrow partisan advantages. That is not at all my intention here. We have fought a big election battle, and the results are known to the country. That is not the point at all. I think for the future of democracy it i= of the utmost importance that we take note of certain unhealthy developments that have come about and have been particularly demonstrated in the course of the elections.

Now, Sir, at the very outset I would like to draw the attention of the House to a photograph which appeared in the *Hindustan Standard* of 11th March 1957, Calcutta Edition. Here is a photograph, hon. Members may not see it from a distance, but the caption reads: "The Imam of the Nakoda Mosque (with turban) praying for the success of the Chief Minister, Dr. B. C. Roy, in the general elections when the latter visited the Mosque on Sunday evening." Then [1] the text of the report says: "Dr. Roy during the election campaign on 1 Sunday evening paid a visit to the Nakoda Mosque on Chitpore Road and stayed with the Imam of the Mosque for some time in the room within the premises of the Mosque. The seventy-one year old Imam and other Muslims present there prayed for the success of Dr. Roy in the coming elections and assured him of all help. This was Dr. Roy's first ever visit to the Mosque." Here you see, Sir, the Imam praying and Dr. Roy sitting. I am not here concerned with what the Imam felt about it that is not at all the point. What I want to point out in this connection is this. We claim ourselves to be a secular State and I take it that the Chief Minister of the Government would be particularly interested in so functioning in his individual capacity even in matters of election that he does not drag religion into politics and strike at the very foundations of what he considers to be a secular State. Certainly he is in need of votes and you have seen from the result that he had been very badly in need of votes. I can quite understand his discomfiture at the challenge that was thrown from the united left. But I do not for the life of me understand as to why he should bring himself in that photograph in that particular manner in which we have the specta cle of a prayer being held in his own presence inviting votes for him. If that does not go against the tenets of a secular State, cut across the founda tions of a secular State, I do not know what does. Now, Sir, I am very sorry to have got to say these things in this manner.....

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): What about the rights of a photographer to take photographs?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may not agree, but the facts I have stated are there, and the photograph is an irrefutable proof of what I am stating. ("Question") I would question

o -n ri T» o

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] whether such pictures should be allowed especially when the person concerned happens to be the Chief Minister of a State. I am very glad to mention in this House that this incident was taken exception to by even certain papers which follow the Congress generally, important Calcutta papers. They wrote many editorial comments.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Which paper was that?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not going into any other thing because I know that, while the Prime Minister was telling the country that the elections should be free and fair, that religion should not be brought into politics and that the State was a secular State, his Chief Minister at least in one State was going not only from door to door but from temple to mosque in search of blessings so that he might get returned. It does not speak well of a secular State to say the least.

Now, Sir, as you see in today's papers, serious allegations have been made both in the Legislative Assem bly of the Punjab and of Bombay about the State machinery being used for the party in power to further its electoral prospects. I am not saying that you should pronounce a verdict immediately on the allegations that have been made, but I do not see why these allegations should not be taken seriously when they have been made on the floor of the House or attempted to be made on the floor of the House by Members of the Opposition. I think respect for democracy also [3] " 'demands a little respect for what the Opposition says from the other side of the House. Therefore, Sir, I would like to draw the atten tion of the Government to some of the reports which have just appeared.....

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: May I ask a question? How does the Communist Party ally itself with communal organisations in a secular State?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think the hon. Lady Member will surely have her chance. I feel that she has been misguided in this matter, and she will, I hope, realise that she has not been well-advised to bring up such allegations against our Party. Anyway, I am not a functionary oi' the State as Dr. Roy is. What I am saying is that Dr. Roy, being a functionary of the State, associated himself with this kind of thing. I think the hon. Lady Member will take note of this matter.

Now, Sir, here I have got a cutting which says that "Opposition charges against the State Government that it had allowed the administrative machinery to be used by the ruling party for its election purposes were strongly refuted in the Bombay Legislative Assembly." In Bombay, some allegations had been made that the Government had allowed the administrative machinery to be used by the ruling party for election purposes, and they were strongly refuted by the Government. But I would like the Election Commissioner to go into those charges and make necessary enquiries, and not simply brush them aside. Or let any other Government agency make an enquiry into that matter and see to what extent those charges are true.

Then, Sir, in Punjab, similar charges had been made, and this is what the press says:

"In the statement which they were unable to read in the House but which they released to the Press later the Communists alleged that the Congress Party resorted to lavish use of money, liquor and transport, in violation of the law and under the very noses of the Government officials, who acquiesc-

ea in au tnese maipra^ices, n nox actually connived at them.

The statement said the Ministers had toured the constituencies in their official capacity giving administrative orders intended to win support for themselves and their party men."

I never ask you to accept the charges when they come from the Communists. But I ask you to go into them and find out the truth. This is my contention. See whether they are really true or not. As far as we are concerned, when we make any charges, we make them in good faith and believe them to be true. If, however, the other Party thinks they are not true, I think that that itself calls for a little discussion and consideration by the Government, because the Government itself is responsible for the conduct of elections in the country. I think the Election Commissioner has some particular responsibility in this matter.

Now, Sir, with regard to Punjab again, we have got reports that the Commissioner of Bhatinda was canvassing personally for the Revenue Minister. I can quite understand the concern of certain officials for the Minister, but I do not know why they should participate in an election campaign in this way. Similarly, Sir, as you know, during those days we had a large number of dissident Congressmen who did not like some of the things that happened inside the Congress, and therefore left the Congress. In Chandigarh, for instance, . the President of the local Congress, Shri Brij Bhushan Garg, left the Congress together with a hundred of his companions, and he made some charges strongly condemning the open use of Government machinery for the Congress candidate. He may be a dissident Congressman, but certainly he is not a Communist or a member of the Opposition so to say. I think it is only fair that these things should be gone into bv the Government.

Then, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House to some other ways in which the Government machinery was associated with the election campaign of the party-in-power. In many places Raj Bhavans or the Government Houses in the States had been used for offering hospitality to the Congress campaigners who had been out on election tours. In the normal course, I have no objection to Shrimati Indira Gandhi being present in the Raj Bhavan because that is the place which would attract her, but when she appeared in Calcutta to deliver five lectures a day, I think some other place than the Raj Bhavan could have been found for her. I think that that is not a right sort of thing to do on the part of the Government or the ruling party. Similarly, Sir, as you know, when the Congress Party found itself in some difficulties, a lot of use was made of the Kashmir issue for election purposes. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed was brought from Kashmir to deliver five or six lectures at the Congress election meetings in Calcutta. I also arrived at the Dum Dum Airport by a plane, and I found that the Raj Bhavan car was receiving him, and he was also a guest there. I can tell you that the Raj Bhavans in many places had been used for Congress election campaigns, and they were used by those who were not at all on any official duties.

Then, Sir, you very well know that Shrimati Renuka Ray, the Rehabilitation Minister of West Bengal, has chosen to adorn the benches of that House, and she has been elected to the Lok Sabha from the Malda constituency. Suddenly, on the eve of elections, we found that she had appeared with the Governor of West Bengal, addressing meetings, and all kinds of receptions were organised for the Governor at which Shrimati Renuka Ray became one of the main speakers. She went all her way to address the reception meetings organised in Malda in West Bengal for the Governor. Now, that is a strange sort of coinci-

Hpnr"P that Viae toVan T^lonr> Tvr_x —i-

LShri Bhupesh Gupta.] that, but a meeting was also held to accord a civic reception to Shrimati Naidu at which Shrimati Renuka Ray was present, and almost all the addresses that were made to the Governor during her tour contained the name of Shrimati Renuka Ray.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON 1 (Bihar): Because she is the Minister for Rehabilitation, she is entitled to go there with the Governor where there are lots of refugees. I do not see anything wrong in it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now the game is over. But still you can judge for yourself whether it was right or wrong. Many addresses were made to the Governor during her tour in Malda, and most of these addresses, if not all, contained the name of Shrimati Renuka Ray and all her qualifications. *(Interruption.)* I would like i to refer here to a local paper which, : of course, Shrimati Lakshmi Menon would not be able to read because it comes out in Bengali. Serious allegations have been made in that paper saying that the Governor was associating herself with the Congress election campaign, pure and simple, in favour of the Rehabilitation Minister, Shrimati Renuka Ray. Now, Sir, we are between three Shrimatis, one here trying to understand the position, and the other two who performed the deeds. I would like to know whether it was right or not. In any case I would like to draw the attention of the Government to this matter.

The Bharat Sewak Samaj is an organisation which is subsidised by Government. It does some good social work but it pained us when we found that in some places this organisation got mixed up with the Congress Election campaign. I don't say that the members of the organisation should not have their own political affiliations or views. They may and in their pi-ivate capacity they certainly have the right to participate in any campaign they liked but the moment they drag the organisation, it becomes a questionable.....

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA NAND: Which was the place where the Samaj did.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You allow me to finish. All these things will be made known to you. Materials have been sent to the Election Commissioner and if the Members are interested they can make a request to the Election Commissioner to furnish them with copies of the complaints that have been made to the Election Commissioner from the various parts of the country. That would be very instructive to them and helpful for others.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Vague charges have no meaning.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is another factor in this election campaign which alarmed me and I am sure my anxiety will be shared by many honest people on that side of the House because this is not a partisan thing. As the elections were drawing near, certain sections of the big business showed very great interest in the election campaign. The Tatas had a resolution passed for making contributions to the election fund and we were soon told that Rs. 15 lakhs had been donated to the election fund of the party in power, *viz.,* the Congress. I would like to know if this is the amount or less. But we are told and it appeared in the press and I have not come across any statement on the part of the President of that organisation or the Secretary that no money had been received from the Tatas for their election campaign. Now the matter came out and it roused particular interest when a petition was filed in the Calcutta High Court on behalf of the Indian Iron and Steel Company. The Directors of the Company wanted the permission of the court to modify the articles of the Association or the Memorandum of the Association in order that they can

make donations to political parties for election purposes. The judge wanted I to delay, I don't know for what reason, the hearing of that application but somehow the Congress Party pressed j for an early hearing of that application and the case was heard. There | the ruling was quite interesting and I would like to draw the attention of the Government in this connection also. There the judge was helpless, he could not prevent the modification of the articles of association or memorandum of association by the Company and his words were:

> "To induce the Government of the day by contributing money to the political funds of political parties was to adopt the most sinister principle fraught with grave dangers to commercial as well as public standards of administration."

He particularly stressed the High Court's duty to focus attention on this danger 'of so recent origin, on the eve of the General Election in the country.' Now, he wanted public attention to be focussed on this matter and I think I should be failing, in my duties if I do not draw the attention of the House to the very valuable observations that were made by the judge in his judgment. The object of the Company, said the Judge, was stated to be 'to contribute to the funds of political parties which will advance policies conducive to the interest of the Company.' Certainly these very serious observations were made and as you know, the judgment received the attention of the press and many comments were made. You will remember that when the Company Law was being discussed, we suggested that the companies should be debarred from making political donations of this kind. Our amendments were not found to be acceptable to the Government and they were rejected. Now when the elections came, we found the companies rushing to make contributions to the Congress Party which, I take it, has served their interests very well in the course of the last five years. This is a very bad practice and I would suggest in this connection that an early opportunity should be availed of for sponsoring an amending Bill to the Company Law so that the companies would not be in a position to make such political donations to any party; whether it is the Congress or the Opposition, I don't care. That would be in the interest of the country and of the growth of democracy and a healthy public life. Here you will find that six days before the application was being heard, the same company, namely the Indian Iron & Steel Company, made out a cheque of Rs. *2*\ lakhs to the Congress Election Fund. The cheque was made in favour of Dr. B. C. Roy and was signed by the Managing Director of the concern. Now it is obvious that after having made that contribution, they went to the Court to have proper legal protection so that no share-holder would be in a position to raise any objection to it.

Here is a facsimile of a receipt issued by the Assam Pradesh Congress Election Committee—No. 108, dated the 17th November 1956. This is in regard to a sum of Rs. 12,500 only from the Director of the French Motor Car Company Limited. I don't know how many such cheques would be in the possession of the ruling party. The less said about it the better. But I fear there will be too many to the great detriment of our democracy, spelling disaster to the future of democracy if this process of handing over huge cash to the Congress Election Fund by the big business is not stopped. I hope the Congress is a big enough party to forgo such sort of things. They claim to have very good support in the country and why should they be in need of such huge funds from various sources?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: In what form the Communist Party gets its funds?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Lady Member will agree that neither

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] she nor I contested the elections. Therefore it does not affect us and we can be a little patient in the matter. The Communist Party, if she cares to know, does not receive any funds from these sources and I can tell you that if Messrs. Tatas were to approach the Communist Party with Rs. 2 lakhs, it will not accept this amount. It will advise Tatas to spend the money for increasing the wages of the employees and workers before they dared to pro duce such cash to .....

(Interruptions.)

Now, I say this is very serious. In the United States they have created lobbies—the big business have created. In our country you find the process has started. Some of the very choicest creatures, representing the big business, have managed to find their way to the Lok Sabha and soon we shall see them sitting there. I am a little alarmed by this when they go to the accompaniment of such heavy subsidies to the Congress Party which is supposed to maintain certain morals in our political life. At least it should be the duty of the ruling party.

Another thing is, the dak bungalows have been used for Congress Election offices. Certainly Congress needs offices but there are other places that they can get. Why should they use dak bungalows? About conveyance and other things also, the rules have been violated. I was there when Dr. Roy's polling took place. I had never seen so many motor cars being parked. This I saw in front of Dr. Roy's house. I don't know what they were doing and where they came from. I thought that the whole of Calcutta's big business cars had been put there for show but eventually I found that certain passengers were being carried in those cars and one can imagine the kind of passengers who had the advantage of riding in such big limousines and big cars on that occasion. I could give you other examples, but the story would not end. But there is one thing I want to emphasise. In Assam, each planter was asked by a circular to pay so much fund to the Congress funds and they fixed the levy on the basis of so much per acre of land held and money was paid, so much so that the whole thing was made public through the publication of the circular. Then in Uttar Pradesh, we have had the sugar magnates contributing to the Congress election funds. There were the Tatas of Calcutta and big business which contributed their funds. The Birlas of course made their contribution too a few days before and I do not know how it was reciprocated in the context of the elections. That we will be interested to know. I think the time has come when we must take drastic steps to prevent such big business participation in the elections, and the use of such big money to corrupt the democratic institutions of our country. I think it is necessary for the Government to adopt measures so that the election expenses are fixed at a low level and effective measures should be taken to prevent any kind of fraud on the election laws, particularly in regard to expenses. That is another suggestion that I would like to make in this connection.

Despite all these things, I must confess that our people have shown a great sense of responsibility and they have shown a great awareness in the selection of candidates, and they have conducted themselves magnificently in the course of the general elections. Of all this we are all equally proud, no matter to which party we may belong. I hope that our ruling party will take note of these traditions of our people and see that such malpractices are not introduced in the elections in order to frustrate free and fair elections.

Now I would like to touch on some of the other points made in this Address. I would not like as far as the foreign affairs and the foreign policy matters are concerned, to dilate much on them, because I am told that this subject will be discussed before we adjourn and so we reserve our observations for that debate. Yet, I would like to say a few words with

regard to some of the most important and pressing issues.

As far as the Kashmir issue is concerned, it is well known that we generally support the present stand of the Government of India and our only regret is that this present boldness was lacking in the earlier years when the Kashmir issue was taken to the Security Council on the advice of Lord Mountbatten. In this connection again, I would like to point out that we were very sorry when we found that eminent leaders of the Central Cabinet were trying to make use of the Kashmir issue for narrow partisan electoral ends. Undoubtedly, the issue cropped up when the election campaign was on and I do not say that a certain measure of debate was not necessary in the course of the election campaign. But it pains us most when we see leaders of Government going and telling their audience that in order to face the Kashmir issue they must vote for the party in power, namely, the Congress. That I think was not right on their part, because it was well known that all political parties, all patriotic parties and organisations in this country are solidly united as far as the defence of our country goes and as far as the Kashmir issue is concerned. We expected Prime Minister Nehru to give a lead in this matter and tell his audience that despite electoral controversies and despite political and party differences, here was an issue on which we could all unite, maintaining our party independence and ideological affiliations, in the larger interests of India. Instead of doing that, the appeal was made to vote for the Congress, as though if the people did not vote for the Congress, we would not be able to face the Kashmir issue at all. That was not the right approach on the part of the Government. That is what I want to say. As far as we are concerned, we made it clear in the course of the election campaign that as far as the Kashmir issue was concerned, Prime Minister Nehru could add our votes to the votes of the Congress party and then tell the world that this is the support that is behind his Kashmir policy. We expected that the Congress would take such a broad approach, but they did not.

In this connection I would also like to offer some criticism of the Government and point out how we must face the situation. The Kashmir problem is to be viewed in the context of the Anglo-American plans, particularly the American plan in the Middle East. It is not an isolated event. You will remember that during the past few months there has been a constant attempt to re-acti-vise the Baghdad Pact and to bolster up the Pakistani Central Government against India and its case against India which does not stand a moment's scrutiny. They are also to be viewed in the context of the general plan which President Eisenhower has laid down for the Middle East against the Asian and African countries. It is in this context that we must face the situation. Here I would like to point out that we must make it known that the Security Council has no jurisdiction whatsoever as far as Kashmir is concerned.

Kashmir is part of India and our Constitution and the Constitution of Kashmir is all that matters in this connection. The Security Council Resolutions of earlier years are absolutely invalid and have no place with regard to Kashmir. We must make this known to the whole world. Sir, the President makes reference to the coming of the Jarring Commission to this country. We had a number of Commissions over Kashmir; we had the McNaughton Commission, the Dixon Commission, the Graham Commission and all that. We have known of all these. We have seen that certain powers who dominate the Security Council, by dint of their majority, are interested not in helping us to solve the problem of Kashmir but in creating tensions between India and Pakistan in order to get a foothold in the strategic regiofTs in order to advance their own plans against the Asian and African nations.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] They have complicated the situation and that has been our criticism all these years. The imperialistic powers in the Security Council were interested in utilising the Kashmir question to advance their own imperialistic end and, at the same time, keep India and Pakistan apart and divided so that they could bank on the tension that exists between the two countries. We do not have any connection whatsoever with these powers who have changed their attitude. On the contrary, we have in the ignominious Four Power Resolution the sorry spectacle of Britain and U.S.A. sponsoring a Resolution which amounted to a provocation or to aggression against India. Now, fortunately, that Resolution has been vetoed by the Soviet Union but we know this that in these actions we see them conspiring against India all the time. When Mr. Kishen Chand was speaking about Mr. Krishna Menon's advocacy in the Security Council, he should also have taken notice of the fact that these powers did not go there to get convinced; they had formulated their Resolution even before Mr. Krishna Menon had started his speech. Naturally, you cannot expect Mr. Krishna Menon to be able to convince such people, whatever else you may .or may not say about his forensic affti-ties. Here, it was not at all a question of convincing those people but of speaking in such a language as they would be able to understand. I do not necessarily suggest that a seven hour long speech is the best that we could do; I think, Sir, that we must certainly make out our case as strongly and as powerfully as possible in the Security Council but what I want to make out here is that if in the past we failed to make out a strong case, it was not at all for the lack of forensic ability but because the Government of India had some illusions about the motives of the Anglo-American powers. I need not go into that story; the soft attitude of the Government of India towards the Anglo-American powers was responsible for weakening our presentation of the case in the Security Council in the earlier years. Today, with a bold stand taken by the Government of India, Mr. Krishna Menon has been in a position to plead his case powerfully and one must say that he has done his best. I do not think we need go into the question about the length of the speech that he had made there. It is not very material in this connection. I think, now that the Jarring Commission is coming to the country, we must make it clear that we would not be prepared to discuss the Kashmir question unless and until it is recognised categorically that Kashmir is part of India and that the Security Council has no jurisdiction whatsoever to alter that constitutionally, politically and historically established fact. It is on the basis of that we may enter into any discussion with the Commission. If the Jarring Commission is interested in reopening the question in the light of the earlier Resolutions of the Security Council, we should be very polite to him but, at the same time, we should advise him to take the first plane back to his country because we are not interested in reopening this case or discussing it in a manner that impinges on the sovereign rights of India or adversely affects the position of Kashmir as an integral part of the Indian Republic. Similarly, we should ask him first of all as to what his attitude with regard to the complaint that we had made nine years ago about aggression against India is. Now, it seems that the Security Council is determined to ignore that complaint of aggression made by India and we would like to know as to where the Jarring Commission stands with regard to that complaint. This is how I think the Commission should be treated. Now, the President says:

> "The Government of India, in accordance with its general policy, has agreed to receive and extend hospitality to Mr. Jarring of Sweden who is expected to arrive here soon."

I am not concerned with the hospitality or that sort of thing. These niceties are not material for me but we would like to know from the Government as to whether we are going to have a repetition of that kind of hospitality and discussions that we have had with Mr. Graham, Mr. Dixon and others who preceded Mr. Jarring. That is all that we would like to know from the Government. If that is so, then we would request the Government not to enter into any negotiation or discussion with Mr. Jarring because that kind of thing did not produce any result. In our view, the outstanding problems between India and Pakistan have to be settled between the two countries without any outsider coming into the picture. If friends are there to help us and advise us, it is a different matter but we would not like the Security Council to butt in in this manner through a Commission and thus frustate the possibilities of direct negotiations between the two countries. In the ultimate analysis, the problems outstanding between the two countries have to be solved by us alone through mutual friendly negotiations. However much they may seem difficult today, we have to strive for it because we know that the people of Pakistan and India are friendly and they wish each other well. It would, therefore, be in the interest of these people to settle their own problems mutually through friendly discussions. I would also suggest to the Government to take another step. I would like to know from the Government as to what step they are going to take with regard to Britain. As you know, Sir, Britain has been particularly active in this matter. It is Britain which is supposed to be a partner in our Commonwealth which instigated Pakistan and produced this infamous Resolution. It was the British Prime Minister who was closetted with Mr. Firoz Khan Noon in London before he went to New York and decided upon the course of action the Pakistani Foreign Minister was to take or that they were to take collectively in the Security Council. We have seen how the British representatives there had insulted our representative, Shri Krishna Menon. Are we to take all these things lying down? That is the question we ask. Now, we have demanded that in view of what Britain has done, there is no point in India remaining in the Commonwealth and I do not see as to why we must go on hugging the Commonwealth when every time we try to kiss them they kick us. That is the point I raise and I hope Government will take serious note of it. When it comes to us, we are very friendly and we do not do anything that would even show a trace of insult to them. The A.I.C.C. bulletin, published an article written in good faith which made certain observations with regard to the visit of the Queen to Portugal. The Prime Minister hurried to apologise to the Queen, sent radio messages to the High Commissioner to go and apologise to the Queen and our High Commissioner not only apologised to the Queen but she was so generous that she apologised to the Foreign Office also. All instructions were sent all over the world and everywhere there was only this, apologise, apologise, apologise. I do not see as to what had gone wrong in the observations. Mistakes had been committed and if a mistake had been committed by a particular journal, the editor of that journal could have said something, and the matter could have endetf there. The Prime Minister, I believe, | is not the editor of that journal and j I further believe that that is not even . the official organ of the Government. In spite of all these things, the Prime Minister came out and started apologising to the Queen. I think that the Prime Minister was not acting in accordance with the temper and feelings of the country. I would like to know from the Government as to how many times the British Prime Minister has apologised to our country when it is known to everybody that the Tory Press, tipped by the British Foreign Office, is accusing i India of aggression, is abusing I India every day, hurling insults at the Prime Minister and the other-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] dignitaries of the State. That being so, when they have not considered it necessary to apologise to us for the abuse against India, how is it that our Prime Minister is so very sensitive to this question that he rushes to apologise for a little comment in a journal of which he is not the editor at all? Now this kind of thing, I think, we should put a stop to. Now if you want to explain it in terms of the magnanimity and greatness of the Prime Minister, I would only say that in dealing with Mr. Macmillan and his friends, magnanimity of that sort has no place, and I think that before we think of apologising to the British Government or the Queen in that manner, we should have asked the British Prime Minister as to why, particularly at this hour, the British Sovereign went to Portugal, Portugal which is a country unfriendly to India, Portugal which had occupied a part of India, Portugal which was causing instigations against India all these months. These things we are entitled to know. Now this Commonwealth relationship seems to have become a one-way traffic, for us to take in all the insults at the hands of other partners of the Commonwealth outside of as well as in the Security Council and at the hands of these countries and of America who sponsored Resolutions there with a view to provoking aggression against India and instigating them against India. Nothing happens to that. But whenever a little thing happens here, then we find that the Prime Minister of the State goes out to apologise in that manner. I think that is not right and that is not in accord, as I have said, with the temper of the country, the feelings of the country. We have felt all offended and hurt as a result of this kind of apology being offered by the Prime Minister. Here I would submit, Sir, that this whole question of the Commonwealth should be discussed. I think the Prime Minister's prestige is not a weighty enough argument to justify the continuance of India within the Commonwealth.

I We would ask the Prime Minister not to introduce extraneous elements in the discussion but to discuss the question on its merits with us and engage with us in a fair debate over the subject as to whether India should remain in the Commonwealth or not. We think that the case for India's quitting the Commonwealth is so strong that even the Prime Minister cannot do otherwise than to quit the Commonwealth if he would at all pay heed to this reasonable case and, what is more, pay heed to the sentiments of the people of the country. It is a national demand to-day that

! we should quit the Commonwealth.

Now, Sir, with regard to the Middle East Plan the President's Address | refers to it and says: "My Prime ; Minister visited the United States at | the invitation of President Eisen-I hower. The visit and the talks J between the President of the United ′■ States and my Prime Minister have I assisted in the promotion of under-| standing between our two countries I and greater appreciation of each other's point of view." I disagree with this kind of statement because the facts are the reverse. Now immediately the Prime Minister had returned to this country we came to know of the Middle East Plan, and the Middle East Plan is something which even Prime Minister Nehru has taken exception to, and he has rightly condemned this thing. Now, surely the Prime Minister did not go there to come to such an understanding that immediately after his visit to that country, President Eisen-hower would produce such an outrageous and aggressive plan, his Middle East Plan. Now I do not see as to why such a reference should be made. If anything, it should be stated here that the Prime Minister's visit to the United States failed because of the intransigence of the President of the United States and because of the policy of the position of strength which the United States still pursues. The failure of the visit

should be frankly admitted today before the public. There is no use trying to cover up which way the mind of the American administration is working and saying something which is not a fact. In this connection. Sir, we are very sorry to mention that immediately the Prime Minister went to the United States the press and some sections in the Congress Party said all kinds of things about America, praising American policy and all that. Even Prime Minister Nehru addressing a press conference in New York on December 28 praised the moral leadership of the United States in the Middle East. He said: "The prestige of the United States has shot up. all over the world." Then again in New York on December 20 it was reported in tlie press: "Mr. Nehru said here today that it was a 'gross exaggeration' for anyone to declare that greater vital differences existed between the U.S.A. and India." Now this is how the thing was sought to be presented. But we know now quite clearly that the Prime Minister's representations or suggestions or discussions did not produce any impression on President Eisenhower, and I think that we should not really tell our people something which is not borne out by facts or by the current policies of the Government of the United States. In this connection I would suggest that we have to face up to that challenge thrown in the form of their Middle East Plan. It is a threat to the security and independence of the Asian-African countries. It does not merely concern the Middle Eastern countries; it concerns all of us. I would therefore suggest that since one plan after another is being unfolded by the imperialist powers and these plans are directed against the countries of Asia and Africa, it is time that a second Bandung conference was held to discuss the situation arising out of the aggressive moods of the Anglo-American powers, particularly the Middle East Plan. I do not see as to why the Bandung powers should not frequently meet and believe them to be true. If how-and discuss and tackle such serious situations and issues. What is more important for the Bandung powers to do is to set up some kind of a machinery whereby prompt discussion could take place between them in order to formulate a'concerted united policy to meet this challenge of the imperialist powers. Therefore I would ask the Government to consider a second Bandung conference which has become the need of the hour today.

Now reference has been made to Goa and I would like to know from the Government what policy the Government is going to pursue with regard to Goa. Now sentiments are all right. There are no two opinions in the country that all of us want the liberation of Goa, but it is the duty of the Government to tell us exactly how and when this objective, that is to say, the liberation of Goa, would be achieved, what are the concrete policies, I would like to know from the Government since there is no indication whatsoever in the President's address nor any indication of any concrete policy in the Government's pronouncements made elsewhere. Therefore I think, Sir, it is necessary for the Government to take the parties of the Opposition into confidence and discuss the matter seriously with them and formulate a vigorous policy for achieving the liberation of Goa within a limited period of time. We cannot just sit on the fence all the time and watch the developments there. We know that this foothold is the springboard of the imperialist powers, and whenever they need it, it will be used against us and we cannot permit this thing if only for this reason that as far as Goa is concerned it is part of our soil, and we have also made statements to that effect. We should proceed now on the basis of concrete steps to secure the liberation of Goa and expulsion of the Portuguese invaders and enslavers from that part of our Indian soil.

Now coming to the internal issues, Sir, here again a rosy picture has been

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] drawn about the economic situation in the country, but it is customary for the President's Address. But reference has been made to the rising prices and unemployment and I am glad that the reference has been made. But it does not of course give any realistic assessment of the situation; neither does it offer any suggestions as to how the prices would be checked or the unemployment problem tackled. Now, Sir, you will remember, on August 30 last year the hon. the Food Minister spoke in this House on the subject of rising prices and he said that we should wait for two weeks and the prices would go down crashing. If I remember, these were more or less his words. I would ask him, "What has happened to the prices?" We have waited not for two weeks but more than 22 to 30 weeks and I would like to know from him what has happened to the solemn assurances that he gave to this House. I do not think that it is right for Ministers to make statements if they knew that they had no policy to back up their statements All economic facts prove that the prices have gone up even during these past few weeks. I have got statistics with me which show that the prices have gone up over the past few months and past few weeks. In respect of food articles in 1955-56 the general index was 313-2 and on 23rd February 1957 it was 403. In respect of miscellaneous items it was 546-4 in 1955-56 and on 9th February 1957 it was 592-9. All these are wholesale prices. The general index in 1955-56 was 360-3; in January it was 442-1 and on 9th February 1957 it was 402-1'.. All this shows that the prices are still rising. Far from crashing, they are rising; this is what we find from ihe facts of economic life when we had very eloquent assurances from the Food Minister that the orices will be crashing in a matter of two weeks. I do not know whether those assurances were made in view of the elections j before him at that time but I would like to know from the Government I what policy they have got to reduce the prices. We have seen during the past few months how the speculation in prices has gone on due to certain bank advances by Scheduled Banks, bank advances to the speculators. The situation came to such a pass that the Reserve Bank was forced to restrict such advances. Now, the harvesting time has come and that restriction has been withdrawn and the Scheduled Banks are making heavy advances to the speculators and we are informed that speculation in food articles has been somewhat as before and it has not intensified.

Then, Sir, certain taxes have contributed to the rise in prices, especially the taxes on the necessities of life like cloth and other articles. I would like to know from the Government whether they recognise this fact and if so whether they are going, to reduce the taxes on some of the consumption articles with a view ta checking the prices and speculation because you cannot isolate the rise in prices from the tax policy of the Government as some taxes inevitably lead to rise in prices; at least they encourage rise in prices.

Then, there is the question of deficit financing which has brought in inflationary pressure. I would like to know from the Government what their policy is with regard to deficit financing, whether they are going to curb it to such an extent as would not create any inflationary pressure whatsoever. These are the three factors which have combined together to move the prices upward and I think each of these factors has to be fought with a view to reducing the prices in the country. The rise in prices has resulted in a decline in the standard of living of the common man. The Congress leaders there would agree that when they went out in their election campaigns they heard complaints about this rise in prices from all sections of the people; no matter to which party they belonged, no matter which party they supported, all sections of the people

•combined to protest against this rise in prices and the Congress leaders were of course giving assurances that steps would be taken to reduce the prices. We heard of course some Ministers making speeches in which they said that the prices have gone up beeause the people were eating more, the people were using more cloth and that sort of thing. Of course the people laughed at such things. I do not know the election result of that particular Congress leader; I am waiting to see. Whether he or she is elected is beside the point but I am sure this kind of speech was not to the liking of the audience because it contradicts the facts of life. We suggest therefore that the Government ' should immediately ■formulate a policy for stable prices ■and that is a very important thing to do, otherwise it will upset, as I have said before, even the planned reconstruction of the country, apart from (causing hardship to the people. So every check has to be put on this rise an prices and speculation but unfortunately when the speculators are caught, they are not prosecuted. In Bengal a few months ago a clandestine telephone exchange was discovered. It was absolutely illegal and some photographs appeared in the Press but then we find that none is being prosecuted for maintaining such an illegal telephone exchange. I "would like to know from the Government as to what happened to those speculators who were caught red-handed in operating that telephone exchange. During the elections of course I found some of them wearing Gandhi caps and running after the pair of bulls in search of Congress votes. I do not know whether that was the *quid pro quo* for having been let off. Anyway, we want drastic action to be taken against speculators.

Now, I come to the fair price shops. 'The Government policy is this. They are closing these fair price shops ■when the food prices are very high. I would suggest to the Government that the fair price shops should not be closed but on the contrary more and more shops should be opened in the country. Then they have stopped the policy of purchase of foodgrains. I would suggest again to the Government that they should go in for Government purchase of foodgrains in order to have a control over the market so that it would at least obstruct the speculation. It is very essential that the Government should go in for purchase of foodgrains from the market. This is all about prices and I think this question deserves very serious attention of the Government and a proper policy has to be worked out.

Now, reference has been made to the unemployment problem and I would like to know from the Government as to what steps they are taking to check the growth of unemployment. We have got the second Five Year Plan and there we nave the story as to how unemployment has grown in the country and what the broad proposals of the Government are. But here and now we would like to know from the Government as to what concrete measures they are going to take today for checking the growth of the unemployment problem. All the reports published by the Government show that the problem is growing. I have got with me here the Employment News. This is also published by the Labour Department and this shows how the unemployment problem is growing in the country, particularly among the middle classes, and, as you know, the Study Group of the Planning Commission has pointed out that 5* lakh people of the educated middle class above Matriculation level are unemployed. We would like to know from the Government as to what policy they have to absorb these people in the nation-building work or to find jobs for them. As far as I can see, there is no policy whatsoever with them to combat this problem of unemployment. Now, I

LShri Bhupesh Gupta.]
would suggest to the Government and —I do not know the Labour Minister is not here—whoever succeeds him .....

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): The Labour Minister is here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not he; I mean Mr. Desai. Now, I would request the Government to discuss , this matter with the trade union and other organisations with a view to formulating certain policies to combat unemployment. Some concrete day to day measures are very essential and my suggestion would be to change or to recast their policy of industrialisation a bit in this respect. We must have a policy of industrialisation with an employment bias. It is important that we build up our heavy industries, machine-building industries and all that. We have been advocating such things all the time but at the same time it is important that we should set up certain industries in the State sector with a view to absorbing the unemployed persons. That is a very important thing to do and I can suggest certain places where such industries can be profitably started by the State but unfortunately the authorities do not see the need for setting up industries as part and parcel of a policy to fight UE employment in the country. Then, Sir, cottage industries should be given real 4PM assistance and I think the Government should make more purchases from the cottage industries, so that the employment situation improves there. As far as the rural unemployment is concerned, I do ' not see how you can tackle the problem until and unless land is distributed to the poor peasants, the tillers and the agricultural labourers. That is of vital importance. During these months and years it has been amply demonstrated that whatever else, you may or may not do, until and unless you distribute land to the peasants it would not be possible for you to hold back the tide of growing unemployment in the countryside.

Then, Sir, the Government should ban the policy of rationalisation in industries and offices which aggravates the problem of unemployment. We were shocked to read a statement by the Chairman of the Damodar Valley Corporation that more people would lose their jobs in the Darnodar Valley Corporation. We would like to know as to what would happen to them and we would like to know as to how is it that even in Ihese reconstructions people are losing job. And we are told by the employees there that nearly twenty-thousand people are threatened by unemployment. Some of them had already been retrenched. Now, we would like this policy to end. We do not want that these people who participate in the reconstruction of the country, building our dams and projects, should be treated in this manner and they should be thrown into the street immediately after the projects are over. This does not speak well of the Plan or of the economic policies of the Government. We want an aU-out war against unemployment because that has become a menacing problem and I think that every effort should be made with a view to solving this problem. We do not ask the Government to solve this problem overnight. It is not possible to do so. But it seems that the more the Plan goes on, the greater becomes the intensity and the extent of the problem. How is it? They should explain to this House. We would like to know from them of their plans as to how they are going to reduce the number at the end of the Second Five Year Plan. It is stated in the Plan itself that there would be two million more unemployed than there are at present. Now, this condemns the Plan and I think the whole Plan with regard to the employment needs a drastic change.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please close now, Mr. Gupta. You have taken one hour and ten minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As regards foreign exchange, I am afraid !

that reference has been made to the foreign exchange position of the country, but I think that reference is not at all critical, because the past policies of the **Government resulted** in a great and avoidable drain on our foreign exchange and now we have come to such a position that we have to go abegging for foreign sid and assistance. And unless we do so, according to the Government **our** Plan is jeopardised. We had, you will remember, warned against that sort of policy of the Government and today I hope they will recognise that the policies they pursued in the matter were not very right and have resulted in this precarious situation as far as the foreign exchange of the country is concerned. Now, Sir, I would suggest that we must base our economic planning on the resources of the country itself. Many suggestions have been made by us and others in this context ?nd T think the Government should consider them. But here I am in full agreement with Shri Kishen Chand when he says that **the** foreign profits that are shipped out of this country should be controlled and utilised for the reconstruction of our economy. That is of great importance today.

Then, Sir, there are certain commodities like tea and jute. The foreign trade in regard to these commodities should be taken over by the Government. We know that tea is purchased here, shall we say, at Rs. 4 and is sold in Western Europe at Rs. 12. We lose on account of foreign exchange. I do not see as to why when the foreign exchange has become so scarce and difficult we should not take *over* the foreign trade, at least in regard to the principal commodities like tea and jute and manage our affairs in our own way.

Then, Sir, I think it is also necessary to put a stop to the import of luxury goods. In the past we had voiced this demand and recently the Government had put some restrictions. That does not go far enough. I suggest that in view of the stringency of foreign exchange you should further restrict the import of luxury articles and goods which we do not need, which the country does not need at the moment. Some rich people at the top may need them, but they are not the country. Therefore, that is very important.

Then, Sir, I suggest to the Govern ment that these companies and mills should not be allowed to introduce innovations, modernisation and rationalisation so that they have to import machinery, because that is a drain on our foreign exchange. The provision in the Second Five Year Plan for facilitating the imports for rationalisation should not be allowed. I think that our installed capacity should be fully utilised and we should' forgo the kind of modernisation that we have had in the tea and textile industries, especially which are intended to yield more and more profits and not intended either to solve the problem of economy and certainly not the problem of foreign exchange. Therefore, I said that a curb should be imposed on such imports also. Considerations of the monopolists should not be given priority in this matter and they should be asked to know how best to utilise the existing machinery and how to fully utilise the installed capacity that exists in the country. I am told that even in the textile industry the full installed capacity is not fully utilised as yet, whereas the Government is allowing the big textile bosses to import machinery for modernisation so that they could boost their profits. This is a policy which does not deserve the support of this House at all. The Government should modify their policy in this respect.

Then, Sir, about gold, plenty of gold is with the big people. I am not talking about the gold ornaments that are with the common man. The princes and the millionaires have got huge quantities of gold. Can we not procure some of this gold from them to meet our foreign exchange require-

[Shri Bh.upe.3h Gupta.] ments? This is also a suggestion that we had made earlier. I repeat it here because I think that if we get hold of some of this gold it would be possible for us to meet the difficult situation in which we are placed today as far as foreign exchange goes. But I would suggest that on no account the Second Five Year Pian, the size of the Plan should be reduced. Because there is a tendency on the part of the Government to reduce the size of the Second Five Year Plan or to map out these projects in such a way as to take a longer time than envisaged in the original Plan. I think the size of the Plan is by no means big enough for the country and it should not at all be reduced. On the contrary, every effort should be made to at least maintain it as such and all resources should be mobilised to maintain the size of the Plan and not to reduce the size.

Then, recently there has been a tendency on the part of the Government to allow the private sector to come into the fields of those industries which have been reserved under the latest industrial policy resolution for the public sector. We are opposed to this kind of concession being given to the private sector and Mr. Krishnama-chari seems to be very much interested in widening the field of the private sector even in lines which should belong now more and more to the public sector. That goes against the scheme of planning and certainly is not in conformity with the policies enunciated in the industrial policy resolution of last year. This is what I would like to say—oil, for instance. Now, we find in the press that the foreign concerns are being invited to invest in oil. I say that more investment is necessary, but that should be made by the Government and only the public sector should be allowed to function in that industry as far as new investment goes. In regard to coal, for instance, we find again the private sector is being given new concessions. We are opposed to more concessions being given to the private sector as far as expansion in the coal industry goes. Now, we would not like the public sector to be scuttled in this manner through the backdoor. That is, the policy which is the policy of the Government should be respected by all sections of the House. You know that there was a great debate as to what should be the extent of the public sector and the relative position of the private and the public sector. I think it was the consensus of the Parliament that we should develop the public sector more and more. When that is the opinion of the Parliament expressed in the speeches of various Members from both sides of the House, the hon. Finance Minister should not modify the policy so as to increase the operational field of the private sector in the vital industries like coal, oil and so on. We are opposed to that kind of thing.

Lastly, I would like to mention about rehabilitation. Some reference has been made to the migration of refugees from East Bengal. I am very sorry to say that when the problem is so great and requires so much of our attention and sympathy, the West Bengal Government and for that matter the Government of India do not still have a proper policy to give relief and succouf to those people who are coming from East Bengal, not to speak of their rehabilitation in life. Even today you will find hundreds of refugees lying on the footpaths in Calcutta and the platforms of Howrah and Sealdah, and the platforms all over West Bengal are crowded with refugees. They do not have any shelter. They have become victims of disease, and their agony is mounting every day. Some have died in that situation. They are being sent to the Cooper's Camp and other camps where there is no proper arrangement for looking after them. In fact they are condemned to live in subhuman conditions. There again, they have become victims of disease and unending suffering. I would ask Government to go into the question with human sympathy and recast its rehabilitation policy. I do not say that they should not be received in

camps, and if they are to be kept in camps temporarily till they are rehabilitated in life or shelter found for them, the camps should be worthy of human habitation. They should not be like what they are today. For this I think the Central Government should make proper increased allocation to the Government of West Bengal, and they should also see that the money is properly used for giving relief to those distressed people who are coming from East Bengal today. This is a problem which has overwhelmed the economy of our State, especially West Bengal. I can tell you now that it requires very great and vigorous measures from all directions to solve it in a co-ordinated way. Otherwise you cannot solve the problem at all. When more and more people are coming and when, as you yourself admit, about three million people are there, I think the Government of India should re-examine its policy which has proved ineffective in this respect and replace it by a proper policy of relief and rehabilitation. I tell you in this connection that apart from relief gainful employment is the crux of the matter. Unless and until we make arrangements to provide gainful employment to the refugees, the problem would remain always with us and will continue to be a drain on our resources, while human misery will continue to swell. That is the position. We suggest therefore that Government should hold after this session consultations with representatives of the refugees and of the various parties in the country with a view to formulating a new policy for tackling this problem.

Now, Sir, I do not want to say anything more except that this Address is disappointing. But we are accustomed to this kind of observations. I say that now we have nearly completed the first year of the Second Five Year Plan. There should have been an objective assessment of the situation and the achievements of the Second Five Year Plan, so that we could learn from our experience. Nothing of that sort has been attempted here. A rosy picture has been sought to be drawn forgetting the live issues that stare us in the face today. I think that the economic reconstruction of the country should be understood in terms of the life of the people, in terms of the living conditions of the people. It is no good just all the time telling that we are building Damodar Valley, Bhakra Nangal and all that, when we see that unempjoy grows, prices rise and the living standards of the masses are continuing to fall. We want to so refashion our economy that side by side with material constructions like Bhakra Nangal and Bhilai Steel projects also goes up the living standard of the masses. That is how we should approach the problem of reconstruction of the country. After all unless and until we improve the living conditions of the masses in the very process of the Plan, we cannot arouse them into nation-building activities, nor can we improve the economic situation in the country. The present policy of the Government seems to ignore all these facts and is much concerned with how the people at the top shall "flourish, and the statistics that are often doled out give no indication of th* realities of life. We know that in this period the rich are doing well, but th« poor have remained subjected to privations and suffering. We want an end of this state of affairs as we are building our country.

SHBI VIJAY SINGH (Rajasthan): Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Sapru. In a democratic form of Government it is a convention that at the beginning of the year the Head of the State comes and reviews the progress that the country has made and also hints at what the future policy of the Government is going to be like. This is the convention and I think we should all welcome this thing because it gives us an opportunity to review the activities of our Government in the year that has gone

[Shri Vijay Singh] by, and we can also make our suggestions for the future.

Sir, the year that has gone by has witnessed several historical events, both in this country and abroad, and in the short time that is at my disposal it is not possible to deal exhaustively with all these events. It has been suggested, Sir, in the beginning by the Chairman that so far as external affairs are concerned separate time has been allotted, and this House will have an opportunity to discuss these in detail. I therefore leave these external matters out of account and will mainly confine myself to the events that have happened in the country in the year that has gone by, and will also say something about the policy that has been hinted at in the Address.

Sir, three notable events have happened in the year that has gone by, besides many others, about which I will speak. The first was that we were able to solve the problem of the reorganisation of States in a most peaceful and democratic way. The second was that our First Five Year Plan was completed in the year that has gone by and we started .with the Second Five Year plan. The third was that we have nearly completed the second biggest general elections that the world has *seen.* These are major events, historical events of which note is not only to be taken by the Indian people but by the people all over the world. Besides these, there are many other events and there are" many other achievements to the credit of the Government about which I will just speak.

Sir, we got our independence ten years ago. At that time there was doubt in the minds of many people in this country as well as in the minds of the people outside that Indians would not be able to govern themselves democratically in a safe way in which we have governed ourselves— but the doubts of those people have been dispelled. In these ten years herself democratically and govern herself in such an efficient way that she has created almost a record in world's history, because after all we know that in the course of these ten years our Government has achieved some things of which any government in the world can legitimately be proud. I will briefly summarise these events for the sake of the House. Though we are meeting now only to consider the events of one year, we y are meeting at the end of a general election. Therefore, the full picture of those five years must also be kept, in the background so that we may be able to appreciate, the events and the policies that the Government has followed in the course of the year that is under review.

Sir, the first thing that the Government did in the course of these years; was to give us a Constitution at the very beginning. Then we were able to> solve tha problem of the integration of States and the linguistic redistribution of States. The third thing that we did was to lay the general foundation of our economic progress by successfully implementing the First Five Year Plan. All these events are very big, but the biggest event that happened was that we had the first general elections in 1932 in which more-than 17 crores of voters were involved. This was the biggest general election that the world's history has ever seen, and we got unstinted praise from all over the world for the way in which we conduct* our first general election. It was almost a record and we are glad to know, Sir, that that: record has now been surpassed only by our own country, because it has been admitted by all people on all hands that the second general elections that have been conducted in India were conducted much more efficiently, much more democratically, than even the first general elections. This, Sir, is an achievement of which every Indian can be legitimately proud. When I was hearing the-speech of my hon. friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta on that side, I almost felt that when hp was dilating uDon the un-

fairness in elections and other things, his very presence there showed that the elections had been conducted in a most fair way. He takes inspiration, Members on the Communist Benches take inspiration, from countries where no such elections are held. There was a change of Government in Hungary, there was a change of Government in Poland. Do we mean to say that such fairness was observed there? Elections have been held here absolutely fairly. Stray reports have been quoted, some newspapers have been produced, some statements have been quoted, but may I ask whether there has been any concrete case put before the House to show that elections have been heJd unfairly or the party has used the influence at its disposal to gain unfair advantage? I can only say, Sir, that not a single case has been pointed out, and this again goes to the credit' of our Government.

Sir, we have to review all these events against the background of five or six years which I have already referred to, and it will not serve any useful purpose if somebody takes one instance from here and one from there and says "Here is the mistake that the Government has committed." After all, Sir, this Parliament is expected to take a panoramic view of the whole thing that has happened, and then only we have to suggest the policies that the Government has to follow. In actual execution, if there is some mistake here or there, well, that can be remedied. But we are expected to take an overall picture of the whole thing. Therefore it is not correct for the hon. Members to blame the Government, if they are able to find out some fault here or there.

Now, Sir, speaking about the general elections of which we Indians are legitimately proud, I must pomt out that they have brought one thing to the notice of the Indian people of which they should take serious note. We all take pride in the fact that we have been able to have unity and integrity of the nation. But I must here point out that this unity and integrity of which we are so proud and which we want to guard jealously is not so strong as we think it to *be.* In connection with the general elections I was touring in the various districts, and I have myself observed that the separatist forces art still very strong. The communal forces, the regional forces or the linguistic forces are all separatist forces, and wherever these separatist forces have found an opportunity, they have never failed to raise the'x ugly heads. We are today fortunate that we have got a strong party in the name of Congress, and we have got a very strong leadership. We have got a strong High Command, but this should not make us forget that these ugly separatist forces are still very strong in the country, and if something is not done to check these communal, regional or linguistic forces, the unity and integrity of India which is very important will be lost. After all, the course of Indian history in the last two thousand years shows only one thing that we were not able to keep our freedom intact because those separatist forces were working against the unity and integrity of the country. This is a thing, Sir, which, I think, must be seriously considered.

The Prime Minister, while speaking the other day, hinted that this unity and integrity that the country is able to have is due to the strong Congress organisation that we have got in the country. There is no other organisation and no other party that the country can produce at this time in order to maintain this unity and integrity in the country. But this is not enough. We have to lay firm foundations for the future, and we cannot afford to be complacent that we have got this leadership or we have got this organisation. In this connection, I am reminded of some thing. A few months ago, there was a hint in the speech of the Prime Minister that the Government was soon going to enact some legislation in order to deal with those communal or separatist

[Shri Vijay Singh.] forces. I think, Sir, it is high time that we should take some definite steps to check these communal aiad separatist forces, especially when we have got the experience of the second general elections. If that is not done, I think that some great harm is bound to come to us in future.

Now, Sir, I would like tc say something about the Second Five Year Plan and the economic development that we have witnessed during the last year. Judged by all standards, the First Five Year Plan was a success. I do not want to burden this House with facts and figures. In fact, this House had an ample opportunity to discuss the First Five Year Plan and the Second Five Year Plan, and all these measures were discussed so threadbare that it is useless now to (repeat the arguments that have already *]jeen* advanced. But I can say it without any fear of contradiction that it is the opinion of all eminent economists in India, who have studied the conditions existing in India, that the economic standard of the Indian people has risen in the course of these years. Maybe, th-it rise is not what we expected, but the rise is certainly there. We all know, Sir, that the first thing that we have got to do is to break the inertia of the people. The Indian people were under foreign rule. But now what is the position? Wherever you look, you will find that people are active; they want more and more roads, more and more schools and so many other things. Maybe, we are not able to satisfy their demands to the extent they require and there is some discontentment, and we should welcome such discontentment. But we can say it with confidence that there has definitely been some economic development in the country. Maybe, it is not as much as we wanted, but we have laid sure foundations for that economic development by our First Five Year Plan, and we have also done something in the Second Five Year Plan.

Regarding our Second Five Year Plan, Sir, I would like to make two suggestions. One is the problem of backward States and the second is with regard to proper utilisation of our manpower. With regard to the problem of backward States, I had an occasion before also to speak in this House. We have got to take a proper note of the economic backwardness of certain States. We all talk of a socialistic pattern of society. But so far as the reorganisation cf States from the economic viewpoint is concerned, there is not that amount of socialism there. Fpr example, we find that a State like Bombay is rich in industries and a State like Rajasthan is very poor in industries. Therefore it is very necessary that the backward States should be taken care of. We are going to have so impressive a programme of industrialisation in the country, but so far as the backward States like Rajasthan, Orissa and Assam—I am, of course, speaking in general terms—are concerned, enough stress has not been laid on removing the industrial backwardness of the particularly-neglected regions of our Union.

Sir, there is a reference in the President's Address in this connection. In paragraph 22, he has stated as follows:

> "Mineral surveys have yielded promising discoveries of oil, and many new deposits of uranium ore have been located in Rajasthan and Bihar."

Last time, when I spoke in this House on the Second Five Year Plan, I quoted from the report of some Russian experts that there are rich deposits of iron-ore, lead, zinc and copper in Rajasthan. So, there are rich mineral deposits available in these backward States, but nothing has been done to tap these resources or start these industries. I do not want to dwell at length on this Address, but I want to point out that there is a serious lacuna which the Central Government should take note of.

When we were discussing the Second Plan it was said that the Second Plan was not final but it would be reviewed year by year and that is what it should be. When we are going to review this, I do hope that adjustments will be made and steps will be taken to have industrialisation in these backward areas of our Union.

I would like to speak on proper utilisation of our man-power. The President's Address has mentioned two things—rising prices and difficulty about foreign exchange. It is no doubt a big problem that the prices of essential commodities are rising. We are facing difficulties so far as foreign exchange is concerned. Some of these are natural. After all when there is this question of Suez Canal, goods cannot come through the Canal and they had to come *via* the Cape of Good Hope. Naturally the charge on transport has increased. There were other problems of foreign policy. We, of course, follow an independent foreign policy. Some of the countries don't like our policy and they don't want to support us in the way in which we want them to support us. These are the difficulties. But here I would like to point out one fundamental thing. After all why should we depend so much on money? Money is very important but too much dependence on money is not nice. We have to so plan our activities that they do not depend on money factor. Money, as someone has said, is a great thing but it is the source of several evils also. Therefore in our planning we must see that we don't lay too much stress on the money aspect only but lay stress on man-power aspect also. We have got tremendous man-power in India, crores and crores of it. They have not got work. We must utilize them in useful occupation. In our Plans and activities henceforth we must so plan that the man-power that is lying idle is used. If we use our man-power in a rational way, much of this money difficulty that we are facing can be removed. This is a technical subject on which a lot can be said. I am not an expert on external finance. So I will not go into that but I would like to point out that so far as the development works and the plan are concerned, we must have an essential item to utilize the vast man-power lying idle in the country. It should also be not thought that this will amount to regimentation. Some sort of regimentation is essential. We have given freedom to the people but it does not mean that freedom should be absolutely unrestricted. If people work for their country and for their economic development and if the State guides them to do so or asks them to do so, that is not regimentation or forced labour. Nothing of the sort. One of the most essential things that we should do is to have proper utilisation of our man-power and we should plan our activities accordingly, and we should bear in mind this fact that ultimately our whole progress will rest upon us. It is not that we can progress in this country by external aid. It may come and if the aid comes we welcome it but ultimately our salvation lies in our own hands and we can't depend upon foreign powers, howsoever friendly they may be.

We talk of our prestige in foreign countries. Well, to a great extent, we all share the pride that we are so much respected in foreign countries but this prestige in foreign countries will ultimately depend on the economic progress that we make at home. If we don't make economic progress at home, we will not be respected in foreign countries and how do we intend to make economic progress? We say we want to follow an independent policy. If you follow an independent policy then you must also tighten your belt. This fact we must bring home to everyone in the country and how can we do it? This is not a matter about which we should talk in a party spirit. But all parties in the country should unite and say that because we are following a

[Shri Vijay Singh.] policy of independence and because we have to make much progress, we should tighten our belt and work more. We should eat less and work more so that we may be able to achieve something for the future and our children and their grand-children may live in peace and prosperity. This is about the economic planning and the Second Plan that I wanted to say.

Another subject about which I wanted to speak is regarding the serious matter of exodus of Hindus from East Bengal. The President's Address has mentioned that nearly 4 million, that is, 40 lakhs of people, have come from East Bengal to India. This is a serious matter. We all say that we did not accept the partition of the country on the basis of the two nation theory. Well and good. We have not accepted the partition on the basis of the two-nation theory but the other side says that they accepted the partition on the basis of that theory. They may not say it hut in practice they are squeezing out the Hindus from Pakistan. If you go to West Pakistan, you will find that few Hindus are left there. Whatever may be the number of Hindus in Pakistan, they are in East Bengal and now about 40 lakhs have been squeezed out from East Bengal to India. What are we doing about them? No doubt Government is doing a lot to rehabilitate tnem and crores and crores of rupees have been spent on them. There were 80 lakhs of refugees formerly and we rehabilitated them. We have done a very good thing but what about the people who are pouring in day in and day out? If this process goes on, I am quite sure not a single Hindu will be left in Pakistan. This is a problem about which we should not be complacent by merely saying that we are doing so much. After all this is a matter which we must take serious note of and we must write to the Pakistan Government saying 'if you are not going to protect S'our minorities, you should give land to India to settle them.' This was a demand which was made by. several Members in this House also last year. I don't know what our Government has done in this connection but this is a very serious problem and I, for my part, would like to suggest that if the present state of affairs does not improve, we must take all diplomatic action that we can, and say to Pakistan clearly 'if you are not going to give rightful protection to minorities and if you are asking them to go out of Pakistan and settle in India, then you must give us land to settle them.' After all, the partition of the country was accepted because there were so many people living on that side and so many on this side. It is not that out of these 4 -or 5 crores in Pakistan they can drive out 1 or 2 crores and then keep the rest of the territory themselves. The pressure of population in India is increasing and this must be made known to Pakistan in strong terms. We talk of Kashmir. I attach great importance to Kashmir about which I shall make a reference later on, but how many people live in Kashmir? It is nearly 40 lakhs. Just see how many 40 lakhs have come from East Bengal to India? If you just measure the tragedy in terms of human lives, this problem is not less serious than the Kashmir problem.

PANDIT ALGU RAI SHASTRI: (Uttar Pradesh): Much more serious.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: This problem of exodus of Hindus is a very serious one and I would ask what action our Publicity Department and our Government have taken. We must make it known to the people. After all Pakistan is doing everything to malign us in the press and the world and what are we going to do to prove these patent facts to the people? Today the Jarring Mission is coming and other international missions are coming. Has our Government done anything to point out that so many people are coming to India every day? You go to West Bengal or anywhere. It is

a miserable sight to see that lakhs and lr.[1]:!-.'. c* pro^lc are lyinf there. 'This is a very problem. Emotions apart, this is a practical problem which demands a solution from us and I do hope that apart from the .fact that all that we can do would be done to rehabilitate them, Government would also take suitable steps to set right the state of affairs that is prevailing in the country.

Then I come to the most important problem that is uppermost in the minds of all of us—the problem of Kashmir. Well, the stand that the Government of India has taken is a very admirable stand and the whole country is behind the Government. We need not dilate on that much. I think the situation in which we are placed today is quite a delicate one. The leaders to whom we have confided our destiny, are reasonable and they have got their responsibilities. They will settle this. We for our part, can assure them that the country is behind them in whatever solution 'they find. Kashmir is a part of India and no strip of land which is a part of India can ever go under foreign domination so long as a single Indian is living. That is a thing that we have to tell our Government. This is what we have to tell our Government but ■there is something which we have to tell our people and our brothers in Pakistan also. The world has changed a lot. It is not the world of the mediaeval days. Our brethren of Pakistan still talk as if these fre the mediaeval days, in terms of jehad and what not. I want *to* tell them in all sincerity and in all friendlines that the type of propaganda that they are doing, the cry of jehad that they are raising is ultimately going to be the cause of the ruin of their own country. The sort of demon that these persons are creating there in Pakistan will ultimately devour them, who are the very originators of this demon. We all remember the story of Bhasmasur in our puranas. It was a demon which was created by the gods and' 'this demon devoured the gods themselves. This is what I would request my Pakistani brethren to remember. This is the lesson that they must learn in their own interest. It is in the interest of Pakistan that we should both live on friendly and amicable terms, that they should be *on* amicable terms with India it is in Pakistan's economic interest and in the interest of the subcontinent which was called India. We do not want to annul the partition and even if Pakistan wants to annul the partition, we don't want to do so. We want to live on friendly terms. They can live their own lives. But they must, in their own interest, keep brotherly and good relations with India. It is not in their own interest to raise the cry of jehad and hatred against the people of this land. If they do so, they will see that it will ultimately recoil upon themselves, for it was said some two thousand years ago that "those who take to the sword, shall perish by the sword" Sir, I thank you for the time you have given me.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have to.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shall we sit through till 5-30 P.M? AS the House knows, we have the presentation of the Budget at 5-30 and if hon. Members have no objection, we may sit till 5-30.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Shall I go on?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: Reading through the President's Address and considering the motion that has been put forward in this House, I would like first to point out that Members on this side of the House, as far as I am aware at least, do not attack the Address, but by their own suggestions try to improve it and I at least have moved my amendments in that spirit.

My first amendment is concerned with para 21 of the Address in which,

[Shri P. C. Bhanj Dep.] speaking of the Five Year Plans, the first arid the second, it is said:

> "This Plan, while continuing to lay stress on greater food production, emphasises the need for industrial development, more especially in regard to heavy industry."

As far as the speedy industrialisation of India is concerned, I do not think there is any other opinion than one of support to these sentiments. But I have moved my amendments in this regard because of what was contained in the First Plan and what was practically achieved in the First Plan and also in view of what is contained in the Second Five Year Plan. 1 feel it would have been better if from the Head of the State, there was this direction that a more proper and effective priority should be fixed for the speedy industrialisation of our country, especially in the long-neglected areas. One of my friends on the other side of the House has spoken very eloquently about this matter. I can only confine my remarks in this field to my own State, naturally, where my experience and interests are chiefly confined. When I attempt to speak on that matter I am reminded of Mahatma Gandhi's remark on Orissa. He called Orissa the epitome of Indian poverty, and that is no exaggeration and that is not a false statement. Today, Sir, if you consider the condition of the people of Orissa and their economic development, then you will find that Orissa is the poorest State in the whole of India. From that point of view, in order to ensure the speedy industrialisation of the whole of India, one would have expected the Government to have followed the salutary doctrine of our ancient wisdom which has said:

That means: "Oh, son of Kunti, always enrich the poor. Do not pive money, do not give wealth to me already wealthy". If only the Govern-

ment had followed that principle, 1. would have had no complaint today. But what does the Second Plan really promise for my State? While West Bengal, for instance, has been provided *per capita* Rs. 63, while Bombay is provided *per capita* Rs. 77, while Punjab is provided *per capita* Rs. 104, while Assam which has a smaller population than Orissa is provided *per capita* Rs. 63, Orissa which is the poorest State and which has a very large population, is provided per capita, Rs. 40. I do not want to burden the House with a lot of statistics and facts and figures. But from this, it can be seen that the present policy pursued in the Second Five Year Plan at least is more or less the enrichment of the rich and making the poor, poorer. To this statement or contention of mine, hon. Members on the other side of the House may say, "What about the Hirakud dam? What about the Rourkela steel plant?" These have been provided for the development of Orissa, they may say. To that I would say that the Hirakud dam has been given to Orissa on **a** loan at the rate of 3 per cent, compound interest.

That is a rate of interest which *&* poor Siate like Orissa and a poor people like the Oriya people can hardly be expected to bear without complaint. As far as the grant of a steel plant to Orissa is concerned, it must be remembered that so far as the people of Orissa are concerned, they have not gained by this grant very much because it has been implemented by means of a public company known as the Hindustan Steel Company. This procedure has robbed the people of Orissa of employment opportunities in this enterprise by ensuring jobs and emoluments to people outside the State and, indeed, this process has gone so far that today in Rourkela in the schools, the Oriya language has disappeared and in its place, Hindi and Bengali are being taught. So, as far as the provision of heavy industries is concerned, for Orissa it has not been an unmixed blessing and my contention

is that if we really want to make India rich industrially and agricul turally, we should help its poorer parts to a greater extent in our planning and even, if need be at the expense of its richer parts. This is because the poorer parts must be brought into line with the other parts. These poorer parts are so rich, as my hon. friend on the other side correctly said, in mineral resour ces that it will pay the State and the Republic to invest in these backward States lavishly so that we can reap good profits and find prosperity in the long run. This is as far as heavy industries are concerned. As far as cottage industries are con cerned, the story is very simple regarding Orissa. For Orissa, Rs. 9,61,00,000 has been provided in the Second Five Year Plan for the development of her industries. There, 14,30,000 people are dependent upon industries for their livelihood. Out of this figure, 9,26,000 are dependent upon cottage industries. Hence, from the provision made for these people depending upon cottage industries, it can be quite easily seen that about Rs. 28 will be spent per *capita* in this State of Orissa. I leave it to the House to judge for itself what progress each man depending on cottage industries can make on this meagre provision of Rs. 28 per head. It is my view that the Head of the State would have done well when outlining his policy for the people of India to have directed that this salutary provision of/should be

"दरिद्रान् भर कौन्तेय मा यच्छ चेश्वरे धनम्"

^-followed in our planning whether it pertains to the First Five Year Plan or the Second Five Year Plan. This finishes off my first amendment.

My second amendment is concerned with paragraph 21 of the President's Address in which it is said, "During the past year, the reorganisation of the States was completed, and this great task which had unfortunately roused much passion in some parts of the country, was accomplished." This mention of the fact that this had unfortunately roused much passion in some parts of the country would have been much improved if some attempt had been made by the Head of the State to analyse the reasons for the passions which had been roused in some parts of the country when this great task was accomplished. As this had not been done, I have put in my second amendment that at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely: "but regret that there is no indication of any positive steps to allay the roused passions in some parts of the country as a result of the re-organisation of States." Now, Sir, I do not profess to speak about other parts of India. There were roused passions in other parts of India as well and there was much dissatisfaction in other parts of India as well regarding this matter; but I shall confine my remarks to my own State, namely Orissa, where also there was much dissatisfaction and much roused passions when what we considered, what the Oriyas considered, as Orissa's legi-timate demand, namely, the incorporation of Seraikella, Kharsawan and Singbhum in Orissa State, was not granted by the Reorganisation Commission, nor was it considered afterwards by the Indian Government. I do not wish to speak on the ethics of this matter but what I do wish to say is that once these passions were roused and they came to the notice of the authorities, steps should have been taken in order to see what lay at the root of these roused passions, what was the history of the whole movement which created such dissatisfaction. If that is not done, no proper remedy for those roused pas-sions can be devised. Hence, in order to understand this whole question, this, whole problem in its proper context, one must understand why such an attitude suddenly arose in Orissa, why the people got so dissatisfied and so excited that they were willing to commit violence, that they were willing to sacrifice themselves, if necessary, for a cause about which they felt very keenly. When we consider the whole question in its true perspective and when we

[Shri P. C. Bhanj Deo]

look into history, it is quite patent that the hope for getting back Serai-kella, Kharsawan and Singbhum into Orissa was excited in the people, nurtured in the people, by the Government itself, by the Congress Government in Orissa itself. Repeatedly in its statements and in its publications in the papers, it had held out this hope to the Oriya people that Seraikella, Kharsawan and Singbhum which were fart of Orissa once will be brought back to Orissa again if the claims could be properly put forward before the Reorganisation Commission, so much so that when the Commission rejected the whole Plan, the Congress paper, "Samaj" came out with an article headed, "Shabash, Orissa Congress" because the Ministers of Orissa were going to Delhi with their resignation papers as a protest against this injustice which they considered was perpetrated against the Oriya people. Now, in such circumstances, I would ask the House through you, Sir, to consider whether the people had genuine grounds for excitement when Hheir artificially nurtured hopes were disappointed for ever. The behaviour of the Central Ministers did not help in appeasing these roused passions. When the members of the Utkal Sammelan came to interview Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru here, they were not granted the dignity of an interview even. They were turned away from Delhi. When the Ministers came with theii resignation letters, the head of the Congress, Mr. Dhebar, told them that they were not responsible to the electorate in Orissa; they were responsible for their position to the High Command here. Now, this sort of insult to the electorate, to the people of Orissa naturally had a very very damaging effect on their psychology. After all, we are saying that we are living in the age of democracy; all of us, whether we belong to the opposition or we belong ' to the ruling party—are al! frying *to* educate the people to consider themselves to be the rulers of this, country. We are trying to teach them that they must be the final arbiters of their destiny by learning to judge issues rightly and independently. So, if in such circumstances, when the very Government that they have elected creates certain hopes and aspirations in them and then those aspirations are crushed rudely and thrown down in almost unbecoming manner, it is not strange that those people should behave in a manner which is not befitting.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: May I remind my hon. friend through you, Sir, that the States Re-organisatiOn Bill has already been passed by this sovereign Parliament and there is no opportunity now for anybody in this House to reopen this question of States reorganisation?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI R. P. TAMTA) : He can refer to it.

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: It is men tioned in the President's Address. I am trying to give the House a pic ture as to why the passions were roused in Orissa. 'Roused passions' are mentioned in the President's Address. I am moving an amendment to that statement and to make that amendment acceptable I. must first present a picture to the House so that it may judge correctly .....

SHRI "VI. K. DHAGE: Orissa did not picture in the reorganisation

SHRI P. C. BHANJ DEO: So, you see this state of affairs naturally roused the passions of the people, which were further roused by the firings which took place in Cuttack before the Radio building on a large band of people, who were demonstrating quite peacefully and quita constitutionally. Firing took place in Puri; firing was resorted to in Sambalpur, and when these things took place the passions of the people were naturally roused. Now my friends on the other side may say 'you are exaggerating the whole question. It may be said that these demonstrations were not peaceful If that

statement is made by people on the other side of the House I can only quote the words of the wife of the Chief Minister of Orissa, Mrs. Maiati Chowdhury, who called the firings tragic and brainless. Now these police firings naturally excited the passions of the people and there were certain highhanded acts which they committed, for which they were not responsible really, because under excited conditions we do many things which we regret afterwards. But that is no reason why their representatives should be turned away rudely from Delhi or the genuine grievances which the Ministers brought to Delhi should not be given a peaceful hearing. If that had been done, in my opinion all this storm would have subsided in the tea cup. The mover of this Motion has said that it is not the policy of the Congress to deal out hatred for hatred but to subdue hatred by love. *(Time bell rings.)*

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Now, if this policy had been followed as far as Orissa was concerned at that time, all those complications would not have arisen, and the need for the mention of 'much passion in some parts of the country' as far as Orissa was concerned would have been a closed chapter.

My third amendment, Sir, has to ■deal with Goa. Two speakers previous to me have spoken about Goa and so I do not propose to say very much about it. I know that an opportunity will be given to this House for a debate on foreign affairs afterwards, but my point in bringing up the question of Goa in my amendment is because I do not consider Goa to be foreign territory. In the first Address delivered by the President when the first Parliament opened he had said in paragraph 7 thereof: "My Government has not sought to interfere with other countries just as it does not invite any interference from others in our own country." Since then the Prime Minister has repeatedly announced that Goa is an integral part of India. If Goa is an integral part of India, as he says, then Goa should be treated as any other integral part of India is treated, and Goa should be treated on the same footing as if an act of aggression, an act of occupation, had been committed in any other integral part of India. I had previously made my remarks on this matter and said that if we can take police action in Hyderabad and if we can bring about the integration of our former Indian States through rightful force, why do we hesitate about Goa? Why should we talk of love and hatred when Goa comes into the picture? We should act in a practical manner .and if we detest bloodshed, if we do not want to take police action, why have we opposed the other method of satya-graha in this case? What positive steps are the Government taking in the diplomatic or other fields in order, to bring about a speedy solution to the crying question of Goa, where our people are repeatedly humiliated and tortured and India is repeatedly insulted in her own territory?

Then *my* fourth and last amendment reads: "but regret to note that no specific indications are given for the fulfilment of the hope that considerable external finance will be forthcoming from friendly countries for the implementation of India's second Five Year Plan." Regarding this matter I would like to say that I am in full agreement with the statement of the speaker on the other side of the Houa* who said that for our salvation we must be dependent on our own resources. We must learn to stand on our own legs. If we hope that friendly powers from abroad are going to be kind to us and are going to help us, we shall never achieve our goal in industrial development in the country and we shall never command the respect of outsiders as we have every right to do. For one thing, there is no clear and specific indication as to the amount we are likely to get from outside and no indication as to what friendly powers we are going *to* approach in order to get sufficient finances to carry through our indus-

[Shri P. C. Bhanj Deo.] trial programme. But if the record of foreign finance in this country has any bearing on our experience, has any bearing on our lives, I would say that the hope that we are going to benefit from foreign sources, from friendly powers, is a very distant hope. On the whole, if {one analyses the amount of foreign help we have been able to receive from the much advertised American aid, we find that we have been only able to secure about Rs. 350 crores. What fraction is this sum of the entire amount of Rs. 2,200 crores which our first Five Year Plan cost us? In the coming Five Year Plan the most we can expect from the so-called friendly powers from outside will be about Rs. 500 crores and this, as the House knows well, would not fill up even \half the gap of foreign exchange that we need today.

Some mention has been made in the President's Address of the World Bank helping to finance our industrial projects. Unfortunately, that record has not been a good one either. So far whatever help we have been able to receive from the World Bank has come to us late and like justice which if delayed is justice denied, finance also which does not arrive in time is utterly useless. Not only that; if I am not mistaken, if my memory does not fail me, the recent experience our Finance Minister has had in his negotiations with the Chairman of the World Bank, Mr. Eugene Black, has not been very favourable to the interests of this country. It seems quite plain to me that this satellite institution to the Anglo-American powers is only willing to help us on certain conditions. Why should we submit to any conditions? To submit to conditions means economic domination by those powers over us, over our internal affairs. Hence it is my considered view that the whole notkm of dependence on foreign finance should be erased from our financial aspirations, from our financial programme, and we must be solely dependent on our own resources even if we fail to achieve as efficiently as we may have done, had we been able to get the necessary finances from outside without conditions. With these words, Sir, I end my speech and pray to the House, through you, to accept my amendments to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर उनको बधाई देने का जो प्रस्ताव तंबू साहब ने उपस्थित किया और जिसका समर्थन, ऐसी योग्यता के साथ, मेरे मित्र श्री हुमायूं कबीर जी ने किया है, मैं भी उसी प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूं। मैंने बड़े ध्यान से किरन चन्द जी के संशोधनों को पढ़ा और उसी ध्यान से जो अन्य दूसरे संशोधन इस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में छपे हैं, उनका भी अध्ययन किया। मैं इस परिणाम पर पहुंचा हूं कि इन संशोधनों में जो भावना अभिव्यक्त की गई है उसका अपने स्थान पर मूल्य है—इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि जो कामनायें इन मित्रों के संशोधनों में निहित हैं उनका अपना स्थान है। किन्तु राष्ट्रपति का भाषण, जिसमें मुख्य मुख्य प्रश्नों का उल्लेख है, वह हमारी उन सारी समस्याओं को हमारे सामने रख देता है, जिनका सामना हमको करना है और उससे वे सारी परिस्थितियां सामने आ जाती हैं, जिन परिस्थितियों से हो कर इस देश को, इस राष्ट्र को और इस सरकार को गुजरना है। तो बिना कई मत बनाये हुये, एक ही मत से, एक ही भावना से, हम एक पूरे राष्ट्र के रूप में उन समस्याओं का सामना कर सकते हैं।

श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने जिन प्रश्नों को अपने भाषण के आरम्भ में ही इस भवन के सामने उपस्थित किया, उनसे मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ कि उनके सामने यह जो अभी चुनाव हो रहे हैं, जिनके परिणाम घोषित हो रहे हैं, उन्हीं पर उन्होंने अपने ध्यान को केन्द्रित किया और उनमें होने वाली त्रुटियों की ओर उनका ध्यान गया। जिस निष्पक्ष भाव से इस

देश की सरकार ने प्रजातंत्र प्रणाली का स्वागत और सम्मान किया है उसका इससे बड़ा प्रमाण और कोई नहीं हो सकता कि जहां कई राज्यों में जो शासन सत्तारूढ़ दल है उसको बहुमत प्राप्त हो गया है, एकांगी बहुमत प्राप्त हो गया है, जिसके आधार पर वहां के सत्ताधारी दल के लोग फिर सत्तारूढ़ हो जायेंगे; वहां दूसरे ऐसे भी राज्य हैं जहां पर सत्ताधारी दल को काफी पराजय का भी सामना करना पड़ा है । कितनी ही दफा कहा जाता था कि बैलट बाक्स के साथ मजाक होता है, बैलट बाक्स तोड़ दिया जाता है, पर्चियां गड़बड़ कर दी जाती हैं । यदि ऐसी बातें होतीं तो जो चुनाव परिणाम रोज रोज घोषित हो रहे हैं, आल इंडिया रेडियो से जिसको हम रोज सुनते हैं, आज चुनाव हुआ और उसका परिणाम तीसरे दिन बाद घोषित हो गया और इन चुनाव फलों का परिणाम और उसका प्रभाव दूसरे आने वाले चुनावों पर पड़ना स्वाभाविक था, उस खतरे को भी उठा कर सत्तारूढ़ दल और उसकी सरकार ने इस बात का प्रयत्न नहीं किया कि सारे चुनाव के परिणाम एक साथ घोषित किये जायें ।

क्या यह इस बात का प्रमाण स्पष्ट नहीं है कि सत्ताधारी दल यह चाहता है कि जनता का जो मत है वह बिलकुल शुद्ध रूप से, स्वाभाविक रूप से, अभिव्यक्त हो और उसके अनुसार जो शासन प्रणाली चल सकती है वह चले । आज ट्रावनकोर कोचीन से जो परिणाम आये हैं, उनसे एक चित्र बनता है । उड़ीसा में एक दूसरा चित्र बनता है । कई राज्यों में इस प्रकार की बातें देखने में आती हैं । तो अखबारों का चित्र दिखाने से काम नहीं बनता ।

चन्दे की रसीदों की प्रतिलिपि छाप करके मेरे मित्र ने दिखलाई । चन्दा लेना और रसीद देना कोई बड़ा भारी पाप नहीं है । हर चुनाव में कुछ खर्च होते हैं और जो पीपुल्स रेप्रिजेंटेशन ऐक्ट है उसमें एक सीमा निर्धारित है कि इस हद तक विधान सभाओं के सदस्य खर्च कर सकते हैं और इस हद तक संसद के सदस्य खर्च कर सकते हैं । इस प्रकार एक सीमा तक खर्चा करने का अधिकार दिया गया है । जितने भी राजनैतिक दल हैं सभी चन्दा करते हैं । मैंने अपने कम्युनिस्ट मित्रों को अपने जिले के बाजारों में मामूली तौर पर चन्दा करते देखा है । वे वहां पर लोगों से चुनाव के लिये पैसा मांगते हैं । पैसा थोड़ा मिलता है और संभव है कि उतने ही पैसे से चुनाव का काम चल जाता हो । लेकिन अगर उतने ही से काम नहीं चलता, गाड़ियां करनी पड़ती हैं, लाउड स्पीकर लगाने पड़ते हैं, इश्तिहार छापने पड़ते हैं, तो इसमें जो पैसे खर्च हो जाते हैं, उन पैसों के आने का कोई साधन होना चाहिये । हम नहीं जानते कि वह पैसा कहां से आता है । अगर उसकी रसीद हमारे मित्र नहीं देते हैं तो वे जानें । लेकिन हमारे दल के लोग अगर चन्दा लेते हैं और उसकी रसीद देते हैं, तो इसमें न कोई अन्धेर है और न कोई अन्याय की बात है । यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि इस प्रश्न को यहां ला कर इतनी देर तक क्यों रगड़ा गया ।

चुनाव बिलकुल निष्पक्ष ढंग से हुये हैं । उनके परिणामों से प्रकट है कि किसी प्रकार की कोई धांधली न की गई है और न हो रही है और न कभी ऐसी धांधली करने का इरादा है । अगर सत्ताधारी लोग शासन में आरूढ़ रहना चाहें तो चुनाव बीसियों कारणों से टाले जा सकते हैं । रिआर्गेनाइजेशन के सम्बन्ध में इतने उपद्रव हुये और वही एक कारण हो सकता था । विश्व शान्ति के मामले में इतने खतरे थे, ऐसी संदिग्ध स्थिति थी, ऐसा वातावरण था कि चुनाव टाले जा सकते थे, लेकिन चुनाव टाले नहीं गये । कुछ लोग समझते थे कि चुनाव किसी न किसी बहाने से टाल दिये जायेंगे । लेकिन चुनाव हुये और ऐसे निष्पक्ष ढंग से चुनाव हुये

[पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री]

कि अगर उनके परिणामों पर ईमानदारी से ध्यान दिया जाये तो कोई आदमी यह नहीं कह सकता है कि इन चुनावों में किसी प्रकार की गड़बड़ी होने की आशंका हुई है। जहां कहीं थोड़ी सी बात हो गई, वहां रीपोल का आर्डर दिया गया। कितनी ही जगह में अपने स्टेट के बारे में जानता हूं, अपने जिले के बारे में जानता हूं, जहां थोड़ी सी बात पर रीपोल का आर्डर दिया गया। मेरे जिला आजमगढ़ में माहुल के द्विसदस्यीय निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में पड़े हुये वोटों की गिनती हो गई थी, परिणाम घोषित हो रहा था और बैलेट बाक्सेज में पर्चियां गिन कर फिर उठा कर रखी जा रही थीं, तभी एकाएक ओले पड़े, आंधी आई और वह शामियाना, जिसके नीचे यह सारा काम हो रहा था, गिर गया। लोगों ने ऐतराज उठाया कि साहब, पर्चियां इधर की उधर रख दी गई हैं, हमको इस पर विश्वास नहीं है। अन्त में १६ पोलिंग स्टेशनों का रीपोल हुआ और उस रीपोल का परिणाम भी वही हुआ जो पहले घोषित हो रहा था। इस प्रकार जहां जरा भी सन्देह हुआ है, वहां एलेक्शन कमीशन ने इस तरह के आदेश दिये हैं और उन आदेशों का पालन हुआ है। किसी प्रकार से सत्ताधारी दल ने कोई गड़बड़ी की हो, इसका कोई सबूत नहीं मिलता। लेकिन वही कहानी गाई जाती है और उन लोगों की ओर से गाई जाती है जो लोग इस प्रकार के प्रजातन्त्रीय निर्वाचन में न विश्वास रखते हैं और न जिन देशों के वे कायल हैं, वहां इस तरह के निर्वाचन होते हैं। हमारे ये मित्र जिन राष्ट्रों के बड़े कायल हैं, उन राष्ट्रों के लोग पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के पंचशील में विश्वास रखते हैं और पंचशील के आधार पर उन राष्ट्रों के साथ हमारे वैदेशिक सम्बन्धों की स्थापना हो गई है। हमारा देश इसी प्रणाली में और इसी सिद्धान्त में विश्वास करता है और शान्ति के आधार पर आपसी समझौते से समस्याओं का समाधान चाहता है। जब इस तरह की बात है, तो जो लोग उन राष्ट्रों में विश्वास रखते हैं, जहां हमारे पंचशील के सिद्धान्त की मान्यता है, वे किस तरह यहां विरोध करते हैं, वे कैसे पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के दल के माने हुये सिद्धान्तों का विरोध करते हैं और लड़ाई करते हैं। यह देख कर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है।

इन चुनावों के सम्बन्ध में हमारे मित्र जयप्रकाश नारायण जी ने पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी से अपने पब्लिक भाषणों में यह अपील की कि जवाहरलाल जी बहुत बड़े आदमी हैं, बहुत बड़े नेता हैं, उनको चाहिये कि विरोधी दल को बल दें। विरोधी दल के लिये बल मांगने की बात उन्होंने कही। अखबारों में यह निकला। संभव है कि उन्होंने ऐसा न कहा हो, लेकिन कोई कांट्रेडिक्शन नहीं हुआ। इसका मेरे मन पर जो असर हुआ वह यह है कि वे यह समझते हैं कि विरोधी दल प्रजातन्त्र शासन प्रणाली का एक आवश्यक अंग है और शासन तभी ठीक चल सकता है, जब विरोधी दल मजबूत हो। शायद इसी आधार पर रूस और चीन पंचशील के अनुयायी हैं, यूगोस्लाविया पंचशील का अनुयायी है और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के साथ हाथ में हाथ मिला कर चलना चाहता है और उनकी नीति का समर्थन करता है। फिर भी ऐसे राष्ट्रों में और उनकी प्रणालियों में विश्वास रखने वाले लोग यहां विरोध करते हैं। कदाचित उनका खयाल है कि विरोधी दल प्रजातन्त्र में होना चाहिये और इसी आधार पर जयप्रकाश नारायण जी ने शायद यह अपील की हो। मैं समझता हूं कि राष्ट्र के जिस निर्माण की बात इस अभिभाषण में है, इस देश को अपने पैर पर खड़े होने वाला एक सम्पन्न राष्ट्र बनाने की जो मांग इस अभिभाषण में पाई जाती है, अगर उसकी तरफ ध्यान दिया जाय, तो जैसा मेरे मित्र विजय सिंह जी ने कहा, हमको मिल कर सामूहिक रूप से इस देश को सम्पन्न, श्रीसम्पन्न, शक्तिशाली और वैभवशाली बनाना होगा। अगर ऐसा

करना है, तो विरोधी दल उतना आवश्यक नहीं है कि जितना भारत के इस नये राष्ट्र को उन्नतिशील बना कर, इससे जलने वाले दूसरे राष्ट्रों को उनकी कुचाल में सफलता प्राप्त न होने देने के लिये यहां के राष्ट्रीय नेता का साथ देना आवश्यक है ।

हमने काश्मीर का एक नन्हा सा प्रश्न देखा । जब यहां की विदेशी सत्ता ने अपना शासन हमको सौंप दिया, वे यहां से रवाना हुये, देश का विभाजन हुआ, यहां के देशी रजवाड़ों को यह अधिकार मिल गया कि वे जहां चाहे जायें, जो चाहें करें, उनकी नकेल कट गई, उनका बन्धन कट गया और वे इसके लिये स्वतन्त्र हो गये कि जिधर चाहें जायें । ऐसी स्थिति पैदा होने में पाकिस्तान की निगाह काश्मीर की खूबसूरत वैली की ओर चली गई और आक्रमणकारियों ने जब काश्मीर पर कब्जा करना चाहा, तब उनको इस कुचाल से रोकने के लिये इस प्रश्न को ले कर हम सीक्योरिटी कौंसिल में प्रविष्ट हुये थे ।

अलबत्ता बात यह थी, जैसा कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने अपने कितने ही भाषणों में और प्रेस विज्ञप्तियों में कहा है कि केवल राजा ने अपने को, काश्मीर को, हिन्दुस्तान के साथ मिलाने की घोषणा कर दी है परन्तु हम इतने से ही सन्तुष्ट नहीं हैं, हम प्रजा की भावना का आदर करने वाले हैं और अगर काश्मीर की प्रजा चाहेगी, तो उसको इस बात में निर्णय करने का अधिकार होगा ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue your speech tomorrow. Mr. Shah

THE BUDGET (GENERAL), 1957-53

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (SHRI M. C. SHAH) : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government. of India for the year 1957-58.

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

I. THE SEA CUSTOMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957.

II. THE FOREIGNERS LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957.

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following Messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

I

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1957, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 19th March, 1957."

II

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Foreigners Laws (Amendment) Bill,. 1957 as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 19th March, 1957."

I lay these Bills on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty-two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 20th March 1957!