

here at least by the end of April or in May.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Oversight.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I cannot at the moment assign the reason but I shall look into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That in pursuance of sub-rule (6) of rule 2 of the Rules of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research read with sub-rule (6) of rule 6 thereof, this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among themselves to be a member of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research *vice* Shri K. S. Hegde, who retired from the membership of the Council of States on the 2nd April, 1954, and ceased to be a member of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research with effect from that date."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR HEALTH (SHRIMATI M. CHANDRA-SEKHAR): Sir, I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of clause (g) of sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Act, 1955, this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among themselves to be a member of the Delhi Development Provisional Authority."

12 NOON.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That in pursuance of clause (g) of sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Act, 1955, this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one member from among themselves to be a member of the Delhi Development Provisional Authority."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform hon. Members that Friday, the 24th

February, 1956, has been fixed as the last date for receiving nominations and Monday, the 27th February, 1956, for holding elections, if necessary, to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and the Delhi Development Provisional Authority.

The nominations will be received in the Rajya Sabha Notice Office up to 3 P.M. on the 24th. The elections, which will be conducted in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, will, if necessary, be held in Secretary's room (Room No. 29) Ground Floor, Parliament House, between the hours of 3 P.M. and 5 P.M. on the 27th.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

श्री इन्द्र बिद्याबाबस्यति (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
सभापति महोदय, मैं यह प्रस्ताव राज्य सभा की स्वीकृति के लिये उपस्थित करता हूँ कि :

"इस सत्र में एकत्रित राज्य सभा के सदस्य उस अभिभाषण के लिये राष्ट्रपति के अत्यन्त अनुगृहीत हैं जिसे उन्होंने १५ फरवरी, १९५६ के दिन दोनों सदनों के सम्मिलित अधिवेशन में देने की कृपा की है।"

†["That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 15th February, 1956."]

सभापति महोदय, मेरा यह कार्य आसान भी है और मधुर भी है। हमारे राष्ट्रपति हमारे संविधान के अनुसार देश के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों द्वारा निर्वाचित हैं। वे देश के सबसे बड़े नागरिक हैं और एक तरह से हमारा संविधान यह समझता है कि वे पार्टियों के भेदों से और बहुत सी ऐसी चीजों से, जो मतभेद पैदा करने वाली हैं

†English translation.

बहुत ऊंचे हैं। उनके इस अभिभाषण के लिये धन्यवाद देना वस्तुतः एक हर्ष की बात है।

राष्ट्रपति हमारे देश के प्रहरी हैं, ऊंची मीनार पर बैठ कर देखते हैं कि उन की सरकार क्या करती है, देश के निवासी क्या करते हैं। वे साल भर यह सब देखते हैं और अगले नये साल के प्रारम्भ में हमें आकर बतलाते हैं कि उन्होंने साल भर में क्या देखा, क्या सम्मति बनाई, और यह कि आगे हमें क्या करना है। हम यह समझते हैं कि पक्षपातहीन दृष्टि से सब कुछ देखते हुए जब वे आ कर हमें बहुत सी बातें बतलायें, हमारा रास्ता बतलायें तब हमें उन के भाषण को ध्यान से सुनना चाहिये और ध्यान से पढ़ना चाहिये।

पिछले साल इसी समय राष्ट्रपति के भाषण पर बहस के अवसर पर एक सज्जन ने यह कहा था, और प्रायः यह बात कही जाती है, कि यह तो एक रिवाजी भाषण है, इस रिवाजी भाषण को कराना, सुनना और उस पर तीन दिन व्यय करना, ये सब व्यर्थ है। कुछ लोगों की ऐसी राय बन जाती है। परन्तु मैं यह समझता हूँ कि वह राय इसलिये बन जाती है कि क्योंकि हम उस छपे हुए भाषण को न तो बहुत ध्यान से सुनते हैं और न बहुत ध्यान से पढ़ते हैं। यह भी कहा जाता है कि वही पिटी पिटाई बातें हर साल आकर कह दी जाती हैं। ऐसा नहीं है अगर हम ध्यान से पढ़ें तो हमें मालूम होता है कि साल भर में जो भी प्रगति हमने की है, या विश्व ने जो प्रगति की है वह उसमें चित्रित होती है, अंकित होती है। यह मालूम होता है कि वह किसी पुरानी किताब का पन्ना है। मगर ऐसा भी नहीं है। यह हो सकता है कि स्याही पुरानी हो लेकिन पन्ना दूसरा है, उस में जो रंग भरे हैं वे दूसरे हैं। हाँ, रूपरेखा एक हो सकती है। मैं आप को थोड़े से शब्दों में यह बतलाऊंगा कि वस्तुतः यह जो भाषण हमारे सामने दिया गया, वह

हमारे देश की आवश्यकताओं को सूचित करता है, हमारे देश की परिस्थिति का पूरा चित्र है।

हम राष्ट्रपति के भाषण से दो लाभ देख सकते हैं। पहला यह कि उन्होंने हमारे सामने देश का ठीक ठीक चित्र पेश करके और संसार का ठीक ठीक चित्र पेश करके हमें यह बतलाया कि पिछले साल हमने क्या किया, अगले साल हम क्या करेंगे। दूसरा एक लाभ और है कि उस से हम को अवसर मिलता है कि अपनी सम्मति सरकार के कामों पर दें, यह एक अवसर रखा गया है कि इस पर हम अपनी सम्मति सरकार के कामों पर, जो पीछे हुए हैं या आगे होंगे, उन पर दें। दोनों काम ऐसे हैं कि जो देश के लिये आवश्यक हैं। साल के आरम्भ में हमें एक बार अपने लेखे जोखे को, जिसे स्टॉक टेकिंग कहते हैं, देखना चाहिये। इसलिये राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण आवश्यक है। फिर, हम को उन बातों पर कहने का अवसर भी मिलना चाहिये, इसलिये भी आवश्यक है।

महोदय, जब मैं आप के सामने कुछ शब्द कह रहा हूँ तो सदस्यों से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप इन दोनों चीजों को अलग अलग कर दीजिये, इन दोनों चीजों को मिलाइये नहीं। मिलाने से क्या होता है? जब आप सोचते हैं कि मुझे इस साल कुछ कहना है तो आप राष्ट्रपति के भाषण को छोड़ देते हैं, उस को बाइपास कर जाते हैं और आगे चले जाते हैं और जो कुछ भी कहना होता है कह देते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ वह भी कहिये, लेकिन इस बात को देखिये कि राष्ट्रपति ने जो परिस्थिति हमारे सामने रखी है वह ठीक रखी है या नहीं। मैं पहले आप को यह बताऊंगा कि क्या राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में जो आशा हम रखते हैं उस को उन्होंने पूरा किया है और जो चीज उन को कहनी थी वह कह दी है? राष्ट्रपति के भाषण को चार हिस्सों में बांट दीजिये,

[श्री इन्द्र बिद्यावाचस्पति]

वे चारों हिस्से हमारे काम के हैं। पहली चीज यह है कि हमारे राष्ट्र का, हमारे राज्य का ध्येय क्या है, लक्ष्य क्या है, हमें क्या करना है। दूसरे, उस लक्ष्य को पूरा करने के लिये हम कौन से उपाय काम में लायेंगे और हम ने कौन से उपाय ग्रहण किये हैं। तीसरे यह कि पिछला साल हमारा कैसा बीता, हम अपने लक्ष्य को तरफ आगे बढ़ने में कुछ सफल हुए या नहीं, हम ने कदम आगे रखा है या पीछे रखा। चौथी चीज यह है कि अब आगे अपने लक्ष्य में जाने के लिये हमें क्या करना है। ये चार चीजें हैं जिन की कमिटी पर आप राष्ट्रपति के भाषण को कमिये। अगर आप देखते हैं कि ये चारों चीजें जिन्होंने अपने भाषण में बतला दी तो हम उन को धन्यवाद देंगे, हम उन को बधाई देंगे कि उन्होंने इतने हमारे ऊपर उपकार किये हैं और हमारी दृष्टि के सामने सब चीजें रखीं।

पहली चीज मैंने यह कही कि हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि राष्ट्रपति ने हमारा लक्ष्य हमें याद दिलाया या नहीं, उन्होंने साल के शुरू में बताया कि तुम्हें करना क्या है और किस तरह से करना है, किन उपायों से करना है। राष्ट्रपति के भाषण को अगर आप देखें तो उन्होंने बड़े सरल और बड़े स्पष्ट शब्दों में हमारे सामने दोनों चीजें इन तीन पंक्तियों में रख दी हैं। हमारा ध्येय इस देश में समाजवाद के नमूने पर समाज की सुव्यवस्था करना है और विशेष रूप से उत्पादन को इस प्रकार बढ़ाना है कि जिस से देश शीघ्र से शीघ्र समुन्नत हो सके। हमारा ध्येय, अन्तिम लक्ष्य क्या है? वह है देश की समुन्नति हो, मगर देश समुन्नत हो जाय। उस को हमारे संविधान में लोक कल्याण के नाम से कहा गया है। हमारे राज्य का उद्देश्य है देश की उन्नति और देश की उन्नति का अभिप्राय है, लोक-कल्याण। एक एक नागरिक जो यहां का

रहने वाला है उस का कल्याण, सब का बराबर बराबर कल्याण, यह हमारा लक्ष्य है। अब उस को पूरा करने के लिये हम क्या उपाय करते हैं? हम समाजवादी ढंग की संगठन बनाना चाहते हैं, हम अपने समाज की स्थापना समाजवादी ढंग पर करना चाहते हैं। आज यह कोई संदिग्ध बात नहीं है बल्कि कांग्रेस ने और उस के बाद फिर सारे राष्ट्र ने इस को संविधान द्वारा स्वीकार किया और सारा देश इस को स्वीकार करता है।

सभापति महोदय, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मदन में ऐसा कोई भी माननीय सदस्य न होगा, जो इस बात से सहमत न हो कि हमारा नारा यह है, हमारा लक्ष्य यह है कि समाजवादी ढंग पर हमारे यहां एक समाज कायम हो। हम में और बातों में आपस में मतभेद हो सकते हैं मगर इस विषय में किसी प्रकार को मतभेद नहीं है। इसलिये हम यह समझते हैं कि यह एक अच्छा और सर्व-सम्मन उपाय है जिस को हम ने स्वीकार कर लिया है और जिस का निर्देश राष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण में कर दिया है।

राष्ट्रपति के इन शब्दों "समाजवादी नमूने पर समाज का निर्माण" के सम्बन्ध में कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि "नमूने" के रखने की क्या जरूरत है, उस के स्थान पर यह कहना चाहिये कि समाजवादी समाज होगा। सोशलिस्टिक क्यों कहते हो, सोशलिस्टिक पैटर्न क्यों कहते हो, यह कहिये सोशलिस्ट स्टेट। राष्ट्रपति के शब्दों के कहने का मैं यह अभिप्राय समझता हूँ कि समाजवाद शास्त्रीय सिद्धान्त है जिस का प्रयोग विभिन्न देशों में भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार से होता है। एक समाजवादी ढंग का राज्य फ्रांस में भी स्वीकार किया गया है। इंग्लैंड ने भी एक समाजवादी ढंग का सिद्धान्त अपनाया है जिस का रूप भिन्न है। हर एक देश अपने ढंग पर समाजवाद मानता है और वह अपनी परिस्थितियों के अनुसार मानता है। हम कहते

है कि यह ठीक है, लेकिन हम समाजवाद की व्याख्या अपनी परिस्थिति के अनुसार करते हैं। समाजवादी ढंग का हमारा समाज होगा। उसूल वही है, लेकिन उस का प्रयोग हम अपने देश के अनुसार जैसा चाहेंगे, करेंगे। हम से कोई यह नहीं कह सकता कि तुम ने समाजवाद क्यों ऐसा बनाया। हम देश की परिस्थिति के अनुसार समाजवादी नमूने पर समाज का निर्माण करेंगे। इन शब्दों का बड़ा महत्व है क्योंकि इस से हमारे हाथ पांव खुले रहते हैं। हम ने अपने देश की जो गृह नीति बनाई है वह यह है कि हम देश के समाज का निर्माण समाजवादी नमूने पर करेंगे। लेकिन एक हिस्सा और है और वह विदेश सम्बन्धी नीति का है। हमारी विदेश सम्बन्धी नीति क्या है? सब जानते हैं कि वह नीति क्या है। उस का नाम आप सहनिवाम की नीति कहिये, शान्ति की नीति कहिये, विश्व के साथ मित्रता की नीति कहिये या कुछ कहिये, किन्तु यह स्पष्ट है कि वह हमारे देश की परम्परागत नीति है। आज अगर दुनिया ने उस को आश्चर्य में सुना है, तो हमारे लिये कोई नई बात नहीं है। संसार ने अब तक उधर ध्यान नहीं दिया था। हमारी प्राचीन, संस्कृति के, प्राचीनतम ग्रंथ वेद में कहा है :

“मित्रस्य चक्षुषा समीक्षामहे”

हम दुनिया को मित्र की दृष्टि से देखें। महात्मा बुद्ध ने पंचशील का उपदेश दिया जिस का अभिप्राय यह था कि सब एक दूसरे को मित्र की दृष्टि से देखें। महात्मा गांधी ने उन सिद्धान्तों को फिर से जाग्रत कर यह बतलाया कि हमारा उद्देश्य है “शान्ति” और हमारा उपाय भी है ‘शान्ति’। केवल हमारा उद्देश्य ही शान्ति नहीं है, उपाय भी शान्ति है, इस में क्या भेद है? कई देश हैं जो अपने देश में शान्ति इसलिये चाहते हैं कि युद्ध की तैयारी करें। हम अपने देश में शान्ति इसलिये चाहते हैं कि हम शान्ति के पक्ष में हैं। इस में बहुत भेद है। जो देश

शान्ति का नाम ले ले कर युद्ध की तैयारियां करते हैं उन को हम शान्ति का आदर्श पक्षपाती नहीं कह सकते। भारतवर्ष शान्ति को अपना आदर्श मानता है और वह शान्ति के लिये शान्ति चाहता, उन्नति के लिये शान्ति चाहता है, लोक कल्याण के लिये शान्ति चाहता है। इसलिये हम ने यह रास्ता चुना है। इस विषय में मुझे बहुत कम कहना है और वह इसलिये नहीं कि विषय महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है। इस में तो हमारी जान है। अगर हमारे किले की दीवारें कमजोर हैं तो हम अन्दर बैठ कर क्या उन्नति कर सकते हैं। हमारी गृह नीति क्या ठीक चलेगी, अगर हमारी सीमाओं पर या आस पास लड़ाई हो। उन्नति के लिये विदेश सम्बन्धी नीति बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। यदि हम दुनिया से लड़ाई छेड़ते रहें, तो क्या हम शान्ति से बैठ सकते हैं। हमारे लिये विदेश सम्बन्धी नीति बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है। मैं यह कहूंगा कि विदेश संबंधी ठीक नीति का आसरा ले कर हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने पिछले सालों में जो देश के लिये कल्याण का काम किया और संसार के लिये कल्याण का काम किया वह इतिहास में अमर रहेगा और हमारे इतिहास में चिरस्थायी रहेगा। उस को कभी दुनिया भूल नहीं सकती। उस से हमारे देश का सिर ऊंचा हुआ है, हमारा मान बढ़ा है। हम एक दम उस जगह आ कर खड़े हो गये हैं जो हम बचपन में विद्यार्थी अवस्था में पढ़ा करते थे :

“एतद्देश प्रसूतस्य सकाशादग्र जन्मनः
स्वं स्वं चरित्रं शिक्षेरन् प्रथिव्यां सर्वं मानवाः॥”

देश का निमंत्रण था कि सब दुनिया के लोग आयें और यहां से शिक्षा ग्रहण करें। हम ने उन से कहा कि हमारे पास विश्व शान्ति की शिक्षा है। शान्ति ही हमारा उद्देश्य है और शान्ति ही हमारा उपाय है। हम यह नहीं मानते हैं कि लड़ाई से शान्ति हो सकती है। यह भारतवर्ष हमेशा सिखाता

[श्री इन्द्र विद्यावाचस्पति]

रहा है। आज भी हमें यह हर्ष है कि हमारे देश के निर्माता महात्मा गांधी ने और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने संसार के सामने यह स्पष्ट कर दिया है कि यदि हमारे पास कोई संदेश संसार को देने के लिये है तो वह यह है कि हम सब के मित्र बन कर रहना चाहते हैं, हम किसी से लड़ाई नहीं चाहते, हम संसार के सामने जो आदर्श रखते हैं वह मित्रता का है, विश्व शान्ति का है।

तीसरी चीज यह है कि हम पिछले साल क्या कर सके। इस विषय में मैं जानता हूँ कि मतभेद हो सकता है, लेकिन इस विषय में मतभेद नहीं हो सकता कि हम आगे चले हैं। मान लीजिये कि हम किसी जगह गाड़ी में बैठ कर जा रहे हैं तो हमें यह देखना है कि हम आगे जा रहे हैं या पीछे जा रहे हैं या खड़े हैं। अगर हम आगे जा रहे हैं तो इस में मतभेद हो सकता है कि गति को तेज करने का क्या उपाय है, लेकिन हम आगे जा रहे हैं और इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है। मैं राष्ट्रपति के बहुत ही सरल और थोड़े से शब्द सुनाऊंगा जिन में उन्होंने ने संक्षेप सब कुछ बता दिया है :

“प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना की अवधि अब समाप्त होने को है और मेरी सरकार दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना तैयार करने में व्यस्त रही है। पहली योजना की सफलता से लोगों में विश्वास की भावना का उदय हुआ है और उस के परिणामस्वरूप हमारे राष्ट्र की अर्थ व्यवस्था की उन्नति की नींव रखी जा चुकी है। पहली योजना के लक्ष्य से कई विषयों में हम आगे बढ़ गये हैं और राष्ट्रीय आय में १८ प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। औद्योगिक उत्पत्ति में ४३ प्रतिशत की और कृषि द्वारा उत्पादन में १५ प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। यह विशेष संतोष की बात है कि अन्न का उत्पादन २० प्रतिशत बढ़ गया है और यह जबकि

विध्वंसकारी बाढ़ ने उत्तर भारत और तूफान ने दक्षिण भारत में बड़ी बरबादी की। इन विपत्तियों के कारण क्षति की पूर्ति में सरकार ने और उस से भी अधिक लोगों ने जो काम किया, मैं उस की सराहना करता हूँ।”

इतने में राष्ट्रपति ने जो हम ने पिछले साल में किया उस का संक्षिप्त रूप दे दिया। यह संक्षिप्त रूप ऐसा है कि एक एक चीज हम कहें कि पानी का इन्तजाम किया, बाढ़ को रोका, बांध बनाये, ये सब चीजें ठीक हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने ने उस का परिणाम बताया है कि पंचवर्षीय योजना से हमारा देश आगे कदम रख रहा है और रखता रहा है। इस विषय में कौन सी गलतियां हुईं, कौन सी भूलें हुईं, इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत कुछ कहा जायगा और इस का अवसर देने के लिये ही यह भाषण है। लेकिन इस में सन्देह नहीं है कि हम ने आगे कदम बढ़ाया है। यह है हमारी गृह नीति के सम्बन्ध में। जहां तक हमारी विदेश नीति का सम्बन्ध है, उस के विषय में मैं ने पहले कह दिया कि वह आगे बढ़ी है। उस का प्रमाण यह है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री विदेशों में गये और वहां जा कर उन्होंने ने प्रेम सम्बन्ध की स्थापना की। बाहर के बड़े बड़े शासक हमारे यहां आये और उन्होंने आ कर हमारी नीति की प्रशंसा ही नहीं की बल्कि हमारी नीति में सहयोग भी दिया। यह हमारी विदेश सम्बन्धी नीति की सफलता का सब से मोटा प्रमाण है। इस पर और अधिक कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं।

इस के आगे यह बात आती है कि हम अगले साल क्या करेंगे। जैसी मोटी मोटी स्थूल बातें कह कर उन्होंने ने गत वर्ष की उन्नति को सूचित किया है, उसी प्रकार अपनी स्थूल योजनाओं को बता कर वे आगे भी बताते हैं कि हम क्या करेंगे। समाजवादी निर्माण में एक प्रश्न यह होता है कि क्या हम राष्ट्रीयकरण करेंगे अपने उद्योग धंधों

का या व्यवसायों का । इस के सम्बन्ध में अधिक नहीं इतना तो अवश्य है कि पिछले साल दो काम हुए हैं, जिन में से एक पूरा हो गया और एक अभी अधूरा है, और वे ये हैं कि जो इम्पीरियल बैंक था वह स्टेट बैंक बना लिया गया और इंड्योरेंस कम्पनियों, बीमा कम्पनियों, को सरकार ने अपने हाथ में ले लिया । इस को अधूरा मैंने इसलिये कहा कि अभी तक यह काम आज्ञा से हुआ है और अब यह कानून से हो जायगा । जहां तक समाजवादी सिद्धान्त का प्रश्न है, राष्ट्र ने इस को अपने हाथ में ले लिया है और इस प्रकार हम आगे बढ़े हैं और आगे बढ़ रहे हैं । इस में भी कहा जा सकता है कि अभी तक इतना ही हुआ है । यह तो हमेशा कहा जायगा । अगर हम अपना कोई भी आदर्श रख लें तो वह एक दम पूरा नहीं हो सकता । यह हमेशा कहा जा सकता है कि इतना भाग पूरा नहीं हुआ क्योंकि कुछ न कुछ हिस्सा शेष रहता ही है । इस मनुष्य जाति की प्रगति में, हमारे राष्ट्र की प्रगति में, वह दिन कभी नहीं आयेगा जबकि कोई खड़ा हो कर यह कह सके कि अब हमें आगे जाना ही नहीं है । हम हमेशा प्रगति करते जायेंगे और नये नये उपाय सोचते जायेंगे । बाधाएँ पैदा होंगी और कठिनाइयाँ सामने आयेंगी और हमें उन को हल करने के लिये उपाय भी सोचने होंगे । अतः हम में से जो महानुभाव बहुत अंधी होंगे वह हमेशा यही कहते रहेंगे कि हम ने काफ़ी नहीं किया है । यह ठीक भी है, क्योंकि अगर हम यह समझने लगे कि हम ने पूरा काम कर लिया है तो क्या आगे कुछ कर सकेंगे ?

जैसा कि मैं ने कहा, जहां तक कि गृह नीति का सम्बन्ध है हम उस में आगे बढ़ रहे हैं और बढ़ते रहेंगे । जहां तक विदेश नीति का सम्बन्ध है संसार के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध अच्छे होते रहे हैं और होते रहेंगे । आप ने राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में पढ़ा होगा कि

गृह नीति के सम्बन्ध में हमें अगले वर्ष क्या करना है । उन्होंने ने कहा है :

“सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के अधिक विस्तार पर, विशेष कर आधारभूत उद्योगों और मशीनों के निर्माण के उद्योग के विकास पर, अधिक जोर दिया गया है । हम ने तीन बड़े लोहे और इस्पात के कारखाने और भारी बिजली कलों के तैयार करने वाले कारखाने खोलने का निश्चय किया है । बड़े पैमाने पर देश के खनिज पदार्थों का पर्यवेक्षण किया जायगा जिस से कि देश में निहित साधनों को उपयोग में लाया जा सके । लोगों को अधिक रोजगार दिलाने और कई प्रकार का उपभोग का सामान पैदा करने की दृष्टि से उत्पादन की उन विधियों पर अधिक जोर दिया जायगा जिन में अधिक से अधिक हाथ खप सकें ।”

प्रायः पूछा जाता है कि बेरोजगारी को दूर करने के लिये आप क्या कर रहे हैं ? यह तो आप आशा नहीं रख सकते कि राष्ट्रपति अपने भाषण में सारी चीजों के लिये पूरे पूरे उपाय बता दें । तब तो वह भाषण न हो कर पूरा महाभारत हो जायगा । उन्होंने ने निर्देश दे दिया है कि हमारा ध्यान बेरोजगारी की तरफ है और उस काम को पूरा किया जायगा । बेरोजगारी कैसे दूर की जायगी ? उस के लिये हाथ करघे के काम को बढ़ायेंगे, गृह उद्योग के काम को बढ़ायेंगे और सामुदायिक योजनाएँ चलायेंगे । बांध बन रहे हैं और बनेंगे, इमारतें बनेंगी, शिक्षा का प्रचार होगा । जब यह सब काम होगा और लोगों में शिक्षा का प्रचार होगा तो उस में थोड़े बहुत अध्यापक और दूसरे लोग लगाये ही जायेंगे । द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना उन योजनाओं से भी पड़ी है जिन में कि काम करने वालों की अधिक आवश्यकता पड़ेगी । जितने अधिक लोग काम में लगेंगे उतनी ही कमी बेरोजगारी में आयेंगी ।

[श्री इन्द्र विद्यावाचस्पति]

प्रायः यह कहा जाता है कि सरकार की बड़ी बड़ी योजनायें व्यर्थ हो जाती हैं, सरकार का परिश्रम व्यर्थ ही जाता है, क्योंकि अखबारों में यह निकलता रहता है कि बेरोजगारी बढ़ रही है। किन की बेरोजगारी बढ़ रही है? शिक्षितों की बेरोजगारी बढ़ रही है। कहा जाता है कि आप उपाय करते हैं लेकिन शिक्षितों की बेरोजगारी बढ़ ही रही है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि बेरोजगारी नहीं है लेकिन शिक्षितों की बेरोजगारी का प्रश्न हमारे सामने क्यों आ रहा है उस का एक विशेष कारण है जिस की ओर हमें ध्यान देना चाहिये। कहा जाता है कि इम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंजों में जा कर देखिये कि किस रफ्तार से बेरोजगारी बढ़ रही है। इम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंजों में बेरोजगारों की लिस्ट के बढ़ने के दो कारण हैं। एक कारण यह है कि गांवों से भाग भाग कर लोग शहरों में आ रहे हैं और रोजगार की तलाश कर रहे हैं। ऐसा मैं अपने अनुभव से कहता हूं। मेरे बहुत से उत्तर प्रदेश के परिचित भाइयों के लड़के, जोकि पहले अपनी जमींदारी पर मुफ्त में बैठे खाते थे, और मौज उड़ाते थे, आज दिल्ली में आये हुए हैं और कहते हैं कि रोजगार तलाश कर दो। वे पड़े लिखे हैं, मैट्रिक पास हैं या बी० ए० पास हैं। ये लोग पहले रोजगार का नाम भी नहीं लेते थे। रोजगार गांवों में तो मिल नहीं सकता इसलिये वे शहरों में आते हैं और रोजगार तलाश करते हैं। जब वे लोगों से रोजगार तलाश करने को कहते हैं तो वे उन से यही कहते हैं कि हम कहां से तलाश करें। इम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में जाओ। वे जो कि पहले रोजगार नहीं करते थे, जमींदारी की मौज में पड़े रहते थे आज बेरोजगार हो गये हैं। ठीक ही है आप भी चाहते हैं कि वह कुछ काम करें और व्यर्थ में बैठे बैठे अन्न न खायें। तो जो पहले रोजगार नहीं करते थे वे भी रोजगार करने आये हैं और उन को भी काम मिल जायगा, धीरे धीरे

मिलता भी जा रहा है। दूसरा कारण लिस्ट बढ़ने का यह है कि पहले लोगों को मालूम नहीं था कि इम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में जाने से रोजगार मिलता है। लोग रोजगार को गलियों में तलाश करते फिरते थे। अब उन्हें यह मालूम हो गया है। ये दो कारण ऐसे हैं जिन की वजह से हम को इधर शिक्षितों की बेरोजगारी मालूम हुई है। कुछ है और कुछ ज्यादा मालूम भी हो रही है, किसी कमी के कारण नहीं बल्कि आप ने जो परिस्थिति पैदा की है उस के कारण। समाज के लिये यह आवश्यक था कि जो निकम्मे हैं वे रोजगार करने वाले बनें और एक दफ्तर बनाया जाय जहां बेरोजगारों की एक लिस्ट रख सकें। पहले बेरोजगारी के बारे में किसी को पता नहीं था लेकिन आज पता है क्योंकि उस के लिये एक लिस्ट बना कर रख दी है। जो काम हम ने जन कल्याण के लिये किये हैं उन से यदि यह मालूम हो जाय कि हमारे यहां बेरोजगारों की संख्या बढ़ रही है तो इस में क्या हर्ज है, इस में कोई घबड़ाने की बात नहीं है। आप के सामने एक स्थिति स्पष्ट आ गई है और उस का उपाय करना है और किया भी जा रहा है।

जैसा कि मैं ने कहा, यदि चार लक्ष्यों को ध्यान में रख कर आप सोचें तो आप देखेंगे कि राष्ट्रपति का भाषण हमारी उन आशाओं को पूरा करता है जिन के लिये कि वह दिया गया है और प्रति वर्ष इसी उद्देश्य से दिया जाता है।

भाषण पर आलोचनायें होंगी। जो कुछ आप शासन नीति के सम्बन्ध में, सरकार के काम के सम्बन्ध में, कहेंगे वह कहने का आप को पूरा अधिकार है, उसी के लिये तो हम यहां बैठे हैं लेकिन राष्ट्रपति के भाषण के सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं कि प्रायः उस लक्ष्य को हम ध्यान में नहीं रखते हैं जिन के लिये भाषण दिया गया है और प्रायः हम उन पंक्तियों पर ध्यान नहीं देते

हैं जो उन्होंने ने कही हैं। हम जो कुछ और कहना है उस को कहते हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि राष्ट्रपति ने जो कुछ कहा है उस पर हमें ध्यान देना चाहिये।

मैं ने शुरू में कहा था कि मेरा प्रस्ताव बहुत ही आसान है और मधुर है। आसान इसलिये है कि आप सब जानते हैं कि राष्ट्रपति ने जो कुछ कहा है वह वस्तुतः तथ्य है। आप यह कह सकते हैं कि भाषण पूरा नहीं है उनको और भी कहना चाहिये था लेकिन उन्होंने ने जो कुछ कहा है वह तथ्य है, इस में कोई अतथ्य बात नहीं है। मधुर इसलिये है कि वह हमारे देश के प्रहरी हैं और हमारे देश के नागरिक हैं। "बधाई" तो एक साधारण शब्द है। वह हमें साल भर तक देखते हैं और एक दिन आ कर हमें बताते हैं कि हम से वह क्या आशा रखते हैं। उन्होंने ने जो आशा रखी है वह भी कोई बहुत बड़ी नहीं है। उन्होंने ने कहा है कि उन्नति के लिये देश को आप के त्याग और एकता की आवश्यकता है। वह अगर होगी तो हमारा कार्य मफल होगा, नहीं होगी, तो नहीं होगा।

एक बात का और उत्तर दे कर मैं अपने कथन को समाप्त करूंगा। प्रायः कहा जाता है कि राष्ट्रपति तो सुन्दर सुन्दर चित्र हमारे सामने रख देते हैं, खुश करने के लिये फूलों वाला चित्र हमारे सामने रख देते हैं, और बैठ जाते हैं। ऐसा नहीं है। अगर हम चित्र को देखें तो उन्होंने ने हमारे सामने फूल भी रखे हैं और कांटे भी रखे हैं। जो हमने किया है वह भी रखा है और जो करना है वह भी रखा है तथा कठिनाइयों को भी सामने रखा है। भाषण के जो प्रारम्भिक शब्द हैं उच को मैं आप के सामने पढ़ देता हूँ, उस से आप को सब स्पष्ट हो जायगा :

"संसद् के इस नये सत्र के समय एक बार फिर आप का स्वागत करते हुए मुझे खुशी हो रही है। घरेलू और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय, दोनों मामलों की दृष्टि से गत वर्ष हमारे लिये सतत प्रयत्न और सफलता का रहा

है। भारतीय जनता और संसद् सकारण विगत वर्ष के प्रयत्नों और सफलताओं को संतोष तथा सतर्क आशा के साथ देख सकते हैं। फिर भी बाहरी जगत में और देश में कुछ ऐसी घटनायें अवदब घटी हैं जिन से हमारा शक्ति हो जाना स्वाभाविक है। इन घटनाओं का हमें साहस, धैर्य तथा पूर्ण प्रयत्न के साथ सामना करना चाहिये। साथ ही ये इस बात की चेतावनी भी देती हैं कि हमें न तो निराश होना चाहिये और न पूर्ण संतोष मान लेना चाहिये।"

इस से अच्छा परिस्थिति का विवेचन नहीं हो सकता। उन्होंने ने कहा है कि हम ने बहुत कुछ किया है और हम बहुत कुछ करना चाहते हैं लेकिन इस से संतुष्ट हो कर न बैठ जायें। जैसा मैं ने कहा, इस में फूल भी हैं और कांटे भी हैं। उन्होंने ने फूल भी दिखा दिया है और कांटे भी दिखा दिये हैं। अब हमारा काम है कि हम उस रास्ते को देखें और यह वर्ष जो शुरू हो रहा है इस में इस भावना से काम करें कि न तो निराश हों और काला ही काला देखें और न संतुष्ट हो कर आलस्य में बैठ जायें।

अन्त में माननीय सदस्य से एक आशा भरा निवेदन कर के मैं समाप्त करता हूँ। हर एक प्रस्तावक यह चाहता है कि उस का प्रस्ताव बड़े मजे में पास हो और इसी में उस की सफलता है। आप जानते हैं और सब सदस्य जानते हैं कि मैं इस संसद का एक मौन सदस्य हूँ। मैं ४ साल से इस में हूँ। मैं एक श्रोता रहा हूँ या एक दर्शक रहा हूँ, आप को देखता हूँ और सुनता हूँ, बोलता बहुत कम हूँ। तो आप यह समझ सकते हैं कि मुझे सम्मति बनाने में बड़ी आसानी है। मैं आप लोगों के बारे में सम्मति आसानी से बना सकता हूँ। मेरी सम्मति यह है कि इस सदन में शायद एक भी सदस्य ऐसा नहीं है जो इस भाषण के अन्दर कहे हुए मूल

- [श्री ईन्द्र विद्यावाचस्पति]

सिद्धान्तों से असहमत हो। यह ठीक है कि कि जब बोलना होगा तो खूब बोला जायगा और मतभेद प्रकट किया जायगा लेकिन फिर भी मैं समझता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने जो मूल सिद्धान्त अपने भाषण में बताये हैं उन से एक भी सभासद् असहमत नहीं हैं। तो क्या मैं यह आशा करूँ कि यह प्रस्ताव सर्वसम्मति से पास होगा और इस के विरोध में "नो" कहने वाला कोई नहीं होगा। हर वर्ष पर ऐसा ही होता रहा है। इतनी बात तो अवश्य होगी कि जो संशोधन है उन को आधार बना कर आप अपने भाषण दीजियेगा और लम्बे लम्बे भाषण दीजियेगा, वह अवश्य दीजिये, परन्तु साथ ही अन्तिम सम्मति के लिये जब यह प्रस्ताव पेश हो तो संशोधनों को आप अपने पास रख लीजिये और सर्व सम्मति से इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार कीजिये। इतना ही मेरा निवेदन है। धन्यवाद।

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the motion, and in associating myself with the observations that have been made by the hon. the mover; I have great pleasure in succeeding one who is a good son of a great father.

The President's Address gives us an opportunity to review the work of the Government in the past. In so doing, I guess that the Opposition Members will be critical. Sir, to be critical is their privilege. They also know that we on this side of the House have not infrequently intruded on their privilege. It is usual, Sir, to estimate, to contrast the results of whatever Government may also achieve with the maximum conditions of social welfare, social good we wish to achieve. It is usual to imagine the optimum conditions of living standards that we wish to achieve and then say that the Government has fallen short of it. I wish to submit that this is not the proper approach that we should take in making an

assessment of the achievements of the Government. Even as we view a picture, we have to appreciate the achievements of the Government as against the background under which the Government have to function. We cannot tear out the picture from its background. We cannot abstract it and if we appreciate in that way, we will be incorrect and it will be unreal. Therefore whatever Government may achieve, we have to view it against the background of a century and a half or more of exploitation by a foreign power and the consequent resultant evils of poverty, unemployment, illiteracy etc. We have to view against the background of our functioning in a society which already vivisected, had been further divided by the interested foreign power into mutually exclusive groups, if not antagonistic groups. We have also to view in relation to the constitutional set up ^{which} circumscribes the power of the Government, and the liberty of action of Government by virtue of it providing for precise rights of citizens and responsibilities of Government. We have also to view the achievements of the Government in relation to both the acts of God and acts of man which, have handicapped the Government to a considerable extent as the House knows. Viewed against this background, I dare say that the achievements that the Government have been able to get do credit to the most competent Government in the world. In the field of international affairs, at least, there will not be any difference of opinion that the Government of India have created for India a position of prestige which is higher than ever it was. I need only say, to support my case or quote a few extracts from the speeches and messages that have been made on the occasion of the celebration of our Republic Day. I have here some articles written by Sir George Schuster, Mr. Rushbrook Williams and Messages by the Earl of Home, Commonwealth Secretary of Great Britain and by Mr. Gaitskell, Leader of the Labour Party of Britain and even Mr. Eisenhower. For want of time, I.

am not burdening this House by reading these statements.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Formidable array of names!

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes. They are true. As the world knows, an Englishman is the last person to over-state a case or to over-rate the merits of an outsider—a non-Britisher. Here is what Mr. Gaitskell says:

"About the part that India is playing in international affairs, I think all of us will be extremely grateful for the remarkable success that India has achieved in acting as a mediator between different groups of Powers."

I hear the mutterings of my friend Mr. Ghose there. I have purposely chosen to quote a statement from what the world knows to be a conservative member. The British are conservative.

Further he goes on to say:

"The task of a mediator is not an easy one; but it is no mean achievement that India has been so successful on two or three occasions, such as the Indo-China and Korean questions. It is no exaggeration to say (this is to be marked) that when a difficult situation develops in the world our thoughts now turn to asking the Government of India whether they can assist us in bringing the two sides together."

It is the highest compliment which can ever be paid to a Government. I quote only one sentence from Mr. Eisenhower's message:

"You and your people have every reason to be proud of India's accomplishments. They have become a source of inspiration to other nations of the world."

More than the situation that Mr. Gaitskell has referred to i.e., the mediation of India in the Indo-China and Korean affairs, this House knows that Indian diplomacy has achieved some more triumphs. When France left the General Assembly of the

United Nations because the question of Algeria was taken up, as we all know, it was India's diplomacy that won back France to the General Assembly. We know how the Geneva spirit was created. When the question of admitting 16 Nations into the United Nations came up, it was again India's diplomacy that prevailed upon the powers and created a situation where at least 16 Nations could be admitted. We also know the part India has played in making the General Assembly pass a Resolution for the creation of a Special United Nations Fund for economic development. Well these are achievements which we should be proud of I wish to ask, whose heart does not swell with pride when we look at this glorious part which India has played in the international field? I am sure that peace will be an accomplished fact if only the Big Powers in the world will listen to the counsels of India. India has been playing, although a glorious part, at the same time a very humble part. It is suggesting to the Big Powers to accept obvious things. It is amazing how those powers sometimes do not accept what is obvious. One of the obvious things which India is suggesting is that if these Bigger Nations of the world have to command respect from other Nations of the world, they have to be above reproach. With regard to the question of admission of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, India has been at pains to point out the moral advantage that the Bigger Nations of the world would get by doing a just thing, the right thing but India has not been able to win over these big nations. It is amazing why they don't see what moral strength they do derive by doing the right. The Bigger Nations, in my humble opinion, are like the Man in the Fable. There is a small fable of Tolstoy. A man was scrubbing the floor with a piece of cloth and while he was scrubbing the floor, with a piece of cloth, he saw a looking glass on the table which was also dirty.

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]
[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

He wanted to clean the looking glass. So what he did was, he took the same cloth with which he was rubbing the floor and began to clean the looking glass. If in one part the dirt was removed, it appeared at another part and when he tried to remove it in the other part, the first part which was cleaned became dirty. He did this time and again but did not succeed in cleaning the looking glass. A wise neighbour who observed this said, 'Look here, man, what are you doing? Wash your cloth first and then try to clean the glass. The cloth is dirty and therefore you have not succeeded in cleaning the looking glass.' The man did so. He washed his cloth and then he was able to clean the looking glass. This is a lesson which the world has to follow from the example of India. Have these big powers, I wonder, ever stopped to consider why India, which has no guns, which has no stock-pile of Hydrogen Bombs, which has no fleet of warships, has been able to command respect in the world? If India has been able to command respect in the world, it is not because of her ammunition, not because of what the Secretary of the United States says, she has the deterrent weapons, but because of her moral strength.

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Soul force.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, soul force. As the Prime Minister has said, India has a soul of her own and India is therefore, proving to the world that by first placing ourselves on the right track, we would win the respect of the world. In days of old, when the Buddhist monks went out, crossed the oceans and traversed the wilds infested with beasts and savages they preached the message of peace and love and succeeded, and these blessings have endured for centuries. Today, our Prime Minister, even as those monks did, in a world of cold-

war, where nations are at daggers drawn, where there is suspicion and fear, he has ventured with his Panch Shil; and even as those Buddhist monks succeeded in spreading the message of peace and love, I have no doubt that our Prime Minister will succeed in bringing to the world peace and in bringing round the Big Powers and thus ease tension in the world and see that peace, good-will and amity are established. We are too near the times to appreciate the results of this noble experiment that is being carried out by our Prime Minister. Posterity, Sir, will appreciate its splendid results, even as we now admire the work of the Great Asoka who established peace not only in his own country but even in other lands.

Coming to our domestic achievements, Sir, I must humbly submit that they are such as to make any man, any Indian, proud. If any Indian who was outside India from 1947 and who had not heard much of India, were today to land in India and see India, he would not recognise the face of India. He will be proud to see that the land which had all along been an exploited land, a land with poverty-stricken masses, a land the natural resources of which had not been exploited there in that land, he would be able to see a number of factories, huge projects, development schemes and community projects. He would see, in short, the signs of progress and prosperity throughout the land. Sir, this is an achievement which every Indian should be patriotic enough to recognize, and I have no doubt that hon. Members on the opposite side are no less patriotic than hon. Members on this side.

The First Plan, as has been pointed out by the President and the hon. the mover of this motion, has been a tremendous success. All the economic targets which the First Five Year Plan wished to achieve and strove to reach have been very largely reached. The economic targets of increase in the national income had not only been reached, but has been over-reached.

We had set the target that at the end of the First Five Year Plan we would achieve an increase of 11 per cent. and we have now reached 18 per cent. We had a *per capita* income of Rs. 235 in 1950-51 and now in 1955-56 it is Rs. 281. Food production has risen by 11 million tons. Commodities such as cotton have risen and the target set for cotton has been exceeded by one million bales. The target fixed for the area under irrigation has been exceeded. We have been able to bring in 17 million acres during these five years, under irrigation. The target for power potential, as the President has been pleased to point out, has been exceeded. The index of industrial production has risen from 105 in 1951 to 146 in 1954 and to 158 in 1955. The targets in other things like cloth, cement and sugar have all been exceeded. Notably, our external accounts today are nearly balanced.

However, we know that our Government have not achieved all that they had wished to achieve and there is still more to be achieved. In order to reach the socialistic pattern of society, the goal that we have set for ourselves, much remains yet to be done. And the Government is no less conscious of this than hon. Members of this House. In fact, the Government does not lay claim to perfection. The Government is fully conscious of the shortcomings in its work in the matter of achieving the various targets and goals which it had set for itself.

One factor which we have to bear in mind if we are to achieve the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society is that we should lessen the gap between the different groups or different classes in our country, the gap in the possessions of wealth, the gap in the earnings of people, the gap that is there in the matter of getting the necessities of life. I however, believe that every hon. Member will appreciate that the Government, although it has not achieved this objective, has taken steps to achieve this objective. It is a well known fact that without industrialising the

country, we will not be able to provide employment for people, we will not be able to produce goods which are necessary for giving a higher standard of living to our people and we will not be able to raise the *per capita* income of the people and consequently the national income of the country. I believe hon. Members do appreciate the difficulties we have in this field, in embarking upon the wholesale industrialisation of the country. It must be admitted that we are still very poor. Capital formation, which before the plan period was 6.2 per cent. rose to 6.7 per cent. in 1951-52. In 1953-54 it rose to 6.8 per cent. and I believe it has not risen above 6.9 per cent. now. This, hon. Members will see, is very slow progress and when we take into consideration the rise in our population, we must admit that this falls far short of any satisfactory degree. The rise in population, as we know, is about half a million a year.

If we are not good at anything else, we are certainly good at this. The population will be expected to reach, by 1971, the figure of 453 million and by 1981, 516 million people. The enormity of the task that is before us is shown by this population figure. We have to provide—food, clothing, the articles of necessity housing, better living and education for these people.

The national output in Government enterprises has been very low. I am just giving figures about the national output. The *per capita* output for four years from 1951 has been at 8 per cent., which, everybody admits, is very small. In order to put in more *per capita* output in Government enterprises and in order to socialise industries, a step that is necessary that the Government should take, further investments have to be found. As everybody knows, Government are not rich in resources. Financial resources are poor and so Government have embarked upon a scheme of providing resources to the extent possible within the circumstances that

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.]
they have to work in. Therefore, nationalisation of insurance has been decided upon by the Government. This is bound to release financial resources, resources which hitherto were not used for national benefit and for the purposes of production and which could be utilised for industrial growth. Government are thinking of enlarging the public as well as the private sector. Without enlarging the public sector, Government will not be able to achieve the results that they want to.

I will briefly refer to the amendments before my time runs out. Most of the amendments that have been tabled are on the reorganisation of States. I want to congratulate the Members who have tabled the amendments in that they have selected very largely problems which the country is facing today and that they have not gone into smaller details as used to be before. There are two or three amendments relating to Goa, some minor ones about foreign capital and some others on education and removal of illiteracy. The reorganisation of the States is a problem which is agitating the minds of all the sections of the country. However, I am surprised to find in the name of one gentleman for whom I have very high regards, an amendment with the words like 'vacillation' and 'confusion'. At first sight, I thought that the name must have been put there by mistake; later on, when I scanned it, it was quite real. Well, Sir, let us impartially view this problem and see whether there is any vacillation and confusion and if there is, is it on the part of the Government or on the part of somebody else. As this House knows, Government had no choice in the matter. All Members of the Opposition have clamoured for reorganisation of the States. Time and again, all over the country, people have clamoured for the re-organisation of States. Government appointed several committees—I need not go into them at this stage—to examine this problem impartially and to find

out what exactly they could do. The Reports of the Committees have been conflicting but the Government's hands were forced by the situation in the country and Government had to concede the principle of the formation of linguistic States. We all know that and we need not go into that history. Friends here say that the policy is one of vacillation and one of confusion but, what is expected of a democratic Government. If Government bring out a plan of their own and then ask the people to follow it, if Government were to foist a plan on the people, all the hon. Members there will rise and say, "This is not a democratic Government. It has taken totalitarian steps. It has become dictatorial". They will condemn the Government in unmitigating terms but when this question has been left open for the public to decide, for the parties to mutually come to an agreement, then we hear these words, "vacillation" and "confusion". How can a Government which is working under a democratic system and wedded to a Constitution which gives the people fundamental rights, I ask, do anything but advise the people to come to a rational arrangement, a reasonable arrangement about the reorganisation of States? Is it right for anybody to accuse Government this way? Wherever Government's good offices could be lent in solving any question, Government have not spared pains in lending their voice in solving any question. Everybody is aware of the developments that have been taking place in the country in this regard. I do not see how any blame could attach to Government in this direction.

There is another point to which I would like to answer and it is the point of my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He revolts against the utilisation of foreign capital. Will he show resources for the Government? No. Government, as a matter of policy, have accepted the utilisation of foreign capital which has no strings attached to it. He will be perfectly right in criticising Government if

Government were to allow foreign capital to go away with a lion's share of the profits. Government have taken pretty good care to see that only a reasonable profit, profit which is just sufficient to induce foreign capital to flow into this country, is allowed. In such circumstances, what is wrong with that policy?

Then there are amendments on the removal of illiteracy and on education generally. I want to know whether any Government has been able to remove completely illiteracy. No Government has done it. What is the magnitude of illiteracy in this country?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendments have not been moved. Some of them may not be moved at all.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: I see the point. I would just touch upon one of them.

I take the amendment relating to Goa. Well, Sir, it is regrettable that the patience of the Government of India has not been appreciated by the authorities concerned. It is a very sad fact that a country which was the first in the world to free itself from Colonialism should now lend its support to Colonialism. I refer to the statement of Mr. Dulles. That is a country where freedom blazed and it revolted against its own mother country to free itself from domination. That is a country which freed itself from Colonialism and it is supporting today the foreign possessions of Portugal and calls Goa as a Province of Portugal. It is commendable that in spite of the gravest provocation, the Government of India have remained patient. They have remained patient because they know full well that if they do not remain patient, it may develop into a conflagration. It is for those countries, countries considered to be leading countries of the world, to take up this matter, to pull Portugal by the ears and ask it to give up Goa.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But that would be asking the tiger to become a vegetarian!

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: They do not realise the logic of it. Goa being such a tiny speck thousands of miles from Portugal cannot form part of Portugal. How can it be a Province of Portugal? If that argument were to be conceded, it could as well be said that Washington or New York could form part of any other country. Would it be right? If we stretch this argument, if we concede that Goa is a part of Portugal, then necessarily Portugal becomes part of India because Goa which is such a tiny speck in such a big country, which is geographically attached to India, could never be a part of Portugal. Well, let us hope, Sir, that wiser counsels will

prevail with these Bigger Nations and, because they want to reduce tension in the world, that they would take certain steps that are necessary including eradication of colonialism to see that tension is lessened and peace is promoted.

Sir, if we take the doings of the Government for the whole year into consideration we cannot but see with pride that the great powers like Britain and the U.S.A. who never thought that India would rehabilitate itself after its freedom in this excellent manner have themselves now come out with admiration for what is done in India. It is a pride, Sir, which we can rightly take and I hope hon. Members of the Opposition will associate themselves with this and will say that they are also proud that they form the Opposition under such a great Government as the Government of India.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]
deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 15th February, 1956."

Hon. Members may please move their amendments.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): I move:

4. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret to note that Government have not taken steps for the early integration with India of Goa and other Portuguese Possessions in India.'

I also move:

5. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret to note that the Address mentions only the dangers to the security of India by the conclusion of the Baghdad Pact and the SEATO, but does not mention the steps for counteracting them.'

I further move:

6. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret to note that the vacillating policy of Government in the matter of States' reorganisation has led to a great deal of agitation and given a set-back to the economic planning.'

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): I move:

8. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that Government's policy in regard to the reorganisation of States has been confused and vacillating, and express the

opinion that the new proposals such as merger of existing unilingual States and the like must not be given effect to without first ascertaining the wishes of the people concerned.'

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I move:

9. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to take note of the serious situation created in the country by the proposals for the merger of the States of Bihar and West Bengal as also by similar other moves on the part of some leaders of Government.'

I also move:

10. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not recognise the necessity for the reorganisation of the States and of redrawing of the State boundaries on linguistic basis, which is the only correct way for solving the problem.'

I also move:

11. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that certain decisions of Government in connection with the reorganisation of the States are being sought to be imposed upon the people against their wishes.'

I further move:

13. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that the proposals for the Second Five Year Plan made in the Plan-Frame have been modified in a positively reactionary direction.'

I also move:

14. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not indicate any concrete steps for the liberation of Goa.'"

I further move:

15. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added:—

'but regret that the Address fails to refer to and express disapproval of the proposal for the merger of the States of West Bengal and Bihar.'"

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancore-Cochin): I move:

17. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address fails to mention that India's continued membership of the Commonwealth of Nations is inconsistent with the opposition to military pacts such as the Baghdad Pact.'"

I also move:

18. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address does not express concern about the Indian citizens who are now undergoing imprisonment and tortures in the prisons in Goa.'"

(Nos. 17 and 18 also stood in the names of Shri S. N. Mazumdar and Shri A. R. Khan.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion and the amendments are open for discussion and they will be taken up after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 in the afternoon.

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

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

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, after the very lucid speeches by Mr. Indra Vidyavachaspati and Mr. Reddy in proposing and seconding the motion my task is a difficult one. I cannot equal their eloquence but the facts are on my side and I have only to enumerate the acts of omission and commission of the present Government to justify my case.

Sir, the Address of the President is an enumeration of the achievements of his Government during the previous year and a statement of the programme laid before the country in the coming year. As such though the President is a non-party man we are not criticising the President but his government. His Government has certainly adopted a very wavering policy in the matter of foreign affairs. Sir, the hon. Member who seconded the motion said that the heart of every Indian was filled with pride when he sees that the prestige of India is going up in foreign countries. I admit; but at what cost? Do we realise—I will give one example—that the liberal policy of our Government of giving everything to other nations at the cost of our nationals and not taking anything has led to this popularity of our Prime Minister?

As I said, I will take the case of, say, Burma. There was a big loan—pre-partition loan, pre-war loan more or less—and we wrote off that loan. Then we entered into a rice deal and we paid double the world price for the purchase of rice which was not wanted in our country. And when that rice came into the country it was of such a bad quality that it was not consumed by anybody. Then the Indian nationals are losing all their property in Burma and on the top of it we have advanced a loan at a very low rate of interest. Possibly at some future date we may write off that loan also. If the Government of India adopts this type of liberal policy, do

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

you not expect the Burmese Government and the Burmans will praise Indians and say, 'what wonderful people these Indians are! They write off our loan and give further loan. They take our bad quality rice at double the price?'

Take now the case of Ceylon. You enter into an agreement with Ceylon. I cannot understand whether there is some defect in drafting or some defect in our negotiations because an agreement is reached with Ceylon about Indians about persons of Indian origin and about their getting citizenship rights in Ceylon. The ink on the agreement is not even dry before the Ceylon Government repudiates it. They put one interpretation and our Prime Minister puts another interpretation and the net result is that persons of Indian origin, numbering nearly eight lakhs, are without a State at present and their future is very dark.

I need not mention about South Africa.

Then there is our record in Kashmir. We enter into an agreement. *Aide de memoires* are brought out. Mr. Dixon comes in and after the agreement has been entered into, the Pakistan Government interprets it in a different way; but we go on harping on the matter being referred to the United Nations and the holding of a plebiscite. Things have changed, completely changed, when Pakistan entered into SEATO and the Baghdad Pact and when Pakistan agreed to accept military aid from U.S.A. Pakistan is arming and the President has been pleased to state that on account of the conclusion of the Baghdad Pact and SEATO, the danger of war has come to the Indian frontiers. But what action has the Government taken to ward off that danger? Has it taken any steps at all to boost up morale in the country and to really prepare ourselves at least for defence? Our ordnance factories have been converted to produce civilian articles and the retrenchment of nearly 6,000

people is going to take place very shortly. Is it for organising the security of India that such steps are being taken by our Government? Sir, in certain affairs of human life, procrastination may be a good thing but in politics, especially in the situation in which India is at present placed, procrastination, that is, putting off what is to be done today for tomorrow, is not at all a good policy. Our Government has got to make up its mind about Kashmir, about Indians living in Ceylon, about Indians living in Burma, about Indians living in Malaya and so on. After we have made up our minds we must take immediate steps to see that the policies are carried out. Otherwise, what will happen is that, as in 1947, Pakistan under the excuse that the tribes have invaded Kashmir will at some future date permit some other tribes to invade Kashmir with the help of modern weapons secured from U.S.A. Then the U.S.A. cannot come forward and stop the use of those weapons by the tribes against Kashmir and the fair valley of Kashmir may once more be invaded. I would therefore suggest that the President should have stated clearly that his Government is going to withdraw this issue from the United Nations Organisation, that Kashmir after its decision by the National Conference has joined India for ever on a permanent basis; that Kashmir is an integral part of India and that no power can really take away Kashmir from India. If that declaration is made, as Kashmir will be an integral part of India, if there is any invasion by a foreign country or by a foreign nation, the matter can be taken to the United Nations and it will be the duty of the world on the basis of mutual security to come to the aid of India and defend Kashmir which will be an integral part of India.

Now, I come to the question of Goa. The hon. Member who seconded the motion tried to anticipate it and said that Opposition Members will harp on Goa. It is not a question of harping. Goa is a part of India and

if the Government of India does not want to do anything, let them not do anything. But if they will only permit Indian nationals, they will, by peaceful methods, by means of satyagraha, take possession of Goa. After all, the Indian nationals have a right of offering peaceful satyagraha but our Government says, 'no'. They say that they are going to take steps. I do not know when they will take steps. At least for the last three or four years the matter has been hanging on. Sir, I am very glad that the question of Pondicherry has been decided. Of course, even till today the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry has not taken place; only *de facto* transfer has taken place.

Now, I come to my second amendment which is about the reorganisation of States. As you know, Sir, in this matter also the President has expressed fears that there has been disturbance of peace. But he has not been pleased to say what his Government is going to do about this reorganisation of States. The matter has been hanging fire for the last two years. A Commission was appointed; it submitted its report in September and it is nearly five months but the Government of India has not taken any action in the matter. The hon. Member who seconded the motion said, 'ours is a democratic Government; we have got to consult the people.' I believe in it. I say we must certainly consult the people but what is the method of consulting the people? Parliament is a representative body; it represents the people of India. A Bill should have been brought forward. The report was received in September; the Government should have taken a decision and should have brought forward a Bill as quickly as possible. The whole thing should have been accomplished by this time, but we go on interminably discussing and the result of this continuous discussion is that slowly and gradually the Government of India yields to threats and pressure and loses its prestige. Interminable discussions are going on on the same

points. I cannot understand what new points are being offered by the Samyukta Maharashtra people or by the Akalis or by others. And on top of it to make confusion worse confounded, the hon. Prime Minister comes forward with his new fad of a zonal scheme and that zonal scheme culminates in the merger of Bihar and Bengal which is a fantastic thing. It is not going to come off. It is not going to materialise and bring any benefit either to Bengal or to Bihar. And yet we are trying to divert the attention of the people from the correct procedure of having linguistic States to some sort of mergers. It is dangerous to the security of India. If we have a Dakshin Pradesh, a Paschim Pradesh and a Purvi Pradesh, it is quite possible that these four powerful Pradeshes may at some later date ask for secession. We do not want such big States in our country. It is a danger to the security and solidarity of India. It is much better to have sixteen linguistic States as has been proposed by the States Reorganisation Commission and then no State will be powerful enough to challenge the Centre.

Then, Sir, I come to the matter of planning. The President has been pleased to State that the First Five Year Plan has been very successful and his Government has drawn up a Second Five Year Plan, a very ambitious plan and when that Second Five Year Plan is achieved, the target of steel will be 5 million tons, the target of cement will be so many million tons and the target of something else will be so many million tons. But the Second Five Year Plan is entirely silent on things which affect the large mass of Indian people—the rural population. It is all very good to imagine that the production of steel will go up by three hundred per cent and the production of cement will go up by two hundred per cent and so on, but the President has not drawn attention to the fact that even in the Second Five Year Plan the income of the rural population will be increased only by ten per cent. He has not drawn the

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

attention of hon. Members to the fact that the *per capita* income of the rural population is only Rs. 180 per year, that the *per capita* income of the entire population of this country is about Rs. 280 per year, that in this meagre sum of Rs. 180 per year, per head, an increase of eleven per cent in a period of five years is not a thing to be very proud of, is not a thing which will bring hope to the toiling masses of our country. Sir, at this rate—I do not know—it will take at least fifty years to double the national income of the rural population. Mr. Govinda Reddy, in his very eloquent speech, said that by 1981 our population will be something like 510 million. I do not remember exactly what figure he quoted, but it was something over 510 million in 1981. If the population goes up, it should be a matter of pride, because there are so many people who will require more goods to be produced, more houses to be built and, therefore, it should be easier for our Government to increase the national wealth and the national income. But we are adopting a slow policy, a policy which only counts in terms of steel and in terms of cement, but not in terms of the directive principles of our Constitution. The directive principle of our Constitution is removal of illiteracy. What has the Government or the President done to remove illiteracy from our country? During the last eight and half years of independence, has any drive been made for removing illiteracy from the adult population of our country, though we are very eloquent that a few one-teacher schools have been opened in a few villages all over the country? At this rate it will take a hundred years to bring literacy to the crores of boys and girls of school going age, what to say of mass education. Other neighbouring countries are taking stronger steps, quicker steps for spreading compulsory education. Mass literacy drives are being taken, but in our country we just have a very nice speech at the beginning of the year, giving us some rosy picture of this thing and that thing and we are

just complacent about it. At this rate our country will be left far behind in the march of progress.

Then, Sir, the President's address is silent about medical relief, about rural housing, about supply of filtered water to rural areas. This very morning at Question Time some hon. Members pointed out that in a big city like Delhi the water supply can go wrong, that it can be contaminated. We can very well imagine what will be the condition of water supply in rural areas, where there is no arrangement and the poor people of the villages have got to depend upon contaminated water of ponds. They have to drink stinking water. Is it fair that after eight and a half years, with the directive principles asking for a socialistic pattern of society in which the common man will be provided with the basic needs of life, the President's address is entirely silent on this point and no programme is placed before the country? I know our country has made some progress. Any country, any Government worth the name will certainly strive for progress. It is not a question whether we have made progress or not made progress. The question is the rate of progress, whether the rate of progress is fast enough in the present world conditions? The world is changing fast. There are new advances in technology and we are still lagging behind in our programme. We just believe in pious hopes. I submit that I am thoroughly disappointed with the President's address and so I have sent in a few amendments which express regret to note that the Government have not taken steps for the early integration with India of Goa and other Portuguese possessions in India and so on. And I would commend to the House that if they make a fair assessment of the progress during the past year and the programme placed before the country for the coming year in the President's address they will come to the conclusion that the achievements of the past year were almost negligible, that the programme for the future is of such a

small order that it cannot enthuse the people of this country and, therefore, it cannot lead to the desired goal of a socialistic pattern of society.

SHRIMATI MONA HENSMAN (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in considering the President's address, there is a good deal that has been said about the innocuous effect, the unexciting aspect of what has been laid before us in between these little yellow covers, but there is a saying, which is as true now as it was hundreds of years ago, that happy is the country that has no history, meaning that it is a good thing that we have had no outstanding rebellions, wars, hydrogen bombs or other things, that have fallen upon our heads, to be noted, in war or peace, in the President's address. Sir, the hon. Member who spoke before me has said that we have got a very small programme pointed out to us for the coming session and the coming year. I think it is a good thing to have a small programme, much better than having a large one that we will never accomplish. And I would leave the problems of finance, the problems of planning to be spoken about by other Members because after all we all have to divide up the interests of the speech. I would specially like to dwell on four aspects. One is the reference to foreign affairs. As the seconder of this motion of Thanks said this morning, India has indeed attained a height that it never had attained before in the eyes of the watching world. But also, Sir, we have to note that we have a few lacunae and discrepancies in our foreign policy still. For instance, it is my humble opinion that the representatives of this country are not paid sufficiently to put up a brave show in the countries where they represent us. Everything has gone up since things were put on paper, since salaries were laid down in budgets that we made out many years ago. We ourselves know that a rupee of ten or twelve years ago is now worth only four annas in what it can buy and I think that, honourably to represent us on the Independence Day and the Republic Day abroad in neigh-

bouring countries—I am thinking of Ceylon and Pakistan especially—we have not to go in for a very big budget, we have not got to expend thousands of rupees, but I think that we should raise the living wage of the people who represent us so that they may become somewhat equal to those from other countries who are also sent there. I do not talk of places like London because there, I think, we have considered this point. I feel that in the new places that have been opened for our foreign policies, emphasis may be laid on this in the coming years.

Again I feel that our policy abroad would be greatly strengthened by better propaganda. We, in this House have been presented with the most excellent diaries and calendars—most attractive pieces of literature that have been given to us—because we are Members of the House. Now, I feel that the same Department that shows so much of art and culture in producing this literature should now bend its efforts for the next ten months of the year towards producing something that will put forward in other countries our art, our carvings, our literature, not necessarily our history because history, as a Member of the other House has told me while travelling in the bus coming to this House one day, is largely being made in our country from geography! So, it would not be history, but it might involve the geography of the places where we are sent abroad. I feel that Pakistan and other countries are spending so much money in putting out literature about their beautiful things. In Australia and New Zealand, two of the members of the Federation of University Women were travelling. They brought back the most expensive and the most beautiful literature about other countries which are no richer than ours. I do believe that this would encourage our artists and our writers if we could produce something that is a little more palatable to the foreign taste.

Next I would like just to touch on the very marvellous gesture that was

[Shrimati Mona Hensman.]

made by France in merging Pondicherry and giving it to us. It was my privilege, not even a month ago, to have the representative—now the Commissioner—of Pondicherry in my college. He spoke to my students giving them a very exact, almost a complete, picture of the very important factor that was presented at that merging when the French flags came down from its mast and the Frenchmen handed over what we may euphemistically call, the keys of their kingdom in favour of the Indian flag and to the Indian Government. It was a gesture that was well suited to the nation from whom we got Pondicherry, because the culture and the background of France has been well known throughout the centuries. But if there can be during this coming year envisaged in the President's Address some such happening in any other part of India, not only would it be making history, but it would also be making the country stronger and more united.

Then I pass on to some of the apprehensions of the country at this time. Most of us in this House do not have large bank balances and do not own houses and lands. But we are concerned with things like the National Small Savings and I feel that that is a very important feature of the economic policy of our States and of the Centre. That has come to stay particularly because it is wedded to the work of women. It is the woman who is going about—certainly in my part of the world—urging teachers, urging parents, urging the rich and the poor alike, to put aside even two annas, four annas a week, eight annas or one rupee a week, as the case may be, so that they may own collectively or individually ten-rupee notes which in a certain limit of time, 12 years probably, will become fifteen rupees. Sir, I feel that this is going to be good for the future. That is why it is so important. It is not that somebody gets the money immediately; it is not that somebody has got a craze for expensive tastes. We have got a

policy of austerity and probably this suits the savings of the nation.

I have been sent, and you have been sent probably, Sir, a good deal of literature about insurance and the nationalisation thereof. Those who have been in insurance offices, and have run the business will shortly be able to speak on the floor of this House. But I would say that it seems to the ordinary person to be rather a gamble—I am not speaking of nationalised insurance, Sir—I am speaking far more of the big businesses; it does seem to the average citizen as he goes about in trains and in buses that there is a great disparity of wealth some people getting large and solid amounts every month from business houses and others who are doing the business, who are doing the work, who are being paid the wages, not anything like a corresponding amount. Well, Sir, this President's Address envisages some of the plans that will lead us to a socialistic State, and I need not say that in one year we are not expected to accomplish much. Probably, during the second Five-Year Plan, the unspoken plan is also to build up this side of the socialistic problem.

One of the last things which I would like to touch upon now is the matter of States Reorganisation. I am a woman, a non-violent woman and I have got to be non-violent to get my way with men. (*Laughter*) You will excuse the Members who have made an exclamation at the moment. I am not saying this just for their exclamations! But we women are prepared to live in any State, speaking the language of that State and developing the education and the social background there as we have always done. But, Sir, the whole thing has not been made plain enough in the newspapers—perhaps, to those who are out of the country. I have talked with Members of Parliament and peoples from other countries and they all feel very much troubled about the way we are going. They all are watching and they love to go and

talk about it. It is surely, Sir, that they do not realise that the unity of India depends greatly on how much the common man is going to understand the happenings in his own State Legislature and the only way to do that is to use the language that will tell him what happens in his municipality, what happens in his average headman's house, and then what happens in the State Legislature—this should be common knowledge to those who are outside. Now, Sir, if you use a regional language, or in bilingual States two languages, all is well because people will come to understand what is happening. That may be going to be the first way to bring forward our propaganda for unity. But in a great many places, there is overlapping of languages, and in the big cities of this country, we will

have to start schools or aid existing schools that will teach in more than one language, because everybody has the right to train his child in his own language, but if a man from Amritsar goes to live in Avadi, he should not expect the full background of his own language; the Avadi man also, if he is transferred to Amritsar, should not expect the full background of his own culture. Therefore, we must give and take. In my humble opinion, it seems to me that we need not decide this matter finally yet. I would leave the decision to the new Parliament, when it comes into being next year. It was not part of any party programme that there should be a break-up like this. In every party programme the unity idea, that the country should be brought closer and closer together, was there. Sir, our experiment with adult franchise four years ago is still fresh in our minds. We accomplished something that no other country would have been able to accomplish. If we are going to do it again with added responsibilities, with more educated people, with more interests at stake, vested interests some of them, then we should permit the electoral rolls to remain as they were at that time and make plans, very detailed

plans and programmes for the coming elections. That I leave to those concerned. Those of us who were able to listen about ten days ago to the speech made by one of our leaders from a rostrum not far from here on the reorganisation of States were very much impressed by it, because he was so reasonable so sincere, so earnest, and we really felt that unity would come about that way only—but not at once

Finally, Sir, I would commend to this House the very excellent passage that closes the President's Address. Peace is spoken of, but it is not the peace that one speaks of in the synagogue, the church or the temple. It is not just the 'Om', 'Let us have peace in our hearts, serenity in our hearts.' It is an active peace that the President's Address visualises, something that everybody works for, without conflict, not with an insincere and false smile on their faces, but with a true singleness of purpose which seeks to build up our country into the greatness that is visualised for it in the future. Sir, this can only be done by peaceful methods and by all of us standing together.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Sir, we have been treated to the usual Address by our worthy President, who spoke nothing new but spoke something which others have already spoken of. In this Address naturally we expected something very refreshing, something new, to which we can put our constructive thought and help the Government in the formulation of future policies. I really sympathise with our President. He, being a constitutional head, naturally has to speak things which others have put in his mouth, and we have to consider such propositions as have been brought before us in the light in which he spoke. History is created everyday in this country but the process of history cannot take a reverse turn. What we expect in this country is a progressive democratic movement but what is it that we are having in our progress in our movement of that

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

nature? I shall deal with the foreign policy of our Government. Being wedded to the philosophy of non-violence and peaceful methods, we encouraged the Goa struggle, and the rulers of this country actively encouraged the satyagrahis to march into Goa and to be mowed down by the Portuguese machineguns. Twenty of our Indian patriots were the first victims of Portuguese bullets, and immediately the Government made a reversal of their policy. I cannot understand how our Government could make such a wonderful somersault and reverse its policy and say, 'Things have taken a different shape; we are going to apply economic blockade; so, the Goa struggle should be conducted peacefully.' You have now deeply regretted the statement of Secretary of State Dulles, who has been very dull indeed and who made a very stupid statement that Goa was a province of Portugal, alienating the sympathy of 400 million of our people but fortunately or unfortunately, there were responsible people in that country like Averell Harrimah, Governor of New York, and Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, who denounced Dulles and said that this did not have the backing of the American citizens. Now, I do not know how that contrast is to be compared with the contrast which we see among our men here, who have made this somersault. You talk so much of this Commonwealth and our association with it. I say this Commonwealth has nothing in common with us; there is no wealth for us to divide in it. It is the British looters who have made themselves rich and brought about our poverty in this country who still dominate your economy today. Now, when this is the position, why is this love for the Commonwealth? Why do you hug this Commonwealth? The truth is that the Britishers are not prepared to back you up in your struggle in Goa, but you will not come out with a statement like that, because it will damn you straightway. The Americans naturally want to play

a double game. I mean only the American rulers, for I have seen the people of America who are very friendly, very sympathetic, very useful. They sympathised with you in your struggle for freedom, but the rulers there are after all politicians—who want to create trouble between countries and countries. Mr. Kishen Chand was speaking about Pakistan being armed with American arms, so that the Kashmir issue could be brought into the forefront of our struggle. When the Soviet leaders were visiting this country, they gave out their minds. They spoke frankly about the situation in Kashmir and you could see the immediate reaction in America. Now, if you have any positive, dynamic policy, with regard to Goa, the Communists have given certain amendments. Ask the Communists to go and occupy Goa. If you have no guts to fight it out, let those who are prepared to liberate Goa, go and liberate it. There will be some sense in it. But this is merely vacillation, sitting on the fence, without allowing others to do your job. This is vacillating foreign policy. Now you are talking about Panch Shil. This Panch Shil is an exportable commodity. Taking it for granted that Panch Shil is a very excellent, exquisite thing to be applied, you apply it at your home. You talk of Buddha, you talk of Gandhi, you talk of the great heritage that we have inherited but when it is to be applied to your home, then you forget all these Panch Shils. It is for external consumption but not for internal use. When you have to think in terms of rational political outlook in this country, you must take things in a rational way. Your objective must be consistent with your profession, but what is your objective today? About the Congress, Mahatma Gandhi said: "We have won our political battle. Now dissolve the Congress. Let the people of our country develop their political, social and economical aspect on the basis of the different ideologies and reorganise their State on the basis of political power." You did not do it. What is the common bond of unity between

my friends on the left—a deposed Prince, a disinherited zamindar, a depressed capitalist, a docile labourer and a dejected worker? The thing common to all is to be found in that immaculate white-cap, which is trying to turn red in which case the friends on my right will become jobless or unemployed. If your socialistic objective is very real and very correct, I want you to declare today from the house-tops that we are a socialistic pattern of society in which case the remnants of capitalism, zamindari and landlordism—all will drop out of your Party. Mr. Kishen Chand and Mr. Ghose as well as others will go into the other side and the rest of them will go out also. There is some sense in it. You are using the word 'Congress' which was our heritage, which has been left to us in the past 50 years of our national struggle and misusing that word in order to abuse the power which you are enjoying today in the name of the Congress. Now poverty is there, unemployment is there and we are 400 million people. The basic difficulty to remove your poverty is your existence in the British Empire. You are a Commonwealth with an Empire, with an exploiting gang of gangsters and they come back and tell you that you are an under-developed country. What monstrous nonsense is this? You have been on my neck like Sindbad the Sailor. You have bled me white in this country for the last 150 years and now you come and just like killing a cow and presenting two pairs of chappals made out of its hide, in the name of Colombo Plan, you are parting with some patrimony for us to develop and are calling us an under-developed nation. If I were in the Government, I would kick those fellows who have been telling that we are an under-developed nation. It is an insult to our intelligence, to our commonsense, to our respect, our honour and our integrity. We are not an under-developed nation. We are an over-exploited nation. That exploitation continues even today in the name of free-trade between Britain

and yourself. Stop this. You de-link your rupee from the Sterling. 400 million people's sweat and toil shall be backing our rupee and see how economically we develop our country. That is a basis which you have to accept. If you cannot accept, any amount of your playing with words like socialistic pattern of society and socialistic structure, from tweedledum to tweedledee, cannot bring happiness or prosperity to our 400 million people.

Now I come to the reorganisation of States. In this House when we discussed about the reorganisation of States, I gave you some original—good—ideas. I said that first of all you agree with Mr. Kishen Chand and have 16 basic linguistic States in this country. You have started the struggle for liberation on the basis of offering people Governments in their spoken languages. That is highly necessary. The masses of our countrymen should be associated with our Government and they should not be looking to the brokers who speak a foreign language for the contact between the rulers and the ruled. They must have direct access to the Government, to the people who run the Government, to the officers who run the Government and the masses of our countrymen must approach them directly in order to get their things done in their spoken language. Therefore linguistic States is an absolute necessity and there also it is a very plain, simple and rational proposition. The majority of the people speaking a particular language—all those areas—will form into one State. If there is any border area where there is any bi-lingual question, give the right of plebiscite to the people and respect the democracy as to which State they must merge. The problem is over. You have an amazing capacity of making a simple proposition a complex proposition, a complex proposition into a compound proposition and after compounding it, coming to a confused position where you don't know where you stand or what you should do. Pressure groups come and worry you and all illogical

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

decisions are taken with the net result that riots break out and people get restive. They are becoming more restless and they try to demonstrate their desire by visible external means in which case you reply them with the bullets left to you by the British. Sir, between 1939 and 1947, how many times the British administration in this country resorted to firing and how many people were dead? Will you kindly give me the data? And between 1939 and 1947—one period—and between 1947 and 1955—another—how many times the Congress men and their henchmen have resorted to firing and how many times people were killed and butchered? I don't encourage violence. In a constitutional democracy of our type, we must assert our rights by telling the people what they are for and telling the Government what we want. But your wrong decisions make the people exasperated and their exhibition of violence is countered hundred times by your violence of bullets and brick-bats. This is no answer. There is no time-limit for doing justice to the people. Do justice. I warned you in this House as to what would happen to Bombay if you took a wrong decision. I warned you in this House that pure logic must be your guiding factor. From the organisation immediately, don't go into extraneous matters. Extraneous matters are no concern of ours. Do it on the spot. Then you will have the States established and your work will be done. You did not hear me. Then I said, 'Bring back these warring elements into five zones—Uttar Pradesh, Dakshina Pradesh, Purva Pradesh, Madhyama Pradesh and Paschim Pradesh—in five zones and divide this Parliament into five Parliaments. Give them a Government. They will come together and this Council of States, with a functioning President—not a *functus officio* President—who will be in charge of Defence, Foreign Affairs, Communication and Currency and Planning which, by sub-delegating our powers to these Governments, they will carry out in their respective

areas. The unity of the country will be gloriously maintained.' There will be a basis which is based on strong linguistic foundations because you and I love our languages—that cannot be denied. Then there will be one Parliament in which the Malayalee, the Tamilian, the Kanarese, the Andhra—all will come into a Southern sector. Then there will be Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam coming into an Eastern sector. Then Himachal Pradesh and U.P. will come into another Northern sector. Bombay, Gujerat and other areas will come into one sector. Then Madhya Pradesh and others will come into a Madhyama Pradesh sector,—with five Governments and five responsible Prime Ministers, they will be able to administer this country in an over-all basis for the economic development, in an over all basis—not on basis where one group of people will be making more and more fortune and wealth at the cost of the rest of them. On a population basis all these five sectors can be developed and the Five Year Plan will be worked upon with glow and merri-ment and they will get all the support that is necessary and all that you require will come forth in a greater measure and you could have the stability of the country well-balanced, well-maintained and well-kept. But that is not to be. I fathered the baby, but the Prime Minister stole it away, carried it away and he talked of some other zonal system in the other House which had no relevance to what I raised in this House. This House should have been given the acknowledgment for the original idea for the zonal system. That system would be the best basis for a Federation which would be helpful to the proper development of citizenship.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Why this House only? The particular Member should get the credit.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I am happy, Sir, that other people are also inter-

ested in the same thing and they are able to look at things in the proper perspective.

Now I come to the much talked of nationalisation and socialism. Sir, socialism without undertaking the responsibility, without undertaking all the social responsibilities and social obligations is unsocial decoity. In other words, it is social vandalism. I can understand the Russian system, in fact, I have studied and bestowed some thought on it. When a war was declared by the enemies of Socialist Soviet Russia, immediately Stalin when he was in power came out with the decree that two pounds of bread should be given to every citizen of the land. Then he said their clothes, raiments and habitation are the responsibility of the State. Put them to work. Take the best out of them and see that the overall structure of a socialist society is developed. If you give me food, if you give me clothing and raiments if you take care of my child which is your responsibility, if you put him to school, if you send him to creches, if when I become sick or dilapidated and unable to work you send me to the hospital, if you take all this responsibility, then you may bring in socialist society tomorrow. But if you believe that only the other way is possible and not this way, then what you should do is not to encourage or indulge in social vandalism, but to allow people to produce more wealth, make them put their efforts and labour to produce wealth and then divide it among the people. You are not bringing in socialism. You are not nationalising insurance. You do not nationalise insurance, but you vulgarise the national insurance. What have you done? You have put the best patriots out of their work and you have put in certain people of your bureaucracy into this job. He will say he will start his work when the papers are on the table. But there will be no papers on their tables except the morning and evening papers. You will not get insur-

ance papers. That requires persistent effort, going and looking up people, telling them of the benefits of insuring and teaching them that they should insure in order to protect their own future lives. In a socialist society no insurance is needed. Every member of it is the care of the State and all the wealth forms part of the wealth of the State. The State is responsible for the maintenance of the people. In the absence of such responsibility on their part, the Government have no right to misappropriate other people's fortunes and labours.

Sir, you know what has happened about insurance. A few North Indian crooks who put on Khaddar and white caps misappropriated certain funds belonging to the policy-holders and consequently the Government misappropriated the entire insurance industry. They said, "No. There are very bad events that have happened. Therefore, we come here with the big stick on you all." They have, like a thief in the night, by an ordinance taken charge of the insurance industry as a whole. But I ask you, Sir, you have been looking at the things that have taken place here. Look at the Bhakra Nangal project and look at the scandals. Read the reports of the Public Accounts Committee and see the scandals committed by the Government officers. There are criminals in every section of the community. They are not confined to the insurance trade. This is not confined to the banking trade. It is not confined to any particular trade. It is confined to the social set-up of our citizens. Criminals must be dealt with in a different way. To give a dog a bad name and hang it is not the responsibility of a responsible government. You have to deal with criminals in a different manner, for which you have got the powers and responsibilities vested in you by the law. And you should not do it in such a way as to overdo other criminals.

Now, what is our objective? Let us come to brass tacks about this

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]
 proposition. We want to convert this into a Welfare State. We want to set up a State in which the people will be happy. Their incomes must be increased, their prosperity assured and their future secured. I think we all stand for that. There cannot be any question with regard to this objective. But what is the means by which you will introduce this change? By bureaucratisation you think you can win your objective. Or if you believe in a Communist dictatorship for this country, you take the other road. If you want the people of this country to have a real democracy, if you want to usher in happiness for the citizens of this Union which you have put in the Preamble of the Constitution, if you want to see wealth really produced, then give the people their opportunity. Do not come in their way. Say that the public sector will be managed by us in the best manner possible. But the private sector must be managed by the citizens in order to create wealth for the nation. Then by tax manipulation, social security, social services, by bringing in a law declaring that the minimum wage of each citizen, be he farmer or worker, shall be Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 per month, by some such social manipulations, bring the feeling to all that they have really become free, really become independent.

The President has laboured very much about the happenings that have taken place in various parts of the States. The States are in a state of ferment, in a state of imbalance and inequality and the latest publication of your Draft Plan will reveal how much imbalance and inequality are there. A sum of Rs. 4,800 crores is to be the target in the public sector for the entire country. Take the Dakshina Pradesh as I visualise it. Look at the population of Dakshina Pradesh. It is nine crores, that is to say, about a fourth of the entire Indian nation. Look at the amount that has been allotted for the development of this area with this popu-

lation. It is only Rs. 460 crores. One-fourth of Rs. 4,800 crores comes to Rs. 1,200 crores. But all that is to be given to these nine crores of people for their development is this pittance of Rs. 460 crores. Is there any wonder that they become agitated and anxious and worried about their future? Do justice, is all that I ask. Do things in an over-all manner. With the tremendous responsibility that is on their head, let the Government do justice to the people so that they may feel the glow of their freedom and help them in their work in harmony, shoulder to shoulder. The country is not the Congress. The country is certainly greater than the Congress. Let our friends feel that ideologically, for the betterment of the nation, the time is come when we must put all our shoulders together and increase the prosperity of our country. May wisdom dawn on our rulers. May liberty be the reality in the country, may happiness be the watchword of our people, may you rule well and better.

श्री ब० कि० प्र० सिंह (बिहार) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे पूर्व वक्ता श्री राजा ने कुछ ऐसी बातें कही हैं और दलीलें दी हैं कि उनके जवाब देने के लिये मुझे कुछ नहीं सूझता। इसलिये मैं उनकी दलीलों के जवाब देने का काम अन्य वक्ताओं पर छोड़ देता हूँ। और इस समय हमारे सामने जो सब से महत्वपूर्ण समस्या है, सब से बड़ी समस्या है, उस पर कुछ कहूँगा।

हमारे सामने सब से अहम और सब से महत्वपूर्ण समस्या राज्य पुनर्गठन की है। यह मामला दो साल से भी अधिक समय से हमारे सामने आया हुआ है। इस सम्बन्ध में हमने चन्द कदम उठाये हैं, वे सही कदम हैं या गलत, उन पर गौर करने का समय अभी नहीं है। बीती बातों पर विचार करना, बीती बातों पर आसू बहाना, जैसा कि संस्कृत में एक उक्ति है, मूर्ख के लक्षण होते हैं। कालिदास ने कहा है :

“गतम् न शोचामि, कृतम् न मन्वे”

यानी जो बीती की सोचता है वह मूर्ख होता है। हमने सही किया या गलत किया, लेकिन यह समस्या आज हमारे सामने है बल्कि यह समस्या एक वृहद् रूप में हमारे सामने आ गई है। इस समस्या का हम कैसे समाधान कर सकते हैं।

देश में चन्द लोगों ने सुझाव दिया है कि राज्य पुनर्गठन के मामले को दस बीस साल के लिये टाल दिया जाना चाहिये। लेकिन आज जब यह मामला हमारे सामने है तो हमें इस समस्या को समझ बूझ और मरदानगी के साथ साल छः महीने के अन्दर सुलझा देना है, और उसके बाद राष्ट्र के सामने जो जरूरी और आवश्यक कार्य है, उनमें लग जाना है। हम शुतुर्मुख की तरह बालू के ढेरों में सर दबा कर इस समस्या से त्राण नहीं पा सकते। जब हम राज्य पुनर्गठन की बातें करते हैं तो स्वामस्वाह लोगों के दिमाग में यह खयाल पैदा होता है कि राज्य के पुनर्गठन का एक ही आधार हो सकता है, एक भाषायी प्रान्तों का निर्माण। लेकिन इधर जो घटनायें हुई जो वाक्यात हुये उनसे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि एक भाषायी प्रान्तों की कल्पना ने एक विषाक्त और विग्रहात्मक रूप धारण कर लिया है। आज हमारे राष्ट्र की एकता, राष्ट्र का अस्तित्व इस कल्पना से खतरे में पड़ गया है। हमें इस कल्पना के पीछे दौड़ने में यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि राज्यों के अस्तित्व के लिये राष्ट्र का अस्तित्व आवश्यक है। यदि किसी वजह से राष्ट्र का अस्तित्व खतरे में पड़ा तो राज्य भी विलीन हो जायेंगे, राज्यों का अस्तित्व भी नहीं रहेगा। हम भूलते हैं कि एक भाषायी राज्यों का निर्माण एक साधनमात्र है, माध्य नहीं है। यह जरिया है, यह मंजिल मकसूद नहीं है। साध्य तो है मानव जीवन का बहुमुखी प्रस्फुटन, राष्ट्र की, जनता की समृद्धि और उन्नति। यदि यह एक भाषायी राज्य की कल्पना

इस साध्य तक पहुंचने में हमारी मदद करती है तब तो हम इसका स्वागत करते हैं, लेकिन अगर इस साध्य तक पहुंचने में यह रोड़ा बन कर आगे खड़ी हो जाती है, तब हमें यह गौर करना पड़ेगा कि कहां तक एक भाषायी राज्य की कल्पना को हम अपने राष्ट्र में साकार करें।

महोदय, आज कई सदियों के बाद हमने गुलामी की जंजीरों को तोड़ा है, हम आजाद हुये हैं। भारतवर्ष की त्रस्त मानवता आज प्रगति के पथ पर है। भाषायी मनोवृत्ति और उस मनोवृत्ति के प्रतीक छोटे छोटे राज्य उस प्रगति में बाधक है। आज यहां जनता की रोटी की आवश्यकता है, कपड़े की आवश्यकता है, छोटे छोटे किन्तु स्वास्थ्यप्रद मकानों की आवश्यकता है। बहुत लोग कहेंगे कि इन्सान केवल रोटी से नहीं जीता। बाइबिल में कहा है: “Man does not live by bread alone” लेकिन यह लोग भूल जाते हैं कि बिना रोटी के इंसान जी ही नहीं सकता। इस लिये सब से आवश्यक है इन आधारभूत जरूरतों को जल्द से जल्द और कम से कम समय में प्राप्त कराना। तो जब छोटे छोटे राज्य, एक भाषायी राज्य हमारे इस साध्य के बीच में रोड़े अटकाते हैं, तो हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि हम इस कल्पना को कहां तक साकार करें। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय बियाबान में नहीं रहते, हम एक ऐसे संसार में रहते हैं, जिसमें एक नहीं, अनेक, सैकड़ों सार्वभौमसत्ता सम्पन्न राष्ट्र हैं। आज भारत को उन आगे बढ़े हुये प्रगतिशील देशों के समकक्ष आना है। हमें इतनी तेज रफ्तार से आगे बढ़ना है कि चन्द साल में, ज्यादा से ज्यादा दस बीस साल के अन्दर, हम दुनिया के समुन्नत और समृद्ध राष्ट्रों के समकक्ष हो जायें। अगर एक भाषायी राज्य हमारी इस रफ्तार में कमी करते हैं तो हमें यह गौर करना होगा कि हम इस सिद्धान्त को कहां तक मानें, कहां तक अमल में लायें।

[श्री ब्र० कि० प्र० सिंह]

अगर हम चन्द साल के अन्दर दुनिया के दूसरे शक्तिशाली और समृद्ध राष्ट्रों के समक्ष नहीं होंगे तो हो सकता है कि हमें खतरा उठाना पड़े। हमारी शांति की नीति है। हम चाहते हैं कि दुनिया में शांति बनी रहे, लेकिन सिर्फ एक हाथ से ताली नहीं बजती। सिर्फ हमारे चाहने से दुनिया में शांति बनी रहे, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। हो सकता है कि किसी दिन शांति भंग हो जाय। वैसी हालत में अगर हम आर्थिक दृष्टि से कमजोर रहेंगे, तो हमारी स्वतन्त्रता, हमारा अस्तित्व खतरे में पड़ सकता है। तो राज्यों के निर्माण में हमें इन सभी बातों पर गौर करना है। जब हम इस पहलू से इस समस्या पर गौर करते हैं तो मुझे यह मालूम होता है कि हमें एक भाषायी राज्य की कल्पना को कुछ थोड़े दिन के लिये या सदा के लिये दफना देना है। यदि बहुभाषी राज्य हों तो ख्वामख्वाह एक या दूसरी भाषा को दबाना ही पड़ेगा, मैं कुछ ऐसा नहीं मानता। हमारे सामने दुनिया के और राष्ट्रों के आदर्श हैं। उनकी एकजाम्बुल हमारे सामने मौजूद हैं। पाश्चात्य जगत में स्वीट्जरलैंड, युगोस्लाविया तथा अन्य कई ऐसे राष्ट्र हैं जहां एक भाषा नहीं है। एक भाषा का प्रचलन नहीं है, एक से अधिक दो तीन चार भाषाएँ वहां प्रयोग में आती हैं। लेकिन वहां के लोगों ने कुछ ऐसे प्रशासकीय नियम बनाये हैं, कुछ ऐसे रास्ते ढूँढ निकाले हैं जिन की वजह से एक भाषा का दूसरी भाषा को दबाने का सवाल ही नहीं उठता। हम उनके इस अनुभव का फायदा उठा सकते हैं और उनके अनुभवों का फायदा उठा कर अपने लायक एक अच्छा सा ढाँचा यहाँ भी बहुभाषी राज्यों का तैयार कर सकते हैं। हम मनुष्य हैं, पशु नहीं। मनुष्यों को, दूसरों के अनुभव से सीखने की क्षमता पशुओं से भिन्नता प्रदान करता है। इस लिये किसी का यह डर कि यदि बहुभाषी राज्य बनेंगे तो ख्वामख्वाह एक भाषा दूसरी भाषा को दबा

देगी, मेरे खयाल में व्यर्थ का डर मालूम देता है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भाषायी राज्य एक मानवीय सिद्धान्त है और कोई मानवीय सिद्धान्त चाहे राजनीतिक हो, आर्थिक हो या सामाजिक हो शाश्वत नहीं होता। सभी मानवीय सिद्धान्त देश, काल और पुरुष से मर्यादित होते हैं। एक सिद्धान्त जो एक युग के लिये, एक देश के लिये सत्य होता है, वही दूसरे युग के लिये, दूसरे काल के लिये, दूसरे देश के लिये असत्य बन जाया करता है। एक दिन जो सत्य, जो सिद्धान्त, प्रगति का प्रतीक होता है, वही कुछ दिनों बाद विनाशकारी स्थायित्व का मेरुदण्ड बन जाया करता है। मैं अपने मार्क्सवादी दोस्तों का, अपने कम्युनिस्ट और सोशलिस्ट भाइयों का, एक महान आत्मा के गम्भीरतापूर्ण वाक्यों की ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ : वे शब्द ये हैं :

"The categorical demand of Marxists' theory in examining any social question is that the question be examined within definite historical limits and if it refers to a particular country then due note be taken of the specific features that distinguish that country from the others."

मैं अपने मार्क्सवादी दोस्तों से कहूँगा कि वे इन गम्भीरतापूर्ण शब्दों पर गौर करें, ध्यान दें और तब मोचें कि आज की उनकी एक भाषायी प्रान्तों की मांग और उसके बारे में उनका रुख कहां तक देश के लिये, जाति के लिये, राष्ट्र के लिये हित कारक है।

मैं अपने दोस्तों को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि ये महात्मा लेनिन के शब्द हैं। उनकी एक किताब "The Right of Nation to Self-determination" सन् १९१४ ई० में लिखी गई थी। ये वाक्य उससे ही उद्धृत किये गये हैं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did you read the whole book?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: The whole of it and not once but many times. I understood it also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It does not seem to be so.

श्री अ० कि० प्र० सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस राज्य पुनर्गठन को लेकर इन आखरी चन्द महीनों में जो घटनायें हुईं उनमें मुझे कुछ डर मालूम होता है, देश के भविष्य के लिये डर होता है। इन घटनाओं ने मुझे बतला दिया है कि हमारी राष्ट्रीयता का, एकदेशता का, आधरण कितना पतला था। मुझे तो ऐसा मालूम होता है कि फ्रांस के बोरबोन राज्य कुन की तरह भारतीय भी न कुछ भूले हैं और न कुछ सीखे हैं। डर मालूम होता है कि कहीं ऐसा न हो कि बोरबोनों की तरह हम भी इतिहास के रंगमंच से सदा के लिये लुप्त हो जायें। हमारा प्राचीन इतिहास बनलाता है कि हममें एकता की भावना की कमी थी और उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि मुट्ठी भर विदेशी आये और हमारी फूट का फायदा उठा कर एक के बाद दूसरे को अपनी हुकूमत के अन्दर लेते चले गये। कभी मराठों की मदद ली, कभी सिखों की मदद ली और कभी बंगाल और बिहार के लोगों की मदद ली। और हम विदेशियों की मदद में एक दूसरे के खिलाफ तलवार उठाते चले गये। हम में एकता की भावना की कमी थी। इस माने में हमारा चरित्र बल, हमारा नैतिक बल बहुत छोटा था, बहुत नीचे स्तर का था और इसलिये हम गुलाम हो गये। हमने चरित्र बल खोया, नैतिक बल खोया और उसके परिणामस्वरूप हमारी गुलामी आई। गुलामी तो हमारी दिली और दिमागी कमजोरियों का एक बाह्यरूप मात्र था। हमारे एक मित्र ने मुझे एक कहानी सुनाई थी। हो सकता है कि वह कहानी मात्र हो या उसमें ऐतिहासिक तथ्य भी हो। वह कहानी यह थी। आधी शताब्दी पहले हिन्दुस्तान का कोई एक बड़ा आदमी जर्मनी गया था। वहाँ उसकी मुलाकात

बिसमार्क से हुई। बिसमार्क ने उसको देख कर कहा, अरे, तुम इतने ऊंचे हो, ५ फुट ६ इंच के हो। मुझे ताज्जुब होता है। मैं तो समझता था कि सभी हिन्दुस्तानी २ या २½ फुट के होंगे, नहीं तो बया वजह है कि मुट्ठी भर अंग्रेज इतने करोड़ हिन्दुस्तानियों पर हुकूमत कर रहे हैं। यह कहानी ऐतिहासिक सत्य हो या कहानी मात्र हो परन्तु इसमें हमारे लिये एक सबक है, एक शिक्षा है। बिसमार्क ने तो उस हिन्दुस्तानी के बाह्य स्वरूप को ही देख कर ऐसा कहा था लेकिन बिसमार्क यदि तब में जाते तो वह देखते कि हममें आत्मबल को और चरित्रबल की कमी थी। हम आत्मबल में, चारित्रिक बल में, राष्ट्रीयता की भावना में, बौने थे और इसीलिये हमारी स्वतन्त्रता जाती रही और हम गुलाम हो गये। राष्ट्रपिता ने, बापू ने, अपने नेतृत्व में हम में राष्ट्रीयता की भावना जगाई और जब हम विदेशियों से टक्कर ले रहे थे तो हमें भी ऐसा भान हुआ जैसे कि यह भावना हम में पूरी तरह जड़ पकड़ गई है और हम बिल्कुल एक हो गये हैं और हम आपस का भेदभाव भूल गये हैं लेकिन इन दो, चार महीनों के अन्दर जो घटनायें हुई हैं उनसे तो मुझे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि हमारी पुरानी प्रवृत्तियाँ मरी नहीं थीं, सिर्फ दब गई थीं। अब जब कि अंग्रेजों का पहाड़ स्वरूप रूप हम पर से हट गया है तो हम भारतीय छोटी छोटी चट्टानों के समान आपस में टकराने लगे हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एकता की आवश्यकता है, राष्ट्रीय भावना की आवश्यकता है लेकिन यह भावना मस्तिष्क में, बुद्धि में पैदा होती है, बुद्धि में जड़ पकड़ती है फिर भी कुछ ऐसे बाह्य साधन होते हैं जिन से कि हम इस एकता की भावना को, राष्ट्रीयता की भावना को, पक्की बना सकते हैं, मजबूत बना सकते हैं। मन और बुद्धि जहाँ जमीन का काम देती है वहाँ ये बाह्य साधन जल या

[श्री ब्र० कि० प्र० सिंह]

पानी का काम दे सकते हैं। हम कुछ ऐसे राजनैतिक और प्रशासनिक उपाय ढूँढ निकालने हैं जिनसे कि हमारी एकता और राष्ट्रीयता अक्षुण्ण रहे। जब इस दृष्टिकोण से गौर करते हैं तो मुझे ऐसा मालूम होता है कि राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने अपने प्रतिवेदन के चतुर्थ भाग के चतुर्थ अध्याय में जो अभिस्ताव दिये हैं, जो सजेसंस दिये हैं, आज उनका तुरन्त कार्यरूप में परिणत हो जाना, उनका अमल में आ जाना, आवश्यक है। यदि हम उन्हें जल्दी में जल्दी अमल में न ला सके तो हमारे राष्ट्र की एकता खतरे में पड़ जा सकती है।

जब राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग के प्रतिवेदन पर यहां पिछली बार बहस हो रही थी तो कई वक्ताओं ने यहां यह सुझाव दिया था कि उन अभिस्तावों को जल्दी से जल्दी मान लिया जाय। उनमें तामिलनाडु के डाक्टर पी० सुब्बारायन मुख्य थे। परन्तु मुझे बड़ा अफसोस हुआ जब कि हमारे राष्ट्राध्यक्ष और प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कुछ कमजोर शब्दों में कहा कि अभिस्ताव तो अच्छे हैं लेकिन राज्यों के मुख्य मंत्री उसको मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। राज्यों के मुख्य मंत्री उनको मानने को तैयार नहीं? यह देश और यहां की जनता कुछ राज्यों के मुख्य मंत्रियों की नहीं है। यह राष्ट्र, यह यूनियन गवर्नमेंट यहां की जनता के लिये है, राज्यों के मुख्य मंत्रियों के लिये नहीं है। यदि उनकी प्रभुत्वलिप्सा, यदि उनका lust for power देश के बड़प्पन में, देश की एकता में बाधक होते हैं तो आज इस संसद का, पंडित नेहरू का और यहां की सरकार का फर्ज है कि मुख्य मंत्रियों को मनवायें और न मनवा सकें तो कुछ ऐसा उपाय निकालें कि उनके न मानने पर भी ये अभिस्ताव जल्द से जल्द अमल में आ जायें।

इसी सिलसिले में, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे संविधान का खयाल आता है। हमने

अपने संविधान में जो १९३५ का गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया एक्ट था उसकी कापी की है, उसकी नकल की है, उसको ले कर हम चले हैं और उसी की बुनियाद पर हमने अपने संविधान को बनाया है। १९३५ के गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया एक्ट में प्राविशियल ओटोनोमी प्रान्तीय स्वराज्याधिकार क्षमता, पर अधिक जोर दिया गया था। उसकी एक खास वजह थी। उस समय अंग्रेजों से हमारी लड़ाई चल रही थी। अंग्रेज इस बात को महसूस करने लगे थे कि उनका भारतवर्ष में बिल्कुल निरंकुश शासन नहीं चल सकता। हमने भी संघर्ष के बाद यह महसूस कर लिया था कि केन्द्र आखरी जगह है जहां से कि अंग्रेज अपना प्रभुत्व हटायेंगे और प्रान्तों में वे हमको अधिकार दे सकते हैं। केन्द्र में वे अपने अधिकार सुरक्षित रखेंगे और अन्तिम दिन तक रखेंगे। इसलिये उस वक्त राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में इस बात पर जोर दिया गया था कि प्रान्तों को अधिक से अधिक अधिकार मिलने चाहियें और १९३५ में अंग्रेजों के हित और राष्ट्रीयता की मांग के बीच में जो समझौता हुआ उसके फलस्वरूप गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया एक्ट बनाया गया और उसमें प्रान्तों को बहुत से अधिकार दिये गये लेकिन जब हम स्वतन्त्र हो गये हैं तब तो सारी परिस्थिति ही बदल गई है। कभी कभी ऐसा होता है कि किसी खास बात को ले कर कोई नियम तैयार किया जाता है परन्तु जब वह बात खत्म हो जाती है और उन नियमों की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं रहती है तब भी वे नियम ज्यों के त्यो बने रहते हैं। इसी तरह एक खास परिस्थिति में हमने प्रान्तीय स्वराज्याधिकार की मांग की थी और अंग्रेजों ने उसको माना था परन्तु आज उसकी आवश्यकता नहीं है। स्वराज्य होने के बाद कोई वजह नहीं थी कि हम उस ढांचे को आदर्श मान कर चलते लेकिन हमने ऐसा किया। उस वक्त अच्छा किया या बुरा किया यह दूसरी बात है परन्तु आज तो मालूम होता है कि हमने गलती थी। मैं

देश के नेताओं का इस ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस बात पर तवज्जह दें कि संविधान को कहां तक बदलना जरूरी है। आज तो हमारे देश में हो या हुकूमत में हो, ऐसे लोग मौजूद हैं जिनमें भारतीयता की भावना है, जो भारत के रंगमंच पर खेले हैं, जिनको हिमाचल से लेकर कन्याकुमारी तक भारत की एकता का भान है। लेकिन वह पीढ़ी, प्रति मानवों की वह पीढ़ी, आज धीरे धीरे खिसकने लगी है, मेघनाद शाह नहीं रहे, आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव चले गये और हमारे इस समय जो कर्णधार हैं, आज नहीं कल उनको भी जाना है। उनके बाद आने वाली जो पीढ़ी है उसने अभी भारत के रंगमंच पर नहीं खेला है। वे प्रान्तों में और छोटे छोटे राज्यों में खेलते रहे। उनकी भावना, उनकी कल्पना इस कदर भारतीयता से ओतप्रोत नहीं है जैसी आज के कर्णधारों की है। तो अगर रद्दोबदल करना है, और मेरे खयाल में संविधान में रद्दोबदल जरूरी है, तो वह आज होना चाहिये जब कि हमारे कर्णधार, जो भारतीयता की भावना से ओतप्रोत हैं, हमारे बीच मौजूद हैं। इनके बाद की जो पीढ़ी हम लोगों की आयुगी, सम्भव है वह इन बड़े कामों को करने में नाकामयाब रहे।

श्री जसपतराय कपूर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : बंगाल और बिहार के एकीकरण के सम्बन्ध में आपकी क्या राय है, यह जानने के लिये हम उत्सुक हैं।

श्री ब्र० कि० प्र० सिंह : १५ मिनट मैं ने फाजिल ले लिये हैं, अब मुझे खत्म करना है। क्या कहूं, मैं अपने दोस्त को! मारी रामायण पढ़ गये सीता किसकी जोई उनको नहीं मालूम हुआ। मैं ने बराबर यही कहा। मैं ने बंगाल, बिहार का नाम न लिया। मैं ने कहा कि एक भाषायी राज्य देश के लिये घातक है। साफ बात है कि बंगाल और बिहार को एक होने की आवश्यकता है। न

बंगाल को खतरा है, न बिहार को। किसी को ऐसा खतरा नहीं हो सकता है।

श्री जसपतराय कपूर : मैं तो "सीता" और "राम" का नाम ही सुनना चाहता था क्योंकि नाम के लेने में भी बड़ा महत्व है।

श्री ब्र० कि० प्र० सिंह तो मुझे इस अवसर पर और अधिक कहना नहीं है। मैं आखिर में इतना फिर दोहराना और तिहरा देता हूँ कि राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने अपनी रिपोर्ट के चतुर्थ अध्याय में जो अभिस्ताव किया है, उसकी जो सिफारिशें हैं उनको भारत सरकार जल्दी से जल्दी अमल में लाने की कोशिश करे। दूसरी बात यह है कि हम तो संविधान को रोज रोज बदलते रहते हैं, जरा एक बार ठंडे दिल से मोचें कि कितना रद्दोबदल आवश्यक होगा जिससे भारत की एकता और भी दृढ़ हो और अक्षुण्ण बनी रहे। जितना जरूरी हो उतने अंश तक हम संविधान को बदलें। इस विषय पर कहने के लिये आप कुछ समय और दें तो कुछ बातें और कहें नहीं तो खत्म कर दूँ, जैसी आपकी इच्छा हो।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already taken more than twenty minutes.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Thank you, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is customary for us to speak on the various issues referred to in the Presidential Address when we discuss such a document but on this occasion I should like to deal with the question of reorganisation of States in general and the proposal for the merger of West Bengal and Bihar in particular. In our view this proposal has come at a time when there should be common endeavour to unify the country, to consolidate its position, to develop fraternal bonds between the various nationalities and to open new avenues for cultural and material advance-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
 ment of the peoples that inhabit our land. But we find this preposterous proposal—I do not know how it was conceived before being placed before the country—for the integration of West Bengal and Bihar and that too in the name of the unity of India. After that, as you know, efforts are being made to push it through and implement it but a great news has come today that the redoubtable Mr. B. C. Roy has been forced to at least keep in suspense the resolution he had tabled to be moved on the 24th of this month. He has been noting the rising tide of the popular movement against his proposal; he has been noting the protests of the people of West Bengal against such a proposal which goes against their grain and that is why he has been obliged for the time being at any rate not to press his resolution but by no means he has taken back that proposal which should be taken back. As far as we are concerned, we are interested in burying this proposal ten feet deep so that there would be no opportunity to resuscitate it or to revive it and fling it at the face of our people.

Reorganisation of States is an important matter and we are now being treated to all kinds of new definitions about the unity of India. There was a time during the freedom movement when we were given some kind of definitions, definitions which did not become political dogmas but became the guide to action in the great struggle for freedom. Was it not in 1905 that the Indian National Congress of the time supported the movement against the partition of Bengal and gave full support to those who wanted to unsettle a settled fact and eventually succeeded in their mission? Was it not in 1908 that at the Murshidabad Congress leaders of Bihar and Bengal passed a resolution for a separate province for Bihar when Bihar was a part of Bengal? Was it not in 1908 that a separate Congress organisation in consonance

with that outlook, was formed for Bihar—I mean the Pradesh Congress organisation—and was it not in 1912 that a separate province of Bihar and Orissa was formed in order to ensure the distinctiveness of the Bihari people, their own aspirations and cultural advancement, their own struggles and their own ways of life? All these things are past history. Today we are told that there will be reunion. Reunion between whom? Between Dr. Bidhan Chandra Roy and Sri Krishna Sinha. Yes; they have been united a long time ago in the Congress Working Committee. Their union is good and we hope that it will endure but the trouble is that the people of Bengal and the people of Bihar seek unity in diversity and in maintaining their own culture, their own ways of life, their own literature and their own social and spiritual ideas in the broader unity of India. That is how we have been conceiving the unity of our land. Sir, we are being told that this merger proposal is “a great lead.” The Prime Minister of India has suddenly discovered a great lead in that preposterous proposal and has announced it to the world. Since when has such a thing become acceptable to our people? After all, he himself had something else to say. I will just read out what he wrote in his book ‘Discovery of India’. This is what he said.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): He is rediscovering India now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes; yes. The name of the sub-chapter is Variety and Unity in India. He says. “Some kind of a dream of unity has occupied the mind of India since the dawn of civilization. That unity was not conceived as something imposed from outside, a standardisation of externals or even of beliefs. It was something deeper and, within its fold, the widest tolerance of belief and custom was practised and every variety acknowledged and even encouraged.” But the trouble with our Prime Minister is that whenever he

in a tight corner in his party due to conflicts and bickerings, he begins to discover India afresh. We cannot catch up with his fresh discoveries of India. I would request the Prime Minister to stand by his old discoveries because the discovery that he had made in Ahmednagar Fort seems to be a much better and more acceptable discovery and a more truthful discovery than the new-fangled discovery that he is making in Working Committee meetings and in the Amritsar Congress Session.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR:
Even Bhupesh Gupta quoting Bible!

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: In this connection I would also like to mention what Gandhiji has said because all things are being challenged now by the Congress leaders who swear by the name of Gandhiji and who of late have begun also to swear by the name of Gautam Buddha when Morarji Desai showers Tommy-gun bullets in the streets of Bombay. That is why I would like to read out from the writings of Gandhiji. Writing in *Harijan* in 1948 he touched on this problem and said: "The redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis was necessary if provincial languages were to grow to their full height. The Congress had already adopted the principle and had declared its intention to give effect to it constitutionally as soon as they came to power, as such a distribution would be conducive to the cultural advancement of the country" That is what

Gandhiji said in 1948 just 4 P.M. before his death. Then, of course, you have got the Nehru Committee Report of which the present Prime Minister of India, the younger Nehru, was a member and the elder one was the chairman. What did they say in the report? It was said in that report:

"What principles should govern this redistribution? Partly geographical and partly economic and financial, but the main consideration must necessarily be the wishes

of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned."

It then goes on to say:

"It becomes essential, therefore, to conduct the business and the politics of a country in a language which is understood by the masses. So far as the Provinces are concerned, this must be the provincial language."

Then, further it goes on to say:

"If a Province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it must necessarily be a linguistic area. If it happens to be a polyglot area, difficulties will continuously arise....."

mark these words "difficulties will continuously arise",—

"and the media of instruction and work will be two or even more languages. Hence it becomes most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Language, as a rule corresponds with a special variety of culture, of traditions and literature. In a linguistic area all these factors will help in the general progress of the Province."

This is what the two Nehrus and other person on the Committee said. Very rightfully these things were said at that time. The whole country accepted this.

Then, in the Congress election manifesto of 1945-46, you gave this pledge to the people. This I am quoting from Shri Pattabhi Sitaramayya's "History of the Congress", which some of them must have read in their old times, but may have forgotten by now. To refresh their memory, may I with your permission read out a certain portion?

"The Congress has stood for equal rights and opportunities for every citizen of India, man or woman. It has stood for the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

punity of all communities and religious groups and for tolerance and goodwill between them. It has stood for full opportunities for the people as a whole to grow and develop according to their own wishes and genius; it has also stood for the freedom of each group and territorial area within the nation to develop its own life and culture within the larger framework, and it has stated that for this purpose such territorial areas or provinces should be constituted, as far as possible, on a linguistic and cultural basis. It has stood for the rights of all those who suffer from social tyranny and injustice and for the removal of all barriers to equality."

That is what was stated in the famous election manifesto immediately before they came into power. These are the pledges before the country. Not only that. At the Nagpur session of the Congress in 1920 a resolution was adopted declaring the formation of linguistic provinces as a clear political objective before the national movement. Immediately after that according to the linguistic principles, Congress organisations were recast and remodelled. All these are historical facts that you can never deny. Then, even after that Nehru Committee Report, at a number of sessions of the Congress and Working Committee meetings and A.I.C.C. sessions, the question then came up for discussion and categorical declarations were made that India should be reconstituted on the basis of language and culture. Now, suddenly we are told that all this is wrong. Prime Minister Nehru speaking at Ramlila grounds on the 30th January said that this was no longer the basis for reorganising the States in our country. Then, in the Amritsar session we heard the same thing dropping from the same precious gentleman of the

Congress leadership. Sir, this is what we have been listening to of late. I say the whole thing goes against the traditions of our people. Not only that, it goes against the historical make-up of our country. India is a confluence of various cultures, various ways of life, various ways of thought, various literatures and it is in this diversity that one discerns the unconquerable greatness of our land. This is what we have been learning all this time. We are not a country like France or England where they have more or less one language, people bound together in one culture or cast in one psychological or cultural mould. This is not so. In this great land of ours various cultures exist side by side intermingling in the main broad stream of what we call the Indian civilization and Indian culture. Would not they dry up if the sources are attacked? Would not the Indian culture be affected if the culture of the Punjabis, the culture of the Biharis, the culture of the Bengalis, the culture of the Gujeratis, the culture of the Marathis, the culture of the Tamils, the culture of the Telugus, the culture of the Malayalis are attacked and stifled? Where will the Indian culture and civilization draw nourishment from if such diverse culture which we have got through years and years of history is treated in this manner? Therefore, I say it is a wrong idea altogether to take a view of this matter as if the unity of Indian culture lies in somehow or other regimenting the nation into a barrack or steam rolling their culture, their literature, and their social and Psychological make-up. That is not the way for building the unity of India. On that ground, therefore, the whole thing is absolutely unacceptable—the proposals that are being made. And above all, who are talking about the unity of India? The unity of India is to be strengthened not by sitting in Delhi and concocting proposals unacceptable to the entire people. The unity of India is to be strengthened by developing mutual and fraternal bonds between the various

nationalities who inhabit our country. The unity of India is to be strengthened and re-forged by making our people content, by satisfying their material and culture needs, by making a new future light up before their eyes. That is not the path they have taken. Now, you can see how the unity is being brought about. Hardly one month has passed since the proposal for merger has come. The whole of Bengal is in tremors. Writers of Bengal have protested against it. Meetings have been held in the house of Rabindranath Tagore where men of letters drawn from all walks of political life, having different beliefs, met together and passed a resolution condemning this merger move. The Calcutta Senate—that temple of learning and culture where the senators met despite the prodings of the Chief Minister and the incessant telephone calls for interference with the meeting—passed a resolution condemning this merger proposal. Then, the artistes, film stars, those who are dramatists, all of them have passed resolutions condemning it. Then the lawyers.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): What about the Calcutta Corporation?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes he has discovered a ray of hope. Calcutta Corporation, certainly I shall come to it. Now, apart from these senators, two hundred trade union organisations in their meetings have passed a resolution condemning it. Students are crying against this proposal, coming out in the streets in demonstrations. Mind you students who follow you, students who follow us, students who follow nobody are joining in the common struggle to save what they call Bengali culture and also by so doing the culture of the Bihari people.....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: All incited by disruptive Communists.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have got a majority. You have passed a resolution and I know that Dr. Roy has been at it for a long time. But in the municipal elections in Bengal

you are facing debacle after debacle. Even in today's paper, you would have seen that you have lost two municipalities from your hands. In one, only one seat you have got, as against the rest for the Opposition. Not a single.....(Interruptions.) I hope you will kindly listen to me because these are, I say, for your own sake. Take note of these developments. In all the municipal elections that have taken place since the publication of this proposal, the Congress has lost, lost heavily. We are challenging them to hold the Calcutta Corporation elections because they are overdue. Now they are fighting shy because the majority that has given the merger proposal will be thrown out: and we shall re-establish the fame of the Calcutta Corporation and the traditions of Chittaranjan Das there. If there is any indication about this public opinion, it is clearly expressed in the streets, in the fields, in the factories, in the educational institutions and centres, in the temples of culture and wherever culture and literature live. The sooner this preposterous proposal is taken back, the better. That is the verdict of the people of Bengal. I have not a doubt in my mind that Bihar is also rising to its stature and that is why the President of the Bihar Bar Association, Mr. Sahay, has declared categorically against getting.....

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: He has no following in Bihar, I can assure you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has declared himself against the proposal. Shri Jai Prakash Narain and other important leaders of Bihar have declared against it. These are all facts. We know. Now, union is being forged before the people of Bihar and Bengal in order to defeat this proposal.

Sir, I have already stated that the unity of India will never be attained by a proposal of this sort. We are told that this will show the way out of the trouble that has arisen in our country over the issue of States Reorganisation. Now, the trouble is

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
the creation of the Congress. It has become the master of the situation. It is they who are now laying down the law after having created the troubles. And they are trying to fish in troubled waters. I tell you that Mr. Roy and Mr. Sinha must first answer for the troubles inside the country. After all, it is these people who are responsible for provincialism and separatism—and you might even use the Prime Minister's expression 'tribalism' in the country. It is the Congress Party and the Congress leaders—I do not mean all of them, it is some Congress leaders—who are responsible for it. The Bihar and Bengal Congress leaders have to answer before they claim that their plan is meant to eliminate the troubles inside the country, which have arisen over the linguistic question.

Sir, let me say a few things about the readjustment of boundaries between our two provinces. Sir, as you know, this has been a dispute for a long period. Even in 1912, a general statement was issued by Shri Sachidananda Sinha, Parameshwar Lal and other Bihari leaders of that time who said that readjustment should be made on the linguistic basis. Those areas which were Bengali-speaking and contiguous to Bengal should be returned to Bengal. There was no difference between us—Biharis and Bengalis. There is no difference between us even today as far as the people are concerned. It is the gentlemen at the top—the rulers—who started quarrelling amongst themselves. What happened? Even before the Linguistic Commission was formed, Dr. Sri Krishna Sinha declared in the Legislative Assembly that the time was inopportune for such readjustment of boundaries. That is what he said in the Assembly. Then the Bengal Congress came forward and demanded—and what are those demands? Now, I do not know if any gentleman from the West Bengal Congress is present here; it does not seem so.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will see it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the Bengal Congress—the Pradesh Congress Committee—demanded 13,950 sq. miles, with 6·7 million population. It was a fantastic demand. It has no relevance to the readjustment of boundaries. It was a kind of demand for "lebensraum". "We want more and more." That is the spirit with which the demand was formulated. We never supported such things. We raised our voice against such unprincipled, aggressive demands on the part of the Bengal Congress. Then they came out with another demand. The West Bengal Government demanded 11,840 sq. miles with a population of 5·7 million. Here again, the demand was unjust, not based on linguistic principles. What are the grounds? The grounds were 'corridor.' "We want land for refugee settlement. We want some area for getting control over the catchment area of the river Ajoy." Such arguments were given in order to justify this unreasonable demand by the Bengal Congress. They went up. They tried to whip up provincialism. But the people of Bihar and Bengal did not allow themselves to be misled by this kind of fantastic demand. Then what happened? Then came the Bihari demand—the irresponsible demand. Shri Krishna Sinha characterised the demand of the West Bengal Congress as Hitlerite demand. Mind you. They belong to the same organization. One talks to the other man—his counter-part who is in the Working Committee—that he is making a Hitlerite demand. Then, what did he do? He became Mussolini. He said, "I want West Denajpur, Midnapur, Jalpaiguri, Birbhum, Malda and so on. They are supposed to be Hindi-speaking areas and should go to Bihar. Well, this competition in the Hitlerite spirit, if I may use that expression, did not arouse anger or prejudice among the Bihari or the Bengali people. They stuck to their position. They remained fraternal.

They remained mutually respectful. Sir, what happened? Then they tried to rouse passions because they thought that it would be the only way of getting something done. That is how they argue. Shri Atulya Ghosh made a statement. As you know, he is the President of the West Bengal Pradesh Congress, who sits in the other House and who is a very powerful figure, not merely because he is the President of the Pradesh Congress, but also because he has got the full backing of the big business behind him. He said about the Bihar Congress:

"The latest phase in Bihar campaign of terrorising and intimidating into silence the Bengali-speaking population residing in areas adjacent to West Bengal appears to be the holding of political conference. All the Government machinery is mobilised to organise meetings, trucks and lorries are forced into service for bringing in people; free cinema shows, dances, etc. are arranged. Even quotas of rice are issued free for the preparation of liquor."

I do not know what Gandhiji would have said had he been alive to hear such a statement of a Pradesh Congress President directed against the Pradesh Congress leaders of another State. Then, Sir, what happened? There was another allegation made in one of the Bihar papers. You see the competition in this. One Bihar paper made the allegation that Mr. Ghosh had sent 700 prostitutes to get signatures for joining certain areas with West Bengal. I would ask hon. Members here to procure this material and read as to how the leaders of the Bengal and Bihar Congress, responsible men, people in responsible positions, behaved. There was a meeting in Purulia organised by the Bihar Congress, in which it was said: "Not an inch of territory shall go out of Bihar." Posters were displayed: "Blood will flow if this happens." Such was the behaviour of the votaries of non-violence, the disciples of the Buddha, the gentle-

men of Amritsar listening to those fine speeches there about such fine things, when it was a question of readjusting the boundaries of two States, a simple enough job for any sensible person. Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is how the trouble was begun. We know the relations between Bihar and Bengal. After all, have we not lived and worked together? Have we not fought for a common cause, for the unity and freedom of the country? Are we Bengali and Bihari workers, not working together in the factories of Calcutta? Have we not worked together for a better life? Have not Bihari peasants and Bengali peasants fought side by side for the betterment of their life? Such people can never quarrel among themselves. It is the disgruntled politicians with their utter bankruptcy who can quarrel among themselves. It is they who, in a shameful manner, are now telling the people that because the differences between the two States cannot be settled amicably, the two States must be united together.

Sir, the same thing happened in Bombay. It was Mr. S. K. Patil who said 'Why in five years? Not even in 5,000 years can Maharashtra get Bombay' speaking at the same public meeting on the 20th November last year. At the same meeting was present Mr. Morarji Desai, the Chief Minister of Bombay. He said that so long as Congress was alive, Maharashtra would never get Bombay. Where did they get that courage from? How did they speak in that manner, in that bellicose manner? After the S.R.C. report was published or when it was about to be published, we were told by the Prime Minister of India that we should dispassionately consider the whole matter, that the matter would be ultimately decided by Parliament. Yet we find that immediately after it was published Congress leaders in high positions vied with one another in making fantastic claims and counter-claims, in issuing threats, which can provoke people at any

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

time in any situation. This is what happened. One should have thought that the Congress leadership would learn from that and proceed to modify their decision in such a manner as would conform to the linguistic principle and the wishes of the people, but nothing happened. While advising us to exercise patience, while advising us to restrain ourselves, they sat in the Congress Working Committee. They met in small groups as if it was a sort of patrimony inherited from some big ancestor to be settled among some co-sharers. The gentlemen who sat in the Working Committee confabulated with provincial leaders of their own party, forgetting that outside that Working Committee there was the country, there were other organisations, there were other people who represented to their misfortune a majority of the electorates even today. You will understand that it is not the Communist Party or the Socialist Party which was doing this. It was the Congress Party, the party in power. It was the Congress Party which was doing it, knowing that any pronouncements they made would be interpreted as a sort of semi-official decision or unofficial decision of the Government. At least that is how things were interpreted by the people. Sir, in Bombay they have completely bungled. On the issue of Maharashtra, they have bungled. The Prime Minister himself is considerably responsible for this. I am suspicious of our leaders and so I started looking up the writings of the Prime Minister. I always keep his books in my shelf. I found the reason in the J.V.P. Report for the decision that the Government has taken. This is what is stated there about Bombay:

"We cannot consider it as belonging to any one linguistic group and attach it to a purely linguistic province."

Then it goes on:

"In the event of the present Bombay Province splitting up into

several provinces, it becomes all the more incumbent for this Greater Bombay taking shape as a separate unit."

This was what was said in April 1949 in the report of the Linguistic Provinces Committee appointed by the Jaipur Congress. The Committee was appointed in December 1948 and the report was submitted in April 1949. What is stated here is sought to be implemented and imposed upon the people of Bombay by sheer force. Sir, the President has expressed his sorrow and distress at these happenings. We are also sorry. We are also full of sorrow. If minorities had been molested in any part of India, if public properties had been destroyed, if ugly incidents had taken place, we are also sorrowful, but I would have expected the President to express his sorrow also for those people, those one hundred men and children who had been butchered by the police in the streets of Bombay. I would have expected the President to express his sorrow for those children of five years and seven years who had been killed in the arms of their relatives. I would also have expected him to express his concern at the terrorism that has been let loose in Bombay by the Government of the day. I would also have expected him to express his sorrow for what is happening in Orissa today. Orissa has been plunged into a reign of terror. Such things should also have been taken note of by the President, but unfortunately the President's adviser did not care to tell him about this sort of things. Otherwise, such things would have found perhaps some kind of reference in his Address.

Then, Sir, about this merger thing again. We have been told that this will lead to the advancement of the country. You see how they had changed. I would tell you the whole story. Dr. Roy, even before the proposal was announced in the press, met the representatives of the press in his chamber. He told them about this and asked them not to publish it until something had come about

officially. He even made it clear to the press that he had the support of no other person than the Prime Minister of India. Thus his proposal was published, and he arrived in Dum Dum from Delhi on the 24th. Then some twelve people got there and put garlands on his shoulders. We do not grudge garlands being exchanged. Let them if they are a sort of mutual admiration society. What happened? After he came, he went to the Writers' Building and met the editors. He knew that Bengal editors would not easily support him in such a proposal. So, what did he do? He saw the newspaper owners and the owners came down heavily upon the editors and silenced them. When the Journalists Bill come up here for discussion, I shall go into that story, and I shall say how the democrats of the Congress regime, in high places, throttle their own press, stifle their own editors, gag their own journalists and regiment the press. I won't go into that now. This is how the press in Bengal has been silenced. One editor who was bold enough to sign a statement along with others opposing the merger move was on the point of losing his job.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Some journalists make the allegation that it is not Congressmen but members of the Opposition who are trying to silence them and throttle them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not wish to discuss it further. Some Congress members of the Assembly started opposing this, but they have been silenced. I do not know how many of you will be silenced if this kind of move were made on the floor of this House, but I hope you will survive the evil reasoning of this proposal. Then, Sir, what happened? People began to ask questions. Dr. Roy said, "Bihar has a population of four crores and twenty lakhs and we have got only two crores and fifty lakhs. But what does it matter? It is the quality that counts. One man of quality can dominate one hundred people without quality." This is how

he explained the matter. On this occasion, first of all, I would apologise to the people of Bihar for the incivility shown by the Chief Minister to them and to their genius. Because I know that the Bihari people are as great as the Bengali people. If per chance, in any field of development, they are lagging behind, it is not their fault. It is the fault of the British and it is the fault of those who have succeeded them. I hope the people of Bengal would be forgiven for having or for suffering such a Bengali in a high position who does not hesitate to fling insults to the Bihari people and to Bihar with whom he is supposed to unite. Dr. Sri Krishna Sinha, his counter-part—one is a Physician and the other is a different kind of Doctor—and he got it said there, "what does it matter? Numbers shall win. We shall dominate by numbers." It was a question of domination. The very proposal, as soon as it came, gave out their minds—the type of union which they were thinking of. One was thinking in terms of dominating by virtue of his alleged quality and the other was thinking of it by virtue of his alleged numerical superiority. Sir, we know, none respects numbers or quality—neither Dr. Sinha respects numbers nor Dr. B. C. Roy respects quality. Had it been so, when Dr. Meghnad Saha's body was taken, the Bengal Government would have been at least present at the air port. None was present so far as I know. About quality, it is they who seldom have the slightest respect for the quality of our people, whether the people be Biharis or Bengalis. About numbers, what happened in Bihar in August last year when there was agitation in the whole of Bihar? The entire Bihari people were plunged in police terror. It is they who came down on the numbers and wanted to silence the people by sheer show of force and sheer use of brute power. That is what happened. Therefore, Sir, the quality and number count for them so long as they can help to dominate one or the other or combine to dominate the people at large.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Therefore we are not going into that now. The only reason why I am mentioning this is to show how their mind is working. Then Dr. Roy thinks.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time. Don't mention any names.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Chief Minister of West Bengal—I don't know what his name is—and his friends are thinking that if Bihar were integrated with Bengal, mineral resources would be available for the big Calcutta capitalists. No wonder the Calcutta capitalists are smacking their lips over the prospects of the integration. Similarly, there in Bihar, ideas are being spread that if Bengal were to be integrated, more revenues in Bengal would be available for being utilized for the development of Bihari areas in Bihar. After all, as you know, Bengal's revenue is about Rs. 50 crores and Bihar has Rs. 29 crores with a deficit in the current budget of Rs. 29 crores or so. None will get anything. They will not get the Bengal revenue in that way nor Bengal capitalists will get the mineral resources that way. But this is how the political adventurers are thinking today. It is not as if they are actuated by the interests of the country. It is not as if they are motivated by the well-being of our people. It is not as if they are trying to unite these two States with a view to advancing the cause of the country at large. Nothing of the sort. Each one has his own interests, his own outlook in this matter, his own axe to grind. That is how they are contemplating unity. Then Dr. Roy thinks that once Bihar comes, he will send the refugees there. I would ask my dear Bihari friends 'Will you accept the refugees when your population or density of population is so high, when it has not been possible for you, as you say, to take refugees because you have not got enough land for your own peasants and how is it that you expect that the refugees could be

sent there when no less than 100,000 Biharis every year trek out of that province in order to find jobs in Calcutta and other places?' This is how the political gamblers are thinking today. They cannot solve the problem at all. They want to get rid of the problem by shoving it on to somewhere else. This is how their mind is working. About education and culture, I don't know what will happen.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL) in the Chair.]

These are some of the reasons they advance and our answer to these is simple. Now there is reason for it as to why they are trying for this and why they are keen on this proposal. I know that the West Bengal Congress made tall promises to Bengal and were talking of 13,000 square miles and 11,000 square miles. When they talked with the Bihar Congress, they were told 'Nothing doing, you will not get anything.' Even after the modification had been made by the Government, the Bihar Congress Ministry threatened resignation. Is it not a fact? Let the Bihari friends deny that Dr. Sinha talked on the subject with resignation in his pocket and every time he was asked to part with certain territories of Bihar, he threatened resignation. The Congress Central Government here was faced with a crisis—a Constitutional crisis, a political crisis within its own party with the Maharashtra problem on its hands unsolved. Then Dr. Roy—after all how can he show his face when he goes back to Bengal, empty-handed? Naturally they had to find some other course. This is one aspect of the matter. Then we know that the vested interests have been at it. We know that Tatas—Mr. J. J. Gandhi—met Dr. B. C. Roy and made a suggestion of this sort and I know it for certain—because Dr. Roy himself has admitted that he has given up claims to two more Thanas in Purulia although they are Bengali-speaking because the Tatas want

them to be placed there. Now this is how things are sought to be arranged. It is no wonder therefore that as soon as this proposal was published, 'Searchlight' in Bihar said, 'Don't wait for October. Implement this proposal by President's Ordinance.' This is what 'Searchlight' says. Did you not, my Bihari friends, read this editorial in 'Searchlight' which demanded that this proposal should be implemented by a Presidential Ordinance instead of waiting till October when the Reorganisation of States is supposed to take effect. Then the 'Eastern Economist' saw in it a new light—discovered in it a new light. Again Mr. Birla's 'Hindustan Times' writing from New Delhi, lost not a single day and came out with a full-throated support for this proposal and more people supported it apart from the 'Statesman'. 'Azad' a Muslim League paper in Dacca, supported the proposal and hailed it as a sort of an example for those who stand for one unit in Pakistan and on the strength of that proposal tried to deride and malign those people who stand for a federation.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: What did Amrita Bazar Patrika say?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Your search will be useless. I am coming to that. In Pakistan, 'Azad' is the champion of this proposal of Dr. Roy and Dr. Sinha—what is called Roy-Sinha proposal and it is an irony of history that when Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan was speaking at a public meeting in support of a Federation and against one Unit and he was referring to the policies of the Congress for linguistic reorganisation of States and linguistic reorganisation of India, at that time he got the news that a merger proposal had been made by the two Chief Ministers of the Congress regime which goes to contradict all that he and his colleagues in the dust and din of the freedom struggle stood for, fought for and for which they were prepared to give their lives. Now, you have been helping the reactionaries even in Pakistan on account

of these proposals that you have made here. Madam Vice Chairman, I would ask hon. Members to take note of these things. They should not brush aside these things as if they are of no importance. They should try to judge of the proposals by seeing who are those people who are supporting it and who are those who are opposing it. Among the opponents of this proposal is the Chairman of the Sahitya Parishad of Bengal—Shri Atul Gupta who has been a staunch follower of the Congress and an eminent jurist in India whose name is familiar to all those who have had anything to do with the legal profession. What does he say in his presidential address at a conference against this merger proposal? He said:

"This kind of imagination is only possible to those who have separated Bombay city from Maharashtra where it naturally belonged and who are determined to send officials from Delhi in order to administer Bombay. This is not the imagination of a healthy mind. It is the perversity, it is the madness of hitherto untested power which has brought about this kind of *Lila Nirth*."

I do not find an English word for that. And in conclusion, he has said:

"The duty of citizens in every democratic Republic is to make arbitrary administration impossible, whichever the political party is in charge of power."

That is what is said by one who is not a political partisan, who has been a supporter of the Congress, an elderly person with wisdom and knowledge of the Constitution of the land. What he is saying, you should take note of.

As far as we are concerned, we know they have made the decision for the merger, but the people of Bengal and Bihar jointly shall unmake it, there is no doubt about that. As surely as the people of Bengal unsettled a settled fact of the early century when Curzon imposed an arrangement on them. Therefore, I want the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

hon. Members of the Congress to ponder about this matter.

Have you not enough troubles on your hands? Why must you create another trouble? We were at peace in Bengal and Bihar. There was no molestation of the minorities. In fact, on 21st January, Bengalis and Biharis came out in a common strike the like of which Bengal has scarcely seen, in support of the linguistic readjustments of the boundaries. We know that eminent Biharis, patriotic Biharis are supporting the linguistic rearrangement of the States. Where did they discover any conflict? Where did they discover trouble as far as Bengal and Bihar are concerned? Now you know what has happened in Maharashtra. I can tell you, Madam Vice-Chairman, that for all the troubles in Bombay they are the people who are responsible. Call the Chief Minister of Bombay to order. Restore civil liberties there. Accept the linguistic principle and return Bombay city to Maharashtra to whom it rightfully belongs. Then Bombay shall be smiling again in peace in no time. But they have not taken that path. On the contrary, in the chawls area the policemen are carrying on raids. Five members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of India, including Mr. Dange, have been arrested, some were arrested even before the announcement with regard to the city of Bombay was made. In the early hours of the morning, their houses were raided and they were taken to jail, some 14 hours before the announcement was made. What kind of democracy is this? What kind of principles of the Buddha are they preaching when they practise such things in public life? Madam Vice-Chairman, for the troubles in Bombay, therefore, it is they who are responsible and they must be called to order.

I find the Prime Minister at Amritsar said he takes responsibility for all these things. Well, one does not feel that he is talking seriously about this matter. If he were a knight in the Victorian age, such chivalry perhaps

would be understandable. But if the Prime Minister, in a democratic set-up, owns responsibility for what has happened in the country, his first and foremost task would be to declare a change in policy with regard to the reorganisation of the States, return to the ideals and principles which our national movement had stood for, recall police repression and proceed to reorganise the States on the basis of language and culture, respectfully and obediently to the wishes of the people and with full regard for the linguistic and cultural aspirations of our people. Nothing of that sort about this owning of responsibility. You know how he owned up the responsibility? You, will have noticed the note of challenge in it. He owns up responsibility, not in a sense of humility, nor in a spirit of self-criticism, nor with a view to reviewing past policy of Government, but in a spirit of justification, that everything that he has done is right. He is telling the people of India that what he decides shall come to stay. And he flings the threat that if the people were to oppose them in the street, they shall be met in the street.

Madam, I should make it clear on the floor of this House that this movement of our people is a democratic and peaceful movement, conducted in a democratic manner. Here is a movement, under the canopy of which men of all faiths and religions, men of all political parties, be they high Congressmen or not, come together for remaking a new India, for preventing a calamity, for averting a crisis which the Congress rulers have created. But certainly, we do not view the movement as if it is a movement where all kinds of violences and such things could be indulged in. Nothing of that sort. But if Parliamentary democracy fails or if perchance hon. Members of Parliament use their majority against the wishes of the people, in defiance of the people, if Dr. Roy succeeds in registering his M.L.As. and arraying 160 people against two crores and fifty lakhs, protected by the Constitution, protected by the bullets and bayonets,

protected by his repressive law, then the issue shall be decided in the streets. There is no doubt about it. Even there, in turmoil, in the trial of strength, in the test of life, in the test of fire, we shall remain non-violent. We shall remain democratic. We shall maintain peace. Never, never shall we as long as we are alive allow the minorities to be molested, public property to be destroyed. That is very clear. This is a declaration which has come from the movement itself. And the leaders of the Samyukta Maharashtra Parishad made it clear. If criminals and anti-social elements took advantage of such a situation, it is impermissible for the party in power to use its propaganda weapon to malign the opposition parties, or the movement for that matter.

Sir, the Prime Minister knows very well that the movement is being conducted peacefully and democratically, that it is the desire of the leaders of the movement to broaden its base and to bring into its fold all those who are still not coming to it. Therefore, I say, let us not confuse the issue. I would tell the Prime Minister, if I may, that if he really believes in democracy, he should use his Parliamentary majority to attack this proposal, to negate this proposal, not to give any quarter to this but to tell the people of India here in this Parliament, true to the pledges of our past, responsive to the wishes of our people, that we shall endeavour with all our goodwill in order to so reorganise the States of India that the various cultures, the languages, literature, art, national entities and soon find their fullest opportunities for their self-expression for unhindered development of their national geniuses. It is in this confluence of all these things that we see the greatness of India rising in stature, rising, developing and advancing to a new life. Madam Vice-Chairman, I would, therefore, ask the Congress Government to view it from this angle. There is yet time. The Bengali people are troublesome people if you rub them in the wrong, the Bihari people are also not very obliging if you rub them in the wrong.

The Britishers understood it. You have got already enough on your head. Do not go in for that sort of thing. Do not plunge us into another struggle which we do not want. Therefore it is essential today here in the course of this debate for voices to be raised against this merger proposal. This merger is a blow aimed at the heart of India; merger is a blow aimed at the very spirit of our civilisation; merger is a blow which wants to wipe out not only the different States from the political map of India but put culture and language under a steam-roller. Merger is a conspiracy or the evil genius of the people who have failed to solve the problem and who have created all manners of troubles in the country, people who want to cover their political bankruptcy by gambling with the destinies of our people. Never, never, shall the people of India true to the traditions of their past, true to the heritage of their civilization, true to the great, immortal and undying inheritance that we have got, allow such a thing to pass. Shri Govind Ballabh Pant said at Amritsar that the merger proposal was not only possible but that it shall materialise, that it is going to come. I do not know which is the source for such strength. Where do those utterances get the backing from? If it is a question of Bengal and Bihar people, his voice would have faltered, his voice would have choked and he would never have uttered these words of insolence towards our people. I know the strength behind this. This lies in the political power that they have got in hand; it lies in the Preventive Detention Act which they can use as they have been using in Bombay. The source of this arrogance lies in the untasted power which they are tasting now. The source and strength behind this thing lies not in any moral force, not in any moral philosophy, not even in any idealism but in the dogmatism of the bankruptcy of the rules in this country who want to get away with their scheme, no matter what happens to our civilization, no matter what happens to the desti-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

nies of our country, no matter what happens to the culture of our country, no matter what happens to the traditions of Tilak, Gokhale, Rabindranath Tagore, Surendranath Banerjee, Mahatma Gandhi and others. Political expediency is the only consideration. The re-definition of the idealism has started. They want to redraw the map of India after their own image. They forget the beauty of our civilization. They forget the diversity; they forget this fact that our civilization is a big river into which many streamlets of culture flow in majestic grace which have to be developed so that they could strengthen what is called the great civilization of our country.

I would again appeal to the hon. Members of the Congress Party not to be carried away by the Congress propaganda, propaganda of the two leaders. I know that the people of Andhra, no matter whether on this side or that, fought so valiantly. Their martyrdom in the struggle for linguistic provinces is an inspiration which will echo down the corridors of history. They will never, never, support such a thing. I know the Maharashtrians who are valiantly fighting for their culture and rights will never, never support such a thing. I know for that matter, the Bihar which Mr. Jaya Prakash Narain represents and other patriotic Congressmen represent, will never be a party to that invidious, horrid, preposterous deed between the two men at the top by which they want to barter away the destinies of both peoples. I know for that matter the people of U.P. who gave us Motilal Nehru who produced the Nehru Committee Report will never be a party to that obliteration of diversity and culture in the midst of the great unity of our land. I know that the people of Tamilnad, the people of Kerala and Karnataka who have been so greatly fighting for their own self-existence, self-assertion and self-expression within the broad framework of Indian unity shall never put their seal of support on that infamous proposal. I know at the

same time, that our Assamese friends who are trying to maintain their separate existence within the framework of India unity, despite Shri Atulya Ghosh's fantastic claims, will never prepare the ground for their obliteration by supporting the invidious merger proposal. I am also conscious of the wishes of the Orissa people who, in 1936, got their right to have a separate Province, will not create a situation wherein they will have to be slaughtered under the merger schemes of the present regime. Therefore, I am using the occasion today to impress upon you and the House and all right thinking men here that here is a proposal which, the sooner it is taken away, the better it is. This is a proposal which must be buried and buried, as I have said, ten feet deep so that one feels ashamed to think of it even.

In conclusion, I would only like to say that we want the unity of India but for that unity, we want to develop the fraternal relations of our people, to give them full opportunities so far as their languages and cultures are concerned, so that they can mingle as free people, as a free family in the garden of Indian civilization.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Madam Vice-Chairman, I did not intend being called upon after such a storm in the House, nor will I be guilty of adding to the storm but would like to examine the President's Address in a calm atmosphere.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): Tomorrow morning.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: As the Leader of the Opposition points out, it is better done tomorrow morning, with your leave. I may be permitted to continue tomorrow when we meet at 11.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 22nd February 1956.