

TRESPASS OF PAKISTANI TROOPS INTO INDIAN TERRITORY—INCIDENT IN THE RANN OF KUTCH

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): Sir, May I draw your attention to an item of news that has appeared in the papers this morning. It reads as follows:

"A strong contingent of the Pakistan Army trespassed into Indian territory and attacked an Indian military patrol with automatic weapons in Chhad 'bet', a 35 mile pasture land in the Rann of Kutch on Sunday, according to authoritative reports received here.

The intruders had taken up positions in trenches on the island and when an Indian military patrol reached the place on routine patrol, opened machine-gun fire on them.

Three Indian Army men were injured, two seriously, and three camels were killed."

This is rather serious news and very disturbing. I would like the Government of India to give us details of this as early as possible and to state what action and what steps they are taking in this regard.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Mr. Chairman, I am rather fortunate in that that I have been called upon to speak immediately after my hon. friend from Bengal. I mean Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the leader of the Communist group in this House. The whole of yesterday evening for over an hour he carried on a tirade against the Congress Party and different leaders of the Congress Party. He was telling us as to how the leaders of the Congress Party are working for disunity of India and how they do not practise non-violence which they preach and how they are not trying to solve problems in a peaceful manner. He also complimented himself and his party for the excellent manner in which they have been working

for the unity of this country and the peaceful approach which they are invariably adopting for the solution of the various problems that have arisen in the country. Undoubtedly to many of us, his speech sounded very ironical. There is no doubt that they are working for the unity of the country according to their own philosophy. I am quite sure that to some extent at least in the recent past they have been consistently agitating for the creation of linguistic States in the country. The reason is quite obvious, because they are hoping, though I am quite sure that hope will not materialise, that in a few small States at least they will be able to capture power, and they have been subordinating the interests of the country to the interests of their own party. It is not with the well-being of India in their heart that they have been doing this but from their own party point of view. Agitation, more or less a tearing agitation, is being carried on by certain parties in this country for the linguistic redistribution of the entire country. Now, in so far as peaceful approach to the various questions arising out of this problem is concerned, it is very evident from what has happened in the recent past. We are very familiar with what happened in the streets of Calcutta, and it is well known who were responsible for it. The Railway station at Puri was burned down, was peacefully burned down. We know who did it. Coming nearer, we know what happened in Bombay last month, how buses after buses were burnt, how buildings were ransacked, how political dacoities were committed, how innocent women and children were assaulted in the name of linguistic States. It requires a lot of courage on the part of my friend to come and tell this House that he and his Party have always been peaceful. If all the information that we have got is correct—and we have no reason to doubt the authenticity of the information—for the havoc that has been caused in Bombay Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and his party must take complete responsibility.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I repudiate the statement. It has not been suggested even by Mr. Morarji Desai. I do not think he need out-Morarji Morarji here.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: We have heard in patience all the tirades that Mr. Gupta indulged in against the Congress Party. He should in patience hear what we feel about his own party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Tell something which decent men can hear.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Evidently my hon. friend does not want me to dwell on the achievements of his party in the streets of Bombay during the last month. It has shamed India. We all regret what has happened in that part of the country. We all regret what has happened in many places in the South. If a proper assessment is being done, it will be known which party has been responsible for all this disorderly behaviour in the country. Undoubtedly, I am also ashamed to admit that some members of my Party, some of our leaders even encouraged a certain type of parochial mentality. It is a gross travesty saying that the Congress Party and the Congress leaders were responsible for all this and that the Communist Party had adopted a non-violent and peaceful approach to this question. This is telling things off the hat, and there is absolutely no truth in it, but I do not want to dilate on this and take up the time of this House, because there are more important things before the country today. Before I pass on from this point, I would like to say one other word about what happened in Bombay. A demand has been made in this House as well as in the other House that there should be an inquiry into the conduct of the police—not the conduct of the people who participated in this crime, but the conduct

of the police in Bombay. Sometimes we try to cover our misdeeds by calling for an inquiry. It is true that in a democratic set up, the life of the people is very important and we have got to save the individual life and individual liberty. We are not in a dictatorial country and we cannot play with the lives of the individuals. But at the same time, individuals, in contrast to the nation, are only small atoms. The nation's interest is more important than that of the individual. However much one might regret what happened in Bombay, one has got to see that to save the calamity from spreading, the Government of the day had to take action and had to take firm action. Many people do regret and genuinely regret, whether this action should not have been taken at the very initial stage, whether violence should not have been curbed rather at the outset. Of course there are difficulties and delicacies. Any democratic Government will fight shy of taking stern action. People who are in Bombay and close friends of mine, gave expression to their feeling that even the redoubtable Chief Minister of Bombay felt weak for a time in the initial stages of the riot that broke out there. Had he taken a firmer action in the initial stage, probably more lives would have been saved. Probably things would not have developed in the manner that they have developed. All praise to the police who acted in a restrained manner in the circumstances in which they had to take action. It is no good running down the police at every stage. They are doing it for our sake, they are doing it for the nation and if you demoralise the police, you are merely creating a chaotic condition under which a dictatorial power can seize power. I can well appreciate the Communist Party raising slogans for inquiry because they want to demoralise our police, they want to create chaos. They don't want the wounds to be healed in Bombay. That is the way they are trying to exploit the situation and we may be only playing into their hands if we yield to this unreasonable demand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why not yield to Mr. Gadgil's demands?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: There have been people speaking differently not only in his party but in my party also. Mr. Gadgil is not in this House but Mr. Gupta is in this House and I am answering his charges and his demands.

(Interruptions.)

May I say that it is the desire of the nation, that it is the wish of this House and I am quite sure, it will be the wish of the other House also to pay our compliments to the manner in which the forces of law and order behaved in the crucial moment at that time in the City of Bombay and in some other places, though the same compliment cannot be paid to the Governments in some other States. We are sorry to see that in some States, the Government did not take proper action in proper time. It is not for me to individually single them out today but one thing is certain. If a Government cannot govern, it has to quit. If the leaders of the country, the leaders of the Government, think that they are not able to function in a particular set of circumstances and they are going to sacrifice the nation for their weaknesses, in that case they will have no right to occupy their seats and they have no right to sacrifice the interests of the nation. Many sad things have happened in the State of Orissa and in other States and we are sorry for it and I am not sure what steps will be taken to see that things don't repeat themselves if occasion arises in the future.

Passing on, what troubles most of us today is what is happening to the unity of India. Can we take it for granted that India is going to be a united country and a united nation or are there factors which are fissiparous in nature? Well, many thinking persons rightly are giving vent to their expressions that the Government of the day and the Party in

power have not taken enough steps to strengthen the unity of the nation. Even the former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has been writing a series of articles which have been appearing in 'The Hindu' wherein he has given expression to his views as to whether we are right in having a Federal State under our Constitution and should we not have had a Unitary State. There is much in what he says but on an over-all examination of the question, I don't know whether in a country like India, with its vast areas, with different types of people residing in different corners of this vast land, whether we could have had—and it would be to our advantage—to have—a unitary form of Government? But I do feel that the Constitution-makers did not fully realise the fissiparous tendencies in the country; did not take note of the historical past when they framed the Constitution in the manner that they have framed it. I for one, would have wished that the forces of unity had been strengthened in the Constitution itself. I greatly regret that in the Constitution, instead of forming provinces, it formed States. You know that names have many times, a misleading influence on the minds. Today there is a feeling merely because we call these areas as States, that they are something like independent units and they have got their own culture, their own existence which can function more or less in opposition to India as a whole. It is not too late even now to amend the Constitution and convert these States into provinces. I am not merely satisfied with changing the nomenclatures. I would want this House and the other House to go much further. I would like the Parliament to re-examine the list in the Seventh Schedule and find out whether we cannot allocate to the Union more subjects than have been allocated today. In the working of the Constitution we have now felt that many times, frictions have arisen between States and States in working the river valley projects, in working electric projects and in many other ways. They should be.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now you get the mind behind the merger proposal.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My friend is thinking of his Party. I and my friends are thinking of the good of the country. That is all the difference. This is what is weighing us down, as to whether these subjects should not be rightly transferred to the Union List. More than that, the recent functioning of the limbs of law and order has made us feel that in many States, many times, the authorities who are in charge of law and order in that State may, for reasons political or otherwise, be unable to function and have not functioned properly in the recent past. I for one, would like the Union of India to take more power in the law and order question and at least the superior ranks of the police ought to be under the Government of India rather than under the Government of the State.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We shall make him the Inspector General of Police of the Union of India.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My friend is deaf to others but vociferous to himself. Anyhow I shall not be troubled by his interruptions. Proceeding further, there have been very useful proposals in the S.R.C. report about the creation of several more All-India services. It is time that the Government of India gives its attention to this matter because after all, any weakening of the unity of this country is bound to have a serious repercussion in the future. I beg of the Government again to reconsider the matter whether they should not constitutionally strengthen the unity of India by taking appropriate constitutional as well as legal steps in the matter.

Passing on to another subject, I am glad that my hon. friend Mr. Shrimali is here. I have got to pay some compliments to the Union Ministry of Education for the manner in which they have implemented the directions in the Constitution regarding the national language. I greatly regret to

say that sufficient attention has not been given to popularise the official language which I should respectfully call as a national language. What has happened is you have allowed parochial tendencies to develop. In one State, the Hindi language which we proudly call as official language, is not even compulsorily taught to the

students. Is it that which
12 NOON should be done if you want to make it the official language in 15 years? But in a particular State it is classed as an alternative subject to handicraft. So you realise the importance attached to the teaching of Hindi. When I was appearing before the Official Language Commission the other day, I frankly told them that if we are to be sincere to the proclamation that we have made in our Constitution, that Hindi is to be the official language, if that is not to be a mere ornamental word in the Constitution, if it is intended to be something genuine, all possible steps must be taken to see that this objective is achieved within a reasonable time, though I do feel that it may not be possible to adopt it as official language in another 15 years. In fact, I mentioned that Hindi must be compulsorily taught in the secondary school stage of our educational system for the next ten years. At the beginning of the eleventh year, it must be the medium of instruction in the secondary school stage. And at the end of the fifteenth year, Hindi must be the medium of instruction at the university stage and at the end of the twentieth year it must also be the medium through which technical education is imparted. Some such programme, you must put before yourself. And you must pursue that programme with determination. There is no use dilly-dallying in this matter. That will not serve any purpose at all. You see the danger now when we have the linguistic bogie raised everywhere. If we stand for the unity of India, we should realise that language is a potential force, both for unity as well as for disunity. If through the medium of

the English language the British have been able to build up the political unity of this country, we certainly can build up the real unity of this country through the medium of a language of this country. But what steps have the Education Ministry taken in this matter? Except appointing some committees, except bringing out certain books, I must say no positive steps have been taken at all. The different States have been allowed to chalk out their own policies at their own discretion in a manner as if they were independent States. There is no sincere attempt yet made to popularise and make Hindi a compulsory language.

What is worse still is this. I have met some Hindi teachers right down in the South. We are sending many people to England and other places to study English; but no Hindi teacher is sent to the Hindi areas to familiarise himself with that language and to acquire proficiency in the Hindi language in our own country. There is absolutely no scheme to increase the efficiency of Hindi teachers right down in the South. They are paid a pittance. While teachers who teach English are paid Rs. 50 or Rs. 60 per month, the Hindi teacher is paid about Rs. 20 only.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Most of them are unemployed.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Yes, many of them are even unemployed. It is really a strange thing. There are a large number of trained Hindi teachers in the South wanting to be employed and there is nobody to employ them. Have the Ministry of Education taken any steps and have they looked into this matter? I am not speaking from the Hindi point of view at all. I myself do not know Hindi and I am not able to speak in Hindi. But I am not now thinking of the present generation. I am looking forward to the coming generation. I am looking at this question from the point of view of the unity of India. It is from that point of

view that I am approaching this subject. While I stoutly oppose imposing this language on the present generation—who may not be able to study the language and equip themselves—I am entirely for making it a compulsory subject for the coming generation. Our students, be they in Hindi areas or in non-Hindi areas, should be in a position to acquire sufficient knowledge of Hindi and they should be in a position to become as much experts in Hindi as they are in the English language.

When I lay emphasis on Hindi, let me not be misunderstood as wishing to under-rate the importance of English. English is becoming a world language and our position in the international field is partly due to the fact that we are proficient in the English language. When I was in America last year, I could see how our delegation did better than others largely because of the fact that they were proficient in the English language. In fact, in Mr. Trygve Lie's book there is an anecdote of how an American representative and an English representative wanted to move a resolution in the U.N. They drafted the resolution, but they were doubtful about the meaning of a particular word in the resolution. And they went to Shri Benegal Narsing Rau to find out from him whether the resolution was correctly worded or not. He says two representatives of two English-speaking nations come to a representative of a non-English speaking nation for finding out whether the word used is the correct one or not. Shri Benegal Narsing Rau told them that that particular word had been interpreted in two different ways in two different decisions of the International Court. And when he was asked to give the appropriate word, he said "It is not my job, because later it may be interpreted in a different manner and you may hold me responsible for it." I am emphasising this only for this reason that while primary importance must be given to Hindi, English must also receive suffi-

[Shri K. S. Hegde.]

cient importance. We must keep up our proficiency in English, because the world is becoming smaller and smaller today and if India wants to play an important role or if she wants to continue to play the important role that she now plays, a good knowledge of the English language is also absolutely necessary.

Finally, Sir, I would like to deal with the matter of the reorganisation of the States, because it is the live question today. I am really sorry that in this matter the country and the Government have made several mistakes. Of course, it is very easy to find out the mistakes now which probably many of us did not foresee at that time. Many did have doubts whether we could simultaneously reorganise the States and also work the Second Five Year Plan. I was also under the impression that the capacity of our Government was such that they would be able to do both these things together. But practical experience has shown me that we are likely to fail in both. I may illustrate this by the experience I have gathered from what is happening. I feel that it will be useful if Government would re-examine the whole matter.

There are many composite States today which are being told that they are going to be disintegrated in order to be formed into linguistic States. Take my own State for example. There are three linguistic groups in that State—the Tamil group, the Malayalam group and the Kannada group. What has happened? The Government of Madras is being told that their territory is likely to be confined only to the Tamil areas. The Government of Madras were quite just and generous to us in the working of the First Plan and there was absolutely no discrimination at all. That must be said to their credit. But when it came to the preparing of the Second Plan, they were more conscious of the fact that they were going to be Tamilnad thereafter and were not going to continue to be the com-

posite Madras State. What is the result? In the preparation of the Second Plan—and any impartial observer or impartial expert will bear out what I say—South Kanara and Malabar have been, more or less excluded. They were not interested in planning for somebody who was going to be in another State. That is only normal human nature. But what is strange is that the Government did not foresee this possibility. Now, in a scheme costing some of Rs. 170 crores, for a population of nearly 30 millions and my district has a population of 1.75 millions—we hardly get one crore out of this sum of Rs. 170 crores. And even this one crore is mostly for works started in the previous Plan and not completed. I make bold to say that so far as Malabar and South Kanara districts are concerned, we are getting almost nothing in the Second Plan. I do not blame the Government, for it is due to the set-up. It is the environment that has created the whole situation. That is why I say that this simultaneous reorganisation of the States and the working of the Second Plan is an extremely difficult process and a re-examination and a re-thinking on this matter has been urgently called for.

Coming back to the question of the reorganisation of the States, we knew from our experience of the formation of Andhra that emotions would be roused. That is natural because this is a subject on which there will be a lot of emotion. A man's emotions are roused when you talk about his religion, when you talk of his community, when you talk about his language. Even the creation of one single State gave us a considerable amount of trouble. In those circumstances it was really bold on the part of the Government of India to appoint a commission on the question of the reorganisation of States in the whole of India. They could very well have anticipated the emotions that would be roused, right from the Himalayas up to Cape Comorin. The worst has happened. We know what has happened in the

recent past throughout India. I am not for raking up the past, but I want you to take a lesson from what has happened in the recent past.

It would have been wiser had we confined our attention to the particular areas as we did in the case of Andhra. That way, there would have been more time available for being devoted to the claims of different areas. I am even now suggesting that it would not be too late to say that we shall reorganise one State first and then the others. That way, we can give the utmost consideration to the claims and counter claims and deal with the problems of law and order in a much easier manner than we are now doing at present.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Which do you prefer?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I thought you have understood me. I prefer State by State to be taken one at a time. That is enough for the day. There is no question of scientific redistribution. This is a matter of human emotion. We have got to take into consideration a number of other things. There is no denying the fact that there is a good deal of dissatisfaction in many places. If you really want to implement the Second Five Year Plan, I would still request you to consider whether you cannot slow down the process of reorganisation and deal with one item after another. Take the most important one first and the less important later on. That is one way of dealing with the situation.

As regards the Members of the Commission, they are men of eminence, men of knowledge and I have no doubt that they have tried to be very impartial judges but unfortunately for them, the terms of reference were the vaguest that could possibly be thought of. If you really meant creating linguistic States, why didn't you frankly tell them to create linguistic States? In that case we were meaning one thing and saying an entirely different thing. We gave them terms of reference which might mean

different things for different persons and that is what exactly has happened. They went on creating linguistic States through the backdoor but protested that they were not creating linguistic States. You know, Sir, what States are now proposed to be formed. Are they anything other than linguistic States? When it came to a question of what they call justice and what the others call injustice, then other considerations are put in. I am not a linguistic faddist at all but, at the same time, the Commission had no clear perspective of the approach that they were adopting; there was a good deal of confusion and for this, the responsibility to some extent must lie with the Government which prepared the terms of reference so far as the Commission is concerned. Another thing is, they professed one thing and they were compelled to practise another. In most places they said that the linguistic consideration is not the main thing whereas in actual practice they adopted that as the main consideration if not the sole consideration. Then they said that a district would be a unit and that they were not going to break up any district because the districts, by and large, due to the administration of the last 100 years, had built up an administrative unity which it was not in the interests of the country to disturb. Let us see what happened. In our district, a taluka was disturbed whereas they did not do it in Madhya Pradesh; that was not proposed to be done in Hyderabad; that was not proposed to be done in the Nilgiris and that was proposed to be done in the Five talukas of Travancore-Cochin. In my own district, one taluka was removed for the reason that a predominating number of people were talking one particular language. The Commission, with the greatest respect to them, should have acted as Judges. It would have been better if they had kept their mouth shut. This is one of the advices that is generally given to the Judges and practised mostly, that they have to keep their mouth shut and ears open. In this particular case, I am very sorry to say, at least

[Shri K. S. Hegde.]

some of the Members of the Commission expressed their opinions too openly or thought too loudly and that many times. I am willing to accept the challenge on this particular point. Two Members of the Commission came to my district. I and several others went and saw the Commission: we had discussions and when it came to the question of the boundary, Mr. Panikkar told us, "So far as you are concerned, the boundary is a settled boundary; it is a historical boundary. There is the Chandragiri River."

He knew more about it than we did. He said that that was natural boundary and that we need not and cannot have any discussion about it. We thought, "Here is a gentleman who has conceded our demands even before we asked him." We did not have any further discussion on this matter but what did we see in the Report? The whole of Kasargod Taluk is being added on to Kerala. If you are adopting a particular principle, why don't you adopt it in the manner you ought to adopt? That is my grievance. Break the country in any manner other than the language basis; I have absolutely no quarrel but you cannot create linguistic States in some cases and deny the same in the case of somebody else and put in the hegemony of somebody else in some other cases. That is all that I am complaining about. Nothing more and nothing less. What is public opinion that you are referring to? The 36 Panchayat Boards have resigned today in protest. I invite Mr. Datar's attention to this. If you want an election on that basis, we are prepared. Consistently this district has been standing for a bilingual State. Even today we are standing for it but if you are creating linguistic States, do not split up areas and add them on to others. Do not constitute yourselves as Judges, but create some machinery by which the public opinion could be assessed. The High Power Committee was appointed but it is most unfortunate that the Prime Minister was in the committee. He is the one link through which the unity of India is maintained today. It

is the Congress Party, the Congress High Command and particularly the Prime Minister's personality around which the unity of India is built today. Having put himself in the Committee, he is bound to give a decision one way or the other and that is bound to be challenged. Today, he has become the subject matter of controversy rather than highest appellate authority to which many like us could look up. That hope has been removed and this is, to some extent, responsible for the present chaos in the country. (Interruption). I am glad that at least I and my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta agree on some point. This is a situation from which we must extricate ourselves. What is the way of extricating ourselves is the main question. One approach that is suggested is, bilingual or multilingual States. I would like to have all people speaking one language to be grouped together but not create a unilingual State but a bilingual one, I for one would welcome it for the simple reason that in a unilingual State you are bound to become more and more parochial and the communal forces are bound to come up and assert themselves. Already there are indications that the communal forces are coming to the forefront in different places. One antidote to this is to have a bilingual or trilingual—preferably bilingual—States. It may be preferable administratively to have bilingual States.

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Multilingual States.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: As regards the boundary questions there is a genuine complaint. We must decide it by ascertaining public opinion in that area in some manner or other; it may be indirectly ascertained or directly ascertained. But do ascertain the public opinion and act upon it and do not constitute yourselves as sole Judges in the matter because your judgment is not likely to be accepted as correct and has not been accepted by the people as correct. It is within your knowledge, Sir, and the knowledge of the House and everybody else

that we were set on an even keel of progress. We have done wonderful job both internationally and in the domestic sphere but unfortunately this reorganisation issue has created so much ill-will and bitterness and it has given courage to friends like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to get up and challenge the authority of the Congress to represent the people. These challenges have always been there in the past. You know, Sir, he challenged us on the eve of the elections in Andhra and all of us know the result. Empty challenges do not deter us but, at the same time, it is our bounden duty to do the just thing by our people. We shall deserve their affection and love. I was quite sure, speaking for my own district that the position of the Congress was impregnable before the reorganisation nuddle. But to some extent an element of confusion has set in due to the reorganisation proposals. It is not too late yet for reconsidering the matter. I want my Government to give a calm and dispassionate consideration to these matters, re-examine the entire question, try to ascertain the will of the people and then to comply with the wishes of the people in this matter. Arguments have been advanced, both in this House and outside the House, that Congressmen were talking in different voices on this issue. But Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is claiming that so far as the Communists are concerned they had always been uniform in their demand and united in their approach. As I said in the beginning of my speech, it is true they are always united because their objective or their approach is different from the approach of the other political parties in the country. They work for their party and not for the country. So far as the other parties are concerned their primary object is the country and not the party. That difference accounts for a certain amount of uniformity in the views of the Communist Party. And again, whether they agree or deny, they are a militant party; they do not swear by non-violence however much Mr. Gupta may profess to have faith in it on the floor of this House. A

party which is wedded to violence must in fact have strict discipline within its own ranks. So I am not surprised about a greater degree of unity prevailing in the Communist Party than in other parties, but even this unity has not been always uniform. Yesterday on the floor of the other House it was brought to the notice of the Members how the Communist Members in the Travancore-Cochin Legislature insisted on Peermede and Devikulam being a part of the Kerala State, whereas when this question arose in the Madras Legislature, the Communist Members there remained neutral.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancore-Cochin): That is wrong.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: If the records of the Madras Legislature are wrong and you are right, which is always your claim, I can only sympathise with you. But the records of the legislature show that the Communist Members of the Madras Legislature did not vote on the subject; they stood neutral, whereas the Communist Members in the Travancore-Cochin Legislature did vote for Devikulam, and Peermede to be with Travancore-Cochin. Now again I know in my own district the Communist Members agitate for the northern half of Kasaragode taluk to be with South Kanara whereas the Communist Members of the southern half of the taluk demand that it should be with Kerala, and when a Resolution on the subject came up before the South Kanara District Board, Communist Members of the southern half voted for the Resolution and the Communist Members of the northern half voted against the Resolution. So the difference is there among the Communist Members themselves. But, so far as other political parties are concerned, their position probably is far worse than that of the stand taken by the Congress itself. Well, I am anticipating some arguments from my friend, Mr. Ghosh. Look at the picture of the P.S.P. It passed a Resolution the other day in Coimbatore—and the ink is not yet dry—saying, 'Well, we must have only

[Shri K. S. Hegde.]

unilingual States, no bilingual States at all." We know what is being said now. Shri Ashoka Mehta in the other House said that Bombay must be a bilingual State. On the other side we have Pottam Thanu Pillai who says that the whole proposal must be dropped. In my own district there is another member of the national executive, Mr. Karant, who claims the northern part of the district, I mean the northern part of Kasargode taluk, for Karnataka, while the P.S.P. leaders of Malabar claim it for Kerala. So probably there is more disunity in the ranks of the P.S.P. Party than in the ranks of the Congress in this matter. It is because there is the regional emphasis and when we come to the question of the language we even cut across party lines; we are not unified in our demand; we are prepared to contradict our own partymen on the other side. It is for that reason I am saying we should not give undue importance to language which is not in the interest of the country. For that reason I would request this House to convey out feelings to the Government and say they must carefully re-examine the question whether we should have linguistic States alone or whether it would be in the interests of the country to have bilingual States. Border dispute should be decided by ascertaining public opinion in the area or by judicial tribunals and not by politicians, however eminent they are. In these matters even the judgment of the highest amongst us is not likely to be accepted as correct by the aggrieved parties. There is likely to be a feeling that it has been influenced by political consideration. So some other machinery, either a judicial machinery or a machinery by which you can ascertain the public opinion would be most important.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Just one other subject, Sir. On this President's Address. I shall try to speak on. I would like to speak about our foreign embassies and the work-

ing therein. We have attained a position in the international world of which we have every reason to be proud. That is all the more reason why we must reorganise our foreign diplomatic corps and our foreign embassies. During my tour of England and America last year, sometimes I was pained to find that our embassies and our High Commissioners' offices were not working as efficiently as they ought to do. There is a certain amount of keep-aloo policy. In fact some of the members of our delegation went to the High Commissioner's office in London. We went to the receptionist and we told him that we wanted to see the High Commissioner, because courtesy demanded that we must call on the High Commissioner. Then the receptionist was good enough to tell us, "The High Commissioner is too busy and he cannot see you today." Mrs. Menon was with us. She flared up and said, "You please phone up to the High Commissioner. It is for the High Commissioner to decide whether he wants to see us or not." Then the High Commissioner was phoned up and Mr. Chakravarti who is an extraordinarily nice man immediately phoned up and said: "Who said I am busy? I shall be only too glad to meet the members of the delegation." Well, we went there. He came up to the door and received us and we were talking with him for over an hour. Some of us remarked, "Your receptionist told us that you were very busy and we do not want to take more of your time" and Mr. Chakravarti was quite pained to hear it. This is not a solitary instance. I have heard similar complaints in many other places, particularly from our students. They expect a certain amount of assistance from our embassies and from our officers of the High Commissions. There is a complaint that they are not treated as properly as they ought to. It is extremely important that we must treat these students with respect and love. If our student population, if our younger generation is dissatisfied with the manner in which our administrative machinery is working and if they get frustrated in the

very working of our democracy, it is no wonder we drive them into the hands of evil advisers. Now I would not like to dwell on this subject in too detailed a manner because the subject itself puts an amount of restraint on us. I want the Foreign Ministry to examine this matter and see whether there is not enough room to improve the efficiency of the work in the different embassies. Our experience of the working of the New York and Washington offices cannot be said to be very happy and I do think there is room for improvement and I am quite sure the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will take necessary steps to improve the functioning of these offices.

I will only again repeat and beg of the House to see whether we should not take early steps to create the conditions for a unified India and a united India. Jai Hind.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR (Nominated): Sir, as I was thinking of the President's Address, all my attention was concentrated on the reorganisation of States. I agree with those who think that it was very unfortunate that in our Constitution we dropped the word 'Provinces' and brought in the word 'States'. That has done some mischief, and I think even from the legal point of view it is not correct because in the same Constitution the word State has been used in one place for the whole of India and in another place for various parts of India. Therefore I think we should change the word 'States' and go back to the word 'Provinces'.

As regards the demand for unilingual, bilingual or multilingual States, I think the historical process has been responsible for much of the mischief, the original principle was that for good administration and for the *Swaraj* administration of a country the people must know they are governed; they should not be governed in a language which they don't know properly. It is not at all necessary that people speaking the same language should come under one State

or one Province. The two things are totally different. It was during the days of the partition of the Bengal when a foreign Government wanted to destroy the unity of the politically-conscious Bengalis, that the people claimed that all the Bengalis must be brought together.

In the same way in other provinces also people wanted that the people speaking one language should come together. Take, for instance, the province with which I am often times identified, namely, Gujarat. Gujaratis naturally felt that like Bengal the Gujarati speaking people should come together in one province or one State. I do not sympathise with that aspiration at all. Now that we have got *Swaraj*, all the people of India from one body politic and we are one nation. It is immaterial in how many States we are divided. We are having intermarriages and there is no reason why people speaking one language should all come under one State. I really come from Karnatak. I belong to Belgaum. In Belgaum you will find people speaking Marathi and people speaking Kannada almost equal in number and they freely inter-marry. If people could inter-marry, there is no reason why they could not be under the same administration. In these border places people must be forced to learn two languages and there should be no difficulty or heart-burning about any part being put in this State or that State.

I had suggested that the State of Bombay would be a bilingual State and that the Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians should live together because they have been living together harmoniously I see very little difference between the Gujarati language and the Marathi language. Our social customs are the same. Our culture is the same. That is why we mix together so easily. I wanted and still want that Bombay should be a bilingual State. The Gujaratis are anxious that Kutch, Saurashtra and the rest or Gujarat should come under one

[Kakashaheb Kalelkar]
 province and how can we quarrel with the Maharashtrians when they say that Vidarbha also must come in? If the Gujarati people were prepared to have Kutch as a Centrally Administered area, it would have been to the advantage of both Kutch and the rest of India. I sincerely wish that Kutch should be, as it is today, Centrally administered. But if all the Gujarati people want to come under one State, naturally the Maharashtrians will say, 'bring in Vidarbha also and do not think of numbers.'

I think Uttar Pradesh—here I agree with Mr. Panikāf—ought to have been divided into two smaller compact units. But they say that the land of Krishna and Ram cannot be divided. I cannot understand these antiquated things. Today we are not thinking of U.P. as the land of Ram and Krishna but we have to have a land of Indians. And the whole country claims Ram and Krishna. I think if people of U.P. had consented to divide U.P. into two parts, then they would have some ground and some justification for preaching to others, saying, 'do not quarrel over these things; they are not so important'. I know that the people of U.P. are patriotic. They say that if it becomes necessary they are prepared to divide U.P. into any number of parts. They must realise that the occasion has arisen; only they do not rise to the occasion. If U.P. were divided into two parts, then they could easily say that Maharashtra should remain divided.

As regards Bombay, if the two linguistic groups could still be kept together it is quite all right; otherwise Bombay should be made the second capital of India. That is my suggestion. Today we have got Delhi as the capital. It has got the atmosphere of the Moghul times. Bombay has got the atmosphere of the British times. So it is much better that we have two capitals—one in Delhi and the other in Bombay. I do not know how my Maharashtrian friends would think

about it, but if Bombay is centrally administered and becomes the second capital, Maharashtra stands to gain. Gujarat also stands to gain. Just as today Punjab, because it is very near to Delhi, has gained a great deal, Maharashtrians and Gujaratis would stand to gain if Bombay is made the second capital of India. I think that both the Gujaratis and the Maharashtrians would see the advantage and would forget the present quarrels.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): What about the South?

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: I must not speak about each and every province but I feel that there also the rule should be that each administrative unit should accept the language which the people know best. And the craze for having all people speaking one language to be brought under one State must be given up. I would even say that the present Bengal may be divided into two parts. I am for having small units. With big zones in which there could be groups. That will help the people to train more persons in administration and constructive leadership.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): There are District Boards already.

KAKASAHEB KALELKAR: I know there are District Boards. But if we have small units as states or provinces, if the whole of India is divided into 40 or 50 units, and if we curtail the State autonomy to a great extent, then alone the Centre could be strong enough to ensure the unity of India.

Now, as regards the problem of languages, people are not tired of telling us about the beauty and importance to us of the English language. Who has ever quarrelled about English being used for international purpose? But as far as the internal administration of the country is concerned, if it is carried on English, (so long as, even I am forced to talk in English to be understood by my fellow-Members here) I think we are

not one with the masses. Today people of various States are quarrelling about the language problem amongst themselves, but the day is soon coming when the masses will join together and rebel against the tyranny of the English language. We had one fight against the British and the British people have gone. It is perhaps necessary that we should have another fight amongst ourselves so that the rule of the English language may go. That India should be governed through English language is an abomination. Why should our own people be governed in a language which is not their language and which they do not know? Why should you want to impose the English language on all people because English language is necessary for international purposes? Have English for all international work but so far as the internal administration is concerned, it must be carried on in the language of the people. Because people are fighting over the question of languages, there are some who want to fish in troubled waters and push in the claim of English. There seems to be some method or policy about this. They know that they cannot speak directly in favour of English. Therefore they speak in favour of Hindi. Let Hindi be the uniting language. Having said that, they go on to say that Hindi is not well equipped, and is not known by all therefore in the meantime let English be there. After all, at heart they want English to continue. The English-speaking community or caste want to rule over the country. They are prepared to give scholarships to ambitious youngmen or women to learn that language; they are prepared to increase the number of their caste, provided the whole administration is carried on in English. So long as the internal administration is carried on in English, we cannot say that the masses are enjoying Swaraj. We are not safe, because the roots of the administration have not gone deep amongst the masses. This is a very important thing and I think we ought to consider whether

it is safe to insist on the use of English language for administration. Let our people study the English language and its literature. It is one thing to study a language and another thing to study through a foreign language. The medium of education and the medium of administration must change.

There is another thing to which our people have not given sufficient thought. The building of public opinion in India is in the hands of the English language journals. No doubt there are papers in the Indian languages but all prestige goes to the English papers. So long as that is there, I would suggest that the Indian language papers must have special concessions so far as telegraphic rates are concerned.

And they should be given greater prestige. Today the Indian language papers do not come up to the level of journalism and perhaps Hindi is weaker as compared with Bengali, Marathi, Gujarati and some of the southern languages. Hindi journalism is very weak. Although the number of people speaking Hindi is great, the circulation of Hindi papers is poor. The circulation of Hindi books is very poor. So, we must at present help the various provincial languages. Let us not be afraid that if we help the provincial languages the unity of India would be destroyed. The English people said that unity in India was there because they were there. Now, our own people come and tell us that there is the unity of India because the English language is there. I do not want such unity. I do not think we are safe today. We must reconsider the whole situation and have faith in the Indian languages. Let us try to bring about unity through our languages, and bring about an awakening in the people through the provincial languages and Hindi. The whole question about this redistribution of India into convenient units has to be reconsidered.

SHRI B. C. GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I had intended today to touch upon two topics which are seriously exercising the minds of the people in my part of the country—the problem of the influx of refugees from East Bengal and their rehabilitation and that of the reorganisation of States. As, however, we shall have an opportunity on Friday next to discuss the first problem on a non-official Resolution, I intend to confine my observations today to the second problem. In spite of my doughty and esteemed friend, Shri Govinda Reddy had stated yesterday—Shri Reddy for whom I have great respect—and although it seems that Shri Hegde had contradicted Shri Reddy, I believe, it is commonly recognized today outside the ranks of blind partisan Congressmen that in the matter of reorganisation of States there has been bungling, blundering and lack of statesmanship. It is unfortunate that there have been outbursts of violence in some parts of the country on this issue. Violent outbursts whatever may be the causes must be condemned, must be deprecated and we do that. But I believe statesmanship does not end by merely condemning violent outbursts and manifestations without examining with sympathy and impartiality the causes that might have led to such outbursts. And in that context let us examine the position in Bombay and Orissa. What has happened in Bombay and in Orissa? I shall not pass judgment, but I leave it to the House and yourself, Sir, after you hear the facts to come to the conclusion which you think it just in the case. Now, let us first take Bombay. When we were discussing the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission, I had said that on the face of it seemed to me that Bombay, if there were to be two States, should have gone to Maharashtra, but I had suspended judgement because I said that I was not conversant with all the facts of the case. Since then I have heard a lot of arguments both inside and outside the House, but not a single

argument has been adduced why Bombay should not have gone to Maharashtra. All that we are told is that there is fear and apprehension among a certain section of the people. Which is that section we should like to know and what is the fear that is entertained if Bombay were to go to Maharashtra? We are told that it does not matter where a bit of territory goes, or to which State it goes. If that is so, then why is this outcry against Bombay going to Maharashtra? And we were told also by the highest men in this country that it does not matter—when discussing this question of Bengal and Bihar—where bits of territory go. Yet when the question of the division of U.P. was under discussion, I may bring to your notice that the hon. Home Minister, who was then the Chief Minister of the U.P., was the stoutest in his opposition. What would it have mattered if U.P. had been divided? It would still have been in India. Similarly, in the case of Bombay, to crown it all, when the recommendations of the high power Congress Committee were announced, the Prime Minister broadcast and stated that, although it was decided that Bombay should be centrally administered, he felt that geographically it was within Maharashtra and that the people of Bombay, the majority of whom are Maharashtrians, had, it appeared to him a legitimate claim to that city. If that is so, then what is the reason that Bombay should not have gone to Maharashtra in case you create two States? I had no objection if you had a bilingual State. Then Bombay would have been the capital of the bilingual State. But if you do not have a bilingual State, what is the criterion, except the fear entertained by certain people, certain businessmen that their trade would be hampered? Now, what is the basis of that fear? Take for instance Bengal. We are being dominated, if you like exploited, by businessmen who are not natives of the soil. As you know, Calcutta is owned by the Marwaris. But are they not plying their business? Are they in fear? Could they legitimately demand that Calcutta should be Centrally administered? Now, that you

create Bombay into a Centrally administered area, tomorrow they may come and say why not make Calcutta a Centrally administered area? Where do you stop? I do not see, therefore, that any argument has been advanced against Bombay going to Maharashtra and although I said I would suspend my Judgement on that occasion, I say today that if you create unilingual States, the claim of Maharashtrians to Bombay is unassailable.

Then, Sir, about the disturbances. How did the disturbances originate? Was it only my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who engineered it? What were the actions of the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee? What did they do? Did they not rouse popular passion when they all united on that question? Then, why condemn only my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta? Was it not also their plan that they should demonstrate against the action of the Government in not giving Bombay to Maharashtrians?

SHRI D. NARAYAN (Bombay): It was not the resolution of the M. P. C. C.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Why did the M. P. C. C. resolve that all the members should resign—Assembly Members and Parliament Members—if it was not to register their protest?

SHRI D. NARAYAN: They were not to resign to the Government; they were to resign to their Party.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: If I have read the papers rightly, I think what was stated was that they were to submit the resignation, of course, to their own organisation—resignation from the Assemblies and Parliament. Of course, they knew that that was a subterfuge and that was why they resigned probably, because it was to be given to the organization. The organization would not permit them to resign, but they would show to the public that they had resigned. (Inter-*ruption*.) That is the motive behind it. That is so far with regard to Bombay.

Now, let us come to Orissa. I have some facts here as to what had happened in Orissa. The decision of the Congress Sub-Committee was announced on the 17th January. The Working Committee of the Utkal Pradesh Congress Committee met on the 18th and passed a resolution asking the M. L. As. and M. Ps. to resign and the resolution also said that unless the Government of India revised its decision, it would be impossible for the Congress Ministry to carry on the administration. And most of the M. L. As. including the Chief Minister, were present at that meeting. The same evening it is said that the Chief Minister of Orissa addressed the East hostel College Union and said that with the youth not merely discipline counted, but they must also possess recklessness.....

PROF. G. RANGA: Oh!

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Yes. And when some of the prominent students of Orissa met the Secretary of the Utkal Pradesh Congress Committee, that Secretary told them that there would be a deadlock and students should act to strengthen it with whatever action was possible for them, including obstruction to transport and trains. Then Action Committees were set up in different cities, Action Committees which in some cases were presided over by Congress members. And there was even an M. P. from ~~over~~ ^{the other} House present in the Puri Action Committee. They passed a resolution that demonstrations should be held and particularly the Central Government property should be attacked because the undelying idea was that this was a protest against the Central Government's decision and therefore, the targets of attack would be the All India Radio, railways, post offices and so forth.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJĠ (Nominated): It was not the decision of the Congress Committee. It was the decision of a party.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I say it was. I am not saying the Congress Working Committee. I am saying that Congress members were presidents of these Action Committees.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: P. S. P. members were there.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I am telling you what happened. The idea got round—since the Ministers and Congress members were associated—that this movement had also Government backing. That was the idea of the people in the initial stages and the Government officers also did not take action at the beginning. Then the trouble started. As soon as it started, the Congressmen went away. They went away because the situation was extremely difficult and they dissociated themselves at once from these Committees. Now, I ask you: Is that honest? You are responsible for the situation you create. Passion is roused. People take to violent methods. You say that violence has broken out. Then you retire. What happened in the meantime? Both the Chief Minister and the Congress President of Orissa came to Delhi. They were told that they must not resign but act firmly. There was a somersault. If that is the situation, then I leave it to you to judge as to who is responsible for the outbursts. And although I agree that even if there is provocation the people should not resort to violent activities, even then, I feel that it is not right and proper that those who have been responsible should not also bear their share of responsibility. As I had said, no consistent principle is to be found in the Government's approach to this problem of the reorganization of States. We know that at about the time when we achieved independence and after the partition, there was a certain shift in the Government's attitude towards this question. Prior to that, the emphasis was always on language. After that, other considerations also came into prominence. I have no quarrel

with that. Times may change and your attitudes may change. But, I believe that even when the Congress was stating that other considerations should also be taken into account, they all the time stated that language had a predominant place and was the dominant factor. They had given these indications in the Resolution which set up the S. R. C. The Commission examined the question and made certain recommendations. How have they gone about implementing them? It was incidentally very gratifying to hear Mr. Hegde saying that the plan was most confused and I ask my friend, Shri Govinda Reddy to take note of it.

Now, the S. R. C. made certain recommendations and what did the Government do about them? At first, if I remember rightly, the impression was conveyed that the S. R. C. recommendations would be accepted *in toto*. The next day great surprise was expressed at some of the recommendations of the S. R. C. On the third day, it was said that changes might be accepted if there was mutual agreement. On the fourth day, there were vague rumours—many things were said, including that of a commercial capital. On the fifth day, we had proposals of zonal councils. On the sixth we saw a new ray of hope in the merger proposals. On the seventh day, God alone knows what will happen. Sir, whether there was any consistency in all this, I leave it to your decision.

I do not want to recite chapters and verses or to cite more examples to show how the Government and the Congress have been inconsistent in this matter. What I intend to do is to place certain facts for your consideration.

Firstly, I would like to draw your attention to the method the Congress has adopted in trying to arrive at a solution of this vexed issue. As my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta said yesterday, they think that it is a domestic affair. They call some Com-

gressmen from this side and that side. They meet together in confidence. We do not know what happens. Thereafter, some Congressmen say that they are given to understand that something will happen. We do not know what happens in those confidential meetings. Then they announce certain decisions, as if there is nobody else in the country, as if the Congress is the whole country. We do know that the Congress is a mighty organization—an organization that was built up by the efforts of all of us including my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta. And they have a great heritage left by a great man. But it seems that they are going to fritter away that heritage. I would like to say that great as the Congress is—we all acknowledge its greatness—it is not the whole country. It should not be equated with the country. We also belong to the country. My friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta is also of the country. His opinion cannot be absolutely ignored as if he does not count. It is based on the wishes of the people. Therefore, I thought that it would be in the fitness of things if Congress had gone about in solving this problem in a better way and if it had tried to create a better atmosphere by taking other parties into confidence. As Shri Hegde has said this question cuts across party lines. There are differences within our parties. But I am sure that if we were consulted, if you had asked the leaders to meet together—they are all patriots; Acharya Kripalani is no less a patriot than any other—they would have tried to solve this problem, because it is an issue on which our future depends and on which our future prosperity depends and therefore, we should have come together in arriving at a solution.

Secondly what I want to say is this that a fashion seems to be growing today to juxtapose—unilinguism against the unity of India, as if the idea is that the two are incompatible and that as soon as these two are brought together there would inevitably be explosion and outburst. I be-

lieve that unilinguism as such does not threaten the unity or stability of India, as much as bilingualism or multilingualism as such does not. It is only when the passion of the people is aroused—passion based upon a sense of inequity that outburst takes place. While the Congress was shifting its ground from emphasis on language alone to the fact that other considerations had also to be taken into account, even then, did not the Congress in the wake of public agitation and outbursts that followed the demand for a linguistic State in Andhra concede Andhra State? Why did they concede Andhra State? And I ask you: Is my friend, Prof. Ranga who had espoused the cause of Andhar and who, I am sure, holds Shri Potti Sriramulu as a great patriot and martyr, less of a patriot than the Home Minister or the Prime Minister of India? Does he threaten the unity of India? Then, why is all this outcry? Is it because you are in a difficult situation to-day; and as a political device, you are suggesting a certain formula? Uni-linguism as it is really not bad. It is a good thing because, as has been said and as has been admitted by all Members in this House. It is good that the people of the country should understand how the Government functions. I need not repeat the quotation which was read out by my friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta yesterday from the Report of the Nehru Committee of 1928. Even the S. R. C. Report says:

"In a democracy, the people can legitimately claim and the Government have a duty to reassure that the administration is conducted in a language which the people can understand."

Sir, the resolution which was passed in Amritsar amazes me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you take more time?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I will take fifteen minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then, please continue after 2-30 P.M.

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

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

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Before we adjourned, I was elaborating on the point that unilinguism as such does not endanger the stability or the unity of the country just as bilingualism or multi-linguism as such does not. In this connection it is rather surprising that certain observations should have been made in the course of the Amritsar Session on this issue, and the resolution on States Reorganization is in parts amazing. An explanation was sought to be given for the change in the Congress attitude towards the formation of linguistic States. It was stated in the Congress Resolution on this issue that there is a difference between now and the British days, that during the British days there was necessity for the formation of linguistic States, as if that necessity does not arise today. To suggest that the end of the British rule makes a difference in the innate value of the linguistic principle for the formation of States is sheer hypothesis. Whether there is British regime or not, there is no doubt that common speech is a strong and natural basis for provincial individuality, if those who speak the same language form a compact and self-contained area so situated and endowed as to be able to support its existence as a separate province.

I think that what has been done in Amritsar has been to misread history and distort facts.

SHRI GULSHER AHMED (Vindhya Pradesh): It only says that it should be postponed.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That may be so. Postponement is one thing and reorganisation is an entirely different

question. If you do reorganise, the question of principle comes in. But if you want to postpone, let the Government say that they want to postpone it and we shall then discuss it.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): What is your own opinion-

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I come to the third point, that is about the merger proposals. I want to say a few words generally and then in particular on the issue of the Bengal-Bihar merger. The merger proposal has been adumbrated presumably on the ground that the formation of bilingual States would be better for the country and would promote better relations between peoples speaking different languages. But that is not borne out by history. I will read certain passages which occur in the S.R.C. Report. For example, first if you take developments outside, paragraph 145 of the S.R.C. Report says:

"European history, however, clearly shows that language is one of the fundamental elements of social life and influences to a large extent national psychology, so much so that speaking of Central and Eastern Europe. Professor Toynbee has been led to observe that 'the growing consciousness of Nationality had attached itself neither to traditional frontiers nor to new geographical associations but almost exclusively to the mother-tongues.' It is to be noted that most bilingual or multilingual States have had to face separatist movements. Belgium and Spain are notable examples. In Switzerland divided sympathy for Germany and France severely strained Swiss neutrality during the war of 1914-18."

Now, coming to the question nearer home, this is what the S.R.C. Report says:

"The question whether multilingual States will strengthen the unity of India is not easy to determine. In States having more than one

developed language, there has been no marked tendency in the past to develop a sense of loyalty to the State. There was never any noticeable Madras sentiment when the State was a composite one. On the other hand, such loyalties as did develop within the area were based on languages. The same holds true about Bombay and Madhya Pradesh. Marathi and Gujarati feeling grew up side by side, practically to the exclusion of any particular loyalty to the province or State of Bombay. In Madhya Pradesh, the Maha Vidarbha sentiment based on the Marathi language has been vocal for many decades."

Contrarywise, I would agree that the formation of bilingual States would not mean any serious danger to the languages themselves, because in bilingual Bombay State Marathi and Gujarati languages have not suffered. But before we accept or before we show our partiality in favour of this newly discovered passion, we should examine the question more thoroughly, more dispassionately, lest we jump from the frying pan into the fire. It appears to me that today, from a reading of history and from experience in this country, it would probably be wiser to base States on language and having such areas as are administratively workable for each linguistic area. It may not be, in the present context, advisable to urge the formation of bilingual or multilingual States. But I am prepared to say that the question requires dispassionate consideration and examination. Just because there have been certain unhappy happenings in the country, we should not run from one extreme to the other. On the contrary, we know that linguistic States in this country, wherever they exist have worked satisfactorily. There has been no question that, when States were organised on the basis of language, those States had not been loyal to the country, so that what is the reason today that we should depart from that state of things and bring in something new which might land us again in serious

troubles as in Bombay. I am sure that, if one could demarcate the areas in Punjab into Sikh and Hindu areas, that would be the best solution, but unfortunately the Hindus and the Sikhs are so mixed up together that it would probably be impossible to do that and therefore it may be necessary to have other arrangements, three tier or four tier formula—I do not know what is transpiring but something may have to be done. That is why I say that before we profess sympathy for or give our support to the bilingual or multilingual formula, we should take more care and see that we do not create a situation which would be worse than what it is today.

I now come to the question of the Bengal-Bihar merger. It is not easy to speak with definiteness on that question, because one does not know what is actually proposed, but certain observations may be made. Firstly, the new lamp of hope which I believe Maulana Azad said was lighted by this proposal does not appear to illumine any other territory of India. Nobody has reacted favourably to that proposal. Assam and Orissa who at one time were supposed to be keen on falling in line with Bengal and Bihar in forming a unified area have slipped away. They would not touch it even with a pair of tongs. Similarly, there is no response from the South. It appears that at least today the people of this country are not very much enamoured of the solution which is being offered to Bihar and Bengal.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): What about Travancore-Cochin? They are very anxious to join.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But are the other people willing to join with them? That is the question.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I may be willing, while the other party may not be.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That is the trouble very often.

Secondly, we have to examine the background of the proposal. How did it come about? That is the most unfortunate part of it because even if there is any merit in the proposal, there is no chance of that merit being rationally examined. The history of it was given yesterday by my friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta. Both the Bihar and Bengal Congress were using the choicest epithets of abuse and condemnation against each other. On the question of a piece of territory there was a threat of resignation. It is reported that the Bihar Chief Minister felt that if certain pieces of territories were given to Bengal—and mark you the Home Minister and the Prime Minister say that it does not matter where a piece of territory goes or does not go—he would resign.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: That is reported.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I said so.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Only reported.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But many reported things are true.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Not all.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Not all. But even a rational person—when the Minister for Revenue and Defence Expenditure is here I might say—like the Finance Minister of India is reported to have tendered his resignation on the Bombay issue. I don't know if it is right or wrong and certainly the Finance Minister.....

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: That is also reported.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: On a point of information. I am told several members of the P.S.P. also resigned.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But you claim that you have all the logic on your side and that the P.S.P. has not logic or rationale or persons who may be called the salt of the earth in their party. The Bengal Chief Minister however found that he could not satisfy his own people with the little bit of territory that he had got from Bihar—it was a very difficult.....

(Interruptions.)

SHRI A. C. GUHA: He has not said anything like that.....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That is a fact. Is it the hon. Minister's contention that that is not so? Let him say it clearly in this House that if the States are reorganised on linguistic basis, he is satisfied with the piece of territory that we have got from Bihar. Let him say that. I sit down. Why has he not got the courage of conviction to say that?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Are you satisfied?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I am not. Let him say it because he wanted to have a dig at me, let him say that he does not worry whether that bit of territory comes to Bengal or not.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): He will be satisfied if both Bengal and Bihar are united.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I am not speaking on that proposition at present. That is a different proposition. Has he the courage of conviction to say that he does not care as to whether.....

SHRI A. C. GUHA: It should be referred to the Chief Minister of Bengal and not to me.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I am asking you. (Interruptions.) Let me go on without these interruptions because it does not help the hon. Minister—it might help me a little. As I said, these two Congress organisations—of Bengal and Bihar—found themselves in a serious quandary. With a view

to getting out of the difficulty, overnight they proposed a merger. All became bhai-bhais. We were bhai-bhais without the merger. There is no necessity of a merger to become bhai-bhais. As soon as you make a proposal of that kind, it becomes suspect. It is not examined on its merits even. It comes as a political expedient. As Shri Jayaprakash Narain has said—I have got it here—it is a sort of an escapist solution....

PROF. G. RANGA: No harm in that.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: He is out of politics now.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But his views still carry great weight. It has not come out of the goodwill of the people of both the States. As a matter of fact, the people did not know. One fine morning they found in the papers that they had become bhai-bhais as if before that they were a sort of enemies. Therefore it is a political expedient and the other parties naturally are not willing to pull Congress's chestnuts out of the fire. If Congress was in a difficulty, let them stew in their own juice. Why should other people come and help them out?

SHRI A. C. GUHA: And let the country go to dogs.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: If as the hon. Minister says, they were at all concerned about the future of the country, they should have given thought to the problem before they went to the S.R.C. and made their demands. Further, the conduct that they have shown since then at least conclusively proves, as my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta had demonstrated yesterday that, let alone the other parties, the Congress was not concerned, according to him, with the good of the country.

Then let us see what the merger proposal is. It appears that since the proposal was first made, the Bengal Chief Minister is having second thoughts. There was going to be

brought forward a Resolution on the merger proposal to be placed before the Bengal Legislative Assembly on the 24th of this month. It is reported in the papers again that that resolution is going to be withdrawn on the plea that an amendment to the Governor's Address which was defeated meant that the Bengal Assembly had given its support to the merger proposal. It was a far-fetched assumption... .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: That was a direct amendment.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I am coming to that. The amendment was to the effect that the House regretted the omission of any mention of the formation of States on a linguistic basis in the Governor's Address and taking proper action therefor.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: There was something else.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Let me come to it. I know it but as I said, it was a subterfuge and an eye-wash because let me again say.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Whose amendment? The amendment was not by Congress.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: On the amendment that was defeated, the Ruling given by the Speaker of the Bengal Legislative Assembly was....

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Why has not the hon. Member quoted the full amendment?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Let me quote the ruling of the Speaker of the West Bengal Assembly who has ruled that the defeat of the amendment does not mean either an approval or disapproval of the merger proposal. Now that is the position and the Resolution had been withdrawn. Secondly, there were Corporation elections due in March this year. They have been postponed. Will the hon. Minister be

[Shri B. C. Ghose.]

in a position to furnish me the reason? He will say "Ask the Chief Minister How do I know?" We have asked. The hon. Minister does not know but any man in the street knows that the only reason was that if the elections were going to be held now, the Congress would lose almost all the seats.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: How many times you have said that before?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: As the hon. Minister will know that there have been certain municipal elections recently round about Calcutta and the Congress has lost heavily. Then I come to what it is that we are speaking about. What is the merger proposal? Have you ever heard of anything—of a proposal—which has been put forward before the people without telling them what it is all about? Those who urged this proposal did not actually themselves know as to what they were wanting to do. Nothing good will ever come out of something which is inspired by motives which are not honest and which is pursued by methods which are also not honest. Now let us see what the Bengal Congress Assembly Members have been saying about this merger. A member of the Congress Assembly Party in West Bengal said in the Bengal Assembly that if there is to be a merger, there must be conditions and some of the conditions are like these:

1. That there should be a convention to have a Chief Minister from one region and the Deputy Chief Minister from the other region.
2. Regional Assemblies to be concerned with interests of the region and decisions of Regional Assemblies to be binding upon the Cabinet and the Composite Assembly.
3. Equal representation in the State Upper House.

4. Land revenue, tenancy and taxation to remain unchanged in each area.

Some of these conditions I find Dr. Roy has also endorsed, for example, that there should be equal representation in the State Upper House, that land revenue, taxation and tenancy laws should be different for each area, that the development budget for each area should be separate. Then what are you merging? I fail to understand what the proposal is.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: On a point of Information, Sir. Does the hon. Member know that his leader has said that so far as Bombay is concerned, there should be a similar arrangement, as is proposed by the hon. Member just now?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I am not concerned with what.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: What your leader says, but only with what you say.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: At the moment I am not concerned with whether my leader has said anything on these separate conditions. If the condition of Bombay necessitates those conditions, that is quite different. I do not think in the first place that he said that all these conditions.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Not all.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: That is to say, he did not object to the principle. But are all these conditions to be fulfilled and we would still call it merger? I do not see that there is any merger where we start with suspicion of each other. We start with suspicion and say that there should be equal representation and all that. It looks like what has happened with East Pakistan and West Pakistan. I do not favour any merger on these conditions. I am quite willing to go along with my Bihar friends if both agree out of their free will, with goodwill and

trusting each other and do not lay down conditions like these. There may be circumstances when these may be necessary, but this proposal does not appeal to me as something that may be called a merger of the two territories, and really I do not know what is the proposal that has been put forward before the people for the creation of a Bengal-Bihar merger. I have never heard of such a fantastic proposition. When first the Chief Ministers of Bengal and Bihar said that these two States should be merged together, they did not give any idea of what they meant. They intend to bring a Resolution and ask the Assembly to support it. And the West Bengal Congress Party supported it, without knowing what it was all about.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: The basic idea.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: They have mortgaged their intelligence and their reason to somebody. But that way democracy cannot function.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Physician, heal thyself.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I say, if only the Congress would tread...

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND DEFENCE EXPENDITURE (SHRI A. C. GUHA): The hon. Member may look to the Chair and not to me.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: But it so happens that though I want to look at the Chair, my hon. friend there is just in front of me and when I stand here I cannot help looking at him.

AN HON. MEMBER: And get inspiration from him.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: (After moving to a different seat) I shall not look at him now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Go on please.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I was saying, Sir, that the whole thing has been conceived for getting the Congress out of a difficulty, for getting the two Congress Provinces from out of the difficulty in which they find themselves today. But that is not the right approach to the problem. The Congress often says that problems must be approached peacefully and in a democratic way. If the Congress would only tread the path of truth, non-violence and democracy, I am sure we shall always reach the right solutions, for if the people want something surely there can be no question of any opposition to it. But the difficulty only arises when something is sought to be imposed upon them. If, therefore, the Congress does not act as it professes that it will act, that is to say, non-violently, peacefully and in a democratic manner, the consequences certainly would be dangerous and woe betide this country and the consequences thereof and the responsibility therefor would lie squarely and fairly on the Congress.

SHRI AHMAD SAID KHAN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion moved yesterday by my hon. friend here and I feel that we should convey our gratitude to the President for the Address delivered by him to both the Houses on the 15th of February.

Sir, I have been hearing the speeches from the Opposition and though I am a great believer in the fact that it is the essence of a Parliamentary system there should exist an opposition, I am sorry to say that some of the speeches coming from the opposite side seem to be just opposing for the purpose of opposing and for maligning the Government. But as my speech develops I may be able to give a reply to some of their criticisms.

I agree with the Address that during the year that has just ended, our achievements and endeavours have been such that we can look back upon them with satisfaction and I may add that we can look forward to the year

[Shri Ahmad Said Khan.]

commenced, with hope and courage. During this year I happened to get an opportunity to visit some of the European countries. I went to Helsinki as a representative of this House to attend the International Parliamentary Conference. There I came into contact with the members of the parliaments of various countries. I assure you, Sir, that it was with feelings of satisfaction and pleasure that I noticed that the people from other countries looked upon us with great respect and heard our opinions with great attention. All this has been achieved in a short time, because as we all know, before we got our independence, we had no foreign policy whatsoever. I have also noticed that Asian and African nations were very friendly towards India, particularly those from the Middle East. Let me assure you that if they are so friendly, and if they have such respect and if the prestige of India is so high in the international field, it is not because they think that we are a great military nation, or that we possess more tanks or that we possess weapons of general destruction. Nor is it due to the fact that they think that we are a very rich nation. They are fully aware that we do not possess either the atom bomb or the hydrogen bomb; nor do we care to possess them. They are also fully aware that we are not a very rich nation. In fact, we are struggling to raise the standard of life of our people and to stabilise the economic condition of our country. What has commanded their respect are not these material considerations. Their respect is due to some moral consideration. It is really on a moral level, because they think that the voice of India's Prime Minister is always raised for peace in the world, because they know that the voice of India is always raised for international justice and peace, and that the Prime Minister of India always champions the cause of the smaller nations who are being controlled or exploited by stronger nations. He believes in their emancipation and their liberation. Moreover, there is another reason

which creates this respect for us and that reason is that these nations are fully convinced that peaceful coexistence is not a matter of political expediency for us.

3 P.M.

It is not due to any administrative convenience. It is really an article of faith, it is a way of life which was preached 2,500 years ago by Mahatma Buddha and repeated again in our lifetime by Mahatma Gandhi. This is now being advocated by our Prime Minister throughout the world. The result is that Panch Shila has now become an accepted factor by all the nations as a basic principle for global peace. They are also convinced that we are always trying to act up to our professions. There is no difference between our words and deeds. Goa is really a proof of this if proof is needed. Is there anyone who does not know about the very strong feelings existing in India about Goa? After all, Goa is a part of India and if our sympathies go to the inhabitants of that territory, it is but natural. However, in spite of the gravest provocation India has not deviated an inch from the path of peaceful negotiation and this is a proof that we are trying to act up to our professions. Yesterday, our friends attacked Government in regard to its policy regarding Goa, Kashmir, Ceylon and Burma. I want to ask them one thing. What do they want Government to do? Do they want Government to send an ultimatum to these nations or to declare war on them? It will be a great mistake if any Government does such a thing. The world knows that we have been acting on a certain principle. The moment we become an aggressor in regard to the weaker nations, the world will think that we are hypocrites, that we are non-violent against the stronger nations and violent against the weaker ones. Do our friends want India to be put in this position?

I do not wish to take the time of the House by enumerating the economic progress. What has been mentioned in the President's Address is

enough to show that the Government's efforts are bearing fruits in the shape of an increase of 18 per cent. in national income, 43 per cent. in industrial production, 16 per cent in agricultural production other than foodgrains and a 20 per cent. increase in foodgrains. That is quite enough to show the progress. I think even the worst enemy of the Government cannot say that the progress achieved during the five preceding years is insignificant. We have got a new Plan for the next five years and I would like to draw Government's Report. So far, I have been supporting Government but here I have to express my opinion, opinion which does not quite agree with that of Government's. In paragraph 14 of this Report, it has been said: "It is appropriate to think more and more in terms of inter-penetration of the public and private sectors rather than of two separate sectors." This principle, I think is good if it is followed instead of downright nationalisation. It has some advantages. One of the advantages is that it is more in harmony with the principle of mixed economy. The second advantage is that it will relieve Government to a very great extent from the worries of finding financial resources for the next Five Year Plan because money will readily come from the private sector. Instead of raising the pitch of taxation higher and higher. Government will be able to get money. The third advantage is that there is a general impression that business concerns run by Government are not efficiently run, that there is a certain amount of corruption. In fact, Government has accepted this fact on page 49 of the same Report in these words: "It was pointed out in the First Five Year Plan that corruption led to wrongs which were difficult to redress and undermined the structure of administration and the confidence of the public in the administration".

ministration": They have themselves admitted that there is corruption in the concerns run by them. If they act upon this formula, then they will have to take businessmen, men with

business experience and talent, on to the directorate with the result that this will improve the efficiency of the concerns and reduce corruption. I am in agreement with this principle but I would like Government to know one thing. There should not be a one-way traffic. It will not do if Government interferes with the affairs of the private sector without taking experienced businessmen to advise them in public sector. If they have real mutual co-operation, I am sure it will have a good effect.

At page 28 of the same Report, it has been said that during the next five years, securities to the value of Rs. 430 crores would mature which will have to be paid. I would like to suggest to Government that they should give an option to the security holders either to accept money in cash or to invest the same for a shorter period and on better terms. In that case, it will not be necessary to pay in cash. There will be, I think, very many people who will be very willing to re-invest their money.

In the same Report, it has been recommended that ceilings should be put on agricultural land. For the information of the House, I might say that in U.P., I know, there is a law which says that nobody who has got 30 acres of land can purchase or acquire any more land by any means except through inheritance. If he inherits land, then he can have, otherwise not. Therefore, as far as the future is concerned, there is no chance of big farms coming into existence. It will be harsh if we try to cut down the present farms according to any ceilings that we may fix and I will tell you why. Most of these farms come under two categories. Some of them are those which were bought by big capitalists during the War. They have spent a lot of money in mechanising them. As far as those farms are concerned, they have been exempted from the ceiling. The other category is the ex-zamindars who have, in their possession, land more than the ceiling

[Shri Ahmad Said Khan.]

fixed and they are under their cultivation. I would like to ask Government and the House, after having abolished zamindari, would they like to cut down the land under their personal cultivation also? Will it not be too harsh on them? We know that these are basic changes; if these changes would have taken place by means of a revolution, that would have been a different thing, like a storm that sweeps away everything but we are making all these changes and reforms through democratic processes which means with the consent of the people concerned. That being the process, I think it will be very wrong to curtail and cut down land which is in the possession of the ex-zamindars. Would you not like to wait a little? The law of inheritance will work and the land will be divided among the children. If you cut it now, what will happen to their children and grand-children on the death of these ex-zamindars? I think, Sir, it is very wrong to try to cut down the land in their possession any more. I am aware that there are feelings against the ex-landlords and here I may quote one simile to make my meaning clear. Suppose there is a Doctor who says that chicken soup is good for the patient. The Doctor is right..... and the patient will also benefit from the chicken soup. But what about the chicken and the chicken's family? It is quite all right to say that these zamindaris should be abolished. But the ex-zamindars are also your nationals, your citizens, and while socialising the thing you should take into consideration the plight of those who are being displaced and dispossessed by this process. Here I may say one thing more. Nearly three years ago zamindaris were abolished but many of the ex-zamindars have not received even the Bonds that were to be given to them. So under these circumstances it will be very wrong to cut down the area of the land in their possession.

Now I will say just a few words about the reorganisation of States.

Much has been said about it. In fact the debate today and yesterday was more a debate on the States Reorganisation Commission's Report than on anything else. I think that Government made only one mistake in that they were very keen to please everybody and that has put them into difficulty. The Commission's main recommendation has been accepted, but in certain places like Bombay trouble arose. Their recommendation was a bilingual State, and I suppose Government was also agreeable to it. But when they noticed conflicting demands from the people there, instead of sticking to the Commission's recommendation, they tried to meet the people by putting alternative proposals and they went on and on, step by step, like this. I think that now the only thing to do is to make some decision for a temporary period, for 3, 4 or 5 years, and to say that the whole thing will be re-opened then, because, at present, the atmosphere is so surcharged with passion that any permanent decision seems impossible to my mind.

With these words, Sir, I should like to support the Motion.

SHRI LAKSHMAN SINGHJI BAHADUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the activities of the Government, the Address of the President contains certain bright features whereas in certain respects it falls short of expectations. The highlight among the achievements of the Government is the mode of conduct of its foreign policy. It is a policy of non-involvement in any of the power blocs. Its outlook is generally friendly towards all nations of the world. It is designed to ease tension where India's services are sought and, broadly speaking, it places reliance on the doctrine of 'live and let live'. The foreign policy of the country has raised the prestige of India and has enhanced the stature of the Prime Minister. The Government's foreign policy is good as far as it goes, but too much stress is season and out of season on the doc-

trine of co-existence might perhaps lessen its value. In season it is good because there is intrinsically nothing wrong about it. But, we must remember that India, although a very large country, is not strong militarily or economically, and it might not be a very pleasant thing if the feeling at all goes round that the principles we value and hold high and close to our bosom are in certain respects not applied in our own case. It is easy for me to criticise in a negative fashion, but I have no doubt that the foreign policy of the Government under somewhat trying conditions, judged as a whole, is unexceptionable.

All sane thinking people in this country would welcome prospects of closer understanding between us and our neighbours, especially us and Pakistan. So long as India and Pakistan do not pull together, the progress of both must continue to be adversely affected. Throughout history bad relations with neighbours have never helped any country and this applies to a far greater extent in the case of Pakistan than in our own case. I would therefore welcome prospects of better understanding between the two countries. It would perhaps be unnecessary on my part to go into the history of the disputed accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. It is obvious that this dispute cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the parties to the dispute by the United Nations. Its solution would be a feather in the cap of the Government of India. It could be resolved with courage and imagination and I believe the Government could rise to the occasion. I do not see what other solution there could be than to amicably agree to the cease fire line with minor geographical adjustments to be the final boundary line between the two countries, or, in the alternative, to accept the verdict of a plebiscite under international auspices. No doubt this might involve the partition of Kashmir, and with my background it is but natural that I should have a soft corner for a princely State for there

cannot be a greater calamity for a country than its partition. This legacy of partition by the by is the aftermath of the last war. It started off with the partition of Germany. Thereafter Palestine and India were partitioned. Not very long ago Korea underwent the same fate and recently Viet Nam was amputated on the same basis or principle, and now a similar picture seems to be gradually taking shape over the China-Taiwan controversy.

It is difficult for me to understand how a great country like China could continue to be unrepresented on the United Nations. It is high time that this anomaly was rectified although it may be rather unpleasant from the point of view of some very important countries. So long as this anomaly continues, to remain unrectified, the representative character of the United Nations will be undermined and prospects of international complications continue to remain undiminished.

Although I personally believe in the doctrine of peace from strength, war at this time is too horrible a prospect to imagine. And this is the main factor that is preventing the two principal camps from clashing while we in India are less panicky and probably better off than very many countries much larger in size than our own. How long we will continue to remain in this happy position is a matter of conjecture and completely unpredictable. I shall however continue to hope for the best.

Alluding to some of our neighbours such as Ceylon, it seems to me rather desirable that the Government of India should convey an assurance to the Ceylon Government that its larger neighbour has no desire whatsoever to impinge upon the sovereignty of that little country by flooding it with Indian nationals of doubtful or double allegiance owing to Ceylon. I should also, if I may, with due respects, state that the problem of Goa is more a problem of time than anything else. I appreciate that the statement of Mr.

[Shri Lakshman Singhji Bahadur.]
Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States of America, with respect to Goa and its enclaves was somewhat inopportune. All the same the Government of India with advantage could be less hasty and perhaps more dignified in its approach. It is probably a more complicated question than the question of French possessions and may perhaps have a legal background, although geographically and morally no one in India would want the continuance of Portuguese rule over Goa and its enclaves.

In his Address two years ago, the President had said "A Board for the preservation of wild life has been set up. At Jodhpur a Desert Afforestation Research Station is being established. This will undertake the work for reclamation of arid areas." Since then very little seems to have been done for the preservation of wild life and reclamation of arid areas. All lovers of wild life take an alarming view of its rapid decrease. In my own State of Rajasthan where wild life used to roam about the countryside, effectively preserved, there is hardly anything left of it now. I wonder what the Wild Life Board has been doing all this while for most of its work seems to have remained on paper. This is particularly so in the case of Rajasthan where certain game sanctuaries, with careful preservation for the last half a century, were a literal paradise for wild fauna. It seems a pity that this asset of the country should be so neglected as to reach the verge of extinction in the course of the last six or seven years. In places wild life can still be revived if given effective preservation and I hope something will be done about it before it is too late.

Another matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the Government is the merciless destruction of forests in Rajasthan, especially in my own home district and in the two districts adjoining it. In this Southern Rajasthan, covering some 5,000 sq.

miles there used to be the best forests. The fate that these forests have met in the course of the last six or seven years is something to be seen to be believed. The countryside looks completely denuded of forest growth and the hills look absolutely bare and shaved off. Timber, maybe to the tune of a crore of rupees, has been indiscriminately leased out, smuggled out, or just wantonly destroyed. The setting up of an Afforestation Research Station in Jodhpur in my opinion seems to be a mockery, if our existing asset, the great forest belt of Rajasthan in Central Rajasthan, in Northern Rajasthan and in Southern Rajasthan, stands practically destroyed and perhaps may be destroyed in very large parts for ever. This was the belt that had bravely withstood the inroads of the western desert for decades and I hope that something will be done about it before it is too late. Forests are a great asset to the country. They maintain the balance of nature. They prevent soil erosion while retaining the fertility of the soil. They do not allow the rainfall to decrease or to become capricious. Forests are a national asset and their indiscriminate destruction in Rajasthan without even a working plan, in my humble opinion, amounts to maladministration and deserves the attention of the Government of India in public interest, although I know forests may not be a Central subject.

There are two issues that are in the mind of many men these days. They are unemployment and corruption. Both, if anything, are not on the decrease, and it is the duty of every responsible Government to fight these evils. Unemployment in Rajasthan has considerably increased. Most of the erstwhile Indian State Forces have been disbanded and the throwing out of some 25,000 people has adversely affected the interests and the future well-being of over two lakhs of people. The abolition of the jagirdari system will throw out another two million people—20 lakhs or more. I admit that in the present context

of things it was inevitable that this jagirdari system be abolished. But many thousands of the poorer type of *jagirdars* with incomes ranging from one thousand to twelve hundred rupees a year must, in all fairness, be given some alternative occupation. These *jagirdars* may at the most technically be called as *jagirdars* but in reality an examination would prove conclusively that these poor people are no more than just ordinary cultivating peasantry. It will be interesting to see what the Government of Rajasthan gives them by way of occupation or employment. Unemployment is an evil that should be tackled in right earnest on a planned basis throughout the country. It becomes ever so much more essential for us to do so in view of the rapid rate of increase in our population.

Corruption is another matter that must be given high priority to grapple with. This canker, as it were, is eating into our very vitals and yet some placed high in our country, as well as certain foreigners, say that we are one of the most efficiently run countries in the world. I do not think it is a compliment to gloat over with satisfaction or complacency. In actual fact there are very few countries now left in the world that are efficiently run in the true sense and I do think **there is great scope for decrease in the quantum of corruption both in the services and society at large. And what we lack and sadly lack is discipline.** The feeling of putting one's own interests below the interests of the Nation is gradually becoming rare. It is visibly dying out in the rank and file of the ruling party. How is it possible under such conditions to increase the pace of progress with corruption being progressively reduced to a fine art? Should we not give greater emphasis to character building at the primary school stage, with greater care towards the moral side of life and specially games, games that would inculcate discipline and a happy family feeling of team work, games which would instil in the young mind the desirability of subordinating one's own interests to the

interests of the team. Games are sadly neglected at the primary school level and I cannot too forcefully emphasise the desirability of due attention being paid to this essential part of education.

I have given a fair amount of thought to the proposal of dividing the country into zonal units. I think it is a proposal which *prima facie* deserves consideration and deserves being pursued, but I do not propose to speak on the vexed question of the reorganisation of States. I would say one thing that if I had my own say I would have only two languages in this country (i) Hindi or preferably Hindustani and (ii) English. But in the present context of things, I readily concede that it is neither practical nor possible to do so. It would, therefore, be an evil day for us—the day we decide to discard the English language or to relegate it to a secondary or third rate position. Not only is English an international language, but it is a unique and great binding force within this country. It is the one *via media* by virtue whereof a southerner can make himself understood to a northerner or a Rajasthani to a Bengali or for the matter of that an Assami. Let no false sense of prejudice or pride persuade us to discard the English language, because I am perfectly certain that we have at the present moment nothing equally good as a substitute.

I do hope Government realise the undesirability of too much copying of the Western system of administration, as if there was nothing good in our own indigenous system that had stood the test of hoary centuries and which had proved that that system suited the genius of our people. I do not think that the country has grown visibly richer or the lot of the poor man has been appreciably or visibly bettered. I also feel that justice has become more and more dear, especially in Part B States in the lower strata of the judiciary. Nor am I very much in favour of indulging in excessive deficit financing to strengthen the

[Shri Lakshman Singhji Bahadur.]

second Five Year Plan. I believe in cutting the coat according to the cloth. Taking a long view of things I feel it might do more harm than good. There is inflation already in very wide areas in this country and it is not a good sign. I will readily concede, in spite of all this criticism, that the Government can legitimately lay claim to some achievements, but I do feel at the same time that all that glitters is not gold.

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am glad that Members in the Opposition also agree that the Government has much to its claim so far as its international policy is concerned. In fact, I think that 1955 can be put down as the best and the most glorious year for free India, especially in its international affairs. We have gained so much in the goodwill of the nations on both sides of the curtain that I am led to hope that during the next five years, while we pursue our path of reconstructing and developing our country through our plan, we might be able confidently to count upon the effective support and sympathy from all those countries on both sides which can afford to give us a helping hand. Having said that, I would like to come down to our own Jammu and Kashmir problem.

My hon. friend who has preceded me just now has made rather a very venturesome suggestion. I can only say that the time has not yet come when we can possibly begin to think on those lines.

Turning to Goa, there was a very courageous suggestion made in the other House by one of our friends that we cannot treat and apply to it the same yardstick of international friendship and also good behaviour as we would apply in our relations with great nations or even small nations—to nations as such—because Goa cannot be treated as belonging to any other nation. Goa's administration cannot be treated as that of a Government and therefore, we have to

explore other ways and means by which we can possibly come to a settlement of that problem. I think that there is very much in that and I do sincerely hope that as soon as possible our Government would begin to give consideration to that approach to this vexed question.

Then I wish to come down to the home affairs. I find that two big things are there before us. One is the problem of States reorganization and the other is the second Five Year Plan. When it comes to the States reorganization, I think that there are certain things over which our Government can be congratulated. One is that they have once again reiterated at the Amritsar Session of Congress their determination to go ahead with the States reorganization in spite of what has happened most unfortunately in some of our States. And the second thing on which they can congratulate themselves is the statesmanlike manner in which they have tried to bring about an agreement between the leaders of Andhra on the one side and the leaders of Telengana on the other. At one time, it looked as if that would also prove to be as hard a nut to crack as many of the other problems where so much blood came to be shed so unfortunately because of the passions roused on either side. But, fortunately because, as I said, of the statesmanship—and the patient statesmanship, I should say—and the spirit displayed and used in a very democratic manner by the leaders of the Congress and the leaders of this Government, we are within reach or within sight of a happy agreement between these two friends on both sides and as a result of it. Vishalandhra is likely to emerge not only successfully, but also in an atmosphere of peace and mutual understanding. That also stands to the credit of the Government.

Thirdly, some of our friends have said once again that the Uttar Pradesh should be divided. I have once before told the House that I was not

at all in favour of dividing any State against the wishes of the people thereof. And at that time, the people of U.P. were so very keen upon remaining united and they continue to entertain that feeling even today and I should have thought that, now that we have gone through all these unhappy experiences of the last two months and also this new issue has come to be placed before the whole of the nation for its serious consideration—the issue of amalgamating as many States as possible—nobody would again repeat that old complaint that U.P. continues to be so very big.

AN HON. MEMBER: U.P.?

PROF. G. RANGA: U.P. or United Provinces, it is all the same.

Now, incidentally, I would like to endorse the suggestion made by my hon. friend, Kakasaheb that instead of calling the various units as States, we might as well begin to call them again as provinces in order to put their problems and their leadership also in their proper setting *vis-a-vis* the need for the unity of our nation as a whole. Anyhow, I am not at all sorry that U.P. is going to continue to be as big as it has been. But at the same time, I am not quite convinced about this proposal that has come up for bilingual and trilingual States. I am, however, willing to encourage all those friends or congratulate all those who are able to settle their internal affairs so well as to impress each other and form themselves into a multilingual or bilingual State on the lines which were suggested by one of the Congress members of the Bengal Legislature, as was indicated to us by my hon. friend, Shri Ghose. Nevertheless, if the case remains so strong in favour of a linguistic State, it is no good fighting shy of it. It is no good being afraid of it merely because something has happened somewhere and so, there should not be any linguistic State. What is the special advantage of a linguistic State which we and our leaders discerned forty years ago and because of which we have been persevering all this

time for the reorganisation of our country? We are democrats. We want to see that our democracy becomes a success. The surest way, the shortest cut to the success of democracy is to provide for the people of a particular language a self-contained administration, so that it would be possible for them to understand what happens in their administration, to be in daily communion with their administration and the agents of that administration and to be also able to control it and to co-operate with it. This is the fundamental principle. That is behind this demand for linguistic provinces. Now, by all means, try and establish linguistic provinces wherever you can. Wherever you cannot do that then of course, you can fall back upon other principles of organization. When you have got this opportunity of reorganising the States on a linguistic basis, why fight shy of it? Why suddenly cry a halt to this and then say, "Oh, we have had enough of this. Therefore, we do not want it." In fact from experience in this country we have known the evils of multilingual States, and in those days there was no democracy. There was not as much demand for democracy, but there is a universal demand for democracy in these days. If we are anxious to make our democracy powerful, make our democracy a successful one, a progressive one, then it would not be right for us to say to these people who want to make a success of it not to go along those lines.

Having said that, I would like to come to the problem of planning. In this regard, it is a trite saying that about 75 per cent. of our people even today live in our villages, and out of them, 65 per cent. depend directly or indirectly upon agriculture, and naturally any planning that is proposed has got to pay special attention to those people and their problems. The first Five Year Plan did give some satisfactory consideration to the problems of the peasants and the cottage industry workers. The second Five Year Plan, although attempting or claiming to pay as much attention as is needed to these people, actually

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

falls short of it. One thing has got to be remembered that, when they make all these estimates, the total national income and the contributions made by the various sectors of our social life, they start with the present prices. The present scales of prices are all based upon wrong values of the services rendered by different classes of our people. For a very long time the agricultural services have been under-valued, and therefore their wages and their prices have both always been below what they really deserved with the result that today the estimates naturally come to be more favourable to other classes of people and less in favour of the agriculturists. For instance, here is one estimate based on these values: They have put the net national product:

Agriculture and allied pursuits, Rs. 6,170 crores, out of a national total for all sectors of Rs. 13,480 crores. When we come to factory establishments, the figure is Rs. 1,380 crores. For professions and services including Government Administration, the figure is Rs. 2,100, i.e. nearly one-third of the total product of all our agriculturists who number more than 60 per cent. of our rural people, who number more than 70 per cent. of our population. Why does this happen. It has happened because the services rendered by the agriculturists are always continually under-valued and the services rendered by the professional classes and manufacturing classes have been over-valued. Now, this is a difficulty we have got to get over. Unfortunately, our planners have not considered this, and therefore they naturally give much less importance to the role that the agriculturists play. This defect has got to be remedied and we must learn to accept one general principle if we are really keen about social justice, and that is that the value of the services rendered by everyone in this country, every class of people in this country, must be properly evaluated. It does not matter if one

works in the field or in the factory or in an office. The services of everybody are equally valuable and needed for the society, and therefore they have got to be valued properly.

Then, I would like to take up this question of deficit financing. We want to spend about Rs. 4,800 crores in the public sector alone. Surely the Government can raise easily Rs. 2,400 crores from savings; they themselves have admitted that the investment in the country is not commensurate with our needs. Therefore they have got necessarily to depend upon what is known as deficit financing or the Nasik Press to the tune of about Rs. 800 crores or Rs. 1,200 crores.

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND DEFENCE EXPENDITURE (SHRI A. C. GUHA): Rs. 1,200 crores.

PROF. G. RANGA: Yes, to the tune of Rs. 1,200 crores. I am glad that a Minister in the Finance Ministry is here. He knows how the whole thing works. Anybody wanting to contribute to the National Loan would be entitled to go to any Bank, hand over a Bill for Rs. 100, and then get a loan for Rs. 90 or so from that bank. That bank goes to the State Bank; the State Bank goes to the Reserve Bank. The Reserve Bank takes recourse to the Nasik Press, and in this way money comes. This gives us the impression that we contribute, that the Government is indebted to us, we are indebted to the banks, the banks are indebted to the Reserve Bank and the Reserve Bank to the Nasik Press. In that way, Rs. 1,200 crores is going to be placed in the hands of the people without anything behind it except what we are going to produce during the next five years by way of constructing various projects and so on. It is a well-known fact that before a particular project is undertaken, so much money has got to be spent over a particular period of time, and somebody has got to pay something out of his pocket and that somebody would be the poor peasants. They have got to hand over their foodgrains at fixed

would like that consideration should prices, at falling rates, and they are given back rupees in notes, not cloth or any other necessity—rupee notes whose value will be coming steadily down, with which the peasants will have to purchase all their daily needs in the market. They will give their produce for which they are going to be paid less and less, and in this way, this plan is going to be financed mostly by the sacrifice of the peasants, of our agricultural workers and also the industrial workers. In return for this, what is it that is proposed to be given to them? They propose to raise the standard of living by about 25 per cent. Well and good. According to them, there is to be what is known as the basic holding, i.e., about 6 acres of land, and the holders of this basic holding are expected to get a monthly income of nearly Rs. 100 ~~per~~ family of five people, whereas our industrial workers are expected to get about Rs. 100 a month. In the case of the farmers it is going to be only Rs. 100 per family per month, and how many of them are going to get even this? Only 30 per cent. of them, who are the holders of basic holdings. These people will get Rs. 1,200 per family per annum, while the per capita income of this country is Rs. 330. Multiply it by five, and it gives you about Rs. 1,600. This is for an average family of this country. Only the peasants are going to have a sub-normal standard of life, and this too only in the case of 30 per cent. of them. Naturally those who have not got this basic holding are going to be much poorer. My hon. friend, Mr. Saksena, was taking me to task the other day when I was pleading for a proper price for the agriculturists for their produce. I would like him to give some thought to the facts that I am placing before the House.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am listening to you with interest.

PROF. G. RANGA: Therefore the great majority of our people are going to be obliged to be content with an income which would be much lower than what is known as the per capita

income of an average individual in this country. It means that there is not going to be any social justice, there is not going to be social equality and that the peasantry will continue to be submerged, suppressed and depressed in this country even after 4 P.M.

the Second Five Year Plan. Therefore I would like our planners to give some consideration to these thoughts and try to reorganise their own plans to some extent. Then there is also this question of prices. Recently, Government announced their policy—and I was in agreement with it—of price support in order to maintain the basic prices for wheat and rice. I complained that the present prices that were fixed were not remunerative. I would like the Government to consider that. I don't want the Government to stop there. I would like them to consider the advisability of similarly helping the producers of other crops. Everyone knows that the prices of oilseeds have come down by more than 50 per cent. during the last three years and if you honestly were to think in terms of the happiness or unhappiness of the millions of families which are involved in this terrible fall in their own income, then you would be able to see the calamity that has visited so many homes in so many States. I have only one thing more to say. We are talking about social justice and I have seen what sort of social justice it is when you say that the ceilings for land holdings should be three times as much as the basic holdings. That means Rs. 100 multiplied by three—Rs. 300 per month in the villages and that none should get anything more than that. Whereas in the towns you are prepared only to do this by gradual stages, by slow, soft, painless stages and in 5, 10 and 15 years you would like to bring down the top salaries and top incomes right down to the paltry sum of Rs. 30,000 per annum as compared to the Rs. 3,600 for the villagers—that means eight times as much as you would have it in the village. What justification is there? Therefore I would like that consideration should

[Prof. G. Ranga]

be given to this fact also because, otherwise what would happen is that in the villages, our peasants will continue to be depressed whereas in the towns you will have all these people getting upto Rs. 40,000 per annum as income and therefore they would be able to monopolise all the Government services through their sons and daughters who would be trained in a better way and more effectively, and more easily through all your schools and colleges and Universities because of the higher financial competence. Sir, I would like only to refer to the report of the All India Rural Credit Survey and read only three sentences from it to give you an indication of what will happen in our country. There is this question of rural and urban people and it is very well known that the urban people have gained an upper hand and they have gained an upper hand not only in the services, not only in the business, not only in employment but also in the Government and even during the elections. At the time of the elections,—especially in our democratic manner we are obliged to carry on our elections—who is able to get the voice of the Government? Who is able to get the nominees not only from the Congress Party or any Party for the matter of that and having got the nomination, who is able to get those candidates in whom one is interested, elected? Mostly it is the urban people and their supporters and their friends and they have got their supporters in the villages. They have their friends in the villages. We have got our own caste system and our own social hegemony. Through all these things they are able to gain a predominant voice in the councils of our own Governments in the States as well as at the Centre, and that is just the fact to which the All India Rural Credit Survey made by the Reserve Bank itself has made very strong reference. Therefore, I am extremely anxious that our planners should again study their own plans carefully in order to see that this bias in favour of the town, in favour of the city, in favour

of the people in the towns and cities is minimised, if not removed, in a democratic and also in a cooperative manner.

श्री देवकीनन्द सहाय (मुम्बई): उपसभा-पति महोदय, राष्ट्रपति का भाषण इस वर्ष ऐसे अवसर पर हुआ जबकि पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना समाप्त हो रही है और दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में पदार्पण हो रहा है, और यह स्वाभाविक है कि प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना का विचार करते हुए हमें यह हाल बताया गया कि प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना बहुत कामयाब रही। ठीक बात है, उत्पादन बढ़ा, देश की सम्पत्ति बढ़ी और नेशनल इनकम भी बढ़ी। परन्तु गरीबों की गरीबी कितनी कम हुई, बेरोजगारों की बेरोजगारी में कितनी कमी हुई, पीड़ितों का दुःख कितना कम हुआ, निरक्षरों की निरक्षरता में कितनी कमी हुई, इन बातों का कहीं तस्फिया नहीं मिलता, और जब तक इन बातों का तस्फिया नहीं मिलता तब तक यह कहना कि हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजना यशस्वी हुई, यह मेरे हिसाब से तो सम्पूर्ण सत्य नहीं हो सकता। राष्ट्रपति जी ने एक जगह ठीक ही कहा है कि :

“The basic criterion for determining our line of advance must always be social gain and the progressive removal of inequalities.”

इस ब्राइटैरिंगन से आप देखिए, कहाँ तक एनइक्वेलिटीज कम हुई है, कहाँ तक सोशल गेन हुआ है। हमें कहीं ऐसी किसी रिपोर्ट से बनाया नहीं गया है कि हाँ, ये एनइक्वेलिटीज इस इस तरह से कम हुई और सोशल गेन यह हुआ। आप देहातों में जाइयेगा तो आपको पता चलेगा कि पहले जिस तरह की गरीबी थी, जिस तरह का अधेरा था, जिस तरह का अज्ञान था, जिस तरह की पीड़ा थी उसमें बहुत कुछ कमी नहीं हुई, वही पुरानी हालत है। मैं मानता हूँ कि पैसा बढ़ा, उत्पादन बढ़ा, अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ी, परन्तु उससे गरीबों के घर में कितना पहुँचा है यह

श्री ह० प्र० सक्सेना : फिर कहां चला गया ?

श्री देवकीनन्दन : वह कहां चला गया इसका जवाब आप दे सकते हैं, मुझसे क्यों पूछते हैं ? इस सवाल का जवाब आप ही दे दीजिएगा । हमारे सामने राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो यह मापदंड (क्राइटेरियन) रखा है उसको आप किसी प्रदेश में जा कर देखियेगा । मैं कम्प्यूनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स एरिया में घूमा हूं, मुझे पता नहीं मास्टर माहब घूमें हैं या नहीं, मैंने नेशनल एक्सटेंशन के गांव देखे हैं जहां काफी रुपया गवर्नमेंट का खर्च हो रहा है और तरक्की भी हो रही है—मैं यह नहीं कह रहा कि तरक्की नहीं हो रही है । परन्तु उन नेशनल एक्सटेंशन के गांवों में और जहां प्रोजेक्ट चालू किये गये हैं उन गांवों में भी गरीबों की जो हालत है, हरिजनों की जो हालत है, बेरोजगारों की जो हालत है, उसमें कोई खास कमी नहीं हुई । इस हिमाब से आप देखेंगे तो आपको यह भी पता चलेगा कि प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में बेरोजगारी कोई कम नहीं हुई, जितनी बेरोजगारी सरकार कम करना चाहती थी उतनी बेरोजगारी वह कम नहीं कर सकी । प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में यह काम नहीं हुआ और द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में भी ऐसा ही होने की आशंका दिखायी देती है । मैं अभी आपको दिखलाऊंगा कि द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना का जो प्लान हमको दिया गया है उसमें यह बात मान ली गई है कि बेरोजगारी बहुत कुछ कम नहीं हो सकेगी । सरकार के अंदाज से यह कहा जाता है कि इस मुल्क में आज ५५ लाख बेरोजगार हैं और हर साल २० लाख बढ़ते जायेंगे । तो यह २० लाख के हिमाब से बढ़ने के बाद ५ वर्ष में करीब डेढ़ करोड़ या १ करोड़ ५५ लाख आदमियों की बेरोजगारी आपको दूर करनी होगी । सरकारी हिमाब यह लगाया गया है कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा ८० लाख को हम सब तरह से काम दे सकेंगे । आप सोचिये, ८० लाख को काम दिया गया तो ७५ लाख रह गए फिर इन बेरोजगारों का क्या होगा ?

इसलिए जब तक इस मुल्क की बेरोजगारी कम न होगी तब तक आप यह नहीं कह सकते कि हम जिस बड़े काम को करना चाहते उसे कर पा रहे हैं । बीस लाख शिक्षित बेकार हैं वे बेचारे मारे मारे फिरते हैं, नौकरी मिलती नहीं । और फिर नौकरी नहीं मिलती है तो वे क्या करते हैं ? मैं आपसे नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूं कि हाल में बम्बई में जो हुल्लड़बाजी हुई, दंगे फसाद हुए, उनमें पढ़े लिखे भी कुछ कम नहीं थे । उसके कारण और भी बहुत से होंगे, पर एक कारण यह भी है कि एक तरह की जो निराशा, जो फ्रस्ट्रेशन आजकल के तरुणों में पैदा हो गई है वह उन्हें सब कुछ करने पर मजबूर कर देती है ।

हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी अपने अभिभाषण में कहते हैं “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 जिनमें अधिक से अधिक हाथ खप सकें । विशेषकर कुटीर और ग्रामोद्योगों पर भरोसा किया जायेगा ।” अब इस मुल्क में आप देखिए कि ग्रामोद्योगों और खादी की हालत क्या है । ग्रामोद्योगों की तरफ ध्यान दिया जाता है, ऐसा कहा तो जाता है, परन्तु प्रत्यक्ष में क्या है ? ग्रामोद्योगों की ही एक बात आप ले लीजिए । यह मान लिया गया है कि “राइस पाउंडिंग” हाथ से चावल की कुटाई के जरिये लाखों आदमियों को रोजगार दिया जा सकता है । इस काम के लिए एक कमेटी कायम हुई थी, राइस मिलिंग कमेटी । एक साल हो गया, अभी तक उस राइस मिलिंग कमेटी की सिफारिशों पर विचार हो रहा है । इस पंचवर्षीय योजना की आउट लाइन में भी उसके लिए यह लिखा गया है कि : “स्टिल दी रिपोर्ट इज अंडर इग्जामिनेशन” । दूसरी बात आप ल लीजिए कि आइल प्रेसिंग कमेटी को साल भर के करीब हो गया अपनी रिपोर्ट दाखिल किए हुए, लेकिन “दी रिपोर्ट इज स्टिल अंडर कंसिडरेशन ।”

[श्री देवकी नन्दन]

कर्वे कमेटी ने सिफारिश की कि ग्रामोद्योग, खादी और अम्बर चर्खे के लिए और खास कर ग्रामोद्योग और खादी के लिए एक मिनिस्ट्री बनाई जाय। परन्तु अभी तक कुछ नहीं। टैक्स-टाइल कमीशन की रिपोर्ट, दो वर्ष हुए, पेश हुई मगर उसकी रिपोर्ट still under consideration है, यानी जितनी भी तरकीबें ग्रामोद्योगों को बढ़ाने के लिए दिखलाई जाती हैं, उनका आखिर में क्या नतीजा हुआ है, यह आप सोचियेगा। आप देखेंगे कि ग्रामोद्योगों को एक तरफ तो कहा जाता है बढ़ावा दिया जाय और दूसरी तरफ इस तरह से अड़चन पैदा की जा रही है। क़ारी के बारे में इस ड्राफ्ट प्लान की आउट लाइन में सत्य ही लिखा है :

“The direct additional employment generated over the Second Plan period may not be much higher than the corresponding increase in the First Plan period.”

यह बेरोजगारी के बारे में हमारा जवाब है। और आगे फिर लिखते हैं :

“Even with the high effort that is envisaged under the Second Plan, the total volume of unemployment during the period of Second Plan may be of about the same order, as at present.”

इतना ही नहीं इसमें यह भी लिखा गया है :

“The impact on the two-fold problem of unemployment and under-employment will not be as much as the situation demands.”

तो मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ और खास कर सरकार से कि बातें तो अच्छी हो रही हैं, काफी रुपया खर्च हो रहा है, सेकंड फाइव ईयर प्लान में पहले प्लान से दुगुना खर्च होगा, पांच हजार करोड़, ४५ सौ करोड़ खर्च होगा, परन्तु हमारे देश में जो डेढ़ करोड़ बेरोजगार लोग हैं, उनको निश्चित उद्योग देने के लिए किसी प्रकार की कोई धजवीज नहीं की जा रही है जिससे हम विश्वासपूर्वक यह

कह सकें कि इस योजना की मारफत लोगों को रोजगार मिल जायगा। जब तक हिन्दुस्तान के प्रत्येक मनुष्य को स्वाभिमान पूर्वक उद्योग करने का जरिया नहीं मिलता तब तक आपकी कोई भी स्कीम कामयाब नहीं मानी जा सकती है और न हम इस देश में एक समाजवादी समाज की ही रचना कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ, प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि आप इस सवाल की ओर गम्भीरता से देखें।

इस सम्बन्ध में यह कहा जाता है कि ग्रामोद्योगों द्वारा बेरोजगारी की समस्या हल की जायगी। हां, की जायगी। किन्तु आज ग्रामोद्योगों की हालत क्या है, यह मैंने अभी आपसे कहा। इसी के साथ साथ एक दो बातें इस सम्बन्ध में और भी कहना चाहता हूँ। ग्रामोद्योग, खादी और स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्री के लिए कमेटी और बोर्ड कायम हुए हैं किन्तु आप इनके कामों के बारे में इनके अधिकारियों से पूछ सकते हैं कि ये किन दिक्कतों में हैं। मुझे इस बारे में कुछ पता है। सन् १९५६-५७ के लिए खादी बोर्ड ने सवा आठ करोड़ रुपये की मांग की थी किन्तु सरकार कहती है कि हम आपको केवल पांच ही करोड़ रुपया देंगे। जब सरकार अपनी ही इच्छा से इसको चलाना चाहती है तो फिर उसने इस खादी बोर्ड को क्यों नियुक्त किया। खादी बोर्ड ने ग्रामोद्योगों के लिए सन् १९५६-५७ के लिए ११ करोड़ रुपये की मांग की थी मगर सरकार कहती है कि केवल ढाई करोड़ रुपया दिया जायेगा।

अब मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप ही के द्वारा नियुक्त किये हुये खादी बोर्ड और ग्रामोद्योग बोर्ड की बात आप नहीं सुनना चाहते तो आप फिर यह कैसे आशा कर सकते हैं कि ग्रामोद्योगों द्वारा आप बेरोजगारों को उद्योग दे सकेंगे। हैन्डीक्राफ्ट बोर्ड से पूछा जाय कि उन्हें पैसा मिलता है या नहीं अगर मिलना है तो कितना मिलता है। इसके साथ ही साथ एक दिक्कत और भी इन बोर्डों के सामने है। जब कभी किसी बात के लिए ये बोर्ड सरकार को सिफारिश करते हैं कि इस काम के लिए

दस लाख रुपया दिया जाय तो सरकार की ओर से केवल छै लाख रुपया ही मंजूर होता है। अगर बारह हजार की मिफारिश की जाती है तो २ हजार रुपया मंजूर किया जाता है। और फिर सबसे आश्चर्य की बात यह है कि यह रुपया मिलने में कई महीने लग जाते हैं। इस तरह से किसी स्कीम को शुरू करने के लिए चार पांच महीने तो मंजूरी के लिए ही रुक जाना पड़ता है। जब आप इस तरह से खादी और ग्रामोद्योग को स्टेप मदरली ट्रीटमेंट दे रहे हैं तो आप कैसे कह सकते हैं कि इन उद्योगों की मारफत हम बेरोजगारी की समस्या को हल करने वाले हैं। इसलिए मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि जब आप इस बात को मानते हैं कि इन उद्योगों द्वारा बेरोजगारी की समस्या हल हो सकती है, राष्ट्रपति जी ने भी ठीक ही कहा है कि यही एक जरिया है जिसके द्वारा हम बेरोजगारी की समस्या को, खासकर देहात की बेरोजगारी की समस्या को दूर कर सकते हैं, तो आप अधिक ध्यानपूर्वक, अधिक श्रद्धापूर्वक और सहानुभूतिपूर्वक इस काम को आगे बढ़ायें।

अब आप अम्बर चर्खे को लीजिये।

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : पांच बजे इसका प्रदर्शन है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन : जी हां, पांच बजे प्रदर्शन है। अम्बर चर्खे के बारे में प्लान की आउट लाइन में इस तरह से लिखा हुआ है :

"The case of the Amber Charkha stands on a different plane, the issue here being that the use of the Amber Charkha and the introduction of decentralised spinning on a large scale will make possible addition to full-time rural employment on such a substantial scale as to justify the expenditure which may be involved during the period of the Plan."

प्लानिंग कमीशन ने जो बात लिखी है वह मुनासिब है परन्तु अभी तक अम्बर चर्खे

के लिए कोई रकम मंजूर नहीं की गई है। हैंडलूम के लिए हमें सूत की आवश्यकता होती है और अम्बर चर्खे से यह आवश्यकता भली प्रकार पूरी हो सकती है। अम्बर चर्खे की मारफत अधिक खादी तैयार हो सकती है मगर उसकी भी पैदायश के लिए रुपया सरकार की ओर से अभी तक नहीं दिया जा रहा है। खादी बोर्ड का कहना है कि अम्बर चर्खे की मारफत खादी का उत्पादन ७ करोड़ गज से २५ करोड़ गज तक किया जा सकता है, आप हमें रुपया तो दीजिये जब आप यह मानते हैं कि अम्बर चर्खे से बेरोजगारी की समस्या हल हो सकती है तो आप रुपया देने में क्यों इतनी देरी कर रहे हैं। अम्बर चर्खे द्वारा मजदूरों को देहातों में १२ आना रोज कम से कम मिल सकता है। बुनकरों और बीवरों को दो रुपये से सवा दो रुपये तक रोजाना मिल सकता है। और ५० लाख लोगों को इसके द्वारा रोजगार दिया जा सकता है। यह सब बातें तो ठीक हैं फिर भी आप इस चीज को क्यों नहीं करते, क्यों नहीं इसके लिए पैसा देते हैं ? इस रिपोर्ट में आगे फिर यह भी लिखा है कि :

इस सम्बन्ध की बहुत सी बातें Under investigation हैं, under examination हैं और under consideration हैं। आप खुद ही मोचियोगा कि क्या खादी के बारे में ऐसा करना उचित होगा। आप खादी को किम निगाह से देख रहे हैं और क्या करने जा रहे हैं।

इन बातों को कहने के बाद, अब मैं उस बात की ओर आता हूँ जिसकी आप सब लोग मुझ से अपेक्षा रखते हैं।

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : अम्बर चर्खा जो लोग चाहते हैं उन्हें दिया क्यों नहीं जाता ?

श्री देवकीनन्दन : आपको पता नहीं है। आज अम्बर चर्खे हिन्दुस्तान में छः हजार चल रहे हैं और एक तरह से गवर्नमेंट

[श्री देवकीनन्दन]

की निगरानी में चल रहे हैं। गवर्नमेंट ने एक कमेटी कायम की है कि टैकनिकली अप्रैल तक उसका प्रयोग किया जाय और उस प्रयोग में कामियाबी होने के बाद गवर्नमेंट सोचेगी कि उसको वह अपनावे या न अपनावे। परन्तु मेरा कहना यह है कि ...

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : मुझे कठिनाई हुई

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: I am not opposing him; I am only seeking information.

मुझे कठिनाई हुई। पिछले चार पांच महीने में मैं चाहता था कि अम्बर चर्खा ले कर उसका प्रदर्शन करूँ, लेकिन मालूम नहीं, अब जानना चाहता हूँ, क्या कारण है कि वह मिल नहीं पाया ?

श्री देवकीनन्दन : उसके लिये सेंटर कायम किये गये हैं। आप मेरे साथ चलिये। मेरे ज़िले में एक सेंटर कायम है जिसमें ये चर्खें चल रहे हैं। उसका मतलब यह है कि दो तरह से चर्खें चल रहे हैं, एक तो खादी बोर्ड की तरफ से चलाये जा रहे हैं और एक प्रयोग के नाते, गवर्नमेंट को सटिसफाई करने के लिये, कुछ चलाये जा रहे हैं। जो खादी पैदाइश के लिये चलाये जा रहे हैं उनकी ज़िम्मेदारी खादी बोर्ड के ऊपर है और गवर्नमेंट तब तक ज़िम्मेदारी लेना नहीं चाहती जब तक कि उनकी निगाह में और उनके टेकनीशियंस की निगाह से वे सम्पूर्ण नहीं माने जाते।

आपने देखा होगा कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने शुरू से आखिर तक हमारी कामियाबी के ऊपर हर्ष प्रगट किया है, परन्तु एक जगह उन्होंने अपना दिली दुःख प्रगट किया है :

"Recent events in some parts of India have caused me great distress as they must have pained all."

जब मैंने इस वाक्य को पढ़ा तो स्वभावतः मुझे याद आया कि यह इशारा बम्बई और उड़ीसा की ओर है। दुःख हुआ, बात सत्य है, छिपाने से छिपाई जा नहीं सकती कि बम्बई में गत महीने में जो कुछ हुआ वह बहुत कुछ शर्मनाक हुआ, हैवानियत से भरा हुआ हुआ, और जो बातें वहाँ हुई, जो अत्याचार वहाँ हुए उनसे हमारी प्रतिष्ठा भी दुनिया की निगाह में बहुत कम हुई। मैंने कुछ अमेरिकन अखबार जनवरी के आखिरी हफ्ते में देखे जिनमें बम्बई में लूट किस तरह से हो रही है, घर किस तरह से जलाये जा रहे हैं, उसके चित्र बनाये हुए थे। परसों भी, एक "टाइम" कर के अखबार निकलता है कहीं न्यूयार्क से, उस में एक चित्र आया हुआ था कि बम्बई में क्या हो रहा है। स्वाभाविक है कि मेरे जैसे मनुष्य के दिल पर चोट आती है जब मैं यह देखता हूँ कि हमारी बदनामी यहाँ ही नहीं, बाहर के देशों में भी हो रही है। जो कुछ हुआ वह आखिर किसी निमित्त से हुआ। यह कौन नहीं मानता कि बहुत बुरा हुआ। मैं अपने गांव का भी आपसे एक किस्सा कह सकता हूँ। आप कहेंगे कि क्या बम्बई में आप थे उस वक्त। मैं तो नहीं था। परन्तु जिस शहर में मैं रहता हूँ उस शहर की एक बात कह देना चाहता हूँ। शायद जनवरी की २० तारीख को गुजरात से ढाई सौ किसानों की एक ट्रेन जलगाव आई थी। वह किसलिये आई? वे ढाई सौ किसान अजन्ता केव देखने को जाना चाहते थे और हैदराबाद गवर्नमेंट की उन्हें ले जाने के लिये नौ बसेज स्टेशन पर आ कर खड़ी थी। गाड़ी आते ही गाड़ी के ऊपर इतने पत्थर फेंके गये कि शायद ही किसी डब्बे का एक कांच बाकी रहा हो। उनको नीचे उतरने तक नहीं दिया और जब उनको किसी ने उतरने नहीं दिया तब औरंगाबाद से आई हुई बसेज दो घंटे ठहर कर वापस चली गई। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि उन पत्थरों से दो तीन आदमी घायल भी और मैंने जो सुना है यदि वह सत्य है

तो उनमें से एक लड़का आखिर आगे जा कर गुजर गया। यह जो कुछ हुआ, क्या आप यह कहना चाहते हैं कि यह सरकार ने करवाया। क्या आप यह कहना चाहते हैं कि वहाँ बहुत पुलिस होते हुए यह हुआ। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई में हमारे ज़िले से पुलिस के चले जाने के कारण और हमारे यहाँ काफी पुलिस न रह जाने के कारण यह हुआ, वैसे शायद नहीं भी होता। यह शर्म की बात है, दुःख की बात है, और अब आप यह कहें कि यह सब कुछ इसने कराया या उसने कराया, तो यह बेकार बात है।

अब यह कहा जाता है कि इसकी इक्वायरी होनी चाहिये। मुझे दुःख होता है जब कोई इक्वायरी की बात करता है। जब दो पराय मुल्कों में कोई झगड़ा हो और उसकी किसी तीमरे से इक्वायरी कराई जाय तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ। पर जब भाई भाई या पड़ोसी आपस में किसी बात के ऊपर झगड़ते हैं, एक दूसरे को ज्यादा सताता है या लूटता, पीटता है, और फिर कोई तीसरा ऊपर से आ कर यह कहता है कि नहीं, इसकी इक्वायरी होनी चाहिये, तो मैं यह कहूँगा कि वारदात हो जाने के बाद यह दिलों के ज़ख्म पर नमक छिड़कना है।

आपको पता नहीं, कहा जाता है कि यह सब गुंडों ने किया। मैं आपसे नम्रता से पूछूँगा कि क्या ये गुंडे हिन्दुस्तान के नहीं थे, क्या हिन्दुस्तान से कहीं बाहर से आये थे, और इन गुंडों को पैदा किसने किया, इन गुंडों को पनपाया किसने? आप जानते हैं कि जब भले आदमियों का समाज से असर जाता रहता है तब गुंडे पैदा हुआ करते हैं। रोमां रोलां ने एक जगह सच ही कहा है कि दुनिया में दुर्जनों से जनता को इतना नुकसान नहीं पहुँचा, जितना दुर्बल सज्जनों से आज तक पहुँचा है। दुर्बल सज्जन जितना दुनिया को अपनी दुर्बलता के कारण दुःख पहुँचाते हैं,

उतना दुःख दुर्जन नहीं पहुँचा सकते। इसी तरह से जब दुनिया में से, समाज में से भले आदमियों का असर जाता रहता है, तब गुंडे अपना राज्य जमाते हैं। फिर गुंडे भी तो हमारे हैं। इन गुंडों को इस तरह से यदि देश में आप पनपने देंगे, तो आपके देश की क्या हालत होगी। गुंडों की तादाद कम करना, समाज से गुडापन कम करना, इसकी ज़िम्मेदारी भी तो आप ही की है या और किसी की है? बुरे को भला बनाना, यदि यह काम हम न करेंगे तो यह काम करने कोई बाहर से आने वाला नहीं है। तो ऐसे वक्त पर सिर्फ यह कह देना कि यह काम गुंडों ने किया है और इसकी चौकसी करनी चाहिये, मैं यह जानना चाहूँगा कि किस बात की चौकसी करनी चाहिये। आज जो कुछ बम्बई में हुआ, क्या वह झूठा है, क्या आखों देखी बात नहीं है, क्या कानों सुनी बात नहीं है? सब कुछ हमने अखबारों में भी देखा है। यहाँ भी कुछ ऐसे हैं जिनका मैं नाम नहीं लेना चाहता। मेरे भाई किशन चन्द है, उनसे पूछियेगा कि बम्बई से लौटते हुये ट्रेन में उनकी क्या हालत हुई। बहुत से लोग कह देंगे कि क्या क्या किसके ऊपर बीती। तो आखों देखी बातें हैं, कानों सुनी बातें हैं, फिर आप कैसे कहते हैं कि इसकी इक्वायरी होनी चाहिये। इक्वायरी से क्या लाभ निकालेंगे? हमारे दिल फट गये हैं, एक तरह से बैर भावना पैदा हो गई है, सद्भावना जाती रही है। इसलिये यदि अब किसी बात की जरूरत है तो इस बात की है कि हमारे जो दिल फटे हैं, उन दिलों को जोड़ें एक जगह लावें। हम कुछ ऐसे काम करें जिससे आपस में जो बैर भाव और अविश्वास पैदा हुआ है उसको हम नष्ट करें और आपस में विश्वास पैदा करें, प्रेम पैदा करें, मुहब्बत पैदा करें यही एक रास्ता हो सकता है। इक्वायरी से क्या होगा? झूठ और सत्य सब सामने आयेगा, एक फरीक यह कहेगा कि मैंने कुछ नहीं किया, दूसरा फरीक कहेगा कि सब कुछ

[श्री देवकीनन्दन]

इसने किया, और इस तरह जो झगड़ा शांत हो गया है वह झगड़ा, फिर से बहुत तेज हो जायगा। यानी इससे कोई फायदा तो निकलने वाला है नहीं जैसा कि मराठी में एक कहावत है “कोलसा उगालावा तित-काकाला” यानी कोयले को आप घिसते रहिये, काला ही काला निकलता रहेगा। इसी तरह से इस इक्वारी से कोई भली बात पैदा होने वाली नहीं है। इससे तो यही होगा कि हमारे भाई ने, हमारे पड़ोसी ने कितना बुरा किया, दूसरा कहेगा कि इस पड़ोसी ने इतना किया, और आखिर में हमें रहना तो एक ही जगह है। और इस तरह बम्बई में रहने वाले हम एक दूसरे के ऊपर दोष लगाते रहेंगे और सद्भावना को धूल में मिलाते रहेंगे, तो जो आप चाहते हैं कि फिर से बम्बई हरी हो, बम्बई में सब प्रेम से और मुहब्बत से रहें, यह कैसे हो सकता है, जब मैं देखता हूँ कि पड़े लिखे पालियामेंटे-रियन इस बात की शिकायत करते हैं, मांग करते हैं तो मैं परेशान होता हूँ। आपको पता होगा, आपने अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा कि बम्बई काँग्रेस में इस तरह का प्रस्ताव लाया गया और वह फेल हुआ क्योंकि चार छः आदमी भी उसके पक्ष में न मिले।

बम्बई असेम्बली में नो-कांफिडेंस का मोशन आया लेकिन उसके एडमिशन के लिये ८ आदमी भी खड़े होने के लिये नहीं पैदा हुए। जो यहां इक्वारी की बात करते हैं उनसे मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ला एण्ड आर्डर स्टेट सबजेक्ट नहीं है? तो ला एण्ड आर्डर की जिम्मेदारी वहां की गवर्नमेंट पर होते हुये भी हम यहां आकर ये सब बातें करें और उनकी दिक्कतों में और दिक्कत पैदा करें और उनको बढ़ायें, यह हमें शोभा नहीं देता है। इस प्रश्न की ओर हमें दूर दृष्टि से देखना चाहिये, मानवता की दृष्टि से देखना चाहिये, राष्ट्रीयता की

दृष्टि से देखना चाहिये, परस्पर पड़ोसी की दृष्टि से देखना चाहिये, और बीती बातों को भूल जाना चाहिये। उन बातों को भुलाना चाहिये और दबा देना चाहिये। पुराने जर्म्हों को बार बार हरा करते रहना और उन्हीं बातों को बार बार छेड़ना हमें शोभा नहीं देगा। उन बातों को भुला देना हमारा कर्तव्य है। इसी हिसाब से राष्ट्रपति ने एक जगह आखीर में कहा है :

“यह तथ्य सर्वोपरि है कि हम अहिंसा, सहिष्णुता और राष्ट्रीय महानता सूचक मौलिक दृढ़ता के बिना अपने देश को ऊंचा नहीं उठा सकते।”

यदि आप अपने देश को अहिंसा और सहिष्णुता के बगैर उठा नहीं सकते तो मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि आप इस इक्वारी कराने की मांग में कौन सी सहिष्णुता दिखला रहे हैं, कौनसी अहिंसा दिखला रहे हैं? क्या इक्वारी की मांग करने वाले “शठ प्रति शाष्ट्य” के सिद्धान्त का, प्रिंसिपल का, अनुकरण नहीं कर रहे हैं? यह “शठ प्रति शाष्ट्य” की नीति कदाच पगियों के साथ तो चल सकती है परन्तु आपस में इस नीति से नाश होगा किसी भाई को शठ कहना बुरा है, और उसके साथ शठता करनी और भी बुरा है। इस नीति से हिन्दुस्तान का भला होने वाला नहीं है। हिन्दुस्तान में अनेक भाषी लोग रहते हैं, अनेक मजहब के लोग रहते हैं, अनेक जाति के लोग रहते हैं। अगर ये तमाम लोग परस्पर सहिष्णुता से एक दूसरे के साथ सम्बन्ध नहीं रखेंगे तो आप बतलाएं कि किस तरह से हम आगे चल सकते हैं? क्या हम यहां पर “शठ प्रति शाष्ट्य” की नीति पर चल सकते हैं? कभी नहीं। भाई को शठ मान कर चलना गैर है। परम पूज्य बापू ने सदा यही कहा कि “शठ प्रति सत्य” की नीति पर चलना चाहिये और मैं आपसे

प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक इस देश के मार्वाजनिक जीवन में गांधी नीति का अनुसरण नहीं किया जायेगा तब तक आप चाहे जितने फाइव ईयर प्लान बनाते रहें, आप इस देश में पनपेंगे नहीं और इस देश में एकता नहीं पैदा कर सकेंगे। अगर आपको इस देश में राष्ट्रीय एकता पैदा करनी है तो आपको महात्मा गांधी की जो नीति है उसका अनुसरण करना चाहिये। मेरे एक भाई ने कुछ दिन पहले कहा था कि हमें कृष्ण नीति का अनुकरण करना चाहिये। मैं नहीं जानता कि कृष्ण नीति किसका नाम है लेकिन मुझे उनकी बातों से पता चला कि कृष्ण नीति दांव पेच की नीति है। मैंने उस वक्त उन से कहा था कि यह कृष्ण नीति या 'शठ प्रति शाठ्य' की नीति इस मुल्क को नाश की ओर ले जायेगी। आपको तो इस देश में "शठ प्रति सत्य" की नीति का ही अनुकरण करना चाहिये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you finished Mr. Deokinandan?

SHRI D. NARAYAN: Two or three minutes more, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken 15 minutes for your last point. आपने आखिरी बात में १५ मिनट ले लिये हैं।

SHRI D. NARAYAN: I will just finish, Sir.

इतना कहने के बाद मैं फिर अपने पहले प्रश्न की ओर आना चाहता हूँ। जिस तरह से मैंने बेरोजगारी की बात कही उसी तरह से एक दूसरी बात भी सदन के सामने कहना चाहता हूँ। सैंकड़ फाइव ईयर प्लान में ऐसी कोई व्यवस्था नहीं मुझाई गई है कि इतने वर्षों में यह देश साक्षर हो जायेगा या इस देश में प्राइमरी एजुकेशन फ्री और कम्पलसरी हो जायेगी। हमारा संविधान कहता है कि दस वर्ष के अन्दर सारे

देश में ६ से १४ वर्ष तक के लड़के लड़कियों के लिये फ्री और कम्पलसरी एजुकेशन की व्यवस्था कर दी जायेगी। लेकिन प्लान में यह बतलाया गया है कि अब तक पांच वर्षों में ६ से ११ वर्ष तक के लड़कों में से ५० सैंकड़ा को ही हम शिक्षा दे सके हैं और द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में ६ से ११ वर्ष तक के लड़कों के लिये इसको ६० प्रति शत तक पहुंचा सकेंगे, यानी ४० सैंकड़ा तब भी रह जायेंगे। तब तक कास्टीट्यूशन में दी हुई दस वर्ष की मियाद भी पूरी हो जायेगी। कास्टीट्यूशन में १० वर्ष में फ्री और कम्पलसरी एजुकेशन की बात कही गई है लेकिन हम १० वर्ष में सिर्फ ११ वर्ष तक के ६० फ्री सैंकड़ा लड़कों तक ही पहुंचेंगे और ११ से १४ तक के लड़के तो रह ही जायेंगे। आगे प्लान में यह बतलाया गया है कि ११ से १४ तक के सैंकड़ा पीछे २५ लड़कों को द्वितीय योजना में हम शिक्षा दे सकेंगे। यह इतना व्यापक प्रश्न है कि जिसका सम्बन्ध गरीब से गरीब लड़के से है। जो पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं, जो मालदार हैं या जो साधारण श्रेणी के लोग हैं वे तो अपने बच्चे की पढाई कर ही लेते हैं परन्तु देहातों में फैले हुये जो गरीब बच्चे और बच्चियां हैं उनकी शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध तो तभी होगा जब कि फ्री और कम्पलसरी एजुकेशन करेंगे। जब तक ऐसा नहीं होगा तब तक आप कैसे कह सकते हैं कि हमारा देश आगे बढ़ सकता है। हमारे यहां १७ करोड़ वोटर्स हैं परन्तु १७ करोड़ में से १६ करोड़ निशानी अंगठा करने वाले हैं। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि आपको इस प्रश्न की ओर गहरी नज़र से देखना चाहिये। हम ४० वर्ष से चिल्ला रहे हैं कि इस देश में फ्री और कम्पलसरी एजुकेशन होनी चाहिये और देश के स्वतन्त्र होने के बाद भी, कास्टीट्यूशन में १० वर्ष की मियाद लिखने के बाद भी, द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में कोई ऐसी तजवीज़ नहीं कर रहे हैं जिससे कि ६ से १४ वर्ष तक के सब लड़के, लड़कियों की प्राथमिक शिक्षा पूरी हो जाय। तो यह सरकार

[श्री देवकीनन्दन]

को मेरी दूसरी सूचना है कि उसे इस ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये और द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के बाद यह कहने का मौका नहीं मिलना चाहिये कि इस देश में ६ से १४ वर्ष तक का कोई लड़का या लड़की अनपढ़ रह गई है या निरक्षर रह गई है। जय हिन्द।

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख (हैदराबाद) : जनाबे सदर, हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने हाल में बम्बई में जो फसादात हुये उनकी निस्वत खेद प्रदर्शित किया है और मेरे से पहले के मुकर्रर ने जो बातें बतलाई हैं वे वाकई सही हैं तो यकीनन वह बहुत अफसोस की चीज है

श्री रघुनाथ प्रसाद दुबे (मध्य प्रदेश) : आप जरा सामने आकर माइक पर खड़े हों तो कुछ सुनाई दे।

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : लेकिन ये जो घटनायें घटी हैं, ये जो वाक्यात पेश आये हैं उनकी बैकग्राउंड को देखना भी जरूरी है।

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

अहोदया, १८ तारीख की रात को ८।। बजे हिन्दुस्तान सरकार की तरफ से हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी अपना स्टेटमेंट देने वाले थे और वहां पर दिन के ११ बजे से ही जो इस भाषाई मूवमेंट को चला रहे थे उन लोगों की गिरफ्तारी शुरू हो गई और उनकी तकरीर शुरू होने तक तकरीबन एक हजार आदमी वहां पकड़ लिये गये थे। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि बम्बई हुकूमत ने यह सब से बड़ी गल्ती की। मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि यही वह वजह है जिस से कि बाद की ये सब घटनायें घी हैं। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि जब हिन्दुस्तान सरकार का एक निर्णय जनता के खिलाफ आ

रहा था और जब जनता कुछ निदर्शन-प्रदर्शन करना चाहती थी तब एसी हालत में उनको रास्ता बतलाने वाले जो लोग थे वे सब पकड़ लिये गये। २१ नवम्बर के रोज खुद बम्बई के चीफ मिनिस्टर को मालूम था कि, बम्बई सरकार के काफी कोशिश करने के बावजूद जो लोग फ्लोरा फाउंटेन के एतराफ में जमा हो गये थे वे वहां से नहीं हटे तो वहां रास्ता बतलाने वाले जो लोग थे उन लोगों को बुला कर वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर ने कहा कि आप इन लोगों को हटाइये, अब निदर्शन-प्रदर्शन खत्म हो चुका है तो वह लोग वहां पर आये और सब लोगों को चौपाटी पर ले गये और सब लोग चौपाटी पर गये। लेकिन उस वक्त अगर वे लोग खुले होते, जिन लोगों को गिरफ्तार किया गया उनको कोई गड़बड़ होने का अंदाजा मालूम होने के साथ ही अगर छोड़ दिया जाता तो मैं यह समझता हूं कि जो निदर्शन वहां होने वाला था वह एक शान्तिपूर्ण रूप धारण कर लेता, लेकिन ऐसा मालूम होता है कि चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब के खयाल में यह बात नहीं आई कि यह निदर्शन शान्तिपूर्ण रूप से हो सकता था। परन्तु कल के अखबागत में बम्बई के मुख्य मंत्री का जो स्टेटमेंट वहां की एसेम्बली में शायी हुआ है उससे यह पता चलता है कि जो फसादात वहां हुये उनकी सब जिम्मेदारी बम्बई के मुख्य मंत्री पर पड़ती है।

SHRI BARKATULLAH KHAN (Rajasthan): Madam Vice-Chairman, how far is this House entitled to discuss the Chief Minister of Bombay who is not present here?

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि फसादात की निस्वत हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने खेद जाहिर किया है, मगर उसकी जिम्मेदारी स्टेट का प्रबन्ध चलाने वाले लोगों पर नहीं आती यह बतलाना भी और इसको साफ करना भी उनके लिये जरूरी है और इस लिहाज से इस चीज को मैं यहां आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं।

SHRI BARKATULLAH KHAN: We cannot criticise the Chief Minister of Bombay here.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL): Order, order.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: The "Chief Minister" does not represent the person; it represents the Government. He merely means to say that it is the Government that is responsible. There is nothing wrong in saying that.

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि एक तरफ फसादात की निस्वत इतना कहा जाता है लेकिन दूसरी तरफ यह नहीं कहा जाता है कि वहां पर वहां की हुकूमत ने बेदरना तौर पर गोलाबारी की। मैं यह समझता हूं कि १८५७ के बाद से अब तक कोई ऐसा वाक्या नहीं हुआ होगा कि ६ दिन में तकरीबन सवा सौ व्यक्ति वहां गोलाबारी में हलाक हो गये। जिन लोगों ने फसादात किये उन्हीं के खिलाफ गोलाबारी हुई ऐसा नहीं है बल्कि बहुत से बच्चे उससे जख्मी हुये और बहुत से लोग जो उनमें शामिल नहीं थे वे लोग भी जख्मी हो गये। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि बम्बई की हुकूमत अब इस गोलाबारी का समर्थन करने के लिये इस तरह से वहां की एसेम्बली में यह स्टेटमेंट देती है कि राज्य सरकार को वहां से हटा कर, राज्य सरकार का कब्जा कुछ लोग लेना चाहते थे या यह कि जो नान-महाराष्ट्रियन हैं उन पर आक्रमण करना चाहते थे। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि ऐसी कोई बात नहीं थी। दर असल लोग निदर्शन करना चाहते थे। उसमें ज्यादाती हुई है। उसकी निस्वत कहा गया है कि अब अफसोस होना चाहिए।

श्री देवकीनन्दन : तो आपको वहां पर अनुयायी बहुत थे शायद तब तो आपको यह पता चल गया।

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : खैर, वह सवाल नहीं है, अनुयायी होने न होने का।

लेकिन जो बेदरना तौर पर वहां गोलाबारी हुई, राष्ट्रपति की स्पीच में उसका इन्दराज होना भी तो जरूरी था। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने बम्बई को मध्यवर्ती (केन्द्रीय) सरकार के कब्जे में लाने का और उसे महाराष्ट्र में अलग करने का जो निर्णय जाहिर किया वह उसी कांग्रेस की हाई पावर समिति के मशविरों से उन्होंने किया। बड़े अफसोस की बात है कि हिन्दुस्तान सरकार ने इसको एक पार्टी के सवाल के तौर पर हल करने की कोशिश की। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि कांग्रेस की पार्टी हिन्दुस्तान में सब से बड़ी पार्टी होगी, लेकिन ३५ करोड़ जनता में एक लाख जिनकी मेम्बरशिप है उसने जनता की तरफ से इतने बड़े सवाल को हल करने की जो कोशिश की है बिल्कुल गलत की है। जनता और दूसरी मुस्लिम पार्टियों के लोगों को कांफिडेंस में न ले कर यह जो निर्णय किया गया वह हमारी उस हुकूमत के लिये जो डेमोक्रेटिक होने का दावा करती है, कोई सही निर्णय नहीं हो सकता। इसलिये यह जो अल्पसंख्या के लोगों के निर्णय को बहुसंख्या के लोगों पर आयाद करने की कोशिश की गई है यह बिल्कुल गलत है। इसी वजह मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि इस तरह की अजीब हालत पेश हो गई। कांग्रेस ने या उसकी हाई कमाण्ड ने अगर किसी से इस सवाल पर मशविरा किया है तो प्राविंशल कांग्रेस कमेटी से और प्राविंशल कांग्रेस कमेटी में बदकिस्मती से ऐसे लोग बाकी रह गये हैं जो जनता के सवाल को मही तौर से हल करने के बजाय अपने सुपीरियर को खुश करने की कोशिश में हमेशा लगे रहते हैं। मैंने कई मर्तबा सेंट्रल हाल में यह कहते हुये सुना है कि भाई, यह महाराष्ट्र का सवाल हल नहीं हुआ तो लोग नाराज हो जायेंगे, लेकिन पंडित जी के महाराष्ट्र का एक दौरा होने के साथ साथ सब सवाल हल हो जायेगा। मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि यह जो सवालान में मुश्किलें पैदा हो गई उसकी वजह यह हो गई कि इन

[श्री एन० बी० देशमुख]

सवालात को हल करने वाले जो वहां के प्राविसेज के लोग थे वे अपनी जिम्मेदारी महसूस नहीं करते थे । उन्होंने एक दफा लोगों को यह कह कर उकसाने की कोशिश की कि हम तो बम्बई को मिलाकर संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बनाने के सिवाय और कुछ नहीं सोचेंगे और यहां आ कर अपने हाई कमाण्ड को खुश करने के लिये उन्होंने यह कहा कि आप जो भी योजना बनायेंगे उसको हम उनसे मनवा लेंगे । इसलिये हिन्दुस्तान सरकार को सारी जनता को कांफिडेंस में ले कर इस सवाल को हल करना चाहिये था, ऐसा न करने की वजह से ही ये मुश्किल हमारे सामने आ गई ।

ऐसा कहा जाता है कि बम्बई के फसादात न होते तो संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का सवाल हल हो सकता था । मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि यह सवाल अब भी खत्म नहीं हो गया है । दरअसल इस सवाल की तरफ देखने का हमारा दृष्टिकोण ही दूषित है । फसादात हों या न हों, वह सवाल वहां मौजूद है और उसको हल करने की जिम्मेदारी हम पर है । कहीं फसादात हुये हों या कहीं किसी ने गड़बड़ की हो तो उसके लिये हमें इस सवाल को अलग कर देना मुनासिब नहीं है ।

राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में यह बतलाया गया है कि हम में सेपरेटिस्ट टेंडेंसी बढ़ी हुई है । मुझे मालूम है कि जो राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से मोचने वाले लोग मौजूद हैं वे भी जब कभी कोई ऐसा मसला हल करने को आता है तो अपने लोगों को तरजीह देते हैं, राष्ट्रीय बंगाली पहले बंगाली लोगों को तरजीह देता है, राष्ट्रीय महाराष्ट्रियन पहले मराठी लोगों को तरजीह देता है, राष्ट्रीय यू० पी० वाला पहले यू० पी० के लोगों को तरजीह देता है ।

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: No. I emphatically say 'No'.

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : लेकिन अमलन ऐसा होता है । जाहिर है कि आजकल की इस डेमोक्रेसी में जो चीजें साफ दीखती हैं, वे साफ दीखने के बावजूद भी ठीक नहीं मालूम होती हैं । जो साफ तौर से कहता है वह प्रान्तीय होता है, वह जातीय होता है ।

यह कहा जाता है कि हम सब एक हैं और एक होने के बावजूद भी मुख्तलिफ प्रान्तों के लोगों का खाना और रहन सहन अलग अलग है । हमारे ड्रेसेज अलग अलग हैं, हमारे सांस्कृतिक जीवन अलग अलग हैं । महज इतना ही नहीं, मैं आपको बतलाऊंगा कि जो महाराष्ट्रीय बड़ौदा, ग्वालियर और तंजौर में रहते हैं उन्होंने इन प्रान्तों का रहन सहन अस्तियार नहीं किया बल्कि अपनी ही संस्कृति को वे मानते हैं । उन्होंने वहां पर किसी तरह की रिस्तेदारी कायम नहीं की । इसके बरअक्स महाराष्ट्र में जो भी मारवाड़ी, राजपूत और गुजराती गये, करीब दो तीन पुरतों से वहां पर रहते आ रहे हैं, उन्होंने वहां का रहन सहन अस्तियार नहीं किया, न किसी प्रकार की कोई रिस्तेदारी कायम की । जब कभी उन्हें किसी प्रकार की रिस्तेदारी कायम करनी होती है तो उन्हें राजस्थान और गुजरात में ही जाना पड़ता है । इस तरह से अगर कोई आदमी उत्तर प्रदेश का इन प्रान्तों में गया हो तो उसे रिस्तेदारी के लिये उत्तर प्रदेश में ही आना पड़ता है । यह सवाल हम टाल नहीं सकते हैं ।

इसी तरह से आप सविमेज में पायेंगे । जिस प्रान्त में सविसेज देने वाले अफसरों के हाथ में बागडोर होती है वह अपने ही प्रान्त के आदमियों को तरजीह देता है । जातीयता के लिहाज से हर प्रकार की सहूलियतें लोगों को दी जाती हैं । यह बात सब प्रान्तों में चल रही है, इस बात को हम टाल नहीं सकते हैं ।

श्री देवकीनन्दन : क्या मैं आपसे जान सकता हूं कि बम्बई स्टेट में सरकारी नौकरी में कितने महाराष्ट्रीय और कितने गुजराती हैं?

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : आप इस चीज को टाल नहीं सकते हैं और यह चीज आज सब प्रान्तों में मौजूद है। यह चीज सत्य है। अगर हमने इसको दूर करने की कोशिश नहीं की तो हम सही नतीजे पर नहीं पहुंच सकेंगे और इसके नतायज कुछ अच्छे नहीं होंगे। आज हम देखते हैं कि प्रान्तों में अपनी जाति के लोगों को स्कालरशिप, कांट्रेक्ट और दूसरी सहूलियतें दी जाती है जो कि एक बहुत खराब चीज है। मैं यह नहीं कह रहा हूं कि जातीयता या प्रान्तीयता कोई अच्छी चीज है और मेरा कहना यह है कि हमें इस चीज को जल्द अज जल्द इस देश से और अपने दिमागों से निकाल देना चाहिये आज हो यह रहा है कि डेवलपमेंट के कामों में भी लोग इस तरह की बातों को करते हैं। हमारे हैदराबाद में चूक तैलंगाना का डोमीनेशन है इसलिये मराठवाड़ा के लिये पंचवर्षीय योजना में कोई स्थान नहीं रखा। इसी तरह से बम्बई स्टेट में भी महाराष्ट्र के लिये कोईना और कोकेरापारा स्कीमों के बारे में झगड़ा हो गया।

श्री देवकीनन्दन : कोन सा झगड़ा हो गया, क्या कृपा कर के बतलायेंगे ?

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : हां बहुत सी कोशिशों के बाद कोईना में काम शुरू हो गया है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन : क्या आप को पता है कि कोईना योजना में कितना रुपया खर्च होने वाला है ?

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : यह मालूम है कि अब वहां पर काम शुरू हो गया है।

श्री अकबर अली खान : हम ने प्लानिंग कमीशन में जा कर इस को मंजूर कराया।

श्री एन० बी० देशमुख : मैं यहां पर यह कहना चाहता हूं कि महज भाषा का सवाल होता तो कोई मुश्किल बात नहीं थी लेकिन यह सब चीज है जिस

की वजह से भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्तों की रचना और राज्यों की रचना का सवाल पैदा हो गया है। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि मैं ने जो डिफरेंसेज बतलाये हैं उन का यह मतलब नहीं है कि हम एक नहीं हैं। हम एक हैं, बहुत से ऐसे प्रश्न हैं जिन की वजह से हम एक हैं। हमारे धार्मिक स्थान सारे हिन्दुस्तान में फैले हुए हैं। हिन्दुस्तान के उत्तर में काशी का धार्मिक स्थान है। वहां हिन्दुस्तान के हर जगह से लोग जाते हैं। हमारे आपस में बहुत सी ऐसी चीजें हैं जिन से हम एकता के सूत्र में बंधे हुए हैं। इस समय हमारे देश के लिये एकता बहुत ही जरूरी है। मैंने जो कुछ भी यहां पर बतलाया उस का मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम अलग रहना चाहते हैं। यह बात हमारे दिलों में नहीं है। इन सब चीजों के बावजूद भी हम लोगों ने अंग्रेजों का एक साथ मिल कर मुकाबला किया और अपनी आजादी हासिल की। हम चाहते हैं कि हम एक नेशन रहें और आयन्दा भी एक नेशन बन कर रहें। लेकिन जिस चीज के अन्तर्गत हम आज तक एक नेशन के तौर पर रहे उस को द्विभाषी राज्य बना कर तोड़ा जा रहा है। हम पहले अलग अलग भाषा के आधार पर ही एकता के सूत्र में बंधे हुए थे। मगर आज द्विभाषी राज्य बनाने की कोशिश की जा रही है जिस से हमारी एकता नष्ट हो सकती है। एस० आर० सी० ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में बतलाया है कि दो भाषा वाले लोग एक राज्य में अच्छी तरह से नहीं रह सकते हैं। एक दूसरे से सैपरेट होने की टेन्डेन्सी पैदा हो गई है, जैलसी पैदा हो गई है। इस चीज को टालने के लिये आप लोगों ने एक नई तहरीक बंगाल और बिहार की शुरू कर दी है। इसी तरह की बात दक्षिण प्रदेश, पश्चिम प्रदेश और दूसरे प्रदेशों की सुनने में आ रही है। इन बातों की वजह से हमारी सैपरेट होने की टेन्डेन्सी बढ़ रही है, अगर फिर भी इसी तरह की कोशिश जारी रखी जायेगी तो यह टेन्डेन्सी

[श्री एन० बी० देशमुख]

खत्म होने वाली नहीं है। यह टेन्डेन्सी तो एक भाषा का एक राज्य बना कर ही खत्म हो सकती है। अगर आप ने इस तरह की बात की तो लोग आपस में अच्छी तरह से रह सकेंगे और अपने प्रदेश का डेवलपमेंट अच्छी तरह से कर सकेंगे। मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर आप ने यह किया तो हिन्दुस्तान की एकता कायम रह सकती है और हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की के लिये एक अच्छा बेस बन सकता है। यह चीज दो भाषा के आधार पर राज्य बनाने से नहीं पैदा हो सकती है और न इस से देश की एकता ही कायम रह सकती है। इस तरह से तो एक दूसरे के साथ मुसलसल झगड़े बढ़ते ही रहेंगे जिस की वजह से यह देश तरक्की नहीं कर सकेगा। इस वास्ते हमारी जो भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्त बनाने की मांग है वह पूरे हिन्दुस्तान की एकता को कायम रखने के लिये है, उन्नति के लिये है, न कि सैपरेट मैन्टेनिटी बढ़ाने के लिये।

इतना कह कर मैं दूसरे प्वाइंटों को डेवलप करना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि अब वक्त नहीं रहा। जनरल डिबेट के वक्त दूसरी बातों को डेवलप करूंगा। इस वक्त मैं अपनी तकरीर खत्म करता हूँ !

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956

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

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th February, 1956."

Madam, I lay the Bill on the Table.

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 Thursday, the 23rd February 1956.

Editor of Debates,
Rajya Sabha Secretariat