

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE
PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU:
Sir, on the international side the prestige of our country has grown enormously. Our prestige in the United Nations is the highest. It is not because our country possesses enormous arms or our country possesses enormous striking power like the United States of America or the Soviet Russia, but it is that moral power that our country possesses that is responsible for this enormous influence which we have and also for the enormous prestige which our country has in the international field. Sir, I need not say the part played by our delegation in the United Nations in sponsoring 16 nations for admission to that august Assembly of the United Nations. And one of those 16 countries was Portugal and our delegation was responsible for admitting this country also into the United Nations. I do not know what was the intention of our delegation in supporting Portugal also to be a member of the United Nations. Whatever it be, what is it that this country has done within a few days after this country was admitted into that august Assembly? That country immediately rushed to the International Court of Justice at Hague and filed a complaint against the very country which was responsible for its induction into the United Nations. Sir, whether there are merits in Portugal going to the World Court or not is a different thing. Anyhow, the matter is *sub judice* and I do not want to say anything further than that.

Coming to the Goa issue, it is no doubt true that this is one of the issues which we have to tackle rather carefully. No doubt, Goa is a very small area in the map of our country, but there are certain Powers which everybody knows, are backing and fomenting this small tiny portion of Goa to remain as a foreign possession in our country. It has been openly said by no less a person than Mr. John Foster Dulles that Goa is a province

of Portugal. I do not know what prompted the Secretary of State of the United States of America to say that, but I do not think that the entire American population is behind that statement of Mr. Dulles. Sir, I was there for some months. I had talks with some of the highest officials of the State Department and with some members of the Pentagon of the United States of America. They were not of the view which Mr. Dulles has expressed in that statement. That this very country which in the 18th century championed the liberation of the people should come out with such a statement is really surprising. The leader of the Democratic Group in the United States of America has immediately come out denouncing this statement by Mr. Dulles. So it may be assumed that the entire American public is not of this view, namely, that Goa belongs to Portugal and that Goa is a province of Portugal. Whatever it might be, we have to tackle this problem very carefully.

[Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Portugal is backed by the NATO Powers. We learn—I do not know how far it is true—that air bases are being built in Goa and that these NATO Powers are behind the entire conspiracy. Some hon. Member in the other House has said that if it cannot be settled by peaceful means, it should be settled otherwise. I do not go to that extent of saying that it should be settled by any other method. We have to settle this by negotiation. Of course, it may take some time, but we have to wait with patience and tolerance and it is only time that will ultimately resolve this wretched question of Goa.

Then I would like to allude briefly to Pakistan with particular reference to the Baghdad Pact. Baghdad Pact is really a very dangerous pact so far as we are concerned. We find that certain Arab countries like Turkey, Iraq, Iran and also England have joined this Pact besides Pakistan and that arms are being rushed to Pakistan

under the terms of this Baghdad Pact. It is, however, gratifying to see that some of the leading Muslim countries of the Middle East like Egypt and Afghanistan have not become members of this Baghdad Pact. Whatever it might be, it is really a dangerous thing that a neighbouring country or countries should be armed to the teeth and we should remain as we are, trying to preach peace and arbitration. Some day or the other, they will try to upset the balance of power and we will be certainly in a very disadvantageous position. I earnestly hope that our Government is fully aware of the danger of this Baghdad Pact and of the neighbouring countries being armed. Sir, probably yesterday's event of Pakistani troops occupying a tiny island on the Kutch coast is a forerunner of the events that are to follow. We have to carefully see through things. If Pakistan is in a position to forcibly occupy a small island which has been, even according to Pakistan, recognised as Indian territory, it clearly shows that her intentions are really *mala fide*, and that we should be well on our guard.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I will be failing in my duty if I do not mention a few words about this S.R.C. Anybody in our country should feel ashamed and should hang his head in shame at the things that have happened in Bombay. Rightly or wrongly, the S.R.C. and also the high-power committee appointed by the Congress have come to the conclusion that Bombay should be a Centrally administered area. What does it matter whether a particular portion of the country belongs to this State or the other? I do not want, in the short time available to me, to go into the merits or demerits of the decision of the S.R.C. or of the high-power committee. But what I cannot understand is why there should be so much of excitement in the country and why plunder, arson, loot, shooting and all that should have

taken place because a certain decision has been taken in this matter. I do not think, Sir, that such things will be repeated elsewhere in this country. What is the urgent necessity for the country to be divided on a linguistic basis?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Only two minutes, Sir. What is the necessity for the country to be divided on a linguistic basis? It may be taken up State by State and when necessity arises. For instance, there was an urgent necessity for Andhra to be carved out and given for Telugu-speaking people. Likewise whenever there is a necessity, whenever there is an agitation, the States can be carved out and distributed on a linguistic basis or otherwise, but to distribute the country wholesale on a linguistic basis would mean certainly giving room for more explosive situations to arise. We must see that such things are avoided in our country, in future. Thank you.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: (Nominated): Sir, the President's Address to the joint session of both Houses of Parliament, which is technically called in political parlance the State of the Union Message, gives Members of Parliament valuable privilege to pass comments and observations on the various aspects of the working of the Government for the year. The procedure that I want to follow will be to confine my remarks to certain statements that are already incorporated in the President's Address. I do not think a Member is justified in going beyond the subjects that are referred to in the President's Address. So, following this procedure, the first point to which I should like to call the attention of the House is this. At page 2, line 1, there is a reference to the successful conclusion of an Indo-Pakistan agreement as regards transport, that is, rail traffic between India and West Pakistan. I am sorry to say that the demands of this traffic as

[Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.]
between East Pakistan and West Bengal have not been properly attended to by the Government. I understand that only some kind of goods service has ~~the ordinary traffic~~ of p.U15nn-shesce been restored, but I wish to plead for the ordinary traffic of passengers between Calcutta and Darjeeling along the routes part of which lies through Pakistan. I wish that the Government should treat these two questions affecting East and West Pakistan with equal consideration.

Now, I come to the greatest problem that is facing West Bengal at the present moment, namely, the exodus of population from East Pakistan. The President's Address has not given us any hope as to the satisfactory settlement of this very knotty problem. He has been pleased to say that the State of West Bengal, already heavily burdened, has to shoulder this additional burden. And he also hopes that the Pakistan Government will take appropriate measures to stop the exodus. I am afraid that this raises questions of very great gravity. I remember that it was Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel of revered memory who first stated when he had to consider the problem of this one-way traffic of the refugees from East Bengal, when he was faced with this problem—it was his clear vision which foresaw the possibilities of mischief in this one-way traffic—that immigrants from East Pakistan should not travel in the air, they should come with land. As you know, the basis of the Radcliffe Award, partition between these two parts of Bengal, was population, the number of people to be accommodated in each of the areas that emerged after the partition. Now, my point is this. Pakistan has driven away roughly 50 lakhs of Hindu population. Now, the question is: Should they come away empty handed or should they not have any claim upon the land on the basis of which this partition was effected? I think that if the Government of India takes up this point, the district of Khulna should easily be

transferred to those Hindus who have already left their home Province. Of course, in settling this issue, we may still say that perhaps Khulna district might form part of East Pakistan Government, provided it is administered by Hindu officials who might probably restore the conditions which will render exodus no longer necessary. So, this is one of the appropriate measures to which I should like to draw the attention of the Government on the basis of Sardar Patel's statesmanlike declaration on this subject.

Now, West Bengal is really faced with a very great and difficult problem. How to find space for the accommodation of 50 lakhs of people whose influx is continuing in an unending stream? That, therefore, raises the question of the reconsideration of the boundaries as between West Bengal and Bihar. I do not like to tread on a delicate ground, but as I already stated in this House, my prayer is this. West Bengal has lost for the cause of freedom 81 thousand square miles of territory and is now reduced to a third of her original size, namely, only 30 thousand square miles. So, I beg of the neighbouring States and the Central Government to consider whether our total claim, which amounts to only about 10 thousand square miles, cannot somehow be provided for the accommodation of this unfortunate population who have been sacrificed ultimately at the altar of India's freedom.....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Why not have the whole of Bihar?

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: I am not so ambitious to think on those lines, but I am only begging for 10 thousand square miles of territory from the rest of India.....

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): Merger will solve the problem.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: If you have the whole of Bihar.....

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: My suggestion was very limited in its character. You give a push towards U. P. and annex the two districts of Ghazipur and Ballia and U. P. could give a push to Vindhya Pradesh and in that way.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): U. P.'s doors are already open for all Bengalis.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Punjab starts pushing towards here.....

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: I want a clear answer. We have lost 81 thousand square miles; and for whom? And against that my claim is, please provide us with a minimum space of 10 thousand square miles. However, as I have said, the President's Address is not the occasion on which we can indulge in these acrimonious discussions.

Now, my second question is this that I do not know whether the President has been advised by Government to make no reference to the burning political problem of India, namely, the issue of Kashmir. I should have thought that there should be some kind of ray of light thrown upon the solution of this question and, therefore, I take the opportunity of making only a few remarks. The first is this. Marshal Bulganin, who was an independent observer of the political situation in India, has come to the conclusion that Kashmir really has already acceded to India and that accession should stand as a fact and in law. And now you know Marshal Bulganin speaks with the authority which attaches to a permanent member of the Security Council.

And if he has come to the judgment by a study of the conditions on the spot, that the accession of Kashmir to India through a vote of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly really makes that accession an accomplished

fact, I do not think why we should go on harping on this issue as if it is not settled. In that connection, I should only like to touch on one point, that is, if the plebiscite is insisted on as a commitment of India to the U. N. O., my answer is that the plebiscite has already been taken on the occasion of Pakistan's invasion of Kashmir. It was this invasion of Kashmir which has forced upon India the accession of Kashmir to it. When the invaders were about to capture Srinagar, at that moment, how did the Kashmiris behave? They did not embrace these raiders as constituting the army of their liberation. They did not fraternise with the invaders. On the contrary, they fought tooth and nail in defence of their hearths and homes there, at that fateful moment, the trends of events have shown us that Kashmir already wrote its plebiscite in blood. Therefore, you should not go on troubling the people of Kashmir for another plebiscite which has already been given in the battle against the enemies of Kashmir.

Sir, as my time is limited, I should like to refer to some other points in the Address of the President. I come to page 5 where the figure of the increase of national income has been given. I think that the increase of our national income has not been quite 18 per cent. I do not know whether this percentage is for a period of 4 or 5 years. In that connection, I find that the framers of the Second Five Year Plan are taking a more optimistic view of the indication of national income in the country. I find, for instance, that even countries like Germany, Canada, Australia and U. S. A. do not show a rate of increase which is higher than 2 to 3 per cent; and therefore, it will be a safer proposition if the planners of the scheme think that we should not build on the basis of a financial assumption which may not be correct. It is, therefore, safer to say that the growth of national income may be taken at the rate of 2 to 3 per cent per annum.

[Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.]

As regards agricultural production, I am afraid the situation is not properly understood by the Government and the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. The Ministry is taking credit for the fact that there has been an increase of foodgrains to the extent of 20 per cent. But I say that this so-called increase in the production of foodgrains is not reaching the masses, because India continues to be one of the most ill-fed countries of the world. I have already stated that you will have to show not merely that there has been an increase in the production of foodgrains, but have also to consider whether the situation as regards food for the masses has really improved. I find, for instance, that in terms of calories.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: All right, Sir. My point is that in point of calories as the standard of measuring the adequacy of the average Indian diet, I find that, whereas the U. S. A. diet accounts for 3160 calories per day and U. K. 2990 calories, India can only get food that will yield 1600 calories only. Therefore, I may say that India, as a whole, still continues to be very inadequately fed and I do not know how on this basis of malnutrition, the national physique of India will improve. Similarly, in terms of weight, I find from an examination of the items in the Indian diet, that it can only amount to 9 ounces per day per individual, as against 21 ounces required. The difficulty is that, although production of foodgrains has gone up in respect of cereals and pulses, these two items of food are not at all nutritive in their value and in fact, the Planning Commission is already anxious to find out how we can achieve an increase in the production of what may be called the "protective foods". Now, in point of protective food, I find that, whereas 10 ounces are required of milk and milk products as a standard,

only 5 ounces are available in India. And not merely that, cereals and pulses are 124 in calories as against U.K. 100. But as regards the more protective foods, milk and milk products, it is a matter of great anxiety.....

(Time bell rings)

One minute more, Sir.

It is a matter of great anxiety that in regard to this protective food from milk and milk products, Indian can get, together, calories for about 46, as against 200 in U. K. and U. S. A. So, really this is the food situation and I do not think that the Ministry of Food should always take things in a spirit of optimism.

श्रीमती लीलावती मुंशी (मुम्बई) :

उपसभापति महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के प्रति आभार प्रदर्शन करने का जो प्रस्ताव सभा के सम्मुख आया है, उस का मैं समर्थन करती हूँ।

उन्होंने देश-विदेश के बारे में कई एक बातें कही। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि हमारी तटस्थता की विदेश नीति हमारे लिये और दूसरों के लिये बड़ी लाभदायी हुई है। हमारे लिए लाभदायी हुई है, क्योंकि आज कल दुनिया के महान देशों में एक प्रकार की स्पर्धा चल रही है और हम एक के साथ जायेंगे, तो हम दूसरे के दुश्मन बनेंगे; चाहे ऐसा कोई दुश्मनी का हमारा इरादा न हो। दूसरों को भी इस से फायदापहुंचा है, क्योंकि संघर्ष चाहने वाले देशों के बीच भारत शांति का सन्देश ले कर पहाड़ बन कर खड़ा रहा है और दुनिया में चलती लड़ाई की बातों में हमारा शांति का सन्देश रुकावट डालता रहा है। शांति हम को हमारे लिये चाहिये क्योंकि बिना शांति के हमारी कोई योजना पूरी नहीं हो सकती है। दुनिया के किमी भी कोने में संघर्ष का असर सारी दुनिया में, न लड़ने वाले देशों में भी, पड़ता है और उस से कोई बच नहीं सकता। कोई ऐसा नहीं कह सकता कि हम लड़ते हैं तो इस से आप को क्या

मतलब, क्योंकि उन के लड़ने का असर हमारे देश पर काफी पड़ता है।

गया साल हमारे लिये एक बड़ी यादगार का साल रहा है। दुनिया के कई बड़े बड़े महानुभाव दोस्ती के नाते हमारे यहां आये और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी भी इसी नाते से कई देशों का सफर करके आये। इस से भारत की दोस्ती इन सब देशों से बड़ी धनी हुई। अफसोस इस बात का है कि हमारे पड़ोसी देश हमारे इतने दोस्त नहीं बनते हैं। कल ही की बात है, हम ने अखबार में देखा कि पाकिस्तान ने हमारे छोटे से एक गांव पर कच्छ में गोली चलाई। उन के पास बहुत से गस्त्रास्त्र परदेश से आये हैं और मैं समझती हूं कि यह एक प्रकार का बहाना है। वे किसी न किसी प्रकार से हिन्दुस्तान के साथ लड़ाई का बहाना सोचते हैं। कोई कहे कि ऐसी चीज भूल में हुई है, मैं यह नहीं मानती हूं। ऐसी कोई चीज कभी भूल में नहीं होती है। ऐसी दशा में हमारी सरकार को सीमा-प्रान्तों की ओर खूब जाग्रत रहने की जरूरत है, जिस से हमारे देश को कोई खतरा न पहुंचे। गोवा का मागला तो कभी न कभी हल होना ही चाहिये और चाहे कल चाहे परसों, गोवा हमारा बन के ही रहेगा।

आज हमारे देश में बड़ी बड़ी बात हो रही है। हमारे सामने दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना आ रही है, जो कि एक बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण घटना है। दूसरी महत्वपूर्ण बात एस० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट है और इस के बाद, हमारे देश में होने वाली घटनायें हैं। जब मैं ने दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना पढ़ी तो मुझे बड़े गौरव का अनुभव हुआ। कई लोग इन योजनाओं की ओर शक की दृष्टि से देखते हैं। कल ही यहां यह पूछा गया था कि रोजगार कितना बढ़ा। मैं कहती हूं कि यदि योजना न होती तो बेरोजगारी कितनी बढ़ती, इस को कोई नहीं पूछता है। हमारी विकास योजनायें सर्वदेशीय हैं, जैसे कि अनाज का उगाना, उद्योग का बढ़ाना,

तन्दुस्ती का बढ़ाना, रास्तों का बढ़ाना, शिपिंग का बढ़ाना, शिक्षण बढ़ाना, आमदनी बढ़ाना, इत्यादि इत्यादि। हमारी योजनायें कई विषयों में हैं। सब चीजों को बढ़ाने की योजना है और एक चीज को घटाने की योजना है और वह है हमारी बस्ती को घटाने की योजना। हो सकता है कि ये योजनायें सम्पूर्ण न हों और इन में बहुत सी भूलें भी हों, मगर कहीं तो हमें काम शुरू करना ही है और भूल करते करते भी हमारा बहुत सा काम बन जायगा। जैसा कि मैं ने कहा, हमारी सब से बड़ी दिक्कत यह है कि बस्ती बढ़ती जा रही है। जब हम ८० लाख नये रोजगार निकालेंगे तब हमारे बेरोजगारों की तादाद १२५ लाख हो जायेगी। तो इतने काम करने वाले नये आदमी पैदा होते हैं। हमारी आयु बढ़ी है, मृत्यु कम हुई है, जीवन का स्तर भी ऊंचा उठा है और इन सब बातों से हमारी जनसंख्या भी बढ़ती जाती है। उस में सरकार के प्लान का क्या दोष है? प्लान से ही तो सब आदमियों को खाना मिलेगा, मगर कोई योजना इतनी वृद्धि का मुकाबिला नहीं कर सकती है। उस के लिये बहुत मोच समझ कर कुछ उपाय करना चाहिये, यह बात मैं मानती हूं।

आजकल देश में अशांति पैदा करने वाली एक दूसरी बात भी है और वह यह है कि एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट के बाद भाषावाद और भाषा के आधार पर देश का विभाजन करने की चर्चा आजकल देश में, हर विभाग में, जोरों से बढ़ रही है। मुझे समझ में नहीं आता है कि हमारे देश भक्तों को हो क्या गया है। भाषावाद का सहारा ले कर एक दूसरे का गला काटना, अपनी बहिनों की भी बेइज्जती करना, लूटना, जलाना, पुलिस को मारना, यह सब क्या हो रहा है? मैं यह सच्ची बात कह कर सब को भड़काना नहीं चाहती हूं, मगर यह तो सच है कि जो काम हमारे परदेशी दुश्मनों ने नहीं किया, ऐसा काम हमारे भाइयों ने भाषावाद के नाम पर किया है। जो बात बम्बई

[श्रीमती लीलावती मुंशी]

म हुई उसे देख कर हमारे सारे हिन्दवासियों का सिर शर्म से झुकना चाहिये। हम "हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई", "हिन्दी रूसी भाई भाई" कहते हैं, तो क्या महाराष्ट्रीय गुजरातियों के भाई नहीं बन सकते हैं? यह बात क्या है, मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है। हम सब भारत-वासी एक हैं, हमारी गवर्नमेंट एक है, तो क्या एक भाषा न होने से हम मानवता को भी भूल सकते हैं? कहा गया है कि गुंडों ने यह काम किया। मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि गुंडों को भड़काया किसने? कल भाई देवकीनन्दन जी ने अच्छा बताया कि गुंडे तो हमारे में से हैं, लेकिन ऐसे गुंडों को बहकाने वाले कौन थे? हमारे अगुवा लोग भड़काने वाले थे और आज भी वे भड़का रहे हैं। उन को इस काम के लिये प्रेरणा, इस काम के लिये इज्जत कहा से मिलती है? उन्होंने जो काम किया, उस के लिये हमारे वे अगुवा जो कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के लिये लड़ते हैं, वे दो चार शब्द भी कुछ कहते हैं? क्या इसी रीति से वे अपना दावा साबित कर सकते हैं? हमारे यहां एक कहावत है, "जिस की लाठी उस की भैंस" अब उस का जमाना चला गया है और अब तो न्याय और समानता का जमाना आया है। अब तो डराने की यह सब बातें छोड़ देनी चाहियें।

हमारे गाडगिल भाई साहब तो हमारे डब्लेस भाई साहब की तरह हैं। जब वह मुंह खोलते हैं तो ऐसी ही बात बतलाते हैं जिस से कि लोगों के दिलों में ज्यादा भड़कने की बात ही पैदा होती है और गाडगिल भाई साहब की बातें धाव पर नमक छिड़कने की ही होती हैं। उन की इक्वायरी चाहिये। इक्वायरी जरूर होने दो, जिस से कि सब बात बाहर निकलें, लेकिन यह बात कोई धाव को भरने वाली नहीं है। दिल व दिमाग कोई एक जाति को ही नहीं मिला है, सब को प्राप्य है और डंडा लगाने की शक्ति भी सब को प्राप्य है। हां, कई जातियों में यह शक्ति ज्यादा जरूर है। बहानों जो भाई बम्बई की बात नहीं जानते

उन की ओर से यह पूछा गया कि मारवाडी जब कलकत्ते में रहने हैं तो क्या गुजराती बम्बई में, महाराष्ट्र में, नहीं रह सकते। आप भूल गये हैं कि गुजरातियों ने, बम्बई की प्राविशियल कांग्रेस कमेटी ने और गुजरात प्राविशियल कांग्रेस कमेटी ने.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): But Calcutta should not belong to Rajasthan.

श्रीमती लीलावती मुंशी..... सब ने जब एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट आई, तो उसको स्वीकार कर दिया था, लेकिन ये सब बातें होने के बाद ही उन के दिल में शक पैदा हो गया कि हमइस तरह से किस रीति में रह सकते हैं। ये सब बातें लोगों के नाम से और लोगों के लिये की जाती हैं, ऐसा कहा जाता है। इस तरह से अज्ञानियों को बहकाया जाता है, मगर बेचारे लोग न तो इस बात को समझते हैं और न उस में उन का कोई हाथ है और न इस में उन को कोई फायदा पहुंचने वाला है। जो कुछ फायदा पहुंचने वाला है, वह तो पौलिटीशियन्स को पहुंचने वाला है। उन के एलैक्शन्स (निर्वाचन) के लिये ये सब झगड़े चल रहे हैं कि कौन कौन क्या होने वाला है। इस के लिये ही ये सब बातें हो रही हैं। मगर इस सभा में ज्यादातर लोग निष्पक्ष हैं इसलिये वे ऐसी बातों में आने नहीं पायेंगे, ऐसा मैं मानती हूँ। मैं आशा करती हूँ कि जो फैसला हमारे बुजुर्ग इस मामले में करेंगे, उस को हम सब मानेंगे, कम से कम कांग्रेस सदस्य तो मानेंगे ही। जिन बुजुर्गों ने हमारे सेनानी बन कर जमाने तक हमारी स्वातन्त्र्य की लड़ाई लड़ी, जिन्होंने ने अपने बलिदान से, देश-सेवा से, स्वातन्त्र्य दिलवाया, जो हमारे देश का कार्य सदा अहोरात्र जाग्रत रहकर कर रहे हैं और जिन के निष्पक्ष होने में किसी को शक नहीं है, ऐसे महानुभाव ऐसा तो कभी नहीं करेंगे कि सारे देश के फायदे की बात न हो और किसी को नुकसान पहुंचे। गुंडापन के जोर से भी वह कोई फैसला नहीं करेंगे, ऐसा

मैं विश्वास रखती हूँ। आप भूलिये मत कि हमारे दरवाजे पर, हमारी दीवार पर, दुश्मन बैठा है। हमारी आपस की यादवस्थली से, जैसी कि उस जमाने में हुई, फायदा उनको ही मिलेगा, जो कि हमारे दुश्मन हैं। सैकड़ों सालों के बाद हम को यह स्वातंत्र्य मिला है और इस को हम इस प्रकार से अन्दर अन्दर अड़ कर नहीं रख सकते हैं। मैं फिर से आशा करती हूँ कि राज्यों के बटवारे के फैसले को हम भारत के नागरिक की हैमियत से अपनायेंगे। जय हिन्द।

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the President has compressed so many items in such a short space and such a short time. Even the Chairman of a Corporation gives more space and more time in describing the problems his Corporation has to face and deal with. I wish the President had given a little more time in dealing with the number of problems that he has touched upon in his Address before Parliament.

Sir, I will touch only one or two aspects of his Address and the first thing that comes to my mind is his reference to the nationalisation of life insurance. The method and the objectives that are involved in the nationalisation of life insurance do not appeal to me at all. An Ordinance has been issued to nationalise life insurance. Rule by Ordinance was a thing that was universally condemned before we came into power. I do not think there can be one set of rules for one Government and another set of rules for another Government. I wish this were done by a natural process of legislation instead of using the method of Ordinance which the Government have tried to do in this case. I have not also understood the implications and the objectives that are underlying this nationalisation of life insurance. It has been said that this is meant for helping the Second Five Year Plan. I don't know how it is going to be

done because what has been assured authoritatively is that the present percentage that is utilised from life insurance fund will be utilised even in the future for the private sector. If that is to be so, I don't know how more funds are going to be obtained from life insurance for the public sector. Another thing that has been said about life insurance is that it will help the socialist pattern that the Government have in view. I don't know what is meant by this. Life insurance never tried to exert any undue influence on anybody. I have not heard at least of any industry complaining that the management of life insurance companies have at any time exerted undue influence on those industries to have any control in management or in any other manner. In fact life insurance is without any managing agency system, about which there have been people in this country so eloquent to run it down. It is a normal form of management through a Board of Directors without any system of long-term management and, therefore, it is one of the items which should be far away from any socialist pattern. However, the Government have decided to nationalise life insurance and I do hope that they will not use this life insurance in an undesirable manner to influence the management of private sector. I only hope that.

Sir, the President has said that we are going on towards a socialist pattern of society. Till some time ago, we were talking of 'socialistic' pattern and now that 'istic' has been changed to 'ist'; really speaking and if we analyse the facts, it is neither socialistic nor socialist but we are slowly and definitely drifting or driven to a communistic pattern, I am afraid.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not under this Government.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: I hear murmurs on my right.

(Interruptions)

[Shri Lalchand Hirachand Doshi.] The Communists would be very happy to have this country go communist. I have no doubt about that because they are wedded to communism though the communist country itself could not bring in communism in their own country and have been drifting to the rightist pattern. Take any principle that they have been advocating through the ages ever since Marx wrote his famous book, "Das Capital." Nationalisation of industry and everything they have done no doubt, but the main basic idea of removing inequality has been completely discarded in that Soviet pattern which is based on communism; and here in this country, in spite of all that experience in Soviet Russia where they have discarded all these principles of inequality.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Equality.

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: These principles of equality and inequality.....

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancore-Cochin): Have they re-established capitalism?

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: No. They have adopted the State capitalism. They have not thrown away the principle of capitalism. They have absorbed it completely; but it is not private capitalism, it is State capitalism if you would like to have it. Therefore, what is it? We say we are going gradually to socialist pattern and we are nationalising one industry after another and the private enterprise—their freedom, the idea of democracy—is being subjected to increasing control from the State and, therefore, the main basic principle of democracy is being gradually sacrificed. "How" is a question that is being raised here.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many are there in the insurance field?

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI: How many are there in the

insurance field? It is not only the insurance field. This is the first stage of nationalisation, and one by one, as I am mentioning, different industries will be brought according to this idea where we want to have a socialistic regime. Do not forget that we are going a step forward now and we are developing ideas and ideologies. We have to scan them and see how we are developing these things. We must realise, study and then come to any conclusion as to what we have done and what we are going to do.

I would like to touch another aspect of the Address, viz., agricultural development. We have been told that there has been considerable increase in agricultural production and there is also mention that the agricultural commodity prices have considerably gone down. They went down so much that at one stage it appeared that the agriculturists would be completely ruined. At that stage the Government came forward to make purchases. I regret to say that purchasing came at such a late stage that the agriculturist hardly got the advantage of that purchasing system. Bulk of the crop was sold out and it was ultimately found that realisation of *taccavi* loans that were advanced by the States could hardly be recovered from the agriculturists except under a process of compulsory acquisition. Sir, I will give you another illustration to show how the agriculturist was very badly hit. Sir, the agriculturist needs his implements and various other things. These are needed for agricultural production. I can tell this House with definite facts that it has not been possible for the agriculturist to come forward and make his purchases from the market with his own cash. He has had to depend on the *taccavi* loans that the State Government have been offering him. Why is that? Is his purchasing power remaining the same instead of improving? I would say that instead of remaining the same, his purchasing power has actually gone down as compared to what it was

three or four years ago, when the agriculturist bought his requirements like ploughs and other agricultural implements with his own money from the market. Today you cannot find such a thing as the agriculturist making his own purchases unless the various States come forward and offer him crores of rupees as *taccavi* loans. Sir, I am a producer of diesel engines and I have sold more engines last year than in previous years. But I can assure you that this has been possible only because the various States came forward with their *taccavi* loans and wherever in a State they delayed the *taccavi* loans, the sale of diesel engines for pumping purposes has been very low. Why should it be so? If the agricultural production has gone up by 15 per cent and if the agriculturist is getting a fair price for his produce, why should he have to depend entirely on the *taccavi* loans or any other loans? He should be in a position to stand on his own legs. That is the idea behind all this planning. But this is exactly what is not happening in this country. I would submit that the Government should examine this and see that the agriculturist gets a fair price for his produce, that he is able to stand on his own legs and not depend entirely on the doles that he may get in the form of *taccavi* loans or from the community projects or from here or from there. This is a very important thing and I would submit that the Government should take into consideration this aspect of the question and not only see that the agricultural production is increased. While agricultural production increases, the agriculturist should get at least a fair price for his produce and his labour.

Mention has been made of the trouble in Bombay in connection with the States reorganisation that Gujaratis and Maharashtrians have been at loggerheads. I would rather say that there has been a violent demand for putting Bombay City in Maharashtra. Yes, there has been considerable agitation. But behind

all that nobody can dispute that there were mainly the *goondas* encouraged by certain groups or parties which believe in violence. These parties have been mainly responsible for the trouble in Bombay. But then I feel that the Government also have neglected to take proper care of these people. Sir, in spite of the open preaching that Bombay's fate will be decided in the streets of Bombay or the virulent propaganda that was being carried on by the Communists and the Socialists in Bombay, hardly any action was taken, hardly any proper action was taken. And then we had to face all the trouble that Bombay had to face at the time of these violent upheavals.

(Time bell rings.)

I am just finishing, Sir. I hope I will get two minutes more, as usual.

Sir, I submit that now efforts must be made to heal up these wounds. However, a vacillating policy and lack of decision will not stop all this trouble. The Government must come to a decision, sooner rather than later. We started with saying that the unanimous decisions of the States Reorganisation Commission would be entirely accepted by the Government. Then we started modifying them. Various conferences were held from stage to stage and yet even now no finality seems to have been reached. This is one of the main causes of the trouble and there were also parties out to exploit the situation and trying to create dissensions in the Congress party itself. On this point I would say that I do hope that this linguistic idea will soon be thrown away in favour of the bigger mergers, which have been announced, like those between Bengal and Bihar and between other States also; and I hope that I will get back my whole State of Bombay, including Gujarat and Maharashtra, with Bombay, all together living in the same social manner that we were living in the past.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would confine myself

[Shri N. C. Sekhar.]

mainly to some of the points referred to in the President's Address. The first one relates to the Five Year Plan. The President in his Address has said that the basic criterion for determining our line of advance must always be the social gain and the progressive removal of inequalities. That is something to be welcomed. The Plan as it has been presented before us is also to be welcomed. But the question so far as I am concerned is, how the Government is going to implement this Plan in order to bring about even development all over our country. I say this because experience so far gained of the working of the First Plan in our parts has not been quite as satisfactory as it is claimed by the Central Government or by the spokesmen of the Central Government. As part of the development schemes, we have community projects in our area; but the way in which these community project schemes have been carried on has not at all been commendable. Rather it is to be criticised vehemently. A good portion of the funds allotted for this purpose is used up as salaries of the officers. These sums have to be utilised with the co-operation of the people. But most of these schemes are still being held up for lack of co-operation from the people. Also whatever is being implemented in those areas is not to the satisfaction of the people. At the same time it benefits only certain sections of the people, that is to say, those people who are known in our parts as the rich people. They get the money on credit and they also get some other facilities. They have managed to get certain wells dug in certain corners of their own property or at the corners of some roads. Such things have been done. So far it is good. But I desire to bring to the knowledge of the Government spokesmen here the unjust way in which the thing was carried out. For example, in Pariyaram, near Chalakudi in the Mukundapuram taluk of the Travancore-Cochin State, there was a co-operative farm functioning

for the last nine years with about hundred families working on it. This land was given under Grow More Food scheme to the hundred families during the War time and they were carrying on a sort of collective farming. After the advent of the community projects, something about 90 acres of this bit of land has been taken possession of by the community project people with the help of the Government, for the creation of a *goshala*. Even this is not functioning properly, to the advantage of the people. The peasants are not so rich as to afford the luxury of having their cows sent to the *goshala* where they will have to pay Rs. 10 a month for the upkeep. The peasants are so poor and it is with great difficulty that they eke out a living on this small bit of land. Land has been so fragmented there and only a few people have got with them land enough to give them a living. This is how things are implemented there, in a way which is not helpful either to the peasants or to the organisers of the *goshala*.

I now come to the coir industry which is very very important so far as the people in Malabar and Travancore-Cochin are concerned. This industry employs about 11 lakhs of people both in the villages as well as in the factories. The Government has now taken up the reorganisation of the village sector of the industry. The Village and Small-scale Industries Committee's Report mentions that the "development work relating to the coir industry which is concentrated in Travancore-Cochin and the Malabar district of the Madras State is still in the early stages. A number of co-operative societies in Travancore-Cochin and also a Central Marketing Society have been organised with a view to eliminating the hold of the middlemen over the industry." This is what is stated in that Report. In fact, instead of eliminating the middlemen, the Travancore-Cochin State Government authorities and the Ministry have actually saved these middlemen from being eliminated by placing them under co-operative

societies. On the one hand, the co-operative societies, as claimed by this Report, are not functioning properly. These societies are still in the hands of the middlemen. They are the members still and they are the only beneficiaries and the bulk of the people employed in the industry do not get any benefit. The workers have started an agitation for organising themselves into co-operative societies so that they may purchase the husk, soak it in water and then make the fibre and yarn. The price of raw and soaked husk has been raised to such an extent that the poor people are unable to afford this. This is the position which obtains in our part today. The societies have become utterly useless so far as our people are concerned.

The Government have also neglected the manufacturing side. It is a known fact that Alleppey and Sherthalay are the two centres which have been producing very fine coir carpets, rugs, mats and such other things for export. These things have been exported for a number of years. Of course, this industry has been dominated by Europeans but, since 1945, the manufacturing has gone down to one-third. Formerly about 400 factories were functioning in Alleppey and Sherthalay, now the number has been reduced to 150 or so. The number of workers employed in these and allied factories was about 35,000 to 40,000. Their number has now been reduced to about 7,000. Even these people are only partly employed or under-employed, not fully employed. This is the state of affairs so far as the manufacturing side of the coir industry is concerned. In this respect, it is the demand of the people of Travancore-Cochin, particularly those engaged in this industry, that the Central Government should see that the industry is reorganised on a competitive basis. According to the reports that I have received, something like 92 factories in Holland are employing about 5,000 and odd workers, producing coir carpets. To feed these 92 factories,

the people there get all the necessary raw materials from Malabar and Travancore-Cochin, particularly from Alleppey Port. The European firms, which once used to manufacture these coir carpets in Alleppey, etc., are now very keen on exporting raw materials such as fibre and coir yarn to Holland. Because of this shift in the centre of production from our place to Holland, our people are suffering and the manufacture has gone down very much. This is not only a loss to our national income but also renders a large number of people unemployed. I do not know whether Government have taken note of this fact and have suggested to the State Government to reorganise the manufacturing side with the aid of mechanised means. In Holland, the whole production is carried on with the help of machines. Unless this is done here, it will be very difficult to sustain this industry here and one of our important sources of national income will be jeopardised and many more will be rendered unemployed. Here is a copy of a memorandum sent to our Prime Minister to call his attention to the urgent necessity of taking the necessary steps to see that one of the important industries of our country, affecting about 11 lakhs of people of our country, is immediately aided.

The Central Government have so many plans but they have not deemed it necessary or even given an iota of thought to establishing a railway-coach-building factory in our area. Malabar and Travancore-Cochin are an area which is one of the biggest timber producing areas of the world. The coaches require very fine and strong teak and other qualities of wood which are available in plenty in our part. Instead of being used for such purposes, they are exported in logs to Arabian and Middle Eastern countries via Bombay at meagre prices. The Government should have thought it necessary to have a coach-building factory somewhere in Chalakudi or Belipatam. Certainly, the Railway Department can produce more

[Shri N. C. Sekhar.]

fine coaches, not only produce fine coaches but also give employment to as many as 2,000 workers in this. This they ought to have done.

(Time bell rings.)

I am finishing, Sir. I am speaking on the assumption that we will have Aikya Kerala. We of Kerala are opposed to Dakshina Pradesh. It is against the interests of our Indian unity; it is against the interests of our Indian people and the development of our own people. We are a peace-loving people and till the other day we were very satisfied with the announcement of the Central Government on the basis of the S.R.C. Report. We are told now that we will be given Dakshina Pradesh. If the Central Government take to that, they will be driving the Kerala people to unwanted struggle, which we do not want to wage. So in the interest of peace, in the interest of our development, in the interest of the unity of our great nation, we, the Kerala people,—it is not the few Congressmen, corrupt, followerless Congressmen that count—the majority of our Malayalee people that count, appeal to the Government that they should accede to this demand for an Aikya Kerala, which they have themselves announced once, and now they should not recede from that and go back upon what they have said once.

With these words, Sir, I conclude my speech.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I support the Motion of Thanks.

The matters dealt with in the President's Address cover not only the domestic sphere but also the international sphere. If everyone were to go on discussing all the topics touched on in the Address of the learned President, it would not be possible especially in view of the limited time, and so, Sir, I will confine myself to some of the salient

points that have been raised by hon. Members on the side opposite

It was gratifying to me to see that the leader of the Democratic Front did not speak, implying thereby that he supports the Address. The leader of the Communist group confined himself only to the S.R.C. Report, thereby also implying that he accepts the other portions, domestic and international, mentioned in the Address.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Similarly the leader of the Praja Socialist Party also confined himself only to the S.R.C. Report and more particularly to the question of Bengal, probably because the Communist leader and the Praja Socialist leader both come from Bengal. Certain other Opposition Members have mentioned a few other things, but, on the whole, the debate has been centred mostly on the S.R.C. Report. I think, Sir, in the difficult circumstances, the way in which the S.R.C. has made the recommendations and the way in which the four-man sub-committee is trying to implement them, in the difficult situation, is the best that could be done.

I would just refer to the domestic and the international matters casually, Sir. As regards international matters, let me say, so far as the policy regarding Goa is concerned, we fully endorse the policy of the Government, and in view of the general international policy based on Pancha Shila, we cannot do anything else, but I would warn the Portuguese that our attitude should not lead them to think that they can remain in occupation of Goa for a long time. We repudiate their claim to Goa and, Sir, while we are at loggerheads with Portuguese Government, the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Dulles, gives a statement saying that Goa belongs to Portugal. Sir, we are sorry that, while we had very cordial relations with the United

States during our struggle for independence and later on, a responsible statesman of the United States of America should make such an irresponsible statement. I want to tell the American people that it is a great shock to us to feel that one of the Secretaries of the country, which had the honour to give birth to Abraham Lincoln and some other great people who had stood against colonialism, should go down to this extent and support colonialism of the worst type. That is why this attitude pains us all the more, Sir. We know how to deal with the situation and we will deal with it in the best possible manner. But we are sorry that American statesmen have come down in this manner. I hope, Sir, as some of the leaders of the Opposition in America itself have repudiated the statement, while Mr. Dulles is here, after discussion things will improve. If a high dignitary like Mr. Eisenhower, the President, comes here, we will give him a hearty welcome as we want to be friends not only with Soviet Russia but also with America and the American people.

Now as regards another question, the exodus from East Pakistan, Sir, the President has put it in a very human way. He has touched on it very gently, but we feel that this thing cannot go on and cannot be tolerated much longer. The other day I read that the Pakistan Ambassador has suggested that this route should be closed. I am sorry. Is that the way to solve any problem? The main thing is that the people living in East Pakistan should have the satisfaction that justice is being done to them. Sir, nobody leaves his own country; nobody wants to go to some other place in such large numbers unless they are forced to do so. So the problem will have to be tackled and a feeling of satisfaction that justice is being done to them will have to be created. Otherwise I am sorry to say that things will take a very serious turn, but I do hope, Sir, that the persons in authority in Pakis-

tan will take this matter very seriously and apply their mind to it.

Now, Sir, regarding domestic affairs, the question that is addressed by the common man is this, Sir: "How far has my economic condition improved after the attainment of independence?" I have no doubt that the First Five Year Plan has not done considerable good as we expected. But it has created an atmosphere and especially the community projects and the national extension service works have brought the administration and the people very close, and I can say so far as my part of the country, namely, Hyderabad, is concerned, on the whole this work has been going on very satisfactorily. But, notwithstanding the fact that there has been an increase in the production of foodgrains and cloth and notwithstanding the fact that there has been an improvement in the general condition, still we have a long way to go, and for that purpose it is high time that we concentrate every bit of our energy to further the plans in the Second Five Year Plan. For that, Sir, we want a calm and cordial atmosphere so that everybody living in this country might exert himself and try to improve the economic condition of our people through the Second Five Year Plan and for that it is necessary that every effort should be made not only from this side of the House, not only from the ruling authority, but also from everybody, from every party and from the public, who are interested in the well-being and the progress of the country.

Now, coming to the last point regarding S. R. C., when I speak on this subject I speak with a heavy heart. Whatever has happened has not only given a blow to the progress of the country but it has also brought down the good name of India which has established its prestige in the international sphere. So it is high time we think carefully, but in a realistic manner, regarding this question of S.R.C. Sir, I need not

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

refer to the unpleasant things that have happened, but I emphatically repudiate the suggestion of an enquiry into this matter. Enquiry means again opening the wounds which is not in the best interests of the country. Sir, even Members from this side of the House were saying that the reference to S.R.C. was confused; the S.R.C. was confused; the four-man committee was still more confused and of course the Opposition—the leaders of the Communist and the Praja Socialist Parties—has said that there was blundering and bungling and there was nothing reasonable or statesman-like. This is not the time to go into this because we have discussed S.R.C. threadbare but what I emphasise is this. I do not agree with some of the recommendations of the S.R.C. regarding Hyderabad itself. We may not agree with the four-man committee also, but we must see in the context of the situation in which we are placed, what would be a realistic and practical solution of this thorny linguistic problem. It is no use condemning the whole thing. The members of the S.R.C. were persons of high calibre and we cannot deny that nobody objected when it was announced that these persons would be the members. At the same time there was resentment and some difficulties, so we have entrusted this to the best four men of the country—and we are proud of them. They are dealing with this matter at the top level—Panditji, Maulana Saheb, Pantji and Dhebar Bhai, acknowledged leaders. What I stress is that we have to create a mentality and atmosphere that no matter what the decision is, howsoever adverse the decision may be, when a certain decision has been taken, as a disciplined nation, as a patriotic nation, as a nation which aspires to earn name and prestige in the international world, we should obey that decision and carry it on as disciplined soldiers, otherwise we are doomed. For instance regarding B.C.G. Rajaji has one view and Rajkumari Amrit Kaur has another

view. Suppose they both start fasting, or agitating. Although the matter is very serious, is it a proper course? Very recently all of us have received statements from eminent doctors supporting B.C.G. and opposing B.C.G. Will you consider it a sane act or a healthy act—even though it touches the health of the future generation of the whole country—that we should take such a step that would upset the whole peaceful atmosphere of the country? Bearing that fundamental principle in mind, what I say is that we have waded through no doubt blood and tears, but we have come to a final stage when we should take a realistic and balanced view. And what is the stage of S.R.C.? Except for the Punjab affair and the Telangana and Andhra affair, all other questions have been settled by this four-man committee. It may be that we may not agree with them, but I would appeal to everybody, especially to my Maharashtrian friends, that in the greater interest of the country they should submit to the decision given by this committee.

Now, regarding Andhra and Telangana, I am pleased to say that the negotiations are proceeding and have proceeded very successfully and I take this opportunity to pay my homage to our leaders of this four-man committee that they are tackling it at a very high level and trying to understand all the points of view. And I shall not be surprised if very soon you hear and the country hears that a compromise solution, that an adjustment has been brought about between these two groups—Telangana and Andhra leaders—somewhat on the lines on which Scotland and England had come to an agreement and united for the good of both the parts. (*Time bell rings.*) One or two minutes more. So at this stage, when we have our economic problems, when in the international field we have the Baghdad Pact and SEATO, as has already been referred to in some speeches, and when our neighbours are trying to take opportunities to have a fling at us, is it right, is it

patriotic that we should go on fighting on this question of language? We may agree or we may differ. But I do not attach importance to language as against our unity and solidarity. This problem has impaired our unity and solidarity as has been proved during the last four months. In view of this I do hope that we will proceed further and finalise and close this chapter. I also hope that the Punjab talks will also conclude successfully and they have my best wishes. We must all realise the gravity of the situation and work in harmony wholeheartedly and have the unity and solidarity of the country above everything else.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by my friend Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati. Sir, in a parliamentary democratic form of Government, the Address by the Head of the State presents before us, Members of Parliament, a nice opportunity to review the work of the Government in the year that has gone by and the future programmes that the Government have on their hand. To that extent I think all Members in this House, irrespective of party affiliations, would welcome the opportunity. And, therefore, we must all be grateful to the President for the Address that he has been kind enough to deliver to both Houses.

Sir, in the year that has gone by, several important events have happened both in this country and abroad. It is not possible in the short Address that the President has given to catalogue all the events; in the same way it is not possible to state in detail all the programmes that the Government have for the future. The President's Address is expected to give broad hints about matters of policy and also about important events that have happened in the year. Therefore, the contention of some of the hon. Members that such and such a thing has been left out of the President's Address is not quite justified. In the short time at my disposal I cannot

deal with all the matters that have been dealt with in the Address of the President, nor can I reply to all the points that have been raised by hon. Members. I shall only try to touch briefly some of the points on which I think I should express my views.

Sir, the year 1955 will be considered the year when India dominated the political scene in the world. It was in this year that our message of truth and non-violence was spread throughout the world; it was in this year that the doctrine of Panch Shila first evolved by India and China came to have more and more adherents in the world; and it was in this year that one of the two great Powers of the world—I mean the Soviet Russia—came to accept this doctrine. Sir, every revolution has helped human history to march forward. The French Revolution came and it gave a forward push to human history. Then came the Russian Revolution which brought in another phase of progress in the world. Now, the world is going to feel the impact of the Indian revolution. We are all too near the event to gauge it, but the future historians will never miss it. It is in this context of future history that we must judge what our country under the able leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the worthy successor and disciple of Gandhiji the author and engineer of this revolution, has been able to do in the year that has gone by.

Sir, the Address of the President consists of eight pages, out of which four have been devoted to the discussion of foreign affairs. This fact goes to show that foreign affairs are gradually becoming more and more important in this country. It is not that foreign affairs are too much with us. The fact is that due to the pre-eminent position that our country has come to acquire in the international field what we do and what we say and what we discuss in this country is naturally looked forward to and eagerly discussed in countries abroad. Sir, regarding the foreign policy we

[Shri Vijay Singh.]

should be glad to note that our country is having its due place in the affairs of the world today. And not only our country but the whole East is having its due place in the comity of nations and we must be glad to note that in this rise of the eastern countries, our country is having its due place.

Sir, the foreign policy as discussed in the President's Address can be divided into three parts: our general approach, the rise of colonial and subject people in the world, and our relations with our neighbours. I will try to speak, in the short time at my disposal, on all the three aspects of foreign policy. I shall first take the general aspect. The Address of the President very modestly speaks of the 'increasing appreciation of the approach that we strive to pursue'. We have just now seen that the doctrine of Panch Shila, which is nothing but the application of the Gandhian principle of reconciliation and mediation in international affairs, has become universal. People have come to accept it. Our prestige in the international field is quite high, but this fact should not lead us to forget that some of the countries of the world are also jealous of the position that our country has come to acquire. The position that we have come to acquire in the international field has got its price and that price is that some of the aid that we are getting we may not get. I think sometimes that the patronising attitude and the discussions that are held in the countries which give us aid are not befitting the dignity of the nation. If you want to give, you must give it with grace. Be that as it may. It is for these countries to decide. For our part we must so arrange our affairs that we do not need foreign aid. In the last analysis, the position that we will come to acquire in the international field will depend upon our sound economy. We, therefore, should back our Government in all their efforts and should be prepared for

whatever sacrifice it demands from us, for the greater glory and the economic development of our motherland. This is all that I want to say about the general approach.

And now I come to the second aspect of our foreign policy, rise of colonial people. India had been under colonial rule for two centuries. We know the miseries and woes of colonialism. Our sympathies are with those who are struggling to throw off this yoke of colonialism. The Address of the President, which very happily mentions that the sympathies of the Government of India are with such peoples, certainly deserves the unanimous vote of this House. In this connection, we certainly welcome the mention in the Address of the President of the cases of Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. Sir, one great thing that has happened after the Second World War is the birth of U.N.O., an organisation which could be very helpful in maintaining peace in the world. But this organisation can only become real when all the sovereign nations of the world are its members. From this view-point we welcome the admission of sixteen new nations as members of U.N.O. The world knows what part our country, in co-operation with others, has played in this admission. But we are sorry to note that a great nation of five hundred million people, I mean the People's Republic of China, is not yet a member of the United Nations. This makes the whole proceedings of U.N.O. unreal in one sense of the term. The world at large knows what stand we have taken in this connection and I have no doubt in my mind that sooner or later our stand is going to be vindicated.

And now, Sir, I come to the third aspect of our foreign policy. Geography, they say, determines the international policy or foreign policy of any country. We must see how the foreign policy of our country has fared in dealing with our neighbours. It is the acid test of our foreign

policy. The principles we advocate in the international field, are we putting them into practice ourselves or not? It is in this respect that the Opposition Members have tabled amendments and have also criticised our policy. To them I will only say, please bear in mind what general policy we are following. What are the general principles that we have come to adopt? And is it right for us to deviate from the principles on any account? Be that as it may. First of all, I would just like to give a general summary of our relations with the countries that are our neighbours. In this connection also I am happy to note, and the House must be grateful to the Government, that our relations have become more cordial. We just take the case of Middle East countries. The Heads of Governments of Egypt, Iran and Arabia visited our country. Our relations with those countries have become more and more cordial. Our next door neighbour, Nepal, the head of that State also came here. Our relations with Nepal today are more cordial than they ever were. Our relations with the countries in the East are more cordial than they were before. There has been definite progress in this sphere also so far as foreign policy is concerned. These facts should not lead us to believe that all is well. There is much to be desired so far as our relations with Pakistan and Ceylon and matters of Goa are concerned. I will take all the items one by one. Let me first take the case of Goa. People have criticised the attitude of the Government of India on matters of Goa. Goa is not a problem from my view-point. It is only a problem of time. It is the test of our patience and endurance. Sooner or later Goa is sure to become part of India. I mean to say Goans are sure to get the right of free determination wherever they want to go. The whole trend is towards that. You cannot check it. No power on earth can check it. Mr. Dulles, the Foreign Secretary of the United States of America, is only lowering his prestige in the world when he says

Goa is a part of Portugal. This should not be taken to mean that world opinion is not veering round the stand that our Government have come to take in this respect. World opinion is slowly gathering round the stand that India has taken and sooner or later the stand is going to be vindicated. I can never imagine that to solve the tiny problem of Goa, we should ever resort to violence at all.

And, Sir, now I come to the question of Ceylon. Ceylon is our younger brother in the south. We have always got very intimate cultural relations with Ceylon, but somehow or other there is some suspicion in the minds of the Ceylonese people. A few days before I had a talk with a world traveller from India who had been to Ceylon. He told me that when he was touring in Ceylon he met certain Ceylonese people there. The Ceylonese have a great suspicion about India. And some of the people confidentially asked him, "Mr. Sharma, is it that Mr. Nehru is going to attack Ceylon?" There is a great suspicion in their minds. So far as matters of publicity are concerned, our publicity is not what it ought to be. People there know more about other countries such as Pakistan. But about India, they are hopelessly ignorant. We should certainly tell our younger brother in the south that India has no intention of infringing the sovereignty of that small country and we are to help them in all our efforts to raise it on its feet and make it resume its position in the comity of sovereign nations.

Now, I come to the question of Pakistan. As we all know, in the year that has gone by, our relations with them have improved, though they have not improved as much as they ought to. In the matter of passport and visa and evacuee property, satisfactory agreement has been arrived at and this has been mentioned in the President's Address. But, there are certain important matters pending solution. There is the exodus

[Shri Vijay Singh.]
of Hindus from East Bengal, as the previous speaker has so nicely said and there is also the canal water dispute. We should also review the position in regard to Kashmir. It is part of India by virtue of the will of the people of India and Kashmir. Dr. Mookerji who spoke this morning made it very clear that the Kashmiris had demonstrated by their action that they were for accession to India. I am glad to note that our Home Minister last summer made this point very clear.

(Time bell rings.)

Can I seek the indulgence of the House to have two or three more minutes since we are in the lunch hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Therefore, this uncertainty about Kashmir should end.

Then I come to the exodus of Hindus from East Pakistan and it is a very serious matter. Gradually the minorities are being squeezed out of Pakistan and if this process continues, a serious situation will arise so far as West Bengal is concerned. It is already over-populated and if more people pour in, we will not have any space for them. Therefore, our Government should make it known to Pakistan in no uncertain terms that if the minorities are not given protection there, Pakistan must give us territory to settle them. Our Government should make this demand. It is only by this strong action of our Government that the rulers of Pakistan will listen to us. Otherwise, a terrible situation will arise.

In the same way, infringement of Indian territories by Pakistan also should be severely dealt with. We must also view, in this connection, the increase in the military aid by

America to Pakistan with grave concern, though we are nobody to meddle in the affairs of those two sovereign countries. But the fact is there that the increase in aid is a matter of grave concern to us. We also deeply deplore the various treaties and pacts that have been concluded. The President has mentioned them in his Address.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, the two minutes time that you have been kind enough to give me is.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is over.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Sir, I would like to say something on the S.R.C. Nothing has.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Bill is coming up again.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: I will take only one minute.

Nothing has stirred the Indian masses as the S.R.C. Report. We deeply deplore some of the unfortunate happenings that have taken place in the country. Our heads hung in shame. Those ugly and deplorable incidents point out one thing and that is that the country should not be divided on the basis of language. So far as the Congress is concerned, though it was the originator of this idea, it had come to revise its opinion about this. The JVP Report is there. The same stand was taken by the S.R.C. Report. The Government of India should make it known to everyone that the country is not going to be divided on the basis of language. Every person in India must back this stand of the Government.

Two sorts of amendments have been put up on this question. One sort of people say that the country should be divided on the basis of language. There is one amendment to this effect.

To them I will say: Do not make this only a political issue. Look at this question from the point of view of the unity of India and in the background of the happenings that have taken place in the last two or three months. Look at this problem from the national point of view. You will soon come to revise the policy. Then there are others who say that the policy has been vacillating and weak. To them I will say it is democratic.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Saksena.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: I thank you for the time given to me and I support the motion.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I have no intention of converting the debate on the President's Address into a general debate or into an S.R.C. debate. We are very soon to have the debate on the General Budget and we have had a full debate on the S.R.C. Report.

The President in his Address has given us a review of past things over which no one now has any control. He has also given us a survey of the present-day happenings and expressed a general, fervent and ardent hope for the succeeding years which lie ahead of us, full of hope and full of promise for the well-being, the happenings and the prosperity of the sub-continent known as India.

I have entered into a sort of compromise with my esteemed friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, to the effect that I shall not speak anything on the S.R.C. Report, since I want to win him over and to bring him from the barren path that he is treading on today in that disowned party known as the Communist Party. I mean to fulfil my pledge and to speak nothing on this S.R.C. Report. Maybe, there may be some matters which are associated with that Report, for instance, the question of the riots in Bombay. I am of the firm opinion that the

Bombay Government did not play its part well. On the one hand, it put behind prison-bars hundreds of Communists as if they were the villains of the piece. On the other hand, those persons who belonged to the other parties and who were the chief engineers and architects of the trouble and the riots were not touched. I am of the firm opinion that even if they were Members of Parliament belonging to this House or the other, who were guilty of rousing the passions of the common people, they should have been put behind prison-bars just like the Communists. But, unfortunately, this was not done. Had it been done in that manner, events would not have taken the turn they did. This is all that I have to say about the S.R.C. Report and the riots that followed last month in Bombay and Orissa.

Sir, it is a very strange thing that we have got very friendly relations with that country known as the United States of America which has chosen to shut out the People's Republic of China from the United Nations. We cannot excuse the U.S. statesmen for doing this act of injustice and unfairness to the people's Republic of China, which is the most populous country in the world. Five hundred million people are being shut out from being represented in the U.N. That injustice cannot last long. There will be a general revolt against this policy of the U.S.A. and the day will soon come when China will find a place in the U.N. and also on the Security Council which it has got every right to occupy.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR) in the Chair.]

Then, Sir, the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, had the audacity to tell the Foreign Minister of that small and tiny country known as Portugal that Goa was a province of Portugal. When did this fellow Dulles, who is as dull as a stone, have

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

the knowledge and information of this? There was one 'province' which was attached to the U.S.A. known as the Philippines and which, because of American public opinion, had to be freed from the clutches of American imperialism, as I would call it, and which policy is finding favour these days with the American authorities. This too is only a temporary phase, and America, remembering its past history and traditions, will remain loyal and faithful to anti-colonialism, and the day will soon come when Mr. Dulles, in the coming general elections, will probably have to pay a heavy price for the irresponsible statement that he made.

A very sad thing is happening on our eastern borders, and that is the unparalleled exodus of East Pakistanis not professing the same faith as those who are in authority in East Pakistan, into West Bengal in millions. This is a running source of trouble and danger. I warn the Pakistan authorities both in the East and in the West that they are writing a very bad chapter in their history, and the repercussions of that chapter will one day, if not today at least ten years hence, fall on their own co-religionists who are residing to the extent of four crores in this country. Of course, we want to have affectionate and sympathetic relationship with all those who live in this country. It is our tradition that we have always been hospitable. Our doors have always been open to those who chose to live in India. We permit them even to propagate their own religious faith here, because India professes a religion which is universal, which contains within itself all religions. Hinduism is not a religion; it is only a way of life in which all manner of beliefs are possible; whether you worship a stone, whether you worship a snake, whether you worship Allah, whether you call him Ram or Krishna, it is the same divinity to which Hindus profess faith

and allegiance, and, therefore, the gates of this universal religion and its boundaries are open to each and every one, but certainly when the common people set to their heart a certain thing which has terribly injured their feelings, then it will be very difficult to turn them from the path that they choose to lead. It is very difficult for the 360 million people of this country to keep silent when so many millions of people from East Pakistan are forced to leave their hearths and homes and come to West Bengal where there is no space to rehabilitate and accommodate them. This state of affairs should be an eye-opener to the Pakistan authorities that this process cannot go on for ever and ever. The High Commissioner for Pakistan in India waxes eloquent that since he has been here, in the last two or three years, out of 160 or 170 points of dispute between India and Pakistan, all except four or five have been resolved, but he has no knowledge perhaps of this running cancer which is known as the exodus of Hindus from East Pakistan into West Bengal. It is with a heavy heart that I speak on this, because unfortunately it smacks of my being a Hindu, but I speak from a humanitarian point of view when I say that this is most unjust, most unfair, and it should be looked into with a watchful and careful eye.

My friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, finds nothing of importance in the Address of the President. What he discovered there was that it was full of the sins of commission and omission on the part of the Government of the President, i.e., the Union Government. To this a very apt and fitting reply was given by my friend, Mr. Rajagopal Naidu, and I need not waste any time over it. Another discovery that he made was that our Prime Minister entered into a deal with Burma in order to gain popularity, as if the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, stands in need of any props to make himself popular in the eyes of others. Solid work,

suffering and sacrifice are the acid tests of a person being popular. These our Prime Minister has got and so, there was no necessity for him to enter into a rice deal or any other deal with Burma for the purpose of getting popularity. I repudiate his statement strongly. I assure my friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, that all that India has done is out of a sense of humanity. If we find that any country stands in need of our assistance.....

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Help a neighbour.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA:even if we cannot afford it, we will render it, whether it be Burma or Pakistan or any other country. Did you not read only two or three days ago that we had promised to supply 10,000 tons of rice to Pakistan? Our relations with them may be good or they may be bad, but there is a duty cast on us as human beings, as the inheritors of an ancient civilisation. It is up to us to see that we alleviate the sufferings of our neighbouring as well as other countries in the world.

2 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): It is time.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I have spoken for ten minutes only.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): For fifteen minutes.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I shall economise. That is the only promise that I respectfully give to you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): I don't want any promises. I want you to wind up.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: The President's Address sums up the entire thing in one sentence when it says that his "Government will continue to use their best endeavours to advance the cause of peaceful negotiations". This is the essence of the President's Address and it is up to us, as faithful and loyal followers of the President,

as well as of his Government, to adhere to this principle of carrying on and conducting peaceful negotiations for which there is no limit. Patience never ceases to be a virtue even if it is carried to the farthest limit.

Then the other important and salient points in his Address are that the Pakistan Government will take appropriate measures to alleviate the circumstances which are leading to this exodus of people from East Bengal to West Bengal. The third thing is the most important conference that was held at Bandung last year. The fourth is that the Portuguese Government is not coming to its senses somehow or other. It thinks that India is speaking from weakness. It does not understand that India is speaking from the fullest measure of strength but it does not use its strength against non-descripts and against weaklings and feeble countries like Portugal. It will be an insanity on the part of India to be measuring swords with Portugal.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Now please wind up. It is time.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am very sorry that even when I am called upon to speak towards the fag end of the debate I am chastised with this restriction of time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Which you have yourself put on yourself. Nobody else has put it.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: If it is so, I am upset and I submit that I wholeheartedly support the Address that the President has been pleased to deliver to us and for which we thank him.

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस भोजन के समय पेट तो खाली है लेकिन हृदय भरा हुआ है, इस कारण मैं कुछ निवेदन करना अवश्य चाहता हूँ। मेरे माननीय मित्र सक्सेना साहब तो सुबह ही

[श्री ज० रा० कपूर]

भोजन कर के आते हैं, इसलिये आप ने यदि समय का बन्धन उन पर लगाया तो शायद कुछ ज्यादाती नहीं की, लेकिन जो भूखा होता है उस को तो शायद अधिकार होता होगा कि अधिक समय बोलने के लिये मिल जाय । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस समय एक विशेष कारण से हिंदी में बोलना चाहता हूं और वह मैं इसलिये चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश में इस समय भाषा के कारण एकता घटती हुई दिखायी देती है । लेकिन हिन्दी भाषा एक ऐसी भाषा है, राष्ट्रभाषा होने के नाते, जो सारे देश को एक सूत्र में बांधती है । भाषा, जिस के कारण एकता बढ़नी चाहिये, मनुष्य मात्र में यदि वह एकता के तोड़ने के कारण बनती दिखाई देती है तो बहुत खेद होता है, और यहां तक मन में भावना उत्पन्न होती है कि यदि भाषा द्वारा एकता घटती है मनुष्य मात्र में, तो गूंगे हो कर लोग एकता के बंधन में बंधे रहें तो वह कोई ज्यादा बुरी बात नहीं है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बड़े खेद की बात है कि भाषा के कारण हमारे देश में इस समय इतने झगड़े पैदा हो रहे हैं ।

भाषावार प्रान्त बनने की जो बात किसी समय कांग्रेस ने निर्धारित की थी उस बात के ऊपर लोग समय-समय पर यहां जोर दे रहे हैं और यहां तक कि हमारे माननीय मित्र, भूपेश गुप्ता जी, जो कि कांग्रेस के सदा विरोधी रहे और अन्य लोग जो कि देश में कांग्रेस का घोर विरोध करते हैं, वे भी भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने का समर्थन करने के लिये कांग्रेस के उस समय के माने हुए सिद्धान्त और नीति के ऊपर जोर देते हैं और नेहरू कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के अंश उद्धृत करते हैं जैसे कि वह सिद्धान्त उन के लिये एक वेदमन्त्र हो गया हो । मुझे अवश्य हर्ष होता यदि वे कांग्रेस के सिद्धान्तों, कांग्रेस की नीति और कांग्रेसजनों की बुद्धि के ऊपर उतने ही विश्वास से निरन्तर चले आते जितना विश्वास उन्होंने कांग्रेस की केवल उस नीति के ऊपर इस समय प्रकट किया है ।

कांग्रेस ने निश्चय ही उस समय यह नीति निर्धारित की थी कि देश के प्रान्त भाषा के आधार पर बनायें, लेकिन उस के बाद ज्यों-ज्यों समय बीतता गया त्यों-त्यों उस नीति को कांग्रेस स्वतः त्यागती गई और मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि एक समय कांग्रेस की जो नीति रही उस पर वे इतना जोर देते हैं लेकिन उस के बाद जो उस में परिवर्तन होता गया उस को वे जानबूझ कर और बहुत आसानी से भूल जाते हैं । उस समय हमारे देश की परिस्थिति दूसरी थी । इस समय, स्वराज्य प्राप्ति के बाद, देश की परिस्थिति दूसरी है । और फिर यह कौन सा पाप है कि समय समय पर हमें नया ज्ञान प्राप्त हो और उस नये ज्ञान के आधार के ऊपर हमारे विचारों में परिवर्तन हो और हमारी नीति में परिवर्तन हो । स्वराज्य प्राप्ति के बाद कांस्टीट्यूटिंग असेम्बली ने जो कमीशन नियुक्त किया, जो कि दर कमीशन के नाम से प्रसिद्ध है, उसने यह निर्णय दिया था कि भाषा-वार प्रान्त बनाना न केवल अनावश्यक है बल्कि हानिकर है । मेरे पास इस समय वह रिपोर्ट मौजूद है और तबियत तो करती है कि मैं उस के कई अंश यहां उद्धृत करूं और सुनाऊं, लेकिन समय के अभाव से मैं ऐसा नहीं करूंगा । केवल इतना ही कहना मैं समझता हूं पर्याप्त होगा कि जिन महानुभावों ने वह रिपोर्ट न पढ़ी हो वे उस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ लें । दर महोदय, जो भूतपूर्व जज, इलाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट के रह चुके हैं, पन्ना लाल जी जो एक निपुण एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर थे, और हमारे देश के एक विशेष कार्यकर्ता, राजनीतिक कार्यकर्ता श्री जगत नारायण, इन तीनों ने बहुत अनुसन्धान इस सम्बन्ध में कर के यह निर्णय दिया था कि भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने की नीति को हमें भूल जाना चाहिये, यह अहितकर है । उस के बाद कांग्रेस ने भी जो जवाहरलाल नेहरू, पट्टाभिसीतारमैया और वल्लभ भाई पटेल, इन तीनों व्यक्तियों की कमेटी बनाई थी उस ने भी अपनी रिपोर्ट में यही निर्णय दिया था कि केवल भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्त बनाना न केवल अनावश्यक है बल्कि इस वर्तमान

परिस्थिति में अहितकर है। इन सब बातों को देखते हुए और आगे के कदम को भी देखिये। जिस समय स्टेट्स रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमीशन राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग बना, उस के टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस से ही यह पता लगता है कि यह उन को बता दिया गया था कि वे केवल उस के ऊपर ध्यान न दें। अगर स्टेट्स रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को भी पढ़ा जाय तो शुरू से पढ़ते-पढ़ते यही मालूम पड़ता है कि वे भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने के विरोध में हैं। लेकिन अन्त में आ कर आश्चर्य जरूर हो जाता है जब कि हम यह पाते हैं कि उन्होंने ने जो अपना निर्णय अन्त में दिया है, जो उन्होंने ने सिफारिश की है वह अधिकतर भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने के लिये हैं। लेकिन संभवतः वे सिफारिशें किसी विशेष कारण से उन्होंने ने दी हों। परन्तु जहां तक सिद्धान्त और नीति की बात है, जहां तक देश के हित और अहित की बात है, इस स्टेट्स रिआर्गेनाइजेशन कमीशन के सदस्यों ने भी एकमत हो कर यह कहा है कि यह देश के लिये अहितकर है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे यह देख कर बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है कि हमारे बंगाल के भाई जो बंगाल और बिहार के एकीकरण से लाभ उठा सकते थे मेरा मतलब इस सदन के जो सदस्य हैं उन से है—वे उस लाभ को उठाना नहीं चाहते और यहां तक कि मेरे माननीय मित्र डा० राधाकुमुद मुर्कजी, जो चाहते हैं कि बिहार का कुछ हिस्सा पश्चिमी बंगाल को मिल जाय इसलिये कि पूर्वी बंगाल में जो लोग आ रहे हैं वे अच्छी तरह से वहां बस जायें, उन से भी जब मैं ने उन के भाषण के दौरान में पूछा कि आप सारे बिहार को क्यों नहीं लेना चाहते हैं, तब भी उन्होंने ने यह जवाब नहीं दिया कि सारे बिहार को ले कर वे हर्षित होंगे कि नहीं। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यदि बंगाल और बिहार के एकीकरण से किसी को अधिक लाभ है तो वह बंगाल को है। मुझ से कोई यह नहीं कहे कि आखिर बंगाल के लाभ की बात में उन्हें क्यों बताता हूं। मुझे इस का थोड़ा सा

अधिकार है क्योंकि १६ वर्ष तक निरन्तर मैं बंगाल और बिहार दोनों में रहा हूं। इस लिये बंगाल और बिहार का जो हित है वह मैं अपना हित समझता हूं। इस वक्त पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से लोग धड़ाधड़ चले आ रहे हैं और उन का रुकना अवश्य ही किसी हालत में नहीं हो सकता क्योंकि पाकिस्तान जिस प्रकार की बातें कर रहा है वह वहां के गैर-मुसलमानों को वहां न रहने देने के लिये बाध्य करतो है। गजनफर अलीखां साहब ने कहा है कि आर्थिक संकट के कारण वहां के गैर-मुसलमान हिन्दुस्तान में, भारत में आ रहे हैं। हो सकता है कुछ अंश में यह बात सही हो। लेकिन उनके सामने केवल अर्थ संकट ही नहीं है बल्कि बड़ा भारी राजनीतिक संकट है क्योंकि पाकिस्तान अपना विधान इस्लामी पद्धति पर बनाने जा रहा है और उन्होंने अभी तक अपने विधान में यह घोषणा की है कि उन का देश तो इस्लाम के आधार पर होगा और राष्ट्रपति केवल मुसलमान ही हो सकेगा। तो फिर जब एक धर्म के आधार पर वह देश चलना चाहता है तो दूसरे धर्मावलम्बी वहां किस प्रकार रह सकते हैं, सिवाय गुलाम की हैसियत के? ऐसी परिस्थिति में गैर मुसलमानों को पाकिस्तान छोड़ना पड़ रहा है। वे अपनी इच्छा से तो अपने देश को छोड़ना नहीं चाहते हैं बल्कि सरकार की ओर से उन्हें बाध्य किया जा रहा है कि वे उस देश को छोड़ें। यह नई स्थिति इस कारण पैदा हुई कि पाकिस्तान सरकार ने यह घोषणा कर दी है कि उन का देश इस्लामी पद्धति के ऊपर चलेगा। जब उन्होंने ने इस तरह की घोषणा कर दी है तो वहां पर गैर मुसलमानों के लिये रहना कठिन हो गया है और यह आवश्यक हो गया है कि वहां पर जो गैर-मुसलमान लोग हैं उन के लिये वहां की सरकार एक अलग प्रान्त छोड़ दे। मैं अपनी तरफ से यह बात नहीं कह रहा हूं बल्कि उन्हीं के मुंह से जो शब्द निकले हैं, उनके सामने रखने जा रहा हूं। जब उन लोगों ने पाकिस्तान के निर्माण की मांग की थी तो उन्होंने ने यह सिद्धान्त रखा था कि मुस्लिम

[श्री ज० ग० कपूर]

धर्मविलम्बियों का एक अलग प्रान्त होना चाहिये । उसी आधार पर आज उन का कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि जब वे अपने देश को एक इस्लामी देश के रूप में घोषित करते हैं तो गैर-मुसलमानों को रहने के लिये अलग जगह दें । मेरे कहने का यह मतलब नहीं है कि गैर-मुस्लिम लोग जिस जगह पर रहेंगे, वे स्वतन्त्र रूप में रहेंगे या भारत में विलीन हो कर रहेंगे । यह तो उन लोगों की सोचने की बात है कि वे हिन्दुस्तान के साथ विलय चाहते हैं या एक अलग पूर्ण स्वतन्त्र राज्य बना कर रहना चाहते हैं । अतः हमारी सरकार के लिये यह आवश्यक हो गया है कि वह इस मामले को अपने हाथ में ले और इस के लिये उचित कार्यवाही करे । आज इस तरह की परिस्थिति पैदा हो गई है जिस के लिये हमारी सरकार को इस बात पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि बंगाल और बिहार के एकीकरण से बंगाल वालों को सब से ज्यादा लाभ है । क्योंकि पाकिस्तान से जो लोग आ रहे हैं वे बंगाल में तो नहीं रह सकते, वहां पर इतनी जमीन नहीं है । सारा बिहार उन को रहने के लिये मिल रहा है । फिर क्यों नहीं वे बिहार को अपने साथ मिलाने को तैयार हैं ? कितने ही भारत-वासी आज इस बात को भूल जाते हैं । लेकिन मुझे याद है कि जब बंग-विच्छेद हुआ था तो देश में एक घोर आन्दोलन शुरू हो गया था । स्वराज्य के लिये लड़ाइयों को उस से बहुत बड़ा बल मिला था । उस समय बंगाल में इस बंग-विच्छेद का बहुत विरोध हुआ किन्तु आज जब फिर कुछ अंश में संयुक्त बंगाल-बिहार बनाने की बात कही जाती है तो हमारे कुछ भाई उस का विरोध करते हैं, जिस से आश्चर्य होता है । डा० विधान चन्द्र राय और श्री श्रीकृष्ण सिन्हा जैसे बुद्धिमान और देशभक्त राजनीतिज्ञों ने बंगाल और बिहार

के एकीकरण की जो घोषणा की है, उसे हमें सब लोगों को सहर्ष स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिये । हमारे बंगाली भाइयों का भी यह कर्तव्य है कि बिहार से अपने पुराने बन्धनों को फिर से जोड़ने के लिये इस घोषणा का हृदय से स्वागत करें । आज हमारे देश में जिस तरह की स्थिति पैदा हो गई है उस में यह आवश्यक है कि इस घोषणा का सब लोगों को स्वागत करना चाहिये । इस घोषणा से देश में इस तरह का वातावरण पैदा हो गया है कि और प्रान्त भी एक भाषा-भाषी प्रान्त को छोड़ कर भिन्न भाषा-भाषी प्रान्तों के एकीकरण की बात सोचने लगे हैं । अगर हम ने इस घोषणा को स्वीकार किया तो इस समय देश में भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्तों के निर्माण का जो विष फैल गया है वह सदा के लिये समूल समाप्त हो जायेगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे प्रान्त कोई भी एक भाषा के आधार पर नहीं हैं और न ही उन में एक भाषा बोली जाती है । आप किसी प्रान्त को ले लीजिये वहां पर भिन्न भिन्न भाषा-भाषी लोग रहते हैं और अपनी अपनी भाषा का प्रयोग करते हैं । उत्तर प्रदेश को ही ले लीजिये, जिसके बारे में कहा जाता है कि वहां पर हिन्दी भाषी लोग रहते हैं, किन्तु यह बात सब को विदित है कि हमारे यहां हिन्दी और उर्दू भाषा का प्रयोग साथ-साथ किया जाता है । बहुत से बंगाली हैं जो बंगाली बोलते हैं । फिर यह बात कहना कि उत्तर प्रदेश में एक ही भाषा बोली जाती है कितनी गलत है । इन दो भाषाओं के अलावा हमारे प्रान्त में सन् १९४७ के बाद जब से पाकिस्तान का निर्माण हुआ था, हजारों की तादाद में बंगाली, पंजाबी और सिंधी आ कर बस गये हैं और अपनी अपनी भाषा का प्रयोग करते हैं । मेरे आगरा शहर में करीब ५०,००० पंजाबी और सिंधी आ कर बस गये हैं और अपनी अपनी भाषाओं में बोलते हैं । जब वे लोग अपनी अपनी भाषाओं का प्रयोग करते हैं तो हमें हर्ष होता है । हम चाहते हैं कि थोड़ी बहुत उन की भाषा

को सीखें और वे हमारी भाषा को सीखें । इसी तरह से आप देश का कोई भी प्रान्त ले लीजिये । आप को वहां पर केवल एक भाषा बोलने वाले आदमी नहीं मिलेगा, भिन्न भिन्न भाषाएं बोलने वाले मिलेंगे । इस तरह से कोई भी प्रान्त एक भाषायी प्रान्त नहीं हो सकता है । लोग एक प्रान्त से दूसरे प्रान्त में जा कर बसते ही हैं । सारा देश एक है और सब के लिये है । न मालूम हमारे से ऐसी भूल क्यों हुई कि हम ने सोचा कि भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्त बनने चाहियें । कुछ भी हो, यदि यह भूल हुई तो उस भूल को कबूल करना कोई बुरी बात नहीं है बल्कि अच्छी बात है । एक मर्तवा गांधी जी से कोई भूल हो गई थी तो उन्होंने ने उस भूल को "हिमालयन बलन्डर" कहा था और उसे कबूल किया । यदि हिमालय जैसी भूल भाषावार प्रान्तों के बारे में हम लोगों से हो गई है तो उस भूल को छोड़ देना चाहिये । इस सम्बन्ध में जो परिस्थिति हमने देश में देखी है उस से हम सब लोगों की आंख खुल जानी चाहिये । एकता का बन्धन हमारे यहां कितना कोमल है जो जल्दी में टूट सकता है । हमारे देश में जो घटनायें इस बीच हुई उन से हम सब लोगों को एक सबक लेना चाहिये और यह प्रण करना चाहिये कि देश की एकता को बनाये रखने के लिये उसको एक सूत्र में बांधे रखने के लिये हम हर प्रकार का प्रयत्न करेंगे और भाषावार प्रान्त की मांग जिससे फूट पड़ी है उसे छोड़ देंगे । अगर हम ने ऐसा नहीं किया तो इस से हमारी स्वतन्त्रता पर भी आंच आ सकती है जो कि एक दुर्भाग्य की बात होगी ।

इस के साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी चाहूंगा कि सब प्रान्त के लोग राष्ट्रीय भाषा को अपनायें यही एक ऐसी चीज है जो हम सब को एकता के सूत्र में बांधती है । उस का हमें शीघ्रता के साथ विस्तार करना चाहिये । हिन्दी ही एक ऐसी भाषा है, एक ऐसी चीज है जो सारे देश को एक सूत्र में बांध सकती है । मेरा यह तात्पर्य नहीं है कि वह प्रान्तीय भाषाओं का स्थान ले

ले । वे भाषायें तो रहेंगी । यह हमारा गौरव है कि हमारे यहां इतनी भाषायें हैं । लेकिन हिन्दी हमारी राष्ट्रीय भाषा है और उसमें सारे देश को एक सूत्र में बांधने की शक्ति है अतः यह हम सब लोगों का कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि नित्य प्रति उस को प्रोत्साहन दें ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): The time is up, Mr. Kapoor.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Am I coming to the end of my time?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: You have already come to the end of it.

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : इतना तो मैं ने भूख के कारण कहा । भोजन मे नहीं तो बातों से ही पेट भरने दीजिये ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Then you will have to impinge on other's time.

श्री ज० रा० कपूर : तो मैं अब समाप्त किये देता हूं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक शब्द गोआ के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूं और वह इसलिये कि हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री राजा ने यह कहा था कि कांग्रेस और सरकार ने लोगों को गोआ में सत्याग्रह करने के लिए प्रोत्साहन दिया था और बाद में बीच मझधार में छोड़ दिया । इस से ज्यादा सत्य से दूर कोई बात नहीं हो सकती । कांग्रेस ने और सरकार ने तो सदा से यह कहा था कि सामूहिक सत्याग्रह हमें गोआ में नहीं करना चाहिये और व्यक्तिगत सत्याग्रह को भी उन्होंने कभी प्रोत्साहन नहीं दिया था । हां, यह नहीं कहा था कि यह भी कोई मत करें क्योंकि इस सम्बन्ध में वे थोड़ी स्वतंत्रता देना चाहते थे । लेकिन जिन लोगों ने वहां सत्याग्रह किया उन्हें न सत्याग्रह का ज्ञान था और न सत्याग्रह में विश्वास था । मैं उन लोगों का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना

[श्री ज० रा० कपूर]

चाहता हूँ कि महात्मा गांधी ने सन् १९४० में व्यक्तिगत सत्याग्रह के सम्बन्ध में यह नीति निर्धारित की थी कि जब तक एक एक सत्याग्रही का पूर्ण राजनीतिक इतिहास वे देख न लेंगे, वे उसको अनुमति नहीं देंगे कि वह जा कर सत्याग्रह करे। एक-एक सत्याग्रह करने वाले के इतिहास की उन्होंने स्वयं छानबीन करके उसे आज्ञा दी कि वह सत्याग्रह कर सकता है। सत्याग्रह एक ऐसी चीज है, एक ऐसा विशेष हथियार है जिसके प्रयोग करने का अधिकार केवल उन्हीं को है जिन्हें इसका पूर्ण ज्ञान प्राप्त हो। मुझे पूर्ण विश्वास है कि यदि हम शांति रखें और सरकार पर भरोसा रखें, जैसा कि निश्चित ही सब लोगों को है उन चन्द लोगों को छोड़ कर जिन को किसी भली बात में भी विश्वास और भरोसा नहीं हो सकता, तो गोआ का मसला बड़े अच्छे और सुन्दर तरीके से हल हो जायगा। थोड़ा समय भले ही इसमें क्यों न लगे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब आप की आज्ञा से एक बात पंचवर्षीय योजना के सम्बन्ध में कह देना चाहता हूँ। इस सम्बन्ध में विस्तार से बहस बाद में होगी जब यह योजना विचारार्थ हमारे सामने आयेगी; लेकिन इस समय मैं इस चीज को इस लिये कह देना चाहता हूँ कि संभवतः इसके कहने से आज जब कि प्लानिंग कमीशन दूसरी योजना पर विचार कर रहा है, वह उसको अंतिम रूप देने से पहले इस बात को मान कर शायद थोड़ासा परिवर्तन कर ले। आज हम अपने देश में समाजवादी ढांचा बनाने जा रहे हैं या यों कहिये कि समाजवाद ढांचा बनाने जा रहे हैं, किन्तु मुझे एक बात देख कर आश्चर्य होता है, मैं समझता हूँ कि भूल से ऐसी बात हो गई होगी, और वह यह है कि जहां तक मकान बनाने का सम्बन्ध है, यह

जो पुस्तिका हमें मिली है, इसके पृष्ठ १६० के ऊपर देखने से यह मालूम पड़ता है कि "लो इनकम ग्रुप हाउसिंग" के लिए ४० करोड़ रुपया निर्धारित किया जा रहा है और जहां तक मुझे मालूम है—और मालूम ही क्यों कहें मुझे ठीक ही मालूम है, निश्चित ही मालूम है— "लो इनकम ग्रुप" को परिभाषा यह रखी गई है कि वह आदमी जिस की आमदनी पांच सौ रुपया माहवार तक है या जिसकी आमदनी सालाना छः हजार से अधिक नहीं है उसको "लो इनकम ग्रुप" का कहा गया है। निश्चित ही जिस की सालाना आमदनी छः हजार रुपया है वह हमारे यहां साधारण आदमी नहीं कहलाता, बल्कि उसे तो हम धनी कहेंगे, ऐसे लोगों के लिये तो ४० करोड़ रुपया रखा गया है लेकिन "स्लम क्लियरेंस" के लिए केवल २० करोड़ रुपया रखा गया है। इस से भी ज्यादा आश्चर्य और दुख की बात यह है कि "रुरल हाउसिंग" के लिए, ग्रामीण लोगों के मकान बनाने के लिए, केवल ५ करोड़ ६० लाख रुपया है। इस प्रकार ६५ करोड़ ६० लाख से ५ करोड़ ६० लाख "रुरल हाउसिंग" के लिये रखा गया है, २० करोड़ ६० लाख "स्लम क्लियरेंस" के लिए रखा गया है और ४० करोड़ रुपया ऐसे लोगों के लिये रखा गया है जिन की आमदनी पांच सौ रुपया माहवार तक है। यह बंटवारा उचित नहीं प्रतीत होता। इस लिये प्लानिंग कमीशन का ध्यान मैं इस ओर दिलाऊंगा कि वह इस ६५ करोड़ रुपये को आधा-आधा कर के, जो कि साढ़े ३२ करोड़ होता है, ग्रामीण लोगों के लिये निर्धारित करे और बाकी साढ़े ३२ करोड़ "स्लम क्लियरेंस" के लिये निर्धारित करे ताकि सब से पहले जो हमारे बहुत गरीब भाई हैं, चाहे वे अछूत हों या सवर्ण हों—कहीं कहीं तो सवर्ण लोग भी बहुत बुरी जगहों में रहते हैं—उन को इस सम्बन्ध में सहूलियत मिल सके।

एक बात और, पन्ना ३६ में भिन्न-भिन्न प्रदेशों के लिये कुछ रुपया निर्धारित किया

गया है। जहां तक उत्तर प्रदेश का सम्बन्ध है, उस की आबादी देश में १७ फी सदी है और पणिक्कर महोदय के बताने के अनुसार हम उन को धन्यवाद देते हैं कि हमारी आंखें उन्होंने खोल दीं—हमारा प्रदेश बहुत ही पिछड़ा हुआ है, विद्या में, प्रबन्ध में और हर प्रकार से पिछड़ा हुआ है जिस से हम पणिक्कर महोदय के बतलाने के पहले नहीं महसूस करते थे, लेकिन अब जब कि उन के बताने के बाद हमारी आंखें खुल गई हैं तो हमारा हक हो जाता है कि जो २२१४ करोड़ ६० भिन्न भिन्न प्रान्तों को दिया गया है उस में हमारा हिस्सा कम से कम आबादी के अनुपात से मिलना ही चाहिये। वैसे तो पिछड़ा हुआ होने के नाते हमारे उत्थान के लिये और भी मिलना चाहिये, लेकिन यथार्थ में हमें इस से ११ फी सदी दिया गया है। जैसा कि श्री एच० डी० राजा ने बतलाया कि मद्रास को कम मिला है और उत्तर प्रदेश को अधिक मिला है, ऐसी बात नहीं है।

श्री कन्हैया लाल दौ बैद्य (मध्य भारत) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूं।

जहां तक सदन में बहुत से सदस्यों ने राज्यों के पुनर्गठन के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार जाहिर किये हैं, उस से यह पता चलता है कि स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के बाद हमारे देश का राष्ट्रीय चरित्र जैसा बनना चाहिये वैसा नहीं बना। जिस तरह दो बच्चे अपनी मां पर प्रहार करते हैं, उसी तरह स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के बाद जब हमारी परीक्षा का समय आया तो हमने अपनी राष्ट्रीयता पर प्रहार किया और आज हम फिर उन बातों का स्वप्न देख रहे हैं जिन के अंतर्गत यह देश गुलाम रहा। हमारे देश के अन्दर करोड़ों ऐसे लोग हैं जिन के रहने के लिये मकान नहीं है और जिन के खाने पहनने के लिये कोई उचित व्यवस्था नहीं है। आज स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के बाद जब हम उन के लिये कुछ करना चाहते हैं, तो राष्ट्र विरोधी तत्व ऐसे कार्य कर रहे हैं जिन से देश का अहित हो। एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट

को आप देखिये। उस में इस के सिवाय और कुछ नहीं है कि हम अपने देश की शासन-व्यवस्था को ऐसे ढांचे में ढालना चाहते हैं जिस से बहुत से फालतू खर्च कम हों। पार्ट बी० और पार्ट सी० स्टेट्स की जो व्यवस्थायें थीं, उन व्यवस्थाओं को खत्म कर के हम ऐसे बड़े राज्यों के निर्माण की व्यवस्था को मंजूर करें जिस से देश का करोड़ों रुपया जो फालतू कामों में खर्च होता है वह बचाया जा सके और देश के सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न के नक्शे को हम पूरा कर सकें। हिन्दुस्तान का कोई हिस्सा किसी विदेशी राज्य में नहीं जा रहा है। स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के बाद जिस तरह का हिन्दुस्तान था, वैसा ही आज है और आगे रहेगा। भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना को ले कर बहुत से सदस्य बड़ी-बड़ी दुहाइयां देते हैं और राष्ट्रपति जी की, जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी की और मोतीलाल नेहरू जी की रिपोर्टों का बिलकुल गीता और कुरान की तरह यहां सदन में गुणगान करते हैं। किन्तु वे यह भूल जाते हैं कि राजनीति में समय और परिस्थितियों के अनुसार परिवर्तन होता रहता है। महात्मा जी ने अपनी मृत्यु के पहले अपने उन विचारों को बदला था और कांग्रेस ने और जवाहरलाल जी ने आज अपने उन विचारों को बदल कर स्पष्ट रूप से इस बात को मंजूर किया है कि यह सिद्धान्त बिलकुल गलत है, राष्ट्र के हित के लिये लाभदायक नहीं है। यदि हम स्वतन्त्रता की बुनियाद को मजबूती के साथ रखना चाहते हैं तो हमें इस सिद्धान्त को दफना देना चाहिये और हमें द्विभाषी प्रान्तों की रचना के सिद्धान्त को स्वीकार करना चाहिये। एक भाषी प्रान्तों की रचना के आधार पर हम अपनी राष्ट्रीयता और स्वतन्त्रता को खतरे में नहीं डाल सकते। वे लोग अन्धे हैं जो समय की गति को नहीं देखते हैं। वे नहीं जानते हैं कि देश की परिस्थिति क्या है।

यहां बड़े बड़े भाषण दिये जाते हैं। अभी एक सज्जन ने इन बैंचों से कहा कि देश

[श्री कन्हैयालाल दौ० वैद्य]

मैं बीमा व्यवसाय के राष्ट्रीयकरण का जो कदम उठाया गया है वह बड़ा घातक है। उस के पश्चात् उन्होंने ने किसानों के बड़े गीत गायें और कहा कि किसानों का बड़ा अहित हो रहा है, किसानों का बड़ा शोषण हो रहा है, सरकार बड़ी दोषी है, उस ने कुछ नहीं किया और वे बेचारे लुट गये। ये बिलकुल धोखे की बातें हैं। किसानों का शोषण करने वाले, जनता का शोषण करने वाले और इस देश में गरीबी लाने वाले ये पूंजीपति हैं। आज देश का पूंजीपति नहीं चाहता है कि देश की प्रगति हो या स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के पहले जिन झोंपड़ों में अंधेरा रहता था उन में दिये जलें। आप इतिहास को देखिये। कुछ दिन पहले सरकार ने जिस भाव पर अनाज खरीदने की व्यवस्था की, उस भाव पर या उस से और भी नीचे के भाव पर इन मिडिलमैन कहलाने वाले शोषक पूंजीपतियों ने तमाम अनाज खरीद कर अपनी कोठियों में भर लिया। जैसे बगुला किसी समुद्र या नदी के किनारे बैठ कर इस ताक में रहता है कि कहीं मछली दिख जाये तो उस को पकड़ कर खा जाय उसी तरह से ये लोग उस ताक में रहे कि हिन्दुस्तान के किसी इलाके में अकाल पड़े और किसी जगह पर अनाज की कमी हो, और उस के लिये पहले से ही सरकार से इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था करवा लेते हैं जिस से कि उन को अपने काम में आसानी हो। अब तो हिन्दुस्तान एक हो गया है इस लिये यह जो एक जगह से दूसरी जगह अनाज ले जाने के लिये बंधन हैं वे खत्म कर देने चाहियें। इस का नतीजा यह हुआ है कि हमारे इन पूंजीपति मित्रों ने खूब ऊँचे दामों पर, दुगने और ढाई गुने दामों पर, एक प्रान्त से दूसरे प्रान्त में अपने पास जमा किया हुआ अनाज भेजा है।

हमारे मित्र पंचवर्षीय योजना की बात करते हैं और कहते हैं कि भाई पांच सौ तक की इनकम वालों की हाउसिंग स्कीम में इतने करोड़ रुपये हैं, उस में से इतना करोड़ हम को

दे दो। उत्तर प्रदेश पिछड़ा हुआ है इसलिये उन की मांग है कि उस को अधिक रूपया मिले। मैं बड़ी विनम्रता से कहूंगा कि देश में करोड़ों लोग ऐसे हैं जो कि झोंपड़ियों में भी नहीं बल्कि फूस-फांस के छप्परों में रहते हैं। आज स्वतन्त्रता के बाद भी उन का जीवन उसी प्रकार से चल रहा है। अगर आप की यह पांच सौ रुपये मासिक आय की मियाद चलने वाली है तो आप विश्वास रखिये कि ये ६ हजार वार्षिक लेने वाले व्यक्ति आप की योजनाओं का सारा रूपया खा जायेंगे और उस को वे अपने जीवन को मौज और शौक का बनाने में लगायेंगे और आप देश के करोड़ों लोगों के रहने के लिये कोई व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकेंगे। तो इन योजनाओं के अन्तर्गत जनता को लाभ पहुंचाने के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि हम इस चीज को देखें कि वास्तव में किस प्रकार से देश का उत्थान हो सकता है।

बीमा व्यवस्था के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात की गई है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि किस तरह से केवल इस बात से ही देश का उत्थान हो सकता है। जब-जब आप कोई ऐसा कदम उठाते हैं तो हमारे पूंजीपति लोग बड़े प्रगतिशील बन कर, किसानों, गरीबों और मजदूरों के हितैषी का चोगा पहन कर, ऐसी बातें करते हैं जिस से कि मालूम हो कि यही उन के तारण-हार हैं, यही उन का उद्धार करने वाले हैं। लेकिन अगर उन के इस महानुभूति रूपी पंजों को बेनकाब कर के लोगों को दिखलाया जाय तो यही मालूम होगा कि वह एक खूनी पंजा है और वह देश का शोषण करने के तरीके को ही कायम रखना चाहते हैं। आज आप बैंकों की व्यवस्था को देखिये। इंग्लैंड के बाद आप को जल्दी से जल्दी बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करना चाहिये। जनता के बैंकों का और उन के पैसों का ये शोषक-वर्ग जिस प्रकार से उपयोग करते हैं उस की एक कहानी है। जो व्यापारी हैं अनाज खरीद लेते हैं, कपड़ा खरीद लेते हैं, दूसरी वस्तुयें कंट्रोल की हों या कंट्रोल के बाहर की हों उन को खरीद लेते

हैं और इन बैंकों के गोडाउनों में भरते हैं। बैंकों के मैनेजर्स से वे दोस्ती करते हैं और कमीशन तय होते हैं। मैनेजर साहब जिन नियमों के अन्तर्गत उन को कर्ज दे सकते हैं उन नियमों पर भूल डाल देते हैं और मनमाने तरीके से उन को उन की जरूरत का पैसा दे देते हैं और कई मामलों में तो उन से अधिक पैसा भी दे देते हैं। इस तरह से ये लोग बाजार को अपने कब्जे में करते हैं, वस्तुओं का संग्रह करते हैं, गोडाउंस भरते हैं, और उस के बाद देश की जनता को देश की तमाम पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं को, और जो आप समाजवादी ढांचे की व्यवस्था लाना चाहते हैं उस को चैलेंज करते हैं; और चारों तरफ अपनी अनीति चलाते हैं और शोषण के जरिये से देश की जनता को लूटते हैं। आप प्लानिंग कमीशन की व्यवस्था करते हैं, योजनाएँ करते हैं कि इतने वर्षों में देश की जो प्रति व्यक्ति आय है उस को २० प्रतिशत या ५० प्रतिशत बढ़ायेंगे, किन्तु हमारे ये शोषक मित्र दो वर्ष या पांच वर्ष की योजनाओं के अन्तर्गत बढ़ी हुई आय को एक हाथ में ही जनता की जेबों से खींच लेते हैं और बीस नहीं, पचास नहीं बल्कि सौ रुपये एक ही हाथ में जनता की जेबों से खींच लेते हैं और जनता बेहाल और परेशान होती है।

जहाँ तक राष्ट्रपति के भाषण का सम्बन्ध है उस भाषण में यदि गरीबी और बेरोजगारी के ऊपर अधिक प्रकाश डाला जाता तो बड़ा अच्छा होता। इस देश के अन्दर गरीबी और बेरोजगारी एक भीषण स्वरूप ले रही है। आप जिन दलों और उपद्रवों की चर्चा कर रहे हैं उन की तह में भी यही बात है। बहुत से लोगों ने कहा कि एस० आर० सी० के मामले में मासेज में बड़ा असन्तोष है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि मासेज तो खुद ही परेशान हैं—भूख में, गरीबी में, रोग में, अशिक्षा में, उन को उस की फुर्सत नहीं है कि आप के इस गोरख-धंधे में पड़ें। यह तो बला है लीडरे वतन की, जिन को कि पार्टीबन्दियों में पड़ना है, जिन को कि अपना भविष्य बनाना है। ऐसे लोगों ने पिछले दिनों

में भी इस देश की गुलामी की चिन्ता नहीं की और अपने हितों की रक्षा करने के लिये विदेशी सत्ता के साथ तथा दूसरे लोगों के साथ गठबन्धन कर के देश को गुलाम रखा। समझौते किये और उन समझौतों के बल पर अपने स्वार्थों का और अपने हितों का रक्षण किया। ये लोग ही इस देश के शोषण की व्यवस्था को और दूसरी सारी व्यवस्थाओं को कायम रखत के लिये जिम्मेदार हैं। ये लोग ही यह गीत अलापते हैं कि देश की व्यवस्था के लिये देश की जनता के उद्धार के लिये, देश के शासन को ठीक करने के लिये; देश के गरीबों को रोटी, रोज़ी और धंधा देने के लिये; खर्चीली शासन व्यवस्था का जो देश के ऊपर भार है उसको ठीक तरीके से, इकानामिक तरीके से कम खर्च में चलाने के लिये; पार्ट बी० और पार्ट सी० स्टेट्स का जो अखाड़ा लगा हुआ है उन को खत्म कर के बहुत कुछ इकानामी करने के लिये; ये जो सब काम हो रहे हैं उस से मासेज में बड़ा असन्तोष हो गया है। मानो मासेज के रक्षण करने वाले ये ही लोग हैं? इस देश के अन्दर ये सब तत्व हैं और जब तक हमारा राष्ट्रीयता के नाते से इस देश में एक ऊँचा चरित्र निर्माण नहीं करेंगे तब तक हम देश की जनता का रक्षण नहीं कर सकेंगे। मैं ऐसी मान्यता रखता हूँ और देश के बहुत से लोग ऐसी मान्यता रखते हैं कि स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के बाद हम ने जहाँ बहुत सी चीजें खोई हैं वहाँ यह भी हुआ है कि अक्सरवादी तत्व बहुत से ऐसे लोग, जिन का काम केवल शोषण करना और बेईमानी करना था, अपनी व्यवस्था को कायम रखने के लिये हर प्रकार से शासन की व्यवस्थाओं को हथियाने के लिये प्रयत्नशील रहे हैं। एस० आर० सी० के कारण इस देश में जो स्थिति पैदा हुई उस का कारण यह है कि मासेज में गरीबी है, बेकारी है, चीजें मंहगी हैं और चीजों के बढ़े हुए भावों के कारण जब गरीब आदमी को दुःख होता है तब वह निश्चित रूप से सरकार के खिलाफ जाने के लिये किन्हीं स्वार्थों के चक्कर में पड़ कर

[श्री कन्हैयालाल दौ० वैद्य]

बहुकता है और वह कुछ उपद्रव करने वालों का साथ देता है। वास्तव में वह समझ नहीं पाता है कि वह क्या कर रहा है। मासेज का नाम लेने वाले लोग यह कभी क्लेम नहीं कर सकते कि मासेज इस देश की सम्पत्ति का विनाश करने वाली हो सकती है। जनता की, सरकार की करोड़ों रुपये की सम्पत्ति को उपद्रवियों ने नष्ट कर दिया। कहा जाता है कि ऐसा मासेज एस० आर० सी० रिपोर्ट से असन्तुष्ट होकर कर रही है। कभी ऐसी बात नहीं है, कभी ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है। इस के पीछे वे ताकतें हैं जो इस देश की प्रगति के लिये नहीं बल्कि अपने स्वार्थों के लिये, अपने हितों के लिये सदा प्रयत्नशील रही हैं। और ऐसे तत्व हैं जो कि कभी भी स्वतन्त्रता के हामी नहीं रहे हैं। जब जनता अंग्रेजी राज्य के विरुद्ध लड़ रही थी तब इन्हीं तत्वों ने...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): Mr. Vaidya, it is time now; you are only repeating.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA: Not repeating, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): These you have said already. It is time; please wind up. If you have anything more to say, please say that and conclude.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA: I have taken only 12 minutes, I think, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. C. MATHUR): It is 15 minutes. Please wind up.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA: Anyway I am finishing just now, Sir.

तो यह जो सारी व्यवस्था है उस सब को देख कर के हमें एक आदर्श राष्ट्रीय चरित्र का निर्माण करना है। जब तक हम इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था नहीं करेंगे तब तक गरीब वर्ग

के लोगों को इन के शोषण से मुक्ति नहीं दिला सकेंगे। हमने जिस तरह से इंड्योरेंस का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया है उसी तरह से जब तक बैंकिंग व्यवस्था के तथा अन्य दूसरी व्यवस्थाओं के राष्ट्रीयकरण के लिये कदम नहीं उठायेंगे तब तक निश्चित रूप से ये शोषण करने वाले लोग अनुचित फायदा उठा कर के देश की स्थिति को बिगाड़ेंगे और सरकार जितनी योजनाएं कर रही है उन योजनाओं को पूरा नहीं होने देंगे क्योंकि उन के जो हित हैं वे व्यक्तिगत स्वार्थ के ऊपर निर्मित हैं। वे व्यक्तिगत स्वार्थों के विकास के अन्दर, इंडिविजुअलिज्म के अन्दर विश्वास करते हैं और राष्ट्र की प्रगति में तथा जो हम एक सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न की स्थिति लाना चाहते हैं उस में वे विश्वास नहीं करते हैं। उन का विश्वास अपने स्वार्थों में है। इसलिये इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूं और आशा करता हूं कि सरकार ऐसे तत्वों से सावधान हो कर के देश में चरित्र निर्माण की तरफ कदम बढ़ायेगी।

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Bharat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, after Mr. Vaidya's speech it is very difficult for me to give a more vehement speech. What he said was, of course, very good. I am also one of those who appreciate and support the President's Address. Sir, I have noted that one of the critics in the other House mentioned that the Address of the President was a third class report of an Under Secretary. I do not share that view. In fact, the Address is a very balanced and brief description of the events of last year and also of the programmes for the next year. In that speech a lead has been given and some opinions have been expressed which are very good. That criticism, therefore, only shows the bankruptcy of the mind and thought of the critic himself. I can say that in this speech of the President there is no indication of confusion of thought either in the mind of the Government or in that of the ruling party. In fact, the confusion

resides somewhere else; the confusion is in the mind of the other parties. The Socialist Party has got divided opinions on the problem of reorganisation of States. There is the Communist Party, and the Hindu Party and the Akali Party. I will just show that it is their minds that are confused and not of the Congress.

Now, the Communist Party of India is very vehemently crying for linguistic provinces. At every important point of time their thesis had gone wrong in India and now they are crying for dividing the whole country linguistically. They have ignored the entire history and the social conditions of this country. There was no need for the hon. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta on the other side to quote the pledges and decisions of the Congress. In fact, the Congress does recognise the importance of language, but language cannot be the predominant factor in the redistribution of provinces. Have we not seen the result of going all out in the direction of linguistic redistribution in the recent happenings in the country? We have seen riots in Bombay, in Orissa and in other places. If language creates separatism in the minds of the people, if it is not a joining force, then too much of linguism is a dangerous thing. So our Government is proceeding cautiously. If linguistic minorities are to be treated as they were treated in Bombay and elsewhere, then Mr. Gadgil's blank cheque cannot do anything. He was prepared to give a blank cheque to the linguistic minorities, but what can those safeguards do if bitterness is created on the basis of language? So the policy of the Communist Party of dividing the whole country into linguistic provinces is fraught with grave danger.

Now, some critics have said that the Congress is not moving democratically. They have suggested that some kind of conference of the different parties should be called or some such steps should be taken. This criticism is also groundless. In fact, the Government was going on with a

time-table in the direction of reorganisation, but these riots and violence occurred. If we have gone in a wrong direction, looking to the conditions of this country and the mentality of our people all over, we should no doubt trace back our steps. We should, therefore, review the whole situation and take whatever decisions are necessary. This Parliament, of course, will take decisions. Now there is much bitterness about the adjustment of boundaries and about some very important towns like Bombay etc. If every group tries to insist that its opinion must prevail and its point of view must be conceded, and if it were to threaten that if this problem is not solved here it will be solved in the streets, I think such a mentality is very deplorable. I will again refer to Mr. Gadgil's speech. He said that he was not going to be Parasuram killing his mother, that Maharashtra was his mother and not *Bharat Mata*. From the great patriotic stand that he belongs to the whole of India and that India belongs to him and that *Bharat Mata* is his mother, he climbs down to the position that Maharashtra only is his mother. That is how we are going in a wrong direction on account of this linguistic madness or mania. So we should not attach too much importance to this linguistic redistribution. There are other things to be considered also. As Panditji once said, thinking in terms of politics is really not progressive thinking but when we think in terms of economics or in social terms, then only our thinking is progressive. Therefore, let us not attach too much importance to this linguistic problem. Here all parties must join. This must not be a party affair. In fact, any important question should not be a party affair; for example, planning, redistribution of States and there may be many others which should not be treated by any party as party affairs. Therefore, going too much in the direction of linguism is bad and we should retrace our steps and consider afresh what is to be done. The idea of multi-lingual provinces has got to be worked out. The constitutional

[Shri Gopikrishna Vijaivargiya.] experts and other people should sit down and think out whether there should be a three-tier State or any other change should be made in the Constitution so that too much of this linguistic madness may not go on.

I have only to add one more thing about this redistribution of States and that is that I generally approve of the decisions taken by the Government. I very much welcome the formation of Madhya Pradesh. In the centre of India it is really going to be a very strong and resourceful province. I may add, of course, if my friends from U.P. are here, that some move is being made to enlarge U.P. and to take in Vindhya Pradesh into U.P.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Not to enlarge U.P. but to open its doors to anybody who wants to come in.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA: But my point is that the Madhya Pradesh which is going to be formed may not be truncated. The valuable minerals and other things that are there should continue to be in Madhya Pradesh. This new Madhya Pradesh will be a thing of pride and hope for everybody, for the whole of India. So it should not be truncated and nothing should be taken out of the proposed Madhya Pradesh.

CAPT. AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH (Vindhya Pradesh): Even without Vindhya Pradesh there will be sufficient minerals and resources.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA: Sir, I have said what I had to say about that.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: There are many suitors for Vindhya Pradesh.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA: It is not the whole of the Vindhya Pradesh that wants to go into U.P. There may be a few persons but there are others who do not want to go.

CAPT. AWADHESH PRATAP SINGH: A majority of the people and the P.C.C.....

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: Do not abduct it forcibly to Madhya Pradesh against its wishes.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVARGIYA: I now go to the other point which is planning. The President has referred to planning in his Address and our success with the first Five Year Plan is very encouraging and fills us with hope for the success of the second Plan. The question of finding out means and resources for Rs. 4,800 crores is, of course, there, but let us hope that we shall be able to solve that problem. As Nandaji spoke yesterday, first priority is being given to the problem of unemployment. In the first Plan 31 crores of rupees were provided for small industries, but in the second Five Year Plan 200 crores have been provided for small and cottage industries. This will remove unemployment to a large extent. And then some people will be employed in agriculture, some in Ambar Charkha, etc. So, in this way in the second Plan we shall be able to remove unemployment to some extent. The targets fixed are, of course, very encouraging. In our country, after the second Plan, we shall go ahead in the direction of industrialisation.

Then, Sir, I am perplexed about the defence of the country. This question is a very serious question and on our borders, on both sides, there have been pacts like the Baghdad Pact and the SEATO pact. The President has very rightly drawn our attention to that. Now, Pakistan is being armed by other countries. That is also a dangerous thing for our country. I think the Government is taking proper steps for that. There was a recent incident. A part of Kutch has been attacked by Pakistan forces. That is a serious affair for us and I think the Government will take proper steps.

There are many other things, but I have chosen only a few and I think we should be thankful to the President for giving us a good speech.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Sir, I rise to associate myself with the sentiments that have been expressed in favour of the President's Address to the joint session of Parliament. I am fully aware that there has been a good deal of criticism both in this House and the other, criticism regarding the omission of certain items which in the judgment of the speakers should have been there and certain items which should have been elaborated upon. But I think we miss the entire spirit of the President's Address and what it is supposed to be. It is not a blueprint of the measures that the Government should take this year, nor is it a very elaborate review of what has transpired before. It simply highlights some of the things that the Government attempted to solve during the last year and it gives a general indication of what are some of the major problems with which we are confronted. I submit that the President himself has admirably summed up the whole thing in a very brief but very appropriate phrase, when he in the very first paragraph, has said that "there is room neither for complacency nor for despair." And I think that sentiment is characteristic of the humility of the President of this great Republic. He has not gloated over what the Government has accomplished, nor is he unaware of some of the problems that still face us. And as I said once we accept that point of view, the President's Address is a commendable piece of document. I am not going into the details of the Address itself, because I feel that enough has been said, but I would request the Members to re-read it and read every paragraph very carefully. I think every paragraph contains a certain basic idea—about foreign affairs where we stand, about the second Five Year Plan. About the question of reorganisation of States, I think, the President has very ably summed up

what the policy of the Government is.

Let me first begin with the section of foreign affairs. Some Members in the other House—and I am not sure whether some might have said it here also because, unfortunately, I have been absent—have said that a great deal of space has been devoted to foreign affairs, a bit out of proportion. I do not happen to share that view, because, I think, you will all agree that in our contemporary world, burning with dissensions and fears of war, nothing is more urgent, nothing is more paramount than the issue of peace and war, because if a modern war unfortunately breaks out, I am sure that all our measures, which might appear to us to be very big, the question of reorganisation of States, the community projects, the Five Year Plan, all of them will go into the dust. I feel, therefore, that emphasis on foreign affairs today means primarily whether you are for peace or for war, for arbitration, for negotiation or for armed conflict. I feel the emphasis on that issue is not only well warranted, but the duty of every Government. And I feel that our Government in emphasising our stand on foreign affairs and trying to make a humble contribution to the problem of peace and war has earned not only the goodwill of the people elsewhere but also the gratitude of our own people. The President has very appropriately, once again, pointed out that there has been some progress in the lessening of tension, but as a realist he has warned us that there has not been any considerable improvement in eliminating fear and eliminating hostilities. The two giants still look at each other menacingly and I think that the section on foreign affairs sums up very appropriately and very cogently the policy of the Government of India which stands vindicated and has been accepted by our people regardless of their political affiliations.

A great deal has been said about the reorganisation of the States, so

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

much so that any outsider listening to the debates in both these Houses, reading the editorials, reading some of the accounts of the recent unfortunate riots in Bombay and elsewhere might feel that the greatest issue that India today was facing was whether a certain minor bit of a *tehsil* or district should go to this State or the other State, as if we had no other problem, the problem of appealing poverty of our people. Sir, day before yesterday I was reading the President's Address and some of the editorials on the reorganisation of States, when my mind was taken away from this otherwise more important issue. An almost half-clad elderly woman—and it is not an unfamiliar sight either in Delhi or elsewhere—came to my door when I was reading the report asking for a piece of bread, *chapati*. Do you for a moment imagine that she is at all concerned with this? Does it mean anything to her whether Bombay goes to Maharashtra or Gujarat, whether Punjabi and Hindi are the two languages accepted by the State of Punjab?

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Her only concern was how to feed herself and possibly her children. So, the paramount issue in India today is not the reorganisation of the States, not even some of the big projects—which I am sure are designed to help the poor—but the paramount issue is whether we of this generation, of this post-freedom India are capable of solving the problems of poverty, hunger and illiteracy in our country. A good deal has been said in criticism of the Congress policy before freedom with respect to the reorganisation of States and recently also. I think that perhaps some of the criticisms are valid, but I submit that all that the Congress said during the pre-Independence days was that the distribution of States was not made having regard either to the economic needs of the people or their cultural affinity or linguistic affinity. It was

made, as we all know, primarily on administrative and military considerations. The Congress kept on emphasizing this year to year in its annual sessions. What is the so-called political somersault since achieving freedom? The Congress leadership has realised that the redistribution of States either according to linguistic or other considerations is not the only issue. They were confronted with the issue of the partition of the country, the question of Kashmir and half-a-dozen other things. If there is anything that I can gather from the resolutions and the statements of the leaders, the only thing that they are saying is that language is not the only consideration. Having seen what eruption this linguistic fanaticism has caused, there is ample warning to our countrymen to beware and walk slowly, and not to be led astray. I do not feel that there has been any betrayal of the people in politics. When you make any decision, you have to take into consideration all the relevant factors and if subsequently the circumstances change, it is neither a betrayal of the masses nor going back on your words, if you modify your stand in terms of the existing circumstances. And I say this not from a partisan point of view, but only objectively, I am not in a position to suggest what should be the solution except to say that whatever solution may be arrived at, must be arrived at democratically with the consent of the people. This is a very obvious statement and at the same time, we should remind ourselves that no matter how guarded we are in our appraisal of the situation and in our demand, we cannot do it wholeheartedly. It will have to be a matter of give and take. In this context, I might say that personally I am not enamoured of the term 'High Command'. In fact, every time I see this term in the newspapers, it is a little bit repulsive. Our leaders are great democrats, great liberals. I have no doubt about it. But I feel that this smacks always of a military term. I would like it to be called a 'Steering Committee' or an 'Advisory Board',

but not 'High Command'. Anyhow, it is neither here nor there.

I would like to say a few words about my own State, Punjab. Just recently, there were three great conventions in the city of Amritsar. I have seen some rallies and conferences both in India and elsewhere. But I have never seen such a mass of humanity that just poured into Amritsar, the Congress, the Akalis and the Mahasabha people trying to surpass the other in trying to demonstrate to the people that they have the largest following. I am not prepared to say who excelled whom. But I would like to utilise this occasion for congratulating the Punjab Administration and the respective parties for the restraint that they have shown during their deliberations and during the processions. When I reached Amritsar, there were ugly rumours—not deliberately let loose by interested parties, maybe that was part of it. But the general feeling was that something was going to happen. The most important thing to bear in mind is that the leaders of the two parties, namely, the Akalis and the Mahasabha people, publicly announced in their respective meetings that no matter what happened, they would not resort to violence. And I think this is a lesson to be drawn that, if the leaders are genuinely and really sincere about restraining their followers, it can be done. These leaders have vindicated this and the whole thing passed off very smoothly and successfully. Of course, the problem is not settled there. But I am sure of one thing that there is no unbridgeable gulf between the Hindus and the Sikhs. They belong to the same larger cultural unity of India. Due to a variety of political circumstances, the Sikhs have become now conscious of their separate entity. But there are inter-marriages; there are bonds of friendship. Nothing really divides the people—I am absolutely persuaded to say—given the goodwill on both sides which happily is growing. Given the spirit that the Central Government or the Congress is showing, think that

some solution of the problem will be arrived at.

Lastly, I would like to say that we are too close to the scenes which grip our minds from day to day disturbances here and there. In this post-independence period, we should keep our minds and heads a bit above the water. If we really decide that we are going to build up a strong and united India and to help the poor and the down-trodden, we would have justified our existence, just as well as those who have gone before us.

DR. D. H. VARIAVA (Saurashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the Motion welcoming the speech of the President to both Houses of Parliament. It was a very lucid speech in which he has told us what has been done and what is going to be done very precisely.

Now, about the Five Year Plan, we have almost succeeded in achieving the target. Not only that, in certain respects, we have just gone over the target. In the case of food and agriculture, it is very gratifying to note that the scarcity with which we started in the beginning of independence has been got over. We are almost in abundance and I must say—as my friend, Dr. Mookerji referred—that we are well up in food. But in certain essential food articles, we have not yet reached the target which we ought to, such as milk and milk products. But I am sure, looking at the progress which we are making and the way in which all the Departments are helping to carry out the Plans, that this deficit will certainly be overcome in the second Five Year Plan.

It is very gratifying to see now-a-days the amenities that the Railway Ministry are providing. It makes us proud to see what the Railway was some five years back and what it is now. The distribution of amenities has not been centred in one State only, but it has been spread all over India. In the small State of Saurashtra, we had a line passing through the

[Dr. D. H. Variava.]

centre of a town. It was a great barrier to the people when they had to go from one part of the town to the other. Only about two years back, the Railway just undertook a diversion of that line and I am indeed glad to think of the facility that we get now in going from one part of the town to the other.

Many a time, patients wanting to go to the hospital had to stand at the railway crossing and lose precious time. Now, all this is over. Previously, people wanting to go from one place to another had to wait for about 20 minutes or so. That is all gone. I really congratulate the Railway Ministry for that. I also congratulate the Ministries of Irrigation, Planning and Communications. They have all done very well, and I have no doubt that in the second Five Year Plan they will do even better. The second Five Year Plan is very ambitious. If we take into consideration what we have done in the first Five Year Plan, then there is no doubt that the second Five Year Plan will be much more successful than the first, and that our aim of a socialistic society and a socialistic State will soon be accomplished.

Coming to foreign policy, it is well known that our foreign policy is not only appreciated in India but all over the world. There are people even in the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union—I do not know what their Governments feel—who appreciate the policy that our Prime Minister has been pursuing since our independence, and I must say that this policy has not only paid dividends to us here but also to other people in the world. Coming to the question of Goa, we have assured Portugal that we are not going to take any military action or use any force and push them out of Goa, but at the same time, we have said that, if they indulge in any aggression against our territory, we will take proper measures, and that is only right. Now, I say that aggression does not mean that they should actually attack us. We have seen that the Portuguese

have been importing large numbers of troops during the last three or four years. This is a type of aggression, and they must be told plainly that, if they import any more troops into this continent, it will be taken as aggression and proper measures will be taken to oppose this type of aggression. The second aggression is the way in which they are oppressing the people of Goa. That is aggression and nothing else. They should also be told that, if this aggression goes on, suitable measures will be taken to counter this, and that aggression will be countered with force. Now, about Pakistan, I think that things are improving as the President has said, but the present position is, unfortunately, due to circumstances over which Pakistan has no control; Pakistan after partition feels that what it has got is absolutely inadequate, as compared with India. When the Pakistanis see the great progress made by India in the economic, social and political fields, they think that they have been misled by their leaders, and this feeling has led to such minor incidents as occurred just a few days back near the region of Kutch, near Saurashtra. These are all pin-pricks, but they must be clearly told of our position. Our Prime Minister has said that we want to attack none unless we are attacked. In this case really we have been attacked and a part of our territory has been occupied and so, appropriate measures must be taken and Pakistan should not go away with the feeling that, if she attacks our territory, and nibbles our territory she will be allowed to do so with impunity. Proper measures should be taken to push them out of this little island as soon as possible.

Now, I come to the S.R.C. Report, because it concerns Saurashtra very greatly. It is really a tragedy that this business of State Reorganisation was taken up. After Sriramulu's fast when the Prime Minister announced in this House that Andhra would be formed. I got up and told him that that was not the right time to do so.

When a man takes to fasting for a political purpose, it is not the way the Government should act. Law must be strict, and for this very reason Andhra should have been held over for about ten years. At the same time I asked, "If a man undertakes a fast saying, 'No, I do not want Andhra', are you going to wind it up?" But at that time, this was not taken into consideration. Of course, Congress was pledged to linguistic provinces before independence, but then looking to the results of this S.R.C. Report, it is absolutely plain that linguism should be absolutely debarred. It was really very unfortunate that these tragic incidents happened in Bombay. I do not say that our Maharashtra friends or the Maharashtra leaders were responsible for this. Of course, *goondas* always prowl about, and they took advantage of this controversy between the Maharashtrians and the Gujaratis and attacked the Gujaratis. I request my Maharashtra and Gujarati friends that they must not take this very seriously. They must take it that it is the work of the *goondas*, because other riots had taken place in Bombay in the past and they were not due to the Maharashtrians or to any other linguistic classes. So, my advice to them is that these great communities should sit together in a conference and devise plans for a bilingual Bombay State. When they have been together for more than 200 years, as brothers, why should the question of language now separate them? It is not a very great thing if the Maharashtrians are more in number in some place or the Gujaratis are more in number in some other place. As it is, the Maharashtrians have a good majority in the Bombay State, and even in a bilingual State with Kutch and Saurashtra, even with Vidarbha thrown in, there should not be any dispute about this. What does it matter? Have we not lived together for so many years, some centuries, and are there not Maharashtrians in Gujarat and Gujaratis in Maharashtra? Do you mean to say that after this linguistic division, you are going to

recall all Maharashtrians to Maharashtra and all Gujaratis to Gujarat? Even those Maharashtrians and Gujaratis will resent this. Are there not Gujaratis and Maharashtrians living in other parts of the country also? Are we going to send out Gujarati from Maharashtra and Maharashtra from Gujarat? Such a proposition will be impossible. So, my request to the leaders of Maharashtra and Gujarat is that they should have a friendly conference, and as suggested by the Prime Minister, shake hands and form a bilingual Bombay. When we are talking of one world-Government it is really tragic to think of having linguistic provinces and balkanise India. At this point I must congratulate the Government of Bombay and the police of Bombay for the restraint with which they acted and brought about a happy termination of those bad results. With this, I support the Address of the President.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have never hesitated in the past and even today it is with a feeling of great pleasure and a sense of some pride that I congratulate the Government and compliment the Government for a very effective contribution which they have made in lessening the world tensions, in averting a global war when we know from the statement of that extraordinary diplomat and politician that U.S.A. had their hands almost on the trigger. While we say all this, let us not over-emphasize this aspect of the question. Our contribution has been very effective and we are very proud of it but let us not forget that Mr. H. Bomb has played a much greater part in this matter. It is not so much the love for peace or a better understanding among nations which are responsible for this state of affairs but fear of H. Bomb has put a great deal of sense in the heads of the nations concerned and we must give the devil its due. The only other most important factor which has emerged during the course of the year is the combined voice of the Afro-Asian countries at the Bandung Conference. That voice of

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

the Afro-Asian countries which certainly is a voice for throwing away colonialism, which certainly is a voice for peace and goodwill, has made its impression and because it is the voice in the cause of righteousness, it had to be heard, but not that it is palatable to certain powerful nations. We have a clear indication that all attempts were made to sabotage that good cause. We have that ghastly occurrence of the *Kashmir Princess* so poignantly reminding us of the intents and motives of certain people in this matter, but, all the same, it is only this factor which should be considered to be the most outstanding event of the year 1955, which has contributed and which has taken us forward towards the cause of peace; and I would submit with all respect that India and our other friends should make all efforts possible to have, and to forge, a commonwealth of Afro-Asian countries. We are members of a certain Commonwealth today. That is true. But if a real commonwealth could be forged where we could sit together, where we could have common problems discussed and where we could further the cause of peace, it is only the commonwealth of the Afro-Asian countries and all efforts should be made in that direction. It will be pointed out perhaps that there are so many troubles even between the countries belonging to these two continents. Our trouble with Pakistan will be pointed out. How are we going to sit together—we are already members of the commonwealth, but, Sir, if we make an analysis of the whole situation, we will find that the entire trouble has nothing to do with any of the Afro-Asian countries. It is only that we have trouble in Goa, we have trouble in Pakistan, we have trouble about Kashmir, but if some of the nations—and we all know—if they withdraw their helping hand from behind, all the troubles would be over. Do you think that Goa can last for five minutes? Do you think Goa could take that attitude? That attitude would have been absolutely

impossible and we all know that in Kashmir, matters are getting complicated simply because of the military assistance which is being given to Pakistan by U.S.A. So we have to bring all the pressure that we are capable of to see that these powers, who have no real interest in the Afro-Asian countries, who are simply poking their nose in, who are enacting a drama from behind the scenes simply for their own power politics and their own interests, are understood in the proper light and we are able to do something about it. I hope the Prime Minister will certainly take the opportunity very soon when he will be discussing the entire matter with the Secretary of the U.S.A. who is supposed to be here some time in the first week of March. Let him understand very clearly that we are a truly democratic country. The U.S.A. can never have a better friend than in India if they are interested only in furthering the cause of democracy. Then they can have a friend in India but let them clearly understand that the economic assistance which they are giving to this country will not befool us. We are accepting this economic assistance simply because we don't want to slam the door against a big power, but what we want is true friendship, sincerity and better understanding and that true friendship and sincerity and better understanding can come only if we are satisfied that they withdraw their pernicious hand from behind the support which they are giving to Goa, to Pakistan and stop fomenting trouble in Kashmir. That would be a true test of their sincerity and friendship. Why was such a rousing reception given to our Soviet friends here? Because we felt that those people particularly in these vital matters where India's interests were concerned, had nothing but identity of purpose with India and they made a good expression. That is an open lesson and now by giving a rousing reception to the King and Queen of Iran it should be obvious to the other party, to the other people that we have not gone communist, that we

have not been sucked into the influence of any particular power bloc. We are absolutely open. We have a free mind and we act according to our judgment and we have been able to give a rousing reception even to a power which has joined the Baghdad Pact because it is only that we want to create goodwill. We are all out for goodwill and we very much appreciate this attitude of the Government and every effort should be made to create goodwill all over and it certainly is a good thing to have goodwill with other countries and with all the countries, but it is not a good policy to depend upon the goodwill of others. Let us realise that while we make all the efforts to create goodwill on both sides, we are not simply depending on the goodwill of others and we must know how to stand on our own legs, how to defend ourselves and we should permit no quarter to powers which can afford to indulge in such violence that we hear about. They must know that such a sort of thing will never be tolerated. It is not only speech-making that will help matters.

I will immediately pass on to the problems at home which very much occupy our mind at present and particularly the States Reorganisation question. Here while discussing this question, when there was such a strong opinion in this House for the formation of linguistic States, I most humbly suggested that—with all respect for those people who speak for linguistic States—I most humbly differ and do not share that view, and let us not be carried away simply by a happening here or a happening there. If it is wrong to give an over-riding consideration to linguism, it is equally wrong to be frightened by a certain incident and to run away from the problem. It is not correct that because of the madness of a certain section of people if certain events have occurred, we will take our decision through the madness of certain other people. That would be extremely child-like. Before we can think of forging these larger States and merg-

ing the bigger States together, let us consider what the consequences will be. We have a little experience of that. These mergers of the existing States should be brought about only where they are absolutely urgent and necessary, where the administrative convenience and where the administrative necessity demand it. Otherwise we would be simply creating more difficulties and more troubles than we solve. We have had a little experience of this in the case of Rajasthan. What has happened? I can assure you, Sir, if we thoughtlessly proceed as we are doing at present—and all indications from the Government benches are to the effect that they would thoughtlessly go into these matters—there will be more trouble. Here is this big Dakshina Pradesh. There is to be the Paschim Pradesh. But what will happen? It is not just putting two and two together. When you merge together two big States you have often so many problems, financial and administrative problems. It is now six years and we have not been able even today to do the integration of these services in the States of Rajasthan and Madhya Bharat. The minds of the people are preoccupied. The Central Government has not been able to solve the big problems of integration of the railway employees. It is six years now since the integration of the States. Do you think that at this time, when we are just launching on our second Five Year Plan, we can afford to embark on these problems which have not received the fullest consideration? It would be only sabotaging the progress of the second Plan. So let us not be hustled into a decision. Let us not be afraid of this situation or the other situation. The Administration should be firm and we should know what is in the best interest of the unity of India and what is in the best interest of good administration and the implementation of the second Five Year Plan. We can then consider having bigger zonal councils and they may bring together States and solve problems. Otherwise we would be in a worse position than we are at present

[Shri H. C. Mathur.]

Sir, there is another thing which I would like to bring to the notice of the House here. While this Address makes mention of so many things, it does not make mention of a most important thing, according to me. I have also a feeling that if the President of India were a free man as I am, the Address would have been written in a very different tone and certain other things would certainly have been mentioned. I have gone through the speeches made by the President of India since 1950 to this day. And if one can read the mind of the President through these speeches, his own mind, I believe, is exercised on certain other problems which find no mention in this Address. There is the problem of reorientation of education. We have done absolutely nothing in this matter. I would simply read out a passage out of the President's own speech which he delivered in 1950, because in making that speech, he made it absolutely clear how fundamental it is for the material progress of this country. He says:

"Education may be compared in my opinion, to a basic industry the products of which are needed by all our industries. The other industries would succeed or fail as this basic industry succeeds or fails."

The entire progress of this country, according to the President, is based on this basic industry and if this basic industry fails, the entire structure would fail. Further on he says:

"Whatsoever be the viewpoint from which we examine the present educational system in our country, it is evident that it stands in need of fundamental and basic changes. I should, therefore, consider it the duty of all universities and other educational institutions to change their mental outlook and their syllabus of instructions."

And then, coming to 1955, just a few months or a few days before the

Address, while addressing the All-India Educational Conference, the President says:

"As far as I know, we have not succeeded in the work of changing the educational system which dates back to about a century and a quarter. I would even say"—

I would like hon. Members to mark these words:

"I would even say that we failed to put in the required effort to change the educational system which was set up with an aim which no longer holds good."

He further says this about the university graduates:

"A few among them do get some job or the other. But many among those who graduate from the universities are useless."

These are his words:

"I do not want to make any complaint against them. They are not to blame. What they are taught in these universities and what they learn do not equip them for anything worthwhile."

Now, this is a very significant thing. Here the President says that the Government have failed to put in the required effort in this respect. I think this is a serious indictment against the Ministry. What its repercussions in any other country would be is a matter on which I would not here touch. But it would to my mind, at least mean a complete overhaul of the Ministry. This is sabotaging the progress of the country and my feeling is that most of the ills and the troubles in this country, these demonstrations and the indiscipline among the people and among the students, they are all simply due to this fact. We have given some attention to the material progress. We have here certain targets which we have achieved. We have here in this Second Plan certain targets which we are going to achieve. But there is very

little or nothing done about the mental and moral health of this country. If we are to progress on sound lines, if we are to be sure that the country would be prepared to absorb any shocks which may result from any changes which we introduce, then the most important thing is that we should take good care of the mental and moral health of this country. This is the most important thing, but it finds absolutely no mention in this Address. If we are to nationalise our industries, if we are to organise a socialistic pattern of society, this is very necessary. No socialistic pattern can be sustained unless we take effective steps and do something about the moral and mental health of the people in this country.

In this respect there have been certain factors which have to be taken into consideration. There has been some over-emphasis on the secular character of our State. Let us realise what a secular State means. I remember, Sir, Mahatma Gandhi, for whom all of us have the greatest respect, was aware of what a secular State meant. He knew what secular character meant. But in spite of that, he was a deeply religious man. As I read his writings, I find that he was a deeply religious man. We have had all sorts of exhortations from our Ministers, but they have had absolutely no effect. They have no effect on the masses, because the exhortation lacks the character behind it. They are empty exhortations, empty speeches and they will never blind our eyes. Unless and until there is character behind and unless and until we do something about it, I think we shall have to face a serious situation and we may have to face something much worse.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I ask for the floor of the House in order to clarify certain points raised by speakers of the Opposition with regard to the External Affairs Ministry. One never expects generosity,

nor even kindness from the Opposition Party, but one does expect justice. Sir, many of the speakers, especially our colleague, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta made.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is all kindness.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: They made certain allegations against the motives of the Prime Minister, and quoted old speeches, documents etc. to prove how very inconsistent he was, little remembering that in politics there is very little consistency and there will be very little consistency. I would like also to give the definition of consistency which has been said to be the virtue of the ass, and surely our Prime Minister is no ass.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: But why grudge others who like to be in that category?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: He knows what the needs of the country are and how these needs keep on changing according to the exigencies.

Now, starting with the last speaker, I find that he wants now a commonwealth of all the Bandung Powers. Till yesterday, or rather till recently, the accusation was that we are in the British Commonwealth and now, while we are still in that Commonwealth, he wants another commonwealth of all the Bandung Powers. Here I would like to request him to read the definition of the word "commonwealth" and find out whether it is at all possible to have a commonwealth of such an amorphous mass of countries which represented the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, including all those non-self-governing territories and trusteeship territories which form the majority of the countries in Africa.

Now, I come to the issue raised by Mr. Kishen Chand. First he attacked Government in regard to the Burma rice deal. Now, this deal was made mainly for political reasons and it is not a new thing. It has been answered on the floor of the House by the

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.]

Prime Minister himself many a time as to why we had this deal with Burma for the purchase of 9 lakh tons of rice at a price far in excess of what is called a fair price. Members should also remember that we did not pay a price higher than what Ceylon has paid and this price was paid by agreement between the two Governments to be used towards the partial liquidation of Burma's debt to us. I do not think that it was a bad deal considering the tremendous political significance attached to it and considering also, the timely help that we had rendered to a friendly neighbour.

Now, I come to the question of South Africa. A question was asked as to why we did not take any strong steps towards South Africa, with regard to the treatment of Indians in South Africa. I do not want to waste the time of the House considering that you have allowed me only ten minutes but I would like the Member who raised this issue to read the records of the United Nations General Assembly from 1947 to 1955 to see the various steps taken by the Indian delegation against *apartheid* in South Africa.

In regard to the *de jure* transfer of the French possessions, a draft treaty of cession of the former French possessions in India was handed over to the French representative in New Delhi as early as May, 1955. I do not have to recapitulate here the happenings in France, the change of Government, the recent elections and other crises which are facing the French Government. As such, it is only thoughtful of us not to hustle the French Government but wait till their troubles are over before we can insist on this *de jure* transfer to be effected.

A question was raised about Pakistan and the Baghdad Pact and we were asked as to why the Government of India have not done anything, as to why we were allowing the enemies to get stronger and stronger outside

our borders. Here I must remind Members that the enemy is within ourselves. Recent events have shown that our enemies are not Pakistan or the Baghdad Pact or the SEATO but the people themselves. As long as we do not take care of ourselves, and forget that we have a duty to our country and to our people, certainly we are exposed to grave dangers. As has always been said, Sir, from time immemorial, man's enemy is man himself and the enemies of India are the Indians themselves. The attitude of the Opposition with regard to recent happenings in Bombay reminds me of the story of a man who killed his father and mother and when he was convicted, pleaded mercy as he was, he said, an orphan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Our friend is developing philosophies.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Yes, following the hon. Member's example.

A question was asked about the Portuguese possession, Goa, and we were asked as to why we were not taking strong measures. Sir, the philosophy—in order to please my colleague, I may say—of the Government of India as far as liberation of subject peoples is concerned is that the movement for liberation should spring from within. The Goan people should fight for the freedom of Goa. We have seen how the march of 1700 Indians into Goa had resulted in nothing but the death of a few Indian citizens. It is not difficult for the Indian Government to take possession of Goa; it may not take even thirty minutes for our forces to march into Goa and take possession of Goa but we will not do it. To have strength is one thing and to use it in a proper and noble way is something quite different. I hope Members here will realise that if the Government of India do not take any rash step or do not march its forces into Goa, it is not because we do not have the forces but because we adhere to certain principles and those principles will prove later on as to who was right, we or the Members of the Opposition.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Only Mr. Morarji Desai forgets the principles.

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: I want to point out to our friends that at no time since our freedom have the Government relaxed their efforts in bringing international pressure upon Portugal and also using every other method besides the use of force in bringing a little sense into the Portuguese mind. A question was asked, since Portugal was behaving in an unstatesmanlike manner, why it was that we recommended the admission of Portugal into the United Nations. We are told that according to Confucius, love must be rewarded by love but hatred must be rewarded by justice. Our philosophy is different. Because we adhere to the principle of universality of membership in the United Nations, it does not matter whether Portugal is our friend or our enemy, it does not matter whether Portugal does or does not surrender Goa,—it does not matter to us—we recommended its inclusion. Possibly, since Portugal has become a member of the United Nations, she might be persuaded to realise her responsibilities in the international field by giving up her possessions in India.

We were asked as to what we were doing in regard to Indians in Ceylon. It is rather difficult, for shortness of time, to go into the details, but I am sure that Members here know what has been happening, how our Prime Minister has been meeting the Prime Minister of Ceylon from time to time trying to tell him what should be done. So far as India is concerned, we have never relaxed in our efforts. Not only that; all the Indians who came to India and asked for Indian citizenship have been given that citizenship. The latest situation is that the Government of Ceylon have registered 37,304 citizens although the applications made were of the order of 1,91,929. As far as we are concerned, we have registered 10,907 persons as Indian citizens during the year 1954-55. We have 3,278 applications

pending with us, but we have not so far rejected a single application for Indian citizenship. So, Sir, if there is any fault it is not the fault of the Government of India.

Sir, the last thing that I would like to say is about Kashmir. Here also we find the same thing year after year, session after session, the same question as to why we did not withdraw the question from the Security Council of the United Nations. Sir, we had put the question on the agenda of the Security Council after Kashmir had acceded to us and that accession has since been confirmed by the Kashmir Constituent Assembly and by many other acts which have proved beyond doubt that Kashmir is a part of India and Kashmir has acceded to India of her own free will. But, Sir, the Government of India do not go back on what they have promised, that is, a plebiscite; and I am sure all the Members know why that plebiscite did not take place; it is because suitable conditions which are necessary for a plebiscite have not been provided yet and, therefore, the situation remains as it was and it is not the fault of the Government of India or the Ministry of External Affairs or the Prime Minister if things are not moving fast enough.

Sir, lastly I would like to point out that the best way to strengthen the country and also to strengthen the hands of the Prime Minister is not by creating confusion in the country, if not on the issue of foreign policy, on other issues. Sir, the strength of a country depends on its being thought of well by others and our prestige in the international field depends on the strength with which we solve our domestic problems. These problems have been solved in a creditable manner and I do not have to tell the Members of this House, especially the Opposition, in what manner. I would like them to travel from Beirut to Siam or to Indo China and find out the respect with which the Indian currency is held in all these areas. The strength, the domestic policy of

[Shrimati Lakshmi Menon.]

the country, the economic stability of the country, the political stability of the country and the progress of the country, everything depends upon the value that other nations attach to our currency. If you agree to truth then you will find neither our domestic policy nor our foreign policy is to be discussed in the manner it was discussed. On the whole it has been a successful policy, and if only the Opposition Members will realise their responsibility not to their parties but to the country, then they will find that within the next five years we can build an ideal country which they themselves want.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I believe I have got 15 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, but better if you could make it less. There is one more lady Member.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: Sir, after listening to the speeches made during these last three days I thought, if I could get a little time, I would do only one thing and that is, stand up and read the Address, because, somehow or other, I have got a feeling that some of the friends, who spoke, spoke because they had to say something. But it was apparent and evident from their speeches that they had neither heard the Address nor taken the trouble of reading it. It is very strange. We come with ready-made speeches. We want to say something. I am not saying about all; 'some', I say; and I wonder where was the necessity for all these speeches of the last three days and why they should make attacks on it. Of course, everyone has got the right to speak and contribute to the debate. We must make speeches; we must talk. We must talk sense; we must talk nonsense also. Otherwise life will become drab and dull and rather very bad. I would really be very happy if we could talk within ourselves here, where we have the privilege of saying anything and everything and then

save the people from our speeches later on. If that could be done, a lot of mischief could be avoided, and a lot of mischief would remain undone; and the country could march and march on from progress to progress. Sir, I have really a very great desire to read this Address for the benefit of those friends, but I see there is not enough time for that, but I would request my friends to read it again if they have read it once. After hearing the speeches I went on reading it again and again to know where was the reference in it for which the people were attacking the Address. It is really very unfortunate. There is a Persian saying: **मर्दे आकिल**

दर वतन हरगिज़ न गरदद सरफ़राज़ (The wise man is not honoured in his own land.) Though our President has given his Address in such a spirit, the spirit of this earth, of this land, of the *sanskriti*, of the civilisation of our people, still one after the other got up and attacked it. I am not able to comprehend it or understand it. The work that our country has done has been appreciated by all and sundry all over the world except by some of us here. It is very strange and that is why I was reminded of that couplet, "**मर्दे आकिल दर वतन हरगिज़ न गरदद सरफ़राज़**" (The wise man is not honoured in his own land.)

Sir, I have a feeling, as just now my friend Mr. Mathur said,—he has gone out—that we should have more stress on education, and I say that the education should start from the class that calls itself the leaders of men. Pardon my saying it. **गर हमीं**

मक़तब व हमीं मुल्ला कारे तपिलां तमाम ख़ाहद खुद (If this is the *maktab* and this is the *mulla* and the teacher, God help the people.) I really sometimes pray that the friends of the people could be sent to some place where they could just become normal human beings. That ~~day~~ our people could be saved from a lot of suffering. The friends of the people advise the people to commit rape, arson and loot. The result was wit-

nessed in Bombay. They were the friends of the people. Once the friends of the people did a similar thing on a much vaster and bigger sale. They were the friends of the people. They were the friends of a certain sect of the people. They called them the friends of Mussalmans. Well, those friends have landed them there where they are lost and every now and then they have to cry out in some form or the other, just as a child cries out of chagrin kicking its legs, as Dr. Variava was saying. You know that. They have come out with an attack here, an attack there. Why is this? I take it in a different way. I take it that it is out of chagrin those people are doing these things. They are crying for mercy and one day will come perhaps when a mission of mercy will have to go from this fatherland. I say so because those people belong to this land as much as I belong to that land. I come from Peshawar. We must save our own people from their friends abroad who put them in pacts, one pact after the other, and save them from their friends who have landed them in this trouble and who have still kept them enslaved, as they are. Similarly, recent events again brought to my mind that the friends of the people advise them and then go to some health resort and take rest. God help the people from these friends! Really if we could have some nice asylums—we might not call them asylums; it is a bad term they say—some rest houses, that sort of thing, where these friends of the people could go and rest, whatever party they belong to, it would be good. They have done great harm to this country—to the reputation of this country, to the great progress that we were making. They retarded the progress of this land by their friendly advice and by trying to do good to the people, as they call it and as they openly declare, but it was quite clear that they were doing good to themselves. Some people had some chairs. They wanted to have bigger chairs. Some people who had no chairs wanted chairs. So there was a rush

for the chairs and some legs broke and the chairs broke and everything broke and there was chaos and turmoil. These friends of the people should all be brought at one place and made to talk and talk; and talk themselves out till they have exhausted themselves out and all the poison comes out of them and nothing remains except that they can just breathe freely and let other people breathe freely and do the good that is being done. Sir, I hope 4 P.M. that people would think of

this: “बर्क गिरते है तो बिचारे मुसलमान पर”

Why is it that every time we lose our heads and raise our hand against women? What has gone wrong in us? There are people, who by any chance are associated with such things, who had stretched out their hands against women. Do they not feel ashamed of it? Do they not feel like going and just drowning themselves in the sea? Why sea? We have got quite a number of rivers also. Why don't they do that? Why should such a thing be repeated? Why should there be at all such a thing in our country which has always held women in great respect.

“यत्र नार्दस्तु पूज्यन्ते रमन्ते तत्र देवता.”

That has been the ideal of this country. Friends will correct me if I am wrong. I am just quoting. I am not a Sanskrit scholar. We have held women in great respect. But what do we see here? With any little excuse, the hand is stretched out at them. And who is responsible for this? The man who calls himself the leader of the people, it is he who is responsible for this state of thing.

The people of this land are simple folk. As the cock crows the tiller gets up and goes to the field. He wants to go to his field; he wants to work. With the blow of the whistle the labourer gets up and goes to his workshop. He wants to work. With the ringing of the bell the actor wants to put on his make-up, whether he gets Rs. 100 or Rs. 1,000. He wants to put up his make-up. He cries in desperation if there is no make-up for

[Shri Prithviraj Kapoor.]
him. They would all be doing their work but for these friends. The friends take the peasant away from his plough and put him on the wrong side of life. They take the labourer away from the factory or the workshop and put him on the wrong side of life. That is how these friends retard the progress of the land. So something should be done for these friends. God save this country from all such friends who come again and again under some garb or the other, in some form or the other, and with some plea or the other; and then incite the people to ruin themselves, to bring a blot upon the good name of the nation, and to smirch their faces black.

Sir, I would not take much time. I only want to say this that if we had read the Address, if we had noted, as Dr. Anup Singh said just now, the spirit of the Address, there would have been no question of talking about it. With one voice we would have welcomed it as my friend Shri Indra Vidyavachaspati said on the first day and we would have saved the time of the nation. But as I said, every bad thing has some good thing behind it and it is better that we talked ourselves out. I only hope that we have exhausted the venom and poison here in this hall where we have got all the freedom, so that we do not go to the people, incite them to violence and destroy the greatest jewel of their life, their humanity, that traditional brotherly feeling and the innate hospitality of the people of this land. It is there. I have been all over the country with a huge group of 100 people, right from Srinagar down to Dhanushkodi. I have gone to lands where the people do not understand our language, but yet they have received me with open arms. They are the same people; they did not throw stones at me. They welcomed us in their homes and hearts. Even in the villages in Saurashtra the peasant comes and says:

दूध पियो बाबू ।

He was just standing near a little bridge and he says to me, 'drink milk' and he offers milk. Such rich land, such rich people we have. I was working on a picture. An ordinary extra comes out at Kolhapur and says: *Bhakhari khaoge?* He has nothing to gain from me. He brings out his *bhakhari* and wants to share it with me. How can we expect such people to do all these shameful acts? But for these friends they would not indulge in such things. Those who have done such things should examine their own conscience to see whether their words had incited the people to do such things, to lose their hospitality, to lose their *dharma*, the *dharma* that has kept us united during all these centuries in spite of the tirade of the tyrants. If anyone has been responsible, he deserves punishment. He should punish himself by drowning himself in the sea.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, I will finish with the prayer of Gurudev:

Where the mind is without fear
and the head is held high;

Where knowledge is free;

Where the world has not been
broken up into fragments by
narrow domestic walls;

Where words come out from the
depth of truth;

Where tireless striving stretches
its arms towards perfection;

Where the clear stream of reason
has not lost its way into the
dreary desert sand of dead
habit;

Where the mind is led forward by
thee into ever-widening thought
and action—

Into that Heaven of Freedom, my
Father, let my country awake.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am the last and perhaps the least and the shortest speaker. I have read with great pleasure the Address of the President. There are

certain points which specially appeal to me and I would just like to mention them. The most important, I feel, in the President's Address, is the statement in the last paragraph where he speaks of the greatest event in this year, the event of the birthday anniversary of the Lord Buddha. Coming as it does from the President as part of the Presidential speech, it makes me feel tremendously inspired and happy, because I have always understood that ours being a secular State, secularism means indifference to what is spiritual and what is essence of great teachings of religions. It shows the spiritual outlook which we all know the President already has, but even more it indicates the beginning of a spiritual revival which, I think, is the most important, as well as, a need in our country. I have just been to Gaya and Sarnath and have seen the repairs that are going on in Sarnath where crores of rupees are being spent for the improvement of the place. I am informed that once again they are going to bring deer into the Deer Park. I was thinking that the deer might come, temples might be built. But will the Lord Buddha come? Everything else might come with the help of money, but the spirit of Buddha is not going to come by building temples or by spending money.

And I hope that this is the beginning of something more, that we shall build more temples in our hearts and that we shall try to make this year a year of greatest event, because we shall not only think of the Buddha and of His teachings, we shall also do something concrete so that 1956 becomes the most memorable year in the history of the world. Buddha did not believe in making images of Himself; nor did He believe in portraits, because for centuries afterwards there was no picture of the Buddha. He wanted people to believe Him only if they believed in His Teachings. He wanted the people to follow the spirit of His Teachings; it is only later on that we built monuments to Him and made statutes of the Buddha. He did

not believe in caste because He elevated all people. He showed the way of equality to all. Even today we want to make a society which is casteless. But perhaps we may be doing something harmful, which is that we want to make everybody equal—equally bad rather than equally good. Instead we have to build up our country so that we elevate the individual. Even Lord Buddha, who did not believe in caste, spoke of who is a *brahmin*. He used the word in its higher sense to show that he who has character and he who is spiritual in living, is the highest and the greatest of all. I would like to suggest that in celebration of the Buddha's birthday—if I may make an appeal—it is that we might once again remember that we have adopted the symbol of Asoka. We have not completely adopted it because we have not adopted that *charka* which goes above it, the *charka* which represents universal religion.

Most important of all Teachings are the two great Teachings—tolerance and compassion. We are trying to show tolerance in so many ways, but we have yet to make concrete the compassion. I do not think we can celebrate the Buddha's birthday better than doing that which represents His spirit. He himself said: Thou shall not kill, nor cause to be killed. He Himself said that life is dear to all creatures. He was the very embodiment of compassion. Why should we not stress that ideal of compassion and see to it, for example, that we recognise the life of all creatures and that we work for the happiness of every creature and give a charter of rights to the animal and bird kingdoms, as well we are giving to human beings? In external affairs we are talking about working for peace which is a marvellous thing. As it has been said previously, to me, what is the use of talking about peace to others if we do not have peace in our country? Even in our country how can we have peace unless we work for that which makes for peace? The

[Shrimati Rukmini Devi Arundale.] only thing that makes for peace is a change of heart. If we are going to be heartless, I think, we are certainly never going to be without war, because war is the result of selfishness and cruelty which we find everywhere.

We talk about indiscipline and we talk about all the horrible things that are happening in our country. Why is there mob rule? Everybody thinks it is his business to rule, ^{because} it is a democratic Government. There has been no educated democracy in our country and our education has not worked to improve the character of the people. In the Second Five Year Plan so much money has been put aside for education. What is the programme of education? Are our young people going to be taught the lives of the Great? Are they going to know something about the beautiful thoughts of all the great people of the country? Are they going to have education in spiritual values? What is the use of saying that we are trying to build up our country, that we have better food production, etc., when food alone is not going to be sufficient? It is only going to give us more strength for more war. If only we could emphasise on something else we will be able to do far more good. It is very sad to think that so many things that we do are contradictory to this great spirit of tolerance and compassion.

Incidentally, I might add that it was sad to see in the newspapers that we welcome our guests from foreign countries by offering to them the pleasure of shooting ducks and such things. I was very happy when the British Government ceased to be, because in the old days when the Viceroy or a Governor came, out of four days of work one day would be allotted for either fishing or hunting. Nowadays, we are trying to provide this pleasure to foreign people which, I think, is one of the saddest happenings which gives a very bad picture of India, the land which is now trying to remember the

Buddha! I would also like to reiterate and say once again, make this a historic occasion. Abolish the export of animals, including monkeys, start hospitals and animals welfare centres everywhere. Asoka did it. Everywhere we go, in all the sacred centres, we will find his edicts where he has declared his policy as the true follower of the Buddha—not merely one who thinks of Him in terms of a picture. These are the suggestions and an appeal which I make to the President.

Secondly, regarding the reorganisation of States. Everywhere we hear about it and obviously there is an awful confusion. There is a great mess. I would stress one point specially. We have spoken about never breaking our word. When we first created the States, we had the Rajpramukhs. What about the promises we made to the Rajpramukhs and what happens to them? That is one of the things, which we must keep in mind, because we have adopted “*Satyameva Jayate*” as our motto. Many of the Maharaja's have ruled States which are more advanced than our country today. Many of them were examples which have been much respected by the people. Though we may not find it in accordance with our modern ideas of India, yet we must respect the promises that we have given to them.

The last point. We are trying to develop culture. In Mysore State there is, for example, the *Dussehra* festival. I am told it is being abolished because of the expenditure. We seem to spend so much money on so many things which are absolutely unnecessary. But that which are not mere entertainment, but in which there are beautiful ideas, beauty and culture, from which so many foreigners could find enjoyment rather than by duck shooting, are unfortunately being abolished for considerations of expenditure. I think those customs ought to continue in our country, for otherwise we will never know them. We are trying to imitate

them in many ways. Those who have the tradition can do it far better than many of us who do not have the tradition.

Once again I wish to refer to the Education Ministry and the Second Five Year Plan. Should there not be a great amount of money allotted for the special purpose of implementing the teachings of the Compassionate One, the Lord Buddha, so that there are more mercy missions for the helping of the animal kingdom as well as the poor people, more money allotted for educating people in compassion, more money allotted for bringing spiritual values? Then only, I am sure, we will find that there is going to be no more riots and no more mob rule. Mobs will misrule us because they do not know how to control themselves as there is no education for character. I would like to see a programme in the Second Five Year Plan and for the next fifteen years laying special emphasis on character and also on building into the people the spiritual values which alone will make India the foremost country in the world, which will make India a land that shall not merely speak of peace elsewhere, not only speak of peace in India, but even more a land that knows how to acquire peace within and how to get rid of the enemy within our own hearts, giving place to compassion, to truth, to high and noble living.

THE MINISTER FOR HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT): Sir, this Address of the President has been under discussion here for the last three days. I have not had the privilege of listening to every one of the speeches, but I have acquainted myself with all that has been said and my colleague, Shri Datar has been good enough to inform me about the utterances that have been made. I would like to express my gratitude to the House for the way they have dealt with the

Address. It covers considerable ground and deals with the principal activities of the Government for the year that has just closed. On the whole, there has been little criticism but for the batteries directed again towards the States Reorganisation Commission Report, and the developments that have followed since. I venture to think that nothing had been said here which would appear to be a disapproval of the policy of the Government in any matter. I conclude therefrom that the whole House is generally in agreement with what the Government has done.

This House consists of experienced leading men and their approval of the policies of the Government can give encouragement and can serve to hearten us all. Shri Bhupesh Gupta was smiling when I was testifying to the experience and the wisdom of the Members of the House. He seemed to have some doubts about himself. Well, I can only wish that he may outgrow them and be able to look at things from the right and not the obtuse or acute angle.

Sir, a number of amendments were notified initially. I have looked at them. But in the course of the discussion, all of them—at least most of them—seemed to have been completely forgotten, if not deliberately ignored. That again indicates that, while in a formal way certain allegations were made, yet no one thought it necessary, advisable or expedient to develop their themes further. That again indicates that what was stated in the Address being only a review of the events was on further consideration, found to be unassailable. I believe it is so.

The Address naturally deals with all spheres with which we in this House have to deal. It has given considerable space to foreign affairs. And then, it has referred to the salient features of the proceedings of this House or of the other House or of the happenings of the last twelve months.

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]

In the field of foreign affairs, there is little to be said now. There is, I think, complete unanimity in the country that the policy that was initiated long ago by our Prime Minister, even before the Congress assumed reigns of office, was best and most suited to our country and also designed to do good not only to us, but also to others. That stands fully vindicated.

The doctrine of Panch Shila has been accepted by all countries and Shri Bhupesh Gupta must be happy that the leaders of Russia who came here recently endorsed it in an unqualified and unreserved manner. So, we stand for a policy—an active, energetic and vigorous one—of peace, friendliness, amity and goodwill for all. We have no malice against any country and we wish to do whatever an economically backward country like ours can to serve others in our own humble way. We do not claim any special position, but we are actuated and guided only by one passion, one desire and one objective that is of fostering, promoting and maintaining peace in the world and also between those who may be inclined to go at each other's throats. I venture to think that our policy in that regard has not been altogether unsuccessful. It is not a verdict which we are competent to give. But we can take note of what others who have not always been friendly to us or to our policy have said. So, we can take some pride in the fact that, although we are only a democracy of a few years—an ancient and independent State—yet our leaders have been able to make a mark—and a permanent mark—for which they will always be complimented not only by our own people, but also by all men of virtue and wisdom all over the world. That is a thing of which we can take note and which will continue to help us in our disinterested activity towards the welfare and well-being of all countries and all people.

Sir, in our own country, we will now be starting on a new enterprise.

The First Five Year Plan will have achieved its targets almost fully within the next few weeks. It is again a matter of gratification that our First Five Year Plan has yielded very satisfactory and thoroughly adequate results. All the targets which we laid for ourselves have been almost achieved. When we started this difficult task, sceptics were many. Few had expected that our people and our Administrations spread all over the country would prove equal to its demands. Our resources were limited, our technical skill was still more strictly defined and restricted, and in other ways too, we were backward. Still, in spite of all these drawbacks and handicaps, our people, through their own unaided efforts, have been able to achieve something which will prove fruitful not only for the present but will yield dividends for all times to come. Now, we are on the threshold of the new Plan. It will commence at the start of the coming financial year. It is a much bigger Plan. The amount that we propose to spend is, considering our Budgets and resources, considerable. We have framed a Plan which will cost Rs. 4,800 crores. By the end of the next Five Year Plan we hope that many of the machines and tools and plants that we import from outside will be produced in our own country. We also hope that our production of food-stuffs will increase to such a degree that we will not only be able to satisfy all our needs but also to export a fair amount to our neighbouring countries. In the field of social services, we will be doing much more than what we have been able to do during the last five years. The additional expenditure for social services comes to about Rs. 1,000 crores. This expenditure over our Plan of Rs. 4,800 crores really exceeds the total budgetary expenditure that we would have otherwise incurred during the five years in the Centre and in all the States. We hope to achieve an appreciable increase in the *per capita* income; our expectation is that it will rise by about 25 per cent, and we also hope that the employment opportunities which will

be released will be able not only to feed the new mouths that come into existence everyday in our country but will also give shelter and succour to those who have to suffer its pangs today in large numbers. These are the main objectives, but we can fulfil these only if all of us regard this Plan as a national Plan and throw ourselves into this task with energy and earnestness, determined to serve the masses and to bring the fulfilment of our aim of a socialist pattern of society and *Sarvodaya* nearer and nearer. It is through these methods—by increasing production, by ensuring equitable distribution, by bringing about so far as possible equality of opportunity—that we expect to be able to maintain the present standards and to raise them steadily and progressively to the point when everyone will have enough not only to satisfy his needs but also to enjoy the good things that Providence has stored in this country for every single citizen. It is to enable everyone to develop his personality to the maximum extent that this Plan has been formulated, but the resources that we will have to find go far beyond our ordinary savings. The Plan envisages deficit financing to the extent of Rs. 1,200 crores. Still there is a gap to be met. So, it is hoped and it becomes the privilege and the duty of everyone, especially of the leaders and hon. Members of this House, to see to it that this gap is covered, that there is no impediment in the way of the fulfilment of the targets and of the programmes in accordance with the time schedule prescribed for these purposes. I would, therefore, appeal to hon. Members to give special thought to this question and to co-operate to the maximum extent that they possibly can in seeing that this great enterprise and undertaking is carried through, so that the foundations may be securely laid and, for the Third Plan, our resources may be much greater than what we have today.

Sir, in the course of the discussions here, as I said at the outset, consider-

able attention has been given to the S.R.C. Report. Observations of various types have been made. Some have alleged that our methods have not been democratic, some that we have been vacillating, some that our mind is confused, some that our policies have not been consistent, and some that we have been proceeding in a dictatorial manner. Well, these criticisms are not quite consistent; many of them cancel each other, but still I should like to say a few words in this connection. We have tried to follow a consistent policy. Yet in this dynamic age, we cannot keep our eyes shut and our ears closed

We should take full note of whatever happens and of all that is said and of all that is done whether for good or for evil. The doings are of various types. There are acts and there are also omissions. Before the States Reorganisation Commission Report was published, we had tried to appeal to the people to receive the Report in a calm and tranquil atmosphere, to treat the recommendations with respect and so far as possible, to accept them. That was our appeal even before the Report was published. After we had received the Report, we published it within ten days. Then as a democratic country and those who have adopted a democratic way of life, we invited the suggestions and the comments of all who were interested or affected by it. We gave every opportunity to every person and we, in our Home Ministry alone, have since received about 50,000 criticisms, memoranda and representations. All these were closely examined. There were discussions in the press naturally, as the subject was important. Then discussions were also held in State Legislatures. We had a conference of Chief Ministers—in fact we met more than once. We had very long debates in the Parliament. All that was relevant and perhaps something that might have been irrelevant was said in this connection. Yet the subject is one which attracts attention and hon. Members have again concentrated on it for the most part during the last

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]

three days. No democratic Government would have done more than what we did. In fact some have blamed us the other way that we should not have given such a free scope for discussion. That would have been hardly fair because we don't want to foist anything upon our people. After all, they are the masters of the situation and we have been guided throughout by one principle and that has been the pole-star which has guided all our activities, i.e., whatever we do should carry with it the maximum consent, agreement and approval of the people concerned. If we have made any changes, we have done so to carry out this very principle in action. We have tried to make changes only where we found that the S.R.C. Report had made proposals which did not commend themselves to the persons affected. Yet I feel that people in their criticisms, have taken almost one-sided view of the affair. If they were to look at the entire picture, they would find that the achievements far exceed the little that has yet to be accomplished.

Look at the Report. It made several suggestions. It covered the whole country. It produced proposals for re-drawing the entire map of India. Yet, of these proposals, only two or three are still the subject of discussion or controversy. All others, with such changes as we considered advisable, had been accepted by the entire country. It is natural that when you have a tooth-ache, you must be thinking only of that ache and forget that all other limbs of your body are healthy. So also, only Bombay looms large today and the rest of the country which is normal, has, in a way, gone into oblivion because it is free from trouble. But if success is to be measured only by creating trouble, then we have failed. If success is to be measured by smoothly fulfilling a big plan, then I humbly venture to submit that we have succeeded beyond expectations. Look at the proposals. The abolition of all States, the abolition of A, B, and C classification,

the abolition of Rajpramukhs, the safeguards for linguistic minorities, the proposals for strengthening and promoting the unity and the integrity of the country—all these have been accepted by almost everyone. Then go further. We have been able to persuade the parties concerned to accept many of the principal proposals. The State of Madhya Pradesh, which is to consist of four States, i.e., in which other three at least have to merge completely effacing themselves out of existence as separate entities, has been accepted and the proposal is going to be implemented. Similarly, the State of Karnatak is going to be formed with Mysore and districts added from two or three other States. All have accepted the proposal with such modifications as have made the scheme acceptable to everybody. Then take the State of Kerala. It has similarly been accepted. Hyderabad has been disintegrated and divided into three parts—that has been accepted. I hope Vishalandhra will also come into existence with other States, but only with the approval of all concerned and I trust all will agree. You will be remembering that the Commission had recommended that Vidarbha should remain separate and had not prescribed any time-limit for its merging with any other State but Vidarbha and Maharashtra will be one State in any case. There was no State provided for Maharashtra but we will have a big Maharashtra State. We will also have a Gujarat State. We hope it may be possible to have a Punjab State with the approval of all concerned with such changes as may be acceptable to all. Well, I am only expressing a hope, because at this stage nothing more can be said. Then Rajasthan will carry out the proposals that have been made in the S.R.C. Report. Tripura will remain separate, with the consent of Tripura and Assam. I would be gratified if Tripura and Assam could again agree to live together as one State, but again the change has been made with the consent of the parties and in order to give greater satisfaction to them. There were many other proposals

relating to boundary disputes and other matters. Those two have been mostly settled with the consent of the parties. So, without going further into details, may I humbly request hon. Members to remember that what remains is but a fraction of what has already been accomplished? So let us not underrate what has been done, and let us not delude ourselves by thinking that everything is wrong, and that there is nothing but drudgery, controversy and conflict before us. We have settled all except one or two, and we are sure that the remaining ones too will be settled. Some of our friends have said that it would have been better if the Report had been shelved. But there are many others who think that it would not only be a counsel of despair, but it would be, in every way, wrong to go back upon the programme that we had outlined some time ago. Well, great countries and great people are not frightened by dangers. They have to face problems, to apply their minds in a positive way, to solve the problems in a dignified manner, to see them through and not run away from them. So we have to see that whatever is left is also put through and that the entire scheme is carried out according to the schedule framed by us at the outset.

Criticism has also been made, as I said, about our policy being a vacillating one. I do not know where that vacillation has been seen, or perceived or suspected; on the other hand we have throughout been facing this problem in a befitting manner. We have throughout pledged ourselves to one guiding principle, that of consulting our people, respecting their wishes and doing whatever is possible in order to meet them. So we had to change the proposals in some cases in order to satisfy them and in a manner which we think is just and sound. Some of those who suggest that the Report should have been shelved, when it comes to the proposals concerning their own States are particularly keen that they should be put through without delay. Similarly, some people

who say that the Report should have been accepted as it has emerged, without any change, when it comes to the proposals concerning them, press for a change. Many of those who have made observations of this character have suggested that Bombay should go with Maharashtra. Well, you cannot have it both ways. If the S.R.C. recommendation is to be accepted, then it has to be a bilingual State. If you want a change, then you cannot have it both ways. So the criticisms do not seem to be well-founded.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We cannot catch this logic.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: I have not been able to catch your words. They must be words of wisdom and I would like to listen to them later.

Then there has been some criticism on the ground of our giving sometimes a subordinate place to linguistic considerations. Our policy in this regard has throughout been consistent. We have accepted that linguistic harmony is an important factor and it must be given due weight in the reorganisation of the States. But at the same time we have repeatedly said that linguism or linguistic fanaticism is a mischievous thing and we should steer clear of these linguistic rocks if we are to build a sound, integrated and united country. It has often been seen that unilingual states tend to become somewhat conservative, somewhat narrow-minded, somewhat petty in their outlook. I do not say that it is always so. But it has often been seen and those who are in a position to pronounce on matters of this character have given definite opinions to this effect. The Commission too, after examining the entire question accepted the principle and they said that there should be a balanced approach, that all relevant factors should be taken into account, but two must be given prominence and priority over others. One is the integrity, security and prosperity of the country as a whole. No part can thrive if India ceases to carry on the concerted effort for the build-

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]
ing up of the new order throughout the length and breadth of this land. It is only through the co-ordinated effort of all people living in this country that we can attain the goal that we have laid and prescribed for ourselves. The second thing is that whatever we may do, our Plan should not suffer and we should be able to carry out all schemes for material, spiritual and cultural development without any impediments and hindrance. Subject to these, language should also be given due weight. So there has never been any inconsistency in this regard.

The other day Shri Bhupesh Gupta talked of sub-nationalities in India. We do not believe in this fiction of a sub-nationality. We all belong
5 P.M. to one nation. We live in a

Union and not in a Federation and we ^{are} all citizens of this great Republic. Sometimes people are misled by this series of Soviet Republics that exist in Russia. They are told that there every Republic has its own language and is free to develop its own culture. I do not criticise their system; they are perfectly entitled to adopt such means as suit them and I believe that what they have done must be quite appropriate in their case but they all live in a monolithic State. Even the Budget of every village soviet has to be approved by the highest body in the land. The resolutions passed, the laws accepted, can be cancelled and rejected by a higher body. They have a sort of hierarchy one over the other and all above the lowest one are entitled to kick off what is done by the lower or the lowest itself. So, when you have a State like that, the various States are just like administrative units, whether in charge of Commissioners or Collectors or are the so-called soviets. They are all subject to the control, guidance and supervision of everybody above them. So, in the circumstances, to talk of liberty in their case or as though they were self-sufficient States is, I think, not absolutely correct. Our system is en-

tirely different. The States here are autonomous. Whatever power has been given to them by the Constitution, they can freely exercise and no one can interfere with those States. That difference must be borne in mind.

There has been some reference to the unfortunate incidents that have taken place in recent weeks. I do not want to mention the details. It is a matter of deep sorrow to us that such outbursts of violence should have been witnessed in any part of the country. No community can be blamed for that. It can be the work only of misguided individuals or anti-social elements but it has done considerable damage to the reputation of our country. We are today preaching the doctrine of Panch Shila, of peaceful co-existence and are expecting that even inveterate enemies will be able to make up their differences in a peaceful way and gradually outlive the stage of hostility and to convert it into one of friendship. In the circumstances that anything like this should happen in our country cannot but be a matter of immense sorrow to everyone of us. I will not say anything about the causes that led to what happened. It is, in the present case, not an occasion for argument. Some people have said that some of our proposals have not been supported by any arguments. Argument is to be advanced in order to convince a man who has not yet been convinced but, first of all, there should be the proper atmosphere which can enable one to appreciate an argument in its proper perspective. So long as that atmosphere is lacking and people are not in a mood to examine and assess all relevant factors in a calm, rational and detached way, nothing is served by advancing elaborate arguments. We have to see that the wounds are healed; we have to see that where distrust has crept in, it is replaced by trust; we have to see that where people, who had been living like neighbours for ages, have fallen out, may unite again and resume the threads that have been unhappily snapped

today. That should be our effort. On occasions like this, to ask for enquiry into the happenings is needless and is hardly of any use. It can do no good. It can only keep the sore there alive and it can only keep the wounds even deeper and prevent them healing up. So, let there be no talk about it. Let us forget and forgive and let us apply our minds to the future and see that we regain the prestige that we had lost and we regain the great name which we had earned. We should also see that within our own country we begin to think in proper terms. We cannot think or speak in terms of my people, my tribe and so on. We are all one people and we have outgrown what is usually called the tribal and primitive stage. We all claim to be civilised, to be polished and even refined. So, in these circumstances, let nothing happen which gives the lie to our claims or which will give a handle to our opponents to be used against us.

There is still the case of Goa which is yet to be solved and to be tackled. A small country like Portugal which is not equal to a very small province of ours has been behaving in an outrageous way. It had been having recourse to terrorism in order to resist the legitimate claim of India which is moral, which is in every way justified according to the international code. We want no more than that Goa which is part of our country geographically, culturally, socially and spiritually should also be politically a part of our country. We will not in any way be scared away by the threats of anyone, nor by any alliances which the people of Portugal may be able to build up or may imagine they have built up against us. Our cause is just and I am sure that Goa will be ours much earlier than many imagine. So, we have to stick to our peaceful methods and to see that the moral force, the spiritual force which brought us freedom and which brought us the French possessions, also proves potent and powerful enough to bring us Goa which is ours and which the Goanese want to be a part of India,

their own motherland, their own country.

Sir, there has been reference to certain proposals that have been made for the union of Bengal and Bihar. I had hoped that every proposal for a union would be welcome to every man who wishes this country to be strong and great. Unity is our prime necessity. It is still true that there are disruptive elements; there are disintegrating forces in our country. So wherever we can come closer we should try to do so. The methods may differ. The systems adopted in different States may not be exactly alike, but, essentially, wherever we can come closer, we should readily accept and approve of all such proposals. Bengal, you know, had a considerable area in the past. It has been reduced in size because of partition. Large numbers of refugees are coming to Bengal every day. They don't find sufficient elbow-room in Bengal. I will not speak of the ways of Pakistan in this connection. If they will consider this question dispassionately, they will realise that, when thousands are leaving Pakistan every day, the fault must lie with their system of administration. Otherwise there is no reason why they should desert their hearths and homes and flee like this to other lands. Then there are millions of Bengalis in Bihar and similarly millions of Biharis in Bengal. In the olden days they used to have almost a common language and there were poets who were respected by both. Calcutta is a big city. There are resources, mineral and other, in Bihar which have to be exploited and which can add to the wealth of the country. So men, technical skill, raw material and other means needed for this economic and material development can be easily found if these two States unite, and thus they can prove of great help to each other. I will not give other reasons for it, but I do not at all see why there should be any objection to this. This much is clear that such a union can be the result only of the free voluntary choice of the two States. It is not going to be imposed

[Shri Govind Ballabh Pant.]
on anyone. But, if the States agree, those who are interested in cutting this country into bits may be disappointed, but the integrity, the strength and the unity of the country will certainly be promoted by the consummation of this proposal. We were thinking only in terms of separatism. Small bits of territory had become the bone of contention and our minds were running into ways which might well have led us to disaster. In the circumstances farsighted people held that, while keeping to the principles of reorganisation, the basic fundamentals should be given the priority and the prominence they deserved and everything else should be subordinated to the imperative need of the hour. In the circumstances we have reason to be grateful to the people and to those wise men who have initiated this thing. They have, I hope, the goodwill of this House.

Sir, I do not think it is necessary for me to take any more time of the House—I have already exceeded the limit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I ask one question, Sir? Unfortunately the hon. Minister has made reference to the proposed negotiation as if the Government decision has taken place. Yet he was telling us that he would look to the views of the people. I hope that he would make the position clear that the Government has not taken any decision with regard to this matter and that would wait for the public opinion to be expressed on this subject. It is most unfortunate that this speech should have been made use of for canvassing for the infamous proposal of merger of Bengal and Bihar.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Well, I do not know if the question is unfortunate or if the method of putting it is unfortunate, but really, before anything can be done, a Bill will have to be framed and that will

come before Parliament. The wishes of the legislatures will have to be ascertained.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is that all? In that case he should have consulted Parliament. Why are you meeting other people? The wishes of the people means the wishes of the people of the country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We cannot go on like this.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: It does not mean that people should in the meantime keep their mouths shut; it is open to everyone.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would ask the Home Minister to tell us exactly how we can express our views, how the people of Bengal can express their opinions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is the third time you are getting up.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: The people of Bengal have a final say in the matter concerning themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not the chorus boys of Dr. Roy in the Bengal Assembly Congress Party.

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: The people of Bengal will decide for themselves, and I hope they will not allow themselves to be misled and misguided by unsocial elements.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I will put the amendments to vote.

The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that Government's policy in regard to the reorganisation of States has been confused and vacillating, and express the opinion that the new proposals such as merger of existing unilingual States and the like must not be given effect to without first ascertaining the wishes of the people concerned'."

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Negating this would mean that the Government is not interested in the wishes of the people.

The motion was negatived.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is clear that they do not want to ascertain the wishes of the people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 15 barred.

The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

The motion was negatived

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I will put the main Motion to the House. The question is:

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

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

The motion was adopted.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE INDIAN RED CROSS SOCIETY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956

SECRETARY: 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 Indian Red Cross Society (Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 18th February, 1956."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

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

The House then adjourned at twenty-five minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 24th February, 1956.