

Fourth Series Vol. VI - No. 40

**Saturday, July 15, 1967
Asadha 24, 1889 (Saka)**

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Second Session)



(Vol. VI contains Nos. 31-40)

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

Price : Rs. 1.00

CONTENTS

No. 40—Saturday, July 15, 1967/Asadhu 24, 1889 (Saha)

COLUMNS

Re. Adjournment Motions and Calling Attention Notice (<i>Query</i>)	12045—46
Demands for Grants, 1967-68	12047—12233
Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation.	
Shri Mritunjay Prasad	12047—50
Shrimati Nirlep Kaur	12050—57
Shri Beni Shanker Sharma	12057—63
Shri Chengalraya Naidu	12063—68
Shri Molahu Prasad	12068—71
Shri Satya Narain Singh	12071—75
Shri K. N. Pandey	12075—77
Shri Bramhanandji	12077—79
Shri Ram Gopal Shalwale	12079—82
Shri Mahant Digvijai Nath	12082—86
Shri Latafat Ali Khan	12086—89
Shri Jagjiwan Ram	12092—12123
Ministry of External Affairs.	
Shri M. R. Masani	12127—42
Shri Sant Bux Singh	12142—49
Shri Bal Raj Madhok	12149—68
Shri R. K. Sinha	12168—73
Shri H. N. Mukerjee	12179—91
Shri Manabendra Shah	12191—96
Shri Abdul Ghani Dar'	12196—12214
Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya	12215—19
Shri Bedabrata Barua	12219—23
Shri Prakash Vir Shastri	12223—33
Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance—	
Killing of policemen by Naga Hostiles.	12233—38

LOK SABHA

Saturday, July 15, 1967/Asadha 24,
1889 (Saka).

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

RE. ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS AND
CALLING-ATTENTION NOTICE
(Query)

Mr. Speaker: Shri Mrityunjay Prasad to continue his speech.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Will you kindly indicate at what time you propose to call the Minister?

Mr. Speaker: At 12 O'Clock, the Minister will be called; we will finish it by 1 O'Clock. We will take up the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of External Affairs at 2 O'Clock.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंजर) : हमारे जो स्वयं प्रस्ताव हैं, काम रोकने के प्रस्ताव हैं उनका क्या होगा? कल आपने निर्णय दिया था कि मंत्री महोदय से जानकारी प्राप्त करने के बाद आप फैसला देंगे। आपने किसी भी प्रस्ताव को खत्म नहीं किया है। मैंने आज के आर्डर पेपर पर देखा है कि ध्यानाकर्षण का प्रस्ताव आ गया है।

Mr. Speaker: When I am ready, I will bring it to the House. We are sitting today only for these Demands.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कोरम के लिए हम लोग बैठते हैं। आज हाउस की स्पेशल मीटिंग हो रही है। हम कोरम करते हैं और हम को ही आप

बोलने नहीं देते हैं। हम भी तो अपनी कांफ्रेंस को रिप्रिजेंट करते हैं और हमें भी तो लोगों के बारे में बोलना है।

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): Yesterday, we tabled an adjournment motion on the reported killing of 23 policemen by Naga hostiles. You were pleased to say that you had not dismissed the adjournment motion. Today, we find in the agenda papers that a Call Attention notice has been put at 6 O'Clock. Are we to understand that after the Call Attention Notice the adjournment motion will be taken up or the adjournment motion is going to be taken up just now?

Mr. Speaker: The Call Attention notice has been admitted; the adjournment motion has not been admitted.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): It is a failure on the part of the Government.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : जो ध्यानाकर्षण का प्रस्ताव है उस में जो नाम दिये गये हैं, उन में हमारा नाम नहीं है।

श्री मधु लिमये : असफलता के बारे में कुछ सुनना है। यह डा० राम सुभग सिंह की असफलता है।

संसद्-कार्य तथा संचार मंत्री (डा० राम सुभग सिंह) : नहीं, नहीं।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप नक्सलबाड़ी जा रहे थे, उधर जा रहे थे। कब जा रहे हैं? असफलता आपकी है।

11.02 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS*—

1967-68—Contd.

MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION—Contd.

श्री मृत्युंजय प्रसाद (महाराजगंज) : मैं कल यह कह रहा था कि हमें एक बहुत ही संशुलित प्रोग्राम बनाने के लिए खेती से सम्बन्धित सभी विषयों पर विचार करना होगा। केवल फूड के बारे में ही हमें नहीं सोचना है, उसके साथ साथ फाडर और कैटल का भी विचार करना है। फिर फूड और फाडर की उत्पत्ति को बढ़ाने के लिए फर्टिलाइजर और फर्टिलाइजर को बचाने के लिए फ्यूल और फ्यूल के बाद फाइनेंसिस, इरिगेशन आदि सभी विषयों पर विचार करना होगा।

मेरे पास समय नहीं है कि मैं फर्टिलाइजर के बारे में ज्यादा कह सकूँ। मैं दो ही बातें कहूँगा। पहली बात तो यह है कि ग्रीन मैन्योर की तरफ हमारा ध्यान बहुत कम जा रहा है। इसके बीज हम लगाना चाहते हैं लेकिन वे आसानी से नहीं मिलते हैं। जिस तरह से कैमिकल फर्टिलाइजर सब जगह मिलता है उतनी आसानी से इसके बीज नहीं मिलते हैं। जितना बीज चाहिये उतना बिहार में पैदा भी नहीं होता है। दूसरे राज्यों से हमें बिहार में इसे मंगाना पड़ता है। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि चाहे कोओ-प्रेटिब्ल के जरिये, चाहे किसी और तरह से, जिस तरह घ्राप मुनासिब समझें, ग्रीन मैन्योर के बीज भी घ्राप मुहैया करने की कृपा करें।

जहाँ तक इनमार्गिनिके फर्टिलाइजर का सम्बन्ध है एक बहुत बड़ा सोमं हमारा छूटा जा रहा है। जो स्टील फेक्ट्रीज हैं उन में एक बैसिक स्लैग होता है जो किसी काम नहीं

घाता है। यह लोहे का मल होता है। वह बरबाद चला जाता है। बल्कि उसको फिट्टाना ही बहुत बड़ा सर दर्द है। जमशेदपुर में मैंने देखा है इसका एक पहाड़ बनता चला जा रहा है। उसको चूर कर घ्राप फर्टिलाइजर बनायें तो बहुत बड़ा काम हो जाएगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस घ्राप ध्यान दें।

हमारे देश में घ्राप खास तौर पर उत्तर बिहार में पानी के लिए हमें कभी दुखा नहीं होना चाहिये। बिहार ही क्या बल्कि यों कहिये कि सारे उत्तर भारत में राजस्थान तक हिमालय के पानी से सिंचाई हो सकती है घ्राप इस सारे इलाके को सिंचा जा सकता है। यहाँ पर भूमि के भीतर पानी का अवाह भंडार है। किन्तु जैसे चाहिये वैसे पानी की व्यवस्था नहीं हो पाती है घ्राप इसलिए हमें दुखा होना पड़ता है। दूसरी तरफ हम देखते हैं कि दक्षिण में जहाँ हिमालय से कोई वास्ता नहीं है, वहाँ पानी की व्यवस्था हमारे यहाँ से कहीं अच्छी है। वह इसलिये नहीं है कि उनको प्रकृति ने उत्तर से अधिक पानी दिया है बल्कि इसलिए कि उन्होंने अपने जंगलों को बचा कर रखा है जिस की वजह से पहाड़ों में पानी जमा हो जाता है घ्राप वह पानी रिस रिस कर उनकी नदियों में घाता रहता है घ्राप बांधों के जरिये भी वहाँ पानी का बन्दोबस्त किया जाता है। जहाँ तक बड़े बड़े बांधों का सम्बन्ध है, उन पर बहुत खर्च घाता है, बहुत बड़ा काम होता है बांध बनाना। किन्तु उसके साथ साथ बहुत बड़े बांधों के बारे में दुनिया का अनुभव दस-बीस या पच्चीस-पचास साल से अधिक पुराना नहीं है। आज ही हमें मालूम हो रहा है कि बंधों तक में मिट्टी जम रही है घ्राप धीरे-धीरे सौ बरस बाद या बड़े सौ बरस बाद डर है कि ये बेकार साबित न हो जायें। उस हालत में इन से उतना काम नहीं निकल सकेगा जितना निकलना चाहिये। उल्टे वे बांध

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

ही बहुत बड़ा संकट प्रागे चल कर उपस्थित कर सकते हैं ।

बड़े बड़े बांध धापने बनाने हों तो बनाइये । उस में कोई अगड़ा नहीं है । लेकिन साथ-साथ माइनर इरिगेशन, छोटी सिंचाई योजनाओं पर भी धाप ध्यान दें । उनसे कुछ बिगड़ता नहीं लेकिन बनता बहुत कुछ है । बड़ बांधों के बिगड़ने से बहुत कुछ बिगड़ सकता है लेकिन ऐसी बात छोटी सिंचाई योजनाओं के बारे में नहीं कही जा सकती है । इसके बारे में अमरीका का उदाहरण अभी संदग्ध ही मानना चाहिये क्योंकि आखिर टैनेसी वैली को बने हुए कितना जमाना हुआ है । बड़े बांधों में मिट्टी फंस जाने पर प्रागे चल कर हमें बहुत अधिक दिक्कत हो सकती है । जो हम पैदा करते हैं उसका संरक्षण भी करने की बहुत आवश्यकता है । इसके बारे में हमें कई तरह की तकलीफें होती हैं । चूहे अनाज खा जाते हैं, बरबाद करते हैं, चिड़ियां बरबाद करती हैं । इस वास्ते चूहों आदि को मारने के अभियान चलते हैं । मैं चाहता हूँ कि चीन ने जो चिड़ियां मारने का अभियान चलाया था उसकी नकल हम न करें । चिड़ियां अगर अन्न खाती हैं तो कीड़े भी खाती हैं और वे कीड़े जो फसल को नुकसान पहुंचाते हैं । इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि प्रकृति द्वारा जो संतुला स्थापित किया गया है उसको बिगाड़ने से पहले खूब उस पर सोच विचार कर लिया जाए । अगर ऐसा नहीं किया गया तो हो सकता है कि आज थोड़ा लाभ मालूम देता हो लेकिन बाद में बहुत सम्भव है कि प्रागे चल कर बहुत अंशत भी पैदा हो जाए । यह एक ऐसी चीज है जिस के बारे में बहुत सोच विचार कर चलने की आवश्यकता है ।

अब मैं एक और महत्व की बात की और आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ । आपके यहां रिसर्च का बहुत अच्छा काम हुआ है । बीज एक से एक अच्छे निकले हैं । ऐसे निकले हैं

जिन से पैदावार चार गुना और तीन गुना हो जाती है । लेकिन फिर भी टोटल पैदावार में ऐसी बढ़ती देखने में नहीं आती है । इसका क्या कारण है । इसके कारण और चाहे जो हों लेकिन मेरे खयाल से एक बहुत बड़ा कारण यह है कि हम ने सभी अपने सरकारी फार्म्स में दोनों चीजें मिला दी हैं । हमने एक्सपेरिमेंटल फार्म और माडल फार्म दोनों को एक साथ कर लिया है । एक्सपेरिमेंटल फार्म पर हम चाहे जितना खर्च करें, क्योंकि उनमें एक्सपेरिमेंट करके नई नई चीजें प्राप्त को निकालनी है लेकिन जो माडल फार्म हैं, जो डेमंस्ट्रेशन फार्म हैं उनका लाभ तभी किसानों को मिलेगा जब वे खुद ऐसा कर दिखायेंगे कि वे स्वावलम्बी हैं । प्राप्त अच्छी से अच्छी जमीन इनके लिए लेते हैं, अच्छे से अच्छे बैल लेते हैं, ट्रैक्टर का बन्दोबस्त करते हैं, अच्छे से अच्छा बीज लेते हैं, खाद की आपके पास कमी नहीं होती है, पानी की कमी नहीं होती लेकिन फिर भी आप उन में स्वावलम्बी नहीं हो पाते हैं । ऐसी हालत में कौन उनकी नकल करेगा, कौन सीखेगा आप से ।

Shrimati Nirlep Kaur (Sangrur):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, one month before the elections, the Cabinet announced their food policy and said that by 1970-71 the country would be self-sufficient in food. Similar announcements have been made by all the previous Ministers also. But the result is that as compared with 4 million tonnes before, now we have started importing 10 million tonnes of foodgrains. So, it is obvious that the food policy that Government have been announcing has been an utter failure. But somehow, Government have got the attitude that they should always defend this policy. Before I proceed to deal with the food policy, I would like to say that from my observation, here in the House for the last two months, I feel that the prime thought in their mind seems to be that whenever they come and sit here, they have more or less decided to oppose

[Shrimati Nirlep Kaur]

us and to oppose every suggestion from the Opposition, and to defend themselves irrespective of whether their policies have been a failure or not. Every Minister who has got up has got up to defend the policy of Government up to the last. For instance, the other day, we saw the Minister of State trying to defend block development which I feel and which every section of this House and which every party in this House feels has been a complete failure in the country; even the majority of the Congress people feel that it has been a complete failure. Even the Ministers, just before resigning from their posts or after leaving their office come to hold the same opinion. But somehow when they are in office, they feel that they have to defend it. This is a very wrong attitude.

ख़ास तया कृषि मंत्री (श्री जगजोवन राव) : आप को मौका मिले तो आप मत कीजिएगा वह ।

Shrimati Nirlep Kaur: That is a very wrong attitude. After all, we also belong to the same country and we are also trying to put forward suggestions and programmes to better the lot of our own people. If Government feel that if they listen to the Opposition they are going to lose or it is a defeat for them, then I would submit that it is a very wrong attitude because actually it is they who will get the credit and not the Opposition, if they implement those suggestions.

As a result of land reforms, uneconomic holdings have come into existence. Formerly, there was an economic unit in which one could afford to invest. But that unit has been destroyed completely. In the past, we had certain units in which we could invest in the form of mechanisation, fertilisers, irrigation and so on. But those economic units have been destroyed by our Government and the new small units cannot function successfully unless they resort to intensive farming and intensive farming cannot be done without mechanisation, and mechanisation is

not possible in the case of these small uneconomic units. Still, we find that there is further fragmentation which is going on in our land. This way I do not think that we shall be able to solve our food problem.

I have one suggestion to make to stop further fragmentation. If a father has got four sons, after the death of the father, one son should get the holding of 30 acres or 15 acres or whatever extent is considered as the economic unit.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri Annasahib Shinde): What about the daughters?

Shrimati Nirlep Kaur: The other sons should be given their share at the market value and the banks should forward that money to them. This is just a suggestion which I am giving. You can always further improve upon it. The maximum which a person can hold can be given to one son after the father dies. One son can decide to take the complete unit so that there is no further fragmentation. The bank should give the market value to the other three sons so that they could either buy more land with that money or do business or invest it as they like. The son who has taken the unit.

Shri Annasahib Shinde: What about the daughters?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Let them have a sense of chivalry. Let them not interrupt.

Shrimati Nirlep Kaur: The brother who has got the unit should be able to pay back the balance in ten years or fifteen years. This period can be decided upon when the policy is finalised.

Another suggestion is that the tenant may be given proprietary right so that he can have at his disposal security for loans. A farmer or tenant holding one or two acres cannot get any loan from anywhere because they are told there is not enough security for loan, mortgage, sale and transfer of tenancy.

Many members over here cite the example of Japan. Many people who go abroad and study conditions there also give a report about those things saying that the production and yield is the highest there where the holdings are small. Japan is usually the example cited. But they fail to see the project as a whole. They only see the production side. They do not see the facilities that the Government gives to the small holdings. The prime factor in Japan is that an agricultural family consists only of one third of the members thereof, the other two-thirds going and working in industry. These two-thirds come back and re-invest their money in the land. On the other hand, here it is just the opposite.

Then there are different prices over there. There are two types of prices. For the farmer, there is an incentive price and for the consumer there is a subsidised price. Then again, machinery, fertiliser, pesticides, electricity—all these are very cheap in Japan. The farmer is richer there. The commodities that he has to purchase cost one third or one half of what his counterpart here, the poor farmer, has to pay. All the requirements of the farmer in that country are available to him practically at his door-steps. The crops are insured. We have no crop insurance in our country. Transportation poses no problem for the farmer in Japan because he delivers his goods practically in his own village where there is a society to take over all his crops. Then again, credit is available to the farmers easily there. All these facilities are given. If all these facilities are given only then can the farmer produce enough or be self-sufficient on those small units.

There is another policy that was followed, namely, that you take the land and give it to the landless. I feel that this was a major folly. If the land was given to the tenants, to the small farmers or agricultural labour who were agriculturists, it was understandable. But to give it to those people who have no idea about cultivation, whose profession was not farming or cultivation and

who do not have the requisite know-how or interest or the capacity to endure the hardships involved in agricultural operations, cannot be said to be a wise policy. I observe that in villages in many cases what happened was that having got the land they just wait for the period when they could resell the land often-times to the very person from whom it was bought or from whom that land was snatched to be given to the landless. The landless people also were not sitting idle. They had very good professions of their own such as piggyery, poultry, leather work and so on for which there is a tremendous scope in our country. Government should have helped them to establish these into small and large industries. The products of these industries have a big scope in our country. The Army could be one of their big customers. If there be any conflict, a serious problem would arise as to how to supply enough food to the Army. By helping them to develop these professions, the right persons would have been on the right jobs and the results would have been much better. Also there is another very important factor: the pressure on land would have decreased.

In the opinion of very many people, the Indian agriculturist is backward and has no idea about agriculture and needs to be educated. Every type of person in this country would give long sermons to the poor agriculturist as to what he should do and what he should not do to promote agriculture. But all these people turn a deaf ear to the demands of the agriculturist, his cry about what he requires. Let this be clear to everyone that among the men who do not have a clue to agriculture are the members of the Planning Commission. Probably the individual who is most vague about the dire needs of the agriculturist is the Agriculture Minister himself. Eventually the food problem will be solved only by the food producer and not by the planners or the executive or the politicians. They have failed. Twenty years' time is enough to try out their experiments. Let us radically

[Shrimati Nirlep Kaur]

change our attitude towards the farmer and give him his due respect. I think it is better if we go to the farmer with our problems than running to all the foreign countries and give him whatever he requires to solve the problem. Government should solemnly fulfil his requirements and give this priority over everything else. You feed the farmer and the farmer will feed you, instead of giving him all your planning and policies. Incidentally, I was in California and there is one Kaku Singh, from Patiala there. He has been there for the last so many years. He is uneducated and can barely sign his name. But he was mostly responsible for Mr. Saund's election to the American Congress. This Kaku Singh has got lands adjoining Berkeley University. The Berkeley University students conduct research and they evolve improved methods to produce more cotton. Kaku Singh has a keen eye and with his experience he just goes and sees what they are doing and he adopts the same practice. It is always Kaku Singh who produces more in a competition, not the Berkeley University. If our farmers can compete so in America or can do well in Canada, one cannot think that the farmer here does not know his job. It is he who knows his job but others will not let him do his job; they will not give him his requirements. Instead, he gets controls, and blocks—I will not say block development,—and zones. This is not what the farmer wants. I am not representing any party or group in saying this; I am stressing only the farmer's point of view. In Punjab, due to the single zone system, the farmer has lost Rs. 25 crores. I do not want to go into details but this is his loss. Government should adopt the attitude of being suppliers to the farmers. They do not want all the other things.

One word about irrigation. Today the figures show that 20 per cent of the land is irrigated; this is after 20 years of independence. Exclude the area which was irrigated by canals before independence and exclude the area irrigated by tubewells by the in-

dividual farmers. The insignificant remaining part is the accomplishment in the field of irrigation by the Government—I will not say incompetent Government—after 15 years of heavy taxation. As the saying goes, they do not build castles in the air but they build canals in the air. Real planning means something like what has been achieved by Israel—to have green pastures in the midst of deserts. But our planners here say that our planning largely depends on the extent of rainfall. However, in my understanding of planning, after twenty years of planning irrigation programmes, our economy should be free from the consequences of good and bad rainfall. If our entire planning depends on the monsoon, then, Planning Commission is unnecessary and is a heavy burden on the exchequer. We talk of the hybrid seeds, and in that connection, I would put forward another suggestion before the House. With Indian hybrid seeds, the best system of irrigation is in the Punjab, but even in Punjab, when we talk of the hybrid seeds, Punjab irrigation can only supply two to three waterings to the crop, while the hybrid system needs six to seven waterings. So, this way, the canals are not sufficient. We have to see that water is there. If we want to introduce this new system of seeds, then, for this, there is a suggestion, namely, that the Government should go in for putting up tubewells on a large scale. If we take one unit of 10 lakh acres, we need about 20,000 tubewells of 4" delivery. The cost of this will be Rs. 15,000 per tubewell, and the total of 20,000 tubewells will cost approximately Rs. 30 crores. With the addition of these tubewells, there will be a minimum increase of two tonnes per acre, of additional yield of grain, such as wheat, bajra, etc. This will amount to a total of two million tonnes. At the present rate of Rs. 30 per maund, it will come to Rs. 150 crores. This way, it will save the land from water-logging and we will get much more food.

Now, I come to the last point, and 16 about fertilisers. In India, the use

of nitrogen fertiliser per acre is 2.42, and when we take another country which we generally take for purposes of comparison, say, Japan, the use of nitrogen fertiliser per acre is 103.42 in Japan. So, naturally, the results have to be different. We must pay special attention to fertilisers.

As the other hon. Members yesterday have been suggesting—I would not repeat them—we should make use of organic fertilisers, trees, weeds, everything that we can get hold of. It is high time that we gave the farmer his due and recognised him as the backbone of industry and fighting force and stopped treating him as the underdog. I am absolutely confident that if you supply him with the fertilisers, water, pesticides, credit, storage and tractors and keep your nose out of his business, he will fill your belly and come to your rescue and restore to us much of the self-respect which we have lost in this world.

Mr. Speaker: Shri B. S. Sharma. I would just like to inform the House that all parties have got just five to 10 minutes each except Jan Sangh which has about 7 to 12 minutes. If each Member takes not more than 10 minutes, we will be able to have some more Members who can speak.

Shri Benj Shankar Sharma (Banka): We have 18 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: 15 minutes. If you take not more than 10 minutes, I will be able to call some other hon. Members also. The other parties have five minutes each, SSP, Communist (Marxist) etc. If you confine yourself to 10 minutes, I can call one or two from this side also. The Congress party has got 40 minutes, but the Minister needs at least 40 minutes.

Shri Mahant Digvijai Nath (Gorakhpur): I want some time.

Mr. Speaker: Let me see; after giving the entitled time to the other parties, let me see.

Shri Mahant Digvijai Nath: I belong to all parties.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Please give me a chance.

Mr. Speaker: Let me see; I have 30 names before me!

श्री बेर्ण/शंकर शर्मा : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, तीन दिन पहले हमारे खाद्य-राज्य मंत्री माननीय अन्नासाहब शिन्दे ने डिबेट में इन्टरवीन करते हुए कहा था कि भूमि रक्षण और जंगल लगाने में, सायल कन्जर्वेशन एन्ड एफोरेस्टेशन में केवल केन्द्रीय योजना के अन्तर्गत 10 मिलियन एकड़ जमीन लाई गई है और 7 मिलियन एकड़ जमीन राज्य योजनाओं के अन्तर्गत इस प्रकार करीब-करीब 17 मिलियन एकड़ जमीन में जंगल लगाये गये हैं। किन्तु यदि भारतवर्ष में इतनी जमीन पर जंगल लग गये होते तो शायद बे आफ बंगाल और घेरेबियन सागर के सारे बादल हमारे यहां आ जायेंगे और हम को पानी की कमी नहीं होगी।

इसी प्रकार हमारे उप खाद्य मंत्री श्रीगुरु-पदस्वामी जी ने भी कहा है कि उनके विभाग के द्वारा करीब करीब 4 लाख 42 हजार कुंए देश में खुदवाये गये हैं। लेकिन हमें मालूम हुआ है कि उनमें पानी नहीं है। बिहार के हिस्से में करीब करीब 2 लाख कुंए आये थे, लेकिन उन में पानी नहीं रहा और लोगों को दस-दस बीस-बीस मील दूर से पानी लाना पड़ा।

अब जो मेरे कट-मोशनस हैं चीनी के उत्पादन और वितरण के सम्बन्ध में उन के बारे में दो चार बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। आज जिस तरह से चीनी का अकाल पड़ा हुआ है वह हमें मालूम ही है। आज चीनी 5 और 6 ६० कीलो पर भी नहीं मिल रही है। इस का कारण यह है कि जहां गत वर्ष यानी

[श्री वेणीशंकर शर्मा]

1965-66 में 35 लाख टन चीनी की पैदावार हुई थी वहां 1966-67 में केवल 22 लाख टन हुई। फलस्वरूप जहां 1965-68 में सरकार भ्रवाई लाख टन चीनी प्रति मास सरकार रिलीज करती थी। वहां 1966-67 में वह करीब डेढ़ लाख टन ही प्रति मास रिलीज कर पा रही है। यानी लोगों को 1 लाख टन चीनी प्रति मास कम दी जा रही है। जब सरकार 2½ लाख टन रिलीज करती थी तब भी कुछ चीनी ब्लैक में जरूर जाती थी लेकिन उस चीनी का दाम घाठ घाने से ज्यादा ऊपर नहीं जाता था। किन्तु अब वितरण में 1 लाख टन की कमी हो जाने से ब्लैक का दाम 4 रु० से ले कर 6 रु० तक हो गया है।

हमारे सामने सवाल यह है कि आखिर ऐसा क्यों हुआ। गत वर्ष सूखे की वजह से तथा गन्ना बोने वाले किसानों से कम दामों पर गन्ना मिलों को देने की वजह से मिलों को पूरा गन्ना नहीं मिल पाया। यह एक ऐसा विश्वास सर्किल है जिस का कोई भ्रन्त नहीं है। इस लिये जितनी कंट्रोल में कड़ाई की जाती है उतने ही ब्लैक के दाम बढ़ते जाते हैं। सब से पहले कंट्रोल सन् 1942 में लगाया गया था और फिर 1947 में उठाया गया था। जहां 1942 में 11.70 लाख टन चीनी पैदा होती थी वहां 1945 में वह 9 लाख 50 हजार टन हो गई। इन आंकड़ों का इतिहास बड़ा दिलचस्प है। अगर आप उन्हें देखें तो आप को वह अपनी ऐसी कहानी सुनायेंगे जिस से आप बहुत कुछ सीख सकते हैं। आप देखेंगे कि जब तक कंट्रोल टाँ है तब तक ब्लैक के दाम बढ़ते गये हैं और ज्यों ही डिक्ट्रोल हुआ ब्लैक के दाम कम हो गये हैं। लोगों को सस्ते दामों पर चीजें मिलती रही हैं।

हमारे देश में चीनी की पैदावार काफी अच्छी हो सकती है। समूचे देश में 202 बीनी मिलें हैं तथा उन का टारगेट 33 लाख

टन चीनी का है जैसे जैसे हम आगे बढ़ते गये हमारा उत्पादन कैंसा हुआ इसको आप देखिये। हमने 1965-66 में 35.27 लाख टन चीनी पैदा की लेकिन 1966-67 में वह केवल 22 लाख टन हुई। परन्तु गन्ना बोने वालों को हम दे रहे हैं केवल 2 रु० प्रति मन। 1963 में गन्ने का दाम फिक्स किया गया था 2 रु० प्रति मन। लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि 1963 के बाद 1967 में कितना परिवर्तन हो गया है भ्रन्त के दामों में तथा और बस्तुओं के दामों में। जहां उस वक्त चावल 1 रु० कीलो मिल जाता था वहां अब 2½ रु० कीलो भी नहीं मिलता है। और सारी चीजों के दाम बढ़ गये हैं लेकिन गन्ने के दाम नहीं बढ़ाये गये हैं। इस का नतीजा यह हुआ है कि गन्ना बोने वाले किसानों को मिलों को गन्ना देने में घाटा होता है। गवर्नमेंट गन्ने के दाम मिलों को बढ़ाने नहीं देती। बहुत कुछ कहने पर उस के दाम को 2 रु० 12 पैसे किया गया। नतीजा वह हुआ कि गुड़ और खंडसारी के दाम भी बढ़ने लगे। 1 अगस्त, 1966 को जहां गुड़ का दाम 60 पैसे किलो था वहां अब वह 2 और 2½ रु० किलो हो गया है। खंडसारी का दाम जहां सवा रु० था अब वह 4 और 5 रु० कीलो हो गया है। यह सब इस लिये हो रहा है कि गन्ना बोने वाले जो किसान हैं वह मिलों को गन्ना न दे कर गुड़ बालों और खंडसारी बनाने वालों को देते हैं। अगर कंट्रोल जारी रहा तो गन्ने के दाम बढ़ जायेंगे ऐसा कहना मुश्किल है। मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि बहुत सी जाइयों पर गुड़ और खंडसारी वाले लोगों ने गन्ने के सीदे कर लिये हैं और वह 6 रु० तक उस के दाम देते हैं। अब आप ही बतलाइये कि जिस को अपने गन्ने का दाम 6 रु० मन मिलता है यह किस तरह से मिलों को 2 रु० 12 पैसे मन पर बेच सकते हैं। किसान कोई दधीचि की सन्तान नहीं है कि अपनी हड्डी पसली दे कर गन्ना देया चीनी के लिये।

प्रश्न यह है कि करना क्या चाहिये । लोग ऐसा कह सकते हैं कि चीनी की आवश्यकता क्या है । गुड़ खाओ लेकिन गुड़ के दाम भी तो उतने ही आगे बढ़ गये हैं और खंडरारी भी उतनी ही मंहगी हो गई है । आधा देश की 70 फीसदी जनता, जो गांवों में रहती है, गुड़ खाती है । लेकिन आज वह जिस गुड़ पर निर्भर है वह गुड़ भी इतना मंहगा हो गया है कि उन के जीवन में जो थोड़ी सी मिठास भी वह भी छिन गई है ।

कंट्रोल रहने से फायदा किस को होता है यह मैं बाद में बतलाऊंगा, लेकिन नुक्सान किस को हो रहा है यह मैं पहले बतलाना चाहता हूँ । आज महीने में सरकार 1 लाख टन कम चीनी रिलीज करती है । चीनी पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी 370 रु० प्रति टन के हिसाब से है और 1 लाख टन चीनी पर साल में करीब 45 करोड़ रु० का नुक्सान हो जाता है । यह तो गवर्नमेंट की एक्साइज ड्यूटी का नुक्सान हुआ । अगर मिलें बराबर चलती जायें तो आज के लागत मूल्य के हिसाब से उन में करीब 500 करोड़ रु० की पूंजी लगनी चाहिये और उस के वितरण के हिसाब से कम से कम 60 करोड़ रु० का रिटर्न होना चाहिये । इस पर मंत्री महोदय को 25 से 30 करोड़ रु० कम मिलना चाहिये वह नहीं मिल रहा है और जो मजदूर हैं उन को काम नहीं मिल रहा है । हमारे किसानों को जो 2 रु० प्रति मन के हिसाब से 2½ लाख मन देना होगा उस गन्ने पर उन्हें भी नुक्सान हो रहा है । जो चीनी विदेशों को जाती है उस के फारेन एक्सचेन्ज का नुक्सान हो रहा है ।

फायदा किस का हो रहा है यह भी मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ । आज सब से बड़ा फायदा हमारे डिस्ट्रिब्यूटर्स को हो रहा है जो हमारे डाइरेक्टोरेट द्वारा नियुक्त किये जाते हैं । आप थोड़ा सा हिसाब लगा कर देखिये कि शुगर डिस्ट्रिब्यूटर्स और जो उन को

अपवाइंट करने वाले आफिसर्स हैं उन के पास कितना जाता है । जैसा मैंने बतलाया 1 लाख टन चीनी कम रिलीज की जाती है डेढ़ लाख टन हम दे रहे हैं, इस से वह धूम धाम कर वापस शहरों में आ जाती है और ब्लैक में 5 और 6 रु० किलो बिकती है । यह ब्लैक का कुछ पैसा डिस्ट्रिब्यूटर्स को मिलता है और कुछ अपफर्सों के पास भी जाता है । यह पैसा उन हाथों में जाता है जिन को उस के पाने का कोई हक नहीं है । मैंने इस का थोड़ा सा हिस्सा लगाया है । हम देखते हैं कि करीब-करीब 60 करोड़ रुपया इस तरह से ब्लैक का डिस्ट्रिब्यूटर्स और आफिसर्स के पास जाता है ।

मुझे उस दिन बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ जब डा० लोहिया ने दस वर्ष पुराने आकॅलाजिक डिपार्टमेंट के फिगर्स को यहां रख कर कहा कि देश में 200 करोड़ रुपया ब्लैक मनी है और पूछा कि उस के ऊपर टैक्स क्यों नहीं लिया जाता । रोज लोग ब्लैक मनी पैदा कर रहे हैं इस पर टैक्स ले तो कैसे लें? मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि ऐसी कोई चीज है जो इस को रोक सके । चीनी में ब्लैक मार्केट को रोकने का एक ही उपाय है कि जितनी जल्दी हो सके चीनी को डिक्ट्रोल किया जाये । सब से बड़ी आवश्यकता इस के लिये यह है कि आप गन्ना बोने वालों और मिल मालिकों को स्वतन्त्र छोड़ दें जिस से वह गन्ने का दाम अपने हिसाब से ले सकें । गन्ने का दाम बढ़ाना बहुत जरूरी है । यह किसानों और मजदूरों के अस्तित्व की बात है । आज किसानों और मजदूरों की हालत क्या है ? किसानों का नुक्सान हो रहा है और मजदूरों को काम नहीं मिलता । यह कंट्रोल किस के फायदे के लिये लगाया गया है यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता । यह न प्रोप्रर्स के फायदे के लिये है और न कंज्यूमर्स के लिये है । इससे न मिल-प्रोनेर्स का फायदा है और न सरकार का फायदा है ।

[श्री बेणीशंकर शर्मा]

अतएव समय का तकाजा है कि हम जल्दी से जल्दी चीनी का कंट्रोल हटाएँ। चीनी कोई ऐसी आवश्यक वस्तु भी नहीं है कि जिसके बगैर रहा न जा सके। अनाज पर कंट्रोल की तुक को थोड़ी देर के लिए समाप्त जा सकता है लेकिन चीनी पर कंट्रोल को क्या तुक है। मैं अनाज के कंट्रोल का पक्षपाती नहीं हूँ। मैं अनाज के मुक्त व्यापार का पक्षपाती हूँ। जहाँ तक जोनल सिस्टम का सम्बन्ध है वह कभी नहीं रहना चाहिये, चीनी पर से कंट्रोल अखिलम्ब उठ जाना चाहिये। चीनी की बनी हुई मिठाई जिस को खानी होगी डिक्ट्रोल के बाद वह जिस भाव पर भी मिलेगी वह खा सकता है। फिर अगर आप किसी कारण पूरा कंट्रोल नहीं हटा सकते हैं तो मैं तो कहूँगा कि सरकार को पार्शल डिक्ट्रोल तो अवश्य ही तुरन्त कर देना चाहिये।

श्री ब्रह्मानन्दजी (हमीरपुर) : जो माननीय सदस्य लिख कर लाते हैं और उसको पढ़ते हैं उनको अपना निज का अनुभव नहीं होता है। जो बिला लिखे बात करें, उनको आपकी समय देना चाहिये।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरमपुर) : स्वामी जी ठीक कह रहे हैं।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Chengalraya Naidu.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu (Chittoor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad to hear the announcement made by the hon. Minister that they will be self-sufficient by 1971 or 1972. I think, the Minister has made the announcement on the basis of the Plan. I do not know whether he has got confidence that he will see to it that food is produced in sufficient quantity by 1971. We are very good at planning but we are very bad at implementing. Our planners sit in cool rooms and they plan very well. But it is our Ministers who have to execute the Plan and they are not able to do it for want of funds. If the Agriculture Minister is

to be successful, the Finance Minister should cooperate with him. I do not know to what extent the Finance Minister is going to cooperate with the Agriculture Ministry in keeping up their promise to be self-sufficient in food by 1971.

We are able to enter into a contract for the import of rice only for 3½ lakh tonnes this year from 12 countries all over the world at a cost of Rs. 1200 per tonne. They have to pay in hard currency. The American people are giving only wheat; they are not able to give rice. So, we have to pay in foreign exchange to import this rice. We have to pay also about Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 per tonne on transport charges and also on insurance. On the whole, it comes to Rs. 1500 per tonne of rice.

Andhra is giving about 6 lakh tonnes of rice for Kerala, Mysore and Maharashtra at the rate of Rs. 500 to Rs. 600 per tonne. When Andhra is able to supply at a cheaper rate and there is no foreign exchange involved, when Andhra is ready to produce more foodgrains to meet the demand, the Central Government is not coming forward to help Andhra Government to complete their projects. Already, the Nagarjunasagar project is in advanced stage and there is a lot of controversy raised by the people of Maharashtra and Mysore that the river, actually starts from their States. They were not interested to construct dams all these years to store water. They were interested only in investing money in developing industries and in getting more money because they thought that some people will grow food for them and they will get the food easily and they can earn more money and become rich... (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: No interruptions; go ahead.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu: All these years, they were interested in earning more money and starting more and more industries. But in Andhra, our people who are at the helm of

affairs were keen on constructing projects to grow more food in the interest of the country. . . . (Interruption).

Projects are sanctioned. The height of Nagarjunasagar is 572 ft. or so. It was sanctioned about 15 years back. Your people are creating troubles. (Interruptions) I am not yielding.

It is not our mistake if the Engineer does not provide the gates to allow water for cultivation. Now, the people from Maharashtra and Mysore ask: why are we providing the gates. You want the project to be washed off? You want the water to be stocked and you do not want to leave water for irrigation. I cannot understand these people's agitation.

Actually, the river, Godavari, starts in Maharashtra; at Nasik, it is a small stream. When it comes here from M.P., some more rivers have joined it; in Andhra also some river join. So, when it comes here, it is a big thing.

Mr. Speaker: He has forgotten Orissa.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu: From Orissa also some river comes. So, when it comes to Andhra Pradesh, it is a very wide one and people think that the entire water comes from Maharashtra. I am very sorry for it. In Maharashtra, the Godavari flows in a small stream and is not wide. If they want to construct any number of projects, Andhra will not come in their way. They can have their projects; they can construct any number of projects; they can stock any amount of water; we are not objecting. We want them also to grow more food. The water is going to the sea and if we construct a project and want to grow more food, then there is this trouble. This attitude is not good. We send so much of rice to Maharashtra. We want these people to be grateful to us. (Interruptions) We are importing wheat from Americans and the Americans want us to be grateful to

them. Likewise, Maharashtrians and Mysorians should be grateful to us. They should not agitate like this. Mysore, Maharashtra and Kerala want us to send them food for their survival. The Kerala people want us to grow more food. Why don't these people also ask us like that?

Mr. Speaker: He has made an important point!

Shri Jagjivan Ram: These are very important points.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu: We are bringing lakhs of acres every year under cultivation and we are growing more food. Actually, if you take into consideration the position about 10 or 15 years back, you will find that we have reached the targets and we are producing more food. But at the same time, we are exceeding the targets in producing children. There is so much of increase in population. I only sympathise with the Minister of Food and Agriculture; he is not able to meet the demand for food as we are producing more children. We have got a Family Planning Minister. (Interruptions) He wants us to plan our families. We have introduced so many legislations. Previously, a Hindu could have any number of wives and could produce any number of children, but now we have controlled it; now a Hindu can have only one wife and can produce only a few children. The Family Planning Minister is asking them to produce only two children. But in the case of Muslims—I am sorry, they should not take it amiss; I am saying this only in the interest of the country—they can have four wives; according to Kuran they can have four wives. The new converts always want to prove themselves to be more faithful to the religion and so they talk much of the new religion. Like that, our Government want to be more loyal and faithful to the Muslims and they have not done anything so far in this regard. In the Government, all officers, whether they are Muslims or anybody, should take the permission of the Government, if they want to have another

[Shri Chengalraya Naidu]

marriage. There, the religion has not come in the way. Here also, they can do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the hon. Member should try to conclude.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu: I have hardly commenced my speech . . .

Mr. Speaker: I want to give opportunity to at least one more Congress Member. I have taken this time from the time allotted to the hon. Minister, so that one or two more Members can speak.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu: The Food and Agriculture Ministry is also in charge of minor irrigation. But the amount that they have budgeted for minor irrigation is not enough, if they really want the country to be self-sufficient by 1971 or 1972. If they are going to spend such small amounts on minor irrigation, I do not think that we can be self-sufficient by that time. The hon. Ministers have announced this target in this House and they have to stick to it. Otherwise, the Minister in charge of Agriculture will not be there and along with them; the hon. Ministers of State will also have to go. So, the Ministers of State must show more interest and take more interest in minor irrigation.

When funds are sanctioned for minor irrigation, they must see that the money is invested in those places where there will be quick and good return. In the south, there are a number of people who cultivate three crops in a year. In some places, the people cultivate only two crops and in some other places, they cultivate only one crop. When the money sanctioned for minor irrigation is invested on it, we must see to it that it is invested in those States where there is cultivation of three crops or two crops. In the south, for instance, in Madras or Andhra Pradesh or Mysore, three crops or two crops are grown in a year. I would request Government to spend more money on minor irrigation in those areas.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the hon. Member should conclude. Shri Molahur Prasad. I shall be very strict in regard to the time. He can take only five minutes. There are some Members belonging to some other parties also who have to be called. They will also have only about five minutes each.

श्री मोलहूर प्रसाद (बांसगांव) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कृषि के मामले पर मुझे बोलने का अवसर मिला है। मंत्री जी को मैं धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि यहां समाजवाद की बात कई दिन से मैं सुन रहा हूँ लेकिन कामराज योजना के अन्दर जिस वक्त खाद्य मंत्री निकाल दिए गए थे उस वक्त इन्होंने गोरखपुर में जाकर एक भाषण दिया था कि अगर लोक सभा में समाजवाद का प्रस्ताव पास हो जाता तो उस दिन कितने सिर सड़कों पर लुढ़कते नजर आते।

श्री जगजीवन राम : निकलने के बाद आप के यहां मैं नहीं गया था। आप की स्मरण शक्ति बड़ी क्षीण हो गई है।

श्री मोलहूर प्रसाद : आप का भाषण मैंने सुना था, इसलिए आप की ही बात मैंने सुना दी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, दुनिया का पिछड़ा हुआ महाद्वीप एशिया, एशिया का पिछड़ा हुआ मुल्क भारत, भारत का पिछड़ा हुआ प्रदेश उत्तर प्रदेश, उत्तर प्रदेश का पिछड़ा हुआ भाग पूर्वी बंगाल, पूर्वी भाग का पिछड़ा हुआ जिला गोरखपुर और वहां की पिछड़ी जाति का अपना नेतृत्व करने के लिए मुझे यहां भेजा है और पिछड़ी जाति के मंत्री से मैं बातचीत करना चाहता हूँ।

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : मैं गोरखपुर में मौजूद था जब हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर बहाने गए थे। मैं मीटिंग में मौजूद था। वैंट वाज दि बैस्ट स्पीच।

श्री मोलहूर प्रसाद : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह समय घेरे समय में नु जोड़ा जाये।

जहां तक उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार का संबंध है दोनों का जुड़ा हुआ मामला है। इसलिए बिहार को जितने सिंचाई के साधन इस साल दिए गए हैं पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश भी उस से कम पिछड़ा हुआ नहीं है और उसी से सटा हुआ है, तो हमारा मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन है कि जितने बिहार के लिए सिंचाई के साधन दिए गए हैं उतने ही सिंचाई के साधन उत्तर प्रदेश को भी देने का कष्ट करेंगे।

इस मुल्क में 82 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन है जिस में 42 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन खेती लायक है। उस में से 34 करोड़ एकड़ पर खेती होती है। 8 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन जो है उस पर खेतिहर पल्टन तैयार कर के अपने साधन द्वारा उस को खेती लायक बना दीजिए। जहां तक चौथी पंच वर्षीय योजना का ताल्लुक है इस के पूरा होने पर 11 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन पर सिंचाई के साधन यह जुटा पायेंगे। 11 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन सिंचित होगी। दो तिहाई जमीन बाकी रह जायेगी सिंचाई से और यह कह रहे हैं कि 1971-72 में हृषभात्म निर्भर हो जायेंगे, यह भी बात प्रसंभव दिखाई दे रही है।

वैसे तो सरकार के सामने बड़े बड़े उद्देश्य पड़े हुए हैं। चीन की सरकार जनसंख्या को बढ़ाकर और बहादुरी के साथ लड़ के मर जाने का उद्देश्य अपना रही है और भारत की सरकार नपुंसक बनाकर नसबन्दी योजना के अन्दर और भूखे मर जाने के लिए विवश कर रही है। तो महोदय, मैं चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान अगर जनसंख्या बढ़ाये तो लड़ के मर जाना अच्छा है। आखिर मरना तो दोनों हालत में है। हम पैदा हुए हैं तो आखिर किसी दिन मरेंगे तो भवश्य ही। हमारी सरकार नसबन्दी योजना के अन्दर नपुंसक बनाकर और भूखे मरने के लिए विवश कर रहा है जबकि मैं कह रहा हूँ कि लड़कर मर जाना अच्छा है।

जहां तक पंचवर्षीय योजना का ताल्लुक है तरक्की करने के लिए चली है। लेकिन

इस योजना का उद्देश्य तो है दिल्ली न्युयार्क बने, बम्बई वाशिंगटन बने, लखनऊ बम्बई बने तब तक उत्तर प्रदेश की क्या हालत होगी? यह योजना आयोग और मिनिस्ट्री खुद सोचे कि यह योजना कहां जा रही है? योजना का मुंह गांव की तरफ नहीं घुमाया जाता क्योंकि यह न्युयार्क की तरफ चल पड़ी है। अब तो झोंपड़ी दिल्ली में भी नहीं दिखाई पड़ेगी कुछ दिन बाद। यह महलों वाले झोंपड़ी वालों को रहने नहीं देंगे। यह योजना कांग्रेस सरकार ने ऐसी बना रखी है कि गांव का विकास हो नहीं सकता। रूरल यूनिवर्सिटी बम्बई में खोली गई है। क्या वहां मिछड़ा हुआ इनाका है? रूरल यूनिवर्सिटी के माने हैं पिछड़े हुए लोगों को ज्ञान देना लेकिन वह बम्बई में खुलेगी, उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में नहीं खुलेगी। क्या खाद्य मंत्री इस तरफ ध्यान देंगे?

उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ, जहां तक उत्तर प्रदेश को केन्द्र से बिजली विकास के लिए पर्याप्त और समुचित सहायता पाने का प्रश्न है पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के प्रारंभ से ही उत्तर प्रदेश का इस बंध में बड़ा दुर्भाग्य रहा है। तीसरी योजनाबंध में बिजली परियोजनाओं पर लगभग 157 करोड़ रुपये व्यय करने और बिजली की स्थापित क्षमता 370 मे० वा० से बढ़ कर 910 मे० वा० हो जाने के बावजूद उत्तर प्रदेश में बिजली की प्रति व्यक्ति खपत देश में सब से कम है। यह विशाल जनसंख्या वाले इस प्रदेश के पिछड़ेपन का खुद नमूना है। बिजली की खपत का अखिल भारतीय औसत वर्ष 1963-64 में 55 यूनिट था जबकि उत्तर प्रदेश का केवल 23 यूनिट। इस की तुलना में यह दिल्ली में अधिकतम 201 यूनिट और इस के बाद प० बंगाल 108 यूनिट, पंजाब 100 यूनिट, पांडचेरी 103 यूनिट, महाराष्ट्र 95 यूनिट मद्रास 76 यूनिट, गुजरात 68 यूनिट, उड़ीसा 65 यूनिट और बिहार में 54 यूनिट है। तीसरी पंच वर्षीय योजना की समाप्ति

[श्री मोलहू प्रसाद]

पर उत्तर प्रदेश में बिजली की प्रति व्यक्ति खपत बढ़ कर लगभग 34 यूनिट है हो गई जो अब भी वर्ष 1963-64 के उक्त प्रखिल भारतीय औसत से बहुत कम है।

उत्तर प्रदेश में बिजली की अधिक खपत करने वाले उपभोक्ताओं जैसे उर्वरक फैक्ट्री गोरखपुर, भारी बिजली के सामान की फैक्ट्री हरिद्वार, एन्टीवायटिक्स श्रृषिकेश, हेवी फैब्रिकेशन वर्क्स नैनी, उर्वरक फैक्ट्री कानपुर, इन सभी की कुल मांग लगभग 400 मे० वा० होगी। चौथी योजना में अन्य बड़े उद्योगों के विकसित होने की संभावना है और इन को भी जोड़कर अनुमान है कि कुल लगभग 704 मे० वा० बिजली की मांग होगी।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि पिछड़ा हुआ प्रदेश होने के कारण इस की आवश्यकताओं के ऊपर ध्यान दिया जाय।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Satya Narain Singh—five minutes.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour): We have 8 minutes to our credit.

Shri Umanath (Kottai): Out of the time allotted to us

Mr. Speaker: It is recorded here by office—just five minutes. Let us not spend more time on this.

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : (वाराणसी)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, योजना के समय ऐसा एलान किया गया था कि जैसे जैसे हमारी योजना पूरी होगी हमारा देश खाद्य के मामले में आत्म निर्भर होता चला जायेगा। आज जैसे जैसे समय बीतता गया हम देखते हैं कि खाद्य संकट आज इतना गहरा और व्यापक हो गया है कि जो कभी भी हमारे देखने में नहीं आया था। हम यह समझते हैं कि

यह जो संकट है यह एकाएक एक दिन में नहीं पदा हुआ बल्कि यह सरकार की लगातार गलत नीतियों का परिणाम है जिस ने मुल्क को इस संकट के कगार पर ला कर खंडा कर दिया है। हम खाद्य और कृषि मंत्री महोदय से यह उम्मीद करते थे, हम यह चाहते थे और जानते थे कि यह जब कभी भी दौरे पर जाते हैं तो जब गरीब समाज में जाते हैं तो इनकी बातें जो भाषण में होती हैं वह सुन कर बहुत प्रसन्नता होती है, वह क्या बातें हैं? हम ने देखा कि 20 साल के अंदर जिन शक्तियों पर हम को भरोसा करना चाहिए था, राष्ट्र की वह महान शक्ति, किसान और मजदूरों की कि जिस को लेकर जमीन के साथ जोड़ने और उत्पादन को आगे बढ़ाने की हम को कोशिश करनी चाहिए थी 20 साल में सरकार ने कोई भी कदम नहीं उठाया और इस सरकार की नीतियों का परिणाम आज यह है कि जो जमीन किसानों के पास थी, वह भी उन के हाथों से निकली जा रही है। एक ऐसा नया वर्ग पैदा हो गया है जो न खेती में काम करता है, बल्कि नौकरी करता है, रोजगार करता है, ऐसे लोगों की बहुत बड़ी तादाद है जो जमानों पर कब्जा जमाये बैठे न खुद करती है और न किसानों को करने देती है, न खेतीहर मजदूरों को उन जमीनों पर काम करने देते हैं, पूरी की पूरी जमीन बेकार पड़ी हुई है।

12 hrs.

हमारा किसान कहता है कि 13 कार्तिक 3 असाढ़ - असाढ़ में खेती तीन दिन में की जानी चाहिए और कार्तिक में बुवाई 13 दिन के अंदर अंदर हो जानी चाहिये। लेकिन ये बड़े बड़े लोग न समय पर बोते हैं, न बीज दे पाते हैं और न पानी दे पाते हैं, इस वजह से जितना बोते हैं उतना हासिल नहीं कर पाते। पुराने जमींदार जो आज

खेतीहर बने हुए हैं, वे कहते हैं कि हम लोग तो केवल जमीन पर कब्जा बनाये रखने के लिये बीज डालते हैं ताकि हमारा कब्जा बना रहे। ऐसी हालत में आप कैसे उम्मीद कर सकते हैं कि वे आपको अच्छी पैदावार देंगे। पूरे देश में ऐसा बहुत बड़ा वर्ग है जो जमीन पर कब्जा कर के बैठा हुआ है। हम आप से निवेदन करना चाहते हैं कि जमादारों के इस बड़े वर्ग से छुटकारा दिलाइए और किसानों के हाथ में जमीन को दीजिये जो अपना शक्ति लगा कर खाद्य के उत्पादन को बढ़ा कर देश की इस महान समस्या को दूर कर सकता है।

दूसरी बात में यह काना चाहता हूँ कि आज जब कोई योजना बनाते हैं तो उसमें किसान का सहयोग प्राप्त नहीं करते इसलिये मैं आप से यह निवेदन करूँगा कि आप कोई ऐसी कृषि योजना, राष्ट्रीय योजना बनायें, जिसमें हिन्दुस्तान के 85 फीसदी गांवों में रहने वाले किसान, खेतीहर मजदूर जुटें। उस शक्ति को जमीन के साथ जोड़ा जाय और उस महान् शक्ति के सहयोग से एक ऐसी भावना पैदा की जाय कि प्रागे प्रागे वालों के सामने एक निसाल बन जाय कि हिन्दुस्तान अपनी पैदावार को बढ़ा सकता है, अपनी खाद्य समस्या को हल कर सकता है। हम इस बात को जानते हैं कि आज जब भी उत्पादन का मवाल पैदा होता है और सरकार की ओर से जो भी मदद बढ़ा जाती है, उसको कुछ मुट्ठी भर लोग छीन लेते हैं, यह मदद उन के घरों में पहुँच जाती है, बेचारे किसान को कुछ भी नहीं मिल पाता है। 85 फीसदी जनता जो खेती का काम करती है, जितको जुट कर इस बोझ में लगना चाहिये, जो वास्तव में देश को रोटी दे सकती है, यह बेकार पड़ी हुई है, उसका तिरस्कार किया जाता है, अपमानित किया जाता है, इन 20 सालों में उसकी हालत पहले से भी ज्यादा गिरी है। हमें इन परिस्थितियों की सम्मति को समझना चाहिये और पूरे देश के लिये एक ऐसी राष्ट्रीय

योजना बनानी चाहिये जिसमें जनता की पूरी शक्ति ला सकें आज जो योजनाएँ हम बनाते हैं, जनता उन योजनाओं के खिलाफ क्यों खड़ी हो जाती है? क्या आपने कभी इस पर गौर किया है। कोई भी योजना जन-सहयोगी के बिना, जनता के समर्थन के बिना पूरी नहीं हो सकती। मुट्ठी भर लूटेरे तो एक तरफ हो जाते हैं और पूरी जनता हमारी योजना के खिलाफ हो जाती है—यह 20 साल का आपका उदाहरण है। इसलिये जनता का समर्थन प्राप्त करने के लिये एक राष्ट्रीय योजना बनाई जाय, जिसमें जनता का समर्थन प्राप्त करके उत्पादन बढ़ाने की कोशिश की जाय और इस तरह से आज देश के सामने जो संकट है उससे निकाला जाय।

सिबाई के लिये जो साधन सरकार की ओर से दिये जाते हैं, बीज और दूसरी चीजों का वितरण जो सरकार की ओर से होता है, वह उनके हाथों में नहीं पहुँचता है, ये सब चीजें किसान के हाथों में पहुँचनी चाहिये ताकि वह उनका ठीक से इस्तमाल कर सके और उन की सहायता से अपने उत्पादन को बढ़ा सके। हमें उम्मीद है कि सरकार इस ओर देखेगी।

इस समय देश के सामने तत्काल संकट फूट का है। सरकार की ओर से किसान से जो गल्ला वसूल किया जाता है—उस मल्ले का वितरण ठीक प्रकार से नहीं होता है। आपके प्राकण्डों से पता चलता है कि 25 एकड़ जोतने वाले से जो प्रतिरिक्त गल्ला लिया जाता है, उसकी वसूली ठीक प्रकार से नहीं हो पाती है। मल्ले का पूरे देश के पैमाने पर ठीक से वसूली किया जाय और फिर ठीक से उस का वितरण हो तो आज जो संकट हमारे देश के सामने है, 24 करोड़ आबादी को जो गल्ला हम दे रहे हैं, हम उसको पूरी तरह से खिला सकते हैं, 24 आउन्स अन्न हम उसको दे सकते हैं—यह बात आपके प्राकण्डों को देखने से पता चलती है।

[श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह]

हमारे यहां जो भ्रष्टाचार फलतः हुआ है उसकी तरफ भी ध्यान देना चाहिए और विचारण को व्यवस्था का ठोक करके गल्ले की बमूली पूरे देश क र्वमाने पर लागू की जानी चाहिये। यदि ऐसा हा सका ता मैं समझता हूं कि खाज ग्रस के मामले में जा हमें दूसरों का मुंह देखना पड़ रहा है, सलो फैला कर खाज हम चूम रहे हैं, इस समस्या पर हम काबू पा सकेंगे। श्रीर देश का इस संकट से विकास कर तेजो से आगे को आर ले जा सकेंगे।

श्री नाबू रान स.हरवार (टोकमगड़) : अध्यक्ष प्रवेश से, अध्यक्ष महोदय, किसी को मौका नहीं मिला है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे मालूम नहीं कि कौन किस स्टेट से बाल रहा है—यह कैसे मालूम होगा।

Shri K. N. Pandey (Padrauna): The issue which I am going to raise is so important that it cannot be covered within five minutes.

Mr. Speaker: You take five minutes to cover this Ministry. About the problem of Labour, you can take more time in that Demand. You know how strict I have been, and so, you should not blame me later on. If you cannot confine your remarks within five minutes, I can give that time to somebody else.

Shri K. N. Pandey: I have tabled a No-Day-Yet-Named motion also.

Mr. Speaker: We will discuss it separately.

Shri K. N. Pandey: Sir, I want to draw your attention to certain facts regarding the sugar industry. Fortunately or unfortunately, two lakh workers are employed in this industry and this industry has got 200 sugar factories which is attached to this Ministry. I am going to give you certain figures from which you can find out how serious the situation is in the sugar industry. For example,

I want to give you comparative figures for 1965-66 and 1966-67. For example, in West Bengal, in 1965-66, the sugar season lasted for 207 days. But in 1966-67, it was only 73 days. Similarly, in North Bihar, in 1965-66, it was 151 days, and in 1966-67, it was 52 days. Thus, in production also, the yield went down. From 35 lakh tonnes, the yield of sugar went down to 22 lakh tonnes last year. This is not the end of the problem. I am very much worried as to what is going to happen next year, because the whole problem lies here, namely, whether the sugar factories are going to get enough cane or not. Last year, the production of sugar by the factories was short because the supply of cane to the factories was very short, since the price of cane was very low, whereas, in comparison, the gur and khandsari people offered a greater price than what the sugar factories could offer. At the same time, it is not within the control of the sugar factories to pay as much as the cultivator demands, because the price of sugar is controlled. The price of sugar is fixed. If they increase the price of cane, the increased price has to be added in the price of sugar. But, if you object to the increase in sugar price, they cannot increase the cane price. The result is that this year the khandsari people are buying the cane from the cultivators at Rs. 12 a quintal. In some cases they have paid even Rs. 6/- a maund. The price you have fixed is Rs. 2.12 a maund of cane. Do you think, under these circumstances, the cultivator is going to give the cane to sugar factories. They are not going to do that.

What will be the result. The result will be that the sugar factories will be closed, the workers will lose their employment and the country will suffer because there will be no sugar at all. There are many people in the country who say that we can import sugar. Sir, those days are gone. We cannot afford to import sugar. Our foreign exchange position is so tight

that we cannot spend our valuable foreign exchange on the import of sugar.

My proposal in this regard is this. There is a demand from the Government of Bihar and also from the Government of Uttar Pradesh that the sugarcane price should be Rs. 4/- a maund. If the price of sugarcane is increased by Government, naturally there will be no justification to deny giving an increase in the prices of other food commodities. For example, there is groundnut and other things. If you increase the prices of these commodities also, the prices of all the finished products will go up. My suggestion, in these circumstances, is that the problem can be solved only if you de-control sugar because then the factories will be in a position to have more sugarcane. The country needs today more white sugar. White sugar can be produced if there is a larger supply of sugarcane and a larger supply of sugarcane is possible only if you increase the price of sugarcane and that can be done only if sugar is de-controlled.

श्री बह्मणन्वजी (हमीरपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज कृषि का विषय चल रहा है और कृषि बिना बैलों के नहीं होती और इस पूरी पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर किसी ने भी गऊ और बैल का नाम नहीं लिया। महात्मा गांधी कहते थे कि अगर बैल नहीं और सड़ाई छिड़ जाये तो क्या ट्रैक्टर से खेती हो पायेगी? आज सब लोग जानते हैं कि बैलों की कमी हो गई है। गाय के बगैर बैल नहीं होते और गाय के बगैर भी नहीं होता। भी के बगैर यज्ञ नहीं होता और यज्ञ के बगैर पानी नहीं बरसता। कहने का मतलब यह है कि गाय का पालन होना चाहिये। मैं बघाई देता हूँ डा० राम सुभग सिंह को कि उनके वहाँ गाय बांधी है। बह्मण साहब ने भी गाय बांधी हुई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि घर घर गायें हों। दिल्ली में लोग कुत्तों को पालते के बजाय गायें बांधें। अमरीका के एक प्रेजिडेंट थे। वहाँ लासा साऊथ राय बने थे। राष्ट्रपति से वह मिलने गये। राष्ट्र-

पति उस वक्त फार्म गये हुए थे। वहाँ वह गये और टाइम लिया। उन्होंने 4 बजे का टाइम दिया। वहाँ वह साढ़े तीन बजे पहुँच गये। उन्होंने सोचा कि बंगले पर मिल में। जब बंगले पर गये तो उन्होंने कहा कि तीन मिनट वहाँ लिया और दो मिनट यहाँ ले ला। तुम को चाहिये कि सड़क की कीमत करो। तुम हिन्दुस्तानी समय की कीमत न जान कर मेरे पास पहुँच गये। आप को समय बरबाद नहीं करना चाहिये। डा० राम सुभग सिंह खूब फड़वा चलाते हैं, कुदाली चलाते हैं। वह इस को जानते हैं। यहाँ पर हर एक आदमी को बोलने का अधिकार नहीं होना चाहिये किसी भी मामले में। वही आदमी बोले जिसके हाथ में घट्टे पड़ गये हों। मैं फड़वा चलाता हूँ। मेरे हाथ में घट्टे पड़ गये हैं। यहाँ पर मैं देखता हूँ कि हर एक आदमी बोलने के लिये खड़ा हो जाता है। यहाँ पर जो पढ़े लिखे आदमी हैं वह अपने हाथ में साबुन लगाते हैं, वह घट्टे की बात नहीं जानते, वह नहीं जानते कि उत्पादन कैसे होता है और कैसे नहीं। जब तक हम स्वयम् श्रम नहीं करेंगे तब तक हम उसके बारे में नहीं जान सकेंगे। आज कोई भी श्रम करने का तैयार नहीं है। एम० ए० बी० ए० पास करके 100 रु० को नौकरी खोजते फिरते हैं। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि बंगले में आधा घंटा फड़वा चलायें तभी असली बात को लोग समझ सकेंगे। चाहे जनसंघ पार्टी हो, चाहे क ई भी दल हो, जब तक हर एक आदमी श्रम नहीं करेगा तब तक खाद्य का उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ सकता है।

सही बात तो यह है कि हमारा बुंदेलखण्ड बीस जिलों को अन्न दे सकता है, अगर तमाम नदियों का पानी, जिन कि गर्मा के दिनों में 11 मील लम्बाई और 11 मील चौड़ाई में भयाह रूप में भरा रहता है, उठाया जाये। मेरा मशीनों में विश्वास नहीं है। मैं तो गांधीवादी आदमी हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि बैलों के द्वारा छोटे छोटे खेतों में हर एक आदमी परिश्रम करे। जिस तरह से जब भयवान सन्तान पैदा करता है तो माता के स्तन में दूध डाल देता है,

[श्री ब्रह्मानन्दजी]

भयवान् के यहां किसी चीज की कमी नहीं है, उसी तरह से हमारी जमीन में किसी चीज की कमी नहीं है। जैसा कुछ मेम्बरों ने कहा, हमारे यहां जमीन नालायकों के हाथ में पड़ गई है, किसानों के हाथ में नहीं रही है जो कि खेती करने वाले हैं। जो मजदूर हैं, किसान हैं, हरिजन हैं, जो कि रात दिन परिश्रम करते हैं, उनको खाने को नहीं मिलता है। यह बात सही है कि राजाओं की बँलियाँ बन्द की जायें, राजाओं की जायदाद ले ली जाय, लेकिन जो पूँजीवाद का फंदा बढ़ता चला जा रहा है, बनियादवाद का फंदा बढ़ता चला जा रहा है, उसको कम करना चाहिये।

श्री राम गोपाल शालवाले (चांदनी चौक) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कृषि मन्त्रालय को कुछ सुझाव देने से पहले मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आज दिल्ली के निवासियों को चावल नहीं मिल रहा है। दिल्ली की जनता का चावल राशन में बन्द किया जा चुका है। इससे पहले एक महीने में कम से कम एक किलो चावल मिलता था एक परिवार को, किन्तु अब वह भी बन्द कर दिया गया है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि दिल्ली में चारों तरफ के लोग इत्राज कराने के लिये आते हैं। यदि उनका कोई डाक्टर खिचड़ी बतलाये और राशन में चावल नहीं मिले तो बतलाइये कि वह खिचड़ी कहां से खायेगा ? गायों के काटे जाने के कारण दूध भी नहीं मिलता, खिचड़ी बनाने के लिये चावल नहीं मिलता। इसके मुकाबले में काश्मीर की जनता को 7 ग्राने और 6 ग्राने किलो के हिसाब से चावल दिया जाता है। वही चावल दिल्ली में 90 पैसे किलो दिया जाता है। यह भेद भाव दिल्ली और काश्मीर की जनता में किया जा रहा है। मैं कृषि मन्त्रालय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा क्यों है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि इस देश में पिछले बीस वर्षों में पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं पर खर्च किया जाने वाला रुपया

खेती पर खर्च किया जाता तो आज हमारे सामने इस प्रकार की विकट घन्न की समस्या न होती। हमारे देश का बहुत ज्यादा रुपया मकानों पर खर्च किया गया है, बागों पर खर्च किया गया है और इस प्रकार की दूसरी चीजों पर खर्च किया गया है। मुझे पता लगा है कि झरकोटल के पास नेहरू गार्डन के नाम पर 5 करोड़ २० की स्कीम है सरकार के सामने और जामा मस्जिद के सामने मौलाना आजाद की यादगार के रूप में एक बड़ा बगीचा बनाया जा रहा है लाखों रुपये खर्च कर के जबकि देश एक एक घन्न के दाने के लिये मोहताज है। पांच पांच सेर चावल के बदले में आज घम परिवर्तन किया जा रहा है और इस देश के शासक केवल यादगारों के नाम पर इस प्रकार की बड़ी बड़ी यादगारें बना कर करोड़ों रुपये खर्च कर रहे हैं। यदि इस देश का पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं का पैसा खेती पर खर्च किया जाता तो मेरा विश्वास है कि आज देश घन्न के मामले में आत्म निर्भर हो गया होता।

भारतवर्ष एक कृषि प्रधान देश है। यहां पर छः लाख गांव हैं और पांच हजार से भी कम नगर हैं। भारतवर्ष का आधार देहात है। देहातों का आधार किसान हैं। किसान का आधार भूमि है। भूमि का आधार बेल है। बेल का आधार गो माता है। लेकिन इस देश में गोहरया हो रही है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1935 में इस देश में 15 करोड़ 90 लाख गायें थीं। 1940 में 13 करोड़ रह गईं। और आज 5 करोड़ 40 लाख गायें देश में बाकी बची हैं जिनमें दूध देने वाली भी हैं और बिना दूध देने वाली भी हैं। आज इस देश में महंगाई बढ़े और शोर से बढ़ रही है। हमें खाने को घन्न नहीं मिलता है। लेकिन फिर भी हम देखते हैं कि आज हमारे खेतों में तम्बाकू बीजा जा रहा है। मैंने इती सदन में एक प्रश्न किया था और उत्तर में मुझे बताया गया था कि केवल आंध्र प्रदेश में दस मिलियन

किलोग्राम तम्बाकू का स्टॉक बचा पड़ा है । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब तम्बाकू का इतना स्टॉक बचा पड़ा है, वह बिक नहीं रहा है, उसके लिए ग्राहकों की आवश्यकता है तो फिर क्यों नहीं तम्बाकू के बोये जाने पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा दिया जाता है । आज ऐसा कोई प्रतिबन्ध नहीं है । मैं जगजीवन राम जी से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि जब तक देश भ्रष्ट के मामले में आत्म निर्भर नहीं हो जाता तब तक इस प्रकार की वस्तुओं के बोये जाने पर हमको प्रतिबन्ध लगा देना चाहिये ।

आप देखें कि आज से लगभग 2200 बरस पहले चन्द्रगुप्त मौर्य के जमाने में घो का भाव बारह आने मन था । एक रुपये का एक मन सवा तेरह सेर मिलता था । अकबर हुमायूँ और जहांगीर के जमाने में गोहत्या पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा था । मुहम्मद तुगलक के जमाने में इसका भाव एक रुपया सात आने मन था । अकबर के जमाने में पाँच रुपये मन था । औरंगजेब के जमाने में इसका भाव मंदा हो कर 1 रुपया का सठ्ठे दस सेर हो गया । इसका कारण यह था कि औरंगजेब के मामा शाइस्ताखाँ ने गोरक्षा पर विशेष ध्यान दिया था । लेकिन आज इस देश में बहुत जोरशोर से गोहत्या जारी है । इस पर प्रतिबन्ध लगना चाहिये । आज हमें गोबर की खाद की बहुत आवश्यकता है । गोबर की खाद अधिक से अधिक हमें मिल सके इसलिए भी यह आवश्यक है कि गोवध पर प्रतिबन्ध लये । मैं यह भी कहूँगा कि गोबर की खाद को देश में प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए गोबर के जलाये जाने पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा दिया जाना चाहिये । साथ साथ एक्सपोर्ट्स को गाँबों में भेजा जाना चाहिये जो हमारे देहात वालों को बतायें कि गोबर जलाना नहीं चाहिये बल्कि गोबर की खाद बनानी चाहिये । गोबर की खाद बनाने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि इस देश में गायों की संख्या अधिक हो । बैलों और दूधियों की संख्या अधिक हो । अतएव ऐसा हुआ तो इस देश में भी मिलेगा,

दूध मिलेगा और इसके साथ साथ खाद भी ज्यादा होगी और जब खाद ज्यादा होगी तो भ्रष्ट ज्यादा पैदा होगा ।

जो थोड़ा सा समय आपने मुझे दिया है उसमें जो कुछ मैं कह सकता था वह मैंने कह दिया है । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस देशमें गोहत्या बन्द होनी चाहिये ।

Mr. Speaker: Mahant Digvijai Nath. I will give him two or three minutes. Then I will call the Minister.

Shri Sonavane: Only monks and Sadhus should be called. They will increase production.

Mr. Speaker: I told you that the Congress Party has only 38 minutes. Even then two members were called. Everybody thinks that he alone should be called.

Shri Sonavane: Only Rajas, Maharajas and Jagirdars should be called.

Mr. Speaker: Will you kindly sit down? I am addressing the House as a whole, and not you particularly. According to the figures before me, there are only 38 minutes left and even then I called two members. Then, because somebody else is called, he gets angry. He should remember that they are equally elected representatives of the people. Now, Mahant Digvijai Nath.

श्री महन्त विविजय नाथ (गोरखपुर) : खाद और कृषि मंत्रालय के अनुदानों पर विचार करने के पहले हमको यह देखना चाहिये कि समाजवाद का नारा लगाने से हमारा काम चलने वाला नहीं है । हमारे देश में छोटी छोटी जोत के किसान बहुत अधिक हैं । उनके पास इतने साधन नहीं हैं कि वे बेती को ठिकाने से जोत सकें । जब से हमने पश्चिमी देशों की नकल करना सीखा है तब से हमारा भ्रष्ट का उत्पादन कम होता जा रहा है । राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति गाय का हमने कभी विचार नहीं किया है । गाय को हम धार्मिक दृष्टि से इसलिए देखते हैं कि वह

श्री मन्त दिग्विजय नाथ

नष्ट न की जाए, उसकी हत्या न की जाए क्योंकि वह राष्ट्र की भ्रमस्थ सम्पत्ति है। इस देश में 42 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन कुषियोग्य है। आठ एकड़ जमीन के लिए एक जोड़ी बैलों की जरूरत होती है। यदि साढ़े दस करोड़ बैल हमारे पास हों तब हम खेतों को जोत सकते हैं भ्रमस्था नहीं। इस समय हमारे पास केवल सवा साढ़े करोड़ बैल हैं। इस तरह से सवा तान करोड़ बैलों की कमी है। ऐसी भ्रमस्था में खाद्यान्नों की समस्या कैसे हल होगी? आप चाहे जैसे और जितने ट्रैक्टर से आये किन्तु छोटे छोटे किसानों का काम इनसे चलने वाला नहीं है। जब तक आप उनकी सस्ते मूल्यों में बैल नहीं दे सकेंगे, तब तक उनका काम नहीं चल सकता।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : एक मिनट और आप लें।

श्री महन्त दिग्विजय नाथ : आप घंटी न बजायें, मैं दो मिनट में समाप्त कर दूंगा। वो मिनट मैं मुझे जो कहना है मैं कह दूंगा।

आज ही यह रहा है कि डालर तथा विदेशी मुद्रा कमाने के लिए गउओं की खानें विदेशों को भेजी जा रही हैं। आपको मालूम ही होगा कि जिस समय गत वर्ष गो अभियान चला था उसी समय अमरीका ने बहुत बड़ा आर्डर चमड़े और चूतों का हमें दिया था। वह इसलिए दिया था ताकि और अधिक गांयें काटी जायें। यह इसलिए किया गया था कि देश को और राष्ट्र की जो सम्पत्ति है उसकी नष्ट किया जा सके, और देश भीख मांगता फिरता रहे। सत्यता तो यह है कि गांय की जब तक रक्षा नहीं होगी, तब तक बैल नहीं होंगे, और जब तक सस्ते बैल किसानों को नहीं दिये जायेंगे, वे खेत जोत नहीं सकेंगे। ट्रैक्टरों की सहायता से खेती उतनी सफल नहीं हो सकती। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक गोबध बन्द नहीं होगा, देश का कल्याण तब तक नहीं हो सकता। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता

हूँ कि गोहत्या पर अविलम्ब पूर्ण प्रतिबन्ध लगा दिया जाना चाहिये।

आज हमें अच्छे बीजों की आवश्यकता है। जब तक आप कृषकों को अच्छे बीज नहीं देंगे तब तक पैदावार बढ़ नहीं सकती है। आपने हर तहसील में बीज गोदाम खोल रखे हैं। ये बीज गोदाम बहुत दूर पड़ते हैं। जरूरत इस बात की है कि हर दो तीन मील के फासले पर बीज गोदाम खोले जायें ताकि किसानों को आसानी से बीज मिल सकें। आजकल होता यह है कि जब बुवाई का मौसम निकल जाता है तब किसानों को बीज मिलता है और जब वह रिपवत देता है तभी उसको यह मिलता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि समय पर बीज देने की आपकी और से उचित व्यवस्था की जाए।

सिचाई के साधन भी आपको किसानों के लिए शीघ्र उपलब्ध करने चाहियें। सिचाई के लिए जो बिजली दी जाती है यह देखा गया है कि वह महंगी दी जाती है। इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को तो तार पांच पैसे यूनिट के हिा स बिजली दी जाती है लेकिन किसानों को बा पच्चीस पैसे के हिसाब से दी जाता क्या यही आपका समाजवाद है? क्या इस तरह से आप समझते हैं कि उपज बढ़ सकती है किसान को तो कम से कम स्ती दरों पर बिजली दी जाए।

आप किसान से लेबा मांगते हैं। आप अस्ती रुपये से लेकर सी रुपये बिबटल के भाव पर उतसे गेहूँ लेबा में ले रहे हैं। अगर वा गेहूँ बाजार में बेचता है तो उसका एक सी पचास और एक सी साठ रुपये एक किण्टल के मिलते है। आप उसका लगान माफ़ करने के बजाय ठोक पैसे ता दें, सुविधायें तो उपलब्ध करें, खाद दें, बिजला ता सस्ती दें, सिचाई के लिए समय पर पाना ता दें, ताकि वह अपनी खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ा सके।

आप यह कह रहे हैं कि जनसंख्या घटाओ। आप कह रहे हैं कि खाने की समस्या इसलिए

ज्यादा विकट होती जा रहा है कि जनसंख्या बढ़ गई है और बढ़ रही है। आप देखें कि दूसरे देशों का क्या हाल है। दूसरे देशों में जनसंख्या बढ़ाने पर जोर दिया जा रहा है। अभी डा० कोठारि रूस से लौट कर आए हैं। यह परसों का "नवभा तट इमा" भ्रमचार है। इसमें इन्होंने कहा है कि संसार में जनसंख्या बढ़ाई जा रही है और यह एक भ्रमाभा देश है जिनमें जनसंख्या का घटाने का बात बड़ी जाता है। जनसंख्या के कारण हमारे देश का संसार में दूसरी पंजशन है। पहल, प. जाशन चीन को है। अगर बहुसंख्यक लोगों को ही आप यहां नहीं कि जनसंख्या घटाओ तो क्या आप देश को बचा सकते हैं ? ऐसा करके आप देश का नपुंसक बना कर रख देना चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि हमारा देश फिर से दूसरों के अधिन चला जाए। जनसंख्या घटाने से क्या हम संसार में अपना अस्तित्व बनाये रख सकेंगे ? किस तरह से हम देश को बचा सकेंगे ? आवश्यकता इस बात का है कि जनसंख्या को घटाने का बजाय इसके बढ़ाया जाए और फेमिला प्लानिंग पर जो आप जोर दे रहे हैं, इसको बिल्कुल बन्द कर दिया जाए।

एक बात मैं उत्तर प्रदेश के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। उत्तर प्रदेश का बेरोजगार सरकार अधिक सहायता नहीं कर सका है, उसका ज्यादा उन्नति नहीं कर सका है, उसका ज्यादा वित्तीय सहायता नहीं दे सका है। इसका एक मुख्य कारण यह है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के हो व्यापक देशों प्रवान मंत्रों अब तक बनते चले आ रहे हैं। इस वास्ते उनका सदैव संकाच हुआ रहा है कि उत्तर प्रदेश का कैसे उचित अनुदान का रीत दिया जाये। क्योंकि कहीं उन पर अन्य प्रान्त वाले प्रान्तीय पक्षपात का अरप न लगे ? इसका परिणाम यह हुआ है कि उत्तर प्रदेश को हमेशा उपेक्षा हुआ रहा है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश को उपेक्षा अब न हो और उसका भी दूसरे प्रान्तों का तरह सहायता की

जाए, वित्तीय सहायता उसको प्रदान की जाए।

श्री श्रीर खाद्य अनुदानों का मैं समर्थन करता हूँ, लेकिन साथ साथ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्री जगजीवन राम जो के ही समय में गौहरया बन्द हो जानी चाहिये।

श्री चतुष्कत अन्नोखा (मुजफ्फरनगर) : जनाब स्पीकर, मैं सिर्फ मुंबालिफ्त करने की गरज से ही ग. नैमेंट की मुंबालिफ्त करना प्रस्ताव नहीं करता। अगर गवर्नमेंट प्रस्ताव करती है तो हमें उसी सराहना करना चाहिये। लेकिन अगर कोई अलम काम किया जाता है तो उसकी हों मुंबालिफ्त भी जरूर करनी पड़ेगी। इस मुल्क में गिजाई हालात ने जिस कदर भयानक शकल भ्रमचार करली है उसके ऊपर गौर करें तो हमें मालूम होगा कि हमने बहुत सी गलतियां की हैं। यह जरूर सही है कि पिछले दो साल से हमारे यहां खुरकसाली हो रही है। लेकिन तमाम इल्जाम खुरकसाली के ऊपर डालना ही काफी नहीं है। हमने पिछले 20 सालों में बहुत सी गलतियां की हैं। जरायत की तरफ जो हमें तवज्जह देनी चाहिए थी वह नहीं दे सके। पर हमने कोई तवज्जह ही भी है तो वह हमारे अफसरान की, दुकूमत के मुलाजमीन की बददियानती और रिश्ततखोरी की नजर हो गई है। देखा जाता है कि ग. नैमेंट जो स्कीम बनाती है, उसके लिए जो रुपया रखती है उसका एक चौथाई हिस्सा हमारे मुलाजमीन की रिश्ततखोरी और बददियानती की तरह से उनके पास चला जाता है। श्री. उ. के नतीजे से जो लोग उस का नजर नफा उठाते हैं एक चौथाई हिस्सा उनके पास चला जाता है। इस तरीके से ग. नैमेंट जो रुपया खर्च कर रही है उसका आधा ही किसान तक पहुंच पाता है। यह कहा जाता है कि किसान बदलने की कोशिश करे, नये नये तरीके जरायत के लिये इस्तेमाल करे लेकिन हमारी गवर्नमेंट अपने को बदलना नहीं चाहती। हमारे

[श्री लताफा. प्रली खा]

यहाँ गवर्नमेंट को चलाने के जो तरीके हैं वह पचास साल पहले ग्रंथजों के जमाने में थे और अब भी वही चले आ रहे हैं। पानी जिसकी सब से ज्यादा जरूरत है जिसकी वजह से खेती पनपती है उस के तिलतिले में भी यह हो रहा है कि जिस तरीके से ग्रंथजों के जमाने में चलता था आज भी उसी तरीके से चलता है। न किसानों को ठीक वक्त पर पानी दिया जाता है और न ठीक मिकदार में दिया जाता है। हम से यह कहा जा रहा है कि नये किस्म के बीज इस्तेमाल करो। नई हाई ब्रिड बेराइटीज के इस्तेमाल के लिए छः सात मर्तबा पानी दिया जाता है। लेकिन जो नहरें सरकार ने चलायी हुई हैं, पहले दो मर्तबा गेहूँ में पानी आ जाता था, अब एक ही मर्तबा आने लगा है। इसलिए हमारी गवर्नमेंट को बदलने की जरूरत है। इस तरह ने अगर गवर्नमेंट पुराने तरीके से चलती रहेगी तो वह उम्मीद नहीं कर सकते कि हमारे कामतकार बदल जायें।

दूसरी चीज यह कही जाती है कि चूहे हमारा बहुत ज्यादा नुकसान करते हैं, गल्ले को खा जाते हैं। मेरे ख्याल में इसकी तरफ तबज्जह देनी चाहिए। मेरी अपनी इस बारे में कुछ रिसर्च है और वह यह है कि सलहरी एक चीज पैदा होती है, उसकी बू से चूहा भाग जाता है। अगर गवर्नमेंट तबज्जह करे और साइटिस्ट्स से इसके ऊपर रिसर्च कराये, कोई एसेस बनाया जाये जिसे कि चूहे भाग जायें तो इससे काफी तरक्की हो सकती है।

[अशरी لطافت علی خان (مظفر نگر):

جذاب سپیکر - میں صرف مخالفت کرنے کی بات سے ہی گورنمنٹ کی مخالفت کرنا اچھا نہیں سمجھتا - اگر گورنمنٹ اچھا کام کرتی ہے تو ہمیں اس کی سراہنا کرنی چاہئے - لیکن اگر کوئی غلط کام کیا جاتا ہے تو

اس کی ہمیں مخالفت بھی ضرور کرنی چاہیگی - اس ملک میں فزائی حالات نے جس قدر بڑھانک شکل اختیار کر لی ہے اس کے اوپر فوراً کریں تو ہمیں معلوم ہوگا کہ ہم نے بہت غلطوں کی ہیں - یہ ضرور صحیح ہے کہ پچھلے دو سال سے ہمارے یہاں خشکسالی ہو رہی ہے - لیکن تمام الزام خشکسالی کے اوپر ڈالنا ہی کافی نہیں ہے - ہم نے پچھلے ۲۰ سالوں میں بہت سی غلطیاں کی ہیں - زراعت کی طرف ہمیں جو توجہ دینی چاہئے تھی وہ نہیں دے سکے - اگر ہم نے کوئی توجہ دی ہوگی تو وہ ہمارے انصران کی اور حکومت کے ملازمین کی بددیانتی اور رشوتخوری کی نظر سے گئی ہے - دیکھا جاتا ہے کہ گورنمنٹ جو سکیمیں بناتی ہے اور اس کے لئے جو روپیہ دیتی ہے اس کا ایک چوتھائی ہمارے ملازمین کی رشوتخوری اور بددیانتی کی وجہ سے ان کے پاس چلا جاتا ہے - اور اس کے نتیجے سے جو لوگ ناجائز فائدہ اٹھاتے ہیں ایک چوتھائی حصہ ان کے پاس چلا جاتا ہے - اس طریقے سے گورنمنٹ جو روپیہ خرچ کر رہی ہے اس کا اڈھا ہی کسان تک پہنچ پاتا ہے - یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ کسان بدلنے کی کوشش کرے - نئے نئے طریقے زراعت کے لئے استعمال کرے - لیکن ہماری گورنمنٹ اپنے کو نہیں بدلنا چاہتی - ہمارے یہاں گورنمنٹ کو چلانے کے جو طریقے چلے آ رہے ہیں وہ پچاس سال پہلے انگریزوں کے زمانے میں تھے اور

اب بھی وہی چلے آ رہے ہوں۔ جس کی سب سے زیادہ ضرورت ہے جس کی وجہ سے کھیتی پلہتی ہے اس کے سلسلے میں بھی یہ ہو رہا ہے کہ جس طریقے سے انگریزوں کے زمانے میں چلتا تھا آج بھی اسی طریقے سے چلتا ہے۔ نہ کسانوں کو ٹھیک وقت پر پانی دیا جاتا ہے اور نہ ٹھیک مقدار میں دیا جاتا ہے۔ ہم سے یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ نئی قسم کے بودج استعمال کرو۔ یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ جو نئی نئی مانی برقی وہیلوٹھیز ہیں ان کے استعمال کے لئے ۶-۹ مرتبہ پانی دیا جانا ہے۔ لیکن جو نہیں سرکار نے چھٹی ہوئی ہوں ان سے پہلے دو مرتبہ کھوپوں میں پانی آ جاتا تھا اب ایک ہی مرتبہ آنے لگا ہے۔ اگلے عماری کورنمنٹ کے بدلے کی ضرورت ہے۔ اس طرح سے اگر کورنمنٹ پرانے طریقے سے چلے دھکی تو وہ اُمید نہیں کر سکتی کہ ہمارے کام کو بدل جائیں۔

دوسری بات یہ کہی جاتی ہے کہ چوہے ہمارا بہت زیادہ نقصان کرتے ہیں۔ غلے کو کھا جاتے ہیں۔ مہوے ختمال میں اس طرف توجہ دینی چاہئے۔ مہوئی اپنی اس بارے میں کچھہ بچ رہے اور یہ ہے کہ ساہوئی ایک چوڑے ہوتا ہوئی ہے اس کی بو سے چوہا بھاگ جاتا ہے۔ اگر کورنمنٹ توجہ دے اور ساہوئیس سے اس کے اوپر دیکھ کر اسے ایسا ہیسا بدلنا جائے جس سے کہ چوہے بھاگ جائیں نہ اس سے کوئی ترقی ہو سکتی ہے۔

Mr. Speaker: Before I call the Minister to reply, I would like to place this matter before the House. About 15 Congress Members and about 17 Opposition Members have

spoken on these demands. The time is divided between the two. There is no discrimination between the two. Half the time is given to the Congress Party and half the time is given to the Opposition Parties. One Opposition Party may have one speaker or two or three speakers. It is left to the Party concerned. Still there are about 15 to 20 Congress Members wanting to speak on these Demands. Unfortunately, the time is allotted and I cannot give time at the cost of some other Parties. Of course, there are some unattached Members also. I think, this time, I have called only one or two unattached Members.

From the Congress time, naturally, two or three hours, about 50 per cent of the time, is taken away by the Ministers. That cannot be compensated by the Swatantra Party or the Jan Sangh Party or some other Party. These are the things which we have to take into consideration. There are about 15 to 20 Congress Members who want to speak on these Demands. One Member said that from Madhya Pradesh, no Member has spoken. (Interruption). How do I know the States of the Members? Some names are given to me and I call them. How do I know to which States they belong. I called Shri Latafat Ali Khan and I do not know from which State he comes.

श्री प्रो. ए. व. व. (हमीरपुर): जो मिनिस्टर का टाइम है वह कांग्रेस पार्टी के टाइम में से न काटा जाय।

Mr. Speaker: If you want to make a change, I have no objection.

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जरा एक मिनट सुन लें। शनिवार को हम बैठ रहे हैं स्पेशल रिक्वेस्ट पर। जरा सुन लिया जाये हमारी बात को.... (ध्वनिमान).....

Mr. Speaker: I know you are very anxious to speak. You are a very important speaker from the Congress Party. I know that also. But still I could not help you. I would have

[Mr. Speaker]

been very happy to give you a chance. I could not help it.

These are the difficulties. The Ministers have also to speak. You can discuss it in your Party meeting. Don't place the Chair in an embarrassing position. You can discuss this matter in your party meeting. (Interruption). Mr. Sonavane, I resented your remark that Swamiji will grow food and will save the country. Don't bring it again. Whether he is Swamiji or not, he is an elected representative of the people here. He has also got votes from the people and he is sitting in this honourable House. I do not elect them; I do not bring them in this House. It is the people who have elected them and sent them here. I have to call them also. Nobody should have the feeling that this group or that group is discriminated. I shall now allow that to the extent it is humanly possible.

About your Party you are at a disadvantage because some time is taken by the Ministers also. You can discuss that in your party meeting; you can discuss it in the Business Advisory Committee. I have no objection to that. Even then, about 15 Congress Members have spoken. But it is a big party, the ruling party, and, therefore, there is some discontent. I realise that. But don't make the Chair responsible for that. I can only call the names given to me. (Interruption). I am not addressing you in particular; I am addressing the whole House. This is my difficulty.

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): I am not anxious to speak on the Demands. I want to make only one submission. The final reply of the Minister should not be adjusted against the time of the Congress Party. The other Ministers' time, when they intervene in the debate, may be taken from the Congress Party.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection to that. Your suggestion must be considered. You can discuss it in your party meeting; you can discuss it in

the Business Advisory Committee where other Party representatives will also be there. It must be an agreed solution. It makes no difference to me.

Now, I call the hon. Minister and we will adjourn for lunch after he has finished.

Shri M. Y. Saleem (Nalgonda): If the hon. Minister is prepared to give some time to Members who want to express their views....

Mr. Speaker: No please; Shri Jagjivan Ram.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : (बेतिया) एक क्वेश्चन पूछना था जिसका जवाब देते वक्त जवाब दें.....

Mr. Speaker: No please. Then, everybody will begin asking questions. Once you make a beginning, God alone knows where it will end.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri Jagjivan Ram): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to the House for having covered a very wide range so far as agriculture and food is concerned. A large number of hon. Members have participated in the debate and that certain criticisms have been made is quite natural while dealing with such a very vast subject over which the whole country is exercised. Many useful suggestions have also been made. At the very outset, I shall make it clear that I welcome many of the suggestions that have been made by the hon. Members. Many suggestions that have been made are already being implemented by the Government.

Before I take up food, I would like to start with agriculture, which is the prime thing in our solutions to all our problems.

In any strategy of agricultural production, I feel that a vast number of farmers will have to be enthused, so that they can make their contribution and can participate in finding solutions to the difficult problems that the country is facing. Any strategy of

agricultural production, which does not enthruse all the farmers, big or small, will not achieve the desired results. We should not forget that, in our country, a large number of farmers have small holdings and the number of persons having large holdings is very small. In any strategy of agricultural production (*Interruption*) if care is taken only of the big farmers, I am afraid, we will not be able to enthruse the farmers, we will not be able to create the condition in which the vast number of farmers will participate. Therefore, the strategy will have to be such as will embrace all the farmers, whether they are small or big.

Here comes the question of land reforms. I feel that this is one of the basic questions on which the success or failure of any strategy of agricultural production will depend. There have been land reforms in this country in varying degrees in various provinces. Some of the provinces have gone ahead and I will not say that they have reached the logical conclusion of land reforms but still substantial progress has been made. In some States legislations have been passed and the pace of implementation remains at various stages. In some States, all the required legislations have not been undertaken.

These things are very fundamental. With the modernization of agriculture—by modernization I do not mean only mechanization—heavy inputs are necessary for increasing the agricultural production. Unless the farmer is assured that his tenancy or his occupation of the land is permanent, he will not be drilling to make any sizeable investment for the development of that land. So, it becomes necessary that the cultivator or the farmer is assured of his occupancy rights over the whole of the land which he possesses. That is the minimum that should be done. This question was discussed in the Chief Ministers' Conference and I am going to pursue it further. But the House should not forget that both land and agriculture are in the

State List. Its implementation has to be done by the State Governments. I do not claim that, during the past twenty years, land reforms have been spectacular, but at the same time, one should not forget that a positive contribution has been made during the past twenty years towards land reforms. Some of the basic land reforms have been done—abolition of zamindari, Jagirdhari, inamdari and all these things. This is a revolutionary step towards land reforms and one should not forget that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Jotedars?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am not saying that it has been completed. I have said that one should not forget that the abolition of zamindari, inamdari and all these things was itself a revolutionary step; there is no doubt about that. Therefore, as I have said, during the past twenty years, we have made some progress in the direction of land reforms. As I have said, we have not reached the logical conclusion, the process of land reforms has not been completed, but the House should not forget that any measure of land reform has to be implemented by the State Governments and there cannot be any blaming of the Central Government. I will make a very humble request to those members that if they used their eloquence, even 10 per cent of what they have done here, on the Chief Ministers of the States, some of whom belong to their Parties.... (*Interruptions*).

श्री मोहन प्रसाद : खेती का बंटवारा नहीं हुआ ।

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Many members do not understand खेती का बंटवारा यहाँ से होगा, या गंखूप से होगा या लखनऊ से होगा ।

I can give some advice but I cannot give commonsense. (*Interruptions*). I can give some advice to the

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

hon. members, but I am afraid I cannot give them understanding.

I was saying that, if the hon. members who have the representatives of their parties in the States—they are leaders of their parties—advise their representatives in various State Governments, I can assure that, in this matter, they will receive the fullest, not cooperation but assistance, from the Centre so far as land reforms are concerned. Let us complete the pace of land reforms because that is one of the basic questions on which agricultural production depends. Then there is no doubt....

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Pernam): What about Congress Governments in the States?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I have said about all State Governments. I am not speaking about non-Congress Governments only.

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): We have done much more than what they have done.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I am speaking about all the State Governments. Land reforms have to be done everywhere. But it is a fact that some of the members are obsessed with the idea of Congress Governments and non-Congress Governments. That will not lead us anywhere.

Shri Pilloo Mody (Godhra): That is their obsession.

श्री श्री० प्र० श्यामी : (मुरादाबाद) : अब तक 20 साल में आप लोगों ने क्यों नहीं किया ?

श्री जगजीवन राम : वह आपको 20 साल समझने में लगेंगे ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह कोई जवाब नहीं है—यह लोक सभा के मंच पर इतने बरिष्ठ मंत्री की तरफ से देने वाला

जवाब नहीं है—आपने 20 साल में जो किया है, वह 20 साल हमको समझने में लगेंगे ।

श्री जगजीवन राम : जो कहा है वह ठीक कहा है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह बड़ी बदतमीजी की बात कर रहे हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: At the fag-end of the fine discussion, why should we have these things?

श्री जगजीवन राम : आप कुछ भी कहते रहें और मन्त्र को कहते हैं कि बदतमीजी की बात है । पार्लियामेंट का शऊर मानूम नहीं है—हम खड़े हैं अपने पैरों पर और बेसऊरी की बात आप करते लगे हैं ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : बेसऊरी की बात आपने की है ।

Shri M. A. Khan (Kasganj): I object to the mood of the hon. Member. What is he saying?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The Minister may resume his speech.

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, ये लोग अपनी जुवान पर लगाम नहीं रखते हैं.... (ब्यवधान)

Mr. Speaker: The Minister is on his legs. Please allow him to reply.

श्री शिव नारायण : इस तरह से काम नहीं चलेगा, इन्हें आपको रोकना चाहिए ।

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): My request is this. They should be courteous to the members; they should have some regard for the members otherwise they will get the retort.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister is on his legs. Allow him to address the Chair and through the Chair to the whole

House. After all, we expect some interruptions, but they should also be limited. The Minister must also accept them in a sporting way.

श्री कंवर ज्ञान गुप्ता (दिल्ली सदर) : मैं आपसे मार्गना करता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के लोग जिज्ञासु रहते बाने हैं, इनका यदि आप नहीं रोकेंगे तो इतर से भी ऐसा हो होगा, यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है, इसको बन्द कीजिए।

Mr. Speaker: His leader has spoken. He may resume his seat. Something has happened, and Shri A. B. Vajpayee has effectively protested, and the hon. Minister has also protested. Let us leave it at that. It should be in a dignified way. The leader of a party has replied, and the hon. Minister has also replied. It should end there. Hon. Members should not get up from all corners and start shouting. Now, the hon. Minister.

Shri D. N. Tiwary: Hon. Members who retort should also be prepared to take it back.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should resume his seat. He is not yet the Minister. After he is sworn in then he may speak. I have called the hon. Minister now.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I have never had any intention of being discourteous to anybody. I was just explaining that during the last twenty years, the Congress has done something. I was talking of land reforms. I have myself admitted that the land reform has not been taken to its logical conclusion; it has not been completed. But at the same time, nobody can say that nothing has been done during the past twenty years. That was what I was saying. I do not mean to be discourteous to anybody in the House.

श्री राजगोपाल खाननाले : मंत्री महोदयने सदस्योंकी बड़ि पर संका की है।

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I may say that I have not gone one word beyond parliamentary dignity and decorum.

The next thing that would be necessary for increasing agricultural production is, water. Even the land must have water.

Shri S. Xavier (Tirunelveli): What about waste lands? They should be brought under cultivation.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: The greatest thing is water. It is only after that that the question of fertilisers, improved variety of seeds and other things will arise. For, with water we can produce something, but without water, even the best variety of seed or fertiliser will not yield results.

So, whether it is major or medium or minor irrigation, irrigation will have to be given first attention in any scheme or strategy of agricultural production. I would straightway admit that irrigation projects, whether medium or small or minor have not been adequate and they will have to be expedited. Efforts should be made to see that the major schemes which are under way are completed according to schedule and where necessary even before schedule. If minor irrigation assumes greater importance, it is only with a view to expediting production; it can give quicker results in a shorter time. The capital investment is also comparatively lower than what it is in the case of major schemes. But let me not be understood as being against any other type of irrigation scheme. All the three types of irrigation will have to be taken up and capital will have to be provided for them.

Here, I would like to make one observation, which many hon. Members have also made, namely that agriculture has not been treated in the same way as industry has been treated so far as availability of credit is concerned, whether it be from

[Sri Jagjwan Ram]

Government or from other financial and commercial institutions. There is no doubt that if the country wants to have a strong economic base, if the country wants greater agricultural production, whether it be food-grains production or the production of other agricultural produce so that the country could become self-sufficient, then agriculture will have to be treated in a better way than it has been treated so far. Credit will have to be made available for that purpose not only from Government sources but even from commercial banks and from other financial institutions in the same way as it is being made available to industry. Of course, they will have to look to their safeguards in order to see that whatever money they advance or invest is soundly and safely invested. Once that condition is satisfied, no discrimination should be made between agriculture and industry. If we succeed in creating an awareness among those who control the commercial banks and financial institutions today, then I think that so far as minor irrigation and other things connected with agriculture are concerned greater credit will be available for investment in this sector of our economy.

Then, the House would like to know whether I am in a position to say that we are going to increase our allocation for minor irrigation. We are making efforts. If I have made reference to the commercial banks and the various financial institutions in this connection, I have done so only with a view to emphasise the importance of minor irrigation, so that we are in a position to secure more and more funds for the State Governments for this purpose.

Then comes the question of helping our agriculturists. While I am on the question of land reforms I would not like to go into the details, but I would make a passing reference to one or two things. Two lady Members from Punjab have said that the holdings should be economic holdings. I want

to dispel this impression that the economic viability of a holding depends upon the size of the holding; it depends upon the pattern of cultivation. One should not forget that. There was a day when the holding was economic or uneconomic depending upon the area of the land. Today it does not depend upon the area of the land; it depends upon the pattern of cultivation. Even five acres may be a very good economic holding, if we have high-yielding varieties and intensive cultivation and if we raise three crops in a year on that land. But if we do not have the facilities, even 50 acres will not be an economic holding. So, one should not forget that.

Then, it was said that agricultural labour was given land in Punjab but they had left it and sold it. Has that happened only in the case of agricultural labour? Do the cultivators also at times not part with their land and sell it? If some percentage of agricultural labour settled on land has sold the land, is an inference to be drawn from it that agricultural labour should not be given any land? I submit that to suggest like that would be a very wrong approach and that might ultimately affect our land system. Today, we have signs of this thing in various parts of the country. If the distribution of land does not take on to rational lines, there is no doubt that a situation may be created in the country when many dislocations and disturbances may take place in our agricultural economy. One should not forget that. Therefore, the necessity of land reforms is there and it has to be taken to the ultimate point.

Then, the cultivator will have to be provided with credit. He has to be provided with various inputs. He has to be provided with the wherewithal with which to cultivate his land. Now, what should be the mechanism of credit to be made available to him? Should it be cooperatives or should it be given by Government directly by way of taccavi loans? What methods should be followed in this connection?

Ultimately, a method will have to be devised which will be most effective, less irksome, cut out delays and would make the cultivator feel that whatever assistance he has to receive he has received fully. Credit will have to be made available to the various institutions by Government, by commercial banks and other financing institutions. Whether it should be through co-operatives or through other institutions to be established for this purpose or through the Government Department is a matter which has to be examined, and different patterns may perhaps be useful in different areas or for different purposes.

If there are weaknesses in the co-operative movement, it is up to the State Governments to rectify those weaknesses. If there are certain defects in the administration of the co-operatives, they can be rectified. If there are certain shortcomings in the co-operative Act, that also can be taken care of.

13 hrs.

Therefore, though there have been complaints—and I know there is much substance in those complaints—so far as the functioning of the co-operative societies in some parts of the country is concerned, I will not say that they are of universal application. Still we have to encourage the co-operatives because that will be one agency in the rural areas which will prepare the people in the villages to take on greater responsibilities for the utilisation of the various facilities made available to them. The whole intention of the co-operative movement is that the people for whom these facilities are meant manage their affairs themselves; and if we create confidence amongst them, they can do so. As I said, there are weaknesses noticeable in several parts of the country so far as the functioning of the co-operative societies is concerned. But it is not necessary to condemn the co-operative movement as such on that score. The weaknesses

have to be removed. State Governments are competent to take those actions and place the movement on a sound footing.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Guna): Will he advise Ministers not to accept purses from co-operatives?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Unless one knows about particular instances, one cannot say. But it is wrong to do so.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I know; I will give him any number of instances.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: If all the members of a society decide to spend a portion of the profit they have made in a particular way, how can it be stopped? But certainly it is not desirable that the money should be spent in the way in which Acharya Kripalani has pointed out.

Shri M. Sudarsanam (Narasaraopet): They give only from a 'common good' fund.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I know there are certain things which are not desirable. Therefore, even if the members have got the authority to do it, I shall point it out to State Governments. That may be one of the weaknesses or defects in the co-operative movement. I am pleading for the removal of these defects. As I have said, even alternative institutions may be established where the co-operative movement is weak, where we cannot take care of them. There has been a demand from the farmers that instead of extending this assistance or credit to them in cash, it will be better if the assistance is extended to them in kind, in the shape of fertiliser, agricultural implements, insecticides, pesticides and all those things which the farmers require. That can be done only when we have an organisation to cater for these requirements readily available in the vicinity of the farmers, in the vicinity of the rural areas.

Then this credit should be supplied to them at a cheap rate. Complaints

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

have been voiced—and there is much substance in them—that the rate charged from the farmers by the co-operative societies is abnormally high. There is no doubt that the Reserve Bank supplies this credit to the co-operative societies at 2 per cent lower than the prevailing rate.

Shri K. N. Tiwary: They charge 9 per cent.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: That is the societies.

But the primary co-operative banks when they advance loan to the cultivator charge a rate of interest varying from 8-1/4 per cent to in some cases 10-1/2 per cent. Some portion has to be taken by the apex bank or the provincial bank, some by the district bank and some by the primary bank. Therefore, it is a matter to be examined how far this can be reduced because I am told there are depositors in these banks to whom interest has to be paid. Whatever credit is available with a co-operative society is the sum total of the advance given by the Reserve Bank plus the deposits given by the members in the co-operative societies, to whom interest has to be paid on the deposits. The rate of interest to be paid to them should not be less than the prevailing market rate. That is how the rate increases. But we will have to examine it. I have started the process to see whether we cannot reduce the rate of interest chargeable from the farmers from what it is today.

Shri K. N. Tiwary: What is the rate at which industries are given loans?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: They are getting at the market rate.

Shri M. Sudarsanam: There is no intermediate agency; they get direct.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: So far as the industries are concerned, they are getting at the market rate from the commercial and other banks. I will not hazard a guess as to what the rate is, but I do not think it will be less than 10 per cent, may be more.

Mr. Speaker: Will he take much longer?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Then we adjourn now for lunch to meet again at 2 P.M. He can continue after we resume.

13.05 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at four minutes past fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—Contd.

MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION—contd.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Sir, before the House rose, I was talking about minor irrigation which has assumed greater importance because it yields quicker results. What we aspire today is quicker results from our agriculture. Tubewell, lift irrigation, open wells—whatever the source of water that is available, whether it is a pond or running water, it will have to be harnessed to provide irrigation to the agriculturists. If power is necessary for that purpose, power will have to be made available. Credit also will have to be provided to the agriculturist. Whatever he requires not only as inputs but also as accessories, whether it is a small quantity of steel or cement, should be made available to him and fertiliser of course. Some Members mentioned that adequate quantities of fertilisers had not been allocated. We have taken care to see that adequate fertilisers to serve the high-yielding variety programmes in these States are made available to these States and we will make special efforts to see that wherever some more quantity is required, it is made available. In this connection, hon. Members from Tamilnad spoke about fertiliser supply from Neyveli and said

Neyveli indulged in something undesirable in the sale of fertilisers. I shall look into the matter and ask the concerned Minister to examine that and see how we can rectify that. Along with chemical fertilisers, we will have to take proper care of the organic fertilisers. Agriculture in our country is not a new thing. As in many other countries, it has continued through ages. I would like to re-emphasise that the Indian farmer may be illiterate but he knows his job so thoroughly that he could give advice to those who pass through the agricultural colleges but who do not possess his rich experience. Our farmer is not conservative, but he is cautious of course. He does not go by theories. He is very reluctant to listen to lectures and once he sees a practical demonstration of any particular method which adds to his yield, he is never reluctant to adopt that process. I would like to remove some misconception about the Indian agriculturist. He will not be carried away by the experimental farm but certainly he will profit by the model farms. He may be reluctant to adopt the processes demonstrated in the experimental farms of the Government. But when he sees a neighbouring farmer adopting modern methods to get better yields, he takes to them immediately. He has the knowledge of ages behind him.

Equal emphasis will have to be laid on organic manure whether it is green manure or compost making or farm-yard manure or sullage water—everything will have to be utilised I propose to take certain action by which some incentive and some encouragement will be given to the farmer for producing these manures. By utilising various things which we waste today, we can produce hundreds of thousands of tons of manure which would serve agriculture. We will have to provide implements to our farmers; I mean modern implements. I do not mean only tractors. Where bullock cart has to be used for many years to come, bullock power will remain the

sustaining power for our agriculture. But improved ploughshares will have to be provided. We have a scheme for the manufacture of agricultural implements through co-operatives in eight or nine districts. I propose to expedite that process so that improved agricultural implements may be manufactured on a larger scale in rural areas. At the same time we will have to take care of the tractor as well. There is great demand for tractors and I know only sizeable cultivators can afford to purchase tractors or maintain them. If Indian agriculture has to be sustained, I think even small farmers will have to be provided with that facility. I have already asked my Ministry to work out a scheme by which we can make tractors available to small farmers. The scheme is to maintain centres at convenient places, tractor centres, a number of tractors of all varieties, where the farmer can hire them at a fixed rate for various agricultural operations and these can be run either by the Governments, co-operative societies or even private parties. Some industrialists have shown interest in entering the field of agriculture, and I have suggested to them that there are several areas of agricultural operation where the industrialists can enter and serve the agriculturist at a reasonable profit on their investment.

The same thing may apply to tubewells for irrigation. If facilities are available to the farmers who are in a position to make some investment themselves and if the small agriculturists have to be taken care of, it can be done through the States and a large State tubewell programme will have to be undertaken at the same time.

As I said in the opening sentence, any agricultural strategy will have to be so decided that it will take care not only of the big farmers but it will take care of the small farmers as well. Of course, all this strategy including flood control, drainage, water logging, will have to be undertaken. I do not

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

want to go into the details. At the same time, water management will have to be taken care of in a big way. Today, we are wasting a fair proportion of our water resources; even irrigation potential; and some experiments are being made profitably for water management. Sometimes, our agriculturists feel that if we water very much we will get better crops forgetting that by giving more water sometimes the crops or the plants are adversely affected.

In this agricultural production, scientific and technological achievements will have to be exploited for the purpose. Therefore, agricultural education, training and extension will have to be taken care of. I want to inform the House that we have already asked all the State Governments that there should be at least one agricultural college in every State, and for that, we are going to help the States in a big way. In every State there should be one agricultural college. (*Interruption*).

An hon. Member: Agricultural university.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I am sorry. I meant one agricultural university in every State: not the traditional university, but a university where emphasis will be paid more to the practical side of agriculture than the theoretical side.

Shri E. K. Nayanar (Palghat): Is there any plan to have an Agricultural University in Kerala?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Yes; Kerala will have an agricultural university.

Shri E. K. Nayanar: The Central Government has not considered it; the suggestion was made by the Kerala Government.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: The Kerala Government is examining that. As I have said, every State will have an agricultural university. It is very necessary. Research and experimen-

tation are also very necessary. Shri Lobo Prabhu made an objection, and asked why more funds are provided for the Indian Council of Agricultural Research. Anybody who will look at our agriculture from modern, scientific aspects, will agree that we will have to spend more and more for agricultural research; research not only in the laboratory, but research where the achievements in the laboratory will be carried by the extension services to the fields of the farmer, and that is what we are doing at present. Therefore, more money will have to be provided and I am sure the enthusiasm and interest that the House is showing in the matter of agriculture will always encourage us to spend more and more for scientific research. The achievements of research, as I have said, will have to be carried to the farmer. We have started our extension service. That is the whole purpose. The farmer must be shown in his own field, not in the experimental field, or a model farm, but in the farm of the agriculturist himself, and he must see that these modern methods of agriculture, improved varieties of seed, application of fertiliser and management of water are going to give him better results. And that is what we are doing through the Indian Council of Agricultural Research.

Then, we will have to train not only those who come from the Agricultural Universities or colleges but to train the farmers as well, and we are having training camps, extension camps, to give short term training to the farmers in the various methods and processes of agriculture which he has to do himself. I want to further expand it. It is not impossible with the co-operation of all the political parties and leaders of public opinion in this country where the farmers themselves will invite them; one village or a group of villages all combining, could invite them to such centres, for a fortnight, or one week or once a month, and that is the process I want to encourage, where there will be greater public

participation and participation of the farmers themselves for training purposes.

Soil erosion is a great bane in our agriculture. All possible efforts will have to be made to prevent soil erosion and to have soil conservation. Trees play a very important part in that. Our forests were denuded very largely in many parts of the country. With the abolition of landlordism, we have very brutally and mercilessly destroyed the forests and we are having the adverse effect of the destruction of our forests. It is necessary that afforestation on a large scale takes place, not only in forest areas, but in agricultural areas also.

But apart from modern science, we must remember the old practices in our agriculture. Anybody who has experience of our agriculture will find that at convenient places in large fields, we used to plant such varieties of trees which will have deeper roots but will not affect the soil, such as palmyrah, sisam, eucalyptus, etc. These are planted on the borders and boundaries of our fields. That was for the purpose of avoiding land erosion without affecting the crop to be sown in the field. We have to take advantage of that old practice, and we should combine those practices with the modern scientific development in the field of forestry, and that is where I want to combine agriculture and forestry together, without the one thing impinging upon the other and the two functioning as complementary to each other. I would like to express my thanks to Shri Chatterjee who made a very pointed reference to soil conservation. We will profit by his suggestion. At the same time, reclamation will have to be undertaken. I would like to inform the House that I want to change the process of reclamation in such a way that if there is a big scheme, it should be so phased that as soon as a small area has been reclaimed, the farmers are settled on that, so that the weeds do not grow and the land is taken care of properly. Up till now, the process was that when

we have a big scheme, until the entire area is reclaimed, we do not start colonisation. Here, in what I envisage, colonisation starts and it will add to our production and at the same time the land will not go into disuse. So, I want to pursue this plan and I am sure the House will extend its fullest support in this matter.

For agriculture, apart from irrigation, inputs, credits and all these facilities, the farmer should be assured of a reasonable return on his production. As I said on the previous occasion, as in the case of industry, in the case of agriculture also, the cost of production should be taken into consideration while fixing the price of agricultural commodities. It should be fixed well in advance, so that the farmer, before he undertakes his planting, knows what price he is going to get for his produce. That is what I propose to do—prices to be fixed well in time and cost of production to be taken into consideration while fixing the prices of agricultural commodities.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : एक चीज जरा बलीअर कराना चाहता हूं। आपने ऐग्रीकल्चरल प्राइस कमिशन बनाया है, उस में जो लोग हैं और जन्होंने जो रिपोर्ट दी है तो रेग्युलरेटिव प्राइस जो ऐग्रीकल्चरिस्ट प्वाइंट आफ व्यू से होनी चाहिए, हम लोग खुद ऐग्रीकल्चरिस्ट्स हैं, वह नहीं मिल रही है। वह लोग बड़े कन्जर्वेटिव हैं। तो क्या इस कमिशन पर फार्मर लोगों को भी रखने का विचार रखते हैं ?

Shri Sonavane: The Commission should be reconstituted with a majority of farmers.

Shri Randhir Singh: You admitted that farmers are more experts than graduates. Then why not have more farmers on the Commission?

Shri Jagjwan Ram: The Agricultural Prices Commission is there. They give their recommendations. But

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

where the Government find that the recommendations of the Agricultural Prices Commission will not meet the requirements of the agriculturists we have never hesitated in modifying the recommendations of the Agricultural Prices Commission to the advantage of the farmers.

बी.क०.ना०.सिबारी : ऐग्रीकल्चरिस्ट्स
रखने के बारे में क्या विचार है ?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Of course, that will be considered more favourably.

Shri Mahant Digvijai Nath: What about introducing crop insurance?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Only yesterday when the Minister of State intervened in the debate he explained what the Government proposes to do. We have adopted the principle of crop insurance. The Bill is being drafted. We are consulting the State Governments and opportunity will be taken to push through that Bill.

Shri Randhir Singh: Kindly say something about marketing also. We are looted in the mandis. The middlemen must go.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I am coming to that. I have come up to production. Let us now walk over from agriculture to food. Several suggestions have been made. One most important thing voiced from different sections of the House was about a national food policy. Everybody demanded that but nobody indicated that. I was trying to listen to the debate and also to go through the proceedings to find out whether anybody had suggested something about the national food policy. It has not been done.

The whole purpose of management of food has been to make food available in the deficit pockets and at reasonable prices. The management of food has been with a purpose, that so long as shortage persists in the country we should make food available

in the deficit pockets and at a reasonable price. Shri Lobo Prabhu quoted certain statistics. I would not like to quote statistics.

Shri Piloo Mody: I wish you would.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I will not. I will give some commonsense calculations. Certain things are obvious. Whatever the statistics may show...

An hon. Member: He quoted from your Economic Survey.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: It is a very simple proposition. If we take that the production in the country is X tons and the population is 50 crores, per capita it should be X divided by 50 crores. It is as simple as this rule of three? I wish it was as simple as that. We should not forget the human factors involved in it. We should not forget that the agriculturists who are producing take more than X divided by 50 crores. The surplus States where these foodgrains are produced consume more than their share. It is just commonsense. Whatever the statistics may show, this will happen and it is happening in actual practice. He quoted certain figures.

Shri Piloo Mody: Let us do away with statistics.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Statistics will have to be interpreted with a pinch of commonsense.

It was said that when there was availability the prices rose and when the availability was less the prices fell. I have to say that the prices of foodgrains do not depend upon the availability or non-availability of foodgrains themselves. The prices of foodgrains also are influenced by so many economic factors existing at a particular time. They have to be taken into consideration. There are actions and inter-actions, play and inter-play of various economic factors in determining the prices of foodgrains. When Shri Lobo Prabhu quot-

ed certain statistics he proved by those very statistics that the prices of foodgrains are not absolutely determined by the availability or non-availability of foodgrains themselves.

He said that after controls are there they function as an inhibiting factor of production. If you will go into the statistics of certain other periods when controls were relaxed you will find that production suffered even during the de-control period. So it is not entirely control or de-control that influences production, increase in production or decrease in production. There are several other factors. I would not like to go into them and take more time of the House. But it is a very important factor and we should not forget that.

As I have already said, the whole purpose of managing the food department is to make foodgrains available to the best of the capacity of the country in the deficit areas and to make the surplus areas help the deficit areas to the best of their capacity. But even with all the foodgrains we have, even with the best efforts of surplus States, it has been found that whatever food is available in the country, whatever market surplus is available in the country, will not be adequate to meet our requirements. Therefore, we have to depend upon imports. The import figures have been varying. What the Food Department is managing to do is to get the foodgrains procured from the surplus States and also from the imports and allocate to the different deficit areas. I do not claim that it meets all the demands of the deficit States. Demands are there, but we have to allocate to the different States depending upon the availability of foodgrains, indigenous and imported in a particular month. That is what we are doing.

Suggestions have been made that if we remove the food zones every thing will be all right. I wish it were as simple as that. But we should not forget that we are functioning under

a federal Constitution. We have different States. Food and agriculture primarily is the responsibility of the State Governments, and whatever we do in the matter of agriculture or food can be done only with the approval, agreement and consensus of the State Governments. That one factor should always be remembered. Even in the matter of management of food unless there is a general consensus among the Chief Ministers of the various States it will be very difficult for the Central Government to lay down a policy. Today the present system of food zones is based on the consensus of the Chief Ministers of all the States, and if any revision or review or change has to be made into the existing pattern it can be done only with the consensus of various concerned States—both the surplus States and also the deficit States. There is perhaps some impression in the House that all the deficit States want removal of the food zones. That is not a fact. In the Chief Ministers' Conference only two deficit States were unequivocal about removal of zones, and all other deficit States and, of course, certainly, all the surplus States were in favour of maintaining the State zones.

Shri Piloo Mody: What are their reasons?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: The reasons are many. Because one of my friends, Shri Lakhan Lal Kapoor, suggested that we should do away with all the zones but, at the same time, introduce universal rationing. I am afraid, it will have to be a magical feat to remove all zones and all controls and then introduce universal rationing. I do not know how it can be achieved. One can understand removing all zones and allowing the market to have its play in foodgrains; but I cannot understand how we can remove all zones and controls and then have universal rationing. I think the removal of zones has become a slogan with some people. Without understanding

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

the implications, they are propounding it.

Shri Piloo Mody: What are the implications?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I say that the reasons are very obvious. This is not something new. All these experiments—control, de-control, zones, no zones, wider zones and restricted zones, restriction on movement of some cereals and other foodgrains, free movement—all of them have been tried and the results of these experiments are before the country. I am not saying anything revolutionary. All I am saying is, that whatever policy has to be determined about the removing of certain restrictions on the movement of foodgrains, that can be done only with the consensus of the Chief Ministers of the deficit and surplus States.

We certainly know the feeling in the country. The farmer wants a free market so that he can sell at the highest price. The trader certainly wants freedom so that he can take foodgrains from the surplus area to the deficit area where he will get the highest profit. The consumers, of course, except in certain depressed pockets of societies, would like to have free movement so that foodgrains will be available to him in any quantity. So, certainly we will have to take care of certain vulnerable sections in the society and provide foodgrains to them at a reasonable price. That is what we are doing. In doing so, we are subsidising food.

Shri Piloo Mody: Do the zones help you in doing this?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Yes, it is helping us. So far as the surplus States are concerned, they have been very helpful.

श्री मोल्लू प्रसाद : चीजों के दाम निश्चित करने के लिये क्या सरकार के पास कोई योजना है ?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Again, I will have to enlighten my friend. In the fixation of prices, if the State Governments think that they can enforce it, they will receive all the assistance from the Central Government. Let them fix the prices and enforce them.

श्री मोल्लू प्रसाद : क्या मुख्य मंत्रियों के सम्मेलन में इस पर विचार किया गया था ?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: If the hon. Member takes a little trouble, travels to Lucknow and seeks an interview with the Chief Minister there and pleads with him, and if the Chief Minister fixes the price of foodgrains in UP, we will give all assistance.

श्री मोल्लू प्रसाद : आप से बात करना भी कोई गुनाह है ।

श्री जगजीवन राम : लेकिन समझना चाहिए कि कौन काम कहाँ से होता है ।

Shri S. Kandappan (Mettur): In the case of UP, the hon. Minister just now stated, that if the price is fixed by the State Government, the Centre will render all assistance. We have fixed the price in Madras.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: If you want some money, we are not going to give you money because you fixed the price at a particular level.

Shri S. Kandappan: Then what do you mean by assistance?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: The House should consider whether the country is in a position to do it. It is not a question of supplying subsidised foodgrains to some people in Madras, Calcutta or Bombay. If it comes to that, why not all the State Governments subsidise the supply of foodgrains to all their citizens? The question is whether the country can afford it.

Shri Piloo Mody: Then what did he mean by saying that he will help the States in every way?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I never said that. I will help them financially.

Shri Piloo Mody: What is the help? Spell it.

Shri S. Kandappan: You did say: let the States fix the price; we will help them.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: That is not what I said. I said: fix the price and enforce it. Well, it will be very easy for any State Government to purchase at Rs. 5, fix the price of supply at Rs. 2 and ask the Central Government to subsidise it. That is the simplest thing to do. But, is the country in a position to do it?

श्री नाथ पार्ई (राजापुर) : ज़ोन के बारे में भी कुछ कहें, बाबूजी ।

Shri Jagjivan Ram: was talking about zones.

Shri Nath Pai: A very distinguished member from your own party, the Maharani of Patiala in a speech in the House made what was a startling revelation that in Punjab, and I think she is speaking with personal experience, wheat is being used as cattle fodder.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I will not believe it, because in Punjab wheat is being procured at Rs. 85 per quintal. I do not think any agriculturist is going to use it as cattle feed. Of course, if there are some sophisticated agriculturists who feed their cattle with milk, ghee and honey, I cannot object to that. May be, they are sophisticated animals.

Shri Nath Pai: May be, the cattle are vulnerable sections of the society.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: They may be princely cattle. I maintain that whatever quantity of wheat is available in Punjab, the Punjab Government is

procuring it. If the Punjab Government cannot, I say, we are here to take over every grain of surplus foodgrains in Punjab. There is no question of the agriculturists being neglected. The Food Corporation and the Punjab Government are there and whatever quantity they procure, finance will be made available to them. So, that question does not arise. It is only the restriction on movement which is irritating the agriculturists. They find that they will have to give it for Rs. 85 when in UP they can get Rs. 108. The trader also feels the same way.

As I have said, I will again make this appeal to the leaders of the various political parties here, that if they feel that the stage has come when there should be free movement of foodgrains in the country, why not let them take up this question with the various State Governments, where they are also represented and persuade them to do it. As I said, it can be done only with the consensus of the Chief Ministers of the various States, if they feel that the stage has come.

Then a question was raised about State trading. I reiterate what I said on several previous occasions that if any State Government wants to take over State trading in foodgrains all sorts of assistance will be given by the Central Government, including financial assistance for the purchase of foodgrains. We have started in a small way through the Food Corporation of India.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That is a scandal.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: Well, if somebody can see nothing else but scandal, how can I help it? Well, there can be some weakness in any organisation. I do not think that the Food Corporation is free from all weaknesses and inefficiencies. I will not claim that. The Food Corporation should function as an efficient organisation, performing its functions economically. If there

[Shri Jagjiwan Ram]

are areas where it has functioned uneconomically and inefficiently, certainly action will have to be taken.

Shri Piloo Mody: What steps have you taken in this regard?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Regarding the Food Corporation employees, those who have transferred from the Centre, a Bill is being introduced in the House, taking care of them. We will see that they do not suffer adversely on account of being transferred to the Food Corporation. That is quite clear.

Then, questions have been raised about our supplies to the various deficit areas. When we are functioning with shortage of foodgrains and when our allocations depend upon the availability of imported foodgrains there have been occasions when there have been shortfalls in despatching the allotted quantities. The House is aware; it has happened in the case of all the States.

Now, questions have been raised about Congress Governments and non-Congress Governments. I do not want to labour the point but I want to tell the hon. Members that by raising that question they do not serve the purpose of any party, either of any State Government or of any people, because in this matter, as I have said on previous occasions, I have tried—and it should be the effort of everybody—to keep food out of politics. As I once remarked when somebody said that, if I supply consciously and deliberately less quantity to a particular State, is it only the non-Congress people who are going to be affected or will the Congress people also be affected? It is very simple. The consumers are the supporters of the Congress and various non-Congress parties. No government will be so efficient as to determine about every individual that he was a supporter of Congress and, therefore, he should or should not get ration. I will never blame any non-Congress Government of that partiality. In this allocation I never take

that into consideration. As a matter of fact the major portion of the quantity that we are supplying today to the various State Governments is being supplied to the non-Congress Governments.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Most of them are deficit States.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: No; again you are mistaken. There are also deficit States among the States where there are Congress Governments. Madhya Pradesh is deficit; Maharashtra is deficit; Gujarat is deficit. They are all Congress States; there are Congress Governments there.

As I have said, as compared to Congress Governments we are supplying larger quantities to non-Congress Governments because the deficits are larger. I am mentioning this only to tell the House that in this matter we do not take into consideration whether the State is a Congress State or a non-Congress State because the people want food. If there have been shortfalls, there have been shortfalls in both categories of States.

Some figures were given about despatches and arrivals. It is very simple to explain. Despatches may be there in the last days of a month but the arrival at the other end may not be in the same month in which the despatch has taken place. Therefore, there will be variation between the figures of despatches and the figures of receipt. The only point to be seen is whether the quantity that is despatched has been received or not in the first week or so of the succeeding month. That explains it. This variation takes place because it is in transit; or, sometimes it so happens that the State Government has nominated a dozen or 20 stations where the wagons are to go and the State headquarters take time in getting the information from the various centres regarding the arrival of wagons. Due to that also there is a time lag.

I do not want to quote the figures but for the benefit of friends who have raised this question I may suggest that they may ask the source from which they got this information as to what was the offtake in that particular month in which they have said that the arrival was less. If the offtake was more than the quantity arrived in the State, it means that the stock was there from the previous month which reached in the first week of the succeeding month. That is very simple.

Shri Vasudevian Nair: Do you claim that your commitment to all the States is fulfilled?

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I have said that to the best of my ability I am trying to do that.

We have taken all the State Chief Ministers into confidence. In view of the difficulty in certain months, we have already informed them in the Chief Ministers' Conference, what will be the shortfall or what will be the quantity that we will be supplying. We are making efforts, if we can increase that availability and be in a position to do that, to supply more than what we have already informed the Chief Ministers.

श्री राम गोपाल शालबासे : दिल्ली में चावल आपने बन्द कर दिया ।

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Delhi is the capital. In some matters Delhi should produce some psychological effect on the country. There is shortage of rice in the country. Delhi is not the rice-consuming centre, but there are people who are rice-consuming. What I have done is that for the people who are not rice-consuming, temporarily I have stopped giving one kilo of rice that was available to them every month. That is temporary, for one or two months. After the rice situation improves, that cut will be restored. That was not with a view to making any sizeable quantity available. That was only to show to the country that Delhi also is prepared to sacrifice for

those areas where there is shortage of rice.

I think, I have nearly covered the important points. I may again express my thanks and gratitude... (Interruption).

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No please.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee (Krishnagar): One question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is not yielding.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: One question only.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more questions. If I permit one, several hon. Members will get up.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I have not finished.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He has not said anything about sugar. Sugar is selling at Rs. 4½ per kilo.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: About sugar I was going to say that the production of sugar this year has been considerably less than what it was in the previous year. The House is aware of the serious drought condition in Bihar, UP and certain parts of Maharashtra. That has very adversely affected our sugar production. It was 35 lakh tonnes last year. This year the production has been nearly 21 lakh tonnes.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : ब्लैक में चीनी कहां से मिलती है ? जितनी चाहो ब्लैक में ले लो ।

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Therefore we had to reduce proportionately the allocation to the various States.

श्री शिव नारायण : पालिटिकल पार्टीज वाले ब्लैकमार्केटिंग करते हैं ।

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: So far as black-marketing or high price is concerned....

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): Is it permissible for a Member to say that political parties do blackmarketing?

Shrimati Mohinder Kaur (Patiala): Sir, may I explain....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No explanations.

Shrimati Mohinder Kaur: I would like to clarify....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, please. I am putting all the cut motions together to the vote of the House.

All the cut motions were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1958, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 32 to 37, 121 and 122 relating to the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation."

The motion was adopted.

[The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha, are reproduced below—Ed.]

DEMAND NO. 32—MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 99,29,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation."

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: I was saying that we had to curtail the allotment of the various State Governments proportionately due to the reduction in our production. I know, that has created some shortage in the States, but there was no reason, if the State Governments manage the distribution properly, why there should be rise in prices.

Sugar has been a big problem at present. I know, the food situation is difficult but what I have been experiencing is that perhaps it is easier to manage the food situation than the sugar situation. I am not talking of the distribution of sugar; I am thinking of the sugar industry as a whole. At present we are examining the whole question of the sugar policy and it may be that in the course of the next 10 or 15 days we will be able to decide something about the sugar policy.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Including sugarcane price.

Shri Jagjiwan Ram: Including that. We have said on previous occasions that an upward revision of the sugarcane price is also under consideration.

Sir, I take this opportunity to express my thanks to the various sections of the House for its lively interest in and encouraging words about agricultural production.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now I will put all the cut motions to the vote of the House.

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No question please. If I allow one hon. Member, several others will get up. We are pressed for time. Please resume your seat.

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav (Baramati): I did not speak on these Demands.

DEMAND No. 33—AGRICULTURE

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,17,89,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st March, 1968, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation'."

DEMAND No. 34—PAYMENTS TO INDIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE RESEARCH.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,00,39,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'Payments to Indian Council of Agriculture Research'."

DEMAND No. 121—PURCHASE OF FOOD GRAINS AND FERTILIZERS.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,76,61,76,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'Purchase of Foodgrains and Fertilizers'."

DEMAND No. 35—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND NATIONAL EXTENSION SERVICE.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,60,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'Community Development Projects and National Extension Service'."

DEMAND No. 122—OTHER CAPITAL

OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 21,10,59,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-Operation'."

DEMAND No. 36—FOREST

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,07,63,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'Forest'."

DEMAND No. 37—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND CO-OPERATION

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,60,04,000 be granted to the

14.50 hrs.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 15 and 16 relating to the Ministry of External Affairs for which 7 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members present in the House who are desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

serial numbers of the cut motions they would like to move:

DEMAND NO. 15.—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,05,93,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 16.—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,94,70,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1968, in respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs'."

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak in support of the cut motions No. 62 to No. 68 that stand in the name of my colleague, Prof. Ranga, and myself. I myself will deal with first three cut motions, leaving my colleague to follow on Monday to deal with the rest.

I think it is correct to say that never in the last twenty years has the policy of the Indian Government been so much at variance with the minds of the people. Never has the chasm between official pronouncements and the feelings of the people been so wide. This is so whether we think of West Asia or whether we think of Peking or of Tibet, as we saw yesterday; when the whole House practically was on one side and the Government on the other.

The policies that the present Government are carrying out are the policies which were evolved twenty years ago by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru in entirely different circumstances. During

the past twenty years, the world has undergone a transformation. Twenty years ago there was the Soviet bloc on one side facing the Western Democracies on the other. There was an active cold war in the context of which the policy of non-alignment, such as it is, was evolved. Whether one agreed with that policy or not, and we did not, at least it made some sense in that particular context but in today's circumstances it make no sense at all because the whole situation has undergone a change.

There are two major respects in which the world scene has been transformed. The first major development is the emergence of Communist China as a nuclear power. Communist China is a major threat to this country's independence, its security and its democratic way of life. This new arrival on the scene has become our open enemy. Militarily, in 1962, and politically since then, it has been trying in every way to damage and humiliate us and the humiliation of our diplomats a few weeks ago was only the last turn of the screw. The main political threat in Naxalbari, as a red base in India, is the beginning of that political infiltration. Even militarily, they have been instigating our neighbours in Pakistan on the west and are trying to encircle us by overcoming Vietnamese resistance and coming down right all the way to Singapore. When we see Chinese allies and friends and the Chinese themselves surrounding us all the way from Karachi to Singapore, we can consider the plight we shall be in.

This is a matter of major concern not only to us but also to our neighbours. Only yesterday, I read a report of a speech made by Mr. Ratnayake President of the Ceylonese Senate in Colombo on 13th July 1967, when he was attending a reception in honour of the new Ceylonese High Commissioner to this

country. I want the House to consider how others are more worried about our own survival than some of us seem to be. He said:

"Ceylon wants not only a friendly India but a strong India."

Then, he went on to say, very ominously:

"If India falls, the chances of Ceylon maintaining her Independence will be really remote."

This is how it is beginning to look to people outside, just as we were able to look at China twenty years ago. People are beginning to see the beginning of our end. This is the first major development.

The second development which has transformed the scene is the new relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. Twenty years ago, they were facing each other like angry giants, ready for war, but since then, a subtle but sure change has come in their relationship and Soviet expansion, which was a feature of the postwar years, has been contained. Whenever it has tried to raise its head whether in Berlin or in Cuba, it has been faced firmly and rejected and repelled. The result is that today the Soviet Union is beginning to accept the position, which is certainly that of a super-power, but of the second super-power. As somebody had said, about the Soviet Union that everyone is equal but some are more equal than the others, so also the two super-powers are equal, but one is more equal than the other. The position of being the second super-power is increasingly being accepted by the Soviet Union. That is not to say that the fight for peace is over. Even today in the Kremlin, there is supposed to be a split, whether it is between Kosygin and Brezhnev we do not know but certainly the Soviet government is a split personality. On one side there is the old reactionary and subversive drive to interfere in other people's affairs, on the other hand, the Soviet

Union is becoming more and more a *status quo* power whose interests are more and more on the side of peace and less and less on the side of war.

Many factors have gone into this. The rise of the Chinese Communist threat to Russia as to us is certainly one factor. Another factor is the social changes that are going on within the Soviet Union which we welcome. Thirdly it is the success of the policy of containment which the United States and others have practised during the last twenty years. This does not mean that the battle is over—it is still on. It is in this situation that we have to consider what should be the role of this country in this new world and not the world of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru.

In this new world, I suggest—I think, the House will go along with me thus far—that our policies should be of trying to bring the two super-powers even closer together than they are today, of helping the tendencies to cooperation while not encouraging the tendencies to quarrel. This means two things. Wherever the super-powers are more or less in agreement unless it goes against our vital national interests, we should not come in their way and we should not antagonise them. But where both of them are quarreling, we should certainly not take sides, if it can be avoided, and we should try to sit quit and use our influence to bring them together because that is what the peace of the world and our own interests demand.

Secondly, it also means that, when they are working together, we should try to help them to interpret their policies to the smaller countries. I believe this country can be a very valuable interpreter, link, between the two great powers on the one side and the smaller countries of Asia, particularly of South and South-East Asia on the other. It is in the context of this role which fits in broadly with

[Shri M. R. Masani]

the policy of non-alignment, if properly understood, that I would like our country to behave today and in the days to come.

If we consider whether today the policies of the Indian Government conform to this pattern or role, I am afraid, the answer is 'No'. I propose to prove that from two specific instances. The first is the case of nuclear armaments where the two great powers are pulling the same way and we are coming in the way of the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty, thereby antagonising the two powers who are trying to check an evil that they see. The other is our role in West Asia. There the two powers found themselves on opposite sides and we play an aggravating role, trying to out-bid one power in quarreling with and antagonising the other. In both the cases, I suggest, we fail in our specific purpose. Let us take the bomb first and then West Asia.

There is no doubt that this country today is vulnerable to the threat of Chinese nuclear blackmail. Making the bomb, unfortunately, is out of the question and anyone who advocates it has either not done his home-work or has not worked out his arithmetics. There are two basic reasons why it cannot be done.

15 hrs.

The first is that the Chinese Communists' progress in making the hydrogen bomb has made our talk of plutonium completely out of date. Five years ago we might have thought that we could catch up with them, but today the gulf has widened so much that it is utterly impossible for India to have any kind of sensible deterrent because, for a deterrent, you need parity. Making one little bomb is not going to help any one. To get parity is outside our reach. There are only two powers in the world which can act as a deterrent and these are the United States and the Soviet Union.

The second reason why making a bomb is ruled out is the cost. The French budget, which is comparable to ours, has a small *force de frappe*, not to compete with China but just to have something. Even that *force de frappe* costs France an equivalent of Rs. 3,200 crores a year to make the armaments and to have a supersonic Air Force to deliver them. Rs. 3,200 crores a year is practically the entire Four Five-Year Plan allocation per annum for all developmental purposes. Does it mean that we are going to stop functioning as normal human beings in order to enter into this arms race? Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, our efficient expert on the subject, who is entitled to say as he ought to know, has estimated that the cost will run into billions of dollars a year. I repeat that Dr. Vikram Sarabhai says that to enter the race with China on a nuclear basis would cost billions of dollars a year to India.

Shri Nath Pai: What did Mr. Bhabha say?

Shri M. R. Masani: Mr. Bhabha's estimate is out of date, along with the bomb he was thinking of.

Therefore, on the economic plane, as Dr. Vikram Sarabhai has put it, if you want window-dressing, if you want to fool the people of this country, if you want "a gimmick, a paper tiger"—these are his words—have it, but it will serve no purpose at all.

Mr. Annadurai, however, is on the right side in this particular respect. I am glad that he has taken this line. The Chief Minister of Madras, the other day, asked for a major cut in military expenditure and said that if China, with its nuclear weapons, chose to attack India, it could not be resisted even if India's entire revenue of Rs. 20,000 millions were spent on defence, and he went on to say:

"Friendly countries more powerful than China would come to our help and annihilate the aggressor."

I am very glad that someone in his position has seen this point.

Then what is to be done? We had earlier President Lyndon Johnson's offer of a nuclear shield. We were foolish enough not to take advantage of it when it was made. That offer is still open. There are people who say: "Let us have a joint guarantee from the Soviet Union and the United States". I certainly agree that a double guarantee would be much better than a single one because even the United States' guarantee, which is worth something, would be worth more to us if the United States knew that the Soviet Union would not come down on the side of Communist China in a nuclear clash. Therefore, I too would welcome a double guarantee by the United States and the USSR.

Is such a guarantee available? I say, Sir, it is. I am sorry that some Ministers have made statements that such a guarantee is not available. That is misleading the country. There has been a shift in the Soviet position. On the 15th February, *Pravda* carried a very long theoretical article which said that Communist China had gone through a "military bureaucratic coup." This means to say that Communist China is no longer in the family of "socialist countries". The implication of that is that the defence pacts between Communist China and Soviet Russia no longer operate because those defence pacts operate only between "socialist countries".

Taking advantage of that, our Government took a small initiative. They sent up Mr. Jha and Dr. Vikram Sarabhai to Moscow and Washington. Mr. L. K. Jha, speaking to correspondents in Washington at the end of his visit, disclosed to them on the 21st April, I am quoting from the *Times of India* report of that day:

"The Soviet Union, like the United States, was prepared to consider giving written guarantees to non-nuclear powers against nuclear attack or a nuclear threat.... The approach here, as

in Moscow, is constructive, understanding and sympathetic."

He went on to refer to what he called 'a community of outlook' between the two.

What has happened to that initiative? That was in April and today we are in July. We have not heard a word more. What steps have the Government of India taken to follow up that very useful initiative that was taken by Mr. Jha and Dr. Vikram Sarabhai? Why have they not persisted in their efforts? What more have they done since then to get a sound guarantee from the United States and the Soviet Union, which, we understand, they were prepared to give? I fear that there has been a failure to follow up this initiative. I would like to know from the hon. Minister or the Prime Minister what exactly is being done on this plane, a very important plane for the security of our country, because today we are vulnerable. And if today we were attacked, the entire responsibility for not having a guarantee would fall on the shoulders of this Government. I have shown that we are not, on the nuclear side, playing the game. We should make an offer to sign a non-proliferation treaty on condition that we get a guarantee both from the United States and the Soviet Union.

Turning to West Asia, which is the last major topic I shall deal with, the approach of my Party has been, and is, that we should be friends of both the Arabs and Israel and that we should maintain a posture of impartiality and objectivity in the dispute that goes on unfortunately between the Arab countries and Israel. It was in pursuance of that policy that we, along with non-communist parties in this House, jointly signed a letter to the Prime Minister on the 5th June as soon as hostilities broke out in West Asia. In that letter, we said:

"Whatever may so far have been said and done, we are of

[Shri M. R. Masani]

the view that from now on the best thing that can be done is for the Indian Government to adopt an objective attitude in this dispute and to abstain from taking sides or apportioning blame at this stage. We feel that, if this attitude is adopted by the Government, it will have the support of the country as a whole. Such an attitude would be conducive to India's playing an honourable part in restoring peace in West Asia."

We asked for nothing more than neutrality, nothing more than impartiality. in the company of Muslim countries like Malaysia, Iran and Turkey, all three of whom maintained impartiality and objectivity throughout the West Asian war, just as Japan did and as other countries did.

I am very sorry to say that the Prime Minister, the following morning, when she made a statement in this House, brushed aside public opinion as expressed by the two socialist parties, the Jan Sangh, Swatantra and the DMK, and took the path of blatant partisanship and unfairness.

What is the Indian stand on West Asia? There are two basic things: before the war and after the war. Before the war or when the war started, we said that Israel was the aggressor, and after the war finished, we said that Israel should withdraw from the territory which they acquired unconditionally.

Shri Nath Pal: 'We' means who?

Shri M. R. Masani: I mean the Indian Government. When I say 'we', I mean the 'Indian Government'. The Hon. Member is quite correct. I shall correct myself.

The Indian Government's position was that Israel was the aggressor and, therefore, it should vacate its territory. Both these attitudes are thorou-

ly unrealistic and wrong. They are lacking in the most elementary sense of justice or reality.

Who was the aggressor? Let us look at the record.

At a Press Conference in Cairo on 28th May, President Nasser said:

"The very existence of Israel is an aggression. When the time is ripe, it will be we who will decide the time and place."

At a Press Conference on the following day, on the 29th May, in Cairo, President Nassar said:

"We do not accept any kind of co-existence with Israel."

In his interview with Christopher Mayhew, British M.P., in B.B.C. Television, he was seen and heard to say that the Arabs and Israel had been in a 'state of war' since 1948 and in war it was natural to seek to exterminate the other.

This was in so-called peace-time before the fighting.

Ahmed Shukairy, Palestinian Front Leader said this: Asked what would happen to Israelis if the Arab war were to be successful, he said: "We will help to facilitate their shipment to their native states". As for Israelis born in Israel, he said, and I quote:

"Everybody who is still surviving will stay in Palestine. It is my estimation that none of them will survive."

After that, President Nasser demanded the removal of the Emergency Force, so that he could attack.

After that, on 24th May, he committed an act of war. The blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba was an act of war, an act of aggression.

Even after these acts of aggression for 12 days, Israel maintained peace to see what the Great Powers would do, what the United Nations would do, what world opinion would do, and what diplomacy could do. It was

after 12 days of these acts of war that they struck back in their own defence.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Did they do that? Even the hon. Member is doubtful about that.

Shri M. R. Masani: They struck back in their own defence because I am saying that an act of war was perpetrated by the UAR. And we know what happened in the six-day war. On the fourth day, the war for "the total annihilation of Israel" ended with a cease-fire.

I think, therefore, that the Times of India editorial on the 10th June was perfectly correct when it said:

"By virtually expelling UNEF from UAR soil, in mobilising its forces, in negotiating a short-lived alliance with Jordan and in closing the Gulf of Aqaba, Cairo was guilty of aggression. This was in effect acknowledged by the UAR representative in the Security Council...."

This, I think, is the verdict of the world and of Indian public opinion as well. In the face of this, for our Government to persist in this heresy, in this lie, that Israel is the aggressor is something that this country cannot go along with.

The Soviet Union has not had a very honourable role to play in this context. It was their armaments that made this war possible. There are reports that they fabricated alarming and false reports which they gave to the UAR Government. Mr. Randolph Churchill, who is writing a book on the war, starts his book by saying:

"It started with a lie—a Russian lie."

And that lie was evidently this—that they sent alarming reports to the UAR that Israel was massing its troops to attack Sayria, which was not true, and Mr. Nasser acted on the strength

of these reports, later on to be let down by those who had instigated him.

The West Asian chapter has been described not inaccurately as "a second Cuba". Cuba had a very important lesson to teach Mr. Khrushchev, and one is not being unduly optimistic in hoping that the failure of this adventure in West Asia will teach Mr. Kosygin a similar lesson and, judging by all the indications, he is learning it very fast. At such a time for our Government to go on taking an incendiary or extreme position is not helpful even to the Arabs or to the Soviet Union.

We have been handicapped by the absence of diplomatic relations with Israel. For years, we have been asking that we should maintain relations with both sides. If we had done that, we would not have been so completely in the dark and made such a mess of our position, because we backed the wrong side on a wrong hypothesis.

All these years, 87 countries have maintained diplomatic relations with both Israel and the Arab countries without forfeiting Arab friendship....

An hon. Member: Including Russia.

Shri M. R. Masani: Yes, including the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc till the other day. These countries include all our neighbours, our own kind of people, like Ceylon, Nepal, Burma and several African States like the Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria and Tanganyika. There are 87 countries. I do not want to waste the time of the House by reading out the whole list. If 87 countries could maintain friendship with the Arabs and yet have a representative in Tel Aviv, why have we been selected for this humiliation—that we can only have friendship on their terms and not on self-respecting terms?

Why do we make a laughing-stock of our country by giving diplomatic recognition to a bogus thing called the Arab League which is no State

[Shri M. R. Masani]

at all and treating its representative as an Ambassador, and by being the only country in the world to recognise a "State" that does not exist? And yet we do not recognise a State that does exist, and very much so. So we have thrown non-alignment out of the window. We have been partisan in a flagrant fashion.

We have voted for every wrong move in the United Nations. On the 25th May, the United States had brought forward a resolution for an immediate cease-fire.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude.

Shri M. R. Masani: I think I can have some more time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can have two more minutes. He can take his own time from his party's time. I was just reminding him.

Shri M. R. Masani: But we voted against that resolution for an immediate cease-fire along with the Soviet Union. If we had voted for it then and that cease-fire had been carried out, we could have avoided the defeat of the Arab Armies and Air Force. We thought that we were backing the winning side, whereby we made a complete misjudgment of our position. Later on, we had to climb down and support a cease-fire.

Similarly, we backed the Soviet resolution declaring Israel an aggressor. But who voted for it? There were only 10 non-Arab, non-communist countries in the whole world that voted for it, and we had the distinction of being one of those ten countries.

In this way, before and after the fighting, we seem to be persisting in completely going out of the way in refusing to see any point of view except our own.

The general debate in the Assembly of the UN has certain lessons to teach

us. One is that the Soviet effort to condemn Israel failed miserably. The second is that the non-aligned nations' effort to make Israel withdraw unconditionally has also failed, because the world conscience does not see why they should withdraw until they are guaranteed security.

What was our own position when we were in a similar situation in 1965? In 1965, when we were asked to withdraw from territories which we had occupied in Pakistan, what did we say? We said that we would not withdraw until our security was guaranteed against another attack. Is Israel not to have the same assurance of security from another attack or another preparation for war from its enemies?

Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri wrote a letter to the Security Council on the 14th September, 1965. If you, Sir, had not warned me about the time, I would have read out that letter. Speeches were made in this House by Shri M. C. Chagla and by Shri Swaran Singh saying that we would never withdraw from Haji Pir until first Pakistan gave assurances that they would not interfere in our affairs and would keep their hands off Kashmir. Is Israel not entitled to the same assurance that at least its existence will be recognised, that the talk of pushing it into the sea will be given up? So, let us not have one law for ourselves and create another law to suit other people.

This very briefly is why I say that in West Asia, far from playing a constructive role, far from trying to help America and Russia to come a little closer together, we have joined one party to this dispute in an extreme incendiary position which makes any settlement impossible.

May I warn the Government? Let them look out. Their Soviet friends seem to be leaving them also in the lurch. I am quoting from today's *Patriot*, so that they do not have any

doubts about the source! In the messages from the UN Assembly in New York, there is one interesting sentence to which I would like to draw the attention of the Foreign Minister, because it seems that, if we go on clinging to the Arab position, we shall soon find ourselves left alone without even the Soviet bloc! This is what the paper says:

"Some diplomatic sources claim that the Soviet Union is ready to accept the Latin draft which the non-aligned group does not accept."

This really will be the logic of the position that we have taken; if we take such an impossible position and we ignore world opinion, which has now expressed itself through the Assembly, we may find ourselves all alone in the end. And if we do that, we shall deserve the laughter and contempt of the world.

Now, what would be a fair basis for a solution? I commend to the House and to this Government the 'Outlines of just peace by Prof. Arnold Toynbee, the great historian who is pro-Arab. Prof. Toynbee has been a noted friend of the Arab countries all these years. What is his proposal for a settlement? I shall read out the four salient points culled out from his long article.

He says, first of all, that there must be Arab recognition of the existence and sovereignty of Israel. This must come first. There can be no withdrawal unless both parties are prepared to sit round the table and talk to each other as equals. So, the first recommendation of Prof. Toynbee is Arab recognition of Israel.

The second is that Israel is to do justice to the Palestinian refugees. This is a very valuable point.

The third is the reciprocal grant of rights of way. Israel to have free passage through the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran and Jordan to

have access to the ports of Jaffa and Haifa.

His last suggestion is that the Holy City of Jerusalem should be made a free city under international trusteeship as suggested by His Holiness the Pope.

This seems to be an admirable basis for negotiations, and I would still commend to our Government to retire from their wrong path, to get in line with Indian public opinion and to follow Prof. Arnold Toynbee even if they do not follow anyone else.

Shri Sant Bux Singh (Fatehpur): I rise to support the Demands of External Affairs Ministry. It gives us great pleasure to hear Shri M. R. Masani lecturing to us on the virtues of neutrality and non-alignment. This merely goes to show that the policies that we have stood for and the policies which have been criticised in the House so far are policies which today the Opposition parties are willing to accept. Shri Nath Pai said the other day that non-alignment was about to receive a burial; I commend Shri Masani's speech to him in the House today. Non-alignment might be used as a word with a certain kind of distortion to inflict criticism on this side of the House. Non-alignment was the means to a certain kind of policy. The policy ever was, as Panditji had repeatedly said, the policy of peaceful co-existence, a policy of friendship and non-alignment in the particular circumstances of the world then which was bi-polar. When American then demanded bases to encircle many other lands, we took a stand on behalf of ourselves and on behalf of many other nations of the world that we were not going to be a part of this fight, that we were not to be a party to any kind of struggle that was waged between the two power blocs.

I come to West Asia because this is something over which the Opposition has waxed eloquent. In their misunderstanding of this issue, sometimes they thought that all that our

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]

foreign office is busy with is West Asia. It is not because you have a lot of shouting; it is not because the press sometimes takes a certain attitude that that reflects either the policies of this Government or the aspirations of our people. There has been tremendous confusion in this country on the West Asia issue. All of us who ever studied the English language, who have known anything about the West, have had great admiration for the Jewish people; a race that produced men like Marx, Freud and Einstein would be worthy of our respect.

Shri Nath Pai: And Moshe Dayan.

Shri Sant Bux Singh: That I leave to my hon. friend.

On that alone, they would be entitled to our respect. What the Jews went through in Western Europe is something that mankind should never forget. On this basis, however if we start giving any people, any group of people, the right to go and aggress, the right to go and persecute, the right to take away somebody else's land, it is an entire confusion. Nobody disputes the fact that the Europeans treated the Jews very badly. But expiation of that sin cannot be at the cost of the people of West Asia. In 1918, a fact mentioned in the article that Shri Masani quoted from Prof. Toynebee—90 per cent of the people in Palestine were Arab.

May I also take this opportunity to remind my friends of the SSP that way back in 1938, when Dr. Lohia sat at foreign desk of the AICC, a resolution was passed condemning the British for inflicting the Jews upon the people of Palestine? In that year too, Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, wrote in the *Harijan*:

"I have my sympathies with the Jews. But sympathy does not blind me to the requirements of justice. The cry for a national home for the Jews does not make

much appeal to me. Palestine belongs to the Arabs as much as England belongs to the English or France to the French. It is wrong to impose the Jews on the Arabs."

This has been something we have upheld for the last 30 years.

Shri M. B. Masani: How many more years will you carry on with the dead past?

Shri Sant Bux Singh: That is precisely how the confusion is created. He starts with point B when point A is fundamental. In the article that Shri Masani read from, there is one simple point that Israel should be recognised by the Arabs. But thereafter, there are other points which refer solely to what should be done by the people of Israel who have been in occupation of other territory even before 5th June, 40 per cent more territory than was allotted to her by the UN resolution. Eilat was captured and taken even in 1956 when Israel joined the open aggression with the French and British Imperialists on Egypt. This is something that cannot be denied today in view of the writings of Mons. Pineau and Mr. Nutting. My socialist friends might have certain sympathies, certain considerations, because, may be, it hurts them to remember that the French Prime Minister then was a socialist gentleman called Mons. Guy Mollet.

May I remind Shri Masani that he is taking a position about aggression which is neither from the starting point nor from the ending point?

I have referred to history only to show that confusion is created and issues is wrongly placed before the people. When Israelis themselves go about in western Europe and say that 'we were the first to start the fight', when it is inscribed on the Parliament in Israel that 'our nation extends from the Euphrates to the Nile', which means that three-fourths of the existing national States of the Arab world

would be wiped out, where can aggression be more proclaimed? Only three or four weeks ago, the *Time* magazine wrote that people were going away from Israel, more people were not willing to come to Israel. This was the condition, and yet this hunger for aggression was for what? It was exactly in the revealing words of Shri Masani, for 'a second Cuba', where certain powers, much bigger than Israel, were using that small country and encouraging it in order to suppress people who are underdeveloped, who are backward, who have been exploited.

Shri Umanath: Name the powers.

Shri Sant Bux Singh: I will.

It is a fact that there has been a certain kind of weakness, but this is the first attempt of the Arab world, subjected to imperialism for so long, to fight back. This is the first attempt in 20 years. The Jews were armed and helped by the British, with the American ships of the 6th Fleet in combat readiness with arms being flown in, with a thousand aircraft being deployed, when there are merely 300 aircraft with the Israelis. It is obvious that something else is happening. We stand with the Arabs. We stand with them because justice is on their side. We stand with them because they are fighting against bigger powers. Humiliation at one stage, defeat at a certain stage, does not draw the curtain on history. Poland was wiped out four times. Yet today Poland exists. Boundaries change justice does not.

May I commend to Shri Nath Pai the words of Pandit Nehru when he talks about non-alignment being buried? Panditji himself said very clearly that 'where there is aggression, where there is injustice, we cannot, and shall not, be neutral'. We have taken that stand....

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: About Tibet?

Shri Sant Bux Singh: ...on the side of justice, no matter what hap-

pens, no matter who wins at a certain stage based on material strength. But it is such a pity—and I feel sorry for them—that the Jews are being used as an instrument of oppression, a people who have described themselves 'as the last of the just' are being instruments for folding back history.

Let us also remember, coming down from this moral plane, another thing. Do we not remember Alexander's route? Right from the time of the Ottoman empire, the route to India has been through the Suez. It is in our interest to be friends with the people who are there. There is a hundred-crore worth trade. There is oil. This is my answer to Shri Nath Pai's arguments—It is in our interest to side with the progressive forces of the Arab world and not to confuse the issues because of communalists misunderstanding them here and trying to dub them merely as a Muslim power. There is a Christian President in Lebanon. A person's religion does not matter. What does matter is that we side with progressive forces and we side with people who stand against the Muslim Brotherhood, we side with a person like Nasser who, according to Pandit Nehru, helped us far more than any power did at the time of the Colombo proposals, who stood by us and prevented a condemnatory resolution being passed at Casablanca. We are not alone; we are not isolated. Look at the resolutions passed at Bandung and Belgrade and the Second non-aligned Nations Conference at Cairo.

It shows that 52 nations side with us. Yet there are nations, small nations, subjected to the big power of certain big countries. It is this kind of fight that we have to fight against. I am glad that at the UN, along with the UAR and Yugoslavia we helped to bring in a resolution asking that no bases of foreign powers to be installed either in Asia or in Africa.

The world has changed; it has become multi-polar; we do not have to

[Shri Sant Bux Singh]

think of old concepts. More and more we need to develop bilateral and multilateral relationship with smaller countries that can help us, smaller countries whose problems are very much akin to our problems; it is far more important than having diplomatic relations with Israel. For instance, on the economic plane, it would be good for us to have relations with the German Democratic Republic which has carried out vast development in the field of chemicals and agriculture. It stands next to a country which quite often has supplied arms to Pakistan and steel to China. We have to develop these relations. We have to give a sense of assurance to the smaller countries on our borders which are threatened by the great land of China.

It is often said that our policy on China has misfired. India as soon as it got freedom tried to have as its friends, both the big and giant powers in Asia. One was the Soviet Union with whom we have had a long history of friendship and an increasing and growing relationship on the economic and political level. We tried our best to do the same with China but whose policy has succeeded with the Chinese? Has the policy of containment of China by the United States succeeded? Britain was the first country to recognise China. Witness what is happening in Hong Kong. Remember the British ambassador parading for three hours before the Embassy. What has poor Burma done to deserve what the Chinese are doing to them? If a truck driver runs amuck and smashes other cars, nothing is wrong with the people who are driving properly. China is passing through a particular phase of its history and the only country that it can befriend is Pakistan. China's policy has dismally misfired in Africa, in Indonesia, in Burma. We do not want to be warmongers and we do not mean to talk about bombing and fighting China. We wish only to maintain the relationship with China which we have historically maintained for the

last 2,000 years; that is all. Till China does not interfere with us, we have no interest and we have no desire whatsoever to become the camp-followers of certain people.

Rajaji writes in 'Swarajya' quoting Bacon: "Trust not the princes" referring to the big powers, and Mr. Masani comes here and talks to us to take security on their guarantee. Let us forget outside history. In 1798, there was a Governor General here called Wellesley and he held out a subsidiary alliance to the princes and he told them: we shall protect you, bother not as to what happens inside or outside; all you have to do is to have a British resident and six battalions; you shall be secure. And secure they were till 1858 when the proclamation came proclaiming Queen Victoria as the Empress of India. That is not the sort of policy to follow if a nation does not want to make the mistake of relying on others. I would commend to Mr. Masani and my friends of the Swatantra Party the speech that Mr. Eshkol made in West Germany; maybe it will make far more sense to them than what I say. He said: there were people who asked us to rely on America. I think he was quoting President Johnson, I speak subject to correction. He told President Johnson: what will happen, Mr. President? You will take sometime to find out who the aggressor is? What happens Mr. President, if you are out shooting in Texas while the fate of my country is decided meanwhile? I hope the rationale of this will be understood. Let us not suffer from these big power complexes.

In terms of our national tradition, in terms of our national heritage India has had a foreign policy which has stood the test of time. All over South Asia and in East Asia, there was the policy of India's culture and India's friendship. It was a policy where we never aggressed, a policy which was built in terms of friendship. That is why I welcome so much the recent offer to Indonesia of 100 million credit and the 50 million

credit agreement we are entering into with Ceylon and the technical co-operation and help that we are working out in South East Asia. I would also like to emphasise more and more that we should come nearer to the greatest Asian industrial power, which is Japan and have closer and better relationship with her.

To end, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Foreign Minister and through him of the foreign services to one point. Our foreign service needs to forget as soon as it can, and to the extent it can, that our foreign policy is not meant to please John Henry Newbolt from Brighton or Miss Mary Wastson from Boston. Our foreign diplomats have to remember that they represent a people that are simple; that it is not the beauty of their language or the quality of their accent or the kind of bow tie that they put on that matters. I am reminded of an incident when Trotsky asked Lenin as he was going to negotiate the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and he asked: what kind of clothes will I wear? Lenin told him: It does not matter how you are dressed; the thing is to get the work done. Our foreign service should remember that. It has also to remember the traditions of Mahatma Gandhi who walked without any trousers on his legs to the Buckingham Palace and sustained the national spirit more than anybody ever did at any stage. Our foreign service has to remember that wherever they go, an attitude of arrogance should never be exhibited. Our diplomats have to remember the downtrodden, toiling people of India who have been oppressed for thousands of years and go about with complete forgiveness in their hearts. And present a face which is full of kindness. It is this humanity that our foreign service has to represent. Thank you.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): Sir, I am moving my cut motions Nos. 16 to 23. Just now the hon. Member Shri Sant Bux

Singh from the Congress benches said that their foreign policy has stood the test of time. It has really stood the test of time because it is because of this foreign policy that our country was invaded four times during the last twenty years and the fifth invasion is in the offing. If that is the success of our foreign policy, I do not know what is meant by failure. The right to conduct foreign relations is an attribute of sovereignty and India could have a foreign policy only when it became free. Prior to that, the Congress did pass resolutions on foreign policy but they were the result of the demagoguery of Pandit Nehru who used to make comments on foreign affairs and the great leaders like Sardar Patel and Mahatma Gandhi used to wink over them as the play things of a play boy. I do not think they could be the basis of the foreign policy of a free country. The foreign policy of a free country has to be guided primarily by national interests. The considerations that have been guiding it—like platitudes, like world peace, Panchasheel, charity, etc., have no place in the foreign policy, and even this talk of non-alignment which has become the sacred mantram of our foreign policy is also not relevant today. The foreign policy is a policy; it is not a principle. So far as non-alignment is concerned, every country in the world has to be both non-aligned and aligned. In the disputes of others, in which we are not directly involved, we have to be non-aligned; we should be non-aligned. We should not go and put our nose everywhere. But in other matters, where our interests are involved, where we are fighting, we have to make friends. Every country in the world is both aligned and non-aligned at the same time. Even countries like USSR and USA which can afford to be non-aligned, which are so strong, and which can go alone, even they are aligned: Russia is in the Warsaw Pact and America is in the CENTO and SEATO. The great non-aligned friend, Nasser of UAR, has also military pacts with Iraq and

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

Syria. Therefore, this fetish about non-alignment must go. India needs to be non-aligned; in the quarrel between Russia and America, estrangement between which is now fortunately disappearing. We should be non-aligned in the quarrel between Arabs and Israel. But there, we have not remained non-aligned. But, when we are fighting with Pakistan and China, we cannot be non-aligned. We need friends; Pakistan has friends and China has friends and we also need friends. And therefore, we must be very clear as to what we mean by non-alignment.

The foreign policy of any country has to be primarily guided by three factors: its geopolitical situation; its need for security and the attitude of its immediate neighbours. The attitude of its immediate neighbours and its relationship with the immediate neighbours is the main guiding factor in the foreign policy of any country. Our immediate neighbours are Pakistan and China.

What is our policy towards Pakistan? Pakistan is our born enemy. The very existence of Pakistan, depends upon keeping up her tension with India. If Pakistan learns to live in peace with India, then the very basis of her existence as a separate State will disappear. And therefore, whoever may be the ruler of Pakistan, he will keep up tension with India.

Now, Kashmir is not the cause of tension with Pakistan. It is the result of that tension. Even if we give 10 Kashmirs to Pakistan, even if we give away Delhi to Pakistan, even then, Pakistan will remain our enemy. It is the basic fact about Pakistan which we should keep in mind. We must also remember the character of Pakistan. You cannot deal with a man, you cannot deal with a country, without understanding the character of that person, or that country. The rulers of Pakistan are bullies. That is their character. That is born out

of their inferiority complex. The other day, Shri Mahant Digvijai Nath said in the House that because some of military and economic pressure some of the weaker elements among Hindus became converts to Islam, and somebody objected. But that is a historical fact. To cover that inferiority complex, they indulge in bullyism, and that bullyism and goondaism of Pakistan rulers has paid them dividends. They got Pakistan by adopting that policy towards the Congress. The same policy they are continuing to pursue towards India. If we look into the Indo-Pakistan relations for the last 20 years, we will find that this goondaism and bullyism has paid them rich dividends. When they attacked India in 1947, they got some 40,000 sq. miles of our territory in return. They again scored over India in respect of the canal waters plus about Rs. 80 crores in the bargain. When they attacked our territory—Lathitilla and Dumabari border—they got two villages. If man knows that if he adopts an aggressive posture he gains something by it; then, why should he give up that posture? And that is why Pakistan is showing an aggressive posture. The only way to deal with Pakistan is to adopt a firmer and stronger policy. We know the character of Pakistanis. I come from that area. President Ayub belongs to a clan akin to that of mine. In Punjab, there is a saying about the Pakistani character:

“म्रागा शेर दा पीछा गीढ़ दा”

That is, they have the front of a tiger and the back of a jackal. They are bullies and they are cowards. If we deal with them strongly, they will run away. But the difficulty is that the people who have been dealing with them on our side have proved to be congenital cowards. We do not need these congenital cowards. We have need to deal with Pakistan firmly and strongly. If Pakistan attacks one village, then, we must attack five of their villages. If they kill two Indians then, let us kill 10 Pakistanis. Only then Pakistan will learn to behave.

This is the only policy that we can adopt towards Pakistan.

15.46 hrs.

[SHRI C. K. BHATTACHARAYYA in the Chair.]

But instead we are still talking about the Tashkent spirit. It is dead as dodo. I was reading the report of the Foreign Ministry, wherein they have said that we are doing this; we are doing that. But clapping cannot be done with one hand and alone. I say that Pakistan has buried the Tashkent agreement. Let us not talk about it. Let us not swear by it. Pakistan has to be dealt with in a different way; and that is, we must change our foreign policy towards Pakistan. We must be firm and be reciprocal in all matters. That is the only way to deal with Pakistan.

We are told that since Pakistan has opened a second front for us through China and because we cannot fight on two fronts, therefore, let us come to terms with Pakistan. That is the most foolish stand to take. If we make such a concession or submission to Pakistan, because Pakistan has made an alliance with China, Pakistan will realise that this policy of alliance with China has paid dividends, and it will strengthen that alliance; it will not weaken that alliance. Therefore, any submission to Pakistan because of this alliance would be wrong. It will not serve any purpose. It will only have the opposite effect. The only way to deal with Pakistan is that if Pakistan could open a second front, we also should open a second front for her.

That brings us to the question of Pakhtoonistan. The question of Pakhtoonistan is a burning question. We have a moral duty towards the Pakhtoons and their great leader. The Pakhtoons have nothing to do with Pakistan. Afghanistan is the national State of Pakhtoons. The Pakhtoons want to have a separate State as part of Afghanistan. Some Pakhtoons have been brought under the control of

Pakistan. They want to go back to their homeland. They will have to go back.

In this connection, I would like to quote from Sir Kerr Fraser-Tytler, from his book on Afghanistan; he is not friendly to India or Afghanistan. This is what he says in that book:

"Unfortunately, the Pathan races, which make up the ruling portion of the Afghan nation, have spilled over their mountain boundaries and spread down into the plains, so that in large areas of Pakistan dwell a people whose affinities are with Kabul, so far as they are with anybody, and not with Karachi. As it stands at present behind the artificial boundary of the Durand Line, Afghanistan is ethnographically, economically, and geographically an incomplete state."

So, without Pakhtoon area of Pakistan, Afghanistan remains incomplete. The demand of the Pakhtoons is not a separatist demand. It is an irredentist demand. They must go back to their own motherland, and we must support them, and support Afghanistan which never accepted the Pakhtoon area as being part of Pakistan. We must support the Pakhtoons in their claim to go back to their motherland, in every way—morally, materially—and in going so we will only be doing our duty towards them. That will also be a second front for Pakistan and that is the best policy that we can follow towards Pakistan. We have followed the present policy towards Pakistan for the last 20 years and we have seen the results; let us change it now.

Now, let me come to China. Actually, China was never our neighbour on the north. Tibet was our neighbour. Our northern frontiers were the Indo-Tibetan frontier. It was never an India-China frontier. But then, here again, our so-called tradi-

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

tional friendship with China was based on two things: Cultural proximity, because China became Buddhists, and secondly, geographical distance because Tibet lay between China and India. Now, both of these have disappeared. Therefore, China today stands as a natural rival of India in the economic field, in the political field and in the military field. Our great blunder in the case of China was that we allowed China to overrun Tibet and here, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a great document, a letter, written by the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, as early as 7th November, 1950, to the late Pandit Nehru, when Sardar Patel came to know about the Chinese invasion of Tibet. I crave your indulgence for reading it in extenso, because I think it is something which every Member of the House, irrespective of party affiliation, must ponder over coolly.

Sardar Patel, in his D.O. No. 821 DPM/50, dated 7th November, 1950, said—it is a long letter, and so I shall read only some relevant extracts:

“Their last telegram to us is an act of gross discourtesy, not only in the summary way it disposes of our protest against the entry of Chinese forces into Tibet but also in the wild insinuation that our attitude is determined by foreign influences. It looks as though it is not a friend speaking in that language but a potential enemy.”

It was on the 7th November, 1950, that Sardar Patel was writing to the effect that China was behaving as a potential enemy. I wish that the people of India, the Parliament, the Congress party, had heeded the advice of Sardar Patel at that time. Then, Sardar Patel continues:

“Recent and bitter history also tells us that Communism is no shield against imperialism and that Communists are as good or

as bad as imperialists as any other. Chinese ambitions in this respect not only cover the Himalayan slopes on our side but also include important parts of Assam. They have their ambitions in Burma also. Burma has the added difficulty that it has no McMahon line round which to build up even the semblance of an agreement. Chinese irredentism and Communist imperialism are different from the expansionism of imperialism of the western powers. The former has a cloak of ideology which makes it ten times more dangerous.

In the guise of ideological expansion lie concealed racial, national and historical claims. The danger from the north and north-east, therefore, becomes both Communist and imperialist.”

Then he continues:

“In these circumstances, to make people alive to the new danger or to make them defensively strong is a very difficult task indeed, and that difficulty can be got over only by enlightened firmness, strength and a clear line of policy.

* * * *

Any faltering or lack of decisiveness in formulating our objectives or in pursuing our policy to attain those objectives is bound to weaken us and increase the threats which are so evident.

* * * *

Hitherto, the Communist Party of India has found some difficulty in contacting Communists abroad, or in getting supplies of arms, literature, etc., from them. They had to contend with difficult Burmese and Pakistan frontiers on the east or with the long seaboard. They shall now have a comparatively easy means of access to Chinese Communists and through them to other foreign Communists. Infiltration of spies, fifth

columnists and Communists would now be easier. Instead of having to deal with isolated Communist pockets in Telangana and Warangal we may have to deal with Communist threats to our security along our northern and north-eastern frontiers where, for supplies of arms and ammunitions, they can safely depend on Communist arsenals in China."

This is what Sardar Patel wrote to Pandit Nehru on 7th November, 1950. Every word that he said has proved to be prophetic. I wish even now the Ruling Party, not only the Ruling Party but all the nationalist parties in India, heed these words of Sardar Patel and adopt a realistic policy.

What can be a realistic policy towards China. The first thing is, to see that Tibet gets back its freedom. There can be no greater falsehood, there can be no greater travesty of truth than to say that Tibet is part of China. Tibet was never a part of China. Tibet has an independent history of 2500 years. According to Tibetan Chronicle the first independent king of Tibet was a son of India, the son of Paranjit of Koshal who was a contemporary of Lord Buddha. They got the script from India, they get the religion from India, they had all the trade with India. In fact, if Tibet has any link commercially, economically, culturally or politically, it is only with India. Whatever link they had with China was because of the Manchu Emperors. The Manchu Emperors were religious followers of Dalai Lama. They looked upon Dalai Lama as their guru. It was on that basis that some kind of relationship was established. But in 1911 when the Manchu Emperors were gone, when the Manchu dynasty was overthrown, immediately Dalai Lama said that their relationship was with the Manchus and now that the Manchu dynasty was gone they had no relationship with China. This is a historical fact. We have admitted

that. Our relationship with Tibet is based on Lhasa Convention of 1904 and Simla Convention of 1914 and they are binding on us even today.

Therefore, we followed a wrong policy about Tibet. We should not have allowed the Chinese to go into Tibet. What is worse we did a great blunder when we accepted Chinese suzerainty over Tibet under the agreement of 1954. But that agreement has never been worked by China. China has already repudiated that agreement. When they have repudiated that treaty it is no longer binding on us. Therefore my appeal to you is the first thing we have to do about China is that we must repudiate the treaty of 1954 and give back to the Tibetans the right of freedom. And we as a neighbouring country, as a people who believe in freedom, as a people who believe in human rights, as a people who stand for oppressed people, we must take up their case in the United Nations and outside. We must work for the freedom of Tibet. Until and unless Tibet is freed there can be no peace in Asia. I have here a statement made recently by H.H. the Dalai Lama wherein he says:

"We firmly believe that for the lasting peace of Asia and of the world the two great nations, India and China should remain at peace. But we also believe that unless Tibet is restored her freedom and created into a demilitarized zone that peace will not be achieved."

If we want to have peace in Asia, if we want to have peace in this part of the world, it is necessary that Tibet must get back its freedom and Tibet should become a demilitarized zone between India and China. This must be the first objective of our foreign policy in regard to China. Secondly, we must break diplomatic relationship with China. It is no use maintaining it. Our Embassy there is not a window on China; it is a prison for our diplomats. Let us close

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

it. Thirdly, we should stop supporting China's entry into the United Nations. Fourthly, we should try and create closer relations with countries which are threatened by China. China is a big giant. China has always been an expansionist power. To deal with China we must have friends. To those who say that we and China are traditional friends, we have never quarrelled, I must say that they are misinformend. The empires we had, in S.E. Asia—the Champa Empire, the Sailendra Empire, the Shri Vijaya Empire, fought long and bitter wars with China. Therefore, we must formulate a positive China policy and we must follow it. I know some of my hon. friends will not agree with this. They represent a lunatic fringe of India, they do not represent the people of India. Therefore, the saner people, honest people, democratic people, nationalist people of India who constitute the large majority of Indian population must formulate a positive policy and that policy we must implement with firmness and determination.

Our other neighbours are Nepal, Ceylon and Burma. These are small countries but these countries are very important for us. These countries are very near to us. Nepal is nearest to us. But for some time she drifted away from us, and gave permission to China to build Lhasa-Kathmandu Road. It was out of reaction. The King of Nepal came here and he did not get a good reception. Later, he was invited to China and given a red carpet reception and he signed the treaty. Later on, when I went to Nepal I talked to the people who count there. They felt that they had committed a mistake, but they could not get out of it. Therefore, if these countries show some leaning towards China, countries like Nepal, Burma, Cambodia etc., it is not because they like China but because they have lost faith in India. Let India stand up to China and then all these countries will be with us and not with China. They know that China is an

expansionist power, a dangerous barbarian. They would like very much to be with India.

Therefore, my submission is that we must try to develop closer relationship with Nepal, with Burma, with Ceylon, Combodia, Thailand and other countries of S.E. Asia. They are our own people. They are our kith and kin. They are culturally a part of us. But we must treat them as equals. We should give up our policy of 'big brother'. Treat them as equals and then you will see that they will be our closest friends. These neighbours we must befriend. This must be the first objective of our foreign policy. We must also pay greater attention to Japan and South Korea. India in fact must learn to look to the pacific instead of the Atomic in the days to come.

Then I come to West Asia. I need not say much about it because my hon. friend, Shri Masani has dilated upon this question in detail. I want only to refer to Shri Chagla's speech in the United Nations where he said:

"To us, therefore, the philosophy of tolerance, peace and co-existence, is natural and the ideas of violence and war repugnant."

I ask Mr. Chagla, where was this policy of co-existence when Nasser was threatening Israel with extinction. I wish he had remembered this thing at that time. If you really stand for co-existence then you must reverse your policy about West Asia. We do not want to stand with Israel. We do not want to stand with the Arabs. We want to follow your policy, the policy of non-alignment, in West Asia, just as the Arabs followed a policy of non-alignment in our dispute with Pakistan, in our dispute with China. We want to be friendly with Israel. We want to be friendly with UAR. But we cannot give the right of veto to UAR, to decide as to who others can or cannot be the friends of India. Just as Nasser says: "I am a good friend of India and at the same time I am a good friend of Pakistan, a

good friend of China", similarly, we should tell Nasser: "We are good friends of you but we are good friends of Israel also". Had we diplomatic relations with Israel we would not have been misled. Shrimati Indira Gandhi said on 7th June here that they could not think that a war was coming and therefore they could not evacuate our troops from Gaza. He evacuate our troops from Gaza. Had we a window in Tel Aviv we could have known that war was coming. Actually I did tell the Minister that it seemed to me that a war was coming. It is argued that Israelis killed our soldiers. Is that true? Hold an inquiry. Is it not a fact that UAR put its guns at a place near our camp? Is it not a fact that three of our soldiers in a jeep were killed by a mine of UAR, the so-called friendly country? Let us, therefore, not blame only Israel. It was our fault. If anybody is responsible for the murder of our 14 jawans, it is the Government of India, the Defence Minister of India and the Prime Minister of India. They are primarily responsible for the murder of 14 of our young jawans. Why could you not evacuate them? Is money more important than the lives of our jawans? If Canada could airlift . . . (Interruptions). I refuse to yield. If Canada could airlift 800 members of her forces why could we not evacuate our jawans and save them from death? Therefore, it is no use blaming Israel or UAR if their shells and mines killed 14 of our jawans. We have to blame ourselves.

16 hrs.

I want to say one thing more about West Asia. We talk of the Arab world. There are 13 Arab States but there is no Arab unity. We must deal with every Arab State, as with any other State in the world, on bilateral basis. Jordan is our enemy; I refuse to treat Jordan as our friend. Syria is our enemy; I refuse to accept Syria as our friend. Saudi Arabia is our enemy; I refuse to accept it as our friend. They all supported

Pakistan. UAR was neutral and I want to be neutral towards UAR. Therefore, deal with every Arab State on a bilateral basis, and the basis should be reciprocity and mutuality of interest. Reciprocity and mutuality of interest could be the only basis of any worthwhile foreign policy. Let us not talk of the Arab world. There is no such thing as an Arab world.

The diplomatic recognition that we have given to the Arab League must be withdrawn. The representative of that organisation has been doing mischief in this country. He has been instigating the Arab students to break our Indian laws. This must not be tolerated. He must be kicked out. We must not recognise the Arab League. You must know the country's opinion, the public opinion. Now you are completely cut off from it. You are more cut off from public opinion than our British rulers of past. That is another aspect. Therefore, I would appeal to you that you should review your policy in regard to West Asia.

Then, about the two big powers, USA and USSR, I have to say that we should try to be friendly with them. We should not rub them the wrong way. But, at the same time, let us not depend on them too much. None of them wants India to become a great power in its own right. Whenever they give us help, they take the price for it. America helped us and they got their price in the devaluation of the rupee. Russia helped us and got the price in the form of the Tashkent agreement. What are the Russian newspapers and her Radio "Peace and Progress" doing? They are interfering in our internal Affairs. They are boosting Kamaraj and Indira Gandhi, condemning Shri Morarji Desai and Shri S. K. Patil. I do not hold any brief for Shri Morarji Desai, nor have I any enmity for Shrimati Indira Gandhi. But how is it that a friendly foreign country in this way, in this blatant and ugly way, is interfering in the internal

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

affairs of our country? Much has been said about CIA. I also condemn CIA and their activities. But I condemn Russia also. Why is she interfering in our affairs? Their Embassy prepare the material and send them to New Age, and through New Age that anti-Indian material is spread in this country. Therefore, I say, I want to be friendly to Russia, I want to be friendly with America but, at the same time, I submit, do not be too much dependent on them. I do not agree with Shri Masani when he says that we should have their joint guarantee of nuclear umbrella. We cannot depend on America, we cannot depend on Russia. We must stand on our own legs and we must have our own atomic weapons to defend ourselves.

Then, we must pay more attention to the countries of Latin America, Africa and East Europe. They are getting out of the clutches of USA and USSR. They have got a lot of affinity and community of interest with us. We must pay more attention to our relationship with such countries. Then we must pay more attention to those countries like Mauritius, Trinidad, Surinam and Guiana where people of Indian origin are there in large numbers. They are peaceful countries. They are our firm friends in United Nations and outside. We must pay greater attention to their needs and interests.

Another object of our foreign policy must be to see to the interests of overseas Indians. Everywhere overseas Indians are being kicked away. Since freedom we have failed to protect their rights. We must do something for them. What is happening in Aden? What has happened in Kenya? Are they not matters of shame for us? We must change our policy and we must see that interests of our overseas brethren are also protected and respected.

When we are discussing a foreign policy, we must also see to it that policy is properly interpreted and pro-

perly implemented. That work is done by the Foreign Office. Our Foreign Office is literally a Foreign Office. It has an American lobby, it has a Russian lobby, it has a Chinese lobby, it has a Pakistani lobby and it has an Arab lobby; but I wonder whether it has any Indian lobby. Make it an Indian Foreign Office. In this Foreign Office, there are people—I would be failing in my duty if I do not refer to it—like Mr. Azim Hussain about whom people have serious misgivings. He has emotionally more links with Pakistan and Arab countries. Make your Foreign Office really Indian Foreign Office and let it safeguard Indian interests.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has referred to the name of a member of the services. They should not be mentioned like this. Please do not use their names.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I know the rules. Then, this Foreign Office is dominated....

Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav (Azamgarh): Sir, on a point of order. The hon. Member has named a particular officer by name.

Mr. Chairman: I have already drawn his attention to it.

Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav: Please listen to me. The hon. Member has referred to the name of an officer who cannot defend himself in this House. He must withdraw that, because the officer cannot defend himself in this House.

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav: My point of order is this. A serious allegation has been made... (interruptions) Please do not shout.

Mr. Chairman: Let us hear the point of order.

Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav: The hon. Member must withdraw the allegation which he has made against the officer. Otherwise, it should be expunged from the proceedings.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I have given expression to the misgivings of the people. I have not made any allegation. I have said that there are serious misgivings in the public mind. I have not made any allegations.

Mr. Chairman: He may resume his seat. This is a point to which the attention of the Speaker has to be drawn, whether the name mentioned by the hon. Member should remain on record.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: As a representative of the people I must enlighten this House about the feelings of the people, the misgivings of the people. Only that I have mentioned, I have not made any personal allegations against him.

In our Foreign Office we must try to have such officers as are attuned to our needs and our way of life. If India needs to nationalise anything, it is the Indian Foreign Office that has to be nationalised. We are having officers in our Foreign Office, we are having diplomats, who look more English than Indians. We need diplomats who feel, live and behave like Indians. I particularly stress that we should use more of Hindi in our Foreign Office. I have seen it, and many Ambassadors have told me, that because English is used we cannot keep our secrets because even our chauffeurs and sweepers get them. So, in our Foreign Office we should see that Hindi is used more and more so that our secrets and our national honour are maintained.

In the end I would say that we should give more opportunities to the young IFS officers. The ICS monopoly of the Foreign Office should go. We know that there are some good ICS officers. Let us send them for administrative jobs in Kashmir and

Nagaland. Then, in our important foreign missions, particularly in countries like USA and USSR, we should have more public men. Dr. Radhakrishnan as our Ambassador in Russia did more for our country than any career diplomat could do. Therefore, more attention should be paid to the appointment of right type of personnel in the diplomatic missions in crucial countries like Japan, USA and U.S.S.R.

In conclusion I would say that foreign policy is not a party question. All over the world foreign policy is looked upon as a bi-partisan thing. It is a national question. In foreign policy and matters relating to foreign countries we should appear to be one. But unfortunately, for some time past, that is not the case because the Government has become oblivious, government has become disdainful to the public opinion. This must go. I would suggest that inside the House, as also outside the House, a consensus should be created in regard to all matters of foreign policy whether it is Pakistan, China or West Asia, so that whatever our differences in the country may be to the outside world we may appear as one. Initiative in this regard must come from the ruling party and not from the opposition. If they take the initiative and if they keep the national interest above all—ideology must not come in, party interest must not come in and only national interest must be uppermost—we can have a really national policy, a bi-partisan foreign policy regarding all problems concerning our neighbours and other countries also.

Mr. Chairman: I hope, the hon. Member who spoke just now would agree with me that the particular name that he mentioned should be deleted from the record.

Shri Umanath: No, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I have not invited Shri Umanath. I have invited the hon. Member who spoke just now.

Shri Umanath: Whatever you do must be within the rules. With regard to expunctions there are rules.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Umanath has not followed me; I have not invited Shri Umanath.

Shri Nath Pal: But Shri Umanath has got a right to give you advice.

Mr. Chairman: I have requested the hon. Member who spoke just now to agree with me that this particular name which he mentioned might not be kept on the record. That is for him and not for Shri Umanath to say.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर नाम न लिया जाता तो अच्छा होता, लेकिन जब नाम ले लिया गया है, तो इस नाम को हटाकर हम कोई गलत परम्परा कायम नहीं होने देंगे। अफसरों के इस सदन में नाम लिये जाते रहे हैं, उनको आलोचना करता रहा है और जवाब देने के लिये मंत्री महोदय हैं। जो आलोचना की गई है, उससे कोई महमत हो या न हो, लेकिन नाम निकालने की बात मान लो तो फिर किसी भी मंत्रालय के किसी भी अफसर को आलोचना नहीं हो सकेगी। यहाँ आज तक ऐसा नहीं हुआ है और भविष्य में भी ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए।

श्री शशि भूषण वाजपेयी (खरगान) : सभापति महोदय, मैं आनरेबिल मेम्बर से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि वह नाम वापस ले लें, क्योंकि इनमें साम्प्रदायिक भावना है, इसलिये उनको नाम वापस ले लेना चाहिए।

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I am not a new Member of this House; I have

been here previously and I know that names have been mentioned. Of course, I did not want to do it but I would have failed in my duty towards the people if I had not given expression to the misgivings of the people. I have done a national duty. It is for the Minister to remove the misgiving. I refuse to withdraw it.

Shri R. K. Sinha (Faizabad): Sir, I rise to support the foreign policy of the Government of India. Before I come to the major points which this House must consider I want to draw the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to a very small thing which might have had no importance a few years back but which might be very useful now.

India would be celebrating the centenary of Mahatma Gandhi's birthday shortly. My attention has been drawn to a book recently published in India. Dr. Pramod Vyas, the author of the book entitled "Dawning on the Capitol" has reproduced a resolution passed by the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives approving the creation of a Gandhi memorial in Washington D.C. The resolution was moved in the U.S. Congress by Congressman Emanuel Celler of New York. It may be noted that Congressman Celler is a great friend of India and was very close to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

This resolution lapsed after 5 years since the money for creating Gandhi Memorial next to Lincoln Memorial in Washington could not be collected as provided for in the resolution. I am told by the author that Congressman Emanuel Celler has given him an assurance that if the Government of India is prepared to co-operate on this project, he can revive the resolution in the U.S. Congress... (Interruption).

This has not appeared very important to my hon. friends in the Opposition but, I think, if a memorial of Gandhiji can be perpetuated in the United States of America, that would do great honour to our country.

Our friends in the Opposition talk of foreign intervention in this country and whenever they talk of foreign intervention, the two speakers of the Opposition who have spoken this afternoon, mostly they talk of the so-called Communist subversion of India. I want to remind them of a pamphlet which has been distributed all over India by the leaders of the Hind Nazi Party, 42, Katra Moti Ram, Amritsar, one of whose founders is Shiv Shakti, which says:—

"Instead of corrupt Parliamentary system which shall be abolished forthwith, nation shall be guided for 20 years under Dictatorship rule to make her a strongest power on this planet. After 20 years people shall be asked to decide if they want democracy or dictatorship and their wish will be honoured."

Ours is a parliamentary democracy. This country of ours has given very important and illuminating experiments of ideology. My friends have tried to degrade the ideology of Nehru. They have only agreed with the word non-alignment when it has suited their interests. Their non-alignment in West Asia means supporting Israel on this issue. Many spokesmen of the Opposition parties will speak after me; some of them have spoken earlier. I want to talk only to those parties who swear by the name of Gandhiji. I need not address myself to the Bharatiya Jana Sangh. I want to read out what Gandhiji said about Israel and Zionism. So said the Mahatma:—

"I have all my sympathies with the Jews. But sympathy does not blind me to the requirements

of justice. The cry for the national home for Jews does not make much appeal to me. Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English or France to the French. It is wrong to impose the Jews on the Arabs. If the Jews have no home but Palestine, will they relish the idea of being forced to leave the other parts of the world in which they are settled? Or do they want a double home where they can remain at will? The Palestine of Biblical conception is not the geographical tract. It is in their hearts. But if they must look to Palestine of Geography as their national home, it is wrong to enter it under the shadow of British guns—"

now that of American guns—

"nothing can be said against the Arab resistance in the face of overwhelming odds."

We have been told times out of number as we shall be told this afternoon or may be later that idea of peace and non-alignment and non-violence means that we should support Israel, that our non-alignment should be so stressed that Jewish imperialism and Zionism should be supported. If America or Australia, which insists on a white policy, wanted to give a homeland to the Jews, they could have had enough space in Australia or America or Latin America and Israel could have been created there. That was not the need of the hour. This region was a forking point between three continents—Europe, Africa and Asia—which were meeting at Suez; therefore, a trigger-gun of imperialism had to be planted at the heart of Asia and Africa. That is how Israel was created.

Our friends forget that Israel was created by 13 lakh Arabs being driven out of their own homeland. I know, those Hindus, who have come from Pakistan who agreed to co-exist

[Shri R. K. Sinha]

there, cannot forget the communal hatred to which they were put in Pakistan. In the same fashion how can those Arabs, who have been driven out of their homeland, forget the Zionist imperialism which threw them out of their homeland, which made them homeless? This is to be remembered when we analyse the question of West Asia.

Once also in 1956 there was imperialist aggression against the Arab people, against the people of Asia and Africa, but our friends in the Opposition never mention that. I am ashamed of the fact that those who call themselves socialists forget that Nasser is also a socialist. How is it that the imperialist supported Zionist socialism appeals to them but Nasser's anti-imperialist socialism does not appeal to them? When the bell rings in their hearts, it is the imperialist bell that rings. Where is the voice ordered from to speak in a particular fashion? It is the order of imperialism; it is the order that is today perpetuating neo-colonialism in the world.

When they talk of 87 embassies being represented in Israel they forget that the majority of the world today, in spite of the fact that nations have been bought and sold in the United Nations, have voted with the Soviet Union, with UAR and with India. Where is democracy? If you take the consensus of the people of the world, the majority of the people of the world are with the Arab people. My friends would like us to support Israel. Let me for the sake of argument agree with them, that we support Israel. What does it mean? It means that we lose Rs. 100 crores worth of trade with the Arabs; it means that we condemn our Arab friends to hostility against India; it means that we give the leadership of the Arab world to the communally minded country of Pakistan, which is our sworn enemy. That is what our Hindu communal friends would like. They would like the Muslim Brotherhood to be re-orga-

nised. They would like a Muslim fanatical bloc against India in the United Nations and in the world. I want you to look at the merit of non-alignment policy. Would non-alignment policy have been successful if China, Soviet Union and the whole socialist world were against us? Today, the merit of Nehru's philosophy can be seen in the fact that Soviet Union supports us in the face of China and the Eastern Europe supports us against China. That is the success of it. Take the Arab countries, the Muslim countries, it may be Malaysia, it may be Indonesia, it may be the land of Afghans which our friends so violently mention. How can they talk of Muslim support, Afghan support, if they do not shed their anti-Muslim obsession in this country?

The success of our non-alignment policy has been that today China is isolated from the whole of the socialist world. China is a barbarous country among the nations of the world. That is the result of the success of our foreign policy. The result of the success of the foreign policy is that today the majority of the Muslim countries in the world, the majority of the Arab countries in the world, the majority of the Asian and the African countries, are behind the Indian people. The major effect of the policy of non-alignment can be judged only in the context of Pakistan and China in collusion. Our friends talk of Pakistan and China collusion. Let us take it on the basis of nationalism, the absolute self-interest. We want to contain China. One of the most successful efforts to contain China is to isolate it from the socialist pressures, from the Soviet Union and from Eastern Europe. Has our policy not succeeded in isolating China from the rest of the world?

Let us take Pakistan. They want us to go against Arabs so that we might be in alliance with Malaysia, in alliance with Iran, in alliance with Turkey, which are in alliance with Pakistan itself except Malaysia. What

is the alliance that you are asking.

16.23 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

This country is among the four great coming-up countries of the world, the United States of America, the Soviet Union, China and India. The destiny of this country is that one day this country, in the comity of the nations of the world, will assert its foreign policy. We shall give honour and dignity to this country and that honour and dignity shall not come by giving up the policies of Nehru. It shall not come by giving up the policy of non-alignment, the policy of militant nationalism, the policy of national self-defence, on which alone we can go forward. National self-defence means not going into an umbrella of the East or of the West. National self-defence does not mean going to our friends either in the East or in the West. National self-defence means an independent foreign policy, a policy of independent India, by her own sinews and strength. This can be possible only if we fight against neo-colonialism, if we fight against racialism, if we fight against all the reactionary forces. That foreign policy shall be a success and there may be many grumblers in Opposition and on this side but this country is a giant country and we shall go forward and forward in spite of all that grumbling.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members may now move the cut motions to the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of External Affairs, subject to their being otherwise admissible.

Shri Ranavatar Shastri (Patna): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Excessive expenditure on Indian Embassies abroad. (2)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Inadequate publicity by Indian Embassies abroad. (3)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[India's foreign policy on Viet-Nam. (4)].

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham (Visakhapatnam): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Non-observance of non-alignment. (9)].

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to formulate and execute a reciprocal policy towards Arab States. (16)].

[Need to establish diplomatic relations with Israel. (17)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to develop closer relations with the countries of South East Asia. (18)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to extend effective support to Afghanistan on the question of Pakhtoonistan. (19)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to transfer the Nagaland affairs to the Ministry of Home Affairs. (20)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Need to take effective steps to secure the liberation of Tibet. (21)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

[Need to secure compliance of Tashkent Declaration on the part of Pakistan. (22)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to give an Indian orientation to India's foreign missions. (23)].

Shri Ramavatar Shastri: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head other revenue expenditure of the Ministry of External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1."

[Provision of facilities of anti-Chinese propaganda by Dalai Lama in India in the name of helping Tibetan refugees. (35)].

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Government's indifference towards the massive and ever escalating brutality of U.S. operations in Viet Nam. (42)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Implications of India's indissoluble links with the anti-imperialist aspirations of Arab countries. (43)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Recent United Nations deliberations over the imperialist-oriented aggression of Israel against Arab countries. (44)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[India's attitude in regard to the proposed nuclear non-proliferation treaty. (45)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Government's continued remissness in offering full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic. (46)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Delay in opening a full-fledged Embassy in Ulan Bator, Mongolian People's Republic. (47)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Abnormally heavy expenditure over our missions abroad. (48)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Desirability of adopting suitable initiatives to ease and ultimately solve problems arising out of our confrontation with China. (49)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need to devise ways and means of bringing about better relations with Pakistan. (50)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to pursue a principled policy in regard to the diabolic U.S. aggression in Viet Nam. (51)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure in activating India's leadership in the International Commission for Viet Nam. (52)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to take note of the sinister implications of growing U.S. intervention against North Korea and Cambodia. (83)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Non-utilisation of Indians trained under Government's Foreign Languages Scholarships Scheme in Embassies and for External Publicity. (54)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Dangerous implications of the iteration of India's policy being one of "containment of China". (55)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Government's supine attitude towards the acquisition by the U.K. and U.S. of island bases in the Indian Ocean area. (56)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Delay in decisions in respect of the Pillai Committee's recommendations and the desirability of Foreign Service reorientation. (57)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Dangers of Government's deflection from basic principles of foreign policy over the issue of Tibet. (58)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to consolidate India's natural posture of friendship with the Himalayan States. (59)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to keep track of and place an entire ban on the operations of the American C.I.A. in India. (60)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to prevent persons like Reita Faria and Zubin Mehta from behaving abroad in a manner most derogatory to India's prestige. (61)].

Shri M. R. Masani: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to take energetic steps to secure guarantees against nuclear blackmail by Communist China from the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. (62)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to take an objective and impartial attitude in the dispute between Israel and the Arab countries and to work for a just and stable peace in West Asia. (63)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to take energetic steps to persuade the Government of the United Arab Republic to reopen the Suez Canal in order to ensure speedy shipments of foodgrains to meet the urgent needs of a large section of the Indian people. (64)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to sever diplomatic relations with Peking in the face of the brutal ill-treatment and humiliation of our diplomats in violation of international law. (65)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100".

[Failure to take the initiative and to join in evolving a system of regional

[Shr M. R. Masani]

security against Chinese Communist expansionism along with Nepal, Ceylon, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, South Vietnam, Philippines, South Korea, Republic of China, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. (66)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to express solidarity with the Government and people of South Vietnam in the defence of their country against aggression and subversion through guerilla warfare on the part of the North Vietnamese satellites of the Chinese Communist regime. (67)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Failure to recognise His Holiness the Dalai Lama as the Head of a Tibetan Government in Exile. (68)].

Shri Srinibas Mishra: I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to pursue correct dynamic and neutral foreign policy. (1)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure of missions abroad to work with efficiency and promptness. (69)].

"That the demand under the head External Affairs be reduced to Re. 1".

[Failure to take positive line for stopping genocide perpetrated in Tibet. (70)].

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The cut motions are now also before the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): **Mr. Deputy-Speaker,** Sir, the Ministry of External Affairs

Demands for Grants would require a second look by the House because they total some Rs. 33 crores, showing an increase of nearly Rs. 9 crores from the previous year, an increase largely on account of devaluation, the noose we wore round our neck on U.S. advice. We notice also a high proportion of allowances and discretionary expenditure to the pay of officers, which is to the extent of Rs. 46 lakhs and Rs. 163 lakhs respectively, to Rs. 35 lakhs in the Secretariat, and it is much larger in the Embassies, which is to the extent of Rs. 193 lakhs and Rs. 206 lakhs, to Rs. 39 lakhs. It requires some explaining, particularly when our country, is so short of funds.

We have, among our foreign representations, such organisations as the High Commission in London, and we have yet to meet anybody, any Indian in the U.K., who has a good word to say about the High Commission. The officials there, who grovel when a Minister of sorts appears on the scene, ignored or tried to patronize artistes like Balasaraswati and Ali Akbar Khan. The memory still rankles, in regard to the mannerisms pursued by the people in our High Commission in London.

It is notable also that the moral authority, which ought to emanate from principled pursuit of policy, is entirely absent so far as the Ministry of External Affairs is concerned. So, we discover a Reita Faria snooking her thumb at Mr. Chagla and going off entertaining the neofascist American soldiery in Vietnam, and also Zubin Mehta, whom our President has decorated, extending his allegiance from western music to western political policies and jubilantly taking part in Tel Aviv demonstrations which were held in order to celebrate the victory of Israel, which had brutally attacked and killed Indians in the United Nations Expeditionary Force.

I must, however, have a good word for the Government's West Asia policy, which, quite understandably, has come under fire from the distin-

guished representatives of Reaction, with a big 'R'. If I attempt, even remotely, to answer some of the fairy tales which they have so cleverly tried to convey, I shall be diverting my time. I must say that the Government has played an honourable role in consistently opposing Israeli aggression and upholding the cause of Arab people. The Arab people, who live in the world's most strategic area, the cross-roads of Asia, Europe and Africa, were fighting for freedom from the yoke of imperialism, who, lured by oil which gears their power machine, want to keep them in varieties of subjection.

Who would not have lively sympathy for the Jewish people who have suffered throughout the Centuries massive agony and anguish in spite of the tremendous talent which they possess. But nobody in the know of world events, unless they choose to shut their eyes like some of my hon. friends there, can believe that Israel is a sort of innocent, little lamb set among big bad wolves. Israel is, on the contrary, the American Trojan horse planted in the Arab world—the superbly armed enclave of international Zionism, a perennial pistol aimed straight at the heart of Arab freedom.

I am told, I read somewhere in some reputable journal, that there is an insolent inscription at the main gate of Israel's Parliament, Knesset, which says:

"Our State extends from the Euphrates to the Nile."

It is an irony of history that exactly like the Hitler fascists, at whose hands the Jews have suffered the most unspeakably horrid tortures, the overweening Israeli aggressors, aided and abetted by the United States, the United Kingdom and West Germany, in particular, are spouting notorious Nazi shibboleths of geopolitics, of *lebensraum*, of a 'new order' and 'vital frontiers' in the Middle East.

We have just heard something about the Israeli treatment of Palestinian refugees, which has been infamous. Their behaviour towards the forcibly-driven out population of Gaza, Jerusalem and other areas and also against non-combatant civilians generally is a cruel disgrace. Like the soil of Viet Nam, the soil of the land of the Arab peoples has also been drenched with napalm and terrible crimes against the civilian population have been and are being perpetrated.

We hear of Western Powers having a guilt complex about the persecution of Jews and so befriending Israel. If they really felt guilty, and since they are concerned only with European Jewry,—and they do not care for Indian Jews who went and found out what their experience was in that part of the world—if they care only for European Jewry who dominate Israel, why did they not carve out a slice from Nazi Germany after the victory over them and set it up as a Jewish State? No, their intention has been and still is to use international Zionism as a weapon of imperialism.

So, the recent ugly happenings are all part of a single imperialist plot whose monstrous face we face from the Mekong river to the Sinai desert.

I am glad we played our role in the UN, but the resolution sponsored by non-aligned countries failed to get the required two-thirds majority, for the very obvious reason that the United States bent on protecting her clients opposed the proposition. The simple resolution had asked no more than that Israel should relinquish territorial gains secured through aggression. Apart from the fact that this is an undisguised attempt to legitimise aggressive, United States has indicated by her attitude in the United Nations and also elsewhere in the past that at no time is she going to give up a cold war advantage. My friends of the Jan Sangh and others should better take note of it in regard to our relations with Pakistan.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

We have seen in the United Nations under the leadership of the United States a brutal display of realpolitik, and if all nations go about in this particular fashion, then good-bye to peace and to hopes of the future of humanity.

India's stand on this issue has been basically correct, although from time to time on account of the fear that she may be rapped over the knuckles in regard to American aid, she has muted her criticism of the US and British positions. We have a habit, it seems of taking firm positions and then watering it down stage by stage. We have to avoid it if we want to maintain our image as a really effective country. Immediate healthy reactions are toned down when the effect on aid programmes is recalled. And ludicrous as it may seem, even Pakistan has managed to get almost as much kudos in the United Nations as India has got. In regard to this aid, we have got this Bell report. The slogan in this country should have been and should be at the present moment 'To hell with Bell' and all that sort of thing, if aid-givers try to dominate our policy. But, of course, we get frightened and we get cold feet and that is why in the United Nations and elsewhere, we sometimes fail to keep up to the posture that we ought to keep up. We must resist unprincipled compromises. The issue must be isolated as one of Israeli vacillation of aggression. All other questions are secondary and can be taken up separately later on.

With the effrontery that comes naturally to itself, United States imperialists pretend to advise us to make up with Pakistan. My hon. friend Shri Bal Raj Madhok should note that the prime reason for our bad relations with Pakistan is not that Pakistan is wicked and we are innocent and dove-like and pure and all that. He himself comes from West Pakistan and the people there are of the same sort as he is, and he is a very good man as we know. It is not because Pakistan is wicked and we are abso-

lutely on top of the tree, the prime reason for our bad relations with Pakistan is the American boosting by American arms to brow-beat India out of non-alignment.

We shall settle our problems bilaterally, not because we are told to do it by Bell or whoever it might be. To these wolves who put on sheep's clothing from time to time in order to bamboozle us, we should know what to do. But unfortunately, my friend Shri Chagla—I am glad he has come back; I did not want to say anything behind his back—has from time to time, particularly recently, begun to specialise in making *faux pas*. I was astonished the day before yesterday when he allowed himself to be hectoring and bamboozled by strident voices in certain parts of the House, and in regard to an area where he himself said there were disputes which were pending. Of course, Pakistan had done something wrong which we are trying to resist. He was asked by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri: 'Would you throw the Pakistanis out?' I am quoting his statement reported on the 14th July, 'Yes, Sir', replied Shri Chagla, 'if that becomes necessary'. He should throw the Pakistanis out! I do not know. Shri Chagla should remember Tashkent. Shri Chagla has been, and is, a great lawyer. In international life as well as in personal relationships, if you come for equity, you must come with very clean hands. Don't in the House of Parliament talk in this fashion. It is not done; it should not be done. It gives a completely wrong impression of the policy of our country abroad. We all have a responsibility in regard to this kind of thing. Does he not remember the unfortunate remarks Pandit Nehru was goaded into making in Colombo in August or September, 1962 which reverberated everywhere? Wherever you go, you are confronted with that statement. It was prised out of the mouth of Jawaharlal Nehru. And here in this House is Shri Chagla, in answer to an interjection, talking in this fashion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The remark of Pandit Nehru he referred to was made in Madras, not in Colombo.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May be in Madras.

This kind of thing happens. Therefore, I say, in regard to Pakistan, let us not imagine that we are going to have eternal enmity with Pakistan or with China or any other country on this planet for that matter. It cannot be so. Particularly, in regard to Pakistan, if what the President says from time to time, what the Prime Minister says from time to time and what Shri Chagla also says from time to time, is seriously meant, it is important that we go on taking initiatives for an understanding. Our people need it; our people wish it. They want trade; they want cultural relations. I come from a part of India which is next door to East Pakistan, where we speak the same language and we want to come nearer to each other. Talk is heard in this House about a possible confederation. It is very much in the future, in the remote future. But here and now we do not take initiatives.

In regard to Kashmir, we merely go on saying that we would not discuss it. For how long are you going to keep up face before the world? Why don't you release Shaikh Abdullah? Why don't we do it at this point of time? What was the initiative which Jawaharlal Nehru had in mind before he died? Or are his successors so puny that they merely jump about in pathetic bravado, knowing very well that they cannot pursue in action what their words seem to purport, overtaken by events and unable to steer their way out of stress and strain? It is a very serious matter. This kind of thing happens over and over again.

Again I found Shri Chagla yesterday—and very rightly Shri Masani as well as Shri Madhok gloated over it; if I were in their place, I would also have gloated over it—here in this

House speaking on behalf of Government in a manner which suggested that the country accepted the position in regard to Tibet, in regard to 'Chinese imperial exploitation of Tibet' or something like that which was mooted in the resolution before the House. When he spoke, he talked about cultural genocide'. I do not want to go into detail. But Tibet is not an 'out of this world' unified monolithic theocracy devoted to the pursuit of nirvana. Tibet is very much part of a world class and clan society in the last stages of decay, riven by sharp conflict, addicted to barbarous punishments and saturated with superstition, corruption, blood-fueds and factional manouvres in which more than one mundane imperialist power took an active part. And there a revolution comes; a change takes place. But in regard to Tibet, he talks about 'cultural genocide'!

He talks glibly—I will put him on the mat—about the "containment of China". Jawaharlal Nehru never used that kind of expression. He deliberately would say: I shy away from that kind of thing. It is an expression coined by perhaps a former friend of Mr. Chagla, because he was ambassador in Washington, Mr. Kennen who formulated this word—containment of China Mr. Chagla perhaps shares the American obsessive fear of communism and is reconciled to the idea of America appointing itself as the custodian of the world. But of course things do not happen in that kind of way. And so what do we do? We take brave postures. We do not take the country into confidence, even this Parliament, in regard to the nuclear non-proliferation business. Even now we do not quite know what the Government has in mind. We know China has gone ahead and has got the hydrogen bomb and God knows what other enormity and similar powers of destruction. Peace hangs today on the balance of terror in the world. It is made somewhat more precarious by the latest Chinese performance.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

I would like to say one thing. However, we may view China and her recent ways—we have condemned here, one and all of us, admiration for this achievement; has to be there as today we are still playing fifth fiddle to western technology. In China things are happening which suggest almost some kind of anarchy over there. But they have done this kind of thing which after all is a very big technological achievement. We have a right to be indignant. Indignation, impatience and even impetuosity is understandable when such incidents take place as it did in relation to the contact between India and China. On either side much steam has been let off and some of the doings on our side were not particularly creditable either and they are made worse by our propensity towards a pose of moral superiority. It is a problem of a statesmanship and Mr. Chagla must try to rise to the height of the occasion and the opportunity which he has got as the Minister of External Affairs of this country. Will it be right to proceed on the assumption that China and for that matter Pakistan also will continue for ever and ever to be actuated by external malice towards India? China has other and much greater worries. Her present stance is wicked, it is mischievous, it is anti-Soviet and to that extent it is upsetting the cause of our fighting against imperialism. Mr. Surendra Pal Singh who is having apprenticeship in foreign affairs is laughing, for heaven knows what reason. If he is serious about India's West Asia policy—I have my doubts about it and I have doubts about so many of the crowd over there if he is serious about West Asia policy, he should know who is trying to put up a fight for freedom and fight against imperialism. It is the Soviets who are leading that fight all over the world. That is being diverted and distorted by certain things which China is doing, by Chinese postures, by Chinese perversities which are taking the attention of the people away from

serious anti-imperialist tasks. These things have got to be remembered. Whatever our feelings in regard to China, we ought to know that her present stance is aimed primarily at the world's richest and most powerful country, the United States. It makes no bones about its intentions towards China. It is significant that the United States and its friends would want the Arabs to recognise Israel but the United States refuses to recognise the existence of China, recognises instead Taiwan, Taiwan which has been a part of China for many hundreds of years before Columbus discovered the continent of America.

Let us not raise unrealistic expectations in regard to what we can do about the bomb. We have neither the money nor the power; it is neither practicable nor desirable for us to join this ugly competition. We are signatories to the Moscow Treaty. Let us hope the Minister would tell us that we are working for nuclear free zones—not anything like the umbrella which can be a very doubtful proposition but nuclear free zones—and ultimately for nuclear and other kinds of disarmament I am not sure if we should sign on the dotted line if there is any particular hurry in regard to the non-proliferation treaty. We should retain our independent right to a course of conduct of our own. But we should not go in for this kind of insensible competition for having the deterrent weapon in our hand. This augmentation of weapon means nothing but the death of civilisation.

Now, admittedly, a *modus vivendi* with China is to be worked for. If we give it up and get under one or the other umbrella and indulge in heroic words which we cannot translate into action, it will be a tragedy. Patience is called for; the stakes are very high, and it would not do to play into the hands of certain people who have their own mischievous motivations.

Now, I refer to the problem of our Himalayan neighbours, and of the people who are our own in the sub-

montane regions. Do we know, for instance, what is going on inside Sikkim? I read a cryptic American comment; "we have two enclaves—one in Sikkim and the other in Morocco."

And I hear in the international tourist year which we are encouraging, there are hordes of Americans going there. And inside Sikkim, the political tangle is there; The Government should know more about it than I do, of course. But we hear about it. We never get this tangle straightened out. The whole thing is there; it is the link up: NEFA, Nagaland the Mizos and the hill people are there. Our friend Mr. Swell wrote an article lately where he has tried to say something important. The whole thing is linked up, but the Government's approach is *ad hoc*; first, there is force and then there is an attempt at persuasion. Neither force does the trick nor persuasion. Then the Government is in the soup and everytime something is said; they gitter and dodder, mumble and tumble, and then ultimately nothing happens, and nothing brings out a clear elucidation of the Government's position. (Interruption). Sir, I must have a little more time, to conclude.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give you a few more minutes. But you have exhausted your party's time.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am expressing a point of view which hardly gets represented. All over our earth we see today the evidence of the arrogance and folly of seeking to impose a Pax Americana upon a world which does not want it and does not accept it. In Korea, in Viet Nam, against Cambodia, whose friendship we seem to spurn these days, the American interventionists diabolically carry on their activities. Our Minister's soft heart cries out at the sorrows of Tibet, that the people are suffering. Naturally, our sympathies are roused, and I could respect that sorrow, however, even more if he had ever diplomatically expressed himself.

even as U Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, has done regarding the American barbarity in Viet Nam, barbarity which in volume and character is the most horrific record in human history. The bombing of North Viet Nam has been on a scale which is much larger than in World War II, and there has been the uttermost refinement of cruelty in such things like the use of napalm, poison gas and anti-personnel fragmentation bombs and cutting of dykes and poisoning of the waters. Defying all that, the people of Viet Nam are fighting. It is an epic story which can hardly be described. Let the Government do something tangible: Let it tell the United States permanently to stop bombing of North Viet Nam and refrain from other acts of war—that is the expression used in an important North Viet Nam statement—"other acts of war". And let this be done unequivocally before the 20th of July when the Geneva agreement anniversary is to be celebrated. In the meantime, do not put a ban on the democratic Viet Namese publicity while you allow Chester Bowles to have the run of the place as far as our country is concerned.

Why do we not fully recognise the GDR? Why is it that when West Germany is a friend of South Africa and of Rhodesia with which Britain has formed such a wonderful link, we do not recognise GDR? Why don't we have a Consul-General in the GDR? Why can't our trade representative in Berlin have same kind of status even as the GDR representative has got in this country? Then, why don't we have a full-fledged embassy in Mongolia? It won't be liked by China. Go ahead with it. Mongolia is a friendly country. Why don't you have a full-fledged embassy there? When Shrimati Indira Gandhi was there in 1965, she promised that it would be done in a few month's time.

Now, I will just conclude by referring to one more matter. A few months ago, at Poona—I think it is

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

your home town—one of our mentionable diplomats, Mr. A. B. Pant, had spoken about our foreign policy and he said that in the Middle East, people look upon India as a sick elephant; he added that we have ceased to be an elephant and we are getting rid of our sickness. I do not like the idea of being called an elephant, noble as that creature is.

Shri Pileo Mody: What is wrong with that?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I do not want to be flabby that way. I do not want to be tamed by the powers, who lure us by their "aid" and make us perform all kinds of tricks at their dictate. I want India to have a straight, clean, strong, principled foreign policy. Even though I agree with Government entirely in so far as their West Asia policy is concerned, I do discover in Government's policy so many lacunae, so many shortcomings, so many deficiencies and so many hesitations, and in the Minister's personal conduct in this House in regard to certain pronouncements so many doubtful and dangerous things that I have to issue a stern note of warning and I do hope Government will give us some satisfaction.

Shri Manabendra Shah (Tehri Garhwal): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it seems to me that the policy of the Government continues to drift with total disregard to the safety of the country and perhaps its unity. Some problems the present hon. Minister has inherited and in some he seems to be not exerting.

The Government it seems is continuing to make wrong assessment and action thereon. We seem to be swayed by emotions and thus becoming blind to realities and its repercussions. I am sorry to see that this atmosphere seem to now extend to this august House also. The atmosphere in this House is more charged with emotion than with realities.

My theme may seem to cover a wide field. But we must remember that no country can afford to live in isolation these days. Our actions, stand and intentions directly or indirectly, minutely or largely and even if it may seem solely a home matter, register favourably or unfavourably in the world, and it is this ministry which has to take the brunt of the whole thing whether it was originally its baby or not.

Home, Defence and External Affairs are three branches which have to have co-ordination. It seems to me that all three work in isolation and in total disregard of one another. The first instance of this disjointed action was taken by us in handing over, in fact if not in law, Tibet to China, thus depriving us of a buffer State. If at that time our foreign policy had been dictated by our defence requirements I am sure some other decision would have been taken. I would not like to enlarge on this issue because we are not in a position to decide what action we should take. The might is with the Chinese, the right may be with us. Therefore, until and unless we are equated in might with the Chinese I think it would be foolish of me to give any concrete suggestions.

16.54 hrs.

[SRI G. S. DHILLON in the Chair]

The steps that should have been taken, I would have suggested when we discussed the Defence Ministry's Grants, but not here. Therefore, I refrain from saying anything further about this matter.

Another such non-coordinated action has been taken recently in the Israel-UAR war. I have full sympathy for the Arab nations. India-China war, Indo-Pakistan war and now Israel-UAR war have abundantly shown that the white races are not the friends of the non-white races. They seem to be interested only in maintaining their trade routes of war equipments they seem to be interested only in seeing that their countries do

not become the battle-fields and they are only interested to see that the non-white countries never become prosperous and never stay in peace for a long time so that the dependence on them continues.

Therefore, I fully agree that our sympathies with the UAR is correct. We must sympathise with them, because that is the only way we can stay united. Hence, the Government have taken the stand and openly declared their support and sympathy for UAR. I have no grouse against it.

But, I fear that we have over-stepped our mark when we said that Israel was in the wrong, that Israel was the aggressor. I am sorry to say that I am not in agreement with this. I would like to clarify the position by giving an example of equating what happened during the Indo-Pakistan war and Israel-UAR war. Pakistan had first sent infiltrators to Jammu and Kashmir; Pakistan had first given us a threat to our lifeline on the Jammu sector. Similarly, UAR had first closed the Gulf; UAR had first stationed their forces on the borders of Israel. We in the Indo-Pakistan war first crossed the international line to prevent further infiltration; to save the lifeline of Jammu, we crossed the international line in the Sialkot and Ferozepur sector. Similarly, Israel had crossed the international line to get the gulf opened. Therefore, Israeli action can be equated to our action. If it was right for us to cross the international line to save ourselves, I do not see why we should say that Israel cannot do so? Why should we condemn Israel for crossing the international line to save herself? I say, and I think the whole House would be in agreement with me, when I see that, if again in the future we have to cross the international line to save ourselves, we shall do so irrespective of whether we are the first or not. If we do not do so, we will find that we will have to fight in our soil and not in their soil. If we had taken that stand last time, we would have been

fighting in Amritsar and not in Sialkot or Ferozepur. Therefore, I think it was wrong on our part to have unnecessarily gone too far by saying that Israel was the aggressor. In fact, I would go to the extent of saying that if UAR feels that for its defence it will have to cross the international line, we should welcome it and we should not call her the aggressor.

The other thing I would like to point out is our foreign relations. At least this one thing we can learn from Pakistan. Whereas we could not be friends of both USA and USSR at the same time or UAR and Israel, Pakistan continues to make an effective balance between USA, USSR and even China and USSR.

Due to the recent happenings the mood in Asia at present is such that we should be able to break this barrier of our isolation. We are faced with a desperate and reckless dictator of China, holding no value for human rights in China itself. In the recent past, the treatment that was meted out to our Embassy in Peking, and probably in a bigger dose to Burma, Great Britain in Hong Kong, Indonesia, Nepal etc., the blasting of atomic bomb on the shores facing Japan and thus making the fish radio active, all these will show to all of us in Asia, Far East and South East Asia the recklessness and the danger of the Chinese. If in this environment we cannot break this barrier of isolation and come to an understanding among ourselves to unite and protect ourselves, I do not know whether we will ever get such an opportunity again to consolidate our position.

I would earnestly request the hon. Minister to remember that now is the time to initiate regional defence arrangements, initially of the South and South East Asian countries against China.

It seems that USA, more than USSR or UK, has really assessed the danger of the Chinese and the creation of the SEATO and the CENTO is probably

[Shri Manabendra Shah]

due to that. But I would suggest that this is not enough. We have now to have a pact of India, Nepal, Burma, Thailand, Ceylon, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and Philippines.....

17 hrs.

Shri Nath Pal: Japan.

An hon. Member: Australia.

Shri Manabendra Shah: ... with the active support of Australia, New Zealand and Japan. It is this alliance which should be able to open the eyes of Pakistan that in the process of our being destroyed it would be she who would be destroyed and devoured by the red dragon. If Burma and Nepal could not be spared, I do not know in which world Pakistan is.

This is a test for the External Affairs Ministry and for the Indian Foreign Service which is supposed to be the cream of all Indian services.

We are in this House obsessed with the slogan of non-alignment. In fact, these days the House is more obsessed with slogans, at the expense of realities. To them I have to say that my suggestion does not infringe or encroach on the slogan of no-alignment because my suggestion is not alignment with either the USA bloc or the USSR bloc; my suggestion is for a non-USA, non-USSR bloc. Therefore I hope those slogan believers of non-alignment should be satisfied.

Shri Madhok touched on the agreement with China. I am glad, he did it, because here again it is a very funny position that the Government of India and the ruling party is under pressure to abrogate unilaterally agreements guaranteed by the Constitution but the case of violated agreements does not seem to register in their minds. I have in mind the agreement with China of 1954. We seem to have completely ignored that this is an agreement which has been unilaterally abrogated by China but to which we still seem to be sticking. Naturally, therefore, in this muddled

position if Sikkim and Bhutan are worried and want re-appraisal of their agreements, it is but natural. It is, therefore, essential for the Minister that a positive lead should be taken by him and he should not permit some other minister to take uncoordinated action affecting foreign relations and endanger our defence.

Another field of lack of foresight has resulted in the exodus of refugees into India. Estimates of budget for external affairs indicate on page 12 that we are spending Rs. 1,53,91,000 on refugees from Kabu and Tibet, and repatriates from Burma and Ceylon. External affairs have failed the moment we accept refugees in India. The function of external affairs is not to accept refugees but to ensure that Indians abroad do not become refugees; otherwise, expenditure under this head will know no limits in the near future. We are supposed to be friends of African States but the way we are dealing with the Indian people's problem there, I feel, we may have another lot of exodus from Africa. It is, therefore, high time that we exert diplomatically in this field.

Some hon. Members: Very good speech. We fully endorse it.

Shri Nath Pal: Very courageous and very good.

श्री अब्दुल हनी हार (गुडगांव) : सभापति महोदय, मुझे खुशी है कि भाज धरब दुश्मनी और मुसलिम दुश्मनी ने मेरे भाई श्री मधोक को इतना गुस्ता दिलाया कि हिन्दी से प्रेम होने के कारण बजाय इसके कि वह हिन्दी में बोलें, अंग्रेजी में उन्होंने मन भर कर कोस-कोस कर मुसलमानों को गाली दी।

एक माननीय सदस्य : भाप समझे नहीं।

श्री अशुभल घनी बार : काश, मैं समझ जाता ।

मैं मानता हूँ कि सरकार की पालिसी में कुछ त्रुटियाँ हैं । लेकिन इसमें बाज ऐसी खूबियाँ भी थीं कि जितने छोटे छोटे अफ्रीकी देश थे उन के सहायता के लिये हिन्दुस्तान ने, हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने उन्हें पूरा सहयोग दिया, जिसका नतीजा वह था कि अफ्रीका के देशों को, जिन्हें गोरी नरकों ने रोंद रखा था आजादी मिली ।

जहाँ मुझे इस बात की खुशी कि है हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने एक ऐसी पालिसी अपनाई जिसका नतीजा यह था कि उन्होंने दुनिया का वह पैगाम दिया अशोक भ्राजम का कहिये या गौतम बुद्ध का कहिये, जो सारे विश्व को धड़ेबन्दी से बचाना चाहते थे । लेकिन मुझे हैरत इस बात से होती है कि जब वह कमजोर देशों के हामी थे तब उन्होंने तिब्बत के बारे में क्यों ऐसी पालिसी अपनाई जिस पर आज वह शर्मिन्दा हैं ? जब डा० लोहिया ने और उनके दूसरे साथियों ने, और हम जैसों ने यह कहा था कि चीन एक ज्यादाती करने पर तुला हुआ है तब मेरे पूज्य नेता पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने हमें बार मांग से कह कर याद किया । हम कोई हिन्दुस्तान को लड़ाई की प्राग में नहीं झोंकना चाहते थे । हम सोचते थे कि एक ऐसे देश को, जो तिब्बत है जिसमें हम कह सकते हैं कि देवी बेवता रहते हैं, चाइना क्यों सताये । लेकिन भारत की उस वक्त की सरकार ने जो कि आज भी वही है, तिब्बत के बारे में एक ऐसी पालिसी अख्यार की जो कि उनकी अपनी पालिसी के खिलाफ थी । अग्र की ही थी तो दलाई लामा को यहाँ बुलाया क्यों ? और चीन को दुश्मन बनाया क्यों ? दो अलग अलग बातें एक ही सांस में कही जायें, वह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया ।

मैं मानता हूँ कि आज वियत नाम के नामसे भी अमरीका बहुशियत और बरवरियत

का सबूत दे रहा है । इसके खिलाफ हिन्दुस्तान ने आवाज उठाई है । लेकिन जब हंगरी में रशिया ने यही किया और जो चेयरमैन साहब इस वक्त हाउस की रहनुमाई कर रहे हैं वह वहाँ गये थे, उस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान क्यों चुप रहा ? हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार क्यों चुप रही ? यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती ।

अरब के मामले में मैं श्री मधोक से भी मुत्तफिक हूँ और श्री मसानी से भी मुत्तफिक हूँ कि इजराइल की हस्ती को मिटाना नहीं चाहिये । लेकिन क्या वह यह बतला सकते हैं कि इजराइल को जहाँ बसाया गया वहाँ के अरबों, ने क्या गुनाह किया था ? उनका सिर्फ एक गुनाह था कि वह कमजोर थे । वह कमजोर थे इस लिये उन्हें उखाड़ फेंका गया । क्या श्री मधोक इस बात के लिये तैयार होते, कि जो यहूदी दुनिया में अपनी कोई जगह नहीं रखते थे उनको वह खुशी से पास बुलाते और उन्हें एक सूबा दे देते ? मैं कभी नहीं मान सकता कि श्री मधोक ऐसा रास्ता अख्यार करते । मुझे इस बात से बहस नहीं है कि इस वक्त हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने जो अरब मुमालिक का साथ दिया वह इस नुकते निगाह से दिया कि वह समझते थे कि इजराइल का वजूद इसी तरह से कायम किया गया है जैसे ताइवान या फारमोसा का कि वहाँ कुछ चीनियों को बिठला दिया गया इस लिये कि अमरीका अपनी मनमानी कार्रवाई कर सके । अमरीका ने जगह जगह अपने अड्डे बनाने की कोशिश की । अमरीका इस वक्त शराफत के पर्दे में इन्सानियत के पर्दे में बहुशियत और बरवरियत का सबूत दे रहा है । इसलिये अमरीका के साथ हिन्दुस्तान वाले मसानी साहब के कहने से या मधोक जी के कहने से मिल जाय, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह हिमाकत होगी ।

इसको कोई नहीं मान सकता कि अरबों के साथ इजराइल लड़ रहा है । अरबों के साथ इजराइल नहीं लड़ रहा है, लड़ रहे हैं

[श्री अब्दुल सनी दार]

कुछ मोरी मोरी नस्लों के धाबकूवा लिपाही ।
 लभाम जहाज उनके थे, हवाई जहाज चलाये
 वाले उनके थे, मारने वाले या दूसरी तरह के
 काम करने वाले हों, वह सब उनके थे
 और उन्होंने जा कर मुकाबला
 किया । न मघोक साहब ने किया न इजराइल
 की फौजों ने किया । मैं मानता हूँ कि बागला
 साहब को या हमारी सरकार को ऐसा स्टेटमेंट
 नहीं करना चाहिये था कि इजराइल वाले
 एग्रेसर हैं । इसका कारण यह है कि पाकिस्तान
 ने हम पर एग्सेशन किया था तो नासिर साहब
 ने और दूसरे धरब मुल्कों ने पाकिस्तान को
 एग्रेसर नहीं कहा था । चीन ने जब हम पर
 हमला किया था तब नासिर साहब ने चीन को
 एग्रेसर नहीं कहा था । नासिर साहब गलत
 हो सकते हैं । लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान अगर इस
 पालिसी को अपनाता है कि वह सही को सही
 करेगा तो उसको जो भी सही बात हो, कहनी
 पड़गी । कौन नहीं जानता है कि नासिर
 जैसा जनरल जो एक फौजी माहिर
 कहलाता है और एक कामयाब जनरल भी
 रहा था, कहां इतना भोला भाला था कि एक
 ही हमले में उसकी तमाम हवाई फोर्स तबाह
 और बरबाद कर दी जाती । अगर कोई
 कहता है कि वह एग्रेसर बनना चाहता था
 तो मैं उससे इतिफाक नहीं कर सकता ।
 मेरी ऐसी राय नहीं है । बुद्ध अगर कोई बनता
 है तो वह अपना नुकसान करता है । उसकी
 हिमायत नहीं की जा सकती है । हिन्दुस्तान
 अगर इजराइल को एग्रेसर मानता है तो
 वह इस बात को न कहे यह नहीं हो सकता है ।
 कल को आपकी टुकूमत आ जाये तो आप
 ऐसा मान सकते हैं । लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि
 यह बात ज्यादा शोभा नहीं देने वाली है कि
 हिन्दुस्तान अपनी राय का इन्हें न करे
 जब कि वह समझता है कि इजराइल एग्रेसर
 है । इजराइल एक फितना बिठा दिया
 गया है धरबों पर । इसलिए बिठाया गया
 है कि जो पोपिशान धरब मुल्कों की है उसमें
 अमरीका वालों के अपने अधिकार कायम रहे ।

लख वाले फेल हुए हैं यह मैं मानता हूँ ।
 इस इसमें कामयाब नहीं हुआ है यह मैं
 मानता हूँ । वह धरबों की इज्जत को बचा नहीं
 सका है । लेकिन क्या इसका मतलब यह है
 कि हिन्दुस्तान सही बात न कहे । मैं समझता
 हूँ कि उनको जिन्दा रहने और जीने का हक
 है । लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि
 एक को दबा करके दूसरे को जिन्दा रखा जाये ।
 अगर इसका यह मतलब है तो मैं मघोक साहब
 से कहूंगा कि वह क्या कभी यह बरदाश्त
 करेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान का कोई टुकड़ा, हिन्दुस्तान
 की एक इंच भूमि भी चीन वाले जबर्दस्ती
 दबोच कर बठ जाय, या पाकिस्तान के लोग
 जबर्दस्ती आ कर हिन्दुस्तान के किसी
 टुकड़े पर अधिकार कर ले ?

मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है
 कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार इस पर भी
 नाकाम रही है कि बीस सालों में यह साबित
 नहीं कर पाई है, दुनिया के लोगों को कन्विस
 नहीं कर पाई है कि काश्मीर का जो एक बहुत
 बड़ा हिस्सा पाकिस्तान ने जबर्दस्ती अपने कब्जे
 में लिया हुआ है वह हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है ।
 हालांकि यह एक सदाकत है कि जो फँसला
 हुआ था उसके मुताबिक काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान
 का था, आज भी हिन्दुस्तान का है । लेकिन
 इनमें इतनी जुर्रत नहीं है, इनकी पालिसी में
 इतनी जुर्रत नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान वाले जो
 यह कहते हैं कि काश्मीर हमारा है उसका
 जवाब ये मजबूत तरीके से दे पाते । इस
 मामले में इनकी पालिसी फेल हुई है । बद-
 किस्मती इस बात की है कि जितने नेहरू को
 जब चीन से एक धक्का लगा तो उन्होंने
 अपनी पालिसी पर फिर से तबज्जह की ।
 लेकिन उसका भी कुछ नतीजा नहीं निकला ।
 चेरमैन साहब पाकिस्तान में नहीं बनवाया ।
 प्रपोजीशन वालों ने नहीं बनवाया ।
 हिन्दुस्तान के जो नेतागण हैं उन्होंने बनवाया ।
 सरदार पटेल का बहुत जिक्र किया जाता है ।
 मैं भी उन पर गर्व करता हूँ । उन्होंने और
 बदाहरलास जी ने पाकिस्तान बनवाया ।
 महात्मा गांधी ने नहीं बनवाया । पाकिस्तान

श्रीर हिन्दुस्तान में कई बार ऐसे मौके पैदा हुए जबकि ये दोनों मुल्क कनाडा और अमरीका की तरह एक अच्छे हमसाये की हैसियत से रह सकते थे । मधोक जी मुझे माफ करें उस बात के लिये जो मैं कहने जा रहा हूँ । सैकड़ों फिरकाबाराना फसादात हुए जिनमें हजारों लोगों को जोरावर लोगों ने मिटाया, हजारों कत्ल हुए लेकिन एक भी मुकदमा नहीं चला, किसी को कैद नहीं किया गया, किसी को कोई सजा नहीं दी गई, किसी को फाँसी नहीं दी गई । इस तरह की बातों से हमारे मुल्क की इज्जत दुनिया की नजरों में बढ़ी नहीं बल्कि घटी है । मधोक साहब को हक हासिल है कि वह मुसलमानों को गाली दें । लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान ने एक ऐमा रास्ता दुनिया के सामने अखत्यार किया है, एक ऐसी पालिसी अखत्यार की है कि वह न तो किसी पर तशद्द करता है और न किसी पर तशद्दुद हो, इसको ही बरदाश्त कर सकता है । मुसलमान जैसे भी हुए लेकिन मेरी राय है कि मधोक साहब को अपनी राय बदलनी चाहिये । मैं कहूंगा किजो लोग यहां पहले पहल बसते थे वे द्राविडिंग कहलाते थे, उन पर आ कर एरियंज ने कब्जा किया और जबर्दस्ती

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi):

The hon. Meber is confusing the attack on Pakistan with attack on Muslims in India. The Jan Sangh has never attacked Indian Muslims. The Indian Muslims are members of the Jan Sangh and honourable Members. He has been hearing him with pre-conceived notions.

Shri Muthyal Rao (Nagar Kurnool): But just now, his leader had attacked them; he had attacked an officer in the External Affairs Ministry and he had cast aspersions on him.

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : मैं जानता हूँ कि दिल्ली के मुसलमानों ने कांग्रेस के मुकाबले में जनसंघ को बाट दिया है । मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश में मुसलमानों ने जनसंघ

1435(Ai)LSD-6.

को बोट दिया है । फिर भी मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि मधोक साहब अगर जहर उगलते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान की शान को बढ़ाते नहीं हैं घटाते ही हैं । उससे सैक्युलरिज्म की शान घटती ही है । अगर आप को चीन और पाकिस्तान दोनों से मुकाबला करना है तो अपने दिल को आप को बसी बनाना होगा अपने दिमाग को खोलना होगा, सारी अरब दुनिया को साथ ले कर चलना होगा, न कि उसको जलील समझ कर । हम को यह भी समझ कर चलना होगा कि इजराइल अमरीका का भ्रात्रे-कार है । अगर आज हिन्दुस्तान की दुनिया में इज्जत है तो इस वास्ते है कि उसने दुनिया को आत्मा और परमात्मा का ज्ञान दिया है ।

पाकिस्तान के साथ हिन्दुस्तान के ताल्लुकात को ठीक करने के लिए आखिरी दौर में पंडित नेहरू ने एक पालिसी अपनाई थी । उन्होंने काश्मीर के सब से बड़े नेता हिन्दुस्तान के सब से जबर्दस्त देशभक्त शेख अब्दुल्ला को इस बात पर डिप्युट किया था कि वह कोशिश करें कि किसी तरह से हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान इस बात पर राजी हो जायें कि काश्मीर को एक बा इज्जत खिता समझा जाये, दोनों अमन और शान्ति से रहें । मुझे अफसोस है कि मधोक साहब जैसे लोग, जैसे नेता भी गुस्से में आ गये और उन्होंने दुनिया की नजरों में गलत तौर पर इसको पेश करने की कोशिश की

Shri M. L. Sondhi: Kashmir is part of India and it is not an international issue.

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : यह हकीकत है कि पंडित नेहरू चाहते थे कि काश्मीर का मवाल हल हो । वह चाहते थे

सभापति महोदय : आप जरा ठहरिये ।

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : मुझे अपनी पार्टी का जितना समय है मिलना चाहिये । हम 27 हैं ।

सभापति महोदय : जब मैं खड़ा होऊँ तो आप बैठ जाइये। आप काश्मीर की बात कर रहे हैं। यह हिन्दुस्तान का इंटरनल मैटर है। इसलिए काश्मीर को डिसकस करने की मैं इजाजत नहीं दूंगा। काश्मीर को किसी तरह बहस में न लायें।

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : मैं एक बुनियादी बात कह रहा हूँ। मैं शेख अब्दुल्ला की बात कह रहा हूँ

सभापति महोदय : शेख अब्दुल्ला की बात आप छोड़िये। आप फारेन एफेयर्स पर बोलिये।

श्री अब्दुल गनी बार : मैं यह कह रहा था कि पंडित नेहरू यह चाहते थे कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान, कनाडा और यू०ए०ए० की तरह रहें। मैं मधोक साहब और मसानी साहब से तथा दूसरे नेताओं से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के ताल्लुकात को बेहतर बनाने की कोशिश की जाये। इसमें चीन की हार है। वरना वह अमरीका के हाथों में खेलेगा, दूसरे देशों के हाथों में खेलेगा। पाकिस्तान को हमें दुश्मन करार नहीं देना चाहिये। इसको खुद इन्होंने बनाया है। इन्होंने कहा है कि ये कोएग्जिस्टेंस के हामी हैं। इजराइल की तो खैर मनाइये। लेकिन पाकिस्तान से लड़ने में शायद ये फल महसूस करते हैं। पाकिस्तान की पालिसी अगर गलत है तो गलत हो। हमारी पालिसी क्यों गलत हो? हम क्यों कहें कि हमें आज हर हालत में पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ना है। अगर वह बेवकूफी करता है तो हम न करें। हमें जो पालिसी सही है, उस पर चलना चाहिये। पाकिस्तान ने हम पर हमला किया तो हम ने लाहौर सेक्टर पर हमला किया। वह बिलकुल जायज था। मैं मानता हूँ इस बात को। लेकिन इसके बावजूद मैं चाहता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट के तमाम अग्रेडर सदस्य इसकी तरफ तबज्जह दें कि पाकिस्तान और चीन को नेक हमशायी बनाने की कोशिश जारी रहे और चीन और पाकिस्तान के साथ

हिन्दुस्तान के ताल्लुकात अच्छे हों। काम कि हमारी हिन्द सरकार इस बात की तरफ ध्यान दे।

[**श्री عبدالغली دار :** (कुराणों)

سہاوتی سہودے - مجھے خوشی ہے کہ آج عرب دشمنی اور مسلم دشمنی نے سہرے بھائی شری مدھوک کو اتنا فسہ دلایا کہ ہندی سے پریم ہونے کے کارن بجائے اس کہ کے وہ ہندی میں بولیں - انگریزی میں انہوں نے من پھر کر کوس کوس کر گالی دی -

ایک مانڈھ سدسہہ : آپ مجھے

نہوں -

ش्री عبدالغلی دار : کاش میں

مجھے پانا -

میں مانتا ہوں کہ سرکار کی پالیسی میں کچھ تروتیاں ہیں - لیکن اس میں بعض ایسی خوبیاں بھی تھیں کہ جتنے چاہتے چاہتے امریکی دیش نہ لیں کی آزادی کے لئے ہندوستان نے - ہندوستان کی سرکار نے انہیں پورا پورا سہوگ دیا - جس کا نتیجہ یہ تھا کہ امریکہ کے دیشوں کو - چلپن گوری نسلوں نے روند رکھا تھا اور قلم ہلا رکھا تھا - آزادی ملی -

جہاں مجھے اس بات کی خوشی ہے کہ ہندوستان کی سرکار نے ایک ایسی پالیسی اپنائی جس کا نتیجہ

یہ تھا کہ انہوں نے دنیا کو وہ پیغام
 دیا اشوک اعظم کا کہنے یا گوتم بدھ
 کا کہنے - جو سارے وشو کو دھرم
 بلدی سے بچانا چاہتے تھے - لیکن
 مجھے حدوت اس بات سے ہوتی ہے
 کہ جب وہ کمزور دیشوں کے حاسی
 تھے تب انہوں نے تبت کے بارے میں
 کہوں ایسی پالمسی اپنائی جس پر
 آج وہ شرملاہ ہیں - جب ڈاکٹر لوہیا نے
 اور ان کے دوسرے ساتھیوں نے - اور ہم
 جیسوں نے یہ کہا تھا کہ چین زیادتی
 کرنے پر تلا ہوا ہے تب میرے پوجتے
 نہتا پلذت جو اہر لال نہرو نے ہمیں
 وار مانگوس کہہ کر یاد کیا تھا - ہم
 کوئی ہندوستان کو لڑائی کی آگ
 میں نہیں چھونکنا چاہتے تھے - ہم
 سوچتے تھے کہ ایک ایسے دیس کو
 جو تبت ہے جس میں ہم کہہ سکتے
 ہیں کہ دیوی دیوتا دھتے ہیں -
 چائنا کہوں دہائے - لیکن بھارت کی
 اس وقت کی سرکار نے - جو کہ آج
 بھی وہی ہے - تبت کے بارے میں
 ایسی پالمسی اختیار کی جو ان کی
 اپنی پالمسی کے خلاف تھی - اگر کی
 ہی تھی تو دلانی لاما کو یہاں بلایا
 کہوں - اور چین کو دشمن بلایا
 کہوں - دو الگ الگ باتیں ایک ہی
 سانس میں کہی جائیں - یہ میری
 سمجھ میں نہیں آیا - میں سنا
 ہوں کہ آج ویت نام کے معاملے میں
 امریکہ وحشیہ اور بہرہوت کا ٹوہ

دے رہا ہے - اس کے خلاف ہندوستان
 نے آواز اٹھائی ہے - لیکن جب ہنگری
 میں رشیا نے بھی کہا اور جو
 چھرمین صاحب اس وقت ہاؤس کی
 رہنمائی کر رہے ہیں وہ وہاں دورے پر
 تھے - اس وقت ہندوستان کیوں چپ
 رہا - ہندوستان کی سوکار کہوں چپ
 رہی - یہ بات میری سمجھ میں
 نہیں آتی -

عرب کے معاملے میں میں شری
 مدھوک سے بھی متفق ہوں اور شری
 مسانی سے بھی متفق ہوں کہ ازرائل
 کی ہستی کو مٹانا نہیں چاہتے -
 لیکن کہا وہ یہ بتا سکتے ہیں کہ
 ازرائل کو جہاں بسایا گیا وہاں کے
 عربوں نے کہا گناہ کیا تھا کہ انکو
 اجازت نہ دی گئی تھی کہ انکو
 صرف ایک گناہ تھا کہ وہ کمزور تھے -
 اس لئے انہیں اگھار پھینکا گیا - کہا
 شری مدھوک اس بات کے لئے تیار
 ہیں کہ جو بھونڈی دنیا میں اپنی
 کوئی جگہ نہیں رکھتے تھے ان کو وہ
 خوشی سے بھارت میں بلا کر انکو ہوم
 لہفت دیں - میں کہی نہیں مان
 سکتا کہ شری مدھوک ایسا راستہ
 اختیار کریں گے - مجھے اس بات سے
 باعث نہیں ہے کہ اس بارے میں
 ہندوستان کی سرکار نے جو عرب
 ممالک کا ساتھ دیا وہ اس نقطہ نگاہ
 سے دیا کہ وہ سمجھتے تھے کہ ازرائل
 کا وجود اسی طرح سے قائم کیا گیا ہے

[شری عبدالغنی دار]

جیسے ٹاویں یا فارموسا کا کہ وہاں کچھ چھپوں کو ہتھیار دیا گیا اس لئے کہ امریکہ اپنے اقدے قائم کر کے اپنی ملتان کاروائی کر سکے۔ امریکہ نے جگہ جگہ اپنے اقدے ہلانے کی کوشش کی۔ امریکہ اس وقت شرافت کے پردے میں انسانیت کے پردے میں وحشت اور بدنیتی کا ثبوت دے رہا ہے۔ اس لئے امریکہ کے ساتھ ہندوستان والے مساتی صاحب کے کہنے سے یا مدھوک جی کے کہنے سے مل جائوں۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ حماقت ہوگی۔

اس کو کوئی نہیں مان سکتا کہ عربوں کے ساتھ ازرائل لڑ رہا ہے۔ عربوں کے ساتھ ازرائل نہیں لڑا ہے۔ لڑے ہوں کچھ کوری کوری نسلوں کے آزمودہ سپاہی۔ تمام جنگی جہاز ان کے تھے۔ ہوائی جہاز چلانے والے ان کے تھے مارنے والے یا دوسری طرح کے کام کرنے والے ہوں۔ وہ سب ان کے تھے اور انہوں نے جا کر مقابلہ کیا۔ نہ مدھوک صاحب نے کہا نہ ازرائل کی فوجوں نے کہا۔

میں مانتا ہوں چاکلا صاحب کو یا ہماری سرکار کو ایسا سنگھٹمت نہیں کرنا چاہئے تھا کہ ازرائل اگرسر ہے۔ اس کا کارن یہ کہ پاکستان نے ہم پر ایگریشن کیا تھا تو ناصر صاحب نے اور دوسرے عرب ملکوں نے پاکستان کو اگرسر نہیں

کہا تھا۔ چھن نے جب ہم پر حملہ کیا تھا تب ناصر صاحب نے چھن کو ایگریسر نہیں کہا تھا۔ ناصر صاحب غلط ہو سکتے ہیں۔ لیکن ہندوستان اگر اس پالیسی کو اپناتا ہے کہ یہ صحیح کو صحیح کہے گا۔ تو اس کو جو یہی صحیح بات ہے وہ اگھلی پڑے گی۔ کون نہیں جانتا کہ ناصر صاحب جیسا جنرل جو ایک فوجی ماہر کہلاتا تھا ایک کامیاب جنرل بھی رہا ہے۔ کہاں اتنا بھولا بھالا تھا۔ کہ ایک ہی حملے میں اس کی تمام ہوائی فورس قہاہ اور برباد کر دی جاتی۔ اگر کوئی کہتا ہے کہ وہ اگرسر بلنا چاہتا تھا تو میں اس سے اتفاق نہیں کر سکتا۔ مہری ایسی رائے نہیں ہے۔ اگر کوئی بلتا ہے تو وہ اپنا نقصان کرتا ہے۔ اس کی حمایت نہیں کی جا سکتی ہے۔ ہندوستان اگر ازرائل کو اگرسر مانتا ہے تو وہ اس بات کو تہ کہتے یہ نہیں ہو سکتا ہے۔ کل کو آپکی حکومت جائے تو آپ ایسا مان سکتے ہیں۔ لیکن میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ بات زیادہ شوبہ نہیں دینے والی ہے کہ ہندوستان اپنی رائے کا اظہار نہ کرے۔ جب کہ وہ سمجھتا ہے کہ اگرسر ہے ازرائل ایک نعلہ ہتھیار دیا گیا ہے عربوں پر۔ اس لئے ہتھیار دیا گیا ہے کہ جو پوزیشن عرب ملکوں کی ہے اس میں امریکہ والوں اور یورپ کے اپنے اڈھکار وہاں قائم رہیں۔ روس والے ٹیل ہوئے ہیں۔

یہ مہن مانتا ہوں - روس اس میں کامیاب نہیں ہوا ہے وہ مہن مانتا ہوں - وہ عربوں کی عزت کو بچھا نہیں سکا ہے - لیکن کہا اس کا مطلب یہ ہے - کہ ہندوستان صحیح بات نہ ہے - مہن سمجھتا ہے ان کو جہلے اور زندہ دہلے کا حق ہے - لیکن اس کا مطلب یہ نہیں ہے کہ ایک کو دبا کر دوسرے کو زندہ رکھا جائے - اگر اس کا یہ مطلب ہے تو مہن مدھوک صاحب سے کہوٹا کہ وہ کہا نہیں یہ برداشت کرینگے کہ ہندوستان کا کوئی تکرہ ہندوستان کی ایک انج بھومی بھی چھن والے زبردستی دبوچ کر بھٹو جائیں یا پاکستان کے لوگ زبردستی آکر ہندوستان کے کسی ٹکڑے پر ادھکا کر لیں -

مجھے افسوس کے ساتھ کہنا پوتا ہے کہ ہندوستان کی سرکار اس پر بھی نا کام رہی ہے کہ بھس سالوں مہن یہ ثابت نہیں کر پائی ہے - دنیا کے لوگوں کو کلونس نہیں کر پائی ہے کہ کشمیر کا جو ایک بہت بڑا حصہ پاکستان نے زبردستی اپنے قبضے میں لیا ہوا ہے وہ ہندوستان کا حصہ ہے - حالانکہ یہ ایک صداقت ہے کہ جو

فیصلہ ہوا تھا اس کے مطابق کشمیر ہندوستان کا تھا - آج بھی ہندوستان کا ہے - لیکن سرکار مہن اتلی جرات نہیں کہ پاکستان والے جو یہ کہتے ہیں کہ کشمیر ہمارا ہے اسکا جواب لایہ مضبوط طریقہ سے دے سکیں - اس معاملہ میں ان کی پالیسی فہل ہوئی ہے - بدقسمتی اس بات کی ہے کہ پلڈت نہرو کو جب چھن سے ایک دھکا لگا تو انہوں نے اپنی پالیسی پر پھر سے توجہ کی - لیکن اسکا بھی کچھ نتہجہ نہیں نکلا - چیر مہن صاحب پاکستان میں نے نہیں بلوایا - ایوزیشن والوں نے نہیں بلوایا - ہندوستان کے جو بھٹا گئی مہن انہوں نے بلوایا - سردار پٹیل کا بھٹ ذکر کہا جاتا ہے - میں بھی ان پر گرو کرتا ہوں - انہوں نے اور جواہر لال نہرو نے پاکستان بلوایا - مہاتما گاندھی نے نہیں بلوایا - پاکستان اور ہندوستان میں کئی بار ایسے موقعے پیدا ہوئے جب کہ بہ دونوں ملک کھڈا ہوو امریکہ کی طرح ایک اچھے ہمسائے کی حیثیت کے ساتھ رہ سکتے تھے - مدھوک جی مجھے معاف کریں اس بات کے لئے جو میں کہنے جا رہا ہوں - سہلیکڑوں فرقہ وارانہ فسادات ہوئے ہزاروں لوگوں کو زور اور لوگوں نے مٹایا - ہزاروں قتل ہوئے لیکن ایک بھی مقدمہ نہیں چلا - کسی کو قہد نہیں کہا گیا - کسی کو کوئی سزا نہیں دی گئی - کسی کو پھانسی

[شری عبدالغنی دار]

نہیں دی گئی۔ اس طرح کی باتوں سے ہمارے ملک کی عزت دنیا کی نظروں میں بڑی نہیں بلکہ گھٹی ہے۔ مذہوک صاحب کو حق حاصل کہ وہ مسلمانوں کو گالی دیں۔ لیکن ہندوستان نے ایک ایسا راستہ دنیا کے سامنے اختیار کیا ہے۔ ایک ایسی پالہسی اختیار کی کہ وہ یہ کہہ سکیں کہ وہ نہ کسی پر تہمت لگائیں اور نہ کسی پر تہمت لگائیں۔ اسکو ہی برداشت کر سکتا ہو۔ مسلمان جھسے بھی ہوتے لیکن سہری رائے ہے کہ مذہوک صاحب کو ایسی رائے بدلی چاہئے۔ میں کہتا ہوں کہ جو لوگ یہاں پہلے پہل بھارت میں تھے وہ دروازے کھاتے تھے۔ ان پر آ کر زمین نے تہمت لگائی اور زبردستی ...

Shri M. L. Sondhi: The hon. Member is confusing the attack on Pakistan with attack on Muslims in India. The Jan Sangh has never attacked Indian Muslims. The Indian Muslims are member of the Jan Sangh and honourable Members. He has been hearing him with pre-conceived notions.

Shri Muthyal Rao: But just now, his leader had attacked them, he had attacked an officer in the External Affairs Ministry and he had cast aspersions in him.

شری عبدالغنی دار - میں جانتا

ہوں کہ دار کے مسلمانوں نے کانگریس کے مقابلے میں جن سگھ کو ورت دیے

میں یہ بھی جانتا ہوں کہ ان پر دیش کے مسلمانوں نے جن سگھ کو ورت دیا ہے۔ یہ بھی میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔ کہ مذہوک صاحب اگر زہر اگلتے ہیں تو ہندوستان کی شان کو بڑھاتے نہیں ہیں۔ کہتاتے ہیں۔ اس سے سگھ اور کم کی شان گھٹتی ہے۔ اگر آپ کو چین اور پاکستان دونوں سے مقابلہ کرنا ہے تو اپنے دل کو وسیع بنانا ہوگا۔ اپنے حریف کو کولفا ہوگا۔ ساری عرب دنیا کو ساتھ لے کر لگنا ہوگا۔ کہ اس کو خلیل سمجھو۔ ہم کہ یہ بھی سمجھو کہ چاہا ہوگا کہ ازرائل امریکہ کا الہ کار ہے۔ اگر آج ہندوستان کی دنیا میں عزت ہے تو اس واسطے ہے کہ اس لئے دنیا کو آتما اور پر ساتما کا کھان دیا ہے۔

پاکستان کے ساتھ ہندوستان کے تعلقات کو ٹھیک کرنے کے لئے آخری دور میں پانڈت نہرو نے ایک پالہسی اپنائی تھی۔ انہوں نے کشمیر کے سب سے بڑے نہتا۔ ہندوستان کے سب سے زبردست دیش بھگت شیخ عبدالہ کو اس مشن پر مامور کیا تھا کہ وہ کوشش کریں کہ کسی طرح سے ہندوستان اور پاکستان اس بات پر راضی ہو جائیں کہ کشمیر کو ایک با صورت خطہ سمجھا جائے۔ دونوں امن اور شانتی سے رہیں۔ مجھے احساس

ہے نہ مدھوک صاحب جیسے لوگ
جیسے نہتا بھی جیسے میں اُگئے اور
انہوں نے دنیا کی نظروں میں بھارت
کو غلط طور پر ہمیشہ کرنے کی کوشش کی۔

Shri M. L. Sondhi: Kashmir is part
of India and it is not an international
issue.

شری عبدالغنی دار - یہ حقیقت

ہے کہ پلڈت نہرو چاہتے تھے کہ کشمیر
کا سوال حل ہو - وہ چاہتے تھے کہ -

सभापति महोदय : आप बरा ठहरिये ।

شری عبدالغنی دار - مجھے اپنی

پارٹی کا جتنا سے ملنا چاہئے . ہم
۲۷ ہیں -

सभापति महोदय : जब मैं बड़ा होंकं
तो आप बैठ जाइये । आप काश्मीर की बात
कर रहे हैं । यह हिन्दुस्तान का इंटरनल मैटर
है । सलिए काश्मीर को डिसकस करने की
मैं इजाजत नहीं दूंगा । काश्मीर को किसी तरह
बहस में न लायें ।

شری عبدالغنی دار - میں ایک

بلہادی بات کہہ رہا ہوں - میں شیخ
عبدالغنی کی بات کہہ رہا ہوں -

सभापति महोदय : शेख अब्दुल्ला की
बात आप छोड़िये । आप फार्न एफवर्ज पर
बोलिये ।

شری عبدالغنی دار - میں یہ کہہ

رہا تھا کہ پلڈت نہرو یہ چاہتے تھے کہ
ہندوستان اور پاکستان کٹاؤ اور ہو -
ایس - اے - کی طرح رہوں - میں
مدھوک صاحب اور مسانی صاحب سے

تھا۔ دوسرے نہتائوں سے کہنا چاہتا
ہوں کہ ہندوستان اور پاکستان کے
تعلقات کو بہتر بنانے کی کوشش کی
جائے - اس میں چین کی ہمارے ورثہ
وہ امریکہ کے ہاتھوں میں کھلے گا -
دوسرے دیکھوں کے ہاتھوں میں کھلے گا -
پاکستان کو ہمیں دشمن قرار نہیں
دینا چاہئے - اس کو خود انہوں نے
بتایا ہے - انہوں نے کہا ہے کہ ایگزٹس
کے یہ حامی ہیں - لیکن پاکستان سے
لڑنے میں شاید یہ فطرت متعصب کرتے
ہیں - پاکستان کی پالیسی اگر غلط
ہے تو غلط تو ہو - ہملو پالیسی کہوں
غلط ہو - ہم کیوں کہیں کہ ہمیں آج
ہر حالت میں پاکستان کے ساتھ لڑنا ہے
اگر وہ بھوکوفی کرنا ہے تو ہم نہ کریں -
ہمیں جو پالیسی صحیح ہے اس پر چلنا
چاہئے - پاکستان نے ہم پر حملہ کیا -
تو ہم نے لاہور سیکر پر حملہ کیا - وہ
بالکل جائز تھا - میں جانتا ہوں اس
بات کو - لیکن اس کے باوجود میں
چاہتا ہوں کہ پارلیا-منٹ کے تمام
آئریہ - ممبر اس کی طرف توجہ دیں
کہ پاکستان اور چین کو نیک ہم ساتھ
ہمانے کی کوشش جاری رہے اور چین
اور پاکستان کے ساتھ ہندوستان کے
تعلقات اچھے ہوں - کاش کہ ہماری
ہلد سرکار اس بات کی طرف دھیان
دے -

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Rai-ganj): While supporting the Demands of the Ministry of External Affairs, I am going to pick up the thread where the House left it yesterday in regard to Tibet, and for that I offer no apologies.

Whatever the merits and demerits of the Resolution we debated yesterday, whatever the effects of the passing of that Resolution would have been, there is no doubt about this fact that there is a general feeling in this country that our dealings in the matter of Tibet have not been fair to that country. If an opinion poll were taken, it would be found that the Indian people by a large majority would like the Dalai Lama to be restored to his position in Tibet. There is no doubt about that. Whether we should allow an emigre government in our country is a completely different proposal. It was on that proposal that we voted yesterday.

We dealt with China over Tibet and the treaty that was entered into was given the name of *Panchsheel*. The expression *Panchsheel* is one of the most sacred expressions evolved in the spiritual and cultural history of the world. Our Prime Minister put that expression on that treaty with the best sincerest of motives. In fact, he was adumbrating in *Panchsheel* what once a masterly spiritual leader of India had put forward before the world and converted to his views.

But what happened in this case? Before the ink on that treaty was dry, the very first principle of *Panchsheel* was violated. The first principle of *Panchsheel*, as preached by the master himself, is:

प्रदिन्वादाना-त्रेरमणि शिवकापदं समादियमि ।

I accept as a vow, the principle that I shall not try to take that which has not been given to me'. That is the first principle of *Panchsheel*. That principle was violated and parts of India were pounced upon by China.

There is a feeling in me that this betrayal by China was the cause of Pandit Nehru's unexpected and premature death. Otherwise that hardy and sturdy constitution would not have broken down in the way it did after what China did. It hastened his early end. But even after that was done, we are continuing in the same position. That is the position which was placed before the External Affairs Minister for his reconsideration.

In his speech yesterday, I believe the External Affairs Minister said that we cannot 'wish away history'. Perhaps that was the expression he used—'wish away history'. Why should we accept history as given to us by China? We go by our own history. We find that Tibet was more an ally of India than of China. If the historical division of this Ministry goes into the traditional Indian literature from the earliest times upto the 6th century at least, it will be found that Tibet continued as an ally of India in cultural and spiritual matters. History does not prove that Tibet was with China and not with ourselves. I disagree with much that Dr. Lohia says. But on one point to which he sticks with determination I agree; he says that our northern boundary should be drawn at Kailas. Anyone who goes through the Indian literature would have no doubt that Kailas was within the Indian boundary. The sixth century poet, Kalidasa, sends his "cloud messenger" from Ujjain and where does he wants to stop them? At the northern boundary of India and he describes it as follows:

“आकलासात् विसकिन्नय-—उदयथे वन्तः ।
मपतरुन्ते नमपि भवतो राजदुपा सहायाः ॥”

“These white ducks will accompany you up to Kailas.”

Their limits will be Kailas and Manas and there he asks them to stop.

Kailas was included in the Indian boundary. There is no doubt about it from the historical point of view. Whether we should insist on that boundary, it is for the Government to decide on that policy. In fact the name of Tibet was "Uttarakuru" or Kuruvashtra. This land where we are having the sitting of the Parliament is known as Kurukshetra and Tibet was called Uttarakuru or Kuruvashtra. This is not only in the old Indian literature but would be found in the letters of Swami Vivekananda to his Co-disciples. He deals with this question and he says that Tibet should be regarded as Kuruvashtra and Uttarakuru. That is the position of Tibet in relation to India in the historical perspective. Even if we go to history, we need not wish away history as history shows that Tibet was more allied to India than China. Yesterday, Mr. Chatterjee referred to the cultural and spiritual exchanges between India and Tibet. Indian Buddhist savants went to Tibet and Indians brought Tibetan traditions into our methods of worship. Even today there are traditional Indian worships of Shakthi cult which are known as Tibetan methods. Even today these forms of worship are practised in a large number of places. They can be verified by anyone who goes into them. Perhaps the speech I am making appears a bit academic but I deliberately intended it to be so in order to make the point that history need not be wished away. A latest book on Vivekananda had been published in America and it contains a very significant incident. In one of the parties he had, he was criticising the adverse effect of the British rule in India. He was asked a question there: What will happen if the Britishers leave India? The swamiji stopped for a second and replied: "China will attack India." This was in 1893 and Vivekananda was not a diplomat. How is it that a sanyasi could foresee what was in store for us now? What actually happened in 1962, our own politicians ought to have anticipated.

17.30 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I shall quote another sage. I shall quote Sri Aurobindo. When Mao had advanced up to the Tibetan border, he came out with a statement in the papers, and that statement said, "There on the top of the Himalayas he will remain poised to take his opportunity to jump upon India." He referred to China. How could that sage in his lifelong seclusion foresee what was going to happen in India? These are forecasts and not comments of any diplomat, of what we were going to do or face. In any case, what he had said came to be perfectly correct, and perfectly true. Shri Aurobindo's statement was made in 1950, and they may be found out from any of the centres of Aurobindo literature. In his statement I believe, that it was the soul of India which spoke and which wanted to express itself about what China was going to do, and what was going to happen in India. At the time of Chinese agreement in 1954, when the Nehru-Chou-En lai Pact was concluded, I happened to meet the Chairman of the UNCIP (United Nations Commission on India and Pakistan) in the United States. I believe his name is Corbell. He was a Czechoslovakian professor. He was very sore of the fact that Pandit Nehru had entered into the agreement with China. He said it would lead to disastrous results. I tried to explain to him our position. It was not good for the world that China should be excluded from the comity of the nations, and that our Prime Minister was doing a very good thing, a very good act, in trying to bring China nearer to other nations. But Prof. Corbell said that if what our Prime Minister was going to do succeeded, it would be a very good thing for the world but if it failed, it would be a danger to us and a danger for the world. This was the forecast that this gentleman had made in 1954, about our entering into an agreement with Chou En-lai.

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya]

Regarding our foreign policy, I can make only one comment. Both Lokmanya Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi, drew their life's philosophy from Gita, but they differed and went into different directions. The policy that Tilak evolved for himself was: *Yc yatha mam prapadyante tanstathairva Bhajamyaham*. "I am to others what they are unto to me." I believe that the hon. Minister of External Affairs would think whether the policy that Tilak had evolved for himself in his circumstances could be made to apply in the circumstances in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Bedabrata Barua.

Shri Bedabrata Barua (Kaliobar):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the policy of non-alignment, when it was formulated by our country in 1947, had very few adherents, but today, it encompasses—in the U.N.—of a number of States, half of the world, and it is a growing approach to the international situation. It is an approach that has come to be accepted by the vast multitudes in Afro-Asia. It is also a fact that with the growth of non-alignment other forces were let loose; our philosophy of co-existence, which India propounded, whether by our efforts or due to the exigencies of the international situation, became a reality. And with co-existence becoming a reality the big powers, the gigantic powers of the world, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, are coming closer to each other. This has certainly brought the cold war to an end. To a certain extent, so far as USA and USSR are concerned, there has been a sort of understanding which, unfortunately for Asian nationalism, has exacerbatingly failed in the West Asian scene. It is not the question of Muslims, as Shri Madhok, possibly, not very correctly, was supposed to have raised. It is not a question of Indo-Muslim or anything of that sort.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I said: "pro-India".

Shri Bedabrata Barua: Anyway, I feel myself unable to agree with him.

At the same time, it is our nearness to Arab nationalism, a nationalism that is vital, that has resisted western imperialism in Asia. That has to be taken into account. It is this stand that we are taking, when in the world framework, it is having a temporary defeat. This cold war, on the other side, has come too close to our borders.

China—I do not know what socialism they understand—has been carrying on its traditional expansionism in a very brutal manner. This expansionism of the Chinese Government we should try to differentiate—with diplomatic offensive—with the policy of millions of Chinese staying outside the borders of China in Formosa, Hong Kong and other places. I should say that the Government of China has instituted a cold war over Asia and has fulfilled, very unfortunately, the American and western ambition of making Asians fight Asians. It is a very unfortunate development and Indian diplomacy would need to be properly armed to see that big power intervention, whether in West Asia or in any other place, does not take place, does not increase. The diplomatic defeat in the hands of USA which some of the Russians have suffered from Cuba to UAR is not a thing for us to be happy about, because that is only a victory of which only those who believe in the thoughts of Mao could be happy. We do not want the aggressive American policy over the sub-continent from Vietnam to their support of Israel should be allowed to go on unabated. Therefore, our government is justified, not only because we are supporting nationalism that is resisting colonisation which started in Australia, that started with the extermination of the local people in Peru and occupation other places in South America, that did away with so many people in the United States. That is a history which we would not like to repeat. But, at the same time, right in the middle of the 20th century as Professor Toynbee has stated—Shri Masani quoted one part of him; I am quoting another part—the Western imperialism's worst aggressiveness is

trying to fust this problem, which is essentially Western, in the Asian continent. Even in the case of India, because the Muslim league wanted it, the British divided the territory so that the trouble will last for ever. This is a problem of the Germans. It was the Germans who were fighting the Jews. Between the Jews and christians the fight was essentially in the western battlefield, a battle which with all their wisdom they were unable to contain. They wanted to settle that essentially western battle, and that also by killing two birds with one stone. That is very unfortunate. They wanted to settle the problem by taking the Jews who were being persecuted by Germans from Europe and foisting them in a place which is part of the Arab territory. For the last one thousand years it was an Arab territory. Even though the Jews may claim that they were in occupation of that territory 3,000 years ago, it was under the occupation of the Arabs for the last hundreds of years, which is a fact of history.

An hon. Member: We have supported the resolution of Soviet Union.

Shri Bedabrata Barua: But I am speaking in the Indian Parliament. The Soviet Union did support the occupation of the Arab territory, but our country's spokesman, Mahatma Gandhi, did not. We have always consistently supported the Arabs because they are fighting a battle for survival against expansionism. What is the answer to the recent stand of the Israelites after occupation? If to India it could happen in Tashkent, it can happen to other countries in other places. Is it possible for this international body, the UNO, to allow the Israelites to enjoy the fruits of aggression, to go away with the fruits of aggression, without coming back to the original status? I do not go into every point in the agreement. Possibly, Israel will have to be recognised as a fact. Its existence will have to be recognised. But, its expansionism will have to be contained.

That must be guaranteed. If the western powers are unable to guarantee it, should not the Asian powers take it upon themselves the responsibility of ensuring that expansionism by Israel is contained? Now the Arabs have lost because of their weakness. We have fought for the battle of freedom and we have supported so many countries in their battle for freedom. But India cannot be a party to expansionism, whatever the consequences, whatever we are going to lose.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I became a refugee because India fought the battle for freedom.

Shri Bedabrata Barua: Shri Masani referred to our nuclear policy. We ought not to try to seek nuclear parity with China. We have already developed nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The question is whether nuclear parity is what is to be desired or whether at all we should develop nuclear weapons.

If the question is posed whether we should develop nuclear weapons, the answer is one; but if it is said that because China has developed nuclear weapons we should invite a nuclear umbrella which may be withdrawn at the appropriate moment, I beg to differ. Self-sufficiency and self-dependence has been proved to be the only possible course for any country in the world today, again after the unfortunate experience in West Asia where the parties were left to fight out their own case and neither friends, this side or that, interfered. So, it is this position where we have to depend upon ourselves because no country, Soviet Union or USA, is likely jointly to guarantee under the very specious arguments as they cannot, from their point of view, support any type of aggressiveness anywhere because they believe that under a nuclear umbrella that country would be encouraged to be very aggressive; so, that cannot be justified. They will not be able to find out at that point of time when a nuclear attack is mounted. That attack is mounted within a minute.

[Shri Bedabrata Barua]

So, the question involves our national defence. We have got many hurdles to cross. We will have to be dependent not merely on nuclear deterrents—that deterrent has to be there—but in regard to China, after what has happened in Indonesia, Burma and Nepal, we have a right to feel that Chinese aggressiveness can be faced with weapons other than military. We have to look to the east, the far east—to Japan and all countries that are slowly coming to feel that China has been posing a danger, a point that was not realised very soon but which has come to be felt everywhere. It is necessary that we approach all our neighbours and try to find out points of contact with them, that we try to have more intimacy with them, a man-to-man contact at the diplomatic and the commercial level because it is on the commercial level that we would have to have our relations strengthened. Our diplomacy must also be a diplomacy in terms of trade and commerce otherwise an economy that is not stable and a social system would not be able to resist aggression ideologically from quarters that are bent upon subversion. All these things we will require.

I would also call the attention of the hon. Minister to the point that has already been mentioned in the House that we need very much to strengthen our diplomatic services, that we need very much to change certain of the attitudes because today the whole world is trying to have new postures. Even the Soviet Union is trying to have a new policy direction in regard to Pakistan and Kashmir. So, it is necessary that our diplomacy should be more dynamic and vital. That is why it would be necessary that our diplomats should be able to give up certain attitudes, certain pro-Western attitudes, as was said, Western dress, Western culture, Western method of speech and accent. That would not do in Afro-Asia. We need very much to take all the people of Africa and

Asia along with us if we are to make a point in our approach to the world.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड) :
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, वैदेशिक नीति का आधार प्रमुख रूप से तीन कसौटियां होती हैं। पहला आधार होता है रक्षा की स्थिति, दूसरा आधार होता है आर्थिक सम्बन्ध और तीसरा आधार होता है जो भारतीय दूसरे देशों में रहते हैं उनके हितों की रक्षा। हमारी वैदेशिक नीति इन तीनों कसौटियों में प्रनुत्तीर्ण रही है। इस का सब से प्रबल प्रमाण यह है कि जहां तक हमारी रक्षा व्यवस्था का सम्बन्ध है वैदेशिक नीति या कूटनीति रक्षा व्यवस्था में किसी प्रकार सहायक नहीं हो सकी है। पिछले दो संवर्षों में हमारी वैदेशिक नीति बुरी तरह असफल रही है। वह इस बात की परिचायक थी कि पिछले बीस वर्षों में वैदेशिक नीति में किसी प्रकार की वृद्धि रही है।

जहां तक हमारे आर्थिक सम्बन्धों का प्रश्न है सब से बड़ा उदाहरण विदेश नीति की असफलता का यह है कि 1951 में जो दूसरे देशों को हमारा निर्यात होता था 1965-66 में उस निर्यात में कोई विशेष वृद्धि नहीं हुई। इससे भी पता चलता है कि हमारी विदेश नीति आर्थिक सम्बन्धों का विस्तार करने में किसी प्रकार भी अधिक सहायक नहीं हो सकी है।

जहां तक भारतीयों के दूसरे देशों में रह कर उनके हितों की सुरक्षा का सम्बन्ध है अभी फल परतों की बात है कि अदन से हमारे देश के कुछ नागरिक निकाले जा रहे थे। कल ही विदेश मंत्री से यह पूछा गया कि उनके वहां से हटाये जाने का कारण क्या हुआ तो केवल यह कह कर उन्होंने बात को समाप्त कर दिया कि कुछ यहूदियों के ऊपर हमले हो रहे थे उससे भयभीत हो कर उन्होंने अपने परिवार यहां भेज दिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्री का इससे अधिक सफेद झूठ कुछ और नहीं हो सकता है। कल जो बम्बई में 686 व्यक्ति पहुंचे हैं

उन्होंने यह कहा है कि तीन दिन के अन्दर नब्बे हजार तो वहाँ पर गोलियाँ चलाई गई हैं। बैंकों से हमारा सम्बन्ध बिल्कुल बन्द कर दिया गया है। कारोबार हमारा बिल्कुल ठप्प पड़ा हुआ है। सड़कों पर हम सुरक्षित नहीं निकल सकते हैं। स्त्रियों और पुरुषों ने रो-रो कर अपनी जो दर्दनाक घटनायें बताईं उनको दो बड़ी न्यूज एजेंसीज पी० टी० आई० और यू० एन० आई० ने समाचारपत्रों तक पहुंचाया है। इससे आप अनुमान लगा सकते हैं कि भारतीयों की स्थिति न सिर्फ अदन में बल्कि दक्षिण अफ्रीका में श्रीलंका आदि में क्या है और भारतीयों के साथ क्या क्या घटनायें वहाँ घट रही हैं। एक-एक देश का उदाहरण दे कर मैं अपने कथन को उधर नहीं मोड़ना चाहता। कहना मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इन तीनों क्षेत्रों में, रक्षा व्यवस्था में, आर्थिक सम्बन्धों के सुधार में तथा प्रभासी भारतीयों की दूसरे देशों में रक्षा करने में हमारी विदेशनीति सर्वथा अनुत्तीर्ण रही है।

इसके पश्चात् दूसरी सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि विदेश नीति की सब से बड़ी सफलता यह होती है कि वह अपने हितों की रक्षा कूटनीतिक क्षेत्रों में भी अधिक से अधिक करे। इस समय हमारी सीमाओं पर दो सब से बड़े शत्रु हैं एक चीन है और दूसरा पाकिस्तान है। चीन चूंकि शक्ति के उगमाद में है इसलिए चीन के जो सहयोगी राष्ट्र थे वे चीन विरोधी होते जा रहे हैं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के वे अंग जो चीन के समर्थक थे, उदाहरण के लिये जापान की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी वे भी चीन के शक्ति उगमाद में होने से चीन-विरोधी हो चुके हैं। हांगकांग में चीन विरोधी भावनायें भड़क रही हैं। बर्मा में भड़क रही हैं। इंडोनेशिया की घटनाओं से हम परिचित हैं। कम्बोडिया जो चीन का सबसे बड़ा समर्थक था आज उसकी स्थिति भी चीन विरोधी हो चुकी है। श्याम आदि कई देशों में चीन के विरुद्ध बहुत बड़ी घृणा फैली हुई है। एक स्पष्ट सवाल मैं विदेश मंत्री

से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि चीन के विरुद्ध इन देशों में जो घृणा फैली हुई है भारत ने उस घणा का क्या लाभ उठाया है? भारत की विदेश नीति को सब से बड़ी सफलता यह होनी चाहिये कि इस स्थिति में हम उन्हें निकट ला पाते। हमें चाहिये था कि हम इससे लाभ उठाते। मैं विदेश मंत्री से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वह स्पष्ट भाषा में हमें बतायें कि इतनी बड़ी परिस्थितियों को अपने अन्तर्कूल बनाने के लिये भारतीय विदेश नीति किन अर्थों में सफल हुई है?

मुझे आप इस बात को कहने की आज्ञा दीजिये कि विदेश मंत्रालय में जो हमारा चीन विभाग है आज तक चीन के सम्बन्ध में जानकारी देने के लिये उसने अपनी आंखों पर या तो ब्रिटेन का चश्मा लगाया हुआ है या अमरीका का या रूस का लगाया हुआ है। जो चीन सम्बन्धी विभाग विदेश मंत्रालय में है भारत की अपनी नीति क्या है चीन के सम्बन्ध में इसके बारे में वह अपने मस्तिष्क को स्पष्ट नहीं कर पाया है। और चीन के सम्बन्ध में कोई निर्णय भी अभी तक किसी प्रकार का वह नहीं ले पाया है।

मैं इसको बहुत ज्यादा बलवती भाषा में तो नहीं कह सकूंगा या इसकी बलवती भाषा में तो अभ्रह नहीं कर सकूंगा कि भारत ने जो तटस्थता की नीति अपनाई है वह क्यों नहीं ताइवान और फारमोसा के साथ अपने कूटनीतिक सम्बन्ध रखती? लेकिन इस बात को मैं बलवती भाषा में कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज चीन की आन्तरिक स्थिति से परिचित होने के लिये जो द्वार या खिड़कियाँ हैं जिन से चीन की स्थिति को पढ़ा जा सकता है उसमें फारमोसा भी एक है। आप भले ही फारमोसा के साथ राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध न रखें लेकिन उसके साथ अपने सम्बन्धों को इतना काट कर भी आप न रखें कि फारमोसा के माध्यम से जो चीन की घरेलू स्थिति का पता चल सकता है या उसके माध्यम से आप

[श्री प्रकाशबोर शास्त्री]

अपने हितों का संरक्षण कर सकते हैं उसकी सर्वथा उपेक्षा हो। यह हमारी विदेश नीति की कुशलता हानी चाहिये कि अगर हम ने उनसे राजनीतिक सम्बन्ध नहीं रखे हैं तो और कई इस प्रकार के सम्बन्ध हो सकते हैं जिनके द्वारा हम उनसे मैत्री रख सकते हैं।

कुछ सदस्यों के साथ मुझे अभी फारमोसा जाने का अवसर मिला था। वहां जा कर मैंने चीन के सम्बन्ध में जानकारी ली। भारतीयों के प्रति जो उनके विचार थे उनको जानने की भी कोशिश की। आज वहां के सब से बड़े नेता जनरल च्यांग काई शेक हैं। उन्होंने हमारे स्वतंत्रता आन्दोलन में बड़ा योग दिया था। एक हमारे साथी ने उनसे पूछा कि क्यों नहीं आप काश्मीर के प्रश्न पर सुरक्षा परिषद् में या संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में हमारा साथ देते। यह जब उनसे प्रश्न पूछा तो उन्होंने उम समय उसी भाषा में उत्तर दिया कि हमारे सम्बन्ध में संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में कैसा पार्ट आपने भ्रदा किया है इसको भी आप ने कभी सोचा है? आप हम से समर्थन की आशा करते हैं तो हमारे प्रति आपकी नीति क्या रही है? या इसको भी आप ने कभी जानने की कोशिश की है? राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों की बात को आप छोड़िये। जो बात में विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि हम ने उन से पूछा कि काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में आपकी नीति क्या है तो उन्होंने कहा कि मैं काश्मीर का कोई समस्या ही नहीं मानता हूं। मैंने भारत के विभाजन के पूर्व ही पंडित नेहरू को पार लिखा था कि हिन्दुस्तान का विभाजन भारत को ही नहीं दुनिया को भी बहुत महंगा पड़ेगा और आज भी मेरी स्पष्ट नीति यह है कि काश्मीर की समस्या कुछ नहीं है अगर इस दीवार को बीच में से हटा दिया जाये। उन्होंने कहा कि न केवल भारत और पाकिस्तान लेकिन जहां जहां भी दुनिया में इस प्रकार के देशों का बटवारा हुआ है वहां की स्वाधीनता सदा के लिये समाप्त

हो गई है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जिन की आजमी भारत के प्रति इतनी हित भावना है उनसे राजनीति सम्बन्ध आप भले ही न रखें लेकिन दूसरे प्रकार के सम्बन्धों को तोड़ कर रखें तो कोई बुद्धिमत्ता की नीति प्रतीत नहीं होती है।

जहां तक पश्चिम एशिया की नीति का सम्बन्ध है अरब और इजराइल के संघर्ष में आप मुझे इस बात को कहने की अनुमति दीजिये कि मेरी स्पष्ट राय यह है कि भारत की विदेश नीति पिछले बीस वर्षों में व्यक्ति विशेष को आधार मान कर चलती रही है। पश्चिम एशिया के सम्बन्ध में जो हम ने अपनी नीति निर्धारित की है उसका एक बहुत बड़ा आधार व्यक्ति पूजा थी। पंडित नेहरू ने अपने समय में नासिर साहब के साथ अपने किसी प्रकार के सम्बन्ध रखे थे। लेकिन उस समय की परिस्थितियां भ्रलग थीं। लाल बहादुर जी के समय की परिस्थितियां भ्रलग थीं और आज के समय की परिस्थितियां बिल्कुल भ्रलग हैं। आज भी हम श्री नेहरू और कर्नल नासर के सम्बन्धों को लेकर पश्चिम एशिया के सम्बन्ध में पुरानी घिसी-पिटी नीति के साथ चिपटे रहें यह भारत जैसे विशाल राष्ट्र के लिये संगत बात प्रतीत नहीं होती है। हम देख चुके हैं कि चीन और पाकिस्तान के साथ संघर्ष में कर्नल नासर ने और इजिप्ट के लोगों ने पाकिस्तान को हथकावर तक कहने का साहस नहीं किया और न ही चीन को कहने का किया। भारत और पाकिस्तान के संघर्ष में भी हम देख चुके हैं कि अरब राष्ट्रों ने किस प्रकार पाकिस्तान की कमर पर धा कर उसका समर्थन किया। हम देख चुके हैं कि भारत सुरक्षा परिषद् का उम्मीदवार बन कर जब खड़ा हुआ तो अरब राष्ट्रों का उस समय किस प्रकार का रुख था? ऐसे समय में उस व्यक्ति पूजा के आधार पर अपनी उसी पुरानी नीति पर चिपटे रहना कोई सम्भवदारी और बुद्धिमत्ता की बात प्रतीत नहीं होती। मेरा निवेदन है कि इस

सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार को फिर से सोचना चाहिये ।

यों भी भारत की विदेश नीति का मूल आधार सह-अस्तित्व है जबकि अरब राष्ट्र सह-अस्तित्व की नीति का विरोध करना, धर्म समझते हैं । ऐसी स्थिति में भारत की विदेश नीति अरब राष्ट्रों के साथ किस प्रकार मेल खा सकती है । आप यह भी देखें कि जो प्रस्ताव भारत ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में उपस्थित किया था : क्या क्या परिणाम हुआ ? जो उसका रूप बना वह भारत की पचास करोड़ जनता के अन्दर ग्लानि उत्पन्न करने वाला था । इन सब बातों को देख कर हम की अपनी भूत का सुधार करना चाहिये था । सुधार का अर्थ यही हो सकता है कि हम संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में और सुरक्षा परिषद् में स्पष्ट रूप से इस बात की घोषणा करें कि स्वैज नहर को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नहर बनाया जाये जिससे आगे चल कर इस प्रकार की कठिनाइयां हमारे मार्ग में तथा दूसरे देशों के मार्ग में बार-बार उपस्थित न हों ।

जहाँ तक विदेश सेवा में सुधार का सम्बन्ध है, मैं विदेश मंत्रियों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू के समय में एन० आर० पिल्ले कमेटी बनी थी और जिसने अपनी रिपोर्ट भी दे दी है और कुछ सुझाव भी दिये हैं । उसके प्रकाश में विदेश सेवा में कहाँ कहाँ और किस किस रूप में सुधार हुआ है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि विदेश मंत्री अपने उत्तरों इस बात का स्पष्ट रूप से संकेत दें कि इतने अनुभवों लोगों की जो कमेटी बनी थी उसने क्या अपने सुझाव दिये थे ? क्यों नहीं उसमें सुझावों को अब तक पालिसी के सामने लाया गया और उसके आधार पर आप ने विदेश सेवा में क्या परिवर्तन किये हैं ।

अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए मैं दो बातें विशेष रूप से और

कहना चाहता हूँ । हम जहाँ दूसरे देशों के साथ विदेश मंत्रालय के द्वारा राजनीतिक या कूटनीतिक सम्बन्धों की स्थापना में सज्जता और जागरूकता बरतें वहाँ साथ साथ इस बात का भी विशेष रूप से ध्यान रखें कि भारत के जितने भी पड़ोसी देश हैं वे राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों से भी कहीं अधिक सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध हमारे साथ बढ़ाने के उत्सुक हैं । लेकिन विदेश मंत्रालय की ओर से इस दिशा में किसी प्रकार का कोई प्रयास नहीं किया जा रहा है जो उनके साथ हमारे सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध बढ़ें । मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि इन देशों के साथ सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्धों की अनिच्छता राजनीतिक सम्बन्धों की अपेक्षा हमारे लिये कहीं अधिक लाभदायक सिद्ध हो सकती है । फिर चाहे बर्मा हो, श्याम हो, कम्बोडिया हो, जापान हो, भूटान हो, जावा हो, सुमात्रा हो, लंका हो, नेपाल हो । जितने भी ये देश हैं व सब के सब हमारे साथ सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध बढ़ाने के उत्सुक हैं ।

18 Mrs.

अध्यक्ष जी आप को कष्ट होगा पिछले साल की इस घटना को सुन कर । इस घटना को जब मैंने सुना मेरा तो सिर लज्जा के साथ झुक गया । थाईलैंड के महाराज के एक राजगुरु हैं । थाई देश का धर्म बौद्ध धर्म है । उनके जो राजगुरु हैं वह शैव धर्म के मानने वाले हैं । कभी उनकी पुरानी पीढ़ियां दक्षिण भारत से जा कर श्याम में बसी थीं । वह अपनी मातृभूमि की यात्रा करने के लिए यहाँ पर आना चाहते थे और उसी आधार पर थाईलैंड के महाराज की उन्होंने अनुमति ली कि मैं भारत जाना चाहता हूँ । थाईलैंड में जो हमारे राजदूत थे उन्होंने भी यह कहा कि उनके भारत जाने का परिणाम थाई महाराज के परिवार पर अच्छा पड़ने वाला था, सारे श्याम पर अच्छा पड़ने वाला था । लेकिन भारत सरकार ने तीन महीने लगातार इस बात के विचार में लगा दिये कि थाईलैंड महाराज के जो राजगुरु हैं उनको भारत आने

[श्री प्रकाशजीर शास्त्री]

दिया जाय या न माने दिया जाय । बाद में जब वह स्वयं रुक गये तो कहा गया कि हम को उन के माने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं है । इस प्रकार की तो छोटी छोटी भू-रे हो गे हैं । श. में इनका कितना बड़ा दुष्परिणाम होता । इसका आप अनुमान हो लगते । उससे पहले भी दो खेलने वाली पार्टियाँ थाईलैंड की यहाँ आ रही थीं । एक खेलने के लिये आ रही थी, दूसरा सांस्कृतिक दल था । जब वह पार्टी थाईलैंड के एयर पोर्ट पर आ गई तब हमारे राजदूत ने यह संदेश भेजा कि वह पार्टी हिन्दुस्तान नहीं जा सकती उसकी भारत के खिलाफ कितनी भयंकर प्रतिक्रिया हुई इसका अनुमान यहाँ हम नहीं लगा सकते । मैंने उसका एक कार्टून देखा था कि थाईलैंड की टीम भारत आने के लिये हवाई जहाज पर तैयार खड़ी है, इधर एयर इन्डिया का हवाई जहाज तैयार खड़ा है, लेकिन भारतीय राजदूत हाथ धिला कर कह रहे हैं कि नहीं, भारत जाने भी अनुमति नहीं है । दूसरी घटना यह थाईलैंड के महाराज के राजगुरु के साथ घटी । तो हम को इन दोनों के साथ राजनैतिक सम्बन्धों के प्रतिरिक्त सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध बढ़ाने चाहिए थे और इस दिशा में विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये था ।

भू-पूर्व राष्ट्रपति डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जब दक्षिणी पूर्वी एशिया के देशों की यात्रा करके भारत आये तो माने पर सब से पहली बात उन्होंने यह कही कि इन देश के साथ सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्धों की घनिष्ठता जितनी बढ़ सके उतनी बढ़ानी चाहिये । लेकिन विदेश मंत्रालय ने आज तक इसकी आवश्यकता नहीं अनुभव की ।

अंतिम बात जो मैं विशेष रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ वह है प्रवासी भारतीयों के संबंध में जो प्रवासी भारतीय

आज बड़ी संख्या में दूसरे देशों में रहते हैं । अभी कुछ दिन पहले की बात है जब पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जीवित थे तो मेरे पास फिजी के प्रवासी भारतीयों की ओर से एक पत्र आया । उस में उन्होंने लिखा था कि जब भारत स्वतंत्र नहीं हुआ था तब तो भारतीय कांग्रेस का जो कार्यालय था उस में प्रवासी भारतीयों के लिए विशेष विभाग खुला था और हमारे हितों की रक्षा के लिए वहाँ से आवाज उठायी जाती थी । लेकिन जब से देश स्वतंत्र हुआ भारत सरकार को उस से सम्पर्क बढ़ाने की, अमेरिका से सम्पर्क बढ़ाने की तो इच्छा है लेकिन हम प्रवासी भारतीयों की जो यहाँ पर हैं, जो भारत का अपने को भ्रंग मानते हैं, भारत के दुख सुख को अपना दुख सुख मानते हैं, उनकी चिन्ता नहीं । चीन के साथ संघर्ष में उन्होंने करोड़ों रुपया इकट्ठा कर के भेजा, पाकिस्तान के साथ संघर्ष में पैसा भेजा, लेकिन आज उन की क्या स्थिति है ? भारत सरकार उस से सर्वथा अपरिचित है, कोई ध्यान नहीं दे रही है । उन्होंने अपने एक पत्र में लिखा जो मैंने पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू को भेजा और पंडितजी ने अपनी मृत्यु से ठीक एक दिन पहले देहरादून से उस पत्र का उत्तर भेजा फिजी के लोगों ने लिखा था कि अगर भारत सरकार नयी दिल्ली में हम को स्थान दे दे तो हम एक प्रवासी भारतीय भवन बनाना चाहते हैं । जिस के माध्यम से हम प्रवासी भारतीय भारत सरकार तक अपनी कठिनाइयाँ पहुँचा सकेंगे । देहरादून से पंडित जी ने यह लिखा कि मुझे यह सूझाव बढ़ा पसन्द है और मैं दिल्ली पहुँचते ही मेहरचंद खन्ना से कहूँगा कि वह प्रवासी भारतीयों के लिए इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था करें । परन्तु मेहरचंद खन्ना ने पंडित जी के आश्वासन देने के बाद भी जगह नहीं दी जब कि वह कई लाख रुपया लगा कर दिल्ली में प्रवासी भारतीय भवन बनाना चाहते

ये। ऐसी स्थिति में विदेश मंत्री महोदय और किस प्रकार से उन की सहायता करेंगे मेरा आप से अनुरोध है कि अगर विदेश मंत्रालय सचमूच में विदेशों के संबंध में सही प्रकार की नीति अपनाया चाहता है तो जहाँ भारतीयों के हितों की रक्षा रूस अमेरिका और इंग्लैंड आदि देशों में करे वहाँ जो प्रवासी भारतीय विदेशों में बसे हुए हैं उन की तरफ भी पूरा ध्यान दे। मुझे यह सुनकर बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ कि जो प्रवासी भारतीय विदेशों से उजाड़े जा रहे थे और जो भारत आ कर बसना चाहते थे और अपना करोड़ों और अरबों रुपया यहाँ लगाना चाहते थे उन्होंने वित्त मंत्रालय से कुछ सुविधा चाही। उन्होंने चाहा कि हम को भास्त की नागरिकता प्रदान करते समय आवश्यक आर्थिक सुविधाएँ भी प्रदान की जायें। लेकिन आप को सुन कर आश्चर्य होगा उस समय के वित्त मंत्री श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमचारी ने उन को किसी प्रकार की सुविधा नहीं दी। नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह विदेशी मुद्रा के रूप में जो करोड़ों और अरबों रुपया भारत में आ सकता था वह इंग्लैंड और स्विजरलैंड के बैंकों में जा कर जमा हुआ। क्या यह हमारी विदेश नीति है? क्या इसी तरह हम उन के हितों की रक्षा कर सकेंगे?

मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि यह इस प्रकार की बातें हैं जिन के ऊपर विदेश मंत्रालय को ध्यान देना चाहिए। हमारी विदेश नीति जरा आकाश में उड़ना छोड़े, धरती पर चलना सीखे।

18.05 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORT-
ANCE

KILLING OF POLICEMEN BY NAGA
HOSTILES

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद (नालन्दा) :
मैं अखिल भारतीय लोक महत्त्व के निम्न-
1435 (A) LSD—7.

लिखित विषय की ओर गृह कार्य मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस बारे में एक वक्तव्य दें :

“मणिपुर में नागा विद्रोहियों द्वारा घात लगा कर हमला कर के केन्द्रीय रक्षित पुलिस के 23 कर्मचारियों की हत्या करने और हथियार व गोला बारूद लूट लेने के समाचार।”

Sri Mem Barua (Mangaldai): This is a very serious matter. May I make a submission again that a calling attention motion cannot serve the purpose? There is evidence available to establish the failure on the part of the Government. We can prove that; we can establish that. Therefore, I hope you will re-think this matter and admit our adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: He has called attention. It has been admitted.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): Sir, a detachment of the Central Reserve Police were escorting, on the 12th July, a telephone line maintenance party in two vehicles from mile 44 to mile 62 on the Imphal-Tamenglong road in the Tamenglong sub-division of Manipur. The hostiles had set up a road block near mile 52 and ambushed our security personnel. They opened fire with small arms and automatic weapons at close range from both sides of the road at about 0730 hours. Twenty-three members of the party were killed on the spot and a lone survivor, a CRP constable, returned to mile 44 at about 11.30 hours. He was also badly burnt and wounded. One vehicle was completely burnt. The hostiles looted the arms and ammunition. Troops have been called in aid of civil authority and are making a search for the offenders.

I may also be permitted to inform the House that on the same day, another line party was fired upon by the hostiles at mile 32 on the same road at 1515 hours. One member of the

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]
line party was killed and five others
wounded.

Shri Hem Barua: That makes it 24.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I would like to extend on behalf of the Government my deepest sympathies to the families of the deceased.

The Tamenglong sub-division where these incidents have occurred is within the area covered by the suspension of operations agreement.

Shri Hem Barua: That was the mistake.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The agreement clearly provides that the underground Nagas would not resort to any ambush or sniping. Government, therefore, view these incidents with very grave concern.

The Prime Minister is sending Rs. 24,000 for immediate assistance to the bereaved families.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहले एक बात का खुलासा करें कि यह फेंडली होस्टाइल नागाज हैं या होस्टाइल होस्टाइल नागाज हैं ?

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि बार बार इस सदन में इस बात की चिन्ता व्यक्त की जाती है कि यह जो विद्रोही नागा हैं यह अपने उपद्रव का क्षेत्र बढ़ा रहे हैं। पहले नागालैंड तक की बात की गई थी। उसको बढ़ा कर मणिपुर किया गया। अभी कुछ दिन पहले विदेश मंत्री ने वक्तव्य दिया था जिस में बताया गया था कि पिछले तीन-चार महीने के अन्दर 126 घटनाएँ घटी, उन में से केवल एक नागा लैंड में घटी। अब मणिपुर तक बढ़ते हैं और उस से भी आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। सरकार बार बार कहती है कि वह ऐसी व्यवस्था कर रही है कि जिस में रोक थाम होगी और बात-चीत चल रही है जिससे कोई

नतीजा निकलेगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या बजह है कि सरकार अपनी नीतियों को ठीक ढंग से कार्यान्वित नहीं कर पाती है या जिन विद्रोही नागाओं से बातचीत करती है उन का नागा लोगों पर कोई असर नहीं है? ऐसी स्थिति में 12 जुलाई को यह घटना घटने के बाद फिर 13 जुलाई को एक घटना घटी और उस में भी एक आदमी मारा गया। तो सरकार इस संबंध में अपनी बात को स्पष्ट कर के इस सदन के सामने क्यों नहीं रखती है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I think the hon. Member has raised a very legitimate question, and it is one I have, no doubt, to answer. We certainly view this with grave concern because this is a blatant breach of the suspension of operations agreement.

Shri Hem Barua: It took place because of the mistake of the Home Ministry.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If it is a mistake, I will own it. But I do not know what mistake he is referring to.

Shri Hem Barua: Why did they allow the cease fire to be extended to Manipur? It was beyond the pale of Naga activities before.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It was not a question of its being extended; it was part of the agreement.

Shri Hem Barua: How could it be unless you agreed?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That certainly is a matter to be discussed. I quite agree there.

Shri Hem Barua: The Home Ministry should not have agreed to that.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: This is a point which I shall take note of. What he says is a point on which I cannot give an answer now. It is certainly a valid point of criticism. But what I am saying is that this is certainly a blatant

breach of this agreement which they had made and we will have to take it up with the people who have entered into an agreement in this matter.

Shri S. Kundu (Balasore): This shocking, barbaric, cold-blooded killing of the 24 Indian policemen added to today's news that some bridges had been blown up points out clearly that the graveyard of this weak-kneed policy pursued by the Government has been finally dug. I would like a categorical announcement here. The hon. Minister, will he say that this short of talk ends today and no more peace talks will continue, where these Nagas think that we are actually weak and therefore they summon the courage and they get arms and ammunition from outside, Pakistan and China, where they reinforce, we fall back. I would like to know whether the truce agreement with them will be completely snapped. Finally, a deadline should be fixed and declared here that from today within a fortnight if they do not come to terms, no pacts or no talks with them. We must tell them: you and I finally part and our armies will march on. I want this categorical announcement from the hon. Minister.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The hon. Member has certainly raised his voice of protest which I share. I do not think that anybody can make an announcement like this. He has made some suggestions.

An hon. Member: Are you prepared to revise your policy?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: These are suggestions and these suggestions will have to be considered seriously.

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज)
क्या सरकार ने यह विचार किया है कि
अण्डर ग्राउण्ड नागाओं के दो दल हैं - एक
एक्स्ट्रीमिस्ट्स और दूसरा वह जो सरकार
से बात कर रहा है, वस्तुतः दोनों एक ही हैं
उनकी मिलीभगत से कोई आगे आकर

एटेक करता है तो कोई आप से बातें
करता है। अगर यह बात सही है तो क्या
गवर्नमेंट अपने दृष्टिकोण में कोई हेरफेर
करने को तैयार है ?

दूसरी बात, क्या मणिपुर के चीफ मिनिस्-
टर ने सरकार से दो बटालियन आर्मी और
मांगी है, जिससे कि वह इन नागाओं को
ठीक कर सके ? यदि हाँ, तो इस पर सरकार
की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: As far as the general question is concerned, naturally Government has to make an assessment of the situation from time to time. There is no question of any doctrinaire attitude in this matter. We had entered into an agreement which has helped us to secure some peace in Nagaland. Now this question will have to be considered. But by and large I must say, there are certain exceptions, but peace was secured in Nagaland.

Shri Hem Barua: They have extended their activities to Assam and Manipur.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Manipur is certainly the scene of this incident. But that does not mean that we should ignore these things. Government will have to take a review of these matters. That is why I have said that Government takes a very serious view of this matter. (Interruptions.)

श्री मधु लिमये : असफलता और
अयोग्यता साबित हो गई, अब कामरुको
लिया जाये।

Mr. Speaker: The House stands adjourned till Monday.

18.15 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Monday the
July 17, 1967/Asadha 26, 1889 (Saka).