

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(THIRD SERIES)

Vol. LV, 1966/1888 (Saka)

[April 30 to May 14, 1966/Vaisakha 10 to 24, 1888 (Saka)]



Fourteenth Session, 1965-66/1887-88 (Saka)

(Vol. LV contains Nos. 51 to 60)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

CONTENTS

No. 60—Saturday, May 14, 1966/Vaisakha 24, 1888 (Saka)

Oral Answers to Questions—	COLUMNS
Short Notice Question Nos. 33 and 34	. 16789—16801
Opinions on Bill	16801
Re. Point of Privilege	16801—02
Message from Rajya Sabha	16802—03
Rules Committee—	
Third Report	16803—04
Business of the House	16804—22
Re: Planning Minister's Statement on his Visit to USA and Canada	16812
Re: Alleged Ill-Treatment meted out to Shri Ram Sewak Yadav by Police at Lucknow	16822—28
Orissa Legislative Assembly (Extension of Duration) Bill—	
Motion to Consider	16829—41
Shri G. S. Pathak	16829—41
Clauses 2 and 1	16841
Motion to Pass, as amended	16841
Shri G. S. Pathak	16841
Motion Re. Statement of Home Minister on Reorganisation of the present State of Punjab— <i>Adopted</i>	16842—16911
Shri Gajraj Singh Rao	16842—47
Shri H. N. Mukerjee	16848—53
Shri G. S. Musafir	16850—62
Shri Surendranath Dwivedy	16862—68
Shri Hem Raj	16869—72
Shri Jagdev Singh Siddhanti	16872—76
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa	16876—81
Shri A. N. Vidyalkar	16881—88
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia	16888—93
Shri Nanda	16893—16902
Shri Prakash Vir Shastri	16902

Asian Development Bank Bill—

COLUMNS

Motion to Consider .	16911
Shri B. R. Bhagat	16911—17
Shri H. N. Mukerjee .	16917—27
Shri Sham Lal Saraf .	16927—32
Shri Tan Singh .	16932—36
Shri Muthiah	16936—39
Shri M. N. Swamy .	16940—45
Shri V. B. Gandhi	16945—48
 Clauses 2 to 7 and 1	 16954
Motion to pass	16954
Shri B. R. Bhagat	16948—54
Shri H. N. Mukerjee .	16955
 Delhi Administration Bill—	
Motion to Consider, as reported by Joint Committee .	
Shri Hathi	16956
 Half-An-Hour Discussion Re: Urbanisation of Areas	 16956—68
Shri H. N. Mukerjee	16956—63
Shri Asoka Mehta	16963—68

LOK SABHA DEBATES

16789

16790

LOK SABHA

Saturday, May 14, 1966 (Vaisakha 24,
1888 (Saka))

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the
Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS

Employees of the Food Corporation of India

+

S.N.Q. 33 Shri Ranga:

Shri Kapur Singh:
Shri P. H. Bheel:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Warlor:
Shri D. C. Sharma:
Shri Buta Singh:

Will the Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have asked 21,000 employees of the Food Corporation of India to resign from the Government service and opt for the Corporation service;

(b) if so, whether any representations of the employees in question have been received by Government and what action, if any, has been taken in this regard; and

(c) whether the situation has been precipitated by Government's refusal to listen to the employees' demands which has resulted in the employees proceeding on hunger strike as from the 4th May, 1966, as it is reported?

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri C. Subramaniam): (a) The terms and conditions for the

transfer of the employees of the Food Department to the Food Corporation of India are still under the consideration of the Government and no employee of the Department of Food has been actually asked to resign from Government service.

(b) Some representations have been received from the Staff Associations of the Food Department employees. The main points raised in these representations were discussed with the representatives of the Staff Associations in a meeting held on the 19th March, 1966, and are now under consideration in consultation with the Food Corporation of India.

(c) The question of refusal on the part of the Government to listen to the employees' demands does not arise in view of the answer to part (b) of the Question. It is not also correct to say that the employees have proceeded on a hunger strike from the 4th May, 1966. Only the employees of the Regional Directorate of Food at Madras observed a token fast for a day on the 4th May, 1966 in support of their demands.

Shri Ranga: I thought, my hon. friend would make a reference to the answer given by his colleague, Shri Govinda Menon, some time ago that the Government of India realised that there was a lacuna in the Food Corporation of India Act and that they were thinking of amending it. I would like to know whether they have prepared that Bill and when they propose to bring forward the Bill before this House and that pending the amendment of that Act, which would assure these people, when they opt themselves out to the Corporation service, the same conditions of service as they have been enjoying till now in Government service, Government would

not take any final steps in regard to their demand or suggestion that they should resign from Government service.

Shri C. Subramaniam: As I have already stated, the whole matter is under consideration. The main difficulty arises with regard to the security of service in Government offered to the employees under article 311 of the Constitution. The employees are demanding that, when they go to the Food Corporation even as employees of the Food Corporation, all the safeguards provided in the Constitution under article 311 should be available to them. This is the matter which is under consideration. Whether for this purpose the Act will have to be amended or it could be achieved by some other process, is under consideration. I am hoping that the matter will be decided by the 30th May; but I can give this assurance that it is our intention to see that the employees get full satisfaction with regard to the terms under which they are transferred to the Food Corporation.

Shri Ranga: In the meanwhile, they will not be asked to resign from here?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Not before we take a decision and come to an agreement with them.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would like to know whether it is a fact that their demand is that total service rendered in the Food Department should count towards the newly-created jobs in the Food Corporation and that they should be given the same benefit of leave, provident fund, pension, etc., and, if so, what is the reaction of the Government to this?

Shri C. Subramaniam: All that has been agreed upon, that the service in the Food Department, to the extent it would have been available for them in the Food Department for seniority and all those things, will be taken into account when they go over to the Food Corporation. My impression is all that has been settled. The

only question is with regard to the security provided under article 311 of the Constitution.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: May I know whether the employees of this Corporation have expressed the worry that they are not being given sufficient work to do? What have been the achievements of the Food Corporation so far?

Shri C. Subramaniam: These people are still in Government service and, therefore, there is no question of their not being given sufficient work....

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: They say, "We are sitting idle; there is no work to do".

Shri C. Subramaniam: I am glad at least in one Corporation that attitude has been taken that they are demanding work.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Replying to my Call Attention notice on this question the other day, the Minister of State for Food and Agriculture said here that he will have a further discussion with the employees' associations on this matter. I want to know whether this discussion has taken place and whether their representation has been given due consideration.

Shri C. Subramaniam: The consultation is going on and according to the note I have, I am told the matter will finally come up before the Food Corporation on the 30th May in the Board of Directors meeting.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Apart from guaranteeing continuity of service to the entire staff of this organisation, may I know whether, at the same time, thought is being applied to retaining such of the people against new jobs in the Food Corporation as would be technically feasible so that they will be able to conduct the work in the best possible manner.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Yes. Of course, that will have to be taken into account. But in this case, the functions which are now being discharged by the Food Department are

being taken over by the Food Corporation. Therefore, the persons who have been engaged for these purposes will have to be taken over. Therefore, the technical feasibility, whether they are capable of discharging the functions, would have been processed by the Food Department when they were employed. That aspect will be kept in mind.

Shri P. Venkatasubbiah: May I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that even before the complete absorption of the employees working in the Food Department is effected, the Food Corporation is recruiting officers from some other Departments, for instance, the Revenue Department and others and, if that is so, whether this will not jeopardise the interests of the employees of the Food Department before they are absorbed. What is the reaction of the hon. Minister to that?

Shri C. Subramaniam: That is for the purpose of building up the general Food Corporation administrative organisation. That has nothing to do with this. Now, these Food Department employees, for example, are employed to discharge the duties and when the Corporation takes over that function, all those persons employed by the Food Department will have to be transferred to the Food Corporation. Therefore, these are two different things altogether.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: There are already certain Government servants working in the corporation and their conditions of service are still to be finalised. May I know whether after the conditions are finalised, those who are already working in the corporation will have the option to come back to Government service, if they so want?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Of course, they are entitled to exercise their option that they would remain in Government service, in which case if those functions have been handed over to the corporation and Government find that they have no service to offer to these people, then the Civil Service

Rules would apply with regard to retrenchment.

Security Position on the North-East Frontier Railway

S.N.Q. 34. Shri Liladhar Kotoki: Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have the latest report regarding the security position on the North-east Frontier Railway particularly Gauhati-Lumding-Furkating, Lumding-Badarpur and the North Bengal Sections;

(b) if so, the particulars thereof; and

(c) the action since taken on the various measures indicated in the statement of the Minister of State for Railways on the 27th April, 1966 for the security on the North-east Frontier Railway threatened by the hostile Nagas and other subversive elements?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh):

(a) Information has been received that some miscreants armed with modern automatic weapons and high explosives are moving in jungles with perhaps plans to commit acts of sabotage.

(b) On 29-4-1966, at about 19.00 hrs. before the arrival of 20-Dn passenger train at Dimapur Railway Station, Police detected one steel trunk in a Third Class waiting hall and recovered from it plastic explosive of 42 lbs. which was taken into custody by the Army expert. 6 persons, who were found in the waiting hall from where the steel trunk was recovered, were arrested on suspicion. Constant vigil is being kept and appropriate action has been taken and will be taken from time to time to meet the situation.

(c) The additional security measures mentioned in my statement of 27-4-1966 have been brought into effect by the Assam Government and necessary assistance of man-power of R.P.F. has been placed at the disposal of Assam Government, and the Ministry of Home Affairs have also taken steps

to assist the State Government in strengthening intelligence and in setting up a Special Investigating Squad.

Shri Liladhar Kotoki: May I know what specific measures have been taken to protect the Brahmaputra bridge and the other major bridges on the railway and also the tunnels on the Lumding-Badarpur sections of this railway?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: As you know, that is a very important bridge, and adequate security staff have been stationed there to protect that bridge. As regards the tunnels, in all, they are about 37 in number on the Lumding-Badarpur hill section, and these are being looked after by the engineering staff of the railway and the overall charge is of the military security people.

Shri Liladhar Kotoki: When I reached Lumding on the 24th of last month and also Diphu along with the hon. Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways, I found that some railway employees had been killed in the explosion, and several of them had been very severely mutilated, and some of them had been permanently disabled. May I know from the hon. Minister what steps Government have taken to give compensation to those disabled persons and also for the maintenance of their families in future?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: We have sent instructions to give Rs. 3,000 to the dependants of each of the railway staff, and for those who have got small injuries also, suitable assistance has been provided. Besides, for the people stationed there in that vulnerable area, further provision is being made, and it is in the stage of being finalised, and a definite figure can be given after that.

Shri E. Barua: What prevented Government from taking adequate measures before the 27th?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: As you know, a statement was made here on the floor of the House on 27th. We returned a day earlier here.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : उस क्षेत्र में रेलवेज की असुरक्षा की हालत को देखते हुए क्या रेलवे विभाग वहां पर अपनी सिक्यूरिटी फोर्स और अपनी इन्टेलीजेंस को रख कर वहां की रेलवे लाइन्ज और सुरंगों की रक्षा के लिए कोई योजना बना रहा है।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : उस दिन के बाद वहां पर दो बैटेलियन्ज आर० पी० एफ० की भेजी गई हैं। लमडिंग-मापोखोती और लमडिंग-डामचारा इन दो सेक्शन्ज को मिलिटरी के अन्डर रखा गया है। आसाम गवर्नमेंट की मदद से और उस की देख रेख में भी और सुरक्षा के कार्य किये जा रहे हैं। टनलज वगैरह के लिए अलग इन्तजाम किया गया है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : क्या सरकार यह बता सकती है कि वहां पर जो विस्फोटक पदार्थ पकड़े गए हैं, क्या वे डिट्रिजनेम हैं या फारैन मेक के हैं?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : जैसे कि पहले खबर दी गई है, वहां पर 42 पौंड का जो विस्फोटक पदार्थ मिला है, उस के बारे में यह रिपोर्ट है :

"Plastic explosive filled in a polythene bag 14 ft. long and 16" wide. Imprinted 'BOTOR Plastic explosive 1957 ca 2.3 Lbs./Feet' fitted with double switch T & P No. 10, both secured with white sticking plaster tape and connected with 8" orange colour fuse to two detonators which, in turn, is connected with CORD-TEX, leading to gun cotton primer placed inside the plastic explosive; weight of the explosive 42 lbs. A Pincer imprinted 'ZBIROVIA made in Czechoslovakia' was found inside the box to operate the switch".

The other one, the rocket launcher, bore French imprint.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the Railway Minister has dismissed the kid-glove policy so long pursued by Government vis-a-vis the Naga hostiles, and the hon. Prime Minister said something to that effect on the floor of the House, may I know, now that the complicity of the Naga hostiles in these acts of murders, murdering men, women and children also, and sabotage, has been conclusively established, whether (a) Government are going to deal with this Naga problem through our police and army, and (b) whether our Government, because of the changed circumstances, are going to stop these talks with the so-called Naga Ministers which the Prime Minister is having in New Delhi?

The Minister of Railways (Shri S. K. Patil): So far as the policy is concerned, it is the responsibility of the entire Government; departments also will have to come in. But so far as the Government are concerned, we are squarely responsible to look after the safety of our track and safety of the passengers, tunnels, bridges and everything referred to by my hon. colleague. But I am quite certain that we must be prepared, in view of these peace talks now having gone off the stage. Possibly we can expect it; if nothing happens, we shall be very happy, but we must be prepared also.

There is another circumstance worth nothing, that the second bomb was much bigger than the first, and the 42 lb. explosive, referred to by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, is the biggest of the three. Therefore, there must be a policy of having increasing pressure, and I think Government must always be ready to meet it.

Shri Hem Barua: The Railway Minister has said that the Government should be alert. I put the question, and here are Ministers like the External Affairs Minister and the Home Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Others I cannot ask at this moment.

Shri Hem Barua: They should come to the rescue of the House. The Home Minister can say. He is next in command.

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ—(प्र) जो बड़े-बड़े ट्रंक पकड़े गये हैं, वे बक धे या नहीं, (ब) रेलवे लाइन के बगल में जो बड़े बड़े जंगलात हैं, रेलवे लाइन को सुरक्षित करने के लिये क्या दो-तीन मील इर्द गिर्द कटवा देने की कृपा करेगे ?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : (प्र) वे बस्ने किसी मुमाक़िर द्वारा लाये गये, जो पकड़ा नहीं गया और निकल गया, इम लिये उनके बक किये जाने की खबर नहीं है ।

(ब) जहाँ तक जंगलात काटने का सवाल है 1963 में जो नीति तय की गई थी, उसके अनुसार कई-एक जगह काटा है, और कुछ जगहों पर अभी बाकी है ।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Since the Railway Minister, as he rightly said, can only look after the track, the bridges and the adjoining areas, what about the hostile Nagas moving in the jungles with automatic weapons, and may I know whether Mr. Patil has been able to convince his Government to get off from the situation of "to be or not to be", and to advise that loyal and peaceful Nagas that "it is nobler in mind to suffer or to take up arms against the hostile Nagas"; if the latter, whether this Government is able to determine that they will be able to take action against them? What is the position?

Shri S. K. Patil: There is perfect co-ordination between the Railway Ministry, the Home Ministry, the External Affairs Ministry and also the Assam Government. All these agencies are working as one body.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : श्रीमन्, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस भयंकर दुर्घटना होने के बाद समाचार-पत्रों में इस प्रकार के समाचार प्रकाशित हुए कि कुछ नागा पकड़े गये हैं जो सन्देशास्पद स्थिति में स्टेशन के आसपास घूम रहे थे और उनके पास कुछ विस्फोटक पदार्थ भी पकड़े गये हैं। क्या जो लोग पकड़े गये हैं उन से किस प्रकार के रहस्यों का पता चला है, यदि हाँ तो वे क्या हैं ?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : जैसा मैंने मूल प्रश्न के उत्तर में बताया, 6 व्यक्ति पकड़े गये हैं, उनकी जांच असम पुलिस और मिलिटरी द्वारा की जा रही है। ये लोग दीमापुर में पकड़े गये हैं अभी यह जांच पूरी नहीं हुई है।

Shri Hem Barua: Where is the guarantee that the Chief Minister would not instruct the Assam Police to let them off as he did before?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

श्री मधु लिमये : लिखित निवेदन में इन्होंने कहा है कि जहाँ तक—

"Responsibility for ensuring the safety of the track, bridges and tunnels between Lumding and Diphu and Lumding and Simalguri is that of the army."

फिर भागे कहा है कि बाकी जिम्मेदारी राज्य सरकार की है। राज्य सरकार के साथ बहम कर के चार नुक्तों पर इन्होंने उनके साथ एग्रीमेंट किया, पहला तो यह है कि इनके घरों का पता लगाना, दूसरा यह है कि पुलिस वालों की शक्ति बढ़ाई जाय . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह सब तो स्टेटमेंट में है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इन में से कितनी चीजों पर अमल हुआ है ? आप जानते हैं कि पुराना शांति मिशन टूट गया है, लेकिन एक नया शांति मिशन भा रहा है, उसके बारे में चालिहा साहब की क्या नीति है ? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ

कि असम सरकार इन नुक्तों पर किस ढंग से अमल कर रही है ?

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : जिम वक्त मैं असम में था और 24-25 तारीख को जो बातें हुईं मेरी वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री, अन्य मंत्रियों और अफसरों के साथ, उस में मालूम हुआ कि उन चीजों में पर कार्यवाही की गई है। अभी जो पीएम मिशन बना है, जिसकी चर्चा माननीय सदस्य ने की है, वह कमीशन है, उसकी घोषणा की गई है, अब उसकी बात जो भी हो, लेकिन जो जो हम लोगों ने तय किया था उस पर कार्यवाही की जायगी।

Shri Basumatari: Since the expulsion of Rev. Michael Scott, may I know whether there is any information concerning the railway line whether these activities have increased or decreased?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I have stated the whole position. 42 lb. plastic explosive was found near Manipur Road, Dimapur station. I have already stated about the situation.

Shri R. Ramanathan Chettiar: The hon. Minister said that the safety of the bridges and the track was the responsibility of the Army but the safety of the passengers travelling in the train is the responsibility of the railways. What steps have the railway administration taken to strengthen the armed security guards on the train?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The first item on which we agreed is being worked out. For the security of the travelling public elaborate arrangements had been made and it was in pursuance of that this bomb was traced and other persons had been arrested. We will keep on pursuing.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: From the statement of hon. Shri Patil it appears that there was a calculated conspiracy deep rooted, in this regard because the second and third explosions are bigger than the first one. I would like

to know whether it is a fact or whether it has been ascertained by the government that foreign countries had also a clear hand in this and whether arms from Pakistan had been smuggled into these areas and whether they gave them training also for sabotage?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The foreign equipment that were found—they could have been dropped from the air. They must have come through the neighbouring country. We do feel that they might have come from Pakistan.

11.27 hrs.

OPINIONS ON BILL

Shri A. S. Salgal (Janjgir): Sir, I lay on the Table Paper No. III to the Bill to provide for the better administration of Sikh Gurdwaras situated in different States of Indian Union and for enquiries into matters connected therewith which was circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the direction of the House on the 3rd September, 1965.

11.27½ hrs.

RE: POINT OF PRIVILEGE

श्री मधु लिषये (मुंगेर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न पहले घाना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: वह पहले घाना चाहिये था।

श्री मधु लिषये: मैंने समझ के अनुसार पीन ग्यारह बजे में पहले दे दिया था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: जब मैंने उसको देखा नहीं, तो कुर्सी पर बैठते ही कैसे फैसला दे दूँ; पहले मैं उसको देखूँगा, तब उसके बारे में कमेंट दूँगा, पहले सब चीजों को छोड़ कर उसको तब यह कैसे हो सकता है।

श्री मधु लिषये: घाप ही ने क्रम बनाया है कि इसके बाद पहले विशेषाधिकार लिया जायगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: विशेषाधिकार नहीं लिया जा सकता। मैं पहले उसके लिये कमेंट दूँगा तब प्रायेण।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार): लेकिन उसको लिया तो जा सकता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मैंने उसकी जांच नहीं की है, इस लिये नहीं लिया जा सकता है।

11.28½ hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

(i) I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on Friday the 13th May, 1966, passed the following motion:—

MOTION

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do appoint a member to the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Patents Bill 1965 in the vacancy caused by the retirement of Shri Dalpat Singh from the membership of the Rajya Sabha on the 2nd April, 1966 and resolves that Shri Dalpat Singh, member of the Rajya Sabha, be appointed to the said Joint Committee."

(ii) I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on Thursday, the 12th May, 1966, adopted the following motion:

"MOTION

This House agrees with the Lok Sabha that in pursuance of sub-section (4) of section 3 of the Kerala State Legislature (Delegation of

[Secretary]

Powers) Act, 1965, the following modification be made by the President in the Kerala University (Amendment) Act, 1966 by enacting an amending Act:—

Section 3

In clause (a) of sub-section (2) of section 3 for the words 'for the period for which it has been made' substitute the words 'for the period of one year from the date of appointment.';

is mentioned in sub-rule (2) as follows:

"Thereafter, on the House agreeing to the report on a motion made by a member of the Committee the amendments to the rules as approved by the House,...." and so on.

I would like to know whether that will apply here or rather, sub-rule (3), will apply.

Mr. Speaker: Sub-rule (3) will come in if notice of such amendment has not been given within seven days etc.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I know.

Mr. Speaker: That period—seven days—has been taken.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The difficulty that I experience is this. I gave amendments to the second report. I would like to know, therefore, whether this third report is a sort of continuation of the second report and is the final report regarding that. In that case, the motion will have to be made. Otherwise, we have to give notice of amendments within seven days under sub-rule (3).

Mr. Speaker: I think this should be the final report.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Then I suppose the motion has to be made.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

11.29 hrs.

RULES COMMITTEE THIRD REPORT

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): Sir, I lay on the Table under sub-rule (2) of rule 331 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, the Third Report of the Rules Committee.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, on a point of clarification may I invite your attention to rule 331, sub-rules (i) and (ii)? The Phraseology used somewhat different. It says that the recommendations of the Rules Committee shall be laid on the Table of the House and within a period of seven days, amendment to these rules should be given notice of by Members. Sub-rule (2) refers to the final report of the Committee. I suppose it means the final report so far as this particular set or instalment is concerned. You have called it the third report. The second report was the last one. I would like to know whether the third report which has come—this is the third report in the four-year term, I believe—is really the final report with regard to the second report which was laid on the Table of the House some days ago. It

11.31 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House on

the 16th and 17th May, 1966 will consist of:

- (1) Consideration of any item of Government Business carried over from today's Order Paper.
- (2) Consideration and passing of the Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill, 1966, as passed by Rajya Sabha.
- (3) Consideration of the Fifth Report of the Committee on Privileges on a motion to be moved by Shri Kapur Singh and others.
- (4) Consideration of motions given notice of by Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath for modification of the Ministers Residences (Amendment) Rules, 1965 and the Ministers' (Allowances, Medical Treatment and other Privileges) Amendment Rules, 1966.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): We have already given notice of a discussion on the statement by Shri Asoka Mehta on his visit to Washington. That is a very important matter and it cannot brook delay because everything is going to be finalised in the fourth Plan and everything will hinge on this particular statement which he has made. It is very necessary that we do find time for the discussion of that statement.

श्री मधु लिनदे (मुंबई) : प्राक्करी दिन एक घंटा रखा जाए। सदस्यों को कोई बात अगर उठानी हो तां बे उसको घायकी निश्चर दे दें और प्राग उनको पांच पांच मिनट दे दें ता उन बातों पर भी यज्ञ पर विचार हो सकता ह।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I support Shrimati Renu Chakravartty's point and I say that we should have a discussion on that statement at least for two to two and a half hours,

as the statement made by Shri Asoka Mehta has created a bad feeling in the whole country not only among Members of Parliament—(Laughter). There is no use laughing. They may laugh but there are people laughing at them outside. So, there should be a discussion on that statement.

The second thing is this. I know that a discussion cannot be had on various subject, but I would only request you and through you the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to see that some statement are made—only statements are made by some of the Ministers—for example, the statement on the reversion and retrenchment of Secretariat staff that has been declared as surplus. On the 12th May nearly 10,000 employees demonstrated before the residence of the Home Minister, Shri Nanda.

Mr. Speaker: He need only mention the items which he wants to be discussed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I must give the background; otherwise they would not listen.

Mr. Speaker: They would listen.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I say there should be a statement by the Home Minister on that. The third thing is this. There should be a statement on the proposed retrenchment of thousands of employees in the foreign oil companies here.

Shri Kandappan (Tiruchengode): The people in the south, particularly in Tamil Nad, are every much exercised over the issue of language. The Government have been making pious promises and assurances and even recently to a letter written by our group secretary, Shri Sezhiyan, the Home Minister has replied that they will honour the assurances given by the Prime Ministers, right from the late Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru down to his daughter. While they are making these promises and they are

[Shri Kandappan]

saying that they will be honouring the assurances, I find that the departments and Ministries of the Central Governments are carrying on a different kind of administration. Even the other day, the Minister of State for Railways said that they are concerned only with Hindi and English and nothing else. The administration is going on giving consideration only to Hindi, thereby not helping the non-Hindi language. So, I rather wish that the Government should come forward immediately to give statutory form to these assurances. If they are not in a position to bring forward that kind of a Bill before the termination of this session, I would request that they should call a separate session for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker: 16th and 17th are the only days left.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I wish to reinforce the request for a discussion on the statement laid on the Table of the House yesterday by the Planning Minister. I say so because I apprehend that the Minister would say, as you have already chosen to indicate, that 16th and 17th are the only two days left to the House. This has created a situation which is most undesirable and certainly unprecedented. The Minister goes abroad; it is noised about....

Mr. Speaker: He need not go into those details now.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: For 5 days, he did not make any statement.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Unless I shout at the top of my lungs, I could not be heard, I am anticipating this objection which has already been indicated by you. A Minister goes abroad, on a very important mission, comes back with something in his bag, good, bad or indifferent and a report is placed before the House. When a report is placed before the

House, I take it that we are supposed to discuss it. In this House, we are developing a convention where very important reports—reports of the Public Accounts Committee the Estimates Committee, the Public Undertakings Committee, etc.—are placed on the Table of the House and never discussed. This is a convention which has grown in this House under aegis of a particular dispensation which must at least realise what it is doing. If we are told that the Minister could not make a statement till only yesterday and therefore the House is incapacitated from having a discussion on this, the House is being reduced to a stage of importance on account of Government behaving in this fashion. You, as Speaker, have an obligation to uphold the authority of this House and you should see to it that a statement of the kind of importance which Mr. Asoka Mehta's is supposed to have, should be discussed in this House before we rise. There is no point in saying that the House adjourns on the 17th *sin die* and therefore, we shall have an opportunity God willing, in some distant future. If that is the way in which Parliament is treated, I forbear from making any remarks on that.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagao): I support Mr. Limaye....

Mr. Speaker: No support or reinforcement is required. Only points are to be made and they need not be repeated.

Shri Shinkre: Your interruptions I think, provoke more wastage of time than anything else. I could have straightway said, I also suggest that. That is beside the point.

I think the statement made by Mr. Asoka Mehta is so fluid and that no useful purpose would be served by discussing it at this stage. Only unnecessary controversial politics would be germinated out of it and on

all accounts we must avoid such germination of unnecessary controversial politics at this stage. Therefore, I oppose very strongly any discussion of that statement at this stage. Let the Planning Minister come forward with concrete proposal and then we shall discuss it.

Shri M. R. Krishna (Peddapalli): A fortnight back, when the Leader of the House read out the business for the coming week he said that the latest report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes is placed on the Table and that could be discussed in the next session. What he stated was based on wrong information. Either deliberately or through ignorance, the Minister concerned has given this information to him. The report which he has placed on the Table is two years old. The last years' report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes is still under print. Therefore, I would suggest that the Commissioner's report, which has already become stale, should be discussed at least in this session.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): I would like to support that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is the last of the preview statement by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs for this session, and I must congratulate him on the success which he has achieved, as usual, in pushing off a majority of the 47 Bills listed for this session, in Lok Sabha Bulletin Part II dated 15th February, 1966, to the next session. That is as usual.

The Minister has told the House that there will be time for discussion of the motion that I gave notice of, which you were pleased to admit. But, Sir, sometimes history repeats itself. I remember very well, in the last session also I had given notice of a similar motion, time was fixed—one hour—but ultimately it was pushed out, and it lapsed. I do not know

whether it will be in order if I give—I want your guidance—notice of a motion in connection with that today so that these may be discussed together—it was a similar motion.

And, before I close, permit me, Sir, to wish you complete success in the talks which, I am sure, and the House is equally sure....

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, it is important. It has been raised every Friday here. I wish you complete success in the talks that you will hold during the recess with the Chairman of Rajya Sabha for the satisfactory solution of the constitutional impasse which has arisen with regard to the scrutiny of budget estimates of the other House. I would only request you to bear in mind what you yourself said last Friday, in this connection, that it will be in conformity with the spirit of the Constitution, and what you yourself said the previous Friday....

Mr. Speaker: What is the use of reading what I have said? I know that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Just to remind the House I am reading. You said:

"So far as this House is concerned, it will be a committee of this House. We have agreed."

You said: "We have agreed". "We" is plural, and not singular. Therefore, it is clear that more persons than you were involved or connected with this decision. I hope this crisis will be satisfactorily resolved.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): Sir, taking every circumstance into consideration and also the fact that the proposals for the Fourth Five Year Plan have to be drafted before the next session commences. I also feel

[Shri K. D. Malaviya]

that you, Sir, may find time for a discussion on the statement that was made yesterday by the Planning Minister. It will perhaps help the Government to know our minds and so perhaps the formulation of the proposals might become easier if the Planning Minister knows our minds. In conclusion, I will seek your permission to apologise to you personally, Mr. Speaker, for having made an improper remark yesterday in connection with the discussion.

Mr. Speaker: I have to be thick-skinned.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when Professor Ranga wanted that the statement by the hon. Minister of Planning should be discussed, I stated that since the hon. Minister has been able to establish goodwill and understanding with the Government of the United States of America and has asked for only qualitative support for structural changes, the statement may not be discussed. Then the hon. Minister shouted at me and said that he was surprised to find that I only got the impression that he had only goody-goody talks there. That forced me to see through his statement last night. I went through every word of it. There is nothing quantitative in that statement, there is no commitment as to how much he shall get either for the current year or in the balance period of the Fourth Plan. I must say that the hon. Minister's statement has forced me to think it over. Now I think that it is very important. I say this because he had mentioned in his statement that he had qualitative talks in the United States of America, that he wanted structural changes in the economy of this country, that he had been able to establish the meeting of two minds—these things I am quoting from his statement. I say that it is very important now, since we are seeing that even though Government has got majority partnership in the Madras project, yet they are giving the entire

management to the Americans. I think, this statement is really important and we should be given a chance, before the session adjourns, to discuss this statement.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मुक्तसर तौर पर कहते चले जायें। मेम्बर साहबान इतने उठ रहे हैं —

श्री हरि चिहण कामत : साखीरी मौका है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मौका है लेकिन वक्त लेने का तो नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : (फर्रुखाबाद) यह सत्र लाजवाब है। इस मामले में कि न जाने कितने टूटे घागे रह जायेंगे ऐसे कि जिनके बारे में आप ने खुद कई दफे मंत्रियों को हियायत दी है। मिसाल के लिए रक्षा मंत्री के 36 एकड़ वाले मामले में बिल्कुल सफाई नहीं हुई। यहाँ तक कि पूरे देश के क्षेत्रफल के बारे में अब सन्देह हो रहा है। उसी तरह से विदेश मंत्री की श्री लालबहादुर शास्त्री जी की मृत्यु के बारे में जो सफाई की बात हुई और आपने खुद कहा था कि हाँ, इसके ऊपर कोई बहसे हो सके तो करवाना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं तो यह नहीं कह।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इसके प्रति-रिक्त अन्न मंत्री ने अन्न संहिता नयी या पुरानी आपके बार-बार कहने पर भी सदन में नहीं रखी। यह सत्र इस मामले में अद्वितीय रहेगा कि मंत्री महोदय सभी मन में जो प्रायं कहकर कल्पना कुर्त्ता झाड़ कर चले गये। इसके अलावा आपने एक अजीब चीज देखी होगी कि यहाँ पर एक मन्त्री को जूरत हुई कहने की उसे लोक सभा के विश्वास की जरूरत नहीं, उसे जरूरत है खाली प्रधान मंत्री के विश्वास की।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब डा० साहब, यह चीजें इस वक्त कैसे भा सकती हैं? सबाल यह है कि उन्होंने कहा कि क्या काम प्रायेण दो दिन में.....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : दो दिन हो या बीस दिन हो, आपके खुद के कहने के मुताबिक यह सब टूटे धागे इस सत्र में चारों तरफ पड़े हुए हैं : उन पर बहस आपको करानी चाहिए क्योंकि अगर इन पर कोई सफाई नहीं होती तो मेरे दिमाग में और मेरे जैसे न जाने करोड़ों लोगों के दिमाग में यही बात रहेगी कि लोक सभा में खाली बात हो जाती है लेकिन कहीं किसी चीज का कोई फैसला नहीं हो पाता। और यह मान लीजिये हम लोग स्कूल कालेज के विद्यार्थियों की तरह से बहस करते चले जायें, एक ने एक बात कही और हमने ने दूसरी बात कही और हंसी मजाक प्रसन्न और गलतबयानी होती रहे तो उसका नतीजा क्या निकलेगा? इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करता हूँ कि यह आपका फर्ज है, नेता सदन से तो कहता ही हूँ, आपसे कहता हूँ कि आप इन पर बहस कराइए।

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda): Sir, as a result of the economy drive many workers have been retrenched and if some decision is not taken about them in this session, they will always remain in suspense and there are chances that they will be exploited by some political parties as they do it always. So, I would like to suggest that Government should come and announce the voluntary retirement scheme in this very session so that the surplus employees, who have got this danger of getting retrenched, may voluntarily take to retirement.

Secondly, time and again this has been raised in this House that the drinking water problem is becoming chronic in some areas because of the drought conditions. I have also tabled a short notice question. If you will kindly have....

Mr. Speaker: In future, I think, I will have to put a limit as to the time which could be spent on this subject. I will have to put it at 10 minutes and more than 10 minutes will not be spent over this.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: 15 minutes.

An hon. Member: 10 minutes will not be sufficient.

Mr. Speaker: Half an hour cannot be spent over this simply because there are two days left. Only, about some business has to be told to him.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: Yes, I am doing that.

About this drinking water problem I would like to make this submission that one hour should be allotted specially for this problem because the Planning Commission has allotted the money to the various States yet that money has not been spent for this purpose. In my constituency, Banda, thousands of cattle and people are dying.....

Mr. Speaker: She is continuing in spite of my request.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: I would beg of you.....

Mr. Speaker: Now I will beg of her to sit down.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam:...to allot some time for this.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): May I say a few words about the Fourth Plan? The Parliament has not discussed this Plan at all and yet provision has been made in this Budget about the Plan. Further, on what basis, Mr. Asoke Mehta went to America to seek for American aid when the Plan has not been discussed here? It has always been that the provision for the Plan has been made after the Plan has been discussed by the House and also the approach to

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

foreign countries has been made in accordance with the sanctioned Plan. This is an unsanctioned Plan. We have not discussed it. I do not know by what method Mr. Asoka Mehta arrived at our requirements.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, my submission is very simple. This is meant for you only. I gave notice of two Half-An-Hour Discussions, one on Mizo hostiles and the other on Naga hostiles. I was informed that since there were too many notices for Half-An-Hour Discussion, my notices cannot be taken up. In this connection, may I say, on Monday you are going to have two Half-An-Hour Discussions.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Day before yesterday also, we had two Half-An-Hour Discussions.

Shri Hem Barua: In that case, I do not know why my notice has not been taken if two had been taken at a time. Today, there is only one and you could have taken one more of mine.

Mr. Speaker: I will find out why this discrimination is there.

Shri Hem Barua: I am dumb and that is why I suffer.

Mr. Speaker: If all were dumb like him, what would happen to the House, I do not know.

Shri Tyagi (Dehradun): I do not think, as far as the statement of my hon. friend, Mr. Asoka Mehta is concerned, there was anything very concrete or a matter of principle which needs any discussion just now. But there is one thing which occurs to me and that is, I have been after it for sometime, the Public Accounts Committee had once made a recommendation that we should not go on incurring any loans, the Government should not be given the freedom of incurring loans to their choice or to their re-

quirements unless they have a sanction from the Parliament about the ceiling to which extent they can be free. I do not want that every time, loan should be sanctioned here. Therefore, I would suggest that the time is now ripe when the Government should obtain sanction of this Parliament for a ceiling of loans to which extent they can be free to borrow.

श्री डे० शि० पाटिल (यवतमाल): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कब से खड़ा हो रहा हूँ, लेकिन मुझे समय नहीं मिलता। हमारी कोई सुनवाई नहीं होती।

श्री ए० सि० सहगल (जंजगीर): आप सारे लोगों को मौका दे रहे हैं लेकिन हम लोगों की कोई वायस यहां पर नहीं है। हम लोग कब से खड़े हो रहे हैं।

Shri Gahmari (Ghazipur): Everybody should be given an opportunity to speak.

अध्यक्ष महोदय: लीजिये, आप लोग भी लीजिये।

श्री डे० शि० पाटिल: अध्यक्ष महोदय, आदिवासियों के बारे में जो एरिया रैस्ट्रिक्शन है उस को रिमूव करने के बारे में बिल पेश होना आवश्यक है। भले ही उम पर अगले सत्र में चर्चा हो, लेकिन बिल जरूर पेश हो जाये यह मेरी रिक्वेस्ट आप से है। आप को मालूम है कि एक ही प्रान्त में, एक ही जिले में शेड्यूल्ड एरियाज के बाहर जो आदिवासी रहते हैं उन को आदिवासी नहीं माना जाता है। इस तरह के लाखों लोग हैं, उन की संख्या कम नहीं है, उन शूड्यूल्ड एरियाज के बाहर रहने वाले आदिवासियों को आदिवासी मानने का बिल लाना जरूरी है। इस बिल को लाने का आश्वामन तीन चार सत्र से दिया जा रहा है। नेहरूजी शास्त्रीजी, नन्दा जी, सन्नी ने आश्वामन दिया है। श्री सेन ने भी पिछले सत्र में बिल पेश करने का यह आश्वामन

दिया था कि लाया जायेगा। कल परसे मैं ने डिमान्ड की थी तो इस खाते के मंत्री जो थे उन्होंने कहा था :

"I think, we will be able to bring in a legislation and if Parliament has time to take up that legislation. I think, we will be ready to bring the Bill in the current session itself."

मेरी रिक्वेस्ट है कि यह बिल कम से कम बेश कर दिया जाये 16 या 17 मई को। इस से काफी फायदा आदिवासियों को मिल जाता है, नहीं तो उन को आदिवासी नहीं माना जाता। कांस्टीट्यूशन में जो सुविधायें मिली हुई हैं, वह भी उन को बिल्कुल नहीं मिलती हैं। विशारथियों को स्कालरशिप्स नहीं मिलते हैं, यह बहुत बड़ी शिकायत है। इस लिये कम से कम बिल पेश जरूर कर दिया जाये। डिपार्टमेंट बिल तैयार कर चुका है।

श्री डॉ० सि० सहगल : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि ऐडवोकेट्स बिल राज्य सभा में पास हो चुका है और राज्य सभा से आने के बाद यहाँ पर उस में एक घंटे से ज्यादा समय लगने वाला नहीं है। यदि पार्लियामेण्टरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर चाहें तो वह 16 तारीख को एक घंटे में खत्म कर सकते हैं। इस से बहुत से लोगों को, जो बकायत करते हैं, फायदा होगा, इस लिये इस को इन्क्यूड कर दिया जाये।

दूसरे जो हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी बिल है वह भी बहुत दिनों से पड़ा हुआ है। मैं चाहूँगा कि शिक्षा मंत्री उस को इसी सत्र में ले आवें। यदि प्राप चाहें तो हम ज्यादा देर तक बैठने के लिये तैयार हैं, लेकिन इस चीज को जरूर लाया जाना चाहिये और इसी सेशन में पास करना चाहिये।

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): At the outset, I seek your permission to place this statement only on record that it will not

be in furtherance of parliamentary etiquette if you allow your discretion to be monopolised by those hon. Members who want to reduce your status to that of the president of a debating society.

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्राप से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि यह सिस्टम या तो बन्द किया जाये या सब को इस पर बोलने का मौका दिया जाये। वैसे तो जब कोई प्रोग्राम लीडर पेश कर दे कि यह कार्यक्रम है हमारा, तो उस को मान लिया जाये, लेकिन उस पर कुछ लोग घगर बोलते हैं। 11 दिसम्बर को उसी तरह से हक है, उस की इयटी है कि वह अपनी बात कहे। हमारे कर्जों पर भी मुल्क की उतनी ही रिस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी है जैसे दूसरों की है। सरकार से मेरा निवेदन है कि हिन्दुस्तान की राष्ट्रभाषा की जो प्राप्तेम है, उस को प्राप ने प्राय तक हल नहीं किया। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह गवर्नमेंट उस पर पूरा जोर दे और हिन्दी जो हमारी राष्ट्र भाषा है उस को उस का पद दिया जाये।

Shri Basumatari (Goalpara): My hon. friend has just referred to the Bill regarding the removal of area restrictions in regard to the Scheduled Tribes. We had a talk with the Prime Minister on this matter, and the Prime Minister had given us a hope; at the same time, I was also informed by the Deputy Minister in the Department of Social Security that she had pressed the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs in this regard, and since it is very important, I would like to hear the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on this matter. We are anxious to know what decision has been taken on this matter, and whether this Bill is going to be introduced in this House during this session or not.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I confess I am at my wits' end to say anything on this occasion, and I confess I am myself guilty of it because I thought I had to come before the

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

House because two new things were to be taken up and I had to inform the House of the same. But hon. Members have taken this occasion to make so many suggestions. The House is going to sit up to the 17th, and I do not know whether in two days it is physically possible to take up all these things.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let us sit up to 7 p.m.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I am prepared, but the hon. Member knows that after 5 p.m. there is nobody here. Even if Shri S. M. Banerjee is there, as I have said, one swallow does not make a summer.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): They will raise the question of quorum always.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: That apart, I seek your co-operation as to what is to be done. As regards what my hon. friend Shri Kamath has said he always brings forward this accusation or complaint that many of the Bills are pushed forward to the next session. In all humility I would ask him who is responsible for it. In spite of the fact that we have had a long session extending over a period of three months and a few days, in spite of the fact that there has been very little time for legislative work, in spite of all this, I quite appreciate that there are a large number of hon. Members who have not got opportunities to ventilate their grievances; their grievances are legitimate, and they want more and more time. But life itself is very short, and Parliament's life is very short, and it is not possible to discuss everything. We are trying our best and we are making efforts to accommodate as much as possible, and I am prepared to make those efforts, but in spite of all our best efforts, many things in this life will remain unfulfilled and not achieved.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I do not blame the hon. Minister.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: So, hon. Members may please remember that also.

12 hrs.

As regards discussion of Shri Asoka Mehta's statement, I do not know, because the time at our disposal is very short. Many Members have expressed their desire to discuss it. I cannot dismiss it by saying that it should not be done. But my only difficulty is the time availability. Even if we drop the two new items which I have introduced today, I am afraid it will not be possible to accommodate it. Still I will consult my colleague and then let hon. Members know what is his reaction.

प्र.यक्ष महोदय : दो मेम्बर साहबान ने इस बात पर आपत्ति की है कि जब प्रपोजीशन के मेम्बरों को यह चांस दिया जाता है तो कांग्रेस के मेम्बरों को क्यों नहीं दिया जाता है ? पहले भी मैं ने यह शिकायत सुनी है कि कई कांग्रेस के मेम्बर साहबान को यह ऐतराज है कि मैं प्रपोजीशन के मेम्बरों को ज्यादा चांस देता हूँ। ख़ुसूसन् इस बात पर मुझे बड़ा अफ़सोस हुआ कि जब यह प्रैज्यूम किया जाता है समझा जाता है कि यह बिजनैस गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से धरा रहा है कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से धरा रहा है कि क्या क्या बिजनैस लेना है उस वक्त अगर उन के मेम्बरस भी अलहदा अलहदा खड़े होकर मांग करे कि उन की भी एक, एक बात सुनी जाय। यह तो उन को अपनी पार्टी में फैसला करके धाना चाहिए कि क्या बिजनैस वह चाहते हैं और क्या बिजनैस इम हाऊस में लाया जाना है। अब जब वह अलहदा अलहदा खड़े होकर बोलना चाह रहे हैं प्रैज्यूम तो यही किया जायगा कि वह बिजनैस के बारे में कहना चाह रहे हैं बाकी जहाँ तक उनको बोलने के लिए बुलाने और चांस देने का सवाल है वह तो कायदे के मुताबिक बराबर मैं उनको देता रहूँगा।

लेकिन जहां तक बिजनेस के लाने की बात है तो यह जिम्मेदारी उन की पार्टी की है क्योंकि उन की तरफ से वह घाता है। लेकिन मैं ने देखा कि अभी दो कांग्रेस पार्टी के मैनबर साहबान बड़े नाराज होकर यह कहने लगे कि उन को मौका नहीं दिया जाता तो मुझे इस बात पर रंज हुआ।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asad: You have said that the Congress Members have got no right to say anything whenever the business of the next week is brought before this House in the form of a statement by the Minister.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asad: Let me speak.

It is true that when the business is brought before the House, it is on behalf of Government. But as you know, even if the parliamentary practices and procedures are allowed to work, it is not possible, within the short span of time—every four or five days—when the business is brought before the House for the Leader to consult all Members of the Congress Party. On the other hand, the Opposition Groups are few in this House, their number being smaller, they can do it better. If you feel in such circumstances that the Business Advisory Committee should be called under your chairmanship in your Chamber to discuss this, rather than it being discussed here, that procedure can be adopted. We can have our say there and then the business will be placed before the House. That will be all right. But if you allow the Opposition Members to have their say here on these matters, I think our Leader will not grudge us our right to have our say also in the matter here.

Mr. Speaker: It is wrong to say that I grudge anybody asking me to give him time to speak. I have no grudge against anyone.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asad: No, no, I did not say that.

Mr. Speaker: Again, it is wrong for the Business Advisory Committee to deal with it. The business of the Business Advisory Committee is only to allot time for the business placed before it by Government. It is not its business to see what business is to be brought before the House. Therefore, I cannot deal with it there also.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asad: It can be done in the Business Advisory Committee. Government can put the business before the Committee. All these things can be discussed there.

प्रध्यक्ष महोदय : डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्रध्यक्ष महोदय,

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : प्रध्यक्ष महोदय

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : व्यवस्था का प्रश्न हो तो उठाइये। मेरा भी एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I wanted to inform the House that I have consulted Mr. Mehta, and the Government is prepared to have a discussion on that statement which he has made.

12.05 hrs.

RE ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT METED OUT TO SHRI RAM SEWAK YADAV BY POLICE AT LUCKNOW.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : प्रध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं नियम 377 के अन्तर्गत श्री रामसेवक यादव, श्री राम नारायण श्री श्रीमती सरला अदीरिया संसद् मन्स्य की गिरफ्तारी और उन के साथ हाथापाई के बारे में प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। सब से पहले जो मैं बात कहूँगा

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पांच मिनट में बात खत्म कर दीजियेगा।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उस का सीधा संबंध इस लोक सभा से है उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार से नहीं है। वे गिरफ्तारियां हुई हैं एक विशेष फौजदारी कानून के मातहत साधारण फौजदारी कानून के मातहत नहीं जोकि कांग्रेसी ने 1932 में महात्मा गांधी के घरने के खिलाफ बनाया था जो उन्होंने शराब के खिलाफ करवाया था। क्रिमिनल ला प्रमैजमेंट ऐक्ट 1932 और उस की दफा 7 में आप को पूरा तो पढ़ कर नहीं सुना सकता लेकिन उस में जो खास बात है कि अगर कोई मर्द या औरत उस इलाके में सिर्फ चलता फिरता रहे और उन का इरादा हो कि कोई आदमी किसी जगह घुस न पाये तब भी उस की गिरफ्तारी हो सकती है। इस तरीके का कानून आजाद हिन्दुस्तान और हमारे वर्तमान संविधान के बिल्कुल खिलाफ जाता है। गलतफहमी में या किसी ने उस के ऊपर ध्यान नहीं दिया यह कानून अभी तक किताबों में पड़ा हुआ है। अभी जो मैं ने बात बताई खाली उस वाक्य को सुन लीजिये। यह दफा सात है :—

“Whoever loiters or does any similar act at or near the place where a person carries on business in such a way as would intend that any person may thereby be deterred from entering or approaching or dealing at such a place....”

यानी कोई जरूरत नहीं किसी से कुछ कहना नहीं है। कोई जरूरत नहीं है किसी को रोकने की, कहीं घासपास ही चलता फिरता रहे लेकिन उस के विमास में यह बात हो कि किसी को कहीं जाने से रोके तो वह व्यक्ति इस दफा के मातहत गिरफ्तार किया जा सकता है। 250 के करीब आदमी और औरतें इस दफा

में गिरफ्तार हुई हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस माननीय लोक सभा को इस सवाल के ऊपर गम्भीरता से सोचना चाहिए और न सिर्फ उन लोगों को छोड़ना है बल्कि इस दफा को खत्म करना है और इस के साथ साथ वहां पर ऐसी दफाओं को... (व्यवधान)

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : वहां पर एक महिला सदस्या की साड़ी उतारी गई। बड़ी ज्यादाती हुई है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उस के होते हुए भी रामसेवक यादव और दूसरे संसद सदस्यों के साथ पुलिस ने काफी हाथापाई की। एक सदस्य श्री मुरहरि के शरीर के ऊपर पुलिस कोई 5-7 मिनट तक खड़ी रह गयी। रामसेवक यादव को धक्के देकर ले गये और मैं यह खाम तोर से कहना चाहता हूँ कि रामसेवक यादव और राज नारायण को ऐसे वक्त पर ले गये जबकि बिल्कुल शुरुआत थी, और किसी को रोकने का कोई सवाल उठता ही नहीं था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य खत्म करे।

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया : मैं अभी एक मिन्ट में खत्म करता हूँ। प्रन्बास भली जो नेता जी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस की आजाद हिन्द फौज के कप्तान थे उन की कमर में ऐसी चोट मारी कि उन को मारफिया का इंजेक्शन देना पड़ा और रतीपाल सिंह को बहुत चोट लगी। मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि मामला आगे बढ़े। मैं आप से साफ कहूँ....

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप की सूचना के लिए मैं एक लफ्ज कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरी कांस्टीटुएँसी के एम० एल० ए० के साथ ज्यादाती हुई है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उसे जवाब देने दीजिये . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं नहीं चाहता कि मामला आगे बढ़े और इसीलिए मैं ने चाहा था कि उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार से कोई बातचीत हो कर मामला निबट जाता। मैं यह भ्रजं करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह लोग छोड़े नहीं गये और उन के साथ न्याय नहीं किया गया तो जो साम्यवादियों और समाजवादियों की मिली जुली एकशन कमेटी है कार्यवाही समिति है उस की तरफ से मुमकिन है और कार्यवाहियां आगे बढ़ें

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बस खत्म करिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एक सैकड़। यह मामला बिगड़ेगा और आप हम ही को दोष दीजियेगा। मैं नहीं चाहता कि कोई कार्यवाही की जाय चुनाव होने तक और जब तक कि अकाल का मामला सुलझ न जाय

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : आप ने पांच मिनट का इन्हें टाइम दिया था और यह आप के द्वारा घंटी कई बार बजाये जाने के बाद भी बोलते चले जा रहे हैं।

On a point of order. This is a State subject. This is a question of law and order.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बस डा० साहब हो चुका। मुझे अब जवाब देने दीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब पांच मिनट में से दो मिनट तो इसी तरह मेरे निकल गये हैं। खाली एक वाक्य को मुझे पूरा कर लेने दिया जाय। (व्यवधान)

क्या अभी तरह से राज्य चलाओगे? चिल्ला कर और शोर मचा कर राज्य चलाओगे? (व्यवधान)

अरे चिल्लाने वाले बहुत देखे हैं। इस तरीके से मेरे साथ बातें मत करना।

श्री शिव नारायण : वहाँ पर इन लोगों ने सदस्यों के साथ दुर्व्यवहार किया। एक महिला सदस्य की साड़ी फाड़ दी गई। (Interruptions)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस तरह डीठपन मत दिखाओ। (Interruption)

श्री शिव नारायण : शर्म घानी चाहिये। (Interruption)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : धरे जाओ तुम्हारे जैसे बहुत (Interruptions) * * (Interruptions)

बेकार बातें यहां पर करते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धांडर, धांडर।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : ये बेमतलब बातें हैं। यह शब्द (Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धांडर, धांडर। आप अब बैठ जायें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्या आप मुझे खत्म नहीं करने देंगे। मैं एक वाक्य कह कर खत्म करता हूँ। इस झुंड के कारण मैं अपना वाक्य खत्म नहीं कर पाया।

मैं खाली कह रहा था कि दुर्भिक्ष होने पर तो मैं भलबला इस सरकार से हर वक्त लड़ाई बढ़ाने के लिये तैयार हूँ, वर्ना भगले दस महीने तक मैं कोई लड़ाई नहीं बढ़ाना चाहता। इस लिए मैं इस सरकार से निवेदन करता हूँ कि वह उत्तर प्रदेश में ऐसी कार्यवाही करे, जिस से लड़ाई बड़े नहीं।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : पायंट आफ धांडर, सर।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त कोई पायंट आफ धांडर नहीं उठता है। सब माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें। मुझे कहने दीजिये।

मैं ने जो टीसीराम पढ़ कर मुनाई की, उस में उन्होंने जो अपनी कहानी जो अपना

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

वर्णन लिख कर भेजा, उस में साफतीर पर कहा गया था कि जो भ्रादमी गिरफ्तार हुए हैं, उन की तरफ से वायलेंस की गई, दूसरे भ्रादमियों को मैनहैंडल किया गया। इस लिए...

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह गलत है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह गलत हो या दुरुस्त, उस टैलीग्राम में जो कुछ कहा गया है, वह मैं बता रहा हूँ।

इस लिए उन को भी मैनहैंडल करना पड़ा और ले जाना पड़ा और फोर्स भी इस्तेमाल करनी पड़ी। इस बारे में कोई झगड़ा नहीं है।

दूसरा सवाल यह है कि आया सैट्रल गवर्नमेंट का इस में कोई अख्तियार है। सैट्रल गवर्नमेंट का इसमें कोई अख्तियार नहीं है। यह ला एण्ड आर्डर का सवाल है, जो स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के मातहत है।

तीसरा सवाल माननीय सदस्य ने यह उठाया कि क्रिमिनल ला (एमेंडमेंट) एक्ट भ्रष्टा वायरस है। कोई भी भ्रादमी ऐसा नहीं कर सकता है कि डिक्लेयर कर दे कि चूकि फलां कानून भ्रष्टा वायरस है, इस लिए मैं इस की खिलाफ-वर्जी करूंगा। जो भ्रादमी समझता है कि कोई कानून भ्रष्टा वायरस है, वह जब तक कोर्ट से यह डिक्लेयर न कराए कि वह कानून भ्रष्टा वायरस है, तब तक वह कानून—और वे सब लाज, जो इस वक्त इन फोर्स हैं—जायज हैं और गवर्नमेंट को अख्तियार है कि वह उन पर अमल करे।

डाक्टर साहब ने जो यह कहा है कि इस के नतायज क्या होंगे, उस से मेरा कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। क्या नतायज होंगे, यह गवर्नमेंट जाने और डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया जानें—उस से मेरा कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है।

श्री भागड़ी (हिसार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इस वक्त और नहीं सुनना चाहता।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): On a point of order. You cannot disallow a point of order.

श्री योगन्ध्र झा (मधुबनी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बारे में दूसरे माननीय सदस्य भी कुछ कहना चाहते हैं। आप उन को भी कहने दीजिए।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (गुना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि इसी सदन में (Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

श्री प्र० प्र० शर्मा (बक्सर) : हमें भी इस बारे में अपनी बात कहने दी जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर। माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें। माननीय सदस्य, श्री भागवत झा आजाद, ने पायंट आफ आर्डर उठाया है। मुझे उन को सुन लेने दें।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह पायंट आफ आर्डर किस रूल के मातहत है?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I am not going to quote the rule. My point of order is that towards the end of his speech the hon. Member Dr. Lohia said.....

मैं आप से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या माननीय सदस्य का यह रिमार्क संसदीय पर-परा के अनुकूल है, क्या यह पार्लियामेंटरी है और क्या यह इन कीपिंग विद दी डिग्नटी आफ दि हाउस है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐसे शब्द इस्तेमाल करना अनुचित है, अनपार्लियामेंटरी है और मैं करार देता हूँ कि वे शब्द रिकार्ड पर नहीं आयेंगे।

12.15 hrs.

ORISSA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(EXTENSION OF DURATION)
Bill—Contd).

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri G. S. Pathak on the 12th May, 1966, namely:—

"That the Bill to provide for the extension of the duration of the present Legislative Assembly of the State of Orissa, be taken into consideration."

Shri G. S. Pathak to continue his reply to the debate (*Interruption*). Order, order. I have always to request that those who want to go away may do that silently.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Why this Napoleonic posture on the part of the Law Minister?

The Minister of Law (Shri G. S. Pathak): I can do like this; what is wrong with this?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): We know his capacity; he can do so many things. But why should he do them?

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): That is a threatening pose. (*Interruption*). We are afraid.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If one rides in the air, what can happen? Shri Pathak may start his speech.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, three views were expressed in this House. One is, supporting the Bill, and those who have supported the Bill have given very cogent reasons. I will come to those reasons immediately. The other view is that elections should be held before the general elections of February, 1967. The third view is that President's rule should be had, and there should be no election whatsoever.

The reasons why this Bill had to be brought have been clearly put forward in the course of this debate. The duration of the Assembly terminates on the 20th August. The next general elections are going to take place in the month of February, 1967.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If all goes well.

Shri G. S. Pathak: This gap is that of about six months. The question is whether it will be advisable to have two elections, one for the Assembly now and the other for the Parliament in the month of February, 1967. A heavy burden upon the administrative machinery will result. Inconvenience will be caused to the electorate. Duplication of expenditure will be caused not only to the candidates, not only to the parties but also to the Government.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): What happened in 1961?

Shri G. S. Pathak: If he will wait a little, I will mention about 1961 also. The impression that has been created on one's mind after hearing the debate is that some of the parties in the Opposition also do not desire that there should be an election, if I have correctly heard what my hon. friend Shri Dwivedy has said, Shri Trivedi has said—

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Chaturvedi. (*Interruption*).

Shri G. S. Pathak: And Shri Kamath.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I did not speak on this.

Shri G. S. Pathak: If my impression is correct, they accept the position that general elections for the Assembly are not feasible. They accept the position that it will involve unnecessary expenditure if we are going to have one general election for the Assembly and another general election for Parliament in 1967. Therefore, the position is incontrovertible

[Shri G. S. Pathak]

and the facts cannot be disputed, that there will be inconvenience caused to the electorate; there will be unnecessary expenditure involved if you have two elections, as has been urged by the Swatantra party. Therefore, the question of having two general elections should be dismissed from consideration altogether.

Then we have the alternative which has been put forward by my hon. friend Shri Dwivedy, and it is this: we should have President's rule, and he has asked me to consider it as his advice. If he considers it himself again, I hope he will agree that this is a very dangerous proposal.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Not more dangerous than extending the life of the Assembly.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Under the Constitution, certain conditions must exist before you can have President's rule. The President must be satisfied that it is not possible to carry on the government in accordance with the Constitution; otherwise, he cannot make a proclamation under Article 356. Also, it is the duty of the Union to ensure that the Government in every State is carried on in accordance with the Constitution. If the Union finds that the power belongs to the Union to have the term of this Assembly extended and it is in accordance with the Constitution that the government should be carried on which the Assembly functioning in the State, it is the duty of the Government to have the Assembly continued and see that the government in the State is carried on in accordance with the Constitution. The Constitution requires that there must be a Legislature in every State. That is the normal rule. Knowing that, if Mr. Dwivedy's argument is to be accepted, the result would be that, the Government should first create a situation in which it can be said that the government cannot be carried on in accordance with the Constitution.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The situation is there; there is complete break-down of administration.

Shri G. S. Pathak: How can that situation be created? First create that situation and then say, have President's rule. He wants the Government to create that situation.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We will create it.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Then the Government must see that the Constitution is observed and the Government is carried on in accordance with it. This will be the absurd result, if I may say so with all respect, to which we will be driven if we contemplate President's rule in the State. There is an Assembly existing. Parliament has the power to extend the duration of the legislature. There will be an elected legislature functioning. Mr. Dwivedy wants President's rule so that the elected legislature may not function and a situation should be created in which article 356 should be applied. This is something which is amazing, if I may say so with all respect.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I have also said that it will be a very good convention if 6 months before the general elections, the ministry resigns on that ground, I said, instead of extending the life of the Legislature, you can also consider whether the ministry should not resign.

Shri G. S. Pathak: The ministry cannot resign so long as the ministry, which is responsible to the legislature, enjoys its confidence.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): Do you remember what happened in Kerala?

Shri G. S. Pathak: Yes; when President's rule was introduced in Kerala, it was said that there was death of democracy. I am sure if President's rule is introduced in Orissa, there

will be Members who will oppose it. I know that also.

Shri S. Kandappan (Tiruchengode): Sir, I want to seek one clarification. For passing this Bill the Government has taken recourse to the emergency provisions in the Constitution. . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Minister is not yielding.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Look at the practical aspect of this question also, apart from the constitutional aspect. It will need some time before the President's rule can be introduced in the State. The change-over from the State Government to the President's rule would need some time. Now there are only just a few months left, and if we introduce President's rule, we will have all kinds of criticism against the President's rule as a substitute for a rule by the government working in an elected legislative assembly, it is difficult to beat a suggestion like this in lack of utter cogency and reason (*Interruption*).

So far as presidential rule of 1961 is concerned, it will be well to bear in mind that on 25th February, 1961 presidential rule was introduced in Orissa. At that time the question was whether legislative assembly elections should be held. The Government agreed. There was no emergency. There was no question of a legislative assembly functioning. The Government agreed, and there were parties concerned which also agreed that there should be elections and that there should be legislative assembly instead of President's rule. The Government did accept the proposal in favour of elections because the Government rightly thought that the presidential rule should be discontinued and popular government should be introduced by means of elections and by means of a legislative assembly. The position was the reverse of what you find today. The Government wants that the legislative assembly should continue there. Then also the Government wanted that a

legislative assembly should come in. Therefore, that instance of 1961 bears no analogy whatsoever to the present position. The present position is that the legislative assembly will continue. The Government is a popular government and for a few months that government continues.

One thing more I would like the House to remember. When you find that there is drought, there are famine conditions and there is trouble, as pointed out by some hon. Members of this House, is it better that the official machinery, which should be concerned with the question of giving relief to the people, should be entrusted with the work of administration of elections, should be entrusted with the work of having polls and setting in motion the entire electoral machinery.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Are you going to postpone the elections in 1967?

Shri G. S. Pathak: I am also meeting the other argument that there should be elections just now. Yours was not the only speech in this House (*Interruption*). The people themselves who, according to the Opposition, are suffering on account of famine and drought, will be put to this trouble twice. It is not an easy thing to go to the polls to have elections going on. It will be saving trouble to the electorate themselves in this period of difficulty if you have only one election in the month of February 1967.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is a novel argument.

Shri G. S. Pathak: The novel argument is having elections with six months twice. The novel argument is having President's rule when you can have a popular Assembly.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Very unpopular.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Shri S. M. Banerjee—

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):
Yes.

Shri G. S. Pathak: I want his attention now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is having the roll call.

Shri G. S. Pathak: He said that this Bill has been introduced and the Government wants that this Bill should be passed because otherwise there would be an election and in the election the Congress Party will lose. This is wishful thinking. In six months' time the position would not be changed. All the parties including the Congress Party have to face each other and this could not be a possible motive at all.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: By that time many voters will die of starvation.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Then I want Shrimati Renu Chakravartty's attention.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You are taking them one by one.

Shri G. S. Pathak: She mentioned the elections after the general war in England.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What do you mean by "general war"? You mean, the world war.

Shri G. S. Pathak: All right, world war. May I ask if after the world war there was any attack on England or there were any forces like the Chinese forces poised to attack on the borders, if they had any borders with them? How can you liken the conditions which are prevailing in India today with the conditions which prevailed in England after the war? There was an enemy who had succumbed completely and there was no danger to the territory of England at that time.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Do you mean to say that till the Chinese are there, we shall not have any

general election at all? Next year also they will be there.

Shri G. S. Pathak: I am not talking of the elections.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What is it then?

Shri G. S. Pathak: I am talking about your likening the Indian conditions today with the English conditions after the war. I have already given my reasons.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, can you appreciate all this?

Mr. Speaker: I do appreciate everything that is said on either side.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: All right then.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Shri Dwivedy put me the question, if emergency is lifted tomorrow, what would happen. If the emergency is lifted tomorrow and this Bill is passed, the result will be that the Assembly shall continue for six months after the termination of the emergency. If the emergency is lifted within one or two months, we will get to the month of January and February 1967. That is my answer. He expressly wanted me to answer that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: So, the emergency will not be lifted for two or three months. Is that your suggestion?

Shri G. S. Pathak: You consider your President's rule argument, whether that is possible.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: His computation is wrong. Six months will go up to December only.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Now I should not detain the House any longer.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You have delivered yourself.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Yes.

I submit that the motion for consideration of the Bill should be passed and the amendment for circulation should be rejected.

Shri S. Kandappan rose—

Mr. Speaker: He will have an opportunity. The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the extension....."

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The motion for circulation should be put first.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a circulation motion also?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He has not argued against circulation.

Shri G. S. Pathak: This will be argued after the motion for consideration is carried. But then this will be rejected here.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. The question is:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 17th May, 1966."

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Only for two days. Even that he does not accept.

Mr. Speaker: Does it stand to reason?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I can call some people for evidence.

Mr. Speaker: That is not circulation.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Then, I can correct it to "the first day of the next session".

Mr. Speaker: Now no correction is needed. On the face of it looks something that is not reasonable. Does he want me to put it? The question is:

"That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 17th May, 1966."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the extension of the duration of the present Legislative Assembly of the State of Orissa, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2—(Extension of duration of the present Orissa Legislative Assembly).

Mr. Speaker: Now we shall take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. Are there any amendments?

Shri G. S. Pathak: Yes, Sir; there are two amendments of Government.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That amendments 2 and 3 be accepted by the House."

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He has not moved them, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: He stood up.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Sir, I move:

(i) Page 1, line 10,—

for "for a period of one year" substitute—

"up to the 1st day of March, 1967". (2).

(ii) Page 2, line 2,—

for "expiration of the said period of one year" substitute—

"1st day of March, 1967". (3)

The need for the amendments has arisen for the reason...

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That we have followed.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Under section 15 of the Representation of the People Act notice which has to be issued for a general election should be issued not earlier than six months prior to the election. Therefore, if one year is the period by which the life of the Assembly is extended, the result will be that the notice for the general election as well as the notice for

[Shri G. S. Pathak]

election both for Parliament and the Assembly could not be simultaneous. That is the reason why this amendment has been moved so that they may be simultaneous. Therefore, instead of "August", we have "March" in this amendment.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Speaker, I have tried to listen carefully to the law Minister but I could not follow him when he said that under the election law notice for holding general elections has to be given six months ahead. I am not aware of any such provision in the election law maybe I am ignorant of that particular provision.

Secondly, a little earlier he made a certain computation. As Minister of Law, I suppose, he might not be quite ready with his arithmetical computation.

Shri G. S. Pathak: I have to forget my law to come to your level.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Law has been superimposed on figures and mathematics perhaps. He said that if the emergency is lifted next month, in June, the expiry of the six months' period after the emergency will take us to February. How can June take us to February after six months? I think, six months after June will be December.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kamath is counting from one month and the Minister is counting from one month or so.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If it is "or so", it should not be so vague; it should be clarified.

Mr. Speaker: There was difference only on the point of computation.

Shri S. Kandappan: The hon. Minister is not agreeing to the proposition that there should be President's rule there. He argued that the conditions prevailing in Orissa are not such which warrant a Proclamation of President's rule. But, I think, he would do fair enough to concede...

Mr. Speaker: That we have just now passed.

Shri S. Kandappan: Just a minute, Sir.

I think, he would be fair enough to concede that even this Bill, which has been drafted depending upon the emergency provisions of the Constitution, is not in the spirit in which it is intended. So, I would ask the Minister whether he does not consider it the lesser evil of the two, that it is better to have President's rule there instead of extending the life of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker: That answer he has given.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: But he has not answered the point of six months' notice for general elections. He is searching for it.

Shri G. S. Pathak: Section 15 of the Representation of People Act say:

"Provided that where a general election is held otherwise than on the dissolution of the existing Legislative Assembly, no such notification shall be issued at any time earlier than six months prior to the date on which the duration of that Assembly would expire under the provisions of clause 1 of article 172."

I want the period of extension to be lessened. Why should there be any objection to that? If one year is the period to which the life is extended, the result will be that the duration will continue till the 20th August, 1967. Now, six months prior to that no notice for election can be issued. Therefore, no notice for election can be issued prior to February, 1967. In order to make the two elections, that is, elections to the Assembly and the Parliament simultaneous, notices have to be issued in January and for that reason this period is being curtailed. That is the purpose of the amendments.

Bill

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It says, "otherwise than on the dissolution". What does it mean?

Mr. Speaker: That does not make material difference.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It does.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

(i) Page 1. line 10,—

for "for a period of one year" substitute "up to the 1st day of March, 1967". (2)

(ii) Page 2, line 2,—

for "expiration of the said period of one year" substitute—"1st day of March, 1967".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri G. S. Pathak: I move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

The motion was adopted.

12.41 hrs.

MOTION RE: STATEMENT OF HOME MINISTER ON REORGANISATION OF THE PRESENT STATE OF PUNJAB—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri on the 12th May, 1966, namely:—

"That this House takes note of the statement made in the House by the Minister of Home Affairs on the 18th April, 1966 regarding the reorganisation of the present State of Punjab."

Shri Gajraj Singh Rao may continue his speech.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): How much time remains?

Mr. Speaker: Out of 3 hours, 1 hour and 30 minutes have been spent and 1 hour and 30 minutes remain.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: When will the Minister reply?

Mr. Speaker: How long will the Minister take?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): About 15 minutes.

श्री गजराज सिंह राव (गुड़गांव) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पिछले दिन यह प्रश्न कर रहा था कि हरियाणा की तमाम पार्टिया, बिली सिहाज कौम व मिसलत और तमाम पब्लिकमेन ने इस स्टेटमेंट का स्वागत किया और आज करते हैं। हर स्टेट पर पार्लियामेन्टरी कमेटी की फाईंडिंग का स्वागत किया गया, और इसका सबूत यह है कि शायद ही किसी भी पब्लिकमेन की या किसी भी पब्लिक प्रेस की आवाज हरियाणा के खिलाफ उठी हो। सारे एम० पी० भी, चाहे वह प्रपोजिशन के हों या इस तरफ के इस चीज के हक में हैं। इस से ज्यादा किसी और सबूत की जरूरत इस बारे में नहीं है।

[श्री गजराज सिंह राव]

यहां पर कहा गया कि बीकनेस के तौर पर यह स्टेटमेंट दिया गया, कमजोरी की हलत में दिया गया। दूसरों की तरफ यह बात कही गई कि यह ऐन्टी नेशनल है यह कम्यूनल चीज है, जिस के सामने सिर झकाया गया। अगर आप वाकयात का तवा पीछ का मुलाहजा फरमायें तो यह बात गलत है सन् 1929 में पहली दफा कमेटी बनी थी जिसके पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव, मि० आसफ अली लाला देशबन्धु गुप्त और मैं मेम्बर थे। उम ने कहा था कि हमारे इम इलाके को जिस में दिल्ली के गदर की मजा दी गई थी, अलाहदा किया जाये। क्या उस वक्त यह प्रकालियों की प्रवाज थी। उसी वक्त से यह प्रवाज चली आ रही है और सन् 1954 में मैं ने इम इलाके की तरफ से स्टेट्स रिआगेनाइजेशन कमिशन के रूप में मेमोरेन्डम पेश किया, जिसमें कुछ शहादत भी दी। आज यह नुक्ताचीनी की जा रही है कि मा० तारासिंह की मांगों के ऊपर यह किया जा रहा है। मैं मा० तारासिंह का प्रदब करता हूँ लेकिन जो स्टेटमेंट मा० तारा सिंह करते हैं क्या उम को उसी तरह से मंजूर किया जायेगा मानों गवर्नमेंट वह स्टेटमेंट कर रही है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने तो वह स्टेटमेंट नहीं दिया। गवर्नमेंट तो सिर्फ जो उमूल मान लिया गया था कि जबान की बिना पर सूबे बने और अगर कोई डिस्क्रिमिनेटरी बात हमारी गवर्नमेंट या होम मिनिस्टर करे तो बुरी बात है, इस को कर रही है। मं प्रज कर्हंगा कि इम तरह से एक सही चीज, दानिशमन्दाना महायता की बात और जायज बात की जा रही है जो कि देश के हित में है। इस लिये इस की जो नुक्ता चीनी की गई, या जो तहरीक लाई, गई वह ज्यादा नुबमानवेह है देश के लिये और देश के कामों के लिये और ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिये। मैं बहुत मशकूर हूँ कि होम मिनिस्टर ने इस चीज को निहायन प्रच्छी तरह से सुलझाया।

अब सबाल यह है कि यहां नुक्ता चीनी की जाती है और 1961, 1931 की, 1921 की या किसी और मर्डूमशुमारी की बात कही जाती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हायेस्ट लेवेल पर बाउंडरी कमिशन बना जिस के टर्म्स आफ रिफरेंस में बहुत सी चीजें रखी गईं। 1961 की आबादी, जियोलोफिजिकल जिआप्रेफिकल वर्ग रह फ्रैक्टर्स जो थे उन को मदे नजर रखते हुए सारा काम किया गया। वह कमिशन हायेस्ट लेवेल पर था और मैं तो कहूंगा कि वह जुडिशल कमिशन के बराबर है। हरियाना की जो साहब पूरी वाकफियत रखते हैं वह इस कमेटी पर थे और उन्होंने पूरा मौका दिया तमाम पब्लिक बाडीज को और तमाम मेम्बर साहबान को कि वह अपना सारा नजरिया पेश करे जिम में कि वहां पर सही तरीके से पूरा डिस्कशन हो सके। मुझे से तो कम से कम एक साहब ने जो कि कुछ और नजरिया रखते थे, कहा कि वहां जुडिशल तरीके पर शाहदत सुनी जा रही है और गौर किया जा रहा है। किसी को भी शिकायत का कोई मौका नहीं है कि इम काम में जल्दबाजी हो रही है। मं प्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह चीज सही है।

सबाल है प्रिमिपल का। मैं ने प्रज कर दिया कि जब एक प्रिमिपल माना हुआ है और उस प्रिमिपल की बिना पर यह चीज की जा रही है तो उम से होगा क्या। इसी उमूल की बिना पर गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र सूबे बने तब क्या हो गया। उन में क्या बुराई चली गई, या आंध्र में ऐसा हुआ तो क्या हो गया। आज इस चीज को करने से जो बुराई नहीं होती वह जिम तरीके पर यह तहरीर पेश की गई उस से पैदा हो सकती है, और हो रही है।

आज हरियाना के बारे में मुझे यह बतलाने की जरूरत नहीं है कि सन् 1857 में गदर के समय जो पहली आजादी

की लड़ाई हमने लड़ी, उस के बदले में हमें यह सजा दी गई। जो लोग मुतहदा पंजाब के हुकमरां थे उन्होंने भ्रंशजों की मदद की थी। हमें सजा के तौर पर यहा रक्खा गया। बड़े बड़े माहिरीन भ्रंशजों ने माना है कि हम को सजा के लिये यहां रक्खा गया। इसी तरह से भागरा और मेरठ डिबीजनो को झलहदा किया गया क्योंकि वहां से गधर की शुरुआत हुई थी। भागरा और भ्रवक्ष को झलग झलग किया गया क्योंकि भ्रवक्ष के नवाब ने उन लोगों की मदद की थी। लेकिन इस सजा को तो हम सूद दर सूद के भुगत चुके हैं। 3 फी सदी सूद, 6 फी सदी सूद, सब कुछ तां हो गया। अब भगर नन्दा साहब ने उसे माफ कर दिया तो क्यों इस में किसी को तकलीफ होती है। हम तो 10 फी सदी ब्याज दे चुके हैं और 110 माल हो गये हैं। मैं तो भ्रंज करूंगा कि उन लोगों को हमारे साथ हमदर्दी होनी चाहिये थी और वह हमदर्दी यह होनी चाहिये थी कि पंजाब का निग्विस्टिक बटवारा हो। वह हमारी मदद करे और सही तौर पर हम को जो हमारा हक हो उसे वापस दिलवा दें। हमें बह फालतू न दिलवायें लेकिन जो हमारा बैनता है वह हमें दिलवा दें।

श्री रागी (देहरादून) : प्राप तो यू० पी० की जब कतरना चाहते हैं।

श्री गजराज सिंह राब : हम यू० पी० की जब नहीं कतरना चाहते। यू० पी० दिल्ली का जो घाटा कर रहा है हम उस को पूरा करना चाहते हैं। जिन लोगों ने भागरा और मेरठ में भ्राजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी थी उन की तबारीख को मुलाहयजा फरमायें कि उन को किस के हवाले किया गया था। प्राज भी उन के साथ क्या हो रहा है इस को देखिये। हमारे पास बह डाकुमेंट भी है जिस में कि 122 एम० एल० एज ने कहा था कि हम यू० पी० में नहीं रहना चाहते, हम

पंजाब में रहना चाहते हैं। तो मुझे ज्यादा नहीं भ्रंज करना है। यह कहा कि यह एक ब्लैक लेटर डे होगा, पर मैं करूंगा कि यह रेड लेटर डे होगा कि जहां इन्साफ किया गया और इन्साफ के साथ सारी कार्यवाही हुई। अब यह सब उनको ज्यादा पता होगा। अपनी हालत पर हम ज्यादा जानते हैं। मैं तो यही बात करूंगा :

मनधानम कि मनदानम शुभाहजगनिष्पेद।
हम अपनी हालत खुद जानते हैं, खुद ही ज्यादा बता सकते हैं, प्राप भ्रन्द्याज न लगाए।

जुबान की बात कही। महात्मा गान्धी ने विश्वास दिलाया हमारे जिले में धासेड़ के मुकाम पर पब्लिक मीटिंग में, मुसलमानों को रखना चाहते थे तो कहा कि तुम्हारी जुबान की हम कद्र करेंगे और तुम्हारी जुबान कायम रहेगी। तो मुलाहिजा फरमाइये कि रीजनल फारमुले में उर्दू गुडगांव जिले के लिए जुबान रखी गई। उसका क्या नतीजा हुआ? उन लोगों ने खुद हिन्दी में अपना सारा कामकाज करना शुरू किया। भगर वह चीज नहीं आती कि नहीं यह नहीं होगा तो एक एजीटेसन का माहिल बनता। लेकिन अब वह कहते हैं कि नहीं हम अपने भाइयों के साथ हिन्दी पढायेंगे हालांकि कानून उनको उर्दू पढ़ने की इजाजत देता है। तो हम नीयत से मैं शास्त्री जी से भ्रंज करूंगा कि प्राप हिन्दी की बात करना चाहते हैं तो उन भाइयों से मिशिनरी स्पिरिट से काम लोत्रिये। पढ़ाए, लिखाए, गुडगांव की मिमाम प्रापके सामने मौजूद है।

त्यागी साहब जो बहुत फरमा रहे थे तो मैं भ्रंज करूंगा कि प्रिवी कौमिल के जजमेंट में कस्टम प्राफ प्रोलड डेल्ही टेरिटरी का जिक्र है जिसमें भागरा और मेरठ डिबीजन भरतपुर, झलबर और दिल्ली यह सब शामिल हैं। तो हरि को तो घाना है, हरियाणा है यह, प्राज नहीं तो कल होगा। जो एक साथ के हैं वह एक साथ जायेंगे। गुवामी

[श्री गजराज सिंह राव]

में रखने की बात करोगे तो कब तक रहेंगे ? निम्नो कालोनिअलिज्म बनाने की बात करेंगे तो भी वह नहीं रहेंगे । हम प्यार और मुहब्बत से चाहे शास्त्री जी को, चाहे त्यागी जी को जीये । प्यार और मुहब्बत से जीये । हम वह करतूत नहीं करेंगे जो पानीपत में हुई। उसके लिए हम माफी चाहते हैं ।

जहां तक बाउन्ड्री कमिशन का सवाल है मैं पहले भी अर्ज कर चुका, वह एक जूडिशियल लेबल पर, हायेस्ट लेबल पर काम कर रहा है । तमाम मेमोरेण्डम प्राये हुए हैं, प्राप भी कीजिये, वहां फैनला हों जायगा । आज 31,32 और 26 और 61 इन चीजों के कहने की गुजायश नहीं है । मैं यही अर्ज करूंगा कि यह चीज मुस्लिमाना तौर पर हुई है और उसमें हम जितनी भी इस तरह की बातें करेंगे, तो जो हो चुका है उसमें हम खराबी पैदा कर सकते हैं और मैं निहायत घदब के साथ, संदजीग्गी के साथ शास्त्री जी से दरख्वास्त करूंगा कि इस मोशन को वह वापस कर लें । इससे बहुत ज्यादा उनका भाव है तो उनको और ज्यादा तकबीयत मिलेगी कि प्राप दरियादिली से काम कर रहे हैं और किसी भाई को थोड़ा बहुत ज्यादा देकर भी नुकसान नहीं उठा रहे हैं । जहां तक सवाल है बाउन्ड्री का वह भी हो जायगा । कमिशन है, उसके सामने सही इन्साफ के साथ दलील जो कुछ होगी वह गौर कर ली जायगी । मैं उस स्टेटमेंट को फिर बेलकम करता हूं और मैं अर्ज करना हूँ कि उसके असेटम और लायबिलिटीज की आबजेक्टिव साइड जो बनती है नन्दा साहब उस पर भी ख्याल फरमायेंगे और मेम्बर साहबान भी यहां उस मुसीबतजदा हरियाने की मदद करेंगे ताकि वह भाई अपनी तरक्की कर सकें जो इनने साल से रकी हुई थी । अन्त में मैं प्रापका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ ।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I am sorry my hon friend Shri Prakash Vir Shastri made a speech while introducing this motion, which was rather unfortunate. It was a kind of speech which makes one understand why and how communalism among a section of the Sikhs who seem to be led at the moment by Master Tara Singh has been sustained for so long. I found him rather late in the day expressing himself against the rightfulness of the Punjabi Suba demand. And what was distressing was that he even reflected prejudicially on the Parliamentary Committee's composition and its work.

But I think that all recriminations should be left behind at this present moment when Government have come forward even though at long last to concede the legitimate and rightful demand of the brave people of the Punjab for a State of their own where their own language would really be cherished at the State level as well as in their personal lives.

We owe it to ourselves to recall the great services rendered to our country by the people of the Punjab, and specially the Sikhs; I do not hesitate to mention them separately with special emphasis because in the history of our struggle for freedom, they have taken a pre-eminent part. I remember how in 1872, on the 17th of January, 65 Kookas were blown to pieces by British guns at Malerkotla; I remember the work of the Gaddar Babas in this country as well as abroad. I recall the story of Komagata Maru and then the work of the Sikhs and other Punjabi stalwarts during the Gandhi age. I know also how with the new qualitative changes which have taken place in the political sphere, when communism and socialism are very much on the map, the people of the Punjab, specially among the Sikhs, have come forward and championed those ideas. For so long, the country had withheld from Punjab certain rights which were legitimately theirs, and it is only fair now that Punjab should have its own

State, and now that Government have come forward with that idea, surely we should welcome it, and we should see that the implementation of the policy of Government is conducted in a manner which would really bring about a harmonious solution, as far as that is possible, of all the conflicts in this region.

In the Parliamentary Committee which functioned under your guidance, we have tried to arrive at the greatest common measure of agreement, and I refer to this because I am quite inclined to share many of my hon. friend Shri Surendranath Dwivedy's ideas about how this process of reorganisation in the Punjab region should have taken place. I think that there were other desirable things which perhaps we should have done if we had the wherewithal at the present moment to do so. Perhaps it would have been best if we had a Haryana State with Delhi as part of it, very probably as its capital, and New Delhi might have been scooped out to become a Centrally administered area. A Haryana Pranth to be really worth what it should be might also desirably have included some chunks from UP, like Meerut and perhaps even a few areas from other nearby regions, but because we have functioned in the parliamentary committee in a manner so that the maximum possible agreement would not be distorted, and because we wanted that the greatest common measure of agreement should not be distorted, I did not give expression to any of those broad ideas which my hon. friend has given expression to.

Shri Tyagi: In that case, the partition of Bengal also could be taken up.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If at the present moment we can let sleeping dogs lie, if today problems which are not likely to crop up in a very acute form remain more or less, if we can carry on without stirring something like a hornet's nest in this part of the country, we better do so, because the predominant objective at the present moment is to have a Punjabi-speaking

State, and naturally, and necessarily as a consequential measure, Haryana with its separate Hindi-speaking areas would have to be constituted.

13 hrs.

In regard to the hilly regions like Kangra, for instance, I have heard different views about whether they should be in Punjab or should go to Himachal Pradesh. But I discovered in the Committee how there was almost unanimous—why almost?—unanimous pressure of opinion from the people who inhabit those areas that Kangra should become part of Himachal Pradesh. Therefore, having discovered the feelings of the people in that regard, I did not put in a separate note of dissent in order to indicate what was my information earlier, that Kangra perhaps ought to be in Punjab.

Here again is a problem which requires to be looked into by the Commission, but I do hope that that would not impede and delay the work of the Commission. I am insisting on the desirability of rapidity in the completion of the work of the Commission. There would be problems of implementation of the policy of Government. But let the Commission, whose job is to demarcate boundaries, do its work as quickly as ever that is possible.

In regard to the language question and the principle of division, the Parliamentary Committee has laid down that the Committee was agreeable to the Punjabi and the Hindi regions already demarcated under the 1957 agreement being taken as the basis. There should be some necessary adjustments. My hon. friend, the Minister, has referred to the census of 1961 as the basis, and he has also, happily, referred to other considerations would be taken into account by the Commission. He has not asked the Commission to rely entirely and exclusively on the 1961 census. But what I find in the House is that one side idea is put forward that the 1961

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

census should be disregarded altogether—that is the point of view of several members, particularly the Sikh members who have spoken in the House. There is another view that the 1961 census alone should be the criterion—that is a point of view of several members including my hon. friend, Shri Siddhanti. However, my feeling is that it is better, since in 1957 we did have a division into Punjabi and Hindi regions, to take that as the major criterion. I am not suggesting that the 1961 census should be disregarded altogether. After all, it is an official job done by specialists and it should not be disregarded, but at the same time, it is absolutely clear that in the 1961 census there was a lot of hocus-pocus, there was a lot of statements made by people who were motivated perhaps because of a certain kind of propaganda, statements which were not true, statements in regard to their language not being Punjabi but of being Hindi. I have been astonished to hear some Members trying to argue in this vein; it was Shri Puri over there who argued the other day that one has a fundamental right to declare one's choice as to which one is one's mother language. I do not know. I have not got a fundamental right to speak an untruth. That cannot be a fundamental right. What is my mother tongue is an ascertainable thing. The language I learnt at my mother's knee is my mother language, no other. If Punjabi is my mother language, if that is the language I learnt at my mother's knee, that is my mother language, and I have no business, I have no right, fundamental or non-fundamental, to choose some other language and call that my mother language. I may adopt Hindi or any other language for that matter, but I have no business to call that my mother language. There is a very well known scholar in our country, Kaka Kalelkar, who writes in Hindi and gets prizes because he writes books in Hindi. But surely his mother language is not Hindi. There are people here who speak broken English, but their mother language is not

English. It is a shameful thing. It is a matter of shame that so many of our people, on account of political reasons, chose to give as their mother language a language which is not their mother language. This thing has happened, particularly in relation to the 1961 census.

That is why I say that we should not depend too largely on the 1961 census. I do not say disregard it altogether, as some of my friends do. It is there, it is on the map, you cannot entirely ignore it; at the same time, take the 1957 demarcation between the Punjabi and Hindi regions as the demarcation which ought to be taken as the standard and make whatever necessary adjustments are called for.

Some members have spoken about the desirability of a common High Court, a Joint Board for electricity and irrigation or a Public Service Commission which might be joint. If there could be a consensus in regard to these matters, if we could economise on these matters, well and good. Let us try and create a harmonious atmosphere, and that is what is needed most of all. That is why I am pleading for friendly understanding and a cordial atmosphere.

13.06 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

We are all Indian nationals and there should not be too much of a worry over some people having to live in a region where the major section of the people speak a language which is not that of that minor section. That kind of thing will happen all the time. Let us have a demarcation done on the basis indicated by the Parliamentary Committee. Take the 1957 division of the Punjabi and Hindi regions as the criterion.

Therefore, I am expecting that as soon as ever it is possible we shall

have carved a Punjabi-speaking State and a Hariana State and we would have a Himachal Pradesh augmented to a certain extent by the inclusion of certain hill regions which are not in the Punjab. I do wish that the Commission proceeds with its work expeditiously so that whatever necessary statutory or constitutional changes are called may be pushed through and the country can write on a clean slate, cleanly and happily in a new atmosphere which at least the Minister's statement has helped to bring about.

श्री गु० सि० सुयारि (भ्रमत्सर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पहले तो प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री जी का मशकूर हूँ कि उन्होंने यह सवाल पालियामेंट में लाया और हमें मौका दिया इस पर कुछ कहने का वैसे शायद हमें यह मौका नहीं मिलता ।

एक बात मैं बड़े स्पष्ट तौर पर कहना चाहता हूँ कि सवाल तो इस वक्त सिर्फ इतना था कि इस पर बहस हो जो 18 अप्रैल को होम मिनिस्टर ने बयान दिया था : मगर मेरे विद्वान मित्र शास्त्री जी ने इसमें बहुत सी बातें कह दीं । मैं ज्यादा धाकड़ों की तरफ पीगर्ग भी तरफ नहीं जाना चाहता क्योंकि मेरे कुछ साथियों ने कह दिया है मगर मैं एक मिद्दान्त की बात करता हूँ । वैसे शास्त्री जी के कहने का ढंग बड़ा अच्छा है, भाषा उनकी बड़ी मज्जी हुई और लोचदार है मगर उनकी वाकफियत पर मुझे एरहा है कि उन्होंने जो बातें कही हैं हा उस में उन में वाक्यात की गलती भी है और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस वक्त उनको लाना भी ठीक नहीं है । उन्होंने कहा है कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की सुपत्री ने वह काम किया जो जवाहरलाल जी नहीं चाहते थे । इस किस्म के कुछ प्रकाज उन्होंने कहे हैं । साथ ही उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि यह न्यू रिभागमेंट इन्ड्रेशन प्राफ स्टेट्स की बात से फूट के बांज बोया है । मैं उनकी वाकफियत के लिये कहना हूँ कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू इसी बात के हामी

थे । जवाहरलाल जी, सरदार पटेल, मोलाना आजाद और राजगोपालाचार्य भी उसके हामी थे । मैं अपनी वाकफियत की बिना पर जानकारी की बिना पर कहता हूँ क्योंकि मैं उस वक्त पंडित जवाहरलाल जी की वकिंग कमेटी का मेम्बर था । मैं कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी का मेम्बर था । उनकी मर्जी यह थी कि पहले हिन्दुस्तानियों में हिन्दुस्तानियत प्राये उसके बाद दूसरी बातें प्रायें । इसीलिए वह नहीं चाहते थे कि जल्दी लिगविस्टिक बेसिस पर कोई विभाजन हो हिन्दुस्तान का । मगर प्राप सब लोग जानते हैं कि वह हमारे महबूब नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जम्हूरियत के यानी डेमोक्रेसी के बड़े दिलदादा थे । वह कोई ऐसी बात नहीं करना चाहते थे जो कि डेमोक्रेसी के खिलाफ जाती हो । मगर वह डेमोक्रेसी के दिलदादा न होते तो हिन्दुस्तान की जवान हिन्दी न होती बल्कि इस देश की जवान हिन्दुस्तानी होती और वह देवनागरी और उर्दू मिश्रित दोनों में लिखी जाती जो कि हमारे राष्ट्रपिता कहते थे । लेकिन थूंक मेजारिटी उसके फेवर में नहीं थी इसलिए उन्होंने बहुमत का आदर करते हुए हिन्दी को इस देश की राष्ट्रभाषा माना और हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन में हिन्दी जवान देश की राष्ट्रभाषा मानी गई । जब कि यह पंजाबी सूबे का सवाल चला तो पंडित जी उसके विरुद्ध इसलिए थे कि यह पहले जो उसके मांगने का ढंग था उसको कम्युनल शकल दी गई उस को कम्युनल समझा जाता था इसलिए वह कहते थे कि कोई लिगविस्टिक बेसिस पर बात प्राये तब देखा जायगा । अब हालात बदल गये हैं और मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उन को मद्दे-नजर रखते हुए पंडित जी की सुपत्री ने पंजाब की तकसांम के सवाल को मान कर डेमोक्रेसी की मर्यादा को बिल्कुल कायम रखा है । इस हाउस में हरियाणा के मेम्बर साहबान की स्पीचिज हुई हैं । मगर हम हरियाणा, कांगड़ा और पंजाब की एक अच्छी खासी गिनती, मगर हम इन सब की राय को मिला कर देखें, तो पता चलेगा कि

[श्री ग० सि० मसाफर]

पंजाबी सूबा प्रकालियों की जिद्द की वजह से या गवर्नमेन्ट की वीकनेस की वजह से नहीं बना। शास्त्री जी ने मास्टर तारा सिंह की स्पीचिज का हवाला दिया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उनकी जितनी स्पीचिज हुई है या उनका और प्रकालियों का पंजाबी सूबा मागने का जो डंग रहा है, उन्होंने पंजाबी सूबे के सवाल को बहुत दूर डाल दिया। लेकिन जो भाई पंजाबी सूबे के हक में नहीं थे, उनके रवैये ने पंजाबी सूबे के सवाल को बहुत नजदीक ला दिया। पंजाबी सूबा बनाने का क्रेडिट हरियाणा को जाता है, कांगड़ा को जाता है और उन हिन्दू भाइयों को जाता है, जिन्होंने अपनी जुबान पंजाबी के बजाये हिन्दी लिखाई और जो आज तक अपनी उम जिद्द पर कायम है। ये सब बातें मिल कर पंजाबी सूबे के सवाल को बहुत नजदीक ले आईं। इस मूरत में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने डेमोक्रेसी की मर्यादा को पूरी तरह कायम रखा और उसकी बिना पर मैजॉरिटी की राय का खयाल करते हुए यह मान लिया कि जिस तरह दूसरे प्रॉविंशियल लिग्विस्टिक बेसिस पर बनाए गए हैं, उसी तरह जुबान के आधार पर पंजाबी सूबा भी बना दिया जाये।

जहा तक 1961 की मर्दमशुमारी का तात्लुक है, मैं समझता हूँ कि गृह मंत्री ने पंजाब की तकसीम के सिलिमिले में उसके साथ दूसरे फैक्जं लगा कर एक बहुत अच्छा काम किया है। लेकिन फिर भी कुछ लोग इस बात पर वाजिद हैं कि पंजाब की तकसीम 1961 की मर्दमशुमारी के बेसिस पर की जाये। इस बारे में प्रोफेसर मकजी ने बहुत खूब कहा है और मैं उस की टाईद करता हूँ। इन्मान की हर एक चीज बदल सकती है। उसकी राय बदल सकती है, उसका लिबाम बदल सकता है। कई दफा इन्मान का देश भी

बदल जाता है, क्योंकि अगर कोई किसी दूसरे मुल्क में जाकर रहे, तो वह उस देश का मिटिजन बन जाता है। लेकिन आज तक यह नहीं सूना गया है कि किसी की भां बदल गई हो। अपनी माता से, अपनी भावी जुबान से, थोड़ा इन्कार नहीं कर सकता है।

होम मिनिस्टर साहब इस बात की टाईद करेंगे कि इस एलान के बाद उन के पाम एक मेमोरेण्डम धाया है, जिसमें यह बयान दिया गया है कि चूँकि कांगड़ा पंजाबी-स्पीकिंग है, इस लिये उसको पंजाबी सूबे में रखा जाये। इस सिलिमिले में जो डेपुटेशन होम मिनिस्टर साहब से मिला, उसके साथ जाने वाले एक शकम ने मुझे बताया कि नन्दा जी ने जवाब दिया कि मेरे पाम वह मेमोरेण्डम मौजूद है, जिस पर तुम्हारे दम्नखत है और जिसमें तुमने लिखा है कि कांगड़ा हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग है—पहले तुम कह चुके हो कि कांगड़ा हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग है और अब कहते हो कि वह पंजाबी-स्पीकिंग है। मुझे यह पता लगा है कि तब उन लोगों ने कहा कि पहले हमने शलत कहा था। मुझे उम्मीद है कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब अपने जवाब में इस बारे में कुछ कहेंगे।

माननीय सदस्य साकड़ों और किताबों की बातों में जाते हैं। मैं अजं करना चाहता हूँ कि किताबों में जो कुछ भी हो, लेकिन इस हकीकत को झूठलाया नहीं जा सकता है कि 1961 में कुछ लोगों ने अपनी जुबान पंजाबी के बजाए हिन्दी लिखाई और आज वे दावा करते हैं कि पठानकोट, ऊना और खरड वगैरह में हिन्दी बोलने वालों की मैजॉरिटी है।

जहा तक पंजाबियों का हिन्दी जानने और बोलने का तात्लुक है, मुझे एक मिसाल याद आती है। मेरे एक दोस्त धाल-बुडिया नेदियों में एक बड़े अफसर थे—मैं उनका नाम

नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ—, जो कि संस्कृत में बी० ए० पास थे। उन्होंने खुद मुझे कहा कि ये जो हिन्दी-स्पीकिंग लोग हैं, या जो हिन्दी के दिलवादा हैं, उनका यह इम्प्रेशन है कि पंजाबी हिन्दी को ठेक प्रोनाउन्स नहीं कर सकते, इसलिए मैं प्राल-इंडिया रेडियो को छोड़ कर मिनिस्ट्री में जा रहा हूँ। वह वहाँ पर किसी पोस्ट पर लग गए।

माननीय सदस्य, पुरी साहब ने, बड़े जोर से कहा कि मेरी ज़बान अब हिन्दी है। जो जालन्धर के रहने वाले हैं, जिन की मातृ ज़बान पंजाबी है, वकिंग कमेटी के फ़ैसले के पहले जो पूरे पंजाबी थे, अब वह कहते हैं कि उनकी ज़बान हिन्दी है और वह 1961 की सर्वमशुमारी के बेसिस को मपोट कर रहे हैं।

इस सिलसिले में मेरी होम मिनिस्टर साहब और दूसरे लीडरों से बातें हुई हैं। वे सब मानते हैं कि उन भाइयों ने बड़ी गलती की है, जिन्होंने पंजाबी होते हुए भी अपनी ज़बान हिन्दी लिखाई है। शास्त्री जी जानते हैं कि मैं हिन्दी का समर्थक हूँ और हिन्दी का राष्ट्र भाषा बनाने के लिए मैंने पूरे तौर पर सहयोग दिया है। मगर एक बात का मुझे तबुर्बा हुआ है कि हिन्दी के समर्थकों ने जो रिजनल ज़बानों पर चोट की है, उससे हिन्दी को हर तरह से नुकसान हुआ है।

घाफ़िज़ल लैंग्वेज के लैंग्वेज कमिशन की रिपोर्ट पर जो पार्लियामेंट की कमेटी बेंटी मैं उसका मेम्बर था। श्री रामास्वामी मुबालियर जैसे सुलझे हुए श्रावमी भी उस कमेटी के मेम्बर थे। उन्होंने पहले रोज़ ही मुझका दिखाया और कहा कि जब तक इस शर्त को न उठा दिया जाये कि 1965 में हिन्दी हमारी अकेली राष्ट्रभाषा बन जायेगी तब तक हम इस कमेटी की कार्यवाही को नहीं चलाने देंगे। पन्त जी, जो इस कमेटी के सेयरमैन्थ, बड़े धीरजवान सुलझे हुए राजनीतिक नेता थे। वह—और हम सब लोग—सोच में पड़ गए।

उस माग के मिनसिले में यह वजह दी गई और यह कहा गया कि अंग्रेजी को यही बदनाम किया जाता है, लेकिन हम तो इसलिए फिक्क मन्द हैं कि हिन्दी या हिन्दी वाले हमारी रिजनल ज़बान पर चोट करेंगे। फिर सेठ गोबिन्द दास तो मान गये। उन्होंने मुझे भी मनाया। उस कमेटी में टंडन जी और डा० रघुवीर भी थे। वह इस मामले में जरा ज्यादा तेज़ थे। तब पन्त जी ने हमें अपने घर बुलाया और कहा कि उनकी जिद पूरी करोगे और 1965 की शर्त को उठाओ, ताकि प्रागे काम चले तब काम प्रागे चला। पन्त जी की नीति की बजह से उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट भी तकरीबन यूनिनिमस हुई। उसमें किसी माउथ वाले ने अपनी नोट प्राफ़ इमिट नहीं दिया। हिन्दी वालों में से शायद किसी ने दिया हो।

मेरा साफ़ मतलब यह है कि जो लोग पंजाब के हिन्दू भाइयों को यह उन्माह देते हैं कि वे अपनी ज़बान हिन्दी लिखाये, वे हिन्दी के हित के खिलाफ़ काम करते हैं। पुरी साहब ने कहा कि अब हिन्दी पढ़ने वाले ज्यादा हो गये हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि यह प्राये समाज की हिम्मत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह बड़े मुलझे हुए सज्जन हैं और वह हमेशा हम हमारी बात को मानेंगे। इसी खयाल से मैं शास्त्री जी के सामने अपनी के तौर पर यह बात कह रहा हूँ कि पुरी साहब ने कुछ फिगख दी कि पंजाब में हिन्दी पढ़ने वाले स्टूडेंट्स ज्यादा हो गए हैं। लेकिन साथ ही उन्होंने अपने प्राप अपने बयान की यह कह कर तरदीद भी कर दी और कहा कि हिन्दी राष्ट्रभाषा हो गई है तो राष्ट्रभाषा तो हर एक ने पढ़नी है। इसका भाव यह नहीं कि पंजाब के हिन्दी पढ़ने वालों की मातृ भाषा हिन्दी हो गई है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय: अब माननीय सदस्य खत्म करें।

श्री सु० सि० मुसाफ़िर उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह ऐसा अहम मसला है कि प्राग

[श्री गु० सि० मुसाफिर]

प्राप मुझे पांच मात मिनट और नहीं देंगे तो मैं इस मजमून के साथ इन्साफ नहीं कर सकता ।

मैं अर्ज़ कर रहा था कि पुरी साहब ने कहा कि 1961 के सेन्सस बड़े आराम से हुए, लेकिन उसी वक्त उन्होंने यह भी कह दिया कि उस वक्त अकालियों में बड़ी टेन्शन थी, उन्होंने जोर लगाया कि पंजाबी सूबा बनना चाहिये, उस टेन्शन की वजह से हिन्दू नाराज हो गये, और उन्होंने अपनी भाषा हिन्दी लिखाई । यानी जो कुछ उन्होंने पहले कहा फिर उसकी तरदीद भी उन्होंने खुद कर दी ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब चूंकि आपका वक्त नहीं है, इस लिये आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री गु० सि० मुसाफिर : हिन्दू और सिख हमेशा से एक रहे हैं, वे एक दूसरे से जुदा नहीं हो सकते । जैसे नाखून से मांस अलग नहीं हो सकता, जिस तरह पानी पर लाठी मारी जाय, तो पानी जुदा नहीं हो सकता, उसी तरह हिन्दू और सिख जुदा नहीं हो सकते, लेकिन अगर शास्त्री जी 1961 से हट कर 1971 की रोशनी पर चले जायें, तो वह रोशनी हमारी रहनुमाई नहीं कर सकेगी, उससे हमारी आंखें चौंधियायेंगी । इसलिये मैं उनसे अर्ज़ करना चाहता हूँ कि आप पीछे की तरफ जायें, जब हिन्दू और सिख एक थे । यह तो 1961 में आकर बदला है, लेकिन जितने भी पुराने हिस्टोरिक गजेटियर्स हैं, उसमें साफ़ जाहिर है कि कौन सा इलाका पंजाबी बोलने वाला था । जितने बन्दोबस्त होते थे, लैड की कन्सोलिडेशन होती थी, उसमें इसका जिक्र आता है । एक अंग्रेज़ आई० सी० एस० आफिसर थे—गैरिसन साहब, उन्होंने लैंग्वेज प्राबलम पर बड़ी मेहनत की थी, 9-10 वाल्यूम में उनकी किताबें हैं, उसमें एक वाल्यूम में जो पंजाबी का हिस्सा है, उसको अगर आप बढें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि कौन पंजाबी बोलने वाले थे और कौन हिन्दी बोलने वाले थे ।

शास्त्री जी को पता है कि मैंने आज से कई साल पहले, जब कांस्टीचुएंट प्रसेम्बली बनी थी, लैंग्वेज के सवाल पर कहा था कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान की एक ही जुबान रखनी है तो उसकी एक ही लिपि हो जाय । हालांकि इस बात से बंगाल वाले नाराज हुए, और दूसरे बहुत से लोग नाराज हुए थे । कल जिस वक्त शास्त्री जी बोल रहे थे तो उन्होंने कहा कि पंजाबी किसी वक्त उर्दू या देवनागरी लिपि में लिखी जाती थी, तब मैंने कहा कि देवनागरी तो पंजाब में बहुत कम लोग जानते थे, सब उर्दू में लिखा करते थे, पंजाबी भी कम जानते थे, उस वक्त उर्दू में लिखते थे, तो अगर इस दलील को ठीक माना जाय तो किसी वक्त पंजाबी दिल्ली में भी लिखी जाती थी तो क्यों न हिन्दी की भी दो लिपियां मान ली जायें, और इस पर शास्त्री जी ने कह दिया कि मैं इसकी हामी भरता हूँ, लेकिन इसके जो नतायज निकलते हैं उस से भी उनको बाखबर होना चाहिये क्या ऐसा वे लोगों को मनवा सकेंगे । इस लिये मैं अर्ज़ करता हूँ कि जहां तक लिपि का ताल्लुक है, इस में मेरा कोई हज़ब नहीं है, मैं पंजाबी लिखने वाला हूँ, पंजाबी में लिखता हूँ और वह देवनागरी में छपे— उर्दू में छपे तो ज्यादा लोग पढ़ेंगे, लेकिन इसका यह मतलब नहीं है कि पंजाबी पंजाबी में न लिखी जाय । सही पंजाबी पंजाबी लिपि में ही लिखी जा सकती है । इसका तो गुरुमुखी नाम वैसे पड़ गया है, इससे प्रेजुडिस पैदा होता है, इससे यह जाहिर होता है कि यह गुरुग्रों की बनाई हुई है । यह लिपि तो बहुत पहले बनी हुई है और गुरुग्रों ने प्रचलित की है, और पंजाबी पंजाबी-लिपि में ही सही तौर पर लिखी जा सकती है । इस लिये मैं तो इस बात का हामी हूँ और मैं होम मिनिस्टर साहब की तबज़ह इस तरफ भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जोन तो पहले ही बने हुए थे, यह तो एक नया अगड़ा खड़ा हो गया है । अब खड़ा हो गया तो हो गया । हम मानते हैं, लेकिन अब तो यह बाउण्ड्री

कमीशन के हाथ में है, जो वह करेगा, उस को सब को मानना होगा। मगर यह बात कैसे हुई कि जो भ्रकाली भाई कहते थे कि सूबा छोटा हो, वे तो अब उसको बड़ा रखने के हामी हैं, क्योंकि 1961 के सेन्सस से वह छोटा होता है, श्रीर शास्त्री जी चाहते हैं कि वह श्रीर छोटा हो जाय।

हम हुए काफिर, तो वह काफिर मुसलमान हो गया।

ऐसी हालत में हम लोग जो नेशनल नुक्ताये-ब्यास के लोग हैं, इस झगड़े में हम किधर जायें, हम किस तरफ जायें।

खुदाबन्दा तेरे ये सादानू बन्दे किधर जायें, है भ्रमीरी भी ऐयारी, है फकीरी भी ऐयारी।

हम किस तरफ जायें ?

प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री जी कहते हैं कि कम्यूनल बिना पर पंजाब की तकसीम न हो, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ वह सन् 1961 के सेन्सस पर जोर देते हैं, इससे तो वे कम्यूनल लोगों के हाथ में सूबा देना चाहते हैं, मगर वहां से ऐसे लोग निकल जायें जो कि भ्रकालियों के समर्थक नहीं हैं, तो फिर सूबा ऐसे हाथों में चला जायेगा जो बिल्कुल कम्यूनल हैं। हालांकि सन्त फतह सिंह जी ने तो सीधे रास्ते पर सोचना शुरू कर दिया है, जिसका नतीजा यह है कि उनकी डिमांड मानी गई है, चाहे वह किसी बिना पर थी, लेकिन वह पूरी हो गई, वे तो अब सीधे रास्ते पर आये हैं और स्वाहिश-मन्द हैं कि सिख और हिन्दू मिल कर सूबे को चलायें। लेकिन अब अगर दूसरी तरफ से इस ढंग से चलना शुरू हो जाये कि उस सूबे में एक फिरके का ज्यादा जोर हो, वेलेंस कायम नहीं रह सकता, वेलेंस कायम इसी तरह से रह सकता है कि पंजाब का पंजाबी और हिन्दी जोन इसी तरह से बना रहे, ज्यादा से ज्यादा कांगड़ा, निकालना हो तो हिमाचल के साथ चला जाय। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि वह भी पंजाबी जोन में रहे, लेकिन अगर उसमें

नहीं रह सकता तो न-हो, जितना उममें रह सकता हो, उतना रखा जाय।

इमलिये मैं बड़े भदब से होम मिनिस्टर साहब से दरखास्त करूंगा कि 1961 के साथ जो दूसरे फीचर्स आपने लगाये हैं, वे बहुत काबिलेतारीफ हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई भी बाउण्ड्री कमीशन धाराम से, संजीदगी से इस बात को सोचेगा तो इसी नतीजे पर पहुंचेगा कि बात मुनासिब ढंग से हो, मुनासिब तरीके से सूबा बने, जिससे कि वह भाइन्दा तरक्की कर सके।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Dwivedy. Hon. Members will please take ten minutes each.

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): The people from this side should get a chance also. Kangra people should get some chance.

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धाप्ती (भज्जर) : समय थोड़ा रहेगा, मुझे भी बोलना है, एक घंटा समय बढ़ाया जाय, नहीं तो काम कैसे चलेगा।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): How I wish that the House had got an opportunity to discuss this much earlier because as it is the commission which has been set up to demarcate the boundaries for these three states will complete its deliberations by the end of May and I do not think it will profit in any way by the discussion in this House or the terms of reference would be changed by the government at this stage. It is too late in the day to argue that the linguistic division of states should not have taken place. Those friends who want to raise this controversy should remember that having agreed to the linguistic distributions of states as a national policy, it was wrong on the part of the Government to deny that very right to Punjab and at long last after a great deal of delay they have agreed to this and if there has been any communal movement or element introduced in the movement, it is

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

because of government's delay in dealing with this problem properly and gracefully, I do not want to go into detail and in my note of dissent to the Parliamentary Committee's Report I have said enough of what should be done.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Repeat that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I do not think I have time. But I will point out some of them here. I was surprised that after the appointment of the Parliamentary Committee the Government and the congress party deliberately worked to undermine this very committee which was entrusted with the task of coming to a decision regarding this very serious problem. It was a body which represented all sections and interests and it was a competent body. When the SRC was deliberating the congress working committee did not appoint a sub-committee to say, how the provinces should be demarcated. But here when our Committee was in the midst of its deliberations suddenly they appointed a sub-committee and the sub-committee said something which was ambiguous and vague and the Prime Minister said that whatever was the decision of the congress working committee will be binding on the Government. As a result of this, because there was no clarity in the resolution that was adopted and released to the press, all these unfortunate incidents happened in Punjab and other places.

Having done that, they had ultimately accepted the recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee. But the Parliamentary Committee, at the same time, had a limited jurisdiction. They had stated that the Parliamentary Committee will discuss only about the carving of this territories in the State of Punjab. The Parliamentary Committee has made its recommendation. The Parliamentary Committee has stated that some pahari-speaking area of Punjab should be attached and integrated with Himachal Pradesh. That is another territory; that is not within the

State of Punjab. That has been accepted. This is good so far it goes. But I want to ask the Home Minister, when we are dealing with this problem, do you want really in this country there will be a finality on these matters, or, do you still keep the room open for further agitations in this matter of linguistic distribution of provinces and demarcation of boundaries. If a proper thought had been given to this, then probably he would have come forward with different proposals.

You will find in the statement that the terms of reference to the Commission that is going to examine this question include the following:

"The Commission shall apply the linguistic principle with due regard to the census figures of 1961 and other relevant considerations."

I do not want to go into the controversy whether the 1961 census was proper or not, and whether that should be accepted or not. I do not think that is the proper thing to do at this moment, but what was the necessity to introduce all these controversies? The Parliamentary Committee itself suggested that the present regional boundaries—the Punjab region and the Hindi region—may be taken as the basis, and that an expert Commission be appointed to adjust the area and work it out taking into consideration administrative and other reasons that may be relevant. And that position was acceptable to all sections of opinion, and if at all the demarcation is to take place, this should be on that basis. If he had not introduced this new element, probably much of this controversy would not have arisen. But he has not done that.

Secondly, I want him to consider it very seriously. What he has done is, he has asked the Boundary Commission to "ensure that the adjustments that they may recommend do

not involve breaking up of existing tehsils." I do not think this is a very sound principle. Because, as you know, and he is confronted with that question—the Prime Minister of India has promised that within a year or so they will come to a decision about it—that in this country, in spite of linguistic division of the States, we have quarrels between different States for boundaries: Maharashtra-Mysore, Maharashtra-Gujarat, and there are several States in which this controversy is going on, and probably in Maharashtra it has already taken the shape of an agitation. Why is all this happening even after the division of States into linguistic areas? Because there are certain linguistic groups in the border areas which probably feel that their people should have been in the other State from where they have been excluded. In all these cases Government should accept the Pataskar Formula which suggested that the village should be the unit for demarcating the boundaries of each State so that the different linguistic groups in the different areas could go to their respective places. This should have been accepted here. And this is a sound principle by which all this controversy, wherever they may be raised now, could be avoided. They should accept that. But the Government has not done that. I think the Minister should seriously consider whether this policy should not be adopted.

Then, it has been clearly stated in the statement that this new State should come into being by the 1st October. All that we demanded is, and there was a popular demand also, that before the general elections these new States should come into being. It is all right so far as that goes, but, at the same time, I want to join issue with him in regard to the other matter in which he has stated that so far as Haryana is concerned,—in the end of his statement he has stated—Haryana will consist of the areas that remain after having a Punjabi Suba is made and after the Hill areas go to

Himachal Pradesh. The Committee has suggested that the Government should consider whether other areas should be attached to Haryana in order to make it a viable and financially strong province. There were suggestions made in the Committee—as has been suggested by other hon. friends in this House—that in order to make the Haryana province a viable State, areas such as Delhi, excluding New Delhi, and other contiguous areas in Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan should be attached to it.

Shri Tyagi: Also Orissa.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Do not be afraid of breaking up of Uttar Pradesh. I think if he resists it now, he will face a great agitation in this country. There are two other aspects which I want to urge upon the Home Minister. They are bringing forward a Bill in order to enable the hill areas to be attached to Himachal Pradesh. They are seeking to amend the Constitution. As I have stated earlier, this is good. There is an insistent demand, and rightly so, that Haryana should consist of all the rest of the contiguous areas—You may call it Vishal Haryana or Vishal Delhi or by any other name, you like and that Delhi and Himachal Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan and Haryana should constitute one State. He has not considered that at all. He could have brought a Bill for this purpose. But he has stated that we are not touching Delhi and Delhi shall remain as the metropolitan capital and we are not going to touch that question or discuss that question at all.

I want to tell you that after this linguistic division is over, there is another problem facing this federal unit of India: the problem of the bigger States and the smaller States. Shri Tyagi may be very much concerned about it, if anybody says that some portion of Uttar Pradesh should be attached to this or that State, but the fact remains that in the SRC Report itself this problem

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

was raised and in a note of dissent, Mr. Panikkar has suggested that in a federal Government, if there are bigger States and smaller States, it will be a politically imbalanced situation. What happens? Even in this Parliament, if Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra...

Dr. M. S. Aney: And CP.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:...and Madhya Pradesh; if all these combine, the smaller States would have no say at all.

Shri Tyagi: I agree; let it be so.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If you agree, Uttar Pradesh has to be divided.

Shri Tyagi: Why?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If Uttar Pradesh has to remain as a separate entity intact as it is, and yet if one says that all the States should be of equal size, then the two things cannot go together (*Interruption*). There must be equitable division.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not concerned with that now.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: We are very much concerned about it. This is very relevant because, when they are going to carve out a Haryana State, what I am urging is...

Shri Tyagi: On what basis do you propose to divide Uttar Pradesh? Is it on a linguistic basis? The whole of Uttar Pradesh is Hindi-speaking.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If language is to be the only basis, then, Uttar Pradesh should not remain as it is. Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan—all these should be added to it and an empire should be created for Shri Tyagi. (*Interruption*)

I do not want to go into any controversy in this matter. But when

we are dealing with this matter, and when we are going to constitute new States, the Government should have given serious thought to these problems, and at the same time, find a suitable solution for them. It is good that Punjab is being made into a new State. We all welcome it. At the same time I request that all elements who are fighting among themselves for different languages, this and that, should realise this. I had made a special request, and I am glad that Sant Fateh Singh had come out with a statement saying that in the Punjab province there is no question of any particular community dominating. Even he does not want a party government; he wants a government representing all sections of the population in Punjab.

The controversy of Hindi or Gurmukhi has to be tackled. I think this would be probably solved if this Government decides once for all what would be the official language of this country. I want a clarification in this regard. If Hindi is the dominant official language of the country; what is going to be its position in different States? Is it going to have an equal status along with the provincial language or not? If that is going to have equal status, then all this controversy would not arise at all, because in the Punjabi State even those who are using Hindi in Devnagari script can continue to use it for all purposes and they will have the same right as people using Punjabi in Gurmukhi script. So, we have to decide what would be the rights of the Hindi-speaking people who are there in sizeable numbers in non-Hindi-speaking States and how their rights would be protected. If Hindi is the official language, there would be no conflict.

I hope and trust that the new States would bring about harmony in this country and all these controversies would be over for all time to come.

श्री हेमराज : उपर्युक्त महोदय, श्री प्रकाशश्रीर शास्त्री ने जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रक्खा है उसमें उन्होंने बत सी टीका टिप्पणी की है। मैं कहूँगा कि उन्होंने जो भाषण दिया उससे बजाय इसके कि पंजाब में सद्-भावना पैदा हो, मुमकिन है कि रोष पैदा हो जाये। जो हमारी कमेटी बनी थी उसके ऊपर भी टीका टिप्पणी करते हुए उन्होंने कहा कि वह निष्पक्ष नहीं थी। उस कमेटी में सारी पार्टियों के आदमी थे, जितनी भी पोलिटिकल पार्टियाँ थीं उन सब के आदमी थे और हर एक ने अपना पक्ष वहाँ पर रक्खा। यही नहीं बल्कि मैं तो यह कह रहा हूँ कि हरियाना वालों ने पूरी तरह पर अपना पक्ष रक्खा। उस कमेटी के सामने चार हजार मेमोरेँडम आये और मुक्तानिक रिप्रेजेन्टेटिव्स आये। जहाँ तक हमारे पहाड़ वालों का सम्बन्ध था, वहाँ पर पहाड़ वालों में से कोई ऐसा आदमी नहीं था जिसने मुखालिफत में कहा हो।

यह ठीक है कि पहाड़ वालों को हरियाना प्रान्त से हमदर्दी थी, लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि यह जो दोनों स्टेट्स होंगी, चाहे वह पंजाब हो चाहे हरियाना प्रान्त हो, वह हम री टांगें खींचेंगी। असल बात यह है कि पहाड़ वाले हमेशा बाल वाली भेड़ की तरह से रहे। उसके बाल उतारने के लिये दोनों तरफ के लोग तैयार रहे और आज भी तैयार हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कितने बाल हैं।

श्री हेमराज : बाल जो हैं वह भी तो नहीं छोड़ते।

श्री यु० सि० मुसाफिर : हम बाल नहीं काटते।

श्री हेमराज : घाय्य अपने बाल रक्खिये। मैं अन्न कर रहा था कि पंजाब की जो समस्या थी वह हल होने वाली नहीं थी। मैं सन्त फतेह सिंह जी का बघाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने साम्प्रदायिकता से, फिर्कापरस्ती से ऊपर उठ

कर भाषावार प्रान्त का मामला हमेशा के लिये सुलझा दिया। इस तरीके से जहाँ हमेशा के लिये हरियाना वालों को तमल्ली होगी वहाँ पहाड़ वालों को भी होगी।

श्री दलजीत सिंह जो ऊना से चुन कर आये हैं कह रहे थे कि पहाड़ वाले पंजाबी बोलते हैं। अकाली भाई आज 1931 की मर्दुमशुमारी की बात कहते हैं। मैं उससे पहले की मर्दुमशुमारी की बात कहना चाहता हूँ। जो भी मर्दुमशुमारी हुई है 1881 से लेकर 1901 तक उन सब में हिमाचल प्रदेश और कांगड़ा के लिये कहा गया है कि यह एक हिमालयन रीजन के हिस्से हैं। पहले मिरमीर रियासत थी, मण्डी थी, सुकेत थी, शिमला रियासतें थीं, कांगड़ा जिला में चम्बा था, यह सारा पहाड़ी रीजन दिखलाया गया है। हमारे कागज मौजूद हैं 1881, 1891 और 1901 की मर्दुमशुमारी के। लेकिन उसके बाद पंजाब ने हम पर गलबा करने की कोशिश की और एक कलम से 1911 में हमें पंजाबी भाषी बना दिया। लेकिन 1931 की जो मर्दुमशुमारी हुई उसके आंकड़े भी मौजूद हैं। वह हमें 94.5 प्रतिशत पहाड़ी भाषी बनाते हैं। उसमें जो उस वक्त सेन्सस कमिश्नर थे उन्होंने साफ तौर पर लिखा है कि :

"The main cause of the variation is, as already remarked in para 192, above, the return of Punjabi in place of pahari in 1921. The obvious explanation is at this census in many cases pahari has been correctly returned as the language instead of Punjabi."

चूँकि हमारे आदमी लिखे पढ़े नहीं थे। इस लिये उन्होंने एक कलम बना दिया और जिस को जैसा चाहा बना दिया। लेकिन जो असली बात है वह छिप नहीं सकती। उसके बाद जिस वक्त पाटिजन हो गया उस वक्त सम्बर फार्मुला बनाया गया। चूँकि हमारी भाषा पहाड़ी थी और पहाड़ी भाषा संस्कृत और प्राकृत से मिलती जुलती है...

एक माननीय सदस्य : डोगरी ।

श्री हेमराज : हम पहाड़ी बोलते हैं । उसकी स्क्रिप्ट टांकरी थी । प्रौर सन् 1868 में लेकर आज तक का जो रेकार्ड है कांगड़ा डिस्ट्रिक्ट के वह टांकरी प्रौर हिन्दी में मौजूद है । रेवेन्यू रेकार्ड मारे टांकरी प्रौर हिन्दी में मौजूद हैं प्रौर हमारी भाषा पहाड़ी लिखी हुई है । जो भाषा हम बोलते हैं उसी तरीके से लिखी हुई है, यह त्रान त थे ।

उसके बाद यहां पर सच्चर फार्मूला बना चुनांचे कांगड़ा डिस्ट्रिक्ट प्रौर शिमला डिस्ट्रिक्ट यह सारे के सारे हिन्दी स्पीकिंग लिखे गये । उसके बाद सन् 1957 में रीजनल फार्मूला बना । फिर 1960 में पंजाब लेजिस्लेटिव असेम्बली ने एक प्राफिगिल लैंग्वेज ऐक्ट पास किया प्रौर कहा कि यह इलाका हिन्दी हिन्दी स्पीकिंग होगा । चूकि नेशनल लैंग्वेज हिन्दी हो गई थी इसलिये हमने उसकी स्क्रिप्ट देव नागरी प्रपना ली । लेकिन मैं एक प्रर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि वहां के जो लोग हैं उन्होंने कभी भी पंजाबी को नहीं पढ़ा । सवाल यह उठता है कि जिम चीज को दो डिक्डम हो गई है, जिस चीज को दो डिक्डम में हमारे बच्चों ने पढ़ा उसको प्राप रिवाइज करना चाहते हैं । 1947 से लेकर 1967 तक के जो एक्जामिनेशन फिगर्स हैं वह मौजूद हैं । मैंने पंजाब के एजुकेशन डिपार्टमेंट को लिखा कि वह हमें वह फिगर्स दे दें जिसमें बच्चों ने अपनी फर्स्ट लैंग्वेज हिन्दी लिखवाई है प्रौर परीक्षा हिन्दी में दी है । लेकिन पंजाब गवर्नमेंट वह फिगर्स देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है । मैंने फिगर्स को डिस्ट्रिक्ट इंटरवार्टमें से लेने की कोशिश की । 100 परसेन्ट विद्या-पिथों ने अपनी फर्स्ट लैंग्वेज हिन्दी में इम्तहान दिये हैं । तो मैं प्रर्ज करना चाहता था कि ऐसी हालत में यह हुआ है । हमारा सारे का मारा जो नेचुरल डिवीजन है वह हिमाचल के साथ एक है प्रौर हमारी जो भाषा है, हमारा जो रहन सहन है, हमारा जो एक दूसरे से स्कूल

प्राप पेंटिंग है सारा का सारा हिमाचल से मिलता जुलता है । तो लाजिमी तौर पर जो पार्लियामेंट्री कमेटी ने फैसला किया वह दुस्त था प्रौर मैं तो होम मिनिस्टर साहब को मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने बड़ी प्रच्छी तरह से प्रपना बयान दिया है । 18 प्र्रैल को उन्होंने स्टेटमेंट दिया है कि हिली एरिया जिनकी लिग्बिस्टिक एफिनिटी हिमाचल से मिलती जुलती है वह उनके साथ रहे जायं । मैं इन शब्दों के साथ उसका स्वागत करता हूं प्रौर यह समझना हूं कि शास्त्री जी जो यह कहते हैं कि यह गलती हुई है, यह गलती नहीं, मैं कहता हूं कि दुस्त हुआ है प्रौर मैं नन्दा जी को धन्यवाद देता हूं कि उन्होंने हमेशा के लिए पंजाब की जो प्राबलम है उसको हल कर दिया है ।

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, 18 प्र्रैल को जो माननीय श्री नन्दा जी ने पहली बार हरियाना का नाम लिया प्रौर जो उन्होंने साहस दिखाया उसके लिए मैं उनको बधाई देता हूं । लेकिन पूरी बधाई तब दूंगा जबकि असली हरियाना जो बनना चाहिए उसको बनवाने के लिए पूरा यत्न करेंगे । तब पूरी बधाई दूंगा । अभी प्रधरी है ।

प्रब देखिए इसके विषय में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि प्राज जो पत्रों में प्राया है श्री मन्त जी का बक्तव्य, उस बक्तव्य से कोई ऐसी बात नहीं रह जाती कि जो पंजाब के रहने वाले हिन्दू हैं उनको किभी तरह का प्रय प्रौर प्राशंका रह जाय । वह प्रच्छा उन्होंने प्राज प्रकान जाला है ।

मैं एक बात चूकि श्री त्यागी जी बहुत ही प्रयभीत प्रौर प्रातंकित हैं, इसलिए उनको बताने के लिए कहना चाहता हूं कि :

"Clay seals of the Yaudheyas have been found in the Ludhiana District, while their coins have been discovered from Saharanpur to Multan. Yaudheya Coins have

been recently found also in the Dehra Dun District. Some interesting coin-moulds of the tribe have come from Rohtak. The heart of the Yaudheya territory may have been the Eastern Punjab, but they dominated also over the adjoining tracts of the U.P. and Rajputana."

भी स्वामी : यह तो पुरानी रियासत रही ।

भी जनशेख सिंह सिद्धाग्नी : पुरानी रही तो अब लो नयो :

"Rohtak was the ancient 'Rohitaka' and it must have been one of the mint-places of the Yaudheyas in the province of Bahudhanyaka, which one of the two province into which the States of Rohitaka was divided, the other being Maru. Maru means desert... it was the desert of Bagar, that it is portion of Haryana west of Rohtak-Sirsa line and adjoining the Bikane: territory."

अब तो जादू बढ़ गया सिर पर ? तो यह जो चीजें हैं इनके साथ मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1961 की जो जनगणना का सवाल है उसके ऊपर भय नहीं खाना चाहिए। मेरे बुजुर्ग हैं ज्ञानी जी, मैं हृदय से उनका आदर करता हूँ। मैं उनसे निवेदन करना करना हूँ कि आप इसकी बिन्ता न कीजिए, क्योंकि कुछ साथ में माननीय नन्दा जी ने धीरे भी चीज दी है। परन्तु उसको भी न देते तब भी उन को बबडाने की जरूरत नहीं थी। अगर यह कहा जाये कि यह गणना 61 की गलत है तो मैं ऐसी जगह का उदाहरण दूँ कि जहाँ कोई किसी तरह का ऐसा प्रश्न नहीं था। सारे पंजाब में 12930045 हिन्दू हैं। लेकिन हिन्दी बोलने वाले। करोड़ 12 लाख 98 हजार 855 हैं। अर्थात् 16 लाख 31 हजार 190 हिन्दुओं ने पंजाबी अपनी जवान लिखायी। इसलिए हिन्दुओं पर यह आरोप नहीं हो सकता कि उन्होंने साम्प्रदायिक

आधार के ऊपर अपनी जवान पंजाबी नहीं लिखायी। धीरे जाने दो इसको। रोहतक में तो कोई भय या आतंक नहीं था। रोहतक डिस्ट्रिक्ट में सिख हैं 6439 लेकिन पंजाबी बोलने वाले 14302 हैं। जिला गुडगांव में सिख हैं 8362 धीरे पंजाबी बोलने वालों हैं 19270 यह हिन्दू ही तो हैं ? हिन्दू नहीं तो धीरे कौन है ? तो हिन्दुओं ने जिन्होंने चाहा कि मेरी जवान पंजाबी है, रोहतक में रह कर के भी, गुडगांव में रह कर के भी उन्होंने पंजाबी लिखवायी। अगरचें पंजाब सतलुज धीरे झेलम के बीच का है। पंजाब का विभाजन तो हो चुका रावी के परे परे। अब तो पंजाब नाम सतलुज धीरे रावी का है। इधर का, नीचे का तो है ही नहीं पंजाब। हमें क्यों ख्यामसबाह इसमें घसीटते हो ? माननीय श्री नन्दा जी को मैं इस बात के ऊपर बहुत साफ कहना हूँ कि वह जो नीचे का भाग है इस नीचे के भाग के लिए पहले जैसे एक या उमी तरह हो। अगर यह हिन्दी के नाम पर धाया है तो हिन्दी के नाम पर वह ऐसी ही चीज है जैसे उधर पंजाबी की चीज धाया है। हमें याज सन् 1957 की सजा से माननीय नन्दा जी ने बाहर निकाला है, धीरे हमें पंजाबी के पजे में रिहा किया है।

सन् 1961 की जो जनगणना है उसमें फाजिल्का, खरड धीरे ऊना के ऊपर बढ़ा झगटा है। पंजाबी भाई खाम कर के बवालिया लोग या जिममें ज्ञानी जी के साथ सिख शामिल हैं कांग्रेसी लोग, वह ये कहते कि फाजिल्का हमारा है, खरड हमारा है धीरे ऊना हमारा है। तो क्या यह सम्प्रदायवाद नहीं है ? फाजिल्का मिरले के साथ पहले मिला टूटा था, ब्रिह्मण कुछ पहले। ज्ञानी करतार सिंह ने एक घाना फाजिल्का के 80 में ऊपर गांध नेकर मुकनमर नहमील में डाक दिये जिमसे कि मिरले धीरे फाजिल्का का सम्बन्ध टूट गया लेकिन यह हिन्दी रीजन है पहले ये धीरे हमेशा में चला धाया है। टमी तरह

[श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती]

छारह हिन्दी भाषी तहसील है। उसी के अन्दर चंडीगढ़ भी है। कैसे कहा जाता है कि वह पंजाबी भाषी है या पंजाब के अन्दर है? अब रहा अना, तो सर छोटू राम का जिस दिन स्वर्गवास हुआ उससे एक दिन पहले उन्होंने भाखरा बांध का जो आयोजन था, उसके ऊपर हस्ताक्षर किये थे। भाखरा बांध का पानी और बिजली विशेषतया हरयाने के लिए किया गया था लेकिन आज वह चीज नहीं रही। इसलिए वह चीज हरयाने में आनी चाहिए। तो मैं श्री नन्दा जी से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि बिजली और पानी इनके ऊपर सेंटर का बॉर्ड हो और उसमें उनके नुमाइन्दे भी हों, हमारे नुमाइन्दे भी हों जिससे हमारा हक हमें मिले और उन भाइयों का हक उनको मिले। यह चण्डीगढ़ तो हमारी राजधानी है। पंजाबियों ने तो अपनी राजधानी पटियाला बना लिया था और उनके पास जालन्धर और अमृतसर जैसे बड़े बड़े शहर हैं। लेकिन हमारे यहां कोई शहर नहीं है। इसलिए चंडीगढ़ हमारी राजधानी होनी चाहिए और जो हिन्दी रीजन की ही है।

और अना इसी तरह से जो हिन्दी भाषी है क्योंकि इसके अन्दर भाखरा बांध है और अंगल प्रोजेक्ट है तो वह हमें हरयाना को मिलना चाहिए।

एक चीज मैं स्पष्ट निवेदन करूं कि हमें कोई चीज सामने की नहीं चाहिए चार भाइयों की एक माता हो और चार भाइयों में रहना चाहे तो उसकी दुर्गति होगी। कोई नहीं उसकी सेवा करेगा। इसलिए न हम हाईकोर्ट एक चाहते हैं, न सर्विसेज एक चाहते हैं और न गवर्नर एक चाहते हैं। हर चीज हमारी बिल्कुल अलग अलग, दो घरों का जैसे बटवारा होता है, वैसे होनी चाहिए। और हमारा हाईकोर्ट जो है देलही का किया जाय। इसमें क्या बात है? देलही का हाईकोर्ट हमारा हाईकोर्ट बने और देलही का जो पुराना क्षेत्र पहले था, नन्दा जी साहस करें हमारी जितनी

आने वाली नस्लें हैं वह उन्हें बघाई देंगी कि एक भाये थे नन्दा जी जैसे गृह मन्त्री कि जिन्होंने हरयाना वालों का जो पुराना मामला लटका पड़ा था, दिल्ली भी दे दिया और वहां से लेकर देहरादून और यह सब... (अवधान)

श्री श्यामी : जमुना पार मत करना।

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती : यह सब मैं अभी जो सुना चुका हूं, वह सब हमारे साथ होने चाहिए। उस दिन हमारा पूरा हरियाना बन जायगा।... (अवधान)... मेरे कानों में श्यामी जी की कोई बात नहीं आती और मैं यह कहता हूं कि यह राष्ट्र का सबसे मजबूत गढ़ होगा, राष्ट्र की रक्षा के लिए जितना अधिक से अधिक हो सकता है और अब भी डोंगराई के मोर्चे पर हमारे इस इलाके के जवानों ने जो बहादुरी दिखलाई वह सबूत है कि राष्ट्र की रक्षा अभी हो सकती है कि जब कि दिल्ली और जितना भाग यू० पी० और राजस्थान का मैंने बतलाया है, वह सब मिला कर एक विशाल हरयाना बनाया जाये। परमात्मा दया करे कि नन्दा जी इतना साहस दिखायें और विशाल हरयाना बनायें।

अब जो मेरा संशोधन है उसको मैं पढ़ूं ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, उसकी जरूरत नहीं है।

14 hrs.

श्री अंकर लाल बेरबा (कोटा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बड़े अफसोस की बात है कि आज हमारे देश का बंटवारे पर बंटवारा होता चला जा रहा है और यह उस समय हो रहा है जबकि देश की सीमाओं पर पाकिस्तानी और चीनी संभरा रहे हैं। ऐसे वक्त में हमारी सरकार ने बोटों के लोभ में आकर कि पंजाब के बोट किस तरीके से प्राप्त किये जायें, हरियाणा के बोट किस तरीके से प्राप्त किये

जायें, हरियाणों की भाषाका उन को बड़ी थी इसलिए उन्होंने यहां पर रातों रात अचानक गौर करने के बाद एक बैठक बुला कर उसमें तुरन्त पास कर दिया कि पंजाबी सूबा बनाया जाना चाहिए। क्या नेहरू जी या श्रीर श्रीयों को इसकी जानकारी प्राप्त नहीं थी कि यह 18 साल से पंजाबी सूबा क्यों नहीं बना ? लेकिन यह सरकार की वोटों को हासिल करने की कमजोरी थी जिसके कि कारण भाज पंजाबी सूबा बना कर खड़ा किया जा रहा है।

जहां तक जनसंघ का इस पंजाबी सूबे की मांग के बारे में सबाल है वह सिद्धान्त रूप से इसके विरुद्ध है। जनसंघ समझता है कि इससे हिन्दु व सिक्खों में अलगगाव की भावना बढ़ेगी जो कि देश के लिए अहितकर सिद्ध होगी। जनसंघ कभी भी हिन्दुओं और सिक्खों को अलग अलग नहीं मानता, वह उनके बीच कोई भेद नहीं मानता और न ही बर्तना चाहता है। वह हिन्दू और सिक्खों दोनों के साथ समानता का व्यवहार करना चाहता है। कभी भी वह उनकी आपस की फूट को नहीं देखना चाहता। जनसंघ इस बात के सक्त विरुद्ध है कि यह पंजाबी सूबा भाषायी आधार पर बना कर दोनों के बीच एक दरार पैदा की जाये। वह दोनों के बीच में इस तरह एक दरार पैदा करने का विरोधी है। दरअसल कांग्रेस इसके आधार पर बोटों को हड़पना चाहती है।

मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि अगर भाषा के आधार पर राज्य का बंटवारा होना है तो हमारे यहां तो प्रत्येक तीन, तीन और चार, चार मील पर भाषाएं बदलती जाती हैं। अगर भाषा के आधार पर लिया जाये तो राजस्थान, मध्य प्रदेश आदि राज्य चार, चार और पांच, पांच टुकड़ों में विभक्त हो सकते हैं और परिणामस्वरूप यह देश इतने अधिक छोटे छोटे टुकड़ों में बंट जायेगा कि यह देश

छिन्न भिन्न हो जायेगा और कमजोर पड़ जायेगा। सरकार ने इस देश को क्या सीमेंट समझ लिया है कि जिसे चाहा उठा कर बोरे दे डाले? सरकार को इस तरह से इस देश की सदा से चली आ रही सार्वभौमिक एकता व अखण्डता को नष्ट नहीं करना चाहिए। चूंकि जनसंघ देश की एकता में विश्वास रखता है और उसको विघटित नहीं देखना चाहता इसलिए आपने देखा कि जब भाषा के आधार पर इस देश का बंटवारा करने के लिए कमीशन बैठा तो हमने जनसंघ की तरफ से कोई मीमोरेंडम नहीं दिया क्योंकि हम इस भाषाई आधार पर देश के विभाजन के सिद्धान्त में विश्वास नहीं रखते हैं। जब हम उस सिद्धान्त के ही विरुद्ध हैं, तो उस बारे में अज्ञा या बुरा क्या कहते? अगर हम इस सिद्धान्त की सपोर्ट में होते तो मीमोरेंडम देते और कुछ सुझाव देते लेकिन हम तो यह देश में अलगगाव और विघटन पैदा करना चाहते ही नहीं हैं। हमारा समझ में सरकार की बात बिरहूण आती ही नहीं है क्योंकि वह देश के लिए अहितकर सिद्ध होगी।

अब सरकार की नीति देखिये कि रेडियो पर पंजाबी के सूबे के बारे में उसी वक्त यह आ गया कि साहब पंजाब की जनता ने यह स्वीकार कर लिया है कि पंजाबी सूबा होना चाहिए। लेकिन मैं यह चीख साफ़ कर देना चाहता हूं कि यह सिर्फ़ अकाली दल का निर्णय था, पंजाब की जनता ने इसे स्वीकार नहीं किया था। मैं उनकी जानकारी के लिए बतलाना चाहता हूं कि जामन्दर के अन्दर करीब पांच लाख आदिमियों के जनसमूह ने इस बात से इन्कार किया है और माफ़ ऐलान किया है कि हम पंजाबी सूबे के बिल्कुल फेवर में नहीं हैं। हुआ यह है कि हमारी सरकार ने कुछ गिने बुने सफ़ेद टोपी वालों का पकड़ लिया और उनसे हां में हां कहलवा लिया और अट से रेडियो पर प्रसारण कर दिया और अखबारों में निकाल दिया। यह बड़े अपसोम

[श्री श्रीकांठ लाल बेरवा]

की बात है कि सरकार ने इस तरह से जनता के साथ खिलवाड़ किया और धोखा दिया। दरअसल पंजाबी सूबे की मांग के पीछे जनता नहीं है, उसके पीछे सिर्फ़ प्रकाली हैं जो कि एक अलग राज्य बनाना चाहते हैं। सरकार ने यह नहीं सोचा है कि आखिर इस राज्य का क्या परिणाम होगा वह तो बस जैसे भी हों वोटों की फिराक में है भले ही वह देश के लिए अहितकर क्यों न हो। आज जब हमारे देश की सीमाओं पर पाकिस्तान और चीन की सैन्य तैनात है, बाह्य संकट विद्यमान है तब मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि सरकार को यह पंजाबी सूबा बनाने की इतनी जल्दी क्या थी? इस तरह से उसने पंजाबी सूबा बनाने की घोषणा करके हिन्दू और सिक्खों के बीच एक दरार डाल दी। एक तरफ़ तो हमारी सरहदों के उस पार पाकिस्तानी सेनाएं जमा हो रही हैं और दूसरी तरफ़ इस तरीके से हमारी सरकार हिन्दुओं और सिक्खों के बीच दरार डाल रही है। महज वोटों को प्राप्त करने के लिए सरकार देश को कमजोर कर रही है। मेरा निवेदन है कि ऐसा करने एक गलत बात की गई है। यह पंजाब की निर्णय आज से कई साल पहले हो जाता लेकिन प्रधान मन्त्री श्री नेहरू ने इस बात का बिल्कुल नहीं माना क्योंकि श्री कैरो ने पंजाब के विभाजन के विरुद्ध अपनी ताकत लगाई और कहा कि अगर पंजाबी सूबा बन जायेगा तो देश छिन्न भिन्न हो जायेगा। उसने अपने हठ के जोर के बल पर पंजाब को एक बनाये रखा और इस बात में श्री कैरो कामयाब रहे कि हिन्दू और सिक्खों में फूट न हो जाये।

मैं आप से निवेदन करूंगा कि पंजाब में जब सरकार ने को यह पता था कि हमारे जवान हिन्दू और सिक्ख दोनों मिल कर लड़ रहे हैं तो फिर मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि सरकार ने ऐसा निर्णय क्यों लिया और ऐसे वक्त के उपर लिया जबकि हमारी सीमाओं

पर संकट के बादल छा रहे हैं? कुछ स्वार्थी नेताओं के चक्कर में आकर और कुछ अपने वोटों के चक्कर में आकर सरकार ने यह जल्दबाजी की है लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम जल्दबाजी के साथ देश का बंटवारा किया जायेगा तो यह देश छिन्न भिन्न हो जायेगा। पहले गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र के मसाले थे। गोवा को अलग कर रखा है महाराष्ट्र गोवा को उसमें मिलाने की मांग कर रहा है तो उसे क्यों नहीं मिलते हैं? इतनी जल्दबाजी आखिर आपने और मामलों में क्यों नहीं दिखाई? 370 धारा को कश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में हटाने के लिए सब और ब्रे ब्रांग की गई लेकिन उसको हटाने सम्बन्धी निर्णय लेने में आपने जल्दी नहीं की लेकिन पंजाबी सूबे के निर्माण वाली बात में जल्दबाजी की। श्री रामकिशन रात को दिल्ली में लौट कर आते हैं और कहते हैं कि पंजाबी सूबा नहीं बनेगा और सबेरे पंजाबी सूबा बनाने का निर्णय हो जाता है तो मेरा कहना है कि इस तरह से रातोंरात निर्णय करके जनता को इस तरह से धोखे में रख कर ऐलान कर देते हैं कि पंजाबी सूबा बनेगा। यह इस सरकार की खास कमजोरी है कि वह इस तरह के एक, आधे स्वार्थी नेताओं की बात में आ गई जिन्होंने कि यह कहा और दबाव डाला कि अगर पंजाबी सूबा नहीं बनाओगे तो वहाँ कांग्रेस चुनाव में हार जायगी जहाँ तक हरियाने वाले लोगों का सवाल है जहाँ वहाँ की जनता जब तक कि यह सरकार द्वारा पंजाबी सूबे के निर्माण की घोषणा नहीं हुई थी तब इसके विरुद्ध थी और वहाँ की जनता तो यहाँ तक कहती थी कि पंजाबी सूबा हम लोगों की माशों पर बनेगा लेकिन जब सबेरे उसके निर्माण की घोषणा अखबारों में आई तो उनके चेहरे मुस्त पड़ गये और मैंने जब उनसे पूछा कि बोलो अब क्या कहना है तो कहने लगे कि अब करना क्या है हमको भी कुछ मिल जायेगा। लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि जो बंटवारे हो रहे हैं और राजनैतिक स्वार्थी काम

कर रहे हैं कि कोई सोचता है कि वह गवर्नर हो जायगा, कोई सोचता है कि वह मन्त्री या वहाँ पर मुख्य मन्त्री हो जायेगा तो यह पदों की लालच में आकर देश के हित को कुर्बान किया जा रहा है यह चीज देश के हित में बड़ी घातक सिद्ध होगी। आज हम सब को मिल-जुल कर चलना है। अगर इस तरीके से टुकड़े टुकड़े करके रहेंगे तो इस देश को कोई भी विदेशी शक्ति अपने अधीन कर सकती है और उसकी आजादी को हड़प कर सकती है। यह इस सरकार की एक कमजोरी और नासमझी का प्रमाण है जो उसने देश को और बांटना स्वीकार किया और यह पंजाबी सूबा बनाने का फैसला किया है। इतना कह कर मैं इस पंजाबी सूबे के निर्माण का विरोध करता हूँ।

श्री ध० ना० बिद्यालंकार (होशियार-पुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जो मसला श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ने पेश किया है मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि जहाँ तक यह सवाल है बाउण्डरीज का या सीमा बांधने का उसका ताल्लुक यहाँ पर नहीं था। बहुत कुछ विवाद इस बात पर चल पड़ा कि 1961 का सैसस ठीक है या नहीं है, सीमाएं इधर होनी चाहिए या उधर होनी चाहिए। मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि वह विवाद विषय के निहाज से अप्रसांगिक है क्योंकि वह विषय बाउंडरी कमीशन के सामने है वह उसका निर्णय करेगा।

इतनी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो स्टेटमेंट अपनी गवर्नमेंट ने किया वह बड़ी समझ के साथ किया है। जो लोग इस बात के विरोधी हैं कि 1961 के सैसस का कोई जिक्र नहीं होना चाहिए, मान लीजिये कि 1961 में सैसस का जिक्र नहीं होता और बाउंडरी कमीशन बना दिया जाता तो उसका स्वाभाविक परिणाम यह होता कि जो बाउंडरी कमीशन के जेजेज वहाँ पर बैठते तो कुदरती तौर पर, स्वाभाविक तौर पर कानूनी धारणा होने के नाते वह कहते

कि क्या आधार है हमारे पास डेटा क्या है? सैसस निकालो यह गवर्नमेंट का पब्लिकेशन है गवर्नमेंट के इस 61 के सैसस के आधार पर हम निर्णय करेंगे। अब कोई कहते हैं कि यह सैसस में गलत लिखवाया है तो वह कहते कि यह हम कुछ फालतू बात नहीं सुनते। यह गवर्नमेंट का पब्लिक डोक्युमेंट है हम तो इसके ऊपर निर्णय देंगे और वह उसके ऊपर निर्णय देते। गवर्नमेंट ने बड़ी समझ के साथ यह किया कि 61 के सैसस का जिक्र किया लेकिन कहा कि दूसरे कंसिडरेशन भी देखे जायेंगे ताकि जो ऐतराज करते हैं 61 के सैसस पर वह भी आकर बाउंडरी कमीशन के सामने ऐतराज कर सकते हैं और कह सकते हैं कि यहाँ पर यह गलती है। सारे का सारा सैसस गलत नहीं है लेकिन जहाँ गलती है उसको अगर कमीशन को बतलावे कि यहाँ पर गलती है तो कमीशन उस मूरत में अपना एक निर्णय कर लेगा लेकिन अगर खाली 61 का सैसस ही आधार होता और यह दूसरे कंसिडरेशन का जिक्र नहीं होता, बिल्कुल 61 के सैसस के आधार पर ही होता तो फिर बाउंडरी कमीशन के सामने और कोई रास्ता नहीं था कि वह इधर, उधर उसमें अन्तर कर सकता इसलिए यहाँ तो गवर्नमेंट ने उसके साथ अदर कंसिडरेशन का जिक्र कर दिया तो यह बिल्कुल उचित ही बात हुई।

शास्त्री जी ने एक बात जो यहाँ पर पेश की मैं समझता हूँ कि इस में जो हमारे निर्णय हो चुके थे उसके बाद शास्त्री जी इस सवाल को न उठाते तो बेहतर था। आखिर यह निर्णय हुआ पंजाब का। जो कुछ यह निर्णय हुआ उसके बाद तो हमें इस बात पर जोर देना चाहिए था कि यह जो कुछ दलदल और जो कुछ मिला वहाँ के वातावरण में दोनों तरफ से धा गया था एजीटेसन आदि होने से, पंजाब के अन्दर ऐसी प्रवाञ्छनीय बातें हुई कि वातावरण दूषित बन गया तो उचित तो यह था कि यह जो इतना मूल व कीचड़ सरफेस के ऊपर धा गया था वह मिटटी और कीचड़

[श्री प्र० ना० विद्यालंकार]

जगहटी में बैठ जाती और वातावरण में इस तरह से सुधार आता ऐसा एक रबैया अपना चाहिए था, लेकिन अभी जो उनकी तरफ से कहा गया है उससे वातावरण सुधरने के बजाय खराब होने वाली बात है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सवाल को इस समय छोड़ना, और फिर जिस ढंग से शास्त्री जी ने इसको छोड़ा, वह उचित नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि शास्त्री जी राष्ट्रीय विचारों के हैं, लेकिन बात यह है कि वह पंजाब में नहीं रहते—पंजाब से जरा दूर रहते हैं, पड़ोस में रहते हैं, त्यागी जी के पड़ोस में रहते हैं। पता नहीं, हायद विशाल हरियाणा भी बने, तो त्यागी जी के देहरादून के साथ उनका बिजणौर भी उसमें शामिल हो जाये।

श्री त्यागी : क्या देहरादून भी छीनना चाहते हैं।

श्री ज० बा० विद्यालंकार : नहीं, मैं देहरादून को छीनने के हक में नहीं हूँ।

श्री त्यागी : अगर यू० पी० को कहीं मिलाना ही है, तो हम हरियाणा से मिलने के बजाय पंजाब से मिलना पसन्द करेंगे।

श्री ज० ना० विद्यालंकार : पंजाब में जो साम्रदायिक भाषियों उठती है, उन का कुछ अंतर बाहर के लोगों की मनोवृत्ति पर भी पड़ जाता है। शास्त्री जी ने दो बातें कहीं, जिनको सुन कर मुझे बड़ा दुख हुआ। उन्होंने पंजाब में राष्ट्रपति के राज की चर्चा की और कहा कि वह भाषावार प्रान्तों के मूल रूप से विरोधी हैं। मुझे यह देख कर आश्चर्य होता है कि शास्त्री जी जैसा व्यक्ति जो लोकतंत्र का इतना समर्थक हो राष्ट्रपति के राज की बात करे। मैं उस के बारे में ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि मैं एक दूसरे प्रसंग में राष्ट्रपति के शासन के बारे में अपने विचार प्रकट कर चुका हूँ। मैं राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू किये जाने में सख्त विरोधी हूँ।

जहाँ तक शास्त्री जी की इस बात का ताल्लुक है कि भाषावार प्रान्त नहीं होने चाहिये, एक प्रान्त में कई भाषाओं के लोग इकट्ठे मिल कर रहे, देश में बहुभाषी प्रान्त, मल्टीलिग्वल स्टेट्स, हो मैं निबेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि पंजाब में मल्टीलिग्वल स्टेट, बहुभाषी प्रान्त बनाया गया था। जिस समय यह निर्णय हुआ कि देश भर में सब प्रान्त भाषा के आधार पर बनाए जायें, उस समय पंजाब के बारे में यह निर्णय लागू नहीं किया गया। पंजाब के बारे में कहा गया कि उस को इकट्ठा रहना है, जिस पर शगड़ा हुआ। बाद में प्रकाली दल और सत्तारूढ़ दल में यह समझौता हुआ कि एक काम्प्रोमाइस के तौर पर एक तजुर्बा किया जाये, परिलक्षण किया जाय कि प्राया पंजाब त्रिभाषी प्रान्त रह सकता है या नहीं। उस समय सब ने इस बात को माना। लेकिन उस का विरोध किस ने किया आज शास्त्री जी चाहते हैं कि देश में बहुभाषी प्रान्त बने, लेकिन जब पंजाब को त्रिभाषी प्रान्त बनाया गया और कहा गया कि इस का तजुर्बा किया जाये और वह तजुर्बा शुरू भी किया गया, तो विरोध किस की तरफ से हुआ ? उस का विरोध इस रूप में किया गया कि पंजाब में हिन्दी एजिटेशन शुरू की गई और कहा गया कि पंजाबी भाषा की पढ़ाई अनिवार्य न हो, हय पंजाबी भाषा को स्वीकार नहीं करते हैं, पंजाबी भाषा को पंजाब के दोनों रिजन्ज में कही भी अनिवार्य न किया जाये, प्राप्ति। शास्त्री जी उस वकत हिन्दी प्रान्सेलन ने समर्थक थे। अगर बहुभाषी प्रान्त के लम्बुओं को कामका बनाना था, तो फिर हिन्दी एजीटेशन नहीं शुरू की जानी चाहिये थी।

उपस्थित महोदय : माननीय सदस्य खत्म करने का प्रयत्न करे।

श्री ज० बा० विद्यालंकार : उपस्थित महोदय, मुझे से पहले कई माननीय सदस्य पढ़े, बीस, पच्चीस मिनट तक बोले हैं। मैं

तो अभी अपनी बात भी कह नहीं पाया हूँ ।
घाघ मुझे दस मिनट और दीजिए ।

श्री हरि बिष्णु कामत : इस चर्चा के लिये घाघ घंटा बढ़ा दिया जाये ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : घाघ घंटा बढ़ा दिया गया है ।

श्री हरि बिष्णु कामत : बोझ कम कर बढ़ा दिया जाये ।

श्री डॉ० ना० बिष्णुलंकार : अगर घाघ पंजाब का इतिहास देखें, तो पता चलेगा कि बहाने पर झगड़ा इसलिए शुरू हुआ कि जब यह फैसला हुआ कि यह एक बहुभाषी प्रान्त बने, तो उस का विरोध शुरू हो गया । उस का तजुर्नी ही नहीं करने दिया गया, बल्कि बुरे में ही उस का विरोध होने लगा ।

घाघ मधोक साहब मानते हैं कि जो हिन्दी एशियेशन हुआ था हम ने पहले जो रिजल्ट फारमूला नहीं माना, वह हमारी शलती थी । जब इस सवाल का निर्णय हो गया और गवर्नमेंट ने फैसला कर दिया कि हम पंजाब में पंजाबी भाषा के आधार पर प्रान्त बनायेंगे, तो अब मधोक साहब कहते हैं कि ठीक है, अगर रिजल्ट फारमूले को चलाया जाता, उसके मुताबिक काम किया जाता, तो बढ़ा अच्छा था । मैं समझता हूँ कि बुनियादी बात यह है कि अगर द्विभाषी प्रान्त को स्वीकार कर लिया जाता और उस तर्जुने के कामयाब बनाया जाता तो वह स्थिति न पैदा होती ।

पंजाब में जो साम्प्रदायिक बाह्य इकट्ठा किया जाता रहा, उस की जिम्मेदारी किस पर है ? जो अखबार और लोग वहाँ पर साम्प्रदायिकता का बाह्य इकट्ठा करते रहे, वे घाघ कांग्रेस को दोष देते हैं । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो भी हालात होते हैं, राजनीतिज्ञ लोग उन में रास्ता निकालते हैं और उनके मुताबिक निर्णय करते हैं । बूँकि पंजाब व हालात और बातावरण की खराब कर दिया गया था, दूषित कर

दिया गया था, इस लिए गवर्नमेंट ने उन हालात को बेहतर बनाने के लिए यह निर्णय किया है कि वहाँ पर दोनों तरफ जो बाह्य जबा किया गया है, उस को अलग अलग कर दिया जाये । घाघ अगर ऐसा न किया जाये, तो इस का मतलब यह होगा कि वह बाह्य फटेगा और उस सीमावर्ती प्रान्त में अशांति बनी रहेगी ।

माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि यह घुटने-टेक और अदूरदर्शिता पूर्ण नीति है । मैं उन को बाव दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब जवाहरलाल जी कहते थे कि सारा पंजाब एक पंजाबी प्रान्त है, तब भी वह कहते थे कि यह घुटने-टेक नीति है । जब सच्चर फारमूला बनाया गया जिस के अनुसार तमाम लोगों को हिन्दी और पंजाबी, दोनों भाषायें, पढ़नी थीं, तब भी कहा गया था कि यह एपीचमेंट की पालिसी है, अकालियों को एपीच किया जा रहा है । जब कहा गया कि लोग दोनों भाषा पढ़ें तब भी एपीचमेंट थी और जब यह कहा गया जा रहा है कि अलग अलग हो जायें, तब भी एपीचमेंट और घुटने-टेक पालिसी है । मैं समझता हूँ कि विभाग में यह बात स्पष्ट होनी चाहिये कि हमारा क्या लक्ष्य है, हम क्या चाहते हैं ।

शास्त्री जी ने लिपि का सवाल भी उठाया है । मैं मानता हूँ कि कोई भाषा किसी भी लिपि में लिखी जाये, इस से कोई अन्तर नहीं पड़ता है । किसी समय बंगाल में संस्कृत की किताबें बंगला लिपि में लिखी जाई थीं और कोई अंतर नहीं करता था लेकिन हर एक भाषा की अपनी एक लिपि होती है । शास्त्री जी कहते हैं कि नागरी और गुरुमुखी दोनों पंजाबी भाषा की लिपियाँ हैं । लेकिन आखिर गुरुमुखी किस भाषा की लिपि है ? आखिर उस को किसी भाषा के साथ तो जोड़ेंगे । और फिर गुरुमुखी के प्रति इतना विरोध क्यों ? किसी उमाने में पंजाब, सिन्ध और काश्मीर में

[श्री अ० ना० विद्यालंकार]

प्राचीन शारदा लिपि चलती थी। गुरुओं ने अपनी भाषा और अपनी लिपि को प्रचलित किया और उस लिपि को गुरुमुखी कहा गया, क्योंकि गुरुओं ने उस का प्रचार किया था। उस समय अरबी और फारसी का खूब प्रचार हो रहा था। उन से बचाने के लिये गुरुओं ने उस समय की प्रचलित शारदा लिपि को अपनाया और जारी किया। लेकिन आज माननीय सदस्य उस लिपि का विरोध करते हैं। वास्तव में उन को उस लिपि का एहसानमन्द होना चाहिये, क्योंकि उस वक्त अरबी और फारसी के सब तरफ फैल जाने का डर था। सिन्ध म अरबी प्रचलित हो गई थी। पंजाब और काश्मीर में भी अरबी लिपि प्रचलित हो जाती लेकिन गुरुमुखी ने बचा लिया। माननीय सदस्य आज उसी लिपि का विरोध करते हैं और कहते हैं कि हम पंजाबी को इस शर्त पर मातृभाषा मानेंगे कि उस की लिपि नागरी रहे और अगर उस की लिपि गुरुमुखी होगी, तो पंजाबी हमारी भाषा नहीं है। मुझे यह तर्क समझ में नहीं आता है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह तर्क बिल्कुल सांप्रदायिकता पर आधारित है।

अन्त में मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह साम्प्रदायिकता की मनोवृत्ति को प्रोत्साहन और प्रश्रय न दें। वह पंजाब को अराम और शान्ति से काम करने दें। पंजाब और हरियाणा अलग बने हैं। वह उन को शान्ति पूर्वक रहने दें और उनके ज़ख्मों को ज्यादा कुरेदने की कोशिश न करें, बल्कि एक शान्त वातावरण में उन को चलने दें जैसा कि सन्त जी ने कहा है, जैसे सब लोग कोशिश कर रहे हैं, जैसे कांग्रेस के लोग कोशिश कर रहे हैं, हिन्दुओं और सिक्खों और हिन्दी और पंजाबी के झगड़े को खत्म कर के ऐसा वातावरण पैदा किया जाना चाहिए जिस में पंजाब और हरियाणा शान्ति के साथ रह सकें।

अन्त में एक बात मैं गर्वैन्मेंट से कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं नहीं जानता कि श्री विवेकी

ने कहा था या किसी और माननीय सदस्य ने कहा था, लेकिन मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि विभाजन के सम्बन्ध में तहसील को न तोड़ने की बात से मुश्किल पैदा होगी। मैं जानता हूँ कि मेरी कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी में खरड़ तहसील है, जिस का कुछ भाग हिन्दी भाषी है और और कुछ भाग पंजाबी भाषी है। इसी प्रकार उना तहसील और गुरदासपुर और अम्बाला में कुछ तहसीलें हैं, जिन के कुछ भाग हिन्दी भाषी हैं और कुछ भाग पंजाबी-भाषी हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर विभाजन के सम्बन्ध में तहसीलों को तोड़ने की इजाजत न दी गई और गांवों के आधार पर विभाजन न किया गया, तो विभाजन में बहुत सी दिक्कतें पैदा हो जायगी।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr. Lohia.

Shri Virbhadra Singh (Mahasu): I want to make a submission...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more speeches.

Shri Virbhadra Singh: The Members from Himachal Pradesh who are vitally interested in this must be given a chance to speak.

डा० राय बनोहर लीहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे कल और आज ऐसी इत्तिला मिली है, जो मैं इस माननीय सदन को देना चाहता हूँ और जिस से हर भारत वासी को गुस्सा आयेगा और उस के रोंगटे खड़े हो जायेंगे। इस माननीय सदन ने कई बार तेलगू सूबे, पंजाबी सूबे, मराठी और गुजराती सूबे पर बहस की है, लेकिन भारत देश की कुल कितनी जमीन है, जिस में ये सारे सूबे बनते हैं, उस पर बहस नहीं हुई है। यह बात सही है कि पाकिस्तान और चीन को लेकर कुछ एकड़ या मील जमीन इधर-उधर हो गई, लेकिन अब वक्त आ गया है कि यह माननीय सदन भारत की कुल जमीन के बारे में सावधानी के साथ बातचीत करे। इसी सम्बन्ध में मैं आपको, अध्यक्ष महोदय, संयुक्त राष्ट्र

की 1950 की सालाना किताब से पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ यह यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की 1950 की ईयर बुक है, जिसके सफा 1010 पर दिया है—

कि भारत का कुल क्षेत्रफल 31,62,454 वर्ग किलोमीटर है अब मैं उसी संयुक्त राष्ट्र की 1964 की सालाना किताब से पढ़कर सुनाता हूँ, यानि 14 वर्ष बाद 1964 की किताब के सफा 579 पर भारत का क्षेत्रफल 30 लाख 46 हजार 232 किलोमीटर बताया गया है। अब ये दोनों उसी संस्था की किताबें हैं जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय है, जिसका सदस्य भारत है और अगर दोनों क्षेत्रफल की तुलना करके घटाया जाय तो 1 लाख 22 हजार 222 वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन भारत की गायब हो गई है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : इस मोशन से इसका क्या ताल्लुक है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मुझे बड़ा अफसोस हो रहा है कि कोई माननीय सदस्य यह कह सकते हैं कि इससे क्या ताल्लुक है। पंजाबी सूबा इसी जमीन से बनता है और कहां से बनता है, बड़े शर्म की बात है।

श्री त्यागी : यह फिर्स जो आपने दी है, ये यूनाइटेड नेशन्स की हैं, इण्डिया ने इनको तमलीम नहीं किया है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस बात को कह कर त्यागी जी ने बहुत अन्धकार किया। मैं उन्हें धन्यवाद देता हूँ। लेकिन आप मेहरबानी कर के सोचें कि ये जितने आकड़े यूनाइटेड नेशन्स को दिये जाते हैं, ये कौन देता है। ये भारत सरकार दिया करती है और बकि भारत सरकार उसकी सदस्य है, अगर भारत के क्षेत्रफल के बारे में इतनी बड़ी गलती हुई है तो क्या सदस्य राष्ट्र को इसके बारे में कुछ कहना नहीं चाहिए ? 1 लाख 22 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर कम हो गया, कहां चला गया ? अगर इस जमीन का चीन और पाकिस्तान से सम्बन्ध है तो

मैं बताना चाहता हूँ, अगर यह उनके कब्जे में चली गई है तो भी इस क्षेत्रफल को घटाया नहीं जा सकता।

इतना ही नहीं, यह तो संयुक्त राष्ट्र की किताब में दिया गया है, मैं आपकी एक और खतरनाक बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ, जो कि भारत सरकार की अपनी खुद की छपी हुई पुस्तक है और वह है सर्वे आफ इण्डिया। जिसमें सन् 1953 में 12 लाख 69 हजार 640 वर्ग मील हमारा क्षेत्रफल था। और 1964 में घट कर वह 12 लाख 61 हजार 597 वर्ग मील रह गया। भारत सरकार की तरफ से छपी हुई पुस्तक सर्वे आफ इण्डिया में 8,043 वर्गमील जमीन गायब हो गई। जमीन कहां चली गई ?

अगर किसी देश में ऐसा काम हो, जहां की जनता शक्तिशाली हो, तो वह सरकार एक मिनट के लिए भी नहीं ठहर सकती। इतना बड़ा कुकर्म करने के बाद, इतनी बड़ी नालायकी करने के बाद कोई सरकार एक मिनट ठहर नहीं सकती। जब माननीय सदन पंजाबी सूबे वगैरह की बात करता है तो उसको ध्यान देना चाहिए कि भारत देश का क्या हाल यह सरकार करती चली जा रही है।

सूबों के हिसाब से देखते हैं तो पिछले 14-15 सालों में मराठी सूबा, गुजराती सूबा, पंजाबी सूबा, न जाने कितने सूबे बने, किम लिये ? भाषा की उन्नति के लिए। तो मैं उन से माफ़ बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी भी सूबे में अंग्रेजी की तुलना में सूबे की भाषा की तरक्की नहीं हुई है। मराठी अंग्रेजी की तुलना में कुछ भी प्रागे नहीं बढ़ी है। औरंगाबाद में मराठी थी, लेकिन आज अंग्रेजी हो गई है, और दूसरे सूबों की भी यही हालत है। इसी के साथ साथ अगर उन्नति की भी कसौटी पर प्राय रखना चाहते हैं तो इन सूबों में उन्नति के मामले

[शम मनोहर लोहिया]

में, खेती और कारखानों के मामले में कोई ऐसा फर्क नहीं पड़ा है कि ये भाषावार प्रान्त प्रान्त सचमुच भाषावार प्रान्त बने हैं, क्योंकि भाषावार प्रान्तों के नाम पर वहाँ अंग्रेजी अभी तक कायम है।

इस के साथ साथ मैं इस सरकार की एक और महान असफलता की तरफ ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। ये सूबे भंगर बनाने की बात थी तो एक वोट में जितने उचित सूबे थे, सब बना देने चाहिए थे। सन् 1948-49 में ही बना देने चाहिए थे, महाराष्ट्र बना देना चाहिए था, गुजरात, बिदरभ, जितने भी बनाने थे, सब बना देने चाहिए थे। लेकिन सन् 1948-49 में ये सूबे नहीं बनाये गये और मामले को टाल दिया गया। पिछले 15 साल में भारतीय जनता के विभाग के अन्दर इस कीड़े को उकसाया गया है और मैं इस सरकार पर आरोप लगाता हूँ कि इस ने उकसाया है, क्योंकि सरकार ने इस मामले को टाल कर इसी पर लोगों का ध्यान केन्द्रित रखा।

एक सवाल यह आता है कि हम जो विरोधी दल हैं, उनका ध्यान भी उचित प्रश्नों की तरफ उतना ठीक नहीं जा पाता, जितना गलत प्रश्नों की तरफ चला जाता है। ये गलत प्रश्न या तो सरकार खुद उठाती है या कुछ हालात ऐसे पैदा हो जाते हैं कि जिनको सरकार के अलावा दूसरे लोग उठा दिया करते हैं। विरोधी दलों का मुख्य लक्ष्य यह होना चाहिए कि सवाल अच्छे उठाये जाय, गलत सवाल उठा दिये जाते हैं, चाहे जितना अच्छा जवाब दिया जाय, लेकिन उस से उद्देश्य की पूर्ति नहीं होती। मैं अपने विरोधी दलों को दोष देना चाहता हूँ कि वे हर सवाल का जवाब देने के लिए उतारू हो जाया करते हैं, इसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं है। हमें उन सवालों का जवाब देने के बजाय और बातों पर जाना चाहिये,

ऐसे अंग्रेजी भाषा खत्म हो, उसकी तरफ जाना चाहिए, जिससे खेती और कारखानों में सुधार हो, उनको उस तरफ जाना चाहिए। नतीजा क्या होता है कि विरोधी पहले तो कहते हैं कि महाराष्ट्र बनाओ, कांग्रेस सरकार कहती है कि नहीं बनायेंगे, 4-6 वर्ष लड़ाई चलती है, गोली भी चलती है, बहुत ज्यादा तकलीफ उठाते हैं, और फिर बाब में धीरे से कांग्रेस सरकार महाराष्ट्र बना देती है और लोग खुश हो जाते हैं और फिर इससे कांग्रेस सरकार को कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता। इस लिये ज्यादा अच्छा यही है कि अब तक जो हो गया, वह हो गया, विरोधी दल आइन्दा अनुचित सवालों पर अपना बक्त न खराब करें और मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्हें उचित सवालों की तरफ जाना चाहिए।

एक माननीय सदस्य : बराबर ध्यान रखियेगा।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं तो हमेशा रखता हूँ, लेकिन मुश्किल यही है कि धाप लोगों को हटा नहीं पाया हूँ, यही मेरी सब से बड़ी दिक्कत है। अगर विरोधी दल मान लेते तो भगले साल ही धाप लोगों को हटाना सम्भव हो जाता, बल्कि उस से भी पहले।

अब जो मैंने बताया है, इस विषय को ऐसे ही नहीं छोड़ देना चाहिए, भारत के क्षेत्रफल के बारे में इस सत्र के खत्म होने से पहले तय करो, यह सत्र खत्म नहीं होना चाहिए जब तक कि यह जवाब न आजावे कि भारत की 1 लाख 22 हजार 222 वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन कहां हड़पी गई, कहां समुद्र से डुबो दी गई।

मैं जब विरोधी दलों से कह रहा था कि सही सवाल पूछो, जो सवाल सरकार की तरफ से या दूसरे जो अंगडम-बगडम दलों की तरफ से पूछे जाते हैं, उनके जवाब देने की जरूरत नहीं है। अंगु बम बने या न बने उसका जवाब हमें देने की क्या जरूरत पड़ी

कोई सूबा बने या न बने इसका जवाब देने की हमें क्या जरूरत पड़ेगी? एक उदाहरण मैं देता हूँ। गुर्जरात में वड़ता का। वड़ता से वहाँ यह मांग की गई कि विदर्भ सूबा बने। फिर बांडवाना सूबा बने यह मांग की गई। आड़खण्ड सूबा बने यह मांग की गई, हरियाणा बने यह मांग की गई। अगर इस तरह की सब मांगों पर विरोधी दल वाले उलझ जायें तो इस में दो चार पांच बरस का और बहुत बरबद हो जायगा और बरबाद होने पर इन किर जहाँ से वहाँ पहुँच जायेंगे। इस बास्ते यह जरूरी है कि विरोधी दल इस मामले पर सम्यक नीति बनायें। खास तौर पर जो मैंने सवाल उठाये हैं उन पर ब ध्यान दें। एक सवाल तो मैंने यह उठाया है कि कहीं सवाल पुछवायें। गलत सवाल पुछवाये जाते हैं तो जवाब देने से इन्कार करो। दूसरी बात यह है कि भारत के कुल क्षेत्रफल के बारे में जरूर इस सरकार से कोई कम्पाई लेनी चाहिए। यह कोई बड़ा जारी रहस्य है। इतना बड़ा यह रहस्य है कि ये लोग अब इस लायक नहीं रह गये हैं कि उस गद्दों पर बैठें। ऐसा न हो कि यू० एन० के मामले में कोई जबरदस्ती करने की जरूरत पड़े और सबेँ आफ इंडिया के मामले में कोई जबरदस्ती करने की जरूरत पड़े।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have already extended it by half an hour.

The Home Minister.

Shri Nanda: Just a few moments ago, I received a chit from the hon. Member, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, that I should on this occasion speak in Hindi. I would have welcomed that very much. Imperfect Hindi such as I have, I would have tried to use it as the vehicle for conveying my thoughts now or on any other occasion. But on this occasion I am encountering and am confronted with a moral issue. I have been more

than 40 years—about 40 years—in Gujarat. That is my adopted State. Still my mother-tongue is Punjabi. I cannot deny that and, therefore, if I start now departing from Punjabi, which I cannot use here now, I would prefer to speak whatever little I have to speak in English; and whatever I have to say is necessarily going to be very brief.

The discussion was around a statement I made on the 18th April. The discussion has cut across all party lines. Speakers whatever they said, were ranged against one another chiefly on regional interest. The whole basis of the controversy was regional interest. They wanted to safeguard regional interests in each case.

Why was this discussion? It appears as if it was just to bring out this sharp divergence of viewpoints and it has—I must thank the hon. Member for it—provided justification for the line adopted by Government in dealing with the situation. Neither side is satisfied with the line Government has adopted and would like to draw it away nearer to its own position. This discussion must have brought conviction that the course adopted by Government was the only feasible course. It has vindicated the line that has been taken by Government in this matter. Any deviation from that one way or the other would meant departing from the just course.

What was the basis adopted in this statement of the 18th? It is very clear; it has been set out in very definite terms that when States have to be carved out of the existing Punjab, this has to be purely on the ground of language. It is the linguistic principle which is going to be applied. That is the fundamental basis of whatever processes are going to be carried out. Therefore, my appeal is; let nothing be done to cloud and obscure this central point.

[Shri Nanda]

It has nothing to do with any caste, community or religion. That does not enter into the consideration of the subject. To import any such considerations into this matter will be vitiating the whole process.

I may read from that statement—because that is the central point—that portion of the terms of reference:

“The Commission shall examine the existing boundary of the Hindi and Punjabi regions of the present State of Punjab and recommend what adjustment, if any, are necessary in that boundary to secure the linguistic homogeneity of the proposed Punjab and Haryana States. The Commission shall also indicate the boundaries of the hill areas of the present State of Punjab which are contiguous to Himachal Pradesh and have linguistic and cultural affinity with that territory”—

this is the relevant portion—

“The Commission shall apply the linguistic principle with due regard to the census figures of 1961 and other relevant considerations”.

what are the other relevant considerations? There has been a question raised about it. Shri D. D. Puri—who is not here at the moment—questioned the manner in which this has been worded. Why not only the 1961 census, he asked. The hon. Member, Shri Vidyalankar, has very properly dealt with that issue. There may be other considerations. If all these had not been set out in this language, it would have left it wide open for any kind of interpretations and led the matter to a different track. Shri Puri himself listed certain considerations about the university examinations, this and that it is not for us to decide what the considerations are, what the relevant considerations are, how much weight

is to be attached to each consideration. It is for the Commission to do so. It has started functioning and I think it is not desirable for us to enter into these various aspects of the matter which are before the Commission. We should leave it at that.

A question was asked, why was any commission necessary? Several members have raised that question. Why not have the basis of the existing Punjabi and Hindi regions and introduce some small modifications? It is all right to put it like that. Exactly this is what has been said:

“The Commission shall examine the existing boundary of the Hindi and Punjabi regions of the present State of Punjab and recommend what adjustments...”

What is the difference? This is what has been said here. But when we come to adjustments, they are minor adjustments. But a minor adjustment may mean the fate of the capital. Who should decide it? Naturally it has to be some kind of judicial examination and decision on the merits of the issue that can arise on one side or the other.

So this has been rightly done, that is, the appointment of the Commission, a high powered Commission composed of an eminent Judge of the Supreme Court and other competent members to deal with this matter. We should feel absolutely secure in the faith that justice will be done and that whatever the decision, it should be carried out in good faith and in the conviction that justice has been done, whatever may have been the views, prejudices or predilections of one side or the other.

Judging by the mind of Parliament, it appears that the reorganisation of Punjab on the lines of the statement will have soon become an accomplished fact. It does not appear to serve

any useful purpose or to yield any benefit to have entered into the merits, demerits, pros and cons of whatever has been done through the Parliamentary Committee and later on through the consideration which Government gave to the subject. What would have been the position today? Hon. Member Shri Prakash Vir Shastri in a very eloquent style vividly presented the past years through which this question came up time and again and yet division was averted. Why is it that we have been pushed into this? That is his question. I will submit, if the great leaders of those years who were at the helm of affairs in the past years had been present to deal with this matter, how would they have solved this question? Who can give the answer now with any certainty? But I can say this: don't we know that in the earlier years also momentous decisions were taken and then some time later, they were altered, and that is not to be considered as an indication of vacillation. We are here working, functioning in a democracy, in democratic conditions, and it is expected that as the tempo of public opinion changes, as circumstances alter, Parliament and Government have to respond, and therefore new adjustments must arise from time to time, and I may illustrate by a reference to the hon. Member, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri's own position. He started and in the course of his speech there was a radical shift. He launched a very, very strong attack on this division, and took a very uncompromising stand, and later on he softened and he almost gave a justification in the interests of Hariyana saying that they were living in conditions of oppression, and here it is that they can heave a sigh of relief. It may be that people of Hariyana did not feel so strongly about it earlier, they now felt their conditions were such that it would be better in their interests to have a State of their own. There may be various opinions, there may be other people, some people may still feel that what has happened is not to the best interests of this

area or the other area or both areas; but here it is a large bulk of the people declaring their mind, and the thing has been settled on those lines.

May I also request the hon. Member to recall my first statement, i.e., of the 6th September. I remember, I recall very clearly, by the whole House, without a single dissent, without a single discordant note, there was acceptance of that, there was applause for the step then taken, including the hon. Member, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. He endorsed it.

The second statement was made on the 23rd September. There again he says:

मैं इसका स्वागत करता हूँ कि इस अवसर पर इसकी घोषणा की गई।

So, that various steps which were taken from time to time were welcomed. That means that they met the real need, the need of the moment. We have to judge these things in the light of the conditions which arose, and it is not that we can have everything bothways. That is, there are advantages and disadvantages, we have to balance everything, and in the national interests all the considerations were taken into account, and these decisions were reached.

I recall also the fact that during this period, after the announcement of this decision and before that, there was very acute tension for some time at least in the Punjabi-speaking area particularly, and disturbances arose. We all feel sad about what happened, but I remember now that in my statement from the very beginning there was mention of a co-operative solution. The whole purpose was that we proceed in this matter in a way, on lines that we get a solution without landing ourselves into trouble of this kind. I realise that the Committee also, Members of Parliament, made efforts. I personally tried to do that, and in a way it may be said that because we tried to bring the parties together, although we did not achieve a co-operative solution in that

[Shri Nanda]

way, a perfect solution where the people could have, all the parties could have seen their way to have some kind of arrangement where a division might be avoided, but that very process, that very effort at least led to this result that, very unfortunate as those disturbances were, still we could come to some kind of a peaceful settlement very quickly and things are settling down.

I have talked of this not to revive those bitter memories, but I am thinking of this in my mind as a warning for the future. Both these States which are going to spring into being, come into being, have big tasks before them. The very process of division will have created problems and difficulties, and therefore in approaching those tasks, we must try to observe a certain restraint, and try to take every precaution that there is no embittering of feelings between the two areas and between various sections of the community in any one area. There are sections in Hariyana also, and there are sections in the Punjabi region, and it is very important, I am saying it deliberately, advisedly, that we have to make every effort in order to see and ensure that things proceed peacefully, amicably now in these processes and later on also.

One question has been raised about this, it is an indication of what the attitudes can be. Should we not have as many ways of collaboration as possible? If as a result of those practices we can secure economic advantages, if nothing else, there should be no such mind set against that, just as one of the hon. Members said, almost setting his face against anything which will have any common operation, any common link. I submit humbly this is not a very healthy attitude. There may be, there is the question of irrigation, the question of electricity, transport, various other things, whatever it may be; I do not say any particular thing should be done or must be done, it has to be a

product of understanding, that attitude has to be that we want to live together, we are neighbours and we will work together in as many ways as possible, so that an atmosphere of harmony prevails. This is not only for these two new States, we have got zonal councils, even for the zonal councils we are trying to bring into being, to create new instruments where there is participation of the various States, so that advantages arise by common operation, and therefore I had to say it after listening to the hon. Member, Shri Siddhanti, who spoke a little while ago.

One more thing arising out of the speech of Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. We have to think of the future of the Punjab. I cannot help bringing up one question to which emphatic reference was made by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri in his speech. It is the statement and activities of Master Tara Singh, I wish to convey to him that there is enough trouble in this country, and he should not add his quota of trouble. Let him not make our task more difficult than it already is. The Punjab itself is going to have more problems in the way of its progress and any kind of a stage of uncertainty created there, strife, is going to hamper the progress of Punjab itself. Punjab needs unity and wise leadership.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The whole country needs it.

Shri Nanda: Because Punjab is going to be reorganised. The whole country needs it. But here there is going to be special problems and let the people of Punjab settle down to hard work. I am saying this in relation to some disturbing factors which are on the horizon now. The division of Punjab is going to create handicaps for both the future Punjab and Hariyana. They will have to be overcome by great deal of effort. People's minds should not be distracted and disturbed by meaningless slogans and fruitless campaigns. This area needs unity and

strength because of the place it occupies as a sensitive border of this country. Anyone who creates weakness in this region by strife and dissension must be held to be disloyal to this country. I am speaking of those who talk a language which is not compatible with the total integrity and unity of this country and underestimates it one way or the other and dream of a status which is something different from the status everyone else has in this country, some kind of self-determination status. I cannot think, I cannot imagine of it. It is inconceivable: Let those who talk in those terms not place too much store on the tolerance of the people of this country. We do not want to have recourse to harsh measures, but we cannot also permit trifling with the national interests. I refer to some things which I think arise out of the speeches here which have a meaning for the future and for which it is necessary to give the reaction. I would make an appeal to the leaders there in the Punjab, especially I am speaking of Master Tara Singh, an old, venerable leader, I know him very well, I will make an appeal to him from the floor of this House: let Punjab now settle down, let not any new disturbing element enter into that state as a result of his activities; so far as I know, they are not desirable activities and therefore, let him become part and parcel of the stream altogether which will build up a new and strong Punjab.

There was one other thing about the future, and hon. Member Prakash Vir Shastri talked about that. He had in his mind the whole country to be divided into five parts. How can I say now, in the flow of time what will happen for this country? As long as things happen which are in the interest of the unity and strength of this nation, it does not matter. Conditions can change. But at the moment, we have somehow, wily-nily, for whatever it is worth, linguistic provinces now. Let us try to make the best of whatever arrangements have been brought into being in this country. There were various other questions

about taking Delhi somewhere, bringing some other areas into Delhi. I have already stated, it does not arise. I believe hon. Members would like Delhi to be where it is.

Shri Tyagi: Cannot you give some relief by saying that about U.P. also?

Shri Nanda: We have definitely stated that the division of Punjab does not mean at all touching any other state for reorganisation. What may happen after a long time in the future, I cannot say.

Shri Tyagi: Only one question, if you permit me. Dr. Lohia has upset us by giving figures that our total area has diminished, according to UN figures, by more than a lakh square kilo metres. Of course the hon. Minister could not readily answer it. Will you kindly ask him to make the position clear before the House adjourns?

Shri Nanda: I shall make a note and I shall deal with it. But no one outside this country, no institution or body or organisation can make any change in the area of this country; it belongs to us.

श० राय मनोहर लोहिया : भारत की अपनी किताब सर्वे आफ इण्डिया में 8 हजार वर्ग मील जमीन गायब हो गई, एक एक इंच जमीन के लिए हम लड़ते हैं, लेकिन यहां 8 हजार वर्ग मील जमीन गायब हो गई, इस के लिए क्या किया ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not relevant to this question.

Shri Tyagi: It is too shocking; it requires clarification.

Shri Nanda: We shall look into it immediately (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has promised that he would look into it.

श्री श्रीकार लाल शेरवा : जमीन घट रही है, इन्सान बढ़ रहे हैं।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : (विजनीर) : गृह मंत्री महोदय ने इस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

मैं अपना भाषण देते हुए, यहीं से अपने भाषण को प्रारम्भ किया कि मैंने उनको एक चिट लिख कर भेजी थी। जिसमें निवेदन किया था कि आज आप अपना भाषण हिन्दी में दें तो अच्छा होगा। गृह मंत्री जी ने इस बात को इतना महत्वपूर्ण समझा कि अपने भाषण का प्रारम्भ यहीं से किया। लेकिन मैंने उनको ऐसा लिखा तो कोई अपराध नहीं किया। इसका कारण यह था कि श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू की हमेशा यह आदत रही कि जब भी कोई इस प्रकार की चर्चा होती थी, कि जिसमें अधिकांश सदस्य हिन्दी में बोलते थे

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका जवाब क्या है, वह बोल दीजिये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह बिलकुल उचित बात है।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उसका उत्तर वह हिन्दी में देते थे, लेकिन कुछ सदस्यों के लिए जो हिन्दी नहीं समझते थे, वे बाद में अंग्रेजी में भी बोलते थे। मैं समझता था कि श्री नन्दा उसी पद्धति का अनुसरण करेंगे।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, कई माननीय सदस्यों ने और विशेष कर गृह मंत्री जी ने इस बात को और ध्यान आकषिप्त किया कि अब तो सरकार निर्णय कर ही चुकी है। अब इस समस्या को सदन में उठाने का विशेष अभिप्राय क्या है? मैं उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपके माध्यम से सरकार पर दोष लगाना चाहता हूँ। पहले भी इस प्रकार पंजाब के विभाजन का प्रश्न आया था। जब एक बार संत फतह सिंह और एक बार मास्टर तारा सिंह ने अनशन किया था। उस समय भी देश के सामने विषम स्थिति उत्पन्न हुई थी। लेकिन उस समय की सरकार पार्लियामेंट को इतना महत्व देती थी कि सरकार अपना निर्णय पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों की राय जानने के बाद घोषित करती थी। उस पर दो बार

चर्चयें यहां हुईं और सरकार ने अपना विचार संसद के माध्यम से देश को दिया। लेकिन आज की सरकार संसद को इतना महत्वहीन समझ बैठी है कि पंजाब के मामले पर जो पिछले 18 माल से बराबर यही कहती रही थी, कि उस का विभाजन नहीं होगा। कांग्रेस वकिंग कमेटी ने और कैबिनेट ने अलग बैठकर निर्णय कर लिया और पार्लियामेंट को विश्वास में लेना उचित या आवश्यक नहीं समझा। जब सीमा रेखा खींचने लगी उस के पहले भी सरकार ने पार्लियामेंट को विश्वास में लेना आवश्यक नहीं समझा। मैंने इस प्रस्ताव को उपस्थित कर देश के इतिहास में एक अध्याय जोड़ना चाहा था कि सरकार अपनी भूल को कम से कम अब तो सुधारे। पहले जिस पार्लियामेंट को विश्वास में लिये बिना इतने बड़े निर्णय नहीं लिये जाते थे अब इस मामले पर उसके प्रतिनिधियों की राय भी नहीं ली गई।

सरकार इस प्रस्ताव के माध्यम से इस भूल को सुधारेगी। इस आधार पर मैंने इस प्रस्ताव को उपस्थित किया था। साथ ही साथ यह भी चाहा था कि इस प्रस्ताव के माध्यम से सरकार जो अब तक असावधानी करती चली आई है आगे तो असावधानी नहीं करेगी।

जब श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा ने यह बात कही कि उस समय के जो नेता थे, उस समय की क्या परिस्थितियां थी? जिस पर वे पंजाब के विभाजन का विरोध करते थे। आज वे नेता होते तो क्या निर्णय लेते, उन्होंने कहा कि मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता। मैं श्री नन्दा से पूछता हूँ और ज्ञानी जी से भी जो अपनी निजी बाकिफयल के आधार पर कहते हैं कि श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू कभी पंजाब के विभाजन के विरोधी नहीं थे। शायद यह उनकी निजी जानकारी है।

लेकिन मेरे हाथ में वह तथ्य हैं जो संत फतह सिंह के साथ तीन बार श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू की बात हुई, और तीनों बार की बातों का विवरण जो उन्होंने सभा की मेज पर रखा। इस में कदम कदम पर श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जो शब्द कहे हैं मैं उन्हीं शब्दों को उन्हीं की भाषा में पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने संत जी को कहा

“दूसरी जगहों पर जहां भी भाषाई सूत्र का अनुसरण किया गया था, जैसा कि आंध्र और गुजरात तथा महाराष्ट्र में, अल्पसंख्यकों का कोई प्रश्न ही नहीं था। यह एक सर्वसम्मत मांग थी। दूसरी तरफ, पंजाब में हालत बिल्कुल भिन्न है और वैसे कोई सर्वसम्मति नहीं। यदि पंजाब में विभाजन किया जाए तो वहां शांति और स्थायित्व नहीं रहेगा और आर्थिक प्रगति नहीं हो सकेगी।”

इसके बाद 1 मार्च 1961 को हुई संत फतह सिंह और श्री नेहरू की मुलाकात में श्री नेहरू ने स्पष्ट कहा था :

“पंजाब का विभाजन केवल पंजाब के लिए ही नहीं, बल्कि मिर्छों और हिन्दुओं के लिए भी हानिकारक होगा और वास्तव में यह सम्पूर्ण भारत के लिए हानिकारक होगा। यदि ऐसी सभी मांगें पूरी की जायें तो भारत टुकड़ों टुकड़ों में बंट जाएगा और किसी भी प्रकार की तरक्की सम्भव नहीं हो सकेगी।”

इसके साथ ही मेरे पास श्री नेहरू का एक पत्र भी है जिस में उन्होंने स्पष्ट रूप से

कहा था कि पंजाब विभाजन की मांग को हम कभी स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते।

राजनीतिक नेताओं के प्रतिरिक्त भी भारत सरकार ने जब राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की स्थापना की थी, तब उस के सामने भी पंजाब के विभाजन का प्रश्न उठाया था। राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने इस प्रश्न पर विचार किया था और अपनी रिपोर्ट के अनुच्छेद 540 में उसने जो कुछ कहा था उसकी तीन बार शक्तियां मैं आपको पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ। उस ने कहा था :

“प्रस्ताविक राज्य से भाषा सम्बन्धी समस्या और साम्प्रदायिक समस्या का समाधान तो होगा नहीं और वह आन्तरिक तनाव जो साम्प्रदायिक दलों से है और भाषायी क्षेत्रीय दलों में नहीं दूर होने के बजाय वर्तमान भावनायें और बिगड़ जायेंगी।”

15 hrs.

यह किसी राजनीतिक नेता की राय नहीं है बल्कि इस सरकार के द्वारा जो राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग बना था उसकी राय है।

इसके प्रतिरिक्त जो विशेष बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ और जिस से आज पंजाब और सारे देश को खेद है, वह यह है कि कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी का निर्णय होने से पहले पंजाब के मुख्यमंत्री और पंजाब के गृह-मंत्री बराबर पंजाब में घूम घूम कर स्थान स्थान पर यह कह रहे थे कि पंजाब का विभाजन नहीं होगा। कांग्रेस का इस मामले में स्पष्ट मत है कि पंजाब के टुकड़े नहीं किये जा सकते हैं। इस निर्णय के बाद पंजाब के अन्दर कुछ हत्यायें हुईं। मैं कभी हिंसा का समर्थक नहीं रहा हूँ। और न अब हूँ। पानीपत के अन्दर जिनकी ओर से भी वे घटनायें हुई हैं और तीन आदिमियों को दुकान में बन्द कर के जलाया गया इसकी

[श्री प्रकाशचंदी सास्त्री]

मैं बोर निन्दा कर चुका हूँ और अब भी करता हूँ। लेकिन क्या श्री नन्दा इस बात को बतायेंगे कि उन तीन भावमिथों के प्रतिरिक्त जो ग्यारह भादमी और पंजाब के अन्दर भरे क्या वे बिना मां बाप के थे? और क्या आप उनको किसी तरह का कोई संरक्षण प्रदान नहीं कर सकते थे? क्या आपका कोई उत्तरदायित्व नहीं था? इन चौदह व्यक्तियों की हत्याओं का दोष भारत सरकार और पंजाब के मुख्य मंत्री और वहाँ के गृह मंत्री पर है। वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री और गृह-मंत्री बराबर यह कहते फिरते रहे "कि पंजाब का विभाजन नहीं होगा। अगर विभाजन करना था तो पंजाब की सरकार का यह कर्तव्य भी था कि वह पंजाब के लोगों का मन इसके लिए पहले तैयार करती ताकि इस प्रकार से एक हम भाग न भड़कती और एकदम से इस प्रकार घबरे भाग्य के सम्बन्ध में दूसरी छत्तर सुन कर उन में किसी प्रकार क तन ब न धाता या किसी प्रकार का रोष न बढ़े।।।

मैंने एक सुझाव रखा था कि भारतवर्ष को पांच भागों में विभक्त करके एक केन्द्रीय सरकार यूनिटरी फॉर्म आफ गवर्नमेंट जिस को कहते हैं वह यहां स्थापित की जाए एक मजबूत सरकार कायम की जाए इस तरह की मजबूत सरकार अगर बन जाए तो वह सारे देश को एकता के सूत्र में बांध सकती है। श्री नन्दा ने इस के जबाब में कहा है कि कभी भागे चल कर इस प्रकार का समय आएगा तो शायद इस पर विचार हो सकता है। क्या मैं उन से पूछ सकता हूँ कि उनकी सरकार ने आषाढार प्रान्त बनाने के बाद क्या इस बात का प्राथमिक क्षेत्रीय परिषदें बना कर नहीं किया? पंत जी ने जो सारे देश को पांच भागों में विभक्त किया तो क्या वह धीरे धीरे इसी रास्ते पर धाना नहीं चाहते थे कि चार पांच रज्यों का पुलिस एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन एक हो जाए, न्यायपालिका एक हो जाए

और इस प्रकार से चार पांच क्षेत्रों में जितनी अधिक से अधिक एकता हो सके वह स्थापित की जाए।

लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि भारत सरकार चीफ मिनिस्टर्स के चक्कर में घा कर इतनी झुकती और बबती जा रही है कि इस प्रकार का महत्वपूर्ण निर्णय जो राष्ट्र की एकता को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए जरूरी है, उसकी बराबर उपेक्षा कर रही है।

इस सब को कहने का मेरा एक बहुत बड़ा कारण यह है कि कम से कम इतिहास इस बात को न लिखे कि जब देश छोटे छोटे टुकड़ों में बंटता जा रहा था और देश के अन्दर खंड खंड होने की प्रवृत्ति उदय हो रहा था, उस समय हिन्दुस्तान में इस प्रकार का चिन्तन ही समाप्त हो गया था। सरकार को इसके बाद बारे में सावधान करने वाले व्यक्ति देश के अन्दर नहीं रहे थे।

अपने बक्तव्य को समाप्ति की ओर ले जाते हुए मैं एक और आवश्यक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। ज्ञानी गुरुमुख सिंह जी मुसाफिर ने इसकी चर्चा की है। आपने भी शायद इसकी चर्चा की है। विद्यालंकार जी भी इसकी चर्चा करते थे। मैं स्पष्ट भाषा में कहता हूँ कि मैंने जब उस दिन आपको उत्तर दिया था तो वह दबी हुई भाषा में नहीं दिया था। मैं मजबूती के साथ उसको दोहराता हूँ मैं कभी इस बात का पक्षपाती नहीं रहा कि पंजाबी की लिपि गुरुमुखी न रहे या पंजाब में या अन्यत्र गुरुमुखी लिपि को समाप्त कर दिया जाए मेरा कहना यह है कि पंजाब के अन्दर अगर कोई भादमी देवनागरी लिपि में भी लिख कर एप्लीकेशन दे या उस के माध्यम से काम करना चाहे तो तथा कथित पंजाबी सूबे की सरकार उसको ऐसा करने की स्वतंत्रता दे। उस पर यह बन्धन नहीं होना चाहिए कि वह उस में काम न कर सके। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी अगर

उत्तर प्रदेश में कोई उर्दू में लिख कर एप्लीकेशन कचहरियों में देता है तो उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने किसी प्रकार का कोई उस पर प्रतिबन्ध नहीं लगा रखा है। अगर उत्तर प्रदेश में यह स्थिति हो सकती है तो पंजाब में भी वह स्थिति रहनी चाहिये। यह मेरा बड़ा अभिप्राय था। इसको मैं फिर दोहराना चाहता हूँ ...

श्री प्र० ना० विद्यालंकार : बंगला, गुजराती भाषा के लिए भी क्या प्राप इसको मानते हैं ?

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री हमारे विद्यालंकार श्री ने बहुत प्रशंसा प्रकृत किया है और मैं इसका उत्तर देना चाहता हूँ। यह मेरा निर्णय नहीं है। यह मुख्य मंत्रियों का सर्वसम्मत निर्णय है जिसको श्री अबाहर माल नेहरू की अध्यक्षता में स्वीकार किया गया था कि हर प्रान्त के अन्दर एक वैकल्पिक लिपि देवनागरी के रूप में स्वीकार कर ली जाए। बंगाली की अपनी लिपि सुरक्षित रहते हुए अगर देवनागरी में भी कोई बंगला को लिखना चाहे तो उसकी उसे स्वतन्त्रता होना चाहिये। यह निर्णय मुख्य मंत्री सर्वसम्मति से कर चुके हैं। इस में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये।

प्रश्न में जो बातें मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। नब्बा जी ने या किसी सदस्य ने अगर मेरे उर्क का उत्तर दिया होता तो मुझे बड़ी ही प्रसन्नता होती कि अगर 1961 के धाकड़ों को प्राप झूठ मानते हैं और यह कहते हैं कि वे धाकड़े साम्प्रदायिक अहाब में आकर तैयार हुए तो प्राप बतायें कि जालंधर के अन्दर छः लाख हिन्दू जो रहते थे उन में से अगर लाख ने ही हिन्दी क्यों लिखवाई ? दो लाख आदिमियों ने क्यों अपनी भाषा पंजाबी लिखवाई ? सारे पंजाब के धाकड़े मेरे मित्र सिद्धान्ती जी ने दिये हैं कि सोलह लाख हिन्दुओं ने अपनी भाषा पंजाबी लिखाई। सब किस आधार पर प्राप कहते हैं कि साम्प्रदायिकता के प्रभाव में आकर भाषा लिखाई गई ?

1961 के धाकड़ों को प्राप छोड़ दें। पंजाब विश्वविद्यालय के धाकड़ों को प्राप लें। वहाँ पर 62 प्रतिशत बच्चे हिन्दी के माध्यम से बैठे। मैट्रिकुलेशन परीक्षाओं में 73 प्रतिशत ने हिन्दी माध्यम को स्वीकार किया। जब ऐसी स्थिति है तो फिर जन गणना के आधार पर कैसे प्राप कहते हैं कि पंजाब के अन्दर हिन्दी का कोई क्षेत्र नहीं है या इसका कोई भविष्य नहीं है। दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि पंजाब में जहाँ हिन्दी कभी राष्ट्रीयता का स देन ले कर गई थी विभाजन से पूर्व, आज इस सरकार की गलत नीतियों के कारण उसी हिन्दी को पंजाब के अन्दर एक साम्प्रदायिक रूप दिया जा रहा है। जो एक राष्ट्रीयता का बहाणा बन कर गई थी और राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन की सहायक बन कर गई थी उसी हिन्दी के बारे में सरकार की गलत नीतियों के कारण प्राप उसकी यह दुर्गति होती चली जा रही है।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रागे के लिए प्राप सही निर्णय लें। मास्टर तारा सिंह से प्रापने अनुरोध किया है कि वह बनने वाले पंजाबी सूबे के वातावरण को न बिगाड़ें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसके साथ साथ एक और निश्चय भी केन्द्रीय सरकार दड़ना से ने पंजाब से ही नहीं बरन् सारे हिन्दुस्तान से सम्बन्धित वह निर्णय लिया जाए। निर्णय यह लिया जाय कि कोई भी राजनीतिक आन्दोलन प्रत्यानों में बैठकर नहीं चलाया जा सकेगा। क्या धर्म स्थान कोई दूसरे देश है कि वहाँ पुलिस नहीं जा सकती है। या सी० आई० डी० नहीं जा सकती है ? अगर प्रापने ऐसा निर्णय नहीं लिया तो इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि कब को जितने भी तत्पर व्यापारी हैं वे सब धर्म स्थानों में अकर शरण लेंगे, और वहाँ बैठकर गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ या देश के खिलाफ विद्रोह की भावना प्रकटायेंगे। सरकार ने अगर इस सम्बन्ध में कोई निर्णय नहीं किया है तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्रागेके लिए तो कम से कम वह इस बात पर निर्णय

[श्री प्रकाशवीर कस्तूरी]

लें कि घर्मस्थानों का राजनीतिक प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग नहीं किया जा सकेगा ।

श्री नन्दा ने अगर इन बातों पर विचार नहीं किया है अभी तक तो अब करें ताकि भागे चल कर इस बात का सुधार किया जा सके । मैं आशा करता हूँ कि वह इस ओर अवश्य ध्यान देंगे

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is an amendment by Shri Siddhanti. I shall put it to the vote.

The amendment was put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House takes note of the statement made in the House by the Minister of Home Affairs on the 18th April, 1966 regarding the reorganisation of the present state of Punjab."

The motion was adopted.

15.08 hrs.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK BILL

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): I move:

"That the Bill to implement the international agreement for the establishment and operation of the Asian Development Bank and for matters connected therewith, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Sir, this Bill as it stands is a relatively simple Bill. It provides mainly for two matters; the first, according to clause 3 of the Bill, provides essentially for payment of share capital to the bank. These payments have been detailed in the

Financial Memorandum covering the Bill. It is needless for me to add that before each payment is made, budgetary approval of Parliament will have to be sought and obtained.

The second is in regard to the extension in India of certain immunities, exemptions and privileges relating to the Asian Development Bank, its officers and employees. These have been detailed in the schedule to the Bill. I may say that these immunities etc., are analogous to those enjoyed by other international financial institutions including the World Bank and the Regional Development Banks serving other parts of the world such as the Inter-American Development Bank and the African Development Bank.

While the Bill thus formally seeks to elicit specific concurrence of this House to the matters detailed therein, I am sure that Hon'ble Members would like to go beyond the Bill to the real subject-matter namely the Asian Development Bank itself. A copy of the Agreement detailing the structure, functions etc. of the proposed Bank has been supplied to each Hon'ble Member. The growth of international institutions that engage in economic aid operations in developing countries on a multilateral basis has been a feature of the past ten years or so. The World Bank and its affiliates, which enjoy the status of being Specialised Agencies of the United Nations, have discharged a signal role in the financing of economic development in the newly emerging areas of the world over the past decade or so; similarly there have been the United Nations Special Fund and certain other activities of a multilateral international character that have greatly helped the development process. Yet, at the same time, there has come to be an awareness, and recognition, that there is a legitimate role for regional development banks through which countries contiguously situated in the under-developed areas of the world

could cooperate among themselves, and perhaps with capital exporting countries, with the purpose of accelerating the process of growth. The Inter-American Development Bank that was founded some years ago has done signal work in Central and South America. The African Development Bank which was a later creation stands poised for action. The Asian Development Bank with which we are now concerned is a logical further step.

Hon'ble Members may ask what the rationale is of such regional development banks, and in particular, of the Asian one. It is clearly expected that it would be a surge of additional capital inflows into the region for the purpose of economic development; it would there by increase the pace of growth. Secondly, by the very fact of being a regional organisation and hence being, so to say, closer to the ground, it would be in a position to engage, with more expedition and with more local expertise, in the economic problems, programmes and plans of the area than is perhaps possible for global organisations; for instance, it can use considerably more initiative in identifying projects either of a national or a regional character that can be financed to the benefit of the country or of the region. Thirdly, and quite significantly, it can help in drawing the nations of the area closer together in the constructive aspects of human existence. It has been for long India's view-point that the main cause of unrest—whether national, regional or international—is economic backwardness. In devising the Asian Development Bank as a tool for the acceleration of growth in the area on a cooperative basis, we may be doing a lot to disarm unrest and to relax tensions in the area.

It is, in fact, the experience of the Inter-American Development Bank that its operations have led to certain amount of economic cohesiveness and that it is an useful adjunct to the growing sense of economic cooperation in that area. It has also been the ex-

perience of that Bank that identification of real needs, whether economic or quasi-economic, can be done easier, and the preparation of the project done more expeditiously, if there is a regional institution.

It is for these reasons that, under the auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and Far East, a lot of intensive work was done since March 1964 toward the setting up of an Asian Development Bank. It naturally took a few months for the idea to catch on. Considerable support was given by the encouragement extended by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to this concept. Under the auspices of the ECAFE, missions consisting of senior officials deputed by nine Regional countries (including India) visited not only the countries of the ECAFE region but also Western countries inclusive of the USSR and Czechoslovakia to muster support for the Asian Bank. It is as a result of this intensive work that we have before us the "Agreement Establishing the Asian Development Bank" and that a sum of \$992.08 millions has already been found out of an original target of \$1 billion.

A word may be said about the organisation of the proposed Bank. The membership of the Bank is open not only to countries in the region but also to outside countries since it has been recognised as being completely consistent with the objective of the Bank that external capital be recruited for Asia's economic development. The criteria for membership are that (a) *inside* the region of the ECAFE, membership in that organisation will be the deciding factor and (b) *outside* the region, either direct participation in, or association in some form with, the United Nations will be a prerequisite. Each country that is a member will be entitled to have one Governor on the Board of Governors of the Bank. The voting rights will be distributed 20 per cent equally among all countries and 80 per cent in proportion to their share capital. For

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

everyday management, there will be a Board of Directors elected by the Board of Governors in consonance with a prescribed voting formula. The chief official of the Bank would be its President; to be appointed by the Board of Governors and to be aided by one or more Vice-Presidents whom he can appoint with the approval of the Board of Directors.

In its functioning the framers of the Charter have been very realistic. They have recognised that it is essential to build up sound traditions and reputation for the Asian Bank and have, therefore, confined 90 per cent of the capital subscriptions to use in furthering distinct and viable economic projects, not more than 10 per cent of the share-capital as also any special funds that the Bank might obtain by special arrangements with any donor country, can be utilised in other forms of assistance of a soft nature. The Bank can also float loans in the capital markets of the world with the concurrence of the country concerned. In one sense, it is a very good feature that the Bank that the Asians set up for themselves will be, so to say, directed in the first instance towards achieving a high credit-rating in the capital markets of the world; it is by its own practice of financial discipline and prudence that the Bank can best serve as an example to member-countries.

As I have already said, the share capital was expected to be \$ 1 billion; when the work started, it was expected that about \$ 600 million would be raised from within the region and \$ 400 million would be raised from outside. It is a matter of gratification that the regional countries have contributed over \$42 millions in excess of \$600 millions and equally a matter of gratification that we have practically reached the aggregate target. India's own total contribution will be U.S. \$93 million. Of this, only 50 per cent will be called up and that too equally in foreign exchange and in local

currency spread over a period of five years; the incidence of these payments is shown in the Financial Memorandum. With a subscription of this magnitude, India would be, within the region the second largest contributor to the Asian Bank, and within all the membership, the third largest; Japan and the USA will be contributing \$200 million each. That India should be contributing more than many other Asian countries to the capital of the Asian Bank is of course in keeping with India's position. The contribution of a portion in convertible currency comes as a time when our foreign exchange situation is under severe strain. Yet, we believe that this strain is well worth taking since the objective is good. If, as I hope, the Agreement relating to the Asian Development Bank is implemented in the spirit in which it was framed, if the Bank is staffed and managed on the basis of merit and not of group or individual interest, and if in dealing with the Bank, member-countries will remember that its health is as important to them as their own, we need have no doubt that the interests of economic cohesion and of economic co-operation in this region would have been well served and that India would have played a due role in it.

15.18 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Procedurally, I would like to report to the House that the draft Agreement was finalised at a meeting of Asian Ministers in Manila in December 1965 and that, I, as representative of India, signed the Agreement. This was only the first step; a country's accession to the Bank will become final only when it has ratified its signature and made its first contribution to the capital. This we hope to do when both the Houses of Parliament are pleased to approve of the Bill. When, according to Article 65 of the Agreement a certain number

of countries with a specified percentage of total voting strength have ratified their signatures, the first Board of Governors can meet and formally set up the Asian Bank.

I am sure that Hon'ble Members would wish God-speed to the Bank.

I move that the Bill be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to implement the international agreement for the establishment and operation of the Asian Development Bank and for matters connected therewith be taken into consideration."

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry I have to oppose this motion. My hon. friend, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance said that it was a relatively simple proposition, that I find it rather a disturbing matter and this country would need a great deal more satisfaction if it can really be persuaded into accepting this Bill.

Sir, I was told by the Minister that the agreement which this country has already entered into for the establishment and operation of the Asian Development Bank has been made available to us, but as far as I know, apart from the provisions of the agreement which are listed in the Schedule, we have not had access to the other articles of the agreement. The Schedule mentions certain things relative specially to immunity, exemptions and privileges, but apart from that a major part of the agreement has not been laid before Parliament.

I find also that clause 5 confers wide privileges and immunities though, perhaps, I should say, some are doubtful persons, foreigners as well as others. I am told, of course, by the Minister that these exemptions are similar to those enjoyed by other international agencies in this country as well as elsewhere. But that brings

me back to the fundamental proposition as to whether this particular Asian Development Bank, projected in the way it has been, would be of real assistance to our country.

The Minister appeared to me to be making certain naive assumptions about this project being a very useful instrument for the acceleration of growth, and I felt it particularly when he referred to the Inter-American Development Bank which is not particularly an exemplar as far as countries like ours are concerned. We know how in the American continent domination of US big money is made sure by the operation of many agencies among which is Inter-American Development Bank.

When this matter of the Asian Bank had come, and this has been pending for quite some time now, I think since 1964, the question had been raised in this country as to how Asian was the Asian Bank. Is there a really genuine Asian bias to this Asian Development Bank? The answer, I am afraid, is to be in the negative. This organisation is planned to be completely dominated by the United States of America through her friends in Asia like Japan and Thailand and also America's Asian cousin, Australia.

Right at the very start, I should say, the Bank has got off on the wrong foot, and the wool is being pulled over the eyes of us poor Asians. I am very sorry the Government has swallowed the kind of bait which they have put forward.

In the early days when this Asian Development Bank was in the process of negotiation, the United States and Japanese attitude towards it was rather cold as could be seen in the March 1965 meeting at Wellington in New Zealand of their Economic Commission of Asia and the Far East. But all that coldness and indifference on the part, particularly, of the United States and Japan, the two major factors in this situation, suddenly changed when President Johnson

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

made somewhat dramatically the announcement that the United States would put a billion dollars for providing assistance to South-East Asia, to show the world that Americans could dangle the carrot just as they were wielding the big stick in South-East Asia. He also appointed at that time the former President of the World Bank, Mr. Eugene Black as Administrator of this Fund which he was inaugurating. At once, after President Johnson's announcement, there began comings and goings. Mr. Walter Rostow, the United States top economic planner, went to Japan, from Japan a high-powered economic mission went to Washington and both these countries suddenly began to wax enthusiastic about Asian Bank in a manner which was considerably in contrast to the earlier reservations. Overnight a lot of warmth was created in regard to this particular project.

It seems, however, that there is a strategy for this Bank. Of the proposed 1000 million dollars, about 500 million dollars are to be raised between Japan and the United States of America and Australia. Particularly, with the help of countries like South Korea, South Vietnam, Philippines and Thailand, and Malaysia being also drawn into this constellation, a solid block of 600 million dollars would be under the control of United States and of Japan working in unison. The rest of the Asian countries like ourselves—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Afghanistan, Nepal and Iran would contribute and control about 400 million dollars with India's share at 93 million dollars as against Japan's quota of 200 million dollars. India, in this Asian Development Bank, will be in a permanent minority. United States and Japan, with all the smaller countries in the Pacific area, which are virtually satellites, US satellites, will dominate the bank management. Of course, some Indians might have a few glittering but inconsequential jobs on the management staff, but I do wish that that kind of thing do not

tempt us into some very dangerous parlours. My grouse is that India's position in the Asian Development Bank will not be even as good as in the World Bank where we had a permanent director, not an elective one. Here the US-Japanese predominance would be a ruling the roost. It is common knowledge that a Japanese would be the first President. Even his name was not much of a secret in recent discussions in different countries. India would have to take whatever position is offered to it by the Japanese and the Americans and will at no time be able to mobilise enough voting strength to neutralise any political stand jointly taken by the United States and Japan. And, we know for a fact that these political stands are taken in order to jeopardise and vitiate and distort economic policies which if the world was behaving in a rational manner would really redound to the benefit of the common people of our planet.

This position of inferiority is being accepted by India with her eyes open, by my friends of the Government and their civil servants, to play the role of bankers, and they do not even care to grasp the basic issues behind all these international banking operation projects which are linked up with world politics on a scale which, I am sure, our Minister of External Affairs is beginning to understand, and when he really gets a grasp of the matter he ought to be able to intervene and tell his colleagues that these are dangerous manoeuvres into which, without knowing everything about them, we should not walk with our eyes bound, so to speak, without knowing what to do.

My hon. friend, the Minister, talked about the African Development Bank and I am glad that he did it because in the case of the African Development Bank, which had come up well ahead of the Asian Development Bank, the Africans had successfully resisted the temptation of having their bank

dominated by non-African powers. But, as it is emerging, there is nothing Asian about the Asian Development Bank.

India seems hardly aware of what it is doing to harm its own future role and stakes in the world economy. India should know what happens in such places as the World Economic Conference where Shri Manubhai Shah, as the Minister of Commerce, represented this country and came back with a very good report about the potentialities. India should know how certain financial interests operate in the world and India should know in particular the set-up in South East Asia and the Pacific Sea Board where American influence is today active in a manner which is so blatantly obvious in South Vietnam.

Early in December last year there was a meeting in Manila in the Philippines where steps were taken which helped the United States becoming the virtual director of the so-called Asian Development Bank. After this we found in the American press jubilant comments as to how this Asian Development Bank was a kind of a blind for American supremacy in that part of the world. The *New York Herald Tribune* wrote with satisfaction how the Bank would be managed by the United States. Some Asian countries, it was true, were asking for a greater share in management for Asians, but their demand lacked muscle. "Muscle" is exactly the word used by the *New York Herald Tribune* so that, although called an Asian bank, it would really be a smaller edition of the US-managed World Bank.

This kind of confidence which was shown by a very knowledgeable newspaper like the *New York Herald Tribune* was not without justification. The charter of the Asian Bank gives majority votes to the industrial countries led by the US and her associates in Asia, like Australia and New Zealand. This charter has been signed on the dotted line by the ministers of Asian countries, including, unfortunately, ours.

Why have Asians done this to themselves? Why have we done this to ourselves? Perhaps, one reason is that our Government has no appreciation of what they are singing away. Perhaps, there is a fear that unless management rights are given to the industrial countries, capital will not come to be nighted countries like India. Simple civil servants from several small Asian countries are asked to draft the Bank's charter without being bankers. They do not realise how the power of management stands related to voting rights.

Officials have, perhaps, argued that since non-Asian countries will have 40 per cent of the equity, Asians will have the majority vote. But actually that is not the way in which things happen in these international organisations. Technically whatever the position might be, the set-up is such and American ways of controlling certain other countries, which are virtually its satellites, are so much there that we shall be in a very difficult situation.

Then again the Economic Commission for Asia, which played an important role in preparing the Bank's charter, has perhaps been found to be sadly deficient in technically effective leadership. They were people drawn from many countries but they were usually such as could be depended upon to underwrite United States' interests and the United States' viewpoint. We find, for instance, that two of these Economic Commission for Asia officials were from the Philippines and the other came from Costa Rica from the staff of the Inter-American Development Bank. The ECAFE's own staff is so weak, so muddled, so diffident that they are unable really to understand the position.

Then, we have also to remember the most important factor which is quite patent in the present day, that the United States is now settling down to a secure position from which to manipulate Asian economic policies thanks to the emergence in the Pacific

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Sea Board of, what may be described as, an American Asia and that is linked up with so many things which are happening in that part of the world. What happened in Indonesia lately in which the hand of the C.I.A. was visible to whoever had eyes to see? That was the part of a grand conspiracy in order to make sure that the entire Pacific sea-board becomes the American sphere of influence in Asia. Therefore, we discovered that there are on the Pacific sea board countries, a whole string of countries, who seem to have no choice—Mr. Swaran Singh, the External Affairs Minister knows very much about it—but to be nosed by the United States at the present moment.

Our misfortune is that India, our own country, is too preoccupied with their problems, internal as well as external. We are unable to offer any leadership to Asia even in terms of ideas let alone in terms of money and that is why we have to go about with a begging bowl in our hands, that is why we have to consign away our economic freedom in dozes which are so sugar-coated that we do not quite see the essence of the matter. We are too preoccupied with our problems and are unable to offer any leadership to Asia in terms of ideas even let alone in terms of money and we leave smaller States, our neighbours, our potential friends, to remain happy in a state of serfdom to the United States. Therefore, in our part of the world, there is growing most unhappily, and our country will have to take note of it sooner or later, if we do not do sooner rather than later, we shall have to pay penalties, a sort of negative equilibrium where conflicts and suspicions among themselves are holding down all these countries and the little powers are joining hands to make things safe for Westerns, particularly, United States policy interests in Asia.

I concede that some useful results in terms of figures, in a petty sense, may emerge from an American-direct-

ed Asian Development Bank which it is going to be but they will be results conceived and supported in the interest of United States foreign policy in Asia which will not be the same as the aims and objectives of an Asian long-term economic policy. For a long time, the dream of Western policy-makers has been that of creating enough divisions and diversions within Asia so that conflict of interests here, among ourselves, will create a negative balance. That dream, that bad old dream of the neo-colonialists seems to be in the process of realisation as reflected in the structure and the composition of the Asian Development Bank. The Western objective today is the same as that which led the United Kingdom diligently in this country to work for the partition of India and set up Malaysia as a separate entity in order to frustrate the larger and genuinely Asian concept of Map-hilindo. The dream of these neo-colonialists is nearing fulfilment because India and Pakistan are cancelling each other out in mutual conflict and the small South-East Asian countries are rushing like chicken under the American wing, all too ready to accept the United States economic and military aid projects which are conceived essentially in the foreign policy interest of America but which unfortunately for us are being publicised as Asian development projects.

It is not just an accident that the Economic Commission for Asia holds most of its seminars and meetings in places like Manila, Bangkok or Tokyo or that the 9-Nation Economic Conference of South-East Asian countries, mostly of American Asia, held some time ago in Tokyo talked about welding together development policies. That was under Japanese and American guidance. This was to be the nucleus of an Asian development plan with a high falutin title which gives my friend an opportunity of coming before us to suggest that here is an innocent little scheme about which nobody need have any worry. It is

relatively a simple matter, you just accept it and there is hardly any audience in the House even to listen to what the Minister says. Nobody cares to read it; people are busy with all kinds of other things in the Central Hall and elsewhere and this kind of very important economic proposition is placed before the country, before the Parliament, pushed through, without us knowing a great deal about it. We cannot give okay, a line clear to the Government unless we know more about it.

Neo-colonialism securing many notable successes under the aegis of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East is a fact of recent history, and the Government of India wittingly or unwittingly is lending a helping hand. So, I am quite disturbed; I am very disturbed by this Bill. I am not at all satisfied with what the Minister says.

As far as I know, we have not got the full text of the agreement except for a few extracts which are included in the Schedule to the Bill. At least, I have had no access to it. I asked my hon. friend, Shri Kamath about it. He is a very diligent person, and a very diligent Member of this House, and he keeps track of what is supplied and what is not supplied. But we have not got the full text of the agreement. But even so...

Shri B. E. Bhagat: On a point of clarification. The full text was circulated to all the Members by the Lok Sabha Secretariat on the 27th April, 1966.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am sorry; I stand corrected, if the text was circulated to everybody; but I have not got it myself. I asked Shri Kamath about it. I am sorry he is not here at the moment to confirm me. Anyhow, I accept the hon. Minister's statement. But even if the full text was there—after all, we could guess what it is, from what is included here; the more important provisions about exemptions

from judicial proceedings and other kinds of immunities and privileges are delineated here—I am completely unsatisfied with this. The point that I want to raise is this. I am glad the External Affairs Minister is here. This is a matter linked up with our foreign policy objectives. This is a matter which we should go into very much more deeply than we have had a chance of doing. This is a Bill which should not be hurried through in this House. The country should have a better opportunity to find out what is what. We have it in our papers like the *Economic Weekly*, which has ceased publication lately from Bombay, calling this the American Asian Bank. I might be in the bad books of Government, and whatever I say might be disregarded by Government, but here is a very respectable academic economic journal which after very serious consideration of all the negotiations which preceded this project of the Asian Development Bank asks very fundamental questions about this being virtually an American Asian Bank. Today's situation being what it is, when there is an attempt all over the world to campaign against India, to blacken our reputation, by seeing that we are in the American pocket, that we are in the American sphere of influence, that we are going the way of South Viet Nam and South Korea and Taiwan and Philippines and God knows what other country, when this kind of thing is going on, and when we know for a fact ourselves what the dangers are of the American kind of infiltration in different countries, the neo-colonialist infiltration, imperialism in a new guise, when we know all about it, it is very dangerous to enter into this kind of agreement. Then again here even compared to India's position in the World Bank, her position would be much worse. We do not have a permanent seat on the board. We have an elective seat. And what are the methods of election? The hon. Minister has said that the voting rights will be 20 per cent equally for all, and 80 per cent relative to share

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

capital, which would make it impossible for India, unless India's candidature is supported by the USA and Japan, ever to be in the directive apparatus, and India from what it looks like has already agreed to take a back seat and to work in the fashion that American and Japan leading the so-called Asian development project want us to take.

That is why I object to this thing. I do wish that Government had the good sense to withdraw it for the time being, and to bring it up before the House next session and give the House a better opportunity when it is more in the mood to try and probe and understand the implications of this matter. I am not an expert in these things, but I have access to certain material which makes me feel extremely apprehensive about it. Therefore, I would ask the Minister to withdraw if he possibly can this Bill and in any case if he goes ahead with this, I shall have to be constrained to oppose it with all my strength.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): I have heard every word that my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee has said on this Asian Development Bank Bill. First of all, I would like to say something with regard to the utilisation of a bank like this. Our country being backward, we want to develop it, and we want that there should be all-round development. For this, certain things are needed, and about these we must be very clear in our minds. We must know when to get those things, how to get those things and wherefrom to get those things.

As far as our country is concerned, our resources are limited. So the resources will have to be secured from some quarters. What can be those quarters? To my mind, those can be quarters, which are first of

all friendly with India, and secondly, which are in a position to advance us certain things. Naturally, keeping that in view, we shall have to be naturally selective on this matter. If we take the European countries, for instance, which are in a position to give us help, they are West Germany, Sweden, Switzerland and Great Britain, though not the latter could give as much help as the three other countries. Now, the point is this. What are the conditions under which we can secure this help? To what extent are they prepared to give? If you go into detail as to the conditions and terms on which these countries are prepared to lend to other countries, I must say very frankly that it will not lead us anywhere. We are a developing country, we are going to develop in a big way. We have to ask for bigger funds and bigger assistance.

I must not forget one thing. As far as political strings are concerned, they must be there. No country would lend to any other country on terms absolutely free of any strings. Take America, UK or any other country. They will have strings. But the question is whether the assistance is given with strings which will be acceptable to us. We have to see to that. I am the last person to say that it will ever be possible to get aid without conditions attached.

Therefore, we have to be selective and see whether the strings attached are in any way such as will jeopardise our political freedom or economic freedom, whether it affects our freedom to talk and discuss and whether it infringes on our rights in other ways, whether it infringes our policies, national or international. Keeping that in view, I do not see why should we go in for aid and assistance from other countries in order to develop this country.

Bank Bill

Today my friends have often been saying that we are going with a begging bowl. I would not say that, certainly not. In this country, we have either to sit idle or move forward, make moves to enhance our production, create more wealth in terms of money in the fields and factories. Only if we embark on the latter effort we will be able to increase the wealth of the country and lead it along the path of development and diversify our production in different ways so that our people can be benefited.

Keeping that in view, we should make every effort. Today every effort is being made to augment our export trade. In respect of certain things in the export trade, it may be a happy augury today. But how long will it last? I cannot say. India, though it started late, is today in a position to export her goods to countries far advanced in terms of industrial development, like America and some European countries. We have also been exporting to Australia and New Zealand. But how long will that last?

Therefore, we have to take the South East Asian countries round about. Excepting Japan, all the countries in this region are backward. Why should we not have unity of outlook, unity of thought and unity of action with the common object of economic development in this region? With this object in view, all the countries of this region can pool their resources, put their heads together. They can get assistance from friendly countries like America. If they are prepared to advance assistance to us on terms acceptable to us, I say yes. We are not ashamed to seek and utilize such assistance. We do not feel any hesitation in going to any other country for the same purpose. Take Russia. We have great respect for that country and the way they have developed their country. We need assistance from them also. Today we are getting it also. I do not know why there should

be any hesitation in seeking assistance on our terms.

Let one thing be made very very clear. When we seek and get assistance from other countries, those countries have also certain interests in mind. All that we have to see in accepting assistance is that two or three things are safeguarded, namely, our political freedom, our internal freedom and our economic freedom. We have to see that these things are in no way jeopardised.

Reading the Bill, with the agreement, I think it is a purely business document. It is a purely business agreement, it is nothing more, nothing less.

My hon. friend Shri Mukerjee, has said about the directorate. Of course, I have a feeling that now that we are subscribing nearly one-tenth of the total paid-up capital of this bank, there should be a permanent seat for India on the board of directors, a permanent director should have been given to India for the reason that we will be subscribing nearly one-tenth and we belong to this part of the world for which it is being set up, though I may not lay very much importance on that, because there are other things also.

Countries living in this whole area, including Middle East countries which are also backward, must think of aligning themselves in a number of ways in order to help themselves in trade, commerce, industry and other development purposes. Keeping this in view, if an opportunity is provided where a number of things which we waste today can be saved, I think I would welcome it.

What happens today? Last time we had conflict with Pakistan. Coming in conflict may be one thing, but at the same time the aid-giving countries from whom we were receiving aid, stopped it altogether. How it has retarded our progress is a matter which should be gone into. We could not get components for our civil production, no machinery, we could get no

[Shri Sham Lal Saraf]

foreign exchange for other things. The result is that today the backlog is quite heavy. This is one of the results because we could not have any foreign exchange readily available for us which could be utilised for such purposes. Keeping this in view, if there is a bank readily available, with finances readily available for our use, why should we not make use of that, because that bank will be helpful to us both for export and for our imports?

If I am correct, after we become a member of this bank, what we earn by way of export trade will be in foreign currency, and that will remain deposited at our credit. Is that not so?

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): That is so even now, even without this bank. There is nothing new about that.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Let me explain what I mean to say. Today we have to remain subservient to America and United Kingdom. Keeping that in view, if the rules of this bank are such that we are able to get foreign currencies whenever we need them, that should be accepted. Certain countries are prepared to give aid which we do take, in a number of ways we take it, but if we have a better way in which everybody is agreed, I do not know what harm there is in it. Keeping this in view, I would certainly say, in case we are able to get a permanent seat on the board of directors—I think India should seek it, India will deserve it because we are contributing one-tenth—in order to be much nearer, in order to understand our trade problems, commerce problems with our neighbours in Southeast Asia and other countries in the Middle East, if they are prepared to join this bank or have some dealings with this bank, this should be very much acceptable.

And then also, wherever we need foreign exchange for a number of things, I think it will be easier to utilise the foreign exchange that may be at the disposal of our country in this bank.

With these words, I fully associate myself with the feelings expressed by the hon. Minister and say again that we should try our utmost to get a permanent directorship on this bank.

श्री तन सिंह (बाइमेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ। इसके उद्देश्य का कारण निरापद है। अभी अभी इसके विरोध में श्री मुर्जी द्वारा जो सिद्धान्त और तर्क प्रस्तुत किये गये थे, उनमें एक बड़ा तर्क यह था कि हम अमरीका और पश्चिमी देशों पर बहुत ज्यादा निर्भर हो रहे हैं। वास्तव में बात यह है कि यदि हम उन की निर्भरता से पृथक होना चाहें, तो उसका एक मात्र उपाय यह है कि हम एशिया के राज्यों के बीच में एक सहकारिता का बैंक स्थापित कर सकें। यही अमरीका के प्रभाव से दूर जाने का एक रास्ता है। एक तरफ वह वर्ल्ड बैंक का समर्थन करते हैं, किन्तु एशियाई बैंक के लिए कहते हैं कि इससे प्रभुत्व घट जाएगा, यह बात समझ में आने वाली नहीं है। सच बात तो यह है कि हम बहुत ज्यादा पश्चिमी देशों पर आश्रित रहे हैं और इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि पश्चिमी देश हम को कर्जा देते देते तंग आ गये हैं। सन् 1955 में विकासशील देशों पर जो कर्ज था, वह सात अरब डालर था, लेकिन सन् 1963 में वह आकर 21 अरब डालर हो गया। लगभग तिगुना कर्जा विकासशील देशों को वर्ल्ड बैंक और पश्चिमी देशों की मारफत मिल रहा है और इसका प्रभाव पश्चिमी देशों की अर्थ व्यवस्था पर पड़े बिना नहीं रह सका। इसलिये हम बैंक की स्थापना से मुझे इस में कोई कठिनाई या बुराई की बात नजर नहीं आती है।

यदि हम, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एशिया के देशों के बीच में ऐसा सन्तुलन बना सकते हैं, जो कि आर्थिक और राजनीतिक दृष्टि से आवश्यक है, तो यह बैंक उसका एक

बहुत बड़ा साधन सिद्ध हो सकता है। दुर्भाग्य से हम पश्चिमी देशों के प्रति राजनीतिक दृष्टिकोण से इतने बड़े हुए हैं, कि हमने इस सहयोग को प्राप्त करने के लिए कभी प्रयत्न ही नहीं किये, जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि जो समर्थन हमें एशियाई देशों से मिलना चाहिए था या पश्चिमी देशों से मिलना चाहिए था, वह हमें नहीं मिला और यह सब हमारी उदासीनता के कारण हुआ। यह जो भ्रमसर उपस्थित हुआ है, जिसमें भारत यदि अपनी हमेशा की उदासीनता को त्याग दे, तो बहुत कुछ करने की सामर्थ्य और प्रभाव प्राप्त कर सकता है और अपने प्रभाव को एशिया के देशों में फैला सकता है। भारत सरकार यह समझती है कि इस बैंक के द्वारा हम देने वाले बनें, लेने वाले नहीं। यह विचार मूलतः ही गलत है, क्योंकि इस में जो व्यवस्था की गई है, मैंने जहां तक इस एग्जिमेन्ट को पढ़ा है, उस से प्रतीत होता है कि इस में केवल विदेशी मुद्रा ही नहीं, बल्कि देशी मुद्रा भी इस में 50 प्रतिशत भा जायेगी। यह मुद्रा यदि हमारे दूसरे एशियाई देशों में जाती है, तो इस का अभिप्राय यह होता है कि उन देशों से हमारे यहां माल या तकनीकी जानकारी भा सकेंगी। हम हमेशा अपने आर्थिक विकास के लिए एक ही दृष्टिकोण से देखते रहे हैं, जितनी पूंजी हम आयात कर सकें, उतना ही लाभदायक है, लेकिन आर्थिक सन्तुलन की दृष्टि से यह बात गलत है। अगर हम आयात ही आयात करते जायेंगे और निर्यात का रास्ता नहीं होगा, तो उस से हमारी परिस्थिति और हमारा सन्तुलन बिगड़ जायगा और हम बहुत अधिक दिनों तक कर्जदार रहेंगे और आर्थिक दृष्टि से निबंल बन जायेंगे और उस से बचना बहुत मुश्किल हो जायगा।

मुझे सरकार से यही कहना है कि उन्होंने इस में कुल 93 मिलियन ही अपनी पूंजी रखी है, क्यों नहीं उन्होंने जापान के बराबर

अपनी पूंजी को बढ़ाने की कोशिश का। अभी जो कारण बतलाया गया है, वह यह था कि हमारे पास इस समय विदेशी मुद्रा की बड़ी भारी कमी है, लेकिन यहां पर इस विधेयक में एग्जिमेन्ट के हिसाब से कुल मिलाकर हमको जो अपनी रकम देनी है, वह पांच वर्षों में देनी होगी और उसमें भी प्राची पूंजी रूपों की मुद्रा में और प्राची पूंजी विदेशी मुद्रा में देनी होगी, इस दृष्टिकोण से हम को 2 करोड़ साढ़े बत्तीस लाख पांच लाख में तोड़ कर देना होगा, जिसका अर्थ है कि साढ़े छियालीस लाख विदेशी मुद्रा प्रतिवर्ष देनी होगी। साढ़े छियालीस लाख विदेशी मुद्रा देना हमारे देश के लिए इतना कठिन काम नहीं है, जब कि बहुत से ऐसे कठिन कार्य हैं, बहुत से ऐसे प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं, और कई ऐसे उपकरण हैं, जो विदेशों से आते हैं, उनको आवश्यकताओं में कटौती कर के और बिना कटौती किये भी साढ़े छियालीस लाख देना कठिन बात नहीं है। जो हमारी पूंजी है इस एशियाई विकास बैंक में वह यदि जापान के बराबर हो तो हम उस से कहीं अधिक अपने देश का फायदा कर सकते हैं और एशियाई देशों में भी हम अपने प्रभाव को अधिक बढ़ा सकते हैं।

16 hrs.

इस के सिवा मुझे एक और बात कहनी है कि हमारा देश और विशेषतः हमारी भारत सरकार इस बैंक के सिलसिले में, और इस बैंक के सिलसिले में ही नहीं और भी कई बातों में, विशेष नेतृत्व प्रदान करने में हमेशा हिचकिचाती रही है। इस बैंक का हेडक्वार्टर स्थापित करने में पहले जापान ने की, प्रत्यक्षतया इस कारण कि उस ने 200 मिलियन रुपये की पूंजी लगाई है, लेकिन जापान इसी लिए स्वीकार नहीं किया गया कि एशिया के लिए वह बहुत दूर है। उस के बाद मनीला ने की और शायद ईरान ने भी मांग की थी, लेकिन भारत बड़े

[श्री तन सिंह]

ने इस दृष्टिकोण से कोई रुचि प्रदान नहीं की कि बैंक का हेडक्वार्टर कलकत्ते में हो जो कि सारे एशिया के बीच में पड़ता है। मनीला कोई सारे एशिया के बीचों बीच में पड़ता हो, ऐसी बात नहीं है। यदि इस बैंक का हेडक्वार्टर हमारे यहाँ होता तो हमें कई लाभ मिल सकते थे। हमारी उदासीनता बैंक के फंशन में आगे चल कर भी इसी प्रकार बनी रहेगी। हम यह समझते जायेंगे कि हमें तो देना है, और देना है सहकारी के दृष्टिकोण से, जो कुछ लगेगा हमें विवश हो कर देना पड़ेगा। विवश हो कर देने के बजाय यह अच्छा है कि हम स्वयम् नेतृत्व दे कर के जो सहायता दें उसका लाभ उठायें।

इस ऐप्रोमेन्ट में डेवेलपमेंट की कोई ब्याख्या नहीं की गई है। वर्ल्ड बैंक का जहाँ तक सवाल है, मेरा ऐसा खयाल है कि बन्दरगाहों के विकास और सड़कों के निर्माण इत्यादि के लिए भी वह पूंजी दिया करता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जहाँ पर इंडस्ट्रीज़ बगैरह होती हैं वहाँ पर तो हम कह सकते हैं कि वह कार्य सीधे तरीके से विकास से सम्बन्धित हैं। लेकिन सड़क निर्माण सीधे तरीके से नहीं परीक्षक रूप से ही विकास से सम्बन्ध रखता है। इस के सिवा हमारे एशियाई देशों में एक बहुत बड़ी आवश्यकता है तकनीकी ज्ञान और शिक्षण की। यह तकनीकी ज्ञान और शिक्षण विकास की श्रेणी में ही माना जा सकता है और न सिर्फ हम एशियाई देशों में इस कार्य को बढ़ायें इस देश में भी शिक्षण का कार्य बैंक के द्वारा किया जा सकता है। अगर ऐसा किया जा सकता हो तो बड़ा अच्छा है। अभी एक दो प्रोजेक्ट्स जरूर आई हैं जो एक देश और दूसरे देश से सम्बन्धित हैं बल्कि दो या तीन को मिला कर ज्वायेंट ढंग की हैं। एक तो मीकांग योजना है दूसरी एशियाई हाई वे के सम्बन्ध में है। मैं

एशियाई हाई वे के उपर विशेष जोर देना चाहता हूँ। यह हाई वे बनना आवश्यक है। हम कई वर्षों से कहते रहे हैं कि हमारा और उन का सांस्कृतिक सम्बन्ध बहुत गहरा है और एशियाई देशों की विकास स्थिति एक सी है। लेकिन इस से कुछ बनता नहीं है। सच बात तो यह है कि हमारे और उन के बीच में जितने भी वैरियस है वह टूटें और आने जाने के साधन सुगम हों। आने जाने के साधन जितने ही सुगम होंगे हम उतने ही उन के निकट पहुँचेंगे। मैंने मंत्री महोदय से यह भी सुना कि इस के लिए एक ट्रस्ट फंड होगा और वह स्पेसिफिक परपज के लिये होगा। स्पेसिफिक परपज के लिये वह हो या न हो, लेकिन मुझे एशियाई विकास बैंक के विधेयक में कोई आपत्ति नहीं लगती। मैं चाहता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष को इस में आगे बढ़ कर मेहनत करनी चाहिये और नेतृत्व प्रदान करना चाहिये। एशियन हाई वे की स्थापना होनी चाहिये। उस को केवल यह नहीं सोचना है कि उसे लेने के सम्बन्ध में भी सोचना है, और वह ले सके तो कोई हर्ज नहीं है। हमारे देश की मुद्रा का रुपया जितना ही दूसरे देशों में इस बैंक की मार्फत जायेगा, उस से हमारा व्यापार बढ़ेगा, हमारे यहाँ उत्पादन की वस्तुयें बढ़ेंगी और इस से हम को लाभ होगा। हम काफी अग्रे तक पश्चिमी देशों पर निर्भर नहीं रह सकते।

मैं इस विधेयक का पूर्णतया समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Muthiah (Tirunelveli): Sir, I rise to support the Asian Development Bank Bill. I do not share the misgivings of the hon. member, Prof. Hiren Mukerjee. I do not like to read political motives in the establishment of this financial institution, viz., the Asian Development Bank. It is a new

financial institution set up for promoting the economic development of the countries of Asia and the Far East in accordance with an international agreement. It fulfills the long-felt need of Asiatic countries to have a bank of their own. What the World Bank is for the countries of the world, this new Bank will be for the countries of Asia. This will play a vital role in the economic development of the developing countries of Asia. It will prove very useful to India in financing its important projects, national and regional. Today important projects in India like the Sethusamudram project are being held up for want of funds, particularly foreign exchange and this bank, I am sure, will give sufficient financial aid to take up and to expedite a number of important projects in our country.

The objects of the bank are:

1. Close economic cooperation among the countries of Asia for achieving efficient utilisation of their resources and for accelerating their economic development.

2. Making funds available for the economic development of the developing countries of Asia by mobilising resources from within and outside the region.

3. Promoting the external trade and intra-regional trade of the member-countries. India is short of foreign exchange today and it will have to increase its foreign exchange by increased exports. This Bank will help in stimulating exports to the members of this Bank.

The functions of this Bank are:

1. Promoting investment of public and private capital in the region for development purposes.

2. Providing technical assistance for the execution of development projects.

3. Cooperating with the United Nations and its subsidiary bodies including the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and with public international institutions.

The membership of this Bank will be open to members of the ECAFE, other regional countries and non-regional developed countries which are members of the United Nations. The members of the Bank at present are 19 countries in Asia and the Far East. The Bank also has non-regional members and they are UK, USA, Canada and West European countries. The authorised capital of the Bank is 1,000 million US Dollars. It is divided into one lakh shares, each having a par value of 10,000 dollars.

Each member-country has to subscribe to the shares of the capital of the Bank. The initial subscription shall be paid in five instalments, 50 per cent to be paid in gold or convertible currency and 50 per cent in the currency of the member. The Bank will accept from any member promissory notes, issued by the Government of that member, in lieu of the currency of the member and such notes are non-negotiable, non-interest-bearing and payable to the Bank at par value on demand.

The total contributions of regional countries amount to 700 million dollars and the total contributions of non-regional countries amount to 300 million dollars. Among regional countries, Japan's contribution is the largest, i.e. 200 million dollars; India ranks next and its contribution is 93 million dollars. Among non-regional countries, the USA contributes the highest share, i.e. 200 million dollars. India's initial subscription of 46.5 million dollars will have to be paid in 5 instalments beginning from 1966 and ending in 1970, half this amount in foreign exchange and the other half in Indian rupees. The remaining 46.5 million dollars is to be paid later when the call is made.

The Bank will provide loans to any member from its own resources or from money borrowed in capital markets. In providing loans, the Bank will furnish foreign currency to a country which needs foreign exchange for its projects, or will provide local currency. The loans will be for the

[Shri Muthiah]

financing of specific projects, national and regional. The Bank will charge, in addition to interest, a commission on direct loans made by it to a member. The commission will be one per cent per annum. The Bank will charge a guarantee fee while guaranteeing a loan.

The Bank will be managed by a Board of Governors, and each member will be represented on the Board of Governors. The head-office of the Bank will be located in Manila in the Philippines, and it will have branches in the member countries.

I shall now say a few words about the Bill. The Bill gives legal sanction in India to articles 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55 and 56 of the International Agreement. Article 49 of the Agreement provides that the Bank shall have power to contract, to acquire and sell immovable and movable property and to institute legal proceedings. Article 50 gives immunity to the Bank from judicial proceedings and legal processes. Article 51 guarantees that the property and assets of the Bank, wherever located, shall be immune from search, requisition, confiscation or expropriation by executive or legal action. Article 55 provides that all Governors, Directors, officers and employees of the Bank shall be immune from legal process with respect to acts performed by them in their official capacity. Article 56 provides that the Bank, the assets, property, income and transactions shall be exempt from all taxation and from all customs duties and that no tax shall be levied on the salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its directors, officers and employees. But the Bill, while accepting Article 56, makes a proviso to it that goods imported into India free of customs duty shall be subject to restrictions on their subsequent sale in India, and that the prices of such imported goods sold in India shall be subject to duties and taxes.

With these words, Sir, I welcome this laudable Bill.

Shri M. N. Swamy (Ongole): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill. While doing so, it is not as if we are against the inflow of capital to build our industries to develop our country. But the whole scheme, the whole idea, although it has been discussed on several occasions at the UNO and at the regional conferences of the Afro-Asian countries, was sponsored by America and other western countries, saying that they should have an Asian Bank of their own choice and funds will be made available. It was perhaps the United States of America that first moved this idea of the Asian Bank.

Who are these regional members and who are these non-regional members? India is a non-aligned country. We have been functioning in the U.N.O. There have been several non-aligned gatherings. In this list of 19 regional countries, I find that they are those who have never been one with us in the UNO in the voting system or in the non-aligned conferences. Barring, Nepal, Afghanistan, Cambodia and one other country, none of these countries—Thailand, Malaysia, Philippines, Australia and all others in this long list—has been one with us, they have all been one with Anglo-American imperialism in the UNO. They have been against us all along, when occasion has arisen for our national interests. Therefore, it is wrong to say that here is a regional gathering to develop the region, that we are having more inflow of foreign capital and, therefore, it is a fine chance for all concerned to develop the country forward.

Then, the non-regional countries are Canada, Britain and America. America, we find from our experience of the World Bank, leave aside the Asian Bank, when we go for foreign aid or let us take the fertiliser plant, they want more shares. They want equity of management and of shares. That is what they want. It is not a question of capital to make India go ahead with

its development plans and other activities. It is not that.

16.16 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Today, foreign countries, mostly western countries, in the name of food, education, technical know-how and other advice, are penetrating into the Afro-Asian countries. That is the experience of several nations around us. That is how in the name of foreign aid and assistance, they are toppling down the governments of several countries whom they do not like, whom they do not want, who do not cooperate with them and who do not bow down to their wishes. That is our experience in several Afro-Asian countries in the last two or three months. Do we not see that in Asia today? What is happening in Indonesia, as my hon. friend pointed out?

Then, West Germany, a country that is now rising up on old Nazi methods, a country that is now aiding Israel against the Arab world with all weapons and money, a country that is today supporting Pakistan by arms and ammunitions, is the second biggest non-regional force that is contributing to the capital of this Bank. Therefore, it is a very very dangerous scheme. Although the name is Asian Development Bank, the idea is different.

Today, in the Far East, America and Britain and their other friends want a say. They want to dictate terms. It is not in a straight line that we find things today. By all indirect methods they do it. Therefore, this Asian Development Bank is a very dangerous scheme. It is not a question of capital. It is not as though we are against capital.

My hon. friends have said that we wanted directorship in the bank or that its headquarters should be situated in Calcutta. These are all minor things, whether its headquarters is in Manila, in Australia or in Calcutta.

Similarly, it is not a directorship that is wanted. The thing is that the forces that are working behind the whole idea are mainly America and Britain.

We are a developing nation and several of the Far Eastern and Asian countries are in need of funds. We want more of developmental activities and more of projects; therefore, we want more funds. That is true. But let us look at the discussions at the regional gatherings of Afro-Asian countries. What do they really want today? Let us know their minds. From the discussions as reported in the *Economic Weekly* of May 16, 1964 I want to quote what the Nigerian Minister of Commerce says. While talking of his country and the countries of Africa and Asia and what really are their problems he says:—

"Between 1948 and 1961, while the value of our exports increased by only 173 per cent, the value of imports increased by about 447 per cent. The position is even worse when we take the more important export commodities in our country. Between 1954 and 1962, the unit value of our exports of cocoa and groundnuts have been on the decline, falling from £70 to £51".

Then, he goes on to say:

"The developing countries are not invoking pity, nor are they asking for charity. They feel that they have been subsidising and underwriting the economic growth and rising standard of living of the advanced industrialised nations."

He further goes on to say that cocoa is their primary product through which they have been earning foreign exchange. He says that when the cost of cocoa was £500 per ton, there was a hue and cry in the Western countries, "The cost is very much high. Please reduce it."

[Shri M. N. Swamy]

When it had been reduced to £ 170 or £ 200 per ton of cocoa, then it did not become very profitable to the growers. Then, they approached the Western countries and they said, "Well, let us leave things to the law of supply and demand. Let us leave it to the natural forces of free market." Therefore, that is how they feel today that the Western countries do not allow their primary commodities to enter their markets. All sorts of restrictions are imposed on them. They do not encourage their primary products in all the developed Western countries and they do not get the proper remunerative prices. That is the experience of the several countries in this region. Take, for instance, Pakistan and Iran. Iran's Minister of Commerce also says so. What about Burma? Burma is our next-door neighbour. She is not a member of this Bank though the gates are open for her. But she has not entered into it. This is what Burma's Minister says:

"It is not only that the infant industries of the developing countries have to compete with the established modern industries of the developed countries, but their agricultural sector meets with stiff and often times unfair competition "from protected agricultural sector of the developed countries.

These are some of the problems that are there.

What they feel is that they must have a fair trade with the developed nations and that they must earn proper price for their primary commodities. But that is not happening. That encouragement is not being given by the developed countries. That is the experience of all these countries in this region.

There is one thing more. We have got not only the Western powers but we have also got the socialist block. Where are they? They are building our industries; they are building our

steel plants; they are helping us in many ways. But they are not the members of this Asian Development Bank. No socialist country which is aiding several of the Afro-Asian countries in their plans, in their industrial development, has chosen to find a place in this Asian Development Bank because they know it better and they are certain that this Bank is not going to help industries, to help development in Far-Eastern and Asian countries. That is why, although the socialist block of countries are there helping individually the countries in Asia, they have not become the members of this Bank.

Lastly, why I oppose this measure is for this reason. I would like to quote from the minutes of the United Nations Information Service Bulletin on Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. I simply read what the Government of Cambodia which is a member of this Bank says. The delegate, Mr. Srey Pong says:

"He also hoped that political considerations would not enter into the Bank's operations but that these would be determined by economic considerations alone."

Here is a country which doubts and rather hesitates to believe that the operations of the Bank would be purely economic. The Cambodian delegate himself has expressed his opinion that the economic considerations alone may not be the guiding factor. Lastly, we find that Taiwan, which is a small country, is also a member. This is the report about what the Taiwan delegate Mr. T. C. Pan, said on the Asian Development Bank:

"Mr. T. C. Pan (China) was of the view that the Bank should invest not only in machinery, equipment, buildings or roads, but should enter such fields as education, health, land-use etc.

He pointed out that it would be no good to lend money to build

additional schools unless this were accompanied with effective plans to modernize teaching methods, curricula and school administration'.

So, we find that Taiwan wants this Bank to give aid to modernize teaching methods, curricula and school administration too. Then we find that:

'He strongly recommended that the Bank should render service as much in the social field as in the economic field.'

Please note that he wants services to be rendered in the social field also. It was not Taiwan that was speaking, but as the American mouth-piece, Taiwan, that was speaking what America wanted. They not only want to give economic assistance, but they want to change the social fabric of our country. They want to cut at our education, design our educational methods, and everything else, as they desire and need. They want to bring up a new generation in the Far East to American requirements. As perhaps in the good olden days when the Britishers, came here first they started schools and universities to train clerical staff. Similarly Americans want to do so today in India and in Asia in the name of this Bank.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now. Only 2 hours have been allotted for this Bill.

Shri M. N. Swamy: Then, I shall conclude.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay Central South): The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the implementation of the international agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank. The Bill, should normally raise no controversy. But as we have heard two speeches from the Opposition, as a matter of fact, it has given rise to controversy. We can only say that we are a little surprised at the fact that this controversy should have arisen at this stage, when the Bank has hardly come into existence and has hardly

had time to operate and show its points of strength and weakness. It is rather premature. The Bill should, therefore, be welcomed and supported.

This is a short Bill, There are only two main clauses which need to be considered. One is clause 3 which authorises the Central Government to make payments to the Bank out of the Consolidated Fund of India for various purposes such as the subscriptions to the capital, or the commissions or for taking care of the fluctuation in the exchange value of the currency holdings which the Bank will be holding. We, that is India, contribute something like 23.25 million dollars in Indian currency, and the value of this currency may change, and it is only right that some provision should be made to protect the Bank from loss on that account.

The other main clause is clause 5 which deals with some of the immunities, exemptions, privileges and status etc. which are to be granted to the new Asian Development Bank.

As has been already explained before, we can see that there is nothing new in these concessions, exemptions or immunities that are going to be granted. They are really customary in the case of international institutions of this standing, that is, of the standing of this new Asian Development Bank that is going to be established.

Then there is another point. These concessions, exemptions, privileges and status are not something that we alone are going to grant to the new Bank. But the new bank will receive similar privileges and status and exemptions in all other countries wherever it is going to function. That should dispose of this point. I won't elaborate on it any more.

This new bank is designed to provide additional development financing for the region and it is going to do so

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

through mobilising and increasing domestic savings. Now, many countries in this region, as we know, are not very rich countries and we know that their capacity for savings is limited. To expect that through their own savings unaided by other sources from outside the region we will be able to achieve the object will be like trying to pull ourselves up by our own bootstraps.

This is an experiment that is going to be made in regional co-operation, and I for one would think that the effort is not worth making if we are not going to have the co-operation of other advanced countries in the matter of providing a greater flow of development funds into this region.

Something is said about weaker countries, that these countries, small and weak, will not get justice in the kind of set-up that has been built up for this Bank. I am glad to see that in the constitution of this bank, in the agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank, there is a clear statement of purpose. I am referring to art. 2 which says that the 'purpose of the bank will be to utilise the resources at its disposal for financing development of developing member countries...'. Then it goes on to say, 'Having regard to the needs of the smaller or less developed member countries in the region'. Now, it is heartening to see that this new institution is aware of the great need of paying attention to small and weak countries or member countries in the region.

One of the objects of the new institution is to promote the orderly expansion of foreign trade, in particular intra-regional trade. We all know that the potentialities of intra-regional trade among these countries are simply immense, and have not been exploited the way they should have been. I have here some figures showing that the expansion of trade among Asian countries declined in the past, in the past ten years. In 1963-64 the inter-

Asian trade formed just about 37.6 per cent of the total trade, while ten years ago the trade was 40.6 per cent. This is a sad state of affairs that due to lack of co-operation and the habit of co-operation among the countries of this region, intra-regional trade has been so badly neglected and allowed to decline. Something very much can be done to whip up this side of the activity through the instrumentality of the new Bank.

Sometimes the question is raised whether the new bank should grant soft loans or hard loans. I think the question is a bit premature. If one is to state a policy, one could say that the Bank's policy should be neither conservative nor too liberal, but it should be prudent and forward looking. I am glad that the Bank has shown awareness of the needs, the special needs of the countries of the region who will not be able to take advantage of the kind of standard loans, hard loans, but who have to be provided with finance, development finance, of certain other kinds. For that purpose we see that there is a provision that the bank is going to set aside 10 per cent of the paid-up capital of the bank, and out of this it is going to establish a special fund to be utilised for the needs of these weak people. Also, we find the U. S. Government has offered 100 million dollars towards the special fund of this bank, which also is to be used for granting special loans to member countries.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the hon. member opposite when he rose to speak I expected the severe tone of his criticism and while listening to his speech my expectations were more than fulfilled. My only satisfaction is that the House has not reacted favourably to him or reciprocated his sentiments. He wants that the Bill be postponed and taken up in the next session because he says the House has not got time to go into this or it would not be able to devote sufficient attention to a measure like this. He objected to my statement

also that this was a simple Bill. When I said imple I did not mean that the Bill does not contain various provisions. I mean that the principle as such was not a new principle; it has been accepted; it is not as if it had not at all been discussed. The burden of his speech was to attack the principle of economic co-operation which according to him is one of neo-colonialism and which interferes with the economic freedom of the countries in this region. I think the House is wedded to the principle of economic co-operation and since we are following an independent non-aligned policy we have accepted aid from all quarters consistent with our interest and dignity. This has been repeatedly accepted by the House. Even in the recent debate, I think no one suggested that we should not accept any aid. The principle of foreign co-operation has been accepted. In that connection I said that there is a new agency for co-operation, the Asian Development Bank. From that point of view it is a simple measure. The House can certainly go into the details if the Members are willing. That is why we circulated the agreement immediately after it was signed; we got printed copies and we sent it to all members; it has been debated in the country and hon. members have quoted from the journals in the country as well as outside although it is only one type of criticism he has quoted. Particularly, he has referred to a leading article of an economic journal which I had also the honour to read; it had ceased publication. I respect it. It does not mean that all that it says is correct. That particular journal has a particular angle in respect of economic aid. He also quoted from an American journal which he described as fairly respectable, the *New York Herald Tribune*. That also has its own angle about this. They may be right or wrong; they may be quoted by anybody. But even in America there are other papers, more respectable and more mature than that paper which have given a different opinion about this matter. But the point is that the basis should not be

this opinion expressed anywhere; the basis should be the merits of the case and how far it meets our own national interest. Although his speech was full of political overtones, which also I expected and I also concede that a purely economic measure of this kind has a political angle, we cannot divorce politics from economics in our every day life, particularly in the present day world, the point is that all the apprehensions or misapprehensions that he expressed arose mostly out of his own studies of this matter, his own attitude towards foreign aid, towards these institutions. According to him, even the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East is dominated by American thinking. He may be right but according to me he is wrong. But he may be right according to his own view. But the point is that if you see the history in this matter, it is this. He concedes that both the American and the Japanese, in the beginning, were cool about the setting up of the Asian Development Bank. He quoted from the Wellington report and only after that he said that President Johnson's announcement in a speech, a south-east Asian fund—that the American interest came in. But he missed this fact that when the Secretary-General of the United Nations who is a very distinguished Asian, made a request to the President that part of this fund should be made available for the Asian Development, it was agreed to. It is a very significant fact. The fact is that, howsoever it may be described as an American-Asian Bank, it does not make this bank an American bank. It is an Asian Bank, because largely it is the effort of the Asian countries. He may like some of the countries and may not like some of the countries, and to describe some of these countries, smaller countries, as chickens under the wings of the Americans, is not proper. I think those countries will feel it very strongly, and rightly so. There are countries, big and small, and there are countries who may be some sort of satellites

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

under one group or the other. But in this country, we have followed, as I said, a non-aligned and independent way; we judge each country from its own policies, we judge the countries from their economic and political policies, and we do not judge them as satellites of one big power or another. Therefore, howsoever he may be right in his own thinking that some of these Asian countries are smaller and are just chickens—they may be smaller—I can tell him from my own experience that each one of those countries is very jealous of its own economic and political freedom. They are fighting and they will fight to the last for keeping their own economic viability and their own freedom. They are much more sensitive about their own national interests and feelings than many of the bigger countries.

Therefore, the point is that this is purely an Asian Bank, and its management is entirely Asian. The management of this agreement also will be Asian. The fact is that we have imported capital from outside the region for the simple reason that there is paucity of capital in the region. If there was that much amount of capital available in this region, there would have been no need for importing it from outside, and because capital plays an important part as an economic stimulant and as a stimulant to growth it was necessary to have capital from outside. Therefore, the choice is that it is better to have capital from outside, from the developed countries, through the agency of a multilateral organisation like this, than to have to negotiate bilaterally where there may be all the various pulls which may be operating between the two countries. Therefore, the choice is always that. The dangers of political domination are minimised in a multilateral arrangement of this kind, and that is the reason for having an Asian Bank of this nature.

Therefore, the Asian Bank is the result of the efforts of the regional

countries of the ECAFE region. It will be managed entirely by the Asian talents and Asian expertise, and the fact that there has been capital from outside does not detract from its basic Asian character. Therefore, to describe it in anyway, that it is an organisation which is being dominated by any big power or the other is not a statement of fact.

Secondly, the hon. Member said that even in the matter of arrangement, India does not figure well because it has no permanent seat on the Board of Executive Directors. The arrangement here is different from the World Bank. It need not be a copy of the World Bank. We may benefit from the experience of the World Bank which has played a leading role in international lending and international economic co-operation and we may benefit from other experiences also; for that matter, we may benefit from the Inter-American Bank or the African Bank. But it need not be that we should have a copy of it.

The Directors are elected and India with its share capital and voting rights will be able to have its Director in any election. The voting rights will be distributed 20 percent equally among all the countries and 80 percent in proportion to their share capital. This will give the benefit to the smaller countries of the region as against the big capital-subscribing countries. That is also to give a balance in favour of the region, particularly smaller countries. India will have a voting strength of 8.67 per cent. According to Annexure B, there are 10 Directors-non-regional countries will have 3 and regional countries will have 7 Directors. The total voting of the regional countries is 68.84 per cent. 10 per cent of this comes to 6.884 per cent, which is the percentage required to get a Director elected by any country. India having 8.6 per cent, will always be able to elect a Director. Therefore, even though there is no provision for permanent Execu-

tive Directors, in any election India will have a place and a say.

As I said, in an institution like this, all the countries of the region, irrespective of their political views, have the right to be represented. It will not be an institution which will be dominated by any group. India has emphasised in all the meetings that the management has to be firm and of a very high level of technical efficiency and the projects will have to be determined on merits and merits alone, considering what they are going to contribute to the region and to the member countries. The projects should be good and be able to sustain themselves on their own merits. Selection of projects can only be on that basis. Therefore, howsoever in the background certain political forces may be operating, if a particular country with the help of some other countries is able to dominate this Bank then that will be the end of the Bank. This feeling is very strong in the region. There was this unanimous feeling in all these countries that the Bank has to be operated purely on economic and technical terms. Politics should not have a part to play in an institution like this. Therefore, I think the misgivings that have been expressed are wrong. One only wishes that this Bank has ample opportunities and support from all the member-countries to play its role in the development of the region, which is so badly needed. It is expected that in the coming months, when the Bank starts functioning, the regional talents—managerial, technical etc.—would be available to it and it will be purely Asian management. If we follow the correct traditions of competence, independence and judging projects on merits and economic criteria only, I think the Bank would be making a great contribution towards the economic cooperation of the region, which is so badly needed.

I would like to emphasise again, in conclusion, that by participating in this Bank, we have fulfilled a role that was expected of us in strengthening the Asian character of the manage-

ment and making the Asian Bank truly Asian and bringing about economic cooperation in this part of the world through this multi-lateral agency. The fears expressed are unfounded.

With these words, I commend this Bill.

Shri M. N. Swamy: How is it that the socialist bloc of countries, essentially the Soviet Union which is very much assisting India and other countries in their developmental activities, have not joined this Bank. What was their approach to this question?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: It is true that they have not joined, but some of the countries in the region, socialist countries or communist countries, might come in later on. The attitude of the Soviet Union is that they have offered constructive cooperation to this Bank. For actual participation in share capital they have their own constitution and other difficulties in the particular way of participation. But they have not closed the doors for joining and they have offered constructive cooperation in the functioning of this Bank. Then there are the non-regional countries like Yugoslavia which have expressed a desire to join this Bank.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

That the Bill to implement the international agreement for the establishment and operation of the Asian Development Bank and for matters connected therewith be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

There are no amendments to any of the clauses. I shall put them together. The question is:

That clauses 2 to 7 and the Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 7 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, I have not the foggiest hope of ever being able to persuade my hon. friend, the Minister of State as long as he holds to the kind of doctrines which he propounded and the portfolio to which he clings, but at least I am grateful for small mercies, and I notice that he was good enough to recognise that economic matters do get tinged with political overtones. That was exactly why I wanted to sound a note of warning. He does not heed to any warning. I do not know what particular paradise he wishes to inhabit. But if he is unaware of the kind of objective with which President Johnson's dramatic announcement took place, which was followed up by so many other things, I am very sorry for my country. I would like only to add one thing, that I am not at all convinced about his explanation of voting rights. He tried to say how this might help India. It might conceivably help India from the statistics, which he gives us, but he told us that 20 per cent is to be equally for all the constituents and 80 per cent to share capital. I should have thought, if he was going to have any kind of sound democratic composition the proportion would have been very different, but India does seem to have agreed to this kind of thing. I am very sorry he has not found his way to accept some of the modifications. I am very sorry he is presenting this Bill as something which the country ought to accept as a very good thing and he disregarded the many points which I have brought out.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

16.59 hrs.

DELHI ADMINISTRATION BILL—
Contd.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs and Minister of Defence Supplies in the Ministry of Defence (Shri Hathi): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the administration of the Union territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister may continue on the next day. The House will take up the Half-hour-discussion now.

17 hrs.

URBANISATION OF AREAS*

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am raising this discussion on account of the unsatisfactory nature of the answers which were given by Government to Starred Question No. 1109 on the 14th April, 1966. This had relation to the urbanisation of areas and Government had been asked if it had studied the reports prepared by the Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organisation on India's urbanisation and what were its salient features. Government gave us the benefit of a note prepared by somebody in the CMPO and almost left it at that.

The Minister of Planning, in answering supplementaries, could only say that there already is a plan for Calcutta which the Government of India had started during the Third Plan and that they had still to decide what should be the programme for the Fourth Plan. When it was pointed to him that the note on urbanisation

*Half-An-Hour Discussion.

which Parliament was given included some rather objectionable statement, for instance, that there is a strong anti-Calcutta sentiment outside of West Bengal because it symbolises Bengal and the Bengalis, he answers that he had no views on the subject. He said, "I do not need to have any views on the report which is drawn up by an odd individual somewhere". So, Parliament was given only a report of an odd individual in the Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organisation and we were left more or less hanging in mid-air unaware of what, if anything, Government was doing about the multifarious problems of Calcutta. That is the reason why I have brought up this short discussion in order that we might have some little satisfaction in respect of the extremely unsatisfactory replies which we had got.

It was rather astounding to find in this note which was supplied to Parliament this reference to Calcutta as a sort of place about which the rest of India has a strong, antagonistic sentiment, because, after all, Calcutta has been the headquarters of Indian nationalism for many years. Gopal Krishna Gokhale, whose centenary we are celebrating at the moment, said very long ago that what Calcutta is thinking today India is thinking tomorrow. I am not saying this in the Bengali chauvinistic way, but Calcutta has been like that. Calcutta, even today, is India's city as the former Registrar General has said in a compilation that an average of 61 per cent in all factories in 1960 and a little over 50 per cent in commercial and other non-factory establishments in Calcutta region are non-Bengalis.

Of course, Calcutta has so many problems. It is a chance-erected, chance-directed city, as Rudyard Kipling said a long time ago, with many contradictions—palaces, bastis, hovels developing side by side—and the result is that in Calcutta there is a terrific combination of circumstances where life has become almost impossible and much of the tension which takes place

in the region is due to the fact that life is really and truly impossible.

The Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organisation was set up some time ago but the original sin of its having been set up, perhaps I could put it that way, was some anti-Communist motivation about which the American agencies setting up this organisation made no bones. I can understand their worry because in this House, for instance, for one Congress Member from Calcutta we have three Members representing the Communist Party. If concern about Calcutta going Communist produced some good results, that would have been very very pleasant, a very happy result; but, unfortunately, nothing of that sort has taken place.

The Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organisation has produced a few things, like some reports—a traffic study of the city of Calcutta, a scheme for a second bridge over the River Hoogly which is still in the offing and many problems are unsettled. It has brought up some urban renewal plans, removal of factories and godowns from either side of the Bhagirathi River and a scheme for garden cities all over. It is a very beautiful picture, but it is almost a joke if one compares it with what actually is the state of affairs in Calcutta at this present moment.

In answering the supplementaries the other day the Minister of Planning could only say that as between the Centre and the State the responsibility is there and we are trying to do what we can. He did not seem to know more about it. I did not blame him at that time because the question was formed in that way. But there are many other things which need to be elucidated. Rs. 6 crores have been given by the Centre to the West Bengal Government for improvement of bastis, slum areas, in Calcutta. But the State Government, it appears, was not able to spend it.

Then, 72-inch water pipes were put up for the improvement of water supply. But after the water pipes were

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

put up, it was discovered that water availability was not there. The setelite town scheme was given by the C.M.P.O. But in the mean time, the Birlas and the Bangurs are buying up land directly or through their *benam-dars* who include some of the more distinguished Members of the Party in power. There is no ceiling on land holding; there is no ceiling on land income.

The position of Calcutta is disturbed by the fact, as the West Bengal Finance Minister said sometime ago, that 55 lakhs of non-food producing people from other States are in West Bengal and half of that number, that is, 27½ lakhs are in the Calcutta region and, therefore, naturally the food problem gets complicated.

It has come to light—and in this Question also a reference was made to it—that while West Bengal's population had grown by 33 per cent in the last decade, Calcutta's population grew only by 8 per cent while in the case of the Greater Bombay, the growth in the same period was to the extent of 39 per cent and the reasons which retarded the growth in Calcutta were, very poor, over-worked, over-congested transport, inadequacy of water supply and sewage system, extremely high land value, higher than even in some cases in Chankayapuri in New Delhi.

The position of Calcutta is jeopardised even more by the fact that Bhagirathi river or the Hoogly river which is called in a very undesirable anglicised name, is a dying river and the port which handles 45 per cent of our export trade and 40 per cent of our imports is in a bad way. There are some long-term projects like Farraka which will be ready, heavens know when, and if it is ready, we do not know whether the results that we anticipate would actually be forthcoming. In the case of Haldia port, of course, some advance has been made. But that is again a long-term project.

In the meantime, we do not know how things will go on.

Inside Calcutta, this question of having a circular railway, in order that the difficulty experienced by the commuters who come to Calcutta everyday can be, to some extent, alleviated, continues to be just a smoking and smouldering scheme but no results follow. In Sealdah station, in Calcutta, everyday there is a congregation of 300,000 people. That is the most congested railway station in the whole world. At the Howrah station, 2000 people come everybody. The scheme for a circular railway is being put off all the time and the Railway Minister said, only the other day, that nothing very much could be done.

There was a scheme for an underground railway with which the late Dr. B. C. Roy had wanted to go ahead. I do not understand, if in Leningrad which was built on a swamp and a marsh, there could be an underground railway, why in Calcutta, an underground railway could not be built. But perhaps the expenses were found to be prohibitive or whatever other difficulties were there, we have neither an underground railway nor an over-ground circular railway nor any kind of method which would solve the present problems, traffic congestion, communication and transport, everything, being in jeopardy.

The only tangible thing which has happened recently was that a road from the Dum Dum Airport to the city has been half-completed and is still largely unlit and mostly unpaved. But, to some extent, some little progress has been made. The other Expressway between Calcutta and Asansol about which Mr. S. K. Patil when he was the Minister of Transport umpteen years ago used to say a great deal has not come into the picture.

The other thing that is making a slightly snail-like progress is the scheme of a second bridge over the river Hoogly. But it is facing all

kinds of difficulties. If we have a bridge there at the spot where it is now supposed to be, the Maidan in Calcutta, which is a lung of the city, would largely be destroyed, the people will be deprived of the access to it and traffic and other problems will also arise. The Stadium for football and other sports which Calcutta people are rather mad of, who have been aching and yearning and thirsting and hungering for so many years, would be put off for God knows how long. That kind of thing is taking place. There is no planning about it, no forethought, no effort to co-ordinate matters, no effort to do something in the short-term as well as in the long-term. I know we shall be told that we are having schemes, and the CMPO is a very expert organisation. I do not know why for the sake of computing traffic figures or for the sake of finding out how to build a bridge over the river Hoogly, we have to have foreign expertise. For everything we have to have foreign expertise! I was told in the Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Committee and such organisations that even to have a Balbhavan we had to have some expert advice from other countries in order that we may learn how exactly to run the Balbhavan. For everything we want foreign expertise, and the result is that everything is pushed forward to some long-term solution. But in the long run, we shall all be dead. It is better that something is done in the short run also at the same time as you proceed with long-term projects.

We find also that in Calcutta educational problems are accumulating, and in regard to that, recently, a question was asked in the House by Shri Madhu Limaye and some other friends of ours, and it is discovered, as Mr. J. P. Nayak has pointed out in his report on primary education in Calcutta that for children in the age group 6-11, the probable enrolment in classes 1 to 5 on the 31st March, 1961 was 1,85,000 only which works out to 60.2 per cent of the total population of the children of that particular age group.

This is most shabby. Recently, we find the Deputy Mayor of the Calcutta Corporation or the chairman of its Education Committee bemoaning that children in the age group 6-11, number about 3,80,000, out of whom only 1,63,000 have schooling facilities. Less than 50 per cent of the children of school-going age are deprived. And we hear talk from foreign quarters, particularly, about this, because they dislike Calcutta as a hot-bed of communism or God knows what other kind of enormity, and they write also about it. Here is something sent to me by the External Affairs Ministry. In the US press, *The New York Times* writing a special article on 'Calcutta crisis growing', says:

"One of the world's largest cities is in crisis, overwhelmed by the runaway population, poverty, hunger, disease and illiteracy."

and it gloatingly writes about how the World Health Organisation calls the city an international health hazard. It is very dangerous that this kind of propaganda goes on. It might also be true, and to a large extent, I am afraid I have to confess that it is true. But even now, Calcutta is one of the biggest places where world tourists come. The Calcutta airport is busier, far busier perhaps than even Delhi, even busier than Santa Cruz. And yet it is an international health hazard to some extent.

This article in *The New York Times* on the 5th May, only a few days ago, writes about Calcutta's educational problem as follows:

"Calcutta is the most backward city and area in India in terms of educational facilities. No school is available for half a million children. At the present rate of population growth, Calcutta would have to build one hundred schools a year for 20 years and these would have to operate on double shifts. The city has not opened a single school in the past ten years."

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

This might be slightly exaggerated, but it is largely true that all this kind of thing is taking place.

This perpetual tug-of-war between the Centre and the States in relation to responsibility for Calcutta should cease at some point of time, and some radical, objective and concrete and tangible relief should be given to Calcutta. The World Bank Mission had said in 1960:

"The very magnitude and challenge that Calcutta presents to the conscience and political common-sense of those in authority no doubt in part explaining the inadequacy of the response."

Everybody admits that more ought to be done about it, but nobody is ready to do it. It is very necessary to do something about Calcutta. You may feel apathetic towards Calcutta because Calcutta is left-oriented, but for that reason, do not disown a part of your country which has played and will continue to play a large part in the history of our development. Do not forget the kind of contribution which Calcutta and that region has made to the rest of India and which it still makes to the economic development of this country. Do not play with the fate of Calcutta. Do something tangible as quickly as ever that is possible. Proceed with long-term and short-term policies together and get the State Government to cooperate. Give some more thought to it so that this chronic problem which has become such a cancerous growth in our body-economic does not become insoluble. That is why I have brought in this discussion today.

The Minister of Planning and Social Welfare (Shri Asoka Mehta): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am grateful to Prof. Hiren Mukerjee for providing us an opportunity to discuss the acute problems of Calcutta on the floor of this House.

Because I come from Bombay—or perhaps in spite of that—I am willing to concede the fact that Calcutta is our premier city industrially, commercially, culturally and in every way. The importance of Calcutta in the life of our country is so obvious that I do not think it needs to be underscored. I also readily agree to the fact that the problems of Calcutta are daunting today. Many of the things Prof. Mukerjee described in the course of his brief speech this afternoon, those facts are there and they are known to us. It is a beautiful city; but there are many ugly spots which have to be removed.

It is not because Calcutta is Left-oriented that there has been any kind of discrimination against it. I really wish Prof. Mukerjee and his colleagues were in a position to provide an effective leadership in the civic life of Calcutta. Because what is happening? If you look at the way taxes are raised in Calcutta, the amount of money spent by the Corporation in collecting taxes, the various ways in which the property-owners as well as the people of Calcutta can be induced to provide resources to solve the civic problems and to meet the civic requirements, if you look at all these things, you will find that they fall short of what is being done in Bombay city. Bombay city may not be as important as Calcutta, but as far as tackling its civic problems are concerned, it has shown greater tenacity.

I have been arguing that while the State Government should do all that it can to solve the problems of Calcutta and the Government of India should be asked to provide whatever support is possible for solving the difficult problems of Calcutta, so far as the Calcutta Corporation is concerned, the resources it can tap also need to be tapped. Only recently a study of this problem is being made; I have not still received the report. I am looking forward to a critical and significant analysis of this aspect.

Secondly, in order that the many problems of Calcutta can be tackled effectively, it is necessary either to set up different authorities or to enact different items of legislation. Some-time back, the Land Use Control Act was put on the statute-book. We now find that the Act does not go far enough. If we want to plan, if we want to see that the development of Calcutta is organised in a manner that would help us solve the problems, if not immediately, at least over a period of time, one of the things that needs to be done is to control land use.

Since 1960 it has been suggested that the Metropolitan Water and Sanitation Authority be set up, because, as you know, besides the Calcutta Corporation, I believe there are 20 or 30 other municipal bodies that have to be brought together; there should be some kind of umbrella under which they all work and organise themselves. Bombay had the same problem, and so created what is known as Greater Bombay, and they have all been made part of the Greater Bombay Municipal Corporation. It is not necessary that Calcutta should do the same thing, but there has got to be some authority, some umbrella which is able to organise all this and provide, as it were, a single co-ordinating initiative. This Metropolitan Water and Sanitation Authority, I believe, is still before a Select Committee.

It was further suggested that there should be a Busti Improvement Bill. I think this Bill is still under consideration. I suggest that Prof. Mukerjee and his colleagues are very influential in Calcutta.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We have no power.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I would personally be very happy if I can be sure of their full and effective support in seeing that whatever authorities are involved in this, we push them forward, because I do not think the Gov-

ernment of West Bengal or my friend the Chief Minister of West Bengal and his colleagues do not want to do this. There are all kinds of difficulties and obstacles including ill-informed public opinion. To the extent we can carry public opinion, these things have to be done and I have no doubt that our progress will be faster.

As Prof. Mukerjee knows, 17 different schemes—I do not want to take up the time of the House by dilating on these schemes—have been taken up in the third plan period, and something like Rs. 23.10 crores will be spent on the schemes. What we should do during the fourth plan is very much under consideration. But here again I am clear in my mind that the resources needed are going to be tremendous, and it is not easy to find resources for our metropolitan areas because similar resources are needed in our less-developed urban and rural areas. The claims of metropolitan areas are important, but they cannot demand that these resources be made available at the expense of the development needs of other areas. Therefore, I have always argued that unless we are willing to take some far-reaching action as far as urban land values in Calcutta, Bombay, Kanpur or Delhi are concerned, we will never get the resources. Surely we must develop these cities, provide good sewage, provide adequate water, because these are human problems, they have to be tackled. I quite agree with Prof. Mukerjee that the snarling up of transport in Calcutta is something to which there is no parallel in the world. The moment you try to do this, the price of land goes up, and there are a set of people who make a profit out of it.

I am told, here again Prof. Mukerjee would be able to enlighten me, that in Calcutta there are a very large number of people who own urban land property. If that is so, if it is so distributed among *bhadra log*, then to touch the urban land values, urban land and property in Calcutta would be, as it were, eroding and undermining and exploding the very limited

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

security that the *bhadra log* has, then it is a different matter. But if as I suspect, the urban land property is more or less in the hands of a limited number of people, surely it is imperative that we take some concrete, specific, determined step to see that the unearned increment in land values is utilised for the purpose of the benefit of the people of Calcutta, that the community has over-riding claim upon the unearned income of those who own urban land property there.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Bar-rackpore): Marwaris.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Whoever they are; it is not against any particular section of our people; it is a question of who owns the land. As I said if it is a question of widows and orphans only owning urban property in Calcutta, I have nothing to say; I have the fullest of sympathies for them. If it is owned by people who are really using it as investments and making capital gains, etc. surely some determined step needs to be taken. Here again I would invite the most fruitful co-operation from my hon. friend Mr. Mukerjee and his colleagues.

Lastly, I hope Prof. Mukerjee will not be so cynical and so very caustic about all the plans that have to be drawn up, all the projects that have to be prepared as beautiful intentions drawn out and when you look at reality, what is it? I do not think that all these problems can be sorted out within five years; they may take ten or twenty years. But unless you are clear about the direction in which you are going, it will not be effective. As you said, over many decades Calcutta has grown in a pell-mell

manner. If this pell-mell growth has to be given some kind of a direction and if it is to be achieved within a certain framework, which is consciously organised, surely we must be clear about what we propose to achieve in the next 15—20 years. Let him not be so cynical about what is to be done tomorrow. We have to do all that we can to sort out the immediate problems but in order to sort out immediate problems we must have the larger picture before us. It is not enough to put all the pressure on the Government of West Bengal and the Government of India; they must play their part undoubtedly, but I think more important is that the resources that are available in Calcutta have to be tapped, in terms of raising whatever taxes that need to be raised and keeping to the minimum the expenses involved in raising these taxes and using the resources for providing amenities to the people. As Prof. Mukerjee says, what Calcutta thinks today, the rest of India thinks tomorrow; what Calcutta does today, the rest of India does tomorrow. I hope and trust that Prof. Mukerjee will see to it that as far as getting the full benefit of increase in urban land values is concerned, the initiative will come from Calcutta so that the rest of India may have the privilege of following that initiative.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The discussion is over. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

17.28 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, May 16, 1966/Vaisakha 26, 1888 (Saka).