

12.54½ hrs.

STATEMENT RE. ESSENTIAL
COMMODITIES (SECOND
AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Dinesh Singh): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the explanatory statement giving reasons for immediate legislation by the Essential Commodities (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1966, as required under rule 71(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

12.55 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESI-
DENT'S ADDRESS—contd.

Shri Kanwarlal Gupta (Delhi Sadar): What is the time allotted for this business?

Mr. Speaker: We are to meet today at 4 O'clock; we will decide that. Now, Mr. Guha may continue his speech.

Prof. Samar Guha (Contai): Sir, this is the first time for me to have the privilege of speaking in this House. Nevertheless I will use this opportunity to raise my voice of protest and indignation in this temple of democracy about the policy that had been so long pursued by the Government about Netaji, the apostle of Indian revolution and the greatest *kshatriya* after Shivaji in India. As a new member when I entered the Central Hall of this Parliament, I was naturally very happy to see so many pictures of the makers of India. I was eagerly looking for another portrait—the portrait of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose but I was shocked to find that although this Government had a mind to install during the last twenty years, one by one, portraits of the makers of India in the Central Hall, they did not have any intention to place the portrait of Netaji in the Central Hall. Almost all the Members present here will perhaps remember that Mahatma Gandhi, not once but several times said that Netaji hypnotised the Indian people. Although

the Father of the Nation had the greatness to say so, the rulers belonging to the Congress Government were not in any way touched in their hearts by the greatness of Netaji. One may wonder whether it was an act of inadvertent omission on the part of the Central Government. But looking to the background of the policy pursued by the Government about Netaji, I say it was not an omission but it was a deliberate and calculated act on the part of the Congress Government to minimise the position of Netaji and relegate him to secondary leadership in the history of national freedom. I have already stated that calculated attempts have been made to distort the history of the freedom movement. Our Government has made many attempts to create an impression in our country and abroad also that this country achieved freedom only under the Gandhian leadership and only by means of non-violent *satyagraha*. While yielding to none in my deep regard for Gandhiji whom I consider as one of the greatest men of the world, it will be a travesty of truth to say that India achieved freedom only by non-violent means. There is another side to this picture, beginning from the first war of independence in 1857, down to the last phase of our freedom struggle, I mean the great role played by the National Army of Netaji, that is the role of the Indian revolutionaries and the Indian revolution had equal importance side by side along with the Gandhian movement. From the 20s and through the 30s to the early part of the 40s, if the Gandhian movement had a great contribution to Indian freedom struggle, it is equally true that the Indian revolutionaries and the Indian revolutionary struggle had an equally important role in the freedom struggle of India. In the revolutionary tradition and heritage of India, Netaji has his place as the supreme emblem of Indian revolution. If we remember the values of peaceful nationalism that we have got from the Gandhian tradition, we should equally remember that

[Prof. Samar Guha]

India, the reawakened India, has also got another value: the value of revolutionary nationalism from the contribution of revolutionaries and their highest manifestation Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose.

13 hrs.

I do not know whether the Members of this House have forgotten that just after freedom was achieved, a committee to draw up the history of Indian freedom struggle was formed under the chairmanship of Dr. R. C. Majumdar, the most eminent among the living historians of India. But it almost passed out of the attention of any that this committee was unceremoniously scuttled. Do you know for what crime? Because that historian, a seeker after truth, showed the temerity to make the suggestion that although Gandhiji and the non-violent movement had a glorious role in our freedom struggle, it is equally true that the revolutionaries and the revolutionary movement of Netaji and the INA had no less contribution in our freedom struggle. It was for this crime that this committee was scuttled, and after a few years, another history committee was constituted with a few 'yesmen' so that the history could be written,—what shall I say—as was suggested, as was dictated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may resume his speech after lunch.

13.03 hrs.

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

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Prof. Samar Guha may continue.

Prof. Samar Guha: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I was saying that calculated and deliberate attempts have

been made to dictate and distort the history of the Indian freedom struggle. This was the reason, because some of our leaders thought that if the history of the Indian revolution gets its proper place in the annals of our freedom struggle, perhaps the role of many of our leaders will be relegated to the position of second line of glory. It is for this reason that this policy of neglecting and ignoring has been pursued about Netaji. Today we do not find any portrait of Netaji in the Central Hall. Although we find statues of our great national leaders here and there inside the Parliament House, at the gate of Parliament, there is no statue of Netaji anywhere to be found in the capital of India. It is for this reason that the birthday of Netaji is not observed by the Government of India. It is for this reason that we do not find anywhere in any of the Government offices in our country the picture of Netaji alongside the picture of Gandhiji. It is for this reason that the All-India Radio is not paying any attention to the glory and the revolutionary heritage of India and Netaji.

I think many hon. members of this House have gone to Red Fort to see the show called "Sound and Light". In that show we hear the recorded voices of Gandhiji and Pandit Nehru, but unfortunately it did not even draw the attention of any of the responsible leaders of this House to suggest that there are recorded voices of Netaji available, which also should be included in that show.

Sir, it is for this reason that valuable documents about Netaji and INA that were lost in Germany and the whole of South-East Asia were not collected by the Government of India. It is for this reason, it is for this apathy, it is for this attitude of neglect towards Netaji and ignoring him that his residences in Singapore, and the historical building in which Arz Hakumat of India was established, have been allowed to be purchased by two Chinese citizens of Singapore.

I had occasion to meet the representatives of the Government of Singapore and Malaya. They agreed that these two houses should be transferred to the custody of Government of India if the Government of India asked for them.

Sir, it is for this reason that the names of Andaman and Nicobar Islands that were re-named by Netaji as Shahid Dwip and Swaraj Dwip have remained as they were. In these two islands, a part of Indian territory that was liberated by Netaji and INA, so many martyrs, so many valiant fighters of Indian freedom, lost their lives. In sacred memory of those great martyrs Netaji wanted to re-name them as Sawaraj Dwip and Shahid Dwip. Unfortunately, our Government, our leaders of the national movement, when they came to power, did not care a bit to retain the names that were given to these islands by Netaji.

Sir, I will draw your attention to another aspect about Netaji. Netaji was a great revolutionary, a great patriot, a great fighter but Netaji was the greatest military genius, the greatest military leader, the greatest commander of India after Shivaji also. I will just read before the House a few of the observations that were made by General Kawabe when I visited Japan. General Kawabe was the man who commanded the Japanese army in the Burma front. He told me about Netaji, about his military genius. This is what he said:

"As an organiser and inspirer of a revolutionary army, as an acute strategist and as a planner of military operation and manoeuvrability, any nation should feel proud of Chander Bose."

He went further and said:

"Chander Bose was a great revolutionary but the greatness of his leadership is largely due to his brilliance as a military leader."

Sir, I have had the privilege of talking to many of the Japanese wartime generals. If you will allow me to sum up the observations that were made by them, in the following words:

"The unique character of Netaji's military leadership as the supreme commander of INA, his magnetic inspiration in infusing dignity, discipline and dauntless patriotism in his army, his paramount control over his army during attack or retreat, his innovation of revolutionary battle-cries, his electrifying order-of-the-days and all other gallant fighting feats in Germany and South East Asia in organising and leading the Azad Hind Fauz manifestly show that India should pay homage to Netaji not only as the greatest revolutionary of our age but also as the greatest military leader of modern India."

It is a tragedy that our Government, the free India Government, when it is necessary that our national defence should be inspired on the basis of nationalism and awakened patriotism, did not think it necessary, and it did not strike our leaders, that Netaji's role as a military leader should be placed before our national army. No attempts have been made to evaluate the role of Netaji as a military leader. No military honour has been shown to him and no attempts have been made to depict the role of Netaji before the Indian army. No military decoration, no insignia, no award of gallantry in the name of Netaji has been introduced. There is no military academy in the name of the first Indian revolutionary, the greatest Indian revolutionary, in the name of the first Indian military leader after Shivaji, as I have mentioned earlier. No military academy has been named after Netaji. What a shame it is that this Government has not made any efforts, has not done anything to place before our defence forces the role as

[Prof. Samar Guha]

the supreme leader of Army of Liberation which Netaji has played for the freedom of our country. It has been reported that Netaji's picture, Netaji's photo is a taboo in our military establishments. It is a shame to us, it is a shame to the whole of our nation that such a prohibitive order could be issued by this Government. I will just remind you that during the second world war even a die-hard communist like Stalin did not hesitate to introduce the highest military award in the name of General Sobrov, who was nothing but an imperialist General of the Czarist days. So far as Netaji is concerned, our Government had not the mind, not even a qualms of conscience, to bestow any role of national honour on such a great national leader. Sir, look at Netaji. It is a historical fact that it is because of Gandhiji and the other Congress leaders, who refused to accept his programme of immediate national struggle, that Netaji was compelled to leave this country and choose a hazardous path in search of freedom. But look to what great height their man, their noble man, could reach. Today all of us, the whole country, has accepted Gandhiji as the father of the nation. But do we remember, do this House remember, do this Government remember that it was he a rebel Congressman, who was twice elected President of the Congress, it was he who was expelled from the Congress, yet despite all injustice done to him, it was he who just at the moment of giving order to march to India to his national army first sought the blessings of Gandhiji, and it was he who first addressed Gandhiji as the father of the nation. It was the combined leadership of Nehru-Patel and Azad that was responsible for expelling the twice elected President of the Congress. But you will see to what height of nobleness of mind he reached, which Netaji alone could reach that he did not care to show any personal ill-will or a sense of personal rivalry towards his erstwhile colleagues when he named many of his INA brigades as Nehru Brigade, Patel Brigade and

Azad Brigade. But how mean our leaders could be, how mean this Government is that we could not show even a bit of honour to this great man, to this great revolutionary that India has ever produced.

Coming to INA, the historic role played by the INA, nowhere in the world has a revolutionary army—it will be known in future history as the army of Indian revolution been betrayed by a free country like we betrayed the INA. Just at the time of the INA trial in Red Fort there was a rush among the Congress leaders to share the glory of INA. Many Congressmen donned afresh their forgotten lawyers' gowns and attended those trials.

Sir, when our leaders came to power, the INA was completely betrayed. Our future generations will feel ashamed for this. None of the INA-men, not a single man of the INA, who valiantly fought against British rule was incorporated in our national army.

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

Prof. Samar Guha: I had a talk with the Speaker and he had the great kindness to say that I will be given sufficient time to speak on this subject. At least I will need 15 minutes more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give you another five or ten minutes.

Prof. Samar Guha: 15 minutes. I have talked to the Speaker and he has agreed to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Time is allocated according to parties. Please finish in another five to ten minutes.

Prof. Samar Guha: Do you know, Sir, who were incorporated in free India's national army? Only those INA-men, who made a statement that they joined INA under duress, were incorporated in our Indian Army and

those INA-men who boldly and courageously said, without caring for what will happen to them during the trial, that joined it to fight for this national freedom were not only not taken but their pension, pay and allowances, everything has been forfeited and not paid till now. What a shame it is! Till now their pension, pay, allowances, nothing has been paid.

Sir, the history of the INA has not been written. We talk much about national unity and about Hindu-Muslim unity. We raise many slogans, but it was Netaji and Netaji alone, it was only the INA, that really created history of unified Indian nationalism with blood and tears and the Hindus, the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Christians and the Buddhists fought shoulder to shoulder and sacrificed their lives, shed their blood in Kohima, Imphal, Kishanpur, Bishanpur, Chittagong, Buthidang and Muthidang. But those glories have not been accepted. There is no necessity felt by this Government to accept this revolutionary tradition of unified Indian nationalism.

There had been much talk about Nagaland. We have been dealing with the problems of the Nagas for so many years. Did it strike anybody that the rebel Naga leader, Mr. Phizo, not once but several times made public statements that Netaji was his leader and that he would follow Netaji? Did it strike anybody of us that in Nagaland the picture of Netaji was found in the houses of many Nagas? Did it strike us that during the great struggle of the INA thousands of Nagas fought with the INA shoulder to shoulder and shed their blood? At that time the question whether they were Indian or not was not raised. They fought as Indians with Netaji and I.N.A. Nothing has been done; not even a monument has been raised either in Kohima or in Imphal or in Kishanpur or in Chittagong or anywhere. Nowhere not even a plaque is there. These are places which would otherwise have been considered

places of national pilgrimage. I am not speaking today as a partyman, I am speaking as a patriotic Indian, as a son of India. It is a shame to us and our future generations will look down upon us on seeing the meanness that the Congress Government have shown towards Netaji and I.N.A.

Now I will come to another very important aspect. What about the mystery about Netaji? I met Shri Shah Nawaz Khan several times before he was made the Chairman of the Commission appointed to inquire into Netaji's mystery and every time he told me that he did not believe the plane crash story. I made as much as I could do an inquiry in Burma, Cambodia, Thailand, Hong Kong, Japan, Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia. Starting from Burma, I met Dr. Ba Maw in Rangoon, I asked him this question: What did he think about the story of the plane crash involving Netaji? He smiled and told me, "Do you know that it was also reported by a radio-broadcast from Tokyo that I had been killed in the plane crash?" Sir, I will now tell you something about the enquiry that I made. I will give you certain revealing, startling facts.

In Tokyo, I made an enquiry about the reported aircrash of Netaji in Rinkoji temple. I was surprised to see that Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had also visited that temple and had made certain observations in the visitors' book. This is what Dr. Rajendra Prasad had written:

"I am happy to be here in this temple and offer my prayer at the samadhi of Netaji."

But you will be astonished to know what Panditji had written. He had visited the temple in which the ashes of Netaji was supposed to have been preserved. Do you know what did he write? He wrote nothing about Netaji, not a word about Netaji. He wrote:

[Prof. Samar Guha]

"May the message of Buddha bring peace to the mankind."

Was it due to an uneasy conscience because he also did not believe in his heart of heart the story of an air-crash involving Netaji?

Then, I met the priest and asked him about the ash. He gave a startling story. He said that just after a few days after the surrender of Japan, three men came to the temple with a casket which contained the reported ashes of Netaji. I asked him, "Do you know the names of the persons who handed over the ashes to you?" He replied that there were two Japanese and one Indian who, according to him, was attached to the Indian Embassy at that time. I enquired about him but such a name could not be traced. About the Japanese, I could not trace one but, fortunately, I could trace the other one. His name is Mr. Hayashi who was the Hindi Interpreter, acting as a liaison officer between the Japanese Army and the I.N.A. I met him and asked him about the episode and he expressed his surprise saying, "After the surrender of Japan, I was taken to the prison by Americans and I do not know anything about that." The priest told me that that was the man who brought the casket containing the reported ashes of Netaji. But that man did not know anything about it. Then, he said, "If you are interested about that, I will take you to Gen. Kawabe who has written a book about Netaji." That book was the most important document which was produced before the Shahnawaz Commission that visited Japan. The second edition of that book was produced as a document on behalf of the Government of Japan. What did Gen. Kawabe say? He said "I know nothing about the plane crash incident? I did not make any enquiry whatsoever. I got certain paper reports and also from my memory, I wrote about Netaji in my book. I have not made any enquiry whatso-

ever about the plane crash incident involving Netaji." And yet that book was considered as one of the most important evidence by the Commission.

Then, he told me, "Would you like to meet the person who travelled with Netaji in the same plane from Saigon to Taihoku in Formosa?" His name is Lt. Col. Arai who is serving as a professor in Mechanical Engineering at the moment in a Tokyo University. When I met him, he gave me a long story. He told me that 14 or 15 persons were travelling in that plane. He also told me that Netaji had expressed his desire to go to Siberia via Mukden in Manchuria. He further told me that before the surrender of Japan, Netaji contacted Mr. Jeco Malik, the Russian Ambassador in Tokyo and through him, Shri Virendranath Chattopadhyaya, the brother of Sarojini Naidu, who was in exile in Russia to make arrangements for Netaji to cross over from Mukden to Siberia. He accompanied Netaji and made an enquiry through Gen. Sedai and the Japanese Army was to accompany him. That is the most valuable evidence. He said that out of 14 or 15 persons, only the pilot, the co-pilot, the radio engineer, Gen. Sedai and Chandra Bose—as they used to call Netaji as Chandra Bose—died in that air-crash. Then I asked him whether it was like too much of an accidental coincidence that the persons who were required to fly the plane, the pilot, co-pilot and Radio engineer, to Mukden died—the person who was deputed to escort Subash Chandra Bose, Gen. Sedai also died, and the Leader of the Drama Netaji Bose also died but all other persons were saved by particular trick of Providence. I can tell you many things, but I will not say much about that. I will only tell you that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, before he died, in a letter to Suresh Chandra Bose, the elder brother of Netaji, wrote, "There is no precise and direct proof." I want to draw your special

attention to this passage. "There is no precise and direct proof, but circumstantial evidences lead to the conclusion that Netaji is no more." What type of circumstances? In Formosa, the plane crashed and the Commission did not visit that place; the Commission did not visit also Mukden or Siberia. I do not know whether you know this. Recently Mr. Kamath visited Formosa and it was the Formosa Government that instituted an inquiry into the plane crash. Recently, the Government of Japan, through Gen. Fuziura, have said that they are prepared to undertake an inquiry into the mystery, jointly with the Government of India. It did not strike the Government of India that a fresh inquiry should be made into the Netaji mystery. A joint inquiry by the Government of Japan, the Government of Formosa and the Government of India, should be instituted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude now. It is an interesting narration. It is a sort of untold story. Still, he may conclude now.

Prof. Samar Guha: These are my concluding remarks.

Netaji is that type of leader who plunged himself in the surge of reckless abandon, in pursuit of freedom of his motherland. He is not an ordinary type of politician; he is more than that. He is a saint patriot of India. He is not a mere revolutionary, but he is a missionary. He is not an ordinary fighter only; he is an Indian pilgrim who wanted that the history of India should know him not as Subash but as an Indian pilgrim. Today we are passing through a national crisis. The galvanising image of Netaji, the inspiration of Netaji, should be brought into the heart of Delhi for our national survival; at this hour when we are passing through a national crisis, only his message, only his ideal of revolutionary nationalism can save India. Netaji Zindabad.

Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi (Bilhaur): I congratulate the learned speaker who preceded me for his eloquent and interesting discourse on Netaji. But I rise to support the motion of thanks.

The President, in his Address, has referred to the prevailing situation in the country and has brought before us the trials and tribulations through which the country is passing now. At the end of his message he has also appealed to us that if we act in a concerted manner, if we have a disciplined will and if we have the proper amount of determination, we can tide over this crisis and lead the nation to prosperity and progress. The first and the most vital question in this difficult and critical time is the food question and I am sure that every member, including the members on the Opposition benches, must be agreeing to this that food shortage is the primary problem that is facing this country today. I am sure that everyone agrees to the fact that whenever we borrow food from any other country, it hurts our self-respect and it is derogatory to our honour and prestige to go on borrowing food from other countries. The nation has to be congratulated, and the Congress Government have to be congratulated on the fact that they have cried a halt to any import of foodgrains after 1971. (*Interruptions*).

There is a saying 'Give the Devil its due'. Here, the question happens to be the President's Address, and I think on every point which is brought forward in the Address, we must pay our tribute very deservedly. So far as the food question is concerned, I would like to say that in spite of various natural calamities which have been overtaking the country for the last few years, in spite of the imports that we have been having, we find that our exports have not been encouraged and they have not been boosted up, and consequently, foodgrains have been imported into our country at the cost of valu-

[Shrimati Sushila Rahatji]

able foreign exchange. The problem has aggravated further because of the rise in the population which has reached the explosion point, because of the rise in the age of expectancy, because the age is now about 40 years or so, that is, a person can hope to live up to that age. Apart from that, we find that the rate of mortality has gone down, and the population has been rising at a tremendous pace. We have to bear all these factors in mind and meet the problem. These problems can only be met if our internal production rises. But how can internal production rise unless we invest more? And how can we invest more unless we save more? So, this is a vicious circle. In order to get out of this circle we have to attack at the very basis of our economic structure.

I would suggest that we take another look at our Plans; because our resources are limited. We cannot think in terms of imposing further and further taxes on our masses, because the cost of living is so high and we would not like to tax the people more than they could afford to give. With our limited resources, I would suggest that our Planning Minister and the Union Cabinet and the Union Government should make a reappraisal of the Plans and give priority only to those factors which deserve the topmost priority.

I know that a lot is said about the Indian farmer. With our land reforms, with our subsidy, with our seeds with our fertilisers and so on, our farmer is happy. But at the same time if we do not provide enough irrigation facilities to our farmers, what is the use of all these? I can only pay a tribute to the farmer who when he sees his crop dwindling before his eyes because of lack of proper irrigation facilities just heaves a sigh; I marvel at his peace-mindedness and his lovable nature. I would say that he is a very patient farmer because in spite of all the provocations of the

various Opposition parties from time to time, all that he does is to just utter a sigh or to allow a tear to drop down his cheeks. I marvel at his peace-loving nature and I marvel at his patience.

But I would suggest that the time has come now when we have to find quick remedies and take short-cuts and give every facility to the Indian farmer. The first thing that the Indian farmer requires is the facility of water for irrigation. I know that if we give him every other facility but deprive him of the very sap or the very stamina of water, he cannot do anything in life. Therefore, I would suggest to the Congress Government that all irrigation dues should be either abolished or reduced to half and the farmer must be made to realise that he is the back-bone to which the present nation is looking, he is the back-bone to which the future is looking, and he is the back-bone on which the present population is going to depend. Therefore, I suggest that irrigation facilities must be given top priority.

Coming to the sugar industry in UP, for instance, I would submit that sugar used to be a commodity which used to be sent out for export, and we used to earn about Rs. 8 crores of foreign exchange. But now because we are in a position to provide the necessary eight to ten waterings required in sugar-cane growth the sugar industry in UP is dwindling and it is going over to the south.

With all these problems facing us, I would submit that we require to have a reappraisal and a new look at our plans; we must have a reorientation of our Fourth Plan. I am even prepared to go the extent of saving that since scarcity and food shortage are facing many States now, we should put aside or postpone some of the welfare activities; by this I do not mean specifically social welfare activities but other welfare activities also. It is not a question of welfare now

but of the survival of the nation or the existence of the nation. Therefore, a new look has to be given to the Fourth Plan.

Secondly, as regards family planning, it is a very good thing indeed. I feel that with rise in population, any plan, any scheme, that we may take up, may flounder on the rock of a growing population. The family planning programme has been intensified. From an initial target of 70 lakhs in the First Plan, the Third Plan target is 27 crores. I would also like Government to keep a watch on the progress of the family planning schemes. It has been brought to my notice—I do not know how far it is true; I would certainly like the Government to take this into account—that the family planning programme is not being pursued very much by the lower strata of society and it has also not been pursued very much by certain communities in society. If this is so, we have to take cognizance of it and prepared to meet the great consequences that may follow after 10—15 years. After 10—15 years, a new generation will come into existence. We have to see whether this is followed only by the richer section and the middle class section in our society. otherwise, after 10—15 years, this may give rise to social, historical and communal questions. Therefore, I would request Government to be observant and keep a note of all these factors.

Thirdly, there is the question of our youth. The President has drawn our attention to the discontent and dissatisfaction prevalent in the youth. I will suggest it is not only dissatisfaction; it is frustration also. It is righteous frustration. With the transformation going on in our society today, with the high cost of living in our society, with the invasion of new ideas in science and technology, with the impact of western education in our society and with the absence of any religious teaching in our secular State, the poor student, the poor youth, finds himself in a very very difficult situation. And above all when he finds

after graduation that he is not given a proper job or find that he has to face unemployment or accept an unemployment which is not a lucrative one or finds an employment which is not suited to his aptitude, his frustration is accentuated.

In these circumstances, there is a ferment in our young society. I would suggest that this can be established, harnessed and channelised into very healthy channels if Government decide to set up a Directorate of Youth in which representatives of our youth are also brought in. They should be able to ventilate their grievances and find solutions for them. If it is tackled this way, I am sure half the problem will be met.

At the same time, I would suggest that our education system should be re-modified and made more realistic. Education must go along with employment, and the schemes which have been put up or the recommendations which have been given from time to time by the Education Commissions must be implemented immediately.

Here I would also appeal to my hon. friends in the Opposition Benches. Fortunately, we have some very eminent and distinguished Members in our Opposition Benches. Sometimes they also exploit the general discontent prevalent in society. I would beg of them. I would implore them, not to play with the discontent prevailing today. They are part and parcel of our families, part and parcel of the society of today. There is a subterranean fermentation going on and any incitement that the Opposition leaders might give may fan the breeze, dignifying the general discontent which may have very dangerous consequences in the long run. The Opposition has a special responsibility at this critical juncture. It has not only to play the part of an Opposition but also that of the party in power in many States. Let the Treasury Benches benefit from their constructive contribution made with all their intellect and wisdom in a manner conducive to the larger interests of the country

[Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi]

as a whole. I thank the President for the appeal he has made to the nation and I would also thank you for the opportunity given to me.

Prof. R. K. Amin (Dhandhuka): I rise to support the amendment moved by Shri M. R. Masani. I would like to speak on the economic policy as enunciated in the President's Address. I would not have chosen to speak at this juncture if there would not have been a good deal but for a great deal of muddleheadedness and wooliness in thinking on the part of the Government. I had trusted that with the inclusion of Mr. Asoka Mehta who wrote the report of the Foodgrains Policy Committee 100 years ago, with the inclusion of Mr. Morarji Desai who had an experience of the Finance Ministry, and with the inclusion of Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao, the sage amongst the economists, probably our economic policy, would be on the right path. But from the debate here on food, on devaluation and on the Budget, I find that the Government is not on the right track, it is still going off the right path. I would, therefore, like to place on record certain suggestions and certain views on our economic policy.

I am taking three points. One is regarding the agricultural policy; the second is regarding the price policy; and the third is about the minimum level of living which ought to be assured to all the people in this country.

Let me take first the food policy. It has been said in the President's Address that we should get rid of foreign assistance in food by 1971. How on earth can the Government keep the promise if they are proceeding in the same manner as they have been doing since 1947? I wonder how they could have had the courage to ask our people to wait for five years to get rid of foreign assistance in food? They have not learnt from the experience of the last two years, from the results of the election, that the people require food here and now, that the people are not

prepared to wait for self-sufficiency in food for more than a year or two. We have been fed up of taking a bowl in our hands and going to America and asking for food. We do not want that situation any longer, and we do not want promises from the Government which tell us that after five years we will get rid of foreign assistance in food. What we really require is to attempt a food policy on a war footing, on the basis of an emergency, with a view to attain self-sufficiency in food in a year or two, not later than that. I assure you, Sir, and I assure the whose House that it is still possible in this country, if we make an attempt sincerely, to attain an increase of 10 to 15 per cent to meet the marginal deficit in this country. Our deficit is hardly 15 per cent now. It was hardly seven to eight per cent so far, and it is not difficult to increase our food output by 15 per cent in a year or two. If we do so, we can get rid of our foreign assistance in food. If we do so, we can live in this world with great honour and dignity.

I would like to ask several questions on the policy adopted on food. Have you ever asked yourself this question: from all the graduates of the agricultural colleges, how many of them go back to the land? If you ask that question and make an inquiry, I challenge you that you will find that hardly one per cent from them go back to the land. You give them education for about four years, you invest your valuable scarce resources for training them in the field of agriculture, but hardly one per cent of them is going back to the land.

Shri Indarjit Malhotra (Jammu): More than that.

Shri R. K. Amin: Then, how can you imagine that your food policy or your agriculture can be progressive? What does the rest of the 99 per cent do? If you ask that question also, immediately the reply will come that they are noting down the marketing statistics, they are working in the Government Agricultural Departments,

attending the office, not the land, not the field, not cultivation. That is the type of work which could have been done by the graduates of other faculties. Why on earth do you invest your resources in them and waste them?

Then there is a second question. When you are evolving the policy of foodgrain distribution, do not make it in such a way as to hamper the attempts for further production. There is scarcity of food and we would like to increase our production. The steps that we take ought not to be such the policy we adopt even in the short run should not be such as to hamper production. Take the instance of the zonal policy, imposition of the levy and fixation of prices at a very low level. You go to the farmer and ask him the impact of the levy on him, what is the impact of the support prices which are fixed for the foodgrains and what is the impact of the zonal system? By and large, the answer you will receive will be: it has discouraged our efforts at increasing the production. You are encouraging co-operative thinking that the middle-men or those who are engaged in the food trade are all hoarders and profiteers. But have you ever addressed yourself to the question of the waste in foodgrains that is happening in the co-operatives? Do you think that rats will not come in co-operative shops and that they will come and destroy food in the shops of the private merchants only?.. (Interruptions.) I tell you that whatever is preserved in the homes of either the consumer or the trader will be better preserved than in most of the warehouses of the Government and the co-operative societies. If you take stock of all these things, you will realise that steps should be taken to reduce waste and set right the distribution policy and make further efforts to increase production. I still feel that the Government is not convinced of the fact. that if at all economic development should go forward, the first achievement should be in the field of agriculture. Unless and until you introduce

an agricultural revolution, no other revolution could be introduced. It is the production from the soil that forms the basis of economic development but this is not yet being realised by the Government; the sooner it is realised, the better it will be for our country. I would like to give you one example. You are spending a lot of money over community development schemes of which 85 per cent of the expenditure is made on the appointment of BDOs, TDOs and DDOs, etc. hardly 15 per cent goes by way of fertilisers to the farmers. I would suggest that they select at random 100 farmers and ask them: did you get any benefit from the BDO or DDO of your district and what sort of progressive advice have you taken from them? I am sure that 99 per cent of the farmers will tell you: nothing. Government's own reports on the evaluation of the community development schemes say, categorically that the scheme had failed. The idea embodied in the scheme is very good on paper, just as the scheme of having co-operatives. But in practice it does not work. But I find no desire on the part of the Government to scrap it and take other economy measures which are vital for in our country.

May I also point out another aspect? Take, for instance, the question of improved seeds. You know very well the results in Mexico; Mexico could improve its output two time in about two years' time, only by introducing hybrid seeds. We also seized upon that idea in the second Five Year Plan. We wanted to increase the seed farms from 1956. But examine at the end of 10 years what progress you have made, how much improved seeds you have supplied to the farmers? Even after 10 years, do you claim that 50 per cent of the farmers receive the seeds from you? No. Have you ever examined why the delay has taken place? Have you ever examined why the targets were not realised at all in this respect?

Take the target of the third Five Year Plan regarding the fertilisers. What a great shortfall you have got

[Shri R. K. Amin]

despite the fact that, time and again, the Government has spoken in this House and outside that they are going to increase the fertilisers, and they are going to increase the inputs which are very important for the development of our country! But what are they doing about increasing those inputs? Only in words: if you take their action of the past 16 years, you find that the Government has not taken any action. So, again, when you give the promises on this score, I think that we cannot put confidence in you.

Before I conclude on this point, I would also like to ask one question, and that question is this. Have you ever addressed yourself to the question as to why the farmer is not enthusiastic about the economic development of this country? You go and ask him. Does he feel any stake in the economic development of this country; you will have an answer, "No." Because there is no attempt to deal with him. He ryot has been kept in the darkness. The ryot has not been touched by our economic development; providing the reels, providing the pamphlets, providing the cinema pictures and other aids will not serve the purpose unless and until the man is ready to receive those things. In our country we have not taken those steps to make him ready.

I give you one example which probably will reveal what can be done by suitable education. I give you the example of Ludhiana in the Punjab State. I find that in Ludhiana, since 1960, the agricultural output is increasing at the rate of 10 per cent per year. In no other district in the State and in no other State in the country, it is increasing by more than 10 per cent since 1960. I asked those people how it happened. Their answer was, although I do not connect the entire increase in production with this factor alone, they have made a change in the Agricultural University. The change was that every student, every year was obliged to stay with a farmer for

a period of four months; in the busy season, the students were asked to stay with the farmers; in other words, one student was allotted to one farmer in one village; the farmer must feed the student; that is all. The student must work with him. Thus, a new energetic mind was working with the old cultivator who is experienced. When the student is staying there for four months with the cultivator, there is an exchange of ideas. The student says something and the farmer says and other thing so there is a tussle, a clash of ideas between them. When the student comes back to the university, he used to put various questions of his professor; the professor in the teaching faculty was not in touch with the cultivators so far, but now a link has been established; the student used to ask the professor about the difficulties of the cultivator; he puts the difficulties of the cultivator, before the professor; says that the cultivator wants this and that; the mind of the professors was therefore applied compulsorily to this aspect of the matter. What they get from the boys would again be conveyed in the second year to the farmer and by the time the four years' course is over, the students have learnt a lot about farming, and they are inclined to go back to the farm. The professors also come to know what are the problems of the farmer, and what the professors give as solutions of the farmers difficulties is again conveyed back to the farmer. Because of this give and take, there is a good deal of knowledge gained by the farmers, and because of this, progress in cultivation was taking place rapidly. I think that since 1960, the rate of increase of 10 per cent in Ludhiana, at least to a great extent if not totally is because of this. If that is so, if there is a connection between the two, what prevents our Government from taking such action at least for the 64 agricultural colleges in our country? If 64 districts can get that outlook and can increase their agricultural output by 10 per cent every year, I am sure our food problem will

be largely solved. But such a simple thing Government is not putting into effect.

Coming to my second point the price policy, I read in the President's Address that the Government proposes to arrest the tempo of rising prices as if the present level of prices is the right one and, which should be stabilised. According to Government statistics, the index number of wholesale prices which was 100 in 1952-53 rose to 203 in February, 1967. The index number of wheat prices which was 138 in 1964-65 rose to 187 on 28th January, 1967. During the last year, especially during the last three or four months, the prices of jowar and other food-grains have increased considerably. The price of chillies is Rs. 9 per kilogrammes and a 16 kilo tin of groundnut oil is sold at Rs. 100. Does the Government want the stabilisation of prices at this high level? It means that the Government does not care for the common man. The common man wants that the prices of essential commodities should be reduced to a reasonable level and not stabilised at the present high level.

How can the prices be reduced? I do not ask you to start with the reduction in taxation. I would like to ask you to start from the other end, i.e. stepping the deficit financing completely. The Finance Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, is absent; I hope he will read the proceedings. The definition of budget deficit he has given in the recent budget is wrong. Even the previous definition was wrong. He has changed it this time, but both are wrong. Previously, net withdrawal from cash balances of the Government and the net issues of treasury bills—both put together used to be described as budget deficit. This time three elements have been taken into account—net issue of treasury bills which are at the level of Rs. 307 crores, a certain amount of treasury bills converted into long-term debts and amounting to Rs. 50 crores and thirdly addition to the cash balances amounting to Rs. 7 crores. These three elements

have been included now. I ask, why do you shift from one definition to the another within 12 months? Thank God, one could notice it here. Otherwise, it would have gone unchallenged.

As a matter of fact, if you want to stop the inflationary pressure being exerted from the Government in our economy, what you should do is to stop deficit financing defined as withdrawal from Governments cash balances, net addition to the treasury bills and the increase in Government debts with the banking system. Then alone you can have the right type of definition of budget deficit and if that is stopped, we will have every chance to see that the prices are being stabilised.

Let me take the budget. I find that there was very little of deficit financing till October 1966. From November onwards it started very rapidly. Is there any connection between this high rate of expenditure and the arrival of elections? Were there some promises made to the electorate which you wanted to fulfil at the time of the elections? Why is there such a rapid rate of increase in the government expenditure? Has it any connection with the rapid increasing in the prices also during that period? I would like Government to examine that.

15 hrs.

There is one thing which also I would like to bring to the notice of the Finance Minister. You describe that the budget deficit is Rs. 350 crores. But you have misrepresented the whole picture. Have you taken into account the gains you have because of devaluation. If you remember, last year when the budget was presented the deficit estimated was Rs. 32 crores. Because of the devaluation in June 1966 Government got certain windfall gains. I would also like to give what those windfall gains were. One was increased value of foreign aid which was to the extent of Rs. 275 crores. The second was the

[Shri R. K. Amin]

increase in customs receipts to the extent of Rs. 36 crores. The third was the tax exemption certificate which also increased by Rs. 12 crores. Total gains from devaluation during the year to the Government were to the extent of Rs. 323 crores. Although there were certain losses due to increase in external debt and increase in cost of defence, if you take Rs. 350 crores as the deficit and add these gains which you devour away, due to devaluation then, probably, your deficit is around Rs. 600 crores while you planned for a deficit of Rs. 32 crores. This is the extent of deficit which I urge this House to keep in mind.

Well, Sir, you will ask me a question, what will be your constructive suggestion? The Finance Minister had asked for such suggestions. I would say, that two steps should be taken by the Finance Minister. The first is this; just as you appointed the Taxation Inquiry Committee some years ago, why do'nt you appoint an Expenditure Inquiry Committee on the same pattern? Many of the items of expenditure can be done away with I have noticed so far that when the Government decides to introduce a particular scheme whether as a temporary measure or as a permanent one, whether it serves the purpose or not, once it comes into existence, it remains there. If a scheme does not serve its purpose we should not hesitate in closing it down. Is there any arrangement in the Government to follow up any expenditure you are incurring? No. I can show you a number of schemes, if the Finance Minister ever cares to ask me, which are not serving any purpose whatsoever. Even evaluation made by independent committees has suggested that it is not serving any purpose, but, despite that it remains in existence. Is it not time for us, just as we appointed the Taxation Inquiry Commission some years ago—to appoint an Expenditure Inquiry Commission to examine all types of expenditure which are being incurred by the Government. If the schemes are not giving to there utility to the

extent we spend our money, why should we not close them down, why should we not stop that expenditure. If we do so, I am sure at least about 25 to 30 per cent of economy in expenditure can easily be achieved in this country. This is the first suggestion I would like to give to the Finance Minister. Because he is absent now I hope the Deputy-Speaker will convey my suggestion to him.

My second suggestion is to stop deficit financing. But not by the promises of the Finance Minister, because so many times in this House the Government has said that now onwards they are not going to resort to deficit financing and we know how many times these promises have been broken. People have no confidence in their promises. But what I would like to do is this. Just as in the Bank of England there was at one time a provision of issuing Treasury Letter, whenever the government wants to exceed the fiduciary issue and for which the Government has to come to Parliament in order to issue the Treasury Letter, we should have a similar provision here. Let us also make a provision that the money supply will not be increased by more than 3 per cent per year. That is the discretion or flexibility which we can give to the Finance Minister and if there are certain circumstances which make it necessary for the Government to exceed that limit, he must first come before this House and take its permission and should exceed that limit only if this House permits him. If you do that, the people will have confidence in the Government. You know the prices are rising because the prices are expected to rise. That expectation of rising prices should be nipped in the bud. For this we should inculcate confidence in the people, just as in the States where the opposition governments have inculcated confidence in the people, the prices are falling, the prices all over the country will fall, or at least stop rising in other States also if the Finance Min-

ister evolves some such method. Similarly, let us have confidence in the Government from now will have no deficit financing will be taken up. Then the expectations of the rising prices will be killed and once those expectations are killed, I am sure the prices will begin to come down.

My third point is about the minimum standard of living. Only two years ago, a Member of the Planning Commission, Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao issued a letter to all the State Governments to have an inquiry of the levels of living. I want to know what has happened of that? Probably nothing. Nothing has been done in that direction. I thought that something in this regard will be mentioned in the President's Address. I thought I will read about it in the budget. But I could not find it. Then I thought that the results of such an enquiry will have an impact on the Fourth Five Year Plan. But I do not find anything of that sort. Since for the last 16 years we have not done anything, I ask the government is it not time for us to assure the poorest people of our country, the *Daridranaryan* as Gandhiji termed,—the lowest 30 per cent of our society, certain minimum level of living say this: this amount of clothing, cereals and at least drinking water they will have in any case? Have we been able to assure to each and everyone at least drinking water? No. What about even 8 ounces of foodgrains? The answer is "No". Have we been able to assure at least the minimum of 8 metres of cloth? No. Many many years ago Dr. Rao started talking about it. I thought that he will persuade the Cabinet on this issue, but I find that he has not been able to persuade the Cabinet to do this. Now I find that even Shri Jagjivan Ram is talking so easily that he does not seem to be concerned about it.

What do the Agricultural Labour Inquiry Commission Reports say? If you read them, one fact emerges regarding so far as the improvement in the living conditions of the agricultu-

ral labour is concerned, there is no controversy about the fact that their conditions have not improved. The chances are that their conditions have deteriorated. About the rest of the people one may say that the conditions have improved but, so far as the agricultural labour is concerned there is no improvement at all, what is agricultural labour if not *Daridranarayan* of Mahatmaji? It was he for whom Gandhiji fought for *swaraj* and also, he becomes the first victim of *swaraj* because his condition has not improved. If my hon. friends in the opposition would like to have any common front, let us take up this common front. We do not want Bhilai or Durgapur or even big industries. We would first like to ensure a certain minimum share to the lowest or the poorest people of the country. The *Daridranarayan* should be uplifted to a particular level. Then alone should we think about other matters. I do not talk of this for equal distribution; I talk of this for economic considerations. If you want to increase productivity, if you want to increase your economic efficiency, this a 'must'. Unless you do it, there is no hope for economic development in our country.

I have a number of points to make but the time at my disposal is very short. The only thing on which I would like to congratulate the Government is that they have decided to re-organise the Planning Commission. Thank God that after 16 years, although they did not admit that they committed a blunder in 1950 even as late as 1967, but it is never too late to men—they have decided to re-organise the Planning Commission. When they are mending it, I am sure they will do it in the right manner. If they do it in the right manner, then alone the hopes will be fulfilled.

In the end I plead: do not talk of stabilising the prices of all commodities, talk of bringing down the prices of essential commodities at a reasonable level, do not have deficit financing any more, and our first concern should be about the *Daridranarayan*, the poorest people of our country.

Shrimati Mohinder Kaur (Patiala): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on the President's Address. The President in his address has drawn our attention to four major problems confronting the country, that is, firstly, to attain self-sufficiency in food by 1971; secondly, to reduce the birth rate from 40 per thousand to 25 per thousand; thirdly, to bring down the prices of essential commodities and, fourthly, to build our economy in a manner that we can do away with external assistance by 1976.

If we are to achieve these objectives, I feel, multi-party co-operation is essential. In this context, I particularly welcome the suggestion made by Shri Masani calling for a moratorium on party strife. I feel that the aim of all political parties is the same. They have the well-being of the nation at heart. So, I do not see why we cannot cut across party lines in the interest of the nation.

The food production of this country in 1949-50 was 55 million tonnes and in 1964-65, which was the peak year of agricultural production in the country, it rose from 55 million tonnes to 89 million tonnes. But since then our production has considerably fallen. Our target for the Third Five Year Plan was 100 million tonnes but we failed to achieve that target.

There are various factors responsible for this. We cannot entirely blame nature though we all know that nature has not been very sympathetic to agriculturists in this country. There are several other factors also responsible for this stagnation in agriculture and I would like to point out a few.

Firstly, we have not given proper incentive to the cultivator. Then, there has been considerable delay in the implementation of the land reforms policy. This I would like to substantiate from a report by Mr. Wolfe Ledjinsky. He was a Ford Foundation Consultant who came out to India in 1963 to study the reasons for the stagnation of agriculture in

India. He made a complete study of the tenurial conditions in the package districts in this country and in his report he has mentioned that there was considerable delay in the implementation of the land reforms policy in India which was responsible for the stagnation of agriculture because there was insecurity in the mind of the farmer or the tenant.

There are other reasons also. You are aware that in India the average holding is very small. We have no law in this country to halt the fragmentation of holdings in this country. I would like to mention that there are several countries which have introduced legislation to put a stop to fragmentation of holdings, but in this country we have not given any consideration to this point at all. As you know, if the land holding is below a certain holding, it becomes uneconomic. The average holding in India is very, very small and we have done nothing to put a stop to these small uneconomic holdings in India.

Then, inputs are absolutely essential to farmers if he is to succeed. Inputs like fertilisers should be made available at the proper time and at a reasonable rate. Inputs like proper seeds, particularly seeds of high-yielding varieties, should be introduced in the country. I know, we have introduced high-yielding variety seeds in the country, but not in a sufficient quantity. Thirdly, it is very essential to provide irrigation for the farmers. All these things are very necessary if we want the farmer to go ahead and produce enough food as we want in this country.

The price of fertiliser in this country is the highest as compared to that of in other countries of the world. I would also like to point out that there is no proper distribution system of fertiliser in the country because, when the quotas are earmarked for States, the question of supply and demand is not taken into account. When we allocate a certain amount of fertiliser for a State, many a time we read in

the papers that there is a glut because that particular State is unable to use that quota whereas other States which need fertiliser do not have it at the right time. So, I personally feel that this distribution system should be overhauled properly. If there are any procedural delays or any other procedural lacunae, they should be looked into and speedily removed if we want agriculture to prosper in this country.

Then, I come to family planning. In this country, we have thought of putting a halt on birth-rate but we have really not made serious attempts towards it. I would like to say that during the Third Five Year Plan period during the tenure of Dr. Sushila Nayar as the Health Minister, substantial amount of work was done in this field. I would like to pay a tribute to her. She brought the Government and the voluntary agencies together to spread the message of family planning in every nook and corner of the country. The climate, the awareness, has now been created among the people. It is now high time that bolder steps are taken in this direction. In the beginning, it was very necessary to create the climate for it, to make the people conscious of it, and to make the people accept the idea of family planning. We have been able to create that awareness. I now say that bolder steps are called for. What I mean to say by 'bolder steps' is that we have to adopt legal measures to reduce the birth-rate. I do not think we ought to shy away from it or hesitate. This is not the first time that I am pleading for it. Time and again, I have done it in the other House. I have spoken many times on this subject but it is a cry in the wilderness. No one seems to take any note of it. Two years ago, a committee was constituted which was headed by one of the hon. Members of this House, Shri Shantilal Shah. They sent out questionnaires and several people had appeared before them. But, as far as I know, no clear-cut mandate was received by that Committee. I, personally, feel that

the time has now come to introduce some legislation to that effect. I know there are very many people in this country who feel that if they are going to allow legal abortion in the country, we are going to encourage immorality in the country. I am extremely sorry to say that if the law is the only custodian of morals, it does not speak well of us at all. Several people have put up an argument, let nature take its course and why tamper with nature. I would like to say that we have already tampered with nature because we have combated disease, epidemics, etc. in this country. You will see that in the last three or four decades, the span of life has more than doubled in this country. Have we not tampered with nature? I feel that the time has now come for taking bolder steps in this direction and that is for legalisation of abortion. There are several countries in the world who have introduced this legislative measure, that is, Japan, France and Scandinavian countries. In this context, I would particularly like to mention the name of Japan. In ten years, after introducing the legalisation of abortion, Japan has been able to reduce its birth-rate to half. If Japan can do it, so can we. I feel that we should not hesitate to do that because, if we are going to hesitate, posterity will never forgive us for this lapse. So, I say, bolder steps are called for. I appeal to every party in this House to lend their support in bringing forward legislation so that we can do some substantial work in reducing the birth-rate in this country.

Then, coming to planning, I am surprised at the people talking of Five Year Plans in the most contemptuous manner in this House as well as outside. I do not wish to enter into arguments. How can any developing country do away with planning? Every developing country has a plan. If we want to strengthen our economy, we have to resort to planning. I feel that for the next twenty years to come, we cannot give up planning. We cannot

[Shrimati Mohinder Kaur]

indulge in the luxury of leaving our economy in the hands of a few people in this country.

We have to have planning. I feel that we can reshape our Plan according to the needs of the time. Priorities can be re-fixed. We have, of course, to give every incentive to agriculture, to boost the agricultural production in the country, but I personally feel that we cannot have a lopsided Plan in this country; we have to have balanced planning. We cannot keep on developing one sector of the economy at the cost of the others because, as I have previously mentioned, there is already too much dependence on land for livelihood. If they are going to concentrate on developing agriculture and lose sight of the other sectors of the economy, then we will be in for a very bad time because the time has come when we have to take away people from the land and build up some sort of an employment potential for the increasing number of people; the population is increasing rapidly in this country and we have to find other avenues of employment for the increasing number of people in the country. I feel that we cannot give up our plans.

These are the two or three things that I wanted to bring to your notice and I once again appeal to all political parties to lend their hand so that we can take out this country from the economic rut which we have got into at the moment; I feel that every one should lend his hand to do that.

Shri S. K. Sambandhan (Tiruttani): The Presidential Address is a great disappointment to the people of this country because fortunately or unfortunately the people of this country had great expectations that the Government which has been returned to power would have learnt, after these twenty years, something, if not out of their folly, at least out of their experience, but it is said, rather a pity that the Government have not learnt

anything from out of the omission and commissions or at least from the reverses as was rightly pointed out by some hon. members in their speeches.

The President's Address, as usual contains some schemes which are impracticable and some assurances which remain as assurances in the paper itself. For instance, year after year the Government come forward and tell us that they are taking steps—ever since the day of their planning of this wasteful Plan—to attain self-sufficiency not only in food but also in the production of other commodities, but—with what result, we know—with the result that the President of the United States, Mr. Johnson, going about begging, on behalf of India, the other nations just to share the responsibility of feeding India. Again, year after year, the Government come forward saying that they are taking measures to arrest the rising prices. As has rightly been pointed out just now, at what level are the Government going to arrest prices, nobody knows. Nobody knows whether the Government have any plan or concrete scheme to arrest prices. Nothing has been mentioned; no concrete schemes have been given in the Address.

Another thing is this. The Government come forward every year and tell the Parliament and the people that they have got plans and that they are trying to export more and more and earn more and more foreign exchange. But with what result? Even at the time of devaluation, the Government were boasting themselves that devaluation was brought about mainly for the purpose of boosting our export and earning more and more foreign exchange. The Finance Minister, the other day, accepted in his statement that our exports had gone down by more than 9 per cent on the overall total in a period of nine months. Really, the Government should be ashamed of this. The export of textiles has gone down by

about 100 million square yards, i.e., the number of units has gone down by 35 per cent. All this has happened because of the false vision and the impractical implications of what they think. So, the Address contains nothing new for the new Parliament and so the disappointment to the people.

There are many tasks that are confronting the Government and which Government should tackle and to which they should find a remedy forthwith. The first and most important issue which has been stressed in this House by many other Speakers, and which I also wish to stress because of its importance, vitality and delicacy is the language issue. Language to anybody in this country or elsewhere is as delicate and as precious as one's own life itself. It is really regrettable that this Government which professes democratic socialism and which preaches democratic socialism has not brought about an equality between languages even within this House. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are really thankful to you for having conceded the right of every Member to speak in his or her own mother-tongue, but that has been conceded only now. I would submit that this Government which professes and preaches democratic socialism should first of all try to put an end to this inequality or discrimination, if I may say so, between the different languages, between one State and another, between the non-Hindi-speaking people and the Hindi-speaking people, which has been going on in this very House, ever since the day of the Constitution.

It may be true that Hindi has been mentioned as the national language or the official language in the Constitution. But I beg to submit to the Government and to the Members of this House that the Constitution has been made for the people and it is intended for the benefit of the people and the Constitution is not a thing that can remain unchanged for ever.

Further, amendment of the Constitution is not something new to this House because Government have amended the Constitution during the last few years seventeen or eighteen times, and the twenty-first amendment to the Constitution has now been circulated to the Members. So, whenever the Members feel the necessity to amend the Constitution, they should not hesitate even for a minute to do so. As far as the language issue is concerned, nothing less than an amendment of the Constitution will be fair and nothing less than amendment of the Constitution will be just; nothing less than that will satisfy the non-Hindi-speaking people of this country. So, I would request Government not to hesitate to bring forward legislation to restore equality among all the Indian languages.

15.28 hrs.

[SHRI G. S. DHILLON in the Chair]

But, here, I have to make one observation. One responsible Member from the Congress said the other day that English was not the language of any Indian. I am not here to support or argue on behalf of the English language. But, anyhow, the fact remains that the language of the Anglo-Indian community is English; the Anglo-Indian community forms a sizable number in this country, and because of their being in a sizable number, the President has been pleased to nominate two Members from that community to this august House, the highest forum in this country. That means that the mother-tongue of the Anglo-Indians is recognised. So, it should be taken in that sense, and English also should be recognised for all purposes which it deserves.

Another thing that we find from the President's Address is that Government have come to realise at last that our country has become a federal set-up. Even though the people have clearly shown that ours is a democratic federal set-up, the Presi-

[Shri S. K. Sambandhan]

dent has accepted it in his Address only now. I only wish to state that Government should not merely remain content with this lip-service, namely that the Constitution lays down what the relationship between the States and the Centre should be. Whatever it is, at the time of the framing of the Constitution or even during the period that the Constitution has been in force so far, the last 17 years, the relationship between the States and the Centre was quite different from what it should be today, because the parties in power in all the States so far as well as at the Centre belonged to one party. Now there is a multi-party complexion; different parties are in power different States. So the Centre-States relationship should undergo a change. This aspect must be given more importance. The Government at the Centre should be sincere whenever it says anything. Mere words will not serve the purpose.

At present, the State Governments do not have enough powers even in the subjects classified in the Constitution as State subjects. For instance, even in regard to health, agriculture etc. the States do not have absolute powers. They do not have even necessary finances to look after these matters.

Here I want to present another aspect. It is the State Government that goes to the people, that is very near the people. It is not the Central Government which does that. The Central Government may be contented with bigger schemes and bigger ideas, but small matters like agriculture, health should be completely in the hands of the States and they should be given more and more finances to implement their schemes on these subjects very effectively and more usefully. It is really a pity that things are not as they should be.

Let me quote one instance of how Centre-State relationship has worked

in the past. Agriculture is a State subject. Just four or five years ago when I was in the Madras Legislative Council, I asked a question, how many drilling machines used for digging bore wells are not used and the reasons for the same. The reply was that drilling machines which were imported at a heavy cost had been kept idle by the State of Madras for three or four years, just for want of some small spare parts, because a few thousand rupees—worth of foreign exchange was not at all made available to the State Government which is interested in agriculture and its promotion for the import of these spare parts. It has taken three or four years to get the necessary sanction from the Central Government. If this is the procedure followed, if this is the kind of administration we have even today, do you think, Sir, we can make any appreciable increase in agricultural production? We cannot at all hope to achieve that objective.

So the Centre should come forward with a more realistic approach.

The President has in another place mentioned that administrative changes will be contemplated. He has said that to ensure efficiency in performance, changes will be made in the administrative set-up. I beg to submit that administrative changes here and there will not do at this juncture. I pointed out an instance of lack of co-ordination between a State Government and the Central Government. That is the kind of administration we have. The common man cannot approach the right person or get the right thing done in a week, month or even a year. When I was talking with some friends a few days ago, I came to know that even some files were missing or not traceable in the Secretariat when the person concerned is not 'properly' approached. Such is the bureaucratic red-tapism prevalent in the administration. Drastic and vast changes should be made.

The changes should be such that anything and everything should reach the common man very easily whenever he has a problem that has to be solved immediately.

Another important thing that has escaped the attention of the Central Government is the problem of unemployment. This is a vitally important problem. In his Address to the new Lok Sabha, no mention has been made about employment. The unemployment problem is growing like anything. It is the most vital problem facing the Government anywhere in this country. Yet no mention has been made of it. We have the problem of educated unemployed. Thousands and thousands of people who are educated find themselves without any job all because they have not been given the right type of education because of lack of vision on the part of Government. In addition, there exists the problem of unemployment among the rural masses. One such category is the poorest wage-earner in the country, viz., the handloom weaver. There are millions of handloom weavers in the country. There are million of them unfortunately in Madras and Andhra who do not get one square meal a day even today. About all these handloom weavers nothing has been done so far. Even in the allocation of funds the Government had no sense of proportion in the past. Particularly in the third plan they have spent Rs. 26.43 crores only on handlooms, an industry on which, more than 1½ crores of people are directly connected, and on whom several other crores of people are dependent. Contrary to this is the amount spent on khadi. I have reverence for khadi, I have been using khadi and even today I am using khadi, but the number of people who depend on the khadi industry, compared to those dependent on the handloom industry, is much smaller. The number of people who depend on the handloom industry is a hundred times more than those who depend on khadi, and yet the estimated amount

spent in the third plan on khadi is more than Rs. 90 crores. Does it show any sense of proportion in the spending even this amount by this Government? The Government should rectify this.

What little they spend in the name of the handloom industry is not spent properly. I can quote hundreds of instances. The representations of the people in the industry to Government only fall on deaf ears. Government are helping in the name of the handloom industry, only those in the co-operative sector, but the handloom industry is dispersed throughout the nook and corner of every village and town in the whole country. The weavers who come under the co-operative sector are only 20 to 25 per cent. even though this Government may show statistics of 40 to 45 per cent, but we know very well how these statistics are obtained. Leaving that alone, even taking in for granted that 40 to 45 per cent of the weavers are under the co-operative sector, only a part of this amount spent goes to the co-operative sector, and the remaining part goes to the State trading organisation, which is nothing but wasting public money. There are many State institutions which are created to waste public money. I can give a recent instance.

Very recently the Government sent two delegations in the name of handlooms. Last year they sent a delegation to America. That delegation went there to find out the possibility of exporting Bleeding Madras which was being exported in large quantities before. You will wonder, even laugh at it when I tell you Sir, that not a single exporter from the private sector, which contributed more than 85 per cent of the total export of this particular commodity to the United States, was included in that delegation. Some interested people who are very closely connected with the Government people or the Ministers only were sent. With what result? Nothing has come out to the poor man.

[Shri S. K. Sambandhan]

So also another delegation was sent to the East, including Australia, very recently, a few months before the General Elections. No exporter, no manufacturer of handloom goods was included in that delegation, even though the delegation consisted of six or seven people.

If this is the position, if this is the way the Government handles these things, can we imagine that things will improve? They will never improve. I can only request the Government to take a practical or realistic attitude in implementing their policies.

Only one submission more. The Government talk about austerity. If only they are sincere, I would ask the Government why they should not appoint common Governors for a few States. For instance, for the southern States there can be a common Governor. Governorship is only a luxury, we know what the powers and position of the Governor is. Why not Government think of appointing only common Governors and that too only eminent jurists? If only they are sincere in their professions, let them first of all start at least in this direction in observing austerity.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu (Chittoor): Sir, I offer my thanks to the President or his address to the joint session of this House. I am very glad that he has said that food imports would be discontinued from 1971. But I want to know what steps the Government has taken in this regard. Government has not taken adequate steps to grow more food. In the last five years, our Government was interested in going to foreign countries and getting food-grains than produce more food here. Now we are having a practical Minister for Agriculture and I think at least in his time he would bestow more attention on food production.

Andhra Pradesh comes first in food production and export of food to other States but what is the treatment meted out to Andhra—a step-motherly treatment. For instance, instead of taking over Nagarjunasagar as a national project under a Central scheme, they are not even allotting enough funds for the completion of the project though it is an advanced stage. We are not helping the production of more food-grains by this process. In Andhra Pradesh about forty per cent of the land depends on irrigation. All the schemes that were or are under execution, about sixty per cent is depending on rain or lift irrigation. The Centre has not shown any interest in electricity expansion. Perhaps it has the lowest per capita electricity consumption. While the Centre has shown interest in establishing thermal power stations in other States, it has taken no interest so far as Andhra is concerned. The Government are also not helping the ryots by giving them electric connections or constructing minor and major irrigation works. They are not giving them good seeds or enough fertilisers in time.

15.45 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The Government should consider giving some incentives to the agriculturists so that they may grow more food. The mere issue of *farmans* will not produce food. We have to talk to the farmers kindly and help them.

We have to give them some incentives such as good fertilisers at subsidised rates; you must give them good speeds at subsidised rates! you must remove the sale-tax on the purchase of tractors and remove the excise duty on the import of tractors. Like that, if you give them some incentives, the agriculturists will be encouraged to grow more food.

I came to understand that in Madras State, due to the harassment of procurement officials, some organisations

of agriculturists have decided to discontinue to grow food crops and to take up commercial crops instead. If this happens in all other States, I am afraid we have to import more food-grains from other countries. If really our Government wanted to discontinue food imports, I think in a practical way our Government should tackle these things.

Rayalaseema, from where I come, is a backward area; the upland area is always affected by famine. Though the President has been kind enough to mention in his address that the Government would fight the drought conditions, and though in Andhra Pradesh, we are hearing not only from the State Government but also from the Central Government that they are going to take effective measures to avoid these drought conditions, nothing has been done. I only request the Central Government one thing: instead of spending so much money on food imports, let them spend some money on electricity extension, on deep well-boring, on execution of minor irrigation works in the Rayalaseema area, so that immediate results of these measures could be shown there.

I have been hearing the Opposition's boasting that they have come in very large numbers this time. But how have they come in here in very large numbers? In Andhra Pradesh and in all other States also, the Congress party used to tell the people when they go to them for votes, what they are going to do and what they can do. But the other parties, thinking that they will not come to power, have said so many things, promised to do many things, and by just saying like that, they were able to come, I think, in large numbers. In the Madras State, one party said that when they come to power, they would give three Madras measures of rice for a rupee, that is, four and a half kilos of rice for a rupee. People really thought that by paying one rupee.....

Shri S. K. Sambandhan: What he says is not correct.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu: It has come in the papers; we have read it. In my own constituency, the DMK people said like that, in support of the Swatantra candidate. I have heard it. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let him be allowed to speak.

Shri Chengalraya Naidu: So, people thought that really they are going to get three measures of rice per one rupee and they voted for them. Fortunately or unfortunately, in Madras, the DMK has come to power, which they never expected. But they have to face the music now. There, people are already asking, are you giving three measures of rice per rupee? They are not able to get even one measure for two rupees, because rice is not available there; they have to produce rice. They have said so many things that their ministers would not draw salaries and so on. This is the last time that D.M.K. would be in power in Madras, because the people will know that they have not fulfilled their promises and they will not be voted into power again. Any Party can deceive only once, not twice. There are some parties in Parliament which indulge only in character assassination by bringing some allegation or other. They can do it twice or thrice or for some months or years, but they can not do it always. There are some parties which will take up tarring up the boards in English in cities and other places, if they do not have any other work. My advice to them is, instead of doing these things, let them go and help the villagers to grow more food. Instead of giving a lot of trouble in Parliament, let them go to the villages and help the villagers to grow more food or let them approach the ministers to provide some facilities to the agriculturists. That would be a better thing for them to do.

With these words, I support the motion of thanks.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Dhireswar Kalit

***Shri Dhireswar Kalita (Gauhati):**
 Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on the President's Address. No where has he mentioned in his Address regarding safeguards and protection of minority communities in India especially Muslim community in Assam. They are always facing hardships and oppression from the State Government of Assam. In Assam it is said that lakhs of Muslims have infiltrated from Pakistan into Assam. Accordingly, Quit India notices in thousands were served on Indian nationals and when these were challenged in Court of Law, proved otherwise. It is seen that police and other authorities go round to the villages with some false papers and threaten the Muslims that notices were there to Quit India and thereby those police took bribe from the poor Muslims. In this connection I may refer to a statement of Shri Fakruddin Ali Ahmad who is now a Union Minister wherein he had said that Muslims in Assam are at the mercy of police and this has not yet been challenged by any authority. Muslims in Assam are getting second-class citizenship status in Assam. This must be put an end to and investigations made therein.

Sir, the second point I want to raise is this. It has been said that greater emphasis will be laid on minor irrigation and energisation of wells, efforts will be made to expedite the completion of major irrigation projects but no flood control measures have been undertaken. Particularly the eastern part of our Republic, Assam, Bengal & Orissa are always hit by big floods. Last year, there was a big flood in Assam which caused a serious damage to crop and property worth of Rs. 21 crores. You know, Sir, Brahmaputra and its tributaries are the cause of Assam's floods. These are to be properly controlled. If flood is controlled in Assam then Assam will always remain a surplus State in food grains. Sir, it has to be noted that in Assam still lakhs of acres of land are lying fallow. Here I can mention that under Forest De-

partment under Government PGR and VGR, and khas and under Tea Gardens these lands are lying fallow. These lands must be immediately brought under cultivation. Here it should be also noted that in Tea gardens only one third of the acreage of total land vested in a tea garden is actually under tea plantation. Government must see that these lands are immediately acquired to be brought under cultivation.

Sir, these tea gardens are mainly owned by British imperialists. Here in Assam there is an Oil Refinery at Digboi and which was first in India. This is also owned by the British. There is a colliery in Marghelita and Lido which is also owned by the British. And, these companies have been earning huge profits for the last two hundred years. Government of India should immediately nationalise these industries and this is the demand of our national movement. Assam is a rich land though it is backward now, it can be developed properly. It has got coal, it has got oil, it has got also iron ores which are not yet exploited fully. Backwardness of Assam must be washed away. Assam should be developed industrially so that more employment opportunities could be created. Finally, sir, many points have to be left untouched for want of time. Regarding reorganisation of Assam, I say it is long overdue. The Govt. of India did not pay any heed to Nagas' demand so the arms struggle now. Government of India did not care to talk with Mizos. The same fate there also. Now the Garos and Khasis are also demanding separate hill states for which Government of India is daily going with some meetings and conferences and some commissions and formulae. The recent communique from the Home Ministry in regard to reorganisation of Assam has given rise to serious misgivings in Assam. Herein, Sir, I want to say, instead of sitting at the parlour of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Home Minister just after the session, should say a visit to Assam and spare considerable amount of time, invite all

*The original speech was delivered in Assamese.

political parties and all shades of opinion, discuss with them around the table and try to come to an agreed solution after which a Commission may be set up, and not before that. I hope the Government of India will seriously consider this point and take steps accordingly.

16 hrs.

Shri Dhireswar Kalita: Sir, I shall render my speech in English.

Mr. Speaker: Not now. He can give a copy of the translation later. He could not take double the time by now translating it.

Shri J. M. Biswas (Bankura): Sir, he only wants your permission to submit his translation.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, yes. He is welcome to translate it and supply a copy later.

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह (छपरा) : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका बहुत शुक्रगुजार हूँ कि आपने मुझे इस बहस में भाग लेने का अवसर दिया। अभी हमारे पहले के प्रवक्ता, जो कि आसाम के रहने वाले हैं, उनका भाषण हम ने सुना। ऐसा जोश पूर्ण बोल रहे थे, कि अगर किसी ऐसी भाषा में बोलते, जिसको हम लोग भी समझ सकते, तो बड़ा ही अच्छा होता। अपने भाषण के अन्त में उन्होंने जैसा कहा, उससे ऐसा मालूम हुआ कि वह अपने भाषण में ऐसी भाषा का भी प्रयोग कर सकते थे, जिसको हम लोग भी आसानी से समझ सकते, यदि वे उस भाषा में बोलते तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता। यों तो हमारे देश में बहुत सी भाषायें हैं और हर क्षेत्रीय भाषा में, या अपनी भाषा में बोलने का लोगों को पूर्ण अधिकार है और यह अधिकार होना भी चाहिए, लेकिन मैं यह समझता हूँ कि राज काज के काम के लिए और अपने व्यवहार के लिए यदि किसी व्यक्ति को ऐसी भाषा का ज्ञान है

जिससे और लोग भी लाभ उठा सकें, उन के भाषण से और उनकी राय को समझ सकें तो उनको उसी भाषा का प्रयोग करना चाहिए। इस में किसी प्रकार के द्वेष या ईर्ष्या से प्रभावित होने की बात नहीं है। अगर कई माननीय सदस्य अपनी क्षेत्रीय भाषा का प्रयोग कर रहे हैं तो घ्रा कर ईर्ष्या या द्वेष के बश हो कर अपनी क्षेत्रीय भाषा को हस्तेमाल कर अन्य लोगों को अपने विचारों से वंचित रखना कुछ उचित सा प्रतीत नहीं होता है। भाषावाद और प्रान्तीयता— ये देश की एकता में बाधक हैं इस के लिए हमें राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर विचार करना चाहिए। कोई व्यक्ति अपने भाषण में दूसरे लोगों को वंचित रखना चाहता है। तो वे स्वतन्त्र हैं, लेकिन ऐसा उन को करना नहीं चाहिए। द्वेष और ईर्ष्या में पड़ कर इतनी बड़ी महत्व पूर्ण बात को अपनी एक छोटी सी क्षेत्रीय भावना से प्रभावित हो कर राष्ट्रीय हितों से ज्यादा महत्व नहीं देना चाहिए।

16.05 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the chair]

आज इस देश में एक अजीब परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हो गई है। आपने देखा कि कल इसी सदन में एक माननीय सदस्य ने अपने भाषण में कहा कि केरल की परिस्थिति ऐसी है कि वे उस राज्य में विदेशों से जो फारेन एक्सचेंज ज्यादा अर्जित करते हैं उस अनुपात से उन के यहाँ प्रगति नहीं की गई है। पिछली तीन पंच वर्षीय योजना में केरल को जो स्थान मिलना चाहिए था वह नहीं मिला है। दूसरे दिन मद्रास के मुख्य मंत्री ने भी एक बयान दिया और उन्होंने अपने बयान में कहा कि हम को बर्मा से चावल लाने की इजाजत मिलनी चाहिए तथा हम विदेशों से वाणिज्य के मामले में सीधा सम्पर्क स्थापित कर सकें। इसी तरह से पिछले दिनों आज से 15-20 दिन पहले विहार के एक मंत्री ने भी एक एलान किया था कि हमको केन्द्र से लड़ाई करनी है

[श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह]

ये केंद्र से लड़ना चाहता हूँ। अभी दो दिन पहले बिहार के एक दूसरे मंत्री ने कहा कि बिहार में कोयला और लोहा ज्यादा होता है इस को आप दूसरे प्रदेशों में ले जाते हैं, लेकिन बिहार के इर्द-गिर्द जो इलाके हैं, जहाँ पर भ्रम पैदा होता है उस को हमारे यहाँ लाने नहीं देते हैं, इसलिए इस चीज की सुविधा हम नहीं देंगे, तो हम कोयले और लोहे को नहीं जानें देंगे। इन सब बातों के कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि देश में एक अलग हटने की भावना बढ़ती जा रही है—वह भावना राष्ट्रीय एकता के लिए बहुत बड़ी बाधक होगी।

हमारे मद्रास के मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा है कि वे अपने इलेक्टोरेट्स से बहुत सी बातों के कमिटेन्ट किये हुए हैं, और ऐसे भी बहुत से कमिटेन्ट्स हम ने लुने हैं, जो हमारे बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री ने भी किये थे। ये कमिटेन्ट्स क्यों हुए किस परिस्थिति में कमिटेन्ट्स हुए—ये कमिटेन्ट्स इस लिए किये गये थे कि वह समझते थे कि प्रदेश का शासन उन के हाथ में आनेवाला नहीं है, इसलिए उस समय हुनाई किले के कमिटेन्ट्स जाह्न बूझ कर उन्होंने जनता के साथ कर दिये, जिनकी पूर्ति नहीं हो सकती थी, वे पूरे नहीं किये जा सकते थे। अब अपने आपको बचाने के लिए, अपनी कमजोरियाँ को छिपाने के लिए वे लोग सेन्टर से लड़ना चाहते हैं, देश का बटवारा करना चाहते हैं, अलग हटना चाहते हैं। इसलिए आपको इन सब बातों पर गम्भीरता से विचार करना होगा। बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री ने उस समय कहा था कि 8 रुपये मन चावल बिकेगा, लेकिन यह परिस्थिति कभी नहीं आ सकती 8 ६० मन चावल कभी बिक नहीं सकता उसके लिए तो दूसरे और तीसरे जीवन में पैदा होना पड़ेगा।

श्री राम श्रवतार शास्त्री (पटना) : उन्होंने ऐसा नहीं कहा था।

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : उन्होंने कहा था, मुझे मालूम है।

श्री राम श्रवतार शास्त्री : नहीं कहा था आपको मालूम नहीं है।

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : गलत बात बोल रहे हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि उन्होंने कहा था। मैं आपसे ज्यादा जानता हूँ।

उन का वह कमिटेन्ट पूरा होने वाला नहीं है। मुख्य मंत्री महोदय ने एक बात और कही थी कि उनके राज्य के विद्यार्थियों को स्वतन्त्रता होगी और अगर विद्यार्थियों पर गोली चलानी पड़ी तो मैं जहर खा लूंगा। लेकिन गोली चली विद्यार्थियों पर नहीं लेकिन औरों पर गोली चली। उन्होंने इस प्रकार के अनेकों कमिटेन्ट्स किये और इस वास्ते किये कि लोगों को भड़काना या भड़का कर उन से वोट लेना था।

बीजे चुनाव जो हुए उस का नतीजा हम ने देखा। यह बात सही है कि जनता में असन्तोष था। जनता महंगाई से परेशान थी और जनता ने कांग्रेस को वोट न दे कर अपना उसके प्रति असन्तोष प्रकट किया। लेकिन जनता ने अपना कोई चुआएस नहीं बतलाया कि वह किस को राज्य देना चाहती है? कांग्रेस को न दें तो किस को दें यह जनता ने नहीं बतलाया। इस से सारे देश में नुकसान हुआ। कोई जगह किसी एक दल का राज्य नहीं बन सका। अगर जनता ने बता दिया होता कि वह किस को राज्य देना चाहती है तो समाज में शान्ति रहती.. (व्यवधान) जो लोग देश की एकता में बाधा उत्पन्न करने वाले थे जिन्होंने कि उत्पादी तत्वों को पैदा किया उत्पादी तत्व उमड़ गये उन्हीं देश की एकता में बाधा उत्पन्न करने वालों के हाथ में ठुकूम चलाने की जिम्मेदारी आ गई और जिसका वि

परिणाम उन्हें भोगना पड़ रहा है। आप के प्रश्नकारों में पड़ा होगा कि बिहार में विचारियों ने कानून तोड़ा। वे दुकानों पर चले गये और गल्ला कम दाम पर बेचने के लिए दुकानदारों को बाध्य किया रोकने पर दुकानों को लूटा। आप ने यह भी सुना होगा कि बिहार की विधान सभा में वहाँ कि सदस्य लोग बैठते थे वहाँ पर बाहर के लोग जा कर बैठ गये और सदस्यों को वहाँ बैठने से वंचित किया। इस किस्ब की भ्रष्टाचक्रता वहाँ पर फैली हुई है। हमें इन सब समस्याओं का समाधान करना है।

राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने भाषण में संकेत किया था कि चतुर्थ चुनाव में कुछ असन्तोष हुआ कुछ गड़बड़ियाँ हुई कुछ परेशानी हुई और कुछ हिंसात्मक उपद्रव भी हुए लेकिन कुछ ऐसी बातें भी हुई हैं जिनका या तो वे बर्णन करना भूल गये या बर्णन करना उन्होंने घाबिब नहीं समझा और वह यह है कि बहुसंख्यक लोगों को मतदान केन्द्रों पर जोर जबरदस्ती से उत्पाती तत्व वालों ने जाने नहीं दिया और उन का बोट जबरदस्ती अपने भ्रादरियों से करा लिया और सही बोटों को बोट देने से वंचित कर दिया ... (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्या माननीय सदस्य का कहने का यह मतलब है कि वे नाजायज चुनाव के ज़रिए चुन कर आये हैं ?

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : आप ही नाजायज बोट्स से चुन कर आये हैं हम नहीं उस तरह से आये हैं। (व्यवधान)

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक व्यवस्था का सवाल है। मैं आप को बतलाऊँ कि वहाँ के कांग्रेसी मंत्रियों ने एक बोट्स पार्टी बनाई थी जो जाते थे

और सारे पोलिंग स्टेशन के लोग बोट प्रक्रेमे ही दे देते थे। (व्यवधान)

जैसे पोलिंग पार्टी होती है उसी तरीके से यह बोट्स पार्टी थी ...

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : आप ने सुना होगा कि जनक्रांति दल के नेता ने स्वयं ... (व्यवधान) इस बोगस बोट्स की समस्या का समाधान होना चाहिये और जो लोग असली बोट्स हों उन का मतदान हो सके और उन की जगह पर कोई दूसरा भ्रादमी बोट न दे सके ... (व्यवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No interruption, please.

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : राष्ट्रपति महोदय को इन बातों को विचार कर के ऐसी कोई व्यवस्था करनी होगी कि जो मतदाता सही हों उन्हीं लोगों का मत हो लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि विरोधी दल ऐसा करना नहीं चाहते हैं क्योंकि वे समझते हैं कि अगर उचित मतदान हो तो वे जीत कर कभी भी नहीं आ सकते हैं। बहुसंख्यक लोगों को मत नहीं देने दिया गया है। आप ने जनक्रांति के एक नेता का बयान पढ़ा होगा जिसमें उन्होंने खुद स्वीकार किया था कि उनके क्षेत्र में बहुसंख्यक लोगों ने बोगस बोट्स दिये हैं लेकिन उनको उस समय पता नहीं था कि वे बोगस बोट्स उन्हीं के पक्ष में मिले हैं। छपरा विधान सभा क्षेत्र की एक घटना में ब्यान करना चाहता हूँ जहाँ पर कि अल्पसंख्यक हरिजनों को मत देने से वहाँ की जनक्रांति के बड़ी जाति के लोगों ने रोका। मेरे जिलाधीश तथा अधिकारियों से कहने के बाद उन का मत तो हुआ पर उन्हें वहाँ के लोगों ने बुरी तरह मारा जिससे एक भ्रादमी का डाइंग डिक्लेरेशन तक करना पड़ा। किन्तु चूँकि वहाँ जनक्रांति दल

[श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह]

की सरकार है इसलिये राज्य सरकार के दबाव के भय से वहाँ के अधिकारियों ने हरिजननों के सारे केशों को दबा दिया। उस का कोई जिक्र भी नहीं है। उसके बदले ये एक छोटा मोटा कम दफ़े का दूसरा मकदमा रेकार्ड में बना लिया . . . (व्यवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let him have his say.

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : श्री रामसेवक यादव जिन्होंने कि उन लोगों से गठबन्धन किया हुआ है उन लोगों ने सारे कांडस खत्म कर दिये और वह सब मुकदमें दबा दिये गये . . .

श्री रामसेवक यादव : चूंकि माननीय सदस्य ने मेरा नाम ले लिया है इसलिये उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप की इजाजत से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि श्री के० वी० सहाय की कांग्रेस की सरकार थी। अब इससे ज्यादा दुःख की बात और क्या हो सकती है कि सरकार की मशीनरी, पुलिस और पलटन इस के० वी० सहाय की कांग्रेसी सरकार के हाथ में रहते हुये भी लोगों को आजादी से मत देने में बाधा डाली गयी।

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : जितने सरकारी अधिकारी थे वे इन लोगों से मिले हुये थे। अगर सही चुनाव होते तो बिहार में कभी भी यह लोग नहीं आते . . . (व्यवधान)

इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी व्यवस्था आप कायम करें ताकि जब कभी चुनाव हों तो असली मतदान करने वाले अपने मत दे सकें और उस में किसी प्रकार की बाधा नहीं हो सके . . . (व्यवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there is any objection, I will listen to it later on.

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अभिभाषण के दरमियान में कहा

है कि मतदाताओं की इच्छा के अनकूल कार्यक्रम बनाया जाय। मतदाताओं की इच्छा क्या है? वे तो चाहते हैं कि कन्ट्रोल न रहें। गरीब जनता को खाना मिलने में कठिनाई होती है इसलिये जनता कन्ट्रोल के खिलाफ है। गरीब लोग आमतौर पर कन्ट्रोल के खिलाफ हैं, भ्रमीर लोग कन्ट्रोल भले ही चाहें। (व्यवधान)

पिछली पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं का काम अभी तक ऐसा रहा है जिससे कि आम जनता को उससे दिलचस्पी नहीं रही है। ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोग गरीब हैं और यह गरीब किसान लोग गांवों में रहते हैं। उन लोगों की आर्थिक स्थिति में कोई सुधार नहीं है और उनकी गरीबी और भी रोज बरोज बढ़ती जा रही है। चीजों के दाम बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। उत्पादन शक्ति भी घटती जा रही है। सरकार ने जो चार संकल्प किये हैं उन्हीं को पूरा कर दे तो सब समस्याओं का समाधान हो जायगा। इन चार संकल्पों को घटा कर मैं एक ही संकल्प बना देना चाहता हूँ और वह यह कि पैदावार में वृद्धि हो। पैदावार में वृद्धि होने से चीजों के दाम भी घट जायेंगे और विदेशों से सहायता मांगनी भी बन्द हो जायगी और इस से ही सभी समस्याओं का समाधान हो सकेगा।

ऐसे बहुत से स्थान हैं जहाँ पानी न होने से पैदावार नहीं होती। पिछले दो तीन वर्षों से ऐसी घटना घटी जिससे कि पैदावार घटती जा रही है और कुछ हम लोग परिस्थिति में तबदीली भी नहीं कर पाते हैं जिसका कि लाभ उठाने का मौका श्री रामसेवक यादव को मिल रहा है . . . (व्यवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May I request Shri Ram Sevak Yadav to keep discipline in his party.

श्री रामशेखर प्रसाद सिंह : पिछले दिन बहस के दौरान यह बतलाया गया था कि यह बड़ी खुशकिस्मती की बात है कि किदवाई साहब के बाद खाद्य मंत्रालय की जवाब देही जगजीवन बाबू के हाथों में आई है। जो कि एक गरीब तबके के भादमी हैं, जिसने कड़ी गरीबी को देखा है, जो किसान परिवार से आता है, जो खेती करना जानता है, जिसके परिवार के लोग हल जोतना जानते हैं, ऐसे परिवार का व्यक्ति बहुत दिनों के बाद यहां आया है। अगर पैदावार बढ़ानी है तो किसानों के पास कोई शक्ति नहीं है जिससे वह पैदावार बढ़ा सकें। जो भी पैदावार बढ़ेगी वह सरकारी साधनों, जैसे ट्रैक्टर आदि, के माध्यम पर बढ़ेगी, और उसके सहयोग से बढ़ेगी। आज पानी की आवश्यकता है, बीज की आवश्यकता है। खेत को जोतने के लिये या तो सरकार ट्रैक्टर आदि से करावे या बैलों के लिये आर्थिक सहायता दे।

ऐसी जमीन देश में बहुत है जहाँ नदी से पानी नहीं पहुंचाया जा सकता, जहाँ पर लघु सिंचाई योजनायें नहीं हो सकतीं। वहाँ पर आप को बोरिंग करानी होगी। इन सब चीजों के लिये आप को सारे देश का सर्वे कराना होगा। आप को देखना होगा कि सारे देश में कौन सी जमीन ऐसी है जहाँ नदी से पानी पहुंच सकता है, कौन सी ऐसी है जहाँ कुओं से काम चल सकता है, कौन सी जमीन ऐसी है जहाँ आप बिजली के माध्यम से बोरिंग वगैरह कर सकते हैं। आप जानते हैं कि जो नदी योजना हमारे उत्तर बिहार की है, जिसको गंडक योजना कहते हैं उसको पिछले आठ दस वर्षों से इस सदन के अन्दर और बाहर मनवाने का बहुत प्रयत्न किया गया है। इस के लिये बार बार हम लोग आप से कहते हैं कि आप इस योजना को केन्द्र सरकार की देखरेख में भीष बनवा दें। इसके पूरा होने से 25

लाख एकड़ जमीन आबाद होगी और 250 लाख मन अन्न की पैदावार होगी। इस के अलावा ईंध आदि की पैदावार भी बढ़ेगी। आज वहाँ पर गैर कांग्रेसी हुकूमत है। मगर यह मैं इसलिये नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि वहाँ पर आज गैर-कांग्रेसी गवर्नमेंट है। इसके पहले भी हमने कहा था कि इस योजना को सरकार को सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के माध्यम से पूरी करवाना चाहिये। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ही इसको जल्दी से जल्दी कर सकती है। यह योजना दस वर्षों से बिहार गवर्नमेंट के पास पड़ी हुई है। साधनों की कमी से, औजार की कमी से, पैसों की कमी से यह काम अभी तक नहीं हो सका है। जसा मैंने कहा, मैं ऐसा इसलिये नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि विरोधी लोगों की वहाँ सरकार है। मैं सदा से कहता रहा हूँ कि अगर इस योजना को सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट अपने हाथ में ले और जल्दी से खत्म कराये तो हमारे बहुत से काम सफल हो सकते हैं।

सरकार ने गोबध बन्द करने के बारे में आयोग बनाने को कहा है। इसका भी लोगों ने बहुत इस्तेमाल किया है। सरकार योजना तो बना लेती है लेकिन उसको जल्दी से पूरा नहीं करती है। जो भी उसे करना हो उसको जल्दी करना चाहिये। हमें ज्यादातर नुकसान इसलिये भी होता है कि हम लोग योजना बनाते हैं, उसकी रिपोर्ट आती है, लेकिन उन पर कार्यवाही नहीं होती है। (व्यवधान)। गोबध को रोकने के संबंध में हम जो भी करें, जल्दी से जल्दी करें (व्यवधान)। अगर इसका समाधान चुनाव से पहले हो गया होता तो बहुतों से हम लोगों की मुलाकात यहाँ होती नहीं। आप से कभी भी नहीं होती, औरों से भले ही हो जाये। मैं निवेदन करता कि सरकार इस बात पर पुनः विचार करे और इस समस्या का सही समाधान कर दें। (व्यवधान)।

[श्री रामसेखर प्रसाद सिंह]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आपने मुझे बोलने और आपने विचार रखने का जो अवसर दिया, उसके लिये आप को धन्यवाद।

Dr. Karni Singh (Bikaner): I rise in support of my amendment No. 87 on the President's Address. After going through the Address of the President and after having heard him I felt that there were certain important matters like poverty, unemployment etc., questions which should have found a place in the President's Address more adequately but which failed to do so.

Many of us in this House, and I am sure people all over the country have been concerned in their minds about the ever-increasing unemployment in the country and also the increase in the levels of poverty in this country. It is a horrible thing to have so much poverty, so much hunger, and so much unemployment in a dynamic socialist country. Although I am sure that Members on both sides of the House have made endeavours to see that the poverty question was licked, I am afraid we have not made strides in that direction. An increase in population has been going on at such a phenomenal rate that no matter how hard we try poverty seems to live with us. For a socialist country, for a socialist Government and for a welfare Government, to permit so much of poverty to exist in this country is in my opinion a matter of very real shame.

The President's Address comes at a time when almost nine governments have been formed by the Opposition and therefore, we are discussing the Address in an atmosphere when the Congress and the Opposition almost equally share the number of Ministries in the States. The atmosphere is, in my opinion, a great deal better, a great deal healthier, than it was when the Congress was the steamroller. The Congress Party today cannot amend the Constitution when it wants to. Today the Opposition is in such a powerful position that for once we in the Opposition are in a position

to apply the brakes. This steamroller has been steamrolling the country for the last 15-20 years and the people at large have called a halt to it. They have at last realised that the time had come when the brakes should be applied. They did this in the last general elections.

I would, however, like to voice a note of caution to my friends in the Opposition that if the questions of poverty, hunger, unemployment and rising prices are not treated with the urgency they deserve and solved by the Opposition Ministries in the States, I have a feeling that they will meet the same fate that the Congress Ministries did in the States. I hope sincerely that we in the Opposition will be able to give the people in the States a better administration, a cleaner administration, and above all, be able to wipe out poverty in the shortest possible time—which the Congress failed to do.

The questions of food and family planning have to be taken together. As a very learned man, very rightly observed, the food problem of India will be solved in the bedrooms of this country. It will not be solved on the Minister's table; it will not be solved in the field. The food problem will be solved if we are in a position to tackle the problem of population increase. If you look through the census figures, from 1891 to 1901, a span of ten years, increase in India's population was a bare 5 lakhs. Today in every 15 days, we are increasing by 5 lakhs. So the problem that existed before our grandparents were completely different. Our generation has to tackle this problem on a war footing. I am very glad that for once two lady Members from the Congress Benches also spoke of population control. What gives me particular pleasure is to see that at long last we have a man like Dr. Chandrasekhar as the Minister in charge of family planning. I only wish that a man like him had been in charge of family planning ten years ago. If that had been the case, we would not have been the

poor country that we are today faced with this calamity of hunger.

Every year, a country as large as ours must face the question of famine and floods in its stride. If you observe the food production trend in the country, it had reached a target of 90 million tonnes three years ago but it has dropped to 73 million tonnes this year. You will realise that a country as big as ours will always be faced with the question of famine. But in this period of four years during which our food production has dropped by close to 17 million tonnes, our population went up by another 40 million. If you observe the figures, in the years that have gone by when there used to be a famine year, even then nobody died. In those famine years, States with better food crops were able to supply food. You will notice that with reasonably good years, we still have famine.

I would like to make a forecast. If we do not check the population increase, we will have bumper crops all right but we will still have to face famine. The Minister of Food told us that by 1971, food self-sufficiency would be created in the country. Prime Minister Nehru told the same to us about 15 years ago, that by 1952 food self-sufficiency would be achieved. The Prime Minister failed for obvious reasons. I sincerely hope that Shri Jagjivan Ram, with whom I have had talks and who I know believes in family planning, will at least not make the same mistake his predecessors did.

Dependence of a country as large as India on America or any other country is a matter of very great shame to us. To go with a begging bowl to another country every year—why?—because we cannot keep our population in check is, I think, a matter of very great disgrace. I feel that if India is to take aid from any country for food, it must do so without any strings attached; and I for one am not prepared to accept that the US or any other country for that matter,

which gives us aid will give it without any strings attached. Strings attached there will be, they maybe visible or invisible. And for a self-respecting country with 50 crores of people, I think it is a matter of much concern and disgrace that we depend on other countries for our very food and very existence. A day will come when, if this type of increase in population goes on all over the world, there will be a food shortage in the whole globe, and President Johnson will be in the same position as we are in India today. I would like to know from our leaders as to from which source they will be getting their food then. Will they be getting from the moon or from Venus or Mars? And there can be nothing more horrible than for humanity to face the spectre of food shortage.

You may blame people for hoarding and all that, but let us look at it from a realistic point of view. If a family is faced with the spectre of no food, I think you can understand what its feelings can be. And I say we still have time; if, not only in India but all over the world, we plan today, the time would come when food self-sufficiency can be created all over the world, and the people throughout the world, whether in the iron curtain countries or the free world, can at least be entitled to a decent life.

I wonder how many people, how many Members of Parliament to be exact, have spoken on public platforms while addressing millions of people in this country during the last general elections, educating them about the population problems that exist before us. Some of us did. I tried that. I was told that if I were to speak on population control, I would be thrown out of Parliament, and I told the people of my constituency that I would be very happy to be thrown out of Parliament, but that I felt it my duty that the correct position should be placed before them. If 500 Members of Parliament were to exercise their privilege of speaking to millions of people on a

[Dr. Karni Singh]

public platform, they could reach the masses much quicker than your secretariat can. After all, a secretary or a doctor does not have the means to reach a million people at one public meeting. I hope that all of us today who are responsible citizens, in whose hands the future destiny of the country lies, will try at least to see that enough food is created for all of us and for generations to come.

Shri Manibhal J. Patel (Damoh): The suggestion is most welcome.

Dr. Karni Singh: As far as to food front is concerned, Mr. Jagjivan Ram spoke at length, and in a very enlightened speech, we heard it with much attention. I had also a half-hour discussion which was admitted, and subsequently disallowed, in which I wished to raise some points about food production. These were covered by other members. However, as far as the river valley projects are concerned, far greater emphasis has to be laid on them.

The Rajasthan Canal Project, which is going to irrigate 35 lakh acres in Rajasthan, and to cost Rs. 200 crores, will take approximately 15 years to be completed, and that project is being slowed down. Other similar projects are also being slowed down. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Irrigation and Power, whom I met this morning, and who is visiting Rajasthan tomorrow, will come back and present before the Government a composite scheme whereby the Rajasthan Canal Project and other projects of that type can be taken over by the Centre and completed expeditiously.

Coming back to a few more statistics, the Rajasthan Canal Project is going to irrigate 35 lakh acres. Taking 30 standard acres per family, it comes to one lakh families who can be settled on the projects. One lakh families at five persons per family is five lakhs of people, and we increase that much population approximately in two months. So, you realise the

immense problem that our country faces, and I for one feel sorry for Mr. Jagjivan Ram because he has one of the most difficult ministries to handle, and all I can say is that all of us from the opposition benches wish him the very best of luck.

Coming to the question of Rajasthan, as you know we in the opposition benches have vehemently opposed President's rule in Rajasthan, and we continue to do so. I feel that the Rajasthan people have been deprived of their democratic rights most unfortunately, and we only hope that the Central Government will not continue to make this a matter of prestige, but will give Rajasthan a democratic administration.

While many other members spoke on the subject, I felt that one point escaped everybody's attention, and that was with regard to the stage when the Governor had decided that he would give his verdict the next day, whether the Congress or the Opposition would be called. At that stage, Mr. Man Singh, a member of the Opposition, contacted the Governor in a deputation and he expressed the hope that the Governor's stand would be impartial. The Governor then lost his temper and said that he was in a frame of mind in which he was unable to take a decision and that the decision would be communicated to the people of Rajasthan 24 hours later. As we all expected, that decision had to go in favour of the Congress. If you appoint Governors who could not hold on to their shirts, who cannot control their temper, they are quite unfit to be heads of State. I would therefore request that in future traditions must be set in this country whereby Governors and Presidents must be no-party men. Think of a situation of a Congress Governor in a non-Congress State and look at the friction you will have. Let us take another example—non-Congress Governor in a non-Congress State; both of them will gang up against the Congress Centre. A situation like

this has to be forestalled. It is, therefore, important that Governors and Presidents must set healthy precedents in the country by being non-party men. Our Speaker, the other day took the first step in this direction which was applauded by everybody in this House when he resigned his Congress membership. I think that these steps should now become natural conventions in the country so far as the appointment of Governors is concerned.

They said that because there was firing in Rajasthan there was instability and that was why President was called upon to take over administration of that State. After the firing that took place in Calcutta, are they going to impose President's rule in West Bengal also? If not what justification have they got to keep Rajasthan in a prison like this? If their objective is that the present Governor who is sitting on a sense of prestige will retire soon and the new Governor whom they are appointing soon will give democratic rights when he assumes the position of the Governor, I think they must not stand on a false sense of prestige. The Government of India and the Congress Party in particular must see the writing on the wall. If the Congress Party which refused to form a Government in Rajasthan for whatever reasons is again asked to form the Government and if trouble starts in Rajasthan over which no human being can have any control, it would be the Congress Party to blame. I am an independent and I have my best friends in the Congress side and in the Opposition parties. Looking at things objectively, I feel that the whole thing is being shabbily handled. I only hope that corrections can be done before it is too late.

I would like to make a few remarks about the role of the Opposition. For once we in the Opposition have been returned with a larger majority strong enough to make our presence felt after the last three elections when I have had the honour to sit in this

House. We were then virtually non-existent; if at all there were small groups, splinter groups and we counted for nothing. Today the Opposition front that you see here is a powerful body. It has been able to give an alternative to the country. I agree—not an alternative in the shape of one single party—that has to emerge in course of time—but a united opposition front as in Rajasthan.

An hon. Member: Is it united?

Dr. Karni Singh: That they will do when the time comes to sit there. With U.P. gone and two-thirds of India out of the clutches of the Congress.... (*An hon. Member: Three fourths*).... all the better, the time is not far off when the Opposition at the Centre will be called upon to form the Government. I would like to make this observation today because I am independent and I can look at things objectively. Unless we in the Opposition are able to unite and give the country one composite homogenous unit, it is not going to be an easy question. We have people from the Communists to the Swatantra party, all shades of public thought. But it is possible that where the future of our country is concerned, all of us 240 Members can sacrifice a little and become one. In the present context when the country is faced with the problem of food and hunger, our political manifestos and isms are going to get us nowhere. It is the unity in the Opposition that can ultimately create a sense of discipline in the country, a sense of wellbeing in the country. I sincerely hope that my friends in the Opposition from all political parties will be able to give up their political squabbles and come together and become a homogenous united front because it is my feeling that Congress will not survive six months. I say that if it is a fashionable thing, that we should have a lady Prime Minister, because the Congress has set the pace, we will find a beautiful girl to be our Prime Minister too. Anybody can be a *de facto* Prime Minister; we

[Dr. Karni Singh]

will have a *de jure* Deputy Prime Minister also. (*Interruption*). But when the time comes for the Opposition to form the Government, there will be one challenge that will be thrown to us: Can we solve the food problem; Can we solve the unemployment problem? Can we give the Indian people a fuller life? If we cannot, then we will meet the same fate as the Congress is about to face. Therefore, I like to say—I should like to give a warning to my hon. friends here—because I also belong to the Opposition, although I do not want to be a Minister....

An hon. Member: Independent. (*Interruption*).

Dr. Karni Singh: I am a free-minded citizen. Now, let those who will share the responsibility of running this country better get cracking at it now, because the problems that this vast country holds out before us will have to be grappled by the Opposition, disunited as it is but united as it is also, as we find in our country today.

I would also request my friends in this House that we will now have to conduct ourselves in an entirely different way. Our whole objective has to be as to how to take over the Government; how to take over power by constitutional means, and for that, we will have to conduct ourselves in a dignified manner. We cannot introduce *subzi mandi* in Parliament, because a time comes when the country has to set such high standards that the rest of the world can look to India and say, "Here is the world's largest democracy, which knows how to run itself". If you have an Opposition Government or a Congress Government, it does not matter in the least, because we are all Indians; today you have the Congress; tomorrow, the Opposition, may be the Communist, but it is a safety valve that the nation wants for ventilating the grievances, and changes must come as time goes on.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is one matter which concerns me this morning when my hon. friend Shri Madhu Limaye made a remark about some *badmash* or the other. (*Interruption*). While I will preface my statement by saying that I stand for solidarity in the Opposition, I still feel that when somebody goes off the track, it is our duty to correct ourselves. What I say this: whether it finds favour with the rest of the Members on my side of the House or not, I am not sure. But I have a feeling that every decent man believes in decent behaviour. And therefore, I asked the Lok Sabha Secretariat to supply me the dictionary which is compiled by Professor R. P. Pathak—not by Dr. Karni Singh—and therefore I imagine it must be authoritative, *Badmash* means "wicked, immoral, a man of bad character or a hooligan". Now, if we the Members of Parliament use such words, I wonder what is the taste left in the minds of those people who sit in the galleries and the rest of the world. Is it necessary? It is a fashionable thing, I know it is perfectly fashionable today to be rude to your superiors: that is a sign of leadership; but I do not succumb to that way of thinking. Is it necessary for Members of Parliament to use such words, when there are better words in the dictionary? Is it necessary for Mr. Madhu Limaye or anybody else to say that the next fellow is a *badmash*?

An hon. Member: *Badmashi*, (*Interruption*).

Dr. Karni Singh: *Badmashi*; whatever it may be. I have heard *nalaiqi* being used. Suppose, when my friend Shri Madhu Limaye, switches over to the Government Benches, I, as a Member of Parliament, were to ask him, "Sir, Mr. Madhu Limaye, may I meet you?", alternatively, I should say, "You *badmash*. I would like to see you". (*Interruption*).

I would like to know whether it is dignified, is correct. Shri Limaye this morning observed that the British

Parliament allows the word *badmash* in its translation. But why should we follow the British Parliament? Can't we evolve our own norms in the House here? After all, the British have their own standards; we have our own standards. So, I say that in our culture—whether it is Hindu, Muslim or any other culture in this country,—it is completely un-Indian to use such words. It is the tradition of every Indian to respect somebody who is older than you. I refer to every Minister on those Benches as "Sir", not because I respect them because of their knowledge—I doubt that—but I respect them because they occupy a certain position today, which Shri Madhu Limaye could also occupy too.

I will give you another example. The other day, I was speaking to some people from my constituency, for whom I had got a pass. I asked, "would you like to see Parliament"? They said, "Yes; we want to hear Mr. Limaye, one of the greatest speakers in the country". I got passes for them. After they had heard Mr. Limaye, I asked them about their opinion. They said, "If this is the standard of Parliament, we are glad we are not M.P.s."

Coming to the question of character assassination, I feel that this matter is now reaching a stage where all decent-minded Members of Parliament have to realise one thing: Are we going to indulge in character assassination—the Congress Party or the opposition—or are we going to draw a line where such things will not find their way into Parliament? Of late, I have been seeing that the only objective of some of us in the opposition is to indulge in character assassination and political vendetta. I have sat in this House for 15 years and I can say from my own experience that if the private lives of the Members of Parliament collectively were given to a research student for a thesis, it would be a best-seller in the country. None of us today is Buddha, the Second. We are all human beings. 500 men in the Lok

Sabha are the same as 500 men picked up from the street. Let us remember, people living in glass houses cannot afford to throw stones at others. We all have our human failings. Let us be charitable. Let us not carry political vendetta to the extent of this sort of character assassination.

Take the question of the General's book *Untold Story*. I believe there is a Prime Minister's ex-Secretary who is also meeting the opposition Members and giving them fancy stories about fur coats, necklaces and what not. This is a double-edged sword. A time will come when we will switch over there and these same people will blackmail us too! The question is, are we as responsible citizens of this country going to encourage this type of political blackmail or are we as decent-minded citizens going to put an end to it? That is the point we Members of Parliament have to answer. I sincerely hope the answer will be that bribery, corruption and blackmail have to be put an end to. If there is something wrong, put the Government on the mat, but don't indulge in political vendetta or political blackmail of a nature which makes every decent-minded citizen feel ashamed of himself.

Sir, I do not want to take more time of the House. I thank you for the time you gave me. I sincerely hope that whoever rules this country—the Congress or the opposition—they will be able to solve the problems before us, viz., poverty, hunger and rising prices.

Shri R. D. Bhandare (Bombay Central): Sir, ever since I came to this House, I tried to understand the attitudes and views of the hon. members of this House. For the first time I have heard some saner views and the feelings which ought to be expressed throughout the country. I must thank the hon. member, Dr. Karni Singh, for expressing the views which were uppermost in the mind of every member of this House. Two things

[Shri R. D. Bhandare]

are oppressing the minds of both the treasury benches and the opposition. When the DMK Government took the oath of office in Madras, the Governor spoke out the mind of the DMK Government. He said:

"In the light of the situation emerging after the fourth general elections, there was need to underline the federal character of the Indian Constitution and restore the States to the position originally visualised for them under the Constitution. The States can no longer be passive spectators in the process of formulation and implementation of plans, but should play a more active part."

This was the view expressed on behalf of the DMK Government in Madras. I have been hearing the views of the hon. Members of this House. They have been playing on the same theme that the Congress Party has been defeated and that the Congress Party must read the writing on the wall. They go to the extent of saying, and they have been harbouring that view for a long time, that they would like to come and occupy the Treasury Benches here. Nobody would hamper them, nobody would come in their way if they are to work within the framework of democracy, within the Constitution which we have accepted.

I do not know whether hon. Members of the Opposition have realised the fact that the Government is more averse to the present situation and the circumstances and conditions which have arisen after the fourth general elections? I am simply referring, for consideration of the hon. Members as to what the President has said in his Address. On page 1 of the Address he says:

"For the first time since Independence, Governments of political complexions different from that of the Government at the Centre have been formed in several

States. In a federal democratic polity, this is to be expected. Our Constitution has provisions defining and regulating the relationship between the Union and the States and their mutual obligations."

Sir, this fact has been overlooked, forgotten, perhaps may not have been understood by the Opposition at all. How long and to what extent will they ignore the constitutional position and hanker after and argue both in this House and outside of it that there ought to be good relationship between the States which are ruled by non-Congress parties and the Government in power here at the Centre? Unless they are to understand the political significance of their own position which emerge after the fourth general elections, I am afraid that they will not be able to work out the democratic form which we have accepted and the Constitution to which we are wedded.

The Constitution has found out all sorts of devices to bring about co-ordination, understanding and co-operation between those States which would be ruled by non-Congress parties and the Centre, which Centre is bound to bring about co-ordination and co-operation. Therefore, two things have been weighing and agitating in our minds: how to bring co-operation in federal policy and how to find out some sort of a national consensus. If the Opposition is not prepared to understand the constitutional position and the principles underlying the Federal policy, how could there be a factor found out for the purpose of smooth working of the democratic machinery in this country. Those parties who are not prepared to understand the constitutional provisions, how can they find out and work out a national consensus?

Federation is a manifestation of the diverse factors which are the ruling passions of the life of this country or the people of this country. It is a manifestation which is reflected in our

federal constitution. If that is a fact, are we not prepared to understand as to what devices are found in the Constitution in order to satisfy those diverse forces or diverse factors—physical or tangible and psychological and sociological—to bring about amalgamation, reconciliation, understanding, co-ordination or co-operation. What is the device that has been envisaged in the Constitution? We, the party to which I now belong have been following both the constitutional devices and the conventional devices for the purpose of smooth working of the constitutional machinery. The constitutional machinery which has been envisaged in the Constitution is the division of power. In fact, we have accepted under the Constitution two devices, two theories. One theory is the division of powers. Why is it that we have accepted the theory of division of powers? We have accepted the theory of division of powers for the purpose of satisfying the needs, ambitions and desires of the people, psychological and socio'logical.

Along with the theory of division of powers, under the very Constitution we have accepted what is known as the theory of nexus, to bring about the co-operation between the States and the Centre on the one hand and States *inter se* on the other. This theory of nexus reflected the need and a necessity of national integrity, the necessity for bringing about social unity and, at the same time, for the purpose of bringing about economic development and progress of the country.

Under that Constitution we have accepted what is known as Directive Principles. The Directive Principles of the State policy have assigned the powers and functions both at the Central and State levels. The Directive Principles have enjoined on the States to bring about a change in the society in a manner whereby the principles enunciated in the preamble of the Constitution, namely, justice, liberty, equality and fraternity could be translated to build the new Indian society

which we would like to develop or build.

Therefore, as I said in the beginning, we have accepted the theory of nexus and we have also accepted, along with the constitutional theory of nexus, the conventional theory and, so, we have been working out this conventional theory which is actually worked through the National Development Council and the Planning Commission. I am not dealing with that problem because the time at my disposal will not permit me to deal with them elaborately. The constitutional theory of nexus in the first place deals with political nexus. Political nexus is reflected in Part XIV of the Constitution, articles 325 to 326. Then, again, there is Part XVII of the Constitution, articles 352, 355 and 356 dealing with political nexus. How to maintain national integrity, political life, political future of the country as a whole, is the question dealt with under these two chapters of the Constitution. Also, there is a legislative nexus engrafted, enshrined in the Constitution. My hon. friends have made so much of the Rajasthan episode. Without understanding the legislative nexus they have been, time and again, criticising the party in power. What I would like to urge upon the opposition is to understand as to how this nexus of legislation has been brought about. Also, there is financial or economic nexus envisaged enshrined and engrafted in the Constitution; that is, Part XII, article 280 and others.

17 hrs.

I do not want to deal with all the parts, chapters or nexuses—political, social, economic—devised in the Constitution but I would like certainly to ask the Opposition one question, a very pertinent question. The Swatantras, who are in the new wedlock with the Opposition, the newly wedded wife....

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: They have left you.

Shri R. D. Bhandare: They were never with us.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Divorced.

Shri R. D. Bhandare: Never divorced. My hon. friend, Shri Ram Sewak Yadav does not know the history as to whether they were with us.

Anyway, now they are working as a united front. Are they prepared to find out a national consensus, an ideological understanding or unity? Dr. Karni Singh had said that they would like to follow a pragmatic philosophy or policy so that there could be an Opposition which could take the place on the Treasury Benches. I would like to ask them whether they can speak with one voice as regards their philosophy and programme.

Shri Pashabhai Patel (Baroda): Do you speak with one voice?

Shri R. D. Bhandare: I do and I intend to do.

Shri Pashabhai Patel: What about Uttar Pradesh?

Shri R. D. Bhandare: I talk on behalf of the party and myself. I talk on behalf of persons who are of my persuasion. I am speaking on their behalf.

I wanted to ask them that, not because out of curiosity, but because I had heard the speech of one of the leaders from the Opposition who said, "Let there be friendship with China."

An hon. Member: Why not?

Shri R. D. Bhandare: There should be. There should be friendly relationship between neighbouring States. But is there any ideological nearness or understanding between us and China? There is difference between the ideology which we had accepted in the month of November 1949 and the ideo-

logy which the Chinese people accepted in the month of November 1949. I need not tell this House that on the 26th November, 1949, when we accepted the Constitution we accepted democracy both as a way of life and as a form of government; whereas in that very month and year the Chinese accepted dictatorship as a form of government and way of life for the people.

The second point on which there is a difference is that they have different attitudes; they have different history. They are expansionists; we are not expansionists. We are for peaceful co-existence which philosophy has been ruling the passions of the day of our country.

One last point and I have done. The President's Address has said that the gulf between the rich nations and the poor nations is widening. I am sorry to reflect that no note has been taken of the fact that the gulf between the rich and the poor is also widening in this country. The backward classes of this country have not been able to get a proper share or dispensation or a fair deal, use any word you like. That has not been expressed, enunciated or even reflected in the Address of the President. My hon. friends of the Opposition may not be knowing this that we have joined the Congress—we means the weaker sections of this country, the downtrodden masses of this country—not for getting ourselves elected or for coming into power but to maintain the democratic form of government at all costs in this country. I am certain—I have my own apprehensions—that there will be a great battle for the retention and preservation of democracy in the country. Looking at some of the Members of the Opposition, I find that they speak with different voices and with dissimilar tendencies. Therefore, the doubt arises as to what extent they will be able to maintain democracy in this country. On our part, we are here determined to maintain demo-

cracy both as a form of Government and the way of life.

***Shri A. Sreedharan (Badagara):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is the first time in my life that I rise to speak in this sovereign and august House which is the highest forum of our democracy. The fact that I am able to speak here in my mother tongue—Malayalam—gives me indeed a great sense of satisfaction.

The President's Address is at a time when the country is virtually facing a multiplicity of problems. He specially emphasized in his speech on two or three important aspects. He spoke about the unity of the country. But he has not said anything about how to strengthen the iron chain of unity.

India represents varieties of cultures and languages. In the Indian Constitution it is said that every citizen of this country has an opportunity to express his opinion freely. As a citizen of Kerala I have got today that opportunity to speak in this temple of democracy. But if I speak in my mother-tongue, what arrangement has the Government done to make me understood to other representatives coming from other States? There is a device installed here for simultaneous interpretation. But that covers only two languages. Government have not done anything to put that machinery into more effective use so as to include other languages as well. I protest against that. These are all ancient languages. Tamil, for instance, is one of the oldest languages in the world. If Government do not bring these languages. Tamil, for instance, is one of the oldest languages in the world. If Government do not bring these languages closer to one another, the unity of the country is bound to be affected. This lesson you might profitably learn from the experiences of other countries. This is one thing to which I want to draw the Government's attention.

Then, the President mentioned about the last general election. What happened in the general election? Congress Governments in many States were thrown out of power. I know for a fact that in my constituency Congress leaders and their expenses of the Congress Party were met by capitalists. I am going to produce evidence to this effect before you.

Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, toured my constituency at the time of election. On that occasion the Mandal Congress Committee President got a notice printed. On one side of that notice, this responsible man, the President got a notice printed. On one side of that notice, this responsible man, the President of the Mandal Congress Committee, said: **PRIME MINISTER MRS GANDHI IN QUILANY—GRAND RECEPTION AT 12 NOON ON 14-1-1967 AT THE HIGH SCHOOL MAIDAN.** On the reverse side there was an advertisement about the Kozhikode Yogi Beedi Company. Are not Congress leaders ashamed of publishing such notices? I am ashamed of it. We have great respect for the Prime Minister, though now—after coming here—I know that no capacity is required to be the Prime Minister. But we have respect for that office because in our country that is the highest office an elected representative in the Parliament can hold. But the Congress leaders insulted even that office and they had no hesitation whatsoever in doing so.

So, at the Mandal level your association is with Kozhikode Beedi Company.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May I know to what document he is referring? I want to know whether there is anything objectionable.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: He is producing a pamphlet notifying that the Prime Minister was to speak at a meeting which was arranged by the

*The original speech was delivered in Malayalam.

[Shri A. Sreedharan]

Mandal Congress Committee. On the reverse of the notice, a Beedi advertisement was printed. We are giving importance to the Prime Minister as such, but this is how the Congress is degrading the position of the Prime Minister.

Shri A. Sreedharan*: The money for printing this notice was paid by the Yogi Beedi Company. I have got the Bill number with me. The Bill No. is 264 and it was printed on 11.1.1967. Nobody can dispute that point.

At the Provincial level you have got the KPCC-Kerala Provincial Congress Committee. But that is known as Kolanjeri Palleppalli Chackopillai Company which is getting Central Government contracts. When the AICC was in session, it was in the backyard of their house that the office of the Kerala Pradesh Congress Committee was housed. So, at the Mandal level your association is with the Kozhikode Yogi Beedi Company. At the provincial level your dealings are with Kolanjeri Palleppalli Chackopillai Company and at the Central level you are hobnobbing with the seventy-five monopolists of this country. This is the danger that one sees at the time of general election.

The President, then, emphasized on the federal form of our Constitution, because in different States there are Governments formed by non-Congress Parties. My State, Kerala, had established even earlier the possibility of having a Government run by a non-Congress Party. Ours was in that sense a pilot project. When the President spoke about the federal shape of our Constitution, my mind went to Rajasthan. I do not want to go into that matter in detail because very eloquent speeches have already been made on that subject. When they referred to the fact that the people of Rajasthan organised demonstrations against the Presidential rule, that angered our Congress friends here. They alleged

that the Opposition Parties were taking the issue to the streets. I would, in his connection, take your mind back to what happened in Kerala in 1958. There was then a Legislative Assembly with a majority party and a Government formed by that Party. What did you do then? The then Congress President is today the Prime Minister. She exhorted the people of Kerala to topple down that Government. Your present Law Minister, Mr Panampillil Govinda Menon had also a hand in that. He too advised the people to remove that Ministry from power. Today when the people of Rajasthan are fighting against the injustice done to them, Congress leaders are angry. You should hang your heads in shame over what you did in Kerala in 1958. Is this the federal relationship that you are going to establish in this country?

The Law Minister, Mr Govinda Menon, the other day addressed a lawyers' Conference. There he characterised certain actions of the non-Congress Governments in the States as a hoax. Yes, he made use of that word. I shall read the relevant newspaper report appeared in The Patriot:

Mr Menon described as a big hoax played on the public the recent declaration by Ministers of certain States with non-Congress Governments that they would serve on a token salary of Re. 1/- He said that the morality of public life must be such that the charity which the right hand gives should not be known to the left.

The Law Minister, thus, openly insulted all the non-Congress Ministries. Is this morality? In that case, do not speak to us about your morality. Instead of the left hand not knowing what you give with your right hand, you seem to follow the principle under which the left hand will not know what your right hand receives.

*The original speech was delivered in Malayalam.

I feel that there should be a permanent instrument of instructions governing the conduct and behaviour of the Central Government whenever there are State Governments formed by Parties other than the one in power at the Centre. I do not believe that the Central Government will be just or fair to such State Governments. Still they are going ahead because they know that the strength of the people is behind them.

India is today faced with the problems of unemployment and poverty. I come from a State where these problems are in a very acute form. Several Members placed their local problems before this August House. Let me now place a few of Kerala's problems before the House.

How is it that whenever there is a cut in the allocation of any Plan, the projects of Kerala become the first casualty? That is what happened to the Second Shipyard. We were told by the previous Chief Minister, Mr. R. Sankar, that he was bringing the Second Shipyard to Kerala. Your Law Minister, Mr. Govinda Menon, said that he was bringing it. Mr. A. M. Thomas said that he was bringing it. It is for you in this House to decide as to who among them said the truth.

When we say that we should have the Second Shipyard in Cochin, when we say that our Idikki project should be executed speedily, when we say that the phyto-chemical project should not be snatched away from us, do not think that we are begging for your favour or your mercy. These are our rights and all that we demand is that justice be done to Kerala.

The population of Kerala represents only 4 per cent of this country's population. But we earn 16 per cent of the country's foreign exchange. We produce 98 per cent of the pepper produced by the country as a whole; we produce 78 per cent of the coconuts; we produce 56 per cent of India's cardamom production; we produce

10 per cent of India's coffee yield, and almost cent per cent. of India's cochi industry is in our hands. We are thus earning lot of foreign exchange.

Speaking about my own constituency, the Planning Commission has decided to cancel some of the projects. The Vythiri-Saravana road is one such instance.

For twenty years the Congress has ruled this country from Kashmir to Cape Comorin. It is the Congress which has widened the gap between the minimum and maximum income of the people. It is the Congress which has murdered democracy in some States. The Government at the centre run by such a Party is bound to collapse soon like a house of cards.

श्री राम कृष्ण (होशियारपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण के जरिये जितनी भी देश की इम्पोर्टेड प्रॉब्लेम्स हैं उन पर पूरी तरह से रोशनी डाली है। सब से बड़ा सवाल इस वक्त हमारे देश के सामने फूड और प्राइसेज का है। यह सवाल एक ऐसी शक्ति अस्त्रधार बर गया है कि अगर यह फूड का सवाल हल नहीं होता है तो हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी खतरे में पड़ सकती है। इस बारे में मैंने जितनी हमारी अपोजीशन बेंचेज हैं, खास तौर पर श्री ए० के० गोपालन और प्रो० हीरेन मुकर्जी और जितने भी लेफ्टिस्ट पार्टीज के मेम्बरान हैं, उन के भाषणों को बड़े गौर से सुना है। मैं महाराज करणी सिंह को, जिन्होंने एक रिस्पासिबल और रिस्पासिब अपोजीशन के मेम्बर के तौर पर कंस्ट्रक्टिव सजेसनस दिये हैं, उन के लिये धन्यवाद देता हूँ। कई उन दोस्तों ने, जिनका मैंने जिक्र किया, बहुत कुछ हमारे इस चौथे चुनाव के बारे में कहा है। लेकिन वह इस बात को भूल गये हैं कि वह जिस आइडियोलॉजी को रिप्रेजेंट करते हैं, शायद इस दुनिया के अन्दर वही एक वाहिद आइडियोलॉजी है, वाहिद मत्क है, जिसने आजाद

[श्री राम कृष्ण]

होने के बाद 19 साल तक कोई चुनाव नहीं कराये। 1 नवम्बर, 1917 में रशिया जार के चंगुल से आजाद हुआ, लेकिन 19 साल तक वहां पर कोई चुनाव नहीं हुए थे। हिन्दुस्तान की हिस्ट्री में यह पहला मौका था और हिन्दुस्तान की इस रूलिंग पार्टी को, इस कांग्रेस पार्टी को यह फ़ख्र हासिल है कि उस ने बावजूद तमाम मुश्किलात के, उन का मुकाबला करते हुये पिछले 19 सालों में चार जनरल एलेक्शन कराये।

सिर्फ़ यही बात नहीं है कि खुराक के सवाल पर ही इस रूलिंग पार्टी के ऊपर झटके किये गये हैं। लेकिन मैं उन बेंचज से, ख़ाम तौर पर कम्यूनिस्ट दोस्तों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि नवम्बर 1917 से लेकर 1928 तक के 11 सालों का जो रशिया का इतिहास है, जहां पर कि 82 परसेन्ट के करीब ऐंप्रिकल्चरिस्ट्स जमीन की काश्त करते थे, आर्मी पर कंट्रोल था, सारी मशीनरी पर कंट्रोल था, दूसरी कोई पार्टी नहीं थी—मैं अपनी तरफ से कोई यह बातें नहीं कर रहा हूँ, यह फ़ैक्ट्स ऐंड फ़िगर्स की बात है—1917 से लेकर 1928 तक कई लाख आदमी उस रूस के अन्दर स्टार्वेशन के शिकार हुए हैं। उस वक्त बावजूद लीग ऑफ नेशन्स के एम्बार्गो लाने के प्रेजिडेंट विल्सन ने कई हजार जहाज अनाज से लदे रशिया की तरफ भेजे थे। लेकिन आज उनको याद नहीं आता है कि दुनिया के तमाम देशों के अन्दर आजाद होने के बाद एक ट्रान्जिशनल पीरियड आता है, और उस में इस तरह के हालात होते हैं। उन्हें इस बात को कतई नहीं भूलना चाहिये।

मैं जानता हूँ कि जहां तक चौथे जनरल नैक्शन का ताल्लुक है, उसने एक शाक ट्रीटमेंट दिया है। रूलिंग पार्टी को भी

शाक ट्रीटमेंट मिला है और दूसरी तरफ के लोगों को भी मिला है। लेकिन इस चुनाव में कुछ बातें हमारे सामने स्टेट्स में साफ़ हुईं। एक तो यह कि अब देश के जितने मसले हैं, जितनी उसकी प्राब्लेम्स हैं मोहल्लों और गलियों में लड़ाई लड़ कर नहीं बल्कि बल्लट बाक्स के जरिये, उन को हल करना होगा।

अपोजिशन वाले बार बार हमारी तरफ इशारा करते हैं कि इस बॉडिक्ट को समझें। हम इसको पूरी तरह से जानते हैं, उससे नावाक़िफ़ नहीं हैं। लेकिन इस वोट ने यह भी बॉडिक्ट दिया है कि जहां तक देश के तमाम सवालों का ताल्लुक है यह बायोलैन्स के जरिये सैंवाटेज को जिये, अकाल या कहन का नारा लगाने के जरिये मोहल्लों और गलियों के अन्दर लड़ाई लड़ने के जरिये हल नहीं होंगे। यह सवाल हल हो सकते हैं रेशनल अप्रोच से। एक दूसरे को समझने से, आज देश के अन्दर यह हालत आ गई है।

अभी मैंने कहा कि देश के सामने सब से बड़ा सवाल इस वक्त खुराक का है। बावजूद इस बात के कि इस देश के अन्दर अपोजिशन को कुछ जगहों में कामयाबी मिली है, उनकी भी गवर्नमेंट आई हैं जहां जहां अपोजिशन ने अपनी गवर्नमेंट बनाई हैं, दो सूबों को छोड़ कर, सब जगह दुनिया को एक नया तज़ुर्बा दे रही हैं और वह नया तज़ुर्बा यह है कि कहीं की ईट और कहीं का रोड़ा भानुमती का कुनबा जोड़ा। वह लोग तेरह घोड़ों की गाड़ी चलाने जा रहे हैं। मालूम नहीं कहां बह दूटती है। मालूम पड़ता है कि वह सब दीपक को बुझा देंगे और बराती और हथोड़ा एक दूसरे को खरम कर देंगे।

एक सामन्य सबस्थ : बेलों की बात कीजिये, आप घोड़ों की बात कर रहे हैं।

श्री राम कृष्ण : नया तज़ुर्बा हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर हुआ है। मुझे इस बात की ख़ुशी है कि

इस देश के अन्दर दो प्रांत ऐसे हैं मद्रास और केरल, जहां टू पार्टी सिस्टम बनने जा रहा है, जिस की तरफ हम सब जाना चाहते हैं। बाकी जगहों पर जो कुछ है वह देश के सामने एक चैलेन्ज है। इस चैलेन्ज को हम किस तरह से मंजूर करते हैं यह देखने की बात है। सब से बड़ा सवाल देश के अन्दर खुराक जो भी अपोजीशन मेम्बर्स बोले हैं, बल्कि अपोजीशन का ही सवाल नहीं है, जो भाई भी बोले हैं, जहां नान-कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट्स बनी हैं और कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट्स भी सबने नेंसेन्टर को कोसा है और सेन्टर से कहा है कि वहां से हमको खुराक मिलनी चाहिये। स्टेट्स को सॉल्यूशन देना चाहिये। फूड ऐंड एग्रिकल्चर स्टेट सब्जेक्ट है लेकिन जहां तक इस का मामला है सेन्टर को पूरी तरह से स्टेट्स को खुराक मुहैया करना चाहिये। इस की बात देखिये कि स्टेट्स जितना प्रोक्योर करती है उसके अलावा बाहर से इम्पोर्ट होता है पी० एल० 480 पर यहां हमला होता है। लेकिन हालत यह है कि पिछले एक साल के अन्दर 11.4 मिलियन टन मारी खुराक देश के अन्दर भेजी गई और उसमें से 10.4 मिलियन टन खुराक इम्पोर्ट हुई है चाहे वह पी० एल० 480 से भाई हो चाहे कैनाडा से आया हो चाहे रशिया से चाहे न्यूजीलैंड से आया हो। आज देश की हालत यह है कि कोई भी प्रोक्योरमेंट की तरफ नहीं जाना चाहता है। इस तरह से कैसे बात बनेगी? 16 नवम्बर, 1966 को हिन्दुस्तान के तमाम चीफ मिनिस्टर्स की मिटिंग हुई और युनैनिमसली फैसला किया गया। युनैनिमसली फैसला यह हुआ कि अगले चार सालों के अन्दर 1 करोड़ 25 लाख टन अनाज प्रोक्योर किया जायेगा। लेकिन वह 16 नवम्बर से लेकर आज तक नहीं हुआ। जहां तक बंगाल का ताल्लुक है जहां वहां 4.5 लाख टन राइस प्रोक्योर होना था सिर्फ 10 हजार टन प्रोक्योर हुआ है। मैं दूसरी स्टेट्स की बात नहीं कहता लेकिन अगर यही हालत है तो बात कैसे बनेगी?

पिछले दस सालों में हमारे देश के अन्दर 1800 करोड़ रुपये का अनाज मंगाया गया है, जिसमें से 1300 करोड़ रुपये का पी०एल 480 के मातहत आ रहा है और 50 लाख रु० का अनाज रोजाना लेकर एक जहाज आ रहा है। जब खुराक का यह हाल है तो पता नहीं इस देश को किस तरफ हम ले जाना चाहते हैं। आज हमारे देश की स्थिति क्या है इस की तरफ भी हमें देखना होगा। राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण के अन्दर इस देश की एकानिमी की तरफ और दूसरी बातों की तरफ भी तवज्जह दिखाई है। हम सब चीजों को देखें कि हमारे देश की स्थिति क्या है और कहां वह पहुंच गई है और उसका सुधार करें। इसका सुधार करना केवल रूनिंग पार्टी का ही कर्त्तव्य नहीं है उसका ही फर्ज नहीं है सब का है, विरोधी दलों का भी है। सारे देश के प्रतिनिधि यहां आए हैं। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि हमारी हालत यह हो गई है कि हम फैसिज्म की तरफ से जाने लग गये हैं। अपोजीशन पार्टीज रूनिंग पार्टी को कोसती हैं और रूनिंग पार्टी अपोजीशन के ऊपर इल्जाम लगाती है, पार्लिटिशियन एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर को कोसते हैं और एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर पार्लिटिशियन को कोसते हैं। यह एक अजीब तरह का सर्कल बन गया है। फैसिज्म की जो बातें हैं उनको हमें छोड़ना होगा, एक दूसरे पर इल्जाम लगाने से हमको बचना होगा, देश के सामने जो स्थिति है वह गम्भीर स्थिति है। इसका हमें नैशनल लेवल के ऊपर सामना करना होगा, इसको नैशनल लेवल पर सल्व करना होगा। फैसिज्म की स्पिरिट जो देश में है, इसको अपना कर हम समस्याओं को हल नहीं कर सकते हैं। जो देश के सामने प्राबलैम्ड हैं उन्हें हमें फेस करना होगा। हमारी बदकिस्मती यह है कि देश के अन्दर जितनी पोलिटीकल पार्टीज हैं वे एक दूसरे को बदनाम करके आगे आना चाहती हैं। काम करके आगे नहीं आना चाहती हैं। इस स्पिरिट को हमको खत्म करना होगा, इस स्पिरिट को पीछे ले जाना होगा। एक नई भावना हमें अपने अन्दर पैदा करनी

[श्री राम कृष्ण]

होगी। अगर हमने इस देश के सबालों को हक करना है इस देश को सुरक्षित रखना है तो हमें इस दृष्टिकोण को ध्यानाना होगा।

हमने कहा है कि हम 1970-71 तक खुराक के मामले में अपने आपको सैल्फ सफिशेंट बना लेंगे और 1975-76 तक इस देश को हर तरह से सैल्फ-रिलायेंट बना लेंगे, अपनी इकोनोमी को सैल्फ-रिलायेंट कर लेंगे। अगर हम यह सब करना चाहते हैं तो हमें इसके लिये कड़ी मेहनत करनी होगी। हमें अपनी जो जिम्मेदारियां हैं उनको सम्भालना होगा, हमें देश को सम्भालना होगा। देश की हालत इस वक्त क्या है? हमारे देश की हालत यह है कि पिछले तीन प्लाज में हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने के बाद से इस वक्त तक 21000 करोड़ रुपये सारे देश के अन्दर हम ने इन्वैस्ट किये हैं जिस में से साढ़े तीन हजार करोड़ रुपये हमारी एग्रिकल्चर के ऊपर इन्वैस्ट हुआ है। लेकिन इसके बावजूद हालत यह है कि जहां हमने अंदाजा लगाया था कि तीसरे प्लान के अन्दर हमारी 90 या 92 मिलियन टन खुराक पैदा होगी वहां वह केवल 76 मिलियन टन ही पैदा हुई है। इसके अलावा इन पिछले तीन सालों के अन्दर हमारी इकोनोमी को बड़ा जबर्दस्त धक्का लगा है। 36.8 परसेंट हमारी प्राइसिस बढ़ी हैं। जहां तक इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ का ताल्लुक है उस में 33 और 36 परसेंट की कमी आई है। डिवैल्युएशन के बाद तो हमारी सारी की सारी इकोनोमी को जबदस्त धक्का लगा है, बहुत जबर्दस्त उस पर बुरा असर पड़ा है। पिछले चार साल के अन्दर मनी सहेजेशन कोई बारह परसेंट के करीब बढ़ा है। इसके साथ साथ इनफ्लेशन दस परसेंट के करीब बढ़ी है। इन सब का हमें बहादुरों के साथ मुकाबला करना होगा। इसमें क्लिंग पार्टी को अपना पार्ट प्ले करना होगा, अपोजीशन को अपना पार्ट प्ले करना होगा।

जहां तक खुराक का ताल्लुक है मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं जो भागूस हैं। मे यह निश्चित मत है कि जो हमारा टारगेट है उसको हम अचीव कर सकते हैं। बावजूद इस बात के कि हमारी पैदावार घटी है मैं मायूस नहीं हूँ। हमने बारह करोड़ पचास लाख टन पैदावार का लक्ष्य रखा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमको इस टारगेट को बढ़ा कर तेरह चौदह करोड़ टन करना होगा क्योंकि छः करोड़ के करीब हमारी आबादी बढ़ जायगी। मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि हम इतनी पैदावार कर सकते हैं। इस के लिये यह जरूरी है कि जो तरीके पैदावार बढ़ाने के हैं उनका हम पूरा पूरा इस्तेमाल करें। इसके लिये जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम इसको अनुभव करें कि ह्यूमन फैक्टर बहुत ही इम्पॉर्टेंट पार्ट प्ले करते हैं। फर्टिलाइजर बहुत अहम रोल अदा करता है। हाईब्रिड इम्प्रूव्ड सीड्स को अपना पार्ट प्ले करना है। इम्प्लेमेंट्स को अपना पार्ट प्ले करना है। जहां तक खाद का सम्बन्ध है उसके लिये मैं गवर्नमेंट से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप चाहते हैं कि 1970-71 तक देश सेल्फ सफिशेंट खुराक के मामले में हो जाये तो जितनी 1950 के अन्दर सारे देश में खाद की खपत हुई थी उससे अस्सी गुना ज्यादा खाद आपको मंगाना पड़ेगा। अगर ये सब कुछ हम अगले चार सालों में नहीं कर पाये तो यह जो प्लान है, आपका यह जो टारगेट है यह धरा का धरा रह जायेगा, यह मसला हल नहीं होगा बल्कि और भी एक्यूट फॉर्म में हमारे सामने आ बड़ा होगा।

पिछले दिनों यू० एन० की एक टीम ने दुनिया के जो डिवेलपिंग कंट्रीज हैं उनका दौरा किया था और 26 मुल्कों की एग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन को पूरी तरह से स्टडी किया था। उसका कहना यह है कि जहां तक भारत का ताल्लुक है इसने पिछले पन्द्रह

सालों के अन्दर कोई तीन प्वाइंट के करीब एग्रिकल्चर की सालाना वृद्धि की है और अगर 3.36 तक प्रोग्रेस हो जाती तो भारत खाद्यान्नों के मामले में सैल्फ-सफिशियेंट हो जाता। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें उसकी तरफ जाना होगा और सैल्फ सफिशियेंट बनना होगा। उसके लिये सब से पहली बात तो यह है कि हमें कैमिकल फर्टिलाइजर का प्रबन्ध करना होगा। इस पर मैं विशेष जोर देना चाहता हूँ। इसका कारण यह है कि जितनी हिन्दुस्तान की एग्रिकल्चरल यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं जितनी अमरीका की हैं, जितनी फारेन की एग्रिकल्चरल यूनिवर्सिटीज हैं उन्होंने सारी तहकीकात करके थ्रू एग्ज्पेरिमेंट फार्मर्स की प्रोडक्शन को देखकर कं पूरी जानकारी देते हुए कहा था कि 45 परसेंट के करीब फार्मर्स की आउटपुट बढ़ा सकती है अगर पूरी तरह से फर्टिलाइजर खेत को दे दिया जाए। साथ ही 27 परसेंट के करीब पैदावार बढ़ सकती है अगर इरिगेशन का पानी सारे खेत को दिया जा सके। तेरह परसेंट पैदावार बढ़ सकती है अगर हम इम्प्रूव्ड सीड किसानों को दें। दस परसेंट के करीब पैदावार बढ़ सकती है डबल क्रॉपिंग के जरिये और नौ परसेंट लैंड रिक्लेमेशन के जरिये। जहाँ तक पैस्टीसाइडज का ताल्लुक है इंसैक्टिसाइडज का ताल्लुक है जितने भी दुनियाँ के बड़े-बड़े देश हैं वहाँ इनका उपयोग होता है और बड़े-बड़े देशों में ही नहीं बल्कि छोटे-छोटे देश भी जैसे नीदरलैंड हैं, डैनमार्क है, वहाँ भी इनका उपयोग होता है। डैनमार्क का रकबा अर्नाडिडाइडिड पंजाब के और वर्तमान हिमाचल प्रदेश के कांगड़े जितना होगा लेकिन इतना छोटा देश होते हुए भी डैनमार्क आज दुनिया को मक्खन, पनीर आदि सप्लाई कर रहा है और दुनिया की मार्किट के चौथे हिस्से को उसने कैप्चर किया हुआ है। इसकी क्या वजह है? इसकी वजह यह है कि उसने इन सब चीजों का इस्तेमाल किया है। मैं सीड और इंसैक्टिसाइडज की बात कर रहा हूँ। इंसैक्टिसाइडज के इस्तेमाल से दस

पन्द्रह परसेंट हमारी पैदावार बढ़ सकती है। पिछले साल इन्होंने कहा था कि सारे देश के अन्दर कोई नौ लाख एकड़ जमीन में पैकेज प्रोग्राम के अन्तर्गत कपास की पैदावार होगी। लेकिन उस के लिये न तो ये फर्टिलाइजर दे पाये और न ही सप्रेइंग के लिये हैलीकोप्टर दे पाये। इसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि सिर्फ 6 लाख एकड़ के अन्दर ही रुई की काश्त हो पाई। अब अमरीका हम पर दबाव डाल रहा है कि काटन का जहाँ तक ताल्लुक है इसकी काश्त को हम कम करें। हमारे देश की हालत क्या है? हमारे पास सिर्फ पचास के करीब हैलीकोप्टर हैं जब कि सीरिया जैसे एक छोटे से देश के पास पांच सौ के करीब हैलीकोप्टर हैं जो सप्रेइंग करते हैं। काटन के ऊपर करते हैं, गेहूँ के ऊपर करते हैं। अगर इन सब बातों को ध्यान में रख कर हमने प्रोग्राम बनाया और पूरी तरह से इसको इम्प्लेमेंट किया तो 1970-71 तक हम सैल्फ सफिशियेंट हो सकते हैं। 1971 तक अभी चार साल बाकी हैं। हमें फँसला करना होगा कि हमें कितनी खाद की जरूरत है, कितनी सप्रेइंग की जरूरत है, कितने इम्प्रूव्ड सीडज की जरूरत है और अपनी जरूरतों का अंदाजा लगा कर हमें इन चीजों का बन्दो-बस्त करना होगा। हमारे देश की हालत आज यह है कि हमारे पास स्टोरेज का भी कोई इंतजाम नहीं है जहाँ हम अनाज को रख सकें। मुझे इसका जाती तजुर्बा है जब मैं पंजाब गवर्नमेंट में था।

आप इम्प्रूव्ड सीडज की बात करने हैं। किसानों को इसको देने की बात करते हैं। लेकिन कब ये दिये जाते हैं, इसको आप देखें। रबी क्राप का जो सोईंग होता है वह अक्टूबर नवम्बर में होता है। लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि सितम्बर के आखिर में और अक्टूबर के पहले हफ्ते में मध्य प्रदेश बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश की गवर्नमेंट्स को सोईंग के लिए रीजि.उ. उधार दिया जा रहा था अब आप अंदाजा लगायें कि बहू सीड कब किसानों को पहुँचा होगा। उसकी

[श्री राम कृष्ण]

कब किसानों के अन्दर बांटा जा सकता था। अगर आप सीरियस हैं—यकीनन आप सीरियस हैं, इस सवाल को हल करने के लिए—तो पहली बात आपको यह करनी होगी कि सोइंग से पहले पहले सारे के सारे जो मीज हैं वे किसानों को मुहैया हो जायें और काफी पहले मुहैया हो जाएं। साथ साथ जहां तक बिहार का ताल्लुक है राजस्थान का ताल्लुक है, मध्य प्रदेश का ताल्लुक है, उत्तर प्रदेश का ताल्लुक है या किसी दूसरी स्टेट का ताल्लुक है, आपको पता लगाना होगा कि कितना बीज आपको चाहिये और उस बीज को मुहैया करने के लिए आपको पंजाब और हरियाणा को कहना चाहिए ताकि गवर्नमेंट टू गवर्नमेंट बीज खरीदा जा सके और समय पर उसका वितरण किसानों में किया जा सके। इसके साथ-साथ आपको फैसला करना होगा कि सारे रिजन के अन्दर कितना आप गेहूं चाहते हैं पैदा हो, कितना चावल चाहते हैं पैदा हो। इस सब की तैयारी अगर पूरी तरह से चले तो मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि जहां तक पंजाब और हरियाणा का ताल्लुक है, और इन दो स्टेट्स को जिन-जिन चीजों की जरूरत है अगर वे दे दी जायें तो ये दो स्टेट्स तीन डिफिसिट स्टेट्स की पूरी तरह से कमी को पूरा कर सकती हैं, चावल के लिहाज से, बाजरे के लिहाज से, मक्के के लिहाज से, बीज के लिहाज से, मैं आपको अपना तजुर्बा बताता हूं। 1964-65 में जब प्लानिंग कमीशन ने यह तय किया था कि सारे देश के अन्दर पांच परसेंट करीब खुराक बढ़ाई जाए तब मैंने एक साल के अन्दर ऐग्रिकल्चरिस्ट्स को इन्सैटिव दे कर 21 परसेंट यहां की ऐग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ावाया था। मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि किसान की आवश्यकता की जो चीजें हैं अगर उनको उसकी आवश्यकताओं के मुताबिक दे दिया जाए तो इस देश की पैदावार बढ़ सकती है। इस देश में अन्तिम आ सकती है, हम इस

देश में सेल्फ-रेलायंस की तरफ जा सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं नहीं जानता कि ये कदम उठाये जायेंगे या नहीं। जहां तक फ्रंटलाइजर का ताल्लुक है, चाईना ने भगले तीन, चार झालों के लिए जिस जिस मुल्क में फ्रंटलाइजर पैदा होता है, वहां सारे आर्डर दे रखे हैं, वहां क्रेडिट दे रखा है, लेकिन हमारे यहां हालत यह है कि बजट पास होगा और उसके बाद हम अपनी कार्यवाही शुरू करेंगे। अगर किसान को जून और जुलाई के महीने में फ्रंटलाइजर दे दिया जाता है, तो कपास की पैदावार हो पायेगी, खरीफ की पैदावार हो पायेगी। लेकिन पता नहीं, कब आर्डर जाते हैं, कब यह सिलसिला चलता है।

हमारा प्लान तो अच्छा है लेकिन उस का इम्प्लीमेंटेशन खराब है। इसी तरह हिन्दुस्तान का एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर तो अच्छा है लेकिन हमारा प्रोसीजर और सिस्टम निकम्मा है जो कि हमने ब्रिटिश पैटर्न से लिया है। इस सिस्टम में कोई इन्सेंटिव नहीं है—यह स्लैगिश और स्लो है। इस को बदलने की जरूरत है। गवर्नमेंट ने अपने सिस्टम में सुधार करने के लिए एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफॉर्मस कमिशन बिठाया है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे यहां भी अमरीका की तरह एपीकल्चर और इंडस्ट्री वगैरह के लिए प्रोग्राम एडमिनिस्ट्रेटर मुकर्रर किये जायें जिन के ऊपर सारी जिम्मेदारी डाल दी जाये। हमारे यहां इतना रेड-टैपिज्म है कि क्लर्क से ले कर मिनिस्टर तक कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं लेता है।

रीकस्ट्रक्शन लोन कारपोरेशन की स्टडी के मुताबिक राउरकेसा की रोलिंग कैपेसिटी को कमीशन करने में दो साल की डिले करने से हमें 80 करोड़ रुपये का नुकसान उठाना पड़ा है। विशाखापत्तनम् से जापान को आयरन और का एक्सपोर्ट करने में एक साल की देर होने से हमें 20

मिलियन डालर के फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज का नुकसान उठाना पड़ा है। इसी तरह हालांकि हमारा पब्लिक सेक्टर स्टील प्रोजेक्ट्स की आरिजिनल कास्ट 425 करोड़ रुपये एस्टीमेट थी गई थी लेकिन इस बारे में देर होने से उसकी एकचुभ्रल कास्ट 620 करोड़ रुपये तक पहुंच गई है जिस से हमें 195 करोड़ रुपये का नुकसान उठाना पड़ा है।

इस इलैक्शन में इस मुल्क के इलैक्टेड ने यह फ़तवा दिया है कि हम लोगों को अपनी इकानोमी, अपनी मानीटरी, फ़िस्कल और एग्रीकल्चरल पालिसी के बारे में, अपनी सारी प्राबलम्ज के बारे में रीथिकिंग करनी चाहिए। हमारी इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ जिस रफ़तार से हो रही है, उस को देखते हुए दुनिया के एक्सपर्ट्स ने कहा है कि हमें जापान के स्टीड्ड तक पहुंचने के लिए 137 साल लगेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह हमारे लिए एक चेतावनी है और हमें इस की तरफ़ तबज्जह देनी चाहिए।

अगर हम ने अपनी इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ को बढ़ाना है, अपनी फ़ार्म आउटपुट को बढ़ाना है, किसान की हालत को बेहतर करना है, इस देश को सुरक्षित करना है, अपने देश को सेल्फ़-सफ़िशेंट और सेल्फ़रिलायेंट बनाना है, तो हमें हकीकत से दो-चार होना पड़ेगा। हमें आसमान से उतर कर धरती पर चलना होगा, ताकि हम इस देश के हालात, यहां के मसलों और प्राब्लम्स को देख सकें।

मैं आशा करता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट इ बातों की तरफ़ तबज्जह दे कर इस प्लान को एक्सपैडीचर का प्लान नहीं, बल्कि प्राइकेशन का प्लान बनायेगी। आज मैक्सिमम एरिया को बढ़ाने की जरूरत नहीं है, बल्कि अपनी मैक्सिमम यील्ड को बढ़ाने की जरूरत है आज हम को अपनी प्लान को प्राइकेशन-आरीयटिड बनाना होगी। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट इस तरफ़ ध्यान देगी।

Shri C. C. Desai (Sabarkantha): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amendment moved by my friend,

the leader of the Swatantra Party, to the motion of thanks for the President's Address. The time at my disposal is short and I have plenty of things to talk about.

First of all, I am very happy to find that there is mention of the good work done by the Election Commission during the recent elections. A well-deserved tribute has been paid to the Chief Election Commissioner and the whole army of its officers, under whose supervision and guidance the entire election machinery was set up and worked and the elections were carried out most peacefully and harmoniously.

17.45 hrs.

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya
in the Chair]

Before the elections were held I had my misgivings about the future of this country, thanks to the twenty-years of misrule and maladministration by the Congress caucus and particularly during the dark days of the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But the elections have shown that the electorate can rise to the occasion particularly when the country is threatened by economic ruin, by political disintegration or by loss of public morality particularly on the part of the Ruling Party. And, we have seen the results of the elections. State after State has been lost to the Congress and today there is a ring right from Kerala to the south-west right up to Rajasthan where you do not see the Congress administration. In Madras the DMK put up 25 candidates and all the 25 got elected, a feat which has not been surpassed even in the hey-day of Pandit Nehru or in the Congress life. In Delhi, the capital city of Delhi, the metropolis of India, where the electorate is the most intelligent and most sophisticated you can get hold of, where the bulk of the voters are government servants, who know these people inside-out, who know their tricks, who know their intrigues, six out of seven went to the Opposition, to Jan Sangh. This is the situation which we find emerging from the recent elections. In my own home State of Gujarat, the Congress is ruling

[Shri C. C. Desai]

by paper-thin majority, and judging from what we have seen or heard, first in Haryana and now in Uttar Pradesh, you cannot say how long this majority will last in Gujarat. After Gujarat and after the other States will come probably the Centre.

The Prime Minister of any country who has led his or her party to such a debacle; to such a disaster would have resigned on the day of the declaration of the result and in any case would not have had the audacity of offering himself or herself for leadership of the party. But whether it is Mohanlal Sukhadia, whether it is Chandra Bhan Gupta or whether it is Indira Nehru Gandhi, it is the same lust of power, same attachment to office, the same shameless clinging to power which is evident and which is the bane of the Congress Party today.

An hon. Member: What about Shri C. C. Desai?

Shri C. C. Desai: He was in the Government service and today he is happy to be in this Parliament.

Why are they clinging to power? Some people think that it is because they are afraid of the exposure of their misdeeds which now makes them cling to power. I shall come shortly to the case of Shri Mohanlal Sukhadia, and what happened in the Sadari gold case. That is probably the reason why he is so anxious to remain in the seat of power. But it is the same everywhere.

Now, Sir, a word about the unity, the solidarity and the loyalty of the Congress Party. When the result of the election of the Congress President was announced—I believe it must have been on the 23rd February, 1967—there was a party in the house of an important member of the Cabinet, great jubilation that one thorn was thrown out of the path. The same thing happened when another Minister was defeated. Another Minister,

the Home Minister apparently, was chuckling with a glee when a colleague of his, a senior member of the Cabinet, a senior member of the Working Committee and a member of the syndicate fell to young Mr. George Fernandes in Bombay South. But the case that takes the cake....

An hon. Member: What about Shri Ranga?

Shri C. C. Desai: Shri Ranga will be in our midst very soon. But the case that takes the cake is that of the Chief Minister of Bihar who, first of all, applied for 17 seats, eventually was given two seats by the Congress High Command, and in those two, lost both and in one, the capital of the State, where he was himself the Chief Minister forfeited his deposit. You ought to be ashamed of a record of this kind... (*Interruptions*).

An hon. Member: What about the performance of the Swatantra party there?

Shri C. C. Desai: The Chief Minister lost his deposit in Patna. I challenge them. Is there any iota of shame in them when they talk of the elections?

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma (Khammam): They joined hands with left Communists.

Shri C. C. Desai: Out of chivalry I will not answer her question.

In Orissa, the wonder-man of the Congress party was specially deputed to organise and supervise the elections by the Congress High Command. What happened in that State? The gentleman concerned lost both his seat and the State.

This is the story of the headless wonders, to use the picturesque phrase of Shri Frank Moraes, Super editor of the Indian Express. If this is the measure of success for which they were thumping their desks, they

we free to do it and I hope it will be complete, if not in 1972, even probably earlier, if we are going to have mid-term elections.

The President in his address refers to the new Council of Ministers. We have seen the Ministers. The list is probably not complete. We are told that in spite of the fact of 53 members of the Council of Ministers—52 plus a joker; I do not know; there are 53 cards in a pack of cards—they are still thinking of putting two or three Ministers of State and something like 17 Parliamentary Secretaries. I do not know what the Deputy Prime Minister is thinking of. On the one hand, he is making recommendations, or his Study Group is making recommendations, that the Cabinet should be as small as possible. On the other hand, his own Prime Minister goes on expanding the Cabinet, regardless of the cost to this country, regardless of the tenuous majority which the party has got in this House, regardless of the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission and, as I said, the list is not complete. This is a poor Cabinet consisting of colourless, talentless people who are ministering the country. A friend of mine described it as nothing but an extension of the kitchen cabinet. This kitchen cabinet is no figment of my imagination; it has been referred to by no less a person than Shri Frank Moraes in article after article.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: Is he your ideal?

Shri C. C. Desai: Will the Prime Minister, when she replies to this debate, take this House into confidence and tell us, let us know, who are these members of the kitchen cabinet, what portfolios do they hold in the kitchen cabinet, what influence they have on the Prime Minister, what qualifications they have—is it a diploma in cookery or a diploma in crookery....

Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal (Samastipur): Sir, is it dignified to

say repeatedly kitchen, kitchen, kitchen? Is it a kitchen?

Shri C. C. Desai: I do not know why this word "Kitchen Cabinet" is hurting. As you know, Sir, truth always hurts and absolute truth hurts absolutely.... (Interruption).

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: These people had a number of women voters in their constituencies and now they have this respect for them.... (Interruption).

Shri C. C. Desai: Is this country going to be governed by ambitious members of the kitchen Cabinet?

Shri Yamuna Prasad Mandal: I object to this. It is not dignified. He should not repeat it. He is a man of very high repute.

Mr. Chairman: I appeal to hon. Members to leave the use of such expressions to the taste of the Member speaking.

Shri C. C. Desai: Whatever implication that remark may have, as I said, this word has been used not by me—it is not figment of my imagination—but it has been used time and again by no less a person than Shri Frank Moraes and I am happy and content to be in his company so far as taste is concerned.

Anyhow, the lone pathetic figure in the Cabinet is the Deputy Prime Minister whose writ does not run six inches to the right or six inches to the left. With all these things going on, with all this expansion of the Cabinet going on, how he reconciles himself to this position it is difficult to say.

The Prime Minister has referred more than once to the changing pattern of political life in the country, Centre-State relationships, the need for co-operation between the Centre and the States and between the Congress and the Opposition. These

[Shri C. C. Desai]

are noble words; these are noble ideas, but what the Opposition wants is deeds not words; action not intention; bona fides not fraud.

On the 13th March, an inauspicious day, they go and take the oath of office; they swear that they will uphold the Constitution without fear or favour, without affection or illwill and straight from the Ashoka Hall, where the ceremony was held, they proceed to the Cabinet Room and the very first act they do is the very violation of the oath, ... (Interruption). The first act which they do is the promulgation of the President's rule in Rajasthan. On what? On the strength of a report of a Congress Governor concocted in conspiracy or in collusion with the Congress Home Minister against the will and better judgment of the President even. This is the very first thing that the Cabinet does.

Shri Manubhai Patel (Dabhoi): How do you know that?

Shri C. C. Desai: I can go from incident to incident to point out the inglorious career....

Shri Manubhai Patel: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member says that it was against the will of the President. How can he say that?

Shri C. C. Desai: I know what I am talking about and I mean what I say.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member will kindly address the Chair.

Shri C. C. Desai: Yes, Sir; certainly.

Shri Virendrakumar Shah (Junagadh): On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member is making a maiden speech and a maiden speech is not interrupted.

Shri C. C. Desai: I do not mind any interruption. They are free to have them because it hurts them.

I was talking of the inglorious career of the new Cabinet.

Mr. Chairman: He may continue tomorrow.

18 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have to inform the House of the decisions which have been taken at the meeting held by you with the leaders of the Opposition Groups to-day.

It was agreed that further discussion on the Motion of Thanks on President's Address might conclude tomorrow so far as the members are concerned and the Prime Minister might reply on the 5th April, 1967.

The allocation of time to the Government business to be transacted during the remainder of the session might be as follows:

- (1) The Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 1967. .. ½ hr.
- (2) The Land Acquisition (Amendment and Validation) Bill, 1967 .. 4 hrs.
- (3) The Mineral Products (Additional Duties of Excise and Customs) Amendment Bill, 1967 .. 1 hr.
- (4) The Essential Commodities (Amendment) Bill, 1967 .. 3 hrs.
- (5) The Finance Bill, 1967 .. 2 hrs.
- (6) The Constitution (Twenty-first Amendment) Bill, 1967, as passed by Rajya Sabha .. ½ hr.

It was also agreed that from the 4th to 7th April, 1967, the House