

14.42 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEM-
BERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao: I beg to present the Thirty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

FORTY-THIRD REPORT

Shri A. C. Guha: I beg to present the Forty-third Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Railways—Northeast Frontier Railway.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
VICE-PRESIDENT DISCHARGING
THE FUNCTIONS OF THE
PRESIDENT—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: We shall now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri and seconded by Shrimati Subhadra Joshi on the 13th February, 1964, namely:—

"That an Address be presented to the Vice President discharging the functions of the President in the following terms:—

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the Vice President discharging the functions of the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 10th February, 1964."

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): May we know when the debate is to end and when the Home Minister is to reply?

Mr. Speaker: There are 2.55 hours left.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, I request you to extend it by one hour.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Kindly extend it by some time.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): The Home Minister has to reply in the other House also. The time has been fixed there, that is, tomorrow morning and, therefore, we must conclude this today.

Mr. Speaker: They are demanding that he might reply at the end of the day. This whole day today might be spent on this debate and no other business may be taken up today. The Minister's reply should be concluded today. This is their desire.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I have no objection. We agree to that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The Minister might reply at 4 O'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any idea as to how much time he will take, whether an hour or more than that?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: At least an hour he must require.

If he is called at 4 O'clock, I think it would be all right.

Mr. Speaker: I would be calling the Home Minister at 15.45 hrs. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri.

The Minister without Portfolio (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there has been a lengthy debate on the Vice-President's Address in this House and many important matters have been raised both national as well as international. I do not want to take much time of the House on national problems as my colleague the Home Minister would be dealing with them.

Sir, I shall have to refer to some of the matters concerning external affairs.

It is but natural that we in this country have taken interest and our notice was especially drawn towards deliberations in the Security Council. The Security Council took up the matter of Kashmir and in spite of our protests that it was hardly necessary for the Security Council to consider the question of Kashmir at the present moment, it was ultimately decided that there should be a discussion. I know that the speech made by Sir Patrick Dean has created a future in our country and the serious note taken by the Members of Parliament as well as by people outside is only just and fair. I do not want to deal much with his speech now as the Security Council has adjourned. However, we have to consider the reasons for the kind of speech Sir Patrick Dean made. As far as I can judge—and I am prepared to consider his approach philosophically—there are two main reasons on account of which the U.K. representative was unable to take a dispassionate view. The first is, they are members of SEATO—U.K. and Pakistan—and they have entered into a military alliance. U.K., therefore, finds herself in a position not to take an independent view. It must side with their allies.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) :
क्या कामनवैल्य का रिश्ता कोई काम नहीं देता ऐसे वक्त ?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: And, as I said, if we consider their approach with some sympathy, one can somewhat appreciate that approach, whether we agree with it or do not agree with it at all...

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Why should we appreciate it?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Not you. Purely theoretically, philosophically, as I said, you might, but as I said in the beginning, the whole country....

Mr. Speaker: She wants that the word should not be 'appreciate', but it should be 'understand'.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: All right. I accept her amendment.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: I have not understood that either. We are also members of the Commonwealth. That tie is not there. The tie of the SEATO is there.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप माननीय मंत्री को हिन्दी में बोलने के लिए क्यों नहीं कहते ? अगर वह हिन्दी में बोलें, तो शायद ज्यादा साफ़ बोलें ।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : मैं तो हिन्दी में बोलना ज्यादा पसन्द करूँ, क्योंकि मैं तो अंग्रेज़ी नहीं जानता । लेकिन मैं, अंग्रेज़ी इसलिए बोलता हूँ कि... (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, Let the Minister proceed as he desires.

श्री ओंकार लाल बरवा (कोटा) :
माननीय मंत्री हिन्दी में बोलें । नन्दा जी अंग्रेज़ी में बोल सकते हैं ।

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : माननीय मंत्री जो इस वक्त अंग्रेज़ों को सुना रहे हैं ।

He is addressing the British.

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : मैं तो नज्दूर हूँ, क्योंकि हाउस चाहता नहीं है । मैं तो हिन्दी में बोलना पसन्द करता हूँ, क्योंकि मैं थोड़ी बहुत हिन्दी जानता हूँ । (Interruptions)

Shri Swell (Assam—Autonomous districts): He should speak both in English and Hindi.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त हम इस झगड़े में न पड़ें ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं डा० स्वेल को यह बतला दूँ कि हम

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

माननीय मंत्री को हिन्दी में इसलिए बुलवाना चाहते हैं कि वह अंग्रेजी बोल नहीं पा रहे हैं और उनका मतलब साफ़ नहीं हो रहा है ।

Shri Swell: He can speak in Hindi first. But we can request him to speak in English also.

Mr. Speaker: Any language that he chooses himself.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (गुना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी जब अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति के सम्बन्ध में उत्तर दे रहे हैं, तो यह विवाद खड़ा करना कि वह अंग्रेजी अच्छी बोल सकते हैं या नहीं बोल सकते हैं, बड़ी धृष्टता है और यह संसद् के सामान्य नियमों के प्रतिकूल है ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कोई प्रतिकूल नहीं है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दोनों माननीय सदस्य खामोश रहें और आनरेबल मिनिस्टर को बोलने दें ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : धृष्टता के बदले में मैं कह सकता हूँ कि यह बड़ी बदतमीजी है

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): May I submit "appreciate" is quite correct and "appreciate" does not mean that we approve.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Shri T. T. Krishnamachari may appreciate it, but we do not appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker: 'Appreciate' also means 'understand'.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not claim to know much English but I can understand the implications of the word 'appreciate'. At least, I know that much. I used that word deliberately and purposely and I think I am not wrong.

I am also prepared to concede that Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia knows much more English than I.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरी बात नहीं है । मैंने तो, अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप का ही नेतृत्व लिया है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं तो हर एक से सीखने के लिए तैयार हूँ क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि मुझे कुछ नहीं आता । दूसरे मेम्बरों को भी यही एटीट्यूड अख्त्यार करना चाहिये और उनको चाहिये कि वे भी सीखें ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं हज़ार बार कह चुका हूँ कि मुझे अंग्रेजी नहीं आती है । लेकिन मैंने आपका ही इस बारे में नेतृत्व लिया है ।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : आप को अंग्रेजी नहीं, कुछ भी नहीं आता है (इंटरप्शन)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या ऐसी संजीदा बहस इस झगड़े में चली जायेगी, ज़बान की बहस में चली जायेगी ?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Now, I might proceed further. I would like to say, as I was saying, that there are two main reasons on account of which the British delegate took up that attitude. And I have dealt with one. The other is because the present ruling party in UK still continues to think in old terms and in old ways. The ruling party has always felt that Kashmir should go over to Pakistan. They have been thinking in that way—they may not say it—because they have the feeling that the Jammu and Kashmir State could easily be divided into two, the Muslim majority part going over to Pakistan and the Hindu majority part going over to India. They think that it is an easy division, just a division of two territories. But they do not visualise the consequences, the true consequences of these

steps. It is not merely a question of division of two territories. The implications, as I said, are much more complex. In spite of the fact that the Britishers say that they are non-communal, and they are, and they believe in a secular kind of State, yet, they have never given thought to what has been happening or what has happened in Pakistan and how the minorities have been dealt with in that country.

The question of accession of Kashmir has been dealt with or has been referred to by many Members of this House. I must pay my compliments to Shri Krishna Menon who spoke at length on this matter. He has said in his speech that in so far as the legal accession of Kashmir with India is concerned, it is final and complete. So, we stand on that basis. It is quite clear that the Government of India have nothing to say further on that matter.

But it is unfortunate that a reference was made by Sir Patrick Dean on this aspect of the problem. It is true that I have gone through the full text of the speech of Sir Patrick Dean. It was given to me by the High Commissioner of UK, and I have gone through it. I am prepared to admit that he has not said so in so many words, and yet the implications are such that if one will read through it, one can easily interpret it in that way. I am also prepared to admit that he had said something in his speech on communal harmony etc. It was a brief reference, but it is regrettable that the Security Council or the members who took part in the discussions did not put the first question first. At the moment, when there were communal riots in Pakistan, when there was terrible communal frenzy and killings were taking place, it was the duty of the members of the Security Council to have considered that matter first, and how to bring about communal harmony and communal peace in Pakistan and in

Calcutta or some other areas where communal trouble broke out in our country. As I said, the Security Council did not pay any attention to that, and instead of giving high priority to that question, they started discussing on Kashmir.

I might add with your permission that my feeling is that the discussion, in the Security Council, of the Kashmir question led to or considerably increased the bitterness in Pakistan and in our country, and instead of, as I said, keeping peace in both the countries, the discussions in the Security Council have led to further troubles; it might be that some countries might be interested, or I would not say 'some' but at least Pakistan which has really no case in regard to Kashmir thought that if some trouble is created in India or in some form in Pakistan, it may lead to repercussions which might go against the stand of India. In their judgment, the Security Council considered or thought it proper to consider this matter, but, however, it has now ended.

Shri Ranga: Ended or adjourned?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Ended in the sense that at least for the time being it has ended. One does not know; Pakistan might like to raise it again. However, for the time being, the Security Council has adjourned, and I think that the Security Council has ultimately taken the right decision. The Security Council has to consider, whenever it wants to consider the matter, whether they will do or not, the best thing for them would be not to do so, because in this matter it is only direct talks which can help in evolving something which would bring about some kind of settlement. But nothing can come in the way of, or touch, our sovereignty or our full rights over these territories and areas.

However, I want to add that two facts must be considered by the members of the Security Council. While they discuss about plebiscite etc., they

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

are apt to forget that the Security Council themselves had declared Pakistan as aggressor, and when the Security Council themselves had accepted Pakistan as aggressor, they should first ask Pakistan to vacate the occupied territories. Unfortunately, they do not do it; and perhaps they do not think of it at all; and on the other hand, ask us to hold a plebiscite. Plebiscite and vacation, in a sense, go together, and if there is going to be no vacation, the question of plebiscite should never arise. If the matter is discussed or considered in this context, I have no doubt the Security Council will be able to arrive at a correct decision.

13.00 hrs.

As I said just now, it does not mean that we are not prepared to meet and discuss. But we certainly do not want any kind of intervention from outside. We want to make a sincere effort, if possible, if Pakistan agrees, to solve our dispute or the problem concerning Kashmir. But the success of it more or less depends on direct talks and discussions.

As regards China, it has been said that the aggression on our borders has not been vacated. Shri Mahatab said that the emergency should not become, more or less, a normal affair. I agree that there is a stalemate and no progress has been made since the Colombo proposals were put up. As the House will remember, China had agreed to the Colombo proposals—in fact, a statement was made at that time that China had accepted them without any reservations: It is quite clear that they have gone back on their assurances and have almost negated the Colombo proposals in action.

The position remains the same. I know some of us get impatient. But that would be diplomatically wrong. India has taken a moral stand, and we should stick to it. If the House

will allow me to do so, I might put it to the House or to hon. Members a major question: whether we want war or peace? I know how strongly we feel against the Chinese aggression. Every young man and woman in this country was touched to the quick and spoke with one voice to resist the Chinese aggression. This spirit is still there, and should be there. However, I feel that in human affairs, one cannot always take a completely rigid and fixed view. The point is, is there any other alternative to violent conflict?

Our Prime Minister has already talked of referring the matter to the International Court. He had also suggested that the matter could be referred to arbitration. The House will remember that both the Houses had approved of these when the Prime Minister had made those suggestions. If we think only in terms of war, then there is hardly much point in making these suggestions. I know the House will generally agree that India will always like to avoid any kind of conflagration, any kind of step which would lead to a major conflict.

Shri Tyagi: But not at the cost of our territory.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Let him kindly listen to me.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Peace with honour.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Therefore, I say that the door for discussion and negotiations should never be closed. But no one in this country, and especially those in power, can conceive of any kind of negotiations or discussions which will not be in consonance with the dignity and honour of our country.

What I wanted to suggest was only this, that there is no point in leaving these things in suspense for a long time, whether it is Pakistan or China. If it hangs fire for a long time to come, it does not serve the interest of either one country or the other.

I have merely put it to the House. I only want that the House might give thought to it. We have to take a realistic and practical view of things. But as I said, it is an exceedingly delicate and difficult matter. It is not for me to make any suggestion. But if Parliament wants that a major conflict or war etc. has to be avoided, it might give thought to the alternative aspect of the matter or to the other side of the picture.

As regards the attitude of China, of course, they say so many things. But the way they have been behaving creates suspicion and doubts in our minds. The kind of build-up they have made on our borders is full of dangers. Therefore, when I say this, I do not forget the fact that our country has to build up its defence strength. We are faced with an enemy which is a very mighty military power today. It is armed to the teeth. So India must build up her defence strength. We must become militarily strong, so that if any critical situation arises, we can meet them on our frontiers, we can meet them in the battlefield, and meet them successfully.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यद् करेंगे क्या ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : जरूर करेंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी से न शुरू हो जाये ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: This process is, no doubt, a slow process. Of course, we are in the thick of it. The defence department and the Government of India as a whole is doing its best to build up our defence strength. But one could not suggest that it could be achieved in about a year's time or so. Of course, we are making progress every day. The point is that we have to go ahead

with our work vigorously. And yet, we will have to show some patience.

Shri Mahatab suggested that the emergency may not become a normal affair of the people of our country. We do not want to do it, and it should not be the attitude of our people if things take time. However, we must realise the fact that these preparations have to proceed steadily and we should try to reach a certain target as early as possible. For example, it is not in the case of our country alone that China has behaved in this manner. Even with Russia, the Chinese have claimed quite a bit of their territory on the frontiers between Russia and China.

Shri Hem Barua: That is our consolation.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Not consolation, but you have to see things in the correct perspective. After the establishment of the People's Republic of China, Russia had withdrawn its border guards and forces along the long frontier with China, and yet, as a Russian statement pointed out, there have been no fewer than 5,000 border violations by China. Sometimes during the Question Hour, questions are asked here about our frontier troubles, border troubles between Pakistan and India. This is not something new to our country. I was surprised to read that there had been no less than 5,000 border violations by China on the Russian frontiers.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Have Russian soldiers been killed also?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not know the details, but it is not impossible.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Have they been killed? That is the point. Not one has been killed.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not know. If the hon. Member knows it . . .

Shri U. M. Trivedi: None of the papers have said anything about killing.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I wonder if the hon. Member had seen this statement that there were 5,000 violations.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Violations have been mentioned, but killing has not been mentioned.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हम ने पहले ही चीन की जमीन ले ली थी ।

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Violation is one thing, occupation is another. Is Russian territory actually occupied by the Chinese today?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : पहले आप हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन चीन में ले लें, फिर झगड़ा होता रहे ।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : अभी रूस ने लिया नहीं है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सौ बरस से ले रहा है ।

श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री : अभी भी मंचूरिया और आमूर रिवर के आस-पास काफ़ी बड़ा एरिया रूस के कब्जे से बाहर है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उसने ब्लेडीवास्टक तक ले लिया था ।

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I have said that this is not wholly uncommon, and if a powerful country like Russia can put up with these things for some time, we have also to take a lesson from them.

Shri Ranga: Both of them are cousins; they are communists, and they know how to deal with each other.

Shri Hem Barua: I did not expect this at least from Shri Shastri. This is very unconvincing.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I have not suggested. . .

Shri U. M. Trivedi: That consolation is there.

Shri Hem Barua: He says that when a strong country like Russia has to put up with this, we have to. Fortunately, he did not say, we who are weak (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Will he be allowed to proceed? Whether this is an argument or not, he has a right to speak and address the House.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am not in the habit of. . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The point is: has China invaded Russia as she has invaded India?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I was merely referring to the role of China. The point is this. The House has to appreciate that aspect of the problem, what kind of attitude China has. I was merely referring to that, and pointing out that if they could do this in the case of a friendly country like Russia, a powerful country, they could do the same or much worse things with others. I am not suggesting that we have to adopt a particular attitude, or Russia's attitude. That is a different matter. There is no comparison between the military strength of Russia and that of India. A country which is strong can put up with it. If the hon. Member wants to say that a strong country like Russia might, but that India should not do that, . . .

Shri Ranga: Our country has been invaded, our territory has been occupied.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Anyhow, I shall now refer to another matter, and it is about the communal riots in East Pakistan. Much has been said

in this House in regard to these riots, and I do not want to cover the same ground again. However, during this period, even during the last week or ten days, we wrote to our Deputy High Commissioner to take up the matter further with the Pakistan Government. We wanted that some of our officers there should be allowed to visit the riot-affected areas and meet the minority community there. We said we were prepared to give the same freedom, we would give permission to their officers in India to go round and see things for themselves.

Shri Hem Barua: They have already gone round.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I know that, but if the hon. Member does not want that they should go again if they want. . . .

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): I am merely objecting that the Pakistan Government. . .

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Will the hon. Member kindly resume his seat, and try to understand what I am saying? I am merely saying that in case they allow our officers to go now, we will have no objection to their officers going again. What is his point? Why should the hon. Member object, as if I have no feelings for the minorities in East Pakistan, or as if I wish to give a special helping hand to Pakistan?

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: I was only trying to point out. . .

Mr. Speaker: He is not giving way. The hon. Member may kindly resume his seat and not intervene.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: At this rate, it would become impossible for me to speak, if the hon. Members interrupt in this way.

Shri Hem Barua: But interruptions help you.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not mind interruptions, but. . .

Shri Hem Barua: Interruptions sharpen your tongue.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But in spite of that suggestion, the Pakistan Government has totally refused it. They have said that they are not in favour of our officers going round to the affected areas.

Shri Tyagi: The Home Minister the other day announced on the floor of the House that our officers there were free to go, as their officers were free to go here. That is the statement made on the floor of the House.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: So far as East Pakistan is concerned, I know that it was only in Dacca that they were allowed to go, but in other areas they were never allowed to go in East Pakistan. This may have been said by the Home Minister also.

श्री प्रकाश बीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
हमारे डिप्टी हार्ड कमिशनर ढाका शहर
में घूम सकते हैं या ढाका जिले में भी ?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I was not present when Shri Badrudduja made his speech. I am told he was very angry, and perhaps he is one who gets easily upset. I do not want to say much myself, but I would like, with your permission, to quote some of the comments made in the Pakistani newspapers on what happened in East Pakistan.

Ittefaq, Dacca, writes: 'Pakistan's Image Tarnished', and says:

"Any decent citizen of Pakistan would be saddened and ashamed by these incidents. It is natural that there should be concern among the Pakistani people over the theft of the Holy Prophet's relic in Hazratbal. But those who have created internal discontent, disorder and riots on the pretext of this incident, are not motivated by religion nor are they well-wishers of Pakistan."

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

Sangbad, another paper, published an item entitled "Communal Elements Must be Checked", and criticised "reactionary circles" for inciting communal passions over the Hazratbal incident resulting in the Khulna riots. It says:

"The reactionaries did not feel pangs of conscience in using this terrible weapon in their own interests. The Hazratbal incident is deplorable. It has naturally upset the simple religious-minded people in both countries."

"But we feel even more upset over the manner in which some well-known elements are inciting communalism by raising the slogan that Islam and Muslims are in danger."

The *Pakistan Observer*, Dacca, in an item entitled "Enemies of Peace", says that while condemning the undesirable repercussions already seen here, "We strongly condemn what has happened in Khulna. We condemn violence as a means of reprisal." The *Morning News*, Dacca, dated January 12th in an item entitled "Editors' Appeal for Peace" referred to a joint statement issued in Dacca on January 11th by seven newspaper editors and said:

"The recent happenings in which human lives were lost due to frenzy and recourse to violent methods by some rowdy elements in Khulna have shocked and horrified us."

The fact that the disturbances in Calcutta and the adjoining areas in West Bengal were the direct reaction to the communal riots in Khulna and its adjoining areas, has been admitted in an article in the Bengali daily *Ittefaq*, Dacca, which said:

"What we feared has happened. Communal riots have flared up in some parts of Cal-

cutta as a reaction to the recent communal disorders in Khulna. . . . The West Bengal Government has taken strong measures to control the situation. Besides the police, it has called in the Army. Disorderly crowds have been fired upon."

The Pakistan Press continued to incite communal passions. I shall read one more quotation. This is what *Pakistan Observer* said:

"It is to be regretted that some West Pakistan newspapers having some circulation in East Pakistan have been carrying inflammatory reports about Calcutta and West Bengal which are having an unfortunate effect on the passions of people here . . ."

Unfortunately the Communications Minister of Pakistan had to say something entirely different; replying to some questions he said that the Indian Press reports were exaggerating minor events. He was contradicting the Indian Press reports which suggested heavy losses of property and life in recent troubles in East Pakistan. Replying to questions, he said, the Indian Radio and Press reports were exaggerating the minor events. These rumours were far from truth, he is reported to have said. This is how communal frenzy was fanned up. I must pay my compliments to the editors and writers in these newspapers who have taken such a balanced and truthful view but the politicians there, one of their Ministers had to paint a different picture altogether.

There is a good deal of suppression of news also and I will not myself say anything on this but here is an extract from the *Times*, London, dated 14th February, 1964.

"The Pakistani Press has at times been much the more inflammatory of the two."

The *Baltimore Sun* of January 22nd, in an item date lined, Karachi, Pakistan, January 14 entitled "Pakistan Censors Hit" quoting from Pakistan weekly *Outlook*, said:

"This clamour for secrecy is nothing but a bureaucratic contraption. For one thing the world Press cannot be bamboozled or bought over like the Press in Pakistan. The home press has been tamed and maimed . . . Foreign correspondents have had their mail censored, travel restricted and queries to officials left unanswered."

I shall merely quote the headlines in *New York Times*, Washington, January 23rd: "Suppression of news by Government from Dacca—Plight of foreign correspondents—How Rayerbazar was ransacked and minority community wiped out."

These are the comments of Pakistan Newspapers and foreign newspapers speaking the truth and I do not know if my hon. friend Mr. Badrudduja had cared to go through these comments. He should see and then decide whether he could put India and Pakistan at par; in fact, he wants to put them on the same level.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi (Firozabad): Have you collected any cutting from the Pakistan Press in which his speech has been displayed prominently and utilised for Pakistan's advantage?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I do not know whether they have utilised his speech. About Kashmir I have nothing much to say. The question of relic has been satisfactorily solved. Some minor off-shoots are there and I am sure there will be no special difficulty in considering them. It is true that the political problems concerning Kashmir have also been carefully considered. Many things have been said here. I do not want to indulge in recriminations or find fault with others. We must act construc-

tively and discuss all matters with different sections of the people in Jammu and Kashmir. I am going there tomorrow and I have every desire to carry as far as possible everyone with me. It is important that the people in Jammu and Kashmir should be fully satisfied that they are being served satisfactorily and that they are being governed by those who are their truly elected representatives. There are certain procedures to be followed in a democratic set-up and ultimately the will of the people will prevail. I have every hope that I shall get the fullest co-operation of all who are closely concerned with this matter. I may have to discuss with the Premier of Jammu and Kashmir and his other colleagues also. I may, however, add that if there are some elements who want to create trouble in Jammu and Kashmir, they will have to be dealt with properly if they do not see reason. I need not have said it but I am surprised over some of the speeches and certain steps which have been proposed by some members of the Action Committee. When I went to Kashmir I gladly met the members of that committee, thrice and went far to meet their reasonable wishes and demands.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why did you not go there earlier—I mean, early in January? You could then save the situation. But anyhow, in spite of all that has been done, if certain members of the Action Committee function in a way which will help any foreign country, no Government will ever like to tolerate it. I have been indeed pained that some of the members of the Action Committee have been—they may not be members of the Action Committee but at least in the meetings which are addressed by members of the Action Committee—raising most objectionable slogans. There may be some pro-Pakistan elements there...

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Agent provocateurs

*President discharging
the functions of the
President*

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Yes; they may be agent provocateurs. But anyhow it has to be stopped. It is their responsibility and you cannot allow it in any part of the country, much less in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. However, I do not want to make any premature statement. As I said, I shall go there and try to do my best.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We wish you godspeed.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I want the good wishes of all the hon. Members of this House. I can perhaps say with some confidence that humanity as a whole feels relieved over the lessening of tension in the world although there is a climate of cold war in some parts and signs of conflict and actual clash taking place in others. The attitude and policies of the two great powers have helped in creating a new climate and the real contribution in this regard has been made by the late President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. Both have attained high positions in the world today and it was a very bold and courageous action on the part of the late President Kennedy to have differed with his other colleagues or with certain sections of the people in the United States; in fact, he took the initiative and extended the hand of friendship to the Soviet Union. He held it out to the end of his life. His life was cut short so soon and so suddenly. He is no longer there, but his successor, President Johnson, I am glad, has assured that he will follow in the footsteps of President Kennedy.

The recent disarmament proposals by Premier Khrushchev are also to be welcomed. He has made out an important point in his proposals. He has said that the border disputes or the problems of territories on the borders between two different countries should not be settled by violent clashes and conflicts, but they should be discussed and as far as possible agreement should be arrived at through negotiations. It applies to every country; it applies to us also. Therefore, the Government of

India has welcomed the statement as a whole. I think that these proposals deserve the earnest consideration of all the countries in the world.

I have dealt with some of the external affairs matters, but there is no doubt that national strength is essential if we really want to become internationally strong. Two things in this connection are important for making the country strong. One, of course, is, economic changes with socialism as our goal. I know that we are faced with a difficult economic situation at the present moment. But we have to pursue our objective and it is equally important that there should be unity and integrity within the country. I do hope that we will take these factors into consideration, both national and international. In fact, they are closely interconnected, and I must pay my humble tribute to the Prime Minister who has been a symbol of unity and who has always stood for economic changes in the country. It is the obligation of each and every citizen of the country, and more so of ours in the Government, to fulfil the great objectives he has placed before the country and thus make it self-reliant and strong.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai, I will not be able to give him more than 15 minutes.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank you very much for the courtesy of calling me. I have said I will be in your hands.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I cannot join the chorus of thanks to the President for his Address which, in my opinion, I am constrained to say, is no more than an insipid, drone, anaemic chronicle. I think it is not wrong for us to expect that the Address of the Vice-President or the President to this nation and to this Parliament should be something more than the annual report of the secretary of the Taluka Mahila Samaj. Nowhere in the Address of the Vice-President do we find an awareness of

the many perils that face us, of the storms that are gathering; not a single word to dispel doubt, to create confidence, to inspire faith in this country. In vain do we read in his Address for an awareness of the perils that this nation is facing at home and abroad. Under this present Government, this country seems to be like the ship adrift on inchartered seas, without a pilot, without a rudder and without a compass, when storms are lying ahead.

This seems to be a country under the present Government which is politically confused, militarily unprepared, economically stagnant and administratively disorganised and demoralised. They have brought us to such a sad state of affairs. We have come to such a pass today under the present leadership that we are without an effective leader at home, without a dependable friend abroad. How chaotic is the state of affairs, the undecisiveness, the lack of a sure guiding hand, was demonstrated very amply today immediately after the Question Hour when this House was held, in spite of the very best efforts of the Speaker, because, not a single reply could come to throw light on so simple a matter like the use of armed forces in Shillong. For 45 minutes we could see the typical paralysis, the chaos and the confusion that are crippling the present administration. I am not gloating over it because it is a gross misfortune which is enveloping all of us. We happen to be the victim of this kind of crisis.

13-38 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

But in spite of this, this Government is quite capable of doing the wrong thing. One such demonstration was given very recently—and I will be very brief about it—in Goa. How perverse pride and petty prejudices will be allowed to prevail against the manifest wishes of the people was very amply proved recently in Goa. This Government has shown very little talent for tackling the existing problems, but it

has displayed an unmistakable gift, almost a genius, for creating problems where none exists. One such example is Goa. For the first time in 463 years, they exercised the sovereign right of man, exercised their universal franchise, which is their heritage as that of other Indians; they expressed what they want in unmistakable terms, and what was the response of the Government of India? Shri Shastri was delivering a very fervent peroration at Bhuvaneswar, and what was his response, and what was the response of the leader to whom he has just paid tributes? After getting the report about the Goa election, the Prime Minister said, "I am pained and shocked." Why was he pained and shocked? What was there painful and shocking in the result except that the people of Goa had not carried out his mandate, except for the fact that not one member of his party, out of the 28 who had won the elections—not one—had been elected? Therefore, instead of bowing down as a democrat to the verdict of the people, he made such a travesty of the past by declaring publicly that he is pained and shocked. I do not want to go into the details of that. I shall pray with the Government, and Shri Shastri in particular, that it should be our endeavour—and I still continue to cling to that hope though it is becoming slender—that Goa will not be made to go through the same ordeal through which they compel other parts of the country to go which happen to hold views of about their own place in this country different from those of the present Government. The Goa matter needs to be handled without any false prestige, without preconceived ideas, as the facts have displayed themselves. I hope they will have the generosity and courage.

I would have liked to talk about the happenings in Goa. I should like to mention one fact. Today, for the first time we are privileged—I wish there was a reference to it either in the speech of the Vice-President or other hon. Members—to have the chosen

*President discharging
the functions of the
President*

[Shri Nath Pai]

representatives of the people of Goa who are taking their place in this House. Formerly they were representatives nominated by the Government. Today they have been sent here by the mandate of the people of Goa. They will have occasion to convey the genuine wishes of the people of Goa as to where they want to be and what they want to be as full Indians.

May I now turn to something which is hanging in the minds of all us—I mean Kashmir. I should plead with the House that let us not confine our assessment of the developments both at home and what happened in the Security Council to the expression of our very legitimate resentment against the stance and posture of the British delegate. I think we need to go a little deeper to find out what happened. First, we should like to tell the Security Council and the world opinion something about the development in Kashmir. The Security Council will have to make up its mind once for all whether it wants to be what it was intended to be—the guardian of world peace—or does it want to be used and to be exploited for propaganda stunts as Pakistan palpably tried to do during the past few days there. The Security Council will be sinking in the esteem of the world and, I think, it will be ceasing to be that effective instrument of peace, avoiding war, if once again it suffers itself to be used in the callous manner in which Pakistan tries to use it. World opinion should also know another thing, that there was never any threat to peace in Kashmir. No peace was endangered, and if every time Pakistan will cry “wolf” the Security Council will be huddled into a conference and those meaningless futile discussions will be held palpably used to malign and blacken this country, I do not think any useful purpose will be served. Maybe, temporarily India suffers, but the world suffers too, because to the extent the Security Councils comes to be twisted and abused like this by a power for its own ulterior motives, it ceases to be an effective, efficacious instrument of world peace.

I should now like to say something about the way other things have happened. We have said something about the British delegate's posture. I think Shri Shastri should have used more firm terms to the universally felt resentment in this country. Caution is all right, but when it comes to talking truth we should not shirk our responsibility. One feels that the Tory Government or some elements in the Tory Government have not forgiven India for daring to throw off their yoke, nor have they forgotten the loyal service rendered to them to perpetuate their shackles on this country by the Muslim League who happens to be in power in Karachi today. One feels, of course, a little angered and also sad at the way Sir Patrick Dean tried to twist the facts relating to Kashmir. Perhaps, there was this thing, that apart from this animus towards us we should try to remember that there may be something to do with our own failures too. Let us not try to console ourselves that this anti-Indian posture was adopted by the United Kingdom because Pakistan is merely a member of the SEATO. There may be other things too.

I would like to venture here to submit something. For a long time we shall continue to be punished and penalised by the world for the sorry performance we gave of ourselves in the NEFA. The world respect those who are strong and, moreover, the world respect those who respect themselves. Just three weeks back the entire Indian Cabinet was dancing attendance on the Chief of Staff of the United Kingdom, Lord Mountbatten, and when it came to defending a very vital interest of this country we were not shown the ordinary courtesy of warning us that a delegate of the United Kingdom will be taking an attitude injurious to the vital interests of his country. This courtesy also was not shown. Our international prestige has so much shrunk that we are being taken for granted in the world that any power can come and slap us in the face and expect that India will thank

them for that. That is the position to which we have been reduced by this Government.

Look at France Sycophantically this Government has been trying to please De Gaulle ignoring the rights of legitimate freedom fighters in Arab Africa. They went to the extent of insulting the entire Arab nation over the question of recognition of free Algeria. The House is not aware to what extent the slick, smart Alecks in the foreign Ministry can go. The first Ambassador of the Republic of Algeria, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, was subjected to the humiliation by this Government of being disallowed to come to this country on the passport of free Algeria. He had to take the passport of Morocco and come. What testimony of our support for freedom? Why were we doing it? We were doing it in the forlorn hope that De Gaulle will support us. And, De Gaulle has delivered a slap, the way he has thrown red carpet at the feet of Chou En-lai. Everywhere we will find this thing towards the Chinese who are shrewd and who have great power. Sir, if a man slaps you once it is his mistake, but if he slaps you a second time it is your mistake. The world is made like that. But this Government whose idealism has been corrupted by power and whose sense of realism has been distorted by fear will never come to the proper conclusion.

We must look to other aspects of the debate in the United Nations. What has grieved us more is not this Tory's posture, because for the Tories Kashmir will continue to be a pawn on the chess board of international politics, a game which the Tories are never tired of playing. But Kashmir is something far more serious to us. It is the kingpin of our hopes for secular democracy. And, here we should take a warning from some of the other speeches too. For the first time, Soviet Union which has been giving sustained support to us has made a departure from their own policy. For the first

time the Soviet delegate has used words which should make us sit up and think. Mr. Khrushchev, only a few months back, had proclaimed that there is no dispute in Kashmir, Kashmir is an integral part of India and nothing can undo it. The Soviet delegate has said now that there is a dispute and—even worse—they have placed it on the same level with regard to the question of minorities in this country. It has rallied us and it has hurt us. I can quite understand the Tories, who will not have more than six months, having their last fling at India for what we did during the Suez episode. The Tory Government perhaps was smarting under the insult and this was their last chance because there will be a general election in Britain before May and they may not get a chance again to do it. But we should look as to who supports us. We stood more or less isolated in the United Nations. Nobody said one word of appreciation about the way we treated our minority. We were put on the same level as Pakistan even by the Soviet delegate, who says "we think of communal tensions". I am not condemning it but we must sit together and draw the necessary inferences and conclusions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude.

Shri Nath Pai: Bear with me a little longer, Mr. Deputy-Speaker.

I do not know if Sir Patrick Dean has succeeded in hurting and injuring India as much as the Tory members wanted to, but one thing is quite clear that the future historians cannot resist this conclusion that he did succeed in permanently demaging the fabric of what is called the Commonwealth. Indian faith in this link has been gravely impaired, and I do not know if it can be restored to what it was after the treatment we got here. Even though what has happened in the United Nations is something very alarming, there is one redeeming feature none the less. Pakistan did

[Shri Nath Pai]

not get what she wanted. She did suffer a major defeat in her attempt at the United Nations. This defeat she did not suffer in the Security Council, this was not inflicted by the very able presentation of Shri Chagla, but this defeat has been inflicted on Pakistan in the valley, in the villages and hamlets of that beautiful land by the people of Kashmir, who refused to be taken in, who refused to respond to their nefarious call to rise in *jehad* to betray this country under the plea of defending Islam. The Kashmiri brothers have covered themselves with glory by the way they discharged themselves during those days and this is an aspect of the problem which we cannot afford to neglect.

I should like to tell the Government that Kashmir's destiny will not be decided by Sir Patrick Dean and Mr. Bhutto in the United Nations.

An Hon. Member: It has already been decided.

Shri Nath Pai: It will be decided in the hearts and minds of the Kashmiris. Here we have to be extremely careful of the way in which we handle the situation. I think the Government of India must not repeat the folly of relying upon the professed loyalties of an individual in preference to the manifest loyalty of the entire Kashmiri population. Those loyalties are very clear. But their grievances must also be looked into and we have to try to see that we do not try to give any shelter, any protection or uphold those elements against which, the Kashmiri people have demonstrated, they have lost their total faith. It would not be the path of patriotism and in the interests of this country that we continue to pamper these elements. I am not interested in names. I also want to tell the Minister without Portfolio, while wishing success in his mission, that we owe to ourselves that we should not think in terms of Pakistan but of ourselves.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Nath Pai: May I have a few more minutes? I will try to wind up.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has taken 19 minutes. He may wind up soon.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He began only at 1.40 P.M.

Shri Nath Pai: I have not yet touched even China. Further, I am the last speaker of my party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He had only ten minutes. Now he has already taken 19 minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Perhaps a miscalculation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are other Members who must be given opportunities.

Shri Nath Pai: I was saying that the processes which we initiate in Kashmir must be such which leave no doubt that either the investigation, or our other approaches, are coloured by political considerations. Either in the investigation of the case, or in dealing with the elements, we must never make any ground, any scope, any margin to be misrepresented that we are departing from our own standard. What Pakistan does is no consideration for us. Pakistan can naturally repudiate her obligations under the Nehru-Liaquat Pact. What better standards can we expect from the leaders of a country, or some leaders of a country who in the morning are sworn in under the Constitution and in the evening hold a revolver at the back of the man who had sworned them and trample under their very feet their own Constitution? But our obligations to our minorities are not enshrined in a document; our obligation to our minorities is something with which we are born; it is a part of our culture; it is a part of our

heritage and civilisation. It is written in our Constitution. We cannot repudiate and discard our obligations to those minorities without ceasing to be Indians. For us there is no escape from our responsibility. So, let this be borne in mind.

I would like to come to China before I wind up and say, I do not know if the Government of India believes, even now after twelve years of experience, that an amalgam of illusions and personal prejudices can make up for the want of a policy. Shri Shastri has talked of negotiations just now and tried to console us by saying that there were 5,000 violations of the Soviet land. May I remind him how the Soviet lion reacted when there was a significant violation, not of land but of Soviet air supremacy? The Soviet Union girded up its loins when a U-2 plane violated the Soviet Air supremacy and put the United States in the dock. Why compare ourselves with the Soviet Union when we are patiently—shall I say patiently? is it the correct word?—quietly, submitting to thousands of violations of our territory? So, the Soviet analogy does not apply to us.

But the alarming thing is the announcement today from Rangoon by General Ne Win who says:

“to enter into direct negotiations on the basis of the Colombo proposals”.

General Ne Win has paid visit to this country only a few days back. Is the Government of India busy again bringing pressure on our friends and others to persuade China to come to the negotiating table even when China refuses to accept the Colombo Proposals? What is the foreign policy of this Government? Hiding, taking shelter behind facts which are blatantly repudiated by others, going on chewing, chewing—how long are we going to chew—this pill from which the last substance has been squeezed out, this pill of the Colombo Proposals? So far as China is con-

cerned, to go on parroting, reiterating, repeating the Colombo Proposals. So far as Pakistan is concerned, what is the policy? The dead and buried Nehru-Liaquat Pact. It is not the path of wisdom and statesmanship to go on hugging a corpse. A wise man knows that the only way to deal with a corpse is to give it an immediate burial or good cremation and do away with it and turn to life. What is the meaning of this? Now General Ne Win has started telling this thing.

Let us remember what the Chinese are thinking. I am not here to strike a posture of militant hostility to China. But let us think what Mr. Mao Tse-tung very recently told a visiting dignitary. Where is the Indian army? Where is it? He says: it is invincible in peace, invisible in war. This is the estimate that the Chinese are making of this country.

Many of the evils with which we are confronted are the inevitable outcome of the way we resisted the first invasion of free India. This is the penalty, the punishment we are getting. About China may I say that this nation created this emergency and what a new India we saw? The Chinese challenge brought to the fore all that is noble and great in the Indian nation and in the Indian character. All of our squabbles, all of our quarrels were forgotten. For the first time since the dawn of independence, for the first time since 1947 we witnessed all Indians marching together under the seal of being Indians, we saw the rebirth of a new India, united, dedicated, determined, facing defeat in the face with equanimity and working with confidence for victory. But all the precious treasure of our unity, of our confidence, all that priceless treasure of our unity, of our faith, all that has been squandered away, has been thrown away. If this nation is to survive the challenges that are looking us in the face, the present Government will have to make up its mind to discard that paralysing indecisiveness,

[Shri Nath Pai]

that uncertainty. India will need something more than the exhortations of the people of this country to follow the path of Mahatma, Gandhi. We will need something of that undying faith with which Mahatmaji led this nation in its darkest hour, something of that courage with which Bhagat Singh marched to the gallows, something of the courage with which Khudi Ram Bose kept on chanting Bande Mataram, something of the soaring idealism with which Netaji and his valiant band of soldiers saw the dream and vision of free India come true. That alone will help us to face the future.

14.00 hrs.

[]

श्री तुलशी दास जाधव (नांदेड़) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, वाइस प्रसीडेंट ने १० एड्रेस दिया है उसको सपोर्ट करते हुए मैं कुछ बातें सरकार के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ ।

हम महाराष्ट्र के सदस्यों ने आपको एक कार्लिंग अटेंशन नोटिस दिया था । उसमें हमने यह लिखा था कि हमारे महाराष्ट्र की प्रान्तीय कांग्रेस कमेटी के अध्यक्ष श्री विनायक राव पाटिल को नगर हवेली से पब्लिक मीटिंग में बोलने के लिए नहीं जाने दिया गया । हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान में पेज १० पर नागरिकों के अधिकार लिखे हैं, उसमें लिखा है :

(a) to assemble peaceably and without arms;

फिर लिखा है

(b) to freedom of speech and expression;

और उसके बाद लिखा है :

(d) to move freely throughout the territory of India;

संविधान से हिन्दुस्तान के हर नागरिक को यह अधिकार होते हुए भी जो श्री विनायक राव पाटिल को नगर हवेली पब्लिक सभा-सम्मेलन लेने से रोका गया

मेरी समझ में यह बड़ी भारी गलती है । यह क्षेत्र केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा शासित होता है । इसमें उनको पब्लिक मीटिंग लेने से क्यों रोका गया हमारी समझ में नहीं आता । उन्होंने जाने से पहले लोगों को इत्तला दी थी, इतना ही नहीं उनको वहां के लोगों ने बुलाया था । उनके साथ महाराष्ट्र राज्य के एक डिप्टी मिनिस्टर श्री भाऊ साहब बर्तक भी गए थे जो कि गवर्नमेंट के नुमायन्दे हैं । ये दोनों वहां १० तारीख को गए, तो पुलिस उनको कोई लिखित नोटिस न देकर केवल उनसे यह कह देती है कि तुम मीटिंग नहीं कर सकते । जब अंग्रेज का राज था उस वक्त भी ऐसा नहीं होता था, वह नोटिस देकर जो कुछ करना होता था करते थे । लेकिन आज हमको आजाद हुए १७ साल हो गये, उस वक्त यह कैसे किया गया मेरी समझ में नहीं आता । पुलिस ने उनको कोई लिखित नोटिस न देकर केवल इतना कह दिया कि तुम्हारी मीटिंग की बन्दी है । और जो लोग मीटिंग के लिए एकत्र हुए थे उनको हक दिया यह कह कर कि मीटिंग की बन्दी कर दी गयी है । उस समय लोगों की बड़ी भीड़ थी और वह उनसे कुछ सुनना चाहते थे ।

फिर उसके बाद जब वह ११ तारीख को दापोड़ा और तलासरी गांव गए तो वहां भी पुलिस ने मीटिंग नहीं होने दी और लोगों को हकाल दिया यह कह कर कि मीटिंग की बन्दी है ।

फिर वह सेलवासी गांव में गये, वहां उनको डाक बंगला भी ठहरने के लिए नहीं मिलने दिया गया । यह बहुत भारी भूल है । क्या सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट के जो अधिकारी वहां हैं उनको यहां से कोई इस प्रकार का आदेश दिया गया था ? यह कैसे किया गया मेरी समझ में नहीं आता । इस भूल को सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को दुरुस्त करना चाहिए । इसके बारे में पूना कारपोरेशन ने निषेध प्रस्ताव पाम किया है । श्री विनायक राव

पाटिल ने श्री नन्दा जी को इस बारे में पत्र लिखा है। और रक्षा मंत्री श्री यशवन्त राव चव्हाण ने भी लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी को कुछ लिखा है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि महाराष्ट्र का जो सवाल है उसकी ओर सावधानी से ध्यान देना चाहिए। आज कल महाराष्ट्र के लिए और भी कई प्राबल्य हैं, उनको दोनों प्रान्तों के लोगों से बात करके जितनी जल्दी हो सके निपटा दिया जाए ऐसी मेरी प्रार्थना है। कृष्णा गोदावरी के पानी का सवाल है, दूसरा बेलगांव कारवार की सीमा का सवाल है और गोम्रा का और इस नगर हवेली का भी सवाल है।

मुझसे पहले एक भाई ने यह बात कही कि डिमाकेटक ढंग यह है कि यदि वहां के लोग किसी प्रान्त में जाना चाहते हैं तो उनको जाने देना चाहिए। गोम्रा और नगर हवेली में मराठी भाषा बोली जाती है और वहां के लोग चाहते हैं कि महाराष्ट्र में चले जाएं, तो इसका फैसला केन्द्रीय सरकार को जल्द करना चाहिए।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस अभिभाषण में उपराष्ट्रपति ने कहा है कि देश का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए देश के लोगों की ताकत को काम में लगाना चाहिए। आज देहातों और शहरों में लोगों की आबादी बढ़ रही है और उनको काम नहीं मिलता। मेरा कहना यह है कि ऐसा उपाय निकालें जिससे कि यह जो बड़ी इनरजी देश में पड़ी है उसका इस्तेमाल हो जाए और देश का उत्पादन बढ़े, कपड़े का उत्पादन बढ़े, और अनाज का उत्पादन बढ़े। तो देश में लोगों को काम पर लगा कर हमको उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहिए। उत्पादन न बढ़ने से हमारा काम नहीं चल सकेगा।

आपने सुना होगा कि अनाज के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं, आज के टाइम्स आफ इंडिया में आपने पढ़ा होगा कि १९६२ में जो गेहूं का भाव १६ रुपये से १९ रुपये मन तक था वह आज १९६३-६४ में २५ रुपये से ३० रुपये मन तक

है। दूसरे भी जो अनाज हैं, जैसे बाजरी, ज्वार मक्का आदि उनके दाम भी ५० प्रतिशत अधिक बढ़ गए हैं। देश में अगर अनाज का उत्पादन न बढ़े और आबादी बढ़ती चली जाय तो क्या होने वाला है। इन्सान जो पैदा होता है तो जहां खाने के लिए उसके एक मुंह होता है तो काम करने के लिए दो हाथ और दो पांव भी होते हैं। इस शक्ति का इस्तेमाल करने की प्लान होनी चाहिए, अगर ऐसा नहीं होगा तो हमारी हालत और भी खराब हो जाएगी।

मैं आपके सामने रशिया का उदाहरण रखना चाहता हूं। वहां पर तो प्लोरेटेरिएट की डिक्टेटरशिप है और वह कानून से बंधे हैं कि लोगों को काम दें या उनको एलाउंस दें। इतना होते हुए भी वहां गेहूं कम पड़ा और उन्हें अमरीका से मंगवाना पड़ा। वहां इतनी ताकत होते हुए भी बाहर से अनाज मंगाना पड़ा। इसलिए मैं कहता हूं कि हमको अपने देश में ४५ करोड़ लोगों की ताकत को काम में लगा कर अपना उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहिये। ऐसा न करके अगर हम इधर उधर से अनाज मंगाएंगे तो कहां तक काम चलेगा। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि जो इतने लोग देहात में और शहरों में बिना काम के हैं उनको काम मिलना चाहिए और यह जो अनाज के रेट बढ़ते हैं इन को कंट्रोल करना चाहिए।

दिल्ली में सरकार का स्टॉक सन् १९६२ में ७५,००० टन था पर इस वक्त केवल १२,००० टन है। जब लोगों को यह बात मालूम होती है कि सरकारी गोदामों में अनाज कम है तो वह भाव बढ़ाते हैं। तो यह भी नहीं होना चाहिए। पिछले तीन साल में हर साल ८० मिलियन टन अनाज ही पैदा होता है और उससे ज्यादा नहीं बढ़ता है।

अन्न के उत्पादन में ज्यादा बढ़ोतरी नहीं होती है। थर्ड फाइव ईयर प्लान के आखिर तक हमें १० करोड़ टन अनाज

[श्री तुलशो दास जाधव]

तैयार करना है तो इस दृष्टि से हमें प्लानिंग भी करनी चाहिए। मेरा कहना यह है कि देहात में हर फैमिली के लिए हर गांव, ब्लाक और जिला की इस रीति से प्लानिंग हो कि वह लोग आयोजनपूर्वक अधिक अन्न उपजा सकें और इसके लिए यह भी देखा जाय कि उन्हें सभी संभव प्रोत्साहन व मदद मिलती है।

यह ठीक है कि आपने फर्टिलाइजर्स दिये हैं और पैसे भी दिये हैं लेकिन उसके हिसाब से अन्न का उत्पादन जितना बढ़ना चाहिए वह नहीं बढ़ता है। देहातों में जो पैसा जाता है उसका जितना उपयोग होना चाहिए वह उपयोग नहीं होता है।

खुद मेरे अपने शोलापुर जिले में बहुत सी बाऊंडियां खुदी हुई हैं और उसके लिए सरकार ने पैसा भी दिया है लेकिन उनमें से बहुत सी खाली पड़ी हुई हैं और उनका कोई उपयोग नहीं होता है। वहां जो काश्तकार होते हैं उनकी इनर्जी उन खेतों के काम में आ जाय। हमें यह देखना होगा कि देश में कृषि की पैदावार बढ़ाने और आत्म निर्भरता का लक्ष्य प्राप्त करने के लिए आज काश्तकारों को जो बहुत सी तकलीफें और कठिनाइयां हैं उनको दूर किया जाय और यह देखा जाय कि उनकी पूरी इनर्जी प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाने में लगे।

जहां तक शहरों की हालत का सवाल है हमारे शोलापुर शहर में आबादी ४ लाख बढ़ी है। हजारों मजदूर अपनी आजीविका कमाने के लिए काम मांगते हैं लेकिन उनको काम नहीं मिलता है। मैंने इस बारे में हाउस में भी कई बार कहा है। उदाहरण के लिए मैं बतलाऊं कि जो शोलापुर स्पिनिंग और वीविंग मिल है उसमें १२,००० वर्कर्स थे लेकिन उनमें कमी होती गई और उनकी संख्या अब केवल ३००० रह गयी है।

वहां के वर्कर्स की हालत बहुत बुरी है। उनको रजा का पगार नहीं मिलता है। ले औषि अर्थात् पाड़ी का पगार नहीं मिलता है।

सोसाइटी का पैसा उनसे लेते हैं लेकिन वह भी वापिस मजदूरों को नहीं देते हैं। यह प्राविडेंट फण्ड काटने का सरकारी कानून है। जो मिल के मैनेजमेंट करने वाले लोग हैं वह उन मजदूरों से तो रुपया बतौर प्राविडेंट फण्ड के काट लेते हैं लेकिन मिल मैनेजमेंट उस पैसे को सरकार में नहीं भर पाती है। न उनका फंड का पैसा भरते हैं और न खुद का ही भरते हैं। मैंने महाराष्ट्र राज्य में यहां तक देखा है कि वहां पर ऐसी मिलें हैं जो कि मजदूरों का जो प्राविडेंट फंड है और जो कि मिल मैनेजर उनसे लेते हैं गवर्नमेंट में उसे जमा नहीं कराते हैं। इस अवसर पर मैं उदाहरण देकर बतलाना चाहूंगा कि उस्मानशाही एक मिल है जिसका कि ५१७८५६ रुपये बतौर प्राविडेंट फण्ड का पड़ा है और वह सरकारी खजाने में जमा नहीं किया गया है। दूसरी मिल का नाम जयशंकर मिल बारसी है जिसका कि ३२४१७ रुपये प्राविडेंट फंड पड़ा है और सरकार में जमा नहीं कराया गया है। एक मिल मोहता मिल, अकोला है जहां कि ५११३६८ रुपये प्राविडेंट फंड का बगैर सरकारी खजाने में जमा हुए पड़ा हुआ है। इसी तरह मोडेल मिल नागपुर है जहां कि ७६५००० रुपया जमा है लेकिन उसे सरकार में जमा नहीं कराया गया है। नरसिंगगिरजी मिल का भी १४५५००० रुपया बगैर जमा हुए पड़ा है। सावलराम अकोला मिल्स का ४४४००० हजार रुपया और बगैर जमा हुए पड़ा है। इसी तरह शोलापुर स्पिनिंग एण्ड वीविंग मिल्स का ३४५६००० रुपया प्राविडेंट फंड का बगैर सरकार में जमा हुए पड़ा है।

यह सब बतलाने का मेरा तात्पर्य यह है कि सरकारी कानून जो होता है उसका अमल यह जो बड़े मिल मालिक और धनी, मानी होते हैं, ठीक से नहीं करते हैं और उसको इबेड करते हैं। लेकिन इसके विपरीत गरीब लोग जो कि सरकारी कानूनों को पूरी तरह से मानते हैं उनकी इस तरह से दुर्दशा होती है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य का समय समाप्त हो रहा है ।

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव : मैं इस पर अभी थोड़ा बोलना चाहता था । हमने श्री विनायक राव पाटिल को कौलिंग एटेंशन नोटिस भी दी थी और दो दिन से मैं इस अवसर की प्रतीक्षा में बैठा था ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य दो मिनट और ले लें । अभी और बहुत से माननीय सदस्य बोलने को इच्छुक बैठे हैं ।

श्री तुलशीदास जाधव : मैंने दो, तीन बातें आप से कहीं । काश्मीर के बारे में एक बात कहनी थी कि काश्मीर अन्य देशों रियासतों की तरह भारत में शामिल हुआ । उसका विलय उस कानून के मातहत था जो कि स्वयं ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट ने पास किया था और उसका विलय भारत में पूर्णतया कानूनी और क़ायदे से हुआ था । मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि अभी इस मसले को लेकर सुरक्षा परिषद् में जो चर्चा हुई तो ब्रिटिश प्रतिनिधि ने ऐसा भारत विरोधी रवैया क्यों अपनाया ? ऐक्सेशन को डाउट करने या उसको यह कहना कि वह रिएलिस्टिक नहीं है सरासर तथ्यों की उपेक्षा करनी है । हम कुछ एम० पी० भारत का इस बारे में विरोध प्रकट करने के लिए ब्रिटिश हाई कमिश्नर जो कि यहां नई दिल्ली में रहते हैं, उनके पास गये । उनको हमने इस सम्बन्ध में एक मैमोरेण्डम भी दिया और उनसे हमने स्पष्ट तौर पर खुलासा करते कहा कि काश्मीर भारत से मिला उस समय आपके नुमाइन्दे गवर्नर जनरल श्री माउण्टबेटन ने हस्ताक्षर किया है । फिर आप कैसे नहीं मानते ? हाई कमिश्नर ने बतलाया कि वे हमारे नुमाइन्दे उस वक्त नहीं थे । हमने उनको बतलाया कि उनका यह कहना कि लार्ड माउण्टबेटन जस वक्त कि उन्होंने यह संधिपत्र साइन किया उस वक्त वह ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के प्रतिनिधि न होकर गवर्नर जनरल के रूप में

भारत के प्रतिनिधि थे, ठीक नहीं है । इस बारे में उनकी स्वयं की पार्लियामेंट ने भारत या पाकिस्तान दोनों में से किसी एक में मिलने के लिए जो कानून पास किया था उस कानून में उन्होंने यह लिखा था कि जो भी रियासत जिधर मिलना चाहे वह मिल सकती है और और इस आधार पर यदि काश्मीर हमारे साथ मिला और हमारे प्रतिनिधि ने उस परवाने पर सिगनेचर कर दिया तो उसमें खामी क्या रहती है ? वह एक्सेशन पूरा हो जाता है । इसलिए जो मौजूदा रवैया ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट का काश्मीर विलय और समस्या के बारे में है वह भारत विरोधी होकर पाकिस्तान पक्षपाती है ।

अब चूक समय मेरा समाप्त हो गया है इसलिए मैं और अधिक न कह कर यह चाहूंगा कि मैंने जो चार बातें कही हैं, जिनमें एक तो विनायक राव पाटिल, प्रेसीडेंट महाराष्ट्र प्राविशियल कांग्रेस कमेटी की नागरहवेली में सभाबन्दी, जुनीगरनी के कामगारों के बारे में, खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के बारे में और इस काश्मीर के मसले के ठीक से हल करने की ओर केन्द्रीय सरकार ध्यान दे ।

✓ **श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कुछ भी कहने से पहले उपराष्ट्रपति के इस भाषण के सम्बन्ध में जो एक बहुत अखरती कमी रह गयी है और जिसकी कि ओर दूसरे हाउस में बार बार ध्यान दिलाया गया है, मैं उस महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न की ओर सरकार का ध्यान आकषित करते हुए कहना चाहता हूं कि सरकार यदि अपनी इस भूल का सुधार एक विशेष संशोधन इस भाषण के सम्बन्ध में लेकर कर ले तो मेरा अपना अनुमान है कि इतिहास की एक बहुत बड़ी भूल का वह सुधार कर सकेगी । वह भूल वही है जिसकी कि ओर इस सदन के भी एक, आद्य सदस्य ने ध्यान आकषित किया है कि भारत के प्रथम राष्ट्रपति डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जो इतने वर्षों तक हमारे राष्ट्रपति रहे हैं, इस उपराष्ट्रपति के भाषण में उनके निघन

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

का उल्लेख न होना और अमरीकी प्रेसिडेंट श्री कनेडी के निघन का उल्लेख होना एक बहुत बड़ी कमी है और मेरा अपना विचार है कि सरकार को एक विशेष संशोधन लाकर इस मूल का सुधार करना चाहिए। यह पहली बात मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

दूसरी बात यह कि उपराष्ट्रपति के अपने इस भाषण में मुझे दो कमियाँ दिखाई दीं। पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में उपराष्ट्रपति ने जो वहाँ पर यह हत्याकाण्ड हुआ है, उसके लिए साम्प्रदायिक दंगा, इस प्रकार के शब्द का उपयोग किया है। अब उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दंगे शब्द का अभिप्राय केवल इतना होता है कि मामूली सा झगड़ा, जिस दंगे में कि दोनों पक्ष दोषी होते हैं। लेकिन यह पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में जो हत्याकाण्ड हुआ है उसको दंगा शब्द कह कर उस की महत्ता को और उसकी गम्भीरता को नष्ट करना है। उसके लिए तो योजनाबद्ध नरसंहार शब्द का प्रयोग इस भाषण में आना चाहिए जहाँ कि इतना बड़ा नरसंहार हुआ।

तिसरी उपराष्ट्रपति के भाषण में सबसे बड़ी कमी जो दिखाई दी वह यह कि उपराष्ट्रपति ने मरने वालों की संख्या के सम्बन्ध में "कई सौ" शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया है। अब कई सौ शब्द का इस्तेमाल करने का अभिप्राय ज्यादा से ज्यादा ६०० तक संख्या पहुँचना है। हमारे गृह मन्त्री नन्दा जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में बहुत बड़ा चढ़ा कर यह संख्या १००० तक दे दी है जबकि मेरी अपनी निजी जानकारी के आधार पर यह संख्या ३०,००० से कहीं अधिक ऊपर है। पहली बात तो यह है कि जिस तरीके से पाकिस्तान के हाई कमिश्नर को हिन्दुस्तान में घूमने, फिरने और ट्रेफ़ रेकार्ड पर उनके वक्तव्य लेने, फोटो लेने और तरह तरह से अपने सम्बन्ध में अपने अनुकूल वातावरण तैयार करने का अवसर यहाँ पर दिया गया, हमारी सरकार बार बार यह कहती है और अभी कुछ देर पहले श्री

साल बहादुर शास्त्री ने कहा कि हमारे हाई कमिश्नर को इस प्रकार की सुविधा पूर्वी पाकिस्तान की सरकार ने नहीं दी। आखिर किस आधार पर आप ने आंकड़े दिये हैं? नन्दा जी के १००० या उपराष्ट्रपति के कई सौ के इन आंकड़ों के आधार क्या हैं, सब से पहली बात यह है "वचने की दरिद्रता"। सरकार आंकड़ों को देने में कजूसी क्यों दिखलाती है? उसमें उसकी दुर्बलता क्यों है? मैं अपनी निजी जानकारी के आधार पर कहना चाहता हूँ कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के क्रान्तिकारी राजनीतिक कार्यकर्ता जो पाकिस्तान बनने के बाद वहाँ की विधान सभा के सदस्य भी रह चुके हैं वह अभी हाल में कलकत्ता आये थे। १६ फरवरी १९६४ को बसुमति पत्रिका जो एक कलकत्ते की एक बहुत प्रमुख पत्रिका है उसमें जो उन का वक्तव्य आया है उसमें का कहना है कि नरसिंहोद्दीह के अकेले एक थाने में १०,००० मौतें हुईं। इसी तरीके से जयदेवपुर थाने में लगभग ५००० मौतें हुईं और ढाका, खुलना इन दोनों जिलों में मिला कर लगभग ३०,००० मौतें हुईं। ढाका से नारायनगंज के लिए जो एक छोटी सी नदी जाती है, शतलक्ष उस का नाम है, उस शतलक्ष नदी के अन्दर लाखों एक, एक फरलांग फरलांग के ऊपर सड़ती हुई दिखाई दे रहा थीं जिसके लिए कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान ने अपना सरकुलर निकाला कि उस नदी के पानी को उतने समय तक कोई प्रयोग न करे। इतनी लाखों जाकर उसमें पड़ गयी थीं। क्या हमारी सरकार के कानों में या सरकार की जानकारी में यह बातें नहीं हैं? क्या सरकार इस बात को नहीं जानती कि एक टैंकस्टाइल मिल के कार्यकर्ताओं को, जब वह इलाका लाशों की बदबू से भर गया तो तीन रुपये प्रति लाश इस काम के लिये दिये गये कि यह लाशें उठा उठा कर कहीं जा कर फेंक या दबा दें और उस मिल के कार्यकर्ताओं ने ११०० लाशें

दबाई। श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने वह कहा कि ढाके में हाई कमिश्नर को जाने जाने की सुविधा थी लेकिन अगर ढाके में हमारे हाई कमिश्नर को जाने जाने की सुविधा थी तो अमरीकन नर्स तो यह बयान दे सकती है कि अकेले ढाका के अस्पताल में ६ सौ बाथ देखने को मिलीं, हाई कमिश्नर क्यों न देख सके? मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि भारत के हाई कमिश्नर के खुल कर इधर उधर घूमने से कौन सी हम ने जानकारी ली ?

यह भी बताना चाहिए था—मैं ने बीच में इन्टरप्ट करते हुए यह भी पूछा था—कि उन को सिर्फ ढाका शहर में घूमने की इजाजत थी या ढाका डिस्ट्रिक्ट में भी घूमने की इजाजत थी। ये तमाम बातें हमारे सामने आनी चाहिए थीं। मेरा अपना अनुमान यह है कि उपराष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में "कई दौ" शब्दों का इस्तेमाल कर के इस समस्या के महत्व और गम्भीरता को बहुत कम कर दिया है।

एक अन्य बात मैं विशेष रूप से यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि माननीय मंत्री, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, के भाषण से हम को कुछ विशय आशायें थीं। पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में जब प्रारम्भ में एक बार हत्याकांड हुआ था, तो उस समय महात्मा गांधी जीवित थे। महात्मा गांधी ने उस समय कलकत्ता में अपनी प्रार्थना-सभा में यह कहा था कि अगर हिन्दू पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में नहीं रह सकते हैं, तो उन को भारत में लाने की जिम्मेदारी हमारी है और भारत के दूसरे प्रांतों को उन का अपने यहां बसने की जिम्मेदारी लेनी चाहिये।

उस के पश्चात् जब पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में बोबारा एर्क नरसंहार हुआ, तो हमारे सौभाग्य से सरदार पटेल जीवित थे। सरदार पटेल ने उस अवसर पर यह कहा कि जिन लोगों ने हमारे राजनीतिक आन्दोलन में भाग लिया है, भले ही वह पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में

हों, उन की रक्षा की जिम्मेदारी प्रत्येक भारतीय नागरिक की है और हम किसी प्रकार भी उन की उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते। समयभाव से मैं उन के भाषण के उद्धरण पढ़ कर नहीं सुनाना चाहता हूँ।

लेकिन तीसरे उद्धरण को मैं पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि वह महानुभाव सौभाग्य से आज हमारे बीच में हैं और वह हैं हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री, पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू। १९५० में जब पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में इसी प्रकार का रक्तपात हुआ, जिस से सारा हिन्दुस्तान तीन वर्ष के पश्चात् एक बार फिर से हिल उठा, तो प्रधान मंत्री पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, ने २३ फरवरी, १९५० को पार्लियामेंट में एक बयान दिया। उस वक्तव्य के कुछ अंश, जो मेरे भाषण से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं, मैं पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ।

पंडित जवाहरलाल जी ने कहा :

"पूर्वी बंगाल में कई जगह बड़े पैमाने पर बड़ी अफसोसनाक बातें हुई हैं और नारायण-गंज, चटगांव, फरी, राज-शाही, बरीसाल, मैमनसिंह वगैरह में तो काफ़ी हंगामा हुआ है। आज भी वहां यह जोर-जुलम जारी हैं। इसका नतीजा कितना ख़ौफनाक हो सकता है, यह हम सोच भी नहीं सकते। सिर्फ एक ढाका शहर में मारे गए लोगों की तादाद ६०० से ज़े कर १,००० से भी ऊपर बताई जाती है। पाकिस्तान में रहने वाले अल्पसंख्यकों में से सब नहीं तो ज्यादातर लोगों को अपनी हिफाजत की सारी उम्मीदें खो गईं नज़र आती हैं. . . "

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

यह १९५० में पंडित जवाहरलाल जी बोल रहे थे कि वहां रहने वालों को अपनी हिफाजत की सारी उम्मीदें खो गई नजर आती हैं।

उन्होंने आगे कहा,।

“... और बड़े डर तथा आशंका के साथ वे वहां पर दिन बिता रहे हैं।”

नेहरू जी ने अपने भाषण में यह भी कहा कि हम ने पाकिस्तान के सामने यह सुझाव रखा था कि वह हमारे हाई कमिश्नर को उस इलाके में घूमने और आने जाने का मौका दें, ताकि उस इलाके की स्थिति की जानकारी हो सके, लेकिन पाकिस्तान सरकार उस के लिए भी तैयार नहीं हुई।

इस के पश्चात् फिर नेहरू जी ने एक स्थान पर यह कहा कि अगर इसी प्रकार के हालात पाकिस्तान के अन्दर चलते रहे, तो हिन्दुस्तान को मजबूर हो कर कोई दूसरे कदम उठाने पड़ेंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन उद्धरणों को अपने वक्तव्य के बीच में लाने का मेरा केवल मात्र अभिप्राय यह था कि जब १९५० में हिन्दुस्तान का प्रधान मंत्री यह कह चुका था कि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में रहने वाले लोगों की अपनी हिफाजत की आशायें समाप्त हो चुकी हैं और सरकार को इस बारे में कोई दूसरे कदम उठाने पड़ेंगे, तो फिर १९६४ तक क्यों यह गवर्नमेंट कानों में तेल डाल कर सोती रही। क्यों नहीं उस ने उन लोगों की रक्षा का प्रबन्ध किया?

इस के बाद मैं इस गवर्नमेंट पर एक सब से बड़ा चार्ज लगाना चाहता हूँ। बिभाजन के बाद पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में रह गये हिन्दुओं की संख्या सरकारी आंकड़ों के हिसाब से १, करोड़ ६० लाख थी। पूर्वी पाकिस्तान की गवर्नमेंट का कहना यह है कि १९६१ में जन गणना में ३२ प्रतिशत के हिसाब से वृद्धि हुई। इस ३२ प्रतिशत

का भी छोड़ कर मैं ३० प्रतिशत का हिसाब लगाता हूँ और सोलह साल के बजाये पंद्रह साल की वृद्धि का हिसाब लगाता हूँ। पढ़-लिखे लोग, और जो आंकड़ों से विश्व हैं, वे मेरी इस बात की साक्षी करेंगे।

१ करोड़ ६० लाख की जन-संख्या अगर ३० प्रतिशत के हिसाब से भी बढ़े, तो पंद्रह सालों में हिन्दुओं की संख्या २,२१० लाख से ऊपर पहुँचनी चाहिए। २,१० लाख में से ४६ लाख आदमी वे हैं, जो भारत सरकार के यहां रजिस्टर्ड हैं और जिन के बारे में कहा जाता है कि वे उस के बाद पाकिस्तान छोड़ कर हिन्दुस्तान चले आए। ४६ लाख की संख्या यह निकाल दी जाए। ४६ लाख की यह संख्या निकालने के बाद इस समय पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में हिन्दुओं की संख्या १,६४ लाख होनी चाहिए, जबकि वास्तव में उनकी संख्या अब वहां है ६२ लाख। अब मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि ये जो ७६ लाख हिन्दू थे, वे कहाँ गए। यह एक सवाल सुरक्षा परिषद् और दुनिया के सामने है कि इन ७६ लाख हिन्दुओं का क्या हुआ। सीधी बात तो यह है कि इन ७६ लाख लोगों में से या तो अधिकांश मार दिये गए और या अधिकांश का धर्म-परिवर्तन कर लिया गया।

भारत सरकार, हमारे उपरिष्ठापति जी और हिन्दुस्तान के मिनिस्टर हमेशा पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के अल्प-संख्यकों और माइना-रिटीज के बारे में बोला करते हैं, किन्तु आज उन की जुबान में यह शक्ति नहीं रही कि वे कह सकें कि वहां पर हिन्दुओं पर अत्याचार हो रहा है। जिन लोगों की रक्षा की जिम्मेदारी इस सरकार के नेताओं ने ली थी, जिस के गवाह महात्मा गांधी, सरदार पटेल और पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के वक्तव्य हैं, जिन में उन्होंने कहा कि उन लोगों की रक्षा की जिम्मेदारी हमारे कंधों पर है, आज उन का नाम भी सांघा ले कर वे कुछ नहीं कहना चाहते।

मैं समझ रहा था कि शायद श्री लाल बहदुर शास्त्री आज अपने वक्तव्य में कुछ इस प्रकार की बातें कहेंगे, जोकि पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के १२ लाख हिन्दुओं के कानों तक पहुंच कर उन को कुछ संतोष दे सकेंगी, जो ढाका में हमारे हाई कमिश्नर के दफ्तर के सामने वीसा लेने के लिए खड़े हुए और रात-दिन सर्दों में ठिठुर रहे चालीसों हजार हिन्दुओं को कुछ सांत्वना दे सकेंगी। सिवाय इस के कि उन्होंने कुछ अखबारों के उद्धरण पढ़ कर सुना दिये, उन के भाषण में ऐसी कोई बात नहीं कही गई। जिस भाषा में देश के इतने बड़े जिम्मेदार आदमी को पार्लियामेंट में बोलना चाहिए था, पूर्वी पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध में वह उस भाषा का प्रयोग नहीं कर पाए।

पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में हुए इस भयंकर हत्याकांड के पश्चात् कलकत्ता में कुछ थोड़ी सी घटनायें हुई और गवर्नमेंट का कहना है कि उन में से लगभग २८० आदमी मारे गए। उनमें ५६ आदमी वे हैं, जोकि पुलिस की गोली से मारे गए। आप अनुमान लगा सकते हैं कि पुलिस की गोली से कौन लोग मारे गए होंगे। उन में भी हमारी संख्या अधिक है। बाकी जो २२१ रह जाते हैं, उन में भी ३८ आदमी हिन्दू थे, जोकि मारे गए। उसके बाद भी माननीय सदस्य, श्री बदरुद्दुजा पूर्वी पाकिस्तान और कलकत्ता के दंगों को एक तराजू में तोलते हैं। जिस समय वह ऐसा कह रहे थे, उस समय कुछ समझदार और पढ़े-लिखे व्यक्ति भी उन का समर्थन कर रहे थे।

मैं आप को खुली भाषा में कहना चाहता हूं कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का वह ग्रुप, जो आज से कुछ समय पहले चीन का समर्थन करता था, आज चीन-परस्त होते के साथ वह पाकिस्तान-परस्त भी हो गया है। आज हिन्दुस्तान में कम्यूनलिज्म और कम्यूनलिज्म का एक नया गठबंधन हुआ है, जिस की ओर

हिन्दुस्तान की गवर्नमेंट को थोड़ा आंख खोल कर ध्यान देना चाहिए। कल को यह चीज बहुत आगे बढ़ सकती है।

इस के साथ ही मैं यह चेतावनी भी देना चाहता हूं कि जो चीज कलकत्ता में हो कर समाप्त हो गई है, वह फिर भी हो सकती है। श्री भुट्टो और श्री छागला ने सुरक्षा परिषद् से लौटने के बाद अपने अपने वक्तव्य दिये हैं। वे दोनों वक्तव्य पढ़ने लायक हैं। जहां मैं श्री छागला को बधाई देता हूं कि उन्होंने हमारे पक्ष को बड़ी समझदारी और बुद्धिमत्ता के साथ सुरक्षा परिषद् में प्रस्तुत किया, वहां साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि श्री भुट्टो ने यह कहा है कि एक महीने के बाद फिर इस प्रश्न को सुरक्षा परिषद् में उठाया जायेगा। भारत सरकार इस विषय में जरा सजग हो कर काम करे कि इस एक महीने में हिन्दुस्तान में फिर कहीं कलकत्ता जैसे साम्प्रदायिक उपद्रवों को भड़काना न जाये। इन उपद्रवों को दोहराने का कारण कौन बनेंगे? वे साढ़े सात लाख पाकिस्तानी, जो असम में हैं, वे पचास हजार पाकिस्तानी, जो त्रिपुरा और मणिपुर और पश्चिमी बंगाल में हैं, जो दिल्ली और बम्बई में हैं। आज जैसी उन की हरकतें चल रही हैं और जिस ढंग से हिन्दुस्तान में साम्प्रदायिक तनाव पैदा किया जा रहा है, सरकार क्यों उन की ओर अपनी आंखें बन्द किये हुए बंठी है? जो दुहरा चश्मा १९४७ से पहले हमारे देश के नेताओं ने अपनी आंखों पर चढ़ा रखा था, उस चश्मे को उन्हें अपनी आंखों से उतार देना चाहिये। अब हिन्दुस्तान के हर एक निवासी को भारतीय की दृष्टि से देखना चाहिये। हमारी गवर्नमेंट यह सोचना बन्द करे कि इस कदम को उठाने से हिन्दू कितने नाराज होंगे और इस कदम को उठाने से मुसलमान कितने नाराज होंगे। सरकार को हिन्दुस्तान के ४४ करोड़ लोगों को एक स्तर पर रख कर सोचने की दृष्टि अपनानी चाहिए।

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

हजरतबल से मुहम्मद साहब का एक पवित्र बाल चोरी हो गया। पाकिस्तान ने इस पर हंगामा मचाया और नतीजा यह हुआ कि हिन्दुस्तान की गवर्नमेंट हिल उठी और नेहरूजी को दो दो बार वक्तव्य देने पड़े। आज तक उस घटना की चर्चा ने हिन्दुस्तान ने कान खड़े कर रखे हैं। लेकिन आप देखिए कि जम्मू के एक मन्दिर से दो पवित्र मूर्तियां चोरी चली गईं, लेकिन उन के बारे में किसी के मुंह में जुबान नहीं हिल पाई। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि यह कहां का सैकुलरिज्म है। कैंस यह सरकार कहती है कि हम इस देश में धर्म-निरपेक्षता चला रहे हैं? क्या इस सरकार का यह नैतिक कर्तव्य नहीं था कि जितनी गम्भीरता के साथ उसने पवित्र बाल की चोरी के बारे में कार्यवाही की थी, उतनी ही गम्भीरता के साथ वह मूर्तियों की चोरी के मामले को भी देखती?

मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जब थोड़े दिनों के बाद पवित्र बाल को चोरी करने वाले का पता लगा और बाल मिल गया, तो हमारे गृह मंत्रालय के सबसे बड़े अधिकारी, श्री विश्वनाथन् ने प्रेस कॉन्फ्रेंस में कहा कि बाल तो आ गया है, लेकिन बाल के चोर का पता नहीं लगा है। कुछ दिन पहले इसी लोक सभा में गृह मंत्री, श्री नन्दा ने कहा था कि हम चोरी करने वाले का नाम अभी नहीं बता सकते। फिर उसके बाद राज्य सभा में उन्होंने कहा कि हां, नामों की घोषणा की जायेगी। फिर उसके बाद वह समय आया कि नामों की घोषणा की गई। उसके चन्द ही घंटे बाद नाम में एक परिवर्तन किया गया और कहा गया कि नहीं, वह नाम सही नहीं था, यह नाम था। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि ये सरकार के दफ्तर हैं या क्या चीज है? जब सरकार की ओर से यह कहा जाता है कि जो आदमी वहां पर बाल रख कर भाग रहा था, उस को पकड़ लिया गया, तो श्री

विश्वनाथन् ने क्यों नहीं प्रेस कॉन्फ्रेंस में बताया कि चोरी करने वाला एक आदमी पकड़ लिया गया है? क्यों इस बात को रहस्य बना कर रखा गया? इन नामों को छिपाने की बजह से पाकिस्तान में जनरल अयूब ने उलटा वक्तव्य दिया और उस के परिणाम स्वरूप वहां पर उपद्रव हुए। तो क्या यह सरकार उस के लिये दोषी नहीं है?

मैं अपने उन मित्रों से सहमत नहीं हूँ जो कहते हैं कि शख अब्दुल्ला को जल से रिहा कर दिया जाय। पहली बात तो यह है, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि आप ही कई बार यह व्यवस्था देते हैं कि अगर किसी कोर्ट में कोई प्रसीडिंग चल रही हैं, तो उन के बारे में राजनीतिक या किसी दूसरे प्रकार की चर्चा इस हाउस नहीं आनी चाहिये। लेकिन जब तक कोर्ट के अन्दर वह केस हैं तब तक उस चर्चा को उठाना वहां तक ठीक है। बिना उन से मिले हुए और बिना उन से आश्वासन लिये हुए इस प्रकार की बातें कह देना, मैं समझता हूं कि देश के हित के विरुद्ध है। इन बातों को थोड़ी गम्भीरता के साथ सब को सोचना होगा।

काश्मीर की समस्या का एक ही समाधान है। शास्त्री जी शायद कल वहां जा रहे हैं.....

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप खत्म करें।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : अपने दिल में से मैं ही बोलने वाला हूं। चार दिन की प्रतीक्षा के बाद मुझ समय दिया गया है....

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : पन्द्रह मिनट आपने ले लिये हैं।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : दो मिनट और इनको मिल जाने चाहिये।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद ने जो काश्मीर की सेवायें की हैं, पर सदर ए-रियासत नहीं, सामान्य राज्य-

उन सेवाओं से किसी को आपसि नहीं हो सकती है और मेरा अपना यह निश्चित विश्वास है और मत है कि उनकी सेवाओं का देश के अन्दर मूल्यांकन किया जाना चाहिये। लेकिन साथ ही साथ यह भी मैं अवश्य कह देना चाहता हूँ कि यह भी घटनाएँ इस पवित्र बाल की चोरी के पश्चात् काश्मीर में घटने लगी हैं और इतनी तेजी के साथ उनकी लोकप्रियता समाप्त होने लगी है कि जिस समय जम्मू में ईद की नमाज के पढ़ने के बाद वह वहाँ जनता को एड्रेस करना चाहते थे तो उनको वक्तव्य तक भी नहीं देने दिया गया, वक्तव्य तक भी वह न दे सके और श्री शमसुद्दीन के साथ गाड़ों में उनको निकाल लाना पड़ा, इसका भी आपको खबरों से ओझल नहीं होने देना चाहिये। अगर उस में कुछ इस प्रकार के लोगों का हाथ है कि जो... (इंटरपक्षन्त्र) इंडियन एक्सप्रेस के अन्दर यह घटना निकली है जिस के आधार पर मैं कह रहा हूँ। अगर आप देखना चाहते हैं तो देख भी सकते हैं। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि काश्मीर में यदि कुछ इस प्रकार के तत्व हैं कि जो उनकी लोकप्रियता के ऊपर पर्दा डालना चाहते हैं तो सरकार को उनका भी ध्यान रखना चाहिये और अगर इनमें कुछ दुर्बलता आ गई है, तो उसको सम्भालने का यत्न करना चाहिये। एक तटस्थ बात इस में यहाँ मैं ने आपको कही है।

एक सब से बड़ी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान के एक जिम्मेदार मिनिस्टर की इस बात को सुन कर मुझे दुःख हुआ जो उन्होंने सुरक्षा परिषद् के बारे में कही कि पाकिस्तान हमलावर है और जब तक हमलावर वहाँ से हट नहीं जाता है तब तक जनमत का कोई सवाल पैदा नहीं होता है। यह कैसी उल्टी बात है, इसको आप देखें। जब देश के प्रधान मंत्री तक यह कह चुके हैं कि काश्मीर में प्लेबसाइट का कोई सवाल अब नहीं है, प्लेबसाइट हो चुका है, एक बार नहीं तीन बार हो

चुका है, एक बार नहीं तीन बार वहाँ सामान्य चुनाव हो चुके हैं तो और किस प्लेबसाइट की भाषा की जाती है? प्लेबसाइट और क्या होता है। इस तरह की बात जो कि मिनिस्टर साहब ने सुरक्षा परिषद् के बारे में कही है ठीक नहीं है और यह तो पाकिस्तान को एक नया हथियार दे देना हुआ। भान सीजिय कल हमलावर हट कर चला जाता है तब क्या आप काश्मीर में प्लेबसाइट करा लेंगे? जब आप चुनाव करा के देख चुके हैं तो आंग चुनाव की क्या जरूरत शेष रह जाती है? जो समस्या है, वह एक ही है। सुरक्षा परिषद् के सामने केवल एक अंश ही काश्मीर समस्या का रह जाता है वह यह है कि जितने हिस्से पर पाकिस्तान का अधिकार है, वह आज नहीं तो कल और कल नहीं तो परसों, हमें दिया जाता है या नहीं दिया जाता है। केवल यही प्रश्न शेष है। सुरक्षा परिषद् के सामने इसके सिवाय और कोई दूसरा प्रश्न हमारा नहीं है। इसके तीन ही हल हैं। पहला यह है कि सुरक्षा परिषद् हमें इस भाग को दिलाये और दूसरा यह कि पाकिस्तान ही हमें इस भाग को दे दे और अगर इन दोनों में से कोई नहीं होता है तो तीसरा हल यह होगा कि भारत को ही शक्ति के साथ इस हिस्से को ले लेना पड़ेगा। इसके सिवाय और कोई उपाय नहीं रह जाता है।

काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में एक अंतिम बात कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ। काश्मीर की समस्या का समाधान यह नहीं है कि बख्शी गुलाम मुहम्मद के स्थान पर श्री शमसुद्दीन को बिठा दिया जाए या सादिक साहब को मिनिस्ट्री के अन्दर ले लिया जाए, ये झगड़े रहेंगे, रहेंगे क्योंकि वहाँ निहित स्वायत्त वाले चन्द व्यक्ति इस प्रकार के हैं जो काश्मीर की सामान्य जनता को शांति के साथ नहीं बठने देंगे। इस समस्या के समाधान के लिये मेरी अपनी जो निजी सम्मति है, उसको मैं आपके सामने रखता हूँ। जो आपने अभी घोषणा की है कि वहाँ

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

पर सदर-ए-रियासत नहीं, सामान्य राज्य-पाल होगा, प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं होगा, मुख्य मंत्री होगा, उस घोषणा को आप तुरन्त लागू करें। आप उसे इलैक्शन कमिशन के अधिकार-क्षेत्र में लाये हैं, आडिटर जनरल को जम्मू काश्मीर में अधिकार देने की बात सोची है, झंडा भी वहां एक ही लगेगा, यह भी आपने सोचा है उसी प्रकार से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि काश्मीर के मुठ्ठी भर लोगों को आप अलग न रखिये, अलग न रखिए, अलग न रखिये। इसका एक ही उपाय है कि जो ये सीमावर्ती राज्य हैं, इनकी रक्षा के लिये और भारत की रक्षा के लिए पंजाब, हिमाचल प्रदेश और काश्मीर, इन तीनों को मिला करके एक विशाल प्रान्त बना दीजिए

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): I am highly thankful to you for having given me the chance to speak. From this House we extend our heartfelt thanks to our Education Minister, Shri Chagla, who has so ably advocated our cause in the Security Council. While speaking to pressmen at the airport in London, he has very correctly pointed out the attitude of the British Government towards our problems. The attitude taken up by the representative of the British Government in the Security Council has not come as a surprise to us. The British Government never reconciled itself to the fact that we wrested power from them and attained independence. They have all along been feeling a spirit of comradeship and fraternity with Pakistan and its leaders who were hobnobbing with them to vivisection this country and to create all sorts of communal troubles and hatred. When there was an emergency, some friends criticised the Government severely for not having more cordial relations with the British Government, but knowing as we do their past history, their attitude towards our Government and our political movement, we could not

have expected more than what they have done.

Shri Tulsidas Jadhav has narrated the interview that some M.Ps. had with Mr. Paul Gore-Booth, the British High Commissioner in this country, in which the High Commissioner pinpointed and crystallised the opinion of his country on the accession of Kashmir to India. That amply speaks for their attitude towards us.

As for America, though we are highly thankful and grateful to that great country for coming to our rescue at the time we faced the crisis of the Chinese aggression, yet I feel that these two countries, America and Britain, want to stage a come-back through their neo-colonialism and to have a grip over our country. In spite of Pakistan hobnobbing with China, they have still got a soft corner for that country. That clearly shows that they have not reconciled themselves to us.

Some doubts have been raised by Shri Nath Pai and other friends about the softer attitude that has been taken by Soviet Russia, but we should not forget the fact that the Soviet representative, speaking in the Security Council, had clearly stated that Kashmir's accession to India was complete and irrevocable. So, the other thing which might have been said in a different tone, should not be taken serious note of. The fact remains that Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia have played their part, and consistently supported us in our stand on Kashmir and in recognising our country's sovereignty over Kashmir.

Coming to the communal riots and the hatred that has been let loose in Pakistan on account of the theft of the sacred relic from the Hazratbal shrine, I would like to point out to this hon. House that it is a grand strategy of both Pakistan and China to see that there is a chain of communal riots in India and Pakistan. I also say that it is an engineered affair. In India also they have got agents

provocateur who will foment trouble at the appropriate moment when a signal is given. More than the outward enemies, Pakistan and China, we should be very careful about our internal enemies who, taking shelter under our democratic set-up are trying to create all sorts of communal troubles. We must be more careful about our doubtful friends than our sworn enemies. That should be our attitude, and the attitude of our Government. I would very earnestly request our Government to have vigilance over the activities of these people who have come here in so many guises only to create trouble in this country.

I was surprised to hear the speech of an hon. Member of this House, who swears by the Constitution of India and by secularism, and at the same time has made the worst communal speech that I have ever heard in this august House. I would sincerely request the hon. Home Minister and others in Government to keep a watch on certain people, and, if necessary, to use their constitutional powers to gag their mouths, so that they may not utter such irresponsible and communal things in this country.

Coming to our internal problems, the Vice-President has told us that in spite of the best efforts of Government, they were not able to make much headway or show improvement so far as the food production of the country was concerned. As has been pointed out by several Members, improvement in agricultural production is the main base for the economic development of our country. Unless we improve things and achieve self sufficiency in foodgrains, we cannot progress towards industrial and economic development. Many conferences of State Ministers and many seminars of agricultural officers are held; still we have this alarming picture of shortage in food production. From reports it seems we cannot reach the 80 million tons of production

which we achieved last year; there would be a shortfall of about 3.5 million tons. There is no use of having conferences or appointing one more IAS officer: these will not produce grains in the country. The Central Food and Agriculture Ministry has no overall control over the working of the various State Ministries. From the way the Agricultural Ministries are functioning, I could say that even for 100 years we cannot achieve any substantial improvement though we may pump several crores in this sector. We must tackle the problem at the village level. There are delays in implementing schemes which can yield quick results. The Ministers completely depend upon files and notes given by their glorified secretaries. Unless they apply their mind to the realities of the situation and remedy the difficulties that stand in the way, no amount of conferences and seminars or crores of money spent on schemes from tax payers' money will solve the food problem.

While answering a question the hon. Irrigation Minister said that the Government was considering taking over big projects with huge capital outlay. In our State, we are constructing a huge project—the Nagarjunasagar project at a cost of Rs. 150 crores. It will take 10–15 years for completion. For all these years the State's resources will be diverted to this huge project with the result minor and medium projects could not get adequate money. An early decision should be taken by the Centre to implement projects costing above a certain sum. Unless this is done no purpose would be served by sanctioning some additional amount for agricultural production.

The cultivable area in a country is limited. With growing population and extended cultivation we could not have quick results. We should take to intensive cultivation so that the yield per acre may increase. We have to see that the land reform problems and fragmentation of land are avoided so that there may be consolidation of

[Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah]

holdings, co-operative farming may be encouraged. Credit should be made available through co-operative societies. Our efforts should not be extensive and diversified but intensive and concentrated so that best results could be obtained quickly. There are three or four departments doing the same sort of work creating confusion and duplication: Community Development Ministry, Food and Agriculture Ministry and some other agencies also—3 or 4 agencies giving credit to the farmers. The result is that only influential and rich farmers get advantage from all the three sources: co-operative societies, Community development agencies, revenue department. We should see that there is an entire review of the land revenue department.

I have got the greatest respect for the leaders who are protagonists of prohibition; they say that it has done immense good to this country. I agree entirely. But I regretfully submit to them that it has thoroughly failed in its implementation; it has polluted the social fabric leading to bootlegging and illicit distillation on a vast scale. If you are not able to implement it effectively, for heaven's sake scrap it. We need not stand on prestige.

About Hindi, I have to say a few words. We are people coming from the South. The Hindi fanatics in season and out of season by their speeches and utterances are antagonising the people of the South. We are in no way lagging behind in learning Hindi. We have committed that Hindi should be the *lingua franca* of the country. But by wounding the feelings of southerners time and again and creating controversies over irrelevant matters that Hindi alone should be spoken, they are antagonising our people. I appeal to them to cultivate the spirit of cordiality and tolerance. We will not take it lying down. They alone are responsible for creating this sort of antipathy towards Hindi. I earnestly request our

friends to be more tolerant and let us hope that ere long it will become our national language.

Shri R. S. Pandey: So far as Hindi is concerned, I want to tell you one thing. The question of Hindi should not be raised in terms of north and south. There are so many South Indians who are very keen, and are learning Hindi, and Hindi is very popular in South India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Shri Gulshan.

श्री गुलशन (मटिडा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उपराष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर कई रोज से चर्चा चल रही है। जहाँ तक मैं समझ पाया हूँ उन्होंने कोई ऐसा सुझाव नहीं दिया जिससे देश की उन्नति हो, देश में बढ़ रही मंहगाई, देश में बढ़ रहा भ्रष्टाचार और देश में बढ़ रही बद-अमनी दूर हो। और नह; उन्होंने पिछड़े वर्गों और पिछड़े इलाकों की उन्नति के लिये कोई सुझाव दिया है। मैं तो इस नीजे पर पहुँचा हूँ कि उनको रूटीन के तौर पर जो लिख कर दे दिया गया उसको पढ़ कर वह चले गए।

हमारे राष्ट्रपति, प्रधान मंत्री और दूसरे मंत्री जहाँ जाते हैं तो वह देश की अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ाने पर बहुत जोर देते हैं और कहते हैं कि देश की पैदावार बढ़ने से ही देश की उन्नति होगी। लेकिन जैसे जैसे वह अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ाने पर जोर दे रहे हैं वैसे वैसे हमारा संकट और बढ़ रहा है।

मंहगाई के बारे में तो क्या कहूँ। हम देखते हैं कि एक तरफ तो सरकार कहती है कि हम दुगनी पैदावार कर देंगे और दूसरी तरफ जब हम अपनी कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी में जाते हैं तो देखते हैं कि कुछ इलाकों में सरसों की फसल ६५ फीसदी, चने की फसल ८० फीसदी, कनक की फसल ७५ फीसदी है, और उन फसलों को खेतों में जाकर देखने का दिल नहीं चाहता। यह जो देश को संकट का सामना करना पड़ रहा है, यह जो अनाज की

कमी है, यह कहाँ से पूरी होगी ? यह तो किसान ही कर सकता है, लेकिन किसान की हालत क्या है ? मैंने पंजाब में देखा है कि एक तरफ तो सरदी के मारे लोग मर रहे हैं और बाजारों में जलूस निकाल रहे हैं, और जो नारे वह लगाते हैं व पलों में छपते हैं । व लोग कहते हैं :

नेहरू देखा तुम्हारा राज,
भूखा मारा हिन्दुस्तान ।

आज देश का जो गरीब आदमी है वह भू । मर रहा है । चालीस पचास रुपये मन गहूँ चला गया है और दूसरी तरफ सरकारी टक्स है । तीसरी तरफ वे लोग हैं जिनको सरकार की तरफ से खाद, बीज कर्ज के रूप में दिये गए थे । दस दस साल से उनको यह नहीं कहा गया कि तुम को यह कर्जा वापस करना है, लेकिन आज इतने संकट के समय उस रुपये की वसूली का एक दम हुक्म दिया जाता है और पुलिस जा कर लोगों को हथकड़ी डाल कर उनको जेल में डालती है । मैं समझता हूँ कि इस हालत में किसान कुछ नहीं कर सकता । चाहिये तो यह था कि जो खाद के लिये या बीज के लिये या चारे के लिये या खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये कर्जा दिया है उसको माफ कर दिया जाता । जो जर्मन का मामला है उसको पाक किया जाना चाहिये था, न कि इस संकट के समय में किसान को पीड़ा दी जाती ।

जब रिपोर्ट आती है या मिनिस्टर साहिबान भाषण देते हैं तो हर साल कागज पर पैदावार दुगुनी दिखायी देती है ; लेकिन जब संकट का समय आता है तो लोग भुख-मरी से मरते हैं । इस का कारण क्या है, कहाँ चला जाता है वह उत्पादन ? यह समझने की बात है । किसान को जो चीज मिलनी चाहिये वह समय से नहीं मिलती । मैंने तजरबे से देखा है क्योंकि मैं भी एक किसान हूँ कि जब खाद कारखाने से निकलती है तो उसकी शक्ल बदल जाती है । उसमें नमक

डाला जाता है, चूना डाला जाता है, छोटी छोटी पत्थरी डाली जाती है जिससे उसकी असली शक्ल खत्म हो जाती है । वैसे तो इस राज में शक्ल और नस्ल का अब सवाल ही क्या है । बिना मिलावट के यहाँ कोई चीज नहीं । घी में मिलावट है, चीनी में मिलावट है, सोने में भी मिलावट कर दी गयी है । मैं समझता हूँ कि इन्सान में भी मिलावट हो रही है । सरकार की योजना ऐसी है कि इन्सान में भी मिलावट होने वाली है । योजना ऐसी है कि जिसमें नसल बदली हो जाए ।

जब मैंने कामराज प्लान के बारे में सुना तो समझा कि इससे कुछ इनकलाब आएगा । थोड़ा सा आया था लेकिन वह प्लान भी वहीं रह गयी । एक तरफ तो सरकार कामराज प्लान की बात करती है और दूसरी तरफ परिवार नियोजना की योजना चलाती है । ये दोनों कैसे चल सकती हैं । एक तरफ तो पाबन्दी है और दूसरी तरफ कामराज है । कामराज में क्या होता है आप समझते हैं । उससे क्या पैदा होता है ।

तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आज देश भूखा मर रहा है । मुझे एक पुरानी बात याद आती है । बंगाल में अकाल पड़ा था जब कि अंग्रेज का राज था । उस समय श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी बंगाल गए । लोग बाजारों और गलियों में भूखे मर रहे थे । उस समय पंडित जी ने एक स्पीच की, उसका रिकार्ड मेरे पास रखा है लेकिन इस वक्त मैं बदकिस्मती से उसको यहाँ लाया नहीं । उन्होंने उस में कहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान के बदकिस्मत लोगो, इस मौत से मरने के बजाय तो गोली से मर जाते तो अच्छा होता क्यों कि उससे अंग्रेज चला जाता तो हम अपने देश का राज खुद करते और तुमको दूध मिलता, घी मिलता, अनाज मिलता, और यहाँ दूध की नदियाँ बह जातीं, आपको कपड़ा मिलता, रोटी मिलती और रहने के लिये मकान मिलता । लेकिन आज जब हमारा राज हो गया तो हम देखते हैं कि राजधानी के दिल में रहने

[श्री गुलशन]

वाले लोगों से से ३५ आदमी ठंड के कारण बाजारों में और गलियों में रात के समय जान तोड़ गए। तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ कि यह राज कैसे चलेगा। और कैसे लोगों की तसल्ली होगी। कहाँ गए वह दूध की नदियों के वायदे? मैं तो समझता हूँ कि सरकार की नीति असफल रही है।

बड़ी बड़ी योजनाएं बनायी जाती हैं, लेकिन उनके लिए जो धन रखा जाता है वह प्लान पर खर्च न होकर बड़े बड़े अफसरों की तनखाह में चला जाता है। चाहिए तो यह था कि एक हजार से किसी अफसर की तनखाह ज्यादा न होती और सवा सौ से कम किसी छोटे मुलाजिम की तनखाह न होती। इस तरह जो ज्यादा रकम हमारे पास रह जाती उससे हमारी योजनाएँ सफल हो सकती थीं। लेकिन योजना सफल कैसे हो। उसमें तो दुर्घटना हो जाती है। यह बड़े दुःख की बात है कि हमारी एक भी योजना सफल नहीं हुई है। योजनाएँ तो कागज पर बहुत लम्बी चौड़ी बनाई जाती हैं और बड़ी बड़ी रकमों भी उनके लिए मंजूर की जाती हैं लेकिन उन स्कीमों को अमल में लाने की जिन पर जिम्मेदारी होती है वह ईमानदारी से काम नहीं करते हैं और काफी रुपया दरअसल उन स्कीमों पर खर्च नहीं होता है। ऐसा केवल मेरा ही कहना नहीं है। स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अभी पीछे हैदराबाद में वर्कर्स की मीटिंग को एड्रेस करते हुए कहा था कि योजना तो बहुत सुन्दर है लेकिन अमल सुन्दर नहीं है।

15.00 hrs.

आज भी मेरे सामने एक पत्र है उसमें भी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि यह जो हमारे उत्पादन का प्रोग्राम है वह बहुत अच्छा है लेकिन खास तौर पर उसके अमल की जो रफ्तार है वह बहुत धीमी है और यही सबब है कि किसी तरफ भी हमारी स्कीमों कामयाब नहीं हो पा रही हैं।

आज अमन की हालत भी तसल्लीबख्त नहीं कही जा सकती है। जो कुछ बंगाल में हुआ या पाकिस्तान से आने वाले हमारे हिन्दू भाइयों के साथ हुआ वह बड़ा हृदय विदारक है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह दुर्घटना जो कलकत्ते में हुई या पाकिस्तान में हुई, नारायनगंज या ढाके में हुई तो वह भी हमारे देश के लिए एक बहुत कठिनाई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उस दौरान सिक्खों ने जो हिन्दुओं या मुसलमानों की सेवा की है वह उनके नेशनलिस्ट होने का सबसे बड़ा सबूत है। सिक्ख भाइयों ने जो कुछ वहाँ हिन्दुओं और मुसलमानों को बचाने के लिए किया है मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने एक बहुत ही काबिले तारीफ काम किया है।

काश्मीर का मसला भी बहुत देर से चला आ रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत सरकार यह मसला हल करने में भी सफल नहीं हुई है। अगर मसले के हल करने का अवसर निकल जाय, मौजूबत हाथ से निकल जाय तो फिर उसका वापिस आना जरा मुश्किल हो जाया करता है। सन् १९४७ में जब पाकिस्तानी हमलावरों ने काश्मीर के ऊपर हमला किया था और महाराजा और वहाँ की जनता की पुकार पर भारत सरकार उनकी हिफाजत के लिए गई और फलस्वरूप पाकिस्तानी फौजों के साथ उसकी बड़ी झड़प हुई थी तो उस समय हमारे फौजी लोग बड़ी दिलेरी के साथ पाकिस्तानी फौजों को खदेड़ते हुए आगे बढ़ रहे थे। पाकिस्तानी और कबायली लोगों का वह हमला उन्होंने पाश पाश किया। जबकि हमारी फौजें आगे बढ़ती जा रही थीं हमारे देश की सरकार ने ऐलान कर दिया कि बस इससे आगे नहीं बढ़ना है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो उस समय मसले का एक हाँ हल था कि हम बिल्कुल पाकिस्तानियों को काश्मीर की जमीन से बाहर खदेड़ देते, वह अच्छा मौका हमने उस वक्त खो दिया। उस मौके को खोने का ही नतीजा है कि काश्मीर के मामले में पेचीदगी पर पेचीदगी पैदा होती जा रही है। वहाँ जो लीडरशिप

बारसरे इक्तदार होती है जब वह गद्दी से उतर जाती है तो वह टेढ़े मेढ़े ढंग से गड़बड़ करने का यत्न करती है और उसकी कोशिश रहती है कि लोग अमन के साथ न रहे बल्कि लोगों ने तो नारा लगाया है कि वहाँ पर राष्ट्रपति राज्य लागू किया जाय। अब जब वहाँ के लोग चाहते हैं कि राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू किया जाय तब मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि हमारी सरकार काश्मीर में राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू करने से क्यों गुरेज कर रही है? अगर राष्ट्रपति राज्य वहाँ पर लागू हो जाय तो यह पार्टीबाजी और एक दूसरे को डाउन करने का जो सिलसिला चल रहा है वह खत्म हो जाय। आज के हालात में यह जरूरी हो गया है कि वहाँ न बख्शी ग्रुप की चने और न उनके मुखालिफ ग्रुप वालों की बात चने बल्कि सीधे सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट और राष्ट्रपति की वहाँ पर बात चले। आज पाकिस्तान भी वहाँ पर ऐक्टिव है और अपने जासूसों आदि से गड़बड़ करने की कार्यवाहियाँ करवा रहा है इसलिए यह और भी जरूरी हो जाता है कि राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करके सीधे सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट वहाँ का कण्ट्रोल अपने हाथ में ले और पाकिस्तानी लोग जोकि हमेशा शरारत करते हैं और कोई न कोई शोशा छोड़ते ही रहते हैं, उनको सख्ती से दबाये। इस नाते में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उपराष्ट्रपति महोदय के भाषण में यह भी एक कमी है कि उन्होंने भी इसका कोई हल नहीं निकाला या बताया कि काश्मीर का मसला कैसे हल होगा।

उपराष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण में शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और बैकवर्ड क्लासेज के लोगों की उन्नति के लिए कुछ भी नहीं कहा। आज मंहगाई बहुत हो गयी है और वह बढ़ती ही जा रही है। आज जब उन गरीब मजदूरों को २ रुपये बतौर मजदूरी के मिलते हैं तो कनक ३० रुपये मन मिल रही है। चीनी और गुड़ तो मिलता ही नहीं है। उन गरीब मजदूरों और उनके ाल बच्चों के लिए जो कि रात में खूने में बगर झोंड़ी के सोते हैं, जो भूखे

रहते हैं, उनके लिए सरकार को कुछ करना चाहिए।

सरकार यह कहती है कि उसने उन गरीब शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के मजदूरों को हैल्प करने के लिए कर्जें आदि का इन्तजाम किया हुआ है। लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि कर्जें उनकी जरूरत के मुताबिक हों और वह इस तरह से दिये जाय कि वह उन्नति कर सकें। इसी तरह से देश में काफ़ी जमीन फालतू पड़ी हुई है। हम चाहते हैं कि यह जमीन उन लैंडलैस लोगों को मईया की जाय और अगर पैसा लिया भी जाय तो बहुत कम लिया जाय। अगर आप ऐसे लोगों के लिए जमीन का बन्दोबस्त करेंगे तो वह देश में अनाज का उत्पादन भी करेंगे और साथ ही आज जो उनकी खराब हालत है वह भी सुधर जायेगी। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की जमीनें उनको दी जाय। आज उनकी दरदनाक हालत देख कर तरस आता है। सरकार स्कीमें तो कई बना लेती है। वह ट्रांसपोर्ट सोसाइटियों के बारे में कई स्कीमें बनाती है लेकिन जब वह लोग कुछ कर नहीं सकते तो उसके बाद वह सोसाइटीज तोड़ दी जाती हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि सरकार इन लोगों के लिए स्कीमें जो बनाये उन को यह देखे कि वे कामयाब हों और उन पर ठीक से अमल भी हो।

चूँकि मेरा समय खत्म हो गया है इसलिए मैं और ज्यादा न कह कर बैठते हुए आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे उपराष्ट्रपति के भाषण पर बोलने का अवसर दिया।

Shri Basappa: (Tiptur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the lengthy debate on the President's Address all these days has evoked intense feelings on all sides of the House because it is connected with certain affairs that have happened in East Pakistan as well as in Calcutta. And, particularly, what has happened in the Security Council has also something to reflect in the debates of this great Parliament. Even on the day when the

[Shri Basappa]

Address was presented, the linguistic rivalry and other things that were created have added to this kind of feeling in this House. Therefore, the Parliament and the people of this great country have to take note of the intense feelings and see that those intense feelings are set at rest so that we may march towards progress in all directions.

Sir, the President's Address has been stated to be very comprehensive all through, but various criticisms have been levelled against this Address. Therefore, it has become our duty to analyse and see to what extent these statements or criticisms can be taken. Analysing these criticisms, I see that some of them are not made in a constructive way. Even this morning, Shri Nath Pai, speaking on the President's Address, was talking in a tone which may not be very helpful. He was speaking of the leaderless state of affairs here. If there was no leadership here probably we would not have stood on the floor of this House to express our views. Certain things may be happening which are not to the liking of the hon. Member. But while making these criticisms one has to be very careful. Asking the Prime Minister to resign is no solution. On the other hand, what we need is a unified approach to all the problems that are before us. Of course, the administration has to be improved. The standard of administration is at a very low ebb and there is uncertainty and insecurity. So, steps have to be devised in order to see that these things are corrected.

It may not be possible to cover all the details and mention all the specific steps to be taken in the President's Address. It is no doubt expected that while referring to the Vigilance Commission or the socialistic pattern of society that we want to establish or any other matter we have to give the direction in which this country has to go and, from that

point of view, it needs certain improvements. Of course, certain omissions are also there. For example, recently there was the death of several of our Generals and other high military officers in a plane accident. I am not referring to the accident which took place yesterday or the day before but to the previous accident. That accident shocked the whole country. So, this address should have made a mention of it.

Though the President has not expressed any complacency in his address, still members have begun to see all kind of things in that address of which one should be disheartened. There need be no disheartening. The very fact that the Security Council has adjourned shows that at last there has been some effect as a result of our steps. Here I wish to refer to the good work of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, Shri Nanda and Shri Chagla who have done wonderful work. The very going of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to Kashmir has created such a confidence in that State. It must be said to the credit of Shri Nanda that he took steps in Calcutta which prevented further happenings there. Although one member in the morning said that Shri Chagla's arguments might not have had much effect, it is the villagers of Kashmir that have shown the way, still we cannot forget the stand taken by Shri Chagla. It had its own effect.

When we are considering the world scene, the death of Kennedy has cast a gloom to the future of peace in the world. But the banning of nuclear weapons, the signing of test-ban treaty and the disarmament move all go in a direction which shows that something good may come out of all these things.

The Address has devoted a great deal to mention about our deteriorating relationship with Pakistan. The only policy that we can pursue with Pakistan is one of firmness, which has

yielded dividends. We have seen a number of times that talks with Pakistan do not yield any results. But once we are firm when we know we are in the right, I think wisdom may dawn on them.

Something has been said about the Security Council. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was right in saying this morning that the Security Council should see wisdom before taking up this issue again. After all, the Security Council is not there to resolve disputes of this kind. Direct talks alone can do it. If Pakistan does not see reason in having these talks with a view to solving the problem, I think it is not the business of the Security Council to do it. When a question of the sovereignty of a nation is involved, the Security Council cannot arbitrate on that. This position was made known very clearly, particularly by Shri Krishna Menon when he spoke the other day. I need not go into the question of how the British representative behaved in the Security Council. If they do not revise their opinion, other methods will have to be devised to see what exactly should be our relationship with Britain. Some explanations have been given this morning as to the partisan attitude that has been taken by Britain for its own reasons. If it takes up that attitude to satisfy its own purpose, we are not here to listen to all those things, particularly when it touches us most. When we are receiving aid from the United States we have been saying that there should be no strings attached to it. But the recent happenings clearly show how far they really believe in the non-alignment policy of our country. Whether it is a question of China and India, or India and Pakistan, they want to have arbitration for settling the dispute as if we are one of the parties to the aggression. When certain things happen in East Pakistan and we refer to it then also we are tried to be equated in that way. Does it mean that, whether we have represented our case

properly or not, it is their deliberate intention to see things in that light? Both may be true. I think it is high time that our diplomatic missions should do something more. What has happened to our publicity abroad? We have been hearing so much about it but what is the result?

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

Shri Basappa: I wish I could have a few more minutes. Since you wanted me to conclude, I will say a few words about the regional imbalance and the backward areas. Sir, since you come from the Malnad area, you know what resources it has got. I have been saying it again and again that why a Central Board could not be constituted to develop the backward areas.

Shri Warior (Trichur): Is it a personal matter?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You may leave me alone.

Shri Basappa: Sir, as you are sitting in the chair, you may not be able to speak more about it. But you also come from a constituency in that region. It is one of the most unhappy things that Mysore has been wrongly understood. There is a wrong notion that it is an advanced State. After re-organisation, its size has become just double. It is facing huge problems. But what about the finance? Only Rs. 47 crores have been given for the Third Plan of which Rs. 29 crores is the Central assistance. Sherawati project will take Rs. 21 crores and the balance left is Rs. 8 crores. How is it possible to develop that State with that small and meagre amount? That is one aspect of the case.

I did not want to speak anything about the border dispute but now I find it has been raised by members of the other House. Also, it has been referred to by the Governor and the Chief Minister of Maharashtra. We want these border disputes to be

[Shri Basappa]

settled once and for all but we are told that there is emergency and so these things will not be taken up. But on the other hand, the urgency of it, the national interest behind it is spoken of by the Governor in his Address in the Maharashtra Assembly. Therefore, I have to speak something about it here. If the question of Balam, Nepani and Karvar is taken, there will be hundred questions. If these questions are revived, I do not know how many big questions will come up in this House. And how to solve them?

Again, about the Krishna river water dispute, what is the reason, what is the rationale behind the distribution of these waters? There is no reason at all and the Maharashtra Government has taken it up. I wish that a more rational basis should have been adopted.

Lastly, about the socialist goal that we want to have and the corruption that we want to eliminate, there must be sincerity, there must be confidence infused into the minds of the people. When we speak of these things, where is that confidence, where is that sincerity? I have been seeing this morning how and with what sincerity and confidence this has been tackled. The sentiments expressed by the Vice President are ennobling sentiments of dedicated attention to all these things. If the independence of our people has to be upheld and increasing prosperity and contentment of our people, the stability, security and peace has to be established, this Parliament, this Government, has to give a correct shape to the things to come.

Shri Shinkre (Marmagao): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this being the first time you have so kindly allowed me to speak in this august House, it becomes my foremost duty to present to you my most respectful greetings and compliments and at the same time to pay, through you, my unstinted tributes to this unique experiment in

democracy we have undertaken in this country. The very presence in this House of my hon. friend Mr. Peter Alvares and my own presence as a result of the last general elections in these Union territories of Goa, Daman and Diu is a very eloquent and befitting tribute to democracy in this country. As you know, the ruling Party, the Congress Party, contested all the 30 seats to the Legislative Assembly of these Union territories and also both the Parliamentary seats on behalf of these territories and, Sir, I will remind you and this House, through you, that the Congress lost all the 28 seats allotted for Goa to the Legislative Assembly and lost both the Parliamentary seats and as a result of this, we both Mr. Alvares and myself have come to this august House as the sole representatives of the people of these Union territories. You will please permit me to take up this opportunity to thank the people of this great country for their sustained and sincere effort in the cause of liberation of these territories. I may state here that but for the sustained efforts and help from the peoples of this country, I wonder whether this Government of ours would have ever realised the need of liberating these territories.

Sir, way back in 1954-55, we almost thought that we were going to be liberated on the 15th August, 1955. Even the Portuguese administration there thought it likewise. But quite of a sudden an announcement came from no less a person than the Prime Minister of India that the Government of India have no concern with the Satyagrahis marching unarmed and non-violently to Goa. That was enough for the Portuguese authorities of the place to butcher away unarmed and non-violent Satyagrahis who marched into Goa and that was the end of it. I might tell you that on the night of the 14th August, 1955, practically almost all the Portuguese civilians and their families plus the families of the military officers had sought refuge and shelter in two or

three houses in a Campal, Panjun, they were just in expectancy. They knew and they were anticipating for something to happen and be bundled away. But nothing happened. The announcement came from the Government of India and everything went to pieces. Many people have asked me after the results of the elections whether the people of Goa have no gratitude towards our Prime Minister. And the question has made me to ponder a little over that. But quite all of a sudden the answer swelled in my mind that most of us, the freedom-loving Goans, are regarding the Prime Minister not so much as a liberator of ours but the man responsible for our agonies for long 14 year. I may tell this House and take advantage of this chance that you have been so kind to grant me and recall here what Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia did for our liberation way back in 1947 even before the independence of this country. To be exact and precise, it was on the 18th June, 1947 that Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia stepped into Goa and defied and challenged the authorities of the Portuguese and said that he wanted to see how the Portuguese deny the basic and fundamental rights of the people. He was subsequently arrested by the Portuguese administration of the day which got completely shaky and did not know for 24 hours what to do. Subsequently, the advice came from Lisbon or their Central Government or London or from elsewhere and the things took a different turn. Why I am reminded of this incident is this. At that time the Portuguese Governor General of the place had written to the Father of the Nation asking how he justified the intervention of a foreigner Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia into the domestic affairs of a foreign country I may recall the words of the Father of the Nation who replied to the Portuguese Governor General of the day:

"Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia commands my respect for putting his foot on this pimple on the face of India."

How are these words compared with the words of our Prime Minister in 1955 saying and telling that the Satyagrahs are not the concern of the Government of India? The Portuguese Government butchered and massacred the poor unarmed and non-violent Satyagrahis when they had the assurance from the Prime Minister.

I may also be permitted to avail of this opportunity to pay homage to the unknown martyrs, endless workers, who have suffered, who have shed their lives and blood in the cause of freedom of these territories. You might be finding it strange that after more than two years of the liberation of these territories, I am taking up the floor of this House to pay this homage. But, as you have been reminded here, this is the first time that the representatives of these territories freely elected through adult franchise and through general elections are having the chance of speaking on the floor of this House and only what these representatives speak will purport to be the exact version and exact mind of the people of these territories. The recent elections of Goa are not a trifle because the Congress Party, the ruling party had made it almost a prestige issue. You will be surprised to know and to learn that barring the Prime Minister himself, almost all the big guns of the Congress Party and even some members of the Government had gone to Goa to campaign and the net result was that they lost all the 28 seats to the Legislative Assembly and both the seats to the Parliament and most sensible people in the country are hoping that election results of Goa, Daman and Diu are an indication of the future trends of things in this country.

An Hon. Member: Nonsense.

Shri Shinkre: It may be a nonsense....

Shri Kishen Pattanayak: Not at all.

Shri Shinkre: This is the first time that I am in Parliament, and I seek for your generous indulgence if unwittingly I might have indulged in or



[Shri Shinkre]

committed some slip or parliamentary impropriety. And I am sure that you will be generous enough to overlook any slip on my part, because I may make it perfectly clear that I have the highest regard for this noble House and its glorious traditions and nothing will ever come to my mind which might in any way be interpreted or even remotely taken as anything like lack of consideration for this august House.

Coming to the Address of the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President, to both Houses of Parliament, there are too many hon. Members of this House who have already spoken on this subject. Although I support the motion of thanks because of the due reverence that I have for the august personage who was kind enough to deliver the Address, I cannot help expressing some of my misgivings over that Address.

First of all, the overall impression that the Address gives is that it is a completely lifeless and insipid document, a document that reflects no perspective, no vision and no sense of dynamism of which we are hearing so much nowadays in this country.

Alluding to the foremost question in the mind of everybody, namely the Chinese aggression, what does the Address say? Has what the Address says any meaning, either positive or negative? The truth is there that a part of our sacred soil is in Chinese hands, according to the admission of the Government themselves. What does the Vice-President's Address suggest vis-a-vis this unlawful and treacherous occupation of our sacred soil. Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri posed a sort of direct question. He said 'Do you want war or peace?'. This is a very pathetic question to pose. But I might be permitted to point out that short of war there are many other things which we could certainly tackle and certainly endorse, or at least we should not be allowed to take a com-

pletely negative, or not even a negative attitude, but an attitude of expectancy. Now, what are we expecting? When the Chinese have already occupied our territory, according to the admission of the Government of India themselves, who is to expect? Are we to expect a fresh attack from the Chinese? Or are we supposed to do something in order to force the Chinese to do something so that the unlawful occupation of our territory is forthwith vacated?

I do not understand what exactly makes the Government or the Vice-President to write such an Address. Sometimes, or rather many a time, I feel that important, basic and fundamental decisions of policy of Government are being taken not by the Cabinet or by the Ministers concerned but by the senior bureaucrats in the Central Secretariat because I cannot understand this way of putting up such an important and such a fundamental and such a national question that practically has touched everyone in the country, no matter to which political party or political ideology he belongs, and not even a who-is-who report will be like this. That is why, as I said, and I repeat it, that sometimes I have a feeling like this. You know, Sir, very well that recently we had this experience in Goa, and we have found that the senior bureaucrats have nothing like considerations of national prestige or dignity of our country as a nation for them, it is only 'Go-safe' or 'Safety-first' policy. They look only to their own comfort and their own welfare for the next as many years as possible, and very little is there which touches them as to whether the Chinese question is affecting the people and people's sentiments are being overlooked or not. That is why, as I said earlier, sometimes I get a feeling that these important and fundamental decisions of policy of the Government of India are being taken not by the Cabinet or by

the Ministers concerned but by the senior men in the Central Secretariat.

The next question which directly concerns me and to which another hon. Member has also referred, is Goa. As I told you, the party which I represent, namely the Maharashtra Gomantak Dal, which is a party only for the specific purpose of obtaining merger of Goa into Maharashtra won the elections to the legislative assembly and won both the parliamentary seats. It is very much regrettable that in the Vice-President's Address there should not be even a passing reference to the future of Goa. The hon. Minister without Portfolio, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, while he was the Home Minister, had declared in this very House that the Union Territory arrangement was a short-term arrangement or at the most a stopgap arrangement, and no territory could remain long as a Union Territory, and shortly, this one would be settled or adjusted with the adjoining States. But I regret to state here that there is no reference in the Vice-President's Address to the question of the merger of Goa with Maharashtra and of Daman and Diu with Gujarat. Government may say that it is a very minor question. It may be a minor question, but I must remind Government that it is these minor questions which become bigger questions or larger questions some time later, and then Government will have to find a reply, because they have never had any reply to them so far. Only yesterday, I think, my hon. friend Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia said on the floor of this House that this Government only knew how to pose questions, but they had no answers to any questions that they had raised.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the hon. Member should try to conclude. He will have other opportunities later on.

Shri Shinkre: I would take just one more minute. In the name of democracy, I ask Government what the idea is of controlling Daman and

Diu which are more than five hundred miles from Goa? What kind of similarity and what kind of homogeneity can Government claim between Goa and Daman and Diu? Because the Portuguese maintained them under the same shackles, do this Government also want to keep them together? They have rightly called it as some sort of domestic colonialism. I would say that trying to dictate terms from New Delhi to Goa and from Goa to Daman and Diu, or from Goa to Daman and from Daman to Diu also amounts to some sort of domestic colonialism, if I may be permitted the use of such an expression here.

That is why I urge Government to take speedy steps and expedite the question immediately and obtain the merger of these territories, that is, the merger of Goa into Maharashtra and that of Daman and Diu into Gujarat, lest things should degenerate in such a way as has happened in the case of other issues. We have had the experience of how questions have degenerated so far. The hon. Members who have spoken before me have vastly referred to the question of Kashmir and pointed out how it was spoilt. I again place the blame at the doors and shoulders of the Government for the imbroglio that the Kashmir Problem is. If we say that Kashmir is fully integrated and it is fully part and parcel of India, why have the Government of India created this ridiculous spectacle of two premiers of one country, one for Jammu and Kashmir and the other for the rest of the country? Why did they go to the Security Council in the first place when they knew that it was a completely and purely internal and domestic question? Why did they not withdraw from the Security Council, the moment the Security Council said that Pakistan was an aggressor? Thereafter they could have decided and settled all these questions with Pakistan directly, if not immediately, at least at our convenience or at the

[Shri Shinkre]

moment when we felt that it was justified to do so if we had done that, at least we would have the baby in our bag, as the saying goes.

Shri Warrior: At the fag end of the debate, I do not wish to cover all the points which have been traversed by so many of the hon. Members who have spoken so far. But I am sorry to say that in this debate, there is one little subject which has almost been neglected, and it is a very vital subject which affects our national economy, and that is the relationship of the working class with production.

The Vice-President was wise enough to say that the production had been going up steadily and progressively and that it was expected that we would have much more increase in production in the coming years. But actually, what is happening in that sector? I feel that Government have not given much thought to it; I am referring to the Government as a whole and not to any particular Minister or for that matter, the Home Minister. I say that the Government as a whole have not given much thought to it; they have not given it the attention which it requires. I can understand this House and the Government being much exercised because of the happenings in East Pakistan and in Calcutta and other parts of Bengal, as well as in the international field and in the Kashmir area. From all these things it is difficult to divert the attention of Government. But at the same time, this aspect is of vital interest to the country not only in the emergency in which we are at present but also for the future.

What is happening there? We had a decade of socialistic pattern of society. The Vice-President says in the opening paragraph of the Address itself:

"We have continued to move forward towards our objective of a democratic and socialist order at home and for peace and

co-operation in international affairs".

We may leave the latter part aside. As regards the former, it is said we have continued to move forward towards our objective of a democratic and socialist order at home. We had the socialist pattern from Avadi in 1955. In the last decade, from that year till now, when we look back, when it is reviewed not only by the Opposition but by the Government and the government party itself, they have come to the conclusion that it is high time a commission was instituted to investigate whether monopoly has grown uncontrollably in our country. Monopoly has grown to such an extent that it has become a state within a state. That was the statement given in the press when the ruling party had its annual session in Bhubaneswar. In another decade of 'socialist democracy and progress', I do not know where we will reach. It may be a state which is completely controlled by the monopolists. Now monopoly is only corroding the Government. At that time, it will be monopoly taking hold of the whole thing, if things go on like this. The crucial question was also debated by the ruling party whether we first create abundance of wealth and then sit down and quietly and calmly begin to distribute to all those who need or both these things should go hand in hand. I know there was much controversy in the ruling party on that also in their annual session, and nothing was decided.

But actually what is happening in this sector? I wish the pointed attention of the House was drawn to that. It is a fact that concentration of wealth and economic power in a few hands has increased and the monopolistic hold on the economy of the country has corroded even our political life. There is no gainsaying that fact. whether we set up a commission or not, it is all patently known. That might be the reason for

the investigators' report not coming to light.

As regards the agricultural sector, I am not saying anything because that has been much discussed. It is admitted on all hands that there we have failed to reach the target or self-sufficiency.

The main question which has agitated the Vice-President in his Address, the main 'disturbing' factor in the economy is the rise in prices. It is only 'disturbing' in the terms of the Vice-President. But actually the position is whether the working classes and the toiling masses live or do not live. It has come to that. We all know that the working class has not got even a bare minimum existence wage, what to speak of a living wage—because prices have gone up. Statistics will show that we are giving some increased wages or some increased dearness allowance. I must remark that the attitude of the Government is callous and it is a mockery; the Government has come forward with a pittance of an increase of Rs. 2 in dearness allowance to its own employees. It is better that it is withheld and this sort of joke not played on the miserable life of the people.

In the First and Second Pay Commission Reports, there had been suggestions and all principles were well laid. It was only up to Government to implement them and give whatever is due to their employees. This is not done.

And how much is the rise in prices? It is abnormal. That is admitted on all hands. Every day prices are shooting up. Government is not controlling them. In the name of emergency, taking shelter under it, in spite of the DIR, profiteers are going scot-free. That is what is happening. In order to protect the economy under the stress of the emergency and the crisis, the working classes of India organised under their various central organisations came together and agreed on their own with the Government's proposal

for a tripartite agreement. What was that agreement? It was just like a stool with three legs. The Government had its own part to play, its own responsibilities to discharge. The employers had their own and the employees also had their own. Government, first of all, had to control and hold the price line. But Government has totally and completely and miserably failed in that. It is helplessly and hopelessly sitting back—'don't know what to do'. This is the attitude to the forefront producers in the economy, the working class. Leave alone the middle class, the agricultural class, the agricultural labourers. Even the industrial workers, the most organised workers, the most conscious workers have been denied a minimum existence because of the high prices. Nobody can control the prices. Take anything in the market. Whatever price comes to the tongue at that particular moment, that is the price demanded. There is absolutely no control. It is complete anarchy. Even for small items like cloth, everyday necessities of life, like wheat, wheat flour, what is the position? Wheat flour is selling today in Delhi at Rs. 31 per maund. It had been Rs. 17. And what is the Government doing? Why is the Government sitting quiet? Why not control these prices? Wheat is in their hands, rice is in their hands. As regards cloth, it is completely left to the millowners. They stamp the prices. Whether we get it at these prices or not, nobody checks. Whether they are stamping correct prices, nobody checks. If there is a checking machinery, everybody knows that there will not be so much talk about corruption then.

Take blades. A blade which had been costing 13 nP is now sold for 28—30 nP in no less a place than Bombay or Delhi. In Connaught Place, you cannot get a blade at all, a shavable blade; and the Government is complacently sitting back, hopelessly and helplessly sitting back. So that leg of the stool is broken and gone.

[Shri Warior]

What do the employers do? They are minting lakhs. How much profit have they made in this period? The latest figures, those of 1962-63, are not available. But in 1960-61, the general increase in profit was 13.2. Taking all concerns together, I declare that the big foreign giant, Lever Brothers, has knocked off the first place in the list, their profit being 26 per cent after paying the taxes. Eighteen or 20 other big undertakings in India have knocked off the major portion of the profits. And nobody can argue it is because of added investment, because their investment is only seven per cent while their profit is 13 per cent more. I do not go into the figures, not that I do not have them, everybody has them. It is all well known, these are figures published not by the communist press, but by the capitalist press, and it is in the hands of the Government, they can see it.

So, the other leg is also gone. But what about the workers, the only remaining leg on which the economic stool must stand now? They rose to the occasion, they consciously understood the implications of the emergency and their responsibility to society, if not to this Government. They alone kept their word, and kept up production, increased production. No other authority than the Vice-President himself says that there has been an upward trend in industrial production.

Shri A. P. Sharma: What is your contribution?

Shri Warior: He can speak when he gets his opportunity.

The point is that industrial production rose. I can quote facts and figures to show that the capacity is also rising, that production is rising. All these have risen, but actually where have the wages stood?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will have two minutes more.

Shri Warior: That is enough and more. If we take 1951 as the base year, and the figures for the index number of money earnings, the all-India consumer price and the index of real earnings in relation to money earnings, to be 100 each, we find that the corresponding figures for 1961 are 137.5, 120 and 114.6 respectively. The real wages may have gone up in terms of rupees to an extent, but actually it was reduced. The conclusion is clear.

I do not want to go into the question of the dearness allowance, but dearness allowance has become a permanent feature of the emoluments of the workers. The trunk of the tree is shrinking and the branch of the tree is enlarging. The branch is much bigger than the trunk of the tree. So, the trunk cannot stand, it falls down. A textile worker, for instance, gets Rs. 37½ as his monthly emoluments, but his dearness allowance is Rs. 75. How can this go on permanently? So, the question of merging dearness allowance with the wage is a foregone conclusion. Just as Government orders so many people to go to this side and that side of the country, they can do it.

About the cost of living index, it is admitted and the hon. Minister Nandaji knows, that it is a complete fraud. Suppose I am sleeping and somebody picks my pocket, it is called pickpocketing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will have another opportunity.

Shri Warior: I do not want another opportunity to say this. It has risen by 29 per cent from 1960 onwards. The Lakdavalva report of Bombay and the Desai report of Ahmedabad have said so. What has this Government done about it? It is nothing but pickpocketing the ignorant workers, a shameless thing that is going on in this country. Is the Government going to stop it? I am not very much concerned about democracy or social-

lism, I am concerned with the real wages and the living conditions of our workers, of our masses, and there the Vice-President has failed because this Government has failed. Unless it rectifies that, we will have to forward their demands to this Government, and the Government will have to consider the demands made by the premier organisation of the working class, the AITUC.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं उठता है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप सुन तो लें ।

राष्ट्रपति के भाषण के ऊपर जो बहस हुई उसका जवाब होने जा रहा है । जवाब के सम्बन्ध में मैं सब से पहले आप का ध्यान धारा ८७(१) संविधान की जो है, उसकी तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ । धारा ८७(१) में कहा गया है कि राष्ट्रपति हर एक साल लोक सभा और राज्य सभा के सत्र को बुलायेंगे, पहले सत्र को और वह संसद् को बतायेंगे कि तलबी का क्या कारण है । यह हमारा पहला सत्र है साल का । राष्ट्रपति ने तलबी के कारण हम को बताये हैं । उन कारणों पर अब बहस चल रही है । बहस के ऊपर फिर प्रस्ताव होगा, या तो राष्ट्रपति को धन्यवाद मिलेगा या नहीं मिलेगा । यह तो मैंने आप को धारा ८७(१) के मुताबिक बताया ।

अब धारा ७४(१) को आप देखें । इस में लिखा हुआ है कि राष्ट्रपति को अपने प्रकायों और कर्तव्यों में सलाह देने के लिए और मदद देने के लिए एक मंत्रि-परिषद् रहेगी जिस मंत्रि-परिषद् के सिर पर प्रधान मंत्री रहेंगे । मैं समझता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति का कम से कम इस लोक सभा के सम्बन्ध में यह सब से बड़ा प्रकाय है, शायद देश के सिलसिले

में भी यह सब से बड़ा प्रकाय है कि वह हमें सम्बोधन करते हैं और उनके सम्बोधन पर हम यहां बहस करते हैं ।

धारा ७५(१) में लिखा हुआ है कि प्रधान मंत्री को राष्ट्रपति नियुक्त करेंगे और दूसरे मंत्रियों को राष्ट्रपति प्रधान मंत्री की सलाह से नियुक्त करेंगे । इसका साफ मतलब होता है कि राष्ट्रपति के सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मंत्री पहले दर्जे के मंत्री हैं और बाकी सब मंत्री दूसरे दर्जे के मंत्री हैं क्योंकि संविधान की धारा ७५(१) में बिल्कुल साफ है कि वह सोचे प्रधान मंत्री को ही खाली नियुक्त करते हैं ।

इन सब धाराओं को साथ में लेते हुए बिल्कुल साफ हो जाता है कि यहां पर राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के सम्बन्ध में जो बहस हुई है, उसका उत्तर केवल प्रधान मंत्री दे सकते हैं, दूसरा कोई मंत्री यहां पर दे नहीं सकता है । साथ में अगर कहा जाये कि धारा ७५(३) के अनुसार मंत्रि-परिषद् मिल जुल कर के इस सदन के प्रति जिम्मेदार है तो मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि मंत्रि-परिषद् प्रधान मंत्री को छोड़ करके नहीं होती है, प्रधान मंत्री को लेकर होती है और प्रधान मंत्री ही राष्ट्रपति के प्रकाय के मामले में सब से बड़े मंत्री हैं, पहले दर्जे के मंत्री हैं ।

इसलिए मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि यह काम जो राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर हुई बहस का उत्तर देने का है, इसको आप प्रधान मंत्री के सिवाय और किसी को न दें । मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि आप अपना निर्णय देने के पहले अगर जरूरत हो, तो सोच विचार कर लें और कल निर्णय दे दें और इसको कल तक उठा रखें । यह कोई छोटा मोटा सवाल नहीं है जो मैंने उठाया है । साथ साथ एक बात जिस तरह से यह झुंड मेरे साथ बर्ताव करता है उस के सम्बन्ध में भी कह दूँ । इस के ऊपर बहुत बहस चलती है . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : धाईर, धाईर ।

16.00 hrs.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : ज़रा ठंडे मन से आप को मेरी बात को सुन लना चाहिये। मैं अपना कर्तव्य पालन कर रहा हूँ। मुझे कोई मतलब प्रधान मंत्री के स्वास्थ्य से नहीं है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरा कर्तव्य . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह तन्दुरुस्त हों। लेकिन मैं अपना कर्तव्य देश के प्रति पालन कर रहा हूँ और किसी हद तक श्री नेहरू के प्रति भी। मैं उन से कहूँगा, और उन की पार्टी के लोगों से कहूँगा, कि हमारे किसान भी एक थके और बूढ़ बैल को आखिर में पेंशन दे दिया करते हैं, उसे जिन्दा रखने के लिये। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप संविधान की धारा ८७(१), ७४(१) और ७५(१), तीनों को पढ़ते हुए इस समय गृह मंत्री को यह अवसर न दें कि वह राष्ट्रपति के प्रकार्यों को यहाँ पर बिगाड़ें।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Dr Lohia has raised a point of order that the Prime Minister has to reply. I would like to read to him rule 20:

"The Prime Minister or any other Minister, whether he has previously taken part in the discussion or not, shall on behalf of the Government have a general right of explaining the position."

There is no point of order.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने यहाँ संविधान पढ़ा है और यह राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have given my ruling. Please sit down.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तो फिर इस के लिये मेरे सामने एक ही तरीका रह जाता है कि मैं अपना विरोध बतलाऊँ। मैं अपना विरोध प्रकट करता हूँ और इस सदन के बाहर जा रहा हूँ, यह कहते हुए कि इतिहास इस निर्णय को कभी क्षमा नहीं करेगा।

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia then left the House.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, before you proceed to call upon the hon. Home Minister I only like to record my protest that for four days I have been standing here trying to catch the eye of the Chair hoping that you would call me. Unfortunately for me, on account of certain technical difficulties which have been communicated to me, I am sorry I could not participate in this discussion.

Shri Nath Pal: It is very reprehensible. It is not at all fair, Sir. We join our voices of protest. I am sorry to interrupt the proceedings but he is the senior-most Member of the House. He is a veteran as you will recall. We are sorry that he is shown such palpable discourtesy (*Interruptions.*)

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : चार दिन की बहस में उन को भी समय मिलना चाहिये जब सब को दिया जाता है।

श्री काशी राम गुप्त (अलवर): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात मैं भी कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि डा० अणे के साथ साथ मेरे ग्रुप के दूसरे सदस्य को मौका नहीं मिला। यह बड़ा भारी अन्याय है और इस प्रकार से हमारी अवहेलना नहीं की जानी चाहिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The unattached Party was given 34 minutes but they have also taken 1 hour 35 minutes. I explained this to Dr. Aney. It is with regret that I had to do it. However, as the House desires, I will give him five or ten minutes so that he can speak.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I am sorry that I have to disturb the ordinary procedure which you wanted to follow for my sake. I did not do that for this purpose. I only wanted to express my regret that such things should come in the way of free expression of views.

*discharging
the functions of the
President*

I rise to support the motion moved by Mr. Chaudhuri on the Address to Parliament by the Vice-President given on the 10th of February 1964 to inaugurate this Budget Session of Parliament. It has given a picture of the nature of progress which the Government of India has been endeavouring to make towards its objective. It frankly points out that the overall rate of economic growth has lagged behind the target which is mainly due to shortage of agricultural production which in 1962-63 showed a fall of 3.3 per cent. It is admitted that there have been successive bad agricultural seasons in the course of the Third Plan and it has called upon those who are most vitally concerned to note that a "steady increase in agricultural production is the most important task before us today." I am sure the whole House will support this fervent appeal made by the Vice-President to the Government of the Centre and of the States and the agriculturists of India. The Fourth and Fifth Plans depend entirely on our success in making up of the short-falls in agricultural production of the Third Plan. The goal of a self-generating and self-sustained economy at the end of the Fifth Plan can be reached only if we succeed in improving our agricultural production upto the targets in the Plan. Our problem is no doubt vast in magnitude and complex in character. But that is what the Planning Commission has to solve not theoretically but guiding the people concerned on practical lines by making available scientific knowledge and technical knowledge as well as easy financial resources at the proper time. The Planning Commission and the Government of India are both on their trial mostly in the remaining two years of the Third Plan and the ten years of the remaining two Plans.

Agricultural progress and industrial growth are the two wheels of the economic van which is to take us to the destination of a socialist democratic society which we envisage as a com-

munity of equality and plenty. Prosperity and progress are the causes and socialist order is the result brought about by the application of the principle of equitable distribution of wealth produced and earned. I deliberately use the word 'equitable' instead of 'equal'. Equal distribution has theoretical existence like Euclid's point and straight line on the global earth.

While I express my appreciation of the points made out in the Address it should be permissible for me to note what in my opinion has not been stated clearly and emphatically. It is stated in the very beginning of the Address after describing the nature of the problems as vast in magnitude and complex in character that the Government have continued to move forward towards their objective of a democratic and socialistic order at home and for peace and co-operation in international affairs. In plain English it means that in internal affairs the goal they had in view to reach was a democratic and socialist order and in international affairs it was peace and co-operation. I admit that peace and co-operation may be taken as broad features of our foreign policy, that is, the policy is aimed at establishing peace in the world outside India if there be any breaking or possibility of breaking out war or armed revolt affecting peace in the world. India has during the last 17 years thrown its weight on the side to bring about the end of hostilities between the belligerent nations and establish peace between them by helping them on to negotiate a settlement or treaty. Theoretically India is not at war with any country. But practically its relations with China and Pakistan are not only unfriendly and uncordial but actively hostile. China has invaded India and is in actual occupation of a large part of Indian territory. Pakistan, apart from the minor border troubles has ceded to and given unto possession of China a portion of the Kashmir State which legally belonged to India. It is an act of hostility and it is also giving threats of militant ac-

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

tion. Pakistan has described India as enemy No. 1 on more than one occasion.

Thus, India has on its border Pakistan and China in an unholy alliance against India. These are acts of hostility. So far as China is concerned, the Indian Government and this Parliament have solemnly declared their determination to drive away China from the Indian territories occupied by it forcibly, if it is not achieved by peaceful negotiations. I want to say this national resolve of the Indian Government is an objective to which the Government of India stands committed, and of which mention has not been made anywhere in the Address. In fact, the continuance of the state of emergency is justifiable only for that reason, and for nothing else.

There is a reference to the Chinese threat in the Address in para 14. The Chinese threat has continued throughout the year, though there has been no actual fighting along our borders. China still maintains an intransigent attitude on the Colombo proposals and the Chinese military build up along our borders has increased. With due deference to the Vice-President and in all humility, I beg to submit, that the above passage in the Address is, to say the least, an understatement of the Chinese aggression and the mischievous activities of the Chinese Government during what is described as the cease-fire period. The Address omitted to refer to three important and most sinister activities and incidents of the Chinese in this period. Though it has stopped actual fighting, it did not go back to the original boundary line which is beyond the MacMahon line, that is, they have been in actual occupation of a considerable part of the Himalayan region which really belongs to us. My point is this. By their being there, it is certainly, in my opinion, a deliberate and calculated insult to India, and Chou En-lai tells the world that he is prepared to have direct talks

with us, while not accepting the Colombo proposals. It is adding insult to injury. I am sure the Government of India will be strong enough in regard to that point.

Secondly, China has concluded a treaty with Pakistan, knowing fully well that Pakistan had no right to do so, and thirdly, China is carrying on a venomous propaganda against India, throughout the world, and Chou En-lai's African tour was mainly for this purpose. So, China is not silent after the cease-fire. Chou En-lai is building up his strength and is strengthening China's position along our border and winning friends in distant countries to isolate India.

In the face of these facts, I feel that our propaganda has proved to be of no efficacy. I do not want to blame the embassies or the distinguished Indians who have been representing India as ambassadors. They may have their own difficulties. But, anyhow, the fact is that we are having greater difficulties in retaining the friendship and sympathies even of tried friends.

I therefore think that in the Address, sufficient justice has not been done to bring out the true position of India in relation to China and Pakistan and also to emphasise the gravity of the responsibility and urgency of the steps to be taken in vindication of the honour and prestige of the Indian nation.

Before, I conclude. I want to make one more point. I think the Government of India must seriously think of raising an Indian militia. Every young man must go through a military training so as to make him a soldier in defence of the motherland. This will create an awakening in the youths about their duties to their motherland and also an impression on the evil-minded neighbouring countries that unfriendly relations with India will not be a paying game in the long run. We must give up what is nicknamed as a policy of appeasement. I congratulate the Defence Minister on the strenuous efforts he has been making, but I venture to say that considering the magnitude of the task, the efforts to turn India into a nation of soldiers re-

quire to be broadbased. I consider this to be the first and foremost object. This will bring manliness and manners of brave and self-respecting men in the youths of India on whom the future glory and prosperity of the Indian nation entirely depends. My motto is, make them brave, self-dependent, wise and compassionate. Let India be full of high-souled young men ready to lay down their lives for the sake of their motherland and not brook any insult to the nation. No country can look at our motherland with an evil eye. We must aspire to create that kind of India.

I thank you for having given me an opportunity to speak and participate in this debate. I conclude my speech with an invocation to God in the language of the Vedic mantra for the success of our soldiers who are at present guarding our frontiers and who will be called upon to fight the enemy in order to drive them out beyond the Indian borders and boundary known as the McMahon line.

उस्माकम् वीरा उत्तरे भवन्त्वस्मान् ऊदेवा
भवताहनेषु

"May our warriors be victorious.
May Gods protect them in the battle."

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I realise my onerous responsibility in being called upon to reply to the debate on the President's Address. I had the honour of listening to the President's Address, as all others had which was delivered by the Vice-President on his behalf.

16.18 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I am glad that very soon the President will be fully in a position to perform the functions of his office. May I also express the hope earnestly—and I hope the Members of the House will join me in that—that in such a debate hereafter the reply to that will come from the Prime Minister himself?

The Address has been characterised in various ways. The hon. Member opposite, Shri Nath Pal, had expressed

some strong feelings about the Address, and some Members said it was an insipid thing and had no perspective, that this was not there and that was not there, and there was this omission and that omission. In a brief compass, the President's Address covers a very wide ground and touches on a large variety and range of subjects. Inevitably, it has to be just an outline, a bare outline to a large extent of the events and developments during the intervening period. That outline is before the House and the House fills that outline. The speeches of hon. Members can provide whatever content and colour has been missing. Thus a picture emerges, a picture of the state of the nation. There are in that picture bright areas; of course, there are also grey patches and even dark patches. It is quite true that it is not of a uniform pattern, it is not of a single hue and colour. But it reflects both the achievements of the nation and its trials and tribulations. Let us all try to see things as they are. I for my part assure the House that my approach is objective. I would not like to exaggerate the bright side of the Government's and the nation's achievements nor would I like to minimise them, and there will be no tendency on my part to suppress anything. We have all to draw lessons from the experience of the recent years and chalk out a course which will give us something better in the coming years.

I first turn to the economic scene. There has been, in the previous session, a full scale discussion on the mid-term appraisal of the Third Five Year Plan. Therefore, there was a fragmentary treatment of the subject in this House during those days. But various aspects of the economic situation were dealt with here. It is very natural that the price level was a recurring theme of the speeches of hon. Members. Production, planning, economic policies generally and other things also came in. I have taken up this question to begin with because it is the most important matter for discussion and a matter of basic importance both for defence and social wel-

*President discharging
the functions of the
President*

[Shri Nanda]

fare and having regard to the needs of those unfortunate refugees who are coming from East Pakistan. I would not enter upon any details. I shall try to share with the House my broad assessment of the economic conditions.

To my mind, one thing stands out and there should be no attempt to explain it away. The rate of economic growth in the country has not been fast enough during the last two years. It has not been adequate in relation to the needs of the people. We had during the previous decade, during the period of the first two Plans, increase in the national income at a cumulative rate of 3.61, and during this period the rate of increase of population has been disconcerting. At the same time, because of the defence needs there has been an additional call on our resources physically and financially. Naturally, stresses and strains have increased and more taxes have had to be levied although care is being taken to see that the internal production of articles of mass consumption are as far as possible spared from taxation. This is one side. On the other side, we are confronted with the fact that the rate of increase of production has been below expectation and below our minimum needs. A conspicuous consequence of this combination of circumstances is that the price-level has not been kept under check, as we have not been able to prevent the rising trend asserting itself and persisting.

In the first two years taken together there was no change. In the first year of the plan there was a decline of 3.7 per cent. This was counter-balanced by an increase of 3.7 per cent in the second year. Since March 1963 there has been a sharp increase. The figures with me are up to 2nd February. The increase has been of the order of 7.7 per cent and, considering the previous month, it appears that this trend is hardening. When we look into it a little further we find this is due very much to the fact that there has been a very significant rise in the prices of food

articles, rice 12.7 per cent, cereals 16 per cent and industrial raw materials 5 per cent. On the other side, the rise in the consumer cost of living index has been 6.2 per cent between March and November 1963. This is a disturbing situation. Let us be clear that this rise is related mostly to the groups of agricultural commodities, food, raw materials etc. Out of 7.7 per cent, 7 per cent is due to the increase of price of agricultural commodities. Therefore, that is the area where we have to try to concentrate our attention.

This leads us on to the question of production. The price level naturally is a very elementary fact. There is the question of the demand of the people on the one side and the availability of services, which means primarily agricultural and industrial production, on the other, along with the other factor of such modifications as may arise from the factor of imports and exports.

Taking agricultural production, the rise in the first year was 1.3 per cent. In the second year there was some decline, 3.3 per cent in agricultural production. Industrial production in the first two years showed a moderate increase. In the first year it was 5.6 per cent and in the second year 8 per cent. The situation has been improving, so far as industrial production is concerned. Therefore, the increase of national income during these two years is 2.5 per cent against 3.6 per cent during the previous decade. And this shortfall is due, as is evident from the figures which I have given, entirely to the shortfalls in agricultural production, which means that if they somehow could have been avoided we would not have been worse off than in the period of the Second Plan.

Let us take a closer look at agriculture. Variations and fluctuations in agricultural production arise out of two factors—one is the human contribution and the other is the role of nature. Human factor means various inputs like fertilizer, water, seed etc. These are well-known things. Hon.

*discharging
the functions of the
President*

Members must be well aware of the fact that during this period these inputs have increased as compared to the previous period. The supply of fertilizers has increased by 75 per cent as compared to the 1960-61 level, credit 35 per cent and irrigation 20 per cent.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The input is all right but the output is not commensurate.

Shri Nanda: I am coming to that. These are crucial facts. So far as the allocation of these materials which have led to increase in production is concerned, there has been sufficient indication of the awareness of their need. It may be, that the effectiveness of the use of those resources is not good enough. But at any rate, it may have been at the same level as in the previous years. Therefore, with the same level of effectiveness of the use of these resources and higher inputs, why is that the production has gone down instead of increasing? There the second factor comes in, that is, the role of nature, vagaries of monsoon, the uncertainty of climatic conditions. These in our country still play a decisive role. I will explain, with reference to some experience in the past, that this is not the first time that we have had to face such a situation. I will request the hon. Members to recall that in the year 1953-54, the increase in agricultural production was 12.1 per cent—not 2 per cent or 3 per cent or 4 per cent but 12.1 per cent—in a single year. This is where this uncertain factor comes in. During the next year, that is 1954-55, it was just 2.4 per cent so that from 12.4 per cent increase in one year it comes down to 2.4 per cent in the next year and in the year after that, in 1955-56, it was—0.2 per cent. This has been the experience of three years during the last period of the two Plans and again in 1957-58 it was—0.8 per cent whereas in 1958-59 it was 13.9 per cent. I think these are important facts to be taken into consideration when we assess whatever has been happening in the matter of agricultural production. There has been

a series of bad years. Other countries also have gone through this experience. But I must acknowledge that it is not a full explanation. That has been my stand, that you cannot throw everything on nature. I believe that our capacity to counteract the effects of ups and downs on this account should have increased more and it is there that our responsibilities come in. I think there has been during the last two or three years particularly very rude awakening, a sharp awakening, about the importance of agriculture. It is not that automatically, since we make allocations of this and that agricultural production is going to increase. It is not so. There has to be more zeal in discharging our responsibilities otherwise and this brings us into the whole field of administration. It is very clear that in the matter of agricultural production, one factor which is at play is that there has not been effective co-ordination and though it has been known for a long time that the quality of the human approach in this field—the persons who are incharge of the various operations in connection with agriculture—has not been good enough; well this is a part of the larger problem.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You have taken so long to realise that.

Shri Nanda: Well, we have been trying. But somehow the problems cannot be easily dealt with when it is a question of inertia, possibly of a century, all the difficulties the vagaries of nature and also the man-made obstacles. This is about agricultural production.

About industrial production, the rise has been uneven. The overall increase in the first year, as I said, was 5.6 per cent and in the second year it was 8 per cent. The rate of production—this is a very important aspect which must be kept in view in a proper appreciation of the...

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: What about the sudden rise in prices within one month?

Shri Nanda: I will come to that.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Failure of the crop in U.P. specially.

Shri Nanda: I am dealing with the background of the rise in prices. As I said, the overall rate of increase in production in the second year was 8 per cent. But the increase in production in basic industries has been much more than average; in the case of basic metal industries, it was 26 per cent, manufacture of metal products 69 per cent, machinery 22 per cent and chemical products 23 per cent. This is a very significant fact. On the other side, namely the consumer goods, the increase has been much less. For example, it has been 6.5 per cent in the case of cloth.

Shri Ranga: Why?

Shri Nanda: Because we cannot do all the things at the same time, and some things really get more importance than other things. In industry again, I might emphasise that there has been a very considerable increase in the production of steel, machine-tools, fertilisers, caustic soda etc. Yet, the improvement in industrial production also cannot be regarded as satisfactory. What are the influences which have retarded production to the full level that was envisaged, that is, an average increase of 11 per cent over the period of the Third Plan? At any rate, it should have started better than has been the experience in the first two years of the Third Plan.

Here are some facts which have come out and which we have properly to impress on our minds. For instance, delays are there, delays because of inadequate pre-planning. Because of this, we have encountered this fact that there was a lack of precise estimates of costs; the implementation of schedules was not realistic; there was also the factor of dependence on foreign aid. There were also administrative drawbacks.

Shri Ranga: Beautiful planning!

Shri Nanda: These are the things on the negative side. There was also, I must say, a wrong assumption that because we had made some financial provisions in the Plan and made some arrangements in that regard, therefore, the things would be proceeding according to a certain schedule. But there has to be a long preparatory stage preceding the actual start of a project which had not been sufficiently visualised and provided for. That has been the experience in the last two years, as it has emerged.

Shri Ranga: During the last sixteen years.

Shri Nanda: Now, there is the other side. You must consider that these are new things, these are more complex things, and the complexity of the job goes on increasing to a bigger and bigger size. Another fact which stares us in the face is that while our ambitions may be very high, the people who have to do these things, the people of a certain level of experience, were not enough, that is, people with the adequate technical experience were not enough. Therefore, there had to be some dilution. Therefore, in quantitative as well as qualitative terms, the tasks had been becoming more and more difficult during this period, and sufficient time allowance was not made. To some extent, the question of lack of administrative co-ordination also may have been a factor in this.

Several measures have been taken to remedy the situation. The answer now is that this thing was realised and understood, and for some time past, measures have been taken or are being taken. Planning cells and designing and construction departments for major industries have been set up. Some other general measures also have been taken. For example, the exemption limit under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act has been increased from Rs. 10 lakhs to Rs. 25 lakhs. Price control

on about sixteen commodities has been removed. The procedures for grant of licences have been revised, and various other measures also have been taken.

Shri Ranga: My hon. friend has been in charge of the Planning Commission all these years!

Shri Nanda: My hon. friend has been in charge of varying charges.

Shri Ranga: I am in charge of Opposition. I have been pointing out these defects all these years, but my hon. friend has not benefited by the criticisms.

Shri Nanda: Let me proceed.

We were encountering at some time some serious difficulties regarding transport and power. This was the talk of the day. It loomed large everywhere. Now, the position has improved a great deal, and we are now sure that in respect of power, which is a very important governing factor regarding development of industry and also in other directions, we are going to achieve the targets. The target of installed capacity was 7 million kw. It is certain that we shall achieve that. The experience of the first two years, I may reiterate—I have had some fairly close touch with those developments—was due to the fact that in the middle of the Second Plan, we came up against this situation that power projects had to be shoved to the background. We could not take them up. So that at the start of the Third Plan, we had not enough power and other things. These are all the consequences of some of the shortfalls in the Second Plan which came above the surface in the early years of the Third Plan. This has been the position. But now timely steps have been taken to mitigate the shortage of power and, therefore, I am quite sure that at the end of the Third Plan, the position regarding power is going to be fairly satisfactory.

Regarding transport also, we are all familiar with the fact that coal could not be moved. Now that is not the position. Traffic movement, in coal and in other respects, is satisfactory, and it is now visualised that the freight moving capacity is going to be more than the target by about 6 per cent at the end of.....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: But Shri Neogy has resigned.

Shri Nath Pai: That is misleading; that is because you did not fulfil your targets in steel and other things.

Shri Nanda: I have said all that. But it is more than the target. It is going to be more than the target visualised in the Third Plan. Therefore, the question of shortfall does not come in here.

Shri Nath Pai: Wish you good luck!

Shri Nanda: As regards exports, there has been an increase of about 8 per cent. But when I mention exports, I must request hon. Members to keep in mind this fact that while in order to earn foreign exchange we have to export, if production is not adequate, the very fact of exporting leads to further strains and stresses and has an influence and bearing on rise in prices.

Regarding the question of prices, I might say what we do about it. Naturally, the first thing is that we must try to do everything possible to increase production. In the matter of agriculture, a number of steps have been taken and are being taken. In regard to the production programme, now a selective approach has been adopted. Areas have been selected where there will be concentration of effort at a few points so that we take the fullest advantage of the growth potential in certain areas. Then there are certain organisational changes. The whole of the Community Development work is now being geared to this programme. Village level workers

[Shri Nanda]
have been placed under the direct control of agricultural extension officers, agricultural production commissions have been appointed to co-ordinate and execute programmes in each State and fullest arrangements are being made now for essential supplies, fertilisers etc.

This must have its effect only over a period. Immediately certain things are being done. One is fair price shops. An hon. Member asked what we are doing about it. The answer is that Government is going to find a solution. Certainly this is a major point today, in the present circumstances, in the solution of this difficulty. The number of fair price shops has been increased; so also the issue of wheat and distribution of rice.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): When stocks are increased, prices also go up.

Shri Nanda: In spite of that, arrangements are being made for further import of these commodities which we need.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): If the stocks are adequate and if the number of fair price shops is also increased what has Government to say with regard to continued rise in prices? What is your view about it?

Shri Nanda: There is another factor also. I am going to refer to that. Things which are open to Government to do are being done. Yet the situation, as the hon. Member says, is like this, partly because it is not possible to make up fully for a big drop in production in a short period. Particularly it relates to rice, and when there is some apprehension about another shortfall, another dwindling of the production in another season, may be psychological influences start operating.

Then again, the price question is not a simple question. It cannot be viewed in isolation from all the vari-

ous other factors of which I have already made mention. It reflects both the achievements of the economy and its disorders as also the pressures of development. They have a great deal to do with it, when we are developing, and more money, more purchasing power is being introduced into the economy, these pressures develop; that is, when so many projects of long gestation are there, that pressure cannot be avoided, and it has to be met in other ways. Whatever we have done, it is clear, as the hon. Member just now pointed out, has not sufficed. All these things which I mentioned, which have been done, have not sufficed, and therefore something more needs to be done.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : माननीय मंत्री और विभागों में किस तरह से वृद्धि करेंगे और उन के उत्पादन को कैसे बढ़ाया जाये, वह मैं नहीं पूछता । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ सके, इस के लिए सरकार कृषक को क्या सहायता देती है । यह बात वह किन्हीं आंकड़ों के आधार पर कह रहे हैं या यह स्वयं उन का विचार है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय मंत्री जी जो कुछ कह रहे हैं, क्या स्वामी जी ने वह समझ लिया है ?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे समझने से इस का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है । मैं तो यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार कृषक को किस तरह से सहायता पहुंचाती है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर स्वामी जी समझ नहीं रहे हैं, तो उन्होंने यह सवाल कैसे किया ?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप इस में क्यों जा रहे हैं ? मैं तो अपने प्रश्न का उत्तर चाहता हूँ । जब मौसम अनुकूल होता है और उत्पादन अच्छा होता है, तो सरकार की ओर से कहा जाता है कि हम ने यह कर दिया । किन्तु जब मौसम खराब होता है, तो

वह कहती है कि मौसम के कारण उत्पादन कम हुआ है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार किसान को सीधे क्या सहायता दे रही है, जिस से वह ज्यादा अन्न पैदा कर सके। क्या माननीय मंत्री जी आंकड़ों के आधार पर यह बात कह रहे हैं ?

Shri Nanda: Swamiji may have partially followed what I said. If he had followed also the other part which I stated before the House, he would know that the answer has been furnished.

I was on this point that in spite of all that we have done, we are still faced with rising prices, it is true, but we have to reckon with the fact that there is hoarding, there is profiteering, there is blackmarketing, it is going on.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: And you cannot stop it.

Shri Nanda: We can all sit together and stop it. I think we can stop it. In this context, it is really a very acute problem, and we must try to face it. An increase of two rupees in dearness allowance is not enough. It should be Rs. 25. On the other hand, those who got the two rupees come and complain that overnight the cost of living has increased, and the two rupees that they got has disappeared, has been neutralised. That is it. Therefore, how is it certain that if we give Rs. 25, that will also not be neutralised? Therefore, that is not the line of solution, going on giving more money, and then having it neutralised by a further rise in prices. This inflationary spiral goes on..

Therefore, it has to be something else.

Shri Ranga: Stop inflation.

Shri Nanda: Therefore, I am dealing with this thing, that we are eternally confronted with the problem of controls or no controls. Shri Ranga will say no control because of corruption, inconvenience and all that.

He and his friends go so far as to say: do not have co-operatives even, because the private shops will be affected.

Shri Ranga: Who said: do not have co-operative stores or that co-operative marketing should not be there. Only, they should not be of the kind of co-operative marketing that you have had the other day under the leadership of your own Brahm Prakash.

Shri Nanda: Somebody says: the normal channels of trade should not be disturbed. That is the kind of *swatantrata* which they want to give to the economy. Therefore, we have to be clear that in a situation of this kind there is to be readiness to face the situation... (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Just as spiralling rise in prices, interruptions are also spiralling up. Hon. Members have had their opportunities and Government spokesman must be heard now.

Shri Ranga: But I have to correct him when he says something wrong.

Shri Nanda: It is the common problem of the nation. The hard realities of the situation are not questioned. It is not a question of this year alone. Let us look ahead for the next five years or even more. Without regulatory mechanisms and without some kind of control, it will not be possible. We have been giving freedom to trade so far in order just to come up to our expectations in the matter of their business behaviour. Following the Emergency, when the Emergency started they said: do not do anything; we shall do our part and therefore you need not intervene with any kind of coercive devices. The main thing that comes out of the situation is this. They have let us down; something has to be done about it. Then there is this question of growers' price on the one side and the consumer's on the other side. I would be satisfied if all this rise in price goes to the grower, even if we

[Shri Nanda]

had to suffer but if somebody else profits during the lean period, if the middlemen gets it, who have not worked hard and did nothing at all, then we will have to curb it.... (*Interruptions*). They should heed the warning; consistently this policy has to be pursued.... (*Interruptions*). Some of these things have been done during the last few months or during the last year or so; action was taken at the level of the wholesalers, when we asked them to register themselves and give their returns and some kind of penalties were prescribed for defaulters. But in fact it has not been done properly, I must admit. This has to be done better in the States and everywhere and this looks like an inevitable development in our economy now if we have to develop as well as keep prices in some kind of order. This is about prices.

Then, about the question of socialism and equality, etc. hon. Members will accept that the Constitution has provided in its Directives about the reduction of inequalities. That is the cardinal principle of our policy. Naturally, it will be asked: what is being done about it? Hon. Member Mr. Ranga asks: what is the difference between democratic socialism and people's democracies?.... (*Interruptions*). That means he does not want socialism of any kind, even democratic socialism. But what does he want? He wants concentration; he wants the rich to grow richer; that is the kind of thing. And the people of this country are not going to stand it; they will not tolerate it. Therefore, certain things have already been done; but we have not done enough. So, in the country there is now a feeling which has grown, that something more has to be done. That is, the whole pattern of private ownership—something has to be done about that. We have introduced certain land reforms, ceiling, etc. I would certainly agree with the hon. Member if he does not

object to those reforms. I agree with him there. But he insists that we should do something more for the people with big incomes and big properties, and so he is in the other direction.

The whole pattern of consumption and ownership has to be now taken care of because the basic conflicts are very clear. When we want to develop consumption has to be restricted; also production has to be increased, and incentives have to be provided. Therefore, if we do not want production to be discouraged, some incentives have to be given. But I think it is now very abundantly clear that the incentives to the people in the shape of the satisfaction that they are going to get a regime which is more egalitarian, where there is more equal opportunity, are now becoming more inescapable. Something more has to be done about it.

Shri Ranga: Question.

Shri Nanda: The hon. Members on the other side particularly are very much averse to the word 'planning', though recently they are getting acclimatized to that and possibly their tolerance for that word has increased. I can tell the hon. Members that whatever word they may use, the processes which we call planning have to be gone through; without those processes it will be difficult. It may be that we are dissatisfied with the achievement during this period. We are; I am. But that would not have been possible without this kind of planning. We would have been very much worse off otherwise. Let it be very clear. What was it before Independence? It was an increase of population of 1.25 per cent and increase of production of one per cent. That was the position. It is only because of planning that we could get on to a better position. During this decade, the rate of increase in population, however, has also stepped up. We had a four per cent increase. When

we look at the achievements, let us compare them with where we started. What was the starting point? What were the difficulties, obstacles and handicaps? Also, in the course of this period, if we had only looked on to easy things such as light industries, consumer goods which can be purchased by the richer people—anything paid for—and therefore earning large profits, and if we had done that—maximising of profits—we would have shown a much better rate of national production. But we have concentrated on those things which will take a longer period now.

Here is my colleague who is dealing with industries which take eight to ten years to develop. We are pumping money; we are not getting any results. Therefore, we are showing something to our disadvantage, but actually it is not to our disadvantage. Major structural alterations in the industrial economy are being made. These are going to pay dividends later on. Having only low capital-output ratio industries over a short period may, for the time being, appear to be something which will be reflected in a higher rate of growth, but it will ultimately retard that growth. What we are doing is over the next decade is going to help us enormously. We have no hesitation about it. I do not think we have to be apologetic about what we have done. Of course, there have been shortfalls, certain difficulties in the face of increase in population which we could not plan adequately. I admit that the population increase has gone on. In the context of democracy, these things are being done in democratic conditions. We want to maintain our democracy. The hon. Members opposite do not think so, but they should realise that if we do not do these things, if we do not industrialise, if we do not have a public sector, and if we do not give some hope or promise of better things in the future, this democracy will break down. It is these things which

mean some restraint, but they are for the purpose of avoiding the total break-down of democracy by the sheer weight of the suffering of the people. Therefore, this is the democratic process of planning in which the minimum restrictions are really the saviours of democracy (*Interruption*). The hon. Member understands all these things. He has been sufficiently acquainted with economic matters.

17.00 hrs.

The type of planning which we have got, I think, is perfectly sound with regard to the allocations, priorities and basic policies. There is nothing wrong with that. But it is a question of implementation. On the question of implementation my own reading of the situation is that our planning has not been comprehensive enough. Its dimensions have to be enlarged. The main idea which I am putting forward is that our planning has to be more comprehensive, in the sense that it has not been able fully to utilise the full employment potential. Therefore, the question of miniaturisation of industries, rural industries or small-scale industries in the rural areas with the help of better techniques arises. That is going to be the direction in which we have to move. We have to see that everybody is employed and given some work. Therefore, for the consumer goods which we are lacking—we must go on with our basic and capital industries—we must go back to the idea that they have to be produced on a small-scale in rural areas based on such materials as are available.

Now I come to the question of administration. This question of administration has been raised frequently. I agree that something has to be done about it. The standards of efficiency have to be improved and the procedures have to be streamlined. This malady of delays is very obvious and I agree that there is need for the re-examination of the whole basis of administration because vast changes

[Shri Nanda]
are occurring in the functions of the administration both in size and in character. New kinds of economic activities are going on and the character of the activities has also changed with the result that the Government has to intervene at so many points with its administration. So the administration has to be attuned to all the new requirements in outlook and in capacity. Here is an economy meant not for the *status quo* but for a social change. I think this one factor requires a deeper transformation of the administration than has been thought of.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Are you appointing a Reforms Commission?

Shri Nanda: I may mention to hon. Members that, at any rate, a beginning is being made. A Department of Administrative Reforms is being set up in the Government. It will start functioning immediately, and it may be that later on there may be need for a Commission of Administrative Reforms. But we have to first pave the way for it, otherwise like many other reforms it may come to nothing.

Now I come to the question of corruption. I hope the hon. Member there would like to listen to me about that. The extent of corruption is being questioned. Some hon. Members have said that it is an epidemic, that it is a kind of *kaumi bimari* or something like that. I do not think we need waste any time trying to assess how much of it is there. The fact is that people believe that it is there. There may be thousands of persons in our service who are honest and efficient and yet it may be the experience of so many people that things may not move in Government unless a price is paid for it in the form of corruption because there are some corrupt officials. That fact is there. So many questions are asked about it both here and outside. Personally I am interested in this matter particularly because I have made some kind of a claim or assertion.

I would not like to give anything more about the Vigilance Commission about which so many questions have been asked. I will only clarify a little doubt that has been raised. As I said on so many occasions, this is an experimental measure. Since we are earnest about it, after the Vigilance Commission has started its work if something more has got to be done or its character has got to be changed, it will be done. The purpose or objective is before us. We have to tackle this problem effectively, and the Vigilance Commission is one part of it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is the Commissioner all right?

Shri Nanda: The results will show, I hope. We cannot afford to fail in this; at least I cannot.

Then, I am thinking of the people. I believe that the unsatisfactory results have been partly due to the fact that, whereas Government has been trying to do something in the matter by having so many investigations, arrests, prosecution, dismissal and so on and there is a feeling among the people that something should be done about it, there is lack of co-ordinated activity between the people's organisation and that part of the Government which is dealing with this problem. I think the key to the problem is there. I have taken one step of having an organisation in which the representatives of social, religious and other organisations will be represented.

An Hon. Member: Religious?

Shri Nanda: Religion also plays an important part in this country. They have been asked to come together and two or three functions are going to be discharged by them in order to create a better climate in the country. It will be a sort of unofficial grievance department. So, I think the machinery in the Government which is going to deal with these things and the unofficial organisation will come together and I think it will lead to far better results than hoped for.

**President discharging
the functions of the
President**

I had invited the representatives of business and industry some time back and I put it to them that if somebody pays a bribe which is of considerable magnitude, it must be a rich person who has done it and that hereafter it should stop and the liaison officers, contact people etc, the whole system should be abolished. A person who pays bribe is not less guilty than the person who receives it, particularly when large figures are involved. At the same time, I have also given an assurance that what they want to achieve through these practices, that they can achieve even without this. They can dispense with this system because we will make arrangements to see that any complaint of theirs, any grievance of theirs regarding delay etc, will be attended to or looked into.

Then there is the question of political corruption, corruption in higher places as it is called. I think some hon. Member, probably Shri Tyagi, referred to it in this House. I was thinking of some line of action in this matter. At a meeting of the Chief Ministers I informally placed before them some ideas and then, later on, they met again and what has been agreed to regarding this, since this is of such great interest to the hon. Members I would like to state it precisely. It says :

“A note on enquiries into complaints involving persons occupying high positions in Government circulated at an earlier meeting of Chief Ministers was circulated again and formed the basis of discussions. The following conclusions were reached:”

There were other conclusions which are interesting but possibly they are not so much relevant. For example, it says that various forms of corrupt practice, should be defined. If, for example, a member accepts some present from a business house it should be deemed a corrupt practice. The note says:

“There was unanimity regarding applying strict and exact standards in the matter of integrity in the case of Ministers both at the Centre and the States.”

Shri Ranga: Including Chief Ministers also?

Shri Nanda: There are about 10 to 12 lines to be read:

“If it appears that a complaint against a Minister in the Central Government calls for further enquiry the Union Home Minister should take it up and with the help of such information as he may be able to obtain through the sources available to him satisfy himself and the Prime Minister whether a *prima facie* case exists.”

“If it is found that there is a *prima facie* case, the Minister concerned will normally be asked to step down.”

Shr Nath Pai: That is not satisfactory. The Home Minister is of the same Party. That vitiates the whole thing.

Shri Nanda: In certain cases this itself will suffice.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This will defeat the very purpose.

Shri Nanda: “If the nature of the case calls for further action, it may be taken in accordance with the circumstances of the case to a suitable agency.”

Suitable agency means a commission of inquiry or something of that kind. There is a provision for that. Then, further:

“There would be cases in which it would be necessary to institute a regular inquiry in some form or the other. The Chief Minister of a State has the responsibility in respect of the Ministers of his:

*President discharging
the functions of the
President*

[Shri Nanda]

State corresponding to the responsibility of the Union Home Minister and the Prime Minister in respect of the Ministers of the Central Government. If the matter concerns the Chief Minister himself, or in any special case, the procedure applicable to the Central Ministers may be followed."

This is a step taken in a direction so that when things are arising here and there, there is now a *modus operandi* which is going to be adopted for this purpose.

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): What about the legislators including the Members of Parliament?

Shri Nanda: Now, I shall come to certain other matters. In spite of the fact that we had a full day's discussion about the communal troubles in East Pakistan and West Bengal, many Members spoke about the matter and it is natural. They cannot put it away from their minds—we cannot do that. Although I dealt with various matters at a fair length on that day, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity and stress one or two points. There is complete unanimity here that whatever provocation there may be, we shall in this country maintain complete communal harmony and peace; we will curb and put down strongly any sign of communal trouble, any eruption of the communal poison. We value our secular principles and traditions—this has its implications and this is very important. We cannot take any risk; therefore, we cannot allow those people who are exposing the community to such risks to have a free hand. And what are those elements? There are individuals, may be small groups, may be large groups, in both Hindus and Muslims. I know them from the reports that I am getting and the way they behave, what they talk, creates an inflammatory atmosphere. Therefore, we must see that those who have any

authority in one community or another are discouraged and, at any rate, the Government will have to do something about those things. We know who they are and, therefore, I say, this warning should be heeded. If he is a Muslim, he may be an agent provocateur, whatever it is, but he does harm and.....

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Wherever they may be.

Shri Nanda: I will come to the other thing which has been urged here on one side that enough was not being said about it: what the Muslims had undergone and on the other side, it was said, the Muslims took offensive, initiated and created that trouble. Both these things are wrong. In my own statement, I dealt at length with whatever the Muslim population was subjected to, what they had to undergo, their sufferings, arson, the lootings, they having been pushed out of their houses and all that. All that I described in my own statement. Therefore, it is not as if we are not quite conscious of their hardships. After all, what did we do in Calcutta and West Bengal except this, namely to see that they were saved from the consequences of the spread of communal hatred in that area?

Now, as regards the other thing, about Muslims having been the aggressors, in the course of the trouble in Calcutta, it did appear that in certain places the Muslims fought back and also in some places they had played an aggressive part. But, on the whole, so far as the beginning of it is concerned, it was not the Muslims. except that there may have been some Pakistani provocateurs at work; but the Muslims of the area did not do that. It arose because of the happenings in East Pakistan, the large-scale carnage there, and the stories which came from there affected the minds of the people.

Now, the other element which has to be taken into consideration is the press. The press on the whole has conducted itself admirably well. But I am hearing reports, and the Chief Minister of West Bengal has been telephoning to me and writing to me that recently some of the newspapers there are writing things which might provoke trouble, and it is not good. He is trying to persuade them. We must try and exercise persuasion as much as possible. After all, if some lurid stories are published there with headlines of that kind, who benefits? If some trouble arises as a result of that and at the cost of the community here, with all the things that follow in its wake, then what will happen? If any body keeps that in mind, then he would not indulge in such kind of writing.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: You can get them published in the foreign press, so that the world may know about it.

Shri Nanda: Now, I come to the question of the refugees from East Pakistan. A question has been asked whether we are doing for them all that is necessary. I shall not give any details about it now. I have already mentioned that the Chief Ministers who met me have offered land, and they have offered to see that a large number of families, in fact, as many as they can immediately arrange for, will be accommodated there.

So far as migration certificates and migration facilities are concerned, I think there is some kind of a wrong impression that there has been some obstruction. I would submit that we are trying to provide facilities as much as possible and we are also improving those facilities and strengthening the arrangements.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Have any efforts been made or are being made to make Pakistan behave?

Shri Nanda: I think that some

hon. Members of the House joined together and issued an appeal also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What do Government propose to do?

Shri Nanda: Government naturally will do all that can be done.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: There has been no reply to the question. What steps have been taken to see that Pakistan does not behave in the manner it did?

Shri Nanda: Whatever we may have done or we may not have done, no suggestion has come forward from anybody who has spoken in the House, which can be considered as worth entertaining no suggestion has come suggesting anything beyond what is being done. Here, I might say one thing, and that is that if we do our part properly, if not today, at least tomorrow, it is going to have effect, and it is going to work to our advantage.

Shri Tyagi: Is enough vigilance exercised by the Armed Forces? For, I have a hunch that Pakistan is soon going to attack us on our borders.

Shri Nanda: My hon. colleague the Defence Minister is sitting here and he will look after that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Prime Minister had referred to other methods. What are those other methods?

Shri Bade: Yesterday, an hon. Member had pointed out that for the last two or three days, migration certificates were not being issued. Is it a fact that Government are not giving migration certificates? He pointed this out yesterday and attacked Government for not issuing migration certificates.

Shri Nanda: Since this question has been raised, I shall give a little more precise information. From January 27th to February 13th, over 2800

[Shri Nanda]

migration certificates covering over 12,300 persons have been issued. Application forms and forms for the issue of migration certificates are available in adequate number in the office of our Deputy High Commissioner. More forms are being sent. The staff in the office has been adequately strengthened with four more officers for interviewing the migrants and a complement of typists. Since hon. Member wanted more information, I have given this. There are more details of it, and more will be done. Whatever more is necessary will be done, and we do realise our responsibilities.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee (Nabadwip): Will migration certificates be sent by post to people who want them?

Shri Nanda: The point is, post or no post, migration certificates or no migration certificates, people are crossing the border, and nobody is stopping them. Many more people have come without any kind of migration certificates.

Shri H. P. Chatterjee: Will you protect them from the obstruction that the Pakistan goondas put in their way when they are crossing the border to our side?

Shri Nanda: In view of the intervention of my hon. colleague, Shri Shastri, this morning, I need not touch on the question of Kashmir. He has given enough information about it. But one thing must be very obvious. That is about these questions which are raised about integration. Integration in the political sense is there. There will be no question about it, that same more integration has to be done. It is there complete. It is only in respect of the other special matters, of a certain relationship between the Centre and State, that there are certain differentiations which should very soon be abolished, because it appears now that the people of the State also want to go ahead in this manner.

There cannot be any big question about it.

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): One thing must be made clear. Charges have been levelled in this House that Government is doing nothing for the recovery of the idols stolen from a temple in Jammu. This was levelled by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

Shri Ranga: What about the release of Sheikh Abdullah?

Shri Nanda: The very best arrangements have been made for the recovery of the idols. If any further assistance is required by the State in this connection, certainly we will give them that for that purpose now.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Now that has been done.

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda (Cachar): What has been done to recover the abducted and kidnapped women of Hindu minority in East Pakistan?

Shri Nanda: Questions were raised about the emergency and it was said that the proclamation should be withdrawn....

Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda: My question has not been answered.

Shri Nanda: ... It may take some time to deal with this matter. But I can briefly say that it is a very wrong thing to urge. Hon. Members may tell the Government that it is not doing its part properly in relation to the emergency. That is one thing. But to say that there is no emergency and, therefore, the emergency proclamation should be lifted is a very wrong approach. The emergency is there much more today; the threat to the whole country is not less serious than it was ever before.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You are not conscious of it.

Shri Nanda: Let us become conscious of it. You, I, all of us, should become conscious of it. Suppose we withdraw the emergency. What hap-

pens . People will think there is no emergency, whereas the threat today is in a worse form.

Shri Nath Pai: No, no, that is not it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Government thinks there is no emergency.

Mr. Speaker: There have been too many interruptions.

Shri Nath Pai: This is a point on which there should not be any misunderstanding. Shri Nanda should be fair enough to accept that a willing Parliament and a willing country gave all the powers to Government under the emergency. The people are fully conscious of it. But the Government of India and the persons adorning the Treasury Benches are not conscious of it. They have made a mockery of the emergency.

Shri Rangar: You kindly release us, Sir, from the pledge that we gave to you, which is not being honoured by the Government.

Shri Nath Pai: What has the Government done? Has it done one-tenth of what it had to do?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You Sir, played such a vital role on that occasion. We all stood up, at your instance, and with acclamation we passed it.

Mr. Speaker: Now I would appeal to hon. Members at least to allow him to conclude.

Shri Nanda: I would not like very much more to tax the patience of hon. Members. There are other things also which I would like to refer to, but shall not do so now, considering the time I have already taken; also these other things can be dealt with in other ways.

One thing I would finally refer to. The hon. Member there said that we

have not been able to solve any problem during this period. Well, it may be so. Considering the conditions in which we started and the whole world situation, I ask which country has solved the problems with which it started in 1947? The solution of our problems is related to world questions, that is an obvious thing. Let not this nation underrate its achievements. It has got much to account for in the way of shortfalls and shortcomings, but it has achievements to its credit, let us not be little or make light of them.

One thing that I would like to urge finally is this. We have these problems, we have these enormous difficulties which we are facing. Therefore the call is on all of us to stand together, and have a unified approach towards the solution of our problems. Let us not create difficulties in the way of the nation. If there are some people who start an agitation to have a general strike in the country, we will have less production and higher prices. Who is going to be helped by that? Therefore these things should not be allowed.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Under the Constitution, agitation is a democratic right.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : यह तभी हो सकता है जब आप सारी पार्टियों को खत्म करें। कांग्रेस को पहले खत्म करें। तब मिली-जुली सरकार बनेगी और कोई एजिटेशन होगा ही नहीं।

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : स्वामी जी चाहते हैं कि सारा मुल्क स्वामी हो जाये।

अध्यक्ष सहोदय : हर एक आदमी स्वामी बनने की कोशिश करता है।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : सब के सब स्वामी बन जायें तो भी देश का कोई मुकसान नहीं। जनसंख्या बहुत बढ़ रही है।

*President discharging
the functions of the
President*

*The amendments were put and
negatived.*

Shri Nanda: I thank the House and yourself, and the Vice President for his Address.

Shri Tyagi: Before you put the question, may I ask the Defence Minister to let the House know what happened to that plane yesterday? That is very important. Has it been traced. He can also answer if enough vigilance is being exercised on the border.

Shri Nanda: May I seek your indulgence in regard to one thing? I have to reply to the debate in the Rajya Sabha tomorrow morning. You have given a direction that I should appear here after Question Hour tomorrow. I am in a dilemma. I am required to be present here and also there. I do not know how to solve it.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I think it may be taken up in the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The Home Minister expresses his inability to be here at 12 O' Clock, after the Question Hour, because he has to reply to the debate in the Rajya Sabha. He says that some time might be fixed in the afternoon.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I suggest 4 O' Clock?

Shri Nath Pai: In case you admit the motion, it will be difficult.

Mr. Speaker: That would be seen. It is said that at 4.30 the Minister will be with us.

Shri Tyagi: The Defence Minister wanted to make a statement. He is ready. It is about that missing plane.

Mr. Speaker: Certainly I will ask him. He will give the information, but let me first finish this.

Shri Nath Pai: Only one question we must ask, if you will permit.

Mr. Speaker: I shall first put Amendment Nos. 1 and 2 to the House.

Mr. Speaker: I shall put amendment No. 3 to the vote of the House.

The amendment was put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put amendment No. 6 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

“but regret—

- (a) the absence of a reference to specific measures to ameliorate the lot of agriculturists and provide incentives for increased agricultural production;
- (b) that the Address does not, in its reference to developments in Africa, contain a single word of sympathy or support to the people of Indian origin in Zanzibar and other countries of East Africa in regard to racial discrimination practised against them and to attacks on their lives, properties and employment;
- (c) that, in its reference to recent developments in Kashmir, there is no indication of an awareness of the breakdown of law and order, no announcement of the release of Sheikh Abdullah and other political detainees and no expression of a readiness to institute a judicial inquiry into the recent unfortunate happenings in Kashmir;
- (d) the absence of an announcement of the withdrawal of the Seventeenth Constitution Amendment Bill pending be-

fore Parliament and the additional threat to introduce yet another Bill to amend the the Constitution for the eighteenth time so as to further restrict the Fundamental Rights of the citizens;

(e) the failure to refer to any measures for the amelioration of the conditions of Scheduled Castes and Tribes and backward classes;

(f) the failure to take note of insecurity of life and person in Punjab and to suggest measures for restoring confidence;

(g) that the Address fails to mention the need to immediately revoke the declaration of the State of Emergency, to repeal

the Defence of India Act and to restore the fundamental rights of citizens suppressed under the provisions of that Act;

(h) that the picture of economic progress and achievement painted in the Address does not reflect the harsh realities of the country's economic plight and the distress and hardship caused to the people by the wrong policies of the Government; and

(i) that the Address fails to disclose any policy or strategy designed to recover our lost territory from Chinese communist occupation" (6)

The Lok Sabha divided: Ayes 3; Noes 110

AYES

Division No. 6]

Kapur Singh, Shri

Ranga, Shri

[17.36 hrs.

Swamy, Shri Sivamurthy

NOES

Akkamma Devi, Shrimati

Alagesan, Shri

Alva, Shri A. S.

Alva, Shri Joachim

Aney, Dr. M. S.

Asad, Shri Bhagwat

Balkrishnan, Shri

Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka

Barman, Shri P. C.

Barupal, Shri P. L.

Basappa, Shri

Basumatari, Shri

Bhagat, Shri B. R.

Bhagavati, Shri

Brij Raj Singh, Shri

Chanda, S. Imati Jyotsna

Chandrabhan Singh, Shri

Chandrasekhar, Shrimati

Chaudhuri, Shri D. S.

Chavan, Shri D. R.

Chavan, Shri Y. B.

Chuni Lal, Shri

Das, Shri B. K.

Dasappa, Shri

Deo Bhanj, Shri P. G.

Dey, Shri S. K.

Dighe, Shri

Dinesh Singh, Shri

Dubey, Shri R. G.

Ganapati Ram, Shri

Ghosh, Shri N. R.

Gupta, Shri Badshah

Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan

Hajarnavis, Shri

Himatsingka, Shri

Jadhav, Shri Julshidas

Jena, Shri

Jyotishi, Shri J. P.

Khadilkar, Shri

Khan, Shri Mehr Chand

Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.

Lakhan Das, Shri

Lalit Sen, Shri

Laskar, Shri N. K.

Malaichami, Shri

Manan, Shri

Maniy angadan, Shri

Masuriya Din, Shri

Mehdi, Shri S. A.

Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari

Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali

Mishra, Shri Babhuti

Mishra Shri Bidudhendra

Misra, Shri Shyam Dhar

Mohanty, Shri G.

More, Shri K. L.

More, Shri S. S.

Mukherjee, Shrimati Sharda

Murthy, Shri B. S.

Muthiah, Shri

Naidu, Shri V. G.

Nanda, Shri

Narayan, Shri P. S.

Nayar, Dr. Sushila

Niranjan Lal, Shri

Paliwal, Shri

Pandey, Shri R. S.

Panna Lal, Shri

Pant, Shri K. C.

Paramasivan, Shri

Parashar, Shri

Patil, Shri S. B.

Prabhakar, Shri Naval

Pratap Singh, Shri

NOES—countd.

Raghunath Singh, Shri
Raghuramaiah, Shri
Raj Bahadur, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
Rane, Shri
Ranga Rao, Shri
Rao, Shri; Jaganatha
Rao, Shri Krishnamoorthy
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala
Sadhu Ram, Shri
Samanta, Shri S. C.

Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Sharma, Shri A. P.
Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Sheo Narsin, Shri
Shinde, Shri
Siddananiappa, Shri
Singha, Shri G. K.
Subbaraman, Shri C.
Subramaniam, Shri C.
Subramanyam, Shri T.
Sumat Prasad, Shri
Swaran Singh, Shri
Thimmaiah, Shri

Thomas, Shri A. M.
Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Tyagi, Shri
Uikey, Shri
Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
Vaishya, Shri M.B.
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Verma, Shri K. K.
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Wadiwa, Shri

The motion was negatived.

*Amendment Nos. 7, 8 and 9 were then
put and negatived.*

Mr. Speaker: We then come to
amendment No. 10.

The question is:

That at the end of the motion, the
following to be added, namely:—

“but regret—

- (a) that (i) the assurance given to the Hindus of East Pakistan at the time of partition that the Government of India will not remain indifferent to the protection of their life, property and dignity has not been reiterated; (ii) no mention has been made of the steps that are essential to force Pakistan Government to do justice to the minorities in that country; (iii) the decision to ensure the safe transit of Hindus from East Pakistan and their rehabilitation in India has not been expressed; and (iv) there is no mention of the fact that Government propose to raise this issue before the United Nations or the International Court of Justice in order to mobilise world opinion against the inhuman atrocities perpetrated on the Hindus in East Pakistan;
- (b) that the determination to liberate one-third of the Pak occupied Kashmir has not been reiterated;
- (c) that (i) a declaration has not been made for imposing the

President's Rule in Kashmir by accepting the demand to this effect of the people of Jammu and Kashmir for intervention by the Central Government after the Hazratbal incident; and (ii) nothing has been said about the appointment of a special Parliamentary Committee to probe into the expenditure of huge amounts given in the form of grants and loans by the Centre to Jammu and Kashmir State;

- (d) that (i) no declaration has been made by the Government of India to free itself from the obligations of the Colombo proposals even after their rejection in toto by China; and (ii) no declaration has been made regarding the decision not to carry on negotiations so long China does not withdraw its armies from Ladakh and also regarding sending Indian troops upto Macmahon line;
- (e) that (i) there is no mention of wide-spread damage caused to the rabi crops due to recent cold wave; it also does not mention of the steps to be taken to offer relief to the peasants; (ii) no mention has been made of the severe economic crisis caused due to the continued rise in prices and neither any announcement has been made about the measu-

res for affording relief to the people of all categories in the society affected by high prices;

(f) that no indication has been made to end the state of emergency;

(g) that no mention has been made of the scheme to adopt stringent measures to check the activities of fifth columnists in the country;

(h) that no announcement has been made accepting the

clear verdict given by the people of Goa for its merger with Maharashtra State during the recent general elections in that territory; and

(i) that no announcement has been made regarding the setting up of a Committee of Experts for determining the cost of living index through scientific method." (10).

The Lok Sabha divided: Ayes 6; Noes 108.

Division No. 7]

AYES

[17.39 hrs.

Bade, Shri
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati

Jena, Shri
Rameshwaranand, Shri

Trivedi, Shri U.M.
Utiya, Shri

NOES

Akkamma Devi, Shrimati
Alegesan, Shri
Alva, Shri A. S.
Alva, Shri Joachim
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Balakrishnan, Shri
Barkataki, Shrimati Renuka
Barman, Shri P.C.
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Basumatari, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagavati, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
Chandrabhan Singh, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
Chaudhuri, Shri D. S.
Chavan, Shri D. R.
Chavan, Shri Y. B.
Chuni Lal, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Deo Bhanj, Shri P. G.
Dey, Shri S. K.
Dighe, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dubey, Shri R. G.
Ganapati Ram, Shri
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri N. R.
Gupta, Shri Badshah
Gupta, Shri Shiv Charan
Hajarnavis, Shri
Himatsingka, Shri
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
Jyotshi, Shri J. P.

Khadilkar, Shri
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Lakhan Das, Shri
Lalit Sen, Shri
Laskar, Shri N. R.
Malaichami, Shri
Manaen, Shri
Maniyangadan, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri

Mehdi, Shri S. A.
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri Bibudhendra
Misra, Shri Shyam Dhar
Mohanty, Shri G.
More, Shri K. L.
More, Shri S. S.
Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Muthiah, Shri
Naidu, Shri V. G.
Nanda, Shri
Naskar, Shri P. S.
Nayar, Dr. Sushila
Niranjan Lal, Shri
Paliwal, Shri
Pandey, Shri R. S.
Panna Lal, Shri
Pant, Shri K. C.
Paramasivan, Shri
Parashar, Shri
Patil, Shri M. B.
Prabhakar, Shri Naval

Pratap Singh, Shri
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Raghuramaiah, Shri
Raj Bahadur, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramaswamy, Shri S.V.
Rane, Shri
Ranga Rao, Shri
Rao, Shri Jaganatha
Rao, Shri Krishnamoorthy
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala
Sadhu Ram, Shri
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Sharma, Shri A. P.
Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Sheo Narain, Shri
Shinde, Shri
Singha, Shri G. K.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Subbaraman, Shri C.
Subramaniam, Shri C.
Subramanyam, Shri T
Sumat Prasad, Shri
Swaran Singh, Shri
Thirumalaiah, Shri
Thomas, Shri A. M.
Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Tyagi, Shri
Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
Vaishya, Shri M. B.
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Verma, Shri K. K.
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Wadiwa, Shri

The amendment was negatived.

Shri Onkar Lal Berwa rose—(Inter-
ruption)

Shri Tyagi: Last time, your ruling was that no correction should be effected.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; unless it affects the results:

*Amendment No. 11 was then put and
पाठ्यपठ*

Mr. Speaker: I now take up the Motion of Thanks.

The question is:

"That an Address, be presented to the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President in the following terms:—

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the Vice-President discharging the functions of the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 10th February, 1964."

The motion was adopted.

17.39 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: MISSING IAF
AIRCRAFT

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): Mr. Speaker Sir, all the efforts to locate the missing plane have not succeeded. Parties both in the air and from the ground are making efforts since yesterday, but unfortunately, they have not yet been successful. Fear was expressed whether possibly by mistake it strayed in the

Pakistan area, and either crashed or landed there. They are merely doubts and fears. But we have asked our High Commissioner there to make enquiries there also.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): May I make one suggestion? Whenever news of the death of members of the defence forces is announced in this House, I might rather suggest something out of the way—since we owe it all to them because they make the most supreme sacrifice for the country—(Interruption).

I am mentioning this today so that . . . (Interruptions).

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I want to know whether in the usual course of diplomatic enquiries any effort has been made by our Defence Ministry or the External Affairs Ministry to know from the Pakistan Government whether they have had any information at all as to the fate of the plane?

Mr. Speaker: He said that we have instructed our High Commissioner to contact the Government of Pakistan and find that out.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Yesterday, Sir, we got a wrong impression from the statement of the hon. Minister. He said that "their next of kin have been informed". Usually the next of kin are informed when the worst happens.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: They were informed about the missing of the plane.

17.42 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, February 20, 1964; Phalguna 1, 1885 (Saka).