

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In addition to the amendments moved yesterday, amendment Nos. 59 and 60 are also to be moved.

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsanā West): I beg to move :

(1) That at end of the motion, the following be added :—

“but regret to note the want of appreciation towards the remarkable performance of the private sector in the First Five Year Plan and under-estimation of its potential in the Second Plan as is evident from the lower allocations made to it in the Second Plan.”

(2) That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

“but regret to note the failure to realise the gravity of the transport situation in the country, which has impeded the pace of economic development.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments moved :

(1) That at the end of the motion, the following be added :

“but regret to note the want of appreciation towards the remarkable performance of the private sector in the First Five Year Plan and under-estimation of its potential in the Second Plan as is evident from the lower allocations made to it in the Second Plan.”

(2) That at the end of the motion, the following be added :—

“but regret to note the failure to realise the gravity of the transport situation in the country, which has impeded the pace of economic development.”

Shri V. G. Deshpande was on his legs yesterday. He may continue.

श्री जी० जी० बेशपांडे (गुना) : कल मैं यह कह रहा था कि भाषावार प्रान्त रचना का जो परिणाम देश में हुआ उस को कांग्रेस सरकार ने देखा। कल बम्बई के मुख्य मंत्री श्री मुरारजी देसाई ने कहा कि बम्बई में केवल दंगे ही नहीं हो रहे थे बल्कि वहाँ की सरकार को उखाड़ने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा था। इस प्रकार के परिणाम देखने के पश्चात् भी पता नहीं सरकार क्या

नीति निर्धारित करेगी। जो चीज कल बम्बई में हो रही थी वही आज मद्रास राज्य में हो रही है और मदुराई, कोयमबदूर और तंजौर में टियर-नीस चलाई जा रही है, बसों पर पत्थर फेंके जा रहे हैं। मालूम होता है कि वहाँ भी सरकार को उखाड़ देने की कोशिश हो रही है।

जब कांग्रेस सरकार ने देखा कि भाषावार प्रान्त बनाने का परिणाम भयंकर हो रहा है तो उस ने द्विभाषी, त्रिभाषी और चार भाषा वाले प्रान्त बनाने का प्रयोग शुरू कर दिया। बंगाल और बिहार का मर्जर (विलय) इसी प्रकार का प्रयोग है। इस प्रयोग के क्या परिणाम होंगे पता नहीं। आप इस विषय की एक साल तक चर्चा चलाते रहे और अब आप जनता के सामने आते हैं और कहते हैं कि ये दो प्रान्त एक हो गये। हम समझते थे कि राष्ट्र एक हो रहा है। एक राष्ट्रियता की भावना जनता में पैदा हो रही है। अब डा० विधान चन्द्र राय खड़े होते हैं और कहते हैं कि मुख्य मंत्री एक वर्ष बंगाल का होगा और एक वर्ष बिहार का होगा। दोनों प्रदेशों के लिये रीजन काउंसिल्स (प्रादेशिक परिषदें) होंगी। सविनों में भी दोनों क्षेत्रों का अनुपात भिन्न भिन्न होगा। यह कौन सी राष्ट्रियता है। यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। मुझे तो ऐसा मालूम होता है कि यह तो दो पहलवानों की कुश्ती कराना है और यह देखना है कि बंगाल मजबूत है या बिहार मजबूत है। यह रीजनल काउंसिल का नया स्टंट बना कर यह किया जा रहा है कि जो एक प्रान्त हो सकता था वह भी दो प्रान्तों की शक्ल में रहेगा।

अब तक तो हम बंगाल और बिहार को एक करने की बात सोचते थे पर अब हमने समाचार पत्रों में पढ़ा है कि आन्ध्र और तेलंगाना को मिलाकर एक द्विभाषी राज्य बनाया जाने का विचार किया जा रहा है। आन्ध्र की भाषा तो तेलगू होगी पर तेलंगाना की क्या भाषा होगी। आज के पत्रों से मालम होता है कि तेलंगाना की भाषा उर्दू होगी और उस क्षेत्र का शासन और शिक्षा का कार्य उर्दू भाषा में किया जावेगा। और इस संयुक्त राज्य का नाम विशाल आन्ध्र नहीं होगा बल्कि इस का नाम हैदराबाद होगा। जो हम को डर। वही हो रहा है। हम चाहते थे कि हिन्दुस्तान के नक्शे से हैदराबाद के मुस्लिम राज्य का नाम मिट जाय लेकिन वह नहीं हो रहा है। इस राज्य में तेलंगाना की भाषा उर्दू होगी।

इसी प्रकार पंजाब के लिये भी रीजनल काउंसिल होगी। मालूम होता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश का गढ़ भी टूटने वाला है और वहाँ की प्रादेशिक भाषा उर्दू को भी माना जायेगा। शायद उत्तर प्रदेश में भी एक रीजनल काउंसिल बनेगी। इस प्रकार का षडयन्त्र देश में हो रहा है। और एकता के नाम पर इस देश में दुहाई और झगड़े पैदा करने का षडयन्त्र रचा जा रहा है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि किस प्रकार पूर्व प्रदेश, आसाम, बिहार, बंगाल और उड़ीसा इन चारों को मिला कर जिनकी कि भ्रलग भ्रलग भाषायें हैं, कैसे एक प्रान्त बना सकते हैं। और उसको एक प्रांत कहते हैं। इस तरह से तो मैं कहूंगा कि आप सारे देश के प्रान्तों को मिला कर एक मल्टी लिगुएल स्टेट (बहुभाषी राज्य) बना सकते हैं और एक मजबूत केन्द्र की स्थापना कर सकते हैं। मैं इस तर्क को नहीं मानता कि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना करने से देश की एकता भंग हो जायेगी और हम कमजोर पड़ जायेंगे। आज हम देख रहे हैं कि आप राज्यों के विलय की बातें अपने स्तर पर कर रहे हैं और सुनने में आ रहा है कि आप बिहार और बंगाल को मिला कर एक प्रान्त बनाने जा रहे हैं और इसी तरह और अन्य राज्यों के भी आपस में परस्पर विलय की वार्ता चल रही है लेकिन ऐसा करते वक्त आप वहाँ की सम्बन्धित जनता से नहीं पूछते हैं और जब आप की योजनाओं के विरुद्ध जनता आवाज़ उठाती है और आन्दोलन करती है तब आप जनता को दोष देते हुए कहते हैं कि जनता प्रजातान्त्रिक ढंग पर नहीं चल रही है लेकिन मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप जनतन्त्रवादी तरीके से यह सब काम कर रहे हैं? आप ने मध्य प्रदेश और मध्यभारत को एक कर दिया, मध्यप्रदेश पहले बाईलिगुएल स्टेट (द्विभाषी राज्य) थी, उस के स्थान पर आप ने बड़ा मध्य प्रदेश बना दिया। मध्यप्रदेश की बाईलिगुएल स्टेट में मराठी और हिन्दी के प्रदेश सम्मिलित थे, उस को तोड़ कर फिर से बनाना शुरू किया है और जैसे कि उर्दू में एक कहावत है कि पायजामा फाड़ कर फिर से सीना शुरू किया, वह बात यहाँ पर लागू होती है। जो पहले बाइलिगुएल स्टेट थी उस को युनिलिगुएल (एक भाषी) बनाया। और ऐसा करते वक्त आप ने जनता की राय नहीं ली कि वह क्या चाहती है। मेरा तो यह आक्षेप है कि आप इस तरह की बड़ी तबदीलियाँ करते वक्त जनता की राय नहीं लेते हैं और अगर जनता उस के खिलाफ

अपनी नाराज़गी और असंतोष प्रकट करती है तो आप उलटे जनता को उसके लिये दोषी ठहराते हैं। मैं कहूंगा कि यह जो आप नया महाराष्ट्र बना रहे हैं, इस में हमारा पुराना मध्यप्रदेश, मराठी और हिन्दी भाषा-भाषी क्षेत्रों को मिला कर एक बाइलिगुएल स्टेट बना देंगे और फिर बम्बई उस का कैपिटल (राजधानी) हो और नागपुर दूसरी राजधानी हो, इस प्रकार की योजनायें आ सकती हैं। मेरा आप से कहना यह है कि आप बगैर जनता का मत जाने और उस की राय की कद्र किये इस तरह की विलय की योजनायें सामने न लाये। इस के अतिरिक्त यदि आप ऐसा समझते हों कि भाषावार प्रान्तों की रचना करने का प्रयोग आज असफल रहा है तो आप उस की स्पष्ट घोषणा करिये। सरकार को इस प्रकार की घोषणा करने का पूर्ण अधिकार है और ऐसी घोषणा करने के पश्चात ही आप यह अपनी नये प्रान्तों के विलय की योजनायें जनता की स्वीकृति के लिये रखें। सारे राज्यों के विधान मंडलों को केन्द्रीय सरकार अपनी इस घोषणा से सूचित करे और उस के बाद इस दिशा में कदम उठाये। मैं आचार्य कृपलानी जी के इस सुझाव से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि आज की अवस्था में भारत सरकार को दस साल तक के लिये राज्य पुनर्गठन सम्बन्धी योजनाओं को क्रियान्वित नहीं करना चाहिये। किस को पता है कि दस साल बाद जब आप पुनः प्रान्तों की रचना का काम आरम्भ करेंगे तब झगड़े और जनता के आन्दोलन नहीं होंगे। कौन कह सकता है कि उस वक्त मद्रास, बम्बई और कलकत्ते में आज की भाँति झगड़े फसाद नहीं होंगे। इस तरह के झगड़े जगह जगह पर उस वक्त भी हो सकते हैं। यहाँ पर मैं यह जरूर कहूंगा कि फरवरी तो खत्म हो रहा है, मार्च के शुरू हफ्ते तक सरकार द्वारा इस बात की स्पष्ट रूप से घोषणा होनी चाहिये कि हमारा भाषावार प्रान्तों की पुनर्रचना का प्रयोग असफल रहा है, अगर सरकार के दिल में ऐसा भाव है तो उस को खुले दिल से सब के सामने घोषित करें कि जिस तस्व पर हम भाषावार प्रान्तों की पुनर्रचना करना चाहते थे वह असफल हुआ है, और इन नये तस्वों के आधार पर हम इस पुनर्रचना के काम को करना चाहते हैं। ऐसा आप पहले घोषित कीजिये और ऐसी घोषणा करने के बाद देश के तमाम पक्षों की एक भ्राल पार्टीज़ कान्फ्रेंस (सर्वदलीय सम्मेलन) आप बुलाइये और जिन तस्वों के आधार पर अब आप प्रान्तों का पुनर्गठन

[श्री वी० जी० देशपांडे]

करना चाहते हैं उन की चर्चा कीजिये और वहां पर लोगों को समझाइये कि अरे भाई, दो भाषा-भाषी प्रदेशों को मिलाकर एक प्रान्त बनाने से ही सच्ची राष्ट्रीयता और एकता का निर्माण होगा और इस तत्त्व के आधार पर ही हम को अपने प्रान्तों की पुनर्रचना करनी चाहिये और इस तत्त्व को वहां पर निर्धारित करने के पश्चात् आप एक नया आयोग इस काम के वास्ते बनाइये जो यह तय करे कि किस किस प्रान्त को मिला कर एक प्रान्त बनाया जा सकता है। वैसे मुझे तो दिल में डर मालूम हो रहा है कि इस से देश मजबूत होने के बजाय इस के टुकड़े-टुकड़े न हो जाय, क्योंकि हम तो चाहते थे कि बड़े-बड़े प्रान्त बनें लेकिन कल ही एक सज्जन महोदय ने कहा कि इन रीजनल कांसिलों को सेंटर की पावर (केन्द्र की शक्ति) दी जाय, यानी पहले तो प्रान्त बने, उस के बाद रीजनल कांसिल की एक सब फेडरेशन बने और हिन्दुस्तान एक बड़ी फेडरेशन बन जाय, इस प्रकार के भी बुरे नतीजे इन चीजों के निकल सकते हैं अगर हम ने अच्छी तरह से सोचविचार कर काम नहीं किया। इस काम के लिये आप एक दूसरा कमिशन बनाइये और कमिशन बनाने के पश्चात् आप एक नया बिल ले आइये और इस प्रकार सोच-समझ कर इस काम को शुरू करें नहीं तो बम्बई में जो झगड़ा-फसाद और गोली से आदमी मारे गये और एक अप्रिय दृश्य उपस्थित हुआ उस की पुनरावृत्ति और जगह भी हो सकती है। बम्बई में हमने गलती की और हमने देखा कि मुरारजी देसाई की पुलिस द्वारा करीब ७०-८० आदमियों को गोली से जान से मार डाला गया और मैं यह स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो कुछ हुआ वह शासक दल की गलती के कारण हुआ। एक पेपर ने लिखा है कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की आवाज के पीछे बम्बई में खूब गुंडागर्दी हुई और विरोधी पक्षों पर वहां के उपद्रवों की जिम्मेदारी डाली जाती है। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप का यह चार्ज (आरोप) बिल्कुल गलत है और बम्बई में जो कुछ हुआ उस की पूरी तरह जांच पड़ताल करने के लिए आप एक स्वतन्त्र और निष्पक्ष समिति की स्थापना कीजिये जो सारे तथ्यों की जांच कर के अपनी रिपोर्ट दे। आप इस तरह की निष्पक्ष जांच कराने के हमारे प्रस्ताव को तो मानते नहीं, और उल्टे हमारे लोगों पर गुंडागर्दी करने का आरोप लगाते हैं। इस अवसर पर मुझे इस में नहीं जाना है कि गुंडागर्दी या कार्रवाई किस ने की, और

किस ने नहीं की, कांग्रेस वालों ने की या दूसरों ने की। मुझे पता नहीं है लेकिन यह बात साफ़ जाहिर हो गई है कि कांग्रेस में आज प्रजातन्त्र नहीं है और जिस के कारण यह सब अप्रिय घटनाएं हो रही हैं। उन के निर्वाचन क्षेत्र वाले उन को कहते हैं कि बम्बई को संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में रहना चाहिये और चूंकि आप उन की बात मानने को तैयार नहीं हैं इसलिये वह अपने त्याग-पत्र देना चाहते हैं तो आप उनको कहते हैं कि त्याग-पत्र मत दो और उनका त्याग-पत्र देना अनुशासनहीनता मानी जायगी और मेरा तो अपने महाराष्ट्र के कांग्रेस जनों पर आक्षेप है कि वे डर कर सही मार्ग का अवलम्बन नहीं कर रहे हैं और मैं आचार्य कृपलानी की इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि उन्होंने झगड़ा फैलाया है। मैं तो यह कहने पर मजबूर हूँ कि हमारे महाराष्ट्र के कांग्रेस जनों ने कांग्रेस हाई कमांड से डर कर कि कहीं हम को आगामी निर्वाचन में टिकट न मिले, अपनी आत्मा की आवाज को दबाया है और यही कारण है कि अमृतसर के कांग्रेस अधिवेशन में हमारे किसी भाई ने बम्बई को संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में शामिल किये जाने का प्रस्ताव नहीं रखा। उन्होंने वैधानिक रीति से दल के अन्दर भी अपनी मांग नहीं रखी है और राष्ट्र के साथ वंचना की है और जनतन्त्र के साथ और अपने लोगों के साथ द्रोह किया है। इस प्रकार से हम देखते हैं कि कांग्रेस दल के लोग भी दोषी हैं, क्योंकि जो उन की अन्तरात्मा की आवाज है, उस को खुले दिल से लोगों के सामने नहीं रख रहे हैं। आज कांग्रेस को उच्च सत्ता अपने दलगत स्वार्थ की खातिर जनतन्त्र की अवहेलना कर रही है और उसी का कारण है कि बम्बई आदि नगरों में इस प्रकार की अप्रिय घटनायें घटीं। महाराष्ट्र की जो बम्बई को उस में मिलाने की मांग है उस के औचित्य को आप स्वीकार कीजिये और अपनी गलती को स्वीकार कीजिये। यह जनतन्त्र की अवहेलना नहीं तो क्या है? मध्यभारत की विधान सभा ने कहा है कि हमें मध्यप्रदेश के साथ न मिलाया जाय लेकिन आप उन की बात नहीं सुनते हैं। नेजो रिटी अग्रर शान्तिपूर्वक कायदे से अपनी मांग रखती है तो आप यह कह कर उस को अस्वीकार कर देते हैं कि यह जनता की मांग नहीं है क्योंकि कोई आन्दोलन अथवा मार-पिट्टाई नहीं हुई और अग्रर कहीं पर मार-पिट्टाई हो जाती है तो आप कहते हैं कि आपने हमारे हाथ कमजोर कर दिये, इस तरह की अजीब दलील आप देते हैं। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि ऐसी दलील देकर

आप भार-पीट और गुंडागर्दी पर प्रीमियम रखते हैं और उस के बाद शिकायत करते हैं कि वहाँ पर लोगों ने अपनी बात मनवाने के लिये गुंडागर्दी की। अन्त में मैं आप को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि आप प्रान्तों का पुनर्गठन करने के सम्बन्ध में जिस प्रकार से जनतन्त्रवाद की अवहेलना कर रहे हैं, उस का परिणाम देश के लिये अहितकर सिद्ध होगा। इतना ही कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I had in the beginning no mind to participate in the discussion but I made up my mind to do so when I read the summary of a speech made by the Chief Minister of Bombay in the Bombay Legislature yesterday. What I want to say shall be in response to the appeal made by the President in his speech that questions about reorganisation should be discussed in an atmosphere of peace, tolerance and goodwill; within the scope of that desire and, also, consistent with the atmosphere that was created at Amritsar both by the Prime Minister as our leader and the Home Minister as our deputy leader.

When I read this morning that the Chief Minister stated that there was a plan to overthrow the Government and to take the city by force, though he has not named by whom, I felt it was a serious statement. If that is true, then in the interest of the public and in the interest of the future of this country, it is necessary that an enquiry by, or presided over by, the highest judicial authority in this country should be instituted.

Only a few days ago there was some firing at Imphal and eight persons were killed. I read in the newspapers that the Union Minister of Home Affairs has ordered an enquiry into the whole affair. Here in Bombay, according to Government, 76 deaths occurred : 72 by bullets, two as a result of tear gas and two as a result of stabbing. An important and responsible worker of the Indian National Trade Union Congress has stated that the number of deaths is 148, the number of injured is 450 and that another 200 have suffered as a result of tear gas. There are wild figures given by certain papers here and certain papers abroad. The papers during the fateful week carried news that orders were there to shoot at sight and that on one particular day, 114 firings took place. I would most respectfully request the hon. Home Minister to realise that in this

matter there is obviously a *prima facie* case for enquiry. They have ordered an enquiry when, as a matter of fact, only eight deaths took place.

Now, was there a real plan? If there was a plan, when did the great Chief Minister of Bombay discover it? If he discovered it after the incidents took place, then surely it is no testimony to the efficiency of his police. If he discovered it much earlier, then obviously one has to take into consideration why he did not act promptly.

In his second statement, he has said that there has been no indiscriminate firing. I have here a newspaper, the copies of which have been, so far as I know, taken possession of by the police in Bombay, and in which the names of 69 persons occur and a description is given as to how they received these wounds. Out of these 69, the Lok Sabha will be surprised to know that 23 are non-Maharashtrians. There are Sikhs, Gujaratis, Marwaris and there are people from other communities. The nature of the wounds and the place on the body on which the wounds have been received have also been mentioned. The wounds have been received right from the eye to the toe. They have received wounds while on the street, while they were in the room and while they were on the terrace. They range from a boy of 14 to an old lady of 64. I am not saying anything by way of final conclusion. What I want to say is that this is a *prima facie* case for enquiry into the incidents. 400 people have been thus wounded. Now, either it is indiscriminate firing or the movement was not exclusively confined to Maharashtrians. No other inference is logically possible. I will not draw either inference at this stage.

It has been said that in Bombay there was a plan. In Bombay there is one policeman for every 228 citizens. That is in greater Bombay. Outside, there is one policeman for 849. In New York, it is 450, and in the much-abused Chicago it is 490. This is the state of affairs for the year 1953-54. Add to this the number of policemen from Uttar Pradesh and Saurashtra and Madhya Bharat who have been imported. Bombay today is just like any other occupied country. It is a sad thing. I do not want to spoil the atmosphere. I want to say that in the interests of truth and for public guidance an enquiry should be instituted. Crime in Bombay, particularly prohibition crime, has increased eight

[Shri Gadgil] times. One can easily imagine that during these seven or eight fateful days, the bootleggers and distillers of illicit liquor and their whole organisation naturally were not functioning in their usual activities. What then must have they been doing? On an average I am told that 150 prohibition crimes are committed every day. I am not referring to the other crimes. In view of this, what should have been the attitude of the Government if there was a plan, or, if there was not a plan what should have been their attitude? I recall to the Lok Sabha what the great Prime Minister said on the 18th of August, 1955 in reference to what took place in Bombay on the 16th August. He said that this was a rehearsal of what was going to happen in Bombay. Later on he explained it away. May I bring to the notice of the Lok Sabha that in that demonstration, the number of Maharashtrians was considerably less. The Goans were much more in evidence, because it was a matter which touched their patriotism and vital interests. May I also bring to the notice of the Lok Sabha the fact that long before the SRC Report was published and was made available to the country, a list of persons who were suspected of pro-Samyukta Maharashtrian tendencies was made and if there was any reason to believe that there was a plot, why were they not preventively detained and arrested? Only on the 16th of this month 300 people were arrested and what I read from the papers is this : that they were arrested because they were considered to be pro-Samyukta Maharashtra and were likely to create violent troubles.

During the fateful months—from July to November—the whole Maharashtra was an armed camp. This covered Poona, Satara, Sholapur, Nagpur—everywhere—as if there was going to be some rebellion and some attempt to overthrow the Government, this, that and the other. There is an allegation made among the Maharashtra public and in the Maharashtra press that all this was planned to bring about a situation in which there would be provocation and to discredit Maharashtra and sabotage its claim to Bombay. What happened? On the 18th November, first incident occurred. In spite of our advice, we did our best as Congressmen, asking them not to take any procession—600 people marched in a quiet manner, men and women, and their only request was that three of them should be allowed to see

the Speaker of the Bombay Legislative Assembly and submit what they had to say. That was rejected and there was a lathi charge and tear gassing, and 600 people were arrested. On the 20th November, there was a big public meeting on the Chowpatty sands and certain statements made by the Chief Minister and the Chief of the Bombay Congress there were highly provocative. I do not approve of what the people did. I condemn it ; I have condemned it and our Committee had condemned it.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur) : What did the people do? They did nothing.

Shri Gadgil : On the 21st November there was an indiscriminate lathi charge, not by the police of Bombay but by the home guards who were imported from outside Bombay. On that day there was no looting. Nothing happened. There was a crowd of three lakhs to four lakhs when they were told by Shri Barucha and Shri S. M. Joshi that Shri Hiray and others had resigned. They then marched from that place to Chowpatty sands where they held a meeting which consisted of four lakhs to five lakhs. The meeting was allowed by the police.

The meeting was held and for the first time the police acted very tactfully and it passed off quietly.
1 P. M.

In December I repeated the demand for an enquiry here in my speech and I was supported by some Members ; but nothing was done. Tracing the events. I am only making out a *prima facie* case I am giving no conclusions of my own. On the 15th of January, there was a meeting of 2 to 3 lakhs of people in Bombay. I was one of the speakers and in the next day morning it was reported in the papers that a meeting more orderly was never witnessed. On the 16th morning, some leaders were arrested and on the evening of the 16th at the Shivaji Park, there was another meeting of 3 to 4 lakhs of people. Some of them wanted me to take away my Gandhi cap. I told them, "Look here, this cap represents certain values in life and I shall rather die than remove it. I have not removed it during British regime and I shall not remove it in the regime of the Congress". The meeting passed off more or less quietly. I want to know this from the Bombay Government and particularly the city police. I want to know when goondas were arrested and if they were not arrested on the 16th, why were

they not arrested. My humble submission is this. As I said before, I am not blaming anybody; I am only making out a case that these facts show that there has been something which cannot be definitely said to be true or false and hence they deserve an enquiry. While I was here in Delhi from the 12th to the 15th January morning, the newspapers here carried the story that the final decision about Bombay, in what way it is going to be centrally administered, would be taken when the Cabinet meeting would be held on the 18th. On the 16th the news carried by the P.T.I. was that there was going to be a surprise broadcast by the Prime Minister. I am stating all these things to show that something forced the situation on the Government on the 16th. I doubt whether it was a Government decision or whether it was a decision prompted by some other considerations not relevant for me now to detail. Now, what happened during the riot days? I have here a statement made by Dr. Charanker who did good Red Cross work in the 1942 movement, in the naval riots of 1946 and in the Hindu-Muslim riots. When he did the same work irrespective of any political consideration, the Red Cross flag was removed from his motor car, the badges of his volunteers were removed and he and the volunteers were assaulted.

An Hon. Member : Shame !

Shri Gadgil : It is not yet an established fact. There was an allegation in the Press that when Congress people and other workers wanted to go about preaching for the establishment of peace, the response of the Bombay Government was not prompt or very helpful. All sorts of allegations are made against the Maharashtrian community. A lady wrote a letter in one of the English papers that there was molestation on the Ghatkopar platform. Promptly another fine gentleman, Natwarlal Shah, immediately wrote a reply that nothing of that kind happened and they were only wild rumours which were set afloat. But, that reply was not published in the English papers for three days, although it was published by another Maharashtrian paper which is run under the same management. I do not know what has happened or what has not happened, but there is a whispering campaign going round in Delhi. I only want that for the sake of our community, for the sake of India's good name and for the establishment of goodwill and peace, an enquiry

should be ordered. Let us know who are guilty. An indication of that is to be got from the figures of arrested persons given by the Government of Bombay.

Shri C. Bhatt (Broach) : May I know why you have used the Gujeratis as the target?

Shri Gadgil : Please keep calm; there is nothing that way. I am your best friend. 7,000 people have been arrested. Out of them 4,955 were for the disturbance of peace, 996 for breach of curfew and about 1,198 for looting. If you see the names from these 1,198—many of them have appeared—every community is represented, because they belong to no community spiritually; but, they are goondas. I am very grateful to my friend Shri Morarji Desai because he has said in his speech, "I cannot blame any particular section." I am much more grateful to the Prime Minister because he has said at Amritsar, "I cannot blame any community and it has been the work of goondas; it is a matter of regret to everybody." There is another international reason why I want an enquiry. All the news that have appeared in the foreign Press have exaggerated the whole thing in such a manner as to discredit us as being unfit for democracy, this, that and the other. Some people were interested in exaggerating this without knowing what would be the implications of an exaggeration of this kind. Was there a civil war? Was there any attempt against the Government? If that were so, the people instead of marching to Kala Chowki, would have gone to the Secretariat. I do not think that people who know that the way to throw out the Government is to win the election and send them to their home unsung and unhonoured, would do like this. If people realise the international implications, they would not spell out a civil war or a plan to overthrow the Government. When I find our beloved leader maligned and criticised in the foreign Press as being a hypocrite, it hurts me more. Only for this purpose at least I say, let us look at these events in the proper perspective. The second reason is that it will be helpful in creating an atmosphere of goodwill.

I want to sum up that I am drawing no conclusion. Whosoever is found guilty as a result of this enquiry, however high he may be, should be punished. Even if I am found guilty, I am prepared to meet the utmost penalty of

[Shri Gadgil]

law, although it is not yet abolished under the Gandhian regime. I am therefore saying that there is a *prima facie* case for an enquiry. I appeal to the conscience of the Home Minister; when he has ordered an enquiry when 9 people were dead, do not the facts that I have stated in my own humble way provide a greater reason for ordering an enquiry of that kind?

There is another point which I want to touch. I am very happy that at the Amritsar Congress Session, the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and Maulana Sahab, our great leaders, have said that peaceful and democratic methods are the ways of solving the problem. I entirely agree with them that they should not yield to violence. But, at the same time, they must give continuous proof that democratic conscience is working in the mind of national leadership by taking concrete steps to convince the people that reason and argument prevail. Justice, fairplay, reason and argument are the four vitamins of the democratic life and if any one of them or the whole lot is found to be deficient, to that extent our democracy will not function. I read in today's papers that Shri Acharya Kripalani has suggested postponement for a period of ten years. My humble submission is, as Pantji has said long ago, it will be a counsel of despair, Pandit has been defined in Mahabharata as :

निश्चित्यः प्रक्रमते नान्तरवसति कर्मणाः

अव्यक्तकालः वश्यात्मा स वै पंडितः

One who does not begin unless he has some definite plan or principle or a philosophy and once begun he will not stop. He will continue.

विघ्नैः पुनः पुनरपि प्रतिहन्यमानाः

प्रारब्धयुत्तमजना न परित्यजन्ति

Are these problems insoluble? I heard a speech by our leader and Prime Minister only a few weeks ago where he said we must not run away from problems, we must accept every challenge to our statesmanship, challenge to our ability for constructive effort. In that spirit we must accept this challenge. What is the problem, after all? A part of it refers to borders and another part to Bombay and Punjab. So far as borders are concerned, I have suggested, and I suggest again : appoint a judicial authority and let that judicial authority try to bring about a compromise in as many matters

as possible and if anything is left outstanding, let us refer that to the Prime Minister and give him the authority to decide.

So far as Bombay is concerned, I repeat my offer : you give Bombay to Maharashtra and I give a blank cheque for safeguards. My friend, Shri Patil, said that I have no credit in the bank. He is right. I have no money in the bank. In fact, what little property I have is already mortgaged with another bank. But so far as the heart of the Maharashtrian masses is concerned, I have more credit than Shri Patil can even in his imagination think. That has been evidenced in the past by various elections and I am sure if further evidence in future is necessary it will be available. Let us therefore approach this problem in the humble spirit in which Mahatma Gandhi approached every problem. As I have often said, reorganisation of states is organisation of freedom. And just as in our Constituent Assembly everybody was allowed to give his own views and there was freedom of voting because everybody was interested in having the best possible Constitution for our country, similarly, in a sense the suggestion made by some of my friends on the right that this is a thing in which everyone of us is interested may be considered. There is nothing wrong in at least trying to explore the possibilities of working out that suggestion, if accepted.

A phrase used by me in a particular context is there in cold print. But I have been made disproportionately famous or infamous for that. I say, Sir, in a democracy nobody should consider himself infallible and nobody should be indispensable. If we do not subscribe to this creed, it will not be democracy. My submission then was that if this is not done then this will happen. So I am very much afraid to foretell what will happen in the near future because, it seems, intelligent anticipation of events is a crime according to certain people and certain parties. Therefore all I say is that we have hard times before us. May I refer to an incident that happened when our beloved Pantji was congratulated for having attained 69 years? I then told him—it was in September or earlier than that—that as far as I see, the times are going to be very hard both here and abroad and I look upon him, I said, as the deepasthambam, as the light house, as guide of the destinies of this country. So, can any one now say because I have said these hard times have come true? Please, therefore, do not misunderstand.

If I speak anything, I take the full consequences of that. Whatever I felt I used to write to him and right from August up to last week I have been writing and speaking to him. I want him to consider how long you will deny democratic rights to Bombay. By all canons of fairplay and justice it belongs to Maharashtra. I understand your difficulties, whatever they are. But no Government can claim to be democratic if it considers prestige to be the only thing that matters. Prestige if of justice, prestige is of truth, prestige is of enduring friendship. In that spirit I appeal to the Government, to think of their own mistakes and be magnanimous. But I want to tell them that they cannot have the exclusive privilege of being fallible. Every human being has that failing, to err is human. There are two things, rather two persons, who never commit mistakes : one is God above and the Almighty editor below. They never commit mistakes. The rest of the people, they do commit mistakes. I commit mistakes. Everybody commits mistakes. It is through mistakes that we go to the next stage of progress. Democracy, I know and appreciate, is Government by consent, Government by argument, Government by peaceful negotiations. And if we cannot succeed today, let us not say we cannot succeed tomorrow. Let us continue to search and explore the possibilities of having an agreed solution or having a fair solution of the problem. I am certain the right thing will be done. All I want to say in conclusion is that let that right thing be done in time and let it not be said, as was stated in the case of the British Government, that whatever they did, they did too late. Therefore, don't condemn anybody without proper enquiry. Mahatma Gandhi, when he was asked to condemn the violence of the people in 1942, said "a mole hill of popular violence had been shown by Government to be a mountain; what the police has done has been defended on the ground that there were no excesses on behalf of the police and what was only necessary was done. The people had at least some cause for what they did. Government had none. I cannot judge popular action by the foot-rule of truth and non-violence unless I can apply the same measure to Government action". I therefore, in all humility ask in order to clear our conscience, clear the fair name of India and to give a proper perspective to whatever has happened in Bombay to the international world for an inquiry and let them then reappraise what has hap-

pened. This is what I want to say and, I am sure, that my appeal will not go unheeded.

सरकार ए० एस्० सहगल (बिलासपुर) : सभापति जी, माननीय सदस्य श्री भागवत झा आजाद ने जो राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के लिये धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव पेश किया है मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ ।

इस समय पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से हमारे हिन्दू भाई बहुत बड़ी संख्या में भारत आ रहे हैं। यही नहीं अक्टूबर के महीने में करीब पांच हजार लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तान के डिप्टी हाई कमिश्नर से ढाका में यहाँ आने के लिये सर्टिफिकेट प्राप्त किये थे। इस के अलावा अगर आप देखें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि नवम्बर में यहाँ ६,००० लोग पूर्वी पाकिस्तान से आये और दिसम्बर में करीब ११,००० लोग यहाँ पर आये और जनवरी सन् १९५६ में १५ हजार आये। १५,००० दरखास्तें तो मंजूर हुई, इन के अलावा महीने के अन्त में १८,००० दरखास्तें और बाकी थीं। इस से मालूम होता है कि पूर्वी बंगाल में हिन्दुओं की माली हालत अच्छी नहीं है। यह एक विचारणीय प्रश्न है और हमारी सरकार को यह सोचना है कि उसे इस माइ-ग्रेशन (प्रवाजन) को रोकने के लिये पाकिस्तान की सरकार के प्रति क्या कार्रवाई करनी है। या हम ऐसी व्यवस्था करें कि जो यह हमारे भाई आ रहे हैं उन को हम अच्छी तरह से रख सकें। यह गम्भीर प्रश्न है और हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने इस सम्बन्ध में अपने अभिभाषण में अपने विचार जाहिर किये हैं।

संयुक्त राष्ट्र अमेरिका के विदेश मंत्री श्री डलस ने अपने एक भाषण में कहा है कि भारतीय पुर्तगाली बस्तियां पुतगाल का ही अंग हैं। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि उन की नीति यह है कि जो भी प्रदेश उन के हाथों में है वह अलग न हों चाहे उस प्रदेश के लोग उनके अधीन रहना चाहें या नहीं। लेकिन यह निश्चित है कि गोआ हमारे पास आकर रहेगा और इसे कोई नहीं रोक सकता। हो सकता है कि ऐसा होने में कुछ समय लग जाये।

बांडुंग सम्मेलन में २६ राष्ट्रों ने भाग लिया था और उस सम्मेलन ने जो प्रस्ताव पास किया था यदि उस के अनुसार दुनिया के राष्ट्र चलें तो जो हम आज दुनिया के विभिन्न भागों में कलह देख रहे हैं वह समाप्त हो जाये। वह एक

[सरदार ए० एस० सहगल]

ऐतिहासिक घोषणा थी और उस के अनुसार चलने से संसार के मतभेद शान्तिपूर्ण तरीकों से हल किये जा सकते हैं। उस रास्ते पर चलने से न केवल भारत का बल्कि दुनिया के सारे राष्ट्रों का कल्याण हो सकता है। उस प्रस्ताव में जिन पंचशील सिद्धांतों का प्रतिपादन किया गया है वे इस प्रकार हैं :

- (1) Mutual respect for one another's territorial integrity and sovereignty ;
- (2) Non-aggression ;
- (3) Non-interference in one another's internal affairs ;
- (4) Equality and mutual benefit ;
- (5) Peaceful co-existence.

यदि दुनिया के राष्ट्र इन सिद्धांतों के अनुसार चलने लगें और यह तय कर लें कि औपनिवेशिक बाद को समाप्त कर देंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हालत बहुत सुधर जायेगी।

मलाया में जो प्रगति हुई है और अफ्रीका में जो गोलड कोस्ट में स्वतन्त्रता की स्थापना होगी उस का अफ्रीका के दूसरे औपनिवेशिक राज्यों पर भी प्रभाव पड़ेगा तथा राष्ट्र मंडल और संयुक्त राष्ट्र को बिचार करके उनको भी स्वतन्त्रता देनी होगी। भले ही वे उन्हें अभी स्वतन्त्र न करें पर पीछे देनी होगी ऐसी मेरी धारणा है। मगर हमको इन समस्याओं को शान्तिपूर्ण तरीकों से और आपसी बातचीत से ही हल करना चाहिये।

संयुक्त राष्ट्र में जो १६ नये राष्ट्र लिये गये हैं इस का श्रेय भारत के माननीय मंत्री श्री कृष्ण मेनन, रूस के सदस्यों तथा उन दूसरे राष्ट्रों के सदस्यों को है जिन्होंने इस काम में हाथ बटाया, परन्तु सब से अधिक श्रेय इस कार्य में श्री कृष्ण मेनन को है और वे बधाई के पात्र हैं। उन की समाचार पत्र वालों ने जो भारत के घुमने वाले चाणक्य की पदवी दी है वह ठीक ही है।

हमको यह कहना पड़ता है कि चीन और मंगोलिया संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में नहीं आ सके। लेकिन हम आशा करते हैं कि चीन और अमेरिका के बीच जो मतभेद है उन को हमारे मनोनीत मंत्री जी अपनी चेष्टाओं द्वारा दूर करने में सफल होंगे ताकि जेनेवा में जो सम्मेलन होने जा रहा है उस के लिये अच्छा वातावरण तैयार हो जाये जिस से सभी देशों का कल्याण हो

सके और एशिया की स्थिति में दृढ़ता आ सके, और जो संघर्ष के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं, जो कि सहज में मालूम नहीं होते हैं, वे भी दूर हो जायें।

मार्शल बुलगानिन और प्रेसीडेंट आइजनहोवर के बीच जो पत्र-व्यवहार चल रहा है उस से भी मालूम होता है कि उन का झुकाव भी शान्ति की ही ओर है। इस के फलस्वरूप जो तनाव है उस में कमी होने की आशा की जा सकती है।

बगदाद सन्धि से जो शान्तिप्रिय देश हैं और लड़ाई से भ्रमण रहना चाहते हैं उनको बहुत अन्देगा हो रहा है, क्योंकि वे समझते हैं कि इस से उन के देशों के लिये खतरा पैदा हो सकता है। हमें दक्षिण-पूर्व एशिया सुरक्षा संघ से भी बहुत खेद हुआ था। ऐसा ही खेद हमको बगदाद सन्धि से हुआ है।

पहली योजना की सफलता से १८ प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। औद्योगिक उत्पादन में ४३ प्रतिशत की, कृषि उत्पादन में १५ प्रतिशत की और अन्न के उत्पादन में २० प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। परन्तु हमें यह देखना है कि जो यह सफलता मिली है उस से कितने प्रतिशत लोगों को लाभ पहुंचा है। यदि हमें देश की गरीबी और बेकारी को दूर करना है तो चाहे हम बड़े अफसर हों या कर्मचारी, चाहे छोटे हों या बड़े, सब को कड़े से कड़ा काम कर के देश के स्तर को ऊंचा उठाना होगा। हमें अपनी फिजूल खर्ची कम करनी होगी और जो हम विवाह आदि में ज्यादा खर्च करते हैं इस को कम करना होगा। इन सारी चीजों को हमें बन्द करना होगा। मैं तो सुझाव दूंगा कि हम की एक कमेटी बनानी होगी जो कि हम को यह सुझाव दे कि जो महकमों में फालतू खर्च हो रहे हैं उनको हम किस प्रकार दूर करें ताकि जो बचत हो वह राष्ट्र निर्माण के काम में लगाई जा सके। यदि हमें समाजवादी राष्ट्र बनाना है तो हमें हर प्रकार की आमदनी पर सीलिंग (अन्तिम सीमा) मुकर्रर करनी चाहिये, चाहे वह आमदनी नौकरी से हो, चाहे व्यापार से हो या किसी और तरीके से हो। जिस तरह से कि हम ने राजाओं का राज्य समाप्त किया, जमींदारी प्रथा को मिटाया, जागीरदारी प्रथा को मिटाया, बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया, और जीवन-बीमा व्यवसाय का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया उसी प्रकार हम को मकानों का और मिर्चों का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण करना होगा। तभी जाकर जो हम समाजवादी समाज की ओर देश को ले जाना चाहते हैं उस में सफल होंगे। मेरा यह सुझाव नहीं है कि यह सब आज

ही कर दिया जाय, लेकिन हम इस धीरे धीरे काम को पूरा करें जिस से कि जिस चीज को हम देश में करना चाहते हैं वह १५ या २० साल में पूरी हो सके।

इस के अलावा में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे यहां हैडलूम चल रहे हैं इन को आप पावर हैडलूम में बदल दें क्योंकि जब तक ऐसा नहीं किया जायेगा तब तक हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता।

यदि हम इन के जरिये से छोटी छोटी चीजों को बना कर के व्यापार करना चाहते हैं तो सहकारिता के सिद्धांत पर हमें इस को चलाना होगा और उन्हें प्रोत्साहन देना होगा।

जिस तरह से आज कई वर्षों से हमारे अफसर लोग छोटे छोटे धंधों की बाबत जानकारी हासिल करने के लिये जापान गये हुए हैं और यह जानने गये हैं कि हमारे यहां कौन कौन सी चीज मुफीद हो सकती है और मैं तो कहूंगा कि यदि हमारे उन अफसरों की उस सम्बन्ध में रिपोर्ट आ गई हो तो हमें उस पर ध्यान करना चाहिये और उस के अनुसार काम करना चाहिये। इस तरह हम देखेंगे कि हमारे देश में जापान के आचार पर छोटे धंधे जल्दी कामयाब हो सकेंगे।

हमारी दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना बड़े महत्व की है। इस के अन्तर्गत लगभग २ करोड़, १० लाख एकड़ नई जमीन की सिंचाई होगी, मगर इस योजना में यदि मल्टी परपज (बहुप्रयोजनीय) हसदो बांध को ले लिया जाता तो कम से कम १० लाख एकड़ जमीन और सिंच जाती तथा जो बिजली होती वह ८० किलोवाट नई बिजली देता और ३४ लाख किलोवाट जो बिजली हम पैदा करते उस से ज्यादा और मिलती लेकिन हमें बड़े दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस हसदो बांध की योजना को दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में शामिल नहीं किया गया है।

इसी तरह यह जो २ करोड़, ३० लाख टन कोयले का अधिक उत्पादन होगा, उस के साथ ही साथ हमें चाहिये कि माइनिंग (खननबिद्या) कालिज जैसा कि धनबाद में है और जिस तरह के कालिज की और भी जरूरत है, वैसा ही हम उस जगह पर एक नया माइनिंग कालिज बनावें जहां पर कि कई कोयले की खानें निकली हैं और जो कि कोरबा में है, इस से माइनिंग के लिए ज्यादा सुविधा होगी। जहां पर कि खानें

हों वहां पर इस तरह के यदि माइनिंग कालिज हों तो ज्यादा कामयाबी मिल सकती है। बनारस में हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी में माइनिंग कालेज है लेकिन प्रैक्टिकल (व्यवहारिक) चीजों की जानकारी हासिल करने के लिये हमारे स्टूडेंट्स को धनबाद और दूसरी जगह जा कर पढ़ना पड़ता है। ऐसा करके हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा आदमियों को काम दे सकेंगे। मगर बढ़ती हुई आबादी को देखते हुए जरूरी है कि इसे कैसे कम किया जाये, यह भी एक विचारणीय प्रश्न हमारे सामने आज है।

राज्यों के पुनर्गठन पर हमें शान्ति के साथ देश के हित को सामने रख कर तथा जिस से कोई रोष न आवे, ऐसे व्याख्यानों से लोगों को हमें समझाना चाहिये न कि जोशीले भाषणों से। जोशीले भाषणों से लोगों को भड़का कर और उस के बाद जिम्मेदारी न लेना, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कोई बुद्धिमानी का काम नहीं है। मैं तो बड़ी नम्रता से अपने मित्रों की सेवा में निवेदन करूंगा कि हमें इन सारी चीजों पर बड़ी शान्ति-पूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये और फर्ज कीजिये कि हमारा कुछ हिस्सा उधर से उधर हो गया तो हमें उस से घबड़ाना नहीं चाहिये क्योंकि आखिर मैं वह हमारा हिस्सा रहना तो हिन्दुस्तान में ही है, हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर जाने वाला नहीं है। ऐसी परिस्थिति घाने पर हमारा उस के ऊपर रोष प्रकट करना और यह कहना कि नहीं हम यहां से अलग हो जायेंगे या उस राष्ट्रीय संस्था से अलग हो जायेंगे कहां तक वाजिब है? मैं इस पृथक्त्व को भावना को सही और उचित नहीं समझता और मैं तो समझता हूँ कि एक सिपाही के नाते जो भी अपने अफसर का हुक्म हो उस को बजा ले लाना चाहिये और यह सिपाही का काम है कि जो भी उस का अफसर उसे आज्ञा देवे, उस का वह पालन करे। मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि जिस को हम ने अपना संस्था नेता माना है अगर वह एक दफे कोई गलत आज्ञा भी देवे तो भी हमें उस को शिरोधार्य करना चाहिये।

परिगणित जातियों तथा अनुसूचित आदिम जातियों की सूची में जो कुछ सुझाव बैंकबर्ड कमीशन ने दिये हैं, उसे चुनाव होने के पहले बिल में जो परिणित जाति वाले हिन्दू लिख दिये गये हैं तथा उन को और उन के बालकों को वे हक प्राप्त नहीं हैं जोकि उन को मिलाने चाहिये, वे भी उन को दिये जायें। इस प्रकार

[सरदार ए० एस० सहगल]

की जो स्थिति आज उत्पन्न हो रही है वह विचारणीय है और मैं तो चाहूंगा कि उनको चुनाव के पूर्ण अधिकार प्राप्त हों और आज चूंकि वह हिन्दू लिख दिये गये हैं इसलिये वह अधिकार उनको नहीं मिल पा रहे हैं। अनुसूचित आदिम जातियों का भी यही हाल है। हमारे बिलासपुर में भी बहुत से हरिजनों को चूंकि हिन्दू लिख दिया गया है इसलिये उनको अधिकार नहीं दिया जा रहा है जो कि दिया जाना चाहिये और मैं इस माननीय सभा के जरिये अपने होम मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह इस सम्बन्ध में आवश्यक कार्यवाही करें जिससे कि वहां के लोगों की जो तकलीफें हैं वे दूर हो जायें।

आमदनी को देखकर यदि दूसरी योजना को कामयाब बनाना है तो हमें काफी मात्रा में आर्थिक मदद जुटानी पड़ेगी और यदि रकम जुटाने के लिये नये टैक्स (कर) भी लगाना आवश्यक हों तो उनको भी भ्रदा करके हमें अपनी इस दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना को सफल बनाना है।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी अर्ज करूंगा कि जिन लोगों ने हाल के उपद्रवों में राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति को हानि पहुंचाई है और तोड़-फोड़ के काम किये हैं, उनसे राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति को जो क्षति पहुंची है, वह पूरी कराई जाये और क्षति-पूर्ति का भार उन पर डाला जाये। राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति समस्त भारतवासियों की सम्पत्ति है और हम इसका नष्ट होना सहन नहीं कर सकते और जो उसको नष्ट करने के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं उन पर इस के लिये टैक्स लगाया जाय। मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि जिन क्षेत्रों में उपद्रव हुए हैं वहां पर सरकार एक निष्पक्ष कमेटी बितला कर सारे मामलों की जांच करवाये।

अन्त में मैं और अधिक न कह कर हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने १५ फरवरी, सन् ५६ को जो अभिभाषण दे कर हमें अनुगृहीत किया है, उसके लिये हम उनका आभार मानते हैं और जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव पेश किया गया है मैं उसका सहर्ष स्वागत करता हूँ।

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): Last year on this occasion I drew your attention to the disproportionate space given in the President's Address to foreign affairs. I find that this year perhaps more space has been devoted to external affairs. Out of the 26 paragraphs in the

President's Address, fourteen are devoted to external affairs. I feel that this shows a lack of focus, a lack of perspective particularly when great things, important things, grave things are happening in our country.

I am surprised that in the Address the President has struck a note of satisfaction and cautious optimism. I have returned to the Lok Sabha from the inter-sessions period with a nightmarish feeling in me. I have come greatly shaken up because in my City and in some other parts of the country I have found events happening, emotions emerging which are loosening the very fabric of our country. There are tears in the fabric that hurt us. Things have happened of which as an Indian I feel hurt and humiliated. I am surprised that there can be a mood of complacency in any part of the country, least of all that such a mood should exist in the President's Address.

The question that we are facing today of integrating our political life on a surer foundation has been faced in the recent past by sister countries of Asia. In Pakistan, as we all know, the linguistic States were eliminated and two zonal States have been created, one for the West and one for the East. The Indonesian Republic emerged as a federation. There were sixteen partner States and autonomous regions. The federation was dismantled and a unitary State with ten provinces was brought into existence in 1950. As you are aware, the insignia of Indonesia is a golden *Garud*, and the *Garud* carries a shield with five fields, and that is the famous *Panch Shil*. Just beneath the shield there is the national motto of Indonesia; *Bhinneka Tunggal Eka*, i.e., unity in diversity. We have been giving a considerable amount of attention to *Panch Shil* that has come from Indonesia. We have almost appropriated that word. May I suggest that we might with profit appropriate the motto of Indonesia also, viz., *Bhinneka Tunggal Eka*?

How are we to discover out of the diversity the unity that we need? On the S.R.C. Report I hear only choruses and cacophonies. I find it very difficult to identify myself with any of those choruses, and that is the reason why on the last occasion my only contribution was to remain silent. There are, however, occasions when even solo voices have some value particularly when one finds that the situation has been permitted to

grow from bad to worse because of the lack of decision. I find that those who are entrusted with the responsibility of the Government have approached this problem of reorganisation without a careful consideration of all the problems involved and their aspects. Their attitude has been changing from day to day, from time to time. Some time back the Secretary of State of the United States of America defined his policy as one of going to the verge of disaster.

I feel that on this question of States reorganisation the policy of the Prime Minister is to permit the nation to go to the verge of disaster. He has been sparking the drive and pulling back suddenly. As was pointed out by Shri Gadgil, as early as the 17th or 18th August the Prime Minister had said that what happened in Bombay City on the 16th was a 'dress rehearsal' of what was likely to happen when the question of States reorganisation was taken up. He was aware, therefore, of the passions that were working, of the emotions that had been roused. But no care and no precautions were taken or such limited precautions were taken that we were faced with developments, the like of which perhaps this country has not witnessed before.

There have been linguistic States. Linguistic States have been created in the past. Take Orissa, for instance. I believe it was in 1935 that the State of Orissa was carved out. I believe at that time a substantial number of Oriya-speaking people were left out of the State of Orissa, some of them in the old State of Madras, some in the old State of Madhya Pradesh, some perhaps in old Bihar too. There must have been discontent. But there was no upsurge. But this time merely because a lakh and a half of Oriya-speaking people were left in Bihar, just on that question, we know that almost an insurrection was staged in Orissa. Something has come over us. This question of language, as I was trying to point out, created difficulties in Pakistan. It created difficulties in Ceylon. The ruling Party in Ceylon had agreed that the State would have two State languages. Suddenly, it has been decided to have only one State language, and the island is today seething with great discontent. These are questions which cannot be settled in a piecemeal manner. They cannot be settled in the manner in which the Government have been handling them—

taking up one attitude today and another attitude tomorrow. Take, for instance, this question of zonal councils. There is nothing new about it. I believe in article 263 of the Constitution there is a provision for such zonal councils. They could have been created. They can be set up even now under the Constitution as it stands. What are we going to get by the zonal councils? What are we getting even by the zonal States that are sought to be created in Bihar and West Bengal? When I read about the creation of the State, I welcomed it. I welcomed it because I felt that we were taking a new turn that is needed. But what do we find? You know probably more than I do that it is not going to be a real State. All the divisions, all those dividing lines are to remain. The unifying force is to be applied only at the top. That is not the way in which this problem can ever be solved.

I come from a part of the country which has earned a very bad name just now—Bombay City has earned a very bad name. I was born in Gujarat. I happened to be a Gujarati by birth, but I was brought up in Maharashtra, all my life. I represent a Maharashtra constituency here. Perhaps I know Marathi better than I know my mother tongue. Believe me, there can be no solution for my part of the country if we are going to think in terms of unilingual States. Unilingual States will only add to our difficulties. I am sure you have seen Dr. Ambedkar's new book, "*Thoughts on Linguistic States*." Dr. Ambedkar is a Cassandra and we do not like to hear his croakings, but we may ignore them only at our peril. Perhaps 13 years back he wrote *Thoughts on Pakistan*. I was annoyed, I was irritated by that book, I wrote a reply to it called *The Communal Triangle in India*. I feel that it was necessary to listen to the croakings of that Cassandra. I would appeal to you to read the book that he has written. He has warned us that out of these linguistic States, we shall be facing the third round. We have had the communal round of disturbances in our country. We have had the linguistic round of disturbances in our country, and, God forbid, we may have to face a third round, the final round of our disintegration, that of caste conflict in our country. Create unilingual States; you will be depressing, you will be annihilating any kind of all-India leadership from emerging in our country. You will be creating conditions where in these unilingual States, the caste forces

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

will come to the top. As regards my City, I listened very carefully to what my hon. friend, Shri Gadgil, had to say. He made a demand for an inquiry committee. I hope the Home Minister will not concede that demand. What will be gained by that inquiry committee? I know what has happened in that City. I know what humiliating things have happened, things that hurt me and humiliated me. It makes no difference as to who is responsible. Do we want to go into this? Do we want to probe into the wound and keep the wound alive? Or do we want the people to come together?—to forget what has happened and to restore the last links of goodwill and comradeship between the different language groups in the country? If that is what we want—I do not know what to propose for the rest of India,—for my part of the country let us have a bilingual State. Let the Gujaratis and Maharashtrians come together and form part of a single unshakable State together, because that is the only solution. There is no other solution for my part of the country. You cannot take away, you cannot break what has got to be united. The Gujaratis and Maharashtrians are complementary people. You will divide them only at peril to the country and peril to our people.

I know that mine is a solo voice. There are very few people who seem to agree that this is the best solution. It is not some kind of appearances of unity that have to be created. I believe in India today what we need is carving out of States which have nothing to do with language boundaries. If we are going to have this language boundary, if we are going to have purely linguistic States, we are going to face more and more trouble. I am inviting your attention to the experiences of Pakistan, of Indonesia and of Ceylon. Let us learn from the experiences of other countries.

I would like to say a few words about the economic conditions in India. I find that we continue to have patterns of stagnation and growth. Simultaneously in India we are witnessing economic stagnation and economic growth. Unless something is done, this again will create far-reaching complications. In the last year, the increase of money supply was to the extent of Rs. 200 crores as against Rs. 120 crores in 1954. Prices have increased by about 9 points in the last

six months. The rise in price of industrial securities, particularly on the Bombay Stock Exchange, was about 20 points. The stock of cotton textiles with the manufacturers this year is just 301 million yards as against 663 million yards a year back. All these indices suggest that the inflationary pressure is slowly mounting up. Whether we welcome that kind of an inflationary pressure is a question which needs to be seriously considered. Nothing will be gained by permitting inflation to creep on us. If we want inflationary pressure to grow, let us understand it, analyse it, and accept it willingly. I would feel very unhappy if inflationary pressure grows in our country without the knowledge and understanding of our people.

We nationalised the Imperial Bank of India some months back, and many friends here are very happy and proud about it. But what do we find? Though bank advances have gone up by Rs. 70 crores, as far as advances to agriculture are concerned, the increase is only Rs. 2½ crores; the increase is only 0.1 per cent. The Imperial Bank of India was nationalised primarily to provide credit facilities for our agriculture. But in the few months for which it has been functioning now, it has not shown any results of which we can be legitimately happy.

Industrial production in our country has been increasing at the rate of six to eight per cent per year. In 1955, the increase was slightly higher by about nine per cent. But we find that employment in factories has been increasing only by one per cent a year. Since 1948, the total increase in employment in factories is only eight per cent. And in some States, especially in the State of West Bengal, for instance, since 1948, employment has gone down by ten per cent. This is what I call a pattern of growth and stagnation. Rise of output is matched by low levels of employment. And in some States, employment has been going down steadily. We all know that the number of unemployed has been increasing. Whereas there were 3.31 lakhs of unemployed people registered in the employment exchanges in 1950, in 1955, the number had gone up to 6.95 lakhs. But when we look at the number of persons who are employed, we find that as against 4.17 lakhs for whom jobs were found in 1951, in 1955 only 1.37 lakhs were found employed.

My hon. friend Shri Tulsidas has given an amendment wherein he has tried to draw the attention of the Lok Sabha to the great contribution that the private sector has made to the development of our economy. May I point out to him that in 1955, the number of registrations in the employment exchanges was 13.6 lakhs, while the number of persons for whom employment was found in the private sector was just 34,000?

As far as educated people are concerned, there 5.57 lakhs of educated unemployed in the country; and about a lakh of them are in the State of Uttar Pradesh alone. About 70,000 to 80,000 are in West Bengal. Nearly 1.40 lakhs of graduates are unemployed in our country.

All the hidden reserves of labour have not come out, but the fact remains that unemployment is engrained in our economic system. While we all talk very proudly about our achievements, let us also be aware of the other side.

I am anxious that we should be aware of the other side for this reason, namely that I believe that there is a macro-vision and there is a micro-experience. The Parliament and all the leaders sitting there, the leaders of the ruling party try to look at the country.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzafarpur Central) : They are not sitting, but sleeping there. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Asoka Mehta : But they do not realise, and they do not take into consideration what is really happening to the little people in the countryside. We enact legislation here, and we are having our big plans. But what is happening to the common people?

I would invite your attention to these things. Perhaps you have seen these things yourself. I have seen them. Each one of us who has gone round the country, who has been going into his constituencies visiting the villages, has seen what is happening. With your permission, I would like to invite your attention to one or two significant descriptions of what is happening in our country, while we feel satisfied and cautiously optimistic about the development in the country.

I am reading from the *A.I.C.C. Economic Review (Amritsar Session Special)*. At page 40 of that publication, this is what the editor has to say :

"I asked: 'Chotu Murmu, what will you do if somebody kills you?' I was constrained to ask this question because Baidyanath Babu told us and many others in Purnea told us, that in the Course of the last two or three months, from the time or three months, from the time that the Settlement Operations, currently on in district Purnea, had been taken up in right earnest; 18 peasants were murdered. Actually the very atmosphere of district Purnea smelted of these murders. Murmu did not react to my above query. I again asked him: 'Chotu Murmu, what will you do if somebody kills you?' He replied. 'HU-ZOOR, we have after all to die, I do not mind if I die, but I will not leave my land.'"

This is what is happening in our country.

I shall invite your attention to another article that has been published in *The Economic Weekly*, a very interesting article about the conditions in the villages in the State of Mysore.

In the Sarinda village of Manhalli, recently, the *panchayat* was elected, and in the *panchayat* some untouchables also were elected as members. And what does the author find there? He says :

"The Untouchable members never dare to enter the place where council meetings are held."

We have passed legislation; we have **abolished untouchability**; we have made it a crime. We are satisfied that we have done all that needs to be done. But we find that even when an untouchable is elected to a *panchayat* he dare not to enter the place where the council meetings are held.

And what is happening in Lokapura village?

"In Lokapura, a village about two miles from Manhalli, economic, political and social power was vested in the Lingayats prior to the recent election, although the Untouchables were in the majority. As a result of the new legislation, Untouchables gained a majority in the

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

village council elections and consequently elected an Untouchable as village chairman. Untouchables gained political power in Lokapura, but nothing changed in their economic dependence on the Lingayats.

This divergence between political power on the one hand and economic and social status on the other has led to serious friction in Lokapura. The Lingayat headman refuses to have anything to do with the newly-elected Untouchable council members or chairman, and the Lingayats, as employers, have discarded responsibilities they formerly carried for their dependent Untouchable families. The newly gained political power offers small compensation to the Untouchables for the loss incurred when the Lingayat severed traditional bonds."

I have nothing against the Lingayats. I am not complaining against them. But I am merely pointing out that these are the realities of our country, and we seem to be shutting our eyes, and we seem to be satisfied and cautiously optimistic about what is happening in our country.

I would beg of you, therefore, to realise that while we should have the wide rolling vista opened up before us, and we should have the macro-vision, we the macro-experiences of the little people.

How can the common people feel enthused, when this is the reality of life in 5½ lakhs of villages in India? Therefore, the President's Address, if it is going to assess the conditions in our country correctly, should not merely deal with the macro-vision, but it should also think in terms of the micro-experiences of the common people, and see how far these difficulties and these experience can be set right.

Then again, much has been made in the Address about the First Plan and the Second Plan. Now, let us look at the First Plan. Many good things have been done. But let us not forget, and let us not ignore our failings and our shortcomings. And what are those shortcomings?

2 P.M.

I shall confine my observations and shall invite your attention only to extracts from the draft outline, a report that has been prepared by the Planning Commission itself.

It says:

"It has not been possible to utilise the provisions in the plans for a new iron and steel plant and for setting up a heavy electrical plant except to a small extent."

Then again, at page 5, it says :

"There have also been shortfalls in expenditure on community projects, education, village and small industries etc."

It says on page 74:

"Invariably the intentions of land reform legislation have not been fulfilled to the extent hoped for because of inadequate administrative action and weakness in organisation at the village level."

At page 80, it says:

"Little has been done for the benefit of landless agricultural workers."

We find that the weakness ultimately lies in our inability to reach the lower levels. Everything may be all right at higher levels; capital may be very sound; but, at the base, at the bottom, we lack organisation, we lack administrative ability, we lack the wherewithals whereby village industries or education or community projects can be properly put through, from where land reforms can be adequately implemented or where benefit can be brought to the landless agricultural workers.

In the Second Plan we are anxious to overcome these very difficulties. In the Second Plan the net national product of the industrial region will increase in the factory establishment from 43 per cent during the First Plan to 64 per cent in the Second Plan. But, in the small enterprise the increase will be from 14 per cent. in the First Plan to 30 per cent. in the Second Plan. Likewise, the plan outlay on large-scale industries in the second Plan as compared to the First Plan is fourfold. The plan outlay on village and small-scale industries in the Second Plan will be sevenfold more. If these things are to be done, if the difficulties of the First Plan are to be overcome, they are not going to be overcome merely by drawing up a right kind of Plan. These deficiencies at the bottom that have prevented us from implementing whatever legislation we may have enacted here or whatever plans we may have drawn up have got

to be eliminated. If they are to be implemented, may I point out that Government should get over the habit that they have formed of exercising a monopoly not only over decisions but even over consultations. On every matter, I can understand the area of decision being occupied by the Government of the ruling party, but even the area of consultation is out of bounds as far as we are concerned. On no question is it thought worth while to take other parties and other individuals into consideration.

For instance insurance companies were nationalised. Members of Parliament were here only a few days before this Ordinance was issued. They had come here as members of a consultative committee. Not one of them was taken into confidence. It seems that whatever is to be done, whether it is the question of nationalisation of insurance, whether it is the question of redrawing the administrative map of India, the sole authority, the sole power not only of decision but even of consultation must reside with the ruling party. I say that because I find that the AICC was consulted as far as the nationalisation of insurance was concerned. In the AICC bulletin, fullest details of nationalisation are published for a period of 4 months. The Secretary of the AICC, the office of the Economic Department of the AICC will be taken into confidence but not the Members of the Lok Sabha; he is not a Member of the Lok Sabha but because he happened to belong to the ruling party, the Finance Minister can take him into his bosom and share with him some of his secrets. But, we, who belong to the Lok Sabha, we who represent the people of this country in howsoever small a measure, we are not to be consulted and we are to be ignored. We do not succeed in communicating to them feelings, the moods, the difficulties, the agonies and ecstasies of our people at the bottom. They do not know; they themselves admit that the channels of communication have got blocked up, and the leadership is no longer able to play the role of sources of stimulation. The leadership is not able to stimulate. What is the condition in the country today? There is fear at the top; there is pessimism among the professional people; there is indifference, there is apathy, there is silence (*Interruption*) among the common people and that silence is a pregnant silence, it is a

fateful silence, it is not a happy silence. The apathy is not happy apathy. Therefore, if we are to move forwards, whether it be the reorganisation of the States, whether it be the implementation of a new Plan, if we are going to break up this pattern of stagnation for God's sake do not call that a socialist pattern of society—if that want of growth and stagnation is to be broken up, if the whole country is to move forward, let us think in terms not of this side of the House or that side of the House. Let us think in terms of putting all our strength together, our energies together, our thoughts together and find out what would be the proper and what would be the adequate solutions.

The sooner we are able to take the problem of States reorganisation out of our path, the greater will be our ability to move forward. I hope and trust that this controversial question will be settled soon, but will be settled in a manner which will not widen or accentuate the tensions that have grown up, which will not widen the gulf that has been created but which will be solved in a manner whereby the unity and integrity of our people will be strengthened; it will be solved in a manner whereby we shall think not in terms of our smaller loyalties, of our smaller allegiance but in terms of the largest loyalty and the largest allegiance that any Indian is capable of.

डा० राम सुभग सिंह (शाहाबाद दक्षिण) :
सभापति जी, मैं राष्ट्रपति जी को इस बात के लिये बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण में इस बात का जिक्र किया है कि :

“मेरी सरकार को इस बात का बहुत शोक है कि संयुक्तराष्ट्र अमेरिका के सचिव ने इस सम्बन्ध में बोलते हुए पुर्तगाली बस्तियों को पुर्तगाल के प्रान्त कहा जिससे इस बात का भ्रम होता है मानो वे बस्तियाँ पुर्तगाल देश का एक अंग हों।”

करीब दो महीने पहले अमेरिका के सचिव श्री जान फ़ॉस्टर डलेस ने यह वक्तव्य निकाला था कि गोआ आदि पुर्तगाली बस्तियाँ पुर्तगाल के प्रदेश हैं। मैं इसलिये भी सरकार को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि बान्द्रुंग सम्मेलन में—घरर उसके कब्ज़े भी—उस ने पंचशील के आदर्शों को अपनाया, जिसका स्वागत दुनिया के अधिकांश देशों में हुआ है और हो रहा है। इस के लिये

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

में प्रधान मंत्री महोदय और भारत सरकार दोनों को बघाई देता हूँ। गोष्ठा के विषय में अमरीका की नीति के सम्बन्ध में यहाँ भी कुछ भ्रम था, जिसका निराकरण अमृतसर कांग्रेस में हुआ, जहाँ पर कांग्रेस के अध्यक्ष श्री डेबर ने अपने भाषण में खुले आम कहा कि अमरीका की जनता डलेस के साथ नहीं है। इस के लिये मैं उन को भी धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

श्री डलेस ने कहा था कि लगभग चार सौ वर्षों से गोष्ठा की यही स्थिति है, लेकिन अगर उन से सरकारी तौर पर यह पूछा जाये कि चार सौ वर्ष पहले अमरीका की स्थिति क्या थी, तो वह अनुचित नहीं होगा, क्योंकि तीन-चार सौ वर्ष पहले अमरीका में वहाँ के रेड इण्डियन लोगों का अधिकार था। उस के अनुसार रेड इण्डियन लोगों का अमरीका पर कब्जा होना चाहिये।

में प्रजातन्त्र में एक बड़ा दोष मानता हूँ। अमरीका में श्री ब्राइजनहोवर वहाँ के प्रेसिडेंट चुने गये, लेकिन अगर श्री डलेस चुनाव में खड़े होकर गवर्नर के पद पर या किसी और इलेक्टिड पोस्ट (निर्वाचित पद) पर जाना चाहें, तो मेरी बुद्धि के अनुसार वह कभी भी नहीं चुने जा सकते हैं। इस को मैं गणतन्त्र का दोष इसलिये कहता हूँ कि जो व्यक्ति चुना जाता है, वह अपने चुनने वालों के अधिकार की रक्षा उस हद तक नहीं करता जिस हद तक करनी चाहिये। वहाँ पर फिर नामजदगी का सवाल आता है। श्री डलेस को वहाँ पर नामजद किया गया और डेमोक्रेसी को धोखा दिया गया। अमरीका के लोगों की दृष्टि से वहाँ पर किसी चुनाव में ऐसे आदमी सफल नहीं हो सकते हैं।

हम एक दूसरे दृष्टिकोण से भी इस विषय पर विचार कर सकते हैं अर्थात् मुनरो डाक्ट्रिन (सिद्धांत) के अनुसार। २ दिसम्बर को यह वक्तव्य प्रकाशित किया गया कि गोष्ठा पुर्तगाल का अंग है। २ दिसम्बर १८२३ को प्रेसीडेंट मुनरो ने अमरीका की कांग्रेस को संदेश दिया था कि उत्तरी या दक्षिणी अमेरिका में कोई भी यूरोपियन राष्ट्र उपनिवेश स्थापित नहीं कर सकते। श्री डलेस को भारत के इतिहास का पता होना चाहिये और उन को मालूम होना चाहिये कि चार सौ वर्ष पहले गोष्ठा की स्थिति क्या थी। मालूम होता है कि अपने यहाँ के अच्छे अच्छे लोगों के विचारों का भी उनको पता नहीं है।

वर्तमान स्थिति के लिए किसी कदर हम भी हिम्मेवार हैं। दूसरे महासुद्ध के बाद से अमेरिका की यह नीति रही है कि कम्युनिस्ट राज्यों को दबाने के लिए वह तमाम नान-कम्युनिस्ट राज्यों को अपनी तरफ मिलाना चाहता है और उसने यह नीति अपनाई है कि इन राज्यों को थोड़ी-बहुत सहायता देकर अपनी तरफ कर लिया जाये। इस चक्कर में हम लोग भी थोड़े-बहुत पड़ गये हैं और भाग भी किसी हद तक पड़े हुए हैं। अमेरिका की इस नीति का पहला चरण था "एंड टू ग्रीस एंड टर्की", दूसरा चरण था "मार्शल प्लान" और तीसरा चरण था "नार्थ एटलांटिक ट्रीटी ऑर्गनाइजेशन"। उस की धारा ४ में साफ लिखा है :

"The parties will consult together whenever in the opinion of any of them the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened."

यह सही है कि कनाडा के प्रधान मंत्री और दूसरे कुछ लोगों के अनुसार उस को गोष्ठा पर लागू नहीं किया जा सकता लेकिन यदि श्री डलेस जैसे विचार के ही दूसरे लोग हों तो उस को जरूर गोष्ठा पर लागू कर देंगे क्योंकि इस धारा में इस का साफ जिक्र है।

आप भारत के इतिहास को ले लीजिये। उस से प्रकट होगा कि गोष्ठा पर पुर्तगाल का अधिकार होने से पहले भी गोष्ठा का इतिहास रहा है। यदि ऐसा न होता तो हम मान सकते थे कि पुर्तगाल पर गोष्ठा का अधिकार है। परन्तु ऐसा नहीं है। जब से यहाँ का इतिहास है तब से गोष्ठा भारत का अंग रहा है। महा-भारत काल में भी मगध के मौर्य शासकों के जमाने में भी, आभीर और विजय नगर के राजाओं के समय में भी और बहमनी और बीजापुर के शासकों के समय भी गोष्ठा भारत का अंग रहा है ऐसा इतिहास से पता चलता है। इसलिये यह कहना गलत है कि गोष्ठा पर पुर्तगाल के अधिकार से पहले भारत का अधिकार नहीं था।

कहा जाता है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून के अनुसार गोष्ठा को लेने के लिये उतने मजबूत कदम नहीं उठाये जा सकते जितने कि उठाये जाने चाहिए। हमें इस प्रश्न पर भी तथ्यों को सामने रखकर विचार करना चाहिये। जब १७ फरवरी सन् १५१० को गोष्ठा पर पुर्तगाल का अधिकार हुआ तो वहाँ पर एक नरमेध हुआ था और सैकड़ों और हजारों लोग कत्ल

किये गये थे। इससे स्पष्ट है कि पुर्तगाल ने एक आक्रमणकारी की भाँति गोम्हा पर कब्जा किया। आप किसी भी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून को पढ़ें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि हमको किसी भी आक्रमणकारी की मुखालिफत करने का अधिकार है।

गोम्हा को एक विदेशी आक्रमणकारी ने हिसात्मक ढंग से अपने कब्जे में किया है। ऐसी दशा में हम को उस की मुखालिफत करने का पूरा अधिकार है। मैं एक उदाहरण देता हूँ। मान लीजिये कि आज कोई कलकत्ते पर हमला करे। उस स्थिति में हमारी सरकार को और हमारी सारी जनता को यह अधिकार है कि हम हर तरह से प्रयत्न कर के आक्रमणकारी को कलकत्ते से निकालें। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून के अनुसार भी हम को अधिकार है कि हम पुर्तगालियों को गोम्हा से हटा दें क्योंकि उस पर उन का जायज कब्जा नहीं है।

आप विचार कीजिये आज क्या स्थिति होती यदि हम सन ४७ और ४८ में जनागढ़ और हैदराबाद को हिन्दुस्तान में न मिला लिये होते। हैदराबाद की नेगासियेशन (दुरभिसंधि) गोम्हा को खरीदने के लिये चल रही थी। कहना कठिन है कि वह ऐसा करने में सफल होता या नहीं। लेकिन यदि आज हैदराबाद की पहले जैसी ही स्थिति रहती तो हमारी कठिनाई और भी अधिक हो जाती। आज स्थिति ऐसी हो रही है कि हम गोम्हा के मामले में कोई भी दृढ़ कदम नहीं उठा रहे हैं हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने सन् ४६ में कहा था कि :

"I do not think it will be necessary to start any kind of direct action because the Portuguese Administration will disappear once the British Power disappears from India."

यह भाषण उन्होंने १० जुलाई सन् ४६ को दिया था। इस को करीब ६ साल हो चुके लेकिन वह प्रवस्था दुरुस्त नहीं हो सकी है। आजकल हमारे सामने पंचशील का आदर्श है। हमारे पंडित जी के चलते आज दुनिया के बहुत से देश इस आदर्श को मान्यता दे रहे हैं और इस के लिये हम सब को गौरव का अनुभव होता है। लेकिन पंचशील का पहला सिद्धांत है : दूसरे राष्ट्र की राष्ट्रीय अखंडता और सार्वभौमिकता का सम्मान। अब सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि पुर्तगाल के राष्ट्र को हम कहां तक मानें। यदि गोम्हा को पुर्तगाल

का भंग माना जाये तो उस के विरुद्ध हम को कार्रवाई नहीं करनी चाहिये। लेकिन जैसा कि मैंने ऊपर सिद्ध कर दिया है, गोम्हा भारत का भंग है और पुर्तगाल का भंग नहीं है। भले ही श्री डलेस कहें कि वह पुर्तगाल का भंग है, लेकिन इतिहास के आधार पर यह नहीं सिद्ध किया जा सकता। हमें चाहिये कि हम जनता के एक एक सदस्य को यह बता दें कि गोम्हा पुर्तगाल का भंग नहीं है। जनता को किसी हद तक यह बता दिया गया था और जनता ने इस दिशा में कदम भी उठाया था लेकिन उस को रोक दिया गया। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय में हमारी नीति बिल्कुल साफ होनी चाहिये कि सरकार क्या कार्रवाई करेगी और जनता को किस हद तक कार्रवाई करनी चाहिये। आज नगर हवेली और दादरा की भी वही स्थिति होती जो शेष गोम्हा की हो रही है यदि २१ जुलाई सन् ४४ को वहाँ के लोगों ने उस को स्वतन्त्र घोषित न कर दिया होता। आज यदि यह हिस्सा स्वतन्त्र न होता तो वहाँ भी वही तबाही हो रही होती। हम अपने यहाँ के लोगों को कार्रवाई करने की छूट नहीं दे रहे हैं, केवल वहाँ के लोग जो चाहें कदम उठा सकते हैं। लेकिन सवाल आता है कि वहाँ के लोगों में और यहाँ के लोगों में अन्तर क्यों मानते हैं। यह सही है कि वहाँ पर १२ या १६ हज़ार पुर्तगाली सैनिक हैं लेकिन जो शेष पांच या छः लाख जनता वहाँ रहती है वे तो हमारे ही भावभी हैं और हमारा यह कर्तव्य है कि उन लोगों को हम अपने समान बनावें। वहाँ सरकार के पास हर प्रकार के हथियार हैं, जब कि जनता निहत्थी है। ऐसी स्थिति में हम यह आशा नहीं कर सकते कि वहाँ की जनता अपने आन्दोलन में कामयाब हो जायेगी। हमें उन को सहायता करनी होगी। और यदि हम ऐसा करें तो यह पंचशील के सिद्धांत के विपरीत भी नहीं होगा क्योंकि गोम्हा भारत के भूखंड का ही भंग है, न ऐसा करना अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय कानून के विरुद्ध हो सकता है। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि ऐसा करने से गोली चलेगी और रक्तपात होगा। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि यदि कोई आक्रमणकारी आकर कलकत्ते पर आक्रमण करें तो हमें अपनी जनता को छूट देनी होगी कि वह उसकी हर प्रकार से मुखालिफत करें।

अगर हम खूद नहीं करते तो न करें। लेकिन अगर वहाँ की जनता मुखालिफत करती है तो हर ढंग की नीति को देखते हुए भी इस में कोई विचकत को बात समझ में नहीं आती।

[**डॉ० राम सुभग सिंह**]

अब सवाल आता है ब्रिटिश कामनवेल्थ का। इस के बारे में कई बातें कही गई हैं। इस बात से भी हमें बड़ी खुशी हुई है कि गोआ के बारे में प्रधान मंत्री की ओर से स्पष्ट ऐलान कर दिया गया है कि :

“The territory will not be permitted to be used as a base for hostile operations against India in case of war and the N.A.T.O. of 1949 and the Anglo-Portuguese Treaty of 1889 have no relevance in this matter as India is not a party to any one of them.”

१८८६ की जो ऐंग्लो पुर्तगाली संधि है उस के अनुसार अंग्रेज सरकार ने यह बीड़ा उठाया है कि :

“British Government promise to defend and protect all interests and colonies belonging to Portugal against all enemies, present and future.”

अब हम लोग ब्रिटिश कामनवेल्थ में हैं तो क्या हम उन को इतना भी प्रभावित नहीं कर सकते कि वे खुद ब खुद इस संधि को रद्द कर दें। हमारे यहां तो यह ऐलान हो गया है कि इस ट्रीटी (संधि) का कोई रिलेवेन्स (संगति) नहीं है, लेकिन क्या अंग्रेज भी हमारी तरफ कुछ हमदर्दी दिखा कर इस संधि को रद्द करने की घोषणा नहीं करेंगे ? नार्थ एटलांटिक ट्रीटी आर्गनाइजेशन के सेक्रेटरी जनरल लार्ड इस्समें बराबर जा कर पुर्तगाल के लोगों को यह प्रेरणा देते रहते हैं कि कुछ भी हो हम नाटो प्रोग्राम के अनुसार विचार करेंगे। अब बात आती है भारत सरकार की। मार्शल प्लान, नार्थ एटलांटिक ट्रीटी आर्गनाइजेशन, प्वाइंट फोर प्लान, इत्यादि चीजे हैं। इस प्वाइंट फोर प्लान के अन्तर्गत साफ सवाल है कि अगर आप किसी से कोई काम कराना चाहते हैं तो या तो आप खुद इतनी हस्ती रखिये कि उस काम को करा लीजिये, नहीं तो यह भी हम को अधिकार रखना चाहिये कि वे हमको ऐसा न समझे कि हम उनसे डरते हैं।

रक्षा संगठन मंत्री (श्री त्यागी) : ऐसा वह नहीं समझते हैं।

डॉ० राम सुभग सिंह : यदि प्वाइंट फोर प्लान के बारे में त्यागी जी ने यह समझा है तो ठीक है। मगर जब यह प्वाइंट फोर प्लान चालू किया गया था तो राष्ट्रपति ट्रूमैन ने यह घोषणा की थी कि जितनी अडरडेबलपंड कंट्रीज

(अधिकसित देश) हैं उनमें जाकर अमरीकी सहायता पहुंचायें इसलिये कि वहां पर कम्युनिस्टों का प्रभाव न होने पावे। यही उस का सिद्धांत है जो कि शायद आप को पता होगा। अगर आप को इस का पता है तो यहीं पर हमारा विरोध आता है। यदि हम उस का विरोध करते हैं तो ठीक है, आंख मूंद कर विरोध कीजिये, लेकिन उसको अलग अलग नाम से रखना कहां तक ठीक है। मार्शल प्लान है, कम्युनिटी डेवेलोपमेंट प्रोजेक्ट, नेशनल ऐक्सटेंशन सर्विस, कोई तामिल या मलायम का नाम दे दें। यह सब बातें अमरीका के लोग ज्यादा आसानी से समझते हैं। आप के देहरादून में कोई समझता है या नहीं, यह मुझे पता नहीं। प्वाइंट फोर प्रोग्राम के बारे में हम बार बार एक के बाद एक समझौता करते गये, यहां तक समझौता भी कर लिया कि अमरीकन घी लावें, यहां तक समझौता कर लिया कि अमरीका से जो गेहूं लावें उस पर अमरीकी झंडा रहे। हमारे यहां बिहार में आदेश हुआ कि अमरीका के इस समझौते के अनुसार उस पर अमरीकी स्टार और स्ट्राइप्स रहेंगी। उन के बिना बोरों का वितरण नहीं हो सकता। मेरा कहना यही है कि या तो आप समझ कर समझौता कीजिये या फिर जो समझौते किये हैं उन में अगर कोई दस्तन्दाजी करे तो उस को दुरुस्त कीजिये। बिहार में इस प्रकार से हो रहा है। इसी तरह से गिफ्टस का सवाल है। अगर आप ने गिफ्टस के बारे में कोई समझौता किया है या किसी से गिफ्ट ली है तो किसी को कोई हक नहीं है कि उस पर अपने कंट्रोल की बात करे।

इसी तरह से हम लोगों की सेक्युलर (कम निरपेक्ष) सरकार है, यदि यहां पर कोई अन्य धार्मिक आदमी आता है तो कोई भी सरकार का आदमी या मंत्री अगर उस के साथ जा कर गाना गावे तो यह भी ठीक नहीं है। यदि हमारी सरकार सेक्युलर है तो उस के किसी भी आदमी को किसी भी धार्मिक संस्था के आदमी के साथ नहीं रहना चाहिये क्योंकि उस संस्था के आदमी का खास उद्देश्य है।

इसी तरह से मान लीजिये कि जार्ज मीने ने जो कि इंटरनेशनल फेडरेशन आफ फ्री वर्ल्ड ट्रेड यूनियन्स के प्रेसीडेंट हैं, पंडित जी के खिलाफ भाषण दिया कि वह कम्युनिस्टों के हाथ में खेल रहे हैं, उन का भाषण सुन कर खून खौलने लगता है, लेकिन उस को आप छोड़ दीजिये क्योंकि इंटरनेशनल फेडरेशन आफ फ्री वर्ल्ड

ट्रेड यूनियन्स के ऊपर हमारा कोई कन्दोल नहीं है। यदि वहाँ यह कहा गया कि नीग्रो को उस ट्रेड यूनियन में रहने का अधिकार नहीं है तो ठीक है, इंटरनेशनल फेडरेशन ऑफ फ्री वर्ल्ड ट्रेड यूनियन को अधिकार है। यदि जार्ज मीने वहाँ ऐसा बोलते हैं तो वह फ्री हैं इस के बारे में। पर आप उन के चक्कर में न पड़ें। आप उस के सदस्य कैसे हो जाते हैं। इसके विरुद्ध हम ने चेतावनी दी, हालांकि चेतावनी देने की में जरूरत नहीं समझता, लेकिन आप को इस झगड़े में नहीं पड़ना चाहिये कि वैसे लोगों की युनियन के आप ईकाई हो जायें।

और भी बहुत सी बातें कही गई हैं जो कि शाहर-या देहात के बारे में हैं। उन पर मैं बाद में कहूंगा। लेकिन जहाँ तक गोम्रा का सवाल है वह पंचशील सिद्धांत के बिल्कुल अन्दर आता है और उसके अनुसार हमें अधिकार है कि चूंकि वहाँ पर पुर्तगालियों की ओर से एग्रेसन (आक्रमण) हुआ है उस का जवाब हम उन को शान्तिपूर्ण ढंग से दें, लेकिन अगर वह एफेक्टिव (प्रभावशाली) नहीं होता तो हमारा यह भी अधिकार है कि हम उसका जवाब किसी तरह से भी दे कर उन को वहाँ से हटावें, हमारा, आप का धर्म है कि हम अपने भाइयों को जाकर स्वतन्त्र करें।

इसी तरह से राज्य पुनर्गठन का सवाल है। हिन्दुस्तान में सभी लोग रहेंगे। लेकिन भाषा-वार प्रान्त के प्रश्न को लेकर सब लोग ऐसे हो गये हैं कि मालूम होता है कि जैसा उन्हीं का एक कल्चर (संस्कृति) है, उन्हीं की एक भाषा है, और किसी का कल्चर या भाषा है ही नहीं। मैं इसे अपनी कमजोरी समझता हूँ। मान लीजिये की झांसी की रानी की जगह से ग्वालियर से राजा कुंवर सिंह के जगदीशपुर तक कानपुर के विठ्ठर आदि सहित जहाँ जहाँ सन् १८५७ में बलवा हुआ उन इलाकों से लेकर कालपी तक न कोई भाषा रहने पाई न कोई संस्कृति रहने पाई। जिन इलाकों में बलवा नहीं हुआ वहाँ बहुत पढ़े लिखे अफसर हुए। आज वह कहने लग कि हमारे पास अपना कल्चर है, इस के अलावा हिन्दुस्तान में कोई कल्चर नहीं, जहाँ के लोगों ने इतनी कुर्बानी की हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी के लिये, उन का कोई कल्चर नहीं, उन की कोई अबान ही नहीं है, तो यह कैसे हो सकता है। आज ५० पी० का कल्चर ही तो सारे भारत का कल्चर है। चाहे राम-कृष्ण हुए, चाहे बुद्ध हुए, उन्हीं

का कल्चर तो है हम लोगों का, फिर चाहे वहाँ हिन्दू हों, चाहे ईसाई हों या धीर कोई हों, आज मथुरा से लेकर गया तक जहाँ बुद्ध देव को ज्ञान प्राप्त हुआ था, या नेपाल से लेकर राम के नगर तक के कल्चर में कोई अन्तर नहीं है, लेकिन कल्चर के नाम पर और भाषा के नाम पर आज सब लड़ने लगते हैं। आज बक्त का तकाजा है कि जब तक गोम्रा, डामन और ड्यू को हम स्वतन्त्र न करा लें, तब तक हम इस भाषा-वार प्रान्त के झमेले में न पड़ें। अगर हम इस प्रकार के प्रश्नों में अपने को उलझायेंगे तो परेशानी में पड़ जायेंगे। मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि अब अशोक मेहता जी भी सोचने लगे कि हम को बाइलिग्वल स्टेट्स बनानी चाहिये। गवर्नमेंट की भी यह कम-जोरी है कि मान लीजिये कि आज दस-पन्द्रह आदमी उठ कर मांग करने लगे कि हम को फलानी चीज चाहिये तो सरकार कांपने लगती है और सोचने लगती है कि उन की मांग मान लें। दस आदमियों ने कह दिया कि लिग्विस्टिक स्टेट्स बना दो, किसी ने कहा कि रीजनल लैंग्वेज की स्टेट्स बना दो, बस तुरन्त सरकार ने एक कमीशन बना दिया। मेरा कहना है कि अगर आज कम्यूनालिज्म (साम्प्रदायिकता) के खिलाफ सरकार है तो उस को इस मामले में नरमी नहीं बरतनी चाहिये, न इस तरह के लोगों को अफसर बनाये और न मिनिस्टर बनाये। अगर आप को यह काम करना है तो मजबूती से करना होगा। इसलिये मैं अपना कर्त्तव्य समझता हूँ और सरकार तथा जनता का भी कि जितनी विदेशी पाकेट्स यहाँ पर हैं पहले उन सभी से अपने देशवासियों को स्वतन्त्र कराना चाहिये, उस के बाद ही किसी दूसरी बात पर विचार करना चाहिये।

अब सवाल आता है टेक्सेशन (कराधान) का। आज क्वेश्चन अवर (प्रश्नकाल) के समय संसदीय सचिव महोदय ने कहा कि हम ने पाकिस्तान से आने वाले लोगों के सम्बन्ध में पाकिस्तान को लिखा, लेकिन पाकिस्तान सुनता ही नहीं है। आज ईस्ट बंगाल में जितनी आबादी है उस की चौथाई आबादी ऐसी है जिसको पाकिस्तान वाले हटाना चाहते हैं और अगर वह नहीं भी हटाना चाहते हैं तो वहाँ की स्थिति के कारण वहाँ के लोग स्वयम् ही यहाँ भाग कर आ रहे हैं। अब हम को ठंडे दिल से विचार करना है। जरूर यह हमारी राष्ट्रीय धाती है कि हम उन आने वाले लोगों की रक्षा करें, अगर वह यहाँ पर आबें तो हम दिल खोल कर उन का स्वागत करें।

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

लेकिन क्या हम उन को इसी तरह से भ्राने दें जैसे कि वह अपने घरबार छोड़ कर भा रहे हैं और उन को जैसे तैसे यहां बसावें ? यहां पर हमारी पालिसी (नीति) का सवाल आता है। पालिसी आप को ऐसी बनानी चाहिये कि जिस में पाकिस्तान को, जो कि अंग्रेजी दिमाग का डांषा है, सोचना पड़े कि यदि पाकिस्तान के लोगों का टेरिटोरियल राइट आफ सेसेशन माना गया तो क्यों इन आदमियों का टेरिटोरियल राइट आफ सेसेशन न माना जाय।

अगर आप एक चौथाई आबादी को हटाते हैं किसी कारणवश, तो आप का फर्ज हो जाता है कि आप उन को बसाने का भी प्रबन्ध करें। चाहे वे लोग अपने आप आते हैं, चाहे वे निकाले जाते हैं, उन को बसाने का सवाल बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण है। उन की जो जमीन वहां पर है, उस का भी आप को ख्याल रखना है। आप को चाहिये कि आप उन को राज्य के नज़दीक ही बसावें। हम भाषावार राज्यों के फेर में इस चीज को भुला देते हैं। आज इस की कोई भी मांग नहीं करता, न कम्युनिस्ट करते हैं, न सोशलिस्ट करते हैं और न ही हिन्दु महासभा करती है। अगर दो-चार आदमी आते हैं तब तो उन को किसी भी जगह बसाया जा सकता है लेकिन जब लाखों और करोड़ों की संख्या में लोग आते हैं तब हम को अपनी पालिसी ऐसी बनानी पड़ेगी जिस से कि उन का कल्याण हो सके और मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि हमारी पालिसी ऐसी होनी चाहिये जिस से कि पाकिस्तान का भी कल्याण हो सके।

श्री स्यागी : बात लाजिक की है।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : अब मैं टैक्सों के बारे में कहूंगा। टैक्स भी खूब लगाये जा रहे हैं। मेडिकल इंस्टीट्यूट खुल रही है, उस पर भी तकरीबन ६ करोड़ का खर्च होना है। ४५० करोड़ रुपये के नये टैक्स लगाने का भी विचार है। इस के अलावा ४०० करोड़ रुपये की और जरूरत होगी जिस को कहीं से लाना होगा। प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना को पूरा करने के लिये भी आप ने काफी टैक्स लगाये हैं। मैं आप से यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि एडीमिनिस्ट्रेशन (प्रशासन) में आप क्या सुधार कर पाये हैं। आप गरीब आदमियों से टैक्स तो काफी बसूल करते हैं लेकिन उस का ख्याल जरा भी नहीं करते। आप को चाहिये कि आप यह देखें कि एक एक

पैसे का सदुपयोग हो। आपने कई कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट्स चलाई हैं, कई नेशनल एक्सपेंशन प्लान्स चलाये हैं, बड़े-बड़े कल कारखाने खोले हैं, और आप इन पर बहुत बड़ी-बड़ी रकमें भी खर्च कर रहे हैं। लेकिन क्या आपने कभी यह भी देखने की कोशिश की है कि क्या इन में जो खर्च हो रहा है वह ठीक ढंग से भी हो रहा है या नहीं। जिस तरह से आप डाक बंगले बनाते हैं, जिस तरह की आप इंस्टीट्यूट्स बनाते हैं और इन के लिये जिस तरह की आप बिल्डिंग्स बनाते हैं वह ऐसी होती है जो एक साधारण आदमी ने कभी देखी भी न होगी। आप ने जो रुपया कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट्स पर खर्च किया है मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप मुझे बतायें उस में से कितना रुपया अफसरों के घर बनाने पर खर्च किया गया है और कितना रुपया पेट्रोल इत्यादि पर खर्च किया गया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन सब चीजों की पहलें जांच की जाए और उसके बाद ही कोई नये टैक्स लगाये जायें। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप टैक्स न लगायें। आप १०,००० करोड़ के नये टैक्स लगायें लेकिन साथ ही साथ आप यह देखें कि पैसे-पैसे का सदुपयोग हो। आज हमारे मिनिस्टर साहिबान ने जो सेंटर और स्टेट्स को मिलाकर सैंकड़ों की तादाद में हैं दौरा करते फिरते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उन का ध्यान इन चीजों की तरफ नहीं गया ? क्या कभी उन्होंने इस बात की ओर भी ध्यान दिया है कि जो रुपया फिजूल खर्च हो रहा है उस को रोका जाय और इसकी जांच-पड़ताल की जाए ? क्या उन को यह मालूम नहीं है कि घूसखोरी कम होने के बजाय बढ़ती जा रही है ? यह जो घूसखोरी बढ़ रही है, यह किसी एक खास डिपार्टमेंट में ही नहीं बढ़ रही है, हर डिपार्टमेंट में यह बढ़ रही है। चाहे पुलिस का डिपार्टमेंट हो चाहे कोई और, कोई भी इस से अछूता नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमें वैसे ही कार्य करने चाहिये जिन के करने से जनता की भलाई हो, उन के स्वार्थ की सिद्धि हो। यह जो घूसखोरी है यह किसी एक जिले या गांव तक ही महबूद नहीं है, यह हर जगह है। हम यहां पर कभी पुर्निया की चर्चा करते हैं और कभी किसी और जगह की। आज जैसी स्थिति है उस में तो मैं यह देखता हूँ कि लोग अपने आप को महफूज फील (महसूस) नहीं करते हैं। चोरियां और डकैतियां हर जगह हो रही हैं। आज हर सूबे में और हर देहात में मानसिंह है। बलिया में मानसिंह है, बाराबंकी में मानसिंह है, बिहार में

मानसिंह है। साथ ही साथ हम कितने ही जलूस निकलते देखते हैं, कितने ही मुज्राहरे होते देखते हैं। मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या कारण है कि ऐसी स्थिति पैदा होती है कि कहीं पर भ्रम लगाई जाती है और कहीं पर कुछ और किया जाता है। इन सब चीजों को रोकने का क्यों प्रयत्न नहीं किया जा रहा है और जिन कारणों से यह सब चीजें होती हैं, उन कारणों को दूर करने की क्यों चेष्टा नहीं की जा रही है? मुझे याद है कि १९४६ में हिन्दु-मुस्लिम रायट्स (इंगों) के दिनों में जवाहरलाल जी ने हवाई अड्डा से जाकर इन को रोकवाने का प्रयत्न किया था और एक प्रकार से धमकी दी थी। आज भी हम को यह चाहिये कि हम यह देखें कि वही आदमी जिलों और देहातों में रखे जायें जिन की आवाज में ताकत हो, जो किसी भी स्थिति का मुकाबला करने में समझदारी से काम ले सकें।

अंग्रेजों के यहां से चले जाने के बाद कितनी ही तरक्कियां अफसरों को दी गईं, इतनी प्रमो-शंज (तरक्कियां) कमी भी अंग्रेजों के जमाने में नहीं दी गईं जितनी पिछले चन्द सालों में दी गई हैं। जो आज हमारी सर्विसिस की हालत है वह मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ आप आर्मी (सेना) को ही ले लीजिये। आप देखेंगे कि वहां पर जो अफसर होंगे वे तो एक तबके के होंगे और जो सिपाही होंगे वे दूसरे तबके के होंगे। इस का क्या कारण है? इसका कारण यह है कि हमारे यहां एक तो पब्लिक स्कूल हैं और दूसरे बेसिक स्कूल हैं। पब्लिक स्कूल जो हैं उन में वही लड़के भरती होते हैं जो कि बड़े लोगों के लड़के होते हैं और जो बेसिक स्कूल हैं उनमें वही लोग भरती होते हैं जिन के मां-बाप गरीब होते हैं। जो लड़के पब्लिक स्कूल से पढ़ कर निकलते हैं वे तो अफसर हो जाते हैं और जो लड़के बेसिक स्कूल से पढ़ कर निकलते हैं वे सिपाही बन जाते हैं। इसी तरह से आप आई० ए० एस० और आई० पी० एस० को ले लीजिये। वहां पर भी यही हाल है। इस किस्म की चीजों को देखकर बहुत दुख होता है और दुःख खास कर इसलिये और भी ज्यादा होता है कि यह अपनी सरकार है और इस के राज में ऐसी बातें हो रही हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जहां पर भी कमियां हैं उन को दूर किया जाए और हर एक को पढ़ने के बराबर मौके मुहैया किये जायें।

अब मैं बेरोजगारी के सवाल पर आता हूँ। पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना में हम ने बेकारी को दूर करने के लिये १७५ करोड़ रुपया खर्च किया है। कितने आदमियों को रोजी मिली है इस का कोई पता नहीं है। मैं तो यह कहता हूँ कि शिक्षितों को नौकरी देने के लिये आप टैक्स न लगायें। जो लोग अधिक्षित हैं शिक्षित हो जाने के बाद वे भाषावार प्रान्तों की मांग करने लगते हैं और अगर उन को कहीं किसी दफ्तर में नौकरी मिल जाती है तो वे घूसखोरी करने लग जाते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि पढ़े लिखे लोगों को नौकरी ही न दी जाये, मैं तो यह चाहता हूँ कि उन में जो यह बुराइयां आ जाती हैं, इन को दूर किया जाये और यह देखा जावे कि यह बुराइयां पैदा क्यों होती हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि एक आदमी जब कहीं पर नौकर हो जाता है चाहे चित्तूरजन में हो जाता है, चाहे किसी सैन्टेरिएट में हो जाता है, चाहे मेडिकल सर्विस में आ जाता है, चाहे आई० ए० एस० में आता है और चाहे आई० पी० एस० में आता है, आप उसका स्टैंडर्ड इतना ऊंचा न कर दीजिये जिस से कि वह उस स्टैंडर्ड को हासिल करने के लिये किसी किस्म की बुराई में फसे।

इसी तरह से सीलिंग का सवाल है। आप का जमीनों पर १२०० की सीलिंग लगाने का विचार है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप ५०० की सीलिंग लगाइये। पर यह सीलिंग सर्वत्र लगे। इसी तरह से बड़े लोगों की तनखाहों पर भी ५०० की सीलिंग लगनी चाहिये। जो लोग थोड़ी तनखाह पाने वाले हैं उन की तनखाह में आप को वृद्धि करनी चाहिये। और जो लोग पांच सौ से ज्यादा तनखाह पाते हैं उन की तनखाह में कमी करनी चाहिये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ५०० की सीलिंग अगर लग जाय तो अच्छा है। साथ ही साथ जो बड़े आदमियों के अधिकार हैं उन में कमी होनी चाहिये। जैसे दरोगा को तनखाह के साथ साथ अधिक अधिकार भी हैं। वह जितनी तबाही और बरबादी चाहे मचा सकता है। बड़े बड़े आदमियों की एक तो तनखाह में कमी होती चाहिये और दूसरे उन के अधिकारों में कमी होनी चाहिये।

अन्त में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि दो-बार आदमियों ने एक मांग पेश कर दी और आप ने उस की मंजूर कर लिया, ऐसी बात नहीं होनी चाहिये। आप को मजबूती के साथ

[डा० राम सुमंग सिंह]

और सोच-समझ कर समस्याओं को हल करना चाहिये और जो कमियां मैने बतलाई हैं उन को दूर करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये ।

✓ **Shri Syamnandan Sahaya** (Muzaffarpur Central): I have glanced through the amendments which have been tabled and have listened with caution and respect to the speeches made but the one thing which appeared to me as being a demand from many sides of this Lok Sabha and an expectation in the President's Address is that it ought to be an encyclopaedia of information and must be an exhaustive survey of future prospects. I do not share that view. It is not possible to state in a speech all the information that possibly the Government can give in an Address of this nature nor is it possible to state with precision all that the future may have in store. In any case, I feel that generally the Address has dealt with the outstanding features in this country and has also given expression to what is immediately before the Government for future developments.

I have been associated with the co-operative movement for a long time and one of the things which I welcome particularly is the emphasis that the Address lays on the co-operative method, for the purposes of developing rural economy and also for dealing with what are described as small-scale industries. The world, in my opinion, is at present torn between two ideologies. One is what is known and called the capitalist economy where the individual has a great incentive and also makes large profits resulting in the accumulation of wealth in comparatively fewer hands. The other is what may be called the socialist economy, but truly speaking, I take it for the time being as the State economy where generally the entire economic uplift of a country, the creation and development of industries, of agriculture and all things connected with the nation and the country are handled by the State itself, of course for the greatest good not only of the greatest number but of the entire nation. It is difficult to foretell at present—although some of my friends may not agree with me—which particular policy and economy will succeed in the end. We have before us two countries, the United States of America and Russia. In the United States of America the capitalist system prevails. I have not been to

America but we are all told that every third man there owns a motor car. It just indicates how prosperous people generally in that country are. There is the other country, Russia, which during the course of a few years has made such a tremendous progress that it staggers those who go and watch things being done there. Therefore, it is difficult to say straightway as to which particular system will ultimately prevail in the world as being the best under the circumstances. But one thing is quite clear. Whether this system succeeds or that system succeeds, there is no doubt that in a country like ours we can neither shut out completely individual initiative nor can we say that we shall not adopt a policy whereby agricultural industry which is, I suppose, the biggest industry in this country and other industries are not run on a basis which may be of the best social advantage to the country. Now, we have to find a *via media* between the two, and I feel that the co-operative method perhaps might be the *via media*. It allows for individual initiative and incentive and also for collective ownership, for collective farming, for the use of implements in agriculture on a co-operative basis. That being so, I have every reason, as I have stated before to welcome this pronouncement and as we all know, agriculture, left entirely to itself, in times of falling prices might not meet the economic and financial needs of the countryside. It is, therefore, essential that the small-scale industries must remain as a partner in the development of rural areas and the rural population. But perhaps it was not visualised when the particular aspect of the Address was under consideration that under the co-operative sphere even large industries are now being tackled. There are now in the country nearly eight or ten sugar factories which are run on co-operative basis and a good number of ginning factories have also been started and are being run very satisfactorily by co-operatives. I hope, therefore, that in time to come the sphere of co-operative activity will not merely be confined to agriculture and small-scale industries but will also be extended to large industries, and if once we succeed in doing so, it would be appreciated that all we need for the purposes of a socialist State, *i.e.*, for the purposes of equitable distribution of profits and wealth, will have been materially and substantially achieved without causing what we have

known in the process elsewhere—hardship to any class—hardship which perhaps might not be palatable yet to this country.

What is agitating almost all people who keep themselves in touch with the day-to-day affairs of this country is the question of reorganisation of States. When the matter was first mentioned in the President's Address on a similar occasion in the past, I had an opportunity of taking part in the debate that followed and I said then that it appeared to me that the step we were taking in that direction was perhaps premature. I find now that the consideration of this matter has raised many more problems than it has solved. My own view is that it has created a situation in which apart from what may happen in the future, in the present we have lost appreciably—I am using this word after due deliberation—both at home and abroad. However, that is past history. There is no going back now, in my opinion, on what has happened, for two reasons. It may be said that a wise man changes his mind and a fool does not. But I am not sticking to this maxim at present for another reason. The reason is that this problem has been raised. It has agitated the public mind and serious situations have developed in some parts of the country. To ignore it now or to give it a decent burial will not be, in my opinion, the right course. The matter has got to be settled. But in the settlement of this affair, in the larger interests of the country and of the nation as a whole, one thing has to be kept pre-eminently before our minds *i.e.*, let nothing be solved on the principle of "Peace, oh Lord, in my time, and after me the deluge".

If, however, we followed only a policy of least resistance, posterity will always lay the blame on us, that we did not do the duty we owed to the country and for which we were sent here. I know that in a decision of this nature, it is impossible for any Government to give a solution which would please everybody. Socrates and Aristotle, if they were here sitting on the Treasury Benches, would not have been able to give a solution which would please everybody. But, the decision, as I have submitted, must be taken with firmness. The problem has been raised and it has got to be solved. About ten years ago, some people said that they

had a different culture and therefore there must be a partition of India. I remember having attended a meeting of the Muslim League. I was invited by some Muslim friends and I attended that conference. I was sitting there listening to the speeches. The Maharaja of Mahmudabad was addressing the meeting and I was just listening. It was no business of mine to get up and enter a caveat. But, I met the Maharaja Saheb, the President, again at tea the following evening. I said, "Saheb, I had been listening to your speech very carefully this morning. You said that we wear different dress, eat different food and speak different languages and therefore, we should have a separate country. Here we are sitting. You are wearing a *chapkan* and I am also wearing a *chapkan*. You are wearing a *churidhar pyjama* and I am also wearing a *churidhar pyjama*. Perhaps yours may be better sewn because you come from Lucknow; but there is no difference in dress. You may say, I am wearing this dress for this particular occasion. Ask the other Muslim friends whether I do not wear the same dress almost every day. Then you talked about food. Come along to the distant villages and see the Hindu food and the Muslim food. It is the same. It is the same in the lower middle-class and in the upper middle-class. Then, you said something about our languages being different—Urdu and Hindi. Here I am talking to you in Urdu. You come from a place which is called *Ahl-e-Zaban*, Lucknow, and perhaps you can speak a little better Urdu, though I do not admit that as yet. But here there are other Muslim friends and I doubt whether they will be able to talk as good Urdu as I do. What is the difference in culture? If you want a separate country, say so; do not base it on culture." Unfortunately, Sir, we are faced with the same problem in the question of the re-organisation of States, and we talk of separate culture. I cannot understand culture being separate as an individual thing belonging to a particular people. What is our culture? It is not what the Aryans brought from Central Asia. Culture is a combination of all that has happened from the time they came here. Even before, we had the culture which we had secured from the Dravidians and the other people who inhabited this country before. Most regretfully one finds sometimes faced with a situation that culture must be protected, language must be protected

[Shri Syamnandan Sahaya]

and so on. These things appear to be rather discomfoting. It is essential for those whom destiny has placed in power to be firm. One, however, notices, sometimes, perhaps on account of his lack of knowledge of internal working, a certain amount of weakness. It seriously affects the country as such. I still feel that here is a question of a particular thing being done which ought to be done in the general interests and not merely to pacify a false and undesirable claim like having a separate culture this and that.

Perhaps, my friends from my State and also from other States, will be unconsciously thinking about the merger of Bihar and Bengal. I may submit that the Chief Ministers of Bihar and Bengal must come forward boldly. As I have stated before, if the nations interests are served by a merger, have merger by all means.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea): Murder!

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Yes, sometimes even murders are taken recourse to; it is nothing new. Acharya Kripalani knows it as a Professor of History; I have been his student and he has taught us. This question of merger has not had any serious objection raised against it both in the Bengal and Bihar Press. It is because, after all it is the development of particular part of the country that is India and if the development would be accelerated by means of joint action and co-operative action, I see no reason why one should not accept it. At present on principle I do not think there will be any objection. But it all depends upon how ultimately things shape when the pictures are fully drawn. I have full faith in the ability of the two Chief Ministers and I think when ultimately the picture comes up before the country, it will be such that it may not be harmful to any part of those two States. But, there is one thing in this connection which I want to suggest for the consideration of those who may be drafting the Bill. It may be absolutely untrue, but from newspaper reports I find that the proposal in the Bill that will be introduced in the Lok Sabha with regard to Bihar and Bengal will contain the recommendations of the S.R.C. so far as the transfer of a part of Bihar to Bengal is concerned, I do not consider it advisable from two points of view. In the

first place, if the proposal for merger has been accepted, then it does not stand to reason why the question of portions Bengal coming into Bihar or portion of Bihar coming into Bengal should be taken up now. Secondly, this question of the transfer of a certain portion of the territory would create an amount of bitterness in those parts of the country.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Bhai-Bhai.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Some people say "Bhai-Bhahino" also! Of course, it is perfectly all right to say "Bhai-Bhai" or "Bhai-Bhahino".

I was suggesting that it would not be politic and it would not be furthering the cause of the merger if you include that. A decision has to be taken, and let it be taken quickly. The more it is delayed, the worse it will be. I would, therefore, suggest strongly for the consideration of the law-makers that it would not be right to include that. But, if you are not in a position to come to a decision now because of the various meetings of the legislatures and so on, at least postpone it for some time. The residents of Bihar who are in favour of this merger will be greatly handicapped if you take this step when proposing the legislation.

3 P.M.

I think I have taken a lot of your time and I do not know how much more time I have got. But I will say one or two things and will finish soon.

I suppose it is now customary when speaking on the President's Address to say something about the international affairs or what you call External Affairs. I read somewhere a jurist pronouncing that it was not merely enough for a judge to lay down good law; it was also necessary for him to create the impression that the particular judge was laying down good law. I think this is a very sound policy which could or should be followed in other spheres also. With regard to politics we have been pronouncing, perhaps rightly, but sometimes in season and sometimes out of season also, that ours is a policy of neutrality, dynamic of course. Now, let us say this is a right course. No one would dispute, I suppose, the rightness of this policy. But I think it is equally desirable that this impression should be created abroad that we are neutral and we propose to continue to be such. From what we have seen in newspapers

of late, I am inclined to think the impression is not as it should be. It is difficult for me to lay blame for this on the Central External Affairs Ministry or on our Ambassadors abroad. But whoever may have the charge of this part of the function should, in my opinion, be able to create the impression that ours really is a policy of neutrality though a little dynamic.

With regard to our frontier problems, somehow or other I feel that we ought to take some other course also. We have been waiting now for years to settle our frontier problems. The problems arise from various negotiations going on between Pakistan and India about the transfer of movable assets and immovable assets, about the exodus of population and all that kind of thing. Then after that we had discussed the Kashmir problem. Since then we have got the Goa problem and last but not the least we have also got the Nepal problem. As to the Naga problem—somebody hinted it—that I consider yet not as a frontier problem but as an internal problem and I do hope that we will be able to settle it. But in all these four others I do not think that we have been successful to an extent on which we could congratulate ourselves. The problems are difficult indeed. But a policy of mere *ahimsa*, I think, may not be as successful as we should like it to be. I am reminded about the story of the old serpent. He went to a *rishi*, *yogi*, and asked: How am I to secure salvation? The *rishi* replied: Don't bite anybody and after this life, in the re-birth you will secure a higher birth. So the serpent accepted the *rishi's* version and went away. After some time when the boys saw that this serpent was harmless and will not bite, they began to beat it and pelt stones at it. Then the serpent went to the *rishi* again and said: This is my problem, I am suffering like this; the boys are troubling me. The *rishi* said: I asked you not to bite. But I did not tell you not to hiss. I do not know how far this advice will be acceptable to the Government of India. In any case, whatever it may be, I think it is time that we did something on this problem. It requires serious consideration.

I will, before I conclude in a minute, say that I am sorry to find that in the Address or in the general plans that the Government of India have been formulating—the First Five Year Plan, the

Second Five Year Plan and the so many *yojanas* and schemes we have not done anything materially in the matter of the beggar problem. He who has passed a night during rains on the streets of a city can only appreciate how welcome it is to have a roof over him. It is a matter to which, I think, attention should be drawn and Government must give, if not their first I suppose the second priority because we are talking of a socialistic pattern of society. Now we talk of socialist society. But when we do so, what about the real needy persons who are at the lowest rung of the ladder? Their case, I think, ought to deserve very serious, careful and sympathetic attention if we desire really to have a socialist State in this country.

The other point to which I wanted to draw the attention of the Government was . . .

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Sahaya has already exceeded the time limit.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: I will not take any more of the time I will also draw the attention of the Government to the necessity of expanding the activities of the National Cadet Corps in all the colleges in the country and of the ACC in all the high schools in the country. It will mean a little money, I appreciate, but it will pay dividend far in excess of anything that we can imagine or visualise.

I am grateful for the time you have given me. I shall say no more. The problems of the Government are such that any one placed in their situation would find it difficult to handle and settle quickly. But the greatness of the Government and the greatness of the administrator is only known when he faces and solves difficult problems. Easy things are easily handled by easy people.

Shri U. C. Patnalk (Ghumsur): While agreeing with the opening remarks of the hon. Member who spoke last, that the President's Address is not expected to be an encyclopaedia, I would submit that there are very important matters, major questions of policy, which have got to be referred to in any overall picture.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Member want to move amendment No. 13?

Shri U. C. Patnalk : Yes Sir, I beg to move:

"That at the end of the motion, the following be added:

"but regret that the Address (a) gives no indication of any proposal to modernise the defence forces with a view to anticipate an attack from outside; (b) discloses no programme for coordinating defence with nation-building activities so as to ensure greater efficiency and economy in the two wings of the national life—civil and military; and (c) overlooks the tremendous scope for training our vast man power, through educational and vocational training schemes in the defence organisation, for implementing various programmes under the Second Five Year Plan."

While moving amendment No. 13, I have to point out that very important items of national activity have been lost sight of in the President's Address. The President, no doubt, has referred to the military pacts in the Middle East, in Western Asia and in South East Asia and he referred, with great concern and great regret, to military pacts like the Baghdad Pact and SEADO Pact. But, as he is the Supreme Commander of the defence forces of this Union under the Constitution, we do expect the President to speak something on the defence side of our national set up—and its organisational side. How far our defence services, of which he is the Supreme Commander, are ensured the necessary safety and security in a modern war, how far the country of which he is the head on the civilian as well as on the military side, is assured of a proper defence in the event of a war.

It is true that we do not expect a global war in the near future, because the powers on either side are going ahead with their atomic weapons, with their guided missiles, with various types of new inventions of offence and defence, which is itself a deterrent to one another, and which may stop a war for some time to come. But, there is some possibility,—at least the possibility should not be ruled out—of local conflagrations here and there. We have also to remember that we spend nearly 50 per cent of our national expenditure on defence. The two wings, civil and military, have got to be co-ordinated. We

have also to remember that we are maintaining this large force for the contingency of a war. Though we have our faith in God, though we have our faith in Panch Shila, we are to be ever prepared for an attack from somewhere or other. That is why, while placing our trust in God, we are trying to keep our "powder dry." The question that we should put to the hon. Minister of Defence every year is whether we are actually keeping our powder dry, and whether we are in fact prepared for a war which we can expect, because, our preparation for war should be in consonance with the expected type and volume of enemy attack.

Our defence policy till now was, if at all to expect an attack, to expect it from a second rate power, from a power with second rate weapons, with weapons only of the conventional type, and that too, inadequate in quantity and not of proper quality. That was our overall defence policy till last year. But, since last year, a change has taken place with the U.S. military aid to Pakistan. A further change has taken place with the Baghdad pact. We have to remember now that modern weapons of offence and defence are coming to our neighbouring country. We do not know what are the types of weapons that are coming and that what are the types to come. We are told that teams of experts are coming from the United States to our neighbouring country to train their regimental centres and other defence units for a war in the modern set up. We do not know what weapons are actually coming for these teams to utilise in the training that is imparted and that is going to be imparted in the near future in Pakistan. There is no doubt that there is a threat of war from that side. It may not be of a major type, but still it is a threat of war in the sense that after getting the latest equipment from America or from the U. K., they will think of creating trouble in Kashmir. They are thinking of a West Pakistan—Kashmir unit. They may not be so particular about East Pakistan; but they and their western patrons are very particular about a West Pakistan Kashmir unit. They may make an attempt in that direction. Then, what will be the position?

I need not dilate upon the inadequacy of our defence structure in the event of an attack with modern weapons. I would not embarrass our hon. Minister on the

other side by going into the details of our defence structure. But, our civilian life has recently shown one weakness, and that is, lack of national unity. Recently, I will not go into the causes, and I will not dilate on that subject which has been referred to by most hon. Members here—it has been noticed not only in this country, but very much more noticed outside this country, that there is lack of national unity and that there are linguistic and other troubles which are likely to keep us divided in times of war.

Apart from that, there are also certain shortcomings which we cannot ignore. We have not been preparing for a war as we should have when we are spending 50 per cent of our national expenditure on defence, because, we do not have a proper defence in the modern sense. The hon. Minister will admit that most of our towns have not the same amount of anti-aircraft defence. We have referred very often to the lack of modern anti-aircraft equipment in our country. In other countries, anti-aircraft weapons have been so much modernised that not only locates enemy aircraft, at a Radar distance, but also keeps touch with it till it comes within firing range. We have not got that type of aircraft even now. Similarly, we have not concentrated upon our urban defence and defence of industrial centres which will be easy targets for enemy attacks. It is true that the National Volunteer Force is being built up. That is only being in the rural areas, in the project areas. What about the urban centres? The Territorial army has got only a skeleton organisation, very inadequate in number, and that to relieve the regular forces of static duties in time of war. What about the auxiliaries on the naval side and on the air force side that we have been promised for years and years? I think, since 1939 the Defence Ministry has been thinking in terms of naval auxiliaries, a naval volunteer force and the like. How is it that till now these things have not seen light of day? So also on the air force side, you may remember, the Lok Sabha passed an Auxiliary Air Force Bill about 3 years ago with so much of enthusiasm. We wanted a second line of defence. The Lok Sabha gave its fullest support to the hon. Minister at that time. We are told that the building of the Auxiliary Air Force Reserves or Air Defence reserves have not been taken up, or it

is just proposed to be taken up. The rules are yet finalised. Sometimes we get revised rules and so on. On the various sides we feel that our defence organisation has got to be activated. We have to work harder in order to have the best results.

We are placing our implicit faith in the Commonwealth organisation of which we are a member. We have recently seen the Baghdad pact and what the Commonwealth organisation of which we are a member is. We are also told that our officers who are deputed to the U.K. as a member of the Commonwealth, do not get the same amount and type of training or are debarred from certain classes which are open to other Commonwealth countries. We do not know how far it is true. We were told by our Deputy Defence Minister yesterday that Government have had no complaints on this score. I would request the Government to try to find out whether it is a fact that our officers are not being treated on equal terms with officers of other Commonwealth countries when they go to the U.K. for training.

We should also try to know from the Government another thing, namely, whether, when our officers come back with training from the U.K., our Government provides them the necessary modern weapons to utilise that training, and with the necessary gadgets that are required for implementing that training in this country. We have to remember that we are spending 50 per cent of our national expenditure on defence. That does not violate our creed of non-violence. We are spending this amount because we want to be prepared for any contingency in the national or international sphere. When we are preparing ourselves for that future contingency, and spending Rs. 250 crores a year, we expect that our efforts will be all out, that we will have the best type of weapons, that we will have the latest type of anti-aircraft equipment with the latest radar gadgets attached to it, and that we will have the best type of civil defence. We should have the best type of harbour defence: not like the harbours that we had where the Defence Ministry is not associated with harbour defence, as every other country does. We should see that in every sphere our defence activities are commensurate with the expenditure that we are incurring on defence.

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

The Supreme Commander of our defence forces is one who has the highest faith in truth and *ahimsa*. We expect that at least in the building up of the nation, the defence organisation will kindly bear in mind that there should be no air-tight compartment to locate the civilian and defence wings of our national life, that our defence organisation should be co-ordinated with civilian activities wherever possible without detriment to our defence activities. What I mean to say is, we do not want to detract from the defence efforts. We are ensuring all-out defence in emergencies. If, while making allowance for the maximum defence efforts, we can build up our national industries and national organisations side by side, it will be a great thing for our country.

Some Members of Parliament in our Defence Study Group have suggested that there should be co-ordination between our civilian and defence wings in our national life, that in our planning for national reconstruction we should take advantage of the defence organisation, see that the defence organisation benefits from this Rs. 5,000 crores expenditure that we are incurring and at the same that the Rs. 250 crores that we spend annually on defence ensures also to the benefit of the national life. From that point of view, we had made a few concrete suggestions which I had summarised in a printed brochure. I earnestly hope that they will be duly considered.

For instance, on the educational side it is quite possible to accelerate education, to promote social education or adult education as well as technical education through the defence organisation on lines that other countries have been adopting for decades and which we have not been doing to the same degree. For instance, in the United Kingdom, which we say is our ideal as far as defence organisation is concerned, education in the Army costs huge sums of money. Diplomas, degrees and certificates are given which are useful for civilian life. Training is given in various technical spheres at great costs to enable ex-defence personnel to be rehabilitated in civil life.

Here, you have got 22 ordnance factories. None of them is giving proper training facilities. Much of the machinery therein is lying idle. We have got to see that the idle capacity of these

factories is worked to the full, that we do not depend upon other countries for our war materials. The time may come when we may not be able to get war materials from other countries. It is also a question of employment. So, from every point of view the entire organisation of the defence forces now under an irrigation engineer with about 50 or 60 British officers marking their time to retire from this country in positions as Superintendents and Deputy Superintendents, has to be set right, and we have got to have the right type of men there. We should accelerate production there and utilise these factories for manufacturing our defence requirements, and if there is any spare capacity, (as there undoubtedly is at present) utilise it for civilian requirements, and all the time utilise these factories for training our young men.

Similarly, on the engineering side, you have got a military engineering organisation here which was till recently under two British officers who have recently left, thanks to the present Defence Minister, but we have got that organisation not taking up any work on the civilian side which is of the same type as military work. In other countries certain military Engineering organisations have built up major dams, bridges, roads etc., and inaccessible areas are being opened up by the military organisation. Here in our country there is no co-ordination between the military engineering services and our other services.

Similarly, on the defence side you have huge dumps in its Depots which could be utilised for nation-building. They are all deteriorating. For seven or eight years they have been lying there without proper cover, without hard standing ground, and we have got to see that if they are not required by the defence authorities they are made over to some other department for use.

Similarly, in every branch of defence organisation it is quite possible to co-ordinate the defence and civilian side. On the air force side, you can very easily co-ordinate the air force with civil aviation with gliding clubs with the air wing of the N.C.C. They could build up the air wings of the Territorial Army, they could build up air forces reserves and so on. So, the civilian and the military sides on the air side could be co-ordinated.

Similarly, on the naval side, it is quite easy for your ship-building organisation coastal shipping and all that to be accelerated as other countries have been doing. For instance, in America, help is being given to private ship-builders at nominal rates of interest, larger time for repayment etc., provided the construction of the ships conforms to the specifications and designs given by the naval engineers. In this country we have not yet adopted that. We have got to take some such measure. Coastal shipping, deep sea fishing and the like could be co-ordinated with the naval organisation and the Navy could have auxiliaries, volunteers and reserves of people who are accustomed from generations to sea life.

I will not take up more of the time of the House. I shall advert to this during the Budget discussion. But my submission is that it is quite possible to co-ordinate the two wings of our national life with profit, economy and greater efficiency provided we have a mind to do it.

Mr. Chairman : Amendment moved : That at the end of the motion the following be added :

“but regret that the Address (a) gives no indication of any proposal to modernise the defence forces with a view to anticipate an attack from outside; (b) discloses no programme for co-ordinating defence with nation-building activities so as to ensure greater efficiency and economy in the two wings of the national life—civil and military; and (c) overlooks the tremendous scope for training our vast man power, through educational and vocational training schemes in the defence organisation, for implementing various programmes under the Second Five Year Plan.”

Shrimati A. Kale (Nagpur) : The Presidential survey of the past year records a number of happenings and notable events that should call for deep deliberation. Let me be frank and own that the advice for maintaining an attitude of cautious optimism given by the President is extremely difficult to adopt. We seem to be marching from one crisis to another ever since the advent of independence. Bitter conflicts break out in all directions which demand among us a greater sense of realism. We must look facts in the face.

I might refer to a few such matters. The exodus of people from East Pakistan we are unable to stop in spite of the utmost caution on our part. There has been a unilateral flow of people and their houses have been broken and ruined in their thousands for no assignable rhyme or reason, for no fault of their own. We have waited optimistically long enough and now the time has come when we should most positively demand justice and satisfaction from Pakistan. If Pakistan is unable to improve conditions in East Pakistan, we should demand an equivalent amount of land to settle this population in Bengal.

Goa is another such instance. A more crass instance of shameless chicanery is hard to find and yet we are all supposed to enlarge our hearts and become internationally minded. When a well-known professor of Geography was questioned to elucidate the concept of a “scientific boundary”, he said that scientific boundary is a boundary that one does not possess. Such is the persisting cynicism of the age. So, in our brave new world the operative policy still continues to be of “catch as catch can” and possession is nine points of law despite all reasonable and fundamental considerations.

Mr. Chairman : Order, order. I think the hon. Member is quite conversant with the English language and can speak fluently also. So, instead of reading word for word, she can refer to notes.

Shri S. S. More : She is only referring to notes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor) : There are gentlemen Members like Sardar A. S. Saigal who were reading. So, what is the harm ?

Shrimati A. Kale : Now, coming to things at home, the First Five Year Plan is reaching its termination. I frankly own my inability to enter into the maze of figures, tables and percentages, potentials and trends. This highly abstracts mode of communication describing our progress and march towards happiness leaves me bewildered.

Having been a Member of this august Assembly and enjoying the privileges and the rare opportunities that flow from the circumstances, I could travel and wonder from one end of the country

[Shrimati A. Kale]

to another. I have kept my eyes and ears open. So, I shall crave your indulgence and will permit myself to express my true feelings and thoughts in these matters.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Now and then look up also.

Shrimati A. Kale: We have been a slave nation for the last 150 years. Our villages have been raped by our previous rulers in order to benefit their trade. I do not yet see any material change in the condition of the villagers.

We have taken up laudable schemes on hand in order to build up a sustaining and self-supporting economy. In the enthusiasm for prosecuting our great projects, we have lost sight of factors like corruption, nepotism and inefficiency. I realise that these things cannot be stopped entirely, but by strong measures, and by purity of character at the top, these could be minimised to a great extent. The well-known maxim that 'Example is better than precept' will have a soothing effect.

It is very satisfying to note that our agricultural production has gone up considerably; and yet there are millions of mouths that do not get a square meal a day. The industrial production has gone up, and yet we find million half-clad. The benefit of this production has not yet reached the masses because of staggering unemployment in the country. No doubt, we want industrial progress for purposes of self-sufficiency and defence, but we must not lose sight of the demon of unemployment. And therefore, at a great sacrifice, Government will have to follow the policy of Bapu's concept of village industries. The rise in percentages of industrial production must not mean increase of unemployment. Rise in agricultural production should not lead us to mining the soil for food, as is happening elsewhere in the world due to intensive cultivation, and causing the ruin of the soil itself.

I do hope that specialists in figure-work would try to understand the life of the common man as an integrated whole. We want in short to see everywhere settled homes with adequate and congenial occupations preferably at home and not too far from their homes. The stipulations that I have laid down will, if properly observed, automatically lead

to the removal of inequalities in incomes progressively, and the conflicting interests of the public and private sectors will eventually decrease.

The President's remarks about the recent disturbances, presumably in Bombay and Orissa, must open our eyes to these signs and portents of a deep-seated chronic malady. It is all the more our responsibility to delve deep into the causes, political, historical, sociological etc., and leave no stone unturned to arrive at the proper diagnosis. We must honestly face the truth that these originally unknown fishing villages of Bombay, Calcutta or Madras have raised their hydra-headed conurbations under the fostering care of a foreign dominion. They retain their vestigial colonial character. It is fashionable to call them cosmopolitan. They are really megalopolitan and necropolitan, as Patrics Geddes would have called them. Reared in the tradition of Ruskin, Geddes had uttered the warning regarding Bombay as far back as the year 1915. The VIP's of the then Bombay sought to choose deliberately the wrong road forty years ago. Now, they are getting just what they do not like, but which in their blind selfishness they worked hard to get. These large overgrown cities, are better called conurbations, are the ruin of humanity.

Coming to the concluding point, namely that of the atom and hydrogen bombs and their so-called terrible threat, may I humbly suggest that our policy in that respect has been completely unrealistic? Mickoyan's remarks to the Communist Party Congress are nearer to the real situation. He definitely denies that the extinction of the human species is at all involved. The capitalist sceptic fossil and similar growths the world over have everything to fear. The USSR itself is not free from the existence of such fear brought into existence under the fostering care of an omnipotent state instead of capitalism.

But we could think out things independently of these power blocks, and give an unprejudiced attention to them, and study the subject independently. If we could do that, solutions could be found to the satisfaction of everybody, which will be in conformity with the teachings of the Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, now being put into practice by Vinoba Bhave.

Mr. Chairman : Now, Dr. Suresh Chandra.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad) : rose.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour) : Why should hon. Members clap their hands? Dr. Suresh Chandra is not a Minister.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of External Affairs (Shri Sadath Ali Khan) : A potential Minister.

Dr. Suresh Chandra : There are several hon. Members who have spoken before me, but they have all spoken mainly on foreign affairs and the SRC report. Speaking on foreign affairs, one hon. Member said that it would be better if we could remove the principle of *ahimsa* or non-violence from our foreign policy.

I really do not understand how anybody could suggest that, and how anybody who has been a student of Indian history, especially the history of the struggle for freedom, can ever say this, because even before India became independent, we had some kind of a foreign policy, and the Indian National Congress which had championed the cause of freedom had for the last sixty years been passing resolutions on foreign policy, laying stress on certain basic principles? And what were those basic principles? Those basic principles were anti-colonialism, anti-racialism, non-violence, and the establishment of peace in the world. After India became independent, our Prime Minister has repeatedly stated that India continues to follow the same principles. In fact, he said that there has never been any intention to adopt any policy or any methods which depart from these principles which are the foundations on which the Indian nationhood has rested, and which are the historic and unique legacy of the Father of the Nation.

I would only point out here that the success of India's foreign policy has been almost entirely due to the principle of *ahimsa* enunciated by us. Very recently, if I may be allowed to quote an instance, in the Congress of World Communists recently held at Moscow, a German Communist, Ulbright, who attended that congress said that it was time for the communists who had all along been believing in methods of violence to wean out the methods of violence, for only that way they could solve

world problems. I feel that this is an instance of the great success of our foreign policy. Therefore, it is a very strange thing to hear that we should remove the principle of non-violence from our foreign policy.

If we remove the principle of non-violence from our foreign policy, I feel that we shall have no basis for approaching anybody, for negotiating with anybody or for being helpful to the other countries as before. We know, and everybody knows, how in the United Nations India has played an important part.

Some of my hon. friends who spoke before me had shown a certain impatience for the solution of the Goa problem. Member after Member had referred to this problem. I would say that it is the exercise of patience on the part of India, and her desire to reach a settlement by non-violent and peaceful means, that has been responsible for our having achieved many things even with regard to the French pockets in India. So far as the question of Pondicherry is concerned, we know what an amount of strain it was causing, and how much we were feeling impatient about it; and everybody thought that we would not be able to solve the problem without resorting to violence and without exercising any violent pressures.

But ultimately we find that foreign policy through peaceful methods succeeded there. I am absolutely sure that anybody who reads the newspapers of foreign countries and the comments which appear about our foreign policy there will say that perhaps one of the greatest steps which our Prime Minister took in regard to our foreign policy was to stop the satyagraha on Goa. By that step we have raised the stature of our country, and there is a feeling of confidence throughout the world now that India is bound to get Goa after a very short while. In certain papers I have read that within three years Goa will become part of India.

Shri V. G. Deshpande : Is it an astrological magazine?

Dr. Suresh Chandra : It is not an astrological magazine.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad) : Astro-political magazine.

Dr. Suresh Chandra : It is a magazine which studies current affairs.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Egyptian astrology.

Shri K. K. Basu: Let us share that knowledge.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I wanted to say also one or two things more about our foreign affairs. I think in the United Nations, we have succeeded in many ways, but we have also failed in one or two things. One of these occasions was when the question of South Africa was discussed during the last session. Hon. Members probably know that there was a question of setting up a Commission to inquire into racial discrimination in South Africa.

Shri Sadath Ali Khan: The Commission was already there.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: The Commission was already there. It was a question of reappointment of the Commission to inquire into the racial discrimination in South Africa. Dr. Santa Cruz was Chairman of that Commission. Unfortunately, India could not succeed in getting the work done through that Commission. There is also one more instance, which I do not quite remember now, where we failed in the United Nations.

Coming to the other points raised by Members, on the question of the SRC Report, I more or less agree with what Shri Asoka Mehta has said before. He said that the question of language created difficulties in Pakistan, Ceylon and other countries. I feel that the question of linguistic States has not been a very wise thing which has been raised here. As has been pointed out by other speakers, we have not, by appointing the States Reorganisation Commission, solved any problem. We have created problems in this country thereby. If we believed in carving out States with boundaries on linguistic basis, we could have done it even without appointing this Commission.

[SHRIMATI SUSHAMA SEN *in the Chair*]

This Commission has not been able to solve any problem at all. In a country like India, there is no possibility of having States on the basis of language or caste or communalism or any such thing. To-day we are thinking in terms of carving out States with boundaries on the basis of language; tomorrow we will have to carve out boundaries on the basis of caste or of religion. The question of development of language has nothing to do with boundaries.

Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram-Reserve-Scheduled Castes): On a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

Mr. Chairman: Now, there is quorum. The hon. Member, Dr. Suresh Chandra, may continue.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I was saying that if this question of linguistic States is carried further, then we shall have to divide India into communal and caste States. This casteism and communalism have been the bane of our country. We divided India on the basis of religion, and we are not going to divide India on the basis of language. I make bold to say that development of language has taken place in this country at a time when India was not a free country. Tagore was there in some small place, Bolepur. While sitting there, he developed the Bengali language, and he raised the stature not only of Bengali but the whole of India. In the same way, there are other languages which have developed. In my opinion, the ultimate solution will be to have a unitary State. The present States are an anachronism. I feel that we should have abolished all the States. Even if the States have legislatures, they need have only powers which the Centre will delegate, and there need not be any Concurrent List. Therefore, if we want to solve these problems now in any manner and if we want to regain the prestige which we have lost because of the linguistic riots in this country, I would suggest that we should accept the idea of unitary government. Then only we shall be able to give guidance from the Centre to the States, and to the people. We shall be able to utilise the energies of the people for the sake of development, for the sake of the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society.

In the Address mention has been made about the Second Five-Year Plan. It is said:

“The success of the first Plan has produced confidence in our people and has laid the foundations for a more rapid growth of the national economy.”

I would say that instead of laying stress on the economic progress, instead of laying stress on the development of our industrial progress, we have been wasting our energy on the question of communal and caste ideas. I would suggest, now that we are increasing our public sector and industrial development, we should devote more time to our Five-Year Plan.

It is a question of priorities. We know that in other countries—let us take a country like France—there are no separate States. They are departments and it is the Central Government which controls all the departments and instructions are given from the Centre. In the same way, in other countries also the trend is towards a unitary Government. Therefore, if we want to have a strong and united India, if we want to have an economically progressive India, I would suggest that we should move towards that. Even if we do not accept it today, I have no doubt in my mind that ultimately we shall have to come towards that. Otherwise there is a possibility of our disintegration and losing even our independence.

Shri U. M. Trivedi : Our President's Address to the Members of the two Houses contains 25 paragraphs of which 15 are devoted to our foreign policy. It appears that we have become suddenly very great before the international world. I can only judge by results whether we have really become great or whether we are looked down upon as we were looked down upon before.

It is true, as the Address says, that many distinguished guests have visited us. It reminds me of those days when poor people living in the capital city of Rajasthan used to invite their Maharajas and Rajas and felt themselves glorified if the Maharaja visited them. These foreigners have visited us and we, like small children, have clapped. If greatness consists of that, let us call it greatness. Who honours us, who honours an ordinary Indian, who honours an ordinary man in the street is and ought to be the judgement before us. Go to Ceylon; Indians are driven out, not tolerated. You go to Burma, you are driven out, not tolerated. You go to Pakistan, you are treated as nincompoops. Portugal, a small country no bigger than a State of the old Rajasthan integrated States, hits you in the face and tells you to get out. It kills you; it kills your people, kills your citizens, puts your citizens behind the bars and you dare not even raise your eyebrow. Is that the international reputation you have earned? I say, 'Fie upon us' if we glorify ourselves upon this that we have gained some international reputation. Madam, we have not. What are we today? Are we growing great simply by saying that H. H. so and so or His Majesty so and so or

the great friend so and so have called us, Bhai, Bhai? Greatness is where greatness is felt.

In South Africa, the apartheid laws are there. We, Indians are treated with contempt; we are not allowed to go into hotels; we are not allowed to enter schools; we are not allowed to enter clubs and we are not allowed to travel by the same compartment in a train in which an ordinary white man travels. And, yet we say that we are respected and we have earned respect in the world. Where do we learn all these things? These are all platitudes. Naturally, a man comes, he praises us and then we think we are called great. There is no greatness attached to it.

We have talked about many things but we have not talked about things close at hand. A passing remark is made about what Mr. Dulles says about Goa being a province of Portugal. What have we said and what have we done? The whole nation, the whole people, as one rose to the occasion and offered satyagraha and offered to continue it. Yet, it was cold shouldered by our own men. We are told, by some astrological calculation, by our friend today that within three years we will get Goa. I do not know where the suit has been filed and from where this three years' limitation has been put. Why can we not get Goa? What prevents you from getting Goa, our own territory? There are methods, political methods and civil methods. If it was a question of an international dispute we can go to a court of law and get an adjudication. If it is a question of getting back our own territory which other people have usurped from us, there is the well-known method of driving out the enemy. Why are we not taking that step? Are we weak and are we going to remain weak and are we going to allow small nations like Portugal dare us in the face? No. We are exposing ourselves to ridicule before the world. We may call ourselves great. Who is this Dulles who can dare to tell us in our face things which he has told before us? Are we going to tolerate it? We are tolerating it except that we have developed the habit of writing strong protests and strong notes in season and out of season.

For the last two years we have been noting this influx from Pakistan. Many of us have said: Why allow this influx into our country? But we have a moral obligation. It is on the sacrifice of those

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

Hindus who have remained in Pakistan that we have to-day achieved our freedom in the country. It is our duty to protect them; it is our duty to help them as much as we can. Are we discharging that duty? We are not discharging it because we are afraid. Should we continue to have this fear complex with us for all time to come? We must put a stop to any fear that we might be feeling. In one world, I can say we have miserably failed in enunciating a firm foreign policy. We have tried to win the pleasure of all. As children we learnt the story of an old man and his son going with a donkey and in trying to please all they had to carry the donkey. It is the same thing that is going to happen with us. We cannot try to please others. We have got a saying in Gujerati :

घरनां छोरानां घंटी चाटे उपाद्या ने आटौ

Our people are suffering. We have nothing to give them. We want to be charitable to others. Give to Pakistan, give to Ceylon, give to Burma and we ourselves have nothing left.

4 P.M.

We want to become *sanyasis*, real communists. We have all around us expenses, expenses and expenses—rising expenses. If we look at the Budget of 1915-16 of the greater India, India including the whole of the present Pakistan and something more, that is, from Aden almost down to Burma, the total income was about Rs. 56 crores and the total expenditure was only about Rs. 55 crores. What is the position to-day? It has gone up hundred times. Have we in any manner benefited the people or is it that we have built big things which can be shown to the public? Have we rooted out corruption? We must drive out this form of circulation of money, as the Acharya puts it, and stop money from going into corrupt hands. In the laws governing corruption, what have we provided? "The corrupt prosecutes the corrupt, with the sanction of the corrupt." How are you going to progress corrupt? How are you going to progress? How are you going to achieve the progress of the country? We have not put a stop to this waste about rehabilitation. Have we been able to rehabilitate the really poor? What is this rehabilitation where prompt payments are not made? Up to date we have not paid any money to those who are clamouring for it. It is said—and I

believe it to be true because it has been said and repeated to me as a lawyer by hundreds of persons—that unless and until you pay something of what you are going to get, that is, a certain percentage of it, your cheque is not passed and you are not paid. Is it that even in this department where it serves only the poor and the miserable, this type of corruption is rampant and yet we are not putting a stop to it?

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): There is a double rehabilitation on both sides!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We have got dacoits; we have them in Rajasthan, Madhya Bharat, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and other places, and our colleagues do not do anything except that of guarding Acharya Kripalani. I was formerly guarded but now I am not.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Perhaps you have ceased to be dangerous!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Are we to ask the police to be employed for that purpose? Are we going to live in the same state in which we were living in the days of the British? Are the Members of the Opposition traitors to the country? Are they some type of wild animals? Are they dacoits? What for is the police sent after them? Why do you indulge in this illegal censoring which is going on? Why should the District Magistrate of my district read my letters and interfere with my legal correspondence, from which I am making some living?

Shri Kamath: They will be interesting!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Why should he prevent me from doing my little legal work to make my both ends meet?

Shri A. M. Thomas: Just to know whether it is legal.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: You are all interested in finding out whether I am lawful and my activities are lawful. You say you are completely lawful in doing a thing which is unlawful.

Shri K. K. Basu: A case of the pot calling the kettle black!

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I come now to the vexed question of the reorganisation of the States. Before I touch this question, I would make one suggestion—and I request my friend, the Cabinet

Minister, to make a note of it—that we must put a stop to this ruling by ordinances, that we must completely stop. This should not be done unless and until an emergency exists. When you were thinking of having nationalisation of the life insurance business for months together for years together—some say you were thinking of doing it for the last three years—you did not do it, but you did it only 21 days ahead of the meeting of the Lok Sabha. Why? Were heavens going to fall if the ordinance was not issued just 21 days before the meeting of this Lok Sabha? Why were three ordinances necessary before the Lok Sabha met? Can we not put a stop to this wrong method of ruling by ordinances? We must take stock of the situation now. Those days are gone. Now this sovereign body is in existence and it is not for you to rule by ordinances. The ordinances rule must be stopped.

Another very pertinent thing to which I would like to draw the attention of the Government through you, Madam, is this. If we have to develop democracy, if we have to go in the wake of democracy, we must take stock of the situation that the Opposition must exist. Do not try to kill the Opposition.

Shri A. M. Thomas : It is killing itself!

Shri U. M. Trivedi : I am giving you examples of how you are trying to kill it. Go to Uttar Pradesh and look at the results of the municipal elections there. Look at the results of the elections in the municipalities of the Punjab. Look at the results of the municipal elections in Rajasthan. Let me tell you that even where there was an absolute majority, a complete majority of the opposition parties,—I am speaking of my party, the Jan Sangh Party—you have left no stone unturned for removing every single president on whom you can lay your hands. The Government is of the opinion that they have flagrantly abused... their positions!

Shri Tyagi : The municipalities are not controlled by the Central Government.

Shri U. M. Trivedi : I have not yet come to it. I thank Shri Tyagi for reminding me about it. That is why I suggest that as you have put a guarantee for Government servants by the provision of article 311 of the Constitution, there should also be a provision

guaranteeing the position so far as the municipal administration and the local self-government administration in the country are concerned, so that these all-powerful Governors and the all-powerful governments in the States shall not exercise such powers in an arbitrary mala fide and illegal manner. Therefore I have made this suggestion and you may kindly take note of it.

I now come to the problem of the reorganisation of States—the most vexed question before us, and it has vexed us for so many months. I can say at once that if you cannot do anything, you may kindly scrap the Commission's Report and have nothing to do with it. But do not get people to break each other's heads. Our Constitution, as I said before and I reiterate it today, envisages a unitary form of government. It is a peculiar federation and has been wisely brought into action looking at the fact that India is not a continent, is not a sub-continent, but is one country and one country alone. Languages do not bind each other. If languages were to bind them, these Urdu-speaking muhammadans from Uttar Pradesh would not have gone over to Pakistan and the Bengali-speaking Hindus would not have left East Pakistan. Languages cannot determine what a particular State ought to be. The languages may be spoken; we all speak different languages, but we are Indians. We here do not have the same mother tongue. Why should there be this linguistic division? We have committed one mistake in one ugly moment—or a weak moment, I should say—when Sriramulu died and we yielded to the formation of Andhra and that sowed seeds for this disruption that is now going on before us. Can we not put a stop to this? Is it too late to go back upon it? We can very easily say: "Come what may, we will put a stop to this SRC Report and try to come more and more, slowly but certainly, together and have only one State in our country and take away the white elephants of the various States." It is they who claim their bread now. It is not the *roti* and *kapada* of the common people. These Ministers are now talking of their *roti* and *kapada* and keeping themselves in the posts to which they have reached. Can we not put a stop to this? Can we not understand this?

Negotiations are going on today to find out a formula for Punjab. I have not understood the formula for the

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

Regional Councils either in Punjab or in the Bihar-Bengal merger. Are the Sikhs a linguistic part or are they merely a particular people belonging to a particular religion? I ask: what type of negotiations are the Government carrying on with the Sikhs? Are you not falling into the same trap in which you fell before when you were negotiating with the British? Of course, Congress was saying that they represented the whole country and that they did not represent the Hindus alone. But you fell into the trap while negotiating with the Muslims. It is the same thing which you are again doing. We have once for all discarded this consideration of religion to decide one's country. We are not going to reopen this question again—the question that had been closed once for all.

I am not going to take longer time than necessary to say a few words about certain problems. There is a paragraph here about the State Bank. It has been said that the State Bank has been created with a view to nationalise all the banks. That I do not think was the idea behind it. There also we have shown a very weak policy. When this State Bank of India Bill was introduced, we were told in unequivocal language that the Bank of Rajasthan, the Bank of Jaipur, the Hyderabad Bank and the Bank of Baroda and all such banks which were doing Government business of the same nature as the Imperial Bank of India, would be taken over. Nearly eight banks were enumerated. Their business was to have been taken over by the State Bank. Have you done that? What has prevented us from doing that? If you can take over the whole of the State Bank with its 300 branches all over the country, what prevents you from taking over these smaller ones? Is it because there is some wire-pulling from some Madhya Bharat Minister or Rajasthan Minister because their friends are placed in good positions there?

Shri V. G. Deshpande: No, no, Election comes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Is it an election stunt? I do not know. You have considered that measure very beneficial for the whole country. Then, why not allow it to become operative in the States of Rajasthan, Hyderabad, Mysore, Madhya Bharat, etc.? Why are you having this vacillating policy?

I am coming to a close; I will not like to have much of your time except that I will mention one thing which I ought to have mentioned when I was speaking about certain fundamental guarantees. We are all Members of this Lok Sabha. Some of the Members are arrested. Under what law? Some are arrested for delivering speeches against orders under section 188 of the IPC. Only the IPC itself it is a non-cognizable section; it defines a non-cognizable offence. But in the mighty Punjab and in the mighty State of U.P., that is Bharat, a man can be arrested as if he has committed this non-cognizable offence by a special amendment of the Act. You deliver a speech to-day as an Opposition Member. I am bound to criticise this Government and I do criticise this Government. The policeman may write a report that I had abused Mr. Tyagi or Mr. Gūha though I might not have done so. But that chap will write down that I have done so and then I am put behind the bars the next day. I cannot challenge what he writes. He writes something and then he has got two witnesses standing by his side whom he has given only two cups of tea on that day and they say: 'yes, yes, yes.'

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya: Not even two cups; a little threat will be enough.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: There is another thing. That is the state of affairs and there is a sort of Damocles' sword is hanging over the Members of the Opposition. It might affect Congress Members also. Some of them might also be taken in. For instance, Sofi Mohd. Akbar has been put behind the bars under the Preventive Detention Act. The Rowlatt Act enacted by Sir John Rowlatt in 1919 when the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy was enacted was not as bad as your present Preventive Detention Act. There it was only the Governor who had to satisfy himself but here the small District Magistrate has powers to say: "Whereas I am satisfied... that you are hydra-headed...." You may say that you have got only one head but he will say: No; you have got six heads "and therefore people are afraid of you and so you must go to the jail". The Supreme Court says "we cannot go into facts if he says you have six heads you have six heads". This sort of a farce is going on. It is doing damage to our administration. Corruption must go, preventive detention must end and

money should be well spent and our country's prestige must be increased side by side.

Shri A. M. Thomas : I wish to confine myself to certain domestic issues but all the same I cannot help referring to the deep regret the President has expressed with regard to Goa and the statement by Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States. I am referring to this not for advocating the action that has now been suggested by my hon. friend, Shri U. M. Trivedi. He has said that the India Government ought to have encouraged the satyagraha movement. You may recall the anxiety that was expressed during question hour to-day by several hon. Members with regard to the Indian prisoners that are in Goa. Does my friend want that more ought to have been detained? I think it was the correct stand and a wise stand that was taken by the Central Government. At least in this late hour it should have been realised by all Members of this hon. Lok Sabha. But unfortunately Shri Trivedi is not prepared to accept that it was a correct and sagacious stand. The other alternative was the declaration of war against Portugal and an attempt to annex Goa. Apart from the fact that that action is not suitable to our policy of peaceful approach, he could have more or less anticipated the international complications that such a step would have brought forward especially in view of the stand that has subsequently been taken by Dulles, the Secretary of State of the United States. The statement of Mr. Dulles has been given prominence in the President's Address. This statement was described in several quarters the "Dulles blunder". Blunder is only a very charitable expression that we can use with regard to the statement of Dulles. If it was a blunder on the part of Dulles, it was a blunder of the first magnitude of which the American nation should be ashamed. It is a blot on the history of America that Mr. Dulles, its Secretary of State, should have identified the United States with a colonial power. If Goa can be considered to be a province of Portugal, how far America was a province of England? We know from history that the argument advanced against American independence by the United Kingdom was that it was part of the mother country. If it was a part of the mother country, what right America had to liberate itself? We should be surprised that such a statement should come from a nation

which has liberated itself from England. I would say that the touchstone of America's foreign policy will be judged from how it would conduct itself in relation to Goa, as far as India is concerned. Its sincerity and the morality of its stand in its relation to foreign countries, I think, will be judged by the stand it will take on this issue. It has been said that the statement of Mr. Dulles is more or less a rejoinder to the statement that was made by Marshal Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev when they were in India. You might recollect that on several occasions on the floor of the Lok Sabha as well as outside our Prime Minister had occasion to say, on the question of Goa, "We have to see who are our enemies and who are our friends." On none of those occasions, America or the United Kingdom came forward with its stand. But I would say that the initiative has been wrested from those nations by the USSR when the USSR said that the Soviet Government supports the just demands of India and holds that the preservation of a Portuguese colony on Indian territory, as in general the preservation of the colonial order in our times, is a disgrace to civilised nations. We ought to have expected such a categorical statement long before, from America and England. So, there is no reason for America to be perturbed on the bold stand that the USSR has taken. We have also to congratulate the USSR on its bold stand.

In to-day's papers, I read a report about a television programme of Mr. Sherman Cooper, the American Ambassador in India. I read about the strong appeal he made for a greater effort on the part of the United States to understand the position and aspirations of India. In his statement he said that it is wrong to suppose that India is a country that can be purchased with any aid or something like that. I wish the statement of Mr. Cooper, in his television programme, that the basic policy of the United States is always to preserve freedom everywhere is translated into action as far as Goa is concerned. Since I want to refer to some of the other more vital internal matters, I do not want to add anything more about the external policy of the Government of India that has been given expression to by the President in his Address.

Unfortunately the debate on the President's Address has turned out to be another debate on the reorganisation of States. When we dispersed last time we

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

heard speeches from more than 100 Members concerning this reorganisation question. It was hoped that during this budget session our attention would be more concentrated on questions of planning and on economic matters. For the President's Address, as many as 20 hours have been allotted mainly, I am told, for discussion of the plan frame, but unfortunately, very few Members have had time to devote their attention to that aspect. My hon. friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee who, on such occasions usually refers to foreign policy and to economic programmes of the Government of India, had devoted the major part of his speech—I may say the whole of his speech—to the matter of reorganisation of States. It is true that we are meeting under the shadow of great tragic events that have occurred in Bombay, Orissa and in some other parts of India. But Shri Mukerjee, towards the close of his speech, made the remark that the Government of India is now losing a golden opportunity. Shri Mukerjee said that the Government of India would have had the co-operation of almost all parties of the Lok Sabha but that it has lost that opportunity. I would say to Shri Mukerjee and his party and also the members of the Congress Party and also the Praja-Socialist party and all the parties that are represented in the Lok Sabha that it is time that we had a little of heart-searching in this matter. Has the co-operation, which Shri Mukerjee has referred to, been coming forth after we dispersed last time? The Lok Sabha may remember that the hon. Home Minister had occasion to congratulate the Sabha on the dignified tone that it maintained when the matter of reorganisation of States was discussed. The Lok Sabha was very serious and at the same time it was keeping up good humour also in the matter of discussion. But after the decisions were announced by the Government of India—I do not think that the decisions came as a surprise—what was it that happened? Incidents of which we should be ashamed happened in different parts of India. This morning, Shri Gadgil referred to certain reports in the foreign press. My friend Shri Syamnandan Sahaya also referred to the fact that our name has been tarnished both inside and outside because of these incidents. Although I do not subscribe wholly to the assessment in the American press as well as outside about the happenings in India, it is good that we

just see the report that was sent to a leading daily of our country from America. That report said :

“Detailed reports of disturbances have been appearing in the Press day by day and though the story is being handled in an objective and fair way, the picture which emerges from them is of a nation whose unity hangs only on the flimsiest of threads and of a people who are still sadly torn by regional, linguistic, social and caste differences.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

“Illustrative of adverse impressions which the riots have created is the reaction of a European correspondent who said to me that after these developments, he was wondering if Indians could call themselves one nation and if they were not really different national groups living in one country. There are many too at the United Nations who think that the disunity which has been shown in such violent manifestation is bound to weaken the effectiveness of India's voice in international affairs and give a handle to her ill-wishers to minimise her importance.”

In this matter of reorganisation it is rather unfortunate that within each political party there has been sharp difference of opinion. The communist party said that in such serious matters they have got more or less an agreed stand and that whatever differences there will be they will patch them up within the party itself and that they will come with a unified stand as far as the people are concerned. That has been their pride, so to say. What is it that has been done in the matter of the reorganisation of the States? I wish to make a reference in this connection to something concerning the South. When the State Reorganisation Commission's report was being discussed during the last session of the Lok Sabha, Shri Punnoose, my hon. friend from Travancore-Cochin, said that as far as the taluks of Devikulam and Peermede were concerned, it was a matter of life and death for Kerala. The Communist Party took the stand that these taluks should form part of Kerala. But when it came to the Communist Party in the

Madras Assembly, they remained neutral on this issue when the report was discussed here. Shri Punnoose prided himself that the Communist Party had a definite plan with regard to this matter; but, after the decision was announced the Communist Party hold a meeting in Madura to protest against that decision. Not only that; the Communist Party in the Madras Assembly which had remained neutral at the previous voting stage, came forward with a motion for adjournment of the House as a protest against giving Devikulam and Peermade to Kerala, I just mention this instance to show that it is not a matter in which agreed solutions might be difficult. Even the Communist party found it difficult to put forward a united stand in these matters. I just want to show that not only the Congress Party, but the Communist Party and the other parties should have some re-thinking with regard to this matter.

I will now refer to one other matter which according to me is perhaps the most important aspect to be dealt with when we discuss the President's Address. In the last Address of the President, only from the penultimate sentence of the Address we could get an idea of the goal that the Government of India placed before itself. He then said :

"It is for you, Members of Parliament, to give shape and form to this hope and to advance the country to this cherished goal of a welfare State and society conforming to the socialist pattern."

Some comments have appeared in the Press to the effect that in the President's Address this year, the word "socialist" has been adopted instead of the word "socialistic". But, I find that the word "socialist" has been adopted in the previous year's Address also. However, there is difference in the emphasis. While in the previous Address the President made a mention of the socialist pattern in the penultimate sentence, in the present Address after, External Affairs, the goal of a socialist pattern is put in the forefront of the Address :

"Our objective is to establish a socialist pattern of society and, more particularly, to increase the country's productive potential in a way that will make possible progressively faster development."

Dealing with that pattern, the Address refers to the nationalisation of insurance. I welcome that measure, but I would ask why the Government confined itself to life insurance alone. I say that it ought to have nationalised some other sectors also, like motor insurance, which is a sort of compulsory insurance. What was it that was standing in the way of the Government nationalising motor insurance also? I think it is a matter which should be borne in mind by the Government.

I would only touch upon one or two aspects of the Plan before I close.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Member has taken 15 minutes. Yesterday I allowed 30 minutes for leaders of groups and 15 minutes for others. A number of Members want to participate and hon. Members must remember even when they start that they will have only 15 minutes.

Shri A. M. Thomas : Some criticism has appeared in a section of the Press to the effect that our Plan is defective in the sense that our resources have not been assessed in the first instance. That criticism has been there when the panel of economists submitted its report. There is a dissenting note by Mr. Shenoi pointing this out. There is a note submitted by Dr. B. C. Roy, the Chief Minister of West Bengal to the Planning Commission which has more or less expressed that fear that we ought to have assessed our resources and then planned. But, I would submit that we should not put so much emphasis on the resources aspect. Desperate situations require desperate remedies and extraordinary situations should be handled in an extraordinary manner. I think we should first of all decide what our minimum requirements are, plan for the same and then find the resources. In this aspect of the matter, I would submit that the approach of the Plan is in a way satisfactory. The Planning Commission has laid for itself the principle that the Plan should not be a rigid one that it should be flexible and there should be a continuous review of the needs and requirements of our country at every stage. The basic decision must be what exactly should be the quantum of investment. I concede that some importance has been given to the unemployment aspect in the draft Plan that has been placed before us. But, I think that although the diagnosis has been correct,

[Shri A. M. Thomas]

the remedy that has been suggested is not in keeping with the diagnosis that has been made in the Plan. It has been said that to alleviate unemployment, so many measures have been taken. But, I find from the report itself that even after the lapse of the second Five Year Plan, the unemployment position that we now find will be the same. From page 43 of the draft Plan, I find :

“Even if existing unemployment were to remain unchanged, 10 million jobs require to be created for this purpose.”

If that is the position, I respectfully ask what is exactly the remedy that has been suggested? Although adequate importance has been given to the aspect of educated unemployment, I find from pages 44 and 45 of this draft Plan that no adequate solution has been suggested. It is said that,

“Complete eradication of educated unemployment would, therefore, require the creation of 2 million job opportunities during the second plan period. It is obvious that the 2 million job opportunities required have some significant regional aspects. For instance, it is recognised that the problem exists in a more acute form in areas like West Bengal and Travancore-Cochin.”

Subsequently we find,

“It has been reckoned by the Group (the Study Group appointed by the Planning Commission) that if these recommendations are given effect to, 2.4 lakhs of additional jobs for the educated would be available.”

That is to say, out of 20 lakhs only 2.4 lakhs will find employment. I would respectfully submit that it is high time that the Planning Commission should devote its attention to this aspect of the matter. When regional reorganisation of States was contemplated and when Travancore-Cochin was suggested to be amalgamated with Madras—some such suggestions were made—some uneasiness was displayed. The reason is, though it is not publicly announced, there is a lot of educated unemployment in that State and if it is merged with some other State, there will be an exodus of educated people and the other region may be swamped.

Shri Velayudhan : Not that.

Shri A. M. Thomas : There has been that lurking fear. There is no use of hiding things. I would submit that this is a top problem to which we will have to give top priority. The Planning Commission has recognised that the unemployment problem has got certain regional aspects. But, what has the Planning Commission done to alleviate that distress? I do not find any scheme worth mention in the Plan with regard to such regions for alleviating unemployment. I want to sound a caveat on this occasion. Unless this problem is solved, it is bound to burst and there will be a flood affecting not only the regional States, but also the neighbouring States. I would say that the stability of the Government of India would also be shaken, if this problem of educated unemployed is not solved properly. I would emphasise that the Government of India has to realise the seriousness when schemes are formulated. When teams are sent to advise on the location of certain projects, the instructions should be, not to travel throughout the country and suggest a site. I would say that the Government of India and the Planning Commission should, hereafter, give instructions that as far as a particular industry is concerned, please see whether it is possible to locate it in this particular area, in an area where unemployment is acute, in an area where the density of population is the largest. With regard to the setting up of heavy electrical equipment industry, you advise the team to travel throughout India. You will have to ascertain whether in any of these regions it is possible to locate that. There are so many industries which could have been located in such places, for example, the setting up of the second ship building yard, the setting up of a factory for the manufacture of metre gauge coaches or wagons. For none of these things the Planning Commission has devoted its attention. I would say that it is lacking in the attention that it has given to such problems. I would again sound this note of warning that unless and until this problem of unemployment, especially unemployment of the educated, is solved, there is not going to be peace and prosperity in this country.

Shri S. S. More : I spoke on the last occasion on the 14th of December when I expressed my views about the reorganisation of States somewhat freely but frankly. Now, since the 14th of December, much water has flowed under the

bridge and, if I can extend the same simile, much blood too has flown on the streets of Bombay. Now, the latest speech which the Chief Minister of Bombay was pleased to deliver in the Assembly says that there was a plan—And what was the objective of the plan?—The plan was to capture the Government, the power of Government and capture the city of Bombay with the sole objective of forcing the non-Maharashtrians to accept the claim of Maharashtra for Bombay. Though he has taken care at a subsequent stage to say, I do not blame any one, this very categorical statement coming from a responsible officer like the Chief Minister, has its own implications. Any lawyer practising even in third class courts will immediately draw the implied meaning that all the trouble that has been caused in Bombay was planned by the Maharashtrians because they stood to be interested in having Bombay incorporated in Maharashtra. It is a very serious charge. I do support what Shri Gadgil said that for the purpose of enquiring into such a charge against a whole community which consists of more than 3 crores, it requires an impartial investigation. I need not go into the details of what happened in Bombay during this disturbed period. I can tell the Lok Sabha in a free manner that something more has happened than has appeared in the press. Even Shri Gadgil, with unflinching loyalty to the party, was led to underestimate and make an understatement of what happened in the Bombay State. In the President's Address, it has been stated in para 20,

"Above all, there can be no progress for our country if we do not adhere to non-violence and tolerance and to the basic integrity which makes a people great."

What about this non-violence? Is it to be confined only to the non-Treasury Benches? Is non-violence to be practised only by those who are not in power? Is non-violence and tolerance expected only from those who are out of office? Mahatma Gandhi was the most devoted apostle of non-violence. But, he used to practise what he preached. Unfortunately, now in this country, with the accession of power, our preaching and practice are as widely separated as the continents of America and Africa. We are asked to be non-violent. Sir, you were an eminent lawyer. We know

the average criminal mentality of a community or an individual. If crimes are to be resorted to, if any community has to be harassed, will an intending criminal resort to places where reprisal will be immediate and ruthless or will he go to such part of the country where the harassment could be done with impunity, where harassment could be caused without any restriction, without any reprisal as it has been done in Bombay? Most of our friends know Maharashtra. There are thousands of villages. I can tell my non-Maharashtrian friends that almost in every village there is a rich bania, a rich Gujarati and a rich Marwari. Has any Maharashtrian in any of these villages harassed any one of these Gujaratis? Has any one harassed any one of these marwaris?

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.—South): Should he?

Shri S. S. More: I am proud to say that the Maharashtrians with all their martial past have shown the greatest tolerance, have shown the most unflinching and unassailable faith in non-violence. In none of these villages has even a hair of a Gujarati or marwari been damaged. What does that show? Shrimati Jayashree says that something has happened in Kolhapur. With all the fresh memory, a very retentive memory and the extensive investigation that she has pursued in this matter, she is able to point out only one Kolhapur.

An Hon. Member: Nasik.

Shri S. S. More: An Hon. Member says Nasik. I know that he knows some geography of Maharashtra. He may go on repeating these things. I challenge him to prove something that damaged a Gujarati or a Marwari in Nasik or. . . (Interruption) I can understand this interruption because we are all agitated and passions have come on the top and reason has receded into the background. But, these are problems which you will have to solve.

Acharya Kripalani said, shelve it for 10 years. When you have roused a tiger, you cannot say, I shall retreat. The more you retreat, the tiger will pursue you and pounce upon you.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: The tiger has to go to the jungle.

Shri S. S. More: He knows about the jungle. I know nothing about the jungle.

[Shri S. S. More]

My submission is, you cannot solve this problem by avoiding it. This problem has got to be solved. The Congress has held for the last 30 years, when you were not in office and even after that, that linguistic reorganisation of States is a necessary thing, is a just ambition, is a legitimate ambition. This is a plant which you have planted for the last 30 years which you have profusely watered and allowed to develop into a mighty tree. You cannot overnight change your policy and say that the policy of linguistic provinces was wrong. Human minds are not like push button affairs so that you can push this button and change the whole thing. Human minds get interested in problems. Human minds develop loyalties to the problem. Human minds develop persistence for fighting for a cause, as we did during the period of national struggle. This persistence is the sense of something which the people want to and hope to get, and has to be tackled in a more diplomatic manner. So, my submission is that no attempt has been made to solve it in a diplomatic and democratic manner.

All along I was reading in the press that the Maharashtra Congress leaders were holding conferences with the Congress High Command. Panditji says he does not like the word "High Command", but it has become a current coin and you will excuse me if I use that word. Why were all these talks and formulae being invented, and what was the crux of the condition given to the Maharashtra leaders? I may disagree with them politically, but some of them are my good friends and I have got a regard for them. They were given one categorical condition, that they must devise a formula on the understanding that Bombay shall not go to Maharashtra. That was the irreducible minimum and they had to build the superstructure of a formula on this foundation. Why?

I am very much pained to say that the High Command ought to have functioned like a Bench of the Supreme Court or of a High Court. They ought to have taken facts into consideration before they gave their verdict. Even the S.R.C. Report has admitted that geographically Bombay is part of Maharashtra. Panditji had the generosity to admit in his broadcast talk that Bombay is surrounded by Maharashtra. As we say a man and woman who are put together by God and man cannot be

separated, so if Nature put Bombay as an inseparable part of Maharashtra, why was that condition given to the Maharashtra leaders to devise a formula, but not to talk about Bombay going to Maharashtra? Because S.R.C. Report has stated that there is a psychological dissatisfaction amongst the Gujaratis and other non-Maharashtrian elements. You are prepared to take notice of the psychological dissatisfaction in such a small community, but you are not prepared to take notice of not only psychological dissatisfaction, but psychological upheaval, psychological turmoil that might break out like a blizzard among more than three crores of Maharashtrais.

Pandit K. C. Sharma : And goondaism also.

Shri S. S. More : Is goondaism confined only to Maharashtra?

An Hon. Member : No, no.

Shri S. S. More : Goondas are produced like Sharmas everywhere. No particular soil is...

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur) : Sir, I take strong objection.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I have been repeatedly requesting the House and all the Members not to indulge in such things. Even though technically Shri More can say there are Sharmas as Brahmins, there are goondas as bad fellows, the analogy is very wrong. It leads to the implication that Sharma is a goonda. It may or it may not be intentional, but it is very wrong. In the world at large consisting of 360 million people, can't we think of any other analogy than Mr. Sharma here? Only Members of Parliament can come in by way of analogy, ridicule and so on?

Shri Velayudhan : He called all the Maharashtrais goondas.

Pandit K. C. Sharma : I never called. I referred to action. I did not refer to persons.

Shri S. S. More : I respect what you say, and I can assure you that I had no mind to bring any Member of this Lok Sabha into disrepute, or any community into disrepute. But I can tell you that the name of More is spread over so many parts. It is a common name. But you will be particular to note that Shri Sharma's implication was that Maharashtrais were goondas.

Pandit K. C. Sharma : No.

Shri V. G. Deshpande : Yes, yes.

Shri S. S. More : If he can slander and abuse the whole community of Maharashtrians, I am perfectly justified in paying a very delicate and left-handed compliment to him. But, all the same....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Order, order, I was also listening. I did not understand that he referred to the whole Maharashtrian community as such.

Shri V. G. Deshpande : Yes, yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He referred to goondalism. Very well. Even if there was a remark of that kind, if my understanding of that was slightly different and the hon. Member understood it differently, it was open to him to say it was very wrong. I would have immediately corrected and pulled up the hon. Member. No community is bad. There are bad people here and there. Therefore, if any person wants to say that goondas charged the situation which was unwittingly created by others, that is a different matter. And therefore, the repetition of one wrong does not make the latter one a right one.

Shri D. C. Sharma : What have Sharmas got to do with goondalism ?

Shri V. G. Deshpande : They are everywhere.

Shri S. S. More : The point that I was....

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda) : That has taken away the poison if there was any there. He said Mores are also scattered everywhere.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : More is not used in terms of goonda, you see. Very well.

Shri S. S. More : You are very kind to me, but your opinion will not be shared by many.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : It is very wrong.

Shri S. S. More : Leave that aside. This shows how much the atmosphere is surcharged with passion and a tendency to get easily offended.

The Chief Minister of Bombay State says that there was a plan. Now, these are the days of planning. And what did the Maharashtrians plan?—not for reconstruction; they planned for

destruction. And what was the destruction—destruction of the Government with a view to force a particular community into accepting the claim of the Maharashtrians. That is a suggestion which is apparent, very evident on the face of it. Therefore, I submit that the High Command did not approach this problem in a democratic manner.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Member has to conclude.

Shri S. S. More : You will permit me some indulgence.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I have to show indulgence to other hon. Members also.

Shri S. S. More : Why was his formula of finding a solution only confined to this aspect—talk about anything but do not talk about Bombay because the psychological dissatisfaction of a particular community comes in the way like a roaring lion. The High Command was pleased to put the whole Maharashtrian leadership into jeopardy by asking them to devise a formula of this kind.

I also come from Maharashtra. I may not have the good fortune to belong to the Congress though I have once been a Congressman, but why were all these discussions confined to Congress people? Because the High Command were under the impression that whosoever is a Congressman is a true sample of a Maharashtrian. And I can assure you that the level of intelligence, the level of honesty and the level of courage that is shown by the Congress leaders in Maharashtra is many times inferior to the intelligence, the courage, the integrity and political honesty seen in the lives of those who are unfortunately at present outside the Congress. It is said about London that London is the roost of all birds. The Congress is becoming the roost of all opportunists and therefore I would say that in this matter it ought not to have been made a party issue. It ought to have been a sort of national issue. Open your doors, consult everybody in the country, everybody's life is going to be affected.

I need not mention the names of the great men who are still there in Bombay enriching the traditions of the late Shri Ranade and Shri Gokhale. You are proud when you mention those names, you become humbled when you mention their great names, but they were not consulted. I am not in a mood to state their names because the list will be

[Shri S. S. More]

very long, and with the time-restriction, I shall not be able to do justice to it. Taking into consideration the fact that time is running against me, I would again make a gesture, and with your permission, I shall make some constructive suggestions.

5 P.M.

I would repeat, let Panditji take the lead. Panditji's name was cherished all along, but now his popularity among the Maharashtrians, I shall say with all my respect for Panditji, is at sub-zero level, because the Maharashtrians feel honestly that he is trying to have an unfair deal with them. Why should that be so?

In the 1952 election, Bombay city which was so enthusiastic about the Congress returned all Congress leaders, and defeated the stalwarts of the Socialist Party, and the stalwarts of the Communist Party. But now why is that Bombay city turning round like a hunted animal, and saying "You, Congress, are unfair to us"?

I would again say, let Panditji take courage. Here is an occasion on which he ought to put his popularity and impartiality to a proper test. Let him invite all responsible elements, parties and groups in Maharashtra for some sort of a conference to develop a formula. Possibly, Congress leadership in Maharashtra was too weak to find out a formula. But the doors are not closed yet for finding such a formula.

And here, I might make this suggestion. Give Bombay city to the Maharashtrians. Have some restrictions if you like. I can even go further and say that just as under the 1935 Act, an instrument of instruction was given to the Governor asking him to safeguard the interests of minorities, likewise, give Bombay to Maharashtra, to which geographically it belongs, leave aside culture and other matters, and have some Governor, and instruct him to see that the interests of the minorities are not seriously jeopardised.

Shri A. M. Thomas : You give also a blank cheque.

Shri S. S. More : I am not prepared to give a blank cheque, because there is no bank in which I possess an account. It is for Shri Gadgil to give such blank cheques, not for me.

But I would say that this is the only thing that you can do. I know you are in power at the Centre; you are in power all over. But power should not make you blind to the future. Power should rather make you more vigilant about the future, for retaining that power, because once a man who holds power becomes blind and becomes a victim of prestige, the days of his remaining in power are already counted.

If you would permit me, I would make one humble submission, and that the non-Maharashtrians who happen to be here should not fall victims to the whispering campaign, because those who indulge in this campaign are very clever, and they know all the avenues of propaganda, and we are being falsified, we are being slandered by those who have all the press at their command, and all the slandering agents at their command.

I would make a personal appeal to the non-Maharashtrian Members of Parliament to study the problem in a dispassionate manner, and if necessary, submit a proper defence, and a proper request couched in a proper and a very mild and modest form to the High Command, so that the integrity and unity of the country will not come into jeopardy.

We are also as much interested in the unity of the country as anybody else. But society must have some bonds to stand together. You say you are against casteism; you say, you are against class cleavages; you say you are against parochial sentiments. If caste disappears, if parochial sentiments disappear, and everything that keeps the society together disappears, then what is the bond that will make the society survive? Probably, membership of the Congress! But it has been shown that that cannot be an enduring bond. I would therefore submit that language and culture must be accepted as the bonds that keep society together. That has been claimed by the Congress, and that has been the plea of scientific writers on such problems. My hon. friend Acharya Kripalani advises, it is no good saying that, shelve the matter. But that would only mean :

अशुभस्य कालहरणम् ।

It will be nothing more than that. Can Acharya Kripalani guarantee that after ten years, the human passions which are finding out a very violent

upsurge now will remain as quiet, and as docile as a newly-born lamb? I submit that these are human passions. They are fundamental passions which go to the root of making humanity. Therefore, by whatever time we may try to solve these problems the passions behind them will come to the forefront, they will have to be faced, and properly tackled.

In conclusion, I would only make one request. Maharashtra is poor. Maharashtra is rich in tradition, though poor at present. It is very easy to form some adverse opinion about Maharashtra. Maharashtra is not getting a proper forum. The judges who sit in judgment over Maharashtra do not seem to be as disinterested as they ought to be, and therefore, they are not able to see the deep feeling of agony and the sense of frustration that have entered into the hearts of the Maharashtrians. If these are to be taken out, then they will have to be taken out with a sense of sympathy, an enduring sympathy, and with a hand which is as delicate as that of a surgeon performing the most dangerous operation.

In conclusion, I would again request the Members of the Lok Sabha to study the case of Maharashtra, and the tradition of Maharashtra.

Shri Matthen (Thiruvellah): For what? For making a linguistic organisation?

Shri S. S. More: The President in his Address has given the message that all these problems should be solved by non-violence and toleration. I can assure you that nobody follows this message in right earnest and in its real sense, more than the Maharashtrians.

I can assure you that we have come to look upon the non-Maharashtrians that may be residing in Bombay or in the interior of Maharashtra as our brothers. If you see the composition of the local bodies, you will find that there are many non-Maharashtrians there who happen to be presidents and other office-bearers of those local bodies. There is no one who can beat Maharashtrians, as far as tolerance is concerned. Nobody can beat Maharashtrians as far as non-violence is concerned.

If non-violence has to be practised and accepted, it should be practised and

accepted by the Chief Minister of Bombay who every now and then says that he is a devotee of Mahatma Gandhi. If Gandhiji's soul has to rest in peace, his disciples should practise at least a fraction of the non-violence that he preached. That is my submission.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): I thought it would not be necessary to speak on the necessity for linguistic States at this late hour. But I find that I have to say something on it now.

You know, we Andhras have been in the forefront of agitation for the formation of linguistic States. And I am proud to be an Andhra and a communist, and an unrepentant believer in the formation of linguistic States. Why do we want linguistic States?

Everyone swears by democracy, and everyone swears by the man in the street, but no one seems to be anxious to see that the man in the street has a government in his own language, so that he may know what is happening, and he may not feel that he is a stranger in his own State. We want to see that the common people have greater opportunities for development.

After you have created problems, and you have created situations by your mishandling of problems, by committing huge himalayan blunders, by having done injustice to the people, you find now that you are confronted with a situation which is frightening you; and now you come and say, that the unity of the country is at stake, that the security of the country is at stake, and you put forward all sorts of irrelevant arguments against linguistic States.

On an earlier occasion, I had occasion to show how linguistic States are essential for the well-being and proper development of the minorities. Take for instance the case of Karnataka. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members have not only a right to speak but also a duty to hear.

Dr. Rama Rao: The Kannadigas are in a minority in the Madras State; they are in minority in the Hyderabad State and they are in a minority in the Bombay State also. It is for the purpose of bringing these minorities together that we wanted a united Karnataka. Now fortunately, the States Reorganisation Commission have acceded to this demand. But I hope it will not be denied by our Government, because we do not know with

[Dr. Rama Rao]

the present Government, what things will take place tomorrow.

The question of the formation of linguistic States has been misunderstood, misrepresented and unnecessarily attacked.

As far as Government are concerned, their look at this question of reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis is not through just coloured glasses, but unfortunately through opaque glasses. As I mentioned on a previous occasion, as far as linguistic States are concerned, unfortunately, the Prime Minister has a blind spot. He had to accede to Andhra State after a lot of sacrifice. When the States Reorganisation Commission was appointed, we thought they would proceed on a systematic basis laying down certain principles and methods. Then boundary disputes could be settled by boundary commissions and so on.

Now the main problems before the country are two. One is regarding the relationship of Bombay City with Maharashtra and the other is the new situation that is now being created, cooked up, by the Government, the so-called merger of States and creation of bilingual and trilingual States. We have already said that we want linguistic States. Regarding Maharashtra, it is not as if we have anything against Gujaratis or against anybody else. We only want the formation of linguistic States. Take, for instance, Bombay City. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru has fortunately accepted that Bombay City is part and parcel of Maharashtra. I read a speech delivered by Shri C. C. Shah questioning this how geographically Bombay has nothing to do with Maharashtra. Probably at that time he was thinking of joining the club of the Dulles-Cunha school of thought. Anyway, that matter is settled as far as the Lok Sabha is concerned, because the Prime Minister has accepted that Bombay City is part of Maharashtra. Why do they want to separate Bombay City from Maharashtra? While expressing my firm conviction that Bombay City must form part of Maharashtra, I want to remind you about the stand we took regarding Madras City at the time of the formation of the Andhra State. You know that several Andhras wanted that Madras City should be included in the Andhra State. Then when they found that their position was weakening, they said: 'If we do not get Madras City, let not Tamil Nad get it; let it be Centrally administered or let it be a Part C

State'. But we of the Communist Party, against some opposition, firmly declared that we have no claim to Madras City. Secondly, we said that not only we have no claim to Madras City, but Madras City must be a part and parcel of Madras State. Therefore, we opposed the so-called demand for a Centrally administered or Part C State or a Lieutenant-Governor's State. So far as Madras City was concerned, when it concerned ourselves, we firmly declared our policy. We had to answer several questions in public meetings about this. I myself answered questions several times. We were asked about it, and I think we satisfied the people at least. It may be real satisfaction or it may be their inherent courtesy; they kept quiet after our answers.

So on the same analogy, it not as if we want to support Maharashtra against Gujaratis or anything like that. It is a question of principle. What does not belong to us linguistically, must belong to the people who have a right claim to it. Maharashtra has the proper claim to Bombay City. Now, among the various solutions that are offered, among the various permutations and combinations that are offered, there is only one solution that is correct, namely, a Samyukta Maharashtra including Bombay City. Can we avoid the correct solution? If we do so, we will only go round about and round about committing hundreds of blunders. You know that in medicine, if you do not have a specific treatment, you will try a number of other treatments, some of them causing you a lot of damage. Therefore, the holocaust created in Bombay is by the himalayan blunder—almost a crime against the people of Maharashtra—of the highest in the land. That irritates the people most. Instead of doing justice, they have yielded to the vested interests. The entire people of Maharashtra want Bombay City to be included in Samyukta Maharashtra. A few vested interests, a few people, wanted it to be separate. We must note that Gujarat has no claim to Bombay City. Nobody has claimed that it should be included in Gujarat. The Gujaratis can carry on business and live and work in the State as free citizens and develop not only Bombay City, but Madras or Vijaywada or any other place Maharashtra has an absolute right over Bombay City and it must be conceded to them, and it was because Government refused to concede it that trouble broke out. Even before the announcement by the Prime Minister on

the radio, they arrested 400 or 500 people in Bombay. You know the Prime Minister spoke on the radio in the night. That very morning hundreds of people were arrested in Bombay. I do not want to go into details; I cannot improve on what Shri Gadgil has said. In fact, I do not want to say anything which would create bitterness. But I appeal to the Government to face the problem squarely and do justice, take courage in their hands, as Shri S. S. More mentioned just now, and solve this problem. It is true that you will displease a handful of capitalists in Bombay whose fears are absolutely unjustified. Nobody is so foolish as to kill the goose that lays golden eggs. How are they going to be affected? Even if they have any fears, they are absolutely unjustified. Mostly their connections are with the Central Government.

Therefore, I hope Government will take this action and not stand on false prestige; let them do the right thing by the people and solve this problem.

Then there is an attempt to have a new method of merger, the merger of Bihar and West Bengal. Suddenly one fine morning, it comes out. The Chief Minister of Bihar offered his resignation because some portions of Bihar were to be included in West Bengal. The next day they embrace each other—Dr. Roy and Dr. Sinha.

Shrimati Sushama Sen (Bhagalpur South): Very good.

Dr. Rama Rao: It is very good if it is genuine. But it is not genuine. There is something behind it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If both the persons who are parties to a struggle, embrace each other, what can be behind it?

Dr. Rama Rao: I welcome it....
(Interruptions)

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Patiala): We can only be judges.

Dr. Rama Rao: If it is done with the people's sanction, I would certainly welcome it. But that is not the case. There is no people's sanction behind it; they want to thrust this down the throats of the people. I would seriously request Government not to cause blood-bath in another City, namely Calcutta. In the south, it has already started. According

to today's *Statesman*, 800 people have been arrested, gas bombs have been used....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where?

Dr. Rama Rao: ...in South Madras. I am sorry you have not read it.

An Hon. Member: Dakshina Pradesh.

Dr. Rama Rao:

"Police fired in Kallakurichi in South Arcot district today to disperse a violent mob which attacked the police station there during a state-wide strike....

Eight hundred people have been arrested, three have been injured by bullets and gas bombs have been used. Fortunately, the Chief Minister has declared against the so-called merger of States in the South. Let there be unilingual areas and let them develop by mutual assistance. Let there be healthy competition. But this merger of State is going to be a serious thing. Now they are trying to merge Kerala, as Shri A.M. Thomas said, with any State that wants to have it. But no State wants to have it. We only want linguistic States as separate units so that they can develop by themselves and they can have government of their own people, in their own way.

In this connection, I wish to refer to a news item. According to this morning's papers, the Congress High Command—they do not like that description—

An Hon. Member: Low Command!

Dr. Rama Rao: ...have come to a decision to form Vishalandhra. Let them call it Andhra. We have no objection. But I want to say something in connection with this news item. I do not believe this news item to be true. So my remarks are relevant only as far as this news item is concerned.

"It is learnt that the special position which Urdu enjoys in the Telengana area at present as a medium of instruction and administration will continue. The matter may, however, be reviewed after five years."

This is a very serious matter. But, I do not want to be misunderstood. I stand entirely for the protection of minorities, whether they are linguistic minorities or religious or racial minorities. We must see that there is no discrimination against them. If there is

[Dr. Rama Rao]

anything, it should be in their favour. But, while I stand for protection to minorities, I refuse to submit to domination by minorities.

Even recently, a few weeks ago, the Prime Minister spoke in Hyderabad that Urdu was forced on the people of Hyderabad. Now, that sort of Urdu is being planned to be forced on the people. It is not fair. I stand for giving every opportunity for educational development to the Urdu-speaking people. They are not only Muslims; but there are several Hindus who speak Urdu there. I go one step further. It is not only for those that speak Urdu that I want protection should be given to the Urdu language; but the whole State will be benefited by the high standard that is existing there. Vishalandhra will have a good stick to beat the North Indians with if we maintain our high standard of Urdu. Therefore, while anxious to give every protection to the Urdu-speaking minority, which is going to be a large minority, I say this is going to be a very serious problem and I hope this will not be followed. There may be some mistake in this. If it is only protection it is all right. But, to have the administration and education in Urdu for the whole of Telengana State is preposterous.

There are several points which I want to make. First, I join my friend Shri Thomas in his remarks about Goa. But, I would remind him and other friends that regarding the Dulles-Cunha statement, many eminent Americans have taken objection to that. They have pointed out that it was a tactless statement. They have pointed out that it was untimely; they have pointed out that the statement gave scope for Soviet propaganda, communist propaganda and so many things. But, no prominent American has stated that the statement was wrong; no American has stated that Goa belongs to India. That we must remember. I hope this matter will be settled.

I have in my amendment mentioned about Malaya. Australian and New Zealand troops are being sent for the suppression of the people of Malaya. Of course, they may say it is for the suppression of the communist party. But, it is the lead that the communist party gave to the Malayan people, their fight

and sacrifices in the interests of the Malayans that has brought down the British Government even to the present condition. Now, these Australian and New Zealand troops are going there to interfere with Malaya's future in colonial interests.

You have already rung the bell and I will not take more time. Regarding Bombay, I request the Government, as Shri Gadgil has requested, to institute a judicial enquiry. Let them release all the arrested prisoners except those that are involved in serious crimes. Most of the offences are by goondas; secondly, by a few people who have lost their temper, who out of indignation lost balance and did much harm to their own cause. Then there is the third set, the agents provocateur. I have already requested that Government must take a bold stand and not stand on prestige and form Samyukta Maharashtra along with Bombay city and settle border disputes by boundary commissions.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Bansilal.

We ought to have started at 12 o'clock and gone up to 5.30 so far as the motion of thanks to the President is concerned. But, it was interrupted by nearly half an hour by the All India Institute of Medical Sciences Bill. The hon. Member who has just now been called upon has some very urgent private work somewhere and, therefore, he cannot be here tomorrow. If hon. Members will kindly bear with patience, we will allow only 15 minutes for him and then close at 10 minutes after 5.30.

श्री बंसीलाल (जयपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस से पूर्व कि मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के सम्बन्ध में अपने विचार रखूँ, मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे पूर्ववक्ता श्री मोरे ने अभी अपने भाषण में बताया कि बम्बई में जो कुछ हुआ उस को लेकर महाराष्ट्रियों के दिल में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के प्रति जो श्रद्धा थी, वह शून्य हो गई। मैं एक ऐसे राज्य का रहने वाला हूँ जिस के बारे में राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग ने या कांग्रेस ने कोई ऐसा निर्णय नहीं किया जिस के बारे में किसी को कोई आपत्ति हो। परन्तु मैं श्री मोरे को यह बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई में जो घटनायें इस पुनर्गठन के प्रश्न को लेकर हुई हैं उन से सारे देश में महाराष्ट्र में रहने वाले लोगों के प्रति कुछ श्रद्धा बढ़ी हो, यह बात नहीं है। जिस प्रकार का वातावरण

बम्बई में बना और जिस प्रकार का वहाँ पर खून-खम्बर हुआ वह न केवल महाराष्ट्रियों के लिये या भुजरातिवों के लिये या मारवाड़ियों के लिये बल्कि सभी के लिये शर्म की बात है और मुझे यह सुन कर आश्चर्य हुआ कि बम्बई में जो कुछ हुआ उस के कारण से महाराष्ट्रियों के दिल में पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू के प्रति श्रद्धा शून्य हो गई ।

जहाँ तक राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के ऊपर प्रस्तावित किये गये धन्यवाद के प्रस्ताव का सम्बन्ध है, मैं कर्तव्यवद्द हूँ कि उस का समर्थन करूँ । परन्तु फिर भी अन्तःकरण का यह तकाजा है कि उस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में भी अपने विचार इस सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत करूँ । जिस मौके पर राष्ट्रपति जी का भाषण होता है, वैसे तो वह अपने आप में एक महत्वपूर्ण भाषण होता है और उस से सरकार की रीति-नीति का पता चलता है । परन्तु ऐसे मौके पर जब सारे देश के अन्दर इस प्रकार का वातावरण हो और बजट से पहले जो भाषण हो तो उस के प्रति देश के लोगों का विशेष ध्यान जाना एक साधारण बात थी । मैं तो केवल यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस अभिभाषण से देश के लोगों में क्या कोई स्फूर्ति पैदा हुई, कोई आनन्द की लहर पैदा हुई, कोई उत्साह पैदा हुआ ? उन के सोये हुए अरमानों में क्या कोई जागृति हुई ? इस से हम इस बात का पता चला सकते हैं कि जो रीति-नीति इस अभिभाषण में सरकार की है उस से देश के लोगों में कितनी खुशी हुई है ।

दो दिन से इस सदन में इस अभिभाषणपर जो वादविवाद हुआ है उस में ज्यादातर सम्मानित सदस्यों ने राज्य पुनर्गठन कमीशन या उस की रिपोर्ट के बारे में सरकारी निर्णय की घोषणा की गई है उस के बारे में विचार प्रकट किये । कई सम्मानित सदस्यों ने तो दोबारा वे ही विचार सदन के सामने रखे हैं, और मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि उन्हीं माननीय सदस्यों के विचार एक बार तो बजट के ऊपर और दूसरी बार बिल के समय सुनने को मिलेंगे । परन्तु इस विषय में जिस के ऊपर सारे देश में इतनी चर्चा हुई है और भाषण यहाँ पर हुए हैं और जो वातावरण सारे देश में बना है, उस से कुछ फायदा हुआ और वह फायदा यह हुआ कि जो प्रस्ताव कमीशन ने दिये हैं देश के विचार के लिये, वे प्रस्ताव इस जमाने में मान्य नहीं हो सकते । बड़े खेद के साथ यह भी कहा गया कि इन प्रस्तावों के संबंध में

जो अनुशासन होना चाहिये था वह भी शासन चलाने वाली पार्टी के सदस्यों में नहीं रहा । शायद ही पहले कभी कोई इस प्रकार का विषय इस सदन में धारा हो जिस के बारे में एक ही पार्टी के लोगों में इस प्रकार का मतभेद हो । जितने भी भाषण हमारे माननीय सदस्यों ने दिये उन से यही पता चलता था कि उन में से कोई भी अपनी मांग से एक भी इंच इधर या उधर जाने वाला नहीं है । बम्बई को ही लीजिये, या पंजाब को ही ले लीजिये या किसी और प्रान्त की जटिल समस्या को ले लीजिए । इन प्रांतों के बारे में जब यहाँ पर बहस हुई उस में जो इन प्रांतों के रहने वाले सदस्य नहीं थे उन को यह मौका कभी नहीं दिया गया कि वह भी अपने विचार यहाँ पर पेश कर सकें । बम्बई के बारे में जब बहस हुई तो श्री पाटिल का बड़े उग्र रूप से भाषण सुनने को मिला । इस भाषण का उत्तर श्री गाडगिल साहब ने बड़े ही जोरदार शब्दों में दिया । आज भी श्री मोरे ने बम्बई के बारे में अपना भाषण दिया है । मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह से यह समस्या या कोई दूसरी समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है । अगर श्री गाडगिल या श्री पाटिल या श्री मोरे यह समझते हैं कि बम्बई उन का ही है तो वे गलती पर हैं । बम्बई तो सारे देश का है । मैं समझता हूँ कि आज देश में कोई भी ऐसा धादमी नहीं है जो बम्बई में दिलचस्पी न रखता हो । खैर इस बारे में मैं कुछ ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ । मैं केवल इतना ही कहूँगा कि जिस प्रकार का वातावरण इस समय देश में बन गया है उस को देखते हुए इन सारी समस्याओं का एक ही हल है और वह यह है कि देश में एक इकाई शासन की स्थापना हो । यद्यपि यह चीज आज मुश्किल नजर आती है मगर एक न एक दिन हमें यह तय करना ही होगा और इस के हक में अपना फैसला देना ही होगा, और मैं समझता हूँ कि जितनी जल्दी हम इस बात को समझ लें उतना ही अच्छा है । यहाँ पर यूनिटरी फार्म आफ गवर्नमेंट (एकात्मक सरकार) ही ठीक रहेगी । जिस प्रकार की समस्याएँ खड़ी हो गई हैं उन को हल करने का यही एकमात्र उपाय है । यह कहा जाता है शासन को सुगम बनाने की दृष्टि से यह सब कुछ हो रहा है । मैं समझता हूँ कि राज्यों का पुनर्गठन कोई मानी नहीं रखता मगर इस से जनता को खुशी न हो । आखिर इस का मतलब क्या है ? इस का मतलब तो केवल इतना ही है कि दो या दो से अधिक प्रांत यदि मिला दिये जायें तो वहाँ के रहने वाले

[श्री बंसीलाल]

लोगों के दिलों में खुशी का संचार हो, न कि यह कि वहां पर कटुतापूर्ण वातावरण पैदा हो।

जिस समय देशी रियासतों को मिलाकर बड़े बड़े राज्य बनाये गये थे उस समय क्या हुआ ? यह ठीक है कि राजा लोग इस के विरुद्ध थे। मगर वहां की जनता को इस में किसी प्रकार का भी एतराज नहीं था। इन राज्यों के बन जाने के बाद जो कुछ भी वहां पर हो रहा है वह हमारे सामने है। माननीय सदस्य जानते ही हैं वहां का शासन किस तरह से अस्थिर रहता है और किस प्रकार वहां पर रोजमर्रा मन्त्रिमण्डलों में परिवर्तन होते रहते हैं। राजस्थान को ही ले लीजिये। राजस्थान के बनने के बाद से मैं समझता हूँ कि वहां पर कम से कम १२ बार मन्त्रिमंडल बने और बिगड़े। इस का क्या कारण है ? इस का कारण यह है कि अलग अलग रियासतों को मिला तो दिया गया लेकिन दिल नहीं मिले। मिलने वाले लोगों ने अलग अलग क्षेत्रीय भावनाएँ रखीं, उन का त्याग नहीं किया। इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए मेरी तो यह स्पष्ट राय है कि इस का एक मात्र हल यूनिटरी फार्म ऑफ गवर्नमेंट ही है। इस चीज को हमें एक न एक दिन मानना ही पड़ेगा और इस को कार्यरूप देना ही होगा। हमारी एक संस्कृति है, हमारी एक राजधानी है और इस के होते हुए भी क्या कारण है कि यहां पर यूनिटरी फार्म ऑफ गवर्नमेंट न हो। यह कहा जा सकता है कि एक इकाई शासन की स्थापना होने से कई समस्याएँ उठ खड़ी होंगी। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस समय गृह मंत्रालय के सामने कुछ कम समस्याएँ हैं ? प्रान्तों में जिस प्रकार के मन्त्रिमंडल हैं और जिस तरह से वे काम कर रहे हैं वह भी एक समस्या प्रस्तुत करते हैं। हमें कठिनाइयों से डर कर जो सही बात है उस को करने से घबराना नहीं चाहिये। इस बारे में मेरी स्पष्ट राय है।

राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषणपर अपने विचार प्रकट करते हुए आचार्य कृपलानी जी ने यह सुझाव दिया है कि देश की परिस्थितियों को ध्यान में रखते हुए यह जो कमीशनकी रिपोर्ट है इस को ताक में रख दिया जाए। उन्होंने यह सुझाव किसी भी कारणवश दिया हो परन्तु मैं समझता हूँ कि यदि एक इकाई शासन लागू करने के लिये इस रिपोर्ट को ताक में रख दिया जाए तो कोई बुराई की बात नहीं है। मगर मैं किसी भी ऐसे सुझाव का

समर्थन करने को तैयार नहीं हूँ कि इस सारी की सारी रिपोर्ट को ताक में रख दिया जाये। इस रिपोर्ट में बहुत से उपयोगी सुझाव दिये गये हैं जिनको भवश्य ही कार्यान्वित किया जाना चाहिये। कमीशन ने जहां कई राज्यों के बारे में विवादास्पद सुझाव दिये हैं वहां पर उपयोगी सुझाव भी दिये हैं। इस रिपोर्ट में सब राज्यों को एक श्रेणीबद्ध करने का सुझाव दिया गया है, इस में राजप्रमुख प्रथा को समाप्त करने का सुझाव दिया है और इसी तरह से और भी कई सुझाव हैं जो कि स्वागत करने योग्य हैं और जिन को ताक में नहीं रखा जा सकता।

मैं यह भी देखता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार का उत्साह माननीय सदस्यों के अन्दर उस समय था जिस समय कि कमीशन बनाने का सुझाव रखा गया था, उस प्रकार का उत्साह जब इस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर यहां बहस हुई, देखने में नहीं आया। यहां पर १०-१२ दिन तक इस कमीशन की रिपोर्ट पर बहस हुई परन्तु उस से वातावरण में कोई सुधार नहीं हुआ। सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने, जिन्होंने अपने विचार प्रकट किये, एकता की दुहाई दी, त्याग की दुहाई दी और बलिदान की दुहाई दी। यह भी उन्होंने कहा कि हमारे जो नेता हैं उन के प्रति हमारे हृदय में आदर है, श्रद्धा है और हम सब को उन के हाथ मजबूत करने चाहिये। परन्तु जब उन की स्टेट के किसी इलाके का प्रश्न आया तो वे बहक गये और बड़े ही कटुतापूर्ण शब्दों में उन्होंने इस का विरोध किया। मुझे याद है हमारे बयोवृद्ध साथी श्री भार्गव साहब ने बड़ी लम्बी चौड़ी तकरीर देश की एकता कायम रखने के बारे में देश की संस्कृति कायम रखने के बारे में दी। परन्तु जब लोहारू तहसील को पंजाब से काट कर राजस्थान में मिलाने का प्रश्न उठा तो उन्होंने बहुत ही कड़े शब्दों में इस का विरोध किया। इसी प्रकार के भाषण करीब करीब सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने दिये। क्या यह इस बात का संकेत नहीं है कि जो कुछ हो रहा है, उस से देश की शान नहीं बढ़ेगी, उस से देश को प्रगति के पथ पर ले जाने में मदद नहीं मिलेगी, उस से देश के लोगों में खुशी का संचार नहीं होगा, उस से लोग आनन्द अनुभव नहीं करेंगे। ऐसी हालत में यह जरूरी है कि देश के अन्दर अच्छा वातावरण पैदा हो और हमें चाहिये कि हम वही करें जो हम कहें।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह शिक्षा पद्धति के बारे में है। जब मैंने राष्ट्रपति जी का

अभिभाषण पढ़ा तो मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ इस बात को देख कर कि इस में शिक्षा पद्धति के बारे में कुछ भी नहीं कहा गया है। वैसे माननीय सदस्यों को राष्ट्रपति जी के विचार जो कि उन्होंने लोक-सभा के बाहर प्रकट किये हैं, मालूम ही हैं। उन्होंने शिक्षा पद्धति के बारे में काफी कड़े शब्दों का प्रयोग किया है और इस की निन्दा की है। परन्तु अपने इस अभिभाषण के अन्दर उन्होंने इस का कोई भी जिक्र नहीं किया है। जो शिक्षा-पद्धति इस समय देश के अन्दर है यदि वह चलती रही तो इस के भयंकर परिणाम हो सकते हैं। हमारे देश में बेकारी बढ़ती जा रही है। अगर यही हालत रही तो हमें एक बड़ी क्रान्ति के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये। जिस प्रकार का आज वातावरण बना हुआ है उस से यह स्पष्ट हो जाता है कि हमें एक दूसरी क्रान्ति में से होकर गुजरना पड़ेगा। यह क्रान्ति अहिंसा और सत्य के आधार पर होगी, यह मुझे नजर नहीं आता है क्योंकि अहिंसा और सत्य पर से हमारे देशवासियों का विश्वास काफी हद तक पिछले दिनों में उठ गया है। जिस प्रकार के वाक्यात बम्बई के अन्दर पिछले दिनों में हुए हैं शायद ही वैसे वाक्यात किसी दूसरे देश में हुए हों। ११४ बार वहाँ पर एक एक दिन में गोली चली है। जैसे भयंकर दृश्य वहाँ देखने को मिले उससे तो ऐसा ही लगता है कि यहाँ पर अहिंसा और सत्य का जनाजा निकल गया है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि अगर पूज्य बापू के जीवन काल में यह चीज होती तो उन्होंने कौन सा निर्णय किया होता। परन्तु यह स्पष्ट है कि जिस प्रकार का देश में वातावरण बनता जा रहा है वह एक खतरे का सूचक है। यह ठीक है हमारे एक दो नेता हैं जिन पर देश का पूरा विश्वास है और जो गैर-कांग्रेस जन भी हैं उन का भी विश्वास है।

परन्तु क्या किसी देश की सब समस्याओं का हल ऐसे एक या दो-चार सम्माननीय नेता निकाल सकते हैं? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार देश की समस्यायें हल नहीं हो सकती हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि इलेक्शन या चुनाव से ही देश की नीति और वास्तविक स्थिति का पता चलता है। अन्दर ही अन्दर सब महसूस करते हैं कि हमारे देश में अशांति बढ़ रही है और इस का कारण यह है कि हम विभिन्न समस्याओं को सुलझाने में किसी एक नीति पर नहीं चलते हैं। हमारे सब मामले उलझे हुए हैं। हमारी इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी उलझी हुई है। काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज, एज्युकेशन, ग्रन-एम्पलायमेंट किसी भी

विषय के बारे में हमारी कोई साफ नीति नहीं है। इस हालत में जो भी समस्या आती है, वह बजाय हल होने के उलझ जाती है। इस प्रकार सब समस्याओं में उलझाव पैदा होता रहता है। परिणाम यह है—और वह इस सभा को मालूम ही है—कि पंचवर्षीय योजना के अर्धीन बहुत काम होने के बावजूद आखिरा-नंगल जैसा बड़ा बांध बनने के बावजूद देश के मुख्य और शान्ति में कोई वृद्धि नहीं हुई है। अगर हम सब अपने दिलों पर हाथ रख कर सोचें तो हम महसूस करेंगे कि ऐसा नहीं हो सका है। इस का नतीजा यह होगा कि अन्दर ही अन्दर जो असंतोष फैल रहा है, उस के कारण हम को एक दिन एक महान् क्रान्ति का सामना करना पड़ेगा। राज्यपुनर्गठन के सम्बन्ध में हो रही घटनायें, हमारे देश में मौजूद बेकारी की समस्या और वर्तमान शिक्षा पद्धति सब इस बात का संकेत करते हैं कि आज हम अपने दिमाग से, अपने मस्तिष्क से इन समस्याओं का हल नहीं निकाल पाते हैं। बेकारी की समस्या के बारे में मेरे अलावा कई माननीय सदस्यों ने प्रकाश डाला है, मगर मैं देखता हूँ कि हम बड़े ऐश और धाराम के साथ इस समस्या का हल ढूँढ़ते हैं। हम को दर्द तो है, मगर बड़े धाराम के साथ और बहुत शर्तें: शर्तें: इस बारे में सोचते और कार्य करते हैं। कभी मौका आया तो किसी भाषण में बेकारी की समस्या के बारे में अपने विचार प्रकट करते हैं और आशा करते हैं कि इस तरह इस समस्या का हल निकल आयेगा। एक और हम देश के माता-पिताओं को आह्वान करते हैं कि वे अपने लड़कों को कालिजों में पढ़ने के लिये भेजें और कहा जाता है कि कानून की शिक्षा के लिये और दूसरी शिक्षा के लिये कालिजों के दरवाजे खुले हैं। दूसरी और जब वे लड़के पढ़ कर कालिज से निकलते हैं और उन के माता-पिता बड़े अरमान के साथ सोचते हैं कि अब हमारे लड़के काम करने के काबिल हो गये हैं, उस वक़्त सरकार कहती है कि तुम इस काबिल नहीं हो कि तुम को कोई काम दिया जाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि वे बिल्कुल असंगत बातें हैं। जब देश का शासन—देशकी गवर्नमेंट—देश के नौजवानों को शिक्षा प्राप्त करने के लिये आह्वान करती है, तब उस का यह भी कर्तव्य है कि जब वह शिक्षा प्राप्त कर चुके, तब उन को काम करने के अवसर भी उपलब्ध करे। अगर वह ऐसा नहीं करती है, तो वह इस किस्म की शिक्षा दिलानी बन्द कर दे। आज हमारे देश में ग्रेजुएट्स, एम० ए० और एल० एल० बी०

[श्री बंसीलाल]

हज़ारों की तादाद में कालिजों से निकल रहे हैं, लेकिन उन के सामने कोई काम नहीं है। कितना दर्द होता है उन माता-पिताओं को, जो पढ़ा-लिखा कर अपने बच्चों को तैयार करते हैं और बाद में जिन को यह जवाब मिलता है कि उन के लिये कोई काम नहीं है। मुझे एक स्वायत्त शासन संस्था को चलाने का मौका मिला है। एक बार हम को दो-तीन क्लार्क्स की ज़रूरत पड़ी, तो आप की यह जानकर आश्चर्य होगा, आठ सौ एप्लिकेशन्स एक लोअर डिविजन क्लार्क की जगह के लिये आईं। हमारे मामले यह मुश्किल आई कि कैसे उन सब लोगों को इन्टरव्यू के लिये बुलायें। मुझे याद आया कि नौजवान, खुशामा चेहरे, अपने बुजुर्ग बादिद को साथ लेकर नौकरी की तलाश में—एक मामूली लोअर डिविजन क्लार्क की जगह के लिये—आए। यह हम सब जानते हैं कि देश में बेकारी फैल रही है, लेकिन खेद इस बात का है कि हम उस समस्या को हल करने का कोई तरीका नहीं निकालते हैं और योजना में लगे हैं। बड़े धाराम के साथ, खरामा-खरामा हमारी योजनायें चलती हैं और बनती हैं। मैं इस समा को बता देना चाहता हूँ—हालांकि दूसरे सदस्यों की तरह मेरी आवाज का भी हाल होगा, उस का कोई बहुत बड़ा असर होगा, यह मैं आशा नहीं करता हूँ—अगर सरकार ने इस समस्या की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया तो एक दिन इस की कीमत देने के लिये हम सब की तैयार रहना चाहिये—उस को कोई रोक नहीं सकता है। आप पंचवर्षीय योजना में दस बीस लाख नौजवानों को काम दिलाने की बात करते हैं, लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस समस्या को हल करने का यह तरीका नहीं है। आप को वर्तमान व्यवस्था में आमूल परिवर्तन करना होगा। अगर आप को ऐसे नौजवानों की—ग्रेजुएट्स की—ज़रूरत नहीं है, तो आप कालिजों को बन्द कर दीजिये। आज उन कालिजों में उन लोगों का बक्त जाया हो रहा है और आप का रुपया जाया हो रहा है। आप थोड़ी देर के लिये ला-क्लासिज को बन्द कर दीजिये। अगर और ला ग्रेजुएट्स नहीं निकलेंगे, तो यहां पर बकीलों की कमी नहीं होने वाली है। इसी तरह से आर्ट्स कालिज भी बन्द कर दीजिए। आज उन पर जो रुपया खर्च हो रहा है, वह एक प्रकार से बेकारी को

बढ़ाने पर खर्च हो रहा है। एक ओर आप बेकारी बढ़ाते हैं और दूसरी ओर कहते हैं कि हमारे पास काम नहीं है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह सरकार की नैतिक जिम्मेदारी नहीं है।

इस प्रकार के राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में सरकार की रीति-नीति का एक दर्शन होना चाहिये, उस से जनता में एक नई हवा आनी चाहिये, उस से बेकार लोगों के दिलों में खुशी की एक लहर दौड़ जानी चाहिये कि सरकार कोई ऐसा कदम उठाने वाली है, जिस से हमारी जिन्दगी में रोशनी होगी। मगर हम को ऐसा नजर नहीं आता।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Member may conclude.

Shri Bansilal: I am trying to conclude.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he still trying to conclude? I think he must. I have given him now twenty minutes. I take it that he has concluded.

Shri Bansilal: Only two minutes more and I will finish. I know that the Lok Sabha is waiting and I am very much obliged.

में संक्षेप में तीन बातों की ओर सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। उस का दिल और दिमाग, उस का मस्तिष्क, हर एक समस्या के बारे में साफ होना चाहिये। अगर विल और दिमाग साफ है, तो अपनी योजनाओं को जल्दी कार्यान्वित करने की चेष्टा करनी चाहिये। धीरे-धीरे काम करने की हमारी जो आदत पड़ गई है, उस को हमें छोड़ना होगा। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि जमाना हमारा इन्तज़ार नहीं कर सकता है। अगर हम अब भी सावधान नहीं होंगे तो इतिहास में यह लिखा जायेगा कि एक बहुत बड़ा मौका हम को देश के शासन का मिला, और हम ने उस का ठीक उपयोग नहीं किया।

5-47 P.M.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 22nd February, 1956.