

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

DELHI DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY

The Deputy Minister of Health (Shrimati Chandrasekhar): I beg to move :

"That in pursuance of clause (g) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Act, 1955, the Members of this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two Members from among themselves to serve as members on the Delhi Development Provisional Authority constituted under the said Act."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is :

"That in pursuance of clause (g) of sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Act, 1955, the Members of this House do proceed to elect in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two Members from among themselves to serve as members on the Delhi Development Provisional Authority constituted under the said Act."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The dates will be fixed later.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—Contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Lok Sabha will now resume discussion on the Motion of Thanks on Address by the President. Out of the total of 20 hours allotted for the purpose 10 hours and 25 minutes have so far been availed of.

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reserve—Sch. Castes): I join with the Mover of this motion in thanks giving and being grateful to the President for all that had been done during the year. Within the limited time at my disposal, I shall mention only one factor in the beginning—the factor that concerns the masses of India. The masses of India are in full accord with the basic criterion the President's Government have adopted, namely, that our lines of advance must always be the progressive removal of inequalities. In fact the President's Government have already accepted the idea of a socialistic pattern of society for our country and we are satisfied

that, though the goal is distant as yet, we are proceeding steadfastly towards that goal, step by step.

We are particularly grateful for one thing that is mentioned in the President's Address. The Community Projects and the National Extension Service have already produced revolutionary changes in many of our rural activities. This will be continued and expanded and it is hoped that by the end of the Second Plan period they will cover nearly the whole of our rural community. Nothing is more encouraging to the masses than this declaration of policy by the President. They are concerned first and foremost with only one thing. As far back as the year 1932, our revered leader had written a letter from the District Jail of Bareilly to his beloved daughter which is headed "Man's struggle for living". I remember those memorable words. There he says about the strange sight of large masses being exploited by the comparatively few, of some who earn without working at all and of millions who work but earn very little. That being the condition of the country even today to a large extent, we are interested to find that the President's Government had rightly accepted the goal of socialist pattern of society and though the goal may be distant we are satisfied that we are proceeding steadfastly towards that goal.

I may say in this undertaking of the Government for the amelioration of the social conditions of the masses in the rural areas, the masses are not lagging behind. I will simply refer to page 2 of the annual report for the year 1954-55 of Community Projects Administration. They say :

"Till March 1955 the total value of peoples' contribution in the Community Projects and NES areas in the form of cash, kind and labour amounted to Rs. 11.37 crores as against a total Government expenditure of Rs. 21:30 crores. Thus peoples' contribution represents nearly 53 per cent. of the total Government expenditure. The all India average of people's contribution per 1000 persons works out at Rs. 2053."

That being the assessment of the results so far as the peoples are concerned, I would make only one request. Whatever may be the economic condition of the masses today, they are doing

their utmost in the performance of the huge task of economic advancement of the country. The Second Plan requires a very large sum and for that the Government of India and the State Governments will have to find other avenues of income. I should suggest that the masses of India should not be further taxed by way of indirect taxation so far as the necessary consumer goods are concerned. All that is necessary to fulfil our objective is to aim at procurement of funds from those sources where money is. I may just imitate another gentleman who said that the lancet should be directed towards that part of the body where blood is congested.

I should like to mention one more important point because it had been mentioned in this Lok Sabha. That refers to the problem Province of Bengal. We are rather committed to the reunion of the States of Bengal and Bihar. But let me make it clear at the outset that this sincere attempt on our side is based on one definite matter and that is the decision of the Government of India so far as the S.R.C. recommendations are concerned. If we do not attempt that lien, what is the result? The result is, so far as the States of Bengal and Bihar are concerned, they will be constituted on the basis of the final decision of the Central Government of which a press *communiqué* had been issued and everybody had been acquainted with those facts. But yesterday my friend Mr. Sahaya said that the Union proposal should be proceeded with on the basis that the S.R.C. recommendation or proposal should be thrown overboard. If that be the decision, I am very much diffident how far we shall be successful, in our real sincere effort for the reunion of the two provinces.

The opposition parties are always trying to misrepresent facts in all possible ways. They are raising the bogey of majority domination and all that. The Deputy Leader of Communist Party spoke the other day for about an hour. I tried to find out whether there was any constructive suggestion from that party. I found none. There were several vituperations and several declamatory statements against our revered leaders of both Bengal and Bihar and against the Central Government. He had nothing constructive to say. They are all opposition tactics. On the national endeavour of this country he

had given some definition to this "nationalism". Towards the last part of his speech he has stated—these are his words—

"I feel that the proposals about the merger of different States are proposals which cut against the whole grain of Indian nationalism....."

I do not know whether Indian nationalism is the monopoly of Mr. Mukerjee. But certainly the country has accepted it that it is the Congress party and the ruling party of the day that knows more of Indian nationalism than the parties that are opposing it from every point of view, right or wrong.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): That is accepted.

Shri Barman: He has disowned the merger proposal. Then he says:

"These are proposals which are not in conformity with the history of our country or with the desires of our people."

There he is completely wrong. It is the desire not only of the Bengalis and Biharis to unite together, but you will find that in all parts of the country there are proposals for forming such bilingual and multilingual States. When he refers to the desires of the people I think he is ignoring the people of the provinces and the masses in general. In this democratic Republic it is the wishes of the masses that should be met first and it is their interest that should be the first and foremost consideration in politics and in the administration of the country.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Put it to the electorate.

Shri Barman: We shall put it, if necessary.

An hon. Member: Then we will see

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): If it is done.

Shri Barman: What are the interests of the masses? I come from a district called Jalpaiguri and there one-third of the population consists of Biharis. We have to look to their interests. We have done it and there has been no contention between us regarding any matter. Of course, the only difference is that none of them has been recruited through the Public Service Commission. Mr.

[Shri Barman]

Acharya Kripalani the other day mentioned that the root cause of these dissensions. He referred to a certain section of the community which look more to their interest and to the interest of the political party than to the real interest of the masses. I fully agree with that view. The other day, yesterday also, the Deputy Leader of the Socialist Party has stated that bilingual States are for the national interest. I am grateful to him for making this statement. I shall then only appeal to him to instill his feeling into the minds of his followers in other parts of India and in Bihar and Bengal.

An Hon. Member : What about Maharashtra ?

Shri Barman : Maharashtra also. We find that in this attempt of ours, which is being pursued with the best of motives it is mostly the Communist Party that is making this sort of agitation and spreading all sorts of rumours through the length and breadth of India. The Deputy Leader of the Communist Party, while he was mentioning certain facts, stated that they are from rumours and from talks all over Bengal. And what did he say in the course of that? He has decried the leaders of the whole of Bengal and Bihar. He says :

“But suddenly by an act of magic... the two Chief Minister come forward and say, we shall have a United State. And, then, they go back to their followers and talk in chauvinistic way saying that the Begalis can control the United States of West Bengal and Bihar or that the Biharis can control the so-called United States.”

When he was challenged as to what is the document which can substantiate this sort of statement he said these are talks all over the State. I do not think that this sort of rumours can be stated on the floor of this responsible House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He said they are reported in newspapers also.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : It will be placed on the Table of the House.

Shri Barman : But that has not yet been placed on the Table of the House. He has stated that....

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : If he desires I will do so.

Shri Barman : The sum and substance of the statement is that both the Chief Ministers are trying to play with the people of the provinces. This is a very damaging statement and unless he can substantiate it on the floor of the House by producing document or something I, submit to you most humbly, he should withdraw the statement. It is very damaging not only to the provinces but it is damaging to the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : May I read out the relevant portion from the West Bengal Government's own report? They are Dr. Roy's own words. Shall I read it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Is it a long one?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : There is quite a lot.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The hon. Member can read it when she gets a chance.

Shri Barman : Up till now no document has been placed on the Table.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : But the hon. Member has offered to place it now. Is it an official communication?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly) : It is Government's own communication.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East) : The West Bengal Government's organ.

Shri Barman : All right; I am willing to hear that statement.

Shri B. K. Das (Contai) : The interpretation put by her is wrong.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : Let me explain the position.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Hon. Members cannot talk across the Table. If Shrimati Renu Chakravartty wants to intervene, I shall certainly give her time. As I have pointed out, I wanted to know if the extract will be a long one. When the hon. lady Members is called upon to speak, she will have an opportunity to refer to that statement. Of course, even when Shri H. N. Mukherjee was speaking, I suggested to him that the statements may be made available to the Lok Sabha and that the extract or the newspaper may be placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha. The hon. lady Member is now in possession of the document. When she speaks, she may place it on the Table of the Lok Sabha. In the meanwhile the hon. Member may say what he likes to say.

Shri Barman : That is a mischievous statement.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada) : What the hon. Member now says is mischievous.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Order, order. Let the hon. Member proceed.

Shri Barman : I may then refer to another statement that has appeared in the columns of newspapers. It was said that the whole idea underlying that policy is that ultimately Calcutta will be taken out from Bengal. That statement was made in the meeting and it has been reported in the paper. I can produce that paper if the Lok Sabha likes. With all this mischievous propaganda, can any one expect that this move for unification of Bengal and Bihar can be successful? Unless the Government does well in suppressing all this sort of propaganda, it is not possible for any honest man to proceed with any honest purpose. I said at the beginning and I say it at the end that it is the starving millions who are more concerned with food, with clothing and other social amenities than others. What is the result of this unification? In my own estimation, the two States will become bigger in size and the masses will unite in their demand and they will get more strength than at present. All sorts of political interests, class interests and class domination and motives will have to be suppressed in the face of these millions and multi-millions when they unite together. Then, neither in Bengal nor in Bihar will those who are now the privileged classes dominate and the interests of the vast millions of masses will be heard and they will have greater say. That is the one positive result of unification, though I do not say that at present this is not being done. But it is quite clear that when the body of the State will become a bigger one, the masses will gather greater strength and their demands will bear fruit. We will then have their demands more successfully met. I for myself am for the dumb millions who have no voice in modern politics. I venture to say that this arrangement of unification is a good move and it will be perfectly beneficial for both the States, and I wholeheartedly support the union of West Bengal and Bihar.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee : I am disappointed with the President's Address. I thought that in this crisis, when our

country is in danger and the repercussions caused by the SRC Report have been very serious, we would get a stirring call from an elder statesman like the President of India. With due deference I must say that he has failed to give any stirring call or any lead to the country and the nation in this crisis. It reads like an insipid report. I am sorry to say that there is no betrayal, no symptom, no evidence, of an architect's hand. It looks like a third class report by an Under Secretary or by a bureaucrat.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem) : I take exception to this remark.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee : You may ; but I am at perfect liberty to criticise this because we know the President never composes such a report.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy : On a point of order. He is making a disparaging remark about the statement of the Head of the State.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I am sorry to say that the conduct of the President is not in question. What I would say is, here, the President is only the mouthpiece of the Government. Therefore, the hon. Member can say that the Address is not what he expected it to be.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara) : My hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee is a practising, leading Advocate of India, and I think he can put it in better phraseology than what he has used, the thing that he wants to say.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee : My hon. friend Shri Ramaswamy is a barrister of 24 years' standing. I am a Barrister of 34 years' standing. He said two years back that he was a Barrister of 22 years' standing. Therefore, it must be 24 years now. Anyway, I only wanted a lead in the President's Address. I am casting no reflection on the veteran statesman who occupies President's Chair or the President's portfolio. It is an attack out of the agony of my heart against those who are sitting on the Treasury Benches, because they have displayed no constructive statesmanship. They have not shown that they have a real mind. Their mind is still suffering from confused thinking. They are talking of Five Year Plan but they are suffering from planned planlessness so far as the reorganisation of States is concerned.

[Shri N.C. Chatterjee]

I was in Europe a few months back, and I was happy to find, before I went to London to attend the Commonwealth Law Conference, that throughout the continent there was a feeling that at least there is one country in Asia where there is political stability and real sanity and a national outlook. But now we have gone down unfortunately in the estimation of the world. We are getting cuttings from the foreign press and you know what the world is thinking of us. The papers show that the riots in India over the linguistic States have hurt India's prestige and have lowered her not merely in the eyes of one country but in the eyes of the whole world. We shall be looked down upon as a third class nation unless we can solve this problem, and this problem must be tackled and solved in a proper democratic manner, with vision, with foresight and with courage.

Doubts have been expressed in important sections of the press that India is a nation. They say that India is hardly a nation and it is a congeries of nations. They are pulling this country to pieces over this problem of reorganisation of States. This problem could be tackled properly if the Government had been more consistent and if the Government had really adopted democratic methods. But what are they doing? They are really identifying the party with the country. They are identifying the caucus with nation. That is what they have done. What is the good of saying now that unilingual States ought to be scrapped and we must swing either to multi-linguism or to composite States of a bilingual or multi-lingual character. In the year 1920 I attended the session of the Indian National Congress at Nagpur when Mahatma Gandhi gave the lead and that was accepted as the correct lead by the whole of India. That lead was that the political map of India must be redrawn and the Indian National Congress then adopted the redistribution of the States on a linguistic basis as the political objective. Not merely that. It was not merely a resolution in the year 1921. The Congress itself refashioned its own Constitution on the linguistic basis. Long before Andhra or Karnataka or Kerala or Maharashtra or Gujerat or any other State was thought of, the Congress provinces were constituted on the linguistic basis and after this was done, the SRC Report says that the Congress became a dynamic institution which could inspire

the people. Sir, you will remember that in the year 1927, Pandit Motilal Nehru's Committee submitted a report and that report definitely gave an impetus to the principle of linguistic re-distribution of States. This is what the Nehru Committee said :

"If a province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it must necessarily be a linguistic area. If it happens to be a polyglot area difficulties will continually arise and the media of instruction and work will be two or even more languages. Hence it becomes most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Language as a rule corresponds with a special variety of culture, of traditions and literature. In a linguistic area all these factors will help in the general progress of the province."

History shows that the great struggle for India's emancipation began with the anti-partition movement in Bengal and with similar movement in Maharashtra. The Indian National Congress shared an agitation on the partition of Bengal and when Bangalis were sacrificing themselves for the purpose of annulling that partition which was imposed upon our province the greatest nationalist forces for the liberation of Mother India along with the Congress stood by us. While giving its support to the anti-partition movement of Bengal in the year 1905-1906, the Indian National Congress accepted the principle of linguistic division of States. After this, the Congress reaffirmed its adherence to this principle at the Calcutta Session held in October, 1937, when it recommended the formation of Andhra and Karnataka provinces. In July, 1938, the Congress passed a resolution at Wardha and gave an assurance to the deputations from Andhra, Karnataka and Kerala that linguistic redistribution of the provinces would be undertaken as soon as the Congress comes into power. In the meantime, the Congress gave its support for the formation of Sind and Orissa, although there was good deal of misgiving with regard to it. Recently Andhra was formed after the Prime Minister's statement on Shri Sriramulu's death. Discussions took place; the Parliament was faced with a Bill and we passed it. The States Re-organisation Commission was appointed consisting of men of character and integrity after the Prime Minister made a state-

ment in the Lok Sabha on the 22nd December, 1953 and then the Home Ministry issued a Resolution on the 29th December, 1953. After two years of hard work, the Commission submitted its report. Look at the majority of its recommendations. It has accepted this principle which the Congress and the other political parties had accepted. As a matter of fact, the Organisation of which I am the temporary head followed suit in the year 1922-23 and did what the Congress had done before; and, the provinces of my organisation were also constituted on a linguistic basis. This Commission has recommended the formation of Kerala, Karnataka, Vidarbha and other States on a linguistic basis. If you think it is improper to have unilingual States and it is better to have bi-lingual States, why break up and disintegrate the Madhya Pradesh which was composed of Hindi-speaking and Marathi-speaking people and which was fairly well administered? Why break up Madhya Bharat which also consisted of Hindi-speaking and Marathi-speaking people. There was a recommendation that the Marathi-speaking people should go to Maharashtra...

Shri M. P. Mishra (Monghyr North-West) : How did he preside over the Maha Punjab Conference?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee : Let him hear me fully; I will come to that. What I am pointing out is this. One finds that there is a complete swing over from uni-linguism and the leaders on the other side of the Lok Sabha are singing praise and applauding bi-lingual or composite States. If national interest demands it, if the security of India demands it and if the integrity of the nation demands it, we should not make a fetish of the formula. I quite appreciate that India should be first above all. That was the cardinal principle which I advocated from the platform at Amritsar. "Akhand Bharat"—that is the glorious ideal. That is the ideal which everyone of us, the representatives of the Indian people, should always adhere to. I come from the land of *Vande Mataram*". What is *Vande Mataram*?

असलाम् कमलाम् सरलाम् सुस्मिताम् भूषिताम्
धारणीम् भारणीम् मातरम्, वन्दे मातरम्

Who is the Mother? The mother is Mother India. We are not paying homage to *Vanga Mata* or *Gujerat Mata* of any other *Mata*. Our mother should

be *Bharath Mata* to whom we should be loyal. That was my appeal at Amritsar. In the interest of Mother India, all narrow and subordinate loyalties must be superseded by the bigger loyalty to Mother India, to the Republic of India. I take that stand.

I had the privilege of going down to Bombay. I was deeply distressed at the cleavage between Gujeratis and Maharashtrais. I was one of those who spoke in the Lok Sabha after my friend Shri S. K. Patil finished his speech. I said that I was a supporter of Samyukta Maharashtra. I supported Samyukta Maharashtra on principle and I thought that there was a good case for the inclusion of Bombay also. I said it was not right to reject it because some capitalists would run away. I am quite sure that no capitalists would have run away even if it had been given to Maharashtra. I supported it when I had the privilege of discussing this matter with the hon. Prime Minister. I said that this Bombay problem should not be left undecided because there was some apprehension on the part of some capitalists. As a matter of fact, my friend Mr. Barman was very critical of Mr. Hiren Mukerjee. I do not agree with Mr. Mukerjee on many points and my stand is substantially and fundamentally different. What I want to point out is that, if you say that Bombay should not go to a particular uni-lingual State because some capitalists are genuinely apprehensive then one day Calcutta may have to come under Rajasthan or the capitalists of Calcutta may stand up and say that they want to be under Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or Pandit Govind Vallabh Pant. We do not want that kind of encouragement to be given to big capitalists. What I am saying is, every right-thinking citizen will deplore and condemn all acts of violence and hooliganism which have been committed in Bombay. But I also found in Bombay millions of Gujeratis and millions of Maharashtrais who were anxious to live as fellow-citizens of one State. They want to build up one State as an integral part of the entire Republic of India. If you honestly feel that a bi-lingual State is the proper consummation, why do you not accept the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee's formula? Why do you not accept Samyukta Maharashtra plus bigger Gujerat along with Bombay? I am appealing to the Prime Minister—I am

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

glad that he is here. I made an appeal in Bombay after consulting not merely the Maharashtrian and Gujarati leaders, but leaders of the different organisations, big industrialists and capitalists that the difficult problem of Bombay can still be solved. It can be solved by one man and that man is the Prime Minister of India. I make an appeal to him to go Bombay; I know that he was in Bombay the other day, but I want him to go not in that way. I want him to go to Bombay for the purpose of summoning a round-table conference of Maharashtrians, Gujaratis and other interests involved. The whole approach at present is wrong. I am saying with great respect, but with great firmness, that the approach is wrong. Do not make it a Congress business. Do not make it a party business, do not make it a business of a four man committee appointed by the executive of one political party. It is a national problem. It must be tackled on the national plane. Do not think that Shri Deogirikar is the only one man who counts in Maharashtra. You send for him, you send for Shri S. K. Patil and decide the fate of Bombay. I have great respect for them. But, is that the proper democratic way? Are people chattle? Are they not men? Are there not millions of men involved in this matter? Are there not leaders of other political parties? I am suggesting, if you really want a bilingual state, have that formula. Have the whole of Maharashtra and the whole of Gujarat along with Bombay and make it one State. If the Gujaratis or if the capitalists or any section or linguistic group wants special safeguards, it can be devised. It is not beyond the range of practical constructive statemanship. I gave a formula in Bombay. In the British Parliament, there is a convention in respect of Scotland. The English majority cannot swamp the Scottish people. There is a convention that if the Scottish members are against any particular measure, that won't be forced down their throats. Some such formula can be devised. The Socialist leaders have also given a formula. That formula is worth considering. That formula is this. If the Bombay city cannot be tacked on to a unilingual State now for certain reasons, if you honestly think that in the interests of the country, having regard to the prevailing bitterness, it cannot be done, do one thing. Make it a city state. Leave it

to the elected representatives of the people of Bombay to decide to which unilingual State it would ultimately go. Don't take upon yourself the dictatorial power which is the claim of the fascists, and say that we three or four people sitting in Delhi, shall decide the future shape of Bombay for all time, Bombay of which we are all proud. That is not the proper approach. I therefore make this appeal.

Shri Barman was talking of democracy. What is democracy? Consulting the will of the people. Has anybody consulted the will of the people of Bombay? There is a method of doing it. The best method is, give them an elected legislature and let the elected legislature decide what will be the ultimate shape and to which particular State they will accede. I am perfectly convinced that either of these, either a bigger bilingual State of Bombay with the whole of Maharashtra and the whole of Gujarat with Bombay or a city state of Bombay will be accepted. If any constitutional safeguards are needed, we can have the British convention made a constitutional safeguard in our own Constitution.

With regard to the other great problem of Punjab, I was very happy to find that the situation was much better at Amritsar. I was depressed, I was sad, I was pessimistic in Bombay; but I was happy to find that the situation was much better in Amritsar. I was told about the increasing cleavage, mounting tension between the two communities in the Punjab. But, the way all behaved in Amritsar was simply remarkable. I paid a tribute not merely to the organisers of the convention over which I presided, but also to the organisers of the other convention over which Master Tara Singh presided. The situation was perfectly controlled. I am very happy that everything passed off smoothly. I am also happy that the authorities behaved well. That gave me great hope. That gave me the courage to plead for sanity. I did not go to Amritsar in the spirit of a militant crusader for the purpose of tilting the scales against a particular community. I went there as an Indian. I went there also as a Hindu, to appeal to both the Hindus and the Sikhs of Punjab to remember that they are organic and essential parts of one homogeneous community. I appealed to the Hindus to remember that the Sikh Gurus are the Gurus of Hinduism. The Gurus of the Sikhs are the prophets of my religion.

There is no difference between Guru Govind and Chatrapathi Sivaji. They are the saviours of India, who struggled for rescuing India, for rescuing the Hindu society from sloth and bondage. We are proud of them. I am told, I made this public declaration in Amritsar, that in thousands of Hindu homes in Punjab *Gurubani* is still recited. I make this appeal today that nothing should be done that would weaken our unity. I am sorry that Sardar Hukam Singh is not here. I wish he had been here. I would have made this appeal to him. Remember that India today is in danger. Remember, my country is in danger. Remember, my nation is in danger. Remember, 40 lakhs of people have been thrown out of East Pakistan. What is the position today? Shri Mehr Chand Khanna, our Rehabilitation Minister has said that about 4 lakhs of people have been squeezed out in less than 2 years. The average exodus from East Bengal is 24,000 per month. You know that Government figures are never accurate. Take it at 24,000. The tempo is going to increase. Shri Ghanfar Ali Khan has got a brain wave today. What is his brain wave: Let the Bengal border be sealed. That would be no solution. That would be consigning the tortured and frustrated minority to perpetual perdition. That would be no solution. What I am appealing is this. Remember that you will have to make arrangements not merely for 40 lakhs, but for the entire Hindu minority in East Bengal. They cannot live there. It is said that this is happening on account of economic depression in East Bengal. You know that the economic depression in Pakistan is manufactured because of the policy of discrimination against the minorities, religious, economic and social. A modern state is a socialistic state, or a socialistic state or a welfare state. Everybody is talking like that. It means that it has got many things to control. The entire economic life and social life can be controlled. It is being controlled in Pakistan for the purpose of squeezing out, for the purpose of driving out the Hindus. In their Constitution they have stated that the Hindu will be an inferior type of citizen. The brand of inferiority, the Hindus have rejected. There was some hope after Mr. Fazul Huq joined the cabinet and after Dr. Khan Saheb was restored to power, that a new leaf would be turned. We are disappointed. Nothing has happened. The Hindu

Ministers have been forced to resign and quit the cabinet both at the Centre and in East Bengal. The result will be that the tempo of exodus will be aggravated, increased and intensified. Remember the incident which took place, about which the Prime Minister spoke a few minutes ago. They are shooting down our soldiers. They are having trenches in our territory. They are being armed by the Imperialist powers. Pakistan is being egged on and everything is being done by the other powers for the purpose of fomenting discord and disharmony between India and her neighbour. Therefore, you have got to be very careful. So, I say, India is in danger, the country is in danger, the nation is in danger. You must do everything possible to face this menace resolutely and not act as Acharya Kripalani says. He had been recently taking some treatment in Malabar or somewhere. He has improved; I am very happy. I am glad that his diagnosis is correct. But his prescription is wrong. What is his remedy? To jettison it. That won't do. How can you today tell the people of Kerala or the people of Karnataka that there shall be no Kerala or Karnataka State? It will be driving the people to despair. That would not be right. Face it and finish it democratically. You can do it. I am again appealing to the Prime Minister that if he takes courage in both hands and says, maybe we have made a mistake in Bombay, I will solve it, the problem can be solved. Send for the leaders of both the communities and also the important men of Bombay and tackle it. It will be finished. The cleavage has not gone so far that it is impossible to repair the damage. I am sorry to know that the Chief Minister of the State of Bombay, for whose administrative ability I have some respect, has said that the Maharashtrians tried to overthrow the Government. The first time I met Shri Gadgil in Bombay and other Maharashtrian leaders, I put it to him there is a whispering campaign against you that these disturbances were planned. Are you ready to face a judicial enquiry presided over by a Supreme Court Judge or a High Court Judge? He said "Yes". Now, you cannot possibly blackguard an entire community and then refuse a commission of inquiry. If you do not have a commission, then you must withdraw the charge. Don't say the Maharashtrians did it in a planned manner. That will not be fair. If they have done it,

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

then should reap the consequence and there should be an impartial commission.

1 P.M.

One fine morning sitting in the City of New Delhi two well-meaning statesmen had a brain-wave. What was the brain-wave in the cold wave of Delhi? —that there should be a merger of Bengal and Bihar. That is looked upon, I am sorry to say, with great distrust. There is a lack of *bona fides*. This is not the way to do things. If you honestly feel that merger of Bengal and Bihar would do good for India then there should be no attempt to dominate, there should be no attempt at imposition. There should be consultation with the people. There should be consultation of other parties.

From the year 1921 the Congress had been wedded to linguistic formation of States, and the States Reorganisation Commission devoted a chapter to it. There was public opinion, there was struggle. Dr. Meghnad Saha who is no more and whose death we all mourn, was looked upon as the spearhead of Bengali agitation. I joined it not in a spirit of animosity towards Bihar. I plead for justice and fair play. That is why I approached the Prime Minister and the Home Minister and Maulana Azad, and I told them: "Do justice to Bengal". British imperialism, for the purpose of crippling my race, my community and my province, deliberately partitioned Bengal. The Commission's Report points out that in proposing the annulment of the partition the British wanted to make Bengal a Muslim majority State by assigning some areas to Bihar. The Congress in 1911 passed a unanimous resolution, moved not by a Bengali but moved by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, a man of unimpeachable integrity and a man of great distinction, to reverse that decision as it was not fair. There was a *hartal* in Calcutta the other day which was successful. There have been very few *hartals* so successful in a big cosmopolitan city like Calcutta. There was not a single deplorable incident. As everyone knows there is a big non-Bengali population in Calcutta. The labour population is predominantly non-Bengali. But none was touched, everything went off peacefully.

There is no question of any inter-provincial disharmony, but feelings were roused because we felt that Govern-

ment was weakening and there was a risk of a reversal of this little chunk of territory which was being given to Bengal. I am sorry my Chief Minister gave away 500 square miles that was recommended by the Commission. I do not know why he did it, but he did it. We are apprehensive that something worse might happen. If you honestly feel, if you are convinced that in the interests of India, some kind of merger is necessary, then do it democratically. Do not say that because Dr. Sinha and Dr. Roy have thought over it it must be forced down the throat by party whips and so on. Is this democracy? The Chief Minister gives notice of a motion and then withdraws it from the legislature. It is not pressed to vote and it is said that there was some kind of debate on the Governor's Address and therefore it is quite final. That is not the way to handle this problem.

You ought to know that not merely professional politicians, but great thinkers, scientists and men of unimpeachable integrity occupying the highest positions in life have been very much perturbed over this, because there are certain factors which you cannot ignore. For example, in a democracy it means counting of heads. In a democracy numbers count. And it is not the old Bengal that is going to be merged with Bihar. I would have immediately jumped at it if it is a question of Bengal, Bihar, Orissa and Assam merging together. I would have welcomed it. We would not have opposed it. But when it is a population of a truncated, divided, partitioned, vivisected Bengal, of less than 2½ crores merged or amalgamated with a State whose population is over 4 crores, difficulty arises. Take the people into confidence. Tell them how you propose to eliminate all chances and risks of discrimination. These things have not been discussed. There ought to have been discussions over these things.

You know, Sir, Dr. Surendra Nath Sen, who is a great historian and was the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Delhi and is now the Sheriff of Calcutta. He went to Dr. Rabindranath Tagore's house where a big conference took place, where he said:

"People who had voted the present Government in the last general elections did not give it any right to liquidate West Bengal by

any abrupt move of merger with Bihar. A clear mandate from the people will have to be taken in a fresh general election before the leaders can proceed with such a vital proposal. If the ruling party, in callous disregard of the people's wishes transgresses the bounds of authority vested in them, it will within the full power of the people to pull them up in a proper way. It would be highly injudicious on the part of them to ride rough shod over the popular opinion and to do something that would destroy the confidence of people in them. That way lies danger.

Members of the legal profession know that Shri Atul Chandra Gupta is one of the outstanding lawyers in India today, he is also a great literateur. He has been a Congressman for years though not aspiring for any office or Ministership or anything like that. He has also taken the same stand. There are also other men like Dr. Saha who have sounded a note of warning. Do it democratically. If this thing had been allowed to evolve as an organic movement from the bottom, nursed and cherished and canalised under proper guidance and proper leadership, it might have gone through. But the way you are doing it, you are irritating the people.

I want to say a few words with regard to the Punjab. I have not yet had the opportunity and privilege of discussing with the hon. Prime Minister or the Home Minister the set up of things there. These Regional Councils I thought were meant really for the purpose of having States integrated, having States formed and then functioning under a Regional Council but it seems that the thing is going to be reversed in the case of the Punjab. We would like to have a proper picture, but if you give these Regional Councils complete power over law and order, then I am afraid it will lead to the accentuation of centrifugal forces. That will also help communal or sectarian elements to ally themselves with undesirable forces, and may put in peril this frontier State of India. I am not against giving legitimate satisfaction to the great Sikh community for any grievances that they have. I had a discussion with the hon. Prime Minister on this issue, and he assured me that if they put forward any grievances, he would look into them. I am quite sure he will do it. As President of the

Maha Punjab Conference I also stated : let a commission be appointed to find out if they have any genuine grievances, but let not imaginary, so called administrative grievances be magnified into a battle cry or a war cry and bring about bitterness between the communities. I still hope that the S.R.C. recommendations with regard to the Punjab would be accepted and implemented.

I have criticised this S.R.C. Report in parts, and criticised it strongly but not in the spirit of a carping critic, but in the spirit of a loyal citizen who wants to build up India during the formative period of our Republic. But I have read and re-read and re-read the chapter on the Punjab and I must say that it is a very well written chapter. It has given cogent arguments which should convince any reasonable man. The Fazl Ali Commission is perfectly right in pointing out that in the Punjab it is not a battle of languages, but a battle of scripts. Whatever may be the geographical set up or the administrative set up it will be a Punjabi-speaking province, even if you make it a Maha Punjab. Seventy one per cent. of the population do not want Punjab to be truncated. They want Punjab to be big, to be powerful, to be resourceful, to be a resilient unit which can resist any menace. We know Defence is a Central subject under Dr. Katju and Foreign Affairs is under the Prime Minister of India, but still if you do not have a resourceful, strong, resilient State, all schemes of defence and planning will go to the wall. Therefore, I want Punjab to be big, Punjab to be great. And I am quite sure that thousands, not merely thousands but millions of people belonging to both communities want to live as fellow-citizens there and want one united big Punjab, making its contribution to build up united and strong India.

Shri N. P. Nathwani (Sorath) : In this debate, the reorganisation of the States has loomed very large. In this context, it is therefore but natural that the recent happenings in Bombay should have been referred to by several Members.

But I was surprised and pained when yesterday my hon. friend Kaka Saheb Gadgil demanded a public enquiry into recent happenings there, and particularly into the police firings during those disturbances; and surely enough, not to be left behind, my hon. friend Shri

[Shri N. P. Nathwani]

S. S. More also endorsed the same plea yesterday. I was equally surprised today when my hon. friend Shri N. C. Chatterjee also supported the plea for a public enquiry into the firings. If the times had been normal, one would have welcomed an enquiry of such a nature. But those who talk in a light-hearted manner seem to ignore the present tension which exists in the State of Bombay and in other parts of the country.

I say, there is no case whatsoever for holding an enquiry. No case, much less a *prima facie* case, has been made out by anyone of the speakers. But even apart from that, in the existing situation, an enquiry like this would widen and suppurate the wound which to-day everybody wishes to heal.

Before I come to deal with the allegations which have been trotted out by the speakers in support of their demand, I would like to say generally a few words about the speech made by the hon. Member who claims to speak on behalf of the whole of Maharashtra. It is very significant that he has no personal knowledge of the happenings in the city of Bombay. He says that he does not know whether those allegations are true or false. He refers to some newspaper reports or whispers only.

I cannot understand why he did not make any attempt to find out the real truth. He does not suggest anywhere that true facts would not have been available to him, if he had approached the authorities in that behalf. Really, it does not flatter either his advocacy or his regard for truth, if I may say so, to indulge in reckless allegations, without the slightest attempt on his part to ascertain their veracity.

Another significant fact about his speech is the complete absence of any reference to the orgy of riot, arson and loot, that shook the city of Bombay for a week during the month of January. I submit that even a brief recapitulation of the fact would have been sufficient to convince anybody of how and under what circumstances the police had to resort to firing, and that no other steps could have been taken by Government to quell those disturbances.

There were violent attacks against the police, not merely with stones but with acid-bulbs. There were violent attacks against public property, when tram ser-

vices, bus services, and even railway services, local as well as through, were completely dislocated. The whole city was held to ransom by certain sections of the population.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): These are a good ground for an enquiry.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: You accept them; but you do not want an enquiry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members may have their say later on.

Shri N. P. Nathwani: My hon. friend did not refer to these events, purposely; he merely referred to the firing. That is why I am trying to give a background about what happened there. Even the lives and properties of persons were in danger, and thousands of families had to evacuate their homes in troubled areas. In these circumstances, can any Government worth its name afford to fail in discharging its primary function of protecting the life and property of individuals? Initially, the Government and the police started with mild measures like lathi-charge or tear-gas; even curfew was imposed; but the rioters remained undeterred, with the result that ultimately the police had to take further steps, and the order of what is popularly called 'shoot-at-sight' was given. I submit, it is completely wrong to say that a shoot-at-sight order was given. If any Member had tried to understand the facts, he would have realised and brought out this fact. In a press note issued by the Government of Bombay on 20th January, this is what is stated:

"Attempts at arson were also reported from the troubled areas. However, orders have been issued to shoot immediately persons who indulge in looting and incendiarism, on their refusal to desist from their activities".

Please mark this. Two conditions have been laid down; firstly, the persons should be found indulging in looting and incendiarism, and secondly they should have refused to withdraw; only then, shooting was to be resorted to. Everybody knows that on the 19th January, looting was rampant. Several shops were looted. Even private houses were looted. There were also mobs marching with flaming torches with a view to set fire to houses and other property. It was under these circumstances that this order was given to the police.

I have another remark to offer on the speeches of those hon. Members. They have not expressed even a word of sympathy or even a murmur of regret for the sufferings endured by the victims. In one word, they dismissed the whole thing saying: "We condemn the violence". But they studiously avoided expressing their sympathy for the victims.

Now, let me go on to some of the alleged facts which were placed before the Lok Sabha by the hon. Member who spoke yesterday. He refuses to accept as authoritative the figures of casualties given by the Government of Bombay. But he would not say what the exact figure is. And what does he say? He merely refers to some leader of the INTUC for saying that the figures of casualties given by the Government of Bombay are larger. Did he try to contact that leader? And what was the result of his enquiry? Certainly, one expects a greater sense of responsibility on the part of Members who claim to speak in the name of Maharashtra. The Government of Bombay have again and again pointed out that they have tried to check up the figure which they have given about casualties is the correct one.

Then, it has been said that there was indiscriminate firing. Why is it said so? They say so because a certain newspaper has alleged that 33 per cent. of the casualties were members communities, other than Marathi-speaking. Now, did he try to verify this aspect? It might be that there were some persons who belonged to other communities. He refuses to admit any other alternative except two, viz., either there was indiscriminate firing or, that people who indulged in those atrocities were mixed and not confined to a single community. But why not a third alternative, and obvious one, which he never tries to understand. It is this, that unvarying pedestrians or onlookers may have received injuries. For instance, during the November disturbances near Flora Fountain, a Gujerati sub-editor of *Janma Bhoomi* during lunch interval, not knowing what was happening in the street went out for his lunch. That street was the scene of violence on the part of the rioters. The unfortunate man received a bullet wound and died.

Shri S. S. More : Is it not a case of indiscriminate firing?

Shri N. P. Nathwani : No. He was not the only person going along the road. There were others—rioters also. Is it suggested that he was alone and was shot down? Nobody has suggested that (*Interruption*). It is, possible some persons received injuries in this way. I do not deny that you may come across such stray cases of accidental injury. But to say that there was indiscriminate firing is totally unjustified. An attempt has been made to create an impression that there was firing only once and at one place and these casualties were inflicted. Friends forget that the firing that was resorted to was spread over a number of days and at several places. If they bear that in mind they can understand the nature of the injuries and other things adverted to.

There is another circumstance which has been referred to. On 21st November, it has been said, Home Guards were imported from outside Bombay. Everybody knows—and Government has made its stand quite clear several times—that they were not imported for this purpose, that they were not imported, but were camping in Bombay at the time and that they consisted of members from all parts of the State of Bombay.

The events of November and January have also been referred to. I was present in Bombay. I belong to Bombay. Though I represent the State of Saurashtra, I have made Bombay my second home and I have been staying there since last 25 years. I was present during this time and was a witness to some of the things which took place then. I am surprised at the attempt that has been made to distort the true facts which are within the knowledge of everybody.

Shri S. S. More : Has your statement been recorded by the Police?

Shri N. P. Nathwani : My friend Shri Gadgil said that on the 18th only 600 persons were trying to approach the Speaker of the Bombay Assembly and the only thing they wanted to do was to bring to his notice their petition. Nothing of that sort. What happened at Flora Fountain is well-known I along with about 100 other members of the Bombay Bar, was an eye-witness to what happened there. There were not 600 persons; there were more than 6000 persons, a crowd of about 10,000 persons who wanted to march to the

[Shri N. P. Nathwani]
 Council Hall where the State Assembly was in session. After repeated warnings, and after resorting to mild measures like lathi charge tear gas when the crowd did not disperse, the police ultimately reported to firing. This incident is sought to be passed on as a mere attempt on the part of 600 innocent persons to approach the Speaker. If this crowd had been allowed to proceed, I do not know what would have happened to the State Assembly on that day.

Then, reference has been made to the public meeting at Chaupaty which was attended and addressed by the Chief Minister of Bombay. I was simply amazed at the version which my hon. friend tried to give about this meeting. For weeks and months the protagonists of Samyukta Maharashtra were holding meetings. It is said in all they held 2000 meetings. None of these was disturbed and nothing untoward happened. But, when the BPCC held the Chaupaty meeting, attempts were made to break it. My hon. friend says, a provocative speech was made at this meeting by the Chief Minister. But it is well known that even before any speaker started addressing the meeting, there were determined attempts to disturb and break that meeting. I was present at that meeting. Two lakhs of persons attended. Stones, shoes and other missiles were thrown at the dias. But the people continued to sit and refused to budge an inch from their places. At this meeting the Chief Minister told the hooligans that that sort of disturbances would not help their cause and that Government would not be cowed. Is this a provocative speech? Did my friend expect the Chief Minister to say that he appreciated the things they were indulging in?

Then, it has been asked if there was a plan behind all this why preventive steps were not taken by the Government. That there was a plan, no honest and dispassionate persons can deny. From the sustained and violent attacks which were indulged in by the rioters, it should be obvious to anyone that there was an attempt to terrorize Government as well as the people of Bombay into submitting to the demand for Samyukta Maharashtra. It has been asked if the Government knew about this, why preventive steps were not taken. My hon. friend Shri Gadgil himself has provided an answer to that. When precautionary steps such as bringing extra police at certain places where

trouble is apprehended are taken the charge is levelled that you are trying to occupy the territory and thereby giving provocation and are discrediting the name of Maharashtra. In face of all these is this line of argument open to these friends? Why do they blow hot and cold at the same time? When such innocent measures are being objected to, how can they talk about preventive detention not being resorted to by Government at that time? Even simple events are pressed to show that the Government and the Police were acting in provocative manner.

Reference was made by the hon. Member to Dr. Charan and his volunteers. I have verified the facts. Some of the persons posing as volunteers of the Red Cross were found in possession of acid bulbs and stones. In these circumstances what can any Government do? Will they not try to prevent, such volunteers, may be, some genuine volunteers also along with them, from functioning in that area? But even this instance has been sought to be exploited by my friend to show that the Government of Bombay was acting in a high-handed manner.

Again, it has been said that the attitude of the Government was not prompt and helpful to congressmen and others who wanted to establish peace. There cannot be a greater travesty of truth than this. When Shanti Sena was started by the R.P.C.C. the Government offered assistance to their batch of volunteers. Only when some communists and leftist leaders wanted to move in the troubled area in company with the police, did Government refuse to comply and give them police assistance. Can this be characterised as want of co-operation on the part of Government?

Sir, I now pass to another aspect of the case. What pained me most was this. It is clear that in attributing the motive for the Bombay happenings to goondas generally and in declining to locate the blame more precisely, the Prime Minister wanted to be generous towards those who were blameworthy and was anxious to avoid further heart-burning. The root cause of the whole trouble was the sustained campaign of inciting a section of the people by speeches and writings. But the hon. Member has tried to suggest that all communities indulged in the orgy of crime. Such a statement is simply amazing. He laboured the point to show that the violence was common and not confined

to members of a particular community, and that members of other communities also indulged in the same. He does not try to analyse the facts on which he relies. He does not give us the exact figures. He merely says "Look at the lists, there are names". There is no mention anywhere as to the names and we are not told about it.

It is therefore unfortunate to make a demand for public inquiry because when the Government and the police were working under severe strain and when more drastic and stern action could have been legitimately invoked by the Government, they handled the situation as mildly and tactfully as possible and saved further loss of life. To come now and ask for an inquiry into the firings is totally wrong. I repeat that there is no case, much less a *prima facie* case made out. Moreover the result of such an inquiry would be as I said before, to widen and sapprate the wound. At present attempts are being made to bring the communities together; by restoring goodwill and amity between them. What will happen if you were to start an inquiry at this juncture or hereafter. The city of Bombay will be split into two camps, one party trying to prove, what has been obvious enough, namely that many atrocities and brutalities were committed by a certain section of the people, an attempt would be made by the other party, though it will be futile, to show that the police acted in an arbitrary manner and that there was indiscriminate firing and so on. The vary process would divide and keep divided the city and our attempts to bring about a rapprochement between the communities would be defeated thereby. Again, you have to judge the effect such an inquiry would have on the police and home-guards who struggled valiantly during these difficult days, trying to maintain law and order and to protect the citizens from harm. Under these circumstances I oppose this demand.

Before I conclude let me pay my tribute to the Chief Minister of Bombay, who kept his head cool and calm, and undeterred by any threats, worked hard and restored normal conditions in the city of Bombay. I must also congratulate the police force and the home-guards for their valiant and successful efforts to save the city from being plunged into chaos.

کہانی جی - اہسن - مسافر (امپوسٹر) :
صاحب صدر - میں آپ کی اجازت
سے راشتہ پتی کے بباشن پر جو شکر یہ
کے پر سا اور گا موشن اس ہاؤس میں
پیش کیا گیا ہے اس کے سمر تین میں
جلد الفاظ کہا چاہتا ہوں -

راشتر پتی نے اہلے مکتبہ سے مگر بڑے
جامع الفاظ میں مرتب کئے ہوئے بباشن
میں اندرونی اور بدروزی دنوں معاملات پر
وضاحت کی ہے - اور حالات اور واقعات
کی بلما پر نتائج اخذ کئے ہیں -

جہاں تک بھرونی معاملات کا تعلق
ہے سارے بباشن سے ایک بات بڑے صاف
طور پر ظاہر ہوتی ہے کہ اس وقت جو
چہر چا امن پسندی کی سارے مسلسلہ
میں ہو رہی ہے اس میں سماجی سرکار
نے صحیح رہنمائی کی ہے - یہ بات
بالکل ٹھیک ہے - میں نے پچھلے سال
اپنے تجربہ سے بھی دیکھا ہے کہ دوسرے
ملکوں میں جو فلد و ستان نے اہلی
ڈارن پالیسی مرتب کی ہے اس کی
شکایا ہے - اور یہ بات بھی ٹھیک ہے کہ
یہ پالیسی راشتر پتی کے سدھانت کے
بالکل مطابق ہے - اس تعمیری پروگ
میں اس چہر کی بڑی سخت ضرورت
تھی -

بعض بھائیوں نے کو آ یا دوسرے
مسئلوں کو سامنے رکھا ہے اور کہا ہے
کہ ان امن پسندی کی باتوں سے کام
نہیں چلے گا - ہمیں اس پر کچھ سخت
کارروائی بھی کرنی ہوگی - بیشک کسی
موقعہ پر سخت کارروائی کی ہی ضرورت
ہو جاتی ہے - مگر ایک وقت میں - جب
کہ ہم ایک پالیسی پر چل رہے ہیں -
اس وقت صرف ایک ہی پالیسی کی
چہر یا عمارت سامنے ہونی چاہئے -

[گھائی جی - ایس - مسافری]

بہت پرانی بات ہے - ایک مرتبہ سیوا گرام میں راشٹری پتا کے ساتھ بات کرتے ہوئے میں نے کہا کہ آپ تو ہمیں اہلسا کا ہتھیار دے رہے ہیں - لیکن اگر یہ کامیاب نہ ہو تو کیا دوسرے ہتھیار کو بھی ہم استعمال کر سکتے ہیں - تو راشٹری پتا نے کہا کہ اس وقت ایک ہتھیار میں نے اپنے دیس کو دیا ہوا ہے - اگر کسی دوسرے ہتھیار کا ایسی میں ذکر کر دوں تو پھر میرے سپاہی اس ہتھیار کو اذیتگو طریقے سے استعمال نہیں کر سکیں گے - اس لئے میں اس بات میں بلو نہیں کرتا کہ دوران جنگ میں اپنے سپاہی کو دوسرا ہتھیار بھی بتادوں -

تو میرے کہنے کا بہاو یہ ہے کہ اس وقت ہمیں اس بات پر ہی پورے طور پر دھیان دینا چاہئے - اور یہی خیال رکھنا چاہئے کہ ہماری جو امن پسندی کی پالیسی ہے ہم اس کے مطابق چل رہے ہیں یا ہم اس سے الگ چل رہے ہیں - راشٹری پتی جی نے جو ملتی پھکت ہو رہے ہیں ان کا بھی ورودہ کیا ہے - کیونکہ ان سے ہتھیاروں کے متعلق لوگوں کا خیال بڑھتا ہے کہ ہتھیار جمع کئے جائیں - اور ایک دوسرے پر شک ہونے لگتا ہے - اور جب شک بڑھ جاتا ہے تو وہ لوائی جگہوں کا کارن بن جاتا ہے - وہ سے بات بالکل صاف ہے - ہندوستان کی سرکار کی امن پسندی کی پالیسی نے بہت کامیابی حاصل کی ہے - جیسا کہ راشٹری پتی نے اپنے بھائیوں میں فرمایا ہے - سولہ دیسوں کا یونائیٹڈ نیشنل ممبر شامل ہونا اور باقی کے لئے کوشش جاری رہنا اس بات کی شہادت ہے کہ یہ پالیسی کامیاب ہو رہی ہے - اور ہم دیکھتے ہیں کہ آج دنیا

میں وہ ماک بھی جو کہ لوائی جگہوں کی بات کیا کرتے تھے یہ محسوس کرنے لگے ہیں کہ اس تعمیر ہوگے میں لوائی اچھی نہیں ہے - وہ یہ محسوس کرنے لگے ہیں کہ ہمیشہ اس تھنگ سے کام نہیں چل سکتا -

دوسری بات انڈونزی معاملات سے تعلق رکھتی ہے - اس میں راشٹری پتی نے زیادہ زور کاٹیج انڈونزی پر دیا ہے - اس طرف بھی ہماری گورنمنٹ کا جو کام ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہ سب سے زیادہ ضروری کام ہے - اس میں شک نہیں کہ اس لوگ سپہا میں جتنی بھی بھاشن ہوئے ہیں ان میں زیادہ زور حد بندی کمیشن کی رپورٹ پر ہی دیا گیا ہے - اسی پر زیادہ چرچا ہوئی ہے - مگر یہ بھکاری کو دور کرنے کا سوال کوئی کم اہم سوال نہیں ہے اور اس طرف کانگریس اور کانگریس سرکار زور دے رہی ہے - جنہوں نے اس دفعہ کانگریس سیشن کے دوران امرتسر میں ہوئی کانٹیج انڈونزی کی نمائش دیکھی ہوگی وہ اس بات کی گواہی دینگے کہ جس طریقے سے وہاں پر کانٹیج انڈونزی کو دکھایا گیا ہے اور اس کا پرچار بہت سا روپیہ خرچ کر کے کیا گیا ہے اس سے صاف ظاہر ہو جاتا ہے کہ ہمارا قدم آگے کی طرف بڑھ رہا ہے - یہ تھنگ ہے کہ اس وقت جب کہ ہمارے سامنے حد بندی کمیشن کا رپورٹ کوٹیشن موجود ہے جو بھی ممبر تقریر کرے گا اس کا وہ ضرور ذکر کریگا اس کا ذکر کئے بغیر نہیں رہ سکتا - مجھے بھی اس کی بہت تھورا ذکر کرنا ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ سوال اہم تو ہے مگر اتنا پھچھدا نہیں ہے جتنا کہ اس کو بنا دیا گیا ہے اور ساتھ ہی مجھے یہ ہی یقین ہے کہ پارلیمنٹ میں کی

گئی اور کی جانے والی تقریروں سے اس مسئلے کا کوئی حل نکلتے والا نہیں ہے۔ اس کا ٹھیک اور مناسب حل تو وہی ہے جسے کانگریس ہائی کمانڈ نے ہم لوگوں کو بتلایا ہے۔ وہی اس کا اچھا حل ہے۔ مجھے یہ پتہ ہے کہ یہ حد بندی کا معائنہ ذاتی فرقہ وارانہ اور مذہبی بنیاد پر چل رہا ہے جو کہ قطعی نامناسب ہے۔ آزاد ہونے کے بعد ہم نے اپنے ویدمان سے فرقہ داری کے زہر کو نکال دیا۔ اور ہم نے اپنے ویدمان میں جو انٹیلیجنٹ الیکٹوریٹ کو رکھا۔ اور ہم نے اس کی کوشش کی کہ چلناؤ کے موقع پر ہمارے یہاں فرقہ وارانہ فضا پیدا نہ ہو۔ لیکن میں دیکھتا ہوں کہ اس حد بندی کے سوال پر ہی کئی لوگوں نے فرقہ داری کے وال کو ہمارے دیکھ میں کھپا کر دیا ہے۔ حد بندی کا بنیادی مقصد تو انتظام میں سہولیت ہی لانا ہونا چاہئے۔ جہاں آسانی ہو وہاں زبان کا بھی خیال رکھ لینا کوئی حرج کی بات نہیں ہے۔ مگر میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس میں لڑائی جھگڑے کی کون سی بات ہے۔ آخر دیکھ تو سارا ایک ہے۔ صوبوں کی حد بندی میں کوئی علاقہ کہاں ہو کس صوبے کے ساتھ ہو۔ اس پر بھی سوچ و چار ہو سکتا ہے۔ مگر اس حد بندی میں کوئی علاقہ کسی صوبے کے ساتھ لگا یا کسی صوبے کے پاس سے نکل گیا تو اس سے کوئی آفت آجائے گی۔ ایسا میرا خیال نہیں ہے۔ اگر سارا دیکھ ایک ہے اور ہم سارے ایک دیکھ کے باشندے ہیں تو کسی علاقہ کے ایک صوبے سے نکل کر دوسرے صوبے میں جا کر مل جانے سے کوئی آفت آنے والی نہیں ہے۔ ہاں یہ بات ٹھیک ہے کہ علاقہ بڑا ہونا چاہئے۔ اس میں طاقت ہوگی۔ اس چیز کو میں ماننا ہوں۔ اس بنا پر صاف ظاہر ہے کہ جن لوگوں نے جھگڑے

شروع کئے ہیں انہیں پورا پورا ہتھیار اور مزہبی منافرت کی ہو آتی ہے۔ اب آپ سوچیں کہ پنجاب کا جھگڑا ہے کس بات کا۔ اس سہوہ سے سادے سوال پر جھگڑا یہ ہے کہ ایک فرقہ یہ کہتا ہے کہ اگر ایسے تھنگ سے صوبہ بنا دیا جائے جس میں ہماری آبادی بڑھ جائے تو ہماری طاقت بڑھ ہی ہے۔ اور دوسری طرف یہ رہی ایکشن ہے کہ اگر اس تھنگ سے صوبہ بہت بڑا کر دیا جائے۔ ایسے تھنگ سے بنا دیا جائے جس سے کہ ایک دوسرے فرقہ کی تعداد بڑھ جائے۔ اور میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس کا جائز حل یہی ہے جو اس وقت اختیار کیا جا رہا ہے۔ اپوزیشن سائیڈ سے گورنمنٹ کے اوپر یہ نکتہ چینی کی گئی ہے کہ گورنمنٹ اپنے فیصلے بدلتی ہے۔ میں ان سے پوچھنا چاہتا ہوں کہ بدلو کرنا اگر مناسب جان پڑے تو ایسا کرنا کیا کوئی جرم ہے۔ یہ کوئی جرم تو ہے نہیں۔ آخر ڈیموکریسی کا زمانہ ہے اور ہماری گورنمنٹ جمہوریت کے تھنگ پر چلنے والی ہے۔ گورنمنٹ انسانوں کا ایک مجموعہ ہے وہ کوئی پتھروں کا قبیلہ تو ہے نہیں کہ جہاں پڑ گئے وہاں پڑ گئے اور اپنے کٹے ہوئے فیصلے کو اگر ضرورت معلوم پڑے تو بدل نہ سکیں۔ سرکار کے اوپر یہ بھی اس طرف سے اعتراض کیا گیا ہے کہ بسنی میں گورنمنٹ نے اپنے فیصلے کو ملوانے میں سختی سے کام لیا ہے۔ ایک طرف تو یہ کہا گیا گورنمنٹ بدلتی ہے اور دوسری طرف کہا گیا کہ اس نے اپنے فیصلے کو سختی سے عمل کرایا۔ اس کے عمل کرانے میں اس نے سختی سے کام لیا اس موقع پر مجھے ایک شاعر کا یہ شعر یاد آتا ہے۔

کہاں لے جائیں دل دونوں جہاں
میں اس کی مشکل ہے۔
اندھریوں کا مجمع ہے
اندھروں کی محفل ہے۔

ایک طرف تو یہ اعتراض کیا گیا کہ گورنمنٹ اپنا فیصلہ بدل ڈالتی ہے۔ اور دوسری طرف اس کی شکایت کی کہ وہ اپنے فیصلوں پر

[کہانی جی - ایس - مسافر]

سختی سے قائم ہے - اس لیے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اصل طریقہ وہی ہے جس کی طرف راجستھانی نے اپنی تقریر میں اشارہ کیا ہے - انہوں نے بڑے صاف انداز میں کہا ہے -

دراجھوں کا پندرگنن ایک سہتویوں وٹھنے ہے اور اس کے لیے سدبھی اور سہتویوں اہکچھت ہے - کلتو بھارت اور بھارت کے بھوشیہ کے پرشن کی تلنا میں راجھوں کی سہما نودھارن کا یہ معاملہ نکلے ہے - یعنی انا بھاو یہ ہے کہ اسکے علاوہ اور بھی ضروری باتیں ہیں راجستھانی نے تھیک کہا ہے کہ ہم میں سے اکثر بھول یہ جانتے ہیں کہ یہ مہان دیہں ہم سب کی ماتر بھومی ہے اور سب کے لئے ایک جھسی وراثت ہے - اور انا فرمانا بالکل تھیک ہے - جو مٹری پوٹھے والے کسی وندیا تھی کو اگر ایک سرکل بلانا ہے تو پہلے پرکار سے سینٹر قائم کریگا اور سینٹر قائم کرے اگر وہ سرکل بلایا تو سرکل اچھا بلہگا - اور ایسا کرنے سے آپ دیکھینگے کہ کیلندر سے سرکل کے اس دائرہ تک جتنی بھی لکریں کھینچی جائینگی وہ برابر ہونگی اور اگر وہ سینٹر اکھو گیا اور پرکار کی جو نوک ہے وہ کیلندر پر تھیک نہیں ہو تو نہ ہی دائرہ تھیک بلہگا اور نہ لکریں برابر رہینگی - اس لئے کیلندر قائم ہونا بہت ضروری ہے - ہمارا کیلندر قائم ہو ہمارا سینٹر قائم ہو اس لئے ہر وقت ہر موقع پر سرکار کو یہ دیکھنا پوتا ہے کہ ہم اپنے سینٹر کی مضبوطی کو اور دیہں کی یکجہتی کو کس طرح قائم رکھ سکتے ہیں -

یہ نہ نہیں آج زبانوں کو لیکر ہمارے بیچ میں چھکوا کہوں چل رہا ہے - ہمارے ویدھان میں چونکہ زبانوں کی ہونئی ہیں - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ہر ایک زبان ہماری قومی زبان ہے - اگر آج یہ خیال ہمارے دل میں پیدا ہو جائے تو پھر کوئی چھکوا پیدا نہیں ہونا - میں نے دوسرے ملکوں میں دیکھا ہے کہ

لوگ ایک دوسرے کی زبان - کلچر اور تمدن کی قدر کرتے ہیں - دوسروں کی زبان کو اپنی زبان سے بھی زیادہ قدر کرتے ہیں - ہمارے یہاں ہندی چینی بھائی بھائی اور ہندی روسی بھائی بھائی کے نعرے تو لگائے جاتے ہیں لیکن یہ کسی صحیح بات ہے کہ پنجاب کے ہندو اور سکھ اور بنگال اور بھار کے لوگ ایس میں بھائی بھائی مل کر نہیں رہ سکتے - مہاراشٹر اور گجرات والے بھائی بھائی کی طرح نہیں رہ سکتے اور جب ایسی حالت ہو تو ہمارا ہندی چینی بھائی بھائی یا ہندی روسی بھائی بھائی کا نعرہ لگانا کوئی معنی نہیں رکھتا - ہمیں پہلے اپنے گھر کو سمجھنا چاہئے - ہمارے بھائی بار بار شک کی بات کرتے ہیں اور آج حقیقت یہ ہے کہ پنجاب میں ہندو سکھوں پر شک کرتے ہیں اور سکھ ہندوؤں پر شک کرتے ہیں -

آچاریہ کرپلانی (بھائل پورو پورنیا) : شک سکھ اور ہندو پیدا نہیں کرتی ہے بلکہ دونوں کے لیترس کرتے ہیں -

گیانی جی - ایس - مسافر : کرپلانی صاحب نے یہ تھیک کہا ہے کہ ان کے لیتروں نے یہ شک پیدا کر دیا ہے -

اس لئے ہمارے لیتروں کو یہاں پر ایسی تقریریں کرنے سے بعض آنا چاہئے جو کہ ماسٹرز میں جا کر غلط نہیں اور جھگڑے پیدا کرتی ہیں انکے شک کو دور کرنا چاہئے - شام نے کیسا خوبصورت شعر لکھا ہے جو کہ مجھے اس موقع پر یاد آ رہا ہے -

نہیں تھانو بھی تھا وہ بھوفا آفوس دشمن میں -
کہ میری بدگمانی نے اسے رکھا وہیں برسوں -
یعنی شک و شبہ کو جو ہوں ان کو دور کر دینا ایک بڑا اچھا اور بھاری علاج ہے - اس لئے میں اپنا یہ خیال ظاہر کرتا ہوں کہ جیسا کہ ایک بھائی نے کہا کہ جو یہ حد بندی کمیشن کی رپورٹ ہے اس کو کچھ عرصہ کے لئے

ماہروی کو دیا جائے۔ میں اس سے اتفاق نہیں کرتا۔ اس کو ہمیں پورے طور سے دلوری کے ساتھ فیمس کرنا چاہئے۔

دوسری بات یہ کہ جو طریقہ نیگوسیشن کا یا آپس کی بات چیت کا اختیار کہا گیا ہے اس کے متعلق کریلانی صاحب نے کہا کہ گورنمنٹ اپنے خیالات بدلتی رہتی ہے۔ میرا یہ کہنا ہے کہ جہاں بھی بات چیت کرنے کے بعد گورنمنٹ کو کوئی اچھا چینج نظر آیا وہاں ہی گورنمنٹ بدلتی ہے اور اس کا اس طرح سے بدلنا قدرتی ہے۔ مگر جہاں پر راولہڈس ہو۔ جھکڑا ہو۔ دباؤ ڈالا جائے۔ رعب ڈالا جائے۔ اگر اس رعب سے ڈر کر گورنمنٹ اپنے فیصلے بدلنے لگے تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ گورنمنٹ کا یہ ڈھنگ درست نہیں ہے۔ ہماری گورنمنٹ نے یہ طریقہ اختیار کیا ہے کہ آپس کے صلح مشورہ سے کام کرنے کو تیار رہتی ہے۔ اس لئے جو کچھ کریلانی صاحب نے کہا کہ سب سے ملا جائے اور بات چیت کرنے کے بعد فیصلہ کیا جائے۔ اس سے میں اتفاق کرتا ہوں۔ جیسے لیڈر بیٹو کر باتیں کرتے ہیں۔ نیگوسیشن چلاتے ہیں اور سب کی بھلائی کی باتیں سوچتے ہیں اور اس کے بعد کسی نتیجہ پر پہنچتے ہیں۔ اگر ہم پورے طور سے اس طریقہ سے کام لیں تو میرا خیال ہے کہ کسی جھکڑے کی سمجھانا ہی نہیں ہو سکتی اس لئے ان سب باتوں کو دیکھتے ہوئے میں یہی کہتا ہوں کہ اس کام کو x ی کرنا ٹھیک نہیں ہے۔

ہاں جہاں ایک زبان کا کوئی صوبہ بن سکتا ہے وہاں اس پر وچار کھینچے اور بدلائے۔ جہاں دو زبانوں کا صوبہ بن سکتا ہے اور وہاں کے لئے وہی مناسب ہو تو وہاں دو زبانوں کا صوبہ بدلائے۔ اس میں دقت کہا ہے۔ دقت تو وہاں پڑتی ہے جب یہ شک پیدا ہوتا ہے کہ جو ایک زبان موجود ہے اسکو اکھاڑ کر پھینک دیا جائے گا۔ تو اگر دو زبانوں کا صوبہ بدلتا ہے تو صوبہ بدلے۔ اس میں کوئی حرج نہیں ہے۔ لیکن وہاں دونوں ہی زبانوں کے متعلق سہنگارنس ہونے چاہئیں۔ ان دونوں کو ہی بڑھانے اور پھیلنے کا موقع ہونا چاہئے۔ اگر ایسا ہو جائے تو اس میں کوئی حرج نہیں ہے۔

ریجنل کونسل کی بات بھی آج کل زیادہ چل رہی ہے۔ اگر کسی جگہ ریجنل کونسل بدلنے سے یک جہتی قائم ہو سکتی ہے اور کوئی مناسب بات ہو سکتی ہے تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس کے کرنے میں کوئی حرج نہیں ہے۔ صرف ایک بات کا ہی خیال رکھنا ہوا ضروری ہے۔ جیسا کہ میں نے پہلے کہا اور پراڈ کی مثال دی کہ ہمارا سوئٹزر قائم ہو۔ ہمارا کیلندر قائم ہو اور دیس کی یک جہتی میں کوئی فرق نہ پڑتا ہو تو کوئی بھی مصالحت کی بات کر لیں میں کوئی حرج نہیں ہے۔ کسی بھی ڈھنگ سے آپ اسکو کر لیں۔ آپ کو کسی بھی طریقہ سے اس سے پہچانے نہیں ملتا چاہئے۔

[English Translation of the Speech]...

Giani G. S. Musafir (Amritsar): With your permission Sir, I like to say a few words in support of the motion of thanks on President's Address.

The President has made clear in his well prepared Address both internal and external affairs in a very appropriate and comprehensive language and drawn conclusions on the basis of conditions obtaining these days.

As far as external affairs are concerned, one thing stands out quite clearly in the Address that our Government have given a right lead to the cause of peace in the world. I agree to it. Last year I myself experienced it that India's foreign policy is being appreciated everywhere. It is also a fact that our foreign policy is in accordance with the principles laid down by the Father of Nation. This was very essential for this age of construction.

Some of my friends have raised the question of Goa and other places and have stated that our policy of peace will not prove to be helpful so far as these problems are concerned. We shall have to take some strong steps in this respect. There is no doubt that such situations arise when we may feel the necessity of taking some strong action but we should follow one policy at a time.

Long ago, while talking to Gandhiji at Sevagram I had said to him "You are giving us the weapon of non-violence. In case it fails can we use other measures". He replied, "so far, I have given only one weapon to my countrymen. If I were to suggest some other weapon then my followers would not be able to use it in an effective manner. So, I do not believe in asking my soldiers to use another weapon in time of war." What I mean to say is that we should at present follow the policy of peace and should carefully note whether we are working according to that or not.

The President has also spoken against the military Pacts that are being concluded these days because they provoke people to collect arms and create distrust and suspicion which later on leads to serious quarrels. Otherwise it is quite evident that India's Policy of Peace has proved to be very successful. The admission of sixteen countries to the United Nations and the efforts

that are being made for the admission of others are living proofs of the success of our policy. We find that even those countries who were always talking of wars have begun to realise that war can serve no useful purpose in this age of construction and war does not suit all times.

Speaking on internal affairs President has laid greater stress upon cottage industries. The activities of the Government in this sphere are also of utmost importance. Undoubtedly, States Reorganisation Commission's Report has been the main subject of the speeches delivered in the Lok Sabha and it has occupied the major part of the discussion but the question of removing unemployment is of no less importance and towards which the Congress and the Congress Government are paying full attention. Those who may have seen the cottage industries exhibition in the Congress Session at Amritsar must have realised that the huge amounts that were spent towards the display and propaganda of these articles, clearly indicate that we are heading towards progress. I realise that no hon. member can help mentioning the burning question of the day *i. e.* the report of States Reorganisation Commission. I have also to make a few observations in this respect. In my opinion this problem is really important but it is not so complicated as it has been made to appear, and at the same time I am also aware of the fact that this problem cannot be resolved merely by delivering speeches in this Parliament. The solution put forward by the Congress High Command is the only correct and reasonable solution. I am very much pained to confess that the question of the reorganisation of States has been based on personal, communal and a religious background and this is very unreasonable. After achieving independence we did not give any place to communalism in our constitution and made provision for joint electorate. We did our best to avoid the creation of communal atmosphere at the time of elections but I find that some people have aroused communal feelings in our country on the question of the Reorganisation of the States. The main purpose of the reorganisation should be to facilitate the administration. There is no harm in considering the question of language if it is convenient in the interest of the administration to do so. But I am unable to understand as to

why there should be any quarrel in this respect. After all the entire country is one. We may however discuss the question of including a particular area in some particular State and the other in another State. What difference would it make if an area is included in a particular State or taken away from it. The entire country is one and we belong to the same country and if a certain area belonging to a State is transferred to another it is not going to harm anybody in any way. It is true that the State should comprise of a big area. I agree to it. It is quite clear that the people who have created troubles are incited by provincialism and religious feelings. In Punjab also the struggle is going on between two communities. Both of them want that the State may be reorganised in such a manner that these may be able to form majority power. I think the right step is being taken to solve this problem. The opposition has accused the Government of changing its decisions very frequently but I see no harm in making changes if they deem necessary and are reasonable. It is not a crime. Moreover our Government is being run on democratic lines and it consists of human beings who can make changes if they feel the necessity of doing so. Another objection has been raised that the Government have compelled the people of Bombay to accept their decision and act accordingly. On one side they say that decisions are frequently changed while on the other they say that decisions have been rigidly enforced and Government have resorted to violence in enforcing their decisions. This situation reminds me of a complete : Oh-where should we take our hearts to it is in hardship everywhere, on one side is a congregation of fairies while on the other of beautiful maidens. On one hand they say that Government changes their decisions frequently while on the other they are accused of enforcing them rigidly, that is why I feel that the best solution is that which has been suggested in the President's Address. He has clearly stated therein that "the reorganisation of States is an important subject and we must apply all our wisdom and tolerance to it; but in larger perspective of India and of India's future it is a small matter what administrative boundaries we prescribe for a State".

What he means by this that there are more important matters besides this. The President has rightly said that most

of us generally forget that this great country is our mother land and it is our common heritage. When a student of Geometry wants to draw a circle, first of all he fixes a centre and then he can draw it well, and only then all the radii will be equal to each other and if the end of the compass lose its position then neither the circle would be drawn properly nor the radii would be equal. Hence it is necessary to fix the centre. For this purpose, Government have to be very careful to see as to how the authority of the centre and the unity of the country could be maintained. I do not know why languages have become the bone of contention between us. Fourteen languages have been mentioned in our Constitution and I think that every one of them is our national language. If we start thinking in that light then there would be no conflict at all. In other countries I have seen that people respect the language, culture and civilization of others. In our country we raise such slogans as "Hindi Cheeni Bhai Bhai" and "Hindi Roosi Bhai Bhai" but it is quite absurd that the Hindus and Sikhs in Punjab, the residents of Bengal and Bihar and the Maharashtrians and Gujratis cannot line side by side like brothers. In such a stage of affairs our slogans are quite meaningless. First of all we should try to improve our own relations. As a matter of fact it is true that the Hindus and Sikhs in Punjab have lost faith in each other and they suspect each other.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): Not the Hindus and Sikhs but the leaders of both the communities suspect each other.

Giani G. S. Musafir : Shri Kripalani has rightly said that their leaders have created such suspicions. Therefore these leaders should avoid delivering such speeches here as may create misunderstanding amongst our masses. They should try to remove these misunderstandings. This reminds me of a beautiful couplet :

If the heartless beloved was not, yet
was in the embrace of enemies,

But my misunderstanding kept him
there for years.

These misunderstandings should better be removed. I do not agree with the hon. member who has suggested that

[Giani G. S. Musafir]

Reorganisation Commission's Report may be postponed for some time. We should face it boldly.

Regarding the method of negotiations, adopted recently, Acharya Kripalani has remarked that the Government changes their decisions very frequently. But in my opinion there is no harm in making changes because the Government make changes only when they consider it reasonable and useful and this is but natural. But if the Government make changes under the influence of threats, violence and disturbance then it is not proper. The Government have adopted the method of negotiations and mutual decisions and are always prepared to act likewise. I agree with Shri Kripalani that decision may be taken after mutual negotiations. Just as leaders negotiate and discuss things for the benefit of the people and then take decisions; if similar method is adopted then there is hardly any chance of any disturbances. Therefore, in my opinion it will not be proper to postpone this issue.

There is no obstacle in forming unilingual and bilingual provinces if we think it proper to do so. The trouble arises only when it is doubted that efforts would be made to root out the existing languages. There are no complications in a bilingual state if both the languages are given safeguards and they get equal opportunities as regards their study and progress. I see no harm in it. So far as the regional councils are concerned, I feel that if we succeed in forming a strong centre and our unity does not suffer then it is immaterial whether we establish regional councils or not. The benefit of the people should be the main consideration.

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West): I wish to thank you, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to make a few observations on my amendment to the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address. On this occasion I should like to draw the attention of the House to some important missing links and lacunae in the Government's economic policy which, in my humble opinion, should have been included in the aforesaid Address.

At the very outset let me make it clear that in my observations on the missing links and lacunae in the Government's economic policy, and parti-

cularly in my reference to the Second Five Year Plan, the draft outline of which has been recently published, I wish merely to make broad observations rather than make a detailed examination of the Government's economic policy and the Second Five Year Plan. This is largely so because I believe the House will have several occasions during this session, at the time of the two Budgets and also the various important Legislative measures such as those concerning the nationalisation of life insurance to make a threadbare examination of the various problems.

I find from the hon. Members' speeches made yesterday that the Members' attention is largely focussed on questions of secondary importance such as the States Reorganisation Report. So many aspects have been put forward, I do not wish to say anything more. Only yesterday my friend Mr. Asoka Mehta made certain observations. I agree with him fully in this respect that this reorganisation has brought a disgrace to this country not only internally but outside the country also and the sooner this problem is solved the better it will be for this country so that we can all think in terms of concentrating our attention on the constructive side of our next Five Year Plan which we are now embarking upon.

As our distinguished President has put it in his Address, it is the economic progress in the future years which is of paramount importance to the country rather than other issues like the reorganisation of States' boundaries. I am constrained to feel that the President in his Address should have dwelt more on domestic, economic and other urgent issues rather than devote half of his Address to foreign or international affairs. I do not wish to underrate the importance of international affairs but I would like to stress the recent developments on our economic front which, I feel, have perhaps not received the necessary attention of the Government and the people at large.

The President's Address is wanting in a fuller appraisal of the philosophy of the Second Plan and the socialist policy. It has also failed in its proper appreciation of the remarkable performance of the different elements such as the private sector in the First Plan. You know very well and whatever is put in the President's Address, it is clearly visible that it is very much due

to the efforts of the elements in the private sector; in fact, if I may say so, the public sector has completely failed in achieving the targets in the First Five Year Plan and, unfortunately, we find in the Second Plan again the responsibility is thrown much more on the public sector than on the elements which are responsible for the success of the First Five Year Plan. Its another shortcoming consists in under-estimating the great potential of those elements in actively participating in the task of rapid industrialisation set out in the Second Plan. I must submit that the President's Address fails to draw attention towards the weaknesses of the public sector in so far as it has fallen short of fulfilling the targets laid out for it in the First Plan.

Coming to the Second Plan, I fully appreciate the Government's anxiety to double the national income in the course of the next decade, its laudable objective of providing employment to 8 to 10 million men through large scale industrialisation. I also endorse the ideal of the socialistic pattern of society which has become the principal objective of Government's economic policy. I do not think there can be any quarrel as regards this ideal of socialism, as commonly understood in this country. In the draft outline of the Plan it is described as "an economic and social order, based upon the values of freedom and democracy, without caste, class, privilege, in which there will be a substantial rise in employment and production and the largest measures of social justice available". I do not mind by what name this ideal called by our friend on the Government side. To me what matters is the pattern of society concept of socialist pattern of society and also the means and methods by which this goal is to be achieved. All of us in this country who have learned the teachings of Gandhiji on ends and means will remember that the means we employ in attaining the aims should have greater importance because it is the means that will lead us to the ends. Gandhiji always had said that right and proper means all can lead us to the desired end in view. Use of incorrect or improper means will never take us to the ideals set forth.

Reading through the second Plan one gets bewildered because it is more of a discourse on economic philosophy and less of a down-to-earth plan for raising the country's living standards. It bears

an impress of the ivory tower dwellers more than that of the people who are intimately connected with field and factories. The draft outline of the Plan excels, in its masterly effort to compress in a skilful way, in a number of contradictions and inconsistencies in the Plan.

Let me deal with the first contradiction of the Plan. The Government's spokesmen including our hon. Prime Minister and the Finance Minister have often admitted that the private sector has done an excellent job in so far as it has over-reached the targets of production and investments set out for it in the first Plan. It has also been admitted by the Planning Commission and the Government that due to a variety of reasons the public sector has been lagging behind in the fulfilment of its targets in the first Plan. Besides, the private sector has also been giving invaluable help to the State by providing talents for pushing through some of its schemes in the public sector and for implementing a number of projects which the State has in view. While this commendable action of the Indian private sector has reflected its spirit of patriotism, it is a pity that it has encouraged the Government to expand the sphere of public sector in a spirit of complacency. This is evident from the allocations of resources and targets of production and investments set out in the draft outline of the second Plan. Ignoring this fundamental fact which reflects the capacity of the two sectors at this time, the second Plan gives to the public sector double its load in the first Plan as well as more than double the load it accords to the private sector. It thus inverts capacity. One really does not understand the logic behind the working of the Government's mind.

It is said that the greater importance to the public sector emerges from the desire to prevent concentration of economic power. I am one with those who seek to create a social democracy which provide a prosperous society based on the ideals of equality of opportunities to all. Other countries who have solved their problem of production have also faced the problem of distribution. They have also sought to bring about the ideal system of distribution by various means. Democracy and socialism have been the twin goal which have been accepted by not only India but many other freedom-loving people

[Shri Tulsidas]
of the world. Various experiments have been made to achieve these twin objectives. In our efforts to achieve these ideals, we must so proceed as not to attain one by sacrificing the other. It must be very clear to all thinking people in this country that socialism without democracy will mean bread without freedom just as democracy without socialism will mean freedom without bread. Therefore, we must see that in the process of development we do not sacrifice one or the other. We must collectively attempt to bring about a society which provides opportunities to all, to work and labour, to earn one's own living through honest means, and at the same time, enjoy the freedom, or, what Professor Harold Lasky has said: "enjoy the variety of freedoms which includes the freedom to enjoy the fruits of one's labour through ownership of property rights".

We all know the British Labour Party in England tried the experiment of socialism in the post-war period and how they learnt, by trial and error, from the mistakes they committed. I would like to read from a recent article which has been published in *The Economist* of London and in which Mr. Richard Crossman has made some observations. It says:

"Socialism in practice has come to mean immense irresponsible public corporations and a state bureaucracy which Mr. Crossman calls "a grave potential threat to social democracy". Nationalisation is too often "a perversion of the socialist ideal": it "has not changed the lives of the workers," but has added to "the steady concentration of power in the hands of the managerial class". And, as well as the crack of the party whip, there are unending examples of the ways in which trade unionists, in pursuance of an industrial battle that "has been won and the enemy forced to come to terms," persist in overriding the liberties (and, it should be added cramping the output) of individuals and minorities."

In the light of these lessons from abroad, what should be the ingredients of our economic policy? To my mind, top precedence to production must be given. Egalitarian distribution in the absence of a higher level of production will simply mean the

distribution of poverty rather than the distribution of future prosperity. Decentralisation or democratisation of economic and political power should be the *sine qua non* of our future development. Dangers of political and bureaucratic centralisation are too well known to be emphasised. I feel that there should be an achievement of equality by creating a property-owning democracy. The place of nationalisation and controls should be such that the governing factor in this respect should be whether there is expansion of human freedom, initiative for social good and common prosperity or whether nationalisation and controls lead to annihilation or destruction of valuable human rights.

Another important consideration should be that the least possible compulsion should be used in achieving the process of equality. I commend the Bhoodan movement which today is achieving good results, because it is a question of property owning democracy, and there is no question of having centralisation of power and thereby creating more centres of power both with regard to the political and economic spheres. What I would like to stress is that the President has not given us a clear picture of what society is supposed to be in future: whether it is going to be a society of regimentation to the extent of losing all the human rights and values or whether it is going to be a society which will have democracy, a free democracy, where the expression of views by the public and a free press would be possible. I only hope that in our future Plan, this is going to be the basis especially when we have always said from the top of our houses that the country is wedded to democracy and in every respect, whatever the consequences, democracy must be made to function.

I have broadly indicated the points that should be taken into account particularly when we take the different aspects at the time of considering the second Five Year Plan and the Budget. But, as we are now on the threshold of the second Five Year Plan, it is but necessary that the people should pay attention to what is going to be our aim about the future society of this country.

I have another amendment to the President's Address and that is with regard to transport. This is an important question and, as you know, I have

brought to the notice of the Lok Sabha even before how important transport is to the development of our country. Whatever be our plans, transport is going to be the most important factor which is either going to mar our progress or going to increase the pace of our progress. In my opinion, the importance of transport has not been taken note of so much either in the President's Address or in the second Five Year Plan. I find that the condition is getting from bad to worse with regard to transport. You must have recently heard about the stoppage of gas in Bombay for residential quarters on account of coal shortage. There have been stoppages of factories. One cotton mill was closed in Ahmedabad on account of lack of coal supply and on account of transport difficulties. I do not know how they are going to solve these difficulties. Unless and until all modes of transport are encouraged as much as possible and unless full freedom is given to all modes of transport, this problem cannot be solved. We should not rely merely on the railways, but encourage all modes of transport; only then it will be possible for us to solve this transport problem. No matter how much money is spent on railways, the railways are not, in my opinion, going to solve the problem of transport in this country. I feel that this very important aspect has not been taken note of in the President's Address.

I have brought these two important points to your notice because, I feel that in the present context of the situation when people's minds are focussed more on the re-organisation of the States, it is much better that we think of doing something constructive and not merely put forward narrow views of State re-organisation. The country is faced with very serious problems today and Mr. Asoka Mehta and Acharya Kripalani have pointed out how serious they are. I feel that unless and until this problem is solved in a way which would be satisfactory to everybody, it is much better to postpone this issue for some time when people will have a little more sober views to express and act dispassionately.

श्री राधा रमण (दिल्ली नगर): उपाध्यक्ष जी, हमारे साथी ने जो प्रस्ताव राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के सम्बन्ध में सदन के सामने रखा है, मैं उस का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं यह देखता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण को दृढीकरण लक्ष्यों में पिरोया है, और हर

लक्ष्य में उन्होंने एक विषय की चर्चा की है। साल भर में एक बार हम को ऐसा प्रचसर मिलता है कि जब हम राष्ट्रपति के मुख से अपने देश में हुए कार्यों का कुछ वर्णन सुनते हैं और हमें यह मौका मिलता है कि हम उसकी प्रालोचना करें या उसका समर्थन करें। अगर हम इस अभिभाषण को—इस वार्षिक उपहार को, जो कि इस वर्ष उन्होंने हम को दिया है—निष्पक्षता से प्रालोचनान्त पहुँचें और उस में त्रुटियाँ न ढूँढने लग जायें, भारतवर्ष में जितनी भी घटनायें घटी हैं, उन सब को वहाँ टटोलने न लग जायें या उस में उन अपने स्वार्थ के विषयों को देखने न लग जायें, जिन से हम को कुछ ज्यादा गृहगत है, तो हम इसी परिणाम पर पहुँचेंगे कि राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण हमारे देश की भाँज की स्थिति का एक बहुत अच्छा नक्शा हमारे सामने पेश करता है।

इस अभिभाषण में चीदह या पन्द्रह ऐसे विषय हैं, जिन्हें हम बँदेशिक नीति से सम्बन्ध रखता हुआ पाते हैं। हमारे कुछ भाइयों ने इस बात पर आपत्ति की है कि राष्ट्रपति ने अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विषयों को इतना महत्व दिया है, जितना कि शायद उन को नहीं देना चाहिये था, बल्कि उन को घरेलू मामलों पर अधिक प्रकाश डालना चाहिये था। मैं उन की इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ, क्योंकि मैं यह समझता हूँ कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय और राष्ट्रीय विषयों को एक दूसरे से गहरा लगाव होता है। इस के प्रतिरिक्त, जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मसले हमारे सामने भाँज घा र हैं, उन की गम्भीरता को सामने रखते हुए जितनी भी चर्चा उन की की जाय, उस से हमें संतोष ही होना चाहिये। हाँ, यह देखना जरूरी है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विषयों की चर्चा करते समय वही हम घरेलू मामलों को भूल तो नहीं जाते, या जिस की चर्चा नहीं करनी चाहिये, जिस की कोई विशेषता या महत्ता हम को नजर नहीं आती, वह तो उस में मौजूद नहीं है। मैं यह प्रश्न करूँगा कि थोड़े दिन पहले मुझे कुछ पड़ोसी देशों में जाने का मौका मिला था। बावजूद इस बात के कि हमारे घरेलू मामले और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मामलों में बहुत सी उलझनें हैं, जिन को हर एक आदमी स्वीकार करता है, और बावजूद हमारी सब कमजोरियों के, जिन को छिपाने की हम ने कभी कोशिश नहीं की है और जिनका ऐलान हम ने स्पष्टता से न सिर्फ अपने देश में बल्कि देश के बाहर भी किया है, भाँज हमारी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति के कारण बुनिया में भारत-वर्ष का बहुत बड़ा नाम है और कोई भी शक्ति

[श्री राधा रमण]

इस तथ्य को मानने से इन्कार नहीं कर सकता । अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में भारतवर्ष ने जो काम किया है, वह एक ऐसा काम है, जिसकी भारतवर्ष के दुश्मन भी सराहना और प्रशंसा करते हैं । यह ठीक है कि हम चाहते हैं कि गोआ का प्रश्न जल्दी से जल्दी हल हो । हम यह भी चाहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारे सम्बन्ध और भी ज्यादा घनिष्ठ हों, मैत्रीपूर्ण हों, हमारे बीच में इस बक्त जो उखझाव हों, वे सुलझें । हम यह भी चाहते हैं कि लंका, नेपाल और हमारे दूसरे पड़ोसी देशों के साथ हमारी जो उलझने हैं, वे दूर हों और इस सम्बन्ध में हम सतत प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं । हमारी सरकार ने इस बारे में जो प्रयत्न किये हैं, वे सराहनीय हैं । आज भी वे प्रयत्न बन्द नहीं हुए हैं । हम में से हर एक जानता है कि हमारे देश के नेता और विशेष कर हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब (प्रधान मंत्री) उस के लिये इन्तहाई फिक्र रखते हैं और कोशिश कर रहे हैं ।

हमारे कुछ भाई बाज मौक़ात यह कहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की नीति बहुत ढीली है, वह ऐसी खोखली नीति है कि उस से ये प्रश्न किसी सूरत में हल नहीं हो सकते और वे हमारे लिये हमेशा परेशानी का कारण बने रहेंगे । परन्तु मैंने इस सदन के किसी भी सदस्य को एक भी ऐसा सुझाव देते नहीं सुना जिस के अनुसार हम अपनी उस सत्य और अहिंसा की नीति पर चलते हुए कोई और कदम उठा सकें, जिस के कारण हम इस मंजिल पर पहुँचे हैं, और जिस की बदौलत हम आगे की मंजिलों को भी तय करेंगे । कोई भी बात कह देना निहायत आसान होता है । मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के ३६ करोड़ लोग और उन के नुमांगदे हम लोग, सभी यह चाहते हैं कि गोआ जल्दी से जल्दी हिन्दुस्तान का अंग बने और उस में शामिल हो । लेकिन साथ ही हम यह भी चाहते हैं कि जो नीति हम ने, हमारी सरकार ने, अब तक अख्तियार कर रखी है, जिस पर चल कर हम ने पाण्डिचेरी और चन्ननगर को अपने साथ मिलाया, उसी नीति पर हम चलते रहें और उसी पर चलते हुए हम गोआ को हिन्दुस्तान का अंग बनायें। मगर जो घालोचक यह बात कहते हैं कि यह नीति गलत है, और कोई कदम उठाना चाहिये, वे हम को यह नहीं बतलाते कि सत्य और अहिंसा की पालिसी के बल पर और कौन सा कदम उठाया जा सकता है जिस से गोआ एक-दो दिन में, या बहुत जल्दी हिन्दुस्तान

का अंग बन जाये । मगर किसी बड़े काम को पूरा करने में हम धैर्य से काम नहीं लेंगे और अपनी नीति पर झकूट नहीं रहेंगे तो हम ने जो कुछ भी पाया है उसे भी लो लेंगे । यह बात ध्यान में रखने की है ।

इसी तरह जो और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मसले हैं उनको हल करना हमारा फ़र्ज है । उनके हल करने की दिशा में हमारा सतत प्रयत्न है । हम अपने मार्ग पर दृढ़ हैं, और हमें इस बात का विश्वास है कि इस नीति के बल पर हमें इस काम में सफलता मिलेगी चाहे थोड़ी देर भले ही लग जाये । मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें यह बात भूलनी नहीं चाहिये ।

राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग की सिफारिशों के बारे में जब से उसकी रिपोर्ट प्रकाशित हुई यहाँ और सारे मुल्क में तरह-तरह की बातें हो रही हैं, और उन बातों को सुन कर मुझे अफ़सोस होता है, मायूसी होती है, और परेशानी होती है । बात सीधी है । हमारा मुल्क बहुत तेजी से आगे बढ़ता जा रहा था और मुझे विश्वास है कि वह आग्यन्दा भी आगे जायेगा । इस में कोई शक नहीं है । लेकिन इस आयोग ने हमारे रास्ते में कुछ रुकावट डाल दी हैं । यह सही है कि आज हमारे देश में अधिकांश सूबों ने आयोग की रिपोर्ट को मंजूर कर लिया है । लेकिन, मैं यह कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि जो हमारा देश तेजी से प्रगति कर रहा था उस में इस आयोग ने रुकावट डाल दी है । यह ठीक है कि हम ने इस आयोग की सिफारिशों की बिना पर बहुत से मसलों को हल कर लिया है और जो मसले बाकी हैं उन्हें भी हम हल कर लेंगे । लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि आज हम अपने नेताओं की श्रद्धा के कारण, या कुछ उन के डर के कारण बहुत सी बातें स्वीकार कर रहे हैं, लेकिन हमारे दिल में एक चोर है और वह चोर चाहे जब निकल सकता है । बम्बई में जो घटनायें हुईं, उड़ीसा में जो घटनायें हुईं, और उन से जो देश को हानि पहुँची और जो सारी दुनिया में उसके सम्मान को धक्का लगा, मैं समझता हूँ कि मुझे उसको बताने की जरूरत नहीं है । इस सदन में एक सदस्य भी ऐसा नहीं होगा जिस ने इस को अनुभव न किया हो । जब बम्बई में ये घटनायें हो रही थीं, मैं उस समय बर्मा में था और मुझे इन घटनाओं के कारण बड़ी शर्म आई और अफ़सोस हुआ । बर्मी लोग मेरे पास आते थे और मुझसे कहते थे कि आप के देश में तो सत्य और अहिंसा की नीति बरती जाती है, वे महात्मा बुढ़का भी नाम लेते थे और महात्मा

गांधी की भी याद दिलाते थे और कहते थे कि तुम यह चाहते हो कि दुनिया को सत्य और अहिंसा का पाठ पढ़ाओ, अगर यह बम्बई में क्या हो रहा है। मैं उन के इस संबाल का कोई जबाब नहीं दे पाता था और धर्म से मेरा मस्तक नीचे झुक जाता था। आज भी हम यहां पर लोगों के तरह तरह के विचार सुनते हैं। जहां एक तरफ यह कहा जाता है कि हिन्दुस्तान एक हो, हिन्दुस्तान के ३६ करोड़ लोग एक हों, उनमें धर्मन और प्रेम हो और सहयोग हो, लेकिन दूसरी ओर हम यह देखते हैं कि यह सब कहते हुए भी जब यहां बोलते हैं तो ऐसी ऐसी बातें कहते हैं जिन से मालूम होता है कि जैसे जले पर नमक छिड़क रहे हों। ये बातें दिलों को और भी जुदा करती हैं। इस वक्त बरूरत इस बात की है कि हम ऐसा प्रयत्न करें कि हमारा मुल्क मजबूत हो, हमारी सरकार मजबूत हो और हम प्रगति करते चले जायें। मैं निहायत ध्रुव से इस सदन के सारे सदस्यों को कहूंगा कि बहुत काफी हो चुका। राज्यपुनर्गठन प्रायोग ने जो सिफारिशें की थी वे बहुत सोच विचार के बाद की थीं। वह ऐसे तीन व्यक्तियों द्वारा की गई थीं कि जिन पर सारे देश को विश्वास था। सब यह महसूस करते थे ये लोग जो कुछ भी करेंगे और जो कुछ भी सोचेंगे वह मुल्क के लिये निहायत अच्छा होगा। आज क्यों उन परसे यह विश्वास हट रहा है। क्यों हम प्रायोग की प्रालोचना करते हैं और क्यों हम उस की रिपोर्ट के कुछ हिस्सों पर इतना लड़ते हैं कि प्राप्त में मार-काट पर उतारू हो जाते हैं। ऐसा करने से हमारे काम को हानि पहुंचती है और सारी दुनिया में हमारे मुल्क का नाम बदनाम होता है। मैं निहायत ध्रुव से तमाम सदस्यों से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि अगर प्रायोग की सिफारिशों के परिणाम स्वरूप कोई सूबा कटता है या किसी सूबे में कोई ऐसी घटा-बढ़ी होती है जो उन को पसन्द नहीं है तो वे उस को देश के हित को ध्यान में रखकर स्वीकार कर लें। इस उम्मीद पर कि ऐसा करने से हमारा मुल्क तेजी से आगे बढ़ेगा। इन्सान बड़ी है जो वक्त पड़ने पर कुर्बानी करने को तैयार होता है। जो सूबा आज सारे हिन्दुस्तान को एक रखने के लिये सारे हिन्दुस्तान को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये कुर्बानी करेगा, वह हिन्दुस्तान की तारीख में अमर रहेगा और हमेशा उस का नाम सुनकर हृदय में लिखा जायेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज चाहे वह बंगाल और बिहार का प्रश्न हो, चाहे संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का प्रश्न

हो और चाहे विशाल आन्ध्र का प्रश्न हो, हमें इन छोटे विचारों को छोड़ना चाहिये और हिन्दुस्तान की एकता को विशेष रूप से धरने सामने रखना चाहिये और हमें प्रायोग की सिफारिशों को ही मंजूर कर लेना चाहिये। यह हमारी बदकिस्मती है कि हम एक कमीशन बनाते हैं, उस पर हम को पूरा विश्वास होता है, लेकिन जब वह एक रिपोर्ट पेश करता है तो उसे हम स्वीकार नहीं करते और प्राप्त में ही छोटी-छोटी बातों के लिये झगड़ते हैं।

मैं अपनी सरकार से भी एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं यह नहीं कह सकता कि यह कहां तक ठीक है लेकिन धर्म लोगों को हमारी सरकार के बारे में यह ब्याल है कि यह एक ठीकी सरकार है, जो फैसला करती है उसको बदल भी देती है। लेकिन इतना मैं धर्म करूंगा कि अगर हम प्रायोग की सिफारिशों को अहिंस्ता अहिंस्ता बदलने लगते हैं, तो इस का नतीजा यह होगा कि झगड़े बढ़ेंगे और हमारी ताकत कमजोर होगी और जो हम एक मजबूत मुल्क देखना चाहते हैं वह नहीं बन सकेगा। इसलिये मैं सरकार से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जितनी जल्दी हो सके इस मसले को खत्म करें, इधर करें या उधर करें ताकि सारे देश के ३६ करोड़ लोग उस फैसले के पीछे चल सकें। देश के ३६ करोड़ इन्सानों को इन फैसलों से कुछ ज्यादा लेना-देना नहीं है। उनकी दिलचस्पी और भलाई इसी में है कि वह खुशहाल हों। उन्हें बीमारी से, गरीबी से और तरह तरह के कष्टों से निजात मिले, जन साधारण की तकलीफें दूर हों। हमें इन सब बातों की ओर ध्यान देना चाहिये।

हमारी पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना अब समाप्त होने जा रही है। उस की सफलतायें हमारे सामने हैं उस से हमें खुशी भी होती है और कुछ असंतोष भी है। खुशी तो इस बात की होती है हमने कामयाबी हासिल की है और असंतोष इस बात का कि जितना हम करना चाहते थे वह नहीं कर सके। लेकिन फिर भी हमें संतोष है कि हम ने जो कदम आगे उठाया था वह आगे ही बढ़ता जाता है। हमारी प्रांल इस बात पर लगी हुई है कि कब हम उस मंजिल पर पहुंचें कि हमारे देश के ३६ करोड़ लोगों की गरीबी दूर हो। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश में ऐसी ताकत पैदा हो कि हम अपनी हालत को सुधारते हुए तेजी से मुल्क को आगे ले जायें। मैं जानता हूँ कि हमारी बड़ी बड़ी आकांक्षाएँ हैं और हमारी

[श्री राधा रवण]

प्राखरी मंजिल भी दूर है। परन्तु हमारा विश्वास है कि हम जल्दी ही वहाँ पहुँचेंगे। ऐसी हमारी आकांक्षा होनी चाहिये। हमने जो पहली योजना में कामयाबी हासिल की है उस को देखते हुए मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि हमारी दूसरी योजना उस से कहीं ज्यादा कामयाब होगी। लेकिन मैं दो-तीन बातों की तरफ सवम का और उपाध्यक्ष महोदय का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। मैं नहीं जानता कि आज से १५ या २० साल पहले हमारे देश में अष्टाचार और घूसखोरी की लोगों को कितनी आदत थी। मेरे पास पैमाना नहीं है, मेरे पास कोई तराजू नहीं है कि मैं यह देखूँ कि पलड़ा अब भारी है या जब भारी था। लेकिन, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ज्यों-ज्यों हम आगे बढ़ते हैं, हमें यह विश्वास नहीं होता कि हमारी जनता आज अष्टाचार रहित हो गई है और हमारे मुल्क में घूस नहीं है। अगर हम यह चाहते हैं कि हम अपनी अगली पंचवर्षीय योजना को कामयाबी की मंजिल तक पहुँचा सकें, तो चाहिए कि हमें कोई न कोई मजबूत क्रम इस अष्टाचार को और घूस को रोकने के लिये उठाना पड़ेगा।

आज हमारे सामने बहुत सारे ऐसे विधेयक आते हैं कि जिनके जरिये हम आम लोगों की हालत को बेहतर देखना चाहते हैं और इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि उन विधेयकों पर अमल करने से मुल्क की हालत बेहतर होगी और मैं यह भी जानता हूँ कि वे जरूरी हैं, लेकिन मैं यह देखता हूँ कि जिन हाथों के जरिये उन विधेयकों को अमल में लाया जाता है, वे इतने कमजोर और इतने हलके हैं कि उन विधेयकों से जो नतीजा निकलना चाहिये वह नहीं निकलता और जो उन का असर होना चाहिये, वह नहीं होता।

अभी कल या परसों हमारे पूजनीय प्राचार्य कृपलानी ने एक बात अटचैबिसिटी (अस्पृश्यता) के बारे में कही और जो उन्होंने कहा वह असाधारण रहा होगा क्योंकि मैं यह कहने को तैयार नहीं हूँ कि आज देश में छुआछूत पहले से ज्यादा है या पहले से कम नहीं है। मैं तो यह मानता हूँ कि आज हमारे देश में छुआछूत बहुत कम है। आज से पन्द्रह वर्ष पहले इसी दिल्ली शहर की गलियों में अगर कोई अंगी या बूड़ा निकलता था तो उस के साथे से आदमी भागते थे, आज ऐसी हालत नहीं है। आज हमारे मुल्क से छुआछूत बहुत कम हो चुकी है। आज अस्पृश्यता निवारण के हेतु हमारे देश में कानन मौजूद

है तब फिर असाधारण रूप से भी किसी हरिजन के साथ असमान व्यवहार होना अनुचित है। हम जब इस प्रकार की घटनाओं की चर्चा सुनते हैं तो हमें आश्चर्य होता है कि कानन के मौजूद रहने पर भी इस प्रकार की घटनाएँ हो जाती हैं। और हरिजन और गैरहरिजन एक साथ मिल कर नहीं रह रहे हैं। विधेयक के मौजूद होते हुए, कृपलानी जी ने जैसा बतलाया अगर वैसा व्यवहार किसी भी हरिजन के साथ किया गया तो वह अति निन्दनीय है और किसी को वैसा व्यवहार करने की हिम्मत नहीं होनी चाहिये थी। लेकिन, इस तरह का व्यवहार करने की हमारे लोगों को आज कानन के रहते हिम्मत होती है और यह हिम्मत उनको इसलिये होती है क्योंकि आज आम लोगों के अन्दर इस तरह की भावना फैली हुई है कि इन विधेयकों से होना जाना कुछ नहीं है, क्योंकि जिन कर्मचारियों पर इन विधेयकों को अमल में लाने की जिम्मेदारी है, वह उतनी मजबूती और ईमानदारी से अपने कर्तव्य का पालन नहीं करते और अक्सर तजुर्बा लोगों को यह रहा है कि बहुत से काम जिन में कायदे काननों की पाबन्दी करने में देर लगती है घूस लेने अथवा देने से काम आसानी से बन जाता है और जो आदमी सदाक़त पसन्द हो और जो अपने बल पर खड़ा होना चाहता हो, उस को सिवाय तकलीफ के और कोई चीज पल्ले नहीं पड़ती और बहुत सी दुस्वारियों का सामना करना पड़ता है।

एक बात मैं इस सिलसिले में और कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम ने पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना में बहुत बड़े बड़े काम किये हैं और दूसरी आने वाली पंचवर्षीय योजना में उस से भी बड़े बड़े काम करना चाहते हैं, मगर मैं यह देखता हूँ कि देश के अन्दर आज जो नौजवान तबका (नवयुवक वर्ग) है, और जिन नौजवानों के ऊपर आपका भविष्य निर्भर करता है, उन नौजवानों की हालत आज बड़ी खराब है। हमारे मुल्क में शिक्षा दी जाती है वह नवयुवकों में इन मानुषिक गुणों को पैदा करने में समर्थ नहीं है। शिक्षा की पद्धति के विषय में जितना भी कहा जाय, थोड़ा है। और मेरा तो यह विश्वास है कि हम लोग और बातों की तरफ तो काफी ध्यान देते हैं और हमने ध्यान दिया है, लेकिन शिक्षा की ओर जो बहुत सी महत्वपूर्ण समस्या किसी देश के लिये हो सकती है, उस की ओर जितना ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये था, नहीं दिया है। अगर आप किसी मुल्क को एक नये

डांचे में डालना चाहते हैं और उस को इस योग्य बनाना चाहते हैं कि जिस के बल पर वह बड़े-बड़े काम कर सके, तो सब से पहला काम आप का यह होना चाहिये कि आप ३ वर्ष के छोटे बच्चे से लेकर कम से कम उस वक्त तक जब तक कि वह पर्याप्त शिक्षा प्राप्त नहीं कर खेता उस की शिक्षा का आप उचित तौर पर प्रबन्ध करें। आप को बालकों को सही और उपयोगी किस्म की शिक्षा देनी चाहिये। आज अफसोस यह है कि हमारे बजट का बहुत थोड़ा हिस्सा शिक्षा की मद पर खर्च होता है, जो कि बिल्कुल अपर्याप्त है। मैं तो कहूंगा कि शिक्षा का काम सब से पहला काम है, जो सरकार को करना चाहिये। अगर सरकार चाहती है कि हमारे देश में से भ्रष्टाचार आदि कुरीतियां दूर हों, तो हमें अपने देशवासियों को ठीक तरीके पर शिक्षित करने की ओर अग्रसर होना चाहिये। मुझे यह देख कर वाज दफा आश्चर्य होता है कि हम से छोटे मुल्क जैसे बर्मा आदि में शिक्षा की ओर कहीं अधिक ध्यान दिया जा रहा है और वहां पर निःशुल्क शिक्षा युनिवर्सिटी स्टेन्डर्ड तक दी जाती है, जब कि अभी तक प्राइमरी शिक्षा भी हमारे सारे मुल्क में अनिवार्य नहीं हुई है। यह एक ऐसी कमजोरी है जिस की तरफ हमें अधिक ध्यान देना चाहिये। अगर हम शिक्षा के ढंग को बदलेंगे, उस के अन्दर नया रस पैदा करने की ताकत देंगे, तो मैं आप को यह विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि आप की दूसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना कामयाब होगी और उस को कामयाब बनाने के लिये खुद ब खुद उस के अन्दर एक ऐसी रवानी आ जायगी, जो हमें कामयाबी तक पहुँचा सके। ठीक शिक्षा एक ऐसी आवोहवा (वातावरण) पैदा कर देती है कि समाज को बिना बहुत बड़ी शक्ति लगाये अपनी मंजिल पर पहुँचना आसान हो जाता है जैसे भीड़ में घिरा हुआ आदमी बिना जोर लगाये आगे बढ़ता है अथवा पानी में तैरते हुए आदमी को अपनी शक्ति नहीं लगानी पड़ती और पानी का बहाव उसे आगे ले जाता है। इसीलिये, शिक्षा-व्यवस्था में सुधार लाने की ओर सरकार को विशेष ध्यान देना बड़ा जरूरी है, क्योंकि हम यह जानते हैं कि ऐसा करने से हमारा मकसद बहुत जल्दी पूरा होगा और हम अपनी मंजिल को पहुँच जायेंगे मैं आप का ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लेना चाहता। मैं जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव श्री भागवत झा आजाद ने रखा है, उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। भारत सरकार ने इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि अपने काम को बहुत ही अच्छे तरीके से चलाया है

और भारत सरकार ने बेक नीयती के साथ जनता की सेवा करने की कोशिश की है और जनता की जो सेवा उस ने की है उस के लिये हम सब लोगों को राष्ट्रपति को, जिन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण में सरकार के उन कामों का ब्यौरा दिया है, उस के लिये उन को धन्यवाद देना चाहिये। जब राष्ट्रपति हमारे बीच में आकर हमें कुछ अपना संदेश देते हैं, एक वार्षिक उपहार के रूप में, तो हम उन का शुक्रिया अदा करना ही चाहिये और उन का धन्यवाद भी करना चाहिये।

आखिर मैं में एक बात यह कहूंगा कि हम और आप सभी एक चीज के गुलाम से हो गये हैं और वह यह है कि हम जितना काम नहीं करते हैं उतना उस का दिखावा करते हैं और दिखावे पर काफी धन खर्च कर डालते हैं। हम हैंडलूम बोर्ड बनाते हैं, या बैकवर्ड क्लासेज कमीशन बनाते हैं, और इसी तरह से और आयोजन करते हैं, तो हमें अनुभव ने बताया है कि जितना उन के द्वारा वास्तविक काम नहीं होता उतना साल व साल उन के सम्मेलन बुला कर और अन्य आयोजन करके सर्वत्र डोल पीटा जाता है कि हम यह करने जा रहे हैं और इस प्रदर्शन पर बहुत सारा रुपया खर्च कर डालते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रदर्शन करने के बजाय अगर हम काम की तरफ ज्यादा तबज्जह दें, तो शायद हम कुछ ज्यादा काम कर सकेंगे और ग्राम लोगों पर भी उसका प्रभाव ज्यादा अच्छा पड़ेगा।

बस, अब मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करूंगा। उपाध्यक्ष जी मैं आप का बहुत अनुग्रहीत हूँ कि आप ने मुझे इतना समय बोलने के लिये दिया। अन्त में अपनी टूटी फूटी तुक बन्दी आप के सामने रख कर मैं बैठ जाता हूँ।

“कर्म को मानो सर्व प्रधान,
कर्म ही हो हमारा जीवन-प्राण,
कर्म में बसते हैं भगवान,
कर्म पर होना है बलिदान।”

इस भावना को ले कर हमें कर्म आम में उतरना चाहिये, तभी हम सफलता प्राप्त कर सकेंगे।

شری ایم - ایچ رحمان (موان آباد)
قسنٹر کنگ - سہیلنول: راشٹریقی کے
ایڈیٹورس پز: فو لن سے ہواہر بصحت ہو

[شہری ایم - ایچ - رحمان]

رہی ہے اور آج اس بحث کا تیسرا دن ہے - میں بھی اس موقع پر راجستھانی کو ان کے بہاشن کے لئے جنو بدھائی کا پرستار تھا ہے اس کے سرتھن کرنے کے لئے کھڑا ہوا ہوں -

ایڈریس میں جن چیزوں پر توجہ دلائی ہے اور گورنمنٹ کی پالیسی کو جس طریقے سے نمایاں کیا ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ آج اس کی بہت ضرورت تھی کہ ہمارے سامنے ایک واضح پالیسی صاف پالیسی آئے جس سے ہم اپنی سرکار کے معاملات کو زیادہ سے زیادہ بہتر سوچ سکیں اور ان پر عمل کر سکیں - باہری راجستھانی کے بارے میں جو کچھ ایڈریس میں کہا گیا ہے وہ چیز ایسی ہے کہ جس کو ہم نے بار بار دہرایا ہے اور مجھے یاد ہے کہ جس وقت ہم نے اپنی باہری راجستھانی کو سامنے رکھا اور ہمارے لہڈر نے اسے دیکھا تو اس وقت راجستھانی سے باہر اور لوگ سمجھا کے اندر بھی بہت سے ہمارے بہائیوں نے اس کا مذاق اڑایا تھا - اور یہ کہا تھا کہ غبر جانبدار ہونا کوئی اچھی پالیسی نہیں ہوگی - یہ ایک قسم کی نیکیتھیو اور نہیں کی پالیسی ہے - لیکن اس وقت لہڈر نے ہمارے سامنے قوت کے ساتھ - طاقت کے ساتھ یہ بات بتائی تھی کہ یہ پالیسی نہیں کی پالیسی نہیں ہے - بلکہ ہاں کی پالیسی ہے - امن کی پالیسی ہے - اور ایک ایسا طریقہ کار ہے کہ جس سے اگر ہم دنیا میں اس کو آئے بوجھائے تو آنے والی لڑائی کو روک سکتے ہیں - ہمارے پاس کوئی ہتھیاروں

کی طاقت یا شکتی نہیں ہے جس سے کہ ہم اس بڑی لڑائی کو روک دیں بلکہ ہمارا وشواس اور بھروسہ تو اس بات پر ہے کہ ہتھیاروں کے ذریعہ روکنے سے کہی بھی لڑائی روکتی نہیں ہے - وہ بڑھتی ہی جاتی ہے -

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the chair]

اس لئے ہماری پالیسی درحقیقت ایسی پالیسی ہے جس سے کہ یہیں کے ساتھ کہا جا سکتا ہے کہ ہمارے ملک اور دیس میں ہی نہیں دنیا کے تمام حصوں میں ہم شانتی اور امن لا سکتے ہیں - آج وہ وقت آگیا ہے کہ جب اعتراض کرنے والے بھی اس پالیسی کی حمایت کرنے اور اس کو پسند کرنے پر مجبور ہیں - اور جو دوسرے بڑے بڑے ملکوں کے ساتھ ہمارے یہاں آئے انہوں نے بھی اسکی سراہنا کی اور آج تو اس کے انکار کی کوئی گنجائش ہی نہیں ہے جب ہم نے اس پالیسی کو پینڈجشیل پر لا کر رکھا - اور ہم نے اپنے مقصد کو ان پانچ اصولوں پر رکھا کر دیکھا کیا جس کو کہ بڑی بڑی حکومتوں اور گورنمنٹوں نے اور بڑی بڑی طاقتوں نے بھی تسلیم کر لیا تب جو ہمارے گبر کے لوگ ہماری شانتی کی اس پالیسی کا مذاق اڑاتے تھے اور وطن کے باشندے جو اس کو برا بھلا کہتے تھے وہ بھی اسکا اعتراف کرنے کے لئے موجود ہوئے - اس لئے آج اس کی کوئی حاجت نہیں ہے کہ میں اس کی کوئی لمبی چوڑی تعریف کروں -

اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے کہ جس طرح سے ہلدوستان نے اس تیسری جنگ کو روکنے کی کوشش کی گرم اور سرد دونوں قسموں کی جنگوں کو جس طرح روکا آج دنیا اس کو اس نے لئے بدعائی دے رہی ہے خوش آمدید کہہ رہی ہے۔ ہاں ہمارے دانشوروں کے ایڈریس میں خاص طور پر دو چیزوں پر تکیف کا اظہار کیا گیا ہے چنانچہ ظاہر کی گئی ہے کہ وہ چیزیں جلد سے جلد دور ہونی چاہئیں ایک مسئلہ پرتال کا ہے جو کہ گواہ سے تعلق رکھتا ہے اس مسئلہ کے بارے میں اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے کہ اکثر اس بات کا اظہار کیا گیا ہے کہ ہمیں اس سے تشویش ہے چلتا ہے لیکن یہ چیز تو ہمارے سامنے پہلے آچکی ہے اور گورنمنٹ اور سرکار کی پالیسی جس طرح واضح ہو چکی ہے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس بارے میں دو رائے نہیں ہیں اور دنیا نے اس بات کو تسلیم کر لیا ہے کہ گواہ ہمارے ہلدوستان کے ہی اندر ہے اور ہمارے دیس کا ہی ایک حصہ ہے وہ چیز دو ملکوں کے معاملہ سے تعلق نہیں رکھتی ہمارے اپنے مکان کے اندر کی چیز ہے۔ لیکن اس میں کچھ ایسی انٹرنیشنل آرچلن بھی ہیں۔ راکاٹیں بھی ہیں جن کی وجہ سے ہمیں اس کو حاصل کرنے میں دیر محسوس ہو رہی ہے۔ لیکن جیسا ابھی ہمارے دوست راندھا رمن جی نے کہا ہمیں اس بات کا پورا یقین ہے کہ جس طرح سے ہم نے اپنے دوسرے دو معاملوں کو طے کیا اور ان کو فرانسسہوں سے حاصل کر لیا چاہئے بلکہ اسی طرح سے گواہ بھی ہمارا حصہ ہو کر رہے گا اور ہمارے اندر خوشحالی کی زندگی بسر کرے گا۔

لیکن گواہ کے بارے میں میں ایک آزاد رائے بھی رکھتا ہوں۔ پچھلے وقت میں جس طریقہ سے ہم نے گواہ کے معاملہ میں آگے بڑھ کر ہلدوستان میں ایک اداروں کا ساتھ دیا تھا یہ مہری آزادانہ رائے ہے۔ میرا ضمیر اور ہونٹے اس بات کو پکار پکار کر کہتا

ہے کہ یقیناً وہ پالیسی اسی طریقہ سے قائم رہنی چاہئے۔ چونکہ ہماری امن کی پالیسی ہے۔ اور جو ہماری شانتی کی پالیسی ہے۔ البتہ امن اور شانتی کی پالیسی میں بھی اسے استیجیوز ایسے درجہ جات ہوتے ہیں جو پست رفتار کی جگہ کئے جاتے ہیں کہ زیادہ تیز رفتار سے حل کرنے کے لئے بڑھتے ہیں آج جنگ کا سوال نہیں ہے۔ ہتھیاروں کے استعمال کا سوال نہیں ہے انٹرنیشنل آرچلنوں کا بھی ہمیں پوری طرح سے صحیح اندازہ ہے۔ ہم کو پتہ ہے کہ ہمارے امن اور شانتی کے ہتھیار نے جس کو سنبھالنا ہے ہمیں امن اور شانتی کی زندگی میں اپنے مقصد حاصل کرنے میں کبھی راستہ بلانے نہیں۔ جن لوگوں نے سنبھالنے کی لڑائیاں لڑی ہیں وہ اچھی طرح جانتے ہیں کہ اسکے بہت سے تھک بھی ہیں جن میں کہ امن اور شانتی رکھتے ہوئے بھی ہم اپنی منزل کو تیزی کے ساتھ طے کر سکتے ہیں۔ اس لئے میں گورنمنٹ کو یہ توجہ دلانا ضروری سمجھتا ہوں کہ صرف اتنی ہی بات کافی نہیں ہے کہ ہم یہ سمجھ لیں کہ یہ چیز یقینی طور پر ہم کو مل کر ہی رہے گی۔ تھک ہے وہ مستقبل کی بات ہے۔ ہمارے اظہار کی بات تو نہیں ہے۔ حالانکہ یہوشد کوئی مہرا کام نہیں ہے یہ بھی مہرا یہ وشواس ہے کہ گواہ ہم کو مل کر رہے گا۔ مگر اس کے لئے عمل کی ضرورت ہے۔ عمل کے لئے شانتی اور امن کی پالیسی کو بدلنے کی ضرورت نہیں ہے۔ جس طرح ہم شانتی اور امن کے ذریعہ اپنے انٹرنیشنل معاملات میں ہر طریقہ سے دخل دے سکتے ہیں اس طرح سے ہم ہتھیاروں کی بات پر بھی غور کریں کہ کس طریقہ سے ہم امن اور شانتی کو قائم رکھتے ہوئے اور پینچشول کے اصولوں کو سامنے رکھتے ہوئے گواہ کے مسئلہ کو حل کر سکتے ہیں۔ مہری رائے صرف مہری ذاتی نہیں ہے۔ بلکہ ہتھیاروں کی ہے۔ ہمارے من پر اس کی چوٹ ہے اور ہمارا

[شری ایم۔ ایچ۔ رحمان]

دل چاہتا ہے کہ یہ مسئلہ جلد سے جلد طے ہو۔ پروتکال یہاں پر اس طریقہ سے قائم نہ رہے اور اس کے ہاتھوں ہمارے لوگوں پر ظلم نہ ہوتا رہے کیونکہ ہماری آنکھوں کے سامنے یہ سب ہوتا رہے اس کو ہندوستان کے کسی کونے میں بھی ہم گوارا کرنے کو تیار نہیں ہیں۔ اس لئے ہمیں گوارا کے معاملہ میں سب کچھ کرنا چاہئے۔

دوسری چلتا جو کہ راشٹریتی کے ایڈریس میں کی گئی ہے وہ بغداد پیکٹ کے بارے میں ہے۔ آخر یہ ذکر کہوں کیا گیا۔ یہ چلتا کہوں کی گئی۔ درحقیقت ہمیں اس سے کوئی بحث نہیں ہے کہ ایک حکومت دوسری حکومت کے ساتھ ایسے معاملات کس طرح رکھتی ہے۔ امداد اگر لینا چاہتی ہے تو کس طرح کن لینا چاہتی ہے۔ ہتھیاروں کی امداد لینا چاہتی ہے۔ روپے پیسے یا مال کن امداد لینا چاہتی ہے اس سے بھی ہمیں کوئی بحث نہیں۔ بحث یہ ہے کہ بھندونگ کانفرنس میں جن قوموں نے جن حکومتوں نے حصہ لیا۔ جنہوں نے ہمارے اصولوں کو تسلیم کر لیا۔ بغداد پیکٹ اس کی توہین کرتا ہے۔ اس کا سامنا کرنا ہے۔ اور اس کی مخالفت کرتا ہے۔ اس تعلق پر ہمیں چلنا ہے۔ ہمیں دکھ ہے۔ ہم نفرت کے راستے سے کسی کے بارے میں نہیں سوچتے۔ کسی ملک کے بارے میں ہم نفرت کن نکالنے سے چلنا نہیں کرتے۔ نشوونما نہیں کرتے۔ ہم دشمنی کے راستے سے بھی کسی حکومت یا قوم کے کام کو نہیں دیکھنا چاہتے اور دنیا کے معاملات کو ورودہ اور کرودہ کے ساتھ نہیں رکھنا چاہتے۔ لیکن ہم یہ ضرور چاہتے ہیں کہ جو چیز یقین کے ساتھ صداقت کے ساتھ اور سچائی کے ساتھ کی گئی ہے۔ اس کے خلاف کوئی قدم نہیں اٹھانا چاہئے۔ جب ہم بھادونگ میں بیٹھ کر اس بات کا قصد کر چکے ہیں کہ ہمیں اس طریقہ پر چلنا ہے۔ یعنی پلنچسپیل کے

ان اصولوں پر چلنا ہے۔ تو پھر ہم کوئی ایسا طریقہ اختیار نہیں کریں گے جس سے ہم اور طرف جا کر ہم کسی اور کے مخالف بن کر جنگ کو ترقی دینے کی مشکل پیدا کر دیں۔ لڑائی کے لئے کوئی ایسا راستہ بنا دیں جس سے لڑنے والی طاقتوں کو اور بڑی قوموں کو اس کا موقع ملے۔ یقیناً وہ ہمارے اصولوں کے خلاف ہے۔ جب ہم اس قسم کا مقصد رکھتے ہیں۔ یعنی ہم سچے اصولوں کی حفاظت کا مقصد رکھتے ہیں۔ اور جب ہمارے اصول ایسے ہیں جہاں دنیا کی سرحد اور گرم دونوں قسم کی جنگوں کو روکتے ہیں اور جن کی بدولت آج موافق اور مخالف دونوں ہی ہمیں عزت کی نگاہ سے دیکھتے ہیں اور ان اصولوں کو خوش آمدید اور لہیک کہتے ہیں۔ تو ان دو مسئلوں کے اوپر خاص طور سے ہمارے ایڈریس میں چلنا کا اظہار کرنا لازمی ہے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس پارلیمینٹ کا فرض ہے کہ اس بات پر بیٹھ کر غور کریں۔ ہمارے لیڈر بھی غور کریں اور ہماری گورنمنٹ بھی غور کرے کہ یہ دونوں چیزیں جس طرح سے ہو رہی ہیں ان کے لئے ایسا کون سا راستہ اختیار کیا جائے جس پر چل کر ہم فلفط راستے پر چلنے والوں کو صحیح راستے پر چلا سکیں اور خود بھی چل سکیں اور دنیا کے دوسرے ملکوں کو بھی وہ راہ دکھا سکیں جس سے کہ ہم جا رہے ہیں۔

چھرمین صاحب! جہاں تک ہمارے اندر کے معاملات کا تعلق ہے اس میں دو ہی چیزوں کی اہمیت زیادہ نظر آتی ہے۔ جن کی چرچا برابر تین دن سے ہو رہی ہے۔ ایک ہماری پلنچ سالہ ہو جانا ہے جس کے ایک جز کو ہم پہلے طے کر چکے ہیں اور دوسری کے راستے تک ہم پہنچ چکے ہیں۔

دوسرا پانچ سالہ پلن ہمارے سامنے ہے۔ ہم یہ محسوس کر رہے ہیں کہ ہم آگے بڑھ رہے ہیں ہم نے پچھلے چل سالوں میں

ترقی کی ہے اس پر ہمیں فخر ہے۔ ہم جانتے ہیں کہ ہمارے سامنے کتنی دقتیں تھیں۔ ہمارے سامنے کتنی ازچلیں تھیں لیکن پھر بھی ان سب کو پار کر کے ہم آگے بڑھنے میں کامیاب ہوئے ہیں۔ آزادی ملنے کے جتنے تھوڑے سے عرصہ کے بعد ہم نے جنلی ترقی کی ہے اس پر ہمیں بجا طور پر فخر ہے اور ہمیں سمجھنا ہوں کہ ہر ایک کو ہونا چاہئے۔ ہم نے پچھلے پانچ برسوں میں ایسا فوڈ پرابلم حل کر لیا ہے۔ بجلی کی بڑی بڑی سکیمیں شروع کی ہیں۔ بڑی بڑی پراجیکٹس چلائی ہیں بڑے بڑے کارخانے کھولے ہیں اور ہزاروں اور لاکھوں گاؤں کو فائدہ پہنچانے کے لئے کمیونٹی پراجیکٹس شروع کی ہیں سیلچائی کی سہولتوں میں کمی ہے اور ہم یہ قسم کھا کر کہہ سکتے ہیں کہ جو کچھ ہم کر پائے ہیں اس سب پر ہمیں فخر ہے۔ ویسے تو کوئی بھی کام ایسا نہیں ہو سکتا جس کے بارے میں اگیاؤں کی نکتہ چینی نہ کی جا سکے۔ جو لوگ نکتہ چینی کرنے کے عادی ہیں ان کے سامنے آپ اچھی سے اچھی چیز رکھ دیجئے اس کی بھی وہ نکتہ چینی کریں گے۔ کوئی بھی حکومت ایسے آپ کو فرشتہ نہیں بنا سکتی۔ کوئی بھی حکومت یہ نہیں کہہ سکتی کہ اس نے اندر کوئی کمی نہیں کوئی خامی نہیں۔ لیکن دیکھنے کی چیز یہ ہوتی ہے کہ جیسے حالات ہیں کیا ان حالات میں اس سے زیادہ کیا جانا کیا ممکن تھا۔ ہمیں یہ بھی دیکھنا چاہئے کہ جو حکومت ہے اس کی نہتی کیا ہے۔ اس کی پالیسی کیا ہے۔ اس کا کام کرنے کا طریقہ کیا ہے۔ وہ کس طرح سے ورک کرتی ہے اور کس طرح سے وہ آگے ملک کو بڑھا رہی ہے اور کتنی تیزی کے ساتھ آگے بڑھا رہی ہے۔ اگر ہم یہ دیکھیں کہ کیا ہمارے قدم آگے بڑھ رہے ہیں یا پھپھے ہٹ رہے ہیں تو ہمیں ماننا پویا کہ ہمارے قدم آگے بڑھ رہے ہیں اور بہت تیزی سے آگے بڑھ رہے ہیں۔

بقول پلڈت جواہر لعل نہرو یہ کہنا تو بہت آسان ہے کہ یہ کام نہیں ہوا اور وہ کام نہیں ہوا۔ لیکن جو کام اے دیکھنا یہ ہے کہ اس تھوڑے سے وقت میں یہ سب کچھ حیرت کے قابل اور تعجب کے لائق ہے۔ اگر ہم انصاف پسند ہیں اور اگر ہم بغیر تعصب کے کسی چیز کی طرف دیکھنا چاہتے ہیں اور دیکھتے ہیں تو ہمیں یہ ماننا پویا کہ جو کچھ بھی ہوا ہے وہ قابل حیرت اور تعجب ہوا ہے۔ بڑی بڑی حکومتوں نے جو تجربے ۲۵-۳۰ اور ۳۰-۳۵ سال میں حاصل کئے ہیں وہ ہم نے پچھلے پانچ سات سالوں میں حاصل کئے ہیں۔ یہی وجہ ہے کہ جو بڑی بڑی طاقتوں میں وہ ہماری کامیابی کو دیکھ کر حیران ہوتی ہیں۔ تعجب کا اظہار کرتی ہیں۔ ہم کو مبارکباد دیتی ہیں۔ ہم آگے بڑھ رہے ہیں اس میں کوئی شک کی بات نہیں ہے۔ جو کامیابی ہم نے پچھلے پانچ سالہ پلان کے دوران حاصل کی ہے۔ اس کو دیکھتے ہوئے ہم نے دوسرا پانچ سالہ پلان تیار کیا ہے اسکا ایک خاکہ تیار کیا ہے اور ملک کے سامنے اسے پیش کیا ہے کر رہے ہیں۔ اگر ہم ایسے دوسرے پلان کو ایک ایک ٹکٹ کرنے میں کامیاب ہو گئے تو یہ اندازہ لگایا گیا ہے کہ ہماری قومی آمدنی ۲۵ فیصدی بڑھ جائے گی۔ ایک ملک کی قومی آمدنی میں دس برسوں کے اندر ۲۵ فیصدی کا اضافہ ہونا کوئی معمولی بات نہیں کہی جاسکتی۔

ایک دیکھ جو ایسے آڈاک ہونے کے دس برس میں اتنی ترقی کر لیتا ہے اور جو ایک ایسی چھوٹا بچہ ہی ہے وہ اتنی ترقی کر لے تو اس پر فخر ہی کیا جا سکتا ہے۔ میں یہ نہیں کہتا کہ نکتہ چینی نہ کی جائے۔ ایک ڈیموکریٹک حکومت کو اسے وہاں کرنا چاہئے اور اگر اسے ایسی کوئی کمزوری نظر آئے تو اسے دور کرنے کی بھی

[شروع ایم-ایچ-رحمان]

کوشش کرنی چاہئے۔ لیکن نہیں یہ بھی چاہتا ہوں کہ جو نکتہ چیلی ہو وہ ایسناداری کے ساتھ کی جائے نہ کہ صرف نکتہ چیلی کرنے کی ہی خاطر کی جائے۔ ہوں نکتہ چیلی سے گھبرانا نہیں چاہئے۔ اس کو سن کر ناراض نہیں ہونا چاہئے بلکہ اس سے فائدہ اٹھانے کی کوشش کرنی چاہئے۔ یہ ایک کورنٹمنٹ جو کہ ایلے آپ کو ڈیموکریٹک کہتی ہے۔ اس کا فرض ہے کہ اس کو سلیے اور اس سے فائدہ اٹھائے۔

میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ دوسرے پانچ سالہ پلان کا جو نقشہ ہمارے سامنے پیش کیا گیا ہے اسکو عمل میں پوری قوت سے لانے کی ہمیں کوشش کرنی چاہئے۔ کیونکہ اسکو پوری طرح سے عمل میں لانے سے ہم ایلے کئی پرابلمز کو حل کر لیں گے۔ ہمیں چاہئے کہ ہم پورے یقین کے ساتھ پورے رشواس کے ساتھ اور ایسناداری کے ساتھ اس کو عملی جامہ پہنائیں اور جو تارگٹس فکسڈ کئے گئے ہیں اور ان کو کامیاب کریں کیونکہ اس کے پورا ہو جانے پر بھروسہ بڑی بہت حد تک ختم ہو جائے گی۔ بیکاری مت جائے گی۔ فریبی کم ہو جائے گی۔ اور جن لوگوں کو آج خوراک اور کپڑا نصیب نہیں ہو رہا ہے ان کو یہ چیزیں ملنے لگ جائیں گی جس طرح کہ ہم نے ملک میں سماج قائم کرنے کا اعلان کیا ہے اگر حقیقت میں ہم اس قسم کی سماج قائم کرنے میں کامیاب ہو گئے تو یہ ایک بہت بڑی کامیابی ہوگی جس پر کہ ہر ایک کو نظر کرنے کا موقع ملے گا۔

ایس۔ آر۔ سی۔ کی رپورٹ کا جہاں تک تعلق ہے اس کے بارے میں پچھلی بار بہت چرچا ہو چکی ہے اور اس پر میں نے ایلے رائے بھی ظاہر کی تھی۔ میں نے اس وقت بھی کہا تھا اور آج بھی میں وہی بات کہتا ہوں کہ اگر یہ چیز کچھ بعد میں آئی تو اچھا ہوتا۔ ہم بڑی بڑی یوجنٹس بنا رہے اور ان کو ایکسپیکٹ کر رہے ہیں۔ ان حالات میں ایک ایسی رپورٹ کا آنا جس سے کہ دیس کی ایکٹا کو خطرہ پیدا ہونا ضرور ٹھیک نہیں سمجھا جاسکتا۔ لیکن اب جب کہ یہ چیز سامنے آچکی ہے اور اس پر چرچا بھی ہو چکی ہے اور کچھ نوٹس بھی کر لئے گئے ہیں لہذا اب ایلے قدم پچھلے ہٹانا مناسب نہیں ہوگا۔ میں اس بات کو مانتا ہوں کہ جو کچھ ہمیں ہو آ رہا ہے۔ جو کچھ اڑسہ میں ہو آ رہا ہے بہت برا ہوا ہے اور اس سے مجھے بہت تکلیف ہوئی ہے بہت دکھ ہو آ رہا ہے۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس قسم کی چیز کو دیکھ کر ہر ایک کو دکھ ہو آ رہا ہے۔ ہم نے جس طرح سے ملک کو آزاد کرایا۔ ہم ملک کی آزادی کو برقرار رکھنے کے لئے جو قدم اٹھا رہے ہیں۔ ہم جس طرح سے انٹرنیشنل معاملوں کو سلجھانے کے پریتن کر رہے ہیں۔ ہم جس طرح سے ایلے سکیموں کو عملی جامہ پہنا رہے ہیں۔ ان میں اس قسم کے واقعات کا ہونا ہمیں شوبھا نہیں دیتا۔ جب اس طرح مشکلات پیدا ہو جائیں۔ اس طرح

کی الجھلیں پیدا ہو جائیں تو اس مسئلہ کا حل کیا جانا بہت ضروری ہو جاتا ہے۔ اگر حکومت نے کوئی غلط فیصلہ کیا ہو تو اس کو بدلنے میں کوئی حرج نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔ اس میں کوئی پریسٹیج کا سوال نہیں ہے۔ ایک ودیسی حکومت کے لئے پریسٹیج کا سوال تو ہو سکتا ہے۔ لیکن اس حکومت کے لئے جو کہ لوگوں کی اپنی حکومت ہے پریسٹیج کا سوال پیدا نہیں ہوتا۔ ایسے معاملوں میں ہمیں جو تے پریسٹیج کا سہارا نہیں لینا چاہئے۔ اگر ایک فیصلے کو بدل دینے سے ایک سٹیٹ کے باشندے اور دوسری سٹیٹ کے باشندے دونوں ہی خوش ہو جائیں۔ دونوں ہی اس بات کے لئے راضی ہو جائیں دونوں کے اندر محبت کا جذبہ پیدا ہو جائے تو اس میں کسی کو بھی کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہونا چاہئے۔ لیکن جب ایک بار حکومت کی طرف سے فیصلہ ہو جائے اور اس کا اعلان ہو جائے تو مہرے خیال میں اس فیصلہ پر مضبوطی کے ساتھ عمل کیا جانا چاہئے۔ اگر ایسا نہیں ہوتا ہے تو حکومت چل نہیں سکتی ہے۔ لیکن فیصلہ دینے سے پہلے یہ دیکھ لینا ضروری ہے کہ ایسا ہی فیصلہ دیا جائے جس سے کہ ملک کی ایکتا مضبوط ہو۔ ملک کی حکومت کے ہاتھ مضبوط ہوں اور ملک کی بہتری ہو۔ حد بندی رپورٹ پر فیصلہ کرتے وقت ہمیں یہ بات دھیان میں رکھنی چاہئے کہ جو بھی فیصلے کئے جائیں ایسے

کئے جائیں جو کہ زیادہ سے زیادہ لوگوں کو قبول ہوں اور لوگوں کے درمیان سمجھوتہ کروا کے کئے جائیں۔ پچھلی بار لوگ سمجھوتہ میں کچھ ایسا معلوم ہوا کہ ایک سٹیٹ دوسری سٹیٹ کو الگیتم دے رہی ہے یا کوئی اعلان جنگ ہو رہا ہے۔ اس قسم کی چیز ہمارے مفاد میں ہو ایسا نہیں کہا جاسکتا۔ اس واسطے یہ ضروری ہے کہ جلد سے جلد فیصلے ہوں تاکہ ہم دوسری باتوں کی طرف بھی دھیان دے سکیں۔

اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ میں یہ بھی کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جو زون بنانے کی بات کہی گئی تھی اس کو سپرپسلی کلسٹر کیا جائے اور اس کو عملی جامہ پہنانے کی کوشش کی جائے۔ اس سے جہاں تک سٹیٹس کے تعلق سے سوال ہے یہ پیدا نہیں ہوگا۔ اور اس سے دیکھنا کہ بہت زیادہ بھلا ہوگا۔ اس سے دیکھنا کہ ایکتا مضبوط ہوگی۔ اور حکومت کے ہاتھ مضبوط ہونگے۔ اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ جو لہنگویچز کے بارے میں خدشات ظاہر کئے جا رہے ہیں وہ بھی مت جائیں گے اور ہمارے ملک کے اندر محبت کا جذبہ پیدا ہو جائے گا۔ اس لئے میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس رپورٹ کو عملی جامہ پہنانے کے لئے جو بھی طریق کار اختیار کیا جائے اس میں سمجھوتہ اور کامپرومائس کی سہرت سے کام لیا جائے۔ اگر کسی مقام پر کسی بھی صورت میں اتفاق نہ ہو سکے تو وہاں پر حکومت جو بھی فیصلہ کرے اس پر ایمانداری اور مضبوطی کے ساتھ عمل کرے اور اس پر قائم رہے۔

[شری ایم۔ ایچ۔ رحمان]

3 P. M.

ہمارے بھائی شری دادھا دمن نے ملک میں پھیلی ہوئی رشوت کا بھی ذکر کیا۔ ہم کو بھی اس بات سے بہت تکلیف پہنچتی ہے کہ ہمارے ملک میں رشوت کا بازار گرم ہے۔ اس بات کو تولنے کی ضرورت نہیں ہے کہ یہاں پر رشوت کم ہے یا زیادہ ہے۔ ہم کو یہ ماننا پڑتا ہے کہ وہ موجود ہے۔ جہاں تک مہرا خیال ہے اسکی ایک وجہ یہ بھی ہے کہ بیرونی حکومت کے زمانے میں انگریز کو دیکھکر اور اسکی اجنبیت کو دیکھکر ملازمین سرکار کو خوف ہوتا تھا اور وہ رشوت بہت دہر کر اور بڑے ایلیج پیلیج سے قبول کرتے تھے۔ لیکن آج وہ سمجھتے ہیں حاکم ہمارے اپنے گھر کے ہیں اور اس وجہ سے ان میں خوف اور وحشت بہت کم ہو گئی ہے۔ اس میں کوئی شک نہیں ہے کہ زندگی کے سب شعبوں میں ہم اپنے ملک کو تیزی کے ساتھ آگے لے جا رہے ہیں۔ لیکن تعلیم میں ہم لوگ بہت پیچھے ہیں۔ میرا خیال ہے کہ اس طرف بہت کم توجہ دی گئی ہے۔ آج ہمارے ملک

میں کتنے مرد اور عورتیں ہیں۔ کتنے بچے اور بڑھے ہیں جن کو ہم نے تعلیم دی ہے۔ ہم نے تجویزیں تو بہت سوچی ہیں لیکن ان پر عمل نہیں ہو پایا ہے۔ آج ضرورت اس بات کی ہے کہ ہم اور باتوں کے علاوہ تعلیم کی طرف بھی کافی توجہ دیں۔ تعلیم کے معاملے میں ہم جتنا زیادہ آگے جائیں گے اتنا ہی زیادہ جمہوریت پر اعتقاد ہمارے عوام میں پیدا ہوگا۔ آپ بھٹک پلان بنائے۔ لوگوں کی تکلیف اور دقتوں کو زیادہ سے زیادہ دور کرنے کی کوشش کیجئے۔ بیروزگاری کا مسئلہ بھی حل کیجئے۔ مگر اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ تعامم کو اتنا عام کر دیجئے۔ اتنا وسیع کر دیجئے۔ اس کے دہانچے کو اتنا بدل دیجئے کہ وہ مہلکا ہونے کے بجائے سستا ہو جائے۔ فری اور مفت ہو جائے تاکہ لوگ جمہوریت کے اصل مقصد کو زیادہ اچھی طرح سمجھ سکیں اور سہی معنی میں وطن اور ملک کی خدمت کر سکیں۔

ان چلدا جملوں کے ساتھ میں اس تجویز کی تائید کرتا ہوں۔ یہ تجویز واقعی اس بات کی مستحق ہے کہ اس کی پوری پوری تائید اور سر تہن کیا جائے۔

[English Translation of the Speech]

Shri M. H. Rahman : (Moradabad Distt. Central): For the last two days we have been discussing the President's address and to-day is the third day. I also rise to support the motion of thanks to the President on his address.

I am of opinion that the matters towards which our attention has been drawn in the address and the way in which light has been thrown on the Government's policy are of the utmost importance to-day. I think ~~it is urgent that~~ a clear cut policy before us so that we may understand the affairs of our Government in the right perspective and act accordingly.

Whatever has been said in the address on our foreign policy, is in tune with what we have always been stressing repeatedly. I remember that when our foreign policy was introduced by our leader, several of our brethren both within and outside the Lok Sabha, had ridiculed it. They had remarked that to be neutral was not a good policy and that that would be a kind of negative policy. But at that time our leader had denied emphatically that it was a negative policy; instead, we had insisted, it was a positive policy—a policy of peace and an instrument with which we would be able to avoid war in future if only we could promote in the world. We have not got the power of armaments with which we might deter war. On the contrary, we believe that armaments do not help avert. Instead it comes nearer

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

and nearer. So our policy is in a fact one through which we can establish peace not only in our own country but in the other parts of the world. The time has come when our critics have also come to support and like our policy. The leaders of the other great powers, who visited our country, also commended it. There is no room for doubt in this connection. When we based our policy on *Panch Shila* and announced our objectives completely in accord with these five principles, not only did big powers and governments accept it, but our own countrymen who once used to laugh at and decay our foreign policy, were also compelled to support it. In view of this, I need not debate on this point. Nobody can doubt that to-day the world is paying tributes to India on the ways adopted by her to avert the third war, both cold

and hot. In the address, concern has been expressed on two matters in particular. It has been said that these should be attended to as early as possible. One is the problem of Portuguese Goa. Of course, this view has been expressed previously also that this problem is causing us anxiety and worry. The matter is already before us and the Government's policy in this regard is also clear. I think there can be no two opinions in this regard. The world has also admitted this fact—that Goa is within the Indian territory and is an integral part of our country. It is not a matter between two countries, but one which is within our country. Nevertheless, there are certain international hurdles and complications which are delaying its solution. As our friend Shri Radha Raman has put it, we are confident that as we have solved our other two problems and have taken back our territories from the French and made them a part of our country, similarly Goa will also become a part of our Union and will share its prosperity.

I have an independent opinion also regarding Goa. I strongly feel that the policy we had adhered to in the past in respect of the movement started in India, must be continued as before. That was our policy of peace. However, there are certain stages also in the policy of peace which are sometimes followed to give impetus where the movement is slow. To-day the question of war does not arise. The question of using the armaments is not there. We have full knowledge of the international hurdles. We knew that how our instrument and weapon of peace, that is Satyagraha, makes its headway in achieving its objectives in the peaceful manner. The people, who have fought the battles of Satyagraha know fully well that there are many ways in which we can stick to the path of peace and yet reach our goal quickly. Therefore I wish to draw the attention of Government to the fact that this is not enough for us to presume that we will be able to get this thing definitely. We may achieve our ends. But we leave it to the future. This is not a thing which is within our arrangement. Though it is my prophecy yet I am confident that Goa will be ours. What is required is action. It is not necessary for us to depart from the policy of peace when we talk of action. We should consider as to how we can solve

[Shri M. H. Rahman]
 the problem of Goa in accordance with the principles of *Panch Shila* without disturbing peace. This is not my opinion alone but many others also share it. This is a sore in our hearts and we would like that this problem is settled as early as possible. The Portuguese should not remain here and our people should not suffer atrocities at their hands. We are not prepared to tolerate and let not these kinds of things happen before our eyes in any part of the country. That is why we should do everything possible in this matter.

The other matter about which concern has been expressed in the President's address relates to the conclusion of the Baghdad Pact. After all, why a reference has been made why some anxiety, has been expressed? In fact it is none of our concern as to how one Government keeps its relations with another. It is also not our concern whether the aid that a country receives is in the form of weapons or money or any other thing. The main issue is that the Baghdad Pact is a violation of the principles agreed to by the countries which participated in the Bandung Conference. This is a thing which is causing anxiety to us. We are pained about that. We have no hatred against anybody and, we have no enmity with any country. Our outlook on the world affairs is not born of anger and opposition. But we do wish to see that nothing is done against the steps that have been taken with the best of intention, faith, honesty and righteousness. When we resolved in the Bandung Conference that we would follow the principles of the *Panch-Shila*, in conducting our affairs. We should not follow a path which will lead us astray and create circumstances leading to war, and encourage such factors which end in war. We will not do a thing which will give a chance to big countries to be at war with one another. No doubt that is against our principles. When it is our objective to defend the true principles, when our principles are directed towards checking both cold and hot wars and when both our opponents and supporters look at us with respect and welcome due to these principles, it is quite natural that anxiety and concern should have been expressed in the President's address over these two issues. I think that it is the duty of this Parliament to consider this matter. Let our leaders and Government also put their heads together and decide the way which we should adopt in order to bring those

who are following the wrong path to the right one. We may also follow this path and also show it to others. Mr. Chairman! So far as our internal affairs are concerned there are only two subjects which look important. These are being discussed for the past three days. One is our Five Year Plan whose first phase we have already completed and we are on the threshold of the Second phase of it. Second Five Year Plan is before us. We feel we are marching ahead. We have made progress during previous years and feel proud of it. We know there were hurdles in our way, yet we have been able to overcome them and march ahead. The progress we have made during the start period after Independence, is a matter of extreme pride to us and I feel everyone should have that feeling. During the last five years, we have solved our food-problem, undertaken the implementation of big schemes, started huge projects put up large scale industries, started community projects to benefit thousands and thousands of the villages and also provided irrigation facilities. We can definitely say that we are proud of what we have been able to do. In a way every work is subject to criticism. Habitual critics would criticise even the best thing. No Government can make itself to be super human. No Government can claim that it is perfect in every respect. But what we have to see is whether anything more could be done in a particular set of circumstances. We should also see as to what is the policy of government; how it conducts its affairs, how it works; and how it is taking the country ahead and with what speed. If we look from this point of view we shall have to admit that we are progressing and that too with a good speed. As Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru said, it is very easy to say that this has not been done and that has not been done. But the thing that is to be seen is that the work done during this short period is amazing. If we are just and are prepared to look at the things without prejudice, we will acknowledge that whatever has been done is amazing. The experiences that big Powers have gained after twenty-five or thirty years, have been gained by us within five or seven years. It is because of this that big powers are amazed to see our achievements. They express their surprise and congratulate us. Undoubtedly, we are marching ahead. In the light of experiences gained, we drafted our Second Five Year Plan and presented it to the country. If we

succeed in executing our Second Five Year Plan, our national income would increase by twentyfive per cent. If national income of a country increases by twenty-five per cent within a period of ten years, this is certainly not an ordinary thing. This is a matter of which a country should be proud. I do not say that no criticism should be made. A democratic government should welcome it and if it finds out some drawback, she should try to overcome them. I do wish that the criticism should be healthy and not merely for the sake of criticism. We should not be afraid of it, we should not feel angry to hear it but should try to learn something from it. It is the duty of a democratic government to benefit from it. We should, I think, do our best to implement the draft Second Five Year Plan, as presented before us, because through its successful implementation we can solve our several problems. We should execute it with all faith and sincerity and try to achieve the targets fixed under it. Its implementation would result in eradication of unemployment to a great extent, poverty will be minimised and the hungry would get food and the needed would get clothing. If we could succeed in making the society of the pattern of which we have made a declaration, it will be a great success to us and everybody will have the chance to feel proud of it.

So far as the S.R.C. report is concerned, much discussion has already taken place on it and I have also expressed my views in this regard. I have stated and I repeat it again today that if this question would have been taken at a later stage it would have been better: We are framing and executing big schemes. In these circumstances the introduction of a report that create danger to the unity of the country, cannot be regarded proper. Now that this has been introduced and that some discussion has taken place and some decision have been arrived at, it is not proper to go back on it. I agree, whatever incidents have taken place in Bombay and Orissa, are very unfortunate. It has pained me much as it would have pained everybody. In view of the fact as to how we made our country independent, how the independence of the country is being preserved, how we are trying to solve the international matters and how we are giving practical shape to our schemes, this sort of happenings do not behove us. When such difficulties

and hurdles come in the way, it becomes necessary to tackle them. There should be no objection in amending a wrong decision taken by Government. There should be no question of prestige. It may be a question of prestige for any foreign government, but for a government which represents the people the question of prestige does not arise. We should not stand on false prestige in such matters. If by revising a decision the people of the concerned States become happy, and begin to love each other there should be no objection in affecting it. But once a decision is made and declared by the Government I feel, it should be implemented with firmness, otherwise Government cannot run. But before taking a decision Government should see that the decision that they are contemplating is such that it strengthens the unity of the country, and also the hands of the Government. While taking decisions on the S.R.C. report, it should be seen that the decisions are such as are acceptable to the largest number of people and that such decisions are taken by agreement. Previously, from the debates in the Lok Sabha it looked as if one State was throwing ultimatum to the other or was declaring a war on the other. Such things are not in our interests. Keeping this thing in view it is essential that decisions are taken as soon as possible so that we may divert our attention to other things.

Besides this, I would like to say that the question of formation of zones, as suggested, should be considered seriously and effort should be made to give a practical shape to it. As a result of it, the question of State rivalries would not arise. The country would be benefitted enormously and the unity of the country as well as the hands of the Government would be strengthened. Along with this, the fears that are being expressed about the languages, would remain no more and a feeling of love would prevail in the country. So I think, the procedure adopted to implement this reports should bear the spirit of compromise. Where there is not possibility of compromise regarding a particular place, the decision arrived at by Government in that regard should be implemented with faith and firmness and they should stick to it.

My friend Shri Radha Raman made a mention of the corruption that is prevalent in the country. It is really painful that corruption is so rampant in

[Shri M. H. Rahman]

our country. There is no need to examine the extent of corruption. We have to admit its existence. During the British regime, the Government servants were afraid to indulge in corruption because they were afraid of the foreigners. But today, they think that officers are not foreigners but are from their own country. They have not fear from them. There is no doubt that we are taking quickly our country ahead in all walks of life, but in the field of education we are far behind. I think, very little attention has been paid to this problem. Today how many persons are there whom we have given education. We have thought out a number of plans but they have not been put into practice. The need of the hour is that we should pay more attention to education along with other things. The more we go ahead with education more faith in democracy would be strengthened in the country. There is no objection to your making the plans, to your making sustained efforts for removing hardships of the people and to your solving the problem of unemployment, but at the same time make the education so common, so extensive and so systematic that instead of being costly it may become cheap and free. It would help people in understanding the real meaning of the democracy. It would also help them to serve their country in the real sense of the word.

With these words I support the motion. It deserves our full support and approval.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: By a curious coincidence, I am the third man from Delhi to speak in succession in this debate. My hon. friends Shri Radha Raman and Maulana Hifzur Rahman represent Delhi City in this hon. chamber, but I happen to have lived here for 21 continuous long years as a citizen of Delhi. I have grown with the city of Delhi; I have seen from this place, from the press gallery, for a decade and a half the evolution of the government and political institutions, with the result that, I repeat, I am the third man from Delhi coming in succession in this debate. That is wholly a coincidence and, I take it, a happy coincidence. I make this remark in order to direct the attention of Lok Sabha to my convinced view that what we have inherited from the British, we are still cherishing—generally I have nothing against it—and not only

are we cherishing the British traditions in respect of the Presidential Address, but we are also embellishing it. The same old red carpet was there in the Central Hall, and more than that, when the Viceroy used to address the Joint Session of both Houses in the old days—and you, Sir, were a Member of this House then—there were no horsemen, mounted lancers, behind the Viceroy, behind the Speaker's chair. We are embellishing it now.

I make a reference to these two little bits specifically to underline the implication of my amendment No. 1 on the Order Paper, which runs as follows :

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

“but regret to note the growing imbalance in the approach of the Government to the problems of the country, international and national, as reflected in the Address, wherein several pressing questions of the people have received little or no attention at all”

I would like to say, in a preamble so to speak, that I have drafted this amendment not because that I am against the foreign policy of the Government of India, not because that I do not see my way, generally speaking, to agree with the basic approach of the Prime Minister and the Government of India to the foreign policy of this country. Let there be no mistake that I am not completely in conformity with the principles of *Panch Shila*, which have now become the sheet-anchor of the foreign policy of this land. In fact, I go a step further and say that little by little India is becoming the fulcrum of international affairs. The whole nation received recently with enthusiasm such honoured guests like the King of Nepal—the present King of Nepal—Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev, King Ibn Saud, the Shah of Iran who is still with us receiving ovation after ovation from every section of this land, and, very soon we are likely to receive the lion of Juda, Emperor Haile Selassie.

We have opened our guest-house to all irrespective of the politics of the country which they represent. I would say that by doing so, we not only affirm the fundamental secular character of the people of this country even after partition but also we represent the principal pivot of peace and co-existence in this trouble-torn world. I say this not to contradict what I sought to indicate in

my amendment, but to make the point clear that I am more concerned with the imbalance of the approach of the Government to the totality of the problems of this country, and the domestic situation which is not being dealt with in the manner in which the people expect the Government to deal with it.

I counted the other day that in the speech of the President 55 per cent. of the time taken to deliver it in the other place was devoted to foreign affairs. As I said at the opening of my speech, the old British tradition is still with us. I have, as I said, nothing generically to condemn the British approach, but I do say that after five years of the First Five Year Plan, as we are entering the Second Five Year Plan, what do we get from the Presidential Address?

I will take the second portion first of the Presidential Address. I tried to discover, as the President was delivering his Address to both Houses of Parliament in the other chamber, some sort of a reflection of the glow of enthusiasm of the people, if there was any glow of enthusiasm of the people since attaining our freedom. I regret to say that it is not there. I thought the President, in his Address, which was naturally based upon the advice tendered to him by the Council of Ministers, would give a comprehensive statement dealing with the most important and urgent problems of the land. And more than everything else, I was trying to discover in it some sort of a mirroring of the attitude of the people to the Government. I concede that the President made a sort of a tabular statement of the achievements of the First Plan in terms of the production indices. The President also made a certain prognostication into the fundamentals of the Second Plan, and there he stopped.

My friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad who moved his motion, to which my motion is an amendment, had tried to give a glowing picture of the land in which this republican freedom of recent origin is flowing with milk and honey. I wish I could sincerely share that sentiment.

I would straightaway go to one point which I regret, has not been touched so far in this debate over these three days on the Presidential Address, in order to pinpoint the implication of my amendment. Yesterday my friend, Shri Nanda, was subjected to a fusillade of

questions on the operation of District Development Councils. What has happened in this country? Are the people behind the Government? In 1952, participating in the debate on the Presidential Address just after the elections, I said that my friends opposite were returned to power with only 38 per cent. of the cast votes. I am not saying this for any polemical purpose, but I want them to remember—and very soon elections will be on in this country—that at that time in 1952 when we went to the polls, only 38 per cent of the total votes were cast in their favour. There are vast sections of the people who are not, what you may call, supporters of the Government. With the result, the question arises whether we in this country are stimulating people to co-operate with the Government. I will give you one or two examples to further sustain my point. Three years ago, the Prime Minister with a fanfare of trumpets inaugurated what was called the Committee on Public Co-operation, on which representatives and spokesmen of the Opposition Parties were invited to serve so that they can understand and back up the Five Year Plan. I may here say without any fear of contradiction that only one meeting was held of this so-called Committee. The Prime Minister, times without number, has declared his fundamental faith in the manner in which the Community Projects are being run. In fact, he said that these projects are the symbols of the advance of the country, especially of the rural side. I have served on these District Development Committees for four long years and have some experience of them. Each of my colleagues here will have had more or less similar experience. I wish to say in a debate of this character that I too have seen the manner in which the people of the rural areas have understood the First Plan and given their co-operation. I regret I have not seen sufficient evidence of the so-called enthusiasm of the people behind the Plan.

What is the manner in which the Bharat Sevak Samaj is sought to be run? I am not a politician, but I put this straight question to this Lok Sabha and to my friends opposite in particular. Is it not being run on terms of patronage? Take any district. I am prepared to go into the names. You will see that the so-called mobilisation of the people behind the Plan and the Government is not there; it has not been there. I regret to say that it is

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

not there now. Nor do I see any indication or possibility of its being there in the near future.

An Hon. Member : Question.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram : My friend questions. It is a question of heart-searching in a debate of this character. I can build up facts to show in this Republic of ours, while the First Plan is concluding and the Second is going to be launched, the people and the Government are farther apart than they were, say, five years go. I regret to say that. When I opened the debate on the First Five Year Plan Report here, I have made a sporting offer to the Prime Minister that he should become the Director of Manpower Mobilisation. Who is there as a link between the people and the Plan? Is it not the Collector, who is the beast of burden? He is the only man; he is the publicity officer of the Plan; he is everything. I am sure no one in this Lok Sabha, to whatever party he belongs, would like to see the country not progressing. All want this country to progress. Has any effort been made to mobilise the people by seeking the co-operation of those who do not happen to be members of the Party in power? I wished to say that after the Five Year Plan which was going to be completed in a month's time, there would be a little more glow in the hearts of the people in the rural side. I regret that I see no indication of that. That is why I say that the Address which the President has given to us on the advice of the Council of Ministers has fallen flat. I regret to say this. We know the President is a man of tremendous eminence in this country, and has earned to himself the affection of people to whatever political party they belong.

Talking of this imbalance, let me come to the foreign policy. I am not totally against the fundamentals of the foreign policy sought to be pursued by the Prime Minister. Let us take Pakistan. This morning we had an adjournment motion which was sought to be moved. What are we doing in this country? In 1948 parts of Tripura were under occupation by Pakistan for 48 hours. A little later, there was the Nekowal incident. The same thing has happened again, two days ago in Kutch. I do not want to give further data; it is not the matter for debate now. This morning the matter was raised in the

form of an adjournment motion. What happened? Our people have gone in after the event and were ambushed. The same thing has happened everywhere in India on the borders. How long should this continue? When we are framing the fundamentals of our foreign policy based upon co-existence and *Panch Shila*, what are we doing to protect our own national frontiers? How long can our men be butchered in ambushes, even though warnings were available from various quarters? I regret to say that even as regards the very limited question of the defence of the frontiers, Government is not alert, and I must say that every citizen wants the security of the country not to be imperilled by inaction on the part of the authorities.

Let us take Kashmir. What is happening there? Across the cease-fire line, there is complete mobilisation of Pakistan forces; across the cease-fire line fortifications are being strengthened and a tremendous network of communications is set up by our neighbouring country. What are we doing? Some of us have been recently and repeatedly in Kashmir. I am not here to discuss military matters, because it is not in the country's interest. But I do say that we are smitten with the complacency bug, that nothing more will happen and that everything will be all right because we have declared a policy. Our policy remains on paper. One or two eminent colleagues from Kashmir sit here. Today, I find more than ever, anti-Indian elements, belonging to Kashmir and India, are stirring up trouble in Jammu and Kashmir and also in India. I am here to give names freely if anybody wants them; I have got a complete record here of names of people who are instigating anti-Indian and deliberate pro-Pakistani feeling in the valley of Jammu and Kashmir. What are we doing in this country? This sort of complacency should not continue. Let us take Goa. I entirely agree with what was said by Maulana Hifzur Rahman in fluent Urdu, in certain respects. What are we doing? The Prime Minister intervened in the debate in December and said that he had drifted. From our experience on Goa, in the past one year in particular, I can say this. I did not want to intervene on the last occasion because the situation was very bad. I do say that ours is an attitude of pathetic, shall we say, looking-on, as the events in Goa are unfolding themselves. Two

days ago, we had a short notice question on Goa. Yesterday too there was something on Goa. Every day we try to bring this question before the Lok Sabha, with as much circumspection as possible in the present situation, because we find that the situation is explosive.

What are the "other methods" about which the Prime Minister was telling us repeatedly when this issue was raised? What is the approach, for instance, with regard to the release of our political prisoners in Goa and the care of prisoners like Shri T. K. Chaudhuri and others? I feel very sad, but I must say this that the flower of our Indian womanhood is now involved in this issue of Portuguese repression of Goa. What are we in this country doing to assist the uprising of the Goan people who have now taken recourse to arms and ammunition, to blow up power installations, etc., in Goa? You are not permitting the masses to go beyond a certain point. But I would say that in August last we were forced into a situation in this country, especially the people were forced into a state when they had to revolt against their own Government and do satyagraha against their own military and police forces. That was fortunately prevented. How long can Government hope to prevent this? What are the "other methods" which the Prime Minister repeatedly refers to whenever there is a debate on foreign policy.

Just as I complained about imbalance in the speech of the President with regard to the problems of the country, both national and international, with the greatest respect, I will have to say that the debate in this House so far, I personally think, has become a debate on States Reorganisation. I have a deep interest in this subject by virtue of my past and present associations with linguistic movement, but I will refrain from going into details. I know there may be opportunities coming before us when we take up the Bill eventually before the current Session ends.

An Hon. Member: If the Bill comes.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Yes, if it comes. I would like to make one or two small observations. I would say what I have said on an earlier occasion. The approach of Government to problems of States reorganisation has not been national. I complained about it

last time when I intervened in the debate here. I repeat the complaint. I only wish to say that it should have been a national approach. It has become a party approach. Barring Master Tara Singh, which of the non-Congressmen has been approached for consultation? What has happened to the numerous offers made by non-Congressmen to assist it in the solution of the problem? Have they been consulted by the Government? Even now I suggest it is not too late to do so.

My hon. friend, (looking at Shri Badridutt Pandey) who interrupted who knows politics better than I do and who had been in this chamber under the British, will understand exactly what I am trying to drive at.

I would like to make one other observation now. I want the House to take me seriously, and I want my friends opposite, of the ruling party, to take me seriously. I am sincere, and my heart bleeds when I say that it is all because the Congress High Command was unable to control its own partymen that the greater portion of this trouble in India—whether it is in Bombay or at Cuttack, has occurred. My friend Shri Gadgil was speaking yesterday, and I listened with the greatest amount of respect and attention to his speech. But what was his role in the matter, when he, in this hon. Lok Sabha, on the floor of the Lok Sabha, said that the matter would be settled in the streets of Bombay? Was there any little finger raised against the statement anywhere, from any quarter, either in the Congress or in the Government? (*Interruption*) I would say this: that because of the entrenched group politics, the politics of positional power, that the greater portion of the trouble about the linguistic reorganisation has come upon us. I am sorry to have to say that. The Lok Sabha will yield me the point when I say that I have no politics to play as far as I am concerned, and I do say, without any sense of shame or fear of contradiction that there was not any attempt made to control this.

I have only one more minute to go. And I now refer to the manner in which this question of linguistic States is sought to be solved with reference to Telangana. The Prime Minister said at one time that he was not in favour of disintegration of Hyderabad. Later on he appears to have changed his

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

mind. Then they said Telangana has to be a separate State in terms of the Fazl Ali Commission's report. At one time they said it should be Vishalandhra, with the Andhra State and Telangana put together. Now, there is another idea, namely that Vishalandhra should be added on to Karnataka and so on and so forth. I would like to say here—and I regard it as an important matter—that because of the same manner in which, and the nonchalant, unthinking and unco-operative attitude in which, the people's representatives from the political parties concerned are functioning, it is going to give us a tremendous amount of trouble in the immediate future. I gather that there are proposals, almost completed, that Telangana would join with the Andhra State, but it would be called Hyderabad. I am here to declare that if this is going to be done—and I understand attempts are being made to finalise or it has been finalised last night—the wrath of three and a half crores of people in Andhra will be visited on the Government of India. I regret to say that. Nobody has a right to destroy the name of Andhra. I say it with all the sense of responsibility that I can command. I say that you cannot wipe out Andhra from the social, political and linguistic dictionary of India. If Telangana wants safeguards, let it have them. What was the record of Andhra in 1937? Twenty long years ago, there was a private pact between the politicians of Rayalaseema and the coastal districts. But why all this trouble now? If only guarantees were wanted, they could have got them. I want to say, the word 'Andhra' cannot be wiped out from the political map of India, and if that is attempted—I regret to say it—the answer will be given by the people.

Secondly, the Andhra language should not be suppressed, in the Telangana portion of the combined State. Why should it be suppressed? (*Interruption*) That is being attempted now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member himself is criticising the attitude of Members that when Shri Gadgil spoke about decision regarding Bombay in the streets nobody raised a finger. But the hon. Member is himself imitating Shri Gadgil now!

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I do not want to be chastised by any of my friends if

they can give one single reason for calling it Hyderabad State. I repeat this invitation. There is no question of Andhra being whipped out from the etymology of the people of India. I say, it is because politics of horse trading have supervened. I repeat it: group politicians have taken hold of the counsels of the Government of India and, with respect, I say, of the High Command of the Congress. That is the only thing I wanted to stress. It is still not too late. In the case of Bombay it is already over. In the case of Andhra it is going to begin, and let us stop it. It is still not too late in the day to prevent a catastrophe in this country.

श्री गिडबानी (याना): सभापति महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव लोक सभा में प्राया है और जिस पर वाद-बवाद चल रहा है, मैं उस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के हेतु खड़ा हुआ हूँ। पहले मेरा बोलने का खास इरादा नहीं था, लेकिन मैं ने जब अपने मित्र डा० लंका सुन्दरम् की स्पीच सुनी तो मैंने मुनासिब समझा कि मैं भी अपने क्यालात सामने रख दूँ। मैं जल्मी हूँ, और एक दफा का जल्मी नहीं हूँ बल्कि तीन दफा जल्मी हुआ हूँ। पहली मर्तबा तो मैं तब जल्मी हुआ जब मेरे प्रान्त को जो बम्बई का एक हिस्सा था, बम्बई से अलग किया गया और यह बिना हमारी राय के किया गया, मेरी और श्री जयरामदास दौलतराम की मुखालफत के बावजूद उस को अलग कर दिया गया। खैर, हम ने उस को बदलित किया। और, आज मेरा प्रान्त कहां है? आज उसका नाम पाकिस्तान है। आज जब मैं कच्छ जाता हूँ और कच्छ से जहाज उड़ कर करांची जाता हूँ तो मेरे दिल पर जो बीतती है वह मैं ही जानता हूँ, और मैं उस का क्या वर्णन करूँ। हमारे प्रान्त का तो नाम ही मिट गया। जिस सिन्ध प्रान्त ने देश को हिन्द नाम दिया वह आज पाकिस्तान में शामिल है, और यह मेरा दूसरा जल्म है। इस के अलावा, अब बम्बई में जो कुछ हुआ उस से मेरे दिल को बहुत चोट लगी है, और उस के बारे में मैं आप से क्या वर्णन करूँ। दो बार मैं ने चोट को बदलित किया, लेकिन बम्बई में अपने राज्य के समय में भाइयों-भाइयों में जो आपस की लड़ाई देखी, स्वयं अपनी आँखों से देखी, उस से मेरे दिल को बहुत सदमा पहुंचा। उस ने मेरे हृदय को बड़ी पीड़ा पहुंचाई है। बम्बई में जो कुछ मैं ने देखा और भाई-भाई को आपस में झगड़ने देख

उस से मेरा सिर भारे शर्म के झुक गया। और मैं ने जो डा० लंका सुन्दरम् का भाषण सुना तो सुनकर हैरान हो गया। मैं कहता हूँ कि थोड़ी देर के लिये यह भी मान लिया जाये कि राज्यों का पुनर्गठन करते वक़्त गस्ती से एक प्रान्त के किसी टुकड़े को किसी दूसरे प्रान्त में मिला दिया जाता है, तो कोई अनर्थ तो नहीं हो जाता, आखिर वह रहता तो इसी हिन्दुस्तान में है, मेरे प्रदेश की तरह वह पाकिस्तान में तो नहीं जाने वाला है। मैं आप को चेतावनी स्वरूप यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की मनोवृत्ति संकीर्णता की परिचायक है और वह बायुमंडल जो हमें बम्बई में देखने में आया, हमारे देश के लिये बड़ा अहितकर है और राष्ट्र को उस से नुकसान पहुंचाने वाला है। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि सब भारतवासियों को ऐसे स्वस्थ वातावरण का निर्माण करना चाहिये जिस से हमारे देश का हित हो और वह प्रगति-पथ पर अग्रसर हो। आपने देखा कि पाकिस्तान का हमारे प्रति क्या रवैया है? आपने ही बतलाया है कि काश्मीर में उस का रवैया यह है और ईस्ट पाकिस्तान में उस का रवैया इस प्रकार का है और आज कच्छ में उस का रवैया क्या है? आप को मालूम है कि हमारे सिन्धी भाई कच्छ के नज़दीक कांडला में जा कर बसे हैं, वहां सिन्धियों के लिये एक टाउनशिप बनाया गया था और वहां जाते समय उनके दिल में यह डर था कि यह पाकिस्तान की सरहद पर स्थित होने से कहीं उन पर कोई मुसीबत न आये और उन्होंने अपनी यह आशंका और डर हम पर प्रकट भी किया, लेकिन हमने उन को विश्वास दिलाया कि तुम हरगिज़ मत डरो और मजे में जा कर वहां रहो। हमारे द्वारा ऐसा विश्वास दिलाने पर वह बेचारे वहां जाकर बसे। अब वहां पर जो कुछ अप्रिय घटनायें घटित हुई हैं, न मालूम उन का क्या असर उन लोगों पर पड़ेगा। न केवल हमारे सिन्धी भाइयों पर, बल्कि कच्छी भाइयों के दिलों पर भी उस का बड़ा निराशाजनक असर पड़ेगा। अभी मुझ से श्री गुलाब चन्द, जो कच्छ के मेम्बर हैं, मिले और उन्होंने मुझ से कुछ बातचीत की। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार इस मामले में अपनी पालिसी को बाज़े कर दे और साफ़ तौर पर घोषणा करे, ताकि कच्छ के निवासियों को तसल्ली हो जाये कि कोई ऐसी बात नहीं होने वाली है।

राज्य पुनर्गठन के प्रश्न को लेकर देश के कुछ भागों में जो अप्रिय घटनायें घटी हैं, वे अक्षयजनक हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रान्तों की

जगह राज्य और स्टेट्स का नाम देने से झगड़ बढ़े हैं। हमारा उन को स्टेट्स कहना गलत था, उन को अग्रर प्राबिन्सेज कहते तो शायद यह झगड़ा न होता। प्रान्तीयता की भावना से और संकीर्ण जातीयता की भावना से देश को बड़ा नुकसान पहुंचा है और मैं तो चाहूंगा कि सरकार को इस के सम्बन्ध में सब पार्टियों के नेताओं को बुला कर और उन से बात चीत कर के इस प्रश्न का शान्तिपूर्वक हल निकालना चाहिये। आप को कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेताओं को भी बातचीत करने के लिये बुलाना चाहिये। आज आप देख रहे हैं कि सोवियत रूस में क्या हो रहा है। जहां स्टालिन को देवता माना जाता था, आज वहां पर लोग स्टालिन को गिराने को तैयार हैं। आज संसार में इतने परिवर्तन हो रहे हैं और क्रान्तियां आ रही हैं और मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि कोई भी कम्युनिस्ट भाई देश को कमजोर बनाना चाहता है। कोई कम्युनिस्ट भाई भी इस देश से अलग होने या इस पर आक्रमण करने को पसन्द नहीं करते हैं। तो इन सब पार्टियों को मिला कर और उन से सलाह ले कर इस मामले को हल किया जाये। इस हद तक मैं भी आप का समर्थन करने के लिये तैयार हूँ। लेकिन अग्रर कोई ऐसी बात हो जाय जो किसी को पसन्द न हो तो हम क्यों कहें कि अग्रर ऐसा हो गया तो हम ऐसा करेंगे, और वैसा हो गया, जिस से वातावरण में और बायुमंडल में डर पैदा हो, जिस से हमारे देश में कोई झगड़ा या फसाद पैदा हो। डा० लंका सुन्दरम् ने ही तो ऐसे रवैयों को गलत बताया था, उससे अग्रर वे क्यों बदल रहे हैं? इस सिलसिले में, मैं इतना ही अग्रर करना चाहता हूँ।

जिस बात को मैं पहले कहना चाहता था वह यह है कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने यह घोषणा की, हमारे यहां की कांग्रेस ने भी यह घोषणा की कि अब हमारा ध्येय इस देश में समाजवादी ढंग का समाज निर्माण करना है। बिल्कुल सही है, इस का अर्थ यही तो है कि जब समाजवादी ढंग पर समाज का निर्माण हो तो इस देश में न कोई गंगा हो, न कोई भूखा हो, न कोई बिना भूमि का हो, न कोई बेघर हो, और न ही कोई बीमार बेइलाज हो। यही पांच बातें होनी चाहियें, जैसा कि गांधी जी कहा करते थे। मैं यह मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि सब से बड़ा सवाल जो देश में है वह यह है कि बेरोजगारी और अन्धराष्ट्रियमेट (अल्प-रोजगार) बढ़ता जा रहा है। मैं एक बात मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ, मैंने

श्री गिड़बानी]

ने खुद पिछले साल, जब मैं पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमिटी का मेंबर था, कमिटी के मेम्बरों के साथ सारे हिन्दुस्तान का भ्रमण किया। मैंने ने कम्प्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स भी देखे, मैंने ने नेशनल एक्स्टेन्शन सर्विस का भी काम देखा और उन बड़े-बड़े कारखानों को भी देखा जो कि बंगलोर और पेरम्बूर में हैं, और जो बड़े बड़े काम हो रहे हैं हीराकुड और भाखड़ा नंगल में उन को भी देखा। कौन कह सकता है कि इस देश में इतने थोड़े समय में उन्नति नहीं की। हम को अपनी धाँखों को तो नहीं बन्द करना चाहिये। यह सही है कि १०० में से १०० धादमियों को काम नहीं मिला, उन को खाना नहीं पहुँचा, लेकिन यह बात कौन कह सकता है कि देश ने उन्नति नहीं की। देश के अन्दर बड़ा जबर्दस्त काम हो रहा है, जिस को हमारे सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के भाई भी देखते हैं। तो अगर यह कहा जाये कि इस तरह से कुछ काम हो रहे हैं तो इस में हम को संदेह नहीं होना चाहिये। मैंने खुद अपनी धाँखों से कितनी जगहों पर जा कर देखा है, मेरा हृदय उन को देखकर प्रफुल्लित हो गया। जब मैं भोपाल गया तो सांची में, जो कि बुद्ध भगवान का एक स्थान है, मैंने एक जनता कालेज अपनी धाँखों से देखा। मैंने देखा कि देहात के लोग किस तरह से उस कालेज में पढ़ रहे हैं। मैं बड़ा खुश हुआ, और किस देश के हितचिन्तक को उस को देख कर खुशी नहीं होगी। तो यह सब देख कर यह मानना पड़ेगा, और मानना चाहिये कि देश ने उन्नति की है और बराबर कर रहा है। लेकिन, हमारे सामने जो प्रश्न सवाल है वह है बेरोजगारी का। हमने बेरोजगारी के मसले को हल किया या नहीं। इसके बारे में जो हमारी पंच-वर्षीय योजना है उस में खुद माना गया है :

The following statement will show at a glance the number of jobs which should be created if unemployment is to be completely eradicated in the Second Plan period.

वह कहते हैं कि १५३ लाख लोग रह जायेंगे जिन को हमें काम में लयाना है मगर हम

कितने धादमियों को काम में लगा सकेंगे और रोजगार दिला सकेंगे, यह बड़ा भारी सवाल है। हमारी दूसरी योजना भी कहती है कि १०० लाख तक तो हम पहुँच जायेंगे, अब पहुँचेंगे या नहीं, यह नहीं कहा जा सकता। लेकिन, इस के साथ साथ एक बड़ा भारी सवाल है, शायद आप उस पर हसँगे। वह सवाल है देश में मर्दुम शुमारी के बढ़ने का। आप को समझना चाहिये कि हर साल ४०-४५ लाख से लेकर ५० लाख तक धादमी देश में बढ़ते हैं। पिछली जनसंख्या के मुताबिक मैं आप को बतलाता हूँ कि सन् १९४१ में यहां की पापुलेशन (जनसंख्या) ३१ करोड़ और २८ लाख थी, और १९५१ में बही ३५ करोड़ ७० लाख हो गई। यानी कोई साढ़े चार करोड़ हमारी मर्दुमशुमारी बढ़ी। अब आप खुद देखिये कि अगर इस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान की मर्दुमशुमारी बढ़ती जाये और जो बेरोजगार पहले से बैठे हैं वह वैसे ही बैठे रहें तो कोई भी योजना कैसे सफल हो सकती है। जब तक कि कोई ऐसा कदम न उठाया जायें जिस से कि किसी तरह से जनसंख्या को बढ़ने से रोका जायें में इस बारे में एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ, भले ही आप लोग इस पर हसँ। मेरी समझ में आप चाहें जो भी रास्ता प्रख्यार करें, आप चर्खा चलाइयें, ग्रामोद्योग चलाइयें, काटेज इन्डस्ट्रीज चलाइयें, बड़े उद्योग चलाइयें, लेकिन बावजूद इन तमाम बातों के जैसा कि आप ने अपनी दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में भी कहा है, कि बेरोजगारी को रोकने में हम पूरी तरह से सफल नहीं हो सकते। आप के सामने जनसंख्या बढ़ने की एक दीवार खड़ी है, जो किसी तरह भी बेरोजगारी का मसला हल नहीं करने देती है। इसके लिये एक ही रास्ता देखने में आता है कि फैमिली प्लैनिंग (परिवार आयोजन) की स्कीम को बढ़ाया जायें। मुझ जैसे धादमी से यह बात सुन कर शायद कुछ धादमियों को मजाक सा मालूम होगा, शायद यह बात उन को ऐसी लगेगी जिस को जल्दी ग्रहण करने में उन को कुछ मुश्किल हो, लेकिन मेरी समझ में सिवा इस के कोई रास्ता नहिन है।

यह मेरे ही विचार नहीं हैं, अभी पंडित जी धागे गये थे ।

At a meeting held in Agra recently under the auspices of the U. P. Pradesh Congress Committee, the Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru spoke. After referring to various major aspects of the projected Second Plan he referred to the need of family planning. He felt that family planning was absolutely essential to ensure a decent standard of living to the people. All efforts to solve the problem of unemployment would come to nought, if the population continued to increase at a rapid rate.

He said that a country's depended on the rate of investment and it would not be possible to raise the rate of national savings in India, unless, somehow, the increase in population is stopped.

यह साफ बात है । यहाँ ही नहीं, मैं अभी जापान गया था, वहाँ भी जहाँ जहाँ पर यह देखा जाता है कि पापुलेशन बढ़ती जाती है वहाँ दूसरे दूसरे रास्ते अख्यार किये जाते हैं, मैं उन में जाना नहीं चाहता । मेरे भाई न समझे कि यह मैं अपनी बात कह रहा हूँ, मैं ने आप को कई बार बताया कि न तो मैं ने दुनिया में कोई बच्चा पैदा ही किया और न आगे पैदा करने की इच्छा ही रखता हूँ, लेकिन चूंकि मेरे पास पिछले आठ वर्षों से जिन लोगों को आप विस्मित कहते हैं उन का काम है, उन के मसले के साथ मेरा सम्बन्ध है इस लिये कोई दिन भी ऐसा नहीं जाता कि जब सबेरे से लेकर शाम तक लोग मेरे पास नहीं आते ह । एक दिन मैं बैठा था कि मेरे पास एक ६० या ६५ वर्ष का सिन्धी रिफ्यूजी आया जो कि कच्छ से आया था वहाँ बूढ़ों के लिये आश्रम है । वह कहने लगा कि मेरे साथ सरकार ने बड़ा जुलम किया है । मेरे साथ बड़ा अन्याय हुआ है । मैंने पूछा कि आखिर क्या हुआ ? कहने लगा कि हम चार भादमी हैं हम बूढ़ों के आश्रम में हैं, लेकिन खाना सिर्फ दो ही भादमियों का फ्री मिलता है । मैंने कहा कि यह कैसे हो सकता है ? वह कहने लगा कि मेरी औरत है और मैं हूँ, फिर कहा कि दो बच्चे हैं । मुझे बड़ी हैरानी हुई कि यह तो ६०-६५ वर्ष का बूढ़ा है, इस के दो बच्चे कैसे हो सकते हैं । मैंने सोचा कि शायद कई-कई बरस के होंगे । एक दो-तीन वर्ष का होगा, दूसरा ६ या ७ वर्ष का होगा । मैंने पूछा कि क्या उम्र है दोनों बच्चों की ? तो कहने लगा कि दोनों की बस दस महीने की है । अभी पैदा हुए हैं । मैंने कहा कि धरे कम्बल, कैसे बच्चे पैदा करता है ?

आप समझ सकते हैं कि यह कैसी चीज है । हमारा भोजीव कानून है, आप सुन कर हैरान होंगे कि किस तरह से उस का पालन किया जाता है । कानून है कि जब बच्चा पैदा होता है तो जब तक वह दो वर्ष का नहीं हो जाता या शायद तीन का तब तक उस को फ्री राशन नहीं मिलता । मैं यह कोई कहानी नहीं कह रहा हूँ, एक हकीकत बयान कर रहा हूँ । इस तरह से अगर दो बच्चे हो गये तो उन की मुसीबत आ जाती है । पुराने जमाने में मेरे एक दोस्त थे जो एम० एल० ए० थे । उन की आमदनी साल की करीब ५०,००० रुपये थी, बड़े अच्छे खाते-पीते थे, तन्दुरुस्त थे । वह हर साल एक बच्चा पैदा करते थे, १८ वर्ष से उन्होंने बच्चे पैदा करने शुरू कर दिये । वह यहाँ आते हैं, मान लीजिये कि वह बराबर बच्चे पैदा करते रहते तो एक धार्मी (फौज) बच्चों की खड़ी हो जाती । और वह यहीं आते, और कहाँ जा सकते थे ? आप की पापुलेशन इस तरह से कितनी बढ़ जाती ? लेकिन उस बेचारे शास्त्र ने आपरेशन करवा दिया । वह अब बड़े आराम में हैं, तन्दुरुस्त हैं, खुद भी बिल्कुल सुखी हैं और औरत भी सुखी है । मुझे कई मर्तबा मिलता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम इस समस्या को इतनी ग्रहणियत देते हैं फिर भी इस तरह की कोई तरकीब नहीं निकालते हैं तो आप की सारी योजनायें खत्म हो जायेंगी और समस्या ज्यों की त्यों ही पड़ी रहेगी । इस लिये हम को इस और बड़े ध्यान से बढ़ना चाहिये । इस में कोई इमारैलिटी (अनैतिकता) नहीं, इस में कोई बुरा पाप करने की बात नहीं, यह एक ऐसा काम है फैमिली प्लानिंग का जिस का आप को तर्जुबा करना चाहिये । आप हमेशा हजारों एक्सपेरिमेंट्स (प्रयोग) करते रहते हैं । आप को इस मामले को भी ग्रहणियत देनी चाहिये । मुझे इस की बड़ी खुशी है कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने फैमिली प्लानिंग के लिये भी ५ करोड़ रुपये रखे हैं । लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह काम ऐसे लोगों के हाथों में हो जिन को इसमें विश्वास हो । हमारे हेल्थ मिनिस्टर साहब हैं, उनका कुछ कारणों की वजह से इस चीज में विश्वास मालूम नहीं पड़ता है । फैमिली प्लानिंग का मसला ऐसा है जिसको कि सीरियसली (गम्भीरता-पूर्वक) लिया जाना चाहिये । मैं तो यह भी कहूँगा कि जो स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स (राज्य सरकारें) हैं, जो म्युनिसिपल कमिटीज हैं, जो डिस्ट्रिक्ट बोर्ड्स हैं या इसी तरह से दूसरे महकमे हैं, उनको भी चाहिये कि वे फैमिली प्लानिंग की स्कीमों पर धमल करें । मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस पर

[श्री . गिडबानी]

गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करें और इस को लागू करने के लिये कनक्रीट (ठोस) योजनायें बनायें।

श्री ब० व० पांडे (जिला अलमोड़ा-उत्तर-पूर्व) : आपकी अपनी इस बारे में क्या राय है ?

श्री गिडबानी : मैंने तो न कोईगुलामी के जमाने में पैदा किया है और न आजाद होने के बाद पैदा किया है।

मैं कोई मजाक की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ। यह बहुत सीरियस (गम्भीर) चीज है और इस को बहुत ज्यादा अहमियत दी जानी चाहिये। अगर यह चीज लोगों को बताई जाये और तरीके बतलाये जायें तो कई कुटम्ब राजी खुशी अपना निर्वाह कर सकेंगे।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह है बचत के बारे में। यह भी इतना अहम मामला है कि इस पर भी मैं अपने कुछ विचार पेश किये बिना नहीं रह सकता हूँ। आजकल इस की बहुत ज्यादा चर्चा है कि लोगों को बचाना चाहिये। इस के बारे में अमृतसर में भी एक रेजोल्यूशन (संकल्प) पास किया गया है और लोगों से अपील की गई है कि वे रुपया बचा कर गवर्नमेंट को उधार दें। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ मिनिस्टर साहिबान से कि वे देखें कि उनके अपने डिपार्टमेंट्स में कितना ज्यादा फिजूल खर्च हो रहा है। उदाहरण के लिये मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि यहां पर हम की तीन-तीन डायरियां सप्लाई की गई हैं। इस का क्या मतलब है ? क्या यह फिजूल खर्चा नहीं है।

श्री श्यामनन्धन सहाय (मुजफरपुर-मध्य) : हमको तो एक ही मिली है।

श्री गिडबानी : नहीं साहब तीन मिली हैं। इस के साथ ही साथ हम को दो-दो कैलेंडर भी सप्लाई किये गये हैं। इन्हीं चीजों से अन्दाजा लगाया जा सकता है कि गवर्नमेंट डिपार्टमेंट्स (विभागों) में कितना ज्यादा फिजूल का खर्च हो रहा है। आज दिल्ली में जो कि भारत की राजधानी है स्कूलों की इमारतें बनाने के लिये जब इतने ज्यादा पैसे की जरूरत है तो क्या वजह कि इस तरह से फिजूल रुपया खर्च किया जा रहा है। मैं यहीं पर दिल्ली में ही यह भी देखता हूँ कि लड़कों के लिये स्कूलों में बैठने के लिये जगह भी नहीं है और इस पर रुपया खर्च करने के बजाय गलत चीजों के लिये रुपया खर्च किया

जा रहा है। इसी तरह से हमें कितने ही कागजात धिये जाते हैं। जो कि किसी काम नहीं आते। मैं चाहता हूँ कि एक एक पाई का सदुपयोग हो और जहां पर रुपया खर्च करने की सब से ज्यादा जरूरत हो वहीं रुपया खर्च किया जाये। मैं आप को महात्मा गांधी की बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ। मैंने भी उनके साथ ३०-४० साल गुजारे हैं और उनको मैं पास से भी जानता हूँ। महात्मा गांधी पुराने कागजात को सम्भाल के रखा करते थे और उन को चिट्ठियां लिखने के काम में लाया करते थे। आप नाम तो लेते हैं गांधी जी का लेकिन उन के उसूलों पर नहीं चलते हैं। केवल गांधी जी का नाम ही ले लेना काफी नहीं है। हमें चाहिये कि हम उन के उसूलों पर चलें। सिखों के ग्रन्थ में यह आशा है :

और उपदेशे आप न करे।

आवत जावत जन्मे मरे ॥

यानी दूसरों को उपदेश देना पर खुद उस पर अम्ल न करना कोई मानी नहीं रखता है। इस वास्ते हमें चाहिये कि हम एक एक पैसे को बचायें और फिजूल खर्ची न करें।

जहां तक राज्यों के पुनर्गठन का सम्बन्ध है इस के बारे में शान्ति से काम लेना चाहिये। हमें अपने राष्ट्र के हितों की सामने रखना चाहिये। और उसी के मुताबिक काम भी करना चाहिये। अगर एक प्रान्त का एक टुकड़ा इधर से उधर चला जाता है तो उस से क्या फर्क पड़ता है, आखिरकार वह टुकड़ा रहेगा तो हिन्दुस्तान में ही। हम लोगों ने जो कि रिफ्यूजीज हैं, इतनी मुसीबतें बर्दाश्त की हैं कि जिन को बयान नहीं किया जा सकता। हमारे दिलों पर जो जखम लगे हैं उन की हम ही जानते हैं। हम अपने घरबार छोड़ कर यहां आये हैं फिर भी हम ने इस चीज की परवा नहीं की। अगर आज आंध्र का नाम कुछ और हो जाता है तो इस में क्या हर्ज है। अगर आज बम्बई का शहर महाराष्ट्र में मिला दिया जाता है तो इसमें क्या फर्क पड़ता है। हमें चाहिये कि हम भाई-भाई की तरह रहें और गांधी जी के बतलाये हुए उसूलों पर चलें। हमें अपने देश को मजबूत करने के लिये हर सम्भव उपाय करना चाहिये। आज जब कि शत्रु हमारे दरवाजे पर खड़ा है हमें अपनी एकता को कमजोर नहीं करना चाहिये। हमें संगठित हो कर समस्याओं को सुलझाना चाहिये और मामूली-मामली बातों पर लड़ना झगड़ना हम की शोभा नहीं देता। मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ

कि राज्यों के पुनर्गठन का मामला सभी पार्टियों के सहयोग के साथ सुलझाया जाना चाहिये। उनको एक जगह बिठा कर फँसले किये जाने चाहिये जिस से कि हम उनकी सप्पोर्ट (समर्थन) भी हासिल कर सकें और भागे बढ़ सकें।

श्री अरार० डी० मिश्र (जिला बुलन्दशहर) :
सभापति महोदय, मैं अपने मित्र श्री भागवत झा आजाद द्वारा पेश किये गये प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। १९५५ में भारत ने जो उन्नति की है उसका नक्शा राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में देखने को मिला है। जो बातें उन्होंने कही हैं में उन को बिल्कुल सही मानता हूँ। उन्होंने सब से पहली बात तो यह कही है कि सन् १९५५ में दुनिया ने यह समझना शुरू कर दिया है कि हिन्दुस्तान की जो वैदेशिक नीति है, जो फारेन पालीसी है, वह बिल्कुल सही है। जो लोग पहले हमारी वैदेशिक नीति का मजाक उड़ाया करते थे वे भी अब यह मानने लग गये हैं कि जिस पालिसी पर हम चल रहे हैं वही सही पालिसी है और दुनिया के राष्ट्रों को भी इसी पालिसी पर चलना चाहिये। अगर हम अपनी तारीफ आप करें तब तो कोई बात नहीं बनती। बात तो तभी बनती है जब कि विदेशी राजदूत, विदेशी नेता और दूसरे देशों के मंत्रिगण हमारी पालिसी की सराहना करें। विदेशी नीति तभी अच्छी कही जा सकती है जब विदेशी लोग उसे अच्छा समझें और यह कहें कि हाँ इस से दुनिया के देशों को कोई लाभ हुआ है। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आप के सामने एक दो बातें रखना चाहता हूँ।

६ अक्टूबर, १९५५ को डा० अल्बर्ट बेरियो ने जो यहाँ पर इटली के राजदूत थे दिल्ली में हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति के मुतालिक जो बयान दिया मैं उसे आप को पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा था कि :

"India has become the symbol of new Asia. It is the first time in history that Asia is playing a very important part in the international sphere, and India is in the fore-front of the role. We in Italy very much admire the genius of your leader who is playing a big part in the international policy and we admire the efforts he has made to make India great in a few years since independence. He has succeeded in giving his country high prestige throughout

the world. We in Italy look upon India with great interest and sympathy because we are guided by the same principles. We both act in defence of peace and democracy and are against totalitarianism."

He further said that :

"India has become a big school for diplomats because at present she is the centre of a big movement from the point of view of international policies. We see here personalities from many parts of the world. India is so full of history, philosophy and monuments which are source of great knowledge."

इस बात को पढ़ने के बाद मुझे मनु की एक बात याद आ गई। उन्होंने कहा है कि :

रतद्देश प्रसूतस्य सकाशातात्र जन्मनः

स्वं स्वं चरितं शिक्षरेन प्रथिमां सर्वमानवः।

यानी इस देश के जो बड़े बड़े महान लीडर जन्म लेते हैं और जिन के पास काश रूपी शीर्षध है, उन के पास आ आ कर समस्त दुनिया के आदमी अपने अपने चरित्र के बारे में शिक्षा लिया करते हैं। मनु का यह कहना था कि उन के समय में दुनिया के सभी देशों के लोग इस देश के नेताओं से आ कर यह पूछा करते थे कि उन को दूसरे देशों के साथ किस प्रकार का व्यवहार करना चाहिए। काश पित्त से उत्पन्न खाँसी की बीमारी को दूर करती है इस का यह अर्थ है कि लड़ाई चर्चा से जो गर्मी उत्पन्न होती है उस को अहिंसा रूपी शीर्षध दूर करती है। इस देश के नेता शान्ति रूपी शीर्षध की शिक्षा दिया करते थे। जो बात मनु ने अपने समय के सम्बन्ध में कही है। आज हमारे नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरूजी ने भी उसी जमाने की फिजा पैदा कर दी है जब कि दुनिया के राजनीतिज्ञ भारत भूमि में आ कर शिक्षा लिया करते थे और पूछा करते थे कि हमें किस तरह से दूसरे देशों के साथ व्यवहार करना चाहिये। यही हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की कामयाबी है। आज रूस में, अमेरिका में हिन्दुस्तान की पालिसी का बोलबाला है। इस पालिसी को देख कर दुनिया अचम्भे में पड़ गई है। इस लिये अगर राष्ट्रपति जी ने यह कह दिया कि हमारी पालिसी कामयाब रही है तो इस में कौन सी गलत बात कही है।

[श्री. आर. डी. मिश्र]

इटली के विदेश मन्त्री डा० मारटीनो ने ५ जनवरी, १९५६ को जो कुछ कहा है उस को भी सुन लीजिये। इस के बारे में आप ने भी प्रश्नकारों में पढ़ा होगा। उन्होंने कहा है:

"Today, the hope of mankind is for peace, that makes life possible and allows the solution of problems arising from life itself. Italians join with Indians in wanting peace which is essential for perseverance and progress in efforts for the development of civil life. The world has received from India the gift of a great example, the example of her tremendous faith in the peaceful solution of problems arising between nations, between classes and between men. Other countries have given birth to men who are remembered as heroes because they believed in force as the only means of solving social and political problems. The Indian nation, instead, has given birth to the Mahatma, the great soul of Gandhi who not only believed in peace, but used it as a means of solving the most difficult problems of his motherland."

इसी तरीके से और लोगों ने भी बयान दिये हैं। मैं किस किस का बयान यहां पर पढ़कर सुनाऊं? यहां पर ईजिप्ट (मिस्र) के प्राइम मिनिस्टर आये, महाराजा नेपाल आये, चीन के प्रधान मंत्री श्री चाउ एन लाई आये और सब ने इस देश की नीति की प्रशंसा की। श्री बुलगानिन और खरुचेव ने सुप्रीम सोवियत के सामने यहां के दौरे के बारे में जो रिपोर्ट दी, वह भी आपने पढ़ी होगी। उन्होंने भी हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति की तारीफ की। उन्होंने यहां पर हो रहे कामों को देखा। उन्होंने देखा कि यहां पर जनता की उन्नति के लिये काम किये जा रहे हैं, कम्प्यूनिटी प्रोजेक्ट चल रहे हैं, बड़े बड़े डैम बन रहे हैं और गरीबी को दूर करने के लिये कदम उठाये जा रहे हैं। इन सब बातों का उन्होंने जिक्र किया और इस देश की नीति की प्रशंसा की। अपने मुंह मियां मिट्टू बनने से कोई फायदा नहीं है। आज दुनिया भर के राजनीतिज्ञ यह मानते हैं कि पंडित नेहरू दुनिया के माने हुए राजनीतिज्ञ हैं। इस हालत में मुझे शर्म मासूम होती है, जब मैं अपने ही लोगों को पंडित नेहरू की राजनीति को क्रिटिसाइज (आलोचना)

करते हुए देखता हूं। विरोधी दल के सदस्यों से मेरा कहना है ज्यादा भ्रच्छा हो अगर आप साहबान कोई सजेस्वान (सुझाव) सामने लाये, कोई रचनात्मक सुझाव पेश करें, लेकिन आप तो महज क्रिटिसाइज करने के लिये ही खड़े होते हैं।

मैं देखता हूं कि सब लोगों के दिमाग में एस० आर० सी० (राज्य पुनर्गठन आयोग) सामया हुआ है। दिसम्बर में यहां पर एस० आर० सी० पर बहस करने का मौका दिया गया। जो नहीं बोल सके, उन को स्टेटमेंट (वक्तव्य) देने की इजाजत दी गई और कहा गया कि जितना बख्शार है, जितना गुस्सा है, उस को निकाल लो। इस के बावजूद लोगों की तसल्ली नहीं हुई और आज भी जिस को देखो, वह एस० आर० सी० की बात कर रहा है। आखिर यह क्या बीमारी है? किसी ने कहा कि इस रिपोर्ट पर भ्रमल करना फिलहाल टाल दो। लेकिन यह राय ठीक नहीं है। हम ने हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी हासिल की है और अब हम सब का कर्तव्य है कि हम इस को बहुत मजबूत बना कर आने वाली सन्तति को दे जायें। यह जिम्मेदारी हम पर है। एक और बात का भी हम को ख्याल रखना है। हो सकता है कि आज से दस-बीस बरस के बाद आज की वह राष्ट्रीय भावना कमजोर पड़ जाय, जिस को महात्मा गांधी ने पैदा किया था और उस वक्त इस रिपोर्ट पर भ्रमल करने से देश में गड़बड़ पैदा हो जाय। मैं तो यह समझता हूं कि आज थोड़े से आदमियों के दिमाग फिर गये हैं। उनकी लीडरी के लिये खतरा पैदा हो गया है और इसीलिये वे इस तरह की उल्टी बातें कर रहे हैं। हम को यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि राष्ट्रीयता का अर्थ है देश की एकता और उस को कायम रखना हम सब का कर्तव्य है। फिर भी लोग बातें करते हैं संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की और विशालान्ध्र की। आप ने सुना होगा कि यहां पर गाडगिल साहब ने कहा था कि अगर संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का सवाल यहां तय नहीं होगा तो फिर वह स्ट्रीट्स (गलियों में) तय किया जायगा। उस के बाद हम ने देख लिया कि बम्बई में क्या हुआ। क्या यही हमारी राष्ट्रीय भावना है? मराठों और गुजरातियों में नफरत फैलाने की कोशिश की गई है, लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि मराठों के दिलों में किसी के लिये कोई नफरत नहीं है और उन के दिमाग अभी सही हैं। और इसी तरह गुजराती, बंगाली और हिन्दी बोलने वाले भी सही तरीके

से सांचत और काम करते हैं—सिर्फ लीडरों का दिमाग खराब हो गया है मैं मानता हूँ कि कांग्रेस में भी ऐसे लोग मौजूद हैं। कांग्रेस वालों का काम था कि वह मजबूत रहते और जनता की रहनुमाई करते, जिस तरह कि वे भंगेज के जमाने में करते रहे हैं। उन को कहना चाहिये था कि ५१ प्रतिशत आदमी हमारे साथ हैं और तुम्हारे साथ ४६ प्रतिशत हैं—और शायद ४७-४८ ही हों या इस से भी कम हों। इस लिये हम जनता का पथ-प्रदर्शन करेंगे। लेकिन उन्होंने अपनी लीडरी छोड़ दी और उस को कम्युनिस्टों और सोशलिस्टोंको दे दियाया औरों को दे दिया। ऐसा कर के उन्होंने संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र के नारे के आगे सिर झुका दिया। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र की बात करना बुरा नहीं है, भाषावार राज्यों का निर्माण किया जाये, यह भी बुरा नहीं है। कांग्रेस ने भी यही कहा था, लेकिन लिम्बिस्म (भाषावार) पर इतना जोर दिया गया कि कल्ल हुए, खून हुए, गारतगरी हुई और लोगों में आपस में नफरत पैदा हो गई। फिर भी यहां पर कहा जाता है कि इन बातों की तहकीकात करने के लिये एक कमीशन बिठाया जाये। बम्बई में चार सी दुकानें फूकी गईं, वहां पर भाग लगाई गई, लोगों का नुक्सान हुआ, लीडरों की बेइज्जती हुई—ये सब वाक्यात हमारे सामने हैं, कमीशन को किस लिये बिठाया जाय ? किस ने वहां पर भाग लगाई ? 'हू इज रेसपांसिबल फार इट' ? (इस के लिये कौन उत्तरदायी है ?)

श्री कामथ (होशंगाबाद) : इस की एन्क्वायरी कराइये ।

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग इन कामों के लिये जिम्मेदार हैं, वे अब अपने किये पर पछतायें कि हम ने मुल्क को इतना नुक्सान पहुंचाया है। आज इन बातों को देखकर विदेशी हंस रहे हैं। असल बात तो यह है कि मुझे इस मामले में विदेशियों की बुराती है। इस में उन का भी हाथ हो सकता है। उन्होंने इन वाक्यात के फोटो खींचे और उन को अपने मुल्कों के अखबारों में छापा। उन्होंने प्रचार किया कि अब हिन्दुस्तान टूट रहा है और महाराष्ट्र और विशाल आंध्र अलग हों रहे हैं। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का रवैया कितना काबिले-तारीफ रहा है। कमीशन ने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी और पंडित जी ने कहा कि उस की कुछ बातें मेरी समझ में नहीं आईं, आप और कर लीजिये। तो कहा गया कि पंडित जी ने ऐसा क्यों कहा। उस के बाद जब कुछ

फैसला किया गया तो फिर नुक्ता-चीनीकी गयी कि इस स्टेट से यह इलाका ले लिया गया है, उस स्टेट से वह इलाका ले लिया गया है, हम को देवीकुलम नहीं दिया गया है, हम से पुरलिया ले लिया गया है, वगैरह-वगैरह। हमारे चटर्जी साहब कहते हैं कि जस्टिस (न्याय) करो। जस्टिस तो सुप्रीम कोर्ट करता है। आप जा कर लोगों को बहकायें और कहें यहां कि जस्टिस करो। आप ने कहा कि पंजाब में भकालियों की कान्फेंस हुई और महा-पंजाब चाहने वाले हिन्दुओं की सभा हुई और कोई झगडा नहीं हुआ। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वहां पर झगडा इस लिये नहीं हुआ कि एक तरफ आप थे, दूसरी तरफ भकाली थे और बीच में कांग्रेस थी और अगर कांग्रेस न होती, तो वहां पर भी सिर फूट जाते। वह कहते हैं कि मैं ने पंडित नेहरू से अपील की। हम जानते हैं कि वह वहां पर भाग लगा आये और महापंजाब का नारा खड़ा कर आये। उन्होंने कहा कि गुरुमुखी ठीक नहीं है, इस मामले को पंडित जी तय करें वहां आग लगायें और पंडित जी मामले तय करें। आखिर वह वहां गये थे। वह मास्टर तारासिंह से बात करते और कहते कि हम आपके गुरुग्रन्थ और आप की भाषा को मानते हैं आप महा-पंजाब के लिए राजी हो जाइए और तय कर लेंते इस में क्या एतराज था, वह मान लेंते।

इसके बाद डा० लंका सुन्दरम् की बारी आई। वह कहते हैं कि अगर विशाल आंध्र न बना तो मैं चलेज देता हूँ कि बहुत बड़ा खतरा पैदा हो जायेगा। मैं हैरान हूँ कि जिस को देखा, वहीं पाटेखा हो रहा है—जिस को देखो, वहीं भकड़ रहा है। मैं गवर्नमेंट से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह हकूमत नहीं चलती है, हकूमत मजबूती के साथ होती है। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का माइन्ड डेमोक्रेटिक (प्रजातन्त्रात्मक) है। मैं देखता हूँ कि इतने कल्ल, खून और गारतगरी के बाद भी लोगों को यह हिम्मत है कि वे पार्लिमेंट में इस तरह की बातें करें।

इस मुल्क में त्रावनकोर-कोचीन के भाई हैं, बंगाली हैं, आसामी हैं, पंजाबी हैं, हिन्दी हैं, गुजराती हैं, लेकिन सब का खाना-पीना, कपड़े और रस्मो-रिवाज अलग-अलग हैं—एक नहीं है। तो फिर उन में कौन सी चीज कामन (समान) है ? उन में एक कामन चीज है एक कामन लैंड (एक ही देश)। कांग्रेस ने यही बात सिखाई

[श्री. आर. डी. मिश्र]

थी। उस ने सिखाया था कि हिन्दुस्तान हमारा है। उस ने तमाम हिन्दुस्तान में राष्ट्रीय भावना जागृत की थी। उस ने सिखाया था कि यह भूमि हमारी माता है—हमारी मातृभूमि है। उसने कन्या कुमारी से लेकर काश्मीर तक, आसाम से लेकर पंजाब तक रहने वाले सब लोगों को एक किया। तब भ्रष्टों ने महसूस किया कि देश का दावा सच्चा है और वे इस को छोड़ कर चल गये।

श्री इयामनंदन सहाय : वे भांग गये।

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : वे तो भाग गये, लेकिन आप तो डटे हुए हैं। आप ने यहां पर कहा कि पंडित नेहरू को गोआ के बारे में नीति गलत है, रूस के बारे में गलत है, कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट्स गलत है, बंगाल-बिहार का मर्जर (बिलय) गलत है, पुरुलिया को शामिल करना गलत है, गरज कि सब कुछ गलत है। मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कुछ सही भी है ?

हम जिस को भारत कहते हैं, वह सब का है। उस की एक एक इंच जमीन यहां पर रहने वाले नागरिकों की है, ३५ करोड़ जनता की है। कहा गया है कि बम्बई मराठियों का है, गुजरातियों का नहीं है, लेकिन मैं यह पूछता हूँ कि हम यू० पी० वाले कहां गये ? गुजराती, तो सीधे-साधे सौदागर लोग हैं, लाला लोग हैं, वे डर गये। मगर हम यू० पी० वालों का हक कहां गया ? हमारे भी भाई वहां पर रहते हैं। इसी तरह बिहारी और बंगाली भी वहां पर हैं। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान पर सब प्रदेशों और सब जातियों के लोगों का हक है।

4 P. M.

अपनी गवर्नमेंट से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस को इन मामलात में इतनी ढिलाई से काम नहीं लेना चाहिये कि जिस को मौका मिले, वह भाग लगा जाये। उस को कुछ कड़ाई से काम लेना चाहिये। हमें भारतवर्ष को ऐसा बनाना है कि जिस में सब लोग इज्जत से रह सकें, वे महसूस करें कि उन का जीवन सुखी है, सब आनन्द से रह सकें। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि एक छोटा सा इलाका नहीं मिला, तो झगड़े शुरू हो गये, देवीकुलम न मिला, तो छुरी चल गई।

आखिर सारा देश एक है, इस का कोई इलाका कहीं उठ कर तो नहीं चला जायगा। इसी किस्म की घटनायें उड़ीसा में भी हुईं। इस में मिनिस्ट्रों की गलती भी है। मैं मानता हूँ कि कांग्रेस ने यह तै किया था कि हमारे देश की एक कम्पोजिट स्टेट (सामासिक राज्य) बने जिस में राजे भी हों, जमींदार भी हों, और सभी मिल कर एक डिमोश्रैटिक स्टेट (प्रजातन्त्रीय राज्य) बनावे। लेकिन आज लोग नाज़ायज़ फायदा उठा कर देश में भाग लगाते फिरते हैं और यहां आकर पंडित जी से जस्टिस की बात करते हैं। अगर कहा जाता है कि बंगाल और बिहार का मर्जर किया जायें तो ये लोग कहते हैं कि नहीं ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये। जिस वक्त कि देश में भाग लगी हुई थी, रेलें तोड़ी जा रही थीं, बसों को भाग लगाई जा रही थी, उस वक्त दो चीफ मिनिस्ट्रों ने एक समझौता पर दस्तखत किये और कहा कि हमारे दो सूबे मिलेंगे। इन दो आदमियों के दस्तखतों का होना था कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में शान्ति की एक लहर फैल गयी। इस दवा ने बहुत जल्द असर किया। बिहारियों और बंगालियों ने जो अपने-आप को गले लगा लिया उस से देश को बड़ा फायदा हुआ। लेकिन जिन लोगों को झगड़ा कराना था वे उस के लिये अभी भी तैयार बंटे हैं। वे कहते हैं कि मर्जर ठीक नहीं है। इस झगड़े को तय करना चाहिये। मैं कहता हूँ कि क्यों नहीं वे खुद इस को तय कर लेते और पुरुलिया बगैरह का जो झगड़ा है उस का आपस में क्यों नहीं फैसला कर लेते। क्या बिहार वालों पर गोली खला कर जबरदस्ती कर के जस्टिस की जाये ? कमीशन ने कहा कि विदर्भ का एक सूबा बना दो और मध्य प्रदेश में मध्य भारत को मिला कर एक सूबा बना दो। अगर विदर्भ का सूबा अलग बनता तो मराठों का ही चीफ मिनिस्टर होता और दूसरे मिनिस्टर उन के होते। लेकिन कहते हैं कि नहीं हम सब को मिला दो और संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बना दो। अगर असल अलग राज्य रहते तो क्या हो जाता ? पंडित जी ने कहा कि लाभो इन की बात मान लें, तो वे बम्बई का सवाल ले आये। कहा गया कि बम्बई का अलग राज्य रहे। पंडित जी ने कहा कि ठीक है। फिर कहा गया कि नहीं यह सेंटर (केन्द्र) के आधीन रहे। पंडित जी ने कहा कि अच्छी बात है। लेकिन जब वे लोग यहां से वापस गये तो कुछ लोगों ने उनसे कहा कि यह तुम क्या कर आये, हम तो यह नहीं चाहते। अब कहा जाता है कि कांग्रेस हाई कमाण्ड ने महाराष्ट्र के साधन्याय नहीं किया। परन्तु इन कांग्रेसी नेताओं ने

जो किया है उस की वजह से महाराष्ट्र में गाडगिल साहब को और श्री शंकरराव देव को बोट नहीं मिलेगा । उन्हें सोचना पड़ेगा कि यह क्या झगड़ा कर बैठे । सरकार क्या करे । बम्बई को शामिल करती है तो मुश्किल है, भ्रमण रखा जाता है तो मुश्किल है और जब झगड़ा हो जाता है तो यहां आकर कहते हैं कि कमीशन मुकर्रर करो । कमीशन के लिये तो मैं भी पंडित जी से कह रहा हूं । मैं तो कहता हूं कि कमीशन मुकर्रर कीजिये और जिन लोगों ने यह भ्रमण लगाई है उन सब को बन्द कीजिये चाहे वे कांग्रेस-मैन हों या गैर-कांग्रेसमैन हों और उन लोगों को छोड़ दोजिये जिन को पकड़ रखा है । एक बेचारे मराठे का नाम गुंडा कह कर बदनाम किया जाता है । पहले तो उस के अन्दर एक नफरत की भावना पैदा कर दी जाती है और उस से कहा जाता है कि दुकाने लूटो और औरतों को पकड़ो । नतीजा यह होता है कि गुजराती और कच्छी बम्बई से भागते हैं । उन के अन्दर जो नफरत की भावना पैदा कर दी गई है उसी का यह नतीजा है । पुलिस को दोष दिया जाता है, लेकिन जब मिनिस्टर लोग तक इस में शामिल हों तो पुलिस क्या कर सकती है । बम्बई के मामले पर सेंटर तक के मिनिस्टर इस्तीफा (त्यागपत्र) देते हैं । मैं कहता हूं कि डिमोक्रेसी में तो कैबिनेट की जाइंट रिसपांसिबिलिटी (संयुक्त उत्तरदायित्व) है । इस रिसपांसिबिलिटी को उन को महसूस करना चाहिये, आड़े बक्त में लीडर को छोड़ कर नहीं जाना चाहिये । मैं किसी का नाम लेना नहीं चाहता लेकिन कृपलानी जी ने बताया कि उड़ीसा में भी इस मामले में एक मिनिस्टर शामिल थे । ऐसी हालत में पुलिस वाले क्या करें । पुलिस-वालों में देशभक्ति है और उन्होंने देश की रक्षा की, लेकिन जो कुछ गड़बड़ी हुई है उस के लिये पोलिटिकल लीडर (राजनैतिक नेता) जिम्मेदार हैं । सरकार को इन पोलिटिकल लीडरों पर निगाह रखनी चाहिये चाहे वे कांग्रेसमैन हों या गैर-कांग्रेसमैन हों । अगर वे लोप भारत की राष्ट्रीयता को गड़बड़ में डालते हैं तो उन के साथ सख्ती की जानी चाहिये । प्रजातन्त्र के माने यही हैं कि जो मैजोरिटी पार्टी (बहुसंख्यक दल) है वह हकूमत करे और माइनोरिटी पार्टी (अल्पसंख्यक दल) को इस चीज को मंजूर करना चाहिये, और मैजोरिटी पार्टी को भी अपनी जिम्मेदारी को पूरा करना चाहिये चाहे ऐसा करने में उसे कितनी ही तकलीफ हो । ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि मिनिस्टरों की गद्दी पर बैठ कर धाराम उठावें और आड़े बक्त में इस्तीफा देकर

चल दें । इस तरह की हरकत नहीं करनी चाहिये कि मजे तो खुद लें और मुसीबत के बक्त पंडित जी को झकेला छोड़ दें ।

मैं अपने भाई चटर्जी से और कम्युनिस्ट सदस्यों से कहूंगा कि यह एक नेशनल मामला है । चटर्जी साहब कहते हैं कि उन्होंने गुजरातियों और मराठों से बात कर ली है, अब उन को बुला कर एक सम्मेलन किया जाये और उनकी राय मालूम की जाये । मैं नहीं समझा कि अगर वे लोग रजामन्द थे तो चटर्जी साहब खुद ही क्यों नहीं एक कागज़ पर उन के दस्तखत करवा लाये । वे उस कागज़ को पंडित जी को दे देते । न मालूम उन लोगों से चुपचाप क्या कहा होगा । बाहर जा कर तो भ्रमण लगा आते हैं और यहां आकर कहते कि है जस्टिस होनी चाहिये । इस बक्त हमारे सामने देश को बनाने का सवाल है । सिग्विज्म का कोई सवाल नहीं है । हम को सेंसस (जनगणना) का हवाला दिया जाता है । मैं ने सेंसस की किताब को पढ़ा तो मालूम हुआ कि अगर यहां ७२० जवान हैं तो क्या ७२० सूबे बनेंगे । जब मैं ने पता लगाया तो देखा कि उन में से ७० जवानों तो ऐसी हैं कि जिन को सिर्फ एक ही भादमी बोलता है । न मालूम वह झकेले कैसे उस भाषा को बोलता होगा ! १५ जवानों ऐसी हैं जिन्हें १५ भादमी बोलते हैं, २२ जवानों ऐसी हैं जिन को चार भादमी बोलते हैं और ३३ जवानों ऐसी हैं जिन को सिर्फ दो भादमी बोलते हैं । शायद मियां-बीबी ही आपस में उस जवान को बोलते होंगे । तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस तरह की चार-पांच सौ जवानों हैं । ढाई सौ जवानों तो हैदराबाद में ही हैं और ढाई सौ जवानों मध्य प्रदेश में हैं । अगर किसी ने कह दिया कि मेरी जवान भादिवासी है तो वैसा ही दर्ज कर दिया गया । किसी ने कह दिया कि मेरी जवान अगरवाली है तो वैसा लिख दिया गया । अब आप देखें कि अगरवाली क्या जवान ही सकती है । सेंसस की किताब में इस तरह की जवानों दर्ज हैं जैसे अन्तारी, वराची

Mr. Chairman : If the hon. Member begins and just recites the names of all these languages, it will take at least 15 minutes.

श्री अर० डी० लिख : मैं ज्यादा नाम नहीं गिनाऊंगा । इस तरह की भाषायें लिखी हैं जैसे खोदी, कापड़ी, वास्नी, अहीरी बगैरह । मैं नहीं समझता कि क्यों सरकारी अफसरों ने जो बड़ी

[श्री आर० डी० मिश्र]

बड़ी तनख्वाहें पात हैं इस तरह के गलत कागज बना कर हनारे पास भेज दिये हैं। इन किताबों को ठीक रखा जाना चाहिये।

अब हमारे भाई मोरे साहब कहते हैं कि तीन करोड़ मराठे हैं। मैं नहीं कह सकता कि यह कहां तक ठीक है। क्योंकि इन सरकारी किताबों पर मुझे विश्वास नहीं है। कहने का मेरा मतलब यह है कि हमें भारत को मजबूत बनाना है और यही आज हमारी नीति है जिस की ओर राष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण में संकेत किया है। राष्ट्रपति ने कहा है कि हमारे जो प्राचीन आदर्श हैं उन के ऊपर हम को चलना चाहिये। यह भी हम क्या तमाशा देख रहे हैं कि लोग बोली के बिना स्टेट्स मांग रहे हैं और कह रहे हैं कि वह प्रान्त हमें मिलना चाहिये। मैं ऐसे लोगों को बतला देना चाहता हूं कि स्टेट्स की मांग बोली की बिना पर करना उचित नहीं है। उन को मालूम होना चाहिये कि हम ने ६०० रजवाड़ों को खत्म कर दिया, निजामशाही को खत्म कर दिया, जमीनदारी को हमने रहने नहीं दिया तब आप यह जो बोली की बिना पर प्रान्तों पर अपना दावा कायम कर रहे हैं, वह कहां ठहर सकता है। क्या कोई जमींदारी या जागीर बांटी जा रही है? इसलिये आज जो यह मांग उठाई जा रही है कि गुजरात हमारा है या महाराष्ट्र हमारा है, यह सब खत्म होना चाहिये और हमें भारत की एकता और उस की दृढ़ता को सब के ऊपर रखना चाहिये।

मैं आप से यह कह रहा था कि राष्ट्रपति ने यह कहा है कि हम इन समस्याओं को तभी सफलतापूर्वक हल कर सकते हैं जब हम ठंडे दिल से इन के बारे में सोचें। राष्ट्रपति ने हमें भारत के प्राचीन आदर्शों की याद दिलाई है और उन आदर्शों के सम्बन्ध में मैं ऋग्वेद के तीसरे मंडल का मन्त्र आप को सुनाता हूं :

य इमे रोदसी उभेऽहमिन्द्रम तुष्टवम् ।
विश्वामित्रस्य रक्षति ब्रह्मोदम् भारतं जनम् ॥

इस के अनुसार एक भारत वासी इन्द्र महाराज से जो कि भारत के वैदिक काल में राष्ट्रपति ये प्रार्थना करता था आज भी सौभाग्य से हमारे राष्ट्रपति का नाम इन्द्र पर है। उन का नाम राजेन्द्र है और जिन पर कि इन्द्र के समान सारे भारतवासियों की रक्षा का भार है उस को यह मंत्र सलाह देता है कि आप लड़ाई की तरफ न सोच कर शान्ति और समृद्धि के लिये कार्य

करो। यह मंत्र विश्व मित्रता की नीति पर चलने के लिये कहता है। इस मंत्र का अर्थ है "मुझे अपने राष्ट्रपति इन्द्र को विश्व मित्रता के ज्ञान से संतुष्ट करना चाहिये जो भारतके जनों की संसार में राष्ट्रीय और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दोनों क्षेत्रों में रक्षा करता है। यही हमारा प्राचीन आदर्श है। विश्वमित्रता अथवा शान्ति की नीति पर चलने से हमारे देश का कल्याण है। हमारा हिन्दी चीनी भाई भाई और हिन्दी रूसी भाई भाई का नारा तभी सार्थक होगा जब अपने घर में भी वही भाईपने का बताव रखें और भाई भाई की तरह मेल कर प्रेमपूर्वक रहें।

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty : After having heard the speech of the previous speaker, one is quite clear in one's mind as to why it is that the ruling party has made such a mess of things, as far as the States reorganisation is concerned. Coming as the hon. Member does from State like Uttar Pradesh, where even in daylight murders have been committed, and even MLA's are not allowed to go about unmolested, he has indulged in a homily about violence and non-violence and in a big tirade on the whole idea of linguistic States. I think it is time that such ridicule is stopped, and we try to find out the real causes for the serious situation which has developed.

In spite of the fact that we are on eve of the Second Five Year Plan, and it is time that we should evaluate what the First Five Year Plan has achieved and has not achieved—that is something which it will not be possible for me to go into within the limited time at my disposal—we have all talked largely about the States reorganisation problem. And a whole chorus of voices has been raised over the events that have taken place in Bombay and Orissa. From these events, we are asked to deduce that the reason for them is the cry for linguistic States.

I would like the Lok Sabha to consider the question in its proper perspective. In those places where linguistic States have been conceded, has there been any trouble? Has there been any trouble in Kerala? Has there been any trouble in Karnataka? Has there been any trouble after the formation of Andhradesh? That is what we have to consider. If there has not been trouble in those places, then where is it there

has been trouble? There has been trouble in those areas only, where linguistic States have not been conceded.

I should like to point out that it is the Congress High Command that has encouraged fissiparous tendencies. I, as a Bengali, could never understand why they encouraged people like Shri S. K. Patil to say that "We in the Bombay city cannot live with Maharashtrians". At the very time, I felt doubtful that perhaps this was the thin end of the wedge. Tomorrow, the *marwaris* who control the money bags in Calcutta will turn round and say: "We are not safe in Calcutta under Bengali administration, we want to be under Central Government, or we want to be in a bilingual State." That is what has happened.

I would like to tell my hon. friend from Bengal—I do not want to answer him in the terms in which he has answered Shri H. N. Mukherjee—who has said that we are given over to speaking lies and trying to mislead the Lok Sabha, this particular thing that certain vested interests have already raised the question of whether Calcutta should be a Centrally administered area or not. I would only like to say that this is the thin end of the wedge. I should like to draw his attention to a small pamphlet that has been written by one Prabhudayal Khaitan, coming from the *marwari* community and speaking on behalf of the *marwari* community, long before this entire question of States re-organisation came up. And what is it that he says? He says that after the passing of the official resolution in the West Bengal Legislature on 7th May 1953 on the basis of the linguistic principle, there comes before them the question of turning Calcutta into a separate State. I have no time to quote everything that he has said, but he goes on to say:

"If we have to accept the principle of linguistic States, then Calcutta has got to be a separate State. Its care has to be undertaken by the Central Government. Those Bengali agitators who are impatient about annexing contiguous areas to West Bengal cannot ignore these important arguments."

He further goes on to say :

"I have explained that the commercial community predominates in the city of Calcutta."—They are largely Hindi-speaking.—"In

September 1946, in my published statement, it was explained that in Calcutta, there is a large section of people whose welfare and protection cannot be afforded by Bengali administrators. The truth is that the viewpoint of the Bengalis is so narrow and constricted that it does not at all bother about the welfare of others. Their trust and faith in the principles of *Amar Sonar Bangal* (our golden Bengal) is unshakable."

He says that : "Our golden Bengal' is the unshakable ideal on which they put their trust and faith". Therefore, he appeals to the Prime Minister and the Rashtrapati :

"Therefore, to protect the interest of the commercial community, I earnestly appeal to the President of India and the jewel of the country, Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, that they should seriously consider this problem and immediately take such measures that Calcutta is formed into a welfare State, and its care remains in the hands of the Government of India. Through the fulfilment of this demand, the welfare of all will be achieved."

This is the thin end of the wedge. We are frightened about it, because we cannot understand why it is that the Gujarati community cannot live side by side with the Maharashtrians in a Maharashtra State, the *marwari* community and the other communities in the city of Calcutta can live in a Bengali State. That is a thing that we have not been able to understand. We could have understood if the Gujarati community had come forward before the country and said : "We are afraid of our minority rights, we want minority rights". If they had said that, then we would have been the first to support their claim, because we know that minority rights in the borders of the bilingual States have been protected by the Government of India. We know how then the Manbhumi agitation was going on, time and again, we went and the Lok Savak Sangh went to Pandit G. B. Pant and put before him various cases, but he said "I cannot do anything, it is for the State Government". This is what has happened in many other areas also.

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

That is why the question of the protection of minority rights is something that is very legitimate. Those rights ought to be guaranteed. And we of our party say that those rights are something that we must guarantee. And that is what we have done in the great *hartal* on 21st January. In the Lok Sabha, we talk so much of violence, civil war and so on. But not a person has got up and congratulated the people of Bengal on the perfectly peaceful way in which they agitated their demands on 21st January. In *The Statesman*, which is not very friendly to the Leftists, this is what we find. In the editorial on 22nd January 1955, we find :

"By the standard set for it, Saturday's *hartal* in Calcutta was a remarkable success...the unaccustomed calm of the city was something to marvel at. Though the State Government deprecated it...they prudently made no effort to interfere." :

That is the crux of the problem. They did not interfere and that was why there was peace. Whenever they interfere there is no peace. The movement can be considered as a challenge to them and the Centre.

"There is little doubt that the vigorous efforts of the *hartal's* organisers to prevent any outbreak were the chief cause of quiet."

✶ In my State we have one of the biggest non-Bengali proletariats to be found anywhere in the whole of India. We have a Bihari proletariat and only in one case there was trouble and we sat the whole night and protected the minority community. That was why we were able to keep peace. We know the value of minority rights. But, we cannot understand how the Government of India could have gone on encouraging fissiparous tendencies which were boosted by men like Shri S. K. Patil when he said : We Gujeratis cannot live side by side with Maharashtrians in the city of Bombay. Today, what is the alternative that is given before us ?

You talk about violence and non-violence. I say, we in Bengal have shown the way. But did we get one word of greetings from the Prime Minister for the non-violent way in which

we have protested ? It is only when there is police on the streets when the police strike down the people that people are driven to desperation and do such acts. After that exaggerated accounts are put before the people so that the rest of India may also be misled. That is why I feel that this question of violence and non-violence, all these things are there just to hoodwink the people and to mislead them.

I would like to say that many friends here have talked about the unity of India. We believe in the unity of India. When the Goa *satyagraha* was going on, the entire India rose as a man. Nobody thought in terms whether one was a Bengali or a Bihari, a Maharashtrian or came from the city of Bombay. When we think of our economic plans, when we were discussing these a few weeks ago, each of us coming from the various States in the Consultative Committee, we put before the Government and the Planning Commission our collective wisdom. We did not think in terms of Bengalis or Biharis. We believed in a Central Plan. But, today we hear unity is in danger. Has the Central Government abdicated its power ? Is there no Union Centre ? I do not understand how this question of the disunity of India comes. We try to ape the West; we try to think that only the type of unity there is in Great Britain and France ought to be the unity which must be the standard here. In India there has been a historic growth. In our Constitution there is the ideal of the Union of States. We have embodied in our Constitution that there are 14 great languages of India. In which country in the world have you this problem of integrating 14 well-developed cultures into one unity ? That is the problem. That is a thing for which there is no precedent in the world. That is our special contribution to unity in India. How are we going to integrate them ? Or are we going to steam-roller them into one ? In spite of unity, the essence of unity, do we not have diversity ? I am proud to be an Indian; I am proud to be a Bengali. When Bengal falls I feel that India is the poorer. It is the same with every State. That is why I feel that this merger movement which is being extolled, which is being put forward is an ideological counterblast to the demand for linguistic States. I think it is a reversal; it

is a sad reversal. Why is it? Certainly, if I was convinced that it stood for the unity of India, for the economic development of India or for the economic development of my region, I would welcome it. Let us see what it really means.

Before I proceed further, I should like to bring forward why we feel suspicious as to whether this merger proposal is going to be to the good of Bengal or Bihar or to the rest of India and specially to the unity of India. It has been stated that we have made certain false statements about Dr. Roy's statement in Calcutta. I put before the Lok Sabha an official West Bengal paper. I am very much surprised that hon. Shri Barman should have stated that we were not quoting the paper aright or that we were misleading the House. This is an official version of a press conference which appeared in every paper in the whole of West Bengal on the 24th January, 1956. Earlier there had been an ugly scene of a West Bengal Minister and West Bengal Congress demanding completely fantastic areas from Bihar and Bihar stating that they want certain portions of Jalpaiguri and certain other parts of Bengal—fantastic claims. In that background this is what Dr. Roy said. A question was put to him.

"Some people have given their opinions on this issue. Some leaders have said that this proposal will be suicidal for West Bengal."

He said that development would be easier if it is in one State—in the case of Ajoy Dam etc. Then another question was put.

"The main fear is about numerical superiority, the fear is about domination."

Mark, the word used is domination.

In answer to that he said:

"In human affairs it is the quality and not the quantity that counts. One man can dominate 100 men, provided he has the quality."

A question was put about Assam :

"What is happening today in Assam, because Bengalees are minorities there."

This was with reference to the Golpara incident.

Shri Barman (North Bengal—Reservé—Sch. Castes) : Will you kindly read the latter portion of the same?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty : Do you want me to read the entire thing. I think I will not have the time but I shall place it on the Table, [Placed in Library. See No. S—57/56.] and let the hon. Member and the Lok Sabha see it.

Dr. Roy's answer was:

"I know more about Assam than you do. In Assam, I blame the Bengalees for not asserting themselves. We were in minority in the old Senate. We were only 12 as against 88. But were we subordinated? We asserted and we won in every matter. It is the quality that counts and, as I said, the Bengalees who are in Assam, if they have suffered from any disabilities, it is because of their own sense of frustration and lack of confidence."

I do not want to deprecate anybody. I do not want to say that there is this idea of domination of Bengalees over Biharis. I have also read some of the discussions in the Bihar Assembly. I do not remember, the name—but an hon. member I specifically remember, said : What have we to fear ; we are 4 crores and the Bengalees are 2 crores. What does it show? It shows the same feeling. This will not bring about the unity; it will bring about more disunity ; it will lead to a great deal of danger.

I would also like to state what are the arguments that have been brought forward about this merger. It is said we will have economic development. I am in the Power and Irrigation Consultative Committee of Parliament. I believe it is said there that Inter-State River Boards will be up to make for better management of certain river projects for irrigation and power. I say, have we no central plans? But Dr. Roy says that there was some difficulty about the catchment area of the Ajoy River. If you argue on this basis, then the river Kosi starts in Nepal, and are we going to bring in Nepal into India? There are fantastic arguments. These are the beginning of *Lebens raum*, which brought so much danger to Germany. There is the question of mineral resources. If we are not able to properly explore the mineral resources of Bihar, then, I say that in the context of the unity of India, it is necessary that we should have nationalisation of

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

coal mines. The Centre must help and Centre should help all the States of India, entire India. The resources of coal and iron do not belong to Bengal or Bihar only. They apply to the whole of India. That is the national outlook with which I would like the Lok Sabha to consider this question.

Lastly, we talk about refugees. I am more closely associated with the refugees than many others in this House. I admit that the refugee problem is a national problem; it has to be tackled at a national level. It is the Union Government's responsibility to see that those who have come from East Pakistan and whose lives have been thwarted because of partition are looked after. It is the nation that has to look after them. Today you are going to send them to Mysore, Vindhya Pradesh and all sorts of places. Do you propose to bring all of them into this merger? These are problems that you have to consider. We are *Bhai Bhai*. Who says we are not *Bhai Bhai*? But, I believe that in keeping our identities we will be able to grow more and more united. What has been the progress of our development? What has been the direction of our development during the course of years when the British were here and we were lumped together and they were following the policy of divide and rule? At that time the Congress advocated linguistic provinces. But today my Congress friends say that we do not have any need to have linguistic provinces. To me it is a just the contrary. When the British were here, the idea of nationalism was not integrated with the idea of your own government. Today the idea of the Government is integrated with the idea of nationalism, the idea of a welfare State. That is why today we want these areas to develop in such a way that the people of the area become more and more integrated with the Government, they are able to understand what you are telling them, and they are able actually to participate in the same government. That is the idea of democracy; that is the idea of nationalism. That is why we say that this merger move cuts against the grain of the national movement, goes against the tenets of democracy. This is the idea that the people of the soil should participate in their own mother tongue in the State for the government of India. This is the idea of the linguistic States. How can you say that it goes against unity? It does not go against unity. It

is the unprincipledness which we have applied in the reorganisation of the States that has brought about so much trouble.

Again I say let us not force this type of merger, unprincipled merger. Take the question of jobs, what will happen? You will again apply double standards. At one time you will tell us that the question will be dealt with only on the basis of qualifications. If it is on the basis of qualifications, I can say that the Bengalis will gain. At another time you will say that it is on the basis of the reservation of seats or at least on the basis of the proportion of the population. In that way, certainly Bihar will gain. There will be friction between the two. We know what had happened before Pakistan was formed. We know the bitter experiences of Muslim League Politics—labour population. When I heard Shri Gidwani talking about the sorrows and about his experiences of partition let me tell him that the leading Muslim League paper *Azad* in Bengal says that they are the people who have welcomed this merger because by this they can tell the people of Pakistan that they must agree to the unitary constitution against which the people of Pakistan are fighting. Today Abdul Gaffar Khan is fighting against the Pakistan Government's decision; he is fighting against this principle itself. Today we have heard in the Lok Sabha impassioned speeches telling us that the only way to unity is to lump all Provinces together. I would only like to quote here what our great leader, Rabindranath Tagore, said :

"India has tried to bind together in close relationship even that which was varied and different. It is only possible to imbue with unity that which is different by recognising the difference and giving its distinctiveness full opportunity to develop and express itself with circumspect care. Just by passing an Act and declaring that all are one, unity is not achieved. To establish good relationship between those that are different, the way lies in giving them the right to independent development. If you force unity upon that which has distinctiveness, one day they must separate and at that time of separation that explosion will bring trouble, death and destruction."

That is why plead not for the putting off of the implementation of the S.R. C. Report but the application of principled linguistic redistribution of Provinces. Boundary disputes can easily be settled. Let us meet together, let us put our heads together and then the question of boundary disputes can easily be settled. It is the principled approach that is wanted, not the idea which many of my friends over here have advocated of talking from positions of strength. Talking from a position of strength in international affairs is a dangerous thing. So too here the idea of talking from positions of strength is dangerous. Let us not be forced into a position where again the disastrous things that had happened in Bombay will happen elsewhere. I feel that we are treading on very very dangerous ground. Unless we apply the principle of linguistic States which has been advocated by the Congress—and that is the direction in which our entire national movement and national growth have led us today—we cannot solve this problem satisfactorily. Let us apply that principle, and if we stick to that principle and not bring forward various unprincipled arguments in order to try and annex this territory or that, if we can try and give the right to the minority communities to live in peace and in safety and guarantee them their rights, I am sure that it is redistribution of the States on the basis of languages, on the basis of culture, which will weld together India into that unity which is our distinctive trait, the type of which has not been seen in the rest of the world.

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): I wish to say a few words touching some of the observations made by hon. Members in course of this debate. The Address delivered by the President contains some mention of our economic policy. It has some reference to the economic situation in the country, it has to something about the achievements of India in the course of period of the First Five Year Plan, and it also gives some indication of our programmes for the Second Five Year Plan period. On these subjects several hon. Members have expressed their viewpoints, asked questions and raised doubts. Some others have expressed deep appreciation of what has been done. I welcome this expression of opinion. My only regret is that enough has not been said about the

Plan; enough attention has not been given to the Plan. Other things have engrossed the minds of hon. Members and those things are very important, but I believe what we hope to do through our Plan will ultimately count for much more than all these things.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea): There will be a discussion on the Plan separately.

Shri Nanda: Regarding the question of a discussion on the Plan to which Acharyaji has drawn my attention, I wish to say that we were very keen that discussion should take place at a very early date. We hoped that this draft outline of the Second Five Year Plan which all Members have would come up for discussion soon. It appears that owing to exigencies of the business of the Lok Sabha, owing to several other pressing claims on the time of the Lok Sabha, it is not going to be possible to have this discussion soon. Of course, the Plan is going to be discussed in the Lok Sabha before it becomes a Plan, but by that time this draft might have developed into something bigger and the Plan as a whole will be discussed of course. But whatever advantage we can take of this opportunity of expression of opinion by hon. Members on various aspects of the Plan and its contents will certainly be useful to us in the process of making the draft Plan which will later on come up before the Lok Sabha. Therefore, it is not my intention to take up the time of the Sabha in expounding the Plan, and giving its implications, but certain points or certain observations which have been made ought to be clarified and I thought it was my duty to clarify those doubts and answer some of those questions. I am thinking of what Acharyaji stated on the subject. He said that there is an increase in the national income in this period. There is an increase in production. It may be so. But what about the masses; they do not appear to have derived much benefit from it and therefore, what is the use of this Plan to us? It is a very pertinent question. So far as figures go, this volume and the Address have given the barest facts and those facts have certain meanings. If agricultural production has increased by 15 per cent. and industrial production by 43 per cent. where have these gone? The common man is really very common and others, the very rich people, are not very many.

[Shri Nanda]

They are very few in numbers. Therefore, if actually we have produced more cloth, food etc., they have all certainly gone to the common man. It is not merely statistics; I do not depend upon statistics. We can look to the facts of life. What is the common, everyday experience of people?

As everyone knows, we were confronted with a serious food shortage. Everybody said "What are you doing if you are not able to get rid of dependence of foreign imports of food?" There was rationing; there were controls and restraints in every direction. Apart from any figures, therefore, one proof of the success of the Plan should be to ask: Have we got rid of those conditions? I hope we have. In those terms the answer is forthcoming. It is also in terms of the expenditure incurred in rural areas. Most of our people live in rural areas. What have we done for the rural areas? I find that in the course of the last four years, out of a total expenditure of Rs. 1318 crores, a sum of Rs. 623 crores was spent on agriculture, irrigation etc. Apart from that expenditure on roads and other social services is also in a certain proportion distributed over the rural areas too. The consumption of foodgrains in the course of the last four years had increased from 12.9 ounces to 14.9 ounces about two ounces more. With respect to cloth it has become 15 yards from 8.9 yards. These are basic things for the common man.

I can of course mention all that has been done in the matter of improving the drinking water supply in the rural areas, control of malaria and various other things but these are details. But the chief thing is that the direction of the expenditure has been and was intended to be very largely towards the common man during this period.

Still, I will be told that the common man suffers in so many ways today. True. That is not denied; we know it too well. It was never claimed that as a result of what we proposed to do in the five year period, we would have abolished poverty and brought economic sufficiency to the country. That was not the claim. That was not possible during this brief period. Whatever we set out to achieve in this period has very largely been achieved and that has been, to a fair extent, for the benefit of the common man, although the

common man still suffers as was said. In so many ways his wants have not been satisfied and his life is certainly below the standards which may be considered the minimum. That may all be true.

It is in the same context that Shri Asoka Mehta said that in this country, while production was increasing on the one side, there was stagnation in the other sector. That is also true. It is a vast country and the expansion on account of the Plan has certainly created a process of development and change which might not have yet extended to all parts of the country and to all sectors of the economy. Here again, the limitation is that we made a start after a long period during which India suffered cumulative results of negligence. We have made a start and I am sure we have made a good start. But if anybody points out the deficiencies, there they are; we know them.

Shri Asoka Mehta pointed out several shortcomings in the First Plan. What did he do? He took up this volume and read out from various paragraphs and chapters. That means that we are fully aware and fully conscious of these deficiencies and shortcomings and we do not look to others to know what those deficiencies are. We welcome any information which may help us in that way but we know them and we propose to remedy and remove those shortcomings and deficiencies.

In the same connection, Shri Asoka Mehta told us that there was legislation but implementation lags behind. It is true in certain cases and for that purpose it is quite certain that we have to do much more to strengthen our machinery of administration and to create new agencies of administration and new institutional arrangements have to be made in order to achieve those large objectives which we have set before ourselves, particularly in relation to the Second Plan.

The other question he asked was: "Is it only the ruling party which is interested in the success of the Plan?". No. A Plan of this size and magnitude, a Plan of this ambitious level is not a Plan for a single party; it is for everybody in the country. All parties and sections of the community should combine and co-operate to their utmost. Then alone it is possible to achieve the results which we anticipate in respect of the Second Plan.

Some other points were made by some hon. Members. The question of employment was stressed again and again. Unemployment in the country—we have not been able to do much to improve the position in that respect. I acknowledge the fact that unemployment has been a weak aspect of the economic situation in the country. We have been struggling to improve this as much as possible. There are certain priorities. In the case of the First Plan, the highest priority was, as I indicated before, to have sufficiency in food so that there was no starvation in the country and sufficiency of raw materials so that our factories might run to their full capacity. A good deal of expenditure during that period, therefore, was incurred in the rural areas, for irrigation schemes and things of that kind and also for the basic development *i.e.*, power, transport, etc. So far as this expenditure in the rural area is concerned, it will not emerge in figures in the course of the five year period. The estimate is that jobs to the extent of 4.5 million would have been created directly as a result of the programmes and the activities of the Plan. The creation of jobs in the tertiary sector, trade, etc., is not included in that figure. This has been done during this period. As I pointed out, a large part of the expenditure in rural area is not reflected in the figures of employment because there is no way of interpreting it in any precise terms.

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

More irrigation, more agricultural production—that is there. But we can only say that income has arisen in the rural areas and also the scope for employment. It may largely be in the form of reduction of under-employment. But that is also a matter of very great importance to this country because in this country—the problem of unemployment is there, of course, and to an extent in the urban areas the unemployment of educated persons—the much more serious problem is under-employment for very very large numbers. Therefore, whatever we attempt and whatever we achieve in regard to diminishing under-employment should not be minimized. It should be considered as an important development, as an important achievement made. So, in connection with the situation which we are facing now, it is true that we have not been able to solve the problem of unemployment in

the course of the First Five Year Plan period. Though it is difficult to make a precise estimate it appears that we were not able during this period to deal with, to provide employment for the entire labour force, the new labour force that arose in the course of these years. It looks like that.

Now, what was the remedy? We have been trying to explore, to discover all remedies that may be available to us for meeting the situation. The immediate remedy is to step up the level of investment to increase the scale of development because ultimately it is the level of investment and the tempo of development which will create increased employment. I am not unaware of the other fact that it is not simply the amount of money that we spend or invest that matters. It also depends on the character of that investment. It is quite possible that in heavy machine-building industries, large-scale mechanised industries, we may spend large amounts. 25,000 rupees may be required to give employment to one person. Therefore, having spent 4,800 crores of rupees also we may find that we are not very much better off in the matter of employment and we have still a difficult problem to face. Therefore it was necessary for us considering the conditions in this country, while we have to strengthen the basis of our economy, while we have to create conditions which will enable this country to move forward more rapidly later on, we have also to think of those people in the country who today are in that difficult and piteous situation. The remedy was to lay stress on cottage industries and the decentralised sector of our economy.

An Hon. Member: Ambar charkha.

Shri Nanda: And Ambar charkha. Very much more so. I shall explain that also. Therefore, what did we do? In the course of the First Five Year Plan period all the money that we could spend was just about 31 crores of rupees on cottage industries and village and small-scale industries. And now what do we propose to do? In the Second Five Year Plan period the proposed expenditure is over 200 crores of rupees. Now the Karve Committee Report, that is, the report of a Committee which was specially assigned the task of finding out what could be done in this direction, has made proposals totalling up to about 265 crores of rupees.

[Shri Nanda]

This 265 crores of rupees includes working capital. We are going to provide 200 crores of rupees just for normal expenditure, exclusive of working capital which may be more than Rs. 65 crores. What I am explaining is that in relation to the needs for dealing with the problem of unemployment the best that could be thought of now is being done, that is, through these various recommendations. And that is not all. We know that through these means about 8 million jobs will be created in the non-agricultural sector and, as I said, in the agricultural sector it is not possible to compute in any accurate manner, though we believe that with all the new irrigation and having a certain basis for computation another about two million people may also get full time employment in the rural areas also. So, on the whole, it will be possible in the course of these five years to just provide employment opportunities to the new entrants in the labour force. That is not enough. We are still thinking of other possibilities of finding more employment and I personally believe that the Ambar charkha does provide the helpful possibility. It holds out the promise of furnishing substantial new employment to large numbers of people in this country. This will be a very substantial addition to the figures of employment that we have given in this Plan. That is about employment.

Other things also arise. There is the question of land reform. An hon. Member, possibly it was Mr. Asoka Mehta, said that we have made very slow progress in the matter of land reform. The position of the agricultural labour, he said remains what it was. During the first three years of the First Five Year Plan I too was feeling very uncomfortable, conscious of things not moving rapidly enough. But I must say that during the last two years, the situation has improved a very good deal. I have got with me figures but I would rather let that information be shared with the hon. Members later on. Now in general terms I may state the position.

There are two major aspects of this question of land reform—security for the tenant and his share in the produce of the land. In both these matters, during the last two years particularly, advance has been made fairly rapidly and I can say that in many of the States now, over a larger part of the

country, security exists and steps have been taken in the case of the other States to improve the position of the tenant. There is some protection extended to him and temporary measures also have been taken; Ordinances have been issued so that pending a proper scrutiny into the problem—the tenants do not suffer harassment.

So far as the rents are concerned, I find that in about 40 per cent. of the area of the country rents have been reduced to one-fifth of the produce. In about 60 per cent.—that is, 14 States—it has been reduced to one-fourth of the produce. In another four States, which covers 10 per cent. of the area, the rent has been fixed at one-third. It is true that we have not attained a uniformly low level of rents in all parts of the country. But this advance is gratifying.

There are other aspects of land reforms. I do not propose to take up the time of the House now for those matters. Among other things which have been urged in the course of this discussion there was one matter on which one might like to speak at length. But I would like to resist that temptation. That matter concerns the question of the socialist pattern. An hon. Member, Acharya Kripalani said: you are talking of the socialist pattern and you say we have to wait for that till production increases, till wealth increases; then we can think of the distribution side. I think there was some misunderstanding on that point. He was basing his remarks on something which he thinks the President has said. I have gone through the text of the Address again, and I do not find any warrant for that kind of inference, namely, the aspect of equitable distribution of social justice is to wait till the country has become economically strong. That is not there. The President says:

5 P.M.

"We have a long way to go before we reach our objective of a socialist pattern of society and the national income has been raised to an adequate level and there is equal opportunity for all. But we are well set on the road to progress."

This is very clear and unambiguous. Regarding these three things we have a long way to go. That is true, but we are well set on the road to progress in

all these things. Maybe it is in different proportions and in different ways. I may make it clear that it will be certainly a misinterpretation of our aims and intentions even to entertain and harbour any kind of doubt on that score. To my mind, the priorities are, firstly, employment. Before anything else is done, everybody must be employed. What is Welfare State in this country to a person who has no employment? What is increase in the national income to a person who has no income at all? Therefore, employment comes first. Secondly, it should be production, because without increased production, there cannot be progress. After all, we do not want everybody to be equally poor. That is not the aim. We do not want to wait for making the lot of the large masses of people better before we have raised the national income to a certain preconceived level. That is not so. After all we want to raise standards and that has to come through increased production. The idea of social justice and equality has its place. We have to increase production and we have to go to the utter most in the matter of social justice. Every opportunity has to be made use of for that purpose and we should not wait except for the consideration that the idea of getting social justice and equal distribution should not come in the way of increase in production so that the very ultimate objective should not be defeated. That is all. But I have never maintained that true social justice and establishment of greater equality do in fact come in the way of production. We have to judge these proposals on merits, but, by and large, I think every effort to make greater equality in the country is going to release the energies and the initiative of large numbers of people in the country and will make for more production. That is my stand in regard to the question which was raised by Acharya Kripalani.

I learn—I was not present then—that the hon. Member Shri Tulsidas said something about the private sector and the public sector. That is an attack on the policy of Government from the opposite side. What does he say? He says socialism is all right, but you do not expand the public sector; do not have regulation; do not interfere with the private sector. That is another conception of socialism. It is true we are not wedded to any kind of dogmatic view about the socialist pattern. But certain ends have to be achieved. If

these ends could have been achieved through the endeavours and exertions of Members like my hon. friend Shri Tulsidas, possibly the situation today may not have arisen. But he believes firstly on the achievements of the private sector during this period. They say that the private sector has done very much better and the public sector has failed. In the first place, on facts, I do not admit that it is so. That public sector is getting on its feet. We are making a beginning and we are learning to do things and in a large part of that work we have succeeded and we have done fairly well, and we are going to do better and better. Even if we have failed in some ways, we are going to do better later on. That is our determination and I am absolutely sure that we are going to succeed in that. I have been very close to the private sector—on the labour side. I know all their doings and their failings. I know that although there are very good and capable people there, how much of the other things go on there. In the public sector, if a few rupees are wasted, somehow the whole world knows it, and knows it day after day. But there, in the private sector, lakhs of rupees may be misused, but it does not come to anybody's notice. All the same, it is public money. It may be in the hands of a private person. But it is the nation's resources which are being misused. So, I say there is nothing at all to fear about the public sector.

The hon. Member Shri Tulsidas made the other plea that there should be no regimentation. My conception of the socialist pattern is not a regulated, regimented, economic life of the country. I personally believe that regulation and regimentation should be kept down to the minimum. But still, freedom to me will not mean the freedom of a person to starve and remain unemployed. That is no freedom. Therefore, when freedom and regimentation are being contrasted, I am going to say that starvation is not there, that unemployment is not there, and if it could be achieved to the fullest extent, it should be on a basis of unregulated and unregulated and uncontrolled economy. Therefore, the essence of the socialist pattern in our mind is to develop the co-operative sector and to decentralise the big units, so that people could manage their own affairs in small-scale units. I am imagining that kind of co-operative structure in the country. Somebody mentioned it also, namely, why not manage

[Shri Nanda]
the factories on a co-operative basis. It is quite possible. It is being done in Sweden, I saw some of the very big factories there working on a co-operative basis.

Shri Syamnandan Sahaya (Muzaffarpur Central): In India also, there are the sugar mills and the ginning mills.

Shri Nanda: Yes; it is being done. More and more of it will be done. I am not really very happy about removing those few industrialists and putting in their place a few officers. I do not think that is really a very much better position. But we can devise ways where the people's participation even in big things would secure a good result. There should be the delegation and distribution of not only wealth but also of responsibility for the management and administration of the economy of the country.

I have dealt with some of the principal things which arose in the course of the debate and, as Acharya Kripalani pointed out, there are going to be further opportunities for a very close discussion of the Second Five Year Plan. So, I shall not take up any more time of the House.

Shri Kamath: The opening week of this session has cast a lengthening shadow of gloom and sorrow over this House. We have lost two of our great colleagues; the Speaker is reported to be seriously ill, and let us hope and pray that he will recover soon. It has cast here sorrow and gloom. Outside, the atmosphere is ominous. The atmosphere is more surcharged with base passions than at any time since 1947. If we do not control this state of affairs, I am afraid there will be a blaze up, a flare in 1957, the centenary year of 1857.

There is profound indignation in Bombay and Maharashtra. There is grave discontent in Tamilnad. There is volcanic unrest in Orissa. There is towering rage in Bengal. There is explosive irritation in the Punjab. There is peace of the grave in Goa and in Jammu and Kashmir, that problem State, the lights of civil liberty and fundamental human rights are being slowly extinguished. Taking first Jammu and Kashmir, one of our colleagues here, Sofi Mohd. Akbar, was arrested and detained when he was on his way to attend this session of Parliament. I am told he was beaten before

he was arrested under the Preventive Detention Act. He has been detained under a harsh Act. It is almost a lawless law that a citizen can be detained for 5 years without the grounds being supplied to him. In a recent case, the Supreme Court commented upon this, and they said it was not within their power to do anything in the matter. It is all because of lack of integration of Kashmir State with India that this sort of regime has been established in Kashmir. We want that the provisions of the Indian Constitution relating to the Supreme Court, Auditor General, Public Service Commission, Scheduled Castes, Backward Classes etc., be extended to the Jammu and Kashmir State forthwith and elections to the State Assembly and Parliament held under the supervision and control of the Election Commission of India at the earliest opportunity. The failure to apply the constitutional provisions and especially the authority of the Supreme Court has given a handle to the State Government to deprive the people of their fundamental rights and civil liberties with impunity.

Recently municipal elections were held in Srinagar. In Kashmir the elections were held in midwinter, on the 21st of January; and in Jammu they will be held in mid-summer, on the 15th or 16th April. It should have been in the reverse way. The elections should be held in Jammu in January and in Srinagar in April. That would have been more reasonable, but deliberately the elections were held like this. The municipal elections were held after 18 years and they were held in this manner. The Act provided for 45 Members for the Srinagar Municipality; but, it has been recently amended and there is provision for only 15 Members in the Srinagar Municipality for a population of nearly 2 lakhs. In Jammu also, the same number of 15 is provided for, though it has only a population of 80,000. Many of the voters—there were woman among them—were prevented from going to the polling booths and were even beaten up. Beating has become such a common feature in Jammu and Kashmir. We have not forgotten how our colleague, Shri Asoka Metha, was assaulted in Srinagar last year. I am told there are 7 bridges and 7 *Bakshis* in Srinagar. One *Bakshi* is, of course, the Prime Minister. He is really the Chief Minister, but he is wrongly dubbed as Prime Minister. There cannot be two Prime Ministers in one and the same country. India is the

only country which has the unique distinction of having two Prime Ministers; there is no other country in the world with two Prime Ministers. There is another Bakshi in charge of the Peace Brigade. The third Bakshi is in charge of "big business" in Jammu and Kashmir, and the fourth one is going to be the Municipal President in Srinagar. Unless Parliament intervenes in the affairs of Jammu and Kashmir, I am afraid it will grow from bad to worse in that State. It will become more and more difficult for that State to be completely integrated with the rest of India.

I referred to the peace of the grave in Goa. The Goa liberation movement has been completely sabotaged by the Government, whose apathy and indifference have become supreme. I will recall what happened in the last session. When Portugal was about to celebrate the Portuguese conquest of Macao 400 years ago, the Chinese Premier Chou En-lai protested against it through the British Governor at Hong Kong. But, in respect of Goa, our Prime Minister said, "We cannot do anything about it, because we have no relations with Portugal." China has no relations with Portugal, but still China protested against it with success. But here the Prime Minister did not even protest against the celebrations. Yesterday we heard the Parliamentary Secretary say that the Egyptian Embassy official was denied access to the prisoners in Goa on the ground that they were not Indian nationals. But, do we accept this position? If we accept it, it would mean that Goa is a part of Portugal. We accept that Goa is not part of India which is the Dulles Cunha thesis. That is what we do; otherwise, we would have protested against the Portuguese authorities refusing permission to the Egyptian Embassy official to see the prisoners in Goa, and we would not be sitting quiet like this doing nothing about the matter. I will have to say more about it when the foreign policy debate comes up. I am racing against time, and I do not want to dilate on any one particular matter.

The worst aspect of the political picture in the country today is that democratic traditions are not being promoted; their growth are deliberately hampered. While we are running after global glamour, we forget that our home fires are becoming dimmer and dimmer. The Prime Minister has been

a very good salesman of Panch Shila in the world market and many countries have subscribed to it. One of the biggest countries, U.S.S.R. also accepted the Panch Shila recently, but through the Communist Party Congress held at Moscow a few days ago, the U.S.S.R. declared first that the Cominform would continue to function and secondly that their aim was to make communism a world system. Do they really accept co-existence? Co-existence postulates and presumes that there are disparate political, social and economic systems. Definitely co-existence presumes that proposition. How can they subscribe to it and also say that their aim is to make communism a world system? I suppose they have gone back to the Trotsky thesis, after repudiating Stalin. Therefore, we should take all these professions of Panch Shila by other nations with more than a grain of salt. I do not know how far our Government has been taken in by the various declarations of certain countries regarding Panch Shila. I hope the Prime Minister will take a lesson from what happened at the recent Party Congress in Russia. The one-man cult is developing in this country and we should take a lesson from what has happened and is happening in Russia. In his megalomania, at Amritsar recently, to the Prime Minister, what his own party did was a good enough thing, but when some other party did it, it became a "tamasha". If it is his party, it titillates him, but if it is any other party, it irritates him. That is very unfortunate and that is a danger signal. We are straying from the democratic path. In live issues like Goa and States Reorganisation other parties have not been taken into confidence, and they have not been consulted. In passing, I may refer to another matter. In those democratic countries which we know, a Minister against whom there is even suspicion of some scandal, resigns. Here, not only has no Minister resigned, but the jeep and allied scandals have given birth to a new Minister, a roving Minister without portfolio who flies from China to Chicago in search of peace and promotion of Panch Shila. I wish that this roving Minister or some other colleague or the Prime Minister himself had gone to Bombay or Orissa last month. The Prime Minister, instead of yesterday, should have gone to Bombay last month and tried to bring about peace and harmony in Bombay. He went yesterday which was not at all very necessary. He had

[Shri Kamath]

gone to see some tamasha. If he had visited Bombay and Orissa last month, he would have served a national purpose.

On this States Reorganisation issue, I am not personally much excited. Permit me to strike a personal note. I have no pride, or prejudice or passion on this linguistic issue. My mother tongue is Konkani; I learnt Kannada at school. I know Marathi. I have been elected from a Hindi constituency. I feel equally at home in any part of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member read at Madras and knows Tamil also.

Shri Kamath: Very little. All languages are equally dear. But I would be failing in my duty to my colleagues in the Lok Sabha and thousands of comrades outside if I do not state what the stand of the party to which I have the honour to belong, the Praja Socialist Party, is.

First of all, permit me to say that the way in which the ruling party has gone about this matter has really been responsible for all the tragedy in Orissa, Bombay and in the rest of India. They have made a mess of the whole matter. Right from the day when, before the report was out the Prime Minister and the Home Minister, I believe, declared at some public meeting or press meeting or in some other connection that the unanimous recommendations of the Commission will be accepted by the Government, to the latest newfangled, escapist, diversionary proposals for these mergers of States, there has been no consistency. It has been vacillation *in excelsis*. The Prime Minister in his first broadcast in October said that he was surprised at some of the recommendations. In his broadcast of the 16th January, he invoked the Blessings of the Buddha, and said that that was an irrevocable plan as if the Government had any power under the Constitution to take final decisions in this matter at all. It is completely unconstitutional and *ultra vires* of the Constitution that the Prime Minister should have broadcast as decisions of Government the proposals of this four-man committee, two Pandits, one Maulana and a Dhebar.* These four people arrogated to themselves not merely the powers of the Government, but also of Parliament. I understand that

these conclusions were broadcast without even a formal meeting of the cabinet, and were palmed off as decisions of the Government. Therefore I say that these decisions so-called, which are really proposals, are *ultra vires* of the Constitution.

This has been bedevilled,—I am referring to the States Reorganisation proposals—by an original evil, an omen in the sky. The Constitution Amendment Bill to expedite reorganisation, was taken up when there was a lunar eclipse. I do not want you to take it very seriously, but to just note it. Secondly, the States Reorganisation debate commenced when there was a solar eclipse. The shadows of these two eclipses have been cast on the entire matter. Whatever may be the other reasons these too may have had little effect. From Bombay and Orissa I have got reliable documents to show that it was the police who prevented and then provoked peaceful demonstrations and processions in the streets. If the streets are not meant for peaceful processions, what are they for? Are they for the Ministers to drive along in their limousines, the traffic being stopped, or held up? If the streets could not be used for peaceful processions in a democratic set up, democracy would go to the wall. You make a mockery of democracy if you prevent the people from taking out peaceful processions. It is the police who used tear gas and provoked the people and used the lathi and the bullet. The Prime Minister invoked the blessings of the Buddha. Perhaps, Buddha did not bless. It is the fashion to invoke the name of the Buddha and of Gandhi time and again. It is like the old Hindi saying, adapting it, in all humility, I may say—

मुह में बुद्ध बगलमें बुलेट
मुह में गांधी बगलमें लाठी

Here, the Prime Minister has written a very lengthy Foreward to a book by Professor Dinkar. The book is entitled, *Sanskriti ke Char Adhyaya*. Here he says something which is very opposite in this context.

"It is extraordinary how our professions run counter to our practice. We talk of peace and non-violence and function in a different way. We talk of tolerance and

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

construe it to mean our way of thinking only and are intolerant of other ways. We proclaim our ideal of a *shhitaprajna* but we act on a far lower plane and a growing indiscipline degrades us as individuals and as a community."

And he goes on to say that we shall continue to suffer from this split personality if we do not reform ourselves. Here Buddha's name was invoked, and even the President's Address ends on this Buddha note, but the number of firings resorted to by the police in Bombay has beaten the blackest record of British imperialism—one hundred firings in one day.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda) : 114.

Shri Kamath : And on the morning before the Prime Minister's broadcast, not after but before the broadcast was made, 600 persons were arrested in Bombay City. In Orissa where our colleagues Shri Sarangadhar Das and Shri Deo were arrested, people were taking out a peaceful procession. First of all, Congressmen including the Chief Minister egged on the people to stage this demonstration. The wife of the Congress Chief Minister of Orissa has described the police firing as thoughtless and pitiless. And after our colleagues here Shri Sarangadhar Das and Shri Deo, were detained they filed a petition in the High Court. The High Court gave Government time to frame charges against them. It was only when the Orissa Government said they had no charges against them, that they were released. And this state of things is going on.

I would conclude now in one or two minutes, unless you let me continue tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He has already had 20 minutes.

Shri Kamath : No, Sir. Fifteen.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : I am noting down the time. The hon. Member started at 5-10.

Shri Kamath : 5-15. Other colleagues have taken half an hour.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He has already taken 20 minutes. Let him take two minutes more.

Shri Kamath : I have the greatest respect for my leader Acharya Kripalani and my able colleague Shri Asoka Mehta. While I hold the view that nothing would be lost if we postpone the question of States reorganisation, yet, if the question is taken up, our party stands for reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis subject to considerations of viability, economic development and administrative efficiency. Our party also stands for the creation of Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital. As regards the Punjab, our party stands for the creation of three States, Punjabi-speaking, Hindi-speaking and a separate Himachal Pradesh, with a common Governor, a common High Court, a common Public Service Commission and a common cadre of services. And we have suggested that so far as the boundary disputes are concerned, the most effective, the most popular and the most acceptable solution would be to hold a plebiscite in the areas concerned. Do not arrogate to yourself the right, whether it is the four-man committee or the Congress Party, to decide it. Let the people decide it in a democratic manner as to where they want to go.

I would conclude on this note, that parliamentary democracy is in peril. The ruling party is putting party above country. The party is putting itself not merely above the country, but it is putting itself above Parliament. Parliament session was originally scheduled, I understand, for the 1st February because it was going to be a long session but because there was a session of the Congress, that *tamasha* in Shaheednagar, they postponed it to the 15th February after the Congress session.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Parliament started on the 15th.

Shri Kamath : Originally it was scheduled for the 1st February, a tentative decision had been taken.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam) : Was there any such schedule? Where?

Shri Kamath : I will not mention names here, but that is my information. The Congress session was originally to be held in January. Then floods came in the Punjab and therefore it was postponed to February. Therefore, Parliament was also postponed. The party is thus taking precedence over country