[Shri Nanda]

voicing the feeling that this interruption of work and the incidents connected with it could very well have been avoided. The prime need of the country is production and the last thing that we can afford is stoppages of work, which result not merely in unnecessary loss to the undertaking and to the community but cause serious hardship for the workers. Government itself has provided machinery for conciliation and for adjudication and the fullest use should be made of this machinery before workers take recourse to a strike. I have been a trade unionist myself and I would be the last person to deny the workers' right to strike but this is a right which should be exercised only after every other avenue has been exhausted. Otherwise the workers themselves may suffer. They will run the risk of losing the goodwill and support of the community at large and will make the task of mediators more difficult. It will of course be my very earnest endeavour to see that every possible facility is extended to the workers for obtaining expeditious redress of their grievances and settlement of disputes. The interests of the community as well as of the workers require, however, that direct action, which bypasses the machinery provided for the purpose, should be discouraged and those who, neglecting to avail themselves of the facilities, resort to such action, should not be treated on a par with others.

I have said that recourse should be had to the formal machinery provided by Government but even more important than the use of such formal machinery, in my judgment, is the attitude which needs to be developed on all sides that disputes should be settled by direct negotiation. To such direct negotiation both sides should bring an attitude of patience and of reasonableness. If, after full and patient discussion, a dispute cannot be solved, then I would ask that recourse be had to voluntary arbitration avoiding both a trial of strength and too much dependence on official machinery. We have recently amended the Industrial Disputes Act to help settlement by arbitration. The new Section 10(A) of the Act provides that if the parties agree, they may, by written agreement, refer a dispute to an arbitrator and the award of the arbitrator would then be legally binding. I hope this procedure will be developed to the fullest extent and I myself would be prepared to assist by making available to both parties names of panels of arbitrators who would be readily available and from whom choice could be made by the parties without too much fuss or friction.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will resume further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Thirumal Rao and seconded by Shri M. P. Mishra on the 14th May, 1957, namely:

> "That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 13th May, 1957."

We have spent two days over this and the whole of today will be set apart. I understand the hon. Prime Minister wishes to reply to the debate and he will do so tomorrow.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I shall not be here tomorrow and so the hon. Home Minister will reply. But, if you wish, I can speak now.

Mr. Speaker: I have no objection. I was informed by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that the Prime Minister would reply to this debate.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He has misunderstood.

Shri Goray (Poona): Yesterday, while moving my amendments, by

oversight, I failed to mention the number of an amendment. Will you kindly allow me to move it now?

Mr. Speaker: It will be treated as moved.

Shri Goray: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that no reference to Goa has been made in the Address."

Shri Supakar (Sambalpur): May I know whether there will bo any further discussion after the Prime Minister's reply or whether it will be over?

Mr. Speaker: No. The hon. Prime Minister is only intervening and the discussion will go on for the whole of this day.

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : अध्यक्ष महोदय,..

Some hon. Members: In English.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the House so wishes I shall add something in English also. I am not making any novel declaration; anyhow, if you, Sir, will permit me I shall speak a few words later in English.

इस बहस में, जो दो दिन से यहां हो रही है, बहुत सारे पुराने महारथी—और कुछ नए भी—बोले हैं, और मुझे खुशी हुई यह देख कर और सुन कर कि तरह तरह के विचार और ख्यालात पेश किए गए। आचार्य कृपालानी जी ने हल्के-मामूल चारों तरफ़ तीर कमान चलाए। हमारे दोस्त, ब्रजेश्वर प्रसाद जी, ने अपने पुराने बम के गोले जरा इधर उधर फेंके। और हमारे विरोधी दल के एक नए नेता जी बोले, उनके हथियार मुझे जरा कुछ बाजारू मालूम हुए। मालूम होता था कि अभी तक इलैक्शन की हवा उन के दिमाग़ से कुछ पूरी तौर से नहीं हटी है और उन का विचार मालूम होता था कि यह लोक-सभा भी कोई इलैक्शन की मीटिंग है। एक और रत्न आए हैं हमारी सभा में, जो कि हमें पुराने जमाने में ले गए—एक राजा साहब, जो उस पर तशरीफ़ रखते हैं—और वह पुराने

महसूस नहीं किया है कि हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हो गया है। बल्कि उन्होंने यहां तक कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान आजाद नहीं है और वह एक टूल है अंगरेजों का, अंगरेजी हकूमत का। अब ऐसे ख्यालात की निस्बत मेरा कुछ कहना जरा दुश्वार है, क्योंकि जो दिमाग पुरानी दलदल में इतना फंसा हुआ है, उस को वहां से निकालना मेरी कुव्वत से बाहर है। हमें आजकल की दुनिया को देखना है, न कि पुराने सबक रटना है और पुराने नारे दोहराना है। आज का जमाना नया है—हिन्दुस्तान में भी और उस के बाहर भी। जो दुनिया आज से बीस, तीस या चालीस साल पहले थी, वह खत्म हो गई है। यह इतिहास में लिखा है, जो पढ़ना चाहें, वे उस को पढ़ें। इस लोक-सभा का काम है—जिम्मेदारी है—हिन्दुस्तान की आज-कल की हुकूमत और कल के हिन्दुस्तान का बनाना और इन्तजाम करना।

हमारे राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में चन्द बातों का जिक्र है। लोग शिकायत करते हैं कि उस में बाज बातों का जिक्र नहीं है, मसलन गोआ का जिक्र नहीं है, या किसी और मसले का जिक्र नहीं है। यह सही है और यह सही एतराज है, लेकिन उसी के साथ राष्ट्रपति का भाषण कोई सवालों की एक फ़ेहरिस्त नहीं होता है। आप ने देखा कि उस में खाने-पीने की चीजों के मुताल्लिक, गल्ले के सिलसिले में खास तौर से ध्यान दिलाया गया है—और शायद वह भाषण का सब से बड़ा हिस्सा है—, क्योंकि वह हमारे लिए एक अहम सवाल है। इन दो दिनों में जितने लोग यहां बोले हैं, उन का भी ध्यान इधर काफ़ी गया है, क्योंकि वह एक बुनियादी सवाल है। राष्ट्रपति जी ने भी उस के बारे में कहा है और वाकयात रखे हैं।

आचार्य कृपालानी जी ने कहा कि राष्ट्रपति का भाषण बहुत जाब्ते का है। यह तो सही बात है कि वह जाब्ते का है और मेरा ख्याल था कि राष्ट्रपति का भाषण जाब्ते का होना चाहिए। जैसे यहां के कोई सदस्य—या मैं—

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

कभी इधर उधर बहक जाय, यह मुनासिब नहीं है कि राष्ट्रपति भी उस तरह बहकें। लोक-सभा यह भी जानती है कि राष्ट्रपति का भाषण कोई उन का जाती नहीं होता है, हालांकि वह उनके शुभ मुख से कहा जाता है। वह गवर्नमेंट की तरफ़ से तैयार होता है।

एक बात और हुई, जिससे मुझे कुछ तकलीफ़ हुई। श्री डांगे ने राष्ट्रपति के भाषण के बारे में कहा कि वह कुछ प्रान्तीयता में फंस गए। पैरोकियल हो गए हैं इसलिए कि उन्होंने बिहार तथा उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों का जिक्र किया है और बाकी हिन्दुस्तान को वह भूल गए हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि यह जो बात उन्होंने कही है, एक नामुनासिब बात कही है और महज़ नामुनासिब ही नहीं बल्कि वाकात से भी दूर की यह बात है। जो बात राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में कही गई है वह सीधी सी बात है और वह यह है कि इन दो जगहों में नुकसान ज्यादा हुआ है और इनमें कोई सन्देह भी नहीं है कि हुआ भी है। इसका यह मतलब नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे हिस्सों में, अक्सर हिस्सों में दिक्कतें नहीं हैं। वे तो हैं ही। तो सब से अव्वल सवाल जो इस वक्त हमारे सामने है वह गल्ले वगैरह की पैदावार का है और लोगों को गल्ला पहुंचाने का है। मैं इस बारे में अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता क्योंकि मेरे साथी जो कि फूड एंड एग्रिकलचर मिनिस्टर हैं, वह आप से काफ़ी कुछ इस सम्बन्ध में कहेंगे। लेकिन एक बात जाहिर है जोकि राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण से भी जाहिर है कि यह सवाल बहुत अहमियत रखता है। इस बात की अहमियत केवल इस वक्त के लिए नहीं है—वह तो है ही—लेकिन आइंदा के लिए भी यह बहुत बड़ी अहमियत रखता है। हमारी आइंदा की तरक्की का दारोमदार इसी पर निर्भर करता है कि हम खेती के जरिये हिन्दुस्तान में क्या पैदा करते हैं और कितना पैदा करते हैं। तो जहां तक इस सवाल की अहमियत का सम्बन्ध है, उसकी अहमियत में कोई शक वाली बात नहीं है। अब क्यों के दिक्कतें पेश आई इसका जवाब मैं यकायक नहीं दे सकता। मैं इस से इन्कार नहीं करता कि कहीं किसी की लापरवाही नहीं हुई है या गलती नहीं हुई है, हो सकता है कि हुई हो। लेकिन यह सवाल ज्यादातर हमारा ही नहीं है। इधर उधर की हकूमतों का भी है। लेकिन एक बात की तरफ मैं आपका और ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। हिन्दुस्तान अकेला मुल्क ही नहीं है जो स वक्त इस साल—पहले सालों को छोड़ दीजिये उस वक्त भी दिक्कतें आई होंगी—इस दिक्कत में पड़ा है। हमारा पड़ौसी मुल्क चीन है। वह एक बहुत बड़ा मुल्क है और यकीनन वहां का इंतिजाम बहुत अच्छा है। वह भी काफ़ी परेशानी में पड़ा हुआ है इसी सवाल के बारे में और इसी वक्त। हमारे विरोधी दल के भाई यह तो नहीं कहेंगे कि वहां इंतिजाम में कोई खलल है, वहां का इंतिजाम तो बहुत ही माकूल है। लेकिन वह भी इसी मामले में इसी परेशानी में फंसा हुआ है क्योंकि ये बातें पूरे तौर से काबू में नहीं हैं। माना हम से कोई गलती हुई हो, हमें अपने आप को सम्भालना चाहिए और मैं पसन्द करूंगा कि यहां के माननीय सदस्य हमें बतायें कि क्या गलती हुई और क्या नहीं हुई। हम उन से मश्विरा करें और उनके मश्विरे से जहां सम्भल सकते हैं सम्भलें। लेकिन यह मोटी बातें समझने की है कि यह बात ऐसी नहीं है कि सौलहों आने काबू में है इस वक्त मैं उम्मीद करता हूं कि आइंदा होती जाएगी। चीन भी एक ऐसा ही मुल्क है जिस का दारोमदार बहुत कुछ खेती पर है। खेती की पैदावार का दारोमदार बारिश होने पर या कोई दूसरी मुसीबत न होने पर होता है। यह बात हो सकती है कि हम अपनी नहरों को बढ़ायें और इस तरह से इसको काबू में लायें। हम तजारत को बढ़ा कर उसको काबू में ला सकते हैं और हमें चाहिए कि हम उन्हें करें। लेकिन कोई जादू मेरे पास नहीं है जिस से यह सब सवाल हल हो जाए। आप जानते ही हैं कि

पीछे बिहार में मुसीबत आई, दिल्ली के पास आई और यहां की सारी फसल की फसल खराब हो गई इन ओलों के गिरने से। मैं नहीं चाहता कि मैं किसी चीज पर परदा डालूं। कोई अगर गलती हुई है या गफलत हुई है तो उस पर हमें गौर करना चाहिए और आपका पूरा हक है कि हमें आप उस गलती को बतायें और हमारा यह फर्ज है कि हम उससे फायदा उठायें। आखिर जो काम हमारे सामने है वह किसी दल विशेष का तो नहीं है और न ही विरोधी दल वालों का है। हमें सब को हिन्दुस्तान के बड़े सवालों को हल करना है और उसके लिए मैं आप से दरख्वास्त करूंगा, प्रार्थना करूंगा, कि आप टीका टिप्पणी तो अवश्य करें लेकिन उन सवालों को हल करने के लिए हम से मिल कर कोशिश करें।

मैंने आप के सामने चीन की मिसाल दी है। मैं और मिसालें भी आपको दे सकता हूं जहां पर इसी मामले की वजह से और पैदावार कम होने की वजह से बड़ी मुसीबत पेश आई है। पूर्वी यूरोप के देश हैं, साम्यवादी देश हैं, काफी मुसीबत में हैं और पूरे तौर से कोशिश कर रहे हैं इसमें से निकलने की लेकिन फंसे हैं और बुरे फंसे हैं। पिछले वर्ष और अब हल्के हल्के उसको समाप्त करने की कोशिश होती है। आप को सुन कर आश्चर्य होगा कि पूर्वीय यूरोप के देशों में एक बड़े साम्यवादी देश में जब ७, ८ महीने या साल भर हुए मुसीबत आई तो वहां उनको सलाह दी गई और उन के बड़े आदमियों ने अर्थ शास्त्र के जो आचार्य हैं, उन्होंने सलाह दी कि तुम हिन्दुस्तान की नकल करो, तुम हिन्दुस्तान की पंचवर्षीय योजना को देखो कि वह क्या कर रहा है। इस के कहने से मेरा मतलब यह नहीं है कि मैं कोई जवाब दे रहा हूं उन गलतियों का जो कि हम से हुई हों। मैं तो आप को वह तस्वीर दिखा रहा हूं, अब आप उस तस्वीर की एक एक बात को पकड़ लें और नुक्ताचीनी करें, वह तो ठीक है लेकिन हमें जरा पूरी तस्वीर को भी देखना होता है। आखिर में हिन्दुस्तान के सामने और एशिया के जो और मुल्क हैं उन के सामने क्या सवाल है? उन सब के सामने एक जबर्दस्त सवाल है कि मुल्क जो कि एक गरीबी के दलदल में फंसा हुआ है उस को उस दलदल में से निकालना है। अब एक मुल्क जिसमें कि बेशुमार आदमी रहते हों, कोई जरिया नहीं है और मुझे इल्म नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तान में या कहीं और यह बातें जल्दी से तेजी से या जादू से हो जायं। कितने ही आप क्रान्तिकारी तरीके करें, फिर भी समय लगता है क्योंकि आखिर में गरीबी के दलदल से बाहर हम तभी निकल सकते हैं जब कि देश में दौलत पैदा हो।

मेरे एक विरोधी पक्ष के भाई ने कहा कि समाजवाद महज कुछ नारों या बयानों से आने वाला नहीं है। मैं उन से पूरा इत्तिफाक करता हूं कि समाजवाद महज नारों या बयानों का नहीं है और मैं चाहता हूं कि वह भी इस बात को याद रक्खें कि नहीं है। हमें तो ऐसी एक बड़ी इमारत को नीचे से बनाना है, करोड़ों घरों से बनाना है और उठाना है, दिमागों को बनाना है और अपने समाज के संगठन को बदलना है और दूसरी हजारों बातें करनी हैं। ज्यों ज्यों हमारे देश में ज्यादा धन धान्य पैदा करने की शक्ति आती जाय, उस से हम लाभ उठायें और उस का फिर ठीक से बंटवारा हो। वह हमारे भाई बंटवारा कर के समाजवाद को लाना चाहते हैं लेकिन यह बंटवारा किस चीज का किया जाये? मालूम नहीं किस चीज का वह बंटवारा करना चाहते हैं? क्या वह देश की गरीबी का बंटवारा कर के यहां पर समाजवाद लायेंगे?

उन भाई ने हिन्दुस्तान की खराब हालत दिखाने के लिए बतलाया कि यहां पर आये दिन खोमचे वाले, मूंगफली वाले और रिक्शा-वाले बढ़ते जाते हैं। अब यह खोमचे वालों का बढ़ना या रिक्शेवालों का बढ़ना, इस से यह नतीजा निकालना कि हिन्दुस्तान की कैसी खराब हालत है, मैं तो समझ नहीं सका, उधर की तरफ कोई नई बात हो तो हो लेकिन यहां तो

[श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू]

यह खोंमचे वाले और रिक्शेवाले बाइज्जत लोग हैं ।

मैं चाहता हूं कि आप इन सवालों को जो चाहे वे हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर के हों या हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर के हों, उन को एक पूरी तस्वीर को सामने रख कर देखने की कोशिश करें, फिर अलग अलग देखें । मैं इस से इंकार नहीं करता कि हजारों गलतियां हुई हैं और गलतियों और खराबियों से सारा हमारा मुल्क भरा पड़ा है । मैं इस मौके पर खुराक और खाने की बाबत ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन मैं उसकी अहमियत को पूरी तौर से महसूस करता हूं और हमारे राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने भी उसको बहुत ज्यादा अहमियत दी है । उस सिलसिले में एक दिक्कत अक्सर हमारे सामने पेश आती है और वह दिक्कत यह है कि हमारे देश में बहुत सारे प्रदेश हैं और प्रदेशों की परस्पर नीति में कुछ न कुछ फर्क रहता है और वह एक जैसी नहीं होती और जिसकी कि वजह से दिक्कत पैदा हो जाती है । हमें कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि प्लानिंग कमिशन के द्वारा और अन्य जरियों से हम इस सवाल के ऊपर एक नीति बना कर चलें ।

एक बात मैं और कह दूं और मुझे खुद इस बात की शिकायत और रंज है कि जो हम ने इस सम्बन्ध में नीति बनाई हुई है उस पर प्रदेशों में पूरी तौर से अमल नहीं हुआ है और अगर कोई इस चीज की शिकायत करे तो मैं उससे सहमत हूं । आज हमारे देखने की जरूरत यह है कि तेजी से उस पर अमल किया जाय और मुझे ठीक से याद नहीं शायद मेरे साथी ने उस बारे में और ज्यादा जांच करने के लिये जिक्र भी किया है । हमारा इरादा है कि हम और तरीके निकालें और पूरी तौर से मालूम हो कि क्या पैदा होता है, और क्यों नहीं वहां अधिक पैदा हुआ जहां कि हम उम्मीद करते थे कि ज्यादा पैदा होगा ? अब हमारे पास इस बात के करने के जरिये भी बढ़ गए हैं, यानी स्टैटिस्टिकल जरिये । पहले भी कुछ थे, पटवारियों के बयानों पर काम चला करता था उस पर क्या भरोसा हो सके ? और काफी दिक्कतें थीं । अब मालूम होता जाता है ठीक से, तो उस से मदद मिलेगी ।

आप इस बात को छोड़ कर और जो सवाल हमारे सामने हैं उन पर आएं । आप का दिमाग गालिबन किसी कदर इस समय कुछ उस से भरा होगा जो कल शाम को आप ने बजट पर स्पीच सुनी । यह तो मेरे बजट पर कुछ कहने का समय नहीं है । बहुत मौके आएंगे आप के विचार करने के, हमारे विचार करने के, एक दूसरे से मिलकर करने के, लेकिन मैं ने उस का जिक्र इस लिए किया कि आप गौर करें कि असलन देश के सामने क्या है, क्यों हमें इस बात की जरूरत हो रही है कि हम ऐसे कदम उठाएं जो कि काफी गम्भीर हैं, काफी मुश्किल हैं, लेकिन उठाएं । क्यों उठाएं ? इस लिए कि या तो हम इस बड़े काम को, जो हम ने उठाया है, जिस को आप पांच बरस योजना कहें, या हिन्दुस्तान को आगे बढ़ाना कहें, जो कुछ कहें, पूरा करें, या हम वहीं के वहीं रह जाएं, उसे गिरने दें और उस के साथ देश को गिरने दें । हम मंझधार में हैं, हम हिम्मत कर के दरिया में कूदें, अब बीच में कोई जरिया नहीं है, बहीं टें रह जाएं, या तो जोर लगा कर आप को उस पार पहुंचना है या गोता खा जाना है वहीं । तो बजट के माने क्या हैं, ऐसे बजट के ? वह है हमारा इरादा, हमारा तहैया, हमारा पक्का यकीन कि हम उस पार पहुंचेंगे, और जोरों से पहुंचेंगे, चाहे कितनी तकलीफ उठानी पड़े ।

आप खुद विचार कर सकते हैं कि किसी गवर्नमेंट को तो अच्छा नहीं लगता है कि लोगों पर बोझा बढ़ाये । आम तौर से गवर्नमेंट झिझकती है इस से । हम ने किया तो कोई खुशी से नहीं, हम तजवीज पेश करते हैं आप के गौर करने का तो खुशी से नहीं बल्कि

इस मजबूरी से और यकीन से कि जब तक इस में काफी जोरों से क़दम नहीं उठाये जायेंगे, हम न इधर के रहेंगे, न उधर के रहेंगे। आप कदम उठायेंगे, कुछ हेर फेर होंगे, आप के विचार करने की बात है। लेकिन मोटी बात यह है कि यह बातें हो नहीं सकती हैं कि हम आज कल की हालत को चलने दें, या फर्ज कीजिये, कहा जाता है, और ठीक कहा जाता है, मुझे इस में एतराज नहीं है, कि किसानों की तन्ख्वाहें बढ़ें, नया पे कमिशन लायें, यह सब बातें कही जाती हैं। बहुत माकूल बहस हो सकती है इसमें, मैं तो नहीं कहता कि नहीं हो सकती है, बहुत बहस हो सकती है, खास कर हमारे आज तबके के लोग हैं, काम करते हैं, उन की आमदनी बढ़े। कौन कह सकता है कि न बढ़े। लेकिन आप इस वक्त कोई कदम उठायें जिस से वक्ती फायदा पहुंचाने की कोशिश में आप बुनियाद निकाल दें, सारी हमारी पांच बरस योजना की, तो वह एक अक्ल की बात तो नहीं है। आप खुद समझ सकते हैं। हां, जहां जहां जरूरी हो मदद करने की, मदद करनी चाहिये, तन्ख्वाह बढ़ानी चाहिये, लेकिन कोई आम ढंग बना दें, तो जो मुल्क इस तरह से बढ़ने की कोशिश करता है, बल्कि ज़मीन से अपने को उठा रहा है, अपनी शक्ति से, आप उस की पीठ पर और बोझा लाद दें तो उस का उठना दुश्वार हो जायेगा। यह एक पेचीदा सवाल है, आप इस पर विचार करेंगे। लेकिन जो कुछ मैं आप से बहुत अदब के साथ तजवीज करना चाहता हूं, वह यह कि आप ज़रा इस पूरी तस्वीर को देखें और खाली इस मुल्क को न देखें बल्कि और मुल्क जो कम व बेश इस हालत में हैं और कोशिश कर रहे हैं आगे बढ़ने की। अजीब मामला है। आप देखेंगे कि जो बड़े बड़े सवाल हमारे यहां हमें परेशान कर रहे हैं वही सवाल उन मुल्कों को कर रहे हैं, हालांकि उन की परिस्थिति दूसरी है, हालांकि उनका सामाजिक संगठन दूसरा है। सवाल वही है अगर उसी ढंग का मुल्क है जैसे चीन या हिन्दुस्तान है या बाज योरोप तक के मुल्क हैं। तो खाली नुक्ताचीनी करने से तो कोई फायदा नहीं है। हमारी यह ख्वाहिश है और विरोधी दल की भी यही ख्वाहिश है कि हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की हो। हिन्दुस्तान को तरक्की के मामले में आप बखुशी बतलाइये कि कहां कहां हमसे गलती हुई। और मैं एक बात सब माननीय सदस्यों से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि यह मेरी ख्वाहिश है कि अलावा उस काम के कि जो आप यहां लोक सभा में करते हैं, जैसे कि आप यहां सवाल करते हैं या बातों को तरफ ध्यान दिलाते हैं, अगर आपको कोई शिकायत किसी मिनिस्ट्री से हो तो आप अपनी शिकायत उस मिनिस्टर के पास सीधे ले जायें। इस के लिये आपकी दावत है। आप अपनी शिकायतें लिखकर या जबानी कहें ताकि या तो कुछ वाकयात आपके सामने रखे जायें या अगर आपकी बात सही हो तो उसको हम करें। गरज यह है कि हम चाहते हैं कि इस तरह का रिश्ता रहे। इस तरह के सहयोग से बहुत कुछ काम हो सकता है। हम यह नहीं कहते कि हर बात जो कही जायेगी हो सकेगी, लेकिन एक तरफ जहां हम एक दूसरे का मुकाबला करें, जैसा कि पार्लियामेंट का दस्तूर है, तो दूसरी तरफ हम उन बड़े कामों में जिनमें हम सहमत हैं एक दूसरे की मदद भी करें, यह भी पार्लियामेंट का दस्तूर है। और हिन्दुस्तान को आगे बढ़ाने में कौन सहमत नहीं है।

आचार्य कृपालानी जी ने कहा कि इस दफा हमारे राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में देश की हालत की तरफ ज्यादा तवज्जह है और दुनिया की हालत पर उसके मुकाबले कम। यह बात सही है, बल्कि, जैसा मैं ने कहा

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

सबसे ज्यादा देश की हालत पर तवज्जह है, खाने पीने के मामले पर, क्योंकि वह एक सवाल हमारे सामने है। जाहिर है कि हमारा और आपका और लोकसभा का काम है कि देश की हालत पर तवज्जह करें। यहां के लिये तो आप कानून बनाते हैं, आप दूसरे मुल्कों के लिए तो कानून नहीं बनाते। और विदेश के लिहाज से भी जितनी ताकत हमारे देश में है उतना ही हम असर पैदा कर सकते हैं। यह मोटी बात है। विदेश की बात हमारे सामने आती ही है। मैं ने पहले ही अर्ज किया है कि हमरी गवर्नमेंट की यह ख्वाहिश नहीं है कि हम विदेशी सवालों में फंसें लेकिन एक वाकयात की मजबूरी होती है और आज कल की दुनिया की मजबूरी है। आप साहिबान को इस बात का खयाल है, आप सब कभी कभी इसका जिक्र भी करते हैं। लेकिन चूंकि मेरा बिलफेल इस मिनिस्ट्री से ताल्लुक है इसलिये आजकल की दुनिया की हालत की वजह से मेरे ऊपर एक बोझा हो जाता है। यानी मुझे यह खयाल रहता है कि कोई बात दुनिया में ऐसी न हो जिससे हमारे घर का काम बन्द हो जाये, हमारे घर के काम में अटकाव हो जाये, और दुनिया की लपेट में हम भी आ जायें। हमारे सामने हाइड्रोजन बम का खतरा है। इस मामले की हमारी महज दिमागी पकड़ नही बल्कि गहरी पकड़ होनी चाहिये ताकि हम महसूस करें कि आजकल दुनिया तबाही के कितनी करीब है। अगर इत्तिफाक से जरा सा कोई मौका हो जाये तो मालूम दुनिया आज कहां से कहां पहुंच जाये। जाहिर है कि हमारी इसमें दिलचस्पी है। जाहिर है कि हमारी जो कुछ ताकत है उसे हमें अमन और सुलह की तरफ डालना है। मैं नहीं कहता, और अगर कोई साहब यह समझते हैं तो वह गलत समझते हैं कि हमारी बड़ी जबरदस्त ताकत है। हमारी थोड़ी ताकत है। हमारी आवाज छोटी है। हम गुल नहीं मचा सकते, हम किसी पर दबाव नहीं डाल सकते। फिर भी जो कुछ तोला माशा, हमारी ताकत है उसको हमें अमन की तरफ डालना है और इसीलिये हमने निश्चय किया है और इस नीति पर चल रहे हैं कि आजकल की दुनिया के जो बड़े बड़े हथियारबन्द गिरोह हैं उनसे दोस्ती रखें, लेकिन लड़ाई झगड़े के मामले में उनसे कोई जाब्ते का ताल्लुक न रखें, जिसे मिलिटरी एलायंस या फौजी सम्बन्ध कहा जाता है। इस तरह के सम्बन्धों से हम अलग रहना चाहते हैं। यही हमारी नीति रही है और मेरा खयाल है कि लोक सभा ने इसे बार बार स्वीकार किया है। अब विरोधी दल के जो साहबान इस नीति को पसन्द नहीं करते या कहते हैं कि हमें कुछ और करना चाहिये, वह साफ साफ बतायें किस ढंग की बात करना चाहते हैं। मै यह जानना चाहता हूं। वह कह सकते हैं कि हमें दुनिया के एक बड़े दल में शरीक हो जाना चाहिये और फिर वे हमारा साथ देंगे। लोग कहते है कि काश्मीर के मामले में सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल में आप का किस ने साथ दिया, क्या आप की नीति है। मैं यह मानता हूं, हालांकि सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल कोई

दुनिया का नक्शा नहीं है, नमूना नहीं है। लेकिन उससे नतीजा आप क्या निकालते हैं। क्या आप यह चाहते हैं कि अपने पड़ोसी मुल्क पाकिस्तान की तरह हम भी एक रथ के पीछे बन्ध जायें और जिधर वह रथ जाय, हम भी जायें? यह मोटी बात है और इस को साफ तौर पर समझना चाहिये कि अगर हम ने इन दोनों बातों को नहीं करना है—जैसा कि मैं समझता हूं कि नहीं करना है —तो उस के नतीजों को हमें बर्दाश्त करना है और मेरा ख्याल है कि उस के नतीजे भी आखिर में अच्छे होंगे—महज एक उसूली हवा के लिये नहीं, बल्कि अमली नुकता-ए-नजर से। अगर हमारी यह बुनियादी नीति आप को पसन्द है, जैसा कि आप ने बार बार कहा है, तो उस का नतीजा यह होता है कि वक्त पर हमें नुक्सान होता है और जो मुल्क बड़े बड़े सुलहनामों में बंधे हुये हैं, वे हमसे नाराज होते हैं और वक्त पर हमारे खिलाफ़ राय देते हैं। लेकिन मेरी राय बहुत ही मजबूत है कि जिस नीति पर हम चले हैं, उस के अलावा हिन्दुस्तान के लिये और कोई रास्ता नहीं है। मैं इतना और कहूंगा कि उस नीति पर चलने से हम ने अपना लाभ किया, अपना फ़ायदा किया, हमारी कुछ इज्जत भी बढ़ी और दुनिया में अमन कायम रखने में कुछ न कुछ मदद भी की। तीन तो जरूर—और शायद ज्यादा—मौके हुये हैं, जब कि हिन्दुस्तान के थोड़े से वजन और हल्की सी आवाज से भी दुनिया के इतिहास में, यानी लड़ाई और अमन के सिलसिले में, एक फ़र्क पड़ गया। लेकिन वह हो, या न हो, हमें तो अपना कर्तव्य—अपना फ़र्ज—अदा करना है, कोशिश करनी है कि हम इस तरह से अपने देश को चलायें कि एक बाजारू मोल-तोल में हम न पड़ें—यानी हम तुम्हें यह देते हैं, तुम हमारा साथ दो, इस तरह की बातों में न पड़ें। इस तरह से कोई शानदार मुल्क आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता है। मेरी फ़िक्र और कोशिश है कि हिन्दुस्तान जो भी बात करे, वह ऊंचे दर्जे की हो, शानदार हो, क्योंकि हम ने दूर तक देखना है और अपने मुल्क को दूर तक आगे ले जाना है।

चन्द साहबान ने कहा कि इस में गोआ का जिक्र क्यों नहीं है। श्री गोरे ने, जिन को गोआ का जाती तजुर्बा है, एक बात कही—और माकूल बात कही— कि आप गोआ की निस्बत साफ़ साफ़ क्यों नहीं कह देते कि आप की क्या नीति है। मेरा ख्याल था कि हम ने साफ़ साफ़ कह दिया है कि इस बारे में हमारी बुनियादी नीति क्या है। हम ने कहा है कि गोआ पर हम कोई फ़ौज नहीं दौड़ायेंगे, हम किसी हथियारबन्दी से गोआ को फ़तेह नहीं करेंगे। क्यों नहीं करेंगे, इस की वजूहात में मैं जाने के लिये तैयार हूं। इसलिये नहीं करेंगे कि दुनिया के सिलसिलों में हम ने अब तक जो नीति रखी है, यह उस के खिलाफ होगा। और उसूल को छोड़िये, हम इससे हजार पेचों में पड़ जायेंगे। दुनिया में जो थोड़ी बहुत जगह हमने बनाई है, वह खत्म हो जायगी। दुनिया के सवालों में थोड़ा बहुत जो हिस्सा हम लेते हैं, उन में हम कमजोर पड़ जायेंगे। हम एक तरह के भिड़ के छत्ते में पड़ जायेंगे जिससे बचना मुश्किल हो जायगा। अलावा उसूली बातों के यह उसका प्रैक्टिकल कान्सीक्वेन्स होगा।

इस के अलावा यह कोई अजीब बात नहीं है, जो कि हिन्दुस्तान कर रहा है, और कोई और नहीं कर रहे हैं। मैंने पहले भी कहा है कि हूबहू ऐसा ही सवाल चीन में मैकाओ का सवाल है। वह भी पार्तुगीज का एक छोटा सा अड्डा है।

चीन एक महा शक्ति है, एक ताकतवर देश है इस में कोई शक नहीं कि जिस वक्त भी वह चाहे फ़ौज से उस को ले सकता है। क्यों

[श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू]

नहीं उन्होंने ऐसा किया ? इसलिये कि वे दूर-अन्देश हैं। वे दूर तक देखते हैं वे एक छोटे से वक्ती फ़ायदे के लिये एक जबर्दस्त नुक्सान नहीं उठाना चाहते।

मैंने आप को दिखाया है कि हम उस वक्त जोश में आ कर एक बात करें और फिर एक मुसीबत में पड़ें, अपनी नीति को छोड़ दें, यह कोई समझ की बात नहीं है। मैंने बार बार कहा है कि यह जरूरी बात है कि गोआ को हिन्दुस्तान में शामिल होना है।

इसको आपने स्वीकार किया है और हर हिन्दुस्तानी भी यही कहता है और मुझे कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि वह होगा लेकिन वक्त की बात जरूर है। हमें कोई भी काम जल्दबाजी में नहीं करना चाहिये और इस वजह से नहीं करना चाहिये कि हम में उत्साह है, हम में जोश है। इस तरह का काम करने का क्या नतीजा हो सकता है, इस पर विचार कर लिया जाना चाहिये। हम अगर फौज से वहां हमला नहीं करते तब हम क्या बड़ा फौजी हमला वहां होने दें या नहीं ? आप जानते हैं यह सवाल हुआ है। अगर बड़ा हमला वहां बगैर फौजों के होने दें तो इसका क्या नतीजा होगा। अगर उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि फिर हमें मजबूर हो कर फौजें ले जानी पड़ीं तो वह गलत बात हो जाती है और सरीहन गलत बात होगी। अकसर लोग जानते नहीं कि क्या उन्होंने कहा। पहले तो कहा था कि हम तो यह इस लिये कर रहे हैं कि आपको मजबूर करें फौजें लाने के लिये। तो अगर आप देखें तो आपको मालूम होगा कि फिर हम उसी पेंच में फंस जाते हैं। गोआ का एक तकलीफदेह सवाल है, हर वक्त सिर में दर्द लगाये रखता है, महज इसलिये वहीं कि वहां बाकी पौर्चुगल की हकूमत को बदतमीजी की बातें होती हैं, गलत बातें होती हैं, ज्यादतियां होती हैं जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ जाती हैं और उसकी शान के खिलाफ जाती हैं—वह तो है ही—लेकिन वहां के लोगों के विचारों का खास तौर से जो उनकी परेशानी हैं, जो उनके ऊपर बोझा पड़ रहा है, दबाव पड़ रहा है, जुल्म हो रहे हैं, इन बातों से भी हमें तकलीफ होती है। मैं आपसे साफ कहूं कि मैं बड़े पेच में पड़ा हूं। हमने जो कार्रवाई की, कुछ आर्थिक कार्रवाई की जिसको कि सैंकशंस कहते हैं उसका कुछ न कुछ असर तो पौर्चुगीज गवर्नमेंट पर पड़ा और यकीनन पड़ा और वह ठीक भी था लेकिन उसका असर वहां की आम जनता पर भी पड़ा, वे बेचारे परेशान हुये और शायद पौर्चुगीज गवर्नमेंट से भी ज्यादा परेशान हुये। तो मैं नहीं चाहता हूं कि उन बेचारे लोगों को परेशान किया जाय। वे यों भी पौर्चुगल के नीचे परेशान कम नहीं हैं। लेकिन हमारी कार्रवाई से जब परेशानी बढ़ती है तो यह बात विचारतलब हो जाती है। तो हम क्या करें और क्या न करें, ये सब पेंच हैं। मैंने एक बार कहा था कि मैं चाहता हूं कि दो तीन मोटी मोटी जो बातें हैं उनको समझ लिया जाये और उनको ध्यान में रखते हुये हम कोई फौजी कार्रवाई नहीं करना चाहते। हमारे ऐसा करने से क्या मालूम दुनिया में क्या उसकी उलट पलट हो। यह छोटी सी बात नहीं है। तब हम क्या करना चाहते हैं। हम वही करना चाहते हैं जो हमारे सिद्धान्त से मिलती जुलती बात है। यह जो चीज है यह यकीनन आखिर में गोआ के लोगों की है—हमारी भी है मैं इससे इन्कार नहीं करता—लेकिन अव्वल तो गोआ के लोगों की है। गोआ के लोग चाहे गोआ में रहते हों या बाहर उनकी है। एक लाख के करीब गोआनी लोग बम्बई

में रहते हैं और मुझे अफसोस से कहना पड़ता है कि वे आपस में ज्यादातर लड़ा करते हैं और इस उम्मीद में रहते हैं कि बाहर से आकर गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया उनकी मदद करती जाये। बिलकुल अपनी टांगों पर खड़े होने की भी उन्होंने कोशिश नहीं की, इस बात का मुझे रंज है। मैं तो चाहता हूं कि इस हफ्ते या इसी महीने विरोधी दल के जो सदस्य हैं और इस तरफ के जो सदस्य है उनसे मैं पूछूं और वे मुझे बतायें और हम लोग मिल कर इस मामले में बात करें और सोचें कि हमें इस मामले में क्या करना चाहिये। अगर वे मानें तो हम अवश्य इस मश्विरे में शरीक होंगे। जो माननीय सदस्य इस मसले में दिलचस्पी रखते है, मैं चाहता हूं वे भी इसमें शरीक हों और कुछ रोशनी डालें।

गोआ के बारे में ही मैं आपको एक बात और याद दिलाना चाहता हूं। पौर्चुगीज़ गवर्नमेंट का इंटरनेशनल कोर्ट आफ जस्टिस में एक मुकदमा है जिसे उसने दायर किया है और आप जानते ही है कि वह किस के बारे में है। असल में वह नागरहवेली के बारे में है। यह सवाल भी खाली उसका नहीं रहता, इसमें भी पेंच आ जाते हैं। इसके बारे में हमारा जो जवाब है वह अदालत में पेश कर दिया गया है। पौर्चुगल ने हमारे जवाब का जवाब देने के लिये वक्त मांगा है और यह झगड़ा महज़ इस बात पर है कि अदालत को इस सवाल पर विचार करने का हक हासिल है या नहीं। तो ये सब पेंच हैं जिनको मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता था।

काश्मीर के बारे में बहुत कुछ बहस हो चुकी है और मैं यह मुनासिब नहीं समझता कि इसके बारे में अब कुछ कहूं। अभी डा० यारिंग यहां आये थे और उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश कर दी है। गालिबन चन्द एक दिनों में या तो एक हफ्तों में —मैं नहीं जानता —सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में बहस होगी। इस वास्ते मैं ज्यादा उस पर कहना इस वक्त मुनासिब नहीं समझता हूं।

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am always glad when this House discusses these broad questions of policy, whether domestic or international. We want as much criticism as possible on governmental policies. We want hon. Members, whether on this side or on the other side of the House, to help us with their views, criticisms, etc. Because, in spite of the fact that there are various parties opposing each other—there is the government party, there are opposition parties, and naturally we have occasion to oppose each other in this House—I have always in mind that this Parliament has to function as a whole for the good of India; and while we may criticize each other, as we should when that is necessary, we have always to remember that we are engaged in a common undertaking. So I welcome criticism. Sometimes, of course, when the criticism is, to my thinking, irrelevant or far fetched, then perhaps my welcome is not quite so warm.

It is a fact that we are facing, in India and the world, problems of tremendous significance. It is a trite saying that we are passing through grave periods of transition, in the world or in India. It is often repeated. But I rather doubt that, although we repeat this very often, we quite realize the crucial nature of this period through which we are passing. These days, months and years that pass, whether in the international sphere or in our domestic sphere, are of the most vital importance. In the international sphere we have lived, during these past terrible years, almost on the edge of disaster and catastrophe. The fact that it has been avoided thus far need not make us complacent; we still live on it. It is an extraordinary state of affairs, what you read about daily in your newspapers—what is happening elsewhere, whether it is the hydrogen bomb, the test explosions, the piling

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

up of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. They are being spread out in other countries too; they are being given to other countries. It is a terrible prospect.

13 hrs.

We talk of disarmament, and sometimes one feels that the world is making some progress towards disarmament. And then we come back to the hub and realize not only that we remain where we were but we have perhaps gone back a little. Hon. Members opposite said that the fault lies with a certain group of nations, not with others. Now, it is not our function to find fault with any nation. We have to express our opinions—sometimes even though they might be disliked by some country—but we avoid finding fault with nations or quarrelling with nations. We want to be at peace with them. If our opinions differ, naturally we have to express them. But it is a somewhat extraordinary state of affairs: take this question of the building up of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. Almost every intelligent person knows and says that if there is a war in which these weapons are employed, it may mean almost extinction of humanity or a large part of it. That being admitted, what is done to prevent it? They build up these very weapons and go on experimenting with them. So far as experimenting is concerned, it is admitted that there are known dangers with each experiment. The extent of danger is argued about. True. But, the fact that they are dangerous is admitted by every one. Whether we have passed the extreme danger point or not may be argued about. Then, there are the unknown dangers about which nobody knows. They are unknown dangers. Yet, this thing goes on. Most countries say that there are at present two major blocs in possession of a large number of these bombs and a third, namely, the United Kingdom which presumably, has some atomic bombs and in the course of experimenting with hydrogen bombs. I should like this House just not to consider this merely on the intellectual plane, important as that is, but just try to understand this picture of great countries, respected countries going ahead with their preparations for what can only end, if this thing continues in world disaster on a tremendous scale. I am not referring to the amount of money that is being spent or wasted over this tremendous armament race. I was told only yesterday that our Five Year Plan with our thousands of crores of rupees is just a few months expenditure on the military budget of a great country. Eighty days, I believe, was the figure Our Five Year Plan with all this development work and everything included in this country is 80 days military expenditure in peace time. In war, of course, it will be much more. Here is this world hungering for development. Asia, Africa, etc, and these vast sums of money being spent not on building up anything but on weapons of destructions. It is an extraordinary state of affairs.

There is another aspect. We see in the Middle East today a number of very odd developments taking place—last year all this has been happening:—first in connection with the Suez Canal, then intervention in Egypt, invasion of Egypt and other matters, then Jordan. Once I said in this House, I remember, though I used the word unthinkingly at that time, that the various changes in the Middle East have led to the creation of a temporary power vacuum there. I did not think then that my words would lead people to think that people should come from outside and try to fill the vacuum. Surely, if there is a so-called power vacuum, the only way to fill it is by the people of that country and not by the imposition of some external agency. I think it is a very dangerous theory of nations, whatever nation it ploc of

I think it is a very dangerous theory of nations, whatever nation it might be, whether it belongs to one bloc or the other bloc of these great blocs. But, this idea of thinking that the world has to be in some way under their sphere of influence and they have to fill the vacuums which are created by the withdrawal of old colonial powers, obviously, so far as our thinking goes, is entirely opposed to our way of thinking. Apart from our thinking, I submit it is not a practical approach. It does not lead even to the results aimed at. It creates difficulties and fresh problems. If one person tries to fill the vacuum, others try to do so and a place which should develop peacefully becomes an arena of conflict as we see it happening. We cannot, I submit, afford to ignore the international scene because it affects our own development, Five Year Plan and everything.

Having said that, I come back to our real and main work. Our main work is the building up of our country and not interfering with other countries. Our main work has broadly been stated in the Five Year Plan. Hon. Members can, I am sure, criticise our Five Year Plan and give us ideas, where it is wrong, where it should change. It is not a rigid Plan. We decided even at the time of the framing of the Plan that it should be a flexible Plan. We have changed it since then; we may have to change it again. But, we do intend to continue with the basic framework of the Plan and the basic idea. Because, I do not think there is any other way out of it. If we give it up, then, we give up any major scheme of development in this country and we are not likely even to remain where we are. We will get submerged by the various forces, economic forces and other forces that our own activities have produced in the world. So that, we have to go ahead with this Five Year Plan.

Some hon. Members opposite may think that the Five Year Plan is not adequate or is weighted wrongly. That is a matter for discussion. The adequacy of it reflects on the adequacy of our resources. The House has some idea of the effort that this Government is making to find these resources from the Budget statement of the Finance Minister yesterday; that is, to say that we are going to do our utmost to go through with this Plan—minor things apart—major things in the Plan. Because, the whole future development of India depends on the success of that Plan. An hon. Member said, why not extend it to six or seven years. Minor matter may be extended or left out even. So far as the basis of the Plan is concerned, the House should remember that extension is not such an easy matter. Because, the more we extend it, the more difficult it becomes to deal with the situation. Suppose we delay, let us say, our iron and steel works, we delay production, we delay the growth of industry in this country, we delay every process that would help us to deal with the situation, and the situation meanwhile gets worse. It is not a question of delaying something by a year or two. We loss all the productive capacity of that year and thereby we permit the situation to worsen and become much more difficult to handle later. That is the problem. It is easy enough to say, stretch it out by a year or two. We may stretch out some relatively less important thing; but we cannot in regard to major things; we cannot in in regard to the machine-building plants. We have to build machines here. How long are we to depend on machines from outside? There are so many other things which we cannot stretch out; we cannot, above all, in regard to agriculture and agricultural produce, which is of the highest importance. Because, however important industry might be, industrial growth will depend on a stable agrarian economy, on a stable food position in the country. Therefore, agriculture will now and always be No. 1 however much stress we may lay on industry. Yet, we may lay stress on industry, heavy industry. Because if this country is to be industrialised, it cannot be industrialised without the growth of heavy industry

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

here. That is a patent thing, and an obvious thing.

Now, building up heavy industry means a great burden. It means a burden which the country has to bear without recompense till that heavy industry begins to produce. For three, four, five or six or seven years, you spend hundreds of crores of rupees in building up a steel plant, a machine-building plant, with nothing coming out of it. Yes; after that, much comes out of it; after that, wealth flows from it. That is why we build it. But in these initial years, any country that has to go through this process, whether it is India or China or any other country of Asia or Europe, must necessarily go through that process. There is no way to escape it. You have to pay the price for industrialisation, for development. And then, you get back, of course, returns afterwards. And it is for us to determine whether we are prepared to pay that price or not.

In other countries which may be termed authoritarian, they have to pay the price too—do not imagine they do not—and sometimes a heavier price. Only, perhaps, they do it by a decree, and they can do it even without the consent of many people there, or too many people—I do not know. Anyway, we cannot do it that way. Whatever planning and whatever activity we may indulge in, we have to carry our people with us. We have, first of all, to have the goodwill of this House, of Parliament, secondly, the goodwill of all the State Assemblies and the State Governments, and finally, of our people right down to the panchayat level.

I have talked about heavy industry and other matters. And yet, I do think that, perhaps, the most important thing that is being done in India, whether from the point of view of food production, agriculture or from the point of view of small industry—not heavy industry—is the community development scheme which has spread now, as the President has said, to about 220,000 villages. I do not mean to say that these 220,000 villages are all up to the mark. But I do think, and I do say with some confidence, that the average level of this community development is high, remarkably high, considering that we started just a little over four and a half years ago.

This community scheme will, we hope, change, and is, to some extent, to our knowledge, changing, the face of rural India, changing the people of rural India, not only the face of rural India.

Acharya Kripalani said that India was a slum. It is very largely true a statement. Of course, it is a slum. A poverty-stricken nation is a slum. There is no doubt about it. But how do we get over this difficulty? How shall we convert rural India? Leave out the slums of Delhi, Calcutta and Bombay; how do we convert the face of rural India? No purely governmental affort or governmental expenditure can do it. It can only be done by the people of those villages *being organised and helped to do it* themselves, by getting that spirit in them to do it. I believe that spirit is coming in them. I have seen with my own eyes how villages are changing. It is not so dramatic a change, obviously. But, it is dramatic, if you compare it to what it was. And it is through these community development schemes, I think, that ultimately our agricultural production will really go up. It went up in those areas.

Shri Frank Anthony, I think, threw some doubt on statistics. I can quite understand that feeling. But I think I can say with some confidence that the statistics we are getting now through our sample surveys are fairly accurate and reliable. Of course, we are making them more and more accurate. And we propose, and we are, developing our statiscal apparatus to get accurate statistics of every crop, as well as other matters, of course.

There is no doubt about it that in these community development areas, food production went up by 25 per cent., that is, in the First Five Year Plan, not in all the areas which are now under the community development scheme, because they have not had a chance yet. Now, 25 per cent., to my thinking, is a substantial increase. I think it should go up much further; that is a different matter. But if we can go up to 25 per cent. too, that is a fairly substantial increase. I shall leave the figure fixed at 28 per cent. for the next Five Year Plan, because we shall cover much more land. I think we can do it.

May I say that I agree with the criticism made by some Members that in a number of States, land reform legislation has been slow, much too slow? It should have been much faster, and I hope it will be speeded up.

Personally,—or rather, not personally; this is what the Planning Commission has laid down, and, I believe, this House has approved of—I do think that the way for progress in agriculture is through agricultural co-operatives, agrarian co-operatives. I do not believe in very large co-operatives. I think probably the best size would be a village co-operative. I do not mind if there are two in a village, because I want intimacy, people knowing each other, the personal factor—not the impersonal one.

Take even this matter of agrarian co-operatives. It can only be introduced, naturally, by consent, by the democratic method. We cannot force them down. But I do think that that is necessary in our country, where holdings are so small; we cannot take advantage of many modern methods, modern techniques with a holding of one acre or two acres. We do not want large holdings. We want to limit those holdings. The only way out, therefore, becomes the development of co-operatives in this field.

And yet, I am surprised that in spite of the Planning Commission having said so, in spite of this House having agreed to it repeatedly, yet doubts are raised, and people say, 'Oh, this kind of thing may be good enough for other countries, but is not suited to India'. I can understand someone like our friend Shri Mahendra Pratap saying that, because he lives in some distant vision of the past, where *raths* used to go about and work and so on and so forth. That one should challenge this fact surprises me. Agrarian co-operatives are necessary for the development of our peasantry, and our villages, and our production, and otherwise. I recognise that we cannot develop them by a decree; and we cannot develop them very rapidly, because we have to convince people, we have to bring them round, and we have to get their agreement. Maybe, we shall have to start in a relatively small way and as results come—and they are bound to—others will follow, because, fundamentally, I think, the Indian farmer, the Indian peasant, is a wise person. If we approach him rightly and explain things, I think he will accept this.

Now, there are so many things that we try to do. There were questions today about oil and other matters. Here is oil extraction going to take place, which, in the course of a few years—two years, three years, or four years, I do not know—would make a fairly considerable difference to us, because oil is vastly important. The mere fact of our non-dependence for oil on foreign countries would make a great difference, apart from the other benefits that will come to us.

I would beg, therefore, this House to consider these matters in this broad perspective, and to remember that we have undertaken this great burden, and we have to discharge it; we have to keep the promise we have made to our people and to ourselves, and to go ahead with it, even though this might involve carrying a heavy burden for some time. And I would

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

beg of Members here to criticise anything to their hearts' content, but to approach every questions in a constructive spirit.

Acharya Kripalani mentioned something about corruption, and in this connection mentioned two cases connected with my Ministry namely the Ministry of External Affairs. The first was about money being borrowed for three consecutive years for the purchase of cars. It was very improper. But we do not lose any money thereby; if it is borrowed, it is paid back. But, nevertheless, it was a very improper thing. And other improper things—one or two were mentioned by him—also come out. That is what the Public Accounts Committee and other Committees are for, and we want the help of Members to deal with such instances. But I would beg of the House to remember that because a number of such instances comes up and is dealt with—and should be dealt with—we must not imagine that this kind of thing is prevalent everywhere, that everybody does it.

Let us take our foreign services. There are hundreds of officers serving abroad. If something bad happens, we take steps. Let us punish them. I do not say that everybody is above error or above doing wrong things. But I do know that a great number of them, these young men and some young women who are in our foreign service, are a fine lot of people.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): May I interrupt for a moment? It is not that such things do not happen. They happen. But the unfortunate thing is that nothing is done about them and the persons who are responsible for those things occupy the same position or even better position.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If the hon. Member tells me of a case where action has not been taken, I will look into it. But I think that whenever such things happen, steps are always taken and where it is proved, punishment awarded. It may of course be that in a particular case the hon. Member may think that the punishment ought to be heavier. That is a different matter. The difficulty is that our procedures are so complicated. Enquiries—departmental and otherwise—go on. Then there is reference to the Public Services Commission. It takes years really to get over these. Sometimes, in order to avoid this complicated procedure, we take some steps and award some punishment which is lighter but which is sudden. That is done. Otherwise, for the heavier punishment, we would have to wait for two or three years and it goes backwards and forwards.

This is a matter for this House to consider.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajganj): Is there a proposal to simplify procedure?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The matter has been considered. The House can consider it. I shall welcome if procedures are simplified.

Anyhow, as I was submitting, we are wide awake as far as we can be. We want the help of this House, we want the help of the Public Accounts Committee and other Committees to deal with these matters. But in dealing with these matters, the House should remember that we should not try to tar everybody with the same brush. We are being served, I think, faithfully, by large numbers of our public servants efficiently and honestly I think our public services can compare with the public services of any country. I do not say that everyone is good. But the general standard is a high one. Any one who knows about the public services of other countries will probably agree with me in this. Those who have come from other countries and have compared their public services with ours have generally formed this opinion.

In connection with this debate on the President's Address, may I repeat that it is, of course, not a personal Address by the President? It represents broadly the Government's policy. Acharya Kripalani stated that it was too formal an Address. It has to be formal; it is its function to be formal. It cannot be informal. We can be informal in the House. The President has to be formal and has to deal with major matters. May be we may have left out some matters, because we cannot deal with every matter there. We try to bring up some major matters. I submit that whatever statements are made in the President's Address are factually accurate. For instance, in regard to the food situation, they are absolutely accurate. There is no attempt to slur over the situation. In fact, grave concern has been shown in regard to that situation in the President's Address.

Then Acharya Kripalani said that it did not tell us what legislation there was going to be for this session. As a matter of fact, there is going to be very little legislation in this 15-day session. Apart from the two debates —Railway and General—there are going to be three or four very minor Bills which will be brought before the House, and, I hope, passed. Because there was no major legislation, it was not mentioned. It will be mentioned in future, whenever there is any major legislation. That is all I have to say.

श्री महेन्द्र प्रताप (मथुरा) : प्रधान मन्त्री जी कामनवेल्थ के दलदल में फंसे हुए हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Home Minister be replying to the debate tomorrow?—Whichever Minister may reply, it is enough for my purpose to know if he will reply this evening or tomorrow. In the latter case, the whole of this day may be devoted to general discussion by hon. Members.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): It will be better if the reply is given tomorrow after the Question Hour.

Mr. Speaker: Then till 18-00 hours today, the debate on the President's Address may go on.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The House can sit even longer.

Mr. Speaker: Quorum may not be there.

Shri Manay (Bombay City Central —Reserved—Sch. Castes): Why is it that the Prime Minister has made no reference to the Samyukt Maharashtra and Maha Gujarat issues?

Mr. Speaker: They have been discussed very well already. Now, so far as regulating the debate is concerned, a number of hon. Members are coming to me saying that they have got different groups, five, six, seven and eight. They say that they really belong to different groups having distinctive appellations or particular points of view. I would not like to exclude them; I would like to give them an opportunity. But three or four Members of a group consisting of eight persons speak and then come and insist upon the fifth Member being also called.

Therefore, whenever a chit is sent, hon. Members will kindly see that the name, the division number and also the group are distinctly mentioned to enable me to decide whether I should call upon the Member concerned or not and whether any other Member of the group concerned has already spoken or not. That is the only way in which the debate can be regulated. Otherwise, I shall be calling Members belonging to the same group over and over again, excluding other groups and preventing their views from being placed before the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate on the President's Address is taking place at the end of the first year of the Second Five Year Plan and, therefore, we had expected it to be a really inspiring Address. It is not that we people are afraid of facing difficulties in connection with the

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

plan; nor we afraid of making sacrifices. But what really alarms people is that certain things have developed as a result of the Plan which the Government does not seem able to control.

First and foremost, almost every Member in this House has pointed out that food production has gone up. An hon. Member from the Punjab pointed out that they have had a record harvest, and yet prices have kept on going up. One of our Members from Andhra Pradesh, who comes from the surplus area of West Godavari, pointed out yesterday that not even in their father's generation, not even in their grandfather's generation, had they seen such a bumper crop as they saw this year, and yet they see that prices are going up. The same thing has happened in the Punjab.

We are told that people are eating more. Who are the people who are eating more? We are told it is the result of inflation. We are also told that it is the result of developmental plans. But, what about the conscious effort of the machinery of the State to at least control and see that there is equitable distribution, that those who have should make sacrifices for those who have not and those who exist below subsistence level? This is the point that alarms people. Why is there scarcity in a situation where we see food production going up?

The second point which we have made again and again earlier too—we think this is a big weakness of the Plan; we had pointed it out during the discussion of the First Year Plan; we did it again at the time when we were discussing the Second Five Year Plan—is the complete absence of a price control policy to be enunciated by the Government.

I remember once the Prime Minister said that we have to take hold of strategic heights. What are those strategic heights? As far as price control goes, up till now the Government has not made itself clear as to what it proposes to do in this situation when throughout the country there is a rise in prices even in the midst of a situation where they claim that they are having bumper crops. What is going to be the machinery for price control?

There is the next and alarming position in the context of planning. That is the growing unemployment. First and foremost, let me take this question of unemployment because I was surprised that in this Address of the President not a word has been said about this unemployment or under-employment. This is a burning problem, which far from being solved has not even been arrested. That is my point.

The pronounced aim of the Plan is to give more employment. It is stated clearly that they may not be able to reduce the present unemployment figures but that they will make provision for 8 million new jobs. But, when we see what is happening, we have very serious misgivings about this. For instance, what do we see in the registers of Employment Exchanges? A random survey shows that in September 1955 the register showed 6·66 lakhs. When we see it in February 1956, it has gone up to 6·9 lakhs. In March 1956, it reaches 7·17 lakhs and in March 1957, it is 7·77 lakhs and, I think, if we were to take the figures today, it may be anywhere near 8 lakhs.

Not only that. The Employment Exchanges in the 'Employment Notes' has made one remark which we all know to be correct. I am quoting it because it is from a government publication. It says that it indicates that except in the public sector, the job opportunities in the private sector has declined. Many people put forward the claim that we should have the private sector because it is much more efficient than the public sector. Here at least is one example where we find that so far as unemployment goes, the private sector has had a big hand in carrying out retrenchment

policies without caring what is to happen.

For example, recently, in West Bengal, taking advantage of a judgment of the Supreme Court, almost immediately, we find that 9,000 workers in the jute mills were retrenched—in mills which had already suffered from a large amount of retrenchment during the last 5 years. There is the case of the Lakshmi Mills which belongs to an Indian. With 1,500 workers, it was closed down. They have not been paid wages for the last 3 months. Then there is the Union Mills, one of the British companies with 600 looms which suddenly closed down, on April 14. They had only recently modernised a section; rationalisation was taking place and without giving some time for it to show whether there was profit or loss, they suddenly closed down. The reason is that they want to amalgamate two mills into one and want to utilise more workers of one than the other. There is also another concern which belongs to Indian owners, British owners and also Pakistani owners. They have all combined together. The Ispahanis have been well-known for mal-practices. They have not even deposited the provident fund monies with the Government. Now, they have closed down saying that they are running at a loss. Government is able to do nothing. They finally came out with an Ordinance. What has that been able to do so far us the closed mills go? Therefore, what we had sensed before has happened. The unemployment situation is already explosive and these have added to this unemployment. Why is this? We had demanded that, for the time being, rationalisation should be stopped. We demanded that there should be a ban on retrenchment for the time being and that there should be no retrenchment without the whole matter being gone into and that malpractices should not be allowed to be covered under the plea of losses. This is a very serious situation which is there.

Take the case of coal mines. Coal is one of the most important commodities that we need for industrialisation. What is the position? It shows that in 1947, there were 3,64,000 people working in the coal mines. But, today, in 1956, when coal is an essential factor for industrialisation and for fuel, the figure is 3,20,000. It means that while there has been increased production and productivity per worker has increased by 50 per cent, there has been a retrenchment of 40,000. I should like to put this query to the Prime Minister. He again and again puts to this House: Are we going to distribute poverty? The main thing is that we shall produce more. We have produced more in food. The peasant has produced more; but what is the result? He has to pay higher prices; he has to starve. Today the worker has produced more. What is the result? He is retrenched; he is thrown out in the streets. This is a paradox which alarms people. It is not a paradox. It has arisen out of certain inherent weaknesses in the Plan and that is what we have to tackle.

13.36 hrs.

[**Shri Barman** *in the Chair*]

In the State sector too, I am afraid we canont completely absolve the State sector of the responsibility for adding to this unemployment. We know the case of the D.V.C. Trained, technical personnel were retrenched. I do not want to repeat that. There are also other sections of the State sector. In the Plan they say they have provided for 8 million jobs. But on the 15th September, a few months later, 6,000 men were retrenched from the Defence Department. This is one of the things that worry us most. It reduces the purchasing power of the people in a context when there is a rise in prices.

I should like also to point out the growing unemployment of the educated. Here again it is a paradox. We need social services; we need doctors; we need teachers, more village workers who may go to the rural areas. Yet in my State, I know very clearly that we have doctors, we have

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

teachers and we have midwives but they have no jobs. Many of them are unemployed. Why is this happening?

In China, when I was there, I saw there was unemployment among the illiterates in the villages, those who could not read and write. But, there was no unemployment amongst those who are technically qualified, who were graduates and matriculates etc. They told us that they needed more and more educated people. But it is surprising that in a country like ours with a sea of illiterates, the literates are thrown out on the sea. These are the things that worry us. And, we find no solution put forward in the President's Address.

I have no time to go in detail into the question of cottage and small-scale industries. These are the biggest potential. I am not raising the question of foreign exchange. The Handloom Board has been set up. It is true. At the same time, I am told by my Madras friends that there is an accumulation of handloom products and their fear is that unless something is done very soon unemployment will come up again among the weavers.

What has the Coir Board done? Thousands and thousands of workers of the cottage industries of Kerala are facing unemployment. What has happened to the paddy-husking schemes which would have given employment to so many thousands of workers, poor widows and poor women? What about the potters in the villages? We talk too much about cottage industries. We have not evolved a proper scheme for marketing their products; nor have we done anything for giving them the finances, and we talk so much about co-operatives.

I come now to the next question; and that is the question which affects my State certainly; but, I think it also affects the national economy of our country and that is the question of the refugees. And, I am glad that an ex-Minister of my State was deeply concerned with this problem is present in the House. I feel that this question has been dealt with in a basically wrong way. When we had no money or less money, we saw the same spectacle. When more money has been allotted, still we see the same spectacle. What is the reason? What is the crux of the problem? Have you been able to give employment to the refugees so that they may rehabilitate them? If we see the condition of the refugees on the platforms of Sealdah and Howrah, one could get an idea of what hell on earth means. Hunger, squalour and disease—something that is unimaginable. When we see the emaciated bodies of these people living on Government doles, one wonders whether they are not a living epitome of starvation. I am not blaming any State Government. I am only blaming the basic policies of the Government. When we see the condition of the people who have come away from the camps outside or inside Bengal and who live in despicable conditions, we can as well imagine that the conditions in which they lived in those camps are worse.

The crux of the problem, as I said, is employment. The rehabilitation problem has never been tackled by the Government in a proper co-ordinated manner. The Prime Minister appeals to the Opposition Parties to look at these problems from a national point of view. I say again that it is the ruling party that has always looked upon this problem in a very narrow partisan spirit. We have appealed to the ex-Minister from the State of West Bengal and also to the Union Minister. We have said again and again that it is a national problem. Let there be all party committees at every level. When the Bettiah camp refugees came away, we have said: 'Let us set up an enquiry committee of the Government, the Ruling Party and all Parties. Let us go there and let us see with our own eyes and then come to conclusions so that we may be able to do something for them." That suggestion was turned down. That is why I say that this complex and

difficult question has not been tackled in the right way and in the right spirit.

I can give you many such examples. Last year, we have been told that there was going to be a factory. Shri Mehr Chand Khanna assured us that the factory would come up in a refugee camp at Gaishpur and also at Tairpur. Two years have passed; the camps are still there and the promise is still on paper. Nothing has happened. If people come out of these camps because of the intolerable conditions there, we are told that it is the political parties that are making capital out of these happenings. This is not the way to help the refugees. Let us tackle this problem in a patriotic way so that we may be able to solve this problem. That is why, we have been demanding an enquiry committee and we still put forward that demand.

There is one small point. I am glad the Prime Minister has spoken about the international situation. We have made it clear that every person on this side is one with him in supporting the demand which he has made that there should be a stoppage of the atom and hydrogen bomb tests. We are also one with him when he expresses himself on the interim proposal of having a standstill agreement. But, if we wish to see it implemented, we should have world public opinion. That is why in Japan, the Japanese Council for the ban of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests has called an international conference in Tokyo on the eve of the Hiroshima Bombing Day and the entire world opinion has been focussed on this so that these tests may stop. It is a peculiar thing. We are made guinea pigs.

One point which I missed in the Address of the President was the new situation that had developed in the Middle-East. The Prime Minister, I am glad, has added a bit about Jordan. Last time when the President addressed this House, he had mentioned the Suez Crisis. At that time there was complete Arab Unity. The Baghdad and the SEATO pacts had not been able to draw all the Arab States into their fold. But, now a new situation has arisen and the Eisenhower Doctrine has been propounded by the United States to fill the vacuum. This is dangerous. By this, there is an attempt to force a break-up of the Arab solidarity and isolate Egypt and—to contain the nationalism that is spreading through Asia, Africa and the Arab States. It is also an attempt to break the *Panch Sheela* which had been catching the imagination of the world. I do not want to take up the time of the House any more but I feel that it is very important for us to take note of it because our next door neighbour, Pakistan is allying itself with Baghdad Pact with the backing of USA. The U. S. arms aid to Pakistan is also endangering our own safety. In that situation, breaking up of the unity of the Arab people by using the influence of the Eisenhower Doctrine is a danger to us.

There is only one small point about the food situation. Many hon. Members have dilated on it and said that they are puzzled at the vast statistical information thrown at us. At the same time, there are certain contradictions. We are told that there is a deficit of five lakh tons in West Bengal. In 1956-57, we had a record harvest of 42 lakh tons. Reducing the demands for seeds, the quantity that can be consumed is 38 lakh tons. In 1955-56, we had only 35 lakh tons and so West Bengal will need 42 lakh tons. We really need about seven lakh tons to meet our deficit. The West Bengal Food Minister has said that there is a clear case of hoarding of six lakh tons. If there is hoarding how are we going to get the stocks out? We are told that bank withdrawals against foodgrains has decreased but the bank advances against cash crops had increased. If that is so, we have to see whether these

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

speculators are hoarding foodgrains under the cover of cash crops. In any case, we have demanded that the Centre has to take responsibility for distributing stocks and giving help where it is needed. We do demand that fair price shops in larger numbers should be opened. We have been told about the situation by the hon. Food Minister who met us yesterday. He told us frankly that he was giving rice at Rs. 17-8-0 per maund. Nowhere in my State—and I think in other States too—do I see that rice is sold at that price. We do not get rice at that price. Even in the midst of plenty, there is no rice and the prices keep shooting up. This is a paradox and dangers inherent in the situation are many. It has worried us that the President's Address failed to point to these matters and the policy that the Government wanted to follow to remedy these situations. Coming closely after the President's Address, was the shock which was given to us yesterday by the Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. It is the poor who are made to pay more indirect taxes and in that situation one certainly feels alarmed.

گیاری جی ایس - مسافر (امرتسر) - راشٹر پتی کے بھاشن کے لئے شکرانے کی جو تجویز اس وقت ہاؤس کے سامنے پیش ہے میں اس کا سمرتھن کرنے کے لئے کھڑا ہوا ہوں - جیسا کہ پرائم منسٹر صاحب نے اپنی اسپیچ میں تھوڑا سا اشارہ کیا ہے راشٹرپتی جی کی اسپیچ میں زیادہ تر زور خاص کر جو شروع کے پیج ہیں ان میں سیکلف فائو ایر پلان پر دیا گیا ہے - اور یہ خطرہ محسوس کرایا گیا ہے کہ ہماری جو دوسری پنچ ورشیہ یوجنا ہے اس کے پہلے سال میں کچھ کمیاں رہ گئی ہیں اور ان کمیوں کی ایک وجہ راشٹرپتی نے یہ بتائی ہے کہ صوبوں کی نئی حد بندی کا سوال ہمارے دیش میں چلا اس کی وجہ سے پہلے سال میں تعمیری کاموں میں بہت کمی رہ گئی ہے اور یہ خوشی کی بات ہے کہ ان کمیوں اور رکاوٹوں کے باوجود راشٹرپتی نے بڑے زور سے اس بات کا اظہار کیا ہے کہ ہم اس یوجنا میں کوئی فرق نہیں آنے دیں گے اور ہم اور ذرائع اکٹھے کریں گے اور استعمال کریں گے - اور اس کام کو ہم ضرور پورا کریں گے - جو صوبوں کی نئی حد بندی کی بات ہمارے سامنے آئی ہے ، میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس سوال نے کچھ جھگڑے ہمارے دیش میں پیدا کئے - ان جھگڑوں کی وجہ سے جیسا کہ راشٹرپتی نے فرمایا ہے ہمارا تعمیر کا کام کچھ رکا مگر اس سوال کو جس دلیری اور تدبر سے نمٹایا ہے وہ قابل تعریف ہے - بےشک مہاراشٹر اور گجرات کی طرف سے کچھ ممبر صاحبان نے اس خیال کا اظہار فرمایا ہے کہ اس میں کچھ تبدیلی ہو یا اس طرف کچھ مذید دھیان گورنمنٹ دے - اس کی طرف تو میں نہیں جانا چاہتا مگر میں

میں اس بات کو مانتا ہوں کہ اختلاف رائے اب بھی موجود ہے - اور خاص کر میں میری اپنی کانسٹی ٹیونسی میں جس حلقے سے میں آتا ہوں وہاں بھی یہ اختلاف رائے موجود ہے مگر سوچنا یہ ہے کہ اس اختلاف رائے کو اس حد تک بڑھا دیا جائے اور اسے ایک ایسی مذہبی رنگت دے دی جائے جس سے کہ دیش کے امن کو خراب کیا جائے تو اس کی طرف دھیان دینا بڑا ضروری ہے - دراصل اس وقت اختلاف رائے کا جو لوگ اظہار کر رہے ہیں ان میں زیادہ تر تعداد ان لوگوں کی ہے جو اپنے آپ کو مہا پنجاب کا حامی کہتے ہیں اور مہا پنجاب سمیتی والے لوگ یہ سلسلہ اس طرح سے چھیڑ رہے ہیں اور اس طریقے سے اسے مذہبی رنگت دے رہے ہیں کہ جس سے کبھی نہ کبھی نقص امن پیدا ہو جانے کا اندیشہ پیدا ہو جاتا ہے - دراصل اگر سوچا جائے تو ہر کوئی اس نتیجہ پر پہنچے گا کہ پنجاب اس ریجنل فارمولا سے مہا پنجاب ہی بنا ہے اور پنجاب پہلے کے پنجاب سے اب بڑا ہو گیا ہے - پیپسو کو ملا کر پنجاب کچھ بڑا ہو گیا ہے - تو اس طریقے سے اگر کوئی بات مانی گئی ہے تو مہا پنجاب والوں کی ہی بات زیادہ تر مانی گئی ہے کیونکہ پنجاب بڑا ہو گیا ہے مگر اب جو اس وقت سلسلہ پنجاب کے متعلق ضرور دو چار باتیں اس سلسلے میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں - پنجاب کے اندر یہ سوال بڑی تیزی سے چلا - ویسے سادھارن طور پر تو یہ ایک ایڈمنسٹریشن کا سوال تھا - سب کو آخر ہندوستان میں ہی رہنا ہے - اب کوئی ضلع ادھر ہو یا کوئی ادھر ہو اس میں کوئی زیادہ فرق نہیں پڑتا تھا لیکن اس سوال کو کچھ پولیٹکل رنگت اور پنجاب میں تو خاص طور پر اس کو مذہبی رنگت دی گئی جس کی کہ وجہ سے کچھ خطرہ پیدا ہوا - پنجاب کے اندر دو سوال بڑی تیزی سے چلے - ایک تو پنجابی صوبے کا سوال اور دوسرا اس کے مقابلہ میں مہا پنجاب کا سوال چلا لیکن نہ تو پنجابی صوبہ ہی بنا اور نہ ہی جیسا کہ مہا پنجاب کا خیال کیا جاتا تھا ویسا پنجاب ہی بنا - اس کا ایک تیسرا حل نکالا گیا - سرکار نے ایسے تدبر سے اور ایسی سمجھداری سے ایک ایسا حل نکالا جس سے کہ پنجاب کے اندر کچھ شانتی ہو گئی - میں اب بھی یہ سمجھتا ہوں اور یقین کے ساتھ کہتا ہوں کہ موجودہ حالات میں اس سے اچھا حل اور کوئی نہیں ہو سکتا تھا - ہو سکتا ہے کہ اب بھی کہیں کہیں اس کے خلاف آواز ہو - اختلاف رائے ہونا تو ایک ضروری بات ہے - ہر ایک اپنے اپنے ڈھنگ سے اور اپنے اپنے طریقے سے سوچتا ہے - اس لئے

[کھانی جی - ایس - مسافر]

چل رہا ہے اس سے اندازہ لگتا ہے کہ یہاں صرف مہا پنجاب کا ہی سوال نہیں تھا بلکہ کسی نہ کسی ڈھنگ سے کوئی مذہبی سوال چھیڑ کر کوئی فرقہ وارانہ بات چھیڑ کر کسی نہ کسی طرح کوئی رگڑا یا جھگڑا پیدا کرنے کی کوشش کریں

اب یہ لینگویج کا سوال سیدھا سادہ سوال ہے مگر اس سوال کو بھی ایک مذہبی رنگت دی جا رہی ہے - ہندی زبان کے نام پر ایسی ایسی باتیں کی جاتی ہیں اور تقریریں اس ڈھنگ سے کی جاتی ہیں مانوں یہ جو ریجنل فارمولا بنایا گیا ہے اس میں ہندی کو ختم کر دیا گیا ہے - حالانکہ ہم لوگ جو ریجنل فارمولا کے حامی ہیں ہم ہندی زبان کے سب سے بڑے حامی ہیں - میں خود اپنے متعلق کہتا ہوں کہ کانسٹی ٹوائنٹ اسمبلی سے لے کر جب بھی کبھی ہندی کا سوال آیا ہم نے بڑے زور سے اس کی وکالت کی کہ ہماری راشٹر بھاشا ہندی ہونی چاہیئے - لیکن اپنے پنجاب کے اندر ہندی اور پنجابی کا سوال یہاں اس ڈھنگ سے چھیڑا جاتا ہے جس سے کہ اس میں کچھ مذہبی رنگت پیدا ہو جائے اور مذہبی منافرت پیدا ہو جائے اور جھگڑا قائم رہے - پچھلے جنرل الیکشن میں اس سوال کی

بنا پر گو ہتھیا کے سوال کو سامنے لے آئے - گائے کی بڑی بڑی رنگ دار تصویریں بنا کر برسراقتدار پارٹی کے کسی آدمی کے سامنے گائے کا کٹا ہوا گلا دکھا کر لوگوں کو یہ بتایا گیا کہ یہ جو برسراقتدار پارٹی ہے یہ تمام گایوں کا گلا کاٹتی ہے اور اس ڈھنگ سے تصویریں بنا کر پرچار کیا گیا -

سبھا پتی جی - میں آپ کی وساطت سے اس بات کا اظہار کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ جن ایلٹی شوشل ہیبٹس کا ذکر راشٹرپتی نے اپنی سپیچ میں کیا ہے اور یہ ہورٹیٹنگ اور سٹے بازی اس کے علاوہ یہ بھی ایلٹی سوشل ہیبٹس میں ہی شامل ہیں کہ دھارمک رنگت دے کر اس طریقے سے لوگوں کو بھڑکایا جائے جس سے کہ مذہبی منافرت پھیلے اور جھگڑے پیدا ہوں اور ہماری پلیچ ورشیہ یوجنا کا کام رک جائے - یہ ڈھنگ ٹھیک نہیں ہوگا اور اس وجہ سے میری یہ تجویز ہے کہ اس کے متعلق بھی کوئی ایک ایسا مناسب قانون ہونا چاہیئے کہ جس سے کوئی سوسائٹی یا کوئی انڈیویجئل دھرم کے نام پر اس ڈھنگ سے پرچار نہ کرے جس سے دو قوموں میں آپس میں جھگڑا بڑھے اور ہمارا جو اصلی تعمیری کام ہے وہ روک جائے

پھل ہے کہ تھوڑے سے سے میں پنجاب ازاج کے لحاظ سے ایک سرپلس پراونس بن گیا ہے - اب آپ بارڈر پر بسنے والے کسانوں کی سہولت کا تھوڑا بہت خیال کیجئے - ان کے لئے کچھ ایسے ذریعہ مہیا کئے جائیں - ان کو ایسا کچھ ایلکویجمنٹ ملے سرکار کی طرف سے تو وہ کافی اناج پیدا کر سکتے ہیں - اور اس اناج سے صرف یہی نہیں کہ اس صوبہ کو یا اس علاقے کو فائدہ پہنچ سکتا ہے بلکہ سارے دیش کو پہنچ سکتا ہے -

کچھ باتیں ایسی ہیں - مثلاً پنجاب اور دھلی بہت نزدیک نزدیک کے صوبے ہیں - پنجاب کے اندر امرتسر ایک ایسا شہر ہے جس کو انڈسٹریز کا سینٹر کہا جا سکتا ہے - اگرچہ اب وہ بارڈر پر آ گیا ہے - مگر وہ ہمیشہ انڈسٹری کا اور خاص کر کپڑا پیدا کرنے کا ایک سنٹر رہا ہے - پرنٹیوسنگ سنٹر بھی رہا ہے اور ڈسٹریبیوٹنگ سنٹر بھی رہا ہے - اس وقت میں اس بات کی طرف زیادہ دھیان تو نہیں دلانا چاہتا - پر بجٹ کے موقع پر اگر وقت ہوا تو کچھ کہوں گا - مگر ایک موٹی بات میں ضرور کہنا چاہتا ہوں - انکم انکمٹ سیلس ٹیکس وغیرہ جو لگائے گئے ہیں ان میں جب دو انکمٹس ایک دوسرے کے ساتھ لگتی ہوں تو ایک کو انکم سیلس ٹیکس سے مستعفی کرنے سے اور دوسرے پر اور روکاوٹیں پیدا ہوں اور اس طریقے سے ہمیشہ کے لئے ایک ایسی مقابلت دو قوموں میں یا دو سوسائٹیوں یا دو جماعتوں میں پیدا جس کی وجہ سے ہمیشہ کے لئے ہندوستان کو نقصان پہنچتا ہو -

دوسری بات جو میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں وہ ہے جو اس وقت فوڈ کی فکر کی گئی ہے - اس کے متعلق یہ بھی میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ ایک بڑا سوال ہے - عالمی پیمانے پر اس کو حل کیا جائے گا - مانٹیک فوڈ منسٹری اس کو سوچ رہے ہوں گے - پروڈکشن کو بڑھانے کی بات تو ایک بڑی بات ہے - جہاں جہاں ہم زیادہ پیداوار بڑھا سکتے ہیں - ادھر اگر زیادہ توجہ دی جائے تو اس سوال کو بہت مدد مل سکتی ہے -

پنجاب سا صوبہ خاص طور پر ایک کھیتی باڑی کا صوبہ ہے - اور خاص طور پر جو ضلعے بالکل بارڈر پر آ گئے ہیں ان کی زمین بہت زرخیز ہے اور وہاں کے کسان لوگ بڑے محنتی ہیں اور بات بالکل سہل ہے اور ظاہر ہے کہ پاکستان میں جن لوگوں نے اچھی اچھی زمینیں تیار کیں - بڑی اچھی اچھی مالیات پر قابض رہے - وہ لوگ پاکستان کو چھوڑ کر تو جب آئے پنجاب میں بسے ہیں - ان کی محنت کا ہی

پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو کا دم جو ہے وہ سلامت رہے - جب میں نے اس سے پوچھا تو اس نے جن خیالات کا اظہار کیا ان کو سن کر میں حیران رہ گیا - وہ کہنے لگا کہ ہم نے سنہ ۱۹۱۷ع سے لے کر اب تک جو کچھ بنایا تھا سنہ ۱۹۳۹ع تک دوسری بڑی جنگ میں ہٹلر نے وہ سب برباد کر دیا اور تباہ کر دیا - اس کے بعد جب لڑائی ختم ہوئی تو سنہ ۱۹۴۵ اور سنہ ۱۹۵۳ کے بیچ ہم نے جو کچھ بنایا ہے کیا گارنٹی ہے کہ اور کوئی ہٹلر نہ پیدا ہو جائے گا اور ہمارا یہ سلسلہ بھی ختم نہ ہو جائے گا - اس طرح سے ہم جو دیرپا کام کرتے ہیں وہ رک سکتا ہے - اب چونکہ پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو نے اپنے بھاشن میں وضاحت کی ہے اس معاملے میں کہ ہم کو آپس میں نیگوشیشنس سے باتوں کو طے کرنا چاہیئے - میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ مجھے خوشی ہے کہ راشٹرپتی نے بھی اس معاملہ میں یہ صلاح دی ہے کہ ہم کوئی کمپرومائز نہیں مانیں گے - نہ تو ایکسپینشن پالیسی کی حد قائم کرنے کی اور نہ رجسٹریشن وغیرہ کی - جو بھی سلسلہ ہے اس میں کوئی بھی کمپرومائز کرنے کے لئے تیار نہیں ہے - انہوں نے ٹھیک ہی کہا ہے کہ اس وقت دنیا کی دوسرے ملکوں کی سرکاریں کچھ بھی

[گھانی جی ایس مسافر]

لگانے سے ان کے حق کو اور خاص طور سے بارڈر اسٹیٹ کو نقصان پہنچتا ہے - امرتسر دس کروڑ روپیہ کی مالیت کا سلک اور کاٹن کلاتھ پیدا کرتا ہے اور وہاں ڈسٹریبیوشن بھی ہوتا چلا آیا ہے - دہلی میں بھی اس کے برابر ہی دس کروڑ روپئے کے کپڑے کا پروڈکشن ہوتا ہے - یہ دونوں ایک دوسرے سے ملتے ہیں آپ ایک کو دوسرے سے الگ نہیں کر سکتے کہ ایک میں تو سیلس ٹیکس کا قانون اور ہو اور دوسرے میں اور ہو -

تیسری بات میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہمارے راشٹرپتی نے جو ۲۵ پیرے میں ذکر کیا ہے وہ بہت ہی مناسب ہے - انہوں نے فرمایا ہے کہ اس وقت پیس کے سلسلہ میں - ہائڈروجن بم یا ایٹم بم کے سلسلہ میں دنیا کی جو اوپینین ہے وہ اس طرح کی چل رہی ہے جو کہ ہمارے پرائم منسٹر نے اپریل سنہ ۱۹۵۴ع میں یہاں پر لوک سبھا کے اجلاس میں کہی تھی - میں نے اس کو اپنے کانوں سے سنا - سنہ ۱۹۵۴ میں اپریل کے فوراً بعد جون کے مہینے میں مجھے رشیا جانے کا اتفاق ہوا - میں نے جارجیا میں ایک مزدور کی زبانی یہ بات سنی کہ ہم تو چاہتے ہیں کہ ہندوستان کی جو موجودہ گورنمنٹ ہے وہ قائم رہے -

سوچتی ہوں مگر جہاں تک جذبا
کا تعلق ہے ۔ جو جذبا کی اوپیلین
ہے وہ یہی سوچتی ہے جس کی
وضاحت پنڈت جواہر لال نہرو نے کی
ہے ۔ جس کی وضاحت سرکار ہند نے
اس موجودہ زمانے میں کی ہے ۔

اس لئے ان الفاظ کے ساتھ میں
شکرانے کی تجویز کا پورے زور کے ساتھ
سمرتھن کرتا ہوں ۔

(*English translation of the above speech*).

[**Giani G. S. Musafir** (Amritsar): I support the motion of thanks for the President's Address which is now before the House. As the Prime Minister has also referred to in his speech, much stress has been laid in the Address on the Second Five Year Plan. The Address makes a mention of some shortfalls during the First year of our Second Five Year Plan. One of the reasons given for this was the reorganisation of States. The Address mentions the determination of the Government to implement the Plan despite these obstructions and without in any way reducing its outlay or extending its period. The Government is determined to implement the Second Five Year Plan. The issue of reorganisation of States gave rise to certain disputes and owing to those disputes some of our constructive activity suffered, but the statesmanlike manner in which this question was handled is worthy of every body's praise. Some Members from Maharashtra and Gujarat have expressed the view that there should be further revision of the decisions already taken and that the Government should reconsider the matter.

I would like to say a few words regarding Punjab. This question assumed big proportions in the Punjab. Ordinarily this was merely a question of administration because after all every body has to live in India and it does not make much difference if a district remains in one State or the other, but some political colour was given to this question and in Punjab this question took a communal turn also. It was due to this trend that some danger was felt. There were two demands; one for the creation of a Punjabi Suba and the other regarding the formation of Maha-Punjab. But neither a Punjabi Suba was created nor a Maha-Punjab was formed. The Government arrived at a very wise solution and the atmosphere in Punjab changed for the better. I can definitely say that a better solution than this could not have been found out. It is possible some people might still oppose this—and this is inevitable because everybody thinks in his own way. I agree that differences of opinion still exist and in my constituency there does exist a vast difference of opinion among parties on this issue. But we are to think whether we should allow this difference to continue and let the communal feelings grow to an extent which might become prejudicial to the peace of our country. In reality now the main opposition to this issue comes from the supporters of Maha Punjab. Members of the Maha Punjab Samiti are giving this question a communal colour which can cause a breach of peace any time in the State. In fact Punjab has now become Maha Punjab as a result of the adoption of this regional formula. With the inclusion of PEPSU it has become bigger and in fact, the demand of the Maha Punjab Samiti has been acceded. So now whatever opposition is being done clearly indicates that this is not merely a question of Maha-Punjab. The real thing is that they want some communal controversy to continue so that some quarrels and strifes should go on in the State. The question of language is quite simple but a communal colour is being given to that also. In the name of Hindi such speeches are made as if the regional formula has abolished Hindi. The fact is that we, the supporters of

[Giani G. S. Musafir]

regional formula, are the greatest supporters of Hindi. Right from the times of the Constituent Assembly, whenever the question of Hindi arose, I pleaded for it and always said that Hindi should be our national language. But in the Punjab this question is being given such a colour by which inter-communal hatred may grow and this dispute may be perpetuated. During the last general elections these people raised the slogan of cow protection. Big paintings of slaughtered cows were displayed and it was told that the party in power was responsible for cow slaughter in the country. They started such a propaganda.

Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I wish to say that besides the anti-social habits of hoarding and speculation etc. referred to by the President in his Address, we may also say that the habit of inciting people by communal propaganda and spreading the poison of hatred among masses is also equally anti-social as it obstructs the implementation of our Plan. In this connection I suggest that some such law should be made whereby no individual or organisation should be allowed to propagate its tenets in the name of religion in a manner which furthers the cleavage among two communities and obstruct the constructive work, or creates hatred among two sections which can prove harmful to our country.

I also wish to say something regarding the food problem. I quite realize that this is a big question. This problem should be solved at a high level. The Food Minister must be considering this matter. If we give more attention to those areas where production can be increased it would be helpful in solving the problem.

Punjab is mainly an agricultural State and some of its border districts are very fertile and the cultivators there are also hardworking. The peasants who made the lands of Pakistan fertile and were the owners of big tracts there had settled down in the Punjab. It is due to their hard work that the State has become surplus in food in such a short period. If some attention is paid to the condition of peasants living on the border and some encouragement is given to them they can still produce more. The increase will not merely benefit the State of Punjab but the whole of India would stand to gain.

Punjab and Delhi are neighbour States. In the Punjab, Amritsar City can be called a centre of industries. Although now it is a border town, yet it has been a very important centre of textile and other industries and also a centre for the distribution of goods. At present I do not wish to go into its details—I will do that at the time of discussion on the budget —but I wish to say one thing. Suppose there are two neighbouring States. Now, if one of them is exempted from the levy of inter-State Sales Tax while in the other it is levied, the state where it is levied, and particularly a border State, would stand to lose much. Amritsar produces silk and cotton cloth worth ten crores of rupees and is also in important centre for the distribution of cloth. Delhi too produces cloth of an equal value and since both the States are adjoining you cannot separate the one from the other and you cannot discriminate between the two by levying Sales Tax in one and exempting the other.

The third thing I want to say is about some important observations made by the President in para 25 of his Address. The President has observed that so far as problems of hydrogen and atomic weapons and the question of peace are concerned, the world is holding the same opinion as was expressed by our Prime Minister in April 1954 in Lok Sabha. I had heard the Prime Minister then and shortly afterwards i.e., in June I had to go to Russia. There in Georgia I heard a labourer saying that the

people there desired that the present government of India should continue and they also wished a long life for Pandit Nehru. When I asked him the reasons the sentiments he expressed in his answer astonished me. He said that whatever progress Russia had made during 1917—1939 was undone by Hitler in the Second World War and everything was destroyed. He said where was the guarantee that whatever they had done during 1945-54 would not be undone by another Hitler and the constructive work they were doing would not be obstructed. Now, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru has also said that nations should resolve this problem through negotiations. I am very happy that the President has also counselled that we would accept no compromise in this matter and we will not accept any limitation of the nuclear explosions or their registration. There can be no compromise on this issue. He has rightly stated that the governments of various countries might be thinking in different ways but so far as the opinion of the people of all countries is concerned—they hold the same opinion which has been expressed by Pt. Nehru here and which is the representative opinion of our Government.

With these words I fully support the motion of Thanks on President's Address.]

Shri Ansar Harvani (Fatehpur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, let me thank the President, at the very outset, for his Address in which he has not only described the great achievements that have been made by his Government but has enunciated the policies which are bound to lead to the prosperity of our country and to the peace of the world.

A casual reference has been made to Kashmir. When we hear of Kashmir, we are reminded of our countrymen on that side of the so-called cease fire line who have been groaning under the iron heals of an alien rule for almost the last ten years. On that side of the cease fire, the news that is coming to us reveals that manhood is being butchered and that womanhood is being dishonoured. Let us tell them here and now that we shall not rest unless every inch of Kashmir is liberated. We should tell them here and now that we are determined, plebiscite or no plebiscite, to see that the people on that side of the cease-fire line enjoy the same fruits of freedom that are being enjoyed by our countrymen in other parts of India.

In the President's Address, reference has been made to the forthcoming visit of our Prime Minister to certain countries, and to his attending the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London. It was rediculed by a very senior Member on the other side of the House. In fact, he suspected that our great Prime Minister is likely to walk into the ring of the imperialists. Let him remember that in our lifetime there has not been a greater undaunted soldier against imperialism than our Prime Minister himself. Let him remember that even in the stormy 1942, when our friends on that side of the House, under the pretex of a people's war, had walked into the camp of imperialists and had accepted Churchill and Chiang as their leader, it was this undaunted soldier of India's freedom, our great Prime Minister, who led the people on this side of the House to the Jails and even to the gallows.

Our Prime Minister is going to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London with a great prestige. He is going there as the seniormost Prime Minister of the Commonwealth countries. He is going there almost as the leader of the Commonwealth countries. We have seen his influence when the Suez crisis was there. It was his influence on the Commonwealth countries which saved the Suez crisis from developing into a major war. I would submit that when our Prime Minister goes to London, he should use his great influence and should see that South Africa is expelled from the Commonwealth. A barbarous country like South Africa has no right

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

to be in a conference to which our great Prime Minister goes. I am sure with his great influence he can do it.

Reference has been made to the food problem and the community projects and community development schemes. There is no doubt that the community development scheme is a great dynamic scheme; but I confess that its dynamo is too weak. We have made great progress and achieved great things, but those achievements were inevitable and they were due to our huge man power and resources. But, the tempo is slow. Let us find out why. The *gram sevakas*, and the Gram Sevaks go to the villages and work there in a missionary spirit; their contributions are innumerable. But I confess I cannot say the same thing about the people who at the top. The development commissioners who are at the top have been drawn from the Magistracy and the collectorate. I know that among them there are some very brilliant people who had a great academic background and in their early twenties had sold their soul to a foreign government governing them. There is no dearth of people in the country who will work with a missionary spirit. There is no dearth of people who, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, have imbibed the missionary spirit in them. With their support, we can make these community projects and development schemes a real lively and dynamic programme. Mere official organisations and mere official mobilisation cannot solve our food problem. It should be tackled on a war basis, on an emergency basis. We know that in the Opposition there are many people who have fought for the freedom of this country, who have gone to jails along with us and who have made sacrifices for the freedom of this country. There are many among them who have worked shoulder to shoulder when we were fighting against imperialism. We appeal to them to co-operate with us when we fight against poverty and hunger. I know that the Government has often made an appeal to the Members in the Opposition. But, I would appeal to them once again on the floor of this House that they should forget their petty differences and shun factionalism and give their whole-hearted support to the Government in tackling the food problem, in going to the villages and cultivating uncultivatable lands and in creating conditions for providing better facilities to the agriculturists.

I do not want to take more time of the House; but, at the same time, I would once again appeal that the food problem has to be tackled on an emergency basis. It cannot be tackled from the desk or the table. We have to mobilise a huge land army of men and women and send them to the villages. We should make it compulsory for young men and women of this country to go to the villages and offer their voluntary services. With these words, Sir, I express my gratitude to the President.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank you for having given me this opportunity to speak on the President's address. I feel that if pious wishes and expressions could solve our problems, if a generalisation full of excuses could give us more food and happiness, then the President's address is a classic instance of the fulfilment of our hopes and expectations. In this matter of fact world, words are of no value, unless they are translated into action in our lifetime. I think the hon. Mover of the Motion of Thanks and his collegues on the Treasury Benches for their eloquence in praising the policy and actions of the present Government; but, it would have been more appropriate had it come from the lips of their critics who are their real friends and who unhesitatingly point out their failings and shortcomings, so that we can better serve the ideal of the Government of the people, by the people and for the people.

Coming to the point on which amendments have been tabled by me, I beg to submit that the various community projects which have been so much praised by the hon. Prime Minister and other Members of the Treasury Benches have signally failed to solve the various problems of the villages. From my experience in Orissa, I would like to point out that the community projects have not succeeded due to the bureaucratic nature of the administration. That is why that amount of people's co-operation as expected is not forthcoming. It has become a regular practice to keep the various resolutions passed in the development advisory boards in cold storage; these are never implemented. The people are completely kept in the dark as to what happened to the various proposals. Therefore, I would submit to the Government that unless they take the people into confidence, it will not be possible to work the community projects successfully.

Secondly, lack of technicians is a great impediment in the way of progress of the various community projects. Lack of overseers, engineers and other technical staff is responsible for the non-completion of the various minor irrigation and other projects in the scheduled time. Very inadequate provision has been made to solve the problem of rural unemployment. In an agricultural State like Orissa, where there are very few factories and land is the biggest industry, most unfortunately the land has been concentrated in the hands of a very few. Unless we take bold steps and try to redistribute the land according to the needs of the people, it will not be possible to relieve the various strains of unemployment prevailing in the rural areas.

I would like to point out in this connection that it is very easy to listen to the high philosophy of socialism and socialist pattern. But there is no social security worth the name in the villages. We find that the sanitary and other living conditions in the villages are far from satisfactory. Diseases and epidemics contribute to the premature death of millions of people. The percentage of literacy in my State is hardly 7 per cent. The poor peasantry is not yet free from the clutches of the local *banyas* and there is a perpetual liquidation of the peasantry. Adequate provision has not been made in the various community projects to give the necessary facilities to the poor peasants in the villages.

Now coming to a very controversial point regarding the re-organisation of States, though it is not proper to speak here, I am forced by circumstances to speak on this subject because this matter has been decided most hastily by the Parliament and we have been elected to this House on the very issue of the re-organization of States. Unnecessarily, bad blood has been created on a very minor point between two neighbouring states, *i.e.*, Bihar and Orissa. We have so much in common between ourselves and we formed one State for nearly 2 decades and that minor point is a tiny bit of land which covers about 600 square miles with 2 lakhs of people and that is Saraikella and Kharswan. In the first General Election and in the last General Election the local princes have been elected there on the very issue of re-integration of those areas in Orissa. They were tiny bits of states and they formed part of Orissa in 1947. But circumstances led them to go to Bihar. After the merger of Saraikella and Kharswan the geographical contiguity was established and there was a great clamour from the people to re-integrate that area into Orissa and on that very issue in the last election my Party did put up a candidate and he was elected with a large majority. Hon. Members from the Treasury Benches spoke about *Janata Ki Rai* and people very much. If the people's verdict is to be respected, I most respectfully suggest that the Government should change their decision, so that the desire of the people could be fulfilled and this area could be integrated in Orissa.

[Shri P. K. Deo]

Lastly, I would like to point out some aspects of democracy in certain parts of this country. In Orissa though the electorate has completely rejected the party in power in the last elections and though only 56 members could be elected in a House of 140 Members, still you find a minority forming the Ministry. It could be possible because the party contained in power and tried to buy people by distributing loaves and fishes. The way some of the local M.L.As. underwent political sacrifices and the Governor came out with.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I do not think that the matter that the hon. Member has mentioned is strictly within the purview of this debate on the President's Address. It is not right for us to say how the Governor of Orissa or a party there behaved. How is the Central Government responsible for it? According to my opinion, this matter is not strictly relevant to the subject under discussion.

Shri P. K. Deo: Thank you very much, Sir. I am absolutely new to this House. I do not know that one cannot speak on any subject.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think that Central responsibility is there.

Shri P. K. Deo: I have got nothing more to say on the President's Address, except that it reminds me of a famous saying of Kalidas:

एकत्र न बाधते राजन्
तव बाधति बाधते ।

"It is not the physical burden on my shoulder that pains me; it is your ignorance."

Shri B. C. Kamble (*Kopargaon*): I am indeed grateful to you for the kindness that you have shown in giving this opportunity to me to address this House. I am speaking on behalf of the Scheduled Castes Federation which is known as Dr. Ambedkar's Party. Within the short time at my disposal, I would like to confine myself only to a few points.

The first is with regard to the states of the Marathi speaking people and the Gujerati speaking people. A great controversy is going on in those regions with regard to the formation of states in the form of bigger bi-lingual state versus two uni-lingual states. We know the results of the general elections; also we know the results of the Bombay Corporation election. When the electorate has given this verdict now, the dispute must come to an end. I am reminded of a famous phrase which was used when the Liberals defeated the Conservatives during the time of Lord Salisbury. At that time the phrase used was: "Rome has spoken and the dispute must end". I submit that in the same way the electorate has spoken in Bombay State and in Maharashtra and therefore, this controversy must come to an end. If this controversy is not brought to an end, I am afraid, there will not be social harmony in those regions. We are told that an experiment should be made with a bigger bilingual state. We know the evils of a mixed state and we know also the way in which the bilingual State has come into being. There is Article 3 of the Constitution of India and a proviso to this provides that the views of various legislatures of the States whose boundaries are likely to be affected by the States Re-organization must be ascertained. With regard to the bilingual states this provision has not been complied with at all. I beg to submit that the bigger bilingual is wholly unconstitutional. The bigger bilingual State has come into being by the lobby door, by an amendment to the three-State formula and therefore this is a patent error which requires to be corrected. Is there anybody who could give an example where a mixed state has been successful? There is no example at all. If there be an example, it is that a mixed state does not sustain; not only that—a mixed

state collapses. That is what happened in Turkistan. That is what happened in Czechoslovakia. That is what happened to the former state of Madras. That is what happened to the former state of Bombay. Therefore to have an experiment with evil is a wrong argument and I say that the bilingual state is an illegitimate state and is not a state which has come into being by the proper and constitutional way. What I would like to pose before the Government is: would Government like to continue this controversy? If the answer is "Yes", then I beg to submit the 4 points for the consideration of this House and for hat matter also for the consideration of the Government party. The first point is that this is a peoples' fight as distinct from a party fight, and it is only in the people that power originates. Is there any authority or power who can defeat the people and we have yet to see an authority or power either in the bigger bilingual state or in India or even in this honourable House which can defeat the people? The people cannot be defeated at all. Since Sahyadri stands, since Kistna and Koyna rivers are flowing and since the Sun is there. Therefore people cannot be defeated. That is the first point that I beg to submit for the consideration of Government.

The second point is that the illusion, namely that this House is sovereign, is a wrong illusion. It must be dispelled. Such of those who have studied a federal constitution must know where sovereignty resides, whether it resides in this House or in written Constitution, or in the aggregate States and it must be decided very carefully. I am very sorry that this kind of argument is also levelled by the hon. the Prime Minister. I would like to make it clear that in a Federal State the Union legislature is never sovereign and after the study I have made with due care I declare in this House that this House is not sovereign. It is only the aggregate States together that are sovereign and not this Union. Therefore this kind of argument also is futile.

The third point that I would like to make is that if there is such a kind of impression that this is a passing phase, then this also must be dispelled for ever. Sir, essentially it is a question of the distribution of sovereign powers. I refuse to accept that the formation of a State is a matter of administrative convenience. It is not so. It is a question which involves the distribution of sovereign powers and no people will accept that position and that is why I say that this fight will be carried from year to year and if necessary from generation to generation. About that there should be no mistake; therefore, I tell those who are arguing that this is going to be a passing phase that they must dispel this illusion.

And, finally, Sir, the fourth point that I beg to submit for the consideration of this House is that this is a House of people. We are not calling this House as the House of Commons. We are calling it—and it has been provided in the Constitution—as the House of the People. It means that the authority originates from different kinds of people, the Bengali people, the Punjabi people, the Gujerati people, Marathi people. Can such people do injustice and suppress a people? I submit if this happens, then the very foundation of this House will be destroyed. This House cannot be utilised for suppressing a people. Therefore, Government must consider ten times before they make an announcement with regard to the formation of States, so far as this controversy goes.

Now, Sir, I would like to turn to another point with regard to the position of the Scheduled Castes and those who have recently adopted Buddhism. Sir, we are very happy that on our side the Prime Minister is commending the teachings of Lord Buddha. He has been repeatedly saying, and we are very glad to note, that before the world there are only two ways. The one is of *yuddha* or war and the other is of Buddha. If the Prime Minister says what he means, then I say that the Prime

[Shri B. C. Kamble]

Minister is on the side of new Buddhists. If the Prime Minister does not mean what he says then the Prime Minister will have to correct himself. Therefore, so far as the position of the new converts to Buddhism is concerned, their interests must be safeguarded.

Now there are two points with regard to the safeguarding of the interests of these people. The first is with regard to the facilities which will be required to be given to them as Buddhists, as Scheduled Caste Buddhists, or Buddhist Scheduled Castes, purely as those who are converted to Buddhism In the Constitution there is a provision made that the interests of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes shall be taken into consideration and accordingly certain facilities are given. An argument will be advanced. The moment they cease to be Scheduled Castes they will not be entitled for any facilities. This will be a wrong argument I have come across an enactment which has been made by this hon. House in the year 1956 where a certain kind of amendment is made. I do not know whether the intention of the amendment was to facilitate the withdrawal of concessions which were enjoyed by these people or it is to make the meaning clear. I submit that the concessions which were given by the Constituent Assembly to the Scheduled Castes were given as a people. That is to say, the principle adopted was the concessions were for the people, not the people were for the concessions. We have accepted the principle of democracy which says Government for the people, by the people and of the people; that is to say, that the people are not for Government, the Government is for the people. In the same way the concessions are for the people; the people are not for the concessions. Therefore, it comes to this , wherever these people go, the concessions must follow and that is why I would like to plead with the hon. the Prime Minister and also with the Government that whatever are the educational and economic facilities which were extended to these people in the name of Scheduled Castes, should also be extended to them, even though they change their faith and become Buddhists. I hope that Government will carry out these intentions. We do not desire to be bitter on this point. We desire to pursue the matter very amicably and very calmly.

Mr. Chairman: Do they maintain their caste after they change their religion?

Shri B. C. Kamble: They have accepted this faith for the simple reason that they do not desire to be called by any caste. The whole country has been disrupted by this caste. The hon. the Prime Minister was speaking about fighting Communalism. Now he has shifted his emphasis to fighting casteism. There are many people who are wondering about the solution—how it has to be fought. Lord Buddha has given that solution. Lord Buddha has said that my religion and the system of my society is such that as in the case of rivers which flow from different provinces the moment they meet the ocean you cannot distinguish the waters of one from the other, so when people follow the Buddhist religion there is no caste, there is no distinction. I humbly submit that due consideration be given to these points.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. P. Jain): Mr. Chairman, Sir, food has naturally loomed large during the discussion on the President's Address. A large number of hon. Members have expressed their views. Some of them have spoken rather hard things. I know that some have spoken with sentiment. Some of them have accused us of complacency. They have said that the President has not presented a correct picture of the food situation; others have said that we are not attaching sufficient importance to the food situation..

Now Sir, it is obvious that the President has made an important refe-

rence to the food situation, he has given prominence to the food situation in his Address. I have also had the occasion to make a rather comprehensive statement before the House on the food situation in the country. In fact, in making that statement I went a little out of the way. I made reference to the State of Assam and to the State of Bihar where there is not much of trouble. But I wanted to take the House fully into confidence. I also spoke about Rajasthan where the trouble is confined to only a portion of the Division of Jodhpur. I also made a refernce to Kerala. Now Kerala has been a deficit State for a long time. It has been importing large quantities of rice from Tanjore in the State of Madras and from Andhra. Now, there is nothing new about what is happening in Kerala. Yet I thought I must give as complete a picture of the food situation as it was possible. Even so, if some hon. Members choose to accuse us of complacency or of not paying sufficient importaace to the food problem, all I can say is that they are not fair to us.

But our way of looking at the food problem is that we must make an impartial study, we must make an accurate study of the food situation in the country and try to find out the remedy. There is no use talking of scare, particularly in places where scare does not exist. There is no fun in creating panic, because any scale for panic or talk of starvation deaths, when they are not actual facts will only help the hoarders and people who keep the stocks and people who are interested in raising the prices of foodstuffs. I, therefore, very earnestly appeal to the hon Members here that the food problem is a common problem; we are all determined to solve it; it is a problem upon which depends the success of our Second Five Year Plan. May I say that it is a problem upon which depends the future and the prosperity of the country. Let us therefore join hands together and wherever there is a defect or wherever thre is a shortfall, let us find a solution for it rather than try to criticize each other. So far as I am concerned, I state in this House that I consider the food problem to be a national problem I am prepared to accept any suggestion which the hon. Members may offer, if it is a practicable suggestion I invite them to give me practical suggestions and I can assure them that they will find full response from me.

With this brief introduction I may say that the permanent solution to the food problem is increased production. We can solve food problem on a permanent basis only when we increase our production of foodgrains and other edible products. We have given some statistics of what has happened during the last ten years. Some hon. Members have expressed doubts about the accuracy of those statistics. On that matter I propose to say something later on. Here I will confine myself to the broad picture of the increase in the production of foodgrains in this country since 1947-48.

In 1947-48 the total production of cereals was 43.7 million tons. In 1948-49 it went down to 43.3 million tons. In 1949-50 it went up to 46 million tons. In 1950-51 it went down to 41.7 million tons, and in 1951-52 it was 42.9 million tons. For these five years it gives an average of 43.2 million tons per year. In 1952-53 the production went up to 49.2 million tons. 1953-54 was a very favourable year and the production went up by 9 million tons; it went up to 58.3 million tons. Again in 1954-55 it came down to 55.7 million tons, in 1955-56 to 53.3 million tons. And the average of these four years works out to 54:13 million tons. I have given the moving averages, that is averages of five years, ending various years, from 1947-48 onwards. And those averages indicate that the average production has increased by 25 per cent. Now, that is not a bad record. None-the-less the question arises: have we become self-sfficient? The President has, in his Address, very clearly said that although the food production has increased despite cer-

[Shri A. P. Jain]

tain calamities, we have yet to make a headway before we become self-sufficient. Is that an exaggerated picture, may I ask? Is that not a realistic picture? Is there not an admission in it that we are not-self-sufficient?

Sir, hon. Members are aware that ever since the formulation of the Second Five Year Plan there has been ample emphasis on agricultural production. The Planning Commission, the National Development Council, the Prime Minister—and of course the Agriculture Ministry whose duty it is —have been constantly talking of increasing the agricultural targets not only on paper but actually achieving them. The House will remember that in the Draft Plan there was a provision for increased production of foodgrains by 10 million tons. We reviewed those targets and we thought that if the Plan was to be made a success we should have higher targets. We reviewed them carefully and raised them to more than 15 million tons.

In order to achieve those targets certain administrative and other changes have been made. The House is aware that the Community Projects Administration has now been created into a regular Ministry. And there was a definite object behind it. Because, the Community Projects Administration was an Extension Wing; and unless the Extension Wing is a strong organisation, and unless there is constant liaison between the Agriculture Ministry and the Extension Wing, it would not be possible to achieve the big targets that we have laid down for agricultural production under the Second Five Year Plan.

One of the Evaluation Reports made by the Planning Commission went to show that the Village Level Worker who is the key man of the Community Development was not paying as much attention to agriculture as to its practical activities like building of schools, hospitals, roads, etc. That emphasis has been changed, and it has been clearly laid down among the rules of conduct of the Community Project officers that agricultural production must receive top priority in the Community Development and N.E.S. Blocks.

The House would also be aware that the question of achieving higher agricultural targets was very carefully reviewed recently at the Development Commissioners' Conference at Mussoorie; and there it was decided that the Community Project and National Extension Service Blocks should achieve an increase of at least 50 per cent. is agricultural production. The position today is that while we are not self-sufficient yet, our deficit is only marginal. Is it something that has happened suddenly; is it something that has arisen from the faults of the Agriculture Ministry?

I will refer to the Second Five Year Plan. On page 100, paragraph 95, the Plan says:

> "With increasing population and rising incomes, the consumption of foodgrains is certain to go up in the coming years. The stocks held at present by Government are very low, and they need to be replenished early. Considering these facts, imports aggregating to about six million tons in the plan period would appear to be essential, and a substantial proportion of this total will have to be imported in the first half of the period."

The Second Five Year Plan fully envisaged the position that would be created by the large developmental expenditure under deficit financing. It was provided in the Plan that a short-fall or deficit in respect of foodgrains should be made up by imports. That is exactly what we are doing. We have received and we are receiving something under Public Law 480. We have entered into a commitment for five years for the import of 2 million tons of rice from Burma. We are exactly doing what

was contemplated in the Second Five Year Plan. The situation today is what was contemplated in the Second Plan. Nothing new has happened.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): Are we to understand that this situation was contemplated by the Second Plan?

Mr. Chairman: That is a matter of opinion. Let the hon. Minister continue.

Shri A. P. Jain: The question today is that the difficulties are there. We are not denying that the difficulties are not there. We are not complacent about the situation. How to combat the difficulties? A number of hon. Members have said that the prices are rising. It is a fact that the prices of foodgrains have risen. We have not denied that. In the statement that I have made, all that I said was that between November 1956 and May 1957, the rise in the price of rice was comparatively less than what it was in the corresponding period last year. Between November 1955 and May 1956, the rise in the price of rice was 20 per cent. This year, during the same period, the rise in the price of rice is 4 per cent. On the contrary, while last year there was a rise in the price of wheat, this year, actually there has been a fall in the price of wheat. All these facts are borne out by quotations from the papers even if our figures are not believed.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Will the hon. Minister give the price figures....

Shri A. P. Jain: I do not want these interruptions. I am not giving way.

The fact is, prices have been rising.

We made some estimates of production. I gave the figures to the House. Some hon. Members said that these figures were not dependable. How are these figures collected? We have got a fairly good system of collecting statistics of production. These figures are collected on the basis of random sampling survey. That survey is conducted under the supervision of the National Sample Survey. I submit that these figures are as accurate as they could possibly be. Yet, the question arises, if there is larger production, why are the prices going up. The question is very legitimate and it has to be answered.

Prices depend on demand and supply. While the supply is increasing, the demand is increasing on even a greater scale and that is why the prices have shown an upward trend. To meet the gap between supply and demand, we are importing foodgrains and releasing them in the market. It is clear that while the Budget of the Centre and the States combined in 1953-54 was Rs. 1019 crores, in 1955-56, it came to Rs. 1430 crores and in 1956-57, it came to Rs. 1894 crores. It is obvious that there has been public expenditure on a very larke scale. With more money circulation, prices were bound to go up it is not a solitary phenomenon that has happened in this country. Every country has had to pay some price for planning and development. For the benefit of hon. Members, I would like to present some figures regarding China. The House will remember that one of our delegations visited China last year to study the technique of planning. The report of the delegation says that the average purchase and sale price of the principal foodgrains at the present time, as supplied by the Chinese authorities are: wheat-Rs. 27-8-0 per maund; paddy—Rs. 15-6-0 per maund which will work out to be the equivalent of Rs. 25 wholesale price and Rs. 27 retail price. I am not quoting these figures as some sort of a justification for the prices that are prevailing in this country. I am quoting these figures to show that you have to pay some price for development. When there was public expenditure on a large scale, there was rise in price in China where, perhaps, governmental authority comes down with a far more heavier hand.

We have also conducted some surveys recently. I said that there is

[Shri A. P. Jain]

hoarding. Some hon. Members did not believe it. The results of our surveys in the two districts of Krishna and Godavari are these. In Krishna, the loans granted by the Central Co-operative Bank to Co-operative credit societies before the end of January, 1957 were about three times than a year ago: Rs. 55.17 Lakhs as against Rs. 18:97 lakhs in January, 1956. Again in Godavari, loans granted by the Central Co-operative Bank to the Co-operative marketing societies in January 1957 were double those a year ago: Rs. 16.22 lakhs in January 1957 as against Rs. 8.24 lakhs in January, 1956. Advances by the Reserve Bank to the Co-operative Banks have increased from Rs. 17.4 crores in 1955-56 to Rs. 23.6 crores in 1956-57. Advances by the Reserve Bank to the farmers also indicate an increase. In regard to these increases, the Reserve Bank has observed that the increase is phenomenal. The report says that in fact, the demand for funds by these Co-operative Banks was so heavy that at least one of them had to take steps to arrange for additional finances through the Apex Bank. A sharp rise of more than 100 per cent was recorded in the outstanding loans against paddy by some of the Agricultural and primary marketing societies. Membership of the societies has risen in the last few months, especially during January and February, obviously due to urgent need for finances. In January 1957, 350 new members have joined the societies.

In a way, this a good thing. Hitherto, the history of our agricultural marketing has been that during the harvest season, on account of distress sales, the farmer brings his entire produce to the market and gets a low price. With the availability of co-operative financing and other financing he is in a position to hold his produce. This produce must out as and when the market needs that. For that purpose, I have suggested in the course of my statement that a high-powered committee is going to be set up, which will constantly study the marketing conditions, credit facilities and other things and suggest adequate steps so that there is a regular flow of foodgrains from the stocks placed with the Banks, Co-operative banks and allied institutions, so that there may be no deficit in the market. We are fully conscious of keeping the prices down. The House will remember that the hon. Minance Minister yesterday had made a provision of not less than Rs. 25 crores for subsidising food prices so that the poorer sections of the people may not suffer. Obviously, we are not complacent about it. On the other hand, we are very much conscious about it. Yet, if there is any defect in our working, or, if any hon. Member has any suggestions to make, they will be most welcome, because we are determined to find a solution for the problem. It is a national problem. We do not treat it as a party problem. We are treating it as a common problem of all the parties present here or outside.

The other aspect of this problem is the problem of immediate shortages. The Leader of the Opposition made some rather uncharitable remarks during the course of his speech. He accused us of manipulating situations, cooking up figures and creating a false impression. I shall read out what the hon. Member said:

> "The White Paper says: 'The fall was due to less favourable weather conditions'. That was in March. In May, it has become natural calamities. From 'less favourable' it has become 'calamity' in two months, and this is a very rapid progress in the thinking of the Ministerial Benches. But why should they find it that 'less favourable weather' had really become a 'natural calamity' after two months?

15 hrs.

That was a very serious accusation. And I make bold to say that it is not we who have misrepresented. Maybe, consciously or unconsciously, it is the Leader of the Opposition who has tried to mislead the House.

He has based his remarks on the White Paper published in March, 1957. Now, what does that White Paper say? It says:

> "The overall index of agricultural production (1949-50-100) declined by nearly 2.4 per cent from 116.4 in 1954-55 to 113.7 in 1955-56 mainly due to less favourable weather conditions."

But to what year does it relate? It relates to the year 1955-56. The President has referred, when he has talked of calamity, to the year 1956-57. To apply the remarks that were made by the Finance Minister relating to 1955-56 to the year 1956-57 is clearly misleading the House, and trying to create a picture that does not exist there. The two sets of remarks were made to two quite different sets of conditions, namely to 1955-56 and 1956-57.

Again, some hon. Members have talked of starvation deaths. Particularly, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said that the people are dying in the streets of Calcutta. I have not known of any such thing. I think it is total exaggeration. It is not a statement which is borne out by facts.

Curiously enough, immediately after the 1952 elections also, almost similar allegations were made. As I was reading some of the previous debates, I was struck by the similarity of the accusation. On 7th. August, 1952 , a question was put to the following effect:

> "whether Government are aware of the report published in the Times of India dated the 21st July, 1952, Delhi Edition, alleging that five million people in West Bengal were starving and another five million were living in near-starvation condition?"

There is also another interesting passage which I would like to read to the House a question was asked on 8th August, 1952:

> "May I know whether Government is aware of the fact that an ex-Member of Parliament, Mr. Shibban Lal Saksena has stated that there have been starvation deaths, and he has declared his intention to start a fast to invite the attention of Government to this fact?"

The answer given by my predecessor Shri Kidwai was:

> 'Today I received a telegram from Mr. Shibban Lal Saksena stating that one hundred persons are dying every day on acount of starvation. ....Mr Shibban Lal had supplied some names of deaths from another village also. Some of those persons had died six months ago. some two months ago. It was discovered that most of them were on austerity rationing and everyone of them had drawn his ration for the week in which he died."

Now, there is no use in trying to draw this dismal picture. The picture is by no means happy. There are scarcities, ther are difficulties, but in a vast country like India where only less than 25 per cent of the area has got the benefit of irrigation, where nature is sometimes hard and produces rather deleterious effects on our production every year, there is one difficulty or another in one party of the country or another; and even if we develop our resources of irrigation to the full, we can never be sure that nature will not have a hand in determining the quantum of agricultural production.

Agriculture is something different from industry. In industry, if you put in a certain amount of raw material, you are assured of certain products. On the other hand, in agriculture, you can never be sure until the crop has actually been reaped. That is what has happened in Bihar this year. Until the end of March,

[Shri A. P. Jain]

there was good crop with fat ears, and everybody was hoping to have a bumper yield. But as soon as some people rubbed the crop, they found that the grain inside had shrivelled, and the crops had very much gone down.

The broad picture in the country, in the eastern region, that is, in the eastern parts of UP, parts of Bihar and parts of Bengal, the rabi crop has been affected by rain, hailstorm and rust. Nobody can have control over natural calamity. Yet, we can do something to alleviate the conditions arising from natural calamities.

It has been said that we are dependent upon statistics too much. Shri Frank Anthony suggested, burn the statistics. Statistics have their own value, but they are nothing absolute by themselves. So far as statistics are concerned, we treat them as a sort of guide, but we do not absolutely depend on them. I have personally visited some of the States affected; I have gone to Bihar, and I have toured in the rural areas; I have gone from *kalyan* to *kalyan*, and I have talked to the peasants. And there are hon. Members of this House who have accompanied me in the course of my tour. I have gone *incognito* to the markets and to the *mandis* to ascertain what the prices were. That is surely not a dependence purely on statistics.

I have been also to Uttar Pradesh. I have been to Bombay to enquire and to study the conditions on the spot. Now, it is on the pragmatic estimate that we are proceeding. I have stated in this House and elsewhere that we have agreed to meet the full demands of the States of U.P. Bihar and Bengal, arising out of these calamities.

Then, there was another difficulty. In the western region, that is Bombay and the adjoining areas of Mysore, the jowar crop had suffered badly year. In kharif 1956, there was a shortfall of about 3 million tons. That is a big quantity. And the prices there are going up. There is no absolute shortage of foodgrains, but the prices are not within the reach of the people.

In the course of my talks with the Chief Minister and the Food Minister of Bombay, we have agreed to release wheat in the areas where the prices are showing an upward trend. My colleague, the Deputy Minister of Food, has toured practically the whole of South India, and his experience by and large is that there are stocks in the markets, but the prices are high The prices have got to be brought down, but the manner and the method of bringing down the prices is not surely, to talk of panic, or to talk of shortages. There is no shortage as such, but the prices are high. The prices have to be reduced.

There are shortages in certain pockets.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Thiruvella): May I know.....

Shri A P. Jain: I am not yielding.

For instance, in the eastern parts of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Bengal, and in Bombay and the adjoining of Mysore, there are shortages. But we have sufficient stocks to meet their requirements.

Shri Punnoose (Ambalapuzha): Is there no time-limit for the hon. Minister? He does not want to be interrupted. He does not want to give information. He is inflicting a speech on us. Can he not answer our questions? What is this procedure?

Shri A. P. Jain: I can answer afterwards. But if it is going to be across the Table now, I think there will be no end.

Mr. Chairman: I agree this is a very important question on which so many Members have spoken. So the hon. Minister is taking a little more time.

Several Hon. Members *rose*—

Shri A. P. Jain: The position is that we have a sufficiently good import programme during the course of the year to meet the requirements of the deficit areas and to cordon off certain areas like Bombay, Calcutta and Delhi to meet their supplies from the imported stock. While the situation will require constant watching and careful handling, there is no reason for alarm. Let us hope that the next kharif crop will be good and the difficulties which we are seeing today will disappear.

I am sorry that some hon. Members think that I do not want to answer questions. That accusation is not proper because I have been answering questions. But if during the course of my speech, there is questioning and cross-questioning, it is rather difficult to keep the trend of thinking.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: On a point of clarification. The hon. Minister was submitting before the House that there was hoarding. A lot of figures were quoted. Has the hon. Minister got any immediate measures which he will take to put a stop to this?

Mr. Chairman: A Committee is being set up.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: He was quoting figures to show that there was hoarding. What steps has he taken to stop hoarding?

Shri A. P. Jain: I have very clearly stated the other day that Government are going to set up a high-power Committee to deal with measures for avoiding hoarding and also for bringing down prices.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Kakinada—Reserved-Sch. Castes): The immediate necessity is to arrest the rise in prices. Therefore, I want to know exactly what is the immediate step that is proposed to be taken to see that the prices are brought down.

Shri A. P. Jain: Government have already placed a curb on advances against foodgrains. That is one of the steps. Certain other steps may have to be taken. But it will not be wise to disclose what steps we are going to take because otherwise anti-measures will found out.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): The hon. Minister has blamed the caprices of nature and hoarding. I want to know if the hon. Minister is aware of the fact that in the State of Assam there has been scarcity and that is due to the fact that paddy and rice are smuggled out of the State of Assam to Pakistan. There are two districts there which are known as the 'rice bowls', Cachar and Coalpara, both of them situated on the Pakistan border. I read a statement the other day by the Supply Minister of the State of Assam that he has been asking the Government of India to delegate more powers to the State so that it might deal effectively with the profiteers. Can the hon. Minister throw some light on this?

Shri A. P. Jain: The power to stop smuggling was delegated to the Governments of Assam and West Bengal several months ago. A ban has been placed on the export of foodgrains from Assam. I understand that as a result of the tightening of these and other measures, there is much less of smuggling now. But I cannot say that smuggling has been altogether stopped. After all, the question is, who is to end the smuggling?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: The Minister told us.....

Shri Achar (Mangalore): On a point of order. When the debate is going on and the hon. Mininster makes a speech, are Members entitled to get up and ask questions in this way and convert this into a question hour?

Mr. Chairman: With the permission of the Chair, questions can be put. The hon. Member will be the last to put a question.

Shri Hem Barua: It is in the interest of the country and of the Government.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: The Minister just now told us that his Deputy Minister toured the whole of South India. We come from Kerala. We do not know whether the Deputy Minister has gone to Kerala. As far as we know, he has not. Still, from Hyderabad he issued a statement on May 8, that the food situation in Kerala was quite comfortable and prices remain steady. This is an unfair statement to make. We want to know whether this statement has come to the notice of the Minister.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): Did the Deputy Minister have a telescope?

Shri A. P. Jain: *The Chief Minister and the Food Minister of Kerala are going to see me in 15 minutes (Interruptions).*

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I cannot allow this sort of questioning for the whole of the time. There are others who want to speak. I am going to call upon the next speaker.

Shrimati Manjula Debi (Goalpara): Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I stand for the first time on the floor of this House and behold this great gathering of the representatives of our people, and our country, assembled here for the common cause of building up our motherland as a great nation, a feeling of assurance for the welfare of the country fills me.

[**Sardar Hukam Singh** *in the Chair*]

Diversity of thought and ideology adds colour to the scheme of things. Criticism and correction, with concrete proposals, infuse strength to the forces of administration, and the power of organising capacity. Thus the Opposition Benches become the welcome instrument of bringing unity in seeming disunity. Co-ordination is effected with a strong and healthy opposition.

Now we face the greatest task of building up our nation as an ideal one not only in the international sphere, but also in the more important and urgent sphere of international home rule. A grave warning of the difficulties that face the country, and our stern resolve to remove those obstacles in the way of the upliftment of our country, ring clearly in the President's Address. I congratulate the President on this timely warning, for at the outset and at every step, we need this warning and we must be kept aware of the dangers facing the country.

I must also congratulate the President on dealing with the different aspects of the economic and industrial questions. The glaring question of food is also dealt with. But it is not an easy matter to dispense with the question of food with a growing population when we are in the process of building up our nation. It would have been much better if the very important and urgent questions of social welfare and education had been dealt with in the Address. For a country steeped in darkness of ignorance and illiteracy, it is imperative that compulsory education should be introduced throughout the length and breadth of the country. Social education, duties of citizenship, and the moral code of living, should be the essential points in education. The young mind is easier to be moulded to the high ideal we aspire....

Mr. Chairman: Our reporters are feeling some difficulty in hearing the hon Member.

Shri Amjad Ali (Dhubri): There is some defect in the acoustics.

Mr. Chairman: I will have that looked into; but, in the meanwhile, the hon. lady Member may move forward.

Shrimati Manjula Debi: The young mind can be better moulded in all aspects for the ideal we propose to hold up for the future of the nation. So, I propose that special care should be taken and stress laid on the education of school children.

As for social welfare, the Social Welfare Board is struggling to cope with the question of social service to the country, more so with the welfare of women and children. But, I feel that it is not quite sufficient. The

voluntary organisations that are in contact with the masses and enjoy the confidence of the people should be given better scope to keep these contacts and win the confidence of the people to the schemes.

I have visited some of the project areas. I know a large amount of money is being spent on buildings and the appointment of workers. Yet, the confidence of the people is not so completely won; and it is gratifying to note that the Social Welfare Board proposes to take over these schemes under their wings. That would be, perhaps, a better scheme to get the contact of the people and win their confidence.

Under social welfare comes tribal welfare. We cannot any longer ignore the question of tribal welfare. Coming from the eastern part of India where this tribal question is very acute and the Naga problem is attracting the attention of even other nations. I think, it is most important that we should pay more attention to it. The Live Line system near the Naga Hills created by the British to prevent easy access and the Tribal belt, has created a feeling of separatism. This has aggravated the feelings of the tribal areas. Every attempt should be made to remove this feeling of separatism and a more psychological approach should be made to win their confidence. To attain this end, we should co ordinate the services of all the social welfare agencies which have a closer contact with these people.

To bring success to all the schemes and projects, a vital point is there. Unless there is efficiency in the administration, none of the schemes, not even the Five Year Plan, can be a success. We must all try, each and everyone of us, to infuse strength into the administration and to get better efficiency in ruling our country.

When I speak of efficiency in administration, I cannot but take up the matter of corruption. Corruption prevails in every sphere of life; not only in the administration but also in the country. This is a rot that has set into the country and this has become the greatest drain on our revenue and wealth. So, I request that all of us, for the betterment of the country, should strive hard, whichever party we may belong to, to remove this rot from the bosom of our country in united effort.

Shri S. L. Saksena: Mr. Chairman, I have moved amendment No. 82 to the motion of thanks. In my amendment there are 4 parts. One is concerned with the rapidly developing famine conditions in Eastern U.P. That is part (3). The first part is about comprehensive schemes to combat these recurring floods and famines. In the second part I have referred to the loss of millions of rupees to the sugarcane growers of U.P. on account of the cane price And, in the last part, I refer to the discrimination against non-INTUC unions in the matter of even simple registration etc.

Mr. Chairman: I would bring it to the notices of the hon. Member that parts 3(b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) are not relevant They relate to State subjects.

Shri S. L. Saksena: They are all Central subjects.

Mr. Chairman: They are not relevant and so are ruled out of order. He was allowed to move his amendment subject to its being admissible and these portions are not admissible. The hon. Member may speak on others; otherwise, he is losing his time.

Shri S. L. Saksena: I have carefully read the statement of the hon. Food Minister and also heard his speech. It has caused righteous indignation and I warn him and his Government that conditions in Eastern U.P. are so grave that something like the Bengal Famine of 1943 is in the offing. You may be content with your statistics. Even on the first page of the statement it is said that a study of the production figures over the last ten years shows that the overall production of cereals as well as the yield per acre are considerably higher at present then before. But, I am surprised at this. It is claimed that the production is very high. Then, there is deficit in Bihar where it is reported that sixty

[Shri S. L. Saksena]

per cent. of the wheat crop is reported to have been lost. When there is deficit in U.P., Rajasthan, Bombay and everywhere, how can there be the highest production in the country this year?

I have been touring my part of the country for the last three or four months and for the last three years there had been recurring drought in the months of June and July; there is flood in the months of August, September and October and then there are very bad conditions in November and Deecember. It has been happening all these three years. The early paddy crop gets dried up; the late paddy seeds are dried up and the rabi crop cannot be saved. All the three sowings are gone and this has happened for three consecutive years. People are almost starving even now when the rabi crop has just been reaped—starving, as has been pointed out, in the midst of plenty. I have known people who had no food for two or three days. After the end of this month, even the scanty harvest will be consumed and there will be absolutely no food. There will be starvation on a mass scale They will say that this is all false.

My friend referred to some statement which I had made in 1952. After that there was an enquiry held by Shri J. C. Kumarappa who was one of the chief collaborators of Mahatma Gandhi. He spent about a fortnight and went from village to village. Hundreds of people had died in his own presence. That is what he himself has said.

It has never been admitted by the Government that there has been starvation death anywhere. They say that there has been no food or that there had been failure of crops or floods but they never say that there have been starvation deaths. If there are people who have died of actual starvation, they say that they died of malnutrition or anything like that. I may tell them again. If they do not want to reproduce the Bengal Famine here, they should not be complacent. The Food Minister says that he is complacent but I say that he is complacent. In the statement he says that there has been very high production this year and yet there are people who are starving not only in U.P., North Bihar, Bengal but in Rajasthan Kerala and other States. Reports are coming in from all places. I say that these statistics are false. I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister what his distinguished predecessor said. He said: "I do not trust in statistics." He kept on moving about everywhere. The Minister just now said that they got these figures through random sample surveys. We know that these are based on the report of patwaris in the villages who give false reports. The officers demand reports from the patwaris to have them as the basis of their sample surveys and if the patwaris write the true state of affairs they are looked with disfavour and are even dismissed. So, they do not write the true state of affairs lest they should get into trouble So, these statistics are false. If the hon. Minister finds these statistical figures on his table and they reveal some good state of affairs, he thinks it is all right. He has been complacent. His predecessor used to tour the whole countryside almost in a motor car and see things for himself but it does not happen now. The Food Minister now thinks that the statistics are all right.

I must say something about the community projects. There are about 21 projects in my district and I know what happens there. The Village Level Workers and others speak that they are increasing production. But, in my district, it is continually going down and down; it is much less than ever before. Production in some of the fields this year has been much lower than even the seeds sow in them. There has been no development in the community project area and it is all incorrect to say that there is tremendous activity and so on. I am sorry there is no time to dilate on how the community projects function.

Yesterday, the Finance Minister told us that he had put heavy taxes on us in order to fulfil the Plan. How can it be fulfilled if the money is being wasted like this almost criminally. So, I say that these taxes must be opposed. We also feel that the Plan must be fulfilled. But we oppose the wastage of money. There are engineers and others who will build bridges which will be washed out in the next rainy season and buildings which will topple down after a year. It is these plans that are being fulfilled and we are made to pay for them. Hundreds of crores of rupees will be spent on all these things and they will say that some engineers failed. Even when the High Court Judge finds that some Central Railway General Manager or somebody is at fault, the Government says that they are not at fault and that they can never be guilty. That is the attitude of the Government. We cannot give money in taxes to be wasted like this. The money is wasted and never put to proper use. The investment in the last Plan is said to be about Rs. 2200 crores. What is the return? Is it compatible with the capital invested? I do not find even a 25 per cent return in value. Cement is blackmarketed. Contracts are given for certain works; the overseer will come and say that a thousand cubic feet had been dug while only about 100 cubic feet had been dug; they will charge for a thousand cubic feet and share the profit among themselves

श्री खुशवक्त राय (खेरी) : तनख्वाह भी तो कम मिलती है सीमेंट न बेचें तो करें क्या ?

Shri S. L. Saksena: Why not stop corruption? I am very sorry Acharya Kripalani had occasion to point out the instance where an officer of the External Affairs Ministry had been dishonest. In this very House, he narrated a case and said that the Inspector General of Police held up a very high official of the Northern Railway and he brought some case against that officer. The Security Officer who had brought the case was suspended. I wrote to the Minister about this. The position was that one of the members of the Railway Board was a friend of the officer involved in the matter. So it was said that there would be no enquiry by the police but only a departmental enquiry would be held. The Home Secretary was addressed by the Inspector General of Police as to whether his instructions should be followed or he must agree to the Railway Board's decision to hold a departmental enquiry. Ultimately, the Railway Board had their way and the officer concerned was not prosecuted. The Security Officer had to resign and give up his post. This is the position with regard to the 'high ups'. You want corruption to be ruled out. You want to collect tax to the tune of Rs. 100 crores. You are imposing tax on the poor man's sugar, tea and matches. What for? For these people in high positions who will black-market cement and other articles and then say that the money has been spent on the Plan.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): Then, what is the remedy? Do you suggest a stand-still?

Shri S. L. Saksena: The remedy is this. You should hang the officer who indulges in black-marketing by the lamp post. Instead of that you are defending the officers. You are defending the officer of the Central Railway who has been responsible for the Mahbubnagar tragedy which resulted in the deaths of so many people. You say that your officers cannot be guilty. The bridges were not wide enough for the water to go. The report of the Judge of the Bombay High Court, who spent a year and a lot of money over it, did not satisfy the Government. The Prime Minister said that he did not know about the report. It was a Cabinet decision and still he said that he did not know about it. It was decided that the Central Railway Administration was not guilty, the engineers can never be guilty. Then, who can be guilty? It was said that some chaprasis, some small people, were guilty and these big people were not guilty. That is the attitude of the Government. I would like to say one

[Shri S. L. Saksena]

thing, Sir. The Government has come to this Lok Sabha again with a clear majority. But, in my State were only 35 members in the opposition there are now 144 members. If this condition continues, there will be no Congress Government in my State next time. If you do not learn even by this, then God save you.

श्री खुशवक्त राय : १९६२ के बारे में तो वह सोचते ही नहीं है।

Shri S. L. Saksena: In the morning when I was discussing about the question of prices of sugarcane, the Minister said that it was the practice for the past two or three years. But why do you not say that this is a method of cheating. Sir, I am the President of the Sugarcane Workers' Federation. In one factory in Saharanpur the recovery shown for the months of May and June is 5 per cent and in another factory 50 miles away from Saharanpur the recovery shown 7·5 per cent. So there is a difference of 2·5 per cent within a distance of 50 miles. What is the matter with the Saharanpur factory? It has shown a bogus purchase of some 100 thousand maunds of sugar to bring down the prices and the money of so many maunds was pocketed by the management. Therefore, you cannot trust these people. You should not pay the growers on that basis. When I point out these things, it is said that we are animated by hostility. We are also patriotic, we also want to serve the country and we also want to see that there is prosperity in the country. When we say something it is taken as though it is coming from the mouth of satan and so it must be all false. If that is the attitude things can never improve; the country's problems can never be solved.

In my amendment I have given concreate suggestions. You have stated, Sir, that they relate to the State. Even so, you can suggest to them. If you do not take the steps suggested by me, I can tell you, Sir, that there will be another Bengal famine in the Eastern U.P. and the Government will say that they do not know about it.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to make a few important suggestions, though I am sorry that it is the fag end of the debate and I will not have the benefit of the reply of the hon. Minister for Agriculture.

My first point is that this question of food is not a question of solving the problem as we face it in the near future, it is a long-term question, it is one which we along do not face but the people all over the world face it. Agriculture throughout the ages has been a subsistence occupation. With the rise of industrial development and general education the question has cropped up that this subsistence occupation must also turn into an industrial enterprise. It is no longer possible to keep it down as a subsistence occupation, and expect not only honest working on the field but also loyalty to the State. You cannot expect a man to be loyal to his State or have and the human decency if the honest and natural course of development is not open to him. You cannot make a mank work and at the same time kill him by inches. Keeping a man toiling on the field, on a subsistence occupation, is simply killing him by inches. The position is that the diet that an average Indian gets, a man who works on the field gets, is not more than 1500 on 1800 calories; that is just killing by inches. A man who works hard on the field is just living by, what you say, the mercy of the weather. The first hot wind that blows, the first attack of a disease takes him to the next world. Can you expect any other solution which will stand the repercussions, the vicissitudes of time, with crises in the economic world? That is an impossible proposition.

Therefore, my first submission is, the first thing that he Ministry has to do is to lay down the policy that we have to turn this subsistence occupation into an industrial enterprise. When I advance this proposition, it has certain consequences. The first

consequence is that you has must guarantee a gainful price to the agriculturist. Now that is not an immediate question because the prices are going up. I only want to disabuse the mind of my friends who are very sympathetic to the poor working people. I am also very sympathetic to them. But, I say that in the coming 50 years it is not possible for the prices to go down considerably. No subsidies, no artificial methods can bring the prices of agricultural products appreciably down for the next 50 years. For the next 50 years the prices for agricultural products cannot have a levelling down of prices. How can you have an under-graduate or a graduate working on the field and ask him to have lower wages than his counterpart working in the factory? That is impossible. To give him enough means higher price for the produce. So, what I beg to submit is that it should be laid down that a price support policy will be resorted to whenever there is need for the measure. Then, Government could help the people working on the field and the peasants would never be allowed to be exploited because the market goes down. A price support policy is necessary.

After the first Great War, the greatest factor which brought down the produce of agriculture was the instability of the prices, and wherever there was a crisis in respect of the farm produce, instability of prices has been the important factor. Therefore, if you guarantee prices, you will get always enough of foodstuffs and grains and better produce too. It is necessary to guarantee a profitable price. That is, the policy of price support should be accepted in principle and should be resorted to when the need arises. Now, there is no need, because the prices are economically profitable.

Secondly, when I say that subsistence occupation is to be turned into industrial enterprise, the necessary corollary is that cash crop will have more and more importance, because, subsistence operation cannot support a higher standard of life. It is also important from the view-point of the development of the country as a whole.

Take the under-developed countries. Take, for instance, China, Russia, Argentina and East European countries. There, the agriculturist has contributed much more for the investment in industries than the industrialist himself. How can an agriculturist contribute. If he is not given the opportunity to have more of cash crops? It is impossible. There is a scheme for small-savings. But where will the small savings come from? Do the small savings come from naked men? Do they come from the starving fellow? We must have a stout and rich peasantry that can save the money and in an agricultural country like ours, where can we get requisite resources from except from the agriculturists? We must have a stout and rich peasantry that can save and also eat well, dress well and live well. Therefore, cash crop is necessary. We must give oppotunities for the export and better facilities for producing better quality of commodities. Not only that. The Government must appoint a Board for fixation of prices of Sugarcane. My friend Shri S. L. Saksena comes and says every year, "Well, this mill-owner is dishonest, this officer is dishonest, etc. Whether they are dishonest or not, the very fact that the hon. Member says that every body is dishonest in certain enterprises means that what is called a decent way of doing thing does not exist.

One cannot build a country with men without any reputation whatsoever. I have not seen any country built up by people without honesty of purposes and good reputation. A man is unacceptable not because he is a thief and a dacoit as such, but he has something of a bad name when nobody believes in his honesty. Therefore, it is necessary that a Board should be appointed for the fixation of prices of cash crops particularly sugarcane, for presidentship of a High Court judge or a Supreme Court judge. Members belonging to various interests should be represented on that Board. Why should you take the responsibility when people are not satisfied with the

[Pandit K. C. Sharma]

procedure. Producer does not believe that the Ministry has done justice to him. Certainly, the Ministry does a thing with honest motives. But Ceasar's wife must be above suspicion. Therefore, my second point is this. There must be a Board for the fixation of prices of Sugarcane and it should be presided over by a High Court judge or a Supreme Court judge. Such a Board exists in Australia and in many other countries. Nobody has any complaint against the judgment of the High Court Judge or the Supreme Court judge, and in the democratic set up, the last forum on which we can depend upon for justice is certainly the judiciary and the people who adorn it by holding exalted positions such as High Court judges or Supreme Court judges.

My next point is about land reform. Most of the States have launched these reforms and I do not attach much importance, though I have read in economics and every student of economics would have read what Marshal has said—that peasant proprietorship turns sand into gold. I do not think this proposition has much value now, because, it was said like that when there was no tenancy law. Now, whether it is ownership or whether it is tenancy, it does not matter, provided you have security of tenure and consolidate the holdings, and have all the holdings in one place. At present, there is one piece of land here and another bit there. There is waste of time and waste of water and manure. You cannot expect to take water from one and the same well for two bighas of land situated half a mile towards one side and half a mile towards the other side of a village. Irrigation by such methods involves waste of time and energy. Therefore, the first thing is, the security of tenancy. Whether it is by tenancy, ownership or by peasant proprietorship, security must be guaranteed. So long as the tenant is secure on the land, the question of the yield from land is not affected much. The land reforms have already been taken in many States and others are following the suit.

My third point is about the laws eliminating fragmentation. These are inheritance laws. You cannot expect 10 bighas of land being cut up into parts and given to five people. What will each man do with just two bighas of land? I do not appreciate much this *bhoodan* movement and other like things. In theory, it may be all right, but in actual practice, if you give a bigha to a man, he will make nothing of it. The bigha will be wasted. Again, no country has ever been built up by begging. I do not appreciate this begging of land and that begging of property. Beggars do not build a State. This *bhoodan* and begging for land is bad. What nonsense it is? It is not begging that makes a State. Hard, struggling people, strong and well-meaning people could make a State with hard work and struggle. Begging makes no State.

So, laws to guard against fragmentation of holdings are necessary. The hon. Minister said that it is a State question. I beg to submit that bigger questions are dealt with by the Planning Commission, or by the Ministry at the Centre, though they may fall strictly within the jurisdiction of the State Governments.

I need not repeat my points. There are three questions that generally affect the life of the people but much more the peasantry. Land reform is one. Easy and ready credit is another. Now, the finances that the present needs are to the extent of about Rs. 150 crores to Rs. 200 crores. A provision of about Rs. 10 crores only is made. It is just like asking the primitive to take a bamboo stick, climb the mountain and to shake the clouds and ask them to rain over the land. Neither the rains came nor the bamboo stick did the work. Therefore, providing Rs. 10 crores for rural credit from the Reserve Bank would do no good. The sum required is Rs. 150 crores to Rs. 200 crores, so that easy and ready credit would be

available to the peasantry. The Co-operatives should be build up for the purpose.

The other important factor is the training of agriculturists in the rural areas. At present a man who is fit to do nothing takes to agriculture. It is not possible to expect that such a man would do much of a job. The cowherd boy beats the buffalo and the cow at the joints and on the bones. Nowhere in the world expect in India can such a dismal spectacle be seen. Look at the village pond; dirty water is being drunk by the cattle. The fodder is also dirty giving a bad smell. Therefore, training at the village level is necessary. If you are to build a stout peasantry, you must train young boys to do the job that they may be better equiped for the work.

With these words, I support the motion.

Shri Thimmaiah (Kolar-Reserved-Sch. Castes): I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the President for his address delivered to both Houses of Parliament.

During the last five years, under the first Five Year Plan, we have increased the economic strength of the country. We have built up big industries and brought about important changes in the economic field; thereby we have increased the economic strength of the country and we are trying our best further to increase it. Though we have increased the national income and the economic strength of the country, we have to see whether the economic strength of the common man has correspondingly increased and how far the schemes under the Five Year Plan have improved the standard of living of the common man in the country. Increasing the economic strength of the country is one thing and providing comforts for the common man is another thing.

Today many Members have spoken about the food problem. There is a considerable rise in the price of foodstuffs. I feel in my own humble analysis that there is no shortage of food in the country and that there is a sufficient stock of foodstufls. But, we have failed to create a psychology in the public mind that there is sufficient food stock available in the country. It is true that though at the beginning food production increased, in the last year of the first Plan, it has fallen. In 1954, it reached about 68·7 million tons and in the last year of the first Plan, it was reduced to 63·5 million tons. I want to make an objective study of this reduction in food production. We have seen that though the first Five Year Plan provided for the irrigation of about 6·4 million acres of land, the irrigated land was only about 4 million acres. This failure is attributed to the State Governments. Though the Government provided irrigation facilities, why did not the agriculturists have the sufficient amount of incentive to grow more food? I feel that after having provided the irrigation facilities, the Government charges a very high rate of irrigation fees. The ryots are not in a position to pay so much and so he has no enthusiasm to grow more food. Also, some sort of impetus should be given to the ryots. They must get a fair price for their produce. The price should be fixed at such a level as would be fair both to the ryot, who is the producer and to the consumer. That fair price level must always be maintained, and if necessary, Government should subsidise it by importing foodgrains.

Another suggestion I want to submit to the Government to increase food production is that the cultivable waste land in the country has to be brought under systematic cultivation. After the abolition of zamindari and jagirdari, some of the big landlords have lost their enthusiasm to cultivate their land and produce more food. I submit that the cultivated land of the absentee landlords must be taken over by the Government and brought under systematic cultivation. Thereby food production can be increased.

In the community project areas and N.E.S. blocks, the Government is

[Shri Thimmaiah]

trying its best to help the agriculturists by giving good quality seeds and good manure. But the poor ryot does not know how to apply that organic manure and because of his lack of knowledge of its application to land the fertility of the land is spoiled; and thereby the yield is also lowered. Therefore, there should be some permanent arrangement for the production of natural manure and high quality seeds in every village. Today the ryots are being exploited by the money lenders; he has no banking facilities and credit facilities. Of course, the Government is trying to open credit societies in all the villages. In the N.E.S centres and community project areas; there are certain facilities for giving credit, but these credits are all taken away by the big fishes. The big ryots, with their influence, take away all the loans and credit facilities; the small peasant does not get anything. I have found that in the agricultural multi-purpose societies the big ryots take away all the manure and good quality seeds, grow more food and hoard them, thereby creating an artificial scarcity of food, resulting in a rise in the food price. So, Government should provide easy credit facilities for the ryots and save them from exploitation by moneylenders.

Coming to agricultural labour, agricultural labour forms about 30·4 per cent of the population in India. For the past ten years, we went on speaking about the introduction of land reforms and the distribution of the surplus land among the poor agriculturists. But nothing has been actually done towards the introduction of the land reforms. In some States tenancy reforms and ceilings on land holding, have been introduced. But complete ceiling on holding of land in all the States has not at all been introduced. At present, the agricultural labourer does not have sufficient work for the whole year; he is underfed and he is suffering from all sorts of diseases. He has no sufficient means of livelihood for the whole year. It is the moral duty of the Government to introduce land reforms as early as possible. In some States, intermediaries have been abolished; but there are still some instances of them. If you go through the report of the Backward Classes Commission, you will find there are instances of forced and compulsory labour still in existence. The agricultural labourers are treated as slaves and are being exploited to a very great extent. Therefore, I submit that there labour wherever it may exist in any part of the country and the Government should see that agricultural labour is saved from such exploitation.

After introducing the land reforms, it is the duty of Government also to see that the Minimum Wages Act is completely implemented in all parts of the country. In the first plan the Planning Commission has recommended this. I know in some states it has been implemented and in some others it is not. They have also recommended that this Act should also apply to non-agricultural workers and I am sure that Government would take steps to see that this act is implemented in all parts of the country and thus help the agricultural labour to some extent. Today we have spent a lot of money on cottage industries, in handloom and small scale industries Land alone cannot solve the problem and you cannot distribute the land to all people. I say that these schemes of development of cottage and small scale industries have not at all helped the common man in the rural parts. In the community project areas there are intermediaries and they are influential people and they take away the money and use them for their purposes and they never encourage people who want to develop certain industries or increase their income. Again in these Community Project and N.E.S. areas, Government has not made any survey of the village talent which can develop the small scale industries in the

rural parts. This is the first and foremost thing that the Community project authorities should take up. I am glad that the Community Development Ministry is opening 25 pilot projects for the development of cottage and small scale industries. I wish that such pilot projects are introduced all over the country so that the village folk, the common man may get another occupation in addition to agriculture.

The President has referred in his Address that we should not hoard and the people should try to save. I welcome that suggestion. In the Community project area at least the Government should see that vigorous propaganda should be carried on for the small savings and that the people should save a lot of money.

Lastly, I refer to the problem of Scheduled Castes people in this country. I maintain that the First Five Year Plan has improved to some extent the economic condition of the people, but there is not a considerable change as far as the Scheduled Caste are concerned. In the Planning Commission's progress report you will never find anything about the economic prosperity of the Scheduled Castes people. They will simply say: We have built so many houses, started so many centres of special craft and so on. Today, as the country knows, the Scheduled Castes people are landless; they have no means of living and they work as labourers and such people ought to progress. What is it that the Government has done? In the directive principle of the Constitution it is said "that the State should promote with special care the economic interests of the weaker sections of the people, and in particular, of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes.". I know the hon. Home Minister will immediately dispense with that argument by saying that it is a State subject and not a Central subject. But what has the State Government done about this? No report says that Government has given them land free of cost for cultivation or they have opened these cottage industries for the improvement of the economic condition of these people.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member would appreciate that I can only ask the hon. Member and not the clock to stop. I am getting so many chits from hon. Members and there is great pressure. It is not possible; he should wind up.

Shri Thimmaiah: As I said before I request the Government to take special steps to see that the lot of the Scheduled Castes people is economically improved. Regarding jobs in Govt. Service—In the old British days we used to be told that we were not educated, that we were not qualified. But today there are educated and qualified people in our community but they say: You are not suitable You can imagine the plight of the Scheduled Castes educated young men today who are selling communistic literature in the States and they are doing all sorts of things....

Mr. Chairman: I shall have to help the hon. Member to conclude his speech and his speech is deemed to have been concluded.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I heard the President's Address, I felt a deep sense of regret that there was no reference to the tragedy that has been enacted in Gujerat. Of course, the President's Address gives an inkling of the Government's policy and therefore, what I have to complain about is that after all that has happened since August 8, 1956, Government has not been pleased to refer to or to get together all information regarding the success of the experiment on which they have embarked, I mean the experiment of the bilingual State, nor they have drawn any proper conclusions from consideration of the whole matter.

Now, as I begin to speak about this subject, I feel a clutch at my throat, because I feel that an atmosphere has been created in which any talk about linguistic States is being taken as a specimen of linguism and linguism

[Shri Yajnik]

has been branded together with casteism and communalism as one of psychological maladies current today. I want, Sir, to put the matter in a proper perspective, because if I speak today about linguistic provinces, it is not because I want to create trouble. I heard and learnt about it from Gandhiji, the Father of the Nation, in 1920, when he confronted with a medley of languages even in the Congress committees, moved first for the linguistic division of the Congress and he always told us that once the Britishers left the country, and we had our own rule, then that rule shall be conducted in the language of the people. The lok raj will be conducted in lok bhasha; the Government of the people will be conducted in the language of the people and therefore the whole of India will be divided by languages.

Well, Sir he taught us in 1917 that after all language is not an end as it is sometimes sought to be made. He told us in Gujerat that Gujerati was the daughter of the Sanskrit language. And that brings me to one of the fundamental principles that we have to bear in mind today. Sanskrit has made for the unity of civilisation, psychological, religious, moral, of this country. So, we have the unity of the country, unity achieved through the propagation of all literature in various aspects through the Sanskrit langauge. Well, if the unity of the country has been achieved, from North to South and East to West through the Sanskrit language then, the unity of the peoples residing in Union is also achieved through the languages that are the daughters of the Sanskrit language.

Now, if I love my region, Gujerat, what is wrong about it? In fact, the first patriotic song that was written in the Gujerati language was *Jaya Jaya Garvi Gujerat*, that is to say, glory to great Gujerat. And lest you, might take it as a specimen of parochial patriotism, I may remind you, Sir, that *Vande Matram* the great song of Bankim Chandra was also first and foremost addressed to the bautiful land of Bengal, and it was only after 1905 that that song was finally made the national anthem and was sung in glory of Mother India. What I mean to say, Sir, is that there should be no contradiction between my love for Gujerat and my love for India or of Bengal. And I claim that the man who does not love the soil on which he treads cannot really have true love of even Mother India. The two are not contradictory to each other. Therefore, what I say is that if Gandhiji wanted the division of the country by languages that truth was ultimately born in the minds of all of us and even in the mind of the Government which after passing through all kinds of Commissions and committees ultimately introduced a law or decided upon a law in the end of 1955 to have all States according to the national languages that have been mentioned in the Schedule to the Constitution.

Now, may I, Sir, in this connection pay a tribute to the makers of that decision, whatever else might have happened in other parts, who really instilled a love for our own province among the boys and the students among the people of the town and the villages alike! However much I might differ today from our Congress leaders and rulers, I must say this that a psychological change was effected from 1955 December to August 1956, when a new wave of warm love and faith in Gujerat was born in my province and people were looking forward every day to the installation of Maha Gujerat in the capital of the province.

Sir, the rulers, the Congress leaders, contributed a great deal. They went about the province and they were loaded with garlands of flowers, because everybody felt that they were the makers of new Gujerat and hopes were entertained of great development of ports and railways and commerce and industry all over the province. Decisions were being taken about the location of the secretariat,

about, the new Chief Minister, about the officers and we were all glad to see that the great dream that had been held before us by Mahatma Gandhi and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was coming true. In fact, if I may use a smile, it was felt that the dream of a mother had been held out before us by Mahatma Gandhi and also by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, who did not live to see it realised, but it was left for the Congress rulers of our province to concretise it to place it before us as something that is being realised. It was almost near realisation and we all felt so happy about it. Wherever we were in politics, whether we were in opposition or on government side, all of us brought ourselves together to celebrate the oncoming of the great event, the installation of Maha Gujerat.

Then, Sir, on the 7th evening and 8th morning there was a cataclysm. I may say, Sir, that in all my life of 65 years I have not seen such a great change wrought in our people within twenty-four hours from the morning of the 8th to the morning of the 9th. Telephones were buzzing, not merely from opposition side; telephones were buzzing in Congress houses and business houses enquiring what was happening and why this decision about Maha Gujerat was changed, why Maharashtra was not being installed and why a bilingual State was being brought in. People were in suspense and finally when they did learn that Government were decided upon a bilingual State, the new-born love for the Mother, as it were, was wounded deeply and sharply. It was a terrible psychological change. There was great sorrow and there was consternation. There was passionate anger and resentment. What actually happened was that young men whose love for Gujerat was born, or reborn, may I say, went to the Congress house in procession, but nobody wanted to burn. They went in thousands on cycles, with books in their hand. They had no stones. Maybe some rowdy people joined. I do not want to go into all the details of the incident. We have rightly demanded a complete enquiry into every incident of shooting. But the main point is that shots were fired from the verandah of the Congress House. Seven lives were lost, almost dead; blood was spilt before the house that was built by Gandhiji and by Sardar Patel, before the house which symbolised truth and non-violence.

I will only say this. The argument is advanced and has been advanced; stone throwing will be answered by bullets. Now, I have no rancour against individuals, but I must passionately register an emphatic protest against such statements.

I am reminded, Sir, in this connection of what a British sergeant did in 1919 on the streets of Delhi. Hear in Delhi, Swami Shradhanandji was leading a procession, and a British sergeant aimed a gun at his crowd and said, "Brickbats will be answered with bullets". Gandhiji wrote the next day denouncing this argument as a pernicious doctrine of the rulers. And I am very much grieved to see a doctrine mouthed by a British sergeant being uttred today by responsible leaders of the Congress....

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Morarji Desai): It is not correct, it is all a lie.

Shri Yajnik: ....and by the Congress Government. I can only say this that from that day, the police thought that they fired at the people, but I may tell you, Sir, that the police unwittingly fired shots at the very foundations of the faith and love of the people in the Congress organisation. It was a very sad thing.

And since then more things happened. Overnight the boys and men and women and merchants, whether in their homes or in the markets, were not cowed down but took up courage. Of course, one eye was streaming with tears because of the loss of their near and dear ones, but the other eye got bright with a firm and new determination to win Maha Gujerat. And in that moment, I may say, the movement for Maha Gujerat was born. It is

[Shri Yajnik]

not a creation of any individual. And since then it gained momentum.

Then, another idea that I want to rebut is that there has been a hell of mischief, that the Gujeratis have been trouble-makers, that there has been mischief galore, there has been trouble and there has been rowdyism. Well, there was rowdyism; I do not want to make any apology for that. But what did it actually amount to? I have seen scenes of 1919. Whole buildings and—not railways—but posts and telegraphs and the big Collector's offices, etc. were in blazes; lakhs and lakhs worth of government property was burnt down; only the next day martial law was proclaimed and three people were shot. Here what do we see? I would invite Members of this House to come and see Ahmedabad to see what has been burnt and broken. What has been done, after everything is said and done, is that a few telegraph and telephone poles were uprooted and a few trees. And all that why? In order to prevent the passage of the black police vans going down and shooting the people. Because, remember that twenty-five people have been shot dead, according to our information, not only in Ahmedabad but in other places. And if I had the time I could relate the stories of a few of them and I can assure you that your eyes will be wet.

Mr. Chairman: Not today.

Shri Yajnik: So I only want to conclude and say this, that when this shooting went on we have been slandered, we have been slandered on every occasion, slandered for "disgracing the name of Gujerat". Well, it is a very serious charge. Because all of us who are saying these things are the inheritors of the great message of Gandhiji. We certainly would hang down our head in shame for every act of mischief done with or without provocation, I agree. When people come and denounce us for some stone-throwing, for some mischief, I certinly am prepared to repent for it. But at the same time you must examine things in the context. First of all, see how this has been brought about, why this is done. Actually it has to be seen in the background of the firing that has taken place, that twenty-five people have gone, young men in the prime of life, and there are so many other things.

Now, Sir, when this is being argued and when we are arguing the case for an enquiry into this firing and for a rule of law that will outlaw all firing on unarmed and innocent people, and when we are shouting and demanding Maha Gujerat according to the original intentions even of the Central Legislature, then the big problem of Bombay is thrown in front of us. In this matter my position is very simple. Nobody has claimed—not even the Gujerat Congress—nobody has claimed Bombay to be a part of the Gujerat State. That is nobody's case. But there was the case of the three-States formula. Yes; when you say "three States", it naturally implies that Bombay is a separate area not only from Maharashtra but Gujerat. When you discuss the matter of Bombay you must remember that it is a cosmopolitan town. While the Gujerati people, I may say, are interested primarily in securing their own language province of Maha Gujerat, they cannot at the same time remain totally indifferent to the woes and feelings of their Gujerati brothers and sisters in Bombay. But what has actually been happening all this time? For the last two years Bombay is also a home of tragedy. Can it be said now that things have improved from what they were before? Can it be said now that a new atmosphere of amity and concord has been established? What do the legislative elections show, and what do the present elections to the Bombay Corporation show? There is tussle. The Maharashtrian friends may conclude and say that the results are decisive for incorporating Bombay straightaway into Maharashtra. I differ. And in fact Mr. Dange also realises that after all the question of Bombay can only be solved in an amicable manner by consultation and discussion between the representatives of

the two great communities that reside there. It is agreed that peace and concord must prevail not merely outwardly but real hearty accord must be established between the communities before any solution could be found. And to that end he has asked that Government should reopen the question. Government should summon a conference, a round table conference, of the different elements of the population, the different parties. Because, I must say that when Government first decided upon this bilingual State in August 1956, what did they do? They just consulted their Congress leaders in the different States but never looked at the other opposition people in the diffrent places. So I would say....

Mr. Chairman: I realize that the hon. Member has very much to say but he should be content with so much today.

Shri Yajnik: I will just finish I will conclude by saying this ...

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): If the hon. Member is prepared to give way I should like to put a question for the purpose of clarification. I am not interrupting him, nor am I taking away his time.

An Hon. Member: But you are.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member is not giving way.

Shri Yajnik: I say, Sir, the Bombay question was decided upon by this House. It is the responsibility of this House. They thought they were getting on into an interim remedy. But actually they begot a mis-shapen monster of a bilingual State, which has worked rack and ruin throughout all our parts, Maharashtra, Bombay and Gujerat. That is why I say it is the responsibility of this House which has taken the decision. Therefore, if the Government does not appoint a Commission, let this House, the House of the People appoint an All-Party Committee because they took the responsibility finally of imposing a bi-lingual State on us. That is what the Prime Minister has also told us. I say in all humility, let this House appoint an All-Party Committee of as many as you like to go round Maharashtra, Bombay and Gujerat, have an on-the-spot study and come to conclusions and place them before this House for a final solution of this problem.

पं० ठाकुर दास भार्गव (हिसार) : जनाब चेयरमैन साहब, तीन दिन से प्रेसीडेंट साहब के एड्रेस पर बहस हो रही है। ज्यादातर मेम्बरान ने जो बोले हैं फूड के मसले पर जोर दिया है । सच तो यह है कि सन् १९४७ से भी पहले से यानी सन् १९४५ से इस हाउस के सामने फूड का मसला चला आता है और १९५३–५४ तक तो हर साल इस हाउस में फूड के मसले पर एक दिन बहस के वास्ते मुकर्रर किया जाता था और हर तरह से उस पर बहस होती थी ।

जो मेम्बरान इस हाउस में बड़े अर्से से रहे हैं वह जानते हैं कि गवर्नमेंट किन किन मरहलों से इस फूड के मसले के बारे में गुजरी, किस तरह से गवर्नमेंट ने ग्रो मोर फूड केम्पेन को चलाया, और किस तरह से इस देश में खुराक की हालत बेहतर हुई । उस वक्त भी जब लोग कहते थे और गवर्नमेंट कहती थी कि देश में खुराक काफी नहीं है, कई शख्स जिन्होंने इस मसले को अच्छी तरह से जांचा था इस राय के थे कि देश में कभी खुराक की इस तरह की कमी नहीं हुई जिस तरह कि गवर्नमेंट बतलाती थी । चुनांचे जिस वक्त कि श्री मुंशी जी यहां पर फूड और एग्रीकल्चर के मेम्बर थे उस वक्त गवर्नमेंट का और श्री मुंशी जी का यह दावा था कि सन् १९५१ में यह मुल्क खुराक के लिहाज से सेल्फसफीशेंट हो जायेगा । चुनांचे एक दफा नहीं चन्द मर्तबा गवर्नमेंट ने हाउस में अपनी इस राय का इजहार किया और एक दिन दफ्तन गवर्नमेंट के

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

अपनी इस राय को तबदील कर दिया और कहना शुरू कर दिया कि हमारी राय गलत थी और सन् १९५१ में मुल्क खुराक के मामले में सेल्फ सफीशेंट नहीं होगा। उसके बाद फिगर्स को देखा गया और खुद हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने फरमाया कि वे फिगर्स दुरुस्त नहीं थे। एक कमेटी कांग्रेस पार्टी ने भी इस बारे में मुकर्रर की जिसका कि मैं कनवीनर था। मैंने भी इस बारे में सारे हालात को देखा और अपने साथियों के साथ इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा कि उस जमाने में भी जहां तक खुराक का सवाल था खुराक की देश में कमी नहीं थी बल्कि फिगर्स गलत थे। सन् १९५१ के बाद जब मामलात ने पलटा खाया तो हाउस को अच्छी तरह से मालूम है, शायद कुछ मेम्बरान को न मालूम हो, कि मुशी साहब की राय थी कि फौरन राशनिंग हटा दिया जाय, लेकिन वह अपनी राय को एक्शन में परिणत नहीं कर सके क्योंकि उन की राय को कबिनट के कुछ मेम्बरान ने मंजूर नहीं किया। जब श्री किदवई साहब तशरीफ लाये तो उस वक्त न तो कोई नई वर्षा हुई, न कोई नई मानसून आयी, न कोई नई पैदावार हुई, लेकिन किदवई साहब ने मामले को खूब अच्छी तरह भांप कर हमारे बुजुर्ग श्री राजगोपालाचारी की मदद से मद्रास में जाकर यह फैसला किया कि कंट्रोल को रिलक्स किया जाये और आखिर रिलक्स करने का नाम लेते लेते वह कंट्रोल दूर हो गया और देश ने राहत की सांस ली और देश ने कंट्रोल से सुबुकदोशी पायी। उससे पहले और उसके बाद भी गवर्नमेंट ने करोड़ों रुपया फूड के मसले पर खर्च किया। सन् १९५३-५४ के बाद गवर्नमेंट कहने लगी कि हम खुराक के मामले में सेल्फ सफीशेंट हो गये। कांग्रेसमैन भी हर जगह अपनी स्पीचों में कहने लगे कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने फूड के मसले को हल कर लिया है। लेकिन आज ताज्जुब की बात है कि इलेक्शन के खत्म होते ही इस तरह की बातें कही जा रही हैं। कुछ अर्सा पहले जब मैं खुराक के मिनिस्टर साहब से मिला था तो मैं ने उनसे कहा था कि आपने बेअर हाउसों का इन्तिजाम कर लिया है लेकिन देश में इतनी खुराक पैदा होगी कि आप उसको रख नहीं सकेंगे। मैं ने उनसे कहा था कि मेरे जिले में इतना चना होगा कि आपके सारे गोदाम भर जायेंगे और आपको उसे रखने को जगह नहीं मिलेगी। मैं ने इलेक्शन के दौरान में देखा कि मीलों तक चने के सिवाय कुछ और दिखायी नहीं देता था। लेकिन अब इस सेशन में आकर सुनता हूं स्टारवेशन डैथ्स के बारे में। एक मेम्बर नहीं कई मेम्बर साहबान कहते हैं कि देश के अन्दर हालत खराब है। लेकिन जहां तक मेरा तजर्बा है, मेरी राय यह है कि अब हमारे फिगर्स गलत नहीं हैं क्योंकि गवर्नमेंट का फिगर्स मुहय्या करने का इन्तिजाम अब पहले से अच्छा है। मुझे इसमें कोई शुबहा नहीं है कि देश के अन्दर काफी खुराक है और फूड का फैमीन नहीं है। अगर फैमीन है तो इस बात का कि लोगों के पास परचेजिंग पावर नहीं है। इन्फ्लेशन की वजह से कीमतें ज्यादा बढ़ गयी हैं और जहां फ्लैड वगैरह आये हैं वहां फस्ल खराब हो गयी है। वहां पर लोगों की हालत यह है कि वह अनाज खरीद नहीं सकते। देश के अन्दर अनाज की कमी नहीं है। हमारे लेटेस्ट फिगर है कि देश में ५६ लाख टन अनाज पैदा हुआ है। सन् १९५३-५४ के फिगर्स गलत थे लेकिन उस वक्त भी हमारे यहां खुराक की कमी नहीं थी। फूड फैमीन तब होता है जब लोगों के पास पैसा हो पर खुराक न हो। आज खुराक तो मौजूद है लेकिन लोगों के पास परचेजिंग पावर नहीं है। इसका इलाज क्या है? इसका वह इलाज नहीं है कि जो मेरे कई लायक दोस्तों ने बतलाया है।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर): मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है कि लोग ज्यादा खाने लगे हैं।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव: मैं अर्ज करता हूं कि आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब का यह कहना गलत नहीं है । क्या यह दुरुस्त नहीं है कि सन् १९३४-३५ में खांड का वह हाल था कि यह बिकेगी कैसे । उस वक्त खांड का भाव सात या आठ रुपये मन था । आज बीस लाख टन खांड होती है । मैं तो चाहता हूं कि देश में खूब खांड पैदा हो और लोग खूब खायें । मुझे यह सुनकर खुशी होती है कि लोग ज्यादा अनाज खाने लगे हैं ।

Mr. Chairman: I would request the hon. Member not to succumb to the temptation of looking behind and addressing Members.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: When voices come from behind, I am compelled to look behind and speak so that other untemting members may not think that I am discourteous to them.

Mr. Chairman: I also deserve that courtesy.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I am always looking towards you. It is only by a lapse that I look behind.

Mr. Chairman: Even on those occasional moments I get jealous of others.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता था कि एक हाई पावर कमेटी कायम होगी । सन् १९५३-५४ में यह शिकायत पैदा हुई कि हमारी जितनी पैदावार हुई है उसका जमींदारों को पूरी कीमत का पैसा कैसे मिलेगा और यह बहुत जरूरी चीज है । अगर उसको ठीक कीमत नहीं मिलेगी तो उसको शिकायत रहेगी । हमारे सामने दो मसले हैं, एक प्रोड्यूसर का और दूसरा कंज्यूमर का । हमें दोनों के इंटरेस्ट्स को रिकंसाइल करना है इस तरह से कि प्रोड्यूसर को भी नुकसान न हो और कंज्यूमर को भी ठीक खुराक मिले । पिछले बरस हुए कीमतें कम होने का सवाल था हुआ और गवर्नमेंट ने अनाज खरीदना शुरू किया ताकि कीमत अच्छी बनी रहे । आज गवर्नमेंट यह चाहती कि ऐसा इन्तिजाम करे जिससे कि प्राइसेस ज्यादा न बढ़ें । यह मसला इतना आसान नहीं है । दूसरे मुल्कों ने इसे बहुत खूबसूरती से हल किया है । वहां पर बहुत पहले प्रोड्यूसर को गवर्नमेंट बतला देती है कि उसको अपनी पैदावार की इतनी कीमत मिलेगी । हमने भी ऐसा करने की कोशिश तो की लेकिन वह कामयाब नहीं हुई । प्राइसेज के लिए एक कमेटी मुकर्रर हुई और उसने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी । उसने कई उसूल कायम किये हैं । अब यह देखना है कि आपकी कमेटी क्या करती है । अब मसला खुराक की कमी का नहीं है । मसला यह है कि लोगों के पास परचेजिंग पावर नहीं है और लोगों को इन्फ्लेशन की वजह से और दूसरी वजूहात से दिक्कत है जिसकी वजह से वे खरीद नहीं सकते । इसका एक छोटा सा इलाज है, जो कि वह बहुत माकूल इलाज तो नहीं है । हमारे फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी स्पीच में फूड सबसिडी के लिए २५ करोड़ रुपया देने की बात कही थी । लेकिन जब आपकी हाई पावर कमेटी बैठेगी तो चन्द तजावीज उसके सामने आवेंगी जिनसे इस मसले को हल करने में मदद मिल सकेगी । मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि पंजाब में और दूसरे इलाकों में प्रोड्यूसर अपनी पैदावार को विदहोल्ड कर रहा है । लेकिन इसको होर्डिंग नहीं कहा जा सकता । प्रोड्यूसर को अख्तियार है कि वह ठीक कीमत पर अपनी पैदावार को बेचे ।

उस को हक है कि अगर वह चाहे, तो वह अपनी प्रोड्यूस को इस तरह से बेचे कि उस को ज्यादा से ज्यादा फायदा हो । ताहम गवर्नमेंट को उस के हकूक का पूरा ख्याल रखते हुए इस मसले को हल करना होगा और कोई ऐसी तजवीज निकालनी होगी कि उस बेचारे गरीब आदमी की मुश्किलात में कमी हो, जो कि खुद खुराक पैदा करता है, लेकिन फिर भी अपने लिए खुराक बाजार से खरीदता है । इस सिलसिले में कई एक तजवीजें पेश की जा सकती हैं । अब इस के

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

मुताल्लिक कमेटी बनेगी, तो उस में इस का कोई फैसला किया जा सकेगा ।

इस के बाद मैं आनरेबल मिनिस्टर आफ रीहैबिलिटेशन की खिदमत में कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं । कुछ अर्सा हुआ, हमारे आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक प्रैस नोटिफिकेशन जारी किया था जिस के मुताबिक उन लोगों से दिसम्बर, १९५५ के बाद सूद चार्ज नहीं किया जायगा, जिन्होंने रीहैबिलिटेशन फाइनेंस कार्पोरेशन से कर्ज लिए हुए हैं । यह इंस्टीच्यूशन फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री के मातहत है । उस ने फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री को लिखा कि जो नोटिफिकेशन जारी किया गया है— जो हुकम दिया गया है, उस को इफैक्चुएट करने के लिए कार्यवाही की जाय और सूद को राइट आफ कर दिया जाये । फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री ने इस का कोई तसल्लीबख्श जवाब नहीं दिया । इसी तरह से रीहैबिलिटेशन मिनिस्ट्री ने भी तसल्लीबख्श जवाब नहीं दिया । मैं समझता हूं कि जब एक मिनिस्ट्री कोई फैसला कर दे, तो सारी गवर्नमेंट को उस को मानना चाहिए और इस सिलसिले में रीहैबिलिटेशन मिनिस्टर साहब का फैसला बिल्कुल दुरुस्त समझा जाना चाहिए । जब एक बार प्रैस-नोट जारी कर दिया गया, तो कोई वजह नहीं कि कोई दूसरी मिनिस्ट्री उस पर अमल होने में रुकावट डाले और उस को इफैक्चुएट न होने दे । लेकिन अगर ऐसा न हो, तो फिर मैं आनरेबल रीहैबिलिटेशन मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में अर्ज करूंगा कि उन के लिए एक रास्ता खुला है । वह हमारी मिनिस्ट्री के— हमारी गवर्नमेंट के— एक रेस्पेक्टेबल मिनिस्टर है । अगर वह मानते हैं कि उन का फैसला दुरुस्त है, तो वह उस को गवर्नमेंट से मनवायें । या वह कोई दूसरा रास्ता सोचें कि उन्होंने जो हुकम दिया है, रेफ्यूजीज को जो एशोरेंस दिया है, वह गलत साबित न हो । यह बात मैं उन पर छोड़ता हूं कि इस सिलसिले में कौन सा रास्ता अख्तियार किया जाय ।

मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि रिफ्यूजीज के साथ हाइड एंड सीक की गेम नहीं खेली जानी चाहिए । आज हालत यह है कि गवर्नमेंट का एक मिनिस्टर कहता है कि सूद बन्द हुआ, और दूसरा कहता है कि हम बेबस हैं— और दर-असल वह बेबस हैं । मैं रीहैबिलिटेशन फाइनेंस कार्पोरेशन का एक अदना सा मेम्बर हूं । मैं जानता हूं कि जब तक हम फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री के मातहत हैं, तब तक हम कोई दूसरा स्टेप नहीं ले सकते हैं । हम लोगों को अब भी उम्मीद है कि जल्द इस का फैसला किया जायगा और जो हुकम एक बार दे दिया गया है उस को वापस नहीं लेना पड़ेगा, चाहे इस के कुछ ही कांसीक्वेंसिज़ हों ।

जहां तक कीमत की इन्स्टालमेंट्स के मसले का ताल्लुक है, इस हाउस में तो ज्यादा बार उस का जिक्र नहीं आया, लेकिन वह एक ऐसा मसला है, जो कि हर उस शरणार्थी को, जो कि मकान में बैठा है, निहायत अनसरटेन्टी की हालत में रखे हुए है । आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब की हमदर्दी उन लोगों के साथ है, जो इन्स्टालमेंट्स चाहते हैं । उन्होंने दौराने-इलैक्शन कई जगहों पर तकरीरें फरमाई । उन की जो एक दो तकरीरें प्रैस में रिपोर्ट हुई, उन को पढ़ कर मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुंचा था कि शायद यह फैसला हुआ है कि उन्होंने दस किस्तें दे दी हैं, लेकिन बाद में मालूम हुआ कि अखबारों की रिपोर्ट दुरुस्त न थी । वह दिल्ली में एक जगह तशरीफ ले गए थे और उन्होंने एशोरेंस दी थी कि मैं पूरी कोशिश कर रहा हूं— और मुझे कोई शक नहीं कि उन्होंने पूरी कोशिश की है । उन्होंने इस हाउस के मेम्बरान को भी यकीन दिलाया था कि वह पूरी कोशिश करेंगे । इसी तरह हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब भी दौराने-इलैक्शन कई जगह तशरीफ ले गए और उन से लोगों को उम्मीद हुई कि इस का फैसला जल्द हो जायेगा । एडवाइजरी बोर्ड ने युनैनिमसली बारह किस्तों का फैसला

कर के आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब के पास भेजा । आज हर रफ्यूजी का माइन्ड इस बारे में ऐक्सरसाइज्ड है और वे लोग चाहते हैं कि इस का फैसला जल्द से जल्द किया जाय । मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि लो इनकम हाउसिंग के सिलसिले में लोन की अदायगी के लिए तीस साल की मियाद मुकर्रर की गई है । पटेलनगर में चौदह पंद्रह बरस की किस्तें मुकर्रर की गई हैं । मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या कांस्टीट्यूशन की दफा १४ के होते हुए मिनिस्ट्री इन लोगों को भी इन्स्टालमेंट्स देने से इन्कार कर सकती है । कहा जाता है कि एक मौके पर एडवाइजरी बोर्ड ने ठीक रिपोर्ट नहीं दी । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर एडवाइजरी बोर्ड की रिपोर्ट को मिनिस्ट्री मानती तो आज यह दिक्कत पेश न आती । हम ने कहा था कि रफ्यूजीज से मार्केट वैल्यू चार्ज न की जाय, जिस को बढ़ाने में उन्होंने मदद दी थी । हम ने एक फारमूला भेजा था, जिस को मिनिस्ट्री ने कबूल नहीं किया । खैर, इस वक्त उस झगड़े में नहीं पड़ना चाहता हूं । मैं तो आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि अगर वह मानते हैं कि हमारी डिमांड्स दुरुस्त हैं, तो उन को इस पर मजबूत रहना चाहिए । कल मुझे उनकी एक स्पीच दिखाई गई, जिस में उन्होंने फरमाया था कि बतौर एक रिफ्यूजी के और बतौर मिनिस्टर आफ रीहैबिलिटेशन के वह चाहते हैं कि इस मसले को ठीक तरह से तय किया जाये । अगर उन का यह स्टैंड है कि रिफ्यूजीज को यह फैसिलिटी मिलनी चाहिए, तो उन को इस पर स्टिक करना चाहिए कि उन की राय फाइनल है । कैबिनट की जायंट रेसपांसिबिलिटी होते हुए भी, अगर किसी महकमे का मिनिस्टर किसी उसूल पर पाबन्द है, अगर वह समझता है कि कोई बात दुरुस्त है, तो या तो उसको अपनी राय के अनुसार पूरा कराना चाहिए और अगर वह न करवा सके, तो वह वहां मौजूद न रहे । मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को इस एक्स्ट्रीम स्टैप को भी उठाने के लिए कहना चाहता हूं । मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि रिफ्यूजीज अपना घर-बार छोड़ कर यहां आए; हम १८५७ का अमूमन जिक्र करते हैं और उस के मुताल्लिक स्पीचिज जोर जोर से करते हैं । मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि अगर १९४७ में गदर नहीं हुआ, तो क्या हुआ था ? उस में लाखों आदमी अपने घरों से छुड़वा दिए गए और वे यतीमों की तरह यहां आए । अगर आप उन के साथ इन्साफ नहीं कर सकते, जिस का कि आप पहले ही यकीन दिला चुके हैं, तो फिर १८५७ की यादगार या इंडिपेंडेंस डे मनाने का क्या फायदा है ? आप हिम्मत से काम लें और मिनिस्ट्री से कहें कि वह इस का फैसला करे और सही फैसला करे । आप को अपने मुकर्ररकर्दा बोर्ड की बारह किस्तों की सिफारिश को नातिक समझना चाहिए था । आप उस के बेसिस पर रेफ्यूजीज के हक में फैसला कर देते । अगर आप नहीं कर सकते तो इस हाउस के मेम्बरान कैबिनेट, प्राइम मिनिस्टर और फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर की खिदमत में हाजिर होते और दरख्वास्त करते कि इस का फैसला जल्द से जल्द और सही कर दिया जाय । वे अब भी ऐसा करने के लिए तैयार हैं ।

इस के बाद मैं एक ऐसी बात का जिक्र करना चाहता हूं, जिस की नौअइत बिल्कुल नई है । पंद्रह दिन हुए कि मैं ने एक अखबार में पढ़ा कि जोधपुर की रियासत में एक दिन में तीस हजार शादियां हुई । मैं समझता हूं कि यह खबर दुरुस्त है, क्योंकि मैं जानता हूं कि मेरे जिले में आरवा तीज के दिन हजारों मैरिजिज होती हैं, और उन में से आम तौर पर ज्यादा तर चाइल्ड मैरिजिज और इन्फैंट मैरिजिज होती हैं । अगर एक स्टेट में तीस हजार मैरिजिज हो सकती हैं और चूंकि सारे हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसी ही हालत है, इसलिए इस के मानी यह हुए कि हिन्दुस्तान में एक वक्त में पांच लाख चाइल्ड मैरिजिज और इन्फैंट मैरिजिज होती हैं । जो नक्शा मैं बयान कर रहा हूं, उस में मुबालिगा नहीं है ।

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

अगर राजस्थान वालों से इस के बारे में पूछा जाय, तो वह इस की तसदीक करेंगे ।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य को इल्म है एक स्टेट का, लेकिन अगर वह इसी तरह उन फिगर्ज को नम्बर आफ स्टेट्स से मल्टीप्लाई करते जायेंगे, तो बड़े डेंजरस कनक्लूजन्ज पर पहुंचेंगे ।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : जनाबे वाला, पंजाब का तो मुझे तजुर्बा है और मैं अपनी आंखें खोल कर सारे हिन्दुस्तान में फिरा हूं । मैं एज आफ कनसेंट कमेटी का मेम्बर था, जिसने इस मामले की तहकीकात की थी । इससे देश का कितना नुकसान हुआ है—कितना मारेल इकोनोमिक और फिजिकल लास हुआ है । अगर आज भी मुझे बताया जाय कि पंडित नेहरू के देश में, डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद के देश में और उस देश में, जिस में जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर हैं, छोटी छोटी बच्चियों की शादियां होती हैं लाखों की तादाद में, तो मुझे दुनिया में कहीं गर्क होने की जगह नहीं रहती है ।

17.00 hrs.

मेरा सिर शर्म के मारे झुक जाता है और यह एक ऐसी चीज है जो नाकाबिले बरदाश्त है । इस चीज से मेरा खयाल है इस हाउस का हर एक मेम्बर शर्म फील करेगा । अगर यह बात दुरुस्त है कि एक स्टेट के अन्दर एक ही दिन में ३०,००० शादियां हुई हैं तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान रहने के काबिल रह जाता है । मैं किस गवर्नमेंट को कंडम करूं, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है । हम दुनियां के अन्दर अपना मुंह दिखाने के काबिल नहीं रह जाते हैं । अगर किसी स्टेट के अन्दर ३०,००० इनफेंट मैरिजिज होती हैं, तो इसका असर बाद में जा कर क्या हो सकता है, यह मुझे बताने की जरूरत नहीं है । किसी देश के अन्दर इससे बड़ा पाप और कोई नहीं हो सकता है । इसके मानी हैं प्रिप्यूबर्टी कंजम्मेशन और ये भी हजारों की तादाद में, लाखों की तादाद में । मैं बड़े अदब के साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि यह एक ऐसा मसला है जिस के बारे में मैं ने इस हाउस में कई बार अर्ज किया है, यह कोई नई बात नहीं है । दूसरा मामला देखिये मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह दुरुस्त नहीं है कि सन् १९४७ से पहले हिन्दुओं और सिखों में इंटर-मैरिजिज ज्यादा हुआ करती थी, क्या यह दुरुस्त नहीं है कि आज बिरादरी से बाहर जाकर आमतौर पर इंटर मैरिजिज नहीं होती हैं । मेरी राय में इंटर मेरिज (Inter marriage) व इंटर डाइनिंग (Inter dining) दो अंग सोसिल इन्टेगरेशन (social integration) के हैं यह जो इंटर मैरियेजिज हैं यह कौन करायेगा ? यह जो सोशल इंटग्रेशन का मसला है, इसकी जिम्मेवारी किस पर है । क्या हमने कॉस्टीट्यूशन के प्रिफेस में Objection resolution में नहीं कहा है कि हम फ्रेटरनिटी fraternity और सोशल जसटिस (social justice) देश के अन्दर लायेंगे ? कौन लाएगा इस फ्रेटरनिटी को ? इस वास्ते मैं बड़े अदब के साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि यह गवर्नमेंट का फर्ज है कि वह एक सोशल रिफार्मर्स और सोशल इंटग्रेशन की अलग से मिनिस्ट्री कायम करें और स्टेट्स के अन्दर उसके काउंटर पार्ट्स हों । यह मेरी कोई नई मांग नहीं है, इसको मैं इसी हाउस में कई बार बुलन्द कर चुका हूं । मैं ऐसी एक मिनिस्ट्री का कायम किया जाना देशहित के लिये बहुत जरूरी समझता हूं ।

जनाबेवाला ये सारी तकरीरें जो आपने सुनी हैं, एक तरफ गुजरात वालों की तकरीरें और दूसरी तरफ महाराष्ट्र वालों की तकरीरें, ये किस तरफ इशारा करती हैं ? यह जो शैड्यूल्ड कास्टस का मसला है वह भी आपको मालूम ही है । भिन्न भिन्न जाति बिरादरियों की जो बातें हैं वे भी आपसे छिपी हुई नहीं हैं। मैं चाहता हूं कि ये सबकी सब चीजें खत्म हों। ये तभी खत्म हो सकती हैं कि जब यहां सेंटर में एक सोशल इंटेग्रेशन मिनिस्ट्री बने । आज हम अनटचेबिलिटी को दूर करने के लिए यहां पर कितने ही बिल लाते हैं और उनको पास करवाते

हैं। मैरिजिज और डाइवोर्स के बारे में आप कितने ही तरीके निकालते हैं और एक तरफ डाइवोर्स का हक देते हैं और दूसरी तरफ शादी को कैदों को मजबूत करना चाहते हैं। आज हमारे क्रिश्चियन भाई फारेन मिशनरियों के बारे में बहुत नाराज हैं। तो इन सब बातों को देखने के लिए और कानूनों को अमली रूप देने के लिए कोई कमेटी होनी चाहिए, कोई सोशल इंटेग्रेशन मिनिस्टरी हो, तभी यह काम हो सकता है। अगर ऐसा न हुआ तो ये जो आपके कानून हैं, वे जो अनटचेबिलिटी बिल है, यह जो सारा मैरिज ला आप ने पास करवाया है, यह जो डाइवोर्स ला पास करवाया है, ये सब कागजों पर धरे के धरे ही रह जायेंगे। आपके पास इन को अमल में लाने के लिए कोई मैशीनरी नहीं है। आज हम कानून पर कानून बनाते चले जा रहे हैं और अगर हम उनको अमल में नहीं लाते हैं तो हमारी जो लेबर्स हैं वे जाया जाती हैं। इस वास्ते मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि एक मिनिस्टरी सोशल रिफार्म्स एंड सोशल इंटेग्रेशन की अवश्य ही बननी चाहिए जोकि इन तथा दूसरे मामलों पर गौर करे और इनको अमल में लाने का प्रयत्न करे। छोटी उम्र की शादियों की रोक थाम को, इंटर-मैरिजिज को बढ़ावा दे, अनटचेबिलिटी के बारे में हमने जो बिल बनाए हैं, उनको अमली रूप दे, जो उसूल हमने फैटर-नाइजेशन का अपनी कॉस्टीट्यूशन में रखा है, उसको ह्यूसिल करें इत्यादि इत्यादि। इसके साथ ही साथ इसके काउंटरपार्ट्स स्टेट्स में होने चाहियें और एक ऐसी फिजा पैदा होनी चाहिए कि लोग यह फील करें कि जो कुछ आपने कॉस्टीट्यूशन में लिखा है उसको अमल में लाने की भी आप दरअसल कोशिश कर रहे हैं। अगर यह सब कुछ नहीं किया गया तो मुझे डर है कि जितने भी कानून आप पास करते हैं, वे बिल्कुल नाकारा होंगे और उन पर अमल नहीं होगा और वे कागज पर ही रह जायेंगे और उनकी कोई वकत नहीं रहेगी। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूं कि आप इस तरफ अवश्य ध्यान दें और ऐसी मिनिस्टरी की जिस की मैं ने मांग की है, बनाने का प्रयत्न करें।

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in seconding amendment No. 21, it will be my endeavour, during the short time that I will be having at my disposal, to try to prick some of the bubbles and baloons which the Treasury Benches have been trying to float in this House, with the poniard of truth.

Yesterday—if I am not wrong and if you permit me to mention a Member by name—Shri Dasappa of Mysore made an appeal to us saying that we should be charitable enough to recognise the achievements of the Government, that we should compliment the Government on its achievements. But we never have an opportunity because we find the Treasury Benches always busy patting their own back. They do it to such an extent that we think we can relieve ourselves of that duty.

I will be confining myself to a few things. I want to say this at the very beginning, that it will be a sad thing if we get into the mental habit, that we do not have the magnanimity and honesty—'we' means the Opposition—of being graceful enough to acknowledge whatever good the Government may be doing now and then, and if the Government gets into the habit of self-complacence and a growing belief in its infallibility. This will be very dangerous. I shall try to guard myself against this.

Some other hon. Member made an appeal—in offering my remarks, I want to make a deliberate reference to this. He said—'For heaven's sake, give a fair chance to what we are doing'. I shall be bearing in mind that also.

Let us take a few things. This morning the Prime Minister, in defending the record of his Government, has said: 'Please, for heaven's sake, look at the other countries and then offer your criticism'. It is only because we have had a look, not only just a look but a very close look, that

[Shri Nath Pai]

makes the spectacle at home so very gloomy. I do not believe much in statistics. Of course I do not want them to be burnt down completely. But another Prime Minister, Disraeli, has said this of statistics:

> "There are three kinds of lies—lies, dirty lies and statistics".

So I won't be relying entirely on statistics in making my points. But here are some poignant factors.

Shri C. D. Pande (Naini Tal): Keeping to dirty lies!

Shri Nath Pai: This morning the Prime Minister took objection to a very small remark of Acharya Kripalani's that the President's speech was very formal. What he meant, and what many of us mean, is this: the speech completely fails in giving the one thing which we need most vitally, that is in inspiring and enthusing. We wanted to get that, but we failed to get it in the Address. After all, the President's Address is supposed to give in broad outline what the Government's plan for action 15 during the time that it hopes to be in power. It is that that we looked for—that there will be something with which we can co-operate, there would be something that would lift the nation from the pall of frustration and disappointment that have descended on us.

We know of the failure of those who occupy those Benches for the past ten years to do what was promised to the nation. Of course they have a few achievements to their credit, but the question arises: are they enough compared to the tasks that lie in front of us? Do they bear a realistic relation to the need of the hour? It is when we apply this criterion and standard that our disappointment comes, and we shall be failing in our duty if we do not give expression to that.

Nothing will be achieved, nothing will be done unless we succeed in making an appeal to the people what is being done is not enough. It is precisely this failure to appeal to the people, to feel with the people, it is the failure of the Government to touch a chord in the heart of the people that makes for the sad decision on Bombay, which is the main purpose of my remarks.

A Minister speaking here—I am glad he is smiling now (referring to Shri S. K. Patil)—just after knowing the results of the elections to the Bombay Municipal Corporation, has said: 'Before long, we shall be in power'. He has got every right to be so very optimistic, but let me say this to him: You have as brilliant a chance of winning back Bombay for your Party as King Farrouk has for winning back the throne of Egypt.

Mr. Chairman: It will be advisable for the hon. Member to address the Chair.

An Hon. Member: He has been doing it.

Shri Nath Pai: I think I was doing it.

Mr. Chairman: No, no. Your neighbour did not advise you correctly.

Shri Nath Pai: I submit to you, Sir.

Taking that question once again, the Government champions and their protagonists never tire of telling this nation that they are democratic. I do not want that we should become only the biggest democracy; I want that we should be the greatest democracy in the world. And, how do we proceed to do it? By showing that we have a capacity to respond to what our people want, that we feel with

them, cry with them, we laugh with them; and then only we can call upon them to march with us. How much do the miseries and sufferings and hopes and aspirations of our people matter to them? They think of democracy; they talk of democracy and want to lecture to us about democracy. Here is a whole State which voted them out of power not because they were ungrateful. And, how do they respect the verdict of the people? We are pained and constrained to say that some of the greatest leaders of that party, whom we also were accustomed to look upon as our leaders, instead of taking with goodness and grace and bowing down before the will of our people have this to say that the people who voted them out of power were carried by emotion. So, what is the criterion? When the people vote them into power they are the symbols and paragons of reason and logic; but, if they have the courage to vote them out of power, they accuse them of being carried away by emotion. They are never tired of saying that they are increasing the prestige of the nation. I think nobody does so much to mar India's fair name than the Minister who keeps on complaining that those who threw them out of power were carried by emotion. This is what happened in Bombay; that is what happened in Maha Gujarat and that is what happened in Maharashtra.

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): What has happened in Marathwada?

Shri Nath Pai: This was the verdict that was given to your bullets, your tear gas and your imprisonment. Fiftyfive thousand people were put in prison. This record throws into insignificance some of the blackest deeds of others. I hate to draw a comparison between them and this. I would never like to do that; but comparison is inevitably drawn before our eyes when we see things. We want to forget that tragic chapter.

This morning the Prime Minister appealed to us for co-operation. Does he really seriously care for co-operation? What is their attitude? It is: We are in power; we have got the majority and we will do what we like so long as that majority is there at the back of what we do. Is this the criterion? Democracy does not function only on the majority of numbers but on the maximum good of the maximum number with the consent of as many as possible. That is the definition of democracy. Not by how many people we can have to vote for us for a course of action in the supreme House of the Nation. Do they care to look at this growing aversion? I want to make this pertenant point. It is not still late in the day if they see the writing on the wall to show grace and goodness. I appeal to all sections of the House: Do not look down upon Maha Gujarat or Maharashtra as having been guilty for the simple reason that India's unity will not be threatened if you concede Maha Gujarat or Maharashtra to have Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital. Every time you open fire on people who demand the rights that have been given to them by the promises of the Congress Party from 1922 and the rights to which they are entitled under our Constitution, every time when people come to demand their rights and you open fire, it is this fire and these shootings that undermine the unity of our country. A united Maha Gujarat and a united Maharashtra will be pillars of strength to India and will, if at all anything, strengthen the unity of the country. It is this failure to feel what the people want that has led to this debacle in Bombay and it is this failure again which may prove our undoing in implementing the Five Year Plan. They do not care whether the people go with them or not, all they say: we are in power and we will do as we like.

Many a Louis XIV has felt the same till he was pulled down from the throne. That is the warning of

[Shri Nath Pai]

time. Turning to this question, I say that we will never give up this fight and we feel confident—I am not uttering threats—that sooner or later, reason will prevail and other sections of the House including those sitting on the benches opposite will see the justice of the demand of Gujarat and Maharashtra. All they want is that they should be treated in this country as equals, equals with Bengalis, equals with Keralites, equals with citizens of Tamil Nad and others. That is all that they demand. You cannot twist it; you cannot condemn it by calling it linguism or parochialism. It cannot be put down like that.

I again come to this—my basic thing, their failure to feel with the people. There are cases it is said where people have died of starvation and I hate to repeat it because the Food Minister has said that he will be looking into the matter fully. But a complaint was made that people died because food was not given. And what is the truth? Once again I say I hate to draw comparisons. But I am reminded of the sad remarks of Col. L. S. Amery, who was then the Secretary of State for India who said: How many did die then? Three and a half million of our brethren died in the streets of Calcutta and many other cities and he told the House of Commons: They are dying because they are over-eating. Some such thing has been told to this House instead of sympathising and saying; wherever there is a difficulty let us all co-operate and try to get over this difficulty. We know that if we come into power there won't be any magic wand with which we can overnight resolve all the problems. The problems are there accumulated over a hundred years. But what have they done to resolve these problems all these 10 years of their rule? What again should have been the attitude? It is not one of impertinence, arrogance, and insolence which symbolises all their doings; it should be one of humility, co-operation and suffering. No, that is not their attitude. When the problem is too big for solution, they say quickly, let us all co-operate with goodwill and grace. When things get too hot for them they become little angles of grace and goodwill. They have been talking of co-operation all along but when they can conveniently get on with blaming the nation they will go on with it. Is this the language to be used? That is the point I want to make. A Minister has been abusing his own people. He said, whatever might the Government can command will be used. If you want to use such threats, use them against Salazar; use them against those who have been occupyng one-third of Kashmir, those who threaten the sovereignty of this nation and others. Against whom do you use these? It is against non-violent people, against the people who want Gujarat, who say: Give us employment. It is used against people who say, increase our subsistence levels, the levels on which we are living for years. This is just the language that they use. This I know is hard criticism but it is imperative and necessary.

I want to suggest one thing. I will not be taking much of the time of the House. I will come to one thing because I am concerned with it as an Indian and as one representing that constituency. The Prime Minister has been forthright in accepting that the policy of sanctions against Goa is not bearing the fruit which, perhaps, when he made it, he was fully justified and entitled to expect. This policy we started to liberate Goa. Because of the failure of the policy what is happening? We have not succeeded in it. In the process not only the Goans are suffering but because of the strange laws which were enforced—and many of the hon. Members, I am sure may not know—if we know the details of them, all honest patriots will be moved to tears to see the suffering of the people on this side of the border that is in India.

There is a river separating Goa from my district, Ratnagiri. There were fishermen on this river who were plying their little boats for hundreds of years and eking out a little living by fishing in the river. Because of this economic sanction against Dr. Salazar the sanction does not operate and there is a lot of smuggling of which we should be ashamed if we know the full details—they are suffering. Goa is receving all her demands from across the border. Somebody across the benches knows the truth. He was a very competent Minister in spite of the many unjust things he did as the Chief Minister of that State, and he knows the truth about it, how smuggling goes on there, how people receive all that they want. He knows that things which we want to prohibit from coming into Indian territory do come. These sanctions are more than tortures to those poor fishermen. They are thrown out of employment and they have nothing to do. I must draw your attention and plead for your sympathy in their sufferings. Not only the Goans who live on the other side of the border—because of all these restrictions which are not doing any good to anybody—but even our own countrymen suffer. If you go and see the low morale as it is on this side of the border, in Belgaum district, in Karwar and Ratnagri district, owing to the conditions imposed in the name of Goa, you can see how our own citizens are made to suffer.

I will conclude my remarks and I do not want your indulgence any further, and in concluding, I hope the House will forgive me for there might have been something very harsh in my remarks. We have been trying to remove it if possible but you never gave us the chance. I want to make once again an appeal. There is no puestion of prestige in granting what your countrymen want. There is no question of prestige or honour in conceding their demands. There is no defeat for our nation if our people wins.

It may be that your Party will perhaps be defeated not the country, not India. She will be gaining. I want to make this final appeal and it is this. Try to bow down gracefully to the will of the people. But, if you do not bow down gracefully, you will be bent down and in that process you may be broken. Sir, I have done.

Shri Morarji Desai: This is the request!

श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल (आनन्द) : सभापति महोदय, मैं ने इस बहस में हिस्सा लेने का विचार नहीं किया था, परन्तु जब कई गलत बातें कही जाती हैं तब यह आवश्यक हो जाता है कि उस का दूसरा पहलू भी सदन के सामने रखा जाए। यहां एक भाई ने यह कहा कि जो निर्णय संसद् ने लिया है, गुजरात के सारे लोग उस के खिलाफ हैं। यदि यह बात अच्छी तरह से सोची जाए और चुनाव में जो परिणाम आए हैं, उन को छांटा जाए तो प्रत्येक आदमी यह समझ जाएगा कि ऐसा कहना गलत है। कच्छ और सौराष्ट्र में कांग्रेस ने एक ही सीट खोई है और वह भी समाजवादी के हाथों खोई है। बम्बई प्रान्त में जो गुजरात था उस में सब जिलों में कांग्रेस हारी है ऐसा नहीं है। सिर्फ चार जिलों में कुछ जगहें कांग्रेस ने खोई हैं, वहां भी ऐसा नहीं है कि सब खोई हैं। लोक सभा में तो सिर्फ चार या पांच जगहें हम ने खोई हैं। परन्तु वहां परिस्थिति क्या थी इस का भी कुछ खयाल किया जाना चाहिए। यहां शान से कहा गया कि क्या लोग कांग्रेस हाउस थोड़े ही जलाना चाहते थे, क्यों उन के ऊपर गोलियां चलाई गईं ? थोड़े पत्थर ही ले कर तो वह आए थे। मैं आप को बताना चाहती हूं कि बहुत काफी पत्थर ले कर वहां पर लोग आए थे। अहमदाबाद का जो कांग्रेस हाउस है वह एक तल्ले का मकान है, उस के ऊपर जो टेरेस है उस के ऊपर टावर है। नीचे से इतने बड़े बड़े पत्थर फेंके गए कि टावर के शीशे टूट गए। इतना ही नहीं, कांग्रेस हाउस के मकान से नीचे से कुछ कागज भी बाहर

[श्रीमती मणिबेन पटेल]

खींचे गए और वहां चीफ मिनिस्टर का फोटो था, उस को भी निकाल कर जलाया। उस के बाद ऐसा कहना कि क्या कांग्रेस हाउस को जलाना चाहते थे, वह कहां तक ठीक है ? बात तो यह है कि दस, बारह राउंड्स तो हवा में फायर किए गए, टियर गैस लाने की भी कोशिश की। वह सब कुछ नहीं आ सका। एक पुलिस वाले की आंख में चोट लगी। उस के बाद यह फायरिंग हुई। यह जो बताया जाता है कि चुनाव में लोगों ने काफी कांग्रेस के खिलाफ वोट दिया, यह भी गलत है। उन लोगों को किस तरह से त्रास दिया गया और किस तरह से बहकाया गया, इस का भी खयाल होना चाहिए, उस का भी चित्र आना चाहिए। सरदार पटेल का फोटो उन्होंने लगाया और उन के नाम को एक्सप्लायट करने की कोशिश की, यह मैं ने अपनी आंखों से देखा है ? जब ढेबर भाई कांग्रेस के जलसे के लिए आए, कांग्रेस के मेंजिडेट भी आए थे। हम लोग सभा कर के जा रहे थे वहां उन लोगों की एक सभा हो रही थी। वहां से लड़के पत्थर ले कर बढ़े। यह मैं ने आंखों से देखा है मैं भी उस मोटर में बैठी थी। मोटर पर चार या पांच पत्थर लगे। ६ तारीख को अहमदाबाद का चुनाव था, ४ तारीख को इंदा गांधी वहां गईं। मैं भी उन के साथ जीप पर गई। उस जीप पर भी पत्थर फेंके गए, चप्पल डाली गई। इसके बाद भी यह कहना कि लोगों ने कांग्रेस के खिलाफ वोट दिया, यह कहां तक उचित है ? यह मैं आप से इस लिए कहती हूं कि लोगों पर कितना जुल्म हुआ है। यहां पर कई बार कहा गया, अभी मेरे पहले जो भाई बोले उन्होंने भी कहा कि महाराष्ट्र के लोग जीत जाते तो उस में क्या होता ? इस में जीतने न जीतने की बात नहीं है। बात तो यह है कि बम्बई में चौपाटी पर ए आई सी सी की मीटिंग थी। मैं उस में से जा रही थी तब भी मेरी मोटर पर पत्थर पड़े और शीशे टूटे, मैं बच गई। लेकिन मेरे साथ सौराष्ट्र के चीफ मिनिस्टर की पत्नी बैठी थीं, उन की पत्नी के खून बहा, उन की उंगली की हड्डी टूट गई, उस के बाद भी यह कहा जाता है कि आप गरीब लोगों पर गोली क्यों चलाते हैं। किसी को गोली चलाना अच्छा थोड़े ही लगता है और कोई जान बूझ कर चलाता भी नहीं है। लेकिन फिर भी आप लोग ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा करते हैं, लोगों ने बहुत तरह से कोशिश की कि गोली किसी न किसी तरह से चलाई जाए, परन्तु हम ने काफी बर्दाश्त किया और गोली नहीं चलाई। हम पुलिस को फिर भी कहते रहे कि मेहरबानी कर के आप मत आइए, हम को जो होना हो होने दीजिए।

एक मदस्य ने कहा कि उन्होंने सन् १९१७ में यह बात सीखी है। आप तो सन् १९१७ में महात्मा जी के पास थे, वह बात मुझे पूरी तरह याद है, परन्तु उस के बाद तो बहुत पानी बह गया, आप ने कांग्रेस को छोड़ दिया। परन्तु मैं तो जब महात्मा जी का देहान्त हुआ उस के दस मिनट पहले तक उन के साथ थी। मैं महात्मा जी के विचार जानती हूं। मैं मानती हूं कि हर एक को अपनी भाषा की सुविधा मिलनी चाहिए। वह भी बम्बई में ठीक से चलता है। बम्बई राज्य का जो भी गजट है वह तीन भाषाओं में प्रकाशित होता है। जो कार्रवाई होती है वह सभी प्रान्तों में अपनी २ भाषा में होती है। बम्बई राज्य के जितने पब्लिकेशन्स हैं वह तीनों भाषाओं में प्रकाशित होते हैं। इस से ज्यादा और मैं क्या कह सकती हूं। आज के राज्यपाल बम्बई के जब अहमदाबाद आए थे तो पूछने लगे कि क्या लोग यह चीज बर्दाश्त करेंगे। मैं ने कहा कि हां, अगर लोगों को तकलीफ नहीं मिलेगी, अगर किसी चीज के लिए उन को बम्बई तक नहीं दौड़ना पड़ेगा तो उन को चिन्ता नहीं है कि आप किस तरह से तंत्र चलाते हैं। हमारी जनता जो है उस को यह चाहिए कि उसे तकलीफ न हो, उस को रोज बम्बई तक भाग दौड़ न करनी पड़े, आसानी से और जल्दी उस को हर चीज मिल जाय, तो उसे

कोई परवाह नहीं है । लेकिन यहां इस तरह से बातें कही जाती हैं मानो जनता उन के साथ है और कांग्रेस के खिलाफ है । यह बात बिल्कुल गलत है ।

मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहती हूं कि दूसरे लोगों ने क्या किया । उन्होंने जलूस निकाला । कैसा जलूस ? उस जलूस में खोपड़ी लाए खून बहाते हुए । इस तरह का जलूस निकाला और पीछे लोगों को बहकाने लगे कि अगर कांग्रेस को वोट दिया तो इस का मतलब इन लोगों को वोट देना है । ऐसी ऐसी बातें कहीं और हमारी सभा नहीं करने दी हम सभा करें, तो क्या यह सभ्यता है कि इस प्रकार से पत्थर डाले जाएं । उन की सभा में कोई जाए नहीं, तो लोगों को वहां जबर्दस्ती ले जाएं । फिर यहां कहते हैं कि गोली चलाना क्या जरूरी बात है ? कांग्रेस को गोली छोड़ना बहुत अच्छा लगता है, कांग्रेस सत्ता पर है, सत्ता वाले जनता पर गोली चलाना चाहते हैं । परन्तु बात तो यह है कि गोली चलानी न पड़े इस के लिए उस वक्त हमारे चीफ मिनिस्टर और आज के हमारे वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री जो हैं उन्होंने अपनी जान खतरे में डाली, क्यों कि उस वक्त परिस्थिति ऐसी गम्भीर हो गई थी कि अगर वह अपनी जान खतरे में न डालते तो सारे गुजरात में उन को गोली चलानी पड़ती । उन्होंने अपनी जान खतरे में डाली ताकि लोगों को ठिकाने पर ले आएं और जो जबर्दस्ती हो रही है उस से जो लोग परेशान हो रहे हैं उन को उस से बचाएं । या तो वे उपद्रवियों को छोड़ें या गोली चलाएं । उन्होंने सोचा कि इस जीने से तो मरना भला है । उन्होंने इसलिए अपनी जान खतरे में डाली । चूंकि सदन में इस तरह की मांगें कर के उल्टा चित्र रक्खा जाए यह उचित नहीं है इसलिए मैं यह बताने के लिए खड़ी हुई हूं ।

यह कहा गया कि इस संसद् को जनता का निर्णय लेना चाहिए और बैठ कर सोचने के बाद कुछ करना चाहिए तो मैं पूछती हूं कि इस संसद् में या लोक सभा में, इस गृह में बम्बई के बारे में, बम्बई राज्य के बारे में जो निर्णय हुआ था क्या वह कांग्रेस ने लिया था ? वह निर्णय सारे हाउस ने लिया था, उस में जिस किसी ने भी हिस्सा लिया हो, लेकिन वह सर्वसम्मति से हुआ । आज जो अपोजीशन में बैठे हुए हैं उन्होंने इस मामले को शुरू किया, हां, इस में हम ने विरोध नहीं किया । हम ने उस में भाग नहीं लिया, लेकिन शामिल भी रहे, इस का कारण यह है कि हम को लगा कि भारत में जो परिस्थिति आज है उस में से जो रास्ता निकला वही सही रास्ता है, उसी पर काम करने से हमारे देश का जो ऐक्य है, जो यूनिटी है, वह रह सकती है, नहीं तो हमारी यूनिटी संभल नहीं सकती है । और आज उस निर्णय के बाद हम यह देख रहे हैं कि जो कुछ लोगों को यह शंका हुई थी कि यह निर्णय ठीक नहीं है वह शंका दूर हो गई । अब अगर किसी को यह निर्णय पसन्द नहीं आया इसलिए फिर से लोक सभा में चीज लायी जाये और फिर इस के ऊपर विचार किया जाये और यह निर्णय बदला जाये, तो ऐसा करने से इस का भी कभी अन्त नहीं होगा । तो मुझे यह कहना है कि इस हाउस को और देश को यह कहकर गलतफहमी में नहीं डाला जाना चाहिए कि इस निर्णय के कारण गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र कांग्रेस के खिलाफ हो गये हैं । यह गलत है कि गुजरात, बम्बई और महाराष्ट्र का वरडिक्ट हमारे खिलाफ है । आज भी बम्बई में कांग्रेस का बहुमत है और गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र में भी कांग्रेस का ही बहुमत है ।

यही बातें कहने के लिए मैं ने आपका समय लिया । अगर ये बातें यहां न चलतीं तो मैं आपका समय बिल्कुल न लेती ।

पंडित कुंजरू नारायण (शिवपुरी) : सभापति महोदय, लोक सभा में राष्ट्रपति के भाषण के लिये जो उल्लेख किया गया उसके

[पंडित ब्रज नारायण]

लिये मैं धन्यवाद देता हूं । मुझे उसमें जो न्यूनता दिखायी पड़ती है उसके सम्बन्ध में ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं ।

हमारे देश में प्रजातंत्र तो आ गया है परन्तु उस प्रजातंत्र के प्रति जितनी जागरूकता होनी चाहिये उतनी मैं नहीं देख रहा हूं । और उसी के साथ साथ हमारे देश में किस प्रकार से यह तंत्र चलाया जा सकता है इस पर भी जिस प्रकार का मतैक्य होना चाहिए वैसा नजर नहीं आ रहा है । इसी के साथ साथ मैं देख रहा हूं कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय, राष्ट्रीय और स्थानीय इन तीन प्रकार की नीतियों में उलझ कर हम दलदल में फंसते जा रहे हैं । एक तरफ जब हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति की तरफ दृष्टि डालते हैं तो हमारी राष्ट्रीयता खत्म हो ती दिखायी देती है, और हमारी राष्ट्रीयता की यह स्थिति है कि हम अलग अलग जातियों में बंटकर जो सच्ची राष्ट्रीयता है उसे एक प्रकार से नाश करने पर उतारू हो गये हैं । यहां जातिवाद इतने जोरों से फैल गया है कि हर एक व्यक्ति ने अपनी जाति को देखना प्रारम्भ कर दिया है । सच्ची राष्ट्रीयता को भूलकर हम जातिवाद के दलदल में फंसते जा रहे हैं । देश के प्रति जो हमारा ध्यान होना चाहिये वह नहीं हो रहा है ।

जिन बातों का हमारे राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने उल्लेख किया है इसमें सन्देह नहीं है कि उन बातों की तरफ हमारी सरकार का ध्यान गया है । और यह कहना गलत होगा कि हमारी सरकार कुछ नहीं कर रही है । मैं तो समझता हूं कि आज की विषम परिस्थितियों में जितनी समस्याओं को सुलझाया जा सकता है उनको सुलझाने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है । मनुष्य एक दुर्बल प्राणी है और आज सारे संसार की अवस्था और स्थिति इस समय भयावह हो गयी है । मैं देखता हूं कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय नीति ने मेरे देश को भी दो से इस लिया है और वह नीति पूंजीवाद और साम्यवाद के बीच में फंसी हुई है । आज साम्यवाद का नाम है रूस और पूंजीवाद का नाम है अमरीका । रूस और अमरीका इन दोनों के बीच आज का संसार फंस रहा है और हम भी प्रकारान्तर से उसी में फंस गये हैं । हमारी यह नीति है कि न हम अमरीकी पूंजीवाद में फंसें और न रूसी साम्यवाद में फंसें । हमारी नीति तो यह होनी चाहिये कि हम हिन्दू समाजवाद को सामने लायें । हमारे देश में यह परम्परा रही है यदि चालीस चालीस दिन भूखा रह कर भी किसी के कष्ट को दूर किया जा सकता है तो किया गया है और चालीस दिन भूखे रहने के बाद भी यदि हमारे सामने भोजन आने पर कोई उसे लेने आ जाता है तो उसे वह भोजन दे दिया जाता है और यह प्रार्थना की जाती है :

न कामयेहम् गति मश्विरात् परा,
अष्टर्धि युक्ता मे पुनर्भवम् वा ।

आर्तिः प्रपद्ये खिल देह भाजा,
मन्तः स्थितो येन भवन्त्य दुःखाः ।।

अर्थात् हे प्रभो, संसार भर के जितने भी प्राणी हैं उन सब का दुःख मैं अकेला भोगूं जिससे कि वह सब दुःख से रहित हो जायें

इस प्रकार की परम्परा इस आर्यावर्त में रही है और उसी आर्यावर्त में आज हम देख रहे हैं कर्तव्य पालन करने के बाद अधिकार प्राप्त करने के लिये लोग युद्ध लड़ रहे हैं और इस प्रकार से अराजकता बढ़ रही है ।

अराज्यकेषु राज्येषु धर्मो न व्यवतिष्ठते,
परस्परम्च खादन्ति सर्वथा धिक् राज्य कम् ।

जहां अराजकता बढ़ जाती है वहां मत्स्य न्याय आरम्भ हो जाता है । जिस प्रकार एक

तालाब में हर बड़ी मछली छोटी मछली को खाती है उसी प्रकार देश में अराजकता फैल जाने पर बड़ा आदमी छोटे आदमी को खाने लगता है। यही यहां आजकल हो रहा है और उसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि अराजकता और बढ़ती जाती है।

तो आज पूंजीवाद और साम्यवाद का संघर्ष चल रहा है। हमारी सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है कि दोनों के बीच सामंजस्य प्रस्थापित करे। जब दोनों में सामंजस्य होगा तो कोई दीन नहीं रहेगा और सब सुखी हो सकेंगे और तभी देश आगे बढ़ सकेगा।

हम देखते हैं कि हम एक समस्या सुलझाने जाते हैं तो दूसरी समस्या खड़ी हो जाती है। भाषावार प्रांतों को लेकर इतना उपद्रव खड़ा हो गया। लोग किसी न किसी प्रकार आगे आने के लिये कोई न कोई तरीका ढूंढ लेते हैं और सरकार समस्या के सुलझाने के लिये मार्ग निकालने का प्रयत्न करती है तो वह भी फंस जाती है। पहले इस झगड़े को सुलझाने के लिये कहा गया कि हम बम्बई गुजरात को दे देंगे, फिर कहा गया कि नहीं महाराष्ट्र को देंगे। उससे भी जब समस्या का समाधान न हुआ तो कहा गया कि नहीं हम उसे केन्द्र के अधीन ले लेंगे। केन्द्र में लेने का सवाल सामने आया तो और भी झगड़ा खड़ा होने लगा। उसके बाद समस्या का वर्तमान हल निकाला गया। लेकिन फिर भी पूरी तरह समस्या का हल नहीं हुआ। इस निर्णय के फलस्वरूप प्रांतीयता और भाषावाद इतना जोर पकड़ गया है कि राष्ट्रीयता दब गयी है और प्रत्येक आदमी सोचने लगा है कि मैं अमुक प्रांत से आता हूं और मैं अमुक भाषा बोलने वाला हूं। हिन्दी, जिसको हमने राष्ट्रभाषा घोषित किया था उसके प्रति घृणा प्रदर्शित की जाती है। लोगों को अंग्रेजी के प्रति महत्व है लेकिन हिन्दी के लिये नहीं। इस प्रकार हम अपने राष्ट्र को भूल कर विनाश की ओर चले जा रहे हैं। हमें इन बातों की तरफ से जनता का ध्यान हटाकर देश की तरफ लगाना पड़ेगा। एक समय था कि हम गोलियां खाकर भी इस देश की स्वतंत्रता के लिये लड़ते चले गये पर आज परिस्थिति यह है कि हम अपनी सरकार की गोलियां खाने को तैयार हैं और सरकार गोलियां मारने को तैयार है जब हमारे देश में यह अवस्था हो रही है तो हो सकता है कि कोई बड़ी शक्ति हमको हड़प जाये। बाहर के झगड़े से बचने के लिये हमारे शासन ने यह नीति अपनायी है वह सब से मैत्री का व्यवहार करे और इसके लिये उसने शांति का नारा लगाया है। यह नारा बुरा नहीं है। हम शांति चाहते हैं और दुनिया में इस नारे को जितना बुलन्द किया जाये उतना अच्छा है। पर यदि दुनिया वाले न मानें और पाकिस्तान की पीठ थपथपायें तो हम क्या करेंगे। उस दशा में हमको अपनी स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिए। मैं चाहता हूं कि इस देश में लोगों को अनिवार्य रूप से सैनिक शिक्षा दी जायें। यह ठीक है कि हम शान्ति चाहते हैं और सुव्यवस्था चाहते हैं लेकिन उसी के साथ साथ देश को शक्तिशाली और आत्मनिर्भर बनाने के लिये लोगों को अस्त्र और शस्त्र देने चाहिएं। यदि ऐसा किया जायेगा तो हमारी राष्ट्रीयता बनी रहेगी और यदि दुनिया के लोगों ने हमारी आवाज को न सुना और हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण हुआ तो हम उसका सामना तो कर सकेंगे। विश्व बन्धुत्व का नारा तो लगाया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन शत्रु हमारे घर में चले आ रहे हैं और हमारी सब बातों को मालूम करके विपक्ष के पास पहुंचा रहे हैं उसकी ओर से भी सावधान रहना चाहिए। हमको यह देखना होगा कि ऐसे व्यक्ति हमारे यहां ऊंचे पदों पर तो नहीं बैठे हैं, या सेना में और पुलिस में तो नहीं बैठे हैं, अथवा हमारी पार्लियामेंट के आफिसेज में तो नहीं बैठे हैं और हमारे कागजात को उठाकर पाकिस्तान को भेज रहे हैं, हमारी गोपनीयता तो भंग नहीं हो रही है। इस तरफ भी जरा बारीकी से ध्यान देना पड़ेगा। इसके साथ ही देश के स्वास्थ्य को सुन्दर बनाने के लिए सम्पूर्ण देश को अच्छी आब हवा

[पंडित बृज नारायण]

देनी पड़ेगी। यह ठीक है कि अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ाया जा रहा है और उसको और अधिक बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न किया जा रहा है, परन्तु यह तथ्य हम सब के सामने है कि जिस प्रकार का भोजन मिलना चाहिए, वह नहीं मिल रहा है। आज लोगों को वैजीटेबल और डालडा खाने को मिल रहा है। आज देश में घी, दूध, मक्खन नहीं मिलता है। इस अवस्था में यह समझ नहीं आता कि हमारी नेशन किस तरह बनेगी। हमारे बच्चों के सिरों पर पुस्तकों का बोझ है, परन्तु उनको घी, दूध मिलता नहीं है यह सन्तान कैसे देश को चला सकेगी और राष्ट्रनिर्माण के महान उत्तरदायित्व को वहन कर सकेगी? हम जानते हैं कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय सतत यत्न कर रहे हैं, दिन रात जागरूक रह कर, देश-विदेश में घूमकर राष्ट्र को शक्तिशाली बनाने का यत्न कर रहे हैं। लेकिन क्या कभी इस बात का विचार किया गया है कि किस तरह से यह मिशन बनेगी? किस तरह से हमारे बालक और तरुण, जिन में बल नहीं है, तेज नहीं है, जिन्हें खाने को कुछ नहीं मिलता है, जिन के गाल बैठ रहे हैं, जिनमें उत्साह नहीं है, साहस नहीं है, देश की रक्षा के लिये मैदान में लड़ सकेंगे? आज इस बात की अत्यन्त आवश्यकता है कि इस स्थिति की तरफ तुरन्त ध्यान दिया जाय और आवश्यक कदम उठाए जायें। हमें इस बात का प्रयत्न करना है कि हमारे बालकों और तरुणों को पौष्टिक भोजन मिले, जिससे वे बलवान और तेजस्वी हो सकें और देशोन्नति में हाथ बटा सकें।

इस के साथ ही यह भी नितांत आवश्यक है कि वर्तमान शिक्षा प्रणाली में सुधार किया जाय, उस में अमूल-चूल परिवर्तन किया जाय। अंग्रेजों के जमाने में ऐसी शिक्षा दी जाती थी, जिस का उद्देश्य क्लार्क बनाना था। यह कितने खेद की बात है कि आज भी ठीक वही शिक्षा दी जा रही है। उस में रंच मात्र भी परिवर्तन नहीं किया गया है। उस के परिणाम हमारे सामने हैं। हमारी राष्ट्रीयता को नष्ट करने और उसकी भावना को विकृत करने के लिए जिस साहित्य और इतिहास का निर्माण किया गया था, वह आज भी मौजूद है। उस साहित्य के अनुसार अन्य विदेशी लोगों की तरह आर्य भी बाहर से इस देश में आए और यहां आकर बस गए। इस का उद्देश्य यह भावना उत्पन्न करना है कि जिस तरह दूसरे कई वर्ग बाहर से यहां आए, उसी तरह हम भी बाहर से यहां आए और हम वास्तव में यहां के रहने वाले नहीं हैं और यह देश तो एक लावारिस माल की तरह है, जिस को हर ताकतवर वर्ग ने लूट खाया। इस तरह की विकृत, दूषित और खतरनाक भावना को जन्म दिया गया है, जो कि सीधे हमारी राष्ट्रीयता की नींव पर आघात करती है। हमारा कहना तो यह है कि यह हमारा देश है, यह हमारी जन्मभूमि, मातृभूमि और पुण्यभूमि है, हम इसके स्वामी हैं, जो इसकी तरफ आंख उठा कर भी देखेगा, हम उस का डट कर मुकाबला करेंगे, जो इस को नाश करना चाहेगा, हम उसका विरोध करेंगे।

समय समय पर पाकिस्तान इस राष्ट्र को मुक्का और आंखें दिखाता है, प्रधान मंत्री महोदय का अपमान करता है और अपशब्द बोलता है। हम लोग, जो यहां लोक सभा में आए हैं, जो अनुभव करते हैं, वह स्पष्टता से, ईमानदारी से और राष्ट्रहित को सामने रख कर कहेंगे, लेकिन इस का तात्पर्य पाकिस्तान को यह नहीं समझना चाहिये कि हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत मतभेद और झगड़े हैं, गुजराती और महाराष्ट्रीय, बंगाली और बिहारी, पंजाबी हिन्दू और सिख, सब आपस में लड़ रहे हैं, और इस लिये वह जो चाहे ज्यादती कर सकता है। यह ठीक है कि देश में विषमता पैदा हो रही है, लेकिन अगर पाकिस्तान इस का लाभ उठा कर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय का अपमान करता है या हिन्दुस्तान को हानि पहुंचाने का प्रयत्न करता है, तो हिन्दुस्तान का बच्चा बच्चा देश के सम्मान और रक्षा के लिये बलिदान हो जायेगा और इस बात को बर्दाश्त

नहीं करेगा कि कोई विदेशी इस प्रकार देश के प्रधान मंत्री या सरकार का अपमान करे और यहां कुचक्र कर के इस की सुरक्षा को खतरे में डाले ।

इस देश में पशुधन ही मुख्य धन है । अगर आप खेती-बाड़ी करना चाहें, तो निरे ट्रैक्टरों से खेती-बाड़ी नहीं होगी, उसके लिये आप को पशुधन से सहायता लेनी होगी । इस कारण से अगर इस देश में यह आवाज उठाई जाती है कि यहां गायों की रक्षा होनी चाहिए, तो उस को धर्म और सम्प्रदाय का प्रश्न नहीं बनाया जाना चाहिए । यतोभ्युदय-निश्रेयस्-सिद्धिः सधर्म : । जो इस लोक में अभ्युदय करे और निश्रयस् की प्राप्ति करे, वह हमारा धर्म है । इस में साम्प्रदायिकता नाम की कोई संकीर्ण भावना नहीं है । यहां जैन, वैष्णव, सिख, बुद्ध इत्यादि सभी हैं, लेकिन वे सब मिल कर हिन्दू धर्म का स्वरूप धारण करते हैं । आज लोगों के मन में यह भावना निर्माण करनी होगी कि मैं जो कर्म करता हूं, मुझे उस का फल मिलेगा । इससे आज चारों ओर फैले हुए चोर-बाजार, रिश्वतखोरी इत्यादि भ्रष्टाचार मिट जायेंगे । आज तो लोग यह समझते हैं कि ऊपर कोई देखने वाला नहीं है, सरकार से बच कर अपने स्वार्थ के लिए जो चाहे, करते जाओ, उससे समाज और राष्ट्र को कितनी ही हानि क्यों न हो । मेरा निवेदन है कि इस के स्थान पर हमको लोगों में सच्ची राष्ट्रीयता पैदा करनी है । मैं समझता हूं कि सरकार इस बारे में जागरूक है । हम को सारे भेद-भाव भुला कर सरकार का ध्यान देश-हित की योजनाओं की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहिए और अपने सुझाव रखने चाहिएं । राज्य को भी उन बातों की तरफ ध्यान देकर अपने कार्य को आगे बढ़ाना चाहिए और यही प्रजातंत्र में होता है । बिना किसी वैर-भाव के, विद्वेष के, जो कुछ हम अनुभव करते हैं, वह सरकार के सामने रखना चाहिए । सरकार को प्रेम-पूर्वक और आदर-बुद्धि के साथ उस में जो सत्य हों, उनको स्वीकार करना चाहिए और राष्ट्र को उन्नत, शक्तिशाली और समृद्ध बनाने का प्रयत्न करते रहना चाहिए ।

इतना कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूं ।

Shri K. G. Deshmukh (Ramtek): I am thankful to you, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to speak on this occasion. Though I am coming last, you have given me a chance to take part in today's debate.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Member does not like to be the last, he might finish earlier!

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: The President has been pleased to make reference to the overall progress that has been made during the last five years. It is true that during the last five years, during the first Plan period, we have made great progress in spheres such as Community Projects, External Affairs, State undertakings and also in the sphere of food. But it has been said during the last three days, during the discussion of the Address, in relation to the food question, that there have been difficulties. It is true that this year we are experiencing some difficulties in respect of food prices. The statistics which have been given by our Food Minister show that we are not in deficit of food this year. In rice, he said we have exceeded even the target of the last five years. In wheat also he showed that an estimate of 8·3 million tons is put down this year. The statistics have been challenged by many of my friends in the Opposition and when the prices are growing this year, it creates some doubt also. But, as the Prime Minister and the Food Minister have stated, statistics are necessary, and they give a true picture of our food situation. The Statistics Department is also an independent department created by the Government and I think there is no doubt that statistics are true, but, for some other reason, the prices may be going upwards. The reasons have also been given by the Food Minister. One of the main reasons is hoarding. About hoarding I admit that

[Shri K. G. Deshmukh]

the fault does not lie with the agriculturists or the cultivators, but mainly with the merchants or the business classes. In this regard, I am glad that the Minister has given us a promise to appoint a committee to enquire about the matter and that action will be taken soon.

I do not understand why we should be very eager to criticise the Food Minister at this stage and not give him a chance to take action soon and improve the food position. Much has been said on the food position. So, I would not go into the details about it, and I shall come to the next topic.

About the question of reorganisation of States which is my next point, I would not say much. It has been raised by my friends in the Opposition, and reference was made about the formation of Maharashtra with Bombay. I think this is not the time when we can go in detail into the merits of the question which had been discussed on the floor of this House in the last year and settled. But when the Members on the other side have given some figures which, I think, are not correct, I should like to refer to them. I may tell the House that some of the arguments which my friends in the Opposition raised are far away from the facts. They said that the House should accept the verdict of the people in Maharashtra and that we should reconsider this question of Maharashtra with Bombay and take a proper decision. They say that the people in Maharashtra and in Bombay have given a verdict against a bilingual State and in favour of Maharashtra. I do not know what the figures are, on which they have based their arguments.

In the last general election, the position became clear. Let me first clear my position. I do not know what they mean by Maharashtra. I think that the people in Bombay and Poona consider that Maharashtra comprises only 13 districts which formed part of the old Bombay Province. But it is not true. Maharashtra is not so small as is supposed by them. When they think of Maharashtra, they must think of the 13 districts previously in the State of Bombay *plus* 8 districts of Vidarbha *plus* 8 districts of Marathwada. Maharashtra comprises of all those 26 districts of Marathi-speaking people; that is real Maharashtra.

For the information of hon. Members opposite, I will give some figures about the last general election. Out of a total of 235 Assembly seats in the Maharashtra area, the Congress won 121 seats. At the time of the election, the Congress gave a clear understanding to the people that we wanted to work out the bilingual administration of the Bombay State. We did not tell the people that after the elections, we would bring out this question before the Parliament and give them Maharashtra with Bombay; we did not give such false hopes to our electors. We won the majority of 121 out of 235 seats on that clear understanding. Where is the question of the verict of democracy? The verdict is in favour of the bilingual State and not unilingual State, as my friends in the Opposition have said. In the elections in the Bombay city also, conducted on the basis of adult franchise, the Congress won 13 out of 24 seats, on the clear understanding of the bilingual State. (*Interruption*) So, if my friends want that the verdict of democracy should be taken as the basis of the problem, let them take these facts and figures. Let the House consider this question on these facts and we are ready to accept the verdict of the House.

I now come to the housing problem. I am glad that the President has referred to this in his Address. He has also said that the Government have taken many measures to relieve the housing shortage. I have no experience in the industrial sphere, but in other spheres, especially in the urban area, I have some experience, and I may say that this problem has not been solved properly. The measures and the procedure that have

been adopted by the Government are not adequate and so, many difficulties are experienced by the people and the societies working in this sphere. I am running a society at my place where there is a great demand for the construction of houses. Nearly 200 to 300 applications are pending with my society. The money granted from the Central Government is also adequate, but the procedure for distributing the money is very long. The money granted by the Central Government goes to the State Government, which gives it to the housing board. The housing board passes that money on to some societies, especially co-operative societies at distant places. This procedure of passing money from one hand to another four or five times is very long and very often the money does not reach the people. Therefore, their enthusiasm to build the houses as well as the enthusiasm of the co-operative societies working in that sphere is marred.

When money is granted to the co-operative societies, especially in my State, many restrictions are laid down. Every time they have to run to the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar and obtain sanction from him. We know that there is official red-tapism and every time he comes forward with some minor objections and there is delay at every stage. If the housing problem is to be solved properly, the procedure of granting money and also distributing money should be simplified. Every year at the time of the budget, we earmark some amount for this purpose, but it lapses. I do not know about Bombay, but in Madhya Pradesh, some lakhs of rupees used to lapse because nobody was trying to utilise the money—neither the Government nor the co-operative societies. The societies which were eager to get money could not utilise it due to the difficulties I have explained. So, I would appeal to the Housing Minister through the Home Minister to simplify this procedure, so that the money may be utilised as far as possible.

I now come to the appeal of the I now come to the appeal of the President for the implementation of the second Five Year Plan. It is true that progress during the Second Plan, especially in the first year, has been too slow. The difficulties that are mentioned are re-organisation and others. Although the various parties may differ in many spheres, I hope they are all agreed at least on one point, namely, the implementation of the Plan necessary for the growth and progress of our country. I think all the parties will come together and do whatever they can to implement the Plan. I am thankful to the President for calling upon the people to come forward with some determined efforts for the implementation of this Plan. I appeal through the House to all parts to come forward with determination to implement the second Five Year Plan.

Mr. Chairman: I know a large number of hon. Members must be feeling disappointed. Once our present Speaker told us that there must remain a larger number of speeches that have been carefully prepared and undelivered than the number of speeches that have been actually delivered. This was the first opportunity and I assure them that there would be many more coming just near; and, the Chair would see that those who have not got an opportunity to speak this time will be accommodated in preference to others who have spoken. So, they need not feel frustrated; they will have ample opportunities in the near future.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Tomorrow, will only the Minister's reply be there?

Mr. Chairman: Yes; tomorrow, only the reply will be given.

An Hon. Member: You can allow more speakers from the Opposition.

Mr. Chairman: I cannot promise at this juncture.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 17th May, 1957.