

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

Section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944:—

- (a) G.S.R. No. 60 dated the 16th January, 1960 making certain further amendment to the Central Excise Rules, 1944.
- (b) G.S.R. No. 61 dated the 16th January, 1960 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1895/60].

STATE BANK OF INDIA (SUBSIDIARY BANKS) (COMPENSATION) RULES

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha): I beg to re-lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of Section 62 of the State Bank of India (Subsidiary Banks) Act, 1959, a copy of the State Bank of India (Subsidiary Banks) (Compensation) Rules, 1959, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1116 dated the 10th October, 1959. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1719/59.]

12.19 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
PRESIDENT

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion on the Motion on Address by the President moved by Shri Viswanatha Reddy and seconded by Shri Ansar Harvani on the 15th February, 1960, namely:

"That the Members of the 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 8th February, 1960."

149 amendments to the Motion were moved yesterday and a list indicating the numbers thereof was circulated to Members.

In addition, the following amendments will also be treated as moved, as requested by the Members con-

cerned: Amendments Nos. 85 to 94, 172 to 180, 195 to 197 and 208.

Shri Liladhar Kotoki may continue his speech.

So far as Shri Vajpayee's suggestion is concerned, when the amendment is tabled, I will consider whether I should allow it, having regard to the fact that some speeches have already been made.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that there is no mention regarding steps to be taken to undo the injustice done to some classes of Central Government employees by the Pay Commission". (85).

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

"but regret that there is no reference of the growing unemployment in the country". (86).

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

"but regret that there is no mention about Government's commitment to adopting the unanimous decision regarding minimum wage, arrived at the Fifteenth Labour Conference". (87).

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

"but regret that there is no mention about distribution of land to the landless persons". (88).

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

"but regret that there is no call for national unity for the success

of the Third Five Year Plan".
(89).

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

"but regret that there is no
mention of the growing prices of
cotton and cloth in the country".
(90).

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

"but regret that there is no
mention about the formation of a
Price Stabilization Committee to
check the growing price of food-
grains". (91).

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

"but regret that no mention
has been made of the abnormal
rise in the price of rice in West
Bengal and Orissa". (92).

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

"but regret that there is no
mention of the formation of Wage
Boards for industries like leather,
jute, iron and steel, chemicals
and transport". (93).

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

"but regret that there is no
mention of the bank employees'
refusal to settle the disputes by
Tripartite Conference". (94).

Shri U. C. Patnalk (Ganjam): I
beg to move:

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

"but regret that there is no
mention of the growing rise of
prices of necessities like food and
clothing and the steps being taken
to check the same." (172).

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

"but regret that the Address
does not indicate measures pro-
posed to be taken for driving the
Chinese from Indian territories
and for preventing further ag-
gression." (173).

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

"but regret that there is no
mention of the urgent need to set
up a Civil Defence machinery." (174).

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

"but regret that the Address
does not disclose any plans,—

(a) to modernise the defence
forces and provide them with
adequate equipments,

(b) to rationalise the defence
machinery so as to yield
maximum results at minimum
costs, and

(c) to integrate defence with
socio-economic planning." (175).

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

"but regret that the Address
does not disclose any proposal on
the part of the Government to
implement Article 53(2) of the
Constitution although ten years
have elapsed since the enforce-
ment of the Constitution." (176).

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

"but regret that the Address
does not take notice of the grow-
ing restlessness among the stu-
dent population nor does it in-
dicate any positive steps to cana-
lise youth energy into channels of
national service." (177).

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

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

“but regret that there is no indication that Planning will take into account the civilian as well as the military wings of our national life to mobilise and train our vast manpower for all-out defence in war-emergencies and for all-round developmental activities in normal times.” (178).

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

“but regret that there is no mention of the proposal to revise the pay scales, amenities and conditions of service of armed-services personnel and for rehabilitation of ex-service men.” (179).

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

“but regret that the Address does not disclose Government's determination to rouse national enthusiasm and to create an atmosphere which is essential not only for defence but also for development programmes.” (180).

Shri Balasaheb Patil (Miraj): I beg to move:

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

“but regret to note,—

(a) that no mention has been made about the settlement of boundaries between the States of Bombay and Mysore based on the principles of the Pataskar formula,

(b) that no mention has been made of the principles on which the boundary of Marathi-speaking and Gujarati-speaking States will be settled in near future, and

(c) that no mention has been made for the redress of the difficulties of linguistic minorities, caused by the State force, and that of the linguistic majority in the areas where the dispute about the resettlement of boundaries between States exists”. (195).

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

“but regret that the Government have failed,—

(a) to check the rising prices of the necessities of life of common man,

(b) to take adequate steps to curb the growing unemployment both in rural and urban areas,

(c) to find ways and means to provide adequate employment for the workers who are thrown out of the employment by artificial creation of shortage of raw materials in factories.” (196).

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

“but regret that the Government have failed to formulate law.—

(a) to put uniform ceiling on land holdings throughout India,

(b) for redistribution of surplus land to the landless peasants,

(c) for abolition of land revenue on the uneconomic holdings,

(d) for application of tax on income in case of small holders,

(e) to regulate the relations of land holders with agricultural labourers so as to give adequate relief to both, and

(f) to change the whole of economics of the village and agriculturist, so as to bring them on par with standard of substantial living." (197).

Shri U. C. Patnaik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address makes no reference to the charges of corruption made against persons at high level nor the measures proposed to be taken to eradicate the same". (208).

Mr. Speaker: All these amendments are now before the House.

Shri Liladhar Kotoki (Nowgong): Yesterday I referred to the border problem with China and suggested that while negotiations should be allowed to continue, we should strengthen our defence measures. I am glad that the Prime Minister has agreed to meet the Chinese Prime Minister. Let us hope that this meeting will result in a fruitful solution of the dispute and will end our apprehensions about border troubles.

In the few minutes left for me, I shall touch briefly on two other important problems, namely, the problem of regional disparities and inequalities and the problem of unemployment. I need not emphasise the fact that unless and until we remove the regional disparities and inequalities, we cannot achieve our goal of socialist pattern of society. It is true that there has been all-round progress more or less throughout the country, but we have to see whether in this progress, we are reducing the disparities and inequalities or widening them. I have a doubt that we are not going in the right direction.

I will only quote one instance to illustrate my point. If you take the

instance of Assam, the per capita income in 1951-52 was Rs. 243.4. It has increased by Rs. 29 during the last eight years and in 1958-59 the per capita income is Rs. 272.4 But how does it compare with the per capita income of India as a whole? In 1951-52, the per capita income of India was Rs. 251.7. It has increased by Rs. 39 in the last eight years and in 1958-59 it has come to Rs. 290.7. So, the difference in per capita income between Assam and India which was Rs. 8.3 in 1951-52 has increased by Rs. 10 and has come to Rs. 18.3 in 1958-59. So, we should see that while there is progress in different regions of the country, the disparities and inequalities should not widen. They should come down as rapidly as possible.

In this connection, I will refer to the complex problem of the north-east region comprising Assam, NEFA, Naga Hills-Tuensang Area, Manipur and Tripura. The people there are suffering from various problems and unprecedented difficulties created by partition and recently by the border troubles from various sectors. So, in the Third Five Year Plan, we must make adequate provision for the development of these regions, so that at the end of the next two Plans at least, the disparities may be wiped out.

Only during the last session, we had to extend the period of reservation in case of the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes by another ten years. That shows that within the period of ten years stipulated in the Constitution, we could not bring them to the level of the other communities. So, during the Third and the Fourth Plans, we have to see that we remove the differences between these communities and establish an equal standard all over the country.

The eastern region is full of potentialities for mineral, forest and power resources. So, if we develop this area, it will not only increase the economic standard of the region,

[Shri Liladhar Kotoki]
but will add enormously to the wealth
of the country as a whole.

I am grateful to the Government for taking up the construction of the bridge across the Brahmaputra and also the hydel project at unling the foundation-stone of which was laid by the Prime Minister only last month. I would like to suggest, in this connection, that the Kapili Valley project, for which the survey has been completed should be taken up in the Third Five Year Plan.

Before I conclude, I want to refer to the problem of unemployment. Here also, certain figures will be revealing. At the end of the first Plan, the back-log was 5.3 million. At the end of the second Plan, which is a bigger Plan, the back-log has gone up to 7 million. It is estimated that at the end of the third Plan, this back log would amount to 15 million. So, this a very alarming situation. I would suggest that the Government and the Planning Commission should take necessary measures to see that this back-log is removed and we can have full employment for the country at least in the Fourth Plan. In this connection, I would suggest that more stress should be laid on labour-incentive industries rather than on production-incentive industries.

With these words, I support the motion of thanks to the President for his illuminating address to the Parliament.

Shri M. R. Masani rose—

Mr. Speaker: Has nobody spoken from his party yesterday?

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi—East):
No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Shri Masani.

Shri M. R. Masani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had intended yesterday, when the debate started, to speak, on

behalf of the Swatantra Party, in support of amendment No. 155 moved by my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, on behalf of several Parties in this House. Unfortunately, as has been appreciated this morning, the course of events has overtaken the terms of that amendment. But the principles on which the amendment was founded are as valid today, if not more valid, than they were yesterday.

I think this country has received with the most unpleasant shock the news of the invitation to this country extended on our behalf by the Prime Minister to Mr. Chou En-lai. That shock is heightened by the fact that only a few days ago, replying to the debate in the Rajya Sabha on 12th February, the Prime Minister actually said something that had misled the public opinion into what was now apparently a false sense of complacency and satisfaction. I read the words of the Prime Minister in the Upper House to show that on this occasion, as indeed on previous occasions in this series of events, the Prime Minister has been less fair to the Parliament than is his usual custom as the very fine parliamentarian that he is. What did he say in the Rajya Sabha on the 12th February?

"Let it be understood quite clearly that though we talk about friendly settlement, I see no ground whatever at the present moment, no bridge between the Chinese position and ours. That is to say, our present positions are such that there is no room for negotiations on that basis. There is nothing to negotiate at present. It may arise later, I don't know."

Well, the Prime Minister did know, and it is now clear that his letter was on its way to Peking when he was uttering these words. I wonder whether it is a fair kind of enlightenment or facts to give to one of the Houses of our Parliament? That is why the shock to public opinion has been even

worse than it might have been otherwise.

I listened this morning to the little debate between the Prime Minister and Shri Asoka Mehta. May I say humbly that I thought the Prime Minister utterly failed to reply to the charge that was made by Shri Asoka Mehta that this invitation marks a complete reversal of our basic policy which Parliament, not thanks to us but against our wishes, was made to accept by the Prime Minister last November and December?

There are three arguments advanced in favour of this move such as it is. The first is that this meeting will not be negotiation. A morning paper this morning in an editorial, has not gone too far when it says that this plea of the Prime Minister and his supporters—I am quoting the words of the newspaper—"is not entirely honest". I think this is a British understatement in this context. It is quite clear that this meeting is negotiations and nothing else; it cannot be otherwise in the present context.

An attempt has been made to say that we should separate the border dispute from the wider complex of Indo-Chinese relations—a very clever argument, but a completely unconvincing one. At a time when foreign troops are on our soil, at a time when one country has committed an act of war against another, to say that we can discuss in the abstract, in the vacuum, Indo-Chinese relation while keeping aside the subject of the aggression and occupation of our territory, is asking too much of the credulity of our public, and I do not think the Indian population will swallow this kind of fiction which is sought to be imposed on it. Let us be quite clear that this invitation is a climb-down.

The second argument is that it cannot do any harm. Why do you object? After all what harm can happen? Many good friends have argued

along these lines. I can only say this that not only do I feel that a meeting in this context, at this time, is fraught with grave consequences but, if I may say so, it can do nothing but harm. I cannot, for the life of me, see any good coming out of this meeting in this context, and I shall give two or three good reasons for this feeling.

First of all, this meeting has to be looked on in the psychological context. What will be the effect on the opponent? What kind of opponent are we up against? We are up against an expansionist imperialist communist Power of the most ruthless kind, a power that has before our eyes murdered our neighbouring country of Tibet, a power that under the guise of volunteers invaded the Republic of South Korea, a power that even today is infiltrating through its North Viet Nam satellite regime into the country of Laos, a power that is striving to expand in every possible direction. This power showed its understanding of negotiations at the time when there was a truce in Korea, and we all recall those agonising months at Pan Mun Jon, where a new kind of diplomacy was revealed, a diplomacy which used the negotiating table for nothing else than waging a war of nerves. The Chinese Communist regime does not believe in negotiations and it has never negotiated in good faith till now. Every promise which it has made, it has violated, whether in Tibet or elsewhere. For the Chinese Communist regime negotiation is an act of war, an act of war at the conference table, a continuation of war by other ways.

It is with such an opponent that we are now dealing, and to say that a friendly meeting between the two Prime Ministers will be used by the Chinese Communists for any other purpose than to push forward the process of intimidating us further is to revel in an illusion which is long past its time. All that I can say is that in future this will encourage toughness on the part of the Chinese.

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Communist regime. They will say "Ah! we have got them down. These people refused to come to talks except under certain conditions they laid down—the recognition of the MacMahon line and the vacating of aggression on their territory—as pre-conditions for negotiations and talks. Now, look, within three or four months they have come down to talk to us unconditionally, as we demanded all along." To a good Christian or a kindly Hindu gentleman, the Gandhian approach of "all right, you have your own way; I will meet you on your grounds", may be all right. But, then, we have to remember the character of the opponent when we are dealing with this problem and there is nothing in the character of the Chinese Communist regime that gives us any reason to hope that this gracious surrender is going to have anything but the most unfortunate consequences on the psychology of the other side.

Then, let us look at our psychology. What is it going to do to us? There is no doubt in my mind that this country will regard this invitation as a national humiliation. I wonder if there is any instance in history where a country that has been attacked, a country whose territory has been occupied, has gone out of the way to make a friendly invitation to the opponent. People have sent armies, navies and air forces into action, people have sent ultimatums, people have broken off diplomatic relations, as Nasser did when Britain and France attacked his country during the Suez incident. Here is a brave and patriotic country which is being attacked and pushed around, its men killed, the blood of its troops and policemen on the hands of the other side, and what we do is to invite them to come here as our honoured guest. This, I think, is certainly breaking new ground in history. What we are doing is to perpetuate the illusions about the Chinese Communist regime which unfortunately has already been created for the

last ten years and which it is high time our people were encouraged to shed. We are trying to perpetuate those illusions which were embodied in our earlier misguided acts.

Then, what will we do to our armed forces? What effect is it going to have on our policemen and our armed forces, who have been killed, or maimed, or tortured, by the Chinese? What are going to be the sentiments of that brave man, Karam Singh, a man who in any other country would have been built up as a national hero whom our Government, to our shame, has relegated to obscurity during the last few weeks. That man would have been taken by any patriotic government round the country to educate the people as to what negotiating with the Chinese really means. What effect is this kind of diplomacy going to have on those to whom we look for the defence of our country against aggressions of this nature?

I regret to say this but to me it seems that this invitation is the result of a complete bankruptcy of policy which we have reached. That feeling was there in the minds of many of us as we listened to the Prime Minister winding up the debate on the penultimate day of the last session when he said that he had no answer to the problem with which we are faced, and this letter has made it clear that there is no answer.

We may be in a hopeless minority in this House today, though we are not in this country, and I want to repeat this warning. Many of us gave this warning in similar terms on December 6 and 7 1950, and I invite any hon. Members who have the time and patience to go through that debate in the proceedings available in the Library of this House. There were nine or ten of us who warned our Prime Minister that the selling out of Tibet was going to lead to an attack

on this country and I say again that the continuation of that weak policy, the policy of appeasement which has found its expression in the latest communication will take this country farther and farther away from our goal.

Now, the third argument that has been advanced is: "What can we do? What else is there to do?" Many good friends have put this question: "what else can we do?" That is a counsel of despair.

I believe there are many things which this country can do. We are not privileged to have adequate data from our military forces on which we can recommend specific policies. We do that is a monopoly of the Government, and that must be left to the not have enough knowledge to judge. Government. But it is quite clear that there are two broad alternatives before this country.

One is, if we have the power, to eject by police action the Chinese aggressors from the territory they have occupied. This is what a country normally does. Whether we have the power to do it or not I do not know. Judging by the very optimistic and hopeful announcements made by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Defence Minister, who tell us that the country's armed forces have never been in better condition, that they are adequately equipped to drive out any aggressor from our territory, which we would like to believe, there is no reason why they should not be asked to do their duty. There are many of us, however, who have doubts on that subject. If they were so adequately armed and equipped, why are we where we are today? Why have we allowed to happen what has happened? So, there are grave doubts among the public. The hon. Prime Minister could usefully enlighten these Houses of Parliament about the nature of the equipment and the logistical support which may or may not be

available to our armed forces for fighting in such terrain. But, as I say, we do not know and, therefore, we can only make the hypothetical statement that if we have the strength to do what we should be able to do then there is only one honourable course and that is to give the order to the armed forces to do their duty.

But let us assume for a moment that we are not in that position. Before I move on to that I would refer to the question that is raised, "But that will lead to war". I do not know if there is any logic in that statement. It will certainly not be an act of war on our part. It has never been held in history that a country that has been invaded, while repelling foreign troops from its territory is guilty of an act of war. It is an act of defence of a police nature. But it is possible that the other party will then make it an act of war by broadening the front or by making it a general action. That is possible. But we seem so pre-occupied with our own difficulties that one would imagine that the Chinese Government is all dying and ready to launch a major war on India. I would like to question that ready assumption.

Why do we assume that the Chinese Communist Government is prepared to have a major war with this country any more than we are prepared to have it with them? We certainly do not want a war. Nobody wants it in this country. But why do we assume that they want it? I am not depending on any peaceful professions of theirs. I am depending on the situation in which they find themselves. They are encountering a severe drought. The regimented communes in which they have penned their people—like animals in a zoo—those people are dying for an opportunity to rise. They have a Nationalist Government outside their boundaries which is almost certain to try and land and liberate the mainland. That threat may or may not be a serious one. But are the Chinese Communist Government prepared to shift their main forces thousands of miles to our frontier, leave their mainland and home territory exposed

[Shri M. R. Masani]

either to internal revolution from discontented people of the country or to a landing from the nationalist Government outside? I doubt it. I doubt if Communist China is prepared to fight a major war on two fronts today.

So, when we think so much of our own weakness, let us also consider the element of bluff on the other side.

If we have not got the fighting force, what do we do? Then again I think there is a great deal that this country can do. Assuming that we have not got the strength to eject the aggressor, does it mean that we have to invite him to come to meet us in our territory? Does it mean that we have in any way to have any dealings with him? A brave nation has not been known to connive or acquiesce in the aggression or the occupation of its territory. I am not saying that the hon. Prime Minister's letter and the Note—and the Note is a very fine note; it evokes a responsive echo in the hearts of all of us—concedes anything. But where is the need to meet when you are not prepared to concede anything? If we are not in a position to restore the *status quo* before the aggression, let us be dignified enough to stay where we are, to say we will not give up this territory, we shall retake it as and when it becomes possible for us to retake it. Many countries in history have bided their time for years and decades before they were able to get back their territory which had been filched from them by superior military power. But they do not negotiate with the other power. They do not invite them to come and sit in conference with them. They say, "You have taken something that is mine. You are too strong for me to take it back. Please note that it is mine and I shall take it back when I can." There you stop. You leave the thing where it is.

It is like asking what does an honest citizen do if a bandit comes and occupies his verandah. Does he go and

ask him to come to his drawing room, have a cup of tea and discuss the matter with him. Or does he go to the telephone, if there is one, and telephone to the Police? Does he raise a shout and call his neighbours to help? Does he barricade his door and say, "I will hang out till somebody comes to my rescue"? Why are we not doing what a prudent housekeeper would do in any part of the world? Which is what? To break off diplomatic relations with the Chinese Communist Government, to open negotiations, which we have not done, with our friendly neighbours in South and South East Asia, who also are menaced by the same menace and who are very worried about the way in which we are meeting the threat to our own frontiers. People who have been in South and South East Asia from this country have come back and said that they are very worried. They have pointed out that the Himalayas are the frontiers of free Asia and that in not defending them actively enough, we are imperilling their own freedom. Why do we not call a Bandung Conference and tell them where we stand? Why do we not invite them to a pact—to say that an attack on one is an attack on all? Why do we not do that? Leave all the foreign powers and the so-called imperialists out. Why do we not call our fellow nations, the uncommitted nations in Asia to get into a group?

Why do we not equip our armed forces better than they are? The hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Defence Minister have, in their wisdom, said that they will not accept military equipment without payment. Acharya Kripalani in a previous debate pointed out that between accepting military equipment and adhering to a policy of non-alignment, there is no contradiction. Marshal Tito took military assistance from America as long as he needed it, discontinued it when he did not need it any more and nobody has ever suggested that he sacrificed non-alignment for even a minute. If Tito

could do it, we can do it. But if we do not want to do it individually or unilaterally, let us do it multi-laterally. Let us form a regional organisation of the countries of South and South East Asia and let that organisation invite assistance and aid from other parts of the world so that the independence of judgment and the independent foreign policy of any single country is not endangered in the slightest.

When I say that, I am aware that the hon. Prime Minister is apt to read too much into these statements, as indeed he did at Bangalore at the annual session of the Congress Party where when an innocent amendment was moved asking for a reconsideration of certain things, he attacked his critics—respectable members of the Congress Party—for daring to suggest that foreign troops should march up and down India trying to defend us from Chinese aggression.

An Hon. Member: Really they are marching.

Shri M. R. Masani: Nobody is asking for foreign troops to be invited to this country. But when this question is raised and the hon. Prime Minister says that he would not agree to one inch of our territory being occupied by foreign troops, the fact remains that 5,000 to 10,000 square miles of our territory are already under foreign occupation. It is a popular game that is going on in certain quarters when people ask, "How many thousand square miles make a square inch?" What kind of arithmetic is this? Therefore, I am not suggesting inviting foreign troops. I am not suggesting alliances. I am suggesting a regional organisation of the countries of South and South East Asia for common security and defence.

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): Does the hon. Member suggest that we should join military blocs?

Shri M. R. Masani: No, I do not suggest anything of the kind. I am saying that the uncommitted countries of Asia, like Burma, Indonesia and Ceylon

and others, should be asked to come and sit with us to find out as to what can be done for the greater security of the region from external aggression. Let such a group—it will not be a military bloc, it will be a group for common consultation—be the channel through which foreign equipment can come into the country without foreign troops or without foreign interference. Therefore, I hope that this bogey of foreign troops marching up and down will not be needlessly raised here as was done in Bangalore.

This is the line of thought that I would suggest. Now, I will be told, "Are you not suggesting something extreme, when you suggest that diplomatic relations should be broken off with this aggressor regime?" Without any provocation, or much less, we have done as much. We have broken off diplomatic relations with South Africa and Portugal without anything comparable to what we have endured at the hands of the Chinese Communist Government. Even worse, we have no diplomatic relations with a friendly, helpful, co-operative country like Israel—a country that has done nothing to us, whose existence we recognise but, for good reasons that the Government alone knows, whom we fail to recognise in the sense of accrediting a diplomatic mission. If we can desist from having diplomatic relations with Israel, surely it is not asking too much that that very mild act of displeasure might be endowed on those who are aggressing against us, who have killed our people and who have on their hands our men's blood.

The Prime Minister's letter ends by saying to Mr. Chou En-lai: "You will be an honoured guest when you come here." Undoubtedly the Prime Minister and the Government are entitled to invite whoever they like as their honoured guests, but may I say that Mr. Chou En-lai will not be the honoured guest of the Indian people? He is not wanted here. If he comes, he will come as the guest of the Government, we cannot help it, but the Indian people do not want to shake hands with murder, with those on

[Shri M. R. Masani]

whose hands is the blood of our policemen and armed forces. Therefore, I do want to dissociate those of us who feel differently on this subject from this unfortunate invitation which, in my view, is a national humiliation.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda): I welcome the President's Address, and more especially do I welcome the mention in it that India will not tolerate any unilateral action on the part of China, and that we shall defend our frontiers.

The last speaker has said a number of things, and I feel that he has contradicted himself and thus has made it quite obvious and clear that the invitation that our Prime Minister has sent to the Prime Minister of China is not one which takes away by one iota the stand that we have taken in regard to this problem.

In the recent note that has been sent from India to China, it has been made clear once again in unequivocal terms that India will not and cannot tolerate this incursion into her frontiers, and that the watershed is the natural barrier which has existed for centuries. After this I think it was not necessary for my hon. friend Shri M. R. Masani to make a speech which is more or less a speech of sabrerattling. I do not understand how it will help our cause or that of any one in the world to merely threaten. I do not yield, and this side of the House does not yield, in any way to Shri Masani or anyone else in love or patriotism of the country. We shall not yield any of our territories, and what has been taken we must have back. This is the stand we have taken, but our approach is the same as the approach which this country had when the battle of freedom was on. It is the approach of non-violence, it is the approach of peaceful methods, and if Shri Masani thinks that we have lost our dignity because we invite someone to come to our land even though we do not agree with him, even though we know that they have done wrong to us, I do not agree with it. But I do agree, and I think this House and the country more

especially does agree that under no circumstances will India tolerate aggression or concede her territories; if some of this is under foreign occupation, we shall get it back. We hope that by this generous gesture if Mr. Chou En-lai comes, in spite of what China has done, he will understand the atmosphere, and that things may change. But it does not mean that we shall be patient for all time; it does not mean we have inexhaustible patience; it only means that to the extent possible, we shall pursue the path of peaceful negotiations, of a peaceful approach, and that is exactly what has been done.

I do not agree with my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta either when he says that the whole frontiers of India have been thrown into the melting pot. That is not correct. I know that people have their apprehensions, we all have apprehensions that our frontiers are violated. There are many things with which we are concerned, but we do not have any apprehensions that because Mr. Chou En-lai has been invited—and it has been made abundantly clear to him and to his Government that India does not by one inch change the stand that she has taken—we are conceding anything.

I turn now to another point made in the President's Address, that is the need for unity in this country if our defence is to be effective. This is most important, and I would suggest in all humility to the Prime Minister, who is not here at the moment, something that I once suggested in the provisional Parliament, namely that at a time like this more especially, there is need for some kind of a coalition Government. I do think that the P.S.P. is a party which is not opposed to us in any very violent way, that its economic policies are more or less the same as ours. Is there any harm if we make a fine gesture and have a coalition between that party and ours at a time when the nation is in danger.

Shri Kalika Singh: It is your individual opinion.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I am merely placing this before the Government. Members may not agree, it is my individual opinion. I know that at one time, many years back, there were negotiations with the Socialist Party, and it is not the Prime Minister's fault that they fell through at that time. I feel that now in a moment of common danger, perhaps if there is a coalition Government with a party with which we had negotiated earlier....

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What about the Muslim League?

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I do not talk of communal or communist parties which do not believe in democratic ways.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): Why Kerala?

Shrimati Renuka Ray: What is even more important is the fact that in this country today insidious attempts, deliberate and underhand attempts, are being made to infringe upon our national solidarity. It is in the dark corners and crevices that a whispering campaign is going on, more especially in the frontier areas, in Darjeeling District, in NEFA, where disturbances have been created by *agents provocateur*, and in other parts of the frontier such as the Ladakh region and U.P. Wherever there are minorities who are fighting amongst each other, or wherever there are groups which quarrel, wherever there is any kind of weakness, this kind of influence is penetrating. It is very unwholesome, and much more dangerous than anything else. I do not speak of those who, like Shri Masani, assail even our defence position. I do not speak of them. I know that they will do anything to oppose this Government. Nor do I speak of any party in the country as a party, because even if there are persons who have extra-territorial loyalties, it is not on the basis of party that I fear them. It is not the known danger, but the subtle influences that are being utilised today to weaken our country, that have to be coped with.

It is known that in present times a nation loses its territory not necessarily by means of armies and warfare; there are other influences. There is the creation of areas of influence through which a nation may lose its very soul, its backbone may be broken, its cultural heritage despoiled.

13 hrs.

It is to these things that I draw the attention of Government, and more especially, of our Prime Minister. I would say that even if we are too cautious, it would not be wrong. But let us not give ourselves away to a sense of complacency and thus be caught napping over these things. It is a very dangerous situation; far more dangerous than the obvious situation about which Shri M. R. Masani and other people have spoken. The Constitution has given us the power to take steps against this type of treachery and this type of disloyalty. As I said, it is not the known that we fear so much as those who are using underhand methods. We must take proper action against them, armed with the Constitution as we are in this matter. I have spent a lot of time speaking on this situation which is uppermost in our minds.

Turning to the internal situation in India, the President's Address has drawn attention to the fact, and we welcome it, that industrial production has gone up. It is also true that for the first time the depletion of our foreign exchange reserves has stopped, and to some extent there is an encouraging position in regard to exports.

But the most important thing in this country today is the increase of our agricultural production. Here, unfortunately, we are in a very difficult position. I do not want to join the chorus of those who sing a swansong of frustration, but, nevertheless, it is necessary for us to focus attention on what is the most urgent problem today. It has been said—and these are Government figures—that our

[Shrimati Renuka Ray]

agricultural production in this country is short of our demands only by 10 per cent. If that be so, why could not the necessary momentum have been created by this time? Why could we not have gone ahead in this matter? I know that some people bewail fate that there are increasing prices, and there are inflationary trends in our economy. I do not hold the view that we can check this altogether, more especially when we are in the midst of a developing economy. Nevertheless, there is truth in this, that so far as the food prices are concerned, we must do something at least in regard to the prices of essential foodgrains. We have to do something in this regard, because food is an essential need of man. In fact, that is the most essential need of man. We need not think of keeping stocks of other things at a time like this during the transitional period, but we must have stocks of foodgrains; even if we have stocks of other things, their significance is not of such great moment, but if people do not have food, which is the most elementary pre-requisite, then it becomes a serious matter. It is for this that we are having our developmental plans for increasing stocks and for increasing agricultural production, and yet we have not gone ahead in the matter. I feel that there is bankruptcy of wisdom in our minds. We are hesitant in our policies. If we believe that there is shortage in this country, and distribution must be effected and enforced properly so that all people, more especially the children, get nutritious food, then let us think of controls. But what is this irritating policy of having checks that are no checks, those zonal systems that merely provoke and do not lead to real results? How does it help us? We are importing foodgrains in order to avert famine, in order to deal with what we should have begun to deal with in another way. But, even the import of foodgrains has not checked the rising prices. In one State, which has been much attacked, namely West Bengal, they did make an attempt to bring in price controls, but in isolation

they could not go on with it, and, therefore, they had to withdraw from that position.

I know that there are many in this country who are allergic to the word 'controls'. You may drop that word and use any other word you like, but it is necessary when we are in short supply that Government should arrange through some form of State trading for enough food, in fact not merely arrange, but see that the distribution of food goes on in the right way and that priorities are allotted in the right way. If that is not done, then how do we say that we talk about the welfare of children? How do we say that we give priority to the children of this nation? I had spoken once before in this House about what war-time Britain did, but even today we have not found our way to doing that. Even in the case of milk which could easily be rationed and distributed to children and nursing and expectant mothers, we seem to have failed to do anything.

I would appeal to the Food Minister who is not here at the moment that when the Demands for Grants relating to his Ministry come up here, he will give us some assurance that in the case of the nutritious diet for children, Government do intend, and have gone ahead in some way, to do something. So far, we have no policy in this matter. As I said, West Bengal has been blamed because she did make an attempt at a policy which was the only policy which could be followed when we were in short supply, but she had to abandon it. Today, we are having these zones, or as I said, these merry irritant checks, but the prices are not controlled by these zones. I do not suggest that Government should try to control all types of prices. But I would suggest that at least they should concentrate on the prices of foodgrains and do something; to the extent that this will influence the other prices, they must do something to check the rising food prices. It does not matter if the other prices go up during this period of a developing eco-

nomy, to some extent. But let us be in a position to give food to our people at rates at which they can buy it....

Shri Barman (Cooch-Bihar—Reservé—Sch. Castes): At economic rates.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: . . . at economic rates, so that they can buy food for themselves and for their children. That should be the thing on which we should concentrate in the home front.

I now turn to another point about which I have spoken many times in this House. But before doing so, I would submit that I regret that in the President's Address, there is no reference to the unprecedented floods that came to West Bengal in 1959. In 1956, there were abnormal floods, and it was said that these were abnormal floods and that for the next fifty years, such floods might not come, but they have come again in 1959. I know that a flood control committee has been set up, but the reason why I am drawing attention to this more particularly and specifically is that it is very unfortunate that the Farrakka barrage over the Ganga, about which so much has been said, and about which Government themselves have given an assurance, has not yet been started. It will take time, no doubt, but it is unfortunate that the construction work has not yet been started, although it is admitted that it will help to prevent floods in many regions of West Bengal, that it will rehabilitate the port of Calcutta and what is more, that it will rehabilitate the region, namely, West Bengal. I hope that when the budget is presented before the House, there will not merely be an allocation for the Farrakka barrage, but when the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Irrigation and Power come up, the Minister in charge will be able to tell us that the construction work has actually started on the Farrakka barrage.

I do not have much time at my disposal, but there are just one or two points which I would like to raise. One of these relates to the Pay Commission's report. We have had a long

discussion on the Report of the Pay Commission. I feel that whatever be the legal position, it is utterly and morally wrong that for the same work, the employees of the Central Government should get more pay than those of the State Governments or the local authorities. What has the teacher in the local authority done that he should be paid less than the *chaprasi* of the Central Government?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member suggest that for a period of ten years, whatever is intended to be given to the Central Government employees as an addition may be reserved and given away or distributed to the States?

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I do suggest that the employees of the State Governments and local bodies should have been dealt with first.

Mr. Speaker: She believes that that will be the method by which there will be equalisation of salaries for the same work.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Yes, for the same kind of work. I want to say that this differentiation is a relic of British days. When the British were here, their last stronghold was the Central Government. The Provinces had transferred subjects. They did not care what the Provincial Governments paid to their employees. They wanted loyalty only at the Centre. But is it for us to continue this? I say to all Members on different sides of this House: have we such bankruptcy of statesmanship that even apart from the fact that it is morally wrong, we do not consider these other people in the same context? A sum of Rs. 55 crores is being spent to enhance the salaries of Central Government servants, and nobody is satisfied because on an individual basis, it comes to little.

An Hon. Member: It is Rs. 31 crores.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: I thought the Finance Minister said it was Rs. 55 crores.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Ultimately Rs. 55 crores.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Ultimately Rs. 55 crores. But Rs. 55 crores is a big dent in our total wealth though individually it is very little. Therefore, I think it would be better if even at this stage we utilise the money already promised to give amenities for the children of these other employees, for their welfare, and raise their money wage on an individual basis.

Lastly, before I conclude, I would ask the Government as to what is happening to the Report of the Direct Taxes Administration Enquiry Committee and their recommendations. Perhaps our coffers may have a little more funds if what Shri Tyagi and his colleagues have suggested are taken into consideration more seriously. This is a very sad state of affairs in our country. I wanted to deal with the administrative side, but there is no time. It is a very sad reflection on authority that the reports of Committees such as the Estimates Committee, and the reports of study teams—so many authorities who take a great deal of trouble to make recommendations—are given so little consideration up till now. We are now going for a very large Third Plan. But how is it going to be implemented? That is of far greater consequence. I will take some other opportunity to speak on it at length.

Lastly....

Mr. Speaker: How many 'lastlys'?

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Thank you very much. I support the Presidential Address. I am sorry I have not been able to have the time to speak on one or two other things.

Mr. Speaker: There will be other opportunities.

Shri Raghubir Sahai (Budaun): I take this opportunity of expressing my gratefulness to the President for the very lucid and exhaustive Address

that he made to the Members of the two Houses only very recently. In that noble Address he dealt with a number of points, both on international affairs as well as on domestic matters. It will not be possible for any of us to deal with all those points, nor with many of them. Only a few can be taken up at the present moment in the limited time at our disposal.

I feel that the President has very rightly given the topmost priority to the subject of China and Chinese intrusion into the borders of India. He has very rightly characterised this action on the part of China as a breach of faith. I am really surprised that some of my hon. friends here and outside should object to this expression. If it is a matter of truth, why should it be concealed? It is the feelings of this country which the President has rightly expressed in this term. I personally think it is a very dignified term, though it is a strong one. At the same time, it is a very restrained use of language.

I personally think that all this time we had not been able to understand China. All along, we were expressing our friendly feelings towards China. While she was busy with her own border incursions, she was blaming us for expansionist designs. Now this mentality and conduct on the part of China could not be understood by any one of us. This is a very absurd position which was adopted by China, and I congratulate our Prime Minister on having taken up a very peaceful approach, at the same time a very firm approach, in this matter. It may be to the dislike of some of our esteemed friends here and outside. But it will be admitted by everybody that it has won us friends all over the world. We find today that China stands isolated in the Sino-Indian dispute. Even as big a personality as Mr. Khrushchev has advised China to come to a peaceful settlement with India. I think many of our friends will agree with me that the advice tendered by Mr. Khrush-

chev will have some salutary effect on China.

I am not at all suprised at the invitation which has been extended by our Prime Minister to the Prime Minister of China to meet him in the middle of March in New Delhi. I do not find that there is any cause for consternation, as was evident from today's motion for adjournment. As the Prime Minister told us, we are brought up in a different atmosphere. I remember when the first non-cooperation movement was on, Mahatma Gandhi was on meeting terms with Lord Reading. I remember also that when we were all locked up in jail, when the civil disobedience movement was at its zenith, Mahatma Gandhi was again meeting Lord Irwin and came to an agreement with him known as Gandhi-Irwin agreement. I also remember that when the civil disobedience movement of 1931 was going to be started immediately, Mahatma Gandhi wanted to meet Lord Wellington. Where is the harm if Mr. Chou En-lai wants to meet our Prime Minister? Let him meet. There is no reversal of policy involved. Our Prime Minister has made the whole thing crystal clear as to what is our stand. Let both Prime Ministers meet and let the world judge the results of that meeting. There is no cause for consternation and there is no reason for dissatisfaction to be expressed in this House.

The Prime Minister has not called upon the country to make a halt in its progress and in its preparation to meet the aggression of China. On the other hand, he has called upon the country to be prepared for the worst, even if we have to meet force with force. So there is no harm in extending that invitation. Are we prepared and are we taking all proper steps to meet the aggression and to strengthen our unity? The Prime Minister has rightly called upon the country to push on with our industrial progress, to push on with our agricultural progress. We are really

359(Ai) LSD-4.

proud that our industrial progress is really giving satisfaction to many people in this country, although we wish that it should proceed with still greater speed.

In this connection, I am glad to note that a decision has been taken that the N.C.C., the Territorial Army and the Lok Sahayak Sena are going to be expanded. I feel that by these actions people will be heartened and will feel that our Government is serious to meet the menace of China. Here, I would like to offer a word of advice and suggestion to the Government that compulsory military training should be introduced in all schools and colleges and universities because this is the right time when such a step could be taken, not only to make our student folk manly and improve their physique but to wean them away from indiscipline which is a canker in our society.

Coming now to agricultural production, as has been rightly pointed out by one of the hon. Members here yesterday, it is the weakest link in the whole chain. We should certainly feel ashamed of it. Look at the soaring prices of foodgrains. Not only the Ford Foundation Committee but also the U.N. Mission Report has also laid stress on taking serious steps to step up our agricultural production. I do not blame the Government for any indifference in this matter; but, we judge the whole thing by positive results. The results are disappointing.

An Hon. Member: Who is to blame? The agriculturists?

Shri Raghbir Sahai: Even where the Government have provided enough water for irrigation, enough fertilizers, enough good quality seed, we find that the yield from our land is the lowest in the world.

Now, as I said, this is not a matter for pride and I feel that we have not created a sense of urgency in the people to take advantage of those amenities or facilities which have

[Shri Raghur Sahai]

been provided by Government. It is up to us to see that all these facilities which are being provided by Government are taken full advantage of. I do not say that further progress should not be made, further irrigation facilities should not be provided, further quantities of fertilizers should not be provided or even more quantities of good seed. But, I say that the present quantities that are available are not being fully utilised and that we should evolve a machinery to see that those facilities are being fully utilised.

In this connection, I very carefully listened to the remarks of my esteemed friend Shri A. P. Jain yesterday, our former Food Minister. He did not have any particular observations to make in regard to agriculture because he happened to be our Agriculture Minister only very recently. But, he offered some remarks in connection with Community Development administration. I have got very great respect for Shri Jain; he comes from my own State and we are all proud of him. (*Interruption*). But, he has, unfortunately, made some very sweeping remarks in regard to another Ministry.

I thought that I was, perhaps, the greatest critic of the Community Development Ministry in this House and I took pride over it (*Interruption*). I took pride as the constructive critic but I find that he has outheroded Herod. He has characterised the whole scheme as mis-conceived or ill-conceived and he has come to the conclusion that it has borne no results.

An Hon. Member: Borne no child! (*Interruptions*).

Shri Raghur Sahai: He is entitled to hold his own honest opinion. But, I wish to ask him. . .

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Whom?

Shri Raghur Sahai: I wish to ask Shri Jain, if he holds this opinion

why did he not make it clear to our Prime Minister or to his Cabinet colleagues (*Interruption*) because our Prime Minister happens to be the greatest advertiser of this Community Development movement not only in this country but all over the world. We are all really very grateful to our Prime Minister for having made this movement a popular movement in this country and all over the world. Shri Jain should have made his position clear. He did not even take Parliament into confidence about his views; and, now, as last as 1960, he is telling us that the whole scheme is mis-conceived, which means that all this time we were wasting all these funds. I think if this criticism had been made by some freelance on the other side that would have been excusable (*Interruption*). I am very sorry for him. Not only that; he has made some more remarks.

13.27 hrs.

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

He says that a functional approach should have been made in the Community Development scheme. I agree with him, to a certain extent; but is that possible? Even now I find that the Community Development Scheme is being criticised, day in and day out, for being a top-heavy administration. And, there is some truth in it.

If we are going to act on the advice of Shri Jain, think of the administrative cost that it would amount to. What he wants is that at the village level, not only should there be a village level worker, whom he characterises as a multi-purpose individual, but experts for every individual matter, for soil, for agriculture, for plantation, for cooperatives, for this and for that. Even now, the village people feel that there are too many officers. If Shri Jain's scheme is to materialise what would be the situation? Where to find all these? It is not possible. He says that there should be experts not only at the village level but at the block level also. It may be perfectly correct; but, is that possible?

Only yesterday we saw that even experts differ. We saw two experts differed on the quality of railway sleepers. One set said they were perfectly good and the other experts said that they were bad. Even experts differ. Can we produce experts by pressing one button?

I am intimately connected with so many activities of community development. At present, our Ministry is busy with the training programme, from the highest level to the village level.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: From the Minister to the Gram Sewak.

Shri Raghur Sahai: But, are we satisfied.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may conclude now.

Shri Raghur Sahai: Sir, I would like to have a few minutes more; and this is the last point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as liking is concerned every hon. Member wants to have more time. All right; he may have 3 or 4 minutes more.

Shri Raghur Sahai: I feel that if this argument is carried to its logical conclusion, it will carry us nowhere. We cannot multiply so many officials in community development either at the village level or the bloc level. The stress at the present moment is that the villagers themselves should be so trained so that we have a very limited number of officials. That is why *gram sahayaks* are being trained in all these matters. We are looking forward to the day when the services of all these officers who have been deputed to this department could be dispensed with and everything could be controlled by the village people themselves.

While the physical results are something of which we can legitimately be proud, we have certainly failed in creating a new outlook. If Shri Jain

had laid stress on that aspect, I would have agreed with him in entirety. We have failed in creating a new urge and a new outlook. But that is not a matter which can be achieved by sending experts or resorting to functional approach which Shri Jain has emphasised. I am sorry that Shri Jain should have gone out of his way to criticise the Community Development Ministry (*Interruptions.*) The hon. Member has explained that he has been relegated to the second position now. I am glad if Shri Jain's views find an echo in the heart of so many of our esteemed friends here on the Opposition Benches. But let us see whether a time comes when Shri Jain would be able to convert the entire House to his views. I think those views should be discussed at length and we should be able to find out where the fault lies.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Sir, at the beginning I want to congratulate the President on his realistic and patriotic stand on the question of Chinese aggression. At the same time he has given a timely call to the nation for national unity and for economic and industrial advancement. I beg to submit that as a corollary to this national preparedness and determination to preserve India's integrity, he should have clearly stated that the Government would not hesitate to take extreme steps to drive away the Chinese from the Indian soil and to restore the lands occupied in Aksai Chin and NEFA to India. I feel that in that part he has completely failed in not explaining the sentiments to the people of this country. He has rather expressed the pious hope that China under the pressure of world public opinion will come to some sort of an agreement with India.

We know very well that though a state of belligerency does not exist between India and China, it would be hypocrisy to admit that the relationship is cordial. You have seen that obstacles had been put to the Indian traders contrary to trade agreements of 1954. Our frontier guards have been taken as captives and subjected to all

[Shri P. K. Deo]

sorts of third degree methods in defiance of all cannons of international law and that has been discussed in this House previously. Very rightly my hon. friend Shri Masani has paid compliments to Shri Karam Singh for his patriotic duty. We have seen that our diplomats in China have been subjected to difficult living conditions.

The Chinese are very regular in reiterating *Panchsheel* in the last paragraph of every communication that has been sent to us but we have seen that this reiteration has not stood in the way of their going in the manner they have done. All the protracted negotiations have not yielded any fruit. It has rather worsened our relations. We have noticed that in every communication not only the old claims are affirmed but new ones are asserted. I think that 47,000 sq. miles territory is the latest claim of the Chinese and I do not know what will be the further claim when Mr. Chau En-Lai visits Delhi. I feel that at this stage any negotiation would be futile.

At the same time, I congratulate the Ministry of External Affairs for having published a fully documented and massive atlas reproducing the various old maps, specially those interesting ones which were prepared by the Chinese authorities and which go to prove the validity of our frontiers. Especially the most interesting part of it is the reproduction of the famous map which was prepared to illustrate article 9 of the Simla Convention, defining the MacMahon Line and it has been signed in the most picturesque calligraphy by the Chinese and Tibetan representatives as a token of their acceptance. All these documents go to prove the soundness of our case and I think we should take firm action to expel the Chinese and not to go in for any negotiation unless and until our land is cleared completely of the bandits.

It is a painful thing to learn that our Prime Minister has invited the

Chinese Premier to Delhi. A few days back such an invitation of the Chinese Premier to Rangoon was rejected by our Prime Minister. That was the line the country has been thinking about because we were all afraid that Rangoon may be a repetition of the Munich Conference. Today, I fail to understand what circumstances have changed and what reasonings have prevailed on our Prime Minister to invite Mr. Chou En-Lai to Delhi. In this connection, I would draw your attention to page 2 of the President's Address where he says:

"My Government, therefore, pursues a policy both of a peaceful approach, by negotiation under appropriate conditions...."

I would like to know if the appropriate condition is not for the Chinese to clear the occupied territory. The same conditions as before have prevailed. Even then our Prime Minister has gone to the extent of extending an invitation to a Prime Minister of a hostile country.

Another painful thing of the present development is the freedom that is given to China to purchase the various strategic war materials from this country, especially jute and jute products which have increased to tremendous proportions in recent years. I think there should be a stop to all these, as these materials may be used against us.

Coming to the home front, I beg to submit my most painful surprise at the omission in the Address of any reference to the integration of the outlying Oriya tracts with Orissa. When the bilingual State of Bombay which was sometime back considered to be an irrevocable decision is going to be bifurcated into two States of Mahagujarat and Maharashtra with great jubilation, it will be a great pity if the fate of the outlying Oriya

tracts of Seraikella and Kharaswan in Bihar and some areas in Bastar, Raipur, Raigarh Districts of Madhya Pradesh and Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam Districts of Andhra Pradesh still remain to be undecided. (*Interruptions.*) I beg to submit that the whole question should be reopened and a boundary commission should be formed on the basis of the Pataskar formula. Then justice will be done to all parties.

Sir, our Government is completely in the know of the deep-seated discontent that is prevailing in Orissa regarding the adjustment of the boundaries which is a very legal claim. In this connection, I would like to bring to your notice that on various occasions it has been pointed out to the Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities as to how a deliberate and systematic attempt has been made to suppress the language and culture of the Oriyas in those areas. Let me take the case of Seraikela and Kharaswan. In the 1941 census a population of only 1,000 persons were there with Hindi as their mother tongue. In 1951 it suddenly rose to 23,633 as against an Oriya-speaking population of 60,000. According to the latest statement made by the Minister of Education, Bihar, we came to know that at the moment there are 257 Hindi primary schools with 9,000 and odd students and 79 Oriya primary schools with 2,000 and odd students. If that be so, it means that 40 per cent of the Hindi speaking population are "citizens" of school going age. I cannot understand how this high incidence of infancy prevails in the Hindi-speaking population. It is absurd.

There is a deliberate denial of the rights guaranteed under the Constitution to the linguistic minorities. When the national literacy stands at 16 per cent 4 per cent of literacy among the Oriyas goes to prove that there is something wrong somewhere.

Settlement records in that area used to be kept in the regional language—

Oriya—and settlement operations used to be conducted in that language. Now we find that settlement operations are being conducted in Hindi.

Apart from the negation of cultural rights of the local people, we often find that they undergo innumerable economic hardships. The Oriya villages are not so well developed as the non-Oriya pockets. The Oriyas do not get suitable jobs in spite of their qualifications. Sir, not only administrative convenience but consideration of civilised human values should prompt the Government to re-examine the whole question and, if possible, to appoint a boundary commission at an early stage.

Sir, my speech would not be complete without a reference to the most controversial suggestion regarding the appointment of a high-powered tribunal to go into the conduct of persons placed high in our national life. I am glad to know that our Prime Minister has been thinking in right earnest in that line, and in his recent utterances at Bangalore he expressed a view that the Ministers should declare their assets. It would not be out of place, Sir, to say that in 1954, as a member of the Orissa Legislative Assembly, on behalf of my party I introduced a non-official Bill, and the name of that Bill was "The Orissa Declaration and Periodical Verification of the Public Servants Properties Bill". That was negated at that time by the brute majority of the Congress Party in the Assembly.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Why don't you bring it now?

Shri P. K. Deo: Now, after the Ganatantra Parishad joined the coalition, it is a good thing that at the direction of that party the Ministers belonging to Ganatantra Parishad there have declared their assets and they are subject to verification at any time. It is a good thing that the main ruling party of the country today and its government have been thinking exactly in the line which was suggest-

[Shri P. K. Deo]

ed by my party six years back. They wanted to act in that line but the suggestion was then rejected by the brute majority of the Congress.

I do not appreciate the appointment of a whole-time tribunal for this purpose, but I want an assurance from the Prime Minister that an *ad hoc* tribunal will be appointed to enquire when specific charges are brought in against persons placed high in public life.

An Hon. Member: He has promised that.

Shri P. K. Deo: Lastly, I beg to submit that it is a good thing that the President's Proclamation so far as Kerala is concerned is going to give place to the normal constitutional machinery which is going to be restored very soon. At the same time, I congratulate the people of Kerala for having taught a very good lesson to our Communist friends for their anti-national stand and the way they reacted to the question of Chinese aggression. But, at the same time, I express my regret at the fact that the communal forces in certain parts of this country are raising their ugly heads as an aftermath of this Kerala elections, and I draw your attention to the various resolutions of the Congress Party and the Praja-Socialist Party which have made it a regular feature to pass resolutions in their conferences that they will have no truck with any communal or Communist Party of the country. But, Sir, adversity makes strange bed fellows. It is a great pity that even for the purpose of elections they have sacrificed the very principle on which they have been speaking to the people so long.

Shri Siva Raj (Chingleput—Reserved-Sch. Castes): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the China cloud seems to hang rather heavily in this House and cast its shadow on many other issues which can be raised in this debate on the Motion of Thanks to the President for his address. Nevertheless, Sir, this

came all of a sudden, this invitation by our Prime Minister to Mr. Chou En-Lai, at least it was not in accordance with the view that we all took on this question especially in this House. I thought any such meeting or negotiation, by whatever term you might like to call it, should be made on the condition precedent, namely, that the Chinese ought to vacate all the territories which they have occupied. It is on that basis we thought this House dispersed last time with the view that the Chinese ought to vacate the aggression if at all there should be any negotiation, settlement or meeting—by whatever term people may like to call it on this occasion.

I am only surprised that our Prime Minister who lays claim that he has been trained under the peaceful and non-violent teachings of Mahatma Gandhi has not gone further and learnt the other big lesson, namely, that if and when—and all human beings are liable to err—he makes a mistake or commits an error he must admit it in the public, as Gandhiji did, that it was a Himalayan blunder. I hope in this case he will come to the House and say that in inviting Mr. Chou En-Lai he has committed this blunder. I do not want to go to the excesses to which my hon. friends Shri Masani and others went in this matter of China border dispute. I think every effort ought to be made, undoubtedly, even at the last moment, to see whether the opponent can be brought round by peaceful negotiations.

One feature of this Address is the reference made by the President to the stream of foreign visitors who came to our country. It is undoubtedly a sign of the importance and the stature that India occupies in the international world. We have always been ready to welcome these foreign visitors coming as most of them did with the ostensible purpose of helping India in her economic and industrial development and also to get the aid of India in their cause for the

furtherance of peace. Most notable were the two visits, one by the President of the United States of America, President Eisenhower and the other by the Premier of Soviet Russia, Mr. Khrushchev. The trend these days seems to be that, apart from the ideology for which these persons stand for—it does not matter—they all agree, or at any rate attempt to agree, on a policy of peace and friendship in the world. While Mr. Eisenhower said "family, peace, food and freedom", Mr. Khrushchev stands for what is called disarmament. I think this disarmament is received now by us with hope and gratitude. I do hope that we on our part will help in such a manner as is possible for our Government and people to further this cause of world peace and disarmament.

Unfortunately, however, while discussing about peace and disarmament, the French nation has conducted nuclear tests in the Sahara desert: not that they are unwilling for world peace, not that they do not know the consequences of the atomic tests, but it is probably to test their own capacity for the production of these nuclear weapons if not on par with the United States and the USSR, but at any rate sufficiently near them in the matter of achievement in these nuclear weapons. That is perhaps quite a legitimate aim, I suppose, with which they have done it. I know some of the young hopefuls in our country also suggest that we should also take to the manufacture of these nuclear bombs and we must also try the test in some part of this country: I hope it is not in the deserts of Rajasthan in any case. But that seems to be the trend. So, in all this confusion I think we on our part should help to come to an understanding to achieve some unity of purpose in order to see that this cause of world peace is achieved.

Not merely this China clouds many other issues. We must also see that the other important questions such as the question of, or the problem of, our Indian nationals in

Ceylon and the problem of Indians in South Africa and the problem of Indians in Goa, are settled. In all these respects also, we must not stop our effort. We must pursue our efforts to solve these problems in such a manner as is possible and in a manner which appeals to the Union Government today, and because of the issues of peace and disarmament these issues should not be given the go-by.

The Address, in the first place, refers to the progress made in the industrialisation of the country. The President has been good enough to give the record of achievements made in this direction; not merely in the matter of steel plants but in the matter of cement and aluminium factories. He has also referred to defence production and the self-sufficiency which is aimed at in the matter of defence equipment in this country. He also has mentioned about the railways and what the railways are trying to do in the matter of self-sufficiency in the matter of equipment, wagons and the locomotives and the like, though he has not mentioned anything about the sleepers. I suppose it is not possible. Nevertheless, progress has been made to the extent that is possible and it is a record on which we must congratulate the Government.

On the agricultural front, however things have not gone so well and not as fast as we all wish it should. One feels that in a way this excessive industrialisation has cast its repercussion upon the agricultural front. One also fears that too much of industrialisation might lead to the sapping of the agricultural economy in this country. Particularly, we find that apart from the fact that there is short supply in the matter of foodgrains for the increasing population of India, the question of distribution of these foodgrains also comes up. It is a tragedy to see that the very person who cultivates his soil and who sees from day to day to the harvest of the crops, the corn-grower and the paddy grower, is not able to get a morsel of the grain at times even

[Shri Siva Raj]

though the birds and the beasts around him get the opportunity to have a go at their produce. Such is the kind of distribution we are having in this country. It has been brought to the notice of both the Central Government and the State Governments as to how food production can be increased more particularly by the allotment of lands to the landless labourers by reclaiming a lot of cultivable waste-land. We do not know what attempts have been made in this direction. We would like to see that as far as possible all the cultivable waste-land must be brought under the plough and to see that all these lands are allotted to the landless labourers in India. That will go to increase production undoubtedly.

We have had an example recently on account of the efforts of the Republican Party of which I have the honour to be the President. Owing to our efforts in five districts of the Bombay State they have been able to get 36 lakh acres of land, by putting pressure upon the Government,—what they call land satyagraha. I think the Bombay Government was both kind and sensible enough to accede to the demand and ultimately they granted 36 lakh acres. Before the agitation they said that the lands were not available for cultivation. Anyway we feel that if honest attempts are made both by the Government and the people who are interested in the welfare of these poor rural population, a lot of land will be available.

Next, I must refer to the rising price of foodgrains and other essential commodities. It is a pity to see that people cannot get things at what is called a fair price and yet one looks on to the moral progress that our country has made. This reminds me of one thing: years ago, there used to be a report sent periodically to the Secretary of State for India; it was called a note on the material and moral progress of India. It started

with moral progress and then dealt with material progress and the conditions in India. Therein they gave an account of the famine this, that and the other. I wish that the President's report referred to some such moral progress. I am afraid on the moral front, far from there being any progress, we are on the decline.

For instance, in the matter of rising prices of foodgrains and other essential commodities, there is black-marketing. This also reminds me of something which I had read sometime before and which seems to have been put in the words of Mahatma Gandhi. This is what he seems to have said:

"High rising prices are due to the fraud of the business. Now we are free. We must do honest work somewhere at least. The apprehension of rising prices is there because we are scoundrels and cheats. Business men do not know how to earn an honest penny. I am ashamed to say all these things. How could *panchayat raj* be established under the present conditions?"

14 hrs.

This is what Gandhiji is supposed to have stated. That is the reason why I said that the President should have referred to the decline in—I do not know what to say—morality. It has declined in the moral front. It is not merely black-marketing; we also find, for instance, that student indiscipline has assumed such proportions that it is a matter for pity that no control can be exercised over the students at a time when such control is necessary in their own interest and in the interest of the future generations of the country. It is incredible that everywhere students should take the law into their own hands.

There is another matter in which, I suppose, there is a sort of decline on the moral front; I refer to the kind of nepotism one finds everywhere. Corruption has figured so much in the

last few days. There are a number of instances of corruption. In every country there is corruption, but the more important danger is that corruption is probably recognised as a sort of normal pattern of conduct in our country. That ought not to be encouraged.

According to me, corruption is not so much a course of conduct, as a state of mind, which either on account of parochialism, communalism or casteism, is prepared to sacrifice truth and honesty for securing one's own ends. That is also a kind of corruption. I am not merely referring to corruption where one blackguard in power deals with another blackguard on a profit basis to do a wrong thing to the detriment of honest citizens. That is the worst form of corruption. I have in mind the general temperament or state of mind where people think that there is no harm in doing a thing like that. If they do a wrong thing, they want to justify it on the ground of provincialism, parochialism or casteism. That is the sort of corruption, which I think is prevalent in this country. I think the President, in his Address has not given us a lead in this matter as to how best this ought to be put down.

There is one other matter which has become stale and many have already referred to it. There seems to be an impression in the public mind—it does not matter how much we protest here—that the Union Government, particularly the Prime Minister is trying to fight shy of the challenge that has been thrown to him by Shri C. D. Deshmukh. It is, of course, very difficult for the Prime Minister overburdened as he is already with many problems of various kinds to deal with it immediately nevertheless, he has got a duty to this House. This House, having got cognizance of the matter, must dispose of it in a suitable manner and it is his responsibility to satisfy the House as to how he is going to deal with this matter. I am not going to talk of personalities, because we do not know the personali-

ties. I am not going to talk about the charges, because I do not know the charges. It is rather amazing that the Prime Minister should get up and ask, "What are the charges?" In fact, we are waiting to know the charges from the Prime Minister as revealed to him by Shri Deshmukh.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Shri Deshmukh has not revealed the charges; that is what the Prime Minister says.

Shri Khushwaqt Raj (Kheri): Why not place all the correspondence before the House?

Shri Siva Raj: My only anxiety is to see that the man in the street does not talk of it all the time in every nook and corner. It is a matter on which we should all agree that irrespective of the consequences either to individuals or even to institutions, we must see that the fair name of our country is not unduly tarnished.

Shri Sanganna (Koraput—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I want to congratulate the President on his excellent speech. In doing so, I will make a few remarks.

The President's speech is elaborate and exhaustive. It speaks of the steps that are to be taken and also strikes a note of boldness. There is mention of the different development programmes, about the working of mines, multi-purpose river valley projects and other development works that are to be executed for raising the standard of living of the country and also food production. The steps to be taken must be so elaborate that decent living standard must be ensured for years to come.

Coming to the defence problem of the country, the north-east and north-west frontiers must be fortified. When the Sino-Indian dispute was discussed, some of the top-ranking Members of this House made suggestions for the successful implementation of the development programmes on the bor-

[Shri Sanganna]

der. They said, roads must be improved and modern amenities must be made available to the people there. When aggression took place in the initial stages, there was panic and a sense of insecurity among the people living on the border. But when the army took it over, now there is a sense of security and safety among the people. Further developments must be made there so that the people may feel a further sense of safety and security. It is gratifying to find from the newspapers that U.P. Government has made some provision in the budget for the development of the borders there. I hope similar steps will be taken in the other border States also.

The food problem is so acute in this country that unless we take some special steps, the whole economic structure of the country may collapse. Yesterday, Shri A. P. Jain, former Food and Agriculture Minister, made a suggestion about an all-India service for agriculture. I agree with him, because food production should not be State subject; it must be made an all-India subject, so that the problem may be tackled on an all-India level. At present the instructions issued by the Centre to the different States on different occasions are only shelved in the secretariat level of the State Governments. It is not their fault, because the Centre wants the problem to be tackled on a war-footing, but the State Governments have no machinery to tackle the problem in that way. So, it is no use asking the State Governments to tackle the problem in the way the Government of India wants. Already, instructions issued from the Centre are not being properly attended to, though they are circulated to the district magistrates, because the district magistrates are so over worked with their own problems of law and order and other development works of the States that they are not able to devote proper attention to this aspect, with the result that the food problem is not being

attended to. In this connection, there is the question of decentralisation, which means the creation of gram panchayats, gram samities and zilla parishads. If these bodies are created, I think they will be in a position to take up and tackle the problem of food production. Now all the States are not moving in this direction. Only Andhra and Rajasthan have embarked on the scheme of decentralisation. It is to be seen how it will succeed.

Yesterday, Shri A. P. Jain, our former Food Minister, stated that community projects have not been much of a success here. In all those areas where there is political and social awakening, the community projects are very successful. The Prime Minister was pleased to say that the State of Andhra has gone ahead in this direction very well. In all those areas where there is social education, these schemes are progressing well. It is no use saying that the Community Project programme is not satisfactory. If there is any defect in the programme, it must be rectified and remedied.

In order to make the programme more broad-based, we must create social consciousness in the people. The Community Development programme was first initiated in the year 1952. It is true that any new programme will have impetus and progress in the initial stages and after some time there will be some slackness. So, in order to create enthusiasm in the programme, we are having seminars and training camps for village level workers. Hitherto, the training for village level worker was only for six months. In view of the stupendous nature of the programme it was felt that the training of six months is quite insufficient and so it has now been extended to two years. Then, every year there is a meeting of the Development Commissioners; They hold in each State, training Camps of the officials and non-officials to exchange views. Even if there is any defect in the progress of the programme, it is only local. It

cannot be said that the whole programme is defective and is not progressing.

If that is so, then there would have been no clamour for the starting of new Community Projects and development blocks. The object of the Government is to cover the entire country by the year 1963. But the people want the date to be advanced so that every area in the country can be covered by this scheme soon, and the people can get the benefit of the programme as early as they can. Therefore, it is not correct to say that the Community Projects on the whole have been a failure.

The programme can be successful only if public participate in the programmes for the construction of roads, wells, schools and hospitals. Community development means social development, spiritual development and other developments. Social development cannot be measured in monetary terms. It can be measured only by the social awakening of the people. The community projects can be made more elaborate, more exhaustive and more progressive by having more of propaganda machinery and personnel.

Coming to the abolition of double-member constituencies, which has been mentioned in the President's Address, in Para 39 I am not in favour of continuing the double-member constituencies, because it goes against the interests of the members of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Because, if there is a double-member constituency, the area will be so unwieldy that it is not possible to cover the entire area and to have contact with the people in a humane way. Before the commencement of the Constitution, when there was no adult franchise, the harijans and the adivasis had no franchise and so there was no necessity for the representatives to meet them or look after their benefits, and the result has been that those areas have not been developed to the extent Government or their leaders want. Now the Government is thinking

wisely that the double member constituencies should be abolished. If they are there, the area will be unwieldy and the responsibility is also of two members. If there is joint responsibility, it will be the responsibility of nobody.

Some members think that if they are left to themselves, members of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes cannot get elected. That is a wrong notion. In 1952 I was representing a single-member constituency, and I got elected uncontested. Now, if it is a reserved constituency, there will be so many rivals, because there are so many classes and creeds. On the other hand, if it is a single member constituency and there is one suitable candidate, the other candidates, whether they belong to the opposition or other parties, they may not contest. In the 1957 elections, because I was standing from a double-member constituency, I had to contest in the elections.

Then, if it is a double-member constituency, the spade work in the constituency will always be left on the shoulders of the reserved member. The general candidate will always be roaming about attending meetings and functions. The reserved candidate will have to go from place to place, maintain contacts with the people and bring their difficulties to the notice of the Government. At the same time, he may not be very effective in the Assemblies or in Parliament though he may be effective in his constituency. So, I am of the opinion that double-member constituencies should be abolished and single-member constituencies should be introduced in all the States.

It is not correct to say that members of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes will not get elected if there are no double-member constituencies. On the other hand, I am of the opinion that they will get a thumping majority if there are single member constituencies.

Article 339 of the Constitution refers to the appointment of a Com-

[Shri Sanganna]

mission to study the economic and social condition of the Adivasis. Because it is mandatory on the Government, I think the Government have already decided about it and the Commission is going to come into existence very shortly. I would submit that the composition of the Commission should be such that more members of the Scheduled Castes are included in it so that they can represent the interests of the people very well. Prior to this Commission, though some other commissions were appointed, members of the Scheduled Tribes have not been properly represented there. Of course, it is true that even others may be interested in the welfare of the Adivasis, but they may not be well-informed. The problems of the Scheduled Tribes are so peculiar and so technical that unless a man is in constant touch with them and has got living contact with them he cannot understand or appreciate them. Many people are not interested in the problems of the Adivasis and Scheduled Castes, because they do not know their problems.

Now coming to the multi-purpose tribal blocks, I would say that though now a committee has been appointed under the able and efficient tribal anthropologist, Dr. Elwin, it has not been able to produce a valuable report so far because there are so many geographical and also topographical difficulties. They are not able to cover the entire area so far in view of the communication difficulties and all those things. So in order to have a more elaborate and exhaustive study of the Adivasi problem, the Committee members must be from such areas where they have been working life-long and where they have been devoting most of their time for the welfare of the tribal people. If the Committees are not properly constituted, I think the wishes of the Government will not be fulfilled.

Lastly, I may point out that Shri P. K. Deo, has suggested that at the instance of his party the hon. Prime

Minister has made a declaration that the people in high authority must make a declaration of the property that they are having. Shri P. K. Deo might have made this remark with some purpose in future, but very recently he has also held a conference of his workers in my constituency where he said that at the instance of his party and himself the Government of India have been moving to make this declaration. But I want to know from him by way of clarification whether he has made any mention of this in his party manifesto of 1957 on which he has been campaigning for the success of his party. Moreover, his party has been here since 1952. Has any of his Members moved any resolution or brought it in the form of a Bill? I just want to know whether all these things have been thought out.

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्ना (निमाड) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के भाषण को मैंने बड़े ध्यान से सुना और बाद में शांति से उसको पढ़ा भी। उस सारे भाषण को सुनने और पढ़ने के बाद ऐसा लगा कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपना भाषण बहुत ही सरल और साधारण दिया है। उस में कोई भी ऐसी बात नहीं है कि जिसके बारे में कहा जाय कि यह बात बहुत बढ़ा चढ़ा कर कही गयी है।

सब से प्रथम बात राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने जो अपने भाषण में कही है वह चीन के भारत भूमि पर आक्रमण के बारे में कही है। मुझे यह कहते हुए बड़ा आनन्द होता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में हमारी सरकार की जो नीति रही है वह बहुत संतोषजनक रही है और अगर यह कहा जाए कि जो बात हमने दुनिया के सामने रखी है उस पर हम कायम हैं तो अत्यन्त नहीं होगी। जोश में आकर कोई भी बात कही जा सकती है और कोई भी काम किया जा सकता है, लेकिन उसका परिणाम क्या आता है यह देखने की जरूरत

है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने समय समय पर चीन के आक्रमण के सम्बन्ध में जो कुछ भी कहा है, और जो कुछ सदन के सामने रखा है, उससे हमारा देश दुनिया की नजर में ऊंचा उठा है और मजबूत बना है। कुछ बेजवाबदार लोग बाहर जिस तरह से बात करते हैं अगर हम भी उसी तरह से बेजवाबदारी की बातें करने लगे, तो हमारा सारा ध्यान अपने विकास पर से हट कर उधर लग जाएगा। इससे आम जनता को नुकसान ही पहुँचेगा क्योंकि उस अवस्था में मेटेलिटी विकास की तरफ नहीं बल्कि विनाश की तरफ हो जाएगी जो किसी भी देश के हित में नहीं है।

दूसरी बात जो राष्ट्रपति ने जी अपने भाषण में कही है उसका जिक्र पैरा १२ में है। उन्होंने औद्योगिक उत्पादन पर कुछ संतोष व्यक्त किया है। उसमें यह बताया है कि हमारा औद्योगिक उत्पादन पहले वर्षों के मुकाबले में बढ़ा है। और इसी प्रकार से कृषि उत्पादन के सम्बन्ध में राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने जिक्र किया है। अविकसित या अर्ध विकसित देश जब विकास के पथ पर चलते हैं तो यह तो मानी हुई बात है कि उत्पादन तो बढ़ना ही चाहिए। हमारा औद्योगिक उत्पादन बढ़ रहा है और उसके साथ ही कृषि उत्पादन भी बढ़ रहा है और उसके साथ साथ प्राफिट भी बढ़ रहा है। दूसरी तरफ भाव भी बढ़ रहा है और तीसरी तरफ.....

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप भी बढ़ रहे हैं।

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा : हम तो घट रहे हैं, बढ़ तो आप रहे हैं। जो मेहनत करने वाला है वह तो वजन में घटता ही है।

तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि हम अद्योगिक उत्पादन को देखते हैं, कृषि उत्पादन को देखते हैं, प्राफिट को देखते हैं, एम्प्लायमेंट को देखते हैं और महंगाई को देखते हैं। अगर

हम आजादी के बाद का सन् १९४८ का फिगर लें और आज का अर्थात् १९५९ का फिगर लें तो हम देखेंगे कि हमारा औद्योगिक उत्पादन इस बीच में डबल हुआ है। इसी प्रकार दूसरी तरफ अगर उसी टाइम का हम प्राफिट का फिगर लेते हैं, चाहे तमाम इंडस्ट्रीज का लीजिए या अलग अलग इंडस्ट्रीज का, तो हम देखते हैं कि कोई भी इंडस्ट्री ऐसी नहीं है कि जिसने टोटल लॉस किया हो। हमारा प्रोफिट का फिगर भी बराबर बढ़ता गया है। मैं कुछ फिगर सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। सन् १९४८ का हमारा औद्योगिक उत्पादन ७८ था तो आज हमारा औद्योगिक उत्पादन १५० है। इस प्रकार हम देखते हैं कि सन् १९४८ के मुकाबले में हमारा औद्योगिक उत्पादन आज दुगना हो गया है। अगर हम सन् १९५१ को लेते हैं और सन् १९५१ के फिगर को १०० मान लेते हैं, तो सन् १९५१ के मुकाबले में सन् १९५९ में हमारा औद्योगिक उत्पादन ५० परसेंट बढ़ा है। इस के साथ साथ मैं यह भी निवेदन कर देना चाहता हूँ कि उत्पादन के साथ साथ प्राफिट भी बराबर बढ़ता रहा है। सन् १९४९ में आल इंडस्ट्रीज का प्राफिट का फिगर १८१-५ है, तो सन् १९५० के अन्दर वह २४६-६ हो गया। उसके बाद हम सन् १९५२ को लेते हैं। इस वर्ष बहुत से उद्योग बंद हो रहे थे और गड़बड़ी मची हुई थी लेकिन इस साल का भी प्राफिट का फिगर १९०-६ है। १९५३ का फिगर २६१-२ है, १९५४ का ३२०-४ है, १९५५ का फिगर ३३४-३ है और १९५६ का फिगर ३२६-५ है। तो जिस प्रकार से हमारा उत्पादन बढ़ा उसी के साथ साथ हमारा प्राफिट भी बढ़ता चला गया।

इसी के साथ जब हम बाजार भाव को देखते हैं तो वह भी बढ़ा है। लड़ाई के पहले अगस्त सन् १९३९ के सरकार के बाजार के फिगरों को अगर हम १०० मान लें तो आज हमारा बाजार भाव ५०० के करीब पहुँच गया है। हमारी यह समझ में नहीं आता कि एक

[श्री रामसिंह बाई वम]

तरफ हमारा उत्पादन बढ़ रहा है, दूसरी तरफ हमारा प्रॉफिट बढ़ रहा है और तीसरी तरफ बाजार भाव बढ़ रहा है। लेकिन लोगों की कमाई कितनी बढ़ी है? राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने भाषण में यह बताया है कि हमने अपनी राष्ट्रीय आय १९५१ की निम्नतः तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में डबल करनी है। मैं सदन के सामने यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी आमदनी-भ्रगर्निंग तो बढ़ी नहीं है, हालाँकि हमारी प्राइकटिविटी परिमाण में काफी बढ़ी है। और हमारा उद्योग बढ़ा है। इस के मुकाबले में अगर हम एम्प्लायमेंट को लेते हैं—रोजगार को लेते हैं, तो वह परिमाण में घटी है, कम हुई है। मैं इस विषय में टैक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री की फिगरज सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। आजादी के पहले हमारी टैक्सटाइल मिल्स लगभग ३५० के करीब थीं, जब कि आज वे ५०० के करीब हो गई हैं, लेकिन अगर हम एम्प्लायमेंट की फिगरज को लें, तो वे पहले से मिलती-जुलती हैं। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जून, १९५८ में काफी टैक्सटाइल मिल्स बन्द हुई थीं और उस समय एम्प्लायमेंट की फिगरज ७,६७,१५० थीं। इस के मुकाबले में १९५९ में कपड़े के भाव बढ़ने के कारण दूसरी और तीसरी शिफ्ट्स भी चलने लगी थीं, लेकिन जून के महीने में एम्प्लायमेंट की फिगरज ७,३१,७३० थीं। कहने का मतलब यह है कि शिफ्ट्स बढ़ने के बावजूद बारह महीने में एम्प्लायमेंट ३५ हजार के करीब कम हो गई, जब कि कपड़े का भाव ३० परसेंट बढ़ गया था।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं एक छोटा सा आदमी हूँ, मजदूरों में काम करता हूँ, लोगों में घूमता हूँ। हम से अक्सर कहा जाता है कि डिसिप्लिन इन इंडस्ट्री होनी चाहिए, एफिशियन्सी बढ़नी चाहिए। इस से कोई इन्कार नहीं है। अगर डिसिप्लिन नहीं होगी, तो काम नहीं चल सकता है। इस में

भी कोई शक नहीं कि प्राइकटिविटी भी बढ़नी चाहिए। लेकिन हो क्या रहा है? भाल इंडिया लेबर कांफ्रेंस में रैशनलाइजेशन इन इंडस्ट्री के बारे में निर्णय हुआ, क्योंकि हम ने प्राइकटिविटी बढ़ानी है। तमाम पार्टियों ने उस को एग्री किया। रैशनलाइजेशन के आधार पर मजदूर कम हो रहे हैं, मजदूरी सम्बन्धी खर्च कम हो रहा है, लेकिन कारखानों में जो रा मैटीरियल लगता है, उस में कितनी कमी हुई है? जब प्राइकटिविटी का सवाल आया, तो हम को हर तरह से देखना होगा कि कितना रा मैटीरियल लगता है, कितना स्टोर लगता है, कितनी पावर लगती है और कितनी मजदूरी लगती है। ये तमाम बातें हम को देखनी होंगी। मैं बड़े दुख के साथ यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मजदूरी सम्बन्धी खर्च में कमी हो रही है, लेकिन रा मैटीरियल का भाव बढ़ रहा है, स्टोर का भाव बढ़ रहा है, हर एक चीज का भाव बढ़ रहा है लेकिन मजदूरी का भाव घट रहा है। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ फिगरज सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। कास्ट आफ प्राइकशन के बारे में गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया की तरफ से नैशनल काउंसिल आफ इकानॉमिक रिसर्च से सर्वे कराया गया, जिस ने अलग अलग इंडस्ट्री के विषय में बताया कि रा मैटीरियल, स्टोर, लेबर, पावर वगैरह कितने परसेंट होना चाहिए रिसर्च करने के बाद यह एक फारमूला ठहराया गया। अगर हम ने प्राइकटिविटी बढ़ानी है, तो हम को यह देखना होगा कि हर एक चीज में कमी किस तरह से हो और किस तरह से हम कनज्यूमर को सस्ता माल दे सकें। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि प्राइकटिविटी का मतलब मुनाफ़ाखोरी नहीं है, बल्कि उस का मतलब देश की जनता को अच्छा और सस्ता माल सुविधा से उपलब्ध कराना है। लेकिन इस दिशा में कुछ नहीं हुआ। मैं अलग अलग इंडस्ट्रीज को लेने के बजाय सिर्फ़ मुख्य एक ही इंडस्ट्री—टैक्सटाइल को लेता हूँ। फाटन में ४८

से ५२ परसेंट तक तो काटन की प्राइस होनी चाहिए, वेज और सैलेरी २५ से ३२ परसेंट होनी चाहिए, स्टोर ६ से ११ परसेंट होना चाहिए, पावर ३ से ५ परसेंट होनी चाहिए और अन्य घाइटम ३ से ६ परसेंट होने चाहिए। आज क्या हालत है? आज हम देखते हैं कि रा मँटीरियल का भाव ७० परसेंट तक पहुंच गया है, हालांकि उस का भाव ४८ से ५२ परसेंट तक ठहराया गया था। वेज और सैलेरी २५ से ३२ परसेंट ठहराया गया था, लेकिन वह २३ परसेंट ही है। ये गवर्नमेंट के फ़िगर्ज हैं। इस का मतलब क्लीयर-कट यह है कि सारा मामला डंडीमार लोगों के हाथ में है। अगर आज हम यह कहें कि हम कोई ऐसा काम करेंगे जिस का फ़ायदा हमारे देश और हमारी जनता को होगा, तो ऐसा होता नहीं है उन को फ़ायदा मिलता नहीं है और ये डीली घोती, लम्बे झब्बे और कड़क टोपी व ले पूरा पूरा फ़ायदा उठा रहे हैं और हारे जैसे गरीब सड़कछाप लोगों को वह फ़ायदा नहीं मिल पा रहा है।

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : सरकार डंडीमार हो गई है।

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा : इस स्थिति पर हम किस तरह से कब्जा करें, यह एक बड़ा भारी महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है। गवर्नमेंट के सामने सब से बड़ी बात यह होनी चाहिये कि किस तरह से जनता का दिल जीता जाये, जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त किया जाये। राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने भाषण में बताया है कि १९५८ में इंडस्ट्री में डिसिप्लिन रखने के बारे में जो समझौता हुआ था, उस के कारण अच्छा प्रभाव पड़ा है। सब पार्टियों ने उस को माना था। गवर्नमेंट ने हमको विश्वास दिलाया था कि अगर मजदूर प्रथम और द्वितीय पंच वर्षीय योजनाओं के अन्तर्गत औद्योगिक शांति बनाए रखें, डिसिप्लिन कायम करें, उत्पादन बढ़ायें, तो उन की जरूरतों को पूरा करने का लक्ष्य

गवर्नमेंट का रहेगा और हम उन के सब मामलों और बेतन सम्बन्धी मसलों का निर्णय वेज बोर्ड से करवायेंगे। वेज बोर्ड का मतलब है पंच। हमारी सरकार, हमारी संस्था और हमारे देश की जनता ने पंच-प्रथा को सब से प्रथम स्थान दिया है और राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने भी अपने भाषण में पंचायती राज्य की व्याख्या की है। मजदूरों ने पंचवर्षीय योजना को सफल बनाया और द्वितीय पंच-वर्षीय योजना को वे सफल बनाने जा रहे हैं। बल्कि मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक इंडस्ट्रियल पीस का सम्बन्ध है, जब हम हिन्दुस्तान और दूसरे देशों की हालत को देखते हैं, तो हम पाते हैं कि उस में हमारे मजदूरों ने बहुत शानदार हिस्सा भूदा किया है। इस हाउस ने अपनी पालिसी के अनुसार प्रथम पंच-वर्षीय योजना और द्वितीय पंच-वर्षीय योजना स्वीकार की और उस में मजदूरों को वेज बोर्ड देने का वायदा किया गया और वह उन्होंने दिया। लेकिन मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता कि जब वेज बोर्ड की यूनेनिमस रिपोर्ट आती है, तो वह रिपोर्ट कहां दबा कर रखी जाती है और क्यों दबा कर रखी जाती है।

श्री बजर्राज सिंह : डंडीमार होंगे।

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा : १९५९ में वह रिपोर्ट आती है और यूनेनिमस रिपोर्ट होती है और गवर्नमेंट ने वचन दिया था कि अगर यूनेनिमस रिपोर्ट होगी, तो उसे वह स्वीकार कर लेगी तो क्या कारण है कि उसको स्वीकार नहीं किया गया है और क्यों उसको प्रकाशित नहीं किया गया है। सब से बड़ी दुःख की बात तो यह है कि मिनिस्टर लोग इधर उधर प्रेस स्टेटमेंट देते हैं और इसी लिये रिपोर्ट का प्रमल नहीं लिया जाता है। हमें पता लगना चाहिये कि उस रिपोर्ट के अन्दर हाथी हैं, घोड़े हैं या गधे हैं, हमें पता तो लगे कि उसमें क्या है। जब इस तरह से चीजों को टाला जाता है तो डिसि-

[श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा]

प्लिन इन इंडस्ट्री कैसे रह सकता है। आप अपने वादे को पूरा नहीं कर रहे हैं।

हमने प्रैस में पढ़ा है कि बेज बोर्ड ने टक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री के लिये उसने छः रुपये और आठ रुपये की सिफारिश की है। मुझे पता नहीं कि यह सही है या गलत है। लेकिन अखबारों में यह चीज छपी है। इसका एवरेज सवा छः या साढ़े छः परसेंट के करीब आता है। हमारी मांग २५ परसेंट की थी। हमारी इस मांग को ले कर ही तो आपने टक्सटाइल, सीमेंट, शूगर, जूट आदि में बेज बोर्ड कायम किये हैं और जैसा कि हम अखबारों में पढ़ते हैं कि छः और आठ यानी सवा छः या साढ़े छः परसेंट की सिफारिश की जाती है जो कि कुछ भी नहीं है लेकिन इतना होने पर भी उस रिपोर्ट को दबा कर रखा जाता है, यह क्यों किया जाता है, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई है। किस के असर की वजह से ऐसा किया जाता है, मजदूरों के असर की वजह से किया जाता है, पूंजीपतियों के असर की वजह से किया जाता है, यह मुझे पता नहीं है। लेकिन इस तरह से करने से जैसा कि राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में कहा गया है कि डिसिप्लिन इन इंडस्ट्री रहे, वह नहीं रह सकता है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस रिपोर्ट पर आप भ्रमल करें और इसको प्रकाशित करें।

जहां तक इंडस्ट्री का सवाल है, उत्पादन का सवाल है, यदि इस स्थिति पर हम काबू नहीं पा सके हैं तो इसमें जो दोष है वह वितरण व्यवस्था का है, वितरण प्रथा का है। हमारा इंडस्ट्रियल तथा कृषि उत्पादन तो सपाटे से हो रहा है, सपाटे से वह आगे बढ़ रहा है लेकिन उसका सही वितरण नहीं हो पा रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि सही वितरण तभी होगा जब उत्पादन के साथ वितरण के ऊपर गवर्नमेंट कंट्रोल होगा

और यह चीज स्टेट ट्रेडिंग के बिना नहीं हो सकती। जब हम मानते हैं कि प्राइव्ति-विटी बढ़नी चाहिये, रेशनलाइजेशन की तरफ हम जा रहे हैं, आटोमेटिक मशीनरी की तरफ जा रहे हैं लेकिन उसके साथ ही अगर रा मीटरियल के भाव और बढ़ जाते हैं तो श्रमिकों को, गरीब लोगों को, कंज्यूमर्स को भारी मुसीबत का सामना करना पड़ता है। मैं

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं डंडी तो नहीं मार रहा हूँ, घंटी मार रहा हूँ। आप खत्म कीजिये।

श्री रामसिंह भाई बर्मा : बहुत अच्छा, आपका धन्यवाद।

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): First of all, I would like to refer to the very serious problem which our country is facing internally, namely the problem of unemployment. Under-employment, partial employment or seasonal unemployment are just its different names or features. While we are thinking about this problem it creates certain aspects of which we have to take cognizance.

There are certain places where there is no unemployment. I make this bold assertion because I represent a constituency, the major portion of which is not facing the problem of unemployment. Rather, it is facing a different kind of problems, namely the problems of prosperity. The point is that a sugar factory, the largest in the country, crushing about 4000 tons of sugarcane a day has created a situation there and has created a problem there, which our country is not giving thought to today.

The problems are these. The minimum wage for the agricultural labourer there is about Rs. 2; on certain days, it rises up to Rs. 4. In spite of this, the community development programme there insists on cottage industries. No cottage indus-

try can give more than eight annas. Even the Ambar Charkha, if plied by an expert hand, would give only about twelve annas, or at the most one rupee. The result is that the money is wasted. There is the staff, there are the officers and so on to look after the cottage industries or small industries, but no benefits accrue to the population. This sort of situation cannot be allowed to continue. So, the point is that we should not adhere to a uniform pattern of budgets. We make this bold assertion always that we do not adhere by it. But I find that in spite of the fact that the block advisory committees or the block panchayat samitis that have now taken form, and the public leaders have been agitating and raising their voice that the moneys allotted for the cottage industries be diverted to other items, particularly, to the construction of school buildings, or hospital buildings, or to the construction of new roads or culverts, yet nothing is being done.

Similarly, in the areas where sugarcane is grown, there is heavy goods traffic. The result is that the roads are washed away in no time, and the repair of roads demands a lot of money. The condition of the roads in my constituency is fast approaching such a point where you will have to find out the road only by the absence of the sugarcane crop. They have gone so bad. Everywhere, there are ditches and ditches and ditches, and you will be able to know where the road is only by the fact that on the one side is the sugarcane field and on the other is the sugarcane field, and, in between there is a small line where there is no sugarcane crop, and, therefore, that must be the road. The sugarcane cess is being collected. The central excise is being collected on sugar, and more than a crore of rupees is collected on this account in my own constituency. In spite of that, no special preference is given to this place for the construction of roads. Besides, whatever quota comes population-wise or even district-wise, Government are

359 (Ai) LSD—5.

not able to spend because of the very reason of the prosperity of the area.

The PWD has a particular rate for the construction of roads. They want roads to be constructed in my constituency also at the same rate. No contractor comes forward, because he cannot get labour at the same rate at which he can get at other places. The result is that the money lapses. After pressure, Government came forward and say that they will pay ten per cent. more, but this 10 per cent. more is no good actually. Over a fourteen-mile track between Nizamabad and Shakkarnagar, Government had taken a decision, and the Central Government had sanctioned also the money needed to construct a cement concrete road. For the last four years, efforts are being made. One after the other, contractors are being persuaded to take up the work. Even if somebody comes forward, he thinks that breach of the contract is more profitable than the construction of the road, and, therefore, he just evades under some plea or other; he is prepared to pay some money for not fulfilling the contract, but he would not complete the road. These are the problems that we are confronted with in different areas.

Of course, in my own constituency, there are certain areas where there is unemployment and where there is poverty. So, my point is that we have to plan according to the needs of the different areas and according to the requirements of the different areas.

I am happy that electricity has also come, but not in as ample a measure as it should have come. This problem of unemployment which is a very serious problem or rather problem No. 1, so far as internal affairs are concerned, is what the country is confronted with today, and if we want to solve this problem, we have to create the employment in the rural sections, in the sections where there

[Shri Heda]

is unemployment. Because of agricultural development, because of better and improved methods of paddy and sugarcane cultivation, in that major portion of my constituency there is no unemployment. But what about the other parts? In other parts, I think one activity which can be undertaken universally all over the country—and not only partially—to meet this menace of unemployment fully is the construction of houses. Under this head, various schemes are forthcoming. There is no doubt about it. Some houses are being constructed for Harijans or backward classes or tribal people. Various other aids and facilities are also provided for the construction of houses in general. But these things are there on paper. In actual execution, we come across various difficulties. Unless you form a co-operative society, you cannot get any aid for the construction of houses. We have a maximum limit of Rs. 8000 as a rule to be given for construction of a house; in case a person has no other house, in a case a person does not own any other house, and he is going to live in the house, that provision is there. But how far is that provision utilised? If you look at it from that point of view, you find that the pace of construction so far as houses are concerned is very slow. If we take up the schemes of construction of houses, I am sure it will help to solve much of the unemployment problem that exists today. Unemployment is not prevalent to that much extent as is generally thought. I am not talking of unemployment among the educated classes or the matriculates and graduates; I am speaking of unemployment in the rural areas. The rural areas are fast changing their face and therefore, we can easily not only eradicate unemployment in those areas, but at the same time create better conditions of living and give a better look to the entire rural areas by undertaking the construction of houses on a larger scale.

Since I have referred to community development, I would like to ex-

press my views on a pertinent point raised by Shri A. P. Jain. He says that the multi-purpose approach we find today in the community development programme is not conducive to success. He is in favour of a functional approach. I do not agree with him. You will note that we have two different levels of administration. One is the Community Development Block which covers a population from 60,000 to 1,00,000; the other is the administrative unit under a collector at the district level. You will find that at the district level there is functional approach, but at the block level there is not the functional approach but the multi-purpose approach. I think this multi-purpose approach at the level of the block is very necessary, particularly after we have accepted the Balwantray Mehta Committee's recommendation on democratic decentralisation. The panchayat samitis have already come up. They are working very well. The new chairman and the members of the various committees are taking interest. Now the matter is not only in the hands of the BDOs or the administration; there is close co-ordination between the public and the administration and they are working very well.

My own constituency was one of the first places where the recommendation of the Balwantray Mehta Committee was given effect to. I find the working of these block panchayat samitis very successful. The zila parishads that have recently come up will, I am quite confident, work very successfully. Therefore, let us continue the multipurpose approach in the community development programme as it is at the block level. We need not change it to the functional level since it is there already at the district level. It is just possible that we may achieve greater prosperity and when we achieve greater prosperity, it may be possible to allot a full-fledged doctor, full-fledged engineer or other scientist for each block; but till our resources are enough for that purpose,

I think the present pattern of multi-purpose approach to community development needs to be kept intact.

When I go through the President's Address, I note in paragraphs 17 and 18 that he has referred to the statutory Oil and Natural Gas Commission. In a nutshell, he has given the progress we have made in the exploration and exploitation of oil. But I think it is not the whole picture. If you look at the developments that have taken place recently, you will notice that there is a little departure from our general policy. Our general policy was that once a thing has been accepted in the public sector, we should not allow the private sector in or should not allow it until it comes with full finances. Finances to come from the public sector and management to come from the private sector—that is not the trend that our Government had been following all along. But I have noticed that certain agreements have been concluded under which there is a departure from this stand. So far as the distribution of oil is concerned, we have already allowed the private sector to take full interest. In the refining part of it also, we find that the private sector is there. But so far as exploration and exploitation of oil was concerned, it was very necessary that Government should have full control over it and the private sector not allowed to enter into it. The entire thing that was in the public sector should have been kept intact as such.

There is an added feature to this departure. Not only are we allowing the private sector, but rather we are allowing the foreign private sector to enter it. If you look at the history of oil in general all over the world, you will find that oil enters into politics. There is a famous novel based on it. Either you who are in politics,

in Government, control the oil or the oil starts controlling you. Therefore, I would plead with Government, and particularly the Minister in charge, to take this aspect into consideration and not allow the private sector to have close association or share with Government in this aspect of oil—I am not talking of the distribution of oil or refining of oil, but the exploration and exploitation of oil.

Shri Goray (Poona): Oil will grease the political wheels!

Shri Heda: Yes, but the difficulty is that the oil will start greasing the wheels of not only one political party but more than one political party and then it will create a problem which I think many in politics may not be able to solve.

Another aspect to which the President has referred and which deserves the attention of the House is the question of export earnings. Last year, we made very good efforts to increase our export earnings. By our earnest efforts in all directions, by various measures—panels, committees, commercial crops, semi-agricultural crops etc.—we have almost exported goods worth about Rs. 700 crores, and I think during the Third Plan we will be exporting annually to the tune of Rs. 700 crores or more worth of goods. But when we take into consideration the amount likely to be made available for development purposes, after providing for defence requirements, servicing of debts and maintenance of the economy, we find that there are hardly Rs. 50 crores or Rs. 100 crores per year for financing the Third Plan. Therefore, it is time we laid greater emphasis on those items which figure in our export earnings, particularly commercial crops, and thereby increase

[Shri Heda]

our annual export earnings from Rs. 700 crores to about Rs. 1000 crores, without which I do not think it will be easy for us to finance the Third Five Year Plan.

15 hrs.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I wish only to deal with two or three points in the President's Address. First of all, I am sorry to say that the President has not made any mention of the most menacing aspect of our economy, namely, the rise in the prices of food materials. The burning problem in the country today is the rise in the prices of food materials. As far as the wage-earners are concerned, it reduces their real earnings. This is a problem that was there last year and this year also it is there and is continuing.

As far as the price of sugar is concerned, instead of 55 nP per lb. it was sold for not less than Re. 1 and crores of rupees have been taken as profit. I want Government to see that there is stabilisation of prices at least as far as the food articles are concerned so that all national development activities in the country may go on smoothly and well. Unless that is done, I am sure, it will hamper national production activities in this country.

The second problem that I want to deal with is about agricultural production. The President has referred to this in his Address on page 3 as well as on page 6. On page 6, it is said:—

"It is, however, by better cultivation avoidance of waste through pests, better animal husbandry, the advance of co-operation both in production and in marketing, and by the determination of the people to be self-reliant, that individual and national prosperity can be achieved."

On page 2, it has been said:—

"The objective of the Third Five Year Plan is to seek almost to double the national income, taking 1950-51 as the basic level, and to pay much greater attention to agricultural production and to our food requirements, to heavy machine building....."

From the speech of the President, it is very clear that in the Third Five Year Plan much attention would be paid to the increase in agricultural production. On page 6, it is said that it will be by better cultivation and avoidance of waste through pests and other things. I am sorry to say that nothing has been said about land reforms. So, without land reform and with avoidance of waste by pests and other things, I am sure, agricultural production cannot increase. Not only that.

In Nagpur, the Congress passed a resolution and it was said that before 1960 land reform legislation in the States would be undertaken. But, as far as this is concerned, nothing has been done. I want to stress that if agricultural production should increase, and that is also the basic economy.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Before 1960?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: It was said, before 1960. That was the resolution as I understood it.

In the Address it is said that agricultural production is the basic economy of this country and it is only by that that rapid industrialisation of the country can come, because it is only by increasing agricultural production that you can increase the purchasing power of the 80 per cent. of the population who live upon land. So that is the main factor.

The objective of the plan is rapid industrialisation and increase in the

living standards of the people and also increase in production. It was also stressed that land reform legislation must be there, which has not been done. There is no mention of any land reform legislation in the Address. It is said that by better cultivation and other things agricultural production can be increased. It is regrettable that land reform is not mentioned here. Until and unless there is land reform legislation, agricultural production can never increase; and it must be done immediately.

In this connection I would like to say that the President should, at least now, be kind enough to give assent to the Agricultural Relations Bill that had been passed by the Kerala Assembly—now that a new Government is coming in Kerala—and return it so that there may be implementation of the agrarian relations which would certainly be able to increase food production.

The next point that I want to touch upon is what the President has said about production. I want to point out that there is a crisis in the handloom industry today. I do not know what is happening in other parts of India, but, so far as Kerala is concerned, from November onwards there has been an increase in the price of yarn from Rs. 18 to Rs. 25. It is still rising; I do not know what it is today. The effect of the increase in the price of yarn is that thousands of handloom workers have gone out of employment and factories have closed. With the increase in price it has become impossible for the handloom owners to run them. So a new crisis has come.

I have already written to the Minister of Commerce and Industry and drawn his attention to this fact; and also to the Adviser to the Governor of Kerala pointing out these things. I want to say that if the prices still continue to rise and if they are not brought down, then, certainly, Kerala, where there are thousands of handloom workers will be affected and there will be great unemployment in

the handloom industry there and also in other parts of India.

The next point that I want to deal with is this. The President has made mention on page 7 of the elections in Kerala. The President has said:—

"Members of Parliament are aware that in the Proclamation issued in relation to the State of Kerala on the 31st of July, 1950, which was approved by Resolutions passed by the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, it was provided that the general election for constituting a new Legislative Assembly for that State shall be held as soon as possible. The general election was accordingly held and polling took place in the entire State on February 1, the number of voters exercising their franchise being one of the highest recorded in any election."

I want to deal with this. The elections are over. It is very good, because the President's rule will be over and a legally constituted Assembly will be there. As the President has said, in the history of this country it was an election where the largest number of people recorded their votes. But there are certain other things that are not known and that should be known, because in parliamentary democracy elections are very important. The way in which the elections are conducted is the basis of parliamentary democracy because parliamentary democracy means coming into power through the ballot box. That is the reason why I want to point out certain things about these elections, and what is happening today after the elections.

A new method of election was introduced, one day's polling and also one day's counting. That was a new thing so far as these elections were concerned. First of all I want to point out that in the history of parliamentary democracy it recorded the

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

highest number of voters. How did it happen? Was it a triumph for democracy or the noble traditions that had been accepted by the Congress Party? But whatever may be our criticism about the elections and the way in which they have been conducted in some places and the defects in them, I want to say that we accept the verdict of the people and we will act as responsible Opposition, co-operating with the Government as far as the national development activities are concerned. Only where we find that certain things are done, as I will place before you, or are happening, we will very strongly mobilise the people and attack those anti-people's policies. That is our position and that is why I say that we respect the verdict of the people because in the elections the Congress and the Alliance have got an absolute majority.

The Governor and the other officers have painted a pretty picture of the elections and said that they were completely free and fair. It was one day's polling and one day's counting. But was it really fair and free? There was only one policeman in one polling booth. That means that in some booths—I do not say in all booths—the whole booth was captured by some unruly elements and they were able to do as they liked. In some places the voters were driven away and the agents were beaten from inside and outside the polling booths. Beatings took place in several places and there had unfortunately been a murder. I have yesterday pointed out to you some things; in one constituency (Thiruvella Constituency), in Kaviyoor Panchayat on the morning of February 1, at 6 O'clock, 200 voters were moving and there was a clash. Some people were inside a tea shop and when they came out they were beaten and unfortunately one man died and 11-12 were injured. The other people went and recorded their vote. The man who died was Kunju Kunju. His mother, his wife and his brother who was a polling agent and others went to record their vote and

when they came back they saw the brother dead. That was one instance.

There was another instance. I do not want to point out many instances because I have no time. The beating of the polling agents had taken place because of posting one policeman in one booth. I am pointing out these things so that the experience of these elections may be kept in view.

In Thiruvella, Shri Kuriyannur Vallyathalayil Unni took out his revolver in front of the polling station in Thottapuzhasseri and threatened the polling agent of the Communist Party and the voters in the queue. Again on the polling day in the Kayamkulam constituency, Communist Party's polling agent in Pathiyurkala booth was forcibly removed from the polling station by Congressmen. The polling agent was beaten up. In spite of repeated complaints the police and the Presiding Officer did not take any action to bring the polling agent back to the station. In another place in Kayamkulam constituency, the polling agent was beaten up on the road by some persons whose names are given here. I do not want to give their names. A police party which happened to pass that way removed the man to the hospital but they never cared to bring the culprits to book. There was another similar incident in the Madai constituency.

I do not want to go into more details about these things. I have given a record of these things to the Governor. All these things were there because there was only one policeman in one booth. When these things were brought to the notice of the Presiding Officer, he said: "What can I do? There is only one policeman; I will not be able to manage."

Again, the counting was in one day. As far as this is concerned, both the parties say that there were irregularities. There are irregularities as far as counting is concerned because there is one agent for three

tables. One man will not be able to do justice to his work. Some papers have written editorials on this—not the Communist Party papers but the other papers—saying that there had been irregularities. Duplicate ballot papers were there. It was reported that there was no check for every table. This is also another aspect and I want to point out these because some enquiry has to be made as to how these irregularities came and if so how they could be avoided in future. Unless it is found out whether there were irregularities, if so what they were and how they happened, these things would continue. Similarly, it could also be ascertained whether because there was one agent for three tables, the counting was not fair. I do not say that these things happened in all the polling booths but in some there were these irregularities. An enquiry may be made into these things so that some changes may be made to avoid in future elections these irregularities.

After the elections were over. I moved an adjournment motion yesterday and the hon. Home Minister in a short reply said that the situation was normal and the officers were impartial. Maybe, the Home Minister may not have got complaints about the real situation there or reports about the way in which some police officers are acting. When I approached some persons and asked them whether they have reported these things, to the officers, they said that they did not report because they were afraid to go to the police station and report about some incidents. I have given copies of the petitions to the Governor. These are here only copies of the signed petitions. I have told the Governor that they did not give these complaints to the police officers because they were afraid to do so. So, the Home Minister will be knowing about them only after the Governor reports to him. That is why I say that these things may be gone into. Then only you will understand whether the situation is normal there. As I told you yesterday, one man

went to Chathan on the morning of the 1st. I told you yesterday how he was murdered.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not remember the exact words, but I think the Home Minister probably said that such incidents do occur even in normal times.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: This is not an incident which will occur in normal times. On the 31st some people approached Chathan and told him that he should not go to the polling booth to vote. Chathan replied that the Government of India has given him a vote and he will cast it at his own free will. Then he was told: "We will deal with you later on". He was dealt with later on, and at night on the 1st he was killed. These things happen only when there are elections and not otherwise. Because Chathan went to vote he was stabbed to death on the 1st at 10 P.M. There was absolutely no clash at that time. His wife is alive today. When we went there his wife said that she knows the people who came to her house on the 31st and 1st. She also gave the names of the people who went there. Even though the names were given they were not arrested and no action was taken.

Another thing happened at Ettumanur at the polling booth there. On the 1st there was the victory celebration. Ettumanur is a place in Moovatu-puzha. Some people took out a procession to celebrate the victory. When the procession came near the house of a native physician the processionists entered his house, broke his bottles and did other things. He has submitted a petition to the police about this incident.

Another polling agent, a man named Damodaran was beaten. Those who die in normal times cannot be polling agents or those who are connected with elections. If only polling agents and people connected with elections die, it is not a normal thing to happen. We find cases where a polling agent is beaten, one who went to vote is

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

murdered and a third man who has been working outside as an agent has also been stabbed. That is why I say it is not a normal thing, it is something that is not accidental, it is something that is very serious.

Then there is a fourth case. In Kayamkulam Raghavan and his brother Gopalan were stabbed. Raghavan died instantly. Raghavan worked as a polling agent for the Communist Party candidate in Kayamkulam constituency. When the police were removing Raghavan's dead body his elder brother came to embrace the dead body but he was beaten by the police. Another relation of the deceased who came there was also beaten by the police.

Why is it that after elections polling agents die, polling agents are beaten, those who vote die and their houses are set on fire. If this is something that is normal, then we must consider whether there must be elections in Kerala. If elections mean beating of agents, setting on fire of houses belonging to agents, I must say it is not a normal thing. There must be a thorough enquiry, because in the four or five cases that I have mentioned, one is a polling agent, there is another one who has been working as an agent outside, and there is a third man who said that he will vote. I do not want to go into the other details which I have here.

As far as the officers are concerned they were not impartial. Not only that. Kerala consists of Malabar, Travancore and Cochin. In Malabar there have not been many representations about police beating in lockup and other places. If it is a general thing, why is it that in Malabar this has not happened whereas in certain constituencies and in certain districts this has happened? Not only after the polling, even before the polling there have been representations about certain officers. Whatever may be the orders given to them, it is they who do these things. Three Members of

my group, Shri Vasudevan Nair, Shri Punnoose and others, personally met the officers and told them that for some six or seven months this has been the situation in certain constituencies, which they named, and suggested that unless they send some more police force there there may be murders, beatings and so on. They urged the officers to take some action to prevent that. Representation was made even after the polling. But it was not done.

Therefore, Sir, it is not for mere pleasure that we say these things here. These are not some concocted stories. These things were pointed out earlier. A memorandum was given to the Inspector-General of Police. The Adviser was also approached in this connection. They were requested to send some more police to certain places where the people were mostly Harijans, but no action was taken.

These crimes were done against a certain section of the people, against the agricultural labourers and Harijans. Except one the other three who died were all Harijans. Not only that. I say that the victory in the elections—many may not agree—is not a victory of democracy. It is a victory of reaction, it is a victory of communalism. I have got here copies of letters. Can you expect, Sir, in a democracy circulars and individual letters being sent to voters saying that they will be excommunicated if they work or vote for the Communist Party. Here is a letter from the Bishop of Mangalore which says:

"Therefore, unless, you inform me before next Sunday (Jan. 24, 1960) that you have withdrawn from such activities, you will be excommunicated from the Church and your excommunication be announced publicly from the pulpit."

This letter was written to Pannikkas-
seri Francis by Father Bonarenture,
O.C.D., Director of Third Order. This
is a photostat copy of the letter sign-

ed by him. I shall read the whole letter. It says:

"I have received reliable information that you, a member of the Carmelite Third Order of the Catholic Church is working for the success of the Communist Party and its candidate in Ernakulam. You know that it is prohibited for any Catholic to work for the Communist Party or its candidates. Therefore, unless, you inform me before next Sunday (Jan. 24, 1960) that you have withdrawn from such activities, you will be excommunicated from the Church and your excommunication be announced publicly from the pulpit."

It is just like a summons from a Magistrate, saying that you inform me by such and such a date or else something will be done. Will not a believer in religion be affected by such a letter? Will it not affect the success or otherwise in the elections? How can you say that this is a success especially in a secular State? India is a secular State. Will not such letters affect the conduct of the elections?

There is another letter from the same Bishop where he has said:

"While giving one's votes a Catholic should clearly bear in mind that he is forbidden under pain of excommunication to vote for the Communist candidate. It does not matter what enticing promises he makes or what beneficial undertakings he gives, the very fact that he is a Communist he is an unworthy, unsuitable and dangerous candidate for us Catholics. I repeat again, the recent Vatican decree forbids voting for a candidate—even a self-styled Christian who favours communism. Catholics who join the Communist Party and work for it knowingly and freely, who defend or propagate it in any way, ipso facto incur excommunication specially reserved to the Holy See."

I do not want to read the other parts of this letter.

I want to bring another thing to your notice. As soon as the elections were over evictions started. I have got petitions from about 50 persons. Evictions are still going on. Even before the new government has come into power evictions have started. Evictions started immediately the results were known. Not only that evictions started, even the wages have been reduced. If before the elections it was 10 for a harvest it is now 8. So, wages are reduced. Evictions have come in. Not only that. Even social boycott is there. Harijans cannot take water from the wells. In some places where I had been, the Harijans said that they were not taking water from the neighbouring well because they were suspected to have voted for such and such a party. So, they said that they had to go a mile away to get water. There are written statements from them. If an enquiry is made, it should be made whereby they will not get more blows, for in many enquiries, the police officer goes there and the men concerned get more blows. So, there is social boycott. There are cases where petitions have been given and which I can show. There are cases where a man who had murdered another person was not arrested. On the 25th January, there was a murder at Guruvayoor. It happened when a procession was going on. The people there handed over the man to the police but till the 1st of this month, that man was walking along freely. He was not even arrested. When there is a charge of murder and when the people hand over the man to the police and say, "this is the man who has done that crime," at least he must be arrested. But till the 1st—I do not know what has happened on the 2nd or the 3rd—he had not been arrested and he was freely going about. So, if a man who stabs another is not sent to jail and, before the election, if he is able to move about freely, what effect will it have on the voters? So, I cannot say that there has been impartiality so far as the officers were concerned. No.

For example, in Chengannur police station, I can say what has happened.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

I went to that place some months ago and I went to the constituency where there was some trouble. I informed the DSP and the police inspector and I said I was going there and that I feared some trouble. Even in spite of my having informed the police authorities of my going there, my car was stoned and fortunately I escaped. The inspector said: "We wanted the information and we were watching in some other place". When I went to the north, they said they were watching in the south! When I informed the DSP and the inspector, they all agreed and said: "We were watching" but not in the place where the stones were thrown but somewhere else.

I am saying all this from personal experience. So, unless you deal with these things properly, such incidents will continue, whatever the intentions of the Home Minister and whatever the reports he may get. But these are things which he may not get in the reports, because it is impossible to get these things in a report now. Not only this. I have got some reports and I shall submit a copy to the Home Minister. For instance, in four or five places, when you go there you cannot find anybody. In one place, when we went there, there were some people remaining outside. When they heard the sound of a horn of the car, they ran in. Nobody was there thereafter. Later, one man came out slowly. The point is, he wanted to know whether there were policemen or somebody else. First, one man came; then five people came; afterwards 20 people came. After knowing that it was not the police who had come to that place, they come out. I asked why it was so. They said that the policemen went round and they feared them. The Harijans have had to go from one place to the other for fear of the policemen, and they get no work by having to do so. So, a situation must be created wherein the people can work peacefully. You can make an impartial enquiry. But the impartial enquiry should be made not by the same officer who beat the man

but by some other officer. If you ask the police whether they beat such and such a man, they will say, "No; we have not". If an enquiry is made in that way, the facts cannot be gathered. There are places from where the people have evacuated. Nobody knows whether it is for any political purpose or for any other purpose. But these things are really happening. I want to say that after the election, the conditions are not normal, though the Home Minister said yesterday that the conditions are normal. Something must be done immediately to put things right.

For example, there is a set form in which names are given—A,B,C., etc. About 20 names are given. Those names are those whom one knows when one sees them! In Malayalam, it is *kandal ariyunnavarku*. That is, I do not know who they are, but when I see them I can know who they are. The policemen take in those people in the list when they see them. Only those names of persons are given whom they know when they see them. When a person is an enemy, they will say, "I can know him when I see him". Then they will say "this is the man against whom such reports are there".

I shall finish now. I do not want to give the names, because there is no use. But I know there are responsible people in the Congress and in the Government who said when they came there that they wanted the election to defeat the Communist party and to eliminate the Communist party and those who supported it. I want to know whether that is the policy today, namely, eliminating one party. Whether any party can eliminate another party, etc., is another question. But whatever it is, this is what they said. What is wanted today is not elimination of the Communist party in Kerala, but elimination of unemployment; elimination of poverty. Because Kerala is industrially backward and there are so many problems in Kerala. We as the opposition are ready to co-operate with the Govern-

ment, but will the Government be able to solve these problems if the State Government is not able to do so? If the present situation in Kerala continues, I am sure that the consequences will be very bad. It is not for pleasure that I am saying all this; it is not for *tamasha* that I am saying all this. It is not due to any political intention that I am placing all this before this House. There may be some habitual exaggeration in what people say or write, but what I have said here, I have seen from personal experience, and I am placing the facts before the House. I want to say that the situation in Kerala today is not normal. If anybody says it is normal, certainly it is very dangerous to say so. On the one hand, the police do what they like: the people, the tea-shopkeeper, the cloth merchant, everybody says so. On the other hand, there is retaliation in the places where the party that has won in the elections is strong. This is bad.

I would request the Prime Minister and the Government specially to look into this matter and see that such things are removed. Or else, it would be bad not only for the Communists, not only for the Congress, but for everyone both inside and outside the Kerala State. As for the way in which the elections have been conducted, I want the Government to make a thorough enquiry about the new method in which the elections are conducted in Kerala: with policemen in the booth and also at the time of counting. This is what I have got to say.

श्री राजराज सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रारम्भ में ही मैं संसदीय मामलों के मंत्री की सेवा में एक बात प्रस्तुत करूँ। राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण एक महत्वपूर्ण नीति वक्तव्य सरकार की तरफ से होता है। ऐसे नीति वक्तव्य पर सब से पहले राज्य सभा में बहस हो, लोक सभा में न हो, यह जो देख की जनतंत्रीय परम्परा है, उस के अनुसार नहीं है। मैं चाहूँगा कि भविष्य में यह प्रयत्न किया जाव कि सब तरह के महत्व-

पूर्ण वक्तव्यों पर सब से पहले लोक सभा में चर्चा हो और बाद में ही उस पर राज्य सभा में विचार हो।

राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में बहुत सी बातों की चर्चा की है। सदन में उन पर काफी बहस हो चुकी है। इसलिये मैं दो तीन बातें ही कहना चाहता हूँ। हमारी पंच वर्षीय योजनाओं को सफल बनाने के लिये जहाँ हर तरह के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता है वहाँ खेती के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने की सब से अधिक आवश्यकता है। खेती के उत्पादन पर पहले तो ध्यान दिया ही नहीं गया, लेकिन कल अपने भूतपूर्व खाद्य मंत्री के भाषण में जो कुछ हमें सुनने को मिला वह एक बहुत ही आश्चर्यजनक बात थी। आप को मालूम होगा कि भूतपूर्व खाद्य मंत्री ने अपने भाषण में कहा था कि २ करोड़ रुपया प्लानिंग कमिशन सिर्फ इसलिये नहीं दे रहा था कि किसी मिनिस्टर की नाक चपटी है या मुँह काला है। यदि इस तरह की बात प्लानिंग कमिशन कह सकता है तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर प्लानिंग कमिशन की क्या व्यवस्था हमारे विधान में है? प्लानिंग कमिशन क्या कैबिनेट से भी ऊपर कोई बाड़ी हो गई है? कोई एक्सपर्ट बाड़ी हो, विशेषज्ञ समिति हो, वह राय दे तो वह ठीक है, लेकिन कल भूतपूर्व खाद्य मंत्री ने बतलाया कि सारे हिन्दुस्तान के खाद्य मंत्री और केन्द्रीय खाद्य मंत्री एक राय के थे कि नालागढ़ कमेटी की रिपोर्ट जो है वह मंजूर की जानी चाहिये और उस पर प्रमल के लिये जितने रुपयों की आवश्यकता है, २ करोड़ के करीब वह मिलना चाहिये। उस पर अगर प्लानिंग कमिशन यह कहे कि जो खाद्य मंत्री हैं उन की राय इस तरह की है इस लिये रुपया नहीं दिया जा सकता, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह आपत्तिजनक बात है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : लेकिन उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा है कि प्लानिंग कमिशन ने यह कहा था, बल्कि यह कहा कि उन का सयास क्या था। उनके इन्कार करने की वजह क्या थी, यह जो उन के मन में आया वह उन्होंने बतलाया।

श्री अजरराज सिंह : जो व्यक्ति कब तक सरकार का एक कैबिनेट रैंक का मंत्री रह चुका है वह आज इस बात को कहता है तो दूसरे लोगों के दिल में क्या भावना पैदा होगी? मैं चाहूंगा कि इस की जांच पड़ताल की जाय कि आखिर कहीं ऐसी बात तो नहीं है कि जिस प्लानिंग कमिशन को हम ने मुकर्रर किया है, उस काम के लिये कि सरकार की नीतियां अच्छी तरह बनें और अच्छी तरह उन पर अमल हो, वह कहीं उच्च में स्काबट हो नहीं डाल रहा है।

खेती का प्रश्न जहां उठता है तो बार बार इस पर ध्यान देने की कोशिश की जाती है कि अच्छी खाद मिले, अच्छी तरह से उसकी गुताई हो और कीड़ों को मारा जाय। यह ठीक है कि उत्तम खाद, सिंचाई की व्यवस्था करके और कीड़ों का नाश करके हम अपने देश में खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन बढ़ा सकेंगे। लेकिन इसके अतिरिक्त खाद्य उत्पादन को बढ़ाने के लिए कुछ मूल कारणों की तरफ हमें जाना पड़ेगा। आज हमारे देश में काफी जमीन परती पड़ी है जिस पर कि आज खेती नहीं हो रही है मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि उस जमीन को तोड़ कर खेती के योग्य बनाने के लिये कौन सी व्यवस्था होने जा रही है? राष्ट्रपति ने अपने भाषण में इस पर कुछ ध्यान नहीं दिया है। मूलक में करीब ८ करोड़ एकड़ जमीन इस तरह की है जिसको कि तोड़ कर खेती योग्य बनाया जा सकता है और जिस पर कि खेती की जा सकती है। धारण्यकता इस बात की है

कि उसको तोड़ कर जल्दी से जल्दी उस पर खेती की जाय। अगर हमें खाद्य उत्पादन बढ़ाना है तो निश्चय ही हमें उस क्षेत्रफल को जिसमें कि खेती की जा सकती है, खेती योग्य बनाना होगा। उससे न केवल खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन ही बढ़ेगा बल्कि मुक्त में जो करोड़ों की तादाद में लोग बेकार हैं उनको काम मिलेगा। इसके जरिए हम दो काब करेंगे, एक तो हम देश में खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन बढ़ा सकेंगे और दूसरी तरफ हम देश में जो बेकारी फैली हुई है उसको भी बहुत हद तक दूर कर सकेंगे। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि मेरे अपने निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में यदि चम्बल और यमुना के खादर को एक ज्वा किया जा सके तो वहां पर ३० हजार खानदान बसाये जा सकते हैं। प्रति परिवार को ५ एकड़ जमीन दी जा सकती है और ३० हजार खानदानों को काम दिया जा सकता है। लोग चाहते हैं कि उनको इस तरह की खेती की जमीन मिले लेकिन सरकार का ध्यान उधर नहीं जा रहा है। अगर हम खाद्यान्न के उत्पादन को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं तो उसके लिए हमारे दृष्टिकोण में एक मौलिक परिवर्तन होना चाहिये। जहां हमें उत्तम खाद और सिंचाई की उचित व्यवस्था करने की जरूरत है वहां उसके साथ ही वह बहुत सारी जमीन जो कि अभी तक छोड़ी बहों गई है उस जमीन को तोड़ कर खेती योग्य बनाने की जरूरत है और उन लोगों को जो कि खेती कर सकते हैं, उन्हें खेती करने के लिए देने की आवश्यकता है। जब तक हम ऐसा नहीं करेंगे मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो ११० मिलियन या १०० मिलियन टन का लक्ष्य रक्खा है वह पूरा नहीं हो सकेगा। इसलिये हमें अपने अब तक के तरीकों में जैसा मैंने बतलाया तबदीली लानी पड़ेगी क्योंकि अगर आपने अभी तक चले आ रहे बही पुराने तरीकों को ही अपनाये रक्खा तो आपको अपने लक्ष्य तक पहुंचने में सफलता नहीं मिल सकेगी।

इस से जुड़ा हुआ सामुदायिक विकास मंत्रालय का काम भी भाता है। सामुदायिक विकास मंत्रालय के सम्बन्ध में भी हमारे नूतनपूर्व खाद्य मंत्री ने कहा कि जिस तरह खे बहां पर सामुदायिक विकास खंडों में काम चल रहा है उससे हम कभी सफल नहीं होने वाला है। उन्होंने कहा कि प्रत्येक के लिये भलग भलग विशेषज्ञ रहना चाहिये लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि आज हमारे देश की जैसी स्थिति व्यवस्था है उसमें न हम इतना धन इकट्ठा कर सकते हैं और न इतने सारे विशेषज्ञ भलग भलग हर ब्लॉक में या गांव में रख सकते हैं। लेकिन मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि सामुदायिक विकास मंत्रालय जिन लोगों के लिए काम कर रहा है क्या बाकई में उन लोगों के लिए कुछ काम हो रहा है? गांवों में जहां कि सामुदायिक विकास मंत्रालय का काम चल रहा है वहां काम करने के लिये आप ऐसे लोगों को भेजते हैं जो कि कोट पैट पहनते हैं जो कि अंग्रेजी में बातचीत करने वाले होते हैं जिनका कि गांव के जीवन से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। ऐसे लोग जो कि यह जानते नहीं कि एक किसान का जीवन कैसा होता है वह उनके बीच में घा कर क्या बात करेंगे और उनकी क्या मदद करेंगे? किसान तो यह समझता है कि एक दूसरा नया अफसर उनके वहां पर भ्रा गया है और ऐसे लोगों का गांव की जनता पर कोई प्रभाव नहीं पड़ सकता है। मुझे दुःख के साथ यह कहना पड़ता है कि सामुदायिक विकास मंत्रालय का काम आज गांवों में जिस प्रकार से चल रहा है वह ऐसा है कि गांव की जनता का उस पर विश्वास नहीं होता। इसमें बाबू बढ़ा दिये गये हैं जो कि खेतीबाड़ी से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रखते हैं। वहां ऐसे लोग पहुंच गये हैं जिनको कि यहां तक पता नहीं है कि गेहूं का पीषा कैसा होता है और ज्वार का पीषा कैसा होता है? उनको गेहूं और ज्वार के पीषे में फर्क नहीं मालूम है। ऐसे लोग कभी भी किसानों का भला नहीं कर सकते, खेती के

बरीकों को अच्छा नहीं कर सकते और खाद्यान्न की पैदावार नहीं बढ़ सकती। उनको जो भलबत्ता वह तरीके मालूम हैं कि जिससे सरकार और राष्ट्र का अधिक से अधिक धन खर्च कर सकें, और बर्बाद कर सकें। आज ज्यादातर यही हो रहा है कि गलब बंग से रुपया खर्च हो रहा है। रुपये का अपव्यय हो रहा है। खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये हमें उस सारे ढांचे में जो खि बना हुआ है ध्रामूल परिवर्तन करना पड़ेगा। ऐसा जब हम करेंगे तभी सामुदायिक विकास मंत्रालय का जो उद्देश्य है वह पूरा हो सकता है।

चीन से जो हमारा सीमा सम्बन्धी विवाद चल रहा है वह एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है। उसके सम्बन्ध में कल हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने एक नोट यहां पर रखा है और अपना वह पत्र भी रखा है जो कि उन्होंने चीन के प्रधान मंत्री को लिखा है और जिसमें उन्होंने चीन के प्रधान मंत्री को यहां दिल्ली आने का निमंत्रण दिया है। अब जहां तक चीन से बात-चीत करने का सवाल है उसके लिए उन्होंने यह कहा था कि जब तक कुछ पूर्व बातें बैकग्राउण्ड की बातें तय नहीं हो जातीं तब तक उसके साथ बात-चीत का कोई प्रश्न नहीं उठता है वैसे मैं यह स्पष्ट कर दूं कि मैं बात-चीत करने का सर्वथा विरोधी नहीं हूं लेकिन जब तक पहले की प्रीलिमिनैरी बातें तय न हो जायें, चीन के प्रधान मंत्री का यहां आना कुछ मुनासिब नहीं जंचता क्योंकि मैं आशा करता हूं कि वे एक दूसरे की शकल देखने के लिए तो इकट्ठा नहीं होंगे। साफ है कि जब आयेंगे तो उन में आपस में बात-चीत चलेगी। बात-चीत भले ही चले लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि देश की जनता की जो भावनायें हैं उसका ध्यान उन्हें रखना चाहिए। चीन देश हमारा मित्र रहा है और एक अच्छा पड़ोसी रहा है। पिछले सैकड़ों और हजारों सालों से उनका और हमारा सम्बन्ध रहा है। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान

[श्री अजराज सिंह]

श्री सरकार को साफ तौर से बताना है कि इस विषय में देश की जनता की क्या भावनाएं हैं और कम से कम मैं तो इस बात को देश की जनता के सामने जरूर कहूंगा कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान में चीन के प्रधान मंत्री आते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को जानना चाहिए कि चीन के प्रधान मंत्री हिन्दुस्तान की जमीन पर नाजायज कब्जा किये हुए हैं और यही नहीं बल्कि उन्होंने एक राष्ट्र की हत्या की है और ऐसी सूरत में देश की जनता उनको उनका जो वास्तविक रूप है उसमें देखे। हम चीन से सीमा के सम्बन्ध में शान्तिपूर्ण समझौता करना चाहते हैं। हम चीन के साथ इस बारे में शान्तिपूर्ण समझौता करने को इच्छुक हैं। हम यह भी जानते हैं कि लड़ने के लिए हम में शक्ति नहीं है और अगर शक्ति हो भी तो लड़ाई से कुछ हासिल नहीं होगा, विनाश होगा लड़ाई से देश की विकास योजनाओं में रुकावट पड़ सकती है। हम सब लोग इस बारे में शान्तिपूर्ण समझौता चाहते हैं लेकिन इसके साथ ही जहां तक कि देश की प्रतिष्ठा और उसके भ्राम्यमान का तकाजा है हम उस पर कोई धांच नहीं आने देना चाहते। हिमालय की हमारी सीमा के पास जो उससे मिले हुए मुल्क हैं उनके प्रति जो रवैय्या हमारा होना चाहिए या वह नहीं रहा और मैं चाहूंगा कि उधर हम ज्यादा सजग और सतर्क रहें ताकि हम हिमालय के अपने बॉर्डर को मजबूत कर सकें। हिमालय से लगी अपनी सीमाओं को हमें सुदृढ़ करना चाहिए।

कुछ दिनों से मुल्क में एक मांग चली है। हमारे भूतपूर्व वित्त मंत्री श्री देशमुख ने एक धावाज उठाई है कि भ्रष्टाचार के मामलों की जांच पड़ताल के लिए ट्रिब्यूनल की स्थापना की जाय। उसकी चर्चा राज्य सभा में हुई और कल यहां हाउस में जब श्री अशोक मेहता उसका जिक्र कर रहे थे, तो प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने उनको चैलेंज किया कि अगर भ्रष्टाचार है तो उससे सम्बद्ध केसेज बे क्यों नहीं देते

तो मैं कुछ केस आपकी सेवा में देना चाहूंगा लेकिन केसेज देने से पहले मैं आपसे विनम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जो कुछ इस देश के प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं वह कहने से पहले सोचें कि वे क्या कह रहे हैं, भले ही वे गुस्से में कहें या प्यार में कहें, क्योंकि जो कुछ बे कहते हैं उसका असर न सिर्फ यहां पड़ता है बल्कि गांवों में जो सिपाही हैं, दारोगा हैं, तहसीलदार हैं अथवा नायब तहसीलदार हैं उन सब पर पड़ता है। जब आप यह बात कहते हैं कि हम इसको नहीं मानेंगे तो नतीजा यह होता है कि दारोगा भी कहता है कि प्रधान मंत्री हमारे साथ हैं, हमारा कोई कुछ नहीं कर सकता। तो इसका अप्रत्यक्ष असर पड़ता है। जब वह कहते थे कि ब्लैक मारकेटीयर को लैम्प पोस्ट से बांध कर गोली मार दी जाय तो उसका असर होता था। इसी तरह इस धीज का भी असर होता है जब आप यह कहते हैं कि हम इसको नहीं मानते। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप ट्राइब्यूनल की स्थापना ही कर लीजिये। लेकिन मैं चाहूंगा कि अगर उनके सामने कोई स्पष्ट मामला आवे तो उसकी जांच पड़ताल होनी चाहिए। मैं एक दो मामले आपके सामने रखता हूं। मैं चाहूंगा कि उनकी जांच पड़ताल की जाय। मैं चाहूंगा कि केन्द्रीय सरकार के मंत्रिमंडल के बारे में भी कुछ कह सकता हूं लेकिन इस वक्त मैं नहीं कहना चाहता। मैं उत्तर प्रदेश की कुछ बातें आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। अगर इन मामलों की जांच पड़ताल होगी तो जब मौका आवेगा तो और भी मामलों की बात कही जायगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आप इंडी-बीजप्रल केसेज की जांच पड़ताल कराना चाहते हैं तो उनको लिखकर भेजिये।

श्री अजराज सिंह : मैं जानता हूं कि आपको परेशानी होगी और सदन का यह नियम है कि ऐसे मामले यहां न रखे जायें लेकिन चूंकि कल प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह चैलेंज किया कि कुछ मामले क्यों नहीं रखे जाते।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह चाहते हैं कि उनके पास भेजे जायें न कि उनका यहां जिक्र किया जाय ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : कल का जो वातावरण था उससे तो यही पता चलता था कि शायद वह ऐसा चाहते हैं कि यहां मामले लाये जायें ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए । यह दुस्त नहीं है कि यहां इस तरह की चर्चा चले, आप किसी पर यहां इल्जाम लगायें जो कि यहां अपने को डिफेंड करने के लिए मौजूद नहीं है । आप उन मामलों को लिख कर प्राइम मिनिस्टर के पास भेजें और तभी उनकी तहकीकात हो सकती है, वहां उनकी चर्चा नहीं चलायी जा सकती ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह खुद चाहते थे ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह क्या चाहते थे वह आपको कहने की जरूरत नहीं ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : यह बड़ी परेशानी हो जाती है । इस तरह के मामले मांगे जाते हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा है उसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि इन मामलों की यहां चर्चा चले और न इस बात की इजाजत ही दी जा सकती है ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : मैं आपकी व्यवस्था को शिरोधार्य करता हूँ लेकिन इससे पहले मैं एक निवेदन कर देना चाहता हूँ । इस मामले को जितना दबाने की कोशिश की जाती है उतना ही जनता पर उलटा असर पड़ता है । मैं आपसे सिर्फ इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि क्योंकि यह मामला देश की जनता को परेशान कर रहा है, अगर आप अपनी व्यवस्था को बदल सकें और इस मामले को यहां लाने दें तो जनता को इससे बहुत संतोष होगा ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आपको साफ़ और पर बातला देना चाहता हूँ कि मैं रूस को

नहीं बदल सकता और न इससे कोई फायदा होगा । मैं आपकी नेकनीयती पर शक नहीं करता । जो आपको कहना है वह आप लिख कर भेज सकते हैं । मैं नहीं समझता कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब चाहते हैं कि इन मामलों को यहां लाया जाये । और यहां उनका फंसला कैसे हो सकेगा ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह तो लाना चाहते हैं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह चाहें तो भी मैं इसकी इजाजत नहीं दूंगा ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : तब मुझे परेशानी होगी । जो आपको आज्ञा है उसको मैं शिरोधार्य करूंगा । लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ने यह चैलेंज किया था कि कोई खास चाज नहीं है ।

श्री यादव (बाराबंकी) : यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि शिष्टाचार के नाम पर सत्य को दबाया जाये । यह ठीक नहीं है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : एक वक्त में एक ही स्पीच हो सकती है और वह भी खुसूसन एक ही पार्टी की तरफ से । मैं मानता हूँ कि आपको परेशानी हो रही होगी लेकिन जो यहां परम्परा है उसी के मुताबिक चलना होगा ।

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : मैं आपकी व्यवस्था को शिरोधार्य करता हूँ लेकिन मैं सिर्फ यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रश्न को यह न समझा जाये कि कोई लोग इसको इसलिए उठा रहे हैं कि वह सरकार को मुल्क में बदनाम करना चाहते हैं । यह ऐसा प्रश्न है कि जिस पर सारे देश की जनता परेशान है । हर जगह हमको यह सुनने को मिलता है कि क्या हो रहा है । लोग कहते हैं कि हम लोग जानते हैं । लेकिन जब ऊपर भेजते हैं तो कुछ होता नहीं है । लेकिन चूँकि आपने व्यवस्था दे दी है इसलिए मैं किसी का नाम नहीं लूंगा । उत्तर प्रदेश के दो

[श्री बजरान सिंह]

मिनिस्टर्स के सम्बन्ध में मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। एक ने तो अपने लड़के को अपने विभाब के ३६ लाख रुपये के ठेके दिये जिन में गोलमाब हुभा और जिसमें सरकार के एक मिनिस्टर ने मतभेद होने के कारण इस्तीफा दिया। एक दूसरे मिनिस्टर साहब हैं जिन्होंने बनारामपुर

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे फिर कठिनाई नजर आ रही है। आप नाम न लेते हुए भी सब कुछ इस तरह कह सकते हैं और वह सब कुछ समझा जायेगा। यह बात तो देखने की जरूरत है। मुझे यह समझ नहीं आता कि अगर आपके पास सुबूत हैं तो उनको लिख कर भेजने में आपको क्या दिक्कत है। जिनको तहकीकात करनी है आप उनके पास लिख कर भेजें, तभी तहकीकात हो सकती है।

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): He wants to be in the privileged position of a complainant inside the House.

श्री बजरान सिंह : मैं कोई प्रिविलेज नहीं चाहता। और जो आपने व्यवस्था दी है उसे मैं मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ। लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि देश की जनता को जो शिकायतें हैं उनको दूर करने की कोशिश की जाये। जैसे तो उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने भ्रष्टाचार को रोकने के लिए अफसर भी रखे हुए हैं। लेकिन जब वे अफसर भी वही करने लगते हैं वो क्या किया जाये। इस चीज को दूर करने के लिए कोई तरीका निकालना चाहिए। इसलिए भ्रष्टाचार के मामलों को देखने के लिए हमें कोई स्वतंत्र संगठन बनाना चाहिए। अगर प्रधान मंत्री महोदय ट्राइबुनल की स्थापना के लिए राजी नहीं होते तो कम से कम पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों की एक कमेटी बनायी जाये जो कि इन मामलों को देखे। मैं जानता हूँ कि शासन की तरफ से इस तरह का ऐतराब किया जाता है कि इस तरह का ट्राइबुनल नहीं बनना चाहिए क्योंकि उससे जनतंत्र पर कुठाराघात होगा। जनतंत्र पर कुठाराघात हो,

वह मैं भी नहीं चाहता। इसी लिए मेरा सुझाव है कि पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों की एक कमेटी इस काम के लिए बनायी जाये। पार्लियामेंट सर्वसत्ता सम्पन्न संस्था है। वह सब कुछ कर सकती है। उसकी एक कमेटी बनाकर हम यह काम उसके सिपुर्द कर सकते हैं। लेकिन उद्देश्य यह होना चाहिए कि अगर कोई ऐसा मामला उठता है तो उसकी जांच पड़ताल होनी चाहिए। मैं और बातों का जिक्र नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन यह मामले ऐसे हैं कि जिनके बारे में लोगों में यह धारणा बन रही है और लोगों का ऐसा विचार होता जा रहा है कि यद्यपि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय क्रान्तिकारी भावनाओं के रहे हैं और जब वह भावनाएं उबल पड़ती हैं तो जोश में वह बह जाते हैं और कुछ बातें कह देते हैं। लेकिन वह अब ट्रेडीशनल होते जा रहे हैं और जब ट्रेडीशन उन्हें पकड़नी है तो भागे नहीं बढ़ पाते हैं। तो मैं इस प्रश्न को यहीं छोड़े देता हूँ और भाशा करता हूँ कि इस पर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार किया जायेगा और कोशिश की जायेगी कि देश की जनता की शिकायतें दूर की जायें जिनमें विरोध पक्ष का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। ये शिकायतें जनता को परेशान कर रही हैं। इनको समाप्त करना चाहिए।

कांग्रेस का नागपुर अधिवेशन हुआ और अभी बंगलौर का अधिवेशन हुआ। मैं मानता हूँ कि कांग्रेस आज देश की सब से बड़ी राजनीतिक पार्टी है और देश में उसकी सरकारें भी हैं। लेकिन चाहे कोई बड़ी पार्टी हो या छोटी, क्या यह उचित है कि उसके प्रचार के लिए विज्ञापन के तौर पर पुस्तिका प्रकाशित करने में सरकार का लाखों रुपया खर्च किया जाये। जैसा कि बंगलौर और नागपुर अधिवेशनों के लिए किया गया। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या यह ठीक किया गया। मैं इसके मैरिट में नहीं घुसना चाहता कि कौन पार्टी बड़ी है और कौन छोटी, लेकिन अगर उसी तौर पर ऐसा किया जाता है तो हर पार्टी के बिच

ऐसा किया जाये। लेकिन मैं उसूलों की तरफ से इसको गलत समझता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए।

Shri Tyagi (Dehradun): I think you are right. We agree.

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह प्रचार के लिए किया गया था।

श्री बजरंग सिंह : प्रचार के दूसरे तरीके भी हो सकते हैं।

फिर बेकारी का प्रश्न आता है। यह देश के सामने एक बड़ा प्रश्न है। नतीजा यह है कि जो स्थान सरकार की तरफ से निकलते हैं उनमें कुछ ऐसी गड़बड़ी होती है कि जिनकी पहुँच होती है वही उन जगहों तक पहुँच पाते हैं और दूसरे नहीं पहुँच पाते। और यह गड़बड़ी इतनी बढ़ गयी है कि लोग रेलवे पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन और दूसरे पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशनों के दफतरो की शिकायतें करने लगे हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि सरकार का ध्यान इधर जाये। लोगों की इस परेशानी को दूर करने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिए। आज लोगों में यह विश्वास हो गया है कि जिनकी पहुँच होती है वही आगे बढ़ सकते हैं। उनको ही नौकरी मिल सकती है। लोगों को विश्वास होना चाहिए कि उनकी चाहे पहुँच हो या न हो अगर वे योग्य हैं तो उनको स्थान मिलेगा।

साथ ही मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि उन वर्गों की उन्नति के लिए जिनका अब तक समाज में नीचा स्थान रहा है, जिनको शिक्षा आदि की पूरी सुविधाएँ नहीं मिली हैं, उनके लिए हमें यह योग्यता का आधार छोड़ना होगा। जो वर्ग पिछड़े रहे हैं, जब तक वे दूसरे वर्गों के बराबर नहीं आ जाते तब तक उनको विशेष सुविधाएँ देनी चाहिए। उनको न केवल नौकरी में बल्कि दूसरे क्षेत्र में भी विशेष सुविधाएँ दी जानी चाहिए। इसके लिए मेरा सुझाव है कि इन पिछड़े वर्गों,

हरिजनों आदि के लिए सरकारी नौकरियों में, फौज आदि की नौकरियों में ६० प्रतिशत स्थान सुरक्षित रखे जायें जब तक कि ये वर्ग दूसरे वर्गों के बराबर न आ जायें। अगर इनके लिए योग्यता का आधार रखा गया तो ये कभी भी दूसरों के बराबर नहीं आ पायेंगे। योग्यता के आधार पर तो कलक्टर का लड़का कलक्टर होगा, कमिश्नर का लड़का कमिश्नर होगा और मिनिस्टर का लड़का भी ऊँचे पदों पर पहुँच जायेगा लेकिन रिश्ते वाले और ताँगे वाले का लड़का आगे नहीं बढ़ सकेगा क्योंकि वह उनका मुकाबला नहीं कर सकेगा। इन सुझावों को सिद्धान्त रूप से मान लिया जाना चाहिए ऐसा मैं महसूस करता हूँ।

16 hrs.

अब खाद्यान्न के बारे में मैं कुछ निवेदन और करना चाहता हूँ। अभी हमने खाद्यान्न के राज्य-व्यापार की बात चलाई। वह चली और उसका विरोध हुआ हमारे कुछ मित्रों की तरफ से। श्री मसानी मौजूद नहीं हैं। मालूम पड़ता है कि बीच में ही भ्रुण हत्या हो गई है—एबार्शन होगया है। इस योजना को लागू करने का सीरियसली-गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार नहीं किया गया है। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि जब तक खाद्यान्न की राज्य-व्यापार योजना में भी यह बात निश्चित नहीं कर देते कि जिस भाव पर हम किसान से कोई चीज खरीदते हैं उसे एक निश्चित प्रतिशत से अधिक भाव पर हम उपभोक्ता को नहीं बचेंगे। जब तक ऐसी व्यवस्था नहीं की जायेगी, यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है। आज हालत यह है कि फसल पर जो चीज बिकती है १६ रुपए मन वही चीज फसल के छः महीने बाद, उस फसल और दूसरी फसल के बीच में ३२ रुपये में बिकेगी। इस का नतीजा यह है कि मोटे तौर से खाद्यान्न के सम्बन्ध में २०० करोड़ रुपये का मुनाफा

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

सालाना बीच के लोग उठा ले जाते हैं और सरकार की ओर से उसका कुछ इन्तज़ाम नहीं किया जाता है। जब और विषयों के बारे में सरकार कानून लागू कर सकती है, तो फिर इसके बारे में भी कानून बनाया जा सकता है। यह निश्चित किया जाना चाहिए कि इस से कम कीमत पर खाद्यान्न बिकेगा नहीं और किसान को इतने से कम कीमत मिलेगी नहीं और किसान को जितनी कीमत मिलती है, उससे १६ प्रतिशत से अधिक कीमत उपभोक्ताओं को नहीं देनी पड़ेगी। आज व्यवस्था यह है कि किसान का शोषण हो रहा है। जब फ़सल आती है, तो उस के भाव गिर जाते हैं और जब अनाज किसान के घर से निकल कर उन के हाथ में चला जाता है, जिस को मेरे मित्र श्री रामसिंह भाई वर्मा डंडीमार कहते हैं, तो व उस अनाज को दूने भाव पर बचते हैं और खूब मुनाफ़ा कमाते हैं। जहां तक खाद्यान्न का सम्बन्ध है, उस की समस्या सिर्फ़ यही नहीं है कि उस की कमी है—कमी तो है और उसके बारे में मैंने सुझाव दिया है—लेकिन कमी के साथ यह भी परेशानी है कि खाद्यान्न का वितरण इतना ग़लत है कि उस से उपभोक्ता का शोषण होता है और उत्पादक—किसान—का भी शोषण होता है उस को सही कीमत नहीं मिलती है। इस का नतीजा यह है कि इन दोनों का शोषण होता है और बिचौलिया करीब करीब २०० करोड़ रुपए का मुनाफ़ा उठाते हैं।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ लोगों से डर कर कि खाद्यान्न के राज्य-व्यापार से कुछ लोगों को हानि हो सकती है, उसको छोड़ दें, यह उचित नीति नहीं होगी। उसके साथ साथ यह निश्चित करना पड़ेगा कि भले ही राज्य की ओर से खाद्यान्न का व्यापार हो, लेकिन एक निश्चित मात्रा से अधिक सरकार भी मुनाफ़ा नहीं कमा सकेगी।

मैं चाहूंगा कि सरकार फिर से गम्भीरता-पूर्वक भ्रष्टाचार के सम्बन्ध में विचार करे यह जो सोचा जाता है कि कुछ लोग सिर्फ़ इस लिए यह आवाज़ उठा रहे हैं कि इस कोई राजनैतिक फ़ायदा होगा मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि राजनैतिक फ़ायदे का इस में कोई प्रश्न नहीं है। प्रश्न यह है कि देश का प्रशासन शुद्ध हो, अच्छा हो, जिससे देश की जनता की परेशानियाँ दूर हो सकें।

Shrimati Mafida Ahmed (Jorhat):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, before I proceed to place my humble observations on this Motion, I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member of the Motion. The hon. President, in his illuminating Address, has given the Parliament a realistic appraisal of the activities of the Government during the past year. He also made a fervent appeal to the Government and the people to be alive to their tremendous responsibilities to make India a welfare state in reality. It was in the fitness of things that the hon. President in his Address first mentioned the Chinese incursions at our border, and made a firm declaration of India's determination to defend her frontiers. I do hope that this House will join with me in affirming our unswerving faith in the mature judgment of our hon. Prime Minister, and in the strength of our Government and our Army to defend the territorial integrity of India.

This vital issue of Sino-Indian tension has now been before the country for some six months. In my opinion this period has been important for a number of reasons. Firstly, it has allowed us to know the exact dimensions of China's expansionist aims not only against India but against other neighbouring countries of South East Asia. For the first time India and countries of South East Asia have fully realised that politically China is a common danger to all.

Secondly, our border defence has been strengthened to a great extent.

We feel happy that in recent months our Defence Minister had been to the remote outposts both in the eastern and western sectors of our northern border, and everywhere he found the morale of our army men very high. While we debate here this issue of Sino-Indian tension, my thoughts go all out to those brave sons of our country who are facing all hazards of the Himalayas and risking their lives for the defence of the motherland.

At the same time, the development of communications in the remote parts of our country has started with utmost speed. Apart from the point of view of defence, facilities for quick and easy transport of men and materials to and from border regions is essential for the economic development of the country. It was unfortunate that proper attention was not given to the development of transport and communications in the north eastern region of the country so long.

In this connection, with your permission Sir, I want to refer to a report which appeared in the magazine 'Time' of November 23, 1953, that is several months before India signed the 1954 treaty with China regarding Tibet. To quote the exact sentences:

"One 1,400-mile road starts from Sinkiang at the edge of Russia and curves through Tibet parallel to the Indian frontier. From this strategic cord, side-roads will point towards every major pass of the Himalayan mountains. The Chinese Communists are also laying down air fields in western Tibet using Russian engineers and Russian equipment on all these projects."

The report, so to say, forewarned India of the possible hostile intentions of Peking at some future date. But unfortunately the news was not taken seriously, and our complacency, in my humble opinion, has left us behind China in the race to build roads in the frontier regions. I respectfully submit that the roads now undertaken should be completed with top speed

not only in NEFA, Sikkim, Bhutan and western Himalayas, but these regions should be linked through feeder roads with the contiguous States in northern India. I humbly suggest that the planning and construction of roads in the border areas should be entrusted to our army engineers so that they may be built in accordance with its strategic importance.

Sir, for the present compelling situation of the Sino-Indian relations I believe posting of military Governors for the border States would be a measure in the right direction, as has been done in the case of Assam.

While discussing the border issue, one thing strikes my mind, and that is the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees. Our Government have formulated some schemes for the rehabilitation of the Tibetan refugees. It is humanitarian, no doubt, but the Government should be very careful, in view of the national interests, while locating the areas to settle the Tibetan refugees. I venture to urge upon the Government that on no account should they be settled in the border regions.

I said that the last six months have been important for so many reasons. It has also helped us to see the true colour of the Indian Communists.

Yesterday, comrade Shri Hiren Mukerjee objected to the phrase 'breach of faith' used by the President. Red China—which solemnly accepted the 'Panchsheel' and presented it to the war-torn world herself committed an aggression on India. A number of Indian policemen were killed in cold blood, and repressive measures were taken against Indian traders in Tibet. So, may I ask the learned professor whether he wants anything more than this to constitute a breach of faith? Peking's grandiose ambition to grab chunks of Indian territory reminds me of the Mongol hordes who centuries ago came from northern China to plunder India. But the Mongols came merely to plunder. But, today, India is face to face with

[Shrimati Mafida Ahmed]

an ambitious, expansionist and totalitarian neighbour, and we have to face it with courage and fortitude. It is high time that we should seriously try to find out the motives behind the Chinese activities and be alert always to her changing tactics from time to time.

The first thing that we have to probe into is the tactics that China has adopted in dealing with Burma and Indonesia in recent weeks. Every Member of this House is aware of the development of those countries and the tactics adopted by the Chinese, and how they delayed settlement of the border issue with Burma and the ratification of the dual nationality agreement with Indonesia. I am not going to dilate the matters of these countries but, I want only to point out that Peking waited for a congenial time to come when she might be in a position to speak from her military strength. And this time came for China last year, and the world found with amazement Bandung's Chou En-lai in a completely changed mood. He made absurd demands on the neighbouring countries of the south and when he found those countries quite strong in their determination to save their sovereignty and territorial integrity, Peking gave second thought to her plan and acted accordingly. But to her utter surprise, China found that she did not even get approval from the communist world for her dealings with India and other neighbours. In the face of the weight of world opinion, and being isolated by the communist world, Peking modified her tough attitude towards her neighbours and sent proposals for negotiations. In November, 1959, Premier Chou En-lai requested our Prime Minister to meet him somewhere in Peking or in Rangoon to settle the border issue, and that request was made along with some preposterous suggestions. Our Prime Minister took up a forthright stand by rejecting that proposal, as thousands of square miles of our territory were illegally being occupied by China, and when, special-

ly, the traditional MacMahon line was not recognised by China. He rightly pointed out that he was always ready to meet and settle issues peacefully. But unless the principles are settled, and facts are recognised by both the parties, the details cannot be settled in just a meeting of the two Prime Ministers, and we hope that our Prime Minister will continue to be firm in his attitude.

In his personal letter to Premier Chou En-lai of 5th February, 1960, which was placed before Parliament yesterday, Prime Minister Nehru has extended an invitation to Premier Chou En-lai to come to Delhi for talks for a peaceful settlement. Hon. Members opposite expressed grave concern this morning at this new approach, but I want to emphasise that this is not a new approach for India; it is one which is consistent with India's basic foreign policy. I believe Peking will accept this invitation and come to terms for a peaceful settlement and practise *Panchsheel* in action and live as a friendly neighbour with India.

Some Members in the other House expressed doubt about the recent agreement signed between China and Burma. The Government of India welcomed that agreement, and both the Government and the people of India will feel happy to see the Joint Border Committee of Peking and Rangoon settle the border matters peacefully. It is needless to mention that it might convince China that like Burma, India is not going to surrender anything in the shape of territory.

Now I come to some other point referred in the Presidential Address. The President referred to the country's foreign exchange position and gave a brief of the Government's policy to be pursued to conserve foreign exchange resources. May I most respectfully ask why Government are delaying the finalisation of the gold-bond scheme to mobilise the country's private gold stocks? I am

sure that every Member of this House is eager to know on this vital point. According to a survey of the Reserve Bank of India, the gold hoards in India are valued at Rs. 1750 crores at the ruling international price of gold, and it can easily solve the foreign exchange crisis of the country. I would like to know whether Government are contemplating to abandon the scheme.

Before I conclude, I take this opportunity to congratulate the Government of India on the decision taken to introduce Assamese as medium of instruction in schools in NEFA from the school session of this year. We are looking forward to the day when the existing artificial barrier between the hillmen and the people of the plains is removed. With these words, I support the Motion and thank you for affording me this opportunity.

श्री० ब्रह्म प्रकाश (दिल्ली सदर) :

जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं राष्ट्रपति जी को श्रीर खास तौर पर गवर्नमेंट को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उसने बम्बई का सूबा बनाने का फैसला कर लिया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि महाराष्ट्र और गुजरात के लोगों के साथ हम सभी लोगों से गलती हो गई थी और उनके साथ उसकी वजह से अन्याय हुआ, उनको नुकसान भी उठाना पड़ा लेकिन हमने अपनी गलती को सही कर लिया है और ऐसा करके मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट ने दानिशमन्दी और बहादुरी की बात की है। इसके लिए मैं उसको मुरिकबाद दिए बगैर नहीं रह सकता हूँ।

लेकिन इसी सिलसिले में एक दूसरी जो बात है, एक दूसरी जो गलती है, उसकी तरफ भी मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। वह भी एक बेइसाफी हम लोगों ने की है और वह बेइसाफी हम ने हिन्दुस्तान के नार्थ वेस्ट का जो इलाका है, उसके साथ की है। यह इलाका, पंजाब, दिल्ली, हिमाचल प्रदेश और उसके पास का इलाका है। इन इलाकों के बारे में मेरी बराबर १९५३ से

एक राय रही है और १९५६ तक मैं अपनी उस राय का इजहार करता रहा हूँ। उसके बाद मैं कुछ खामोश हो गया और मैंने सोचा कि कुछ इतिहास करना बहुत होगा। लेकिन अब भी मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सारे इलाके की तरफ हम ने उतना ध्यान नहीं दिया जितना हमें देना चाहिए था। इस इलाके के राजनीतिक, इस इलाके के पोलिटिकल प्रॉब्लम की तरफ हमने सोचा ही नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस इलाके का दुबारा पुनर्संगठन होना चाहिए। इसके न होने की वजह से इस इलाके की पोलिटिकल हैलथ पर काफी बुरा असर पड़ रहा है और दिन-ब-दिन यह खराबी बढ़ती ही जा रही है। मेरी तजवीज यह है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश, पंजाब और हरियाना प्रान्त, ये तीन सूबे जरूर बनने चाहियें। हिमाचल में आज कोई जिम्मेदार हकूमत नहीं है। इसी तरह से दिल्ली के अन्दर कोई जिम्मेदार हकूमत नहीं है। इस तरह से इन इलाकों को एक दूसरे के साथ मिला दिया गया है कि डिब्लेपमेंट के एतबार से, कल्चर के एतबार से, हिस्ट्री के एतबार से इनको किसी दूसरे के साथ मिलने का मौका नहीं मिला। खेती के एतबार से भी ये इलाके भिन्न भिन्न हैं। जबानें भी इनकी मुस्तलिफ हैं। इनका हिस्सा भी भलग भलग रहा है। पंजाब का हिस्सा फौज में या खेती में भलग रहा है। पंजाब में पंजाबी चलती है और हरियाना के लोग बिल्कुल उससे मुस्तलिफ जबान बोलते हैं। इन का व्यवहार, इनका तरीका, इनकी कल्चर, इनकी जबान, सब कुछ भलग भलग होते हुए भी मैं नहीं समझ पाया हूँ कि क्यों हिमाचल आदि को उनके राजनीतिक अधिकारों से वंचित रखा जाता है या क्यों किसी इलाके को दूसरे के साथ मिला कर रखा जाता है। क्या वजह है कि वेस्टर्न यू० पी० को खामसाह इतने बड़े सूबे के साथ मिला कर रखा जाता है। हो सकता है कि उसका यू० पी० के दूसरे इलाके के साथ कुछ चीजों में थोड़ा बहुत मेल हो

[श्री० ब्रह्म प्रकाश]

लेकिन इस इलाके का ज्यादा मेल दिल्ली और दिल्ली के आसपास के इलाकों के साथ है।

यह ठीक है कि इस बारे में अभी इतनी आवाज पैदा नहीं हुई है जितनी कि दूसरे सूबों में हुई थी। इसका कारण यह हो सकता है कि यहां के लोग शायद ज्यादा शान्तिप्रिय रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इस चीज के लिए आवाज दिन-ब-दिन बढ़ेगी, दिन-ब-दिन ज्यादा तेज होगी। गवर्नमेंट को यह पालिसी नहीं अख्तियार करनी चाहिए कि जब तक पूरा प्रेशर न आये तब तक किसी बात को भी माना न जाये। इस वास्ते मैं समझता हूँ कि इन इलाकों की तरफ गवर्नमेंट को ध्यान देना चाहिए, इन इलाकों की समस्याओं को हल करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए।

कभी कभी सुनने में आता है कि जो इस तरह की आवाज उठाते हैं, उनके बारे में कहा जाता है कि ये लोग कम्युनल हैं, कम्युनल बात कहते हैं, इनका एटीट्यूड पैरोकियल है। अगर कोई प्रोफेसर इस तरह की बातें कहे तब तो बात समझ में भी आ सकती है लेकिन जब कोई पालिटिशियन इस तरह की बात कहता है तो समझ में आने वाली यह बात नहीं होती है। अपने सूबे की बहतरी के लिए, अपने सूबे की खुशहाली के लिए, अपने सूबे की भलाई के लिए अगर कोई बात करता है तो फौरन उस पर इस तरह का इलजाम लगा देना कि यह कम्युनल है या कोई और किसी किस्म का इलजाम लगा देना, मेरे खयाल में सही नहीं है। अगर इस तरह की कोई भी किसी ऐसे शख्स की तरफ से भी कही जाती है जिस का कि एटी-ट्यूड सारी जिन्दगी में कम्युनल रहा है उससे भी यह बात गलत नहीं हो जाती है। हमें फेक्ट्स को फेस करना चाहिए और उनके आघार पर कोई हल तलाश करना चाहिए।

श्री रघागो : आपकी राय में पंजाबी सूबा बनना चाहिए ?

श्री० ब्रह्म प्रकाश : मेरी राय में वह बनना चाहिए और मैं समझता हूँ कि वह सही हल है। मेरी राय यह भी है कि इन इलाकों के सभी लोग इस बात को चाहते हैं, सिर्फ कुछ लोग जो शहरों में रहते हैं, जिन्हें देहाती जिन्दगी के बारे में कुछ ज्यादा मालूम नहीं है, वहां के लोगों के अन्दर क्या जड़भाव है, इसका इल्म नहीं है और खास तौर पर जो बिजनेस तबका है, वह इस बात की ज्यादा मुखालिफत करता हुआ आपको मिलेगा।

श्री० रणबीर सिंह : आप क्या चाहते हैं ?

श्री० ब्रह्म प्रकाश : हम हरियाना चाहते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : इनके वाद में श्री० रणबीर सिंह को ही बोलने का मौका दे रहा हूँ।

श्री० ब्रह्म प्रकाश : अब मैं एक दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ। आज श्री मसानो साहब ने जब यह बात कही कि वह हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का चीन के प्रधान मंत्री के साथ मिल बैठ कर चाय पीना, मुक़रर कर बात करना, या बातचीत करना भी पसन्द नहीं करते हैं, तो इससे मुझे कोई इंस्पिरेशन नहीं मिला। मेरी समझ में नहीं आया कि यह कौन सी पोलिटिकल स्ट्रेटिजी है, कौन सा यह हमारे बिहेवियर का तरीका है? हम आखिर कोई जंगली सिविलाइजेशन में नहीं रह रहे हैं या हम कोई ऐसे मैकाथियन ईरा में नहीं रह रहे हैं कि जहां मिल बैठ कर बात करना भी एक ग़तती समझी जाती है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बार बार इस बात को जाहिर किया है और जो नोट भ्रब भेजा है उसमें भी साफ लिखा है कि चीन जो कुछ कहता है उसकी बेसिस पर अगर बात करने का प्रस्ताव हो तो हमारी उनके साथ नेगो-

शियेशन नहीं हो सकती है। यह बात उसमें साफ लिखी हुई है। अगर कोई कहे कि बात कर लो या अगर कोई हम से बात करने के लिए कहे तो हम कह दें कि हम बात करने के लिए भी तैयार नहीं हैं तो इस तरह का बिहेवियर एक इगोइस्ट का, एक डिक्टेटर का ही हो सकता है, यह ह्यूमन और डेमोक्रेटिक बिहेवियर नहीं हो सकता है। श्री अशोक मेहता साहब या मसानी साहब का रवैया गोपालन साहब के रवैये से मेल नहीं खाता है। लेकिन फिर भी वे जिस समय भी चाहें मिलते हैं, बात भी करते हैं, और कभी कभी डिबेट करने के लिए बैठ भी जाते हैं। तो थोड़ी सी बात करना हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के लिए चीन के साथ अगर एक गुनाह माना जाता है, तो यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है और कम से कम यह बात रीजन पर पूरी नहीं उतरती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें उनसे बात करनी चाहिए। हमने उनको बुलाया है, हमें उनको मेहमान तसलीम करना चाहिए, हमें उनकी इज्जत करनी चाहिए, मगर उसके साथ ही साथ अपनी बात को मजबूती के साथ पेश करना चाहिए अपनी ताकत को कायम रखना चाहिए, जो हमारी बुनियादी पॉलिसी है, उम्मी के आधार पर हमें हमेशा बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार होना चाहिए।

अशोक मेहता साहब हमारे बुजुर्ग भी हैं और उनमें बहुत मान्य भी हैं। उन्होंने दो एक बातें कही हैं जिनके बारे में मुझे एतराज है। एक बात तो उन्होंने बहुत परसनल सी उठाई है। बार बार कहा जाता है कि डिफेंस मिनिस्टर को जाना चाहिए। खास तौर से यह बात कही जाती है कि जो मौजूदा डिफेंस मिनिस्टर हैं, वे जायें।

श्री अशोक मेहता (मुजफ्फरपुर) : मैंने कल अपने भाषण में बात नहीं कही।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह : कही तो नहीं लेकिन इस की तरफ इशारा जरूर किया था।

श्री० ब्रह्म प्रकाश : अगर जाती तौर पर यह बात नहीं कही तो मुझे उनके बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जाने की बात नहीं कही उनकी तकरीर पर एतराज किया था।

श्री० ब्रह्म प्रकाश : किसी भी जगह, यहां या कहीं और यह कहना कि फलां मिनिस्टर नहीं रहना चाहिए, ठीक नहीं है। उनको भी परखने का शायद तब मौका मिलेगा जब कभी उनको प्राइम मिनिस्टर बनने का मौका मिलेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी भी मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ एतराज करना, सरासर अनडैमोक्रेटिक है, गलत है। मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि अगर हमारे डिफेंस मिनिस्टर साहब कुछ कहते भी हैं तो यहां पर ज्यादा रिसपांसिबिलिटी है और हम फल्ट के साथ कह सकते हैं कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपने इस अर्थ में और इससे पहले भी जो कुछ किया है, ऐसा किया है जिस पर हम फल्ट कर सकते हैं और ऐसा कोई काम नहीं किया है, जिस की वजह से हमारी गर्दन झुकती। डिफेंस फोर्स के बारे में मैं इतना कहूंगा, खास तौर पर आर्म्ड फोर्स के बारे में कि उन की एक शिकायत है, एक हार्ट बनिंग है उन में। मैं नहीं हूँ सता कि मैं उन में से एक हूँ और उन की तर्जुमानी ठीक से कर सकूंगा, लेकिन आखिर उन से मिलने का मौका मिलता है, छोटे से लेकर बड़े तक, उन की शिकायत है कि हमारे सेक्रेटिरियट के लोग उनके साथ ठीक तरह से व्यवहार नहीं करते। उन को छोटी छोटी चीजों में स्लाइट करते हैं और एक जो ब्यूरोक्रेटिक ऐटिट्यूड है रोब दाब का वह उन के साथ रखना चाहते हैं यह अगर है तो बहुत गैरमुनासिब है और नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं अशील करता हूँ, खास तौर पर अपने सेक्रेटिरियट में बैठने वाले लोगों से कि वह आर्म्ड फोर्स के लोगों से कंटैसी का बिहेवियर करें, उनकी इज्जत करें। यह

[ची० ब्र० प्रकाश]

एक सिपाही से लेकर एक जनरल तक के दिल की बात है जो मैं कह रहा हूँ। मुझे उन से वातचीत करने का मौका मिलता है और ऐसे इन्स्टन्सेज मेरं नोटिस में प्राये हैं, जिन को कोट किया गया है, जब सेक्रेटरी डिप्टी सेक्रेटरी और ग्रन्डर सेक्रेटरी ने उन लोगों के साथ बुरा बिहेवियर किया है।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी ग्राम्बफोर्सज के अन्दर एक श्री हार्ट बनिग है, और वह यह कि जब वह अपनी फौज में होते हैं और उनके पीछे घर बार की कोई प्राब्लेम आती है, तो उन की देखभाल की तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता। पहले ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट के जमाने में कुछ तरीके बने थे। आप ब्रिटिश गवर्नमेंट को बुरा कह सकते हैं, लेकिन कुछ तरीकों की फौज में जरूरत होती है। हम चाहते हैं कि वे लोग खुश रहें। पहले एक यह तरीका बना था कि जब डिप्टी कमिश्नर गांव में जाया करता था तो सब से पहले वहाँ के सिपाही से बात करता था, उस के कुनबे से बात करने की कोशिश करता था। आज कोई पूछता नहीं है। यह आम तौर पर उन की शिकायत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जब ग्राम्ब फोर्सज फौजमें हों तो उन की फैमिलीज की, और जब वे फौज से वापस आयें और रिटायर हो कर गांवों में रहें, तो उन की देख भाल हो। इस बात की तरफ गवर्नमेंट को खास ध्यान देना चाहिये। खास तौर पर जो मौजूदा सिचुएशन है, जो उन में डिस्कॉन्टमेंट है उसे मिटाने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये। जो भी उन की बातें हों उन की तरफ हमारी डिफेंस मिनिस्ट्री को और दूसरे लोगों को खास तौर पर जी सिविल डिपार्टमेंट के लोग हैं, उन को इस तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिये। उन्हें राइबेलरी की हैसियत से नहीं देखना चाहिये।

एक बात अशोक मेहता साहब ने कही और वह थी ट्रिब्यूनल के बारे में ऐन्टी-करप्शन के लिए एक अधारिटी के बारे में। जहां तक

मैं समझता हूँ, इस से ज्यादा गलत और गैरमुनासिब बात और नहीं हो सकती। इस के दो तीन हिस्से हैं जिन पर मैं कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। जो करप्शन की बात है, इस में कोई शक नहीं कि हमारे समाज में करप्शन है, हमारे डिपार्टमेंट्स में करप्शन है। मुझे बहुत मौका मिला है समाजों को देखने का। लेकिन अभी मुझे एसा सिस्टम मिलना बाकी है जिस में कोई कह सके कि फलां मुल्क में करप्शन बिल्कुल नहीं रहा जब कि उन्हें डेवलप करते करते काफी वक्त हो गया है और उन्होंने काफी अचञ्चा स्टैन्डर्ड हासिल कर लिया है। मैं किसी खास सिस्टम का नाम नहीं लेना चाहता, लेकिन एक आदत हो गई है करप्शन की जरूरत से ज्यादा चर्चा करने की। यह सब से ज्यादा डेन्जरस ऐटिट्यूड हमारा है। कहीं भी आप चले जाइयें, जैसे दोपहर बाद घर में खाना बना कर औरतें अपनी सिस्टर-इन-लाज के मुताल्लिक उधेड़ बुन करती हैं बिल्कुल उसी तरह से हमारी आदत हो गई है। आप काफी हाउस में जायें, क्लब में जायें, एक दम करप्शन की बात होने लगेंगी। माफ कीजियेगा, चाहे अपोजीशन का मेम्बर हो, चाहे दूसरा पालियामेंट का मेम्बर हो, कोई मिनिस्टर हो या गवर्नमेंट का हायैस्ट आदमी हो, सब के मुताल्लिक चर्चा सुन लीजिये, भले ही वह किसी भी पार्टी का आदमी हो। कोई बचा हुआ आप को नहीं मिलेगा। अगर अशोक मेहता साहब को अपने ऊपर बहुत घमंड है, तो हम मंजूर कर लेते हैं, जरा वे किसी पद के पीछे बैठ जायें और अपने बारे में सुन लें। वह सब कुछ गलत होगा, लेकिन एक आदत हो गई है गलत बातें करने की, गासिप करने की। जितनी भी बातें की जाती हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि उन में से ६६ फीसदी गलत होती है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि करप्शन न बढ़े और वह कैसे हो इस की मुस्तलिफ फिलासफीज है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर

करप्शन को खत्म करना है तो सोशल, पोलिटिकल और एकनामिक इन्स्टिट्यूशन में, खास तौर से सोशल ऐंड एकनामिक इन्स्टिट्यूशन में बगैर ग्रावर आल तब्दीली किये करप्शन नहीं मिटाया जा सकता। और इस के लिये पीपल्स इन्स्टिट्यूशनस होने चाहियें, चाहे वह गांव की पंचायत की शकल में हों, कोग्रो-परेशन की शकल में हों या दूसरी शकल में हों। जब तक यह इन्स्टिट्यूशनस क्रिएट नहीं होते तब तक कुछ नहीं हो सकता। चाहे राजतंत्र हो चाहे ब्यूरोक्रेसी हो जहां करप्शन जन्म लेता है जब तक इस तरह के इन्स्टिट्यूशनस डवलप नहीं होते तब तक करप्शन किसी ट्राइब्यूनल के जरिये दूर हो सकेगा, इस पर मैं भरोसा नहीं करता। यहां किसी तरह का प्रोग्राम ला कर वह खत्म नहीं किया जा सकता। हां, यह जरूर है कि हमें बिजिलेंट रहना चाहिये। जहां पर करप्शन के स्पेसिफिक केसेज हमारे सामने धायें, उन को डील करने के लिये एक हमारी अथारिटी होनी चाहिये। आज जितनी अथारिटीज हम बनाते हैं, वह नई करप्शन का भड्डा बन जाती हैं। मैंने देखा है कि जहां ईमानदार और शरीफ आदमी होते हैं उन के चारों तरफ जो इन्स्टिट्यूशन क्रिएट होता है उस में करप्शन पैदा हो जाता है। जहां सज्जन और ईमानदार आदमी होते हैं वहां उन के चारों तरफ खराब लोग इकट्ठा हो जाते हैं। ठीक है, वह अथारिटी तो अच्छी होगी, दो तीन आदमी उस में अच्छे धायेंगे, लेकिन उस के चारों तरफ जो दफ्तर बनेगा उस के अन्दर जो डाटर्स इन ला होंगी, सन्स इन ला होंगे, सन्स खण्ड डाटर्स होंगी उन का क्या बनेगा ? फिर यह भी मैं कहूंगा कि मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह के ट्राइब्यूनल जिस तरह के लोग यहां पर इन्वेसेज किया करते हैं वह सिर्फ डिक्टेटरशिप में बैठ सकते हैं, डिमोक्रेसी के अन्दर नहीं बैठ सकते हैं। जो लोग ऐसा कहते हैं, मेरे स्थाल में उन को अच्छी तरह पर कांस्टिट्यूशन को देखना पड़ेगा। मेरी राय में तो नहीं

बैठ सकते हैं। इस तरह के ट्राइब्यूनल ग्रावर-आल पार्वंस की बिटलाई जायें हाई कोर्ट्स के ऊपर, फौज के ऊपर, प्राइम मिनिस्टर के ऊपर, प्रेजिडेंट के ऊपर और सुप्रीम कोर्ट के ऊपर, यह कैसे हो सकता है ? जरा आप देख लीजिये अपनी किताबों की और ला बुक्स को कि कहां तक यह मुमकिन हो सकता है।

श्री रघुपति : ट्राइब्यूनल के ऊपर एक और ट्राइब्यूनल बिठलानी होगी।

श्री० बहादुर प्रकाश : हां, इस ट्राइब्यूनल के ऊपर दूसरी ट्राइब्यूनल बिठलानी होगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बिलकुल गलत तर्जवीज है और इस के अन्दर बहुत बड़े डेन्जर्स हैं। हां, इस तरह की मशीनरी जरूर हमें रखनी चाहिये कि जो स्पेसिफिक करप्शन के केसेज हों, उन को हम डील कर सकें।

अब जो कुछ हमारे अजित प्रसाद साहब ने यहां कहा उस के बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहूंगा। उन्होंने कम्यूनिटी डेवेलपमेंट के बारे में कहा कि वह इलकंसीड है। यह उन के शब्द हैं। वह मेरे दोस्त हैं, और मुझे हैरानी हुई कि उन्होंने कैसे कहा। मुझे तो ऐसा लगता है कि इतने दिन तक उस मिनिस्ट्री से ताल्लुक रखने के बाद जो खेती से ताल्लुक रखती है, उन्होंने कम्यूनिटी डेवेलपमेंट को शायद समझने की कोशिश नहीं की। कम्यूनिटी डेवेलपमेंट और मल्टी परपज ऐप्रोच दोनों का एक दूसरे से जुदा नहीं किया जा सकता। अगर आप कम्यूनिटी डेवेलपमेंट चाहते हैं, जो फिलासफी आपने बनाई है, तो मैं कहूंगा कि आप ने बड़े-बड़े प्लैन्स बनाये, प्रोजेक्ट्स बनाये और जहां तक देहात का ताल्लुक है, रूरल डेवेलपमेंट का ताल्लुक है, उस में कम्यूनिटी डेवेलपमेंट जैसा रिबोल्यूशनरी प्रोग्राम क ई नहीं आया है। उस में कमियां हो सकती हैं, उन को हय अच्छी तरह जानते हैं, लेकिन उसका ऐप्रोच मल्टी परपज है। उस को डील करने का जो तरीका है, वह फंक्शनल है। मल्टी परपज

[ची० ब्रह्म प्रकाश]

एप्रोच है कि डेवेलपमेंट हो, कम्प्लीट डेवेलपमेंट हो गांवों का, सोसायटी का, कम्प्यूनिटी का, लेकिन उस का मेथड क्या होगा। वह मेथड फंक्शनल है। हो सकता है कि उस फंक्शनल मेथड में कमियां हों इस वक्त उस को कहने का मौका नहीं है, लेकिन जो मेथड फंक्शनल है, उस में मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि ग्रौर पर्सनेल की जरूरत है और उस का ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन टाप हेवी नहीं है। जैसा कहा जाता है, उस के लिये और रुपया बढ़ाने की जरूरत है और फंक्शनरीज पैदा करने की जरूरत है। इस से ज्यादा रिबोल्यूशनरी प्रोग्राम और नहीं हो सकता और उस को और मजबूत और तेज करने की जरूरत है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अजित प्रसाद साहब ने अपने हैसियत से इस मुवमेंट के साथ बड़ा अन्ध्याय किया है इस तरह के शब्द कह कर।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी इतनी सारी प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं, सब कुछ है, लेकिन अल्टिमेटली हम यह देखते हैं कि हमारी जो बैंकवर्ड कम्प्यूनिटीज हैं खास तौर से गांवों में वह बदकिस्मती से क्लासेज में बटी हुई हैं। उन की हालत दिन ब दिन खराब होती जा रही है। जो हमारे एकानामिक डेवेलपमेंट का फायदा है वह उन तक नहीं पहुंचता है। इस के लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट को कोई कमिशन मुकर्र करना चाहिये कि क्या तरीका अख्यार किया जाय कि हम उन बैंकवर्ड कम्प्यूनिटीज को कोई स्पेसिफिक फायदा दे सकें। मेरी राय में इंडस्ट्री, और एजुकेशन उन के लिये एक डामिनेन्ट फैक्टर बनाया जाना चाहिये, लेकिन और भी तरीके निकल सकते हैं अगर हम एक कमिशन बिठलायें। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कमिशन बहुत जरूरी है ताकि उन की हालत को वह असेस कर के उन की हालत को बेहतर बनाने के लिये हमारे सामने कोई सजबोज रखे।

ची० रणबीर सिंह: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में जो शुरू में ही चीन के अतिक्रमण का जिक्र किया गया है और हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने जो भावनाएं रखी हैं वह इस देश के तकरीबन सब आदमियों की भावनाएं हैं लेकिन मसानी साहब ने आज सवेरे और श्री अशोक मेहता ने कल कांग्रेस पार्टी और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को यह बताने की कोशिश की कि देश में चीन द्वारा जो हमारी सीमाओं पर अतिक्रमण हुआ है उसके विरुद्ध भारतीय जनता में कितना रोष और असन्तोष है और उन्होंने चेतावनी दी कि अगर भारत सरकार या प्रधान मंत्री ने चीन से बातचीत करने और डील करने में जरा भी कमजोरी दिखलाई या चीन के प्रधान मंत्री से बातचीत शुरू की तो भारत की जनता इसके लिए उनको कभी माफ नहीं करेगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्हें खुद ही याद नहीं है। यह आज की बात नहीं है बल्कि जिस रोज कि यह देश आजाद हुआ उसके चन्द महीने बाद की बात है कि पाकिस्तान ने इस देश की हजारों मील के भूभाग पर गैर कानूनी कब्जा कर लिया और आजतक वह गैर कानूनी कब्जा बरकरार है। इस सम्बन्ध में हमने एक दफा नहीं बल्कि सैकड़ों दफे पाकिस्तान से बातचीत करने की कोशिश की ताकि शान्ति से यह मामला निपट जाय और मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें उसमें किसी कदर कामयाबी भी हासिल हुई है तो मैं नहीं समझता कि विवादों और झगड़ों को शान्तिपूर्ण बातचीत के द्वारा सुलझाने का प्रयास यदि सरकार द्वारा किया जाय तो उसमें क्या आपत्ति की बात हो सकती है।

उसके बाद इस देश के अन्दर दो चुनाव आये। उनमें मसानी साहब जीते भी और हारे भी और उनके साथी जीते भी और हारे भी लेकिन आम तौर पर इन चुनावों में जनता ने कांग्रेस पार्टी का साथ दिया और उसका समर्थन किया और इसलिए वह जो देश की

जनता की ओर बोलने का दावा करते हैं वह मेरी राय में कुछ मुनासिब नहीं है अलबत्ता जो वह अपने विचार रखते हैं उनके लिए मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। यह तो ठीक है कि हमारे देश के लोगों में चीन ने जो यह हमारी सीमाओं का अनुचित प्रतिक्रमण किया है उसको लेकर नाराजगी की भावना है लेकिन अगर वह ऐसा समझते हैं कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब अगर किसी को यहां पर आने का बुलावा देना चाहते हैं तो लोग उनका स्वागत नहीं करेंगे तो वे गलतफहमी में हैं।

यहां कई दफे कहा गया श्री कृष्ण मेनन के बारे में कि वह ठीक तरह से काम नहीं करते और यह उनकी अपनी राय है लेकिन मैं बतलाऊं कि कृष्ण मेनन जब बम्बई में जाते हैं तो उन का बड़ा शानदार स्वागत होता है और अन्यत्र जहां कहीं वह जाते हैं जनता उन का दिल से स्वागत करती है और इसलिए उन का जो श्री कृष्ण मेनन के बारे में खयाल है वह मेरी समझ में सही है। इसी तरह अगर श्री चाऊ एन लाई इस देश में आयें तो मुझे पूरा भरोसा है कि अगर पंडित जी चाहें और जैसाकि उन्होंने ने जाहिर भी कर दिया है कि हम भारत आने पर उन का स्वागत करेंगे और उन से इस झगड़े को शान्तिपूर्ण बातचीत कर के सुलझाने की कोशिश करेंगे, तो उन का जनता दिल से स्वागत करेगा क्योंकि यह सब पर विदित है कि इस देश को जनता पंडित जी के साथ है।

इस के बाद चौ० ब्रह्म प्रकाश ने बम्बई के दो सूबे बनाने के बारे में जो कहा तो मैं भी मानता हूँ कि यह सही फैसला हुआ और अगर यही फैसला आज से कुछ समय पहले हो जाता तो जनरल भोंसले जोकि शिवा जी के खानदान से ताल्लुक रखते थे और बहुत से हमारे अन्य साथी और आज पंजाब के जो गवर्नर हैं हमारे गाइगिल साहब जोकि पञ्चले २७, २८ सालों से निरन्तर चुनाव में

जीत कर यहां पार्लियामेंट में आते रहे हैं वे कभी नहीं हार सकते थे। वह एक गलत फैसला हम ने किया और उस को चालू करने की कोशिश की लेकिन चूकि वह सही फैसला नहीं था इसलिए हमें उस को बदलना पड़ा।

जिस तरह से चौ० ब्रह्म प्रकाश ने कहा उस तरह से तो नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन एक बात मैं जरूर महसूस करता हूँ कि दिल्ली जिस तरह से देहात में एक मसल है कि (चिराग तले अंधेरा) अर्थात् जहां दिया होता है तो उस दिये के नीचे नीचे सब अंधेरा होता है हालांकि अब बिजली के युग में बिजली का जो लट्टू होता है उस लट्टू के नीचे अंधेरा नहीं रहता। कहने का मतलब यह है कि यह दिल्ली की बदकिस्मती है कि यह जो दिल्ली के चारों ओर बसते हैं उन के साथ कोई न्याय अभी तक सही तौर पर नहीं हुआ है। दिल्ली का सूबा ले लीजिये। उस की कोई असेम्बली नहीं है। उस से आगे चल कर हम लोग हैं। पंजाब को दो हिस्सों में तकसीम किया गया। आप को भी याद है और मुझे भी याद है। पंजाब के अन्दर आज से पांच साल पहले गुरुद्वारा के चुनाव हुए थे और उस चुनाव में अकाली पार्टी से हम लोग हारे थे? उस चुनाव में हम ने कुन तीन सीटें जीती थीं। पांच साल के बाद फिर गुरुद्वारों के चुनावों में अकालियों के साथ हमारा मुकाबिला हुआ और अब की दफे हम ने पांच सीटें जीती हैं तो वैसे तो देखा जाय तो हम ने तरबकी ही की है तीन की जगह अब की दफे पांच सीटें जीती हैं। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि कांग्रेस और अकालियों का एक समझौता हुआ और अकाली पार्टी के लोग कांग्रेस के साथ आ मिले और कांग्रेस पंजाब के अन्दर बड़ी शान से कामयाब हो कर आई लेकिन उस कामयाबी के अन्दर एक राज खिपा था और वह यह कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार ने और इस सदन ने पंजाब को दो हिस्सों में तकसीम कर दिया था। रीजनल

[चौ० रणवीर सिंह]

स्कीम्स को माना था, एक पंजाबी रीजन और एक हिन्दी रीजन। जो लोगों का इस बारे में शक था हम ने उस शक को कुछ मिटाने की कोशिश की और लोगों ने विश्वास किया था कि शायद वह बात सही है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे मालूम नहीं कि आगे हमारे पास वह कोई दूसरा हथियार इस किस्म का सन् १९६२ तक आने वाला है या नहीं या बगैर हथियार के हम ६२ में जायेंगे। पांच सीटों से मुझे घबराहट नहीं है। पांच सीटों हम ने जीतीं और १३३ मास्टर तारा सिंह ने जीतीं, मुझे इस के लिए घबराहट नहीं है लेकिन आप बिना दूसरे हथियार के जाते हैं तो मुझे जरूर घबराहट है और उस के बारे में अवश्य हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार को और कांग्रेस पार्टी को सोचना होगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज आप देखते हैं कि एक तरफ पंजाबी रीजन के भाई हैं, उस में एक मजहब के मानने वालों को अपना खयाल जाहिर करने का मौका मिला और उन्होंने भले ही उस स्कीम को अच्छा नहीं समझा और पंजाबी सूबे के हक में राय देने की कोशिश की है। हो सकता है कि कुछ और भी वजूहात हों लेकिन मैं यह मानता हूँ कि पिछली दफे गोकि हम ने केवल तीन सीटें जीती थीं लेकिन हम को ३३ फीसदी राय मिली थी जबकि अब की दफे सीटों तो हम पांच जीते हैं लेकिन राय कुल २२ फीसदी हम को मिली है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि पिछली मर्तबा की अपेक्षा इस दफा हम शायद कुछ अधिक खराब हालत पर पहुँचे हैं। एक तरफ तो यह हालत है और इस के साथ ही हम यह भूलना नहीं चाहते कि आज हमारे पंजाब के अन्दर जो ६ बड़े माननीय और योग्य नेता हैं और जिन को कि इस देश की सेवा करने का मौका मिला है वह छहों के छे पंजाबी रीजन के हैं। हिन्दी रीजन की तरफ से किसी एक भी भाई को चाहे वह दिल्ली से ताल्लुक रखत हो, दिल्ली सरकार का ताल्लुक हो या

पंजाब सरकार का ताल्लुक हो, हिन्दी रीजन के किसी भी भाई को सेवा करने का मौका नहीं मिला। आज हिन्दी रीजन के साथ यह उपेक्षापूर्ण व्यवहार चल रहा है। यह तो बात सही है कि हम दिल्ली से, हिमाचल प्रदेश से अच्छे हैं इस मर्ते में कि हमारे अपने नुमायन्दे हैं। हमारी अपनी बजारत है और उस के अंदर कुछ हमारी छोटी छोटी ही सही हमारी थोड़ी बहुत आवाज है लेकिन क्या वह आवाज इतनी है जिस से कि लोगों को तसल्ली हो तो मुझे इस में शक है। हिन्दी रीजन के भाइयों के दिल में शक है और शायद सही तौर पर शक है कि उन के साथ उचित व्यवहार नहीं हो रहा है और उन को जो मुनासिब हिस्सा मिलना चाहिये वह नहीं मिला है।

राज्य सभा के अन्दर पंजाब से १२ मेम्बर हैं। उन के अन्दर कितने भाई हमारे इस हिन्दी रीजन से आते हैं इस को भी कभी आप ने सोचा है भले ही हम चाहे उस की गिनती न करें लेकिन कुछ लोग करते हैं। इसी तरह से पंजाब के अन्दर जो कौंसिल है और उस में ५१ सदस्य आते हैं। उन ५१ में से कितने सदस्य पंजाबी रीजन के हैं और कितने हिन्दी रीजन के हैं? कुछ लोग तो इस बात की गिनती करते हैं। जैसा मैंने पहले जिक्र किया उन ६ में से कितने हिन्दी रीजन के पहुँचे? तो इन चीजों का जबकि जनता यह देखती है कि उन की उपेक्षा हो रही है तो उस का उन के दिमाग पर असर पड़ता है।

अगर यह बात इसी तरह से चलती रहे।

X. उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर मुकाबले में मेरी भी आसामी है तो चौधरी साहब यहाँ आ सकते हैं।

चौ० रणवीर सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप का तो मैं बड़ा मशकूर हूँ कि आप ने

मुझे अपनी भावनाएं सदन के सामने रखने का मौका दिया। मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि आप जब तक आप की आयु है यहां पर रहें।

एक माननीय सदस्य: पंजाब न जाएं।

श्री० रणबीर सिंह: पंजाब में जा कर कहां अगड़े में फंसेंगे।

तो मैं जिक्र कर रहा था कि लोगों के दिलों के अन्दर कुछ भावनाएं हैं कुछ आशंकाएं हैं। हम दिल्ली से अच्छे हैं, हिमाचल से अच्छे हैं। दिल्ली और हिमाचल की हालत कौन नहीं जानता। वहां तो बड़े-बड़े अफसर हैं और उन के नाते रिश्तेदार हैं। पंजाब में अगर हमारे भाई राम किशन को गिला होगा तो वहां चीफ मिनिस्टर के लड़के के खिलाफ होगा लेकिन दिल्ली और हिमाचल में तो किसी अपने आदमी का रिश्तेदार नहीं है। वहां तो बड़े बड़े अफसर हैं। उन को बड़ी बड़ी तनख्वाहें मिलती हैं जितनी कि बड़े बड़े प्रदेशों में नहीं मिलती। मालूम नहीं कि वित्त मंत्रालय कैसे इस की मंजूरी दे देता है।

इस के बाद मैं कुछ दूसरी बातें कहना चाहता हूँ। भाई अजित प्रसाद जैन ने कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्टों का जिक्र किया। चौधरी ब्रह्म प्रकाश जी ने भी उन का जिक्र किया। अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि मुझे चौधरी ब्रह्म प्रकाश जी से देहात का ज्यादा पता है तो यह बात सही नहीं होगी। लेकिन मैं उन से एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ, मैं वकालत की बहस में तो जाना नहीं चाहता कि कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का क्या मुलैटिव आउटलुक क्या है। मुझे गोरी और काली शकल से कोई मतलब नहीं है। मुझे तो इस से मतलब है कि इस देश के देहात में काम होता है या नहीं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट की कीमत किस तरह से जांची जाती है। अभी उन्होंने जिक्र किया कि वहां और आदमियों की जरूरत है। इस बारे में तो मेरा उन से कोई मतभेद नहीं है। लेकिन

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज तक जितनी जीपें और आदमी काम करते रहे हैं वे कहां तक पहुंचे हैं। मैं नीचे से शुरू करना चाहता हूँ। आप जानते हैं कि देहात का सब से निचला तबका बाल्मीकी भाइयों का होता है। वह हमारे इलाके में और दूसरे इलाकों में भी मुर्गियां और सूअर पालते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या बाल्मीकी भाइयों को कोई अच्छा सूअर पालने को दिया गया। उन के बाद धानुक भाई हैं, वह गरीब हैं। मुझे कोई बताए कि उन के लिए कितने पावर लम लगाये गये हैं। कितने कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्टों में उन के लिये कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बना कर उन के स्तर को ऊंचा करने की कोशिश की गयी है। इसी तरह से कुम्हार हैं, लुहार हैं। जो भाई लुहार कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट के इलाके में बसते हैं उन को परमिट से कोयला नहीं मिल सकता। लोहा परमिट से नहीं मिल सकता। आज ऐसी अजीब हालत है देहात के अन्दर।

मैं समझता हूँ कि राट्पति जी ने अपने भाषण में जो जिक्र किया वह सही किया कि हमारा देश आज रेल के इंजिन बनाने में, रेल के डब्बे बनाने में, लोहे के कारखाने बनाने में, हैवी और बेसिक इंडस्ट्रीज के मामलों में बहुत आगे बढ़ रहा है। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज में हम इन १२ सालों में कहां पहुंचे हैं।

जहां तक खेती का वास्ता है, मैं इतना ही अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि खेती के सिलसिले में कोआपरेटिव का बड़ा जिक्र किया जाता है। रिजर्व बैंक समझती है कि हम तो रुपया देने के लिये तैयार हैं लेकिन देहात के अन्दर कोई एजेंसी नहीं बनी है जिस से कि रुपया पहुंच सके। मुझे यह सुन कर ताज्जुब होता है। पिछली सदियों में प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब उत्तर प्रदेश में एक कोआपरेटिव फैक्टरी देखने गये थे—वाजपुर कोआपरेटिव शुगर फैक्टरी। मेरा भी उस से कुछ वास्ता है। वहां पर सवा करोड़ को एक

[श्री० रणवीर सिंह]

शुगर फैक्टरी खड़ी की गयी है। वहां सोसाइटी किस तरह से बनी उसके इतिहास में मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। जो भ्रामदी बाहर से गए थे, जो उजड़ कर गए थे उनके पास पैसा नहीं था कि सवा करोड़ की फैक्टरी लगा सकें। उन्होंने दरखास्त में लिखा था, जो शेरर कैपिटल है उसको कर्ज लिया जाए। कुछ मामूली सी फीस कर सदस्य बन गए और शेरर कैपिटल कर्ज के लिए पर दिया गया। जब एक सवा करोड़ की फैक्टरी इस उसूल पर बन सकती है, तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि गांवों में बीस हजार तीस हजार या एक लाख की कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी इसी उसूल पर क्यों नहीं बन सकती। तीन साल के वक्त में से एक साल तो बीत गया। इस वक्त में सिर्फ नामकरण हो पाया है। इस बीच में मल्टी-परपज कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी को सरविम कोऑपरेटिव का नाम दिया जा सका है, बाकी कोई और तरक्की नहीं हुई है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि अगर एक सोसाइटी का शेरर कैपिटल २० हजार है और मैक्सिमम क्रेडिट लिमिट एक लाख ६० हजार है, अगर मेरा गांव एक लाख ६० हजार दे सकता है और रिजर्व बैंक उसके बारे में ऐतबार कर सकती है, तो एक लाख ८० हजार देने में कौनसी आपत्ति होनी चाहिए अगर वही उसूल काम में लाया जाए।

ग्राम सेवक की जिम्मेदारी बहुत ज्यादा रखी गयी है। वह बेचारा जैक भाफ भाल ट्रेड्स एंड मास्टर भाफ नन होता है। अगर उसको कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटी का सेक्रेटरी बना दिया जाए तो मैं समझता कि हूँ कि देहात का काम अच्छा होगा और खासी तरक्की होगी। और रिजर्व बैंक से और वित्त मंत्रालय से अगर देहात में दो लाख, ढाई लाख या तीन लाख पहुंच सके उस सोसाइटी को तो अनाज की कमी दूर हो सकती है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक मिनट और लेना चाहता हूँ। मेरे दोस्त श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी को खास तौर से गिला है कि विदेशों का फालतू कैपिटल देश के अन्दर आने दिया जा रहा है। वह तो कुछ करोड़ों की बात करते हैं। क्या वह समझते हैं कि हम जो यहां लोगों का झंडा हिला हिला कर स्वागत करते हैं यह सब जबानी उमा खर्च है। यह हमारे पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू की कोशिशों का ही नतीजा है कि हमको विदेशों से १७६० करोड़ रुपए की मदद के वायदे मिले हैं अपना पंच वर्षीय योजना के लिए जिसके लिए एक हजार करोड़ टैक्स से वसूल किया जाएगा। हमारे मुकर्जी साहब कहते हैं कि तनखाहें भी दायी जाएं, टैक्स भी ज्यादा न लिया जाए और बाहर से भी मदद न ली जाए। यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती।

मैं एक मिनट और लेना चाहता हूँ। अक्षे एक बात और अर्ज करनी है। हमारे देश का अन्दर रुपया बढ़ाया गया है जिसे डिफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग कहते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय: आपका यह एक मिनट कब खत्म होगा।

श्री० रणवीर सिंह: मैं ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लूंगा। एक मिनट लूंगा।

देश के अन्दर १५०० करोड़ रुपए का डिफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग किया गया। लेकिन यह बात सही है कि ऐसा करने के बावजूद जो सन् १९४८ में गेहूं का कंट्रोल का भाव १६ रुपए मन था वही आज भी है। यह कमाल की बात है कि इस तरह से डिफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग किया गया। सरकारी नौकरों को गिला है। उनको ५० रुपए से ८० रुपए हो गए। हां सेक्रेटरी साहब की तनखाह आधी नहीं तो एक तिहाई कम हो गयी। यह जरूरी था। एक शान्ति देश के अन्दर आ रही है और शान्ति से आ रही है। तो मैं

समझता हूँ कि यह क्रिटिसिज्म बहुत सही नहीं है ।

श्री रामकृष्ण गुप्त (महेन्द्रगढ़) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रैजिडेंशियल एग्ज्रेस की सपोर्ट के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ । राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में बहुत सी महिम बातों का जिक्र किया है । उन्होंने अपने भाषण में इन्टरनेशनल हालात, चाइनीज एग्जेशन और नैशनल मामलात, मसलन थर्ड फ्राइव यीअर प्लान और देश की फूड प्राडक्शन को बढ़ाना, इन तमाम जरूरी विषयों पर पूरी रोशनी डाली है ।

जहां तक थर्ड फ्राइव यीअर प्लान का ताल्लुक है, राष्ट्रपति जी ने शुरू में ही इस के बारे में सफ़हा २ पर जिक्र किया है और कहा है—

“The work on the preparation of the frame and the outline of the Third Five Year Plan with its longer perspective and higher targets is making good progress. The objective of the Third Five Year Plan is to seek almost to double the national income.....”

इस के बारे में मैं सिर्फ इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज जब हम थर्ड फ्राइव यीअर प्लान बनाने जा रहे हैं, तो सब से पहले हमें सैकंड फ्राइव यीअर प्लान पर नज़र डालनी पड़ेगी और उस से जो एचीवमेंट्स हुई, जो तजुर्बात हासिल हुए, उन एचीवमेंट्स और तजुर्बात की रोशनी में हमें थर्ड फ्राइव यीअर प्लान बनानी चाहिए । मेरे कहने का

मक़सद यह है कि सैकंड फ्राइव यीअर प्लान का सब से बड़ा मक़सद यह था कि इनकम और वैल्य में जो बड़ी भारी डिसपैरिटी है, उस को कम किया जाय । आज पांच साल के बाद हम ने इस बात पर नज़र डालनी है और मालूम करना है कि इस मक़सद में हम कहां तक कामयाब हुए हैं और रास्ते में जो स्कावटें आईं, उन को दूर करने के लिए थर्ड फ्राइव यीअर प्लान में हम कौन सा ऐसा इफ़ेक्टिव प्रोग्राम बनायें कि जिस से हम इस मक़सद को पूरा कर सकें । यह ठीक है कि देश की इनकम बढ़े, नैशनल इनकम बढ़े, प्राडक्शन बढ़े, लेकिन हमारा मक़सद तभी कामयाब होगा कि जो इनकम बढ़ती है, जो प्राडक्शन बढ़ती है, उस से, जो छोटी क्लासिज़ दबी हुई हैं, उन को फ़ायदा पहुंचे, जो एरिया बैंकवर्ड और अनडेवेलप्ड हैं, उन को ज्यादा से ज्यादा फ़ायदा पहुंचे । आज हम ने इस नज़रिये से सैकंड फ्राइव यीअर प्लान पर नज़र डालनी है और इसी नुक्ता-ए-नज़र से इस फ्राइव यीअर प्लान को बनाते वक्त इन तमाम बातों को सोचना है । मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि इन तमाम बातों का पूरा स्थाल रखा जायेगा ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मेम्बर साहब अपनी स्पीच को कल जारी रखें ।

17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, February 17, 1960/Magha 28, 1881 (Saka).