

Bill

Shri Morarji Desai: It is to be considered.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: It should be left over to the next Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: It will be considered now.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Where is the hurry?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members who do not come again will have an opportunity!

Shri Braj Raj Singh: We do not want an opportunity.

12.05 hrs.

ESTATE DUTY (DISTRIBUTION)
BILL*

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the distribution of the net proceeds of the estate duty among the States in pursuance of the principles of distribution formulated and the recommendations made by the Finance Commission in its report, dated the 14th day of December, 1961.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the distribution of the net proceeds of the estate duty among the States in pursuance of the principles of distribution formulated and the recommendations made by the Finance Commission in its report, dated the 14th day of the December, 1961."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Morarji Desai: I introduce† the Bill.

12.05½ hrs.

ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF EXCISE
(GOODS OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE)
AMENDMENT BILL *

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Additional Duties of Excise (Goods of Special Importance) Act, 1957.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Additional Duties of Excise (Goods of Special Importance) Act, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Morarji Desai: I introduce† the Bill.

12.06 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
PRESIDENT

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Sushila Nayar.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to move the motion of thanks, 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 12th March, 1962."

I move this motion with deep feelings. Our beloved President has addressed Parliament every year and has been at the helm of the ship of State ever since the Constitution of free India came into force. A valiant fighter in India's freedom struggle, an able administrator, a wise statesman, the President has been the embodi-

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II-Section 2, dated 15.3.62.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

ment of such refinement, poise and dignity that not only has he brought honour to our country, but he has also endeared himself to all those who have come in contact with him. His term of office will be soon coming to an end, and he has announced that he will not stand for re-election. We are privileged to have had this opportunity of being addressed by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the first great President of our great country, and a great and good man who has been aptly described as the very symbol of gentleness and unassuming humility.

The Father of the Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, was able to build up a wonderful leadership in the course of India's fight for freedom, a galaxy of stars who have lighted our path and guided the destinies of the nation all these years. One of the brightest stars of this galaxy is our revered Rashtrapati. He will before long retire as the President of India. Let us hope and pray that his wise counsels will be available to us for many years to come. I am sure I echo the feelings of this august House when I say that we are deeply grateful to the President for the address that he has delivered to us.

The President's Address has given a bird's eye-view of the achievements of the different departments of the Government of India. He has not said much about legislative measures **except those that had to be urgently taken up and passed by this brief session.** The House has passed yesterday the Bills amending the Constitution and providing for the administration of Goa, Daman and Diu, and the fact that these Bills received the unanimous support of all sections of the House is an indication of the deep sense of relief throughout the country that at last our country is free from the last vestige of imperialism. We spent 14 years in persuading the Portuguese to read the writing on the wall and quit peacefully, but that was not to be. At last the cup of our patience was full and military action had to be resorted to reluctantly but firmly. Having push-

ed out the mighty British Empire from India in a peaceful manner, we felt somewhat small that our peaceful approach had not succeeded with the Portuguese. Our consolation is that the Go_a operation was almost bloodless.

Shri Muhammed Elias (Howrah): To whom is she addressing her speech? Is she consulting her notes, or reading her speech?

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I am using my notes as everybody else has used them, and I am surprised at the objection raised by the hon. Member.

Mr. Speaker: Occasionally she may look at me also.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I am looking at you, but you are looking at that gentleman.

It was, however, odd for us to receive admonitions for the use of force from Governments armed to the teeth and having no faith in the theory or practice of non-violence whatsoever. The vast majority of the people in the world have rejoiced with us at the end of Portuguese imperialism in India; and we hope and pray that it will come to an end elsewhere also before too long.

The new Lok Sabha which will meet next month will deal with many new legislative measures and policies and programmes which have already been outlined in the Third Five Year Plan and have already been launched and will be pursued in the years to come. These policies and programmes, in spite of criticism, ignorant as well as enlightened, by individuals **as well as by institutions,** have received the approval of the people of India. The success of the Congress at the polls in the recent elections is a clear vote of confidence in the policies and programmes pursued by the Congress Government.

Sir, the President has referred to the General Elections in his Address in these words:

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

"I would like to echo your sense of rejoicing that this vast democratic exercise has been peaceful, orderly and in accordance with our constitutional processes."

The whole world has watched us and has been duly impressed by the way in which the world's biggest democracy has conducted its Third General Elections. Barring an occasional complaint here and there, all are agreed that the elections have been peaceful, free and fair. The electorate is becoming more and more aware of the power of adult franchise, a power which has reduced the Marxist theories of class conflict into an outmoded concept, and has opened the way to peaceful revolution in the social and economic life of the country.

The results of the postal ballot, however, have revealed that many of those engaged in election duties were not satisfied with the Congress Government. They are salaried lower middle class people by and large. And the reason for their dissatisfaction is the high prices of foodgrains and other consumer goods. The small rise in the salaries brought about as a result of the Second Pay Commission's recommendations, and, in Delhi, as a result of Delhi being declared as A class city, soon resulted in the rise of prices which more than counter-balanced the small gains. The salaried groups must be protected against this kind of rise in prices.

The Finance Minister yesterday has assured us that prices have been stable, but, Sir, something more has got to be done. We need not be complacent at what has been achieved.

Our Government has accepted the goal of socialism and big strides have been made in that direction since independence. The abolition of the Princely States, and the zamindari system, introduction of land reforms and land ceilings, growing public sector in commerce and industry and the high taxes for higher income groups,

are all leading us towards socialism step by step.

While we welcome land ceiling, I think, some kind of ceiling on other incomes, especially some kind of proportion between the highest and the lowest salaries, say 1 to 10, is absolutely necessary if we are to be true to ourselves and our goal of socialism.

Similarly, while I welcome the growth of the public sector, we must see to it that business methods apply in our industrial and commercial undertakings in the public sector and there is fair competition between the public and the private sector, and the public sector is run more efficiently and more economically and there is no criticism that we are lacking in economy or efficiency.

The public sector is not profit motivated in the ordinary sense of the term; but we do want these concerns to be run profitably and the profits to be used for the people, the consumers as well as those employed in such concerns.

All the steps towards socialism that I have mentioned are calculated to ensure just distribution of wealth. But, that in itself cannot end poverty. The only way to end poverty is to produce more wealth. Then only we can distribute it fairly and properly; and the President's Address has mentioned the progress made in several directions in several fields in this connection.

The President has said:

"The overall index number of agricultural production rose to 139.1 in 1960-61, compared to 128.7 in 1959-60, thereby showing an increase of 8.1 per cent. This increasing was shared both by foodgrains and commercial crops. Compared to the index for 1955-56, the base year of the Second Five Year Plan, the overall index of production for 1960-61 was higher by about 19.1 per cent."

This is very encouraging. But, we have to go on with our effort to increase agricultural production still further.

As the Finance Minister said yesterday, in an agricultural country like ours, the prosperity of the people is closely linked up with agricultural production and this agricultural production has to be combined judiciously with small-scale industries, village industries and other industries

The President's Address has referred to many other schemes of training, improved seed corporations, minor irrigation, soil conservation etc. for improving our agriculture. I am glad that we are thinking in terms of minor irrigation. The water-logging caused by the big hydro-electric schemes like Bhakra Nangal has thrown out thousands of acres of good land from cultivation, and has thus reduced the benefits of such schemes. I would like to draw the attention of the Government of India and the Planning Commission towards the urgent need for a comprehensive planning so that such by-effects can be anticipated and taken care of well in time. I hope effective drainage schemes for the water-logged areas will be taken up without further delay.

The President has referred to Panchayati Raj, in his Address, in the following words:

"The development and growth of Panchayati Raj and co-operation are integral to progressive agricultural and rural development. The efforts of my Government in this direction have already resulted in large scale extension of village self-government in eight States and it is estimated that this covers 65 per cent of the country's population."

This is a most welcome and revolutionary step. Decentralisation of power and responsibility is creating new enthusiasm in our countryside. I was recently asked to inaugurate the

new constitution of Block Samitis in some of the blocks in my constituency. We have often heard criticisms in this House and outside and also complaints about the shramdan roads having been washed off by the rains because the P.W.D. did not step in in time to make them pucca. At one of these meetings, I was asked: 'Why can't we have a road roller at the block level so that after doing the earthwork we can spread some stones and make them pucca, so that our shramdan is not washed off by the rains?'. The moment responsibility is given, complaints and criticism have taken the form of constructive thinking.

Another asked, 'Why not we have a tractor to break hard land, and keep it at the block level and loan it or hire it out to those who need it?'

I am sure they will think of many other things to ensure the speedy and effective implementation of our plans and to reduce inefficiency and corruption. It may not be easy for officers to prove if taccavi loans have been misused or seeds and fertilizers have been given to the right persons or not. But the villagers knew each other and everything that goes on in the village and can deal with the problems much better. No doubt there will be mistakes and failures here and there. But on the whole panchayati raj will strengthen our democracy at the grass roots and enable the village community to throw up new and competent leadership who, with the training and experience of service from the village upwards will be ready for higher responsibilities. In the past we had a training ground during the freedom struggle in our satyagraha movement and Mahatma Gandhi's constructive programme. Those trained in that great school must pass away sooner or later. The panchayati raj offers us a new training ground and I hope it will not only enable us to train men and women to become legislators and administrators but also help in training the electorate

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

to have an independent mind of their own and use that independence with wisdom and responsibility.

I welcome the programmes for expansion of education and provision of scholarships for poor and worthy students. The quality of education needs much more attention. To ensure the quality of education it is necessary that teachers be given better training and better salaries. There has been much talk of compulsory social service for students. If we can link up this type of programme of social service for students with teaching so that these students can be posted in the primary schools teaching there, say, for a couple of months or so and then the teachers be sent for three to six months of refresher courses we shall solve the problem of replacements while our teachers are sent for further training and at the same time we will be able to discover a lot of new talent for teaching among the students. Those who display such talents and are interested in making teaching their career could in their turn be trained to become trained teachers.

As for scholarships, I find there are boys and girls who having won in competitions on an all India basis were sent to public schools at Government expense. After finishing their school education they have to knock from pillar to post in search of scholarships to continue their studies. This is something undesirable. Those students who have been trained at Government expense in these public schools or otherwise, if they do well in their final school examinations should find it possible to straightaway go up for higher studies without having to feel frustrated and go from door to door in search of scholarships. There should be some kind of continuity about these scholarships.

Sir, we are very glad that the President's Address has mentioned programmes for the eradication of communicable diseases and in particular mention has been made of eradication

of small pox from the country. I wish along with small pox we had taken up a programme for the eradication of cholera as well. Cholera has been eradicated by practically every other country and it is a blot on India's fair name that it still continues to take such a toll of life year after year in this country. Everyone knows that cholera is spread by the contamination of food and water with faecal matter carrying cholera germs. We are a clean people. But we have many insanitary habits such as sale of food exposed to dust and flies. Our local self governments have to be educated about the dangers of this practice. Programmes for providing protected water supply and adequate disposal of nightsoil will not only free us from cholera but also from other diseases such as dysentery, typhoid and the like. I hope this programme will be given top priority in the years to come.

Sir, the President has referred to our uneasy relations with China. I am sure everyone in this house will welcome the Government's reply to China asking for the reversal of the aggressive policies pursued by her and restoration of a climate of peace before we renew the Indo Tibetan agreement. We are pledged to peace but we want peace with honour. We shall never allow China or anyone else to violate the sovereignty of India over our own territory. The peaceful policies pursued by India under the able leadership of our Prime Minister and the contribution made by India in reducing international tensions has been given due recognition and India has been elected to the eighteen nations disarmament committee. People all over the world are looking to the results of the deliberations of this Conference. People everywhere in the world want peace. Money spent in the arms race if diverted towards the development of the world's resources can usher an era of plenty and prosperity for everybody everywhere in the world and thus remove the causes of war. Let us hope and pray that our delegation

under the wise leadership of our Defence Minister will be able to make a contribution worthy of the traditions of non-violence bequeathed to us by the Father of our Nation and the disarmament committee will be able to fulfil the expectations of the people all over the world. With these words, Sir, I move the motion of thanks for the Address delivered to us by our revered Rashtrapati on the 12th of March.

स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ (औरंगाबाद) :

माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के बारे में अपनी कृतज्ञता प्रकट करने का जो प्रस्ताव बहिन सुशीला नायर जी ने पेश किया है, उसकी तार्किक करने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ ।

जैसा कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने स्वयं बताया है, इस संसद के सामने उनका यह आखिरी अभिभाषण है । इसलिए इसकी एक खास विशेषता भी होती है । साथ ही साथ यह बात भी स्पष्ट है कि राष्ट्रपति जी अपने स्थान से निकट भविष्य में निवृत्त हो रहे हैं, और उन्होंने जो कुछ इस लोकशाही के प्रति अपनी सेवाएं अर्पित की हैं, इस संसद का और संसद के द्वारा भारतीय जनता का जो उन्होंने मार्ग दर्शन किया है, उसके लिए उनको बधाई देना और उनके प्रति अपनी कृतज्ञता प्रकट करना हमारा परम कर्तव्य हो जाता है । इसलिए जब कि एक तरह से यह विदाई का ही संदेश है, हमें अपनी भावनाओं का इजहार जितना हम कर सकते हैं उतना हमें करना चाहिए ।

यह जो अभिभाषण है वह हमारी लोकशाही में जो कुछ कार्य हुआ उसकी फहरिस्त तो आज हमारे सामने नहीं रख रहा है क्योंकि पिछली दो योजनाओं में जो कार्य हुआ और तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में हमें जो कुछ कार्य करना है उस पर काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है और बड़ी तफसील से उस पर बहस हुई है । इसलिए इस अभिभाषण में कोई

कैटेलाग आफ एचीवमेंट्स नजर नहीं आयेगा । फिर भी जो कुछ कार्य हुआ है उसके प्रति उन्होंने अपना इत्मीनान और संतोष प्रकट किया है और साथ ही साथ भविष्य में जो कार्य हमें सम्पन्न करना है उसके प्रति हमें सचेत भी किया है । भविष्य के बारे में जाग्रत रहते हुए, पिछले दिनों में हमने जो कार्य किया है उससे हम अपने दिलों में संतोष, समाधान और गौरव अनुभव कर सकते हैं ।

अध्यक्ष जी, जो यह अभिभाषण है, उसमें राष्ट्रपति जी ने चन्द बातों की तरफ बड़ी गम्भीरता से इशारा किया है । देशवासियों ने इस हुकूमत के प्रति अपना विश्वास प्रकट किया है । आम चुनाव हुए और आम चुनावों में बड़ी श्रद्धा से, बड़े विश्वास से लोगों ने अपनी जिन्दगी को बनाने का उत्तरदायित्व इस हुकूमत को सौंप दिया है । यह एक महान् जिम्मेदारी है और करोड़ों लोगों ने अपनी आशाओं और आकांक्षाओं को सामने रखते हुए कुछ अपेक्षा व्यक्त की है यह समझ कर कि इस हुकूमत के जरिए उन की आशाओं और आकांक्षाओं की पूर्ति होगी । जब इतना महान् विश्वास मतदाताओं ने प्रकट किया है तो एक, दो बातों के प्रति हमें बहुत कठोरता से सचेत रहना जरूरी हो जाता है जिस का कि इशारा कुछ संक्षेप में राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में किया है । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सदन और यह हुकूमत उनके अभिभाषण के उस परिच्छेद के इन शब्दों की तरफ दृष्टिक्षेप करेगी :—

“A determined effort to implement the physical programmes as set out in the Plan would require care in regard to economy and efficiency and the endeavour to keep to time schedules and priorities, all of which are the continuing concern of my Government, will alone help the country to overcome these obstacles.”

मेरे कहने का आशय यह है कि आज की सब से बड़ी जरूरत जो कि एक कमी है हमारे

[स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ]

कार्य में वह यह है कि लोगों को अभी यह भान नहीं हो रहा है कि ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन क्लिन एंड इनकरप्टिबल है। यह सही है कि हम ने अपने ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में काफी सुधार किया है और बावजूद हमारे यह कहने के कि अब हमारा ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन क्लिन एंड इनकरप्टिबल है, लोग ऐसा महसूस नहीं कर रहे हैं और उनकी समझ में नहीं आता कि प्रशासनिक कार्यवाही में आज जो देरी होती है वह क्यों नहीं हटाई जाती। मैं बड़ी नम्रता से हुकूमत के सामने यह सूचना रखना चाहता हूँ कि थर्ड फाईव ईयर प्लान हमारा कितना ही ऐम्बिशस और कम्प्रीहेंसिव नेचर का क्यों न हो लेकिन अगर उसको कार्यान्वित करने में कुछ देरी होती है और ढिलाई होती है और उसमें हम जिस मजबूती से कदम उठाना चाहिए वह नहीं उठाते हैं तो यह मतदाताओं ने जो विश्वास हम पर रखा है उस के प्रति हम अन्याय करेंगे ऐसा मेरा ख्याल है। इस बारे में हमारी हुकूमत को सचेत रहना चाहिए।

एजुकेशन के बारे में मेरी बहन डा० सुशीला नायर ने काफी विस्तार से बहुत कुछ कहा है। मैं एक ही बात उस में बढ़ाऊंगा। इतने बड़े पैमाने पर शिक्षा का, विद्या का प्रसार हो रहा है लेकिन उस विद्या से जो विद्यार्थी बन रहा है जो भविष्य का नागरिक बन रहा है उस के दिल और दिमाग पर हमारी भारतीय सभ्यता का, हमारी संस्कृति का, जो भी गौरवपूर्ण भूतकाल है उस के मूल्यों का क्या प्रभाव हो रहा है इस की ओर हमें बड़ी चिंतायुक्त नजर से देखना चाहिए और सोचना चाहिए।

मैं एक छोटी सूचना करूंगा। बहुत कुछ विद्यार्थियों के अनुशासन के बारे में कहा गया है। आम तौर पर भारत का विद्यार्थी अनुशासनप्रिय होता है—डिसिप्लिन को मानने वाला और पालन करने वाला है। मेरा शिक्षण क्षेत्र से काफी गहरा सम्बन्ध है और हजारों

विद्यार्थियों के बीच में कार्य करने का मुझे सुअवसर मिला है। मैंने आम तौर पर विद्यार्थियों को अनुशासित ही देखा है। अगर उनको एक ढंग से शिक्षित किया जाता है और एक अनुकूल आबहवा पैदा की जाती है तो भारत के विद्यार्थी जरूर डिसिप्लंड ही रहेंगे इस में मुझे कोई शक नहीं है। इसलिए भारत के विद्यार्थियों का चरित्र निर्माण किस तरीके से हो रहा है इसके बारे में चिन्ता करनी चाहिए।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में संस्कृत भाषा के बारे में जो कुछ कहा गया है मैं उस का स्वागत करता हूँ और यह भी अपेक्षा करता हूँ कि संस्कृत भाषा जो कि कम अज कम हिन्दुओं की है क्योंकि यह संस्कृत भाषा उनकी संस्कृति, सभ्यता व अध्यात्म का एक सोर्स अथवा उद्गम स्थान है, यह अगर सेकेंडरी एजुकेशन के स्टेज में कहीं न कहीं दो, तीन साल के लिए कम्पलसरी कर दी जाये तो यह स्वागत योग्य बात होगी। ऐसा होने से भारतीय सभ्यता, संस्कृति और अध्यात्मिक तथा तत्वज्ञान हर एक की जिन्दगी और दिमा में बैठ जायगा।

अभी हाल के आम चुनावों के बारे में हमारे चंद भाइयों ने यहां कुछ संशोधन पेश किये हैं। आम तौर पर देखा जाये और निश्चयपूर्ण वृत्ति से देखा जाये और कुछ बाएँ हम अपने दिल में नहीं रखते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो तीसरा चुनाव हुआ है उस चुनाव में भारतीय मतदाताओं ने अपनी लोकशाही प्रवृत्ति को बड़े गौरवपूर्ण तरीके से काम में लाया है। इस के पूर्व के दो चुनावों में जो एक दौड़ धूप होती थी, शोर मचाया जाता था और लाउडस्पीकर्स का खेल चलता था इस तीसरे आम चुनाव में मैं ने कहीं नहीं देखा और अगर कहीं हुआ भी है तो वह पहले के मुकाबले बहुत कम हुआ है। यह शोर गुल हाल के चुनाव में बहुत कम हुआ है यह कोई मैं

अतिशयोक्ति नहीं कह रहा हूँ। हैदराबाद शहर में जोकि कम्पोजिट पापुलेशन का शहर है वहाँ स्वयं मैंने देखा और मेरे दोस्तों ने मुझे यह बतलाया। इस पर मैंने उनसे शिकायत भी की कि वे मीटिंग्स वगैरह क्यों नहीं कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने मुझे बतलाया कि मीटिंग्स वगैरह करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है क्योंकि हम लोगों को उनके घरों पर एप्रोच करते हैं और उनको सब बातें बतलाते हैं। मीटिंग्स से लोगों के मन में कोई परिवर्तन होगा या उनका शिक्षण होगा ऐसा महसूस नहीं किया जाता। इसलिए इस में कोई बहुत बड़ी गलती हुई है और यह अनफेयर चुनाव हुआ है ऐसा आरोप लगाना अनुचित बात होगी। हकीकत यह है कि भारतीय मतदाताओं ने काफी संजीदगी से और विचारपूर्वक अपने वोट का इस्तेमाल किया है और उसको काम में लाया है। अगर हम यह समझते हैं कि कुछ ऐसे ही प्रयत्न कर के यह वोट हासिल किये गये हैं, कुछ प्रेशर्स डाल कर यह वोट हासिल किये गये हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह भारतीय वोटरों की बुद्धिमानी के प्रति एक अन्याय करना होगा क्योंकि उसने जुडीशसली वोट का इस्तेमाल किया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज जब भारत में लोकशाही बड़े गौरव के साथ बढ़ रही है अपना संदेह प्रकट करना अच्छी बात नहीं होगी और अनुचित बात ही होगी।

जब हम इन तमाम बातों की तरफ देखते हैं तो कुछ इतमीनान का सांस लेने का हमें मौका मिल जाता है। यह पंचायती राज्य का एक्सपेरिमेंट जो चला है यह एक अच्छा प्रयोग है। आज हमारी डेमोक्रेसी पर या उसकी फंक्शनिंग पर आक्षेप लगाया जाता है कि यह दूर दिल्ली से चलने वाली जो डेमोक्रेसी है वह लोगों की जिदगी में नहीं बैठेगी। लोकशाही में हमें अपने कर्तव्य का पालन करना चाहिए यह भावना नागरिकों में पैदा नहीं हो रही है। यह एक शिकायत रही है और उस में बहुत कुछ सत्यांश है और तथ्य है। इस दोष को हमें दूर करना है जिसमें कि लोगों का

डाइरैक्ट पार्टिसिपेशन हो। ऐसी लोकशाही की पद्धति हमें अपनानी होगी ताकि जनता यह महसूस कर सके कि उसको नेगलेक्ट नहीं किया जा रहा है। इस दृष्टि से मैं समझता हूँ कि सत्ता के विकेन्द्रीकरण की जो पद्धति हमने पंचायती राज्य कायम करके स्वीकृत की है वह स्वागत योग्य है। पंचायती राज्य का जहाँ हम स्वागत करते हैं वहाँ असावधान रहने से उनके कुछ गम्भीर परिणाम भी हो सकते हैं। जाहिर है कि अगर आज की ही आबहवा रही और हर एक पोलिटिकल पार्टी जाकर वहाँ दौड़ घूप करने लगे और ग्राम चुनाव में जो तरीके बर्ते जाते हैं और जातीयता और दूसरी संकीर्ण प्रवृत्तियों का खेल चलता है वही खेल अगर पंचायत राज्य के सम्बन्ध में ग्राम स्तर पर चला तो ऊपर से भी लोकशाही नहीं बनेगी और नीचे से भी नहीं बनेगी दोनों तरफ से वह बिगड़ जाने वाली है। इसलिये नीचे के स्तर पर लोकशाही को प्रजातन्त्र की भावना को, जितने विशुद्ध रूप से हम स्वीकार कर सकते हैं और पंचायत राज को एक सुदृढ़ आधार पर स्थापित कर के उस का एक अच्छा स्वरूप बना सकते हैं, उसी मात्रा में भारतीय लोकशाही पनप सकती है, वृद्धिगत हो सकती है और उस का विकास हो सकता है। आज हम देखते हैं कि हमारे इंदगिर्द के मुल्क में पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी लड़खड़ा रही है, नष्टप्राय हो रही है। इस देश में भी प्रजातन्त्र के अस्तित्व के बारे में कभी-कभी सन्देह प्रकट किया जा रहा है। लोग सोचते हैं कि कौन जाने, भारत में भी वही बात होने वाली है, जो कि अन्य देशों में हुई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस का एक ही इलाज है कि हम अपने देश में पंचायत राज की नींव एक विशुद्ध और अच्छे ढंग से डालें। इस अवस्था में कम से कम भारत में लोकशाही के लिये कोई खतरा नहीं होगा। इसलिये देश में पंचायत राज स्थापित करने के बारे में जो कुछ कार्य किये जा रहे हैं, मैं उन की सराहना करता हूँ।

[स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ]

अब मैं गोआ के बारे में कुछ विचार इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। गोआ के बारे में जो कार्यवाही की गई है, मैं उस को गलती नहीं कहूँगा, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे व्यवहार, उच्चार और अटर्नेसिस में एक प्रकार का धुंधलापन सा रहा है, ऐसी एम्बिग्विटी रही है कि दुनिया के लोगों का जो मेन्टल-मेक-अप है, उस के संदर्भ में वे पीसफुल मैथड्स और नान-वायलेन्स में फर्क करने में असमर्थ रहे हैं, जो कि किया जाना चाहिये। हमारे इस कथन का कि हम शान्तिमय मार्ग से सब बातों का निपटारा करेंगे यह अर्थ निकाला जाने लगा कि हम शस्त्रों का उपयोग ही नहीं करेंगे। इस का कारण यह है कि महात्मा गांधी का नान-वायलेन्स का जो विचार है वही उन के सामने आता रहा और उसी के कारण यह गलत-फहमी पैदा हुई। हम को यह समझना चाहिये कि हमारे पीसफुल मैथड्स के बारे में वैस्टर्न इन्टेलैक्टुअल्स में जो प्रभाव है, उस से कहीं ज्यादा प्रभाव महात्मा गांधी की नान-वायलेन्स की फिलासफी का है। इसलिये अगर उन्होंने यह समझा कि जब भारत नान-वायलेन्स की तरफ कदम बढ़ने वाला है, तो फिर गोआ में मिलिटरी अप-रेशन्स क्यों किये गये, तो यह बहुत कुछ उनकी गलती है।

इस बारे में मैं ऐसी पावर्ज का जिक्क नहीं करना चाहता, जिन्होंने जान बूझ कर मिस-अन्डरस्टैंडिंग पैदा की। उन के प्रति मुझे कोई सहानुभूति नहीं है। लेकिन यह जो कुछ गलत-फहमी हुई हम को उसको दूर करने के लिये यह स्पष्ट कर देना चाहिये कि भारतीय लोकशाही, या भारतीय सरकार अपनी फौज का उपयोग छोड़ देने या उस को अलग कर देने के लिये तैयार नहीं है, बल्कि जरूरत पड़ने पर, अपनी सुरक्षा के लिये और अपनी सोवियरेनिटी को बरकरार रखने के लिये वह उस को काम में लायेगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि गोआ अपरेशन्स के वैस्टर्न वर्ल्ड में यह बात स्पष्ट हो गई है कि

अगर जरूरत पड़ी, तो हिन्दुस्तान मिलिटरी कुब्वत को इस्तेमाल करेगा, जो कि बहुत जरूरी है।

आखिर में एक विनती के रूप में प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के विचार के लिये कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। इन्डो-तिबत एग्रीमेंट, १९५४ समाप्त हो जायेगा और उसके रिन्युअल के लिये कुछ कदम उठाये जा रहे हैं। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा है कि चाइना ने आज तक जो भी एग्रेसिव पालिसीज अख्तियार की हैं, उनमें परिवर्तन करना चाहिये और वे समाप्त हो जानी चाहिये। यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है, लेकिन अगर मैं इस कथन का इन्टरप्रेशन इस तरह करता हूँ, तो कोई गलत नहीं करता हूँ कि जब तिब्बत का सवाल उठाया जाता है तो हम दलाई लामा को नहीं भूल सकते, उन के भविष्य को अपनी दृष्टि से ओझल नहीं कर सकते। यह नहीं हो सकता कि तिब्बत के बारे में कुछ एग्रीमेंट हो और दलाईलामा की स्थिति का उस में समावेश न हो, इसबात का ध्यान न रखा जाये कि दलाईलामा का, उन के स्टेटस का, उन के अधिकारों का और तिब्बत में उन के स्थान का क्या होने वाला है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन के हितों को सुरक्षित रखने की जिम्मेदारी भारतीय सरकार पर है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब इस पर गौर करेंगे।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने आखिर में, संविधान में जो सिद्धान्त हम ने प्रतिपादित किये हैं, जो घोषणायें की हैं, जो आश्वासन हम ने दिये हैं, दुनिया के सामने जो चित्र हम ने रखा है, भारतीय समाज को हमने जो अभिवचन दिया है, उन को दोहराया है। जब हम एक काल-खंड को समाप्त कर के अपनी जिन्दगी के एक नये पर्व को शुरू करते हैं, तो उन घोषणाओं का पुनरुच्चार कर के उन के प्रति हमारे दिलों में जो निष्ठा है, उस को प्रकट करना आवश्यक हो जाता है और उस को हम इस प्रस्ताव के द्वारा प्रकट कर रहे हैं।

मैं एक बार फिर राष्ट्रपति जो को अपनी कृतज्ञता की अंजलि अर्पित करता हूँ और ईश्वर से यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह उन को लम्बी आयु दे और वह भारतीय लोक-शाही का मार्ग-दर्शन करने के लिये लम्बे अरसे तक जीवित रहें ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ ।

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:

"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 12th March, 1962."

The motion has been moved and also seconded.

I have received notice of a number of amendments to this motion. Shri Arjun Singh Bhadauria, Shri Yadav and Shri S.L. Saxena are absent. Shri Sarju Pandey.

Shri Sarju Pandey (Rasra): I move the amendments in my name.

Mr. Speaker: I will take them as moved subject to objections relating to relevancy, etc.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (New Delhi): I move the amendments standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker: I will treat them as moved. Shri Sampath is absent.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): I move the amendments standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker: I will treat them as moved.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): I move the amendments standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must observe the rules. His amendments were received late last evening and they could not be circulated to any of the hon. Members.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan (Coimbatore): The discussion is continuing tomorrow. So, the amendments may be admitted.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are inclined to waive notice. So, I will treat his amendments as moved. No more amendments will be received for the reason that once the debate starts, hon. Members who speak have no opportunity to say anything about those amendments.

Shri Sarju Pandey: I beg to move:

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

"but regret India's association with the Commonwealth of Nations notwithstanding the policy of some members of the Commonwealth practising racial inequality." (11).

Shri Sarju Pandey: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any steps for achieving economic equality." (12).

Shri Sarju Pandey: I beg to move:

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

"but regret the failure to handle the food problem in a well planned and co-ordinated way and to take any steps to stop the wastage of food in various ways." (13)

Shri Sarju Pandey: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any positive

[Shri Sarju Pandey]

and effective steps to ease the serious economic and unemployment conditions in the country." (14).

Shri Sarju Pandey: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any steps for implementing Article 46 of the Constitution aiming at the improvement of the Social, economic and educational condition of the Scheduled Castes." (15)

Shri Sarju Pandey: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the deterioration in the affairs of the Banaras Hindu University." (16)

Shri Sarju Pandey: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any steps for preventing the exploitation of the people by foreign and Indian capitalists." (17).

Shri Sarju Pandey: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any steps—

(a) to provide work and vocations to the teeming millions of unemployed persons within a definite period;

(b) to eradicate corruption, nepotism and favouritism rampant in Employment Exchanges established by Government." (18)

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the address omits to take note of the widespread abuse of governmental machinery and commission of numerous irregularities and malpractices by the ruling party for the promotion of their election ends and to indicate adequate preventive measures for the future." (19).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address has failed to represent the national will vis-a-vis the aspiration of the people of Tibet, by omitting to avail of the opportunity afforded by the lapse of the Indo-Tibetan Agreement to reorientate our Tibetan policy." (20).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address had failed to state categorically that vacation of China's illegal occupation of Indian territory (and not merely a reversal of aggressive policies) is a pre-condition for any sort of negotiations with China 'for the restoration of a climate of peace.'" (21).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address has failed to reassure the Nation against disturbing reports that the Government proposes to lease out to China that portion of Ladakh where the Chinese have built a road". (22).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address fails to allay misgivings emanat-

ing from the Prime Minister's utterances that the Government was prepared to settle the Kashmir issue on the basis of the ceasefire line". (23).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address has not taken note of the worsening of relations between India and Nepal and to indicate positive steps to strengthen ties between the two countries". (24).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address has failed to refer to the inflationary trends in the country's economy to the sharp increase in the cost of living index and to the resulting hardship caused to the common masses in general and the fixed income groups such as government employees in particular, and to indicate ways and means of holding the price line". (25).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not take note of continuous rise in prices of a number of essential commodities and does not indicate steps to be taken to arrest this phenomenal rise in prices." (51).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the privations arising out of high incidence of indirect taxation." (52).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not show concern about the manner in which the power of money and appeals in the name of caste, religion, community and narrow provincial sentiments were used in the Third General Elections to influence the voters." (53).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the serious allegations that have been made regarding malpractices and corruption in the elections nor does it promise any enquiry into such allegations as for instance the non-despatch of thousands of postal ballot papers in some parliamentary constituencies such as in Madurai District." (54).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not take into account that in the Third General Elections, the electorate of Kerala have given a verdict in favour of the opposition party, namely, the C.P.I. and its democratic allies and shown thereby that the present State Government does not enjoy the confidence of the people of Kerala State". (55).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not acknowledge the need for

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

the granting of democratic set up and responsible Government to Manipur, Tripura and Himachal Pradesh". (56).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not take notice of the unfriendly attitude of the Governments of U.K. and U.S.A. in the Security Council and otherwise on the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu". (57).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not promise full diplomatic recognition to the Provisional Algerian Government". (58).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not recognise the need for giving full democratic recognition to the German Democratic Republic". (59).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the necessity for an early settlement of the problem of Ceylon Tamils". (60).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that there is no mention in the Address of Government views on the alleged open interference in India's internal affairs by foreign agencies particularly in the Third General Election". (61).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that the U.N. Force in the Congo have not been in a position to ensure the implementation of the U.N. resolution regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops and the unity and independence of Congo and further that the Indian troops stationed there have not been allowed to fulfil their role in this respect". (62).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not firmly lay down that the Government of India does not any more recognise the jurisdiction of the U.N.O. in regard to Jammu & Kashmir problem nor propose to take steps to withdraw the question from the U.N.". (63).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the need to rename Madras State as Tamilnad following that change at the State level". (64).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

President

"but regret that the Address fails to take note of growing problems that face the handloom industry nor indicate any steps Government propose to take to protect the industry". (65).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that land reform legislations are creating intermediaries particularly in the State of Kerala". (66).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that there is no mention of suitable steps for rehabilitating the workers employed in the various major projects". (67).

Shri Yajnik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not mention any concrete steps to introduce the spirit of Swadeshi in the political and economic policies of Government." (68).

Shri Yajnik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not mention any concrete steps to further apply the principle of socialism by nationalising the Banking and General Insurance Companies in India". (69).

Shri Yajnik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not mention any concrete steps to diminish the increasing gap between the highest and the lowest incomes". (70).

Shri Yajnik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not mention any steps for diminishing the growing stranglehold of Western Capitalists and their Indian partners on the economy of India". (71).

Shri Yajnik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not mention any steps to check the increase in indirect taxation which bears heavily on the masses of India". (72).

Shri Yajnik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not mention any steps to check the steep rise in the prices of necessities of life". (73).

Shri Yajnik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not mention any drastic economies in Civil Administration and expenses of the Government". (74).

Shri Yajnik: I beg to move:

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

"but regret that the Address does not mention any steps to

[Shri Yajnik]

check the black-marketing, corruption and nepotism rampant in the country". (75).

Mr. Speaker: These amendments are now before the House.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the President in his address has referred to the liberation of Goa. We are happy to welcome the liberation of Goa and yesterday we have expressed our sentiments about it while discussing the Bill. So, I do not want to say anything more about it now.

The President has also referred to the disarmament conference of 18 nations now going on in Geneva. Entire humanity hopes to achieve positive results from this conference. India is a participant in this conference, and we are sure India will play a worthy role and help the world in taking a big step towards the elimination of war.

Another point to which the President has referred in his Address is about South Vietnam. During the last few days alarming reports of open U.S. armed intervention in South Vietnam have been appearing in papers. U.S. sources themselves have admitted that U.S. armed forces are fighting in South Vietnam. This is a threat not only to the peace of Vietnam but also the whole of Asia and even to the rest of the world. India is the Chairman of the International Commission for supervision and control. There is a feeling that India as the Chairman of this Commission is not meeting this threat to peace, and therefore we request that India should take steps to see that proper action is taken to stop this threat and to save peace. This is our responsibility to peace-loving forces and we must not fail in that responsibility, and India has to take steps as the Chairman of that International Commission.

The next thing that the President has referred to is about Congo. In his Address he says: "...the essen-

tial tasks for which India sent troops remain unfulfilled and, therefore, have agreed to continue the assistance which was given". I am sure that the essential task for which India sent troops will remain unfulfilled however much the sincerity of our Government to fulfil it may be, as long as the western powers behave in the way in which they are behaving today. So we do not find any necessity for our troops remaining there today and the troops have to be withdrawn. Whatever our desires may be, from the things that are happening in Congo today we think it will only be a waste and it is good that we withdraw our troops from Congo.

The Address has also referred to the Third Plan and speaks of its success. Nobody minimises the success of the Plan or the developments achieved and increase made in production. All of us want nation-building plans to succeed. But what are the realities of the situation. The agricultural production has increased. But as far as the increase itself is concerned, it is not stable; not only that it is not stable but the *per capita* availability of cereal has not even reached the pre-war level. About unemployment, I do not know whether the Plan has been able to arrest the growth of unemployment in the country or there is a deterioration as far as the employment situation is concerned. We have not been able till now to arrest the rise in prices. There is no effective price policy. As far as the question of wages is concerned, the real wages have not increased. People are burdened with taxation, and I think we can also believe that the burden of taxation will be more as far as the common man is concerned. Living standards of the people have deteriorated. Concentration of wealth has taken place. Not only that, monopolies have grown, foreign capital has strengthened its hold and our dependence on foreign loans as well as foreign aids has grown. So only one side of the picture has been shown whereas the

other side shows a growing deterioration in the situation.

There is another aspect of the Plan which I want to point out. The *Third plan* on page 153 says:

"Progress in different regions must, therefore, be watched carefully, and additional steps taken to speed up development in particular areas which are found to be seriously lagging behind. In the perspective of long-term self-sustained growth and with steady rise in the living standards of the people, regional and national development are essentially two different facets of a common objective."

But what do we find? The backward regions remain backward like before. The Plan has said that after every Plan an assessment should be made and it should be seen whether the backward regions have developed and what further help should be given to them. That has not been done and the backward regions even after the Third Plan will remain backward as they are today.

That means there is a big gap between the development that has taken place in the towns and the development in the villages. The villages especially in India are situated in hilly places. There are no roads. There are no means of communications at all. There are no medical facilities available. The villages remain as they are in spite of the two Plans and they are likely to remain so even after the Third Plan. In some villages there is not even good drinking water. We do not know when we will be able to close this gap between the villages and the towns, when the villages will see the same amount of development as in the towns. Therefore, as I said, as far as these two aspects of the question are concerned, the backward regions still remain backward and there is a big gap between the villages and the towns. Whatever may be the increase in the

national income, there is still a big gap. The rich people are becoming more and more rich. The *per capita* income of the common man shows that he remains where he was. Sir, this is all that I want to say about the reference to the Third Plan

Then I want to say something about the agrarian policy. The President has said that there is an increase in production and the increase is encouraging. The President has in his address said: "...the agricultural yield for 1961-62 is encouraging". But in another place, Shri V. T. Krishnamachari of the Planning Commission, a week back, has said that as far as the yield of crop in 1961-62 is concerned it is not very encouraging. I do not know which of the two statements is correct. Anyhow, in regard to supply of agricultural seeds, fertiliser and other things, the President has said that top priority has been given to agricultural production in the Third Five Year Plan. It is good. For the development of agriculture, good seeds, good implements and fertilisers are necessary. But what about the human aspect? As far as the agricultural labourers and peasants are concerned, what is it that has been done in order to encourage them. Even if they are given good seeds, good implements and fertilisers, the enthusiasm of the human labour also counts for increase in production.

There are two aspects. One is the land-reform legislation and their implementation. In all the States in India, today land-reform legislation has been completed. But in the Third Plan it has been specifically pointed out that they are defective. The Plan itself has pointed out that as far as certain aspects of the land-reform legislations are concerned, they are defective. I do not want to point out all the defects that have been pointed out. They have mentioned the provisions relating to abolition of intermediaries, evictions, permanency of tenure, etc. In the chapter on land-reforms, the Third Plan has mentioned that there are certain defects.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

Whatever legislation is there, the implementation of such legislation is still worse. I will give two or three examples to show how the implementation of land-reform legislations, however defective they are today in certain respects, has worsened the matter. Firstly, the land-reform legislations have said that the intermediaries should be abolished. In some States where the intermediaries have already been abolished, new intermediaries have been brought in. This matter has been referred to the Planning Commission and the Government also. In Kerala, where there had been no intermediaries, a system of *Melcharth* has come. Thousands of acres of land are leased to those intermediaries so that the peasants can be evicted at any time. It has been the policy of the Government to abolish intermediaries wherever they are existing through land reform. But what we find in actual practice is that new intermediaries are introduced where there are no intermediaries, and the Planning Commission is not interfering. In Kerala there is a place called Kottiyur where thousands of acres of land belonging to the Devasom have been leased out to some people, thereby creating some intermediaries between the landlords and peasants, giving them the right to evict the peasants. So the implementation of the land reform legislation has been done in such a way that instead of giving the peasants some benefits they are made to lose their land.

13 hrs.

Then, Government have failed to distribute all the fallow and surplus lands after the ceiling. In many States the surplus lands have not been distributed. In some States there are no surplus lands but even in those States the fallow lands have not been distributed. Whenever I have referred to this matter in the previous years, it has been stated that survey is taking place and so on, but, up till

now, the surplus and fallow lands have not been distributed.

Another aspect of the land legislation which does not enthruse the people of this country to work hard in their lands is eviction in the name of projects, in the name of preservation of forests, apart from allowing the landlords to indulge in evictions. In Kerala, in the name of projects and in the name of encroachment thousands of peasants have been evicted. This is happening not only in Kerala, but in Punjab, Bengal and other parts of India. And this is happening not as one isolated case but in thousands. There is absolutely no compensation, force is used, police is brought in and the peasants are driven away to the roads. I hope you all know that some months ago about 3,000 families were driven away from a place where they have been cultivating for the last ten or fifteen years, I had to go on fast for twelve days and then Government promised to give one acre of land to each peasant. It was only the beginning of eviction for projects. I do admit that for nation-building it is necessary that the peasants are made to undergo some sacrifices and they should be ready to go away from the lands they are cultivating for years. But, at the same time, if there is no programme for rehabilitation of such peasants and they are left alone without a place to live in and without any means of livelihood, then it is really a cruel thing. Since so many new projects are coming up in the Third Plan, I would say that the rehabilitation of those peasants must be taken up immediately and normally a person who has got a piece of land and is cultivating that land for some years should not be removed from that land. Otherwise, there will be no enthusiasm for the peasants to cultivate their lands.

Then I come to another important matter. So far as the implementation of land reform legislation is concerned, the Planning Commission has very definitely stated that certain things

must be done immediately. Because they have not been done, thousands of people are losing the lands which they have been cultivating for the last so many years. The Second Five Year Plan report says:

"The maintenance of correct and up-to-date land records is a pre-requisite for the implementation of land reform. In several States, following the abolition of intermediaries, revenue records have been or are in the process of being prepared. Frequently, revenue records are defective in as much as they do not provide information in respect of the holdings of tenants and crop-sharers.

...Revision and preparation of village records has to be taken up urgently and cannot wait until cadastral surveys are completed."

This is what the Planning Commission has stated. It says again:

"Problems arising in the implementation of land reform legislation enacted in the States have been studied by the Panel on Land Reform and the urgent tasks to be performed have been listed separately in respect of abolition of intermediaries, tenancy reform and ceilings. The Panel has laid particular stress on the preparation of correct and up-to-date records of rights and on the need to strengthen the revenue administration. Records of rights have been brought up-to-date in several areas, but in some of them there is need for a more intensive programme of work. In several States records of rights do not provide information regarding tenants, sub-tenants and crop-sharers, and as such implementation of the legislation itself suffers..."

The implementation of this legislation in several States has suffered. So far as Kerala is concerned, when the Agrarian Relations Act has been passed and assented to by the President, several peasants went to the

court and filed petitions for reducing their rent. At once the landlords stated that the lands do not belong to them for though the land had been in their possession for the last fifteen years they had no records of rights. Instructions were issued by Government long ago that there must be documented records and unless these records are there the implementation of the land reform legislation will not only not give anything to the peasants but will have the effect of depriving them of their lands because they have no records. In Kerala especially, 70,000 people courted arrest and then the Government promised that they will try to make records. So, I would say that those records must be prepared immediately and whenever any land reform legislation is passed, all that is necessary for its implementation should be done so that the result of the land reform legislation may not go against the peasants.

The President has referred to the question of elections in his Address. The hon. lady Member who spoke just now also referred to this and said that the elections went smoothly. But I would say that instances are not wanting of undemocratic practices in this election. The per capita income in India, according to the official figures, is Rs. 372 per year. How can a person who is getting Rs. 372 per annum stand for the election for Lok Sabha when the security deposit itself is Rs. 500? Even the entire money that he earns for the whole year is not sufficient to pay the security deposit and he will have to borrow something. Then he has to provide security deposit for the dummy also, which means another Rs. 500, making a total of Rs. 1,000. The hon. lady Member who preceded me said that by this election the theory of Marxism and class conflict have been wiped out. I would say that the elections have shown very clearly that those who have money can win in the elections and those who have not enough money cannot win in the elections, however good they may

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

be. I do not want to go into the practices resorted to in the elections. Sir, you yourself have contested the elections and you know how difficult it is to win and what the practices resorted to by the candidates are. So, I would say that the elections must be more democratic. The Maharajas and Maharanis are winning the elections because they have got the money. How can a poor and backward peasant, whose annual income is Rs. 372, pay a security deposit of Rs. 500? Therefore, I would say that the security deposit should be at least below the *per capita* income.

Mr. Speaker: All the same, some Maharajas have been defeated in the elections.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: In some cases they were defeated. But, if the elections had been more democratic, all of them would have been defeated.

Then I want to point out that in Jammu and Kashmir the opposition parties had to threaten the boycott of the elections.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member being a lawyer, he must know....

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I am not a lawyer.

Mr. Speaker: Those persons who are not able to pay the court-fees on a plaint are allowed to appear on filing a pauper petition. Those hon. Members who are not able to pay the security deposit may get loans.

Sardar Hukam Singh: (Bhatinda): If he succeeds, that money is charged from him.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Even if there are pauper nominations....

Mr. Speaker: I do not say that there should be pauper nominations. They may be given loans for the purpose of making the deposit.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: In Punjab the opposition parties have all challenged

the methods by which the Chief Minister has won. It is said that they are all going to meet in deputation the President and express before him the irregularities that had happened there.

In Kerala what happened? Just a few days before the elections in one constituency from where a Congress leader stood some increase in the reservation in services for Latin Christians had been given so that the votes of the Latin Christians may be got. There was a Pastoral letter which the hon. Prime Minister himself condemned when he went there. But the next day another Congress leader who had been standing from another constituency said that the Bishops had got every right to issue Pastoral letters because he wanted to get the votes. In a secular state there is no use of only condemning Pastoral letters because these letters by the Bishops will certainly carry weight and the voters will not be able to exercise their franchise according to their will. In some places more important than democratic principles was the question of getting votes by hook or by crook. I do not want to go into details because we have seen those details in the papers.

A more important thing is what is happening in our country after the elections. In most of the States after the elections there is a thing which, I think, has to be noted. In Punjab where there are 90 Congress MLAs 30 of them are Ministers. Every third Congressman becomes a Minister or a Deputy Minister. There are the Ministers, Deputy Ministers, Panel of Chairmen and other things. I do not know whether out of the 90 Members anybody will be left without any office. This is a very bad thing. Also, this is spending the money of the taxpayer. In Madras there are only nine Ministers but in Punjab there are 30 and in UP there are 40. Out of the names of 40 Ministers that have been listed, I have found in the papers today that 4 have not come because all

the factions could not be pleased. The forming of the Ministries in the States today is not in the interests of the country and the people. The people will suffer. What has happened after the elections surely shows that in order to please the factions and groups inside the Congress, it wants to take every man as a Minister, Deputy Minister or a Parliamentary Secretary. This is a very bad example which will not help the country and the interests of the people. The people are more and more dissatisfied. It will also be spending the money of the taxpayer.

Yesterday the hon. Prime Minister lost his temper when I referred to Kerala. I can understand the hon. Prime Minister losing his temper but I did not want to speak. I only want to point out that there cannot be double standards. As far as democracy and the parliamentary system are concerned there must be only one standard in 1959, in 1962 and as long as this system remains. What is the result of the elections in Kerala today? The result is that the percentage of votes polled by the Congress and the PSP is 44 per cent. The majority of the people have voted against the ruling parties. Of the 126 Assembly constituencies only in 42 have the Congress and the PSP secured the majority of the votes. Out of the 18 Parliamentary seats the Alliance has got only six seats. You may say that it was not an election for the Assembly and that it was an election for the Parliament. But whatever it is, the results have shown that wherever the Congress and the PSP stood together in all the constituencies except 42 they have been defeated. They are in the Government today.

In 1959 it was said that there was a mass upsurge. When we met the hon. Prime Minister in Kerala two days before the dismissal of the Ministry he said that there was a mass upsurge and the Government had lost the confidence of all those who voted for it in 1957. But here is a mass verdict. Is there any difference between a mass upsurge and a mass

verdict? A mass upsurge was something which had been created. I do not want to go into its details. But here is a mass verdict.

Mr. Speaker: On account of the linking up of the candidates for Parliament with the candidates for the local Assembly one or the other suffers.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: As far as we were concerned, we made this an issue in the election. The Chief Minister also said that this was an issue in the elections. We made this an issue whether this Government which has been there has lost the confidence of the people or not and the Chief Minister also said that.

Shri Maniyangadan (Kottayam): It was just the contrary.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: He will have an opportunity. What I say is that this was an issue. It is not a question whether it is election to the Parliament or to the Assembly. This was an issue and certainly it would have been taken note of and said that the issue whether there was no confidence in the Ministry should be decided. What was the position in 1959? There was no election then. The Government that was in power was in a majority. The majority did not go down. It was because the Government here thought that there was a mass upsurge and they had lost the confidence of the people that they were asked to resign. It was not by a mass verdict or as a result of an election. But even then they were asked to resign and because they did not resign they were dismissed. Now the question is: Is it not necessary after the elections to have some healthy conventions for the parliamentary democracy to develop? Why be afraid of the wishes of the people? If the people say that as far as the Parliament is concerned we do not want you to go to Parliament but we want you to be in power, one can understand. But if they do not want those parties that are in power to be

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

represented in Parliament, will they think that they must be in power in the State? As far as the elections in Kerala are concerned, I say very strongly that it is adopting a double standard. It is politically immoral also. So, this should not have been done.

As far as complaints are concerned, the Election Commission should give an opportunity to all people to enquire about these and hear them so that hereafter elections may be held more democratically and whatever irregularities have been committed may not be committed again.

Shri Raghuraj Sahaj (Budaun): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we feel very grateful to the President for his Address which he delivered only the other day. I associate myself with the tribute that has been paid to the President by our hon. friends, Dr. Sushila Nayar and Swami Ramananda Tirtha. During the brief time that I have at my disposal I would like to make certain observations only regarding two main points that have been touched in this Address, namely, the General Elections and Panchayati Raj.

The Election Commission, no doubt, deserves a tribute for having arranged these elections in a very short period, shorter than was taken in 1957 and with greater efficiency. For the most part law and order was maintained and elections were held in a peaceful atmosphere. Therefore a word of praise is due to the officials who were associated with these elections. But during these elections certain lamentable features were also brought to our notice; for instance, the very defective lists of voters that were supplied to the candidates.

13.19 hrs.

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

In these lists generally it was found that the names of living persons had

been left out in very large numbers and those of the dead and of those who had migrated to Pakistan were found existing. That gave rise to a lot of discontentment among the people as also disappointment. I submit that some machinery should be evolved by the Election Commission to see that these lists of voters are made up to date and correct.

The result of the election no doubt has given a fresh mandate to the Government and an approval in their policies, international and domestic. We hope that these policies will be pursued by the next Parliament vigorously. But these general elections have been a great eye-opener as never before. For instance, very undesirable forces in the form of casteism, communalism and regionalism came to the top and played almost havoc. The entire election was fought on that basis and not on political ideologies or programmes or achievements of any political party. What we saw was: a Thakur for a Thakur, a Jat for a Jat, an Ahir for an Ahir and a Muslim for a Muslim. This was the attitude of people in voting. That was the general experience in these elections. Take, for instance, the attitude of the Muslims. In one district where there had been two parliamentary constituencies, in one parliamentary constituency the entire Muslim population voted, one and all, for one independent candidate who was a Muslim, and in the same district in the other constituency where, happily, the Congress ticket had been given to a Muslim gentleman, an extremely good friend of mine, every Muslim voter voted for him. That poses a very sad and lamentable feature in these elections. The attitude of our Muslim friends is almost incomprehensible. During the elections we heard that the Muslims had decided to vote only for Muslim candidates—I am speaking about Rohilkhand Division in Uttar Pradesh—and we found that that hint which was given during the elections came out true. Wherever a

Muslim candidate stood, he may have been given a ticket by any political party, the Muslim voters veered round to him.

Shri A. M. Tariq: (Jammu and Kashmir): Question.

Shri Raghbir Sahal: Go to U.P. and study the results.

Shri A. M. Tariq: U. P. is not the whole of India.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order order.

Shri Raghbir Sahal: It is not proper on my hon. friend's part to make these interruptions. He does not know the conditions in all States.

This is a very dangerous trend, and if it is not arrested the whole experiment of parliamentary democracy will fail. What I have said about Muslims is true of other communities also, as said in the beginning, and that shows a very dangerous trend. There have been criticisms during the elections by educated people that this adult franchise should not have been given in the manner it has been conferred by the Constitution. It is too late in the day to withdraw that right from the people as a whole, because that will be a very retrograde step. But there must be certain provisions made and the future Parliament will have to consider as to how this franchise should be exercised in the proper manner. For instance, certain qualifications can be fixed for a candidate either for the Lok Sabha or for the Assembly. At the present moment, unhappily, there is no qualification and candidates can stand up only on the basis of caste, community or religion.

Now, there is another feature about these elections, namely, that the candidate for the Lok Sabha is entirely at the mercy of the Assembly candidates. He is not judged on his own merits or demerits. In case the Assembly candidates make unholy alliances with Lok Sabha candidates of other political parties, as they have done in U.P., then the Lok Sabha candidate is doomed. So a point to be considered

by the Election Commission and by the future Parliament would be whether these elections could be held separately. There might be considerations for and against it, but at least if the elections for the Lok Sabha are held separately the candidate will be judged on his own merits and will not be at the mercy of the Assembly candidates.

Coming to the other point, namely panchayati raj, the President has very wisely referred to this important subject and this important experiment which has been going on in our country for the last two years. We are very glad to know that this programme has been accepted by as many States as eight and that the other States would sooner than later take up this programme in right earnest. With regard to the working of panchayati raj a sociological study had been conducted by the Central Research Institute, Mussoorie through some of their experts. These people proceeded to Rajasthan and Andhra where this experiment was taken up first and has been there for more than two or three years. There they examined very elaborately something like 250 persons at random from a block, both from Rajasthan and Andhra. They have come to certain conclusions. We find that a good many people out of these examined had expressed their view that the panchayat elections should be held on a unanimous basis. You know that this view has been expressed in this Parliament several times before, and we find that this view has been expressed by the villages people themselves, and one of the reasons that they gave for unanimous election was that a good deal of unnecessary expenditure would be saved. It is true that unanimous elections cannot be enforced by legislation. But we shall have to carry on our educative propaganda vigorously amongst those people so as to educate them to see that these elections are held on a unanimous basis.

Another result to which the Study Team arrived was that although 80

[Shri Raghbir Sahai]

per cent. of the people do take part in these elections by casting their votes, they do not take an intelligent interest in regard to the implications of panchayati raj. They do not understand, and they do not have an adequate comprehension about the programme.

One of the results to which the Team has arrived is that the idea entertained by these village people is that these village panchayats are meant only for settling their disputes and instead of referring them to caste panchayats they could as well be referred to the village panchayat. It is true that this was no doubt one of the functions of the village panchayat, but this is not the only function. And the Sociological Study Team has come to the conclusion that they are not fully aware of the implications of panchayati raj.

Another feeling that is entertained by these people both in Rajasthan and in Andhra is that this is a government programme and not a peoples programme, and that make a lot of difference. Because, they can only take full interest in it if they consider it to be their programme. On the other hand, it is considered to be a routine affair, some business which has been laid down by the Government for their performance. But, a very happy feature that has been brought out by the sociological study was—and that is observed almost everywhere—that the people do take advantage of the medical help provided by these bodies in these blocks everywhere. They take the help of the male and female doctors. They take the help of the veterinary surgeon. They take their cattle to these dispensaries and they get them treated. They feel grateful for this help that the Government is giving. Further more, they are having a very good opinion about the village level worker. They have expressed their opinion that their visits should be more often so that they could take advantage of these people on account of their being technical experts.

In this connection, it has been brought out several times before in this Parliament that the charge which is given to the V.L.W is very large—a number of villages, 10 to 15, sometimes 20. In that case, he is not able to devote himself to any particular village. If the charge is reduced, if the area under his command is reduced, he would be able to give more attention to these villages and the villagers also would come more in contact with him.

Another point that was brought out by this sociological study was that the village people were entirely ignorant about the village production plans on which so much stress is being laid for the last so many years. Until and unless the people take active interest in the village production plans, how can the targets be reached? If they do not take an interest in the village production plans, we cannot hope to raise our agricultural production which we need so much. It is very necessary that the village people should be associated with the preparation of village production plans. Up to this time, it is only a routine affair which is being taken up by the members of the staff.

Another conclusion to which this study team has come is that the influence of caste is decreasing and the influence of the village panchayats is growing. We cannot subscribe to this conclusion to which the sociological study has come. We found during this election that caste influence was predominant. If our Panchayati Raj is to succeed, if really democratic decentralisation is to succeed, we shall have to see that at every level, from the village, block, and the district to the State level, proper guidance and training is given to all these people, either officials or non-officials, associated with this movement so that they may be immersed in the traditions of Panchayati Raj and work it out for the good of the people and the community.

Shri Yajnik: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am happy to pay my humble tri-

bute to the President who is one of the oldest colleagues of Mahatma Gandhi and who has brought to bear the great powers of his head and the qualities of his heart on the work that he has been doing as the President of this country.

I am sorry to say that advantage has not been taken of the ensuing retirement of the President to make a new departure in some important matters. I remember Gandhiji to have said that when we have Swaraj, the Viceregal Lodge will be converted into a museum or a nursing home. Apart, from that, I feel that as the President is about to retire, the Government should have paused and embarked on a new policy of reducing the pomp, pageantry and the heavy expenses and other paraphernalia that is associated not only with the Rashtrapati Bhavan but with all the Raj Bhavans in the country and with all the ministerial establishments in the whole land. It is not a question of merely reducing the expenses. But, when we are asking the millions to day to gird up their loins, to produce more, to exert themselves for making a success of the Third Five Year Plan, we must set an example from the highest quarters. I say that the reduction in the pomp and pageantry of these establishments will go a long way in giving some hope and faith to the millions in the country in the Government of the day. It will also set an example to the Rajas, Maharajas, to all the mill-owners and the capitalists of India, and to the civil services, who are otherwise inclined to be capitalist minded.

This election, like all other elections won with money as well as with votes. The Congress party has been generally making a habit of getting money from the rich and votes from the poor. This Government has set a socialist pattern of society as its goal. But, I am surprised to see that under this Government, the rich have been continuously getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. It is not an accident. It is the result of the

policies, laws and practices that are pursued by all the Ministries of this Government both at the Central as well as the State levels. The capitalists pay good contributions in the Congress coffers and get abundant loans and subsidies and facilities from the Government of the day. It is because this Government has been following a deliberate policy of favouring vested interests and the biggest capitalists in the country that they are getting contributions from the biggest financial houses in the country. But, then, they have to proclaim socialism from the house tops in order to get the votes of the poor. They always speak in the name of the millions as Gandhiji used to do.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If we take out money from the rich, that is also conducive to socialism.

Shri Yajnik: They give money to the Congress coffers and take a lot more as Mundhra did from the Government coffers. That is my complaint. Mundhra gave a lakh or two to the Congress coffers and got one crore and probably fifteen lakhs from the L.I.C. on shares which were of very doubtful quality.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Fatehpur): We got it back.

Shri Yajnik: We got it back because this matter was noised about, and it was in the press and it was in Parliament. But, there are lots of Mundhras today masquerading in the whole country, all kinds of capitalists and super-capitalists.

Shri Sampath (Namakkal): Shri T. T. Krishnamachari warned.

Shri Yajnik: He warned. The point is, this socialism is really funny. It gets money from the rich. Not only that. It also gives them facilities to be continuously getting richer more than ever before.

I want to draw the attention of the House to the common man who is living in his mud-hut or in his basti or his *chawl* in a city. How do the

[Shri Yajnik]

common people feel about it? What are their reactions to the policies of Government? What do they think of the Plan? How do they evaluate it? What are the results that they get? How do they benefit by it? I think that that is a question that has not been very adequately dealt with in the President's Address.

The President has given figures of food production. But as my hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan has shown, the *per capita* availability of cereal has not only not increased but has decreased, and it is yet to be shown that it has come up to the pre-war level. What does it benefit a common man, a labourer or a peasant or an agricultural labourer or a tenant or an artisan to see the figures, figures of millions of tons being grown more during the last few years, if he is not able to get food and food articles at a price within his reach?

I have been going round the streets of Ahmedabad, and also round Gujarat, but especially round the streets of Ahmedabad during the last few months, going to hundreds and thousands of houses, and the one complaint that I heard continuously from the people, the middle class people, the lower middle class people and the poor workers, was that they were pinched for food. Food was there, but not within their reach. Even the American wheat which was of very spurious quality did not satisfy their hunger, and they were not able to buy enough with the money at their disposal.

After food comes coal, which has risen very high in prices. I am talking of domestic coal. Oil also has risen in price. Somebody says that if oil is not there, one can do without oil. That is a good Sermon on the Mount, but it is not practicable. If ghee is not available, if vegetable ghee is not within their reach, if *til ka tel* is also not within their reach, if people have now come to use groundnut oil, and if even that is not there, then how are they to have any

lubricant that is essential for digesting their food? Government are never tired, and Government spokesmen are never tired of applauding the great advance in industries. Industries are developed, no doubt, but how does it benefit the common man in the country? They do not employ more labour; they do not employ very much more labour.

In Ahmedabad, the textile mills are taking to automatic looms, which results in diminution of labour power. But the increase in production is very big. Undoubtedly, it is big, it is so much that they are able to export now. The total exports from the country range round about Rs. 85 crores. But then, cloth is not cheap. Why is it not cheap? Why are the millowners allowed to keep all the profits for themselves, including the big profit that they get from the export of textiles? It is the right of the Indian people to demand from Government that they shall have cloth at a reduced price, when the cotton textile industry is flourishing and it is producing more than ever before.

Then, we have the steel industry growing up very well. We are very happy to see the three steel plants that have been newly established. But the common man thinks of the corrugated iron sheets, and the iron sheet is still available more in the black market than in the white market.

Our statisticians and Government propagandists talk about the development of the cement industry. Now, we are producing more cement than ever before, and yet cement is not only scarce, but it largely available in the blackmarket only.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): Prices have gone up also.

Shri Yajnik: And the prices also have gone up.

Then, there is the case of sugar. There is a very big production of

sugar. And figures of sugar production are flaunted in our face as a great achievement of the Congress. But who benefits by it? Are our mouths sugared? Is sugar getting cheaper? Are the sugarcane growers benefited? Are the workers in the sugar factories benefited? The consumer is not benefited at all. All the big profits are being pocketed by the millowners, who are paying handsomely to the Congress coffers. They have accumulated such big stocks that they must export a lot in order to keep going. Government obliges them by selling this sugar at a very reduced price, but the millowners would not incur any of the loss that is incurred by Government; Government must pay the whole loss in rupees to these millowners. And, therefore, they must tax us more, and, therefore, the prices must increase.

It is a curious phenomenon. While on the one hand, we are told that production must be increased in order to reduce the prices of necessities here in the case of sugar, the production has risen to such an extent that the millowners cannot keep it in their warehouses, so it has to be exported. On the other hand we find that the export results in a loss, and that loss has to be borne by taxation by Government, and the taxation which is mostly indirect falls on the necessities of life and makes things dear. So, it is a curious phenomenon of greater production of sugar entailing greater burdens on the people. And yet the figures of increased industrial production are flaunted in our face, and are being paraded a about as the glories of the Congress raj.

There is one aspect of the development in this country about which I must warn Government. As I have said before, the only people almost who benefit by the growth in industry are the capitalists of India, but they are not the only ones. There is the other side as well, and there are the foreign capitalists. Foreign capitalists, about the time of the transfer

of power in 1947 started selling some of their factories to the Indian counterparts. But they very soon realised that this Government was very happy to welcome foreign capital, with the result that the investment of foreign capital has been increasing by leaps and bounds in recent years. Formerly, it was British capital, but now it is American and West German. In fact, all the big capitalist countries of the world are finding the climate of India suitable for making very big profits.

Let us remember that this country suffered from the British monopoly of insurance, of banking and of foreign trade. During the British regime we thought that when we had Indian *swara*, we would be able to have all these departments in Indian hands. But that was not to be. Even today, except for the life insurance business which is in the hands of the LIC, foreign trade, general insurance, banking, and of course, shipping, largely remain in foreign hands. Jute, coal and plantation industries were also inherited as British interests from British times. What has happened during recent years? More and more money has been invested by foreigners in all these British and other concerns. More foreign exchange has been flowing in. So we welcome it. There are not only the Loans given to Government, but there is this infiltration of private capital invested in private companies. During recent years much more is being invested in partnership with Indian counterparts. So we have now a new development of foreign-cum-Indian companies. Very often, the percentage of capital may be more Indian than foreign; sometimes it is more foreign than Indian in contravention of the Industrial Policy Resolution. Anyway, even where sign-board is Indian, the power behind the throne is vested in the foreigner in many cases. This grownig collaboration of Indian capitalists with foreigners is a very serious matter for this country. It strikes at the very root of our

[Shri Yajnik]

concepts of freedom. Foremost, we wanted to get free not only from foreign political rule, but also from foreign economic empire. Today, while doing away with foreign consumer goods to a certain extent, we are allowing these foreigners to be entrenched right on our own soil. There is less of imports from foreign countries to show that the stranglehold of foreign consumer goods on the Indian market has lessened, but then we are inviting these foreign big monopolists and capitalists to make home in this very land and entrench themselves in partnership with Indian capitalists.

Now, where is our economic freedom? The stranglehold of this mixed foreign and Indian capitalism is growing tighter and tighter round the necks of India's millions. They have also political repercussions. Let us not forget how the foreigners behaved during the last elections. I do not want to go into all kinds of reports and stories that have been current. But it is a significant warning for that future, that if we allow these foreigners to stabilise themselves here in this country in co-operation with Indian capitalists, it spells a great danger to democracy in this country. They will take an increasing share and interest in the elections and all the political and economic policies of the Government, and will try their level best to see that their wills and wishes and the wills and wishes of their governments situated abroad are carried out in India through Indian hands.

Lastly, as I said before, the economic inequalities between the poor and the richer are increasing. In his last work, or one of his last works, on constructive work, Mahatmaji said:

"The contrast between the palaces of New Delhi and the miserable hovels of the poor labouring class nearby cannot last one day in a free India in which the poor will enjoy the same

power with the richest in the land. A violent and bloody revolution is a certainty one day unless there is a voluntary abdication of riches, of the power that riches give; and sharing them for the common good".

This was his warning, Mahatmaji was wedded to policies of peace and non-violence, but when he felt it necessary to write about the possibility of an explosive, bloody revolution, it is a warning that our Government should take to heart betimes.

श्री अ० मु० तारिक : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं आप का मश्कूर हूँ कि आप ने मुझे यह मौका बख्सा है। मैं न तो उस रोह में हूँ जो हार गये हैं और न मुझे यह मालूम है कि मैं वापस आऊंगा भी या नहीं। इस लाहज से मैं आप का मश्कूर हूँ।

मैं प्रेजिडेंट साहब के ऐंड्रेस की पुरजोर हिमायत करता हूँ।

सब से पहले मैं मि० रघुवीर सहाय की गलतफहमी को दूर करना चाहता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि एक कांग्रेसमैन की हैसियत से उन्होंने मुसलमानों के साथ सरासर नाइन्साफी बल्कि जुल्म किया यह कर कि मुसलमान ने मुसलमान को वोट दिया, गैरमुसलमान को वोट नहीं दिया। यह हकीकत नहीं है। फिर ब हैसियत इन्सान के यह मेरा हक है कि मैं जिस को चाहूँ वोट दूँ और जिस को चाहूँ न दूँ। एक मुसलमान की हैसियत से भी मुझे इस मुल्क में जिन्दा रहने का, सयासी जिन्दगी में, समाजी जिन्दगी में, अपना फर्ज अदा करने का पूरा हक है। कोई शक्त्त अपनी मर्जी के तहत मुझे डिकटेट नहीं कर सकता जब कि इस मुल्क की अक्सरियत पर इस किस्म की कोई पाबन्दी नहीं है कि कौन किस को वोट दे।

شری ع - م - طارقی - جلاب ڈپٹی
اسپیکر صاحب - میں آپ کا مشکور

ہوں کہ آپ نے مجھے یہ موقع بخشا ہے - میں نہ تو اس گروہ میں ہوں جو ہار گئے ہیں اور نہ مجھے یہ معلوم ہے کہ میں واپس آؤنگا بھی یا نہیں - اس لحاظ سے میں آپ کا مشکور ہوں -

میں پریزیڈنٹ صاحب کے ایڈریس کی پرزور حمایت کرتا ہوں -

سب سے پہلے میں مسٹر رگھوہر سہائے کی غلط فہمی کو دور کرنا چاہتا ہوں - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ ایک کانگریس میں کی حیثیت سے انہوں نے مسلمانوں کے ساتھ سراسر نا انصافی بلکہ ظلم کیا یہ کہہ کر کہ مسلمان نے مسلمان کو ورت دیا - جو مسلمان کو ورت نہیں دیا - یہ حقیقت نہیں ہے - پھر بحیثیت انسان کے یہ مہرا حق ہے کہ میں جس کو نہ چاہوں نہ دوں - ایک مسلمان کی حیثیت سے بھی مجھے اس ملک میں زندہ رہنے کا - سہاسی زندگی میں - سماجی زندگی میں - اپنا فرض ادا کرنے کا پورا حق ہے - کوئی شخص اپنی مرضی کے تحت مجھے ڈکٹیٹ نہیں کر سکتا جب کہ اس ملک کی اکثریت پر اس قسم کی کوئی پابندی نہیں ہے کہ کون کس کو ورت دے -

Shri Sampath (Namakkal): On a point of order. I think the hon. Member is speaking in the Urdu language.

Shri A. M. Tariq: Yes, It is one of the 14 languages mentioned in the Constitution.

Shri Sampath: I want a clarification from the Chair as to whether any language other than Hindi or English can be freely used here without giving prior translation of the speech. If Urdu is allowed, will all other languages also enjoy the same privilege?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Urdu is so akin to Hindi that it sometimes becomes difficult to differentiate between the two. Only there is some leniency towards this side or that, towards Persian on one side or Sanskrit on the other. That is all that discriminates between the two, otherwise, Urdu as such is understood by those people who speak Hindi.

I hope the hon. Member will also take care about this.

Dr. Samantsinhar (Bhubaneswar): We have got also Hindi as official language, what is accepted as the *lingua franca*.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I remember an incident in this connection. When Maulana Azad was speaking here, Seth Govind Das stood up and asked what was the language that was being spoken, and he said it was Hindi. So it was so accepted at that time, that what Maulana Azad spoke was also Hindi and what Seth Govind Das spoke was also Hindi.

Shri Sampath: But the hon. Member said that he was speaking in Urdu.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): He is speaking in Hindi.

Shri Sampath: He said he was speaking in Urdu (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then he is mistaken perhaps. He will correct himself.

Shri Sampath: Shri A. M. Tariq said that he was speaking in Urdu. In the list of language given in the Constitution, Urdu is one apart from other languages.

[Shri Sampath]

So, I want to know whether the privilege enjoyed by Urdu can also be enjoyed by other languages. Without giving prior translation, can we speak in our mother tongue?

14 hrs.

Dr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not giving any privilege to any other language. And then, once it is conceded that he is speaking in Hindi, no question arises.

Shri Sampath: But he said he was speaking in Urdu.

Shri Morarji Desai: He is speaking in Hindi.

श्री अ० मु० तारिक: मैं हिन्दी में बोल रहा हूँ ।

Shri Sampath: He is not speaking in Hindi.

श्री अ० मु० तारिक : तो मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि मेरे ऊपर कोई पाबन्दी नहीं है । और मेरे दोस्त ने जहाँ यह कहा कि ठाकुर ने ठाकुर को वोट दिया, राजपूत ने राजपूत को वोट दिया, उन्होंने एक खास अन्दाज से यह बात कही कि मुसलमान ने मुसलमान को वोट दिया । हिन्दुस्तान से मतलब सिर्फ़ यू० पी० का सूबा नहीं है । हिन्दुस्तान बहुत बड़ा मुल्क है । हिन्दुस्तान में गुजरात भी है और बम्बई भी, आसाम भी है और मद्रास भी, आन्ध्र और केरल और पंजाब भी हिन्दुस्तान में हैं ।

मैं आपने: नोटिस में चन्द वाक्यात लाना चाहता हूँ । यू० पी० में शायद ही किसी जगह मुसलमानों की इतनी अक्सरियत हो कि वह किसी को कामयाब करा सकें । और फिर यू० पी० में ही अलीगढ़ का किस्सा लीजिए जहाँ एक मुसलमान कैंडीडेट था पर वहाँ एक गैर मुस्लिम कामयाब हुआ । आप कायम गंज को लीजिए जहाँ एक गैर मुस्लिम कामयाब हुआ मुसलमानों के वोट से । मैं नहीं समझता कि

यह बात मुसलमान के लिए जरूरी है कि वह सिर्फ़ कांग्रेस को वोट दे । सिर्फ़ कांग्रेस ही एक जमाअत नहीं है । हर शख्स वोट देने के मामले में आजाद राय है ।

हमारे सामने हमारे एक लीडर बैठे हैं, फाइनेन्स मिनिटर साहब बैठे हैं । उनकी कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी में मुसलमान हैं और उन्होंने उनको वोट किया । चाहे यह बम्बई से खड़े होते तो बम्बई के मुसलमान इनको वोट करते । यह तो अपनी जाती खदारी का मामला है । बम्बई में एस० के० पाटिल साहब की सीट को लीजिए । और मुहम्मद अली रोड पर मिस्टर फौकी कामयाब हुए और मुस्लिम लीग हार गयी ।

Shri Keshava (Bongalore City): Dr. Melkote has been returned by a Muslim majority.

श्री अ० मु० तारिक : डा० मैलकोटे मुझ से कहते हैं कि ५० परसेंट मुसलमानों ने उनको वोट किया । तो मुसलमानों को फिरकापरस्त कहना निहायत जुल्म है और जुल्म ही नहीं है बल्कि एक साजिश है मुल्क में फिरकापरस्ती को द्वा देने की । मुझे इन्ताहाई अफसोस है कि कांग्रेस बैचेज ने यह आवाज उठी ।

अगर मैं अपने वोटों की खिदमत नहीं करता, अगर मेरे में इतनी काबलियत नहीं है कि मैं अपने वोटों के सामने जाऊँ तो इस का इल्जाम किसी खास कम्युनिटी पर डाल देना निहायत बेइन्साफी है । हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत सी कौम बसती हैं । मुसलमान भी एक कौम है और उनको हक है कि वह जिसको चाहें वोट करें ।

आप नार्थ बम्बई को लीजिए जहाँ हिन्दुस्तान का सबसे बड़ा इलेक्शन लड़ा गया । जहाँ सोशलिज्म, जहाँ डिमाक्रेसी और सरमायादारी की जंग थी । और उस कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी

में ७६,००० मुसलमान हैं और जहां तक मुझे यकीन है, और मेरा दावा है, कि ६० परसेंट मुसलमानों ने कांग्रेस केंडीडेट को वोट दिया। बावजूद इसके कि उन पर तरह तरह के दबाव डाले गए। मुल्क की मुखालिफ जमायतों ने अपने जलसों में कुरान शरीफ पढ़वाए, अजानें लगवाईं। इसके बावजूद मुसलमानों ने कांग्रेस को वोट दिया।

सिर्फ कांग्रेस को वोट देना मेरे उपर लाजिमी नहीं है जिस तरह कि अब सरियत के लिए यह लाजिमी नहीं है कि वह कांग्रेस को वोट करे। जहां जनसंघ रह सकता है, हिन्दू महासभा रह सकती है, स्वतंत्र पार्टी रह सकती है, और भी जमाअतें हैं, इंडिपेंडेंट्स भी हैं। और बहुत से मुसलमान हैं जो हिन्दुओं के वोट से आए हैं। आप आसाम को लीजिए। मफीदा अहमद मेम्बर हैं। उनके नीचे आठ गैर मुस्लिम थे और आठ के आठ जीत गए और मफीदा अहमद हार गयीं उनके मुकाबले में। मैं ऐसी बहुत सी मिसालें आपके सामने रख सकता हूं। हुमायून कविर साहब की कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी ले लीजिए। बिजनीर में लतीफ साहब की कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी ले लीजिए, उनकी कुरबानियों से तारीख बन सकती है। वहां ४० फी सदी मुसलमान वोट थे लेकिन वह श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री से हार गए। फिर भी हम से गिला है कि तुम फिरकापरस्त हो। तुम बफादार नहीं हो। अरे हम बफादार नहीं, तू भी तो दिलदार नहीं। जहां आप खुद रवादार नहीं हैं वहां हम पर इल्जाम लगाते हैं कि हम फिरकापरस्त हैं। इस मामले में कांग्रेस के मेम्बरों को अपनी खामियों को और अपनी कमजोरियों को छिपाना नहीं चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जितना कुछ अब कहा गया है उससे आगे मेम्बर साहब न जाएं। उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा कि मुसलमान फिरकापरस्त हैं। उन्होंने तो सिर्फ यह कहा था कि इस बार इलैक्शन में जात पर बहुत जोर दिया गया। यह बात उन्हें ने औरों के बारे में भी कही और मुसलमानों के बारे में भी कही।

श्री अ० मु० तारिक : उन्होंने मुसलमानों पर ज्यादा जोर दिया था।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो मैंने तराजू पर वजन नहीं किया कि किसको कितना जोर दिया था। मगर इस बात को बहुत हद तक खींचने की जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री अ० मु० तारिक : जहां तक प्रेसीडेंट साहब के एड्रेस का ताल्लुक है, जो उन्होंने कहा सोशलिज्म के बारे में। यह एक हकीकत है कि हमने इस मुल्क में सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न का एक प्रोग्राम बनाया है। लेकिन यह सिर्फ कहने से ही नहीं होगा। हमें इत्तहाई शिद्दत के साथ उस पर अमल करना चाहिए। हमें चाहिए कि हम उन लोगों का जो बड़े बड़े सरमाएदारों के हाथों में जकड़े हुए हैं और जो लोग निहायत शिद्दत के साथ अपनी सरमाएदारी को हिन्दुस्तान में फैला रहे हैं, सख्ती से मुकाबला करें। अगर हमने इस मुल्क में सोशलिज्म को लाना है तो यकीनन उसके लिए हमें चन्द बुनियादी बातों को करना चाहिए। एक तो यह कि मुल्क में ज्यादातर कारखाने पब्लिक सैक्टर में खोले जाएं। तालीम आम की जाए और लोगों को इल्म से रूसनाश किया जाए और तालीम के बारे में लोगों को मजिद सहूलियतें हों।

जनाब वाला पिछले इलेक्शन में जो चीजें सामने आयीं उन्होंने यह साबित कर दिया कि इस मुल्क में जो जंग होगी या इलेक्शन में जो जंग हुई वह सोशलिज्म और सरमाएदारी की जंग थी। हमने देखा कि कुछ लोगों के हाथ में इस मुल्क की दौलत है और दौलत के साथ-साथ हमने यह भी देखा कि बड़े-बड़े सरमाएदारों के पास अखबारात हैं जो कि एक सबसे बड़ा जरिया है लोगों तक किसी चीज को पहुंचाने का, जो एक सबसे बड़ा हथियार है लोगों के जहनों को तबदील करने का, जो कि एक सबसे बड़ी चीज है लोगों को सियासी तौर पर एजुकेट करने की। हमने देखा कि वह बड़े-बड़े सरमाएदार जो

[श्री अ० मु० तारिक]

एक तरफ तो हमारे दोस्त बनने का दावा करते हैं जब उनको अपनी दौलत को और बढ़ाना होता है लेकिन वह बड़ी तेजी से, बड़ी शिद्दत से और बड़ी जुरत के साथ हमारे सामने आए कि हमारी पालिसियों को नाकाम करें और इसमें उन्होंने अखबारों को इस्तेमाल किया। जब मैं अखबारों का जिक्र करता हूँ तो मैं उन छोटे छोटे लोगों का जिक्र नहीं करता जो इन अखबारों में काम करते हैं बल्कि मेरा मतलब उन सरमाएदारों से है जो इन अखबारों के मालिक हैं। वह इन अखबारों में काम करने वाले छोटे छोटे लोगों का भी खून चूसते हैं और दूसरी तरफ कोशिश करते हैं इस मुल्क को गलत रास्ते ले जाने की और सरमाएदारी को फिर से मजबूत करने की।

सिर्फ ये सरमाएदार ही नहीं हैं बल्कि हमारे सामने जो सबसे बड़ी चीज है वह इस मुल्क के राजे महाराजे हैं। एक तरफ तो यह कहा गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान में हर एक को मसावी हक है कि किसी शस्स की आमदनी से किसी के कारोबार से नाजायज फायदा न उठावे। लेकिन ये राजे महाराजे, जिन्हें हम बड़ी-बड़ी रकमें देते हैं बगैर किसी काम काज के, बगैर किसी मतलब के, आखिर वही दौलत जो हमारे गरीब लोगों की आमदनी से इनको दी जाती है वही हमारे सामने लायी गयी। यह सिर्फ कांग्रेस का सवाल नहीं है बल्कि उन तमाम जमाअतों का सवाल है जो इस मुल्क में सोशलिज्म को कायम करना चाहती हैं। चाहे वह सोशलिस्ट पार्टी हो, चाहे पी० एस० पी० हो, या कांग्रेस हो या कम्युनिस्ट हों। इन सब को इसका मुकाबला करना है। यह खतरा सिर्फ कांग्रेस के लिए नहीं है। बल्कि हमारी सभी जमाअतों के लिए है। फिरकापरस्ती अगर इस मुल्क में सिर उठाती है, तो उससे सिर्फ कांग्रेस ही कमजोर नहीं होती बल्कि और भी जमाअतें कमजोर

होती हैं। तो इन चीजों का, चाहे वह फिरकापरस्ती हो या सरमाएदारी हो, हम सब को मुकाबला करना चाहिए।

जनाब वाला मैं एक और बात आपकी तबज्जह में लाना चाहता हूँ। वह है ताजा शोर गुल और ताजा प्रोपेगेंडा जो हुकूमत पाकिस्तान ने काश्मीर के बारे में किया है। मुझे अफसोस है कि प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने इसका जिक्र अपने एड्रेस में नहीं किया है। अभी पिछले चन्द महीनों में, पिछले इलेक्शन से पहले, पाकिस्तान ने जो नाकाम कोशिशें कीं न्यूयार्क में अपने दोस्तों की हिमायत से हिन्दुस्तान को बदनाम करने के लिए काश्मीर के मसले पर। यह एक हकीकत है, और इसमें मुझे बार बार यह कहने की जरूरत नहीं कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा बन चुका है। लेकिन मैं यह देखता हूँ कि वह लोग जो एक तरफ तो हम से दोस्ती करते हैं, एक तरफ तो यह चाहते हैं कि हमारी उनसे सियासी दोस्ती हो, वही लोग जब दूसरी तरफ उनको जरा भी मौका मिलता है तो वह हमारी पीठ में छरा भोंकने की कोशिश करते हैं और उन्होंने बार-बार ऐसा किया है। मैं नहीं जानता कि क्या हक है हुकूमत अमरीका को कि वह हमसे यह कहे कि हम काश्मीर के मसले पर फिर बातचीत करें पाकिस्तान से, और वह हमें नाम भी पेश करे, चाहे वह मिस्टर ब्लैक हों या मिस्टर व्हाइट हों, जो आज मसावत करेंगे काश्मीर के मसले पर। काश्मीर का मसला कोई मसलेहत के ताबे मसला नहीं है वह मसला सिर्फ यह है कि काश्मीर की सरहदों पर जिन गैर मुल्की ताकतों का कब्जा है, चाहे वह चीन हो या पाकिस्तान हो, उनको काश्मीर से बाहर निकाला जाए। और अगर कोई शस्स वाकै हिन्दुस्तान से दोस्ती करता है तो उसे निहायत दयानतदारी से इस मामले में हमारी हिमायत करना चाहिए और काश्मीर को गैर मुल्की हमलावरों से पाक कराना चाहिए।

तीसरी बात जो मैं आपकी खिदमत में लाना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि जो गैर मुल्की लोग हमारे अन्दरूनी मामलात में दखल देते हैं इसको हम कब तक बरदाश्त करते रहेंगे। नार्थ बम्बई के इलैक्शन ने यह साबित कर दिया कि उसके पीछे कितनी गैर मुल्की ताकतें थीं, कितने गैर मुल्की अखबार नवीस थे जो हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ तरह तरह की बातें फैलाते थे। अब तो इस मुल्क में एक और हंगामा पैदा किया जा रहा है। अब मैननिज्म आ रहा है। कहीं नेहरूइज्म है, कहीं सोशलिज्म है। तो मैं हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत से दरखास्त कर्हंगा कि वह इन हकीकतों की तरफ ख्याल करे। यह हरकतें सिर्फ हिन्दुस्तान में ही नहीं बल्कि हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर भी हो रही हैं। कुछ लोग हिन्दुस्तान में भी इस रोल को अदा कर रहे हैं।

अभी पिछले दिनों एक साहब ने यह कहा है कि उनका पावर पालिटिक्स से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है लेकिन उन्होंने सियासत नहीं छोड़ी है। उन्होंने कहा है कि हालांकि वह पावर पालिटिक्स से बिल्कुल अलग हैं लेकिन अगर मुल्क में कोई क्राइसिस हुई तो वह वापिस तशरीफ लाने की जहमत करेंगे। मैं उन से इस ऐवान के जरिए दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में कोई क्राइसिस नहीं आयेगी। हिन्दुस्तान में कोई गैर मुल्की ताकत नहीं आ सकती है। हिन्दुस्तान के लोग काफी खबरदार और होशियार हैं और मैं उनसे दरखास्त कर्हंगा कि वह वापिस आने की जहमत न करें क्योंकि वापिस आने के लिए वह कोई ऐसी जगह नहीं पायेंगे जहां कि वह बैठ सकें और न ही वापिस आने के लिए कोई उनसे दरखास्त करेगा।

जनाब वाला, आखिर में मैं कौमी यकजहती के बारे में चन्द अल्फाज कहना चाहता हूँ। जहां इस वक्त हमारे मुल्क के सामने एक बहुत बड़ा मसला है हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की का लेकिन उसके साथ ही सबसे

बड़ा मसला है कौमी यकजहती का। मैं समझता हूँ कि हुकूमत उन तमाम सिफारिशों पर जो कि नेशनल इंटिग्रेसन कमेटी ने की हैं, चाहे वह कांग्रेस की थीं या हुकूमत की थीं उन सिफारिशों पर पूरी तहकीकात करने के बाद फौरन अमल किया जाये।

इस मुल्क में हिन्दू, मुसलमान अथवा सिक्ख ईसाई का सवाल नहीं है। इस मुल्क में सबसे बड़ा सवाल है रोटी का। अगर हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को सही तालीम दी जाये हमारी माशी हालत हालत बेहतर की जाये तो मुझे उम्मीद है कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी पर कोई बाहर की ताकत या कोई अन्दरूनी साजिश शबखू नहीं मार सकती है। हिन्दुस्तान में रोशनी फैल चुकी है, सवेरा आया है और हमारे यहां अंधेरा नहीं आयेगा। कोई भी बुजदिल इस अंधेरे से फायदा उठा कर शबखू नहीं मार सकता। इन चन्द अल्फाज के साथ मैं हिन्दुस्तान के सदर के खुतबे की ताईद करता हूँ।

شری - ع - م - طاریقی - میں بلندی
بول رہا ہوں -

Shri Sampath: He is not speaking in Hindi.

شری - ع - م طاریقی - تو میں یہ عرض
کر رہا تھا کہ میرے اوپر کوئی پابندی
نہیں ہے - اور میرے دوست نے
جہاں یہ کہا کہ تھاکر نے تھاکر کو
روٹ کیا - راجھوت نے راجھوت
کو روٹ کیا - انہوں نے ایک خاص
انداز سے یہ بات کہی کہ مسلمان نے
مسلمان کو روٹ کیا - ہندوستان سے
مطلب صرف یو - پی - کا صوبہ نہیں
ہے - ہندوستان بہت بڑا ملک ہے -
ہندوستان میں کجبرات بھی ہے اور

[شہری ع - م - طارق]

بمبئی بھی - آسام بھی ہے اور مدراس
بھی - ائدھر اور کھول اور پنجاب
بھی ہندوستان میں ہے -

میں آپ کے نوٹس میں چند
واقعات لانا چاہتا ہوں - یو - پی -
میں شاید ہی کسی جگہ مسلمانوں
کی اتنی اکثریت ہو کہ وہ کسی کو
کامیاب کرا سکیں - اور پھر یو - پی -
میں ہی علیگڑہ کا قصہ لیجئے -
جہاں ایک مسلمان کیلنڈریٹ تھا
پر وہاں ایک غیر مسلم کامیاب ہوا
آپ قائم کالج کو لیجئے - جہاں ایک
غیر مسلم کامیاب ہوا مسلمانوں کے
دور سے - میں نہیں سمجھتا کہ یہ
بات مسلمان کے لئے ضروری ہے کہ وہ
صرف کانگریس کو روٹ دے - صرف
کانگریس ہی ایک جماعت نہیں ہے
ہر شخص کو روٹ دینے کے معاملہ میں
آزاد رائے ہے -

ہمارے سامنے ہمارے لیڈر بیٹھے ہیں -
فالٹیلنس منسٹر صاحب بیٹھے ہیں
ان کی کانگریس ٹیوٹیلنس میں
مسلمان ہیں اور انہوں نے ان کو روٹ
کیا - چاہے یہ بمبئی میں کھڑے
ہوتے تو بمبئی کے مسلمان ان کو روٹ
کرتے - یہ تو اپنی ذاتی روانداری کا
معاملہ ہے - بمبئی میں ایس - کے -
پاتل صاحب کی سہت کو لیجئے -
اور محمد علی روت پر مسٹر فوٹی
کامیاب ہوئے اور مسلم لیگ ہار گئی -

Shri Keshava (Bangalore City):
Dr. Melkote has been returned by a
Muslim majority.

شہری ع - م - طارق - ڈاکٹر مہکوتے
مجھ سے کہتے ہیں کہ ۵۰
پرسنٹ مسلمانوں نے ان کو روٹ کیا -
تو مسلمانوں کو فرقہ پرست کہنا
نہایت ظلم ہے - اور ظلم ہی نہیں
ہے بلکہ ایک سازش ہے ملک میں فرقہ
پرستی کو ہوا دینے کی -

اگر میں اپنے ووٹروں کی خدمت
نہیں کرتا - اگر میرے میں اتنی
قابلیت نہیں ہے کہ میں اپنے ووٹروں
کے سامنے جاؤں تو اس کا الزام کسی
خاص کمیونٹی پر ڈال دینا نہایت
بے انصافی ہے - ہندوستان میں
بہت سی قومیں رہتی ہیں - مسلمان
بھی ایک قوم ہے اور ان کو حق ہے
کہ وہ جس کو چاہیں روٹ کریں -

آپ نارٹو بمبئی کو لیجئے جہاں
ہندوستان کا سب سے بڑا الیکشن
لوا گیا - جہاں سوشلزم - جہاں
ڈیموکریسی اور سوشل ڈیموکریسی کی جنگ
تھی - اور اس کانگریس ٹیوٹیلنس میں
۷۹۰۰۰ مسلمان ہیں - اور جہاں
نک مجھ سے یقین ہے - اور میرا دعوے
ہے کہ ۶۰ پرسنٹ مسلمانوں نے
کانگریس کیلنڈریٹ کو روٹ دیا
باوجود اس کے کہ ان پر طرح طرح
کے دباؤ ڈالے گئے - ملک کی مخالف
جماعتوں نے اپنے جلسوں میں قرآن

شریف پڑھوائے - ازانہں لکوائیں -
اس کے باوجود مسلمانوں نے کانگریس
کو روک دیا -

صرف کانگریس کو روک دینا میرے
اوپر لازمی نہیں ہے جس طرح کہ
اکثریت کے لئے یہ لازمی نہیں ہے کہ وہ
کانگریس کو روک کرے - یہاں جن سنگھ
رہ سکتا ہے ہندو مہا سبھا رہ سکتی ہے -
سوتلتر پارٹی رہ سکتی ہے - اور بھی
جماعتیں ہیں - انڈیپنڈینس بھی ہیں -
اور بہت سے مسلمان ہیں جو ہندوں کے
روک سے آئے ہیں - آپ آسام کو
لیجیٹ - مفیڈا احمد مومبر ہیں -
ان کے نیچے آتے تھے مشام تھے - اور
آتے کے آتے چھت گئے اور مفیڈا احمد
ہار گئیں ان کے مقابلہ میں - میں
ایسی بہت سی مثالیں آپ کے
سامنے رکھ سکتا ہوں - ہمایوں کبیر
صاحب کی کانگریسی ٹھونڈی لے
لیجئے - بچنور میں لطیف صاحب
کی کانگریسی ٹھونڈی لے لیجئے - ان
کی قربانیوں سے تاریخ بن سکتی ہے -
وہاں ۴۰ فی صدی مسلمان روک
تھے - لیکن وہ شری پرکاش وہر
شاستری سے ہار گئے - پھر بھی ہم سے
کلہ ہے کہ تم فرقہ پرست ہو - تم
وفادار نہیں ہو - ارے ہم وفادار نہیں
تو بھی تو دلدار نہیں - جہاں آپ
خود وادار نہیں ہیں وہاں ہم پر
الزام لگاتے؟! ہیں کہ ہم فرقہ پرست
ہیں - اس معاملہ میں کانگریس

کے ممبروں کو اپنی خاموشی اور اپنی
کمزوریوں کو چھپانا نہیں چاہئے -

اوپادھکس مہودے - جگتا کچھ
کہا گیا ہے اس سے آگے ممبر صاحب
نہ جائیں - انہوں نے یہ نہیں کہا
کہ مسلمان فرقہ پرست ہیں -
انہوں نے تو صرف یہ کہا تھا کہ اس
بار الیکشن میں ذات پر بہت زور
دیا گیا - یہ بات انہوں نے اوروں کے
بارے میں بھی کہی اور مسلمانوں
کے بارے میں بھی کہی -

شری ع - م - طارق - انہوں نے
مسلمانوں پر زیادہ زور دیا تھا -

اوپادھکس مہودے - یہ تو سہلے
نے ترازو پر وزن نہیں کہ کس نہ کسی
کو جگتا زور دیا تھا - مگر اس بات کو
بہت حد تک کھینچنے کی ضرورت
نہیں ہے -

شری ع - م - طارق - جہاں تک
پریزیڈینٹ صاحب کے ایڈریس کا
تعلق ہے - جو انہوں نے کہا سوشلزم
کے بارے میں - یہ ایک حقیقت
ہے کہ ہم نے اس ملک میں
سوشلسٹ پیٹرن کا ایک پروگرام بنایا
ہے - لیکن یہ صرف کہنے سے ہی
نہیں ہو گا - ہمیں انتہائی شدت سے
اس پر عمل کرنا چاہئے - ہمیں
چاہئے کہ ہم ان لوگوں کا جو بڑے
بڑے سرمایہ داروں کے ہاتھوں میں
چکڑے ہوئے ہیں - اور جو لوگ

[شری ع - م - طارق]

نہایت شدت کے ساتھ اپنی سرمایہ داری کو ہندوستان میں پھیلانے میں - سختی سے مقابلہ کریں - اگر ہم کو اس ملک میں سوشلزم کو لانا ہے تو عقیباً ہمیں اس کے لئے جلد بلیداسی باتوں کو کرنا چاہئے - ایک تو یہ کہ ملک میں زیادہ تر کارخانے پبلک سیکٹر میں کھولنے چاہیں - تعلیم عام کی جائے اور لوگوں کو علم کے روشناس کیا جائے اور تعلیم کے برے میں لوگوں کو مزید سہولتیں دیں -

جناب والا پچھلے الیکشن میں جو چیزیں سامنے آئیں انہوں نے یہ ثابت کر دیا کہ اس ملک میں جو جنگ ہوگی یا الیکشن میں جو جنگ ہوگی وہ سوشلزم اور سرمایہ داری کی جنگ ہی - ہم نے دیکھا کہ کچھ لوگوں کے ہاتھ میں اس ملک کی دولت ہے - اور دولت کے ساتھ ساتھ ہم نے یہ بھی دیکھا کہ بڑے بڑے سرمایہ داروں کے پاس اخبارات ہیں جو کہ ایک سب سے بڑا ذریعہ ہے لوگوں تک کسی چیز کو پہنچانے کا - جو ایک سب سے بڑا ہتھیار ہے لوگوں کے ذہنوں کو تبدیل کرنے کا - جو کہ ایک سب سے بڑی چیز ہے لوگوں کو سیاسی طور پر ایجوکیٹ کرنے کی - ہم نے دیکھا کہ وہ بڑے بڑے سرمایہ دار جو ایک طرف تو

ہمارے دوست بننے کا دعویٰ کرتے ہیں جب ان کو اپنی دولت کو اور بڑھانا ہوتا ہے - لیکن وہ بڑی تیزی سے - بڑی شدت سے اور بڑی جرت کے ساتھ ہمارے سامنے آئے کہ ہماری پالیسیوں کو ناکام کریں - اور اس میں انہوں نے اخباروں کو استعمال کیا - جب میں اخباروں کا ذکر کرتا ہوں تو میں ان چھوٹے لوگوں کا ذکر نہیں کرتا جو ان اخباروں میں کام کرتے ہیں - بلکہ میرا مطلب ان سرمایہ داروں سے ہے جو ان اخباروں کے مالک ہیں - وہ ان اخباروں میں کام کرنے والے چھوٹے چھوٹے لوگوں کا یہی خون چوستے ہیں اور دوسری طرف کوشش کرتے ہیں اس ملک کو غلط راستہ لے جانے کی اور سرمایہ داری کو پھر سے مضبوط کرنے کی -

صرف یہ سرمایہ دار ہی نہیں ہوں - بلکہ ہمارے سامنے جو سب سے بڑی چیز ہے وہ اس ملک کے راجے مہاراجے ہیں - ایک طرف تو یہ کہا گیا ہے کہ ہندوستان میں ہر ایک کو مساوی حق ہے کہ کسی شخص کی آمدنی ہے - کسی کے کاروبار سے ناجائز فائدہ نہ اٹھارے - لیکن یہ راجے مہاراجے جلتھیں ہم بڑی بڑی زمینیں دیتے ہیں بغیر کسی کام کاج کے - بغیر کسی مطلب

کے - آخر یہی دولت جو ہمارے
غریب لوگوں کی آمدنی سے ان کو
دی جاتی ہے وہی ہمارے سامنے
لائی گئی ہے - یہ صرف کانگریس کا
سوال نہیں ہے - بلکہ ان تمام
جماعتوں کا سوال ہے جو اس ملک
میں سوشلزم کو قائم کرنا چاہتی
ہیں - چاہے وہ سوشلسٹ پارٹی
ہو - چاہے پی - ایس - پی - ہو یا
کانگریس وہ یا کمیونسٹ ہوں -
ان سب کو اس کا مقابلہ کرنا
ہے - یہ خطرہ صرف کانگریس کے لئے
نہیں ہے - بلکہ ہماری سہمی
جماعتوں کے لئے ہے - فرقہ پرستی اگر
اس ملک میں سر اٹھاتی ہے - تو
اس سے صرف کانگریس ہی کمزور
نہیں ہوتی - بلکہ اور بھی جماعتوں
کمزور ہوتی ہیں - تو ان چھوڑوں کا
چاہے وہ فرقہ پرستی ہو یا سرمایہ -
داری ہو - ہم سب کو مقابلہ کرنا
چاہئے -

جناب والا - میں ایک اور بات
آپ کی توجہ میں لانا چاہتا ہوں -
وہ ہے تازہ شورنگل اور تازہ پرائیگنڈہ جو
حکومت پاکستان نے کشمیر کے بارے
میں کہا ہے - مجھے افسوس ہے کہ
پریزیڈنٹ صاحب نے اس کا ذکر
اپنے ایڈریس میں نہیں کیا ہے -
ابھی پچھلے چند مہینوں میں -
پچھلے الیکشن سے پہلے - پاکستان نے
جو ناکام کوششیں کیں نیویارک میں
اپنے دوستوں کی حمایت سے ہندوستان
کو بدنام کرنے کے لئے کشمیر کے مسئلہ

پر - یہ ایک حقیقت ہے - اور
اس میں مجھے بار بار یہ کہنے
کی ضرورت نہیں کہ کشمیر ہندوستان
کا حصہ بن چکا ہے - لیکن میں یہ
دیکھتا ہوں کہ وہ لوگ جو ایک
طرف تو ہم سے دوستی کرتے ہیں -
ایک طرف تو یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ
ہماری ان سے سیاسی دوستی ہو -
وہی لوگ جب دوسری طرف ان کو
ذرا بھی موقع ملتا ہے تو وہ ہماری
پیٹھ میں چھوا بھونکنے کی کوشش
کرتے ہیں اور انہوں نے بار بار
ایسا کیا ہے - میں نہیں جانتا
کہ کیا حق ہے حکومت امریکہ
کو کہ وہ ہم سے یہہ کہے کہ ہم
کشمیر کے مسئلہ پر پھر بات چیت
کریں پاکستان سے - اور وہ ہمیں نام
بھی دیکھیں کریں - چاہے وہ مسٹر
بلیک ہوں یا مسٹر وہائٹ ہوں -
جو آج مساوات کریں گے کشمیر کے
مسئلہ پر - کشمیر کا مسئلہ کوئی
مصاحبت کے تابع مسئلہ نہیں ہے -
وہ مسئلہ صرف یہہ ہے کہ کشمیر
کی سرحدوں پر جن غیر ملکی
طاقتوں کا قبضہ ہے - چاہے وہ چین
ہو یا پاکستان ہو - ان کو کشمیر
سے باہر نکالا جائے - اور اگر کوئی
شخص واقعی ہندوستان سے دوستی
کرتا ہے تو وہ ہماری دیانت داری
سے اس معاملہ میں ہماری حمایت
کوئی چاہئے - اور کشمیر کو غیر ملکی
حصہ اوروں سے پاک کرانا چاہئے -

[شہری ع - م - طارق]

تیسری بات جو میں آپ کی خدمت میں لانا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ ہے کہ جو غیر ملکی لوگ ہمارے اندرونی معاملات میں دخل دیتے ہیں اس کو ہم کب تک برداشت کرتے رہیں گے۔ نارتھ بھٹی کے الیکشن نے یہ ثابت کر دیا کہ اس کے پیچھے کتنی غیر ملکی طاقتیں تھیں۔ کئی غیر ملکی اخبار نویس تھے جو ہندوستان کے خلاف طرح طرح کی باتیں پھیلاتے تھے۔ اب تو اس ملک میں ایک اور ہنگامہ پیدا کیا جا رہا ہے۔ اب مہلنزم آ رہا ہے۔ کہیں نہروزم ہے۔ کہیں سوشلزم ہے۔ تو میں ہندوستان کی حکومت سے درخواست کروں گا کہ وہ ان حقیقتوں کی طرف خیال کرے۔

یہ حرکتیں صرف ہندوستان میں ہی نہیں بلکہ ہندوستان سے باہر بھی ہو رہی ہیں۔ کچھ لوگ ہندوستان میں بھی اس رول کو ادا کر رہے ہیں۔

ابھی پچھلے دنوں ایک صاحب نے یہ کہا ہے کہ ان کا پارور پالیٹکس سے کوئی تعلق نہیں ہے لیکن انہوں نے سہاست نہیں چھوڑی ہے۔ انہوں نے کہا ہے کہ حالانکہ وہ پارور پالیٹکس سے بالکل الگ ہیں لیکن اگر ملک میں کوئی کرائسس ہوئی

تو وہ واپس تشریف لانے کی زحمت کریں گے۔ میں ان سے اس ایوان کے ذریعہ درخواست کرنا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہندوستان میں کوئی کرائسس نہیں آئیگی ہندوستان میں کوئی غیر ملکی طاقت نہیں آسکتی ہے۔ ہندوستان کے لوگ کافی خیرنار اور ہوشیار ہیں اور میں ان سے درخواست کروں گا کہ وہ واپس آنے کی زحمت نہ کریں کیونکہ واپس آنے کے لئے وہ کوئی ایسی جگہ نہیں پالہنگے جہاں کہ وہ بیٹھ سکیں اور نہ ہی واپس آنے کے لئے کوئی ان سے درخواست کریگا۔

جناب والا - آخو میں میں قومی یکجہتی کے بارے میں چند الفاظ کہنا چاہتا ہوں۔ جہاں اس وقت ہمارے ملک کے سامنے ایک بہت بڑا مسئلہ ہے ہندوستان کی ترقی کا لیکن اس کے ساتھ ہی سب سے بڑا مسئلہ ہے قومی یکجہتی کا۔ میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ حکومت ان تمام سفارشوں پر جو کہ نیشنل انٹیگریشن کمیٹی نے کی ہیں۔ چاہے وہ کانگریس کی تھی یا حکومت کی تھی ان سفارشوں پر پوری تحقیقات کرنے کے بعد فوراً عمل کیا جائے۔

اس ملک میں ہندو مسلمان یا عیسائی کا سوال نہیں ہے۔ اس ملک میں سب سے بڑا سوال ہے

روٹی کا - اگر ہندوستان کے لوگوں کو صحیح تعلیم دی جائے ہمارے معاشی حالت بہتر نی جائے تو مجھے اُمید ہے کہ ہندوستان کی آزادی پر کوئی باہر کی طاقت یا کوئی اندرونی سازش شب خون نہیں مار سکتی ہے - ہندوستان میں روشنی پھیل چکی ہے سویرا آیا ہے اور ہمارے یہاں اُندھرا نہیں اُٹھتا - کوئی بھی ہڑل اس اُندھرے سے فائدہ اُٹھا کر شب خون نہیں مار سکتا - ان چند الفاظ کے ساتھ میں ہندوستان کے صدر کے خطبہ کی تائید کرتا ہوں -

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Sampath has written to me saying that he wanted to move certain amendments. Where was he when the Speaker enquired whether any hon. Member wanted to move his amendments?

Shri Sampath: Sir, I came late. I crave the indulgence of the Chair as this is the last opportunity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is a great appeal, that this is the last opportunity. I cannot refuse that. I will allow him to do so as a special case. His amendments will also be deemed to have been moved.

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the difficulties of the Indian population living in Malaya and Burma for travelling facilities for coming to India”. (33)

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the deplorable conditions of the Indian ships that ply between India and Malaya, and the plight of the deck passengers who travel in them” (34).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the insecurity that threatens the handloom industry as a result of lack of proper protection from the Government”. (35).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the plight of the people of Indian origin and Indians living in Ceylon as a result of various measures and attitudes of the Ceylon Government”. (36).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any steps to rename Madras State to Thamizh-nadu” (37).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any steps taken to allay the fears of the people of non-Hindi speaking areas about the imposition of Hindi on them.” (38).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the steps taken to check and reduce the concentration of powers in the Centre.” (39)

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the growth of malpractices in the 1962 General Elections and the failure of the government machinery to check and present them”. (40).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any step taken to remove the disparity in scales of pay and conditions of service that exist among various Public Sector Undertakings”. (41).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any step being considered to hold the price-line effectively”. (42)

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the indignation of the people of Thamizhnadu over the use of the word ‘Akashvani’ by all India Radio from its Thamizhnadu Stations instead of the Thamizh word ‘Vanoli’ which was in use till recently”. (43)

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any step taken to foster the growth and development of the various national languages of India instead of giving attention to the growth and development of the Hindi language alone.” (44)

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of the undesirable tendency among the Government officers at high level to travel by air at Government expense unnecessarily and any step to check it”. (45).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that in the Address there is no mention of any steps taken to introduce facilities to send telegrams in all the national languages in their respective scripts.” (46).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that there is no mention in the Address of any steps to remove the handicap of many a public worker who suffers on the score of not knowing one or two languages other than his own mother tongue.” (47).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that there is no mention in the Address of any steps to protect the independence of the judiciary from interference by the executive.” (48).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the delay to effect the *de jure* transfer of former French possessions in India and the resultant plight of the people living in these areas.” (49).

Shri Sampath: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that there is no mention in the Address of any steps to

ensure proper, courteous and helpful treatment of Indian people, both visiting and staying in foreign countries at the hands of our Embassy officials." (50).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: These amendments are also before the House.

श्री बजराल सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक ऐसे सदन में बहस कर रहा हूँ जिसके कि अधिकांश सदस्यों को और अधिकांश नहीं तो काफी सदस्य ऐसे होंगे जिन को कि जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है। इसलिए मैं आप के द्वारा पहला निवेदन सरकार से यह करना चाहता हूँ कि भविष्य में कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिए ताकि जब आगामी चुनाव सम्पन्न हो जायें तो उस के बाद पुरानी संसद कोई भी कार्य न करे। अच्छा तो यह होगा कि चुनावों के वक्त ही सरकार ऐसा निर्णय कर ले कि वह पद से हटती है और फिर चुनावों के बाद दूसरी ही सरकार पद पर आयेगी। यदि हम इस तरीके की व्यवस्था नहीं करते हैं तो हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान में यह एक अजीब सी बात लगा करेगी कि वे लोग जो कि जनता का विश्वास खो चुके हैं वह भी नीतियों पर बात कर रहे हैं। आज सवेरे जब वित्त मन्त्री महोदय ने कुछ विधेयक प्रस्तुत किये तो इसी कारण मैंने यह जानना चाहा था कि क्या यह विधेयक इस वर्तमान संसद द्वारा पास किये जाने हैं। मेरे विचार में इस संसद द्वारा अब कोई ऐसा कार्य नहीं किया जाना चाहिये जो कि बहुत ही विस्तृत नीति से सम्बन्ध रखता हो। अब चूँकि यह संसद बुला ली गई है इसलिए इसके द्वारा सिर्फ काम चलाऊ काम ही किये जायें कोई नीति सम्बन्धी काम इसके द्वारा नहीं किया जाना चाहिए। मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा कि भविष्य में कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था की जाय जिससे चुनावों के सम्पन्न हो जाने के बाद पुरानी संसद की कोई बैठक न हो और नई संसद ही आकर इन सब मसलों पर विचार करे। जब मैं यह बात कहता हूँ तो यह मानते हुए कहता हूँ कि चूँकि मैं अपने मतदाताओं का

विश्वास प्राप्त नहीं कर सका हूँ इसलिये मैं आम तौर से नीति सम्बन्धी बातों पर कोई चर्चा नहीं करूँगा

Shri Morarji Desai: May I explain, Sir, that only non-controversial things are taken up in this session generally; and that is what the hon. Member will find.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: There are certain controversial things also.

Shri Morarji Desai: Anything can be made controversial.

श्री बजराल सिंह : अभी राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने जो अपना अभिभाषण दिया है उस में कई चीजों की तरफ यद्यपि उन्होंने संकेत किया है लेकिन एक बड़ी खुशी उन्होंने ने जाहिर की है और वह यह है कि इतना बड़ा मताधिकार शान्तिपूर्ण, व्यवस्थित और हमारे संविधान की प्रक्रियाओं के अनुसार संपन्न हुआ है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय को उन की सरकार ने शायद बिना किसी आघात के ही यह सलाह दी है।

अभी आज सुबह ही कानून मंत्री ने यह कहा कि चूँकि चुनावों में गड़बड़ियों के बारे में उन के पास कोई शिकायतें नहीं हैं इसलिये वह समझते हैं कि चुनाव बिल्कुल सही ढंग से संपन्न हुए। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरह की बात कहना कि कोई शिकायतें नहीं हैं और उन के पास इस वक्त तक नहीं पहुँच पायी हैं इसलिये यह मान लेना कि चुनाव बिल्कुल कायदे से हुए और कोई धांधलीबाजी नहीं हुई उचित बात नहीं होगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चुनावों के दौरान बर्ती गई अनियमितताओं की तफसील में आज नहीं जाना चाहता था लेकिन चूँकि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में चुनावों के बारे में जो कहा गया उस के कारण मुझे यहाँ पर कुछ चुनावों में बर्ती गई अनियमितताओं आदि के बारे में निवेदन करना पड़ रहा है। यह मैं

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

मानता हूँ कि जो हो गया सो हो गया आखिर चुनाव हो चुके हैं और जनतन्त्र में हमें अपनी आस्था रखनी है तो चुनावों के द्वारा जो लोग चुने गये हैं उन में विश्वास रखना है और सरकार को चलाना है। उस के बिना जनतन्त्र मजबूत नहीं होगा। लेकिन उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले चुनावों के दौरान में जो प्रवृत्तियाँ उभरी हैं जो कुछ कार्यवाहियों की गई हैं और जो कुछ कानून का उल्लंघन हुआ है वह मुझे लगता है कि हिन्दुस्तान के फलते हुए जनतन्त्र के लिये एक खतरा पैदा हो रहा है। उस के रहते जनतन्त्र संभवतः पनप नहीं सकता।

मैं उन चीजों की तरफ तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता जिन का कि जिक्र मेरे मित्र श्री तारिक ने बड़े जोर शोर के साथ किया है लेकिन कोई इस से इंकार नहीं कर सकता कि हिन्दुस्तान में जातिवाद की भावना उभर रही है। हिन्दुस्तान के चुनावों में जातिवाद की भावनाओं को बहुत बड़ा प्रश्रय मिला है। मजहबपरस्ती की भावना को बहुत बड़ा प्रश्रय मिला है। और कह नहीं सकते कि किन किन भावनाओं को प्रश्रय मिला है जिस के कि परिणामस्वरूप अनेक प्रकार की प्रतिक्रियावादी शक्तियाँ उभर रही हैं। यदि हम समाजवाद में विश्वास करते हैं यदि हम जनतन्त्र में विश्वास करते हैं और चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान में जनतन्त्र फले फूले तो बिना किसी पार्टी के भेदभाव के हम सब को मिल कर यह सोचना पड़ेगा कि इन प्रवृत्तियों को उभार न मिले। इन प्रवृत्तियों की कांट छांट की जाये, इनको खत्म किया जाय और तभी हिन्दुस्तान का जनतन्त्र पनप सकता है।

मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वक्त यह नई मत पत्रों की पद्धति

बनाई गई थी उस वक्त भी मेरी यह आशंका थी कि इस में गड़बड़ी की गुंजाइश है और मैंने अपनी उस आशंका को प्रकट भी किया था। मत पत्रों की नई पद्धति पर जो अमल हुआ है उस से तो मैं बिल्कुल एक तरह से भौचक्का ही रह गया। इस बार दो बैलट पेपर्स मतदाता को दिये गये। एक तो विधान सभा के लिये था और दूसरा लोक सभा के लिये था। दोनों मत पत्र एकसाथ ही मतदाता को दिये गये। हम ने देखा कि इन मत पत्रों का किस प्रकार प्रयोग हुआ और गड़बड़ी की गई। मैं किसी पर लांछन नहीं लगाना चाहता कि कहां किस अधिकारी ने खास किसी पार्टी के उम्मीदवार को जिताने में गड़बड़ी की। मैं यह भी नहीं कहना चाहता कि कहीं अधिकारियों ने अर्थात् पोलिंग आफिसर्स ने किस तरह कांग्रेस पार्टी की रूलिंग पार्टी की सहायता की है। लेकिन इस तरह के उदाहरण पेश नहीं किये जा सकते हैं जहां पर पोलिंग के अधिकारियों ने मत पत्रों का दुरुपयोग किया। मतदाता को एक साथ दो मत पत्र दिये जाने थे। पहला मत पत्र जो कि विधान सभा के लिये था वह मतदाता ने बक्स में डाल दिया लेकिन दूसरा मतपत्र मतदाता को नहीं दिया गया और जो पोलिंग अफसर ने खुद ही मुहर लगा कर बक्स में डाल दिया। अब जो हो गया सो हो गया। मैं नहीं कहता कि उसको यहां पलटा जा सकता है। ऐसे दो उदाहरण हैं जहां एक संसदीय क्षेत्र में १५००० पार्लियामेंट के बैलट पेपर्स अफसरान ने किसी खास उम्मीदवार के लिये अपने हाथ से डाले। अगर इस तरीके की पद्धति जारी रहती है तो मैं नहीं समझता कि कोई निष्पक्ष चुनाव हो सकेगा। राष्ट्रपति महोदय अपने अभिभाषण में कहते हैं कि चुनाव शान्तिपूर्ण, व्यवस्थित और हमारे संविधान की प्रक्रियाओं के अनुसार संपन्न हुए हैं, लेकिन क्या संविधान में यह भी प्रक्रिया थी कि विधान सभा और लोक सभा के लिये एक ही साथ चुनाव होने चाहियें। मुझे तो शक होने लगा है कि कहीं विधान सभा और

लोक सभा के लिये एक ही चुनाव कर के हम संविधान की प्रक्रियाओं का उल्लंघन तो नहीं कर रहे हैं कहीं उन प्रक्रियाओं को तोड़ तो नहीं रहे हैं। एक ही हाथ दो मत पत्रों का दिया जाना और उन मत पत्रों के दुष्प्रयोग की आशंका रहना यह बहुत ही गड़बड़ चीज है ऐसी सूरत में खास तौर से जब कि इस चुनाव में गड़बड़ी हो चुकी है। मैं जोरदार शब्दों में सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि वह इस पर पुनर्विचार करे कि क्या बैलट सिस्टम में मत पत्रों की पद्धति में किसी तरह के परिवर्तन को आवश्यकता है। अगर और कोई परिवर्तन तुरन्त नहीं किया जा सकता है, तो कम से कम यह एक परिवर्तन निहायत आवश्यक है कि विधान सभा और लोक सभा इन दोनों के मत पत्र एक साथ मतदाताओं को न दिये जायें। हमारे मतदाता अभी इतने काबिल और होशियार नहीं हैं कि वे इन मत पत्रों को नियमों के अनुसार ठीक तरीके से डाल सकें। पहले उन को एक मत पत्र दिया जाता था। वे जाते थे और डाल देते थे। अब दोनों मत-पत्र एक साथ दिये जाते हैं। इस स्थिति में अगर पोलिंग आफिसर की कुछ करने की नियत हुई, तो उस ने दूसरा मत पत्र दिया ही नहीं और बहुत से मत दाता अपनी इच्छानुसार उस का प्रयोग नहीं कर सके। ये सब बातें देखते हुए यह कैसे कहा जा सकता है कि ये चुनाव निष्पक्ष हुए ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जहां मत पत्र दिये जाते थे, वहां कैंडीडेट के एजेन्ट भी मौजूद होते थे।

Shri Morarji Desai: I do not know if the procedure was different. But I have myself seen what was being done. They were issued two papers, which were being given to the person who was giving them the seal. There he was given only one paper and after he marked it and put it in

the box, another paper was given to him which he marked and put in the box.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: The system varied from place to place. Firstly, two ballot papers were given to the voter. Then both the ballot papers were taken back by the polling officer and one paper was given—say, the one for the legislative assembly—and he marked it. But when he came back the second paper was never given to the voter. That is my charge.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने अभी कहा कि वहां पर एजेन्ट भी तो रहे होंगे। यह सही है कि वहां पर एजेन्ट रहने चाहियें। लेकिन मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या वह इस बात की गारण्टी कर सकती है कि हर एक पोलिंग स्टेशन पर पोलिंग एजेन्ट्स के बैठने की व्यवस्था की गई थी। कम से कम मुझे बीसियों संसदीय क्षेत्रों के सम्बन्ध में मालूम है, जहां पोलिंग एजेन्ट्स के बैठने के लिये कोई स्थान नहीं था। उन को कह दिया गया कि हमारे यहां कोई स्थान नहीं है, आप चाहें, तो यहां पर खड़े रह सकते हैं, या फिर बाहर खड़े हो सकते हैं। आखिर आठ घंटे तक कौन व्यक्ति खड़ा रह सकता है। इस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि पोलिंग एजेन्ट्स को तो मजबूर हो कर बाहर ठहरना पड़ा और उन की अनुपस्थिति में पोलिंग आफिसरज ने इस तरह की गड़बड़ियां कीं।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : बाहर कैसे खड़े रहे ?

श्री ब्रजराज सिंह : वे बाहर खड़े रहे, बैठे रहे या किसी दूसरे काम में लगे रहे। क्या किसी पोलिंग एजेन्ट से यह आशा की जा सकती है कि वह आठ घंटे तक वहां पर खड़ा रहे। श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू के पोलिंग एजेन्ट श्री मोरारजी देसाई किसी एक छोटे आफिसर की मौजूदगी में आठ घंटे तक वहां पर खड़े रहें, क्या यह सम्भव हो सकता है ?

[श्री ब्रजराज सिं:]

पोलिग एजेन्ट्स के बैठने वगैरह की व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिये थी, जो कि नहीं की गई और इस वजह से निष्पक्ष चुनावों में बाधा पड़ी। यह बात सिर्फ मैं ही नहीं कह रहा हूँ। देश के वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री, श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू, ने भी मत-पत्र डालते वक्त इस प्रकार की भावनाओं को प्रकट किया था। मुझे ठीक याद नहीं है, लेकिन इस को साफ किया जा सकता है कि इस तरह की बात है या नहीं। लेकिन यह निर्विवाद है कि इस तरह की बैलट पद्धति में संशोधन की आवश्यकता है। ताकि जो हमारी मंशा है, जो हमारा उद्देश्य है, वह पूरा हो सके। आखिर हम यही चाहते हैं कि वोटर अपनी राय का सही इस्तेमाल कर सके। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कोई नहीं चाहता कि उस की राय का सही इस्तेमाल न हो। इस उद्देश्य को पूरा करने का कोई उपाय किया जाना चाहिये।

इस के अलावा यह भी देखा गया है कि हर क्षेत्र में आम तौर से पांच फीसदी वोट खारिज कर दिये गये। जिस पद्धति में पांच फीसदी वोटर अपने मताधिकार का प्रयोग ही न कर सकें, उस पद्धति में सुधार करने के विषय में कोई मत-भेद नहीं होना चाहिये। पहले तो पचास फीसदी से ज्यादा मतदाताओं ने वोट नहीं दिया और जिन्होंने वोट दिया, उन में से पांच फीसदी मत-दाताओं के मत ही खत्म हो गये और उन का इस्तेमाल न हो सका। जिस पद्धति में पांच फीसदी मत न पड़ सकें, उस के बारे में यह कैसे कहा जा सकता है कि उस के द्वारा निष्पक्ष चुनाव सम्पन्न हो सकते हैं ?

यही नहीं, प्रान्तीय सरकारों और जिलों के चुनाव अफसरों के पास अन्तिम समय तक इस बात का हिसाब नहीं था कि कितने मत पत्र छापे गये। इस के अलावा बैलट पेपर्स पर किसी का नाम और निशान नहीं था। फिर भी सरकार की तरफ से यह कहा जाता है कि ये

चुनाव शान्तिपूर्ण ढंग से, एक व्यवस्थित रूप से और संविधान की प्रक्रियाओं के अनुसार सम्पन्न हुए। मैं कहूंगा कि यह उचित कथन नहीं है। मैं जनतन्त्र में बहुत ही गहरी आस्था रखने वाला हूँ। इसलिये इन बातों पर ज्यादा हो-हल्ला न मचाते हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर सरकार यह समझती है कि ये बातें गलत हैं, तो वह एक उच्च सत्ता प्राप्त आयोग की स्थापना करे, जो पिछले चुनावों की इर्रेगुलैरिटीज, अनियमितताओं की जांच-पड़ताल करें। मैं यह नहीं कहना चाहता कि इस का राजनीति से सम्बन्ध हो। उस आयोग में हाई कोर्ट और सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज हों और वे इन सब बातों की जांच करें। इस बात का पता लगाने की आवश्यकता है कि जो बैलट पेपर्स छापे गये, क्या उन का पूरा हिसाब था और क्या उन पर कैंडिडेट्स के नाम और निशान पूरे थे या आधे। अपने मामले में मैं जानता हूँ कि बैलट पेपर पर मेरा नाम "ब्रजराज" रखा गया और उस पर पूरा निशान नहीं छपा गया। अलीगढ़ का पोलिग आफिसर रिपोर्ट करता है कि बैलट-पेपर्स पर नाम और निशान नहीं था। इन सब अनियमितताओं का चुनाव पर बुरा प्रभाव पड़ा। इसलिये हिन्दुस्तान में जनतन्त्र को मजबूत करने के लिये और देश की जनता की जनतन्त्र पर आस्था मजबूत बनाने के लिये इन बातों की जांच की जानी चाहिये, ताकि कम से कम भविष्य में ये अनियमिततायें खत्म की जा सकें और देश का हर एक मतदाता अपने मत का प्रयोग कर सके।

इस प्रकार के समाचार भी मिले हैं कि पोलिग आफिसर ने मत-दाताओं को कहा कि एक ही पर निशान लगा दो और दूसरा मत-पत्र अपने पास रख लिया। इस प्रकार एक एक क्षेत्र में हजारों ऐसे बैलट पेपर निकले, जिन में मत-दाताओं ने दो स्थानों पर अपना निशान लगा रखा था। ऐसा इस मतलब से जान-बूझ कर किया गया कि इस प्रकार बहुत से मत

पत्र नष्ट हो जाने में किसी खास उम्मीदवार को फायदा हो सकता था ।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं इस विषय में किसी खास पार्टी पर लांछन नहीं लगाना चाहता हूँ, हालांकि अगर मैं चाहूँ, तो एक पार्टी पर लांछन लगा भी सकता हूँ । आखिर हम सब जनतन्त्र पर आस्था रखते हैं और देश में जनतन्त्र को सफल बनाना चाहते हैं इस लिये सरकार गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार कर के एक उच्च-सत्ता-प्राप्त आयोग की स्थापना करे, जो कि पिछले आम चुनावों में हुई अनियमितताओं और चुनाव पर पड़े उन के प्रभाव की जांच करे और यह भी पता लगाये कि इतनी लम्बी चौड़ी परसेंटेज, पांच फी सदी वोट खारिज क्यों किये गये और भविष्य के लिये उचित उपाय सुझाये ।

मैं तो इस विचार का हो गया हूँ कि यह पद्धति त्रुटिपूर्ण है और इस में परिवर्तन करना चाहिये । या तो पुरानी पद्धति पर वापस जाना चाहिए और अगर यही पद्धति रखनी है, तो दो मत पत्र तो निश्चित रूप से मत दाता को एक साथ न दिये जायें, क्योंकि पोलिंग आफिसर इस व्यवस्था को नाजायज तौर पर इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं । कम से कम यह सुझाव तो ऐसा है, जिस को मानने में सरकार और ईलेक्शन कमिशन को कोई दिक्कत नहीं होनी चाहिये । इस से किसी को हानि नहीं होगी, बल्कि देश में निष्पक्ष चुनाव करने में मदद मिलेगी ।

मुझे खेद है कि मैं चुनावों के बारे में इतना कुछ कह गया, हालांकि यह मेरी इच्छा नहीं थी । मैं फिर यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि देश में ऐसी प्रवृत्तियाँ पैदा हो रही हैं, जो कि जनतन्त्र के लिये खतरनाक हैं । मैं किसी पर लांछन नहीं लगा रहा हूँ, इसलिये श्री तारिक या अन्य भावुक मित्र मेरी बात का बुरा न मानें । आज स्थिति यह है कि देश भर में कोई समाजवाद, पार्टी या संगठन नहीं रह गया । केवल एक संगठन रह गया है,

जो कि जाति और मजहब पर आधारित है । चुनाव किसी विचार-धारा के आधार पर नहीं, बल्कि जाति और मजहब की विना पर लड़ रये हैं । वर्ना कोई कारण नहीं हो सकता कि जो संगठन चुनाव के एक दिन पहले खड़े हुए, वे असेम्बली और संसद् की कई सीटें छीन ले गये और जो लोग जिन्दगी भर काम करते रहे, उन की जमानत जप्त हो गई । इस सम्बन्ध में विचार करना चाहिये कि मुल्क के कबाडी पालिटिक में, सियासी जिन्दगी में जो यह नई प्रवृत्ति टेंडेंसी, पैदा हो गई है, उस को कैसे खत्म किया जा सकता है और जनतन्त्र को कैसे सफल बनाया जा सकता है ।

राष्ट्रपति ने अपने अभिभाषण में घातायात और कोयले की सप्लाई के कुछ संकट का जिक्र भी किया । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि ये संकट ऐसे हैं, जिन का भविष्य में देश के उत्पादन पर बहुत बड़ा प्रभाव पड़ेगा । हम संसद् के पिछले कई अधिवेशनों में इस बात पर जोर देते रहे हैं और उस के फलस्वरूप इस सदन में यह आश्वासन दिया गया था कि मुगलसराय के ऊपर के हिस्से, उत्तर प्रदेश, पंजाब, राजस्थान और दिल्ली, के लिये दो सौ गाड़ी कोयला प्रति दिन ढोया जायेगा । लेकिन उस आश्वासन के अनुसार काम नहीं किया जा रहा है । मुगलसराय से ऊपर के हिस्से की उत्तर भारत की, इंडस्ट्रीज के लिये कोयला कहीं एक तिहाई और कहीं आधा काट दिया गया है और उन का चलना मुश्किल हो रहा है न सिर्फ इससे निर्माण कार्यों में रुकावट पड़ती है बल्कि प्रगति आम तौर से रुक जाती है । इसका एक नतीजा यह भी होता है कि जो मजदूर हैं, उनको बेकार रहना पड़ता है । इस तरह से हमारी जो योजना है उसका जो फल है, वह हम को प्राप्त नहीं होता है । मैं अनुरोध करता हूँ कि सरकार कोई इस तरह से कदम उठाये जिससे कि कोयले के घातायात और सप्लाई के सम्बन्ध में जो संकट पैदा हो रहा है,

[श्री बजराल सिंह]

उसको दूर किया जा सके। कोयला एक ऐसी चीज है जिस के बिना न तो बड़े शहरों में जैसे दिल्ली है रोटी पकाई जा सकती है और न ही देहातों में ईंट पकाई जा सकती है जिससे कुएं बनेंगे, सड़कें बनेंगी, स्कूल बनेंगे, अस्पताल बनेंगे तथा दूसरी और बहुत सी चीजें बनेंगी। इस वास्ते यह निहायत आवश्यक है कि कोयले की सप्लाई और यातायात के सम्बन्ध में सरकार कोई ऐसी नीति अपनाए जिससे भविष्य में कोयले का संकट पैदा न हो।

दूसरी बात इस सम्बन्ध में यह कही गई है कि साढ़े तीन करोड़ डालर का एक ऋण कोयला उद्योग के विकास के लिए मिल रहा है जिसका उपयोग प्राइवेट उद्योग के काम में आएगा, जिसको प्राइवेट उद्योग अपनी खदानों के विकास के काम में लाएगा। मैं सरकार के ध्यान में यह बात लाना चाहता हूँ कि १९५६ के इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी रीजोल्यूशन में जहाँ कुछ और चीजों का जिक्र किया गया है वहाँ यह भी कहा गया है कि उन चीजों में कोयला भी एक वह चीज होगा जिसका विकास सिर्फ पब्लिक सैक्टर में होगा, जो प्राइवेट हाथों में नहीं दिया जाएगा। अब जब कि साढ़े तीन करोड़ डालर का ऋण पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह औद्योगिक नीति प्रस्ताव का सही पालन है? उस प्रस्ताव के विरुद्ध जा कर साढ़े तीन करोड़ डालर का ऋण प्राइवेट उद्योग को हिन्दुस्तान के कोयला उत्पादन के लिए दिया जा रहा है। यह ऋण हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार की स्वीकृति पर दिया जा रहा है। इस तरह से अगर आप लगातार प्राइवेट उद्योग को कोयला क्षेत्र में सुविधायें देते रहेंगे तो कभी भी कम से कम जहाँ तक कोयले की सप्लाई का सम्बन्ध है, उसमें संकट पैदा होने का सम्बन्ध है, उसे दूर नहीं कर सकेंगे क्योंकि प्राइवेट उद्योग कोयले के सम्बन्ध में ऐसी स्थिति पैदा करना चाहता है जिस में कि हिन्दुस्तान

के कोयले का पब्लिक सैक्टर आगे न बढ़ सके और अगर वह बढ़ता है तो उससे उसका जो मुनाफा है वह कम हो जाता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस ओर ध्यान दे और देखे कि अमरीका साढ़े तीन करोड़ डालर का ऋण प्राइवेट सैक्टर को न देकर पब्लिक सैक्टर के लिए दे और उसी के लिए इसका प्रयोग हो ताकि कोयले की समस्या अच्छी तरह से हल हो सके।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यदि आपकी आज्ञा हो तो दो मिनट में एक और बात कह कर मैं समाप्त कर दूंगा और वह पंचायती राज के सम्बन्ध में है। पंचायती राज का भी इस अभिभाषण में कुछ जिक्र किया गया है। पंचायती राज फले फूले, सफल हो यह हर कोई जनतंत्रवादी व्यक्ति चाहेगा और अगर ऐसा होता है तो इससे और बड़ी खुशी उसको नहीं हो सकती है। हम कितने ही सालों से इसके बारे में चर्चा करते आ रहे हैं लेकिन इतना होने पर भी पंचायती राज जिस शकल में राज्यों में जाना चाहिए नहीं जा रहा है। सुना जाता है कि कुछ राज्यों में जिस शकल में यह आगे बढ़ना चाहिए आगे बढ़ा है यानी जो हम यह चाहते हैं कि अधिकारियों का कोई दखल न हो, उस शकल में बढ़ा है। लेकिन कुछ राज्यों में अभी भी अधिकारी लोग अफसर बने हुए हैं और जो लोग चुन कर जाते हैं जिला परिषद के अध्यक्ष या दूसरे उसके सदस्य, उनकी कोई हैसियत नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में भी कोई अच्छी नीति अपनाई जाये, सही नीति अपनाई जाये और पंचायती राज को सही मानों में लागू करने के लिए राज्यों को निर्देश किया जाये, सलाह दी जाये कि वे चुने हुए व्यक्तियों की क्या हैसियत है, उसका आदर करें और अधिकारी लोग दखल न दें और अधिकारियों की जो तानाशाही चलती है, उसको खत्म किया जाये।

राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में हिन्दुस्तान

की परिस्थिति को जिस शकल में हम देखने की इच्छा रखते थे उस शकल में उसको हमारे सामने पेश नहीं किया गया है, यह अफसोस की ही बात है। हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के सामने सही तस्वीर इस से सामने नहीं आती है। इस पर कोई भी हिन्दुस्तान का आदमी राष्ट्रपति को धन्यवाद नहीं दे सकता और मैं भी धन्यवाद नहीं दे सकता हूँ।

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur): Sir, may I make a suggestion? The hon. Member who spoke just now made several allegations. Will he kindly name the polling booths in which these things occurred? Instead of making general accusations of malpractices, if only he had given the names of polling booths where they are alleged to have occurred, it would have been more useful to us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The names of the polling booths will be mentioned in the election petitions.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: If you would permit me, I am prepared to mention them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not want the names of the booths to be mentioned here. It will be done in the election petitions.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: If the hon. Member opposite is anxious, I can mention them, if the Chair permits.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Chair is not prepared to give permission.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: He could have mentioned the names of one or two booths.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Why one or two? I can give the names of 350 booths.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That can be done in the lobby.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, let me repeat what I had suggested long ago

that we should refer our territorial dispute with China to arbitration by Russia, if it cannot be resolved by direct negotiations with China. No negotiation between any two powers can ever succeed unless it is conducted on the basis of give and take.

I am in favour of a political settlement with China, because I am opposed to the establishment of any Russo-American *entente*. Russia and America can never come together on the basis of the division of the Afro-Asian land mass into two spheres of influence—Russian and American—if India and China come together.

I am in favour of a political settlement with China because I am opposed to the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact. The whole of the Afro-Asian land mass will be divided into two spheres of influence, Russian and Chinese, on the basis of communist hegemony, if the Sino-Soviet pact is resurrected.

I am in favour, Sir, of the integration of the Rimland and the Heartland into one political unit on the basis of democracy and not of hegemony. Friendship between India and China will weaken the influence of those in Peking and Moscow who stand for the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact.

I am in favour of a political settlement with China because I dread the possibility of the coming together of China and America. There will be two courses left open to Russia if China and America come together. Russia may join hands with either India or China and America. The pull of China and America over Russia will become stronger than that of India if a Sino-American *entente* is established. China must be prevented from joining hands with the United States of America. India will be weakened if China and America come together. Those of us who are opposed to China are compelling China to join hands with Russia or America or both. It is only by a policy of friendship with China that China can

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

be prevented from joining hands with either Russia or America or both. China will become a greater menace than what she is today if she joins hands with either Russia or America or both. The Rimland and the Heartland will be integrated into one political unit on the basis of democracy if India and China join hands together. But if they drift apart either the bipolar will break up into a large number of autonomous centres of power or the Rimland and the Heartland will be integrated into one political unit on the basis of either communist or white hegemony. Friendship between India and China will lead to the integration of the whole world into one political unit on the basis of democracy.

Russia will join hands with India and China if India and China come together. Russia will join hands with the United States of America if India and China do not come together. The coming together of Russia and the United States of America connotes the establishment of white hegemony over the black and coloured races of the earth. The condition precedent to human progress is the liquidation of the power position of the western powers. A political settlement between India and Pakistan is neither possible nor desirable. Pakistan will never come to terms with India unless Kashmir is handed over to her. Any political settlement between India and Pakistan will lead either to the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact or to the establishment of Russo-American or Sino-American *entente*. All these three alternatives constitute a threat to peace and democracy.

A political settlement between India and Pakistan cannot act as a brake upon Russia and China. The non-aligned nations are free because there is a nuclear stalemate. The rivalry between Russia, China and America provides a breathing-space to all of us. The Sino-Soviet pact cannot be resurrected unless the United States

of America withdraws from the Rimland. But as a result of the nuclear stalemate, American military position in the Rimland has become unassailable. Neither Russia nor China, either singly or jointly, can oust the United States of America from the Rimland.

The United States of America bars the way to a political settlement between Russia and China. The condition precedent to the resurrection of the Sino-Soviet pact is the withdrawal of the United States of America from the Rimland. A political settlement between India and Pakistan cannot prevent the establishment of Sino-Soviet hegemony over the Rimland if, as a result of some unforeseen development, the United States of America withdraws from the Rimland. Russia and China are bound to remain on hostile terms with each other as long as the United States of America remains entrenched in the Rimland.

If China attacks India, Russia will attack China to maintain her preponderant power position vis a vis China. China will become stronger than Russia if Russia remains a silent spectator and permits China to swallow India. The Sino-Soviet conflict had not started in right earnest at the time of the Hungarian uprising. Now, Russia is not in a position to crush Albania because Albania enjoys the political support of China.

As long as Russia and China are on hostile terms with each other, neither India nor Pakistan can be attacked either by China or Russia. A political settlement between India and Pakistan cannot serve any useful purpose because there is no likelihood of either Russian or Chinese aggression over either India or Pakistan. It is the fear of Russia and America that impels China to seek a political settlement with India. If China does not come to terms with India, Russia will expand towards

Mongolia, Manchuria, Sikiang and Tibet.

The United States of America will occupy South China if Russia starts moving towards the peripheral regions of China. A political settlement between Russia and America connotes the dismemberment of China. China must come to terms with India if she wants to escape the tentacles of Russo-American hegemony. We should cultivate friendship with China and not waste our time and energy in trying to cultivate friendship with Pakistan. A Sino-Indian *entente* will act as a brake upon Russia and America.

No political settlement between Russia and America can ever be arrived at if India and China come together. The condition precedent to the establishment of Russo-American *entente* is the establishment of Russian hegemony over the Middle East and of American hegemony over the continental and peninsular regions of Asia bordering the Pacific.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now, the Deputy Minister of External Affairs is here!

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am sorry I did not see her. India's interest both in the Middle East and South-East Asia will be jeopardised if any political settlement between Russia and America is arrived at on the basis of the division of the Afro-Asian land mass into two spheres of influence—Russian and American.

Indo-Pakistan friendship will not improve India's power position *vis à vis* Russia, China and America. Pakistan, however unfriendly she may be towards India, can do no harm to India. Pakistan is as important to India as any other country in the world. Pakistan's military and political importance has dwindled with the advent of the thermo-nuclear age. All nation states have become obsolete. The solution of the Indo-Pakistan dispute is Indo-Russian *entente*.

1886 (Ai) LSD—6.

President

From a long-term point of view, the only solution of all the problems of international politics is the transformation of the United Nations Organisation into a world government.

If really there is any danger of war between India and Pakistan or India and China or Russia and America, it can be averted not by pursuing any policy of either non-alignment or alignment but by the handing over of the defence portfolio to the United Nations Organisation.

The condition precedent to disarmament is the handing over of the defence portfolio to the United Nations Organisation by the non-aligned states. But no non-aligned nation will ever hand over its defence portfolio to the United Nations unless India takes the lead in the matter. Disarmament means the transformation of the United Nations Organisation into a world organ. Disarmament does not mean the destruction of firearms. Only congenital idiots can think otherwise.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Has the hon. Member ever thought of sending a paper to the United Nations to be read there in the Security Council or some other organisation?

Shri Sampath: I first of all want to draw the attention of the House to a passage in the President's Address on page 8, which reads as follows:

"As a result of the elections my Government have received a significant vote of confidence in their internal and external policies...." etc.

I want to say that at least in the Address, there should be a distinction between a party and the Government. If I understand correctly, the Government do not go to the elections to get a vote of confidence. They come to Parliament, if there is any doubt in that matter. If we are to accept this passage, then we have to accept the contention made by

[Shri Sampath]

Shri A. K. Gopalan that the Kerala election has given a verdict that the people of Kerala have no confidence in the present Government.

I mention this because, at least in the President's Address in future, such things, such statements, the propriety of which could be disputed, should not be repeated and care and vigilance are exercised to prevent them.

Then, it is painful to note that the Centre do not yet consider fit to accept or accede to the demands of the people of Tamilnad regarding the question of renaming of the Madras State as Tamilnad. That the demand is just could be seen from the fact that the State Government has succeeded, rather implemented, the change at the State level, and we find no valid reasons why the Central Government should be obstinate not to accede to that demand and implement that change throughout. Even for such very obvious matters on which there cannot be two opinions, if the Government expects the people to agitate and struggle and only then get their demands fulfilled, then our politics will not be a very smooth one. It will be agitational politics. Even though our Prime Minister and others day in and day out say that we should cry halt to agitational politics after achieving freedom, this Government do not yet learn to understand and respect the feelings and sentiments of the people in such matters which ultimately makes agitational politics inevitable. One does not know whether we are dealing with our own Government or with some foreign Government; especially the people of Tamilnad have very bitter experience with the Government at the Centre on many problems similar to this.

Another thing to which I would like to draw the attention of the House and which I had already once expressed in this House is, in Tamilnad from the day the first radio station

was installed in Tiruchi, the radio broadcasting stations were using "Vanoli", a Tamil word in their announcements. The announcement used to say "Tiruchi Vanoli Nilayam" meaning Tiruchi broadcasting station. But suddenly recently they have discontinued the practice of announcing "Vanoli" and they have introduced a new word "Akashvani". This was resented to by many. Almost all sections of the Tamilnad, great Tamil pandits, many political parties and important men in all walks of public life have protested, but to no avail, with the result that now there is a movement in Tamilnad which appeals to all people not to pay the radio licence fee. Hundreds of people have already written to the Postmaster General saying that they would not pay the radio licence fee unless the old practice is resumed.

It may look a very trivial matter from here, but one should go to Tamilnad to understand how much the Tamil people feel about it; especially when we hear from Radio Ceylon a very pure and chaste word like "Vanoli", and we are deprived of that in our own free land. This is something which causes great concern. This matter should be viewed with serious concern, because there is already a fear in the minds of Tamil people that there are designs and manoeuvres from the Centre to impose Hindi at all costs. Recently we read an announcement in the papers from the postal department—although that department is manned by one of our Tamil veterans here—that hereafter telegrams could be sent in all the national languages of India. It was quite heartening to see that development, but on further scrutiny it is to be learnt that it could be sent only in Devanagari script. It is as good as saying that one should send telegrams in Hindi. It looks as though a new facility is being given to the people, who know to read and write only in their mother-tongue. But on further scrutiny it shows that unless he has a knowledge of Devanagari

script or Hindi, he cannot avail of this facility. These designs lay bare their real intentions that at all costs they want to impose Hindi on the people who are not willing to accept it. These things are creating very bad trends in politics.

In Delhi, we sit and analyse the election results and say that separatist elements are coming up, which is something very dangerous. But nobody bothers to go to the root of these causes. These are all small things which can be remedied if there is a generous or understanding mind here. But we do not care; we say "Our Director has decided like that" and so on. So, I would request the Government to be very careful on problems like this.

I shall now draw the attention of the House to a dispute between a Judge of the Calcutta High Court and the Government of India. I do not want to go into the details of the issue but I feel it is a case which does not bring credit to the Government, which is expected to protect the independence of the judiciary from the interference of the executive. The controversy was whether it was proper for the Government to reopen the question of age of a Judge once it had been accepted and acted upon. If the Government were allowed to question a Judge's age at any time during the tenure of his office, he will be in perpetual peril of his position and thus will be unable to administer justice without fear or favour. Many might rightly feel that this is an instance of crucial significance in India's constitutional development. I am sure instances like this will cause grave concern in the minds of those who believe that the liberty of the citizen is closely bound up with the complete independence of the Judges.

As we are fresh from the general elections, everybody's mind is full of election effects. Shri Braj Raj Singh dwelt for most of the time on elections. Even Shri Gopalan pointed to the malpractices that were rampant

in the last general elections. It was in this House are not aware of these malpractices, who else are going to know all those things? I do not say that all of us have learnt or practised these things, but we are well aware of the sort of malpractices adopted in the general elections. It is a matter of shame especially for those who are responsible for making legislation to curtail and prevent such malpractices, because it is done just before everyone's eyes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are responsible for making legislation. I heard the hon. Member say that it is a matter of shame for those who are responsible for making legislation.

Shri Sampath: Ineffective legislation, I may add. We are responsible and we should have considered about it. At this stage, after the elections . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That would not be proper for the hon. Member to say. If a legislation is defective, he can certainly suggest improvements or amendments. But to say that it was a shame for the whole Parliament to adopt certain legislation is not fair and that could not be allowed.

Shri Sampath: I would rather say that it is very regrettable, if it is not a matter of shame.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What difference does it make between the two—it is regrettable or it is a matter of shame that we have passed bad legislation? Does the hon. Member mean that?

Shri Sampath: No, Sir; after having seen the malpractices after the legislations have been made.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should bring up certain amendments to improve them and make the House agree. Whatever we have done, we are proud of it.

Shri Sampath: I am only impressing on the necessity for bringing about certain improvements.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can say that he has detected certain defects in the legislation that is there at present or that its implementation and execution have not been properly done. But to say that it is regrettable that we passed such legislation or that it is shameful is not fair.

Shri Tangamani: The legislation is such that its implementation is almost impossible.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can say there are difficulties in implementation. Everyone has a right to say that.

Shri Sampath: I mean no offence to this august House; I only want that either the defects in the existing legislation should be corrected or the implementation should be more strict. I would recall in this context that the *Indian Express*, published from Madras, published a very big photograph of a lorry-load of voters coming to a polling booth. It has also mentioned a particular party responsible for the operation. With a photograph it is published in the *Indian Express* and also *Dinamani*: "Such and such party is bringing voters to the booth in this lorry".

15 hrs.

An Hon. Member: The voters themselves must have engaged it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. You cannot carry voters in a lorry. The law is all right so far as that is concerned.

The Thimmaiah (Kolar-Reserved—Sch. Castes): The voters themselves must have engaged that lorry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is not the allegation.

Shri Sampath: What I want to say is that such offences should be made cognizable. Otherwise these offences cannot be checked, because every

candidate who loses is not in a fit position to come with an election petition.

Dr. Samantsinhar: Was the lorry engaged by Dravida Kazhagam?

Shri Sampath: I do not want to mention the name of the party. The paper has clearly mentioned the name of the party.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Probably there would be another kind of complaint that even when there was no case the police jumped over the voters and arrested them.

Shri Sampath: But all the same, Sir, we have to find out effective means of checking these things. In this context there are many malpractices which every one of us has been witnessing during the last general elections. Soon after every election we complain, but we have not been able to do anything. This is a serious challenge to democracy; that is what I am afraid of.

The role of the governmental machinery, as has been brought out, in some places had been very derogatory, very anti-democratic. Many parties have pointed this out. It is very difficult to prove all these things in a court of law. Therefore, I would impress upon the Government, I would impress upon this House to bring in more proper and suitable foolproof legislations which could be more effective to prevent all these malpractices.

The question of implementation of these legislations is also very important. One of the party leaders has called for the resignation of the party in power six months prior to the general elections. That I think should be acceptable to almost all. Almost all the parties today, except the Congress Party, feel that the elections could be more fairly conducted if the party in power resigns six months, four months or even three months prior to the general elections.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: In Orissa the Congress Party fought the election after going out of office and came out victorious.

Shri Sampath: Then it can be very easily followed in other States also. That is what I suggest. They need not be afraid of the election results. They can follow it in the case of all other States.

Sir, I have done.

Dr. Samantsinhar: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank the President for his kind expression of sentiment regarding the hon. Members of the out-going Parliament, particularly those hon. Members who cease to be Members in the third Lok Sabha. I am very grateful to him for his advice, because he is rather representative of a tradition in India and such type of men are now not available and the country would be losing his services.

15.05 hrs.

(SHRI JAGANATHA RAO *in the Chair*)

While, saying this, I also draw your kind attention to the constitutional provision under article 83(2) regarding the dissolution of the Lok Sabha. It is now told that the Lok Sabha would be dissolved by the 30th or 31st of this month. But the proviso under that article says that the period of five years will be counted from the first day of the first meeting. Therefore, I do not know how the President has been advised by the executive and the Government to dissolve the Parliament before it has completed five years. We know that the officers of the Lok Sabha and at least the Members of the Government, those who will continue in their offices till, at least, the new Cabinet is formed, will be receiving their emoluments and other privileges. But the members for whose confidence and trust they are there, will go without their inconvenience being properly considered. Therefore, this point though it looks a little awkward for us to mention here, must be looked into, My submission is that in future

the out-going Lok Sabha should not be called after the general elections. The Parliament should finish its work before the general elections because, as Shri Braj Raj Singh pointed out, if the old Lok Sabha is convened after the general elections, it becomes very awkward for those Members who are defeated or who are not coming to the House.

Again, we all know that we have the railway pass and an identity card in which it is mentioned that it will be continued till May, 1962. Now we are told that a bulletin is going to be issued. This is another difficulty to adjust one's programme.

The advice to the President for dissolution should be well thought of and it should not be done like this. This session of Parliament has been called only to pass a vote on account. This forms part of the general budget. I think we have no power to give this vote on account particularly in the year in which the elections have been held. That must be left to the representatives of the people and we should not be asked to pass it in this manner.

Coming to the President's Address, in the second paragraph of his Address the President has mentioned about the Plan. The Third Plan was discussed in this House and also in the parliamentary groups. But I am sorry to say that the criticisms offered or the suggestions made by the Members have not been followed by the planners. These have only been of academic value and the Plan has not been done according to popular needs. While saying this, of course, I am not of the opinion of Shri Rajagopalachari that the Planning Commission is a super-cabinet. But what I feel is that actually this House or the representatives of the people have no power to offer any opinion in the framing of the Plan. The Planning Commission is now without any responsibility of executing the Plan. They give us a Plan which is not actually for bringing about the socialist pattern of society which this Parliament has

[Dr. Samantsinhar]

accepted. You know that after the two Plans the regional disparities and disparities in growth is rampant everywhere. Therefore, what is the good of having these Plans if these regional disparities will only increase and the Plans will provide nothing to eradicate them?

Sir, India is a country of problems. I would rather say that by these Plans we are adding another problem to this country which in future would be very gigantic. This aspect must be properly considered. We all know that in the Plan, cottage industry stands much neglected. We are all for industrialisation and we want to compete with the so-called civilised western countries. While doing that, we are forgetting our Indian culture, our Indian heritage. Ours is basically an agricultural country and our aim should be to give the agriculturists additional income so that their living standard improves and they could have their budgets within limits. That can be done only by developing the cottage industries. We all know that whatever be the increase in the number of machines that we have, whatever may be the size of the plants that we install, we cannot employ a large portion of our population, which is increasing every year, unless we develop our cottage industries, but they are being completely neglected.

In the third para of his address, the President refers to floods. I am sorry to say that Orissa, which is chronically affected by floods, has not got a place in this para. Why is it so? Is not Orissa a part of the Indian Union? Has not the President been informed that Orissa is affected by floods? Why this negligence on the part of those who advise the President?

Orissa is facing three recurring calamities annually. They are: floods, drought and fire. Though fifteen years have passed after we have achieved our independence, neither

the Union Government nor the State Government could eradicate the causes and execute any planned programme for controlling the floods. We have got the Hirakud dam after spending about Rs. 70 crores. Floods which were of certain duration before the construction of the dam are now of greater duration; previously, the floods were bringing natural fertilizers to the fields whereas now the floods bring sands to the fields. In comparison with overall spending irrigation potentiality is very meagre, it could only irrigate a few lakhs acres of land which could very well have been provided with irrigation at a cost of Rs. 20 crores.

Coming to the steel plants, I am glad the Rourkela plant would be expanded. While saying this, I must point out that the sons of the soil, that is, Oriyas, are not given proper employment in the plant. Whereas in Durgapur and Bhilai the people of the respective States are being given preference. When we claim for the Oriyas in Rourkela, we are told that it is an all India institution which has been established by the Government of India and so the Oriyas cannot claim any preferential treatment in the matter of employment there.

Coming to trade, I want to say that practically for the last five years though we are pressing for a change the old established houses and firms only are given permits for import and export. No new business house can get a licence or permit for import or export. This monopoly system should go. Because these old rules are generally followed, the business houses in the poor and backward States are not able to get permits or licences. So, those States cannot prosper whereas the developed States are developing still further. This system must be changed.

Then I would say that the office of the Controller of Iron and Steel should not remain in Calcutta; it should be changed to a central place. The concentration of offices in a par-

ticular area should be avoided. In the olden days, most of the offices were concentrated in particular cities because then the communication was very poor and they could not keep contact with the various offices unless they are in the same place. Now that the communication system has improved so much, there is no longer any necessity to concentrate these offices in one place. They should be dispersed throughout the country so that the people of those areas can get some employment and broaden their outlook.

Coming to Panchayati Raj, I quite agree with my hon. friend, Shri Raghubir Sahai, that it has become a Government programme, not a peoples' programme. In the panchayats the Sarpanch and Naib Sarpanchs even Samity Chairman behave as if they are Government employees. Their outlook should change. The otherwise peaceful and docile village atmosphere is vitiated by the petty politics of the Panchayati Raj. Then, we are not giving them enough power. Only in speeches and radio programmes we say that we are giving the panchayats more power. Actually, the power is not there. They must be given sufficient powers. I would say that all work relating to land revenue should be given to the panchayats. They must also be asked to manage the forests from which the people collect their fuel.

Coming to education, we have passed an Act, making primary education compulsory. We all know that there is a campaign to make all children attend the schools. But in my State of Orissa, there are students but no teachers or buildings. In the British days at least a little furniture used to be provided; nowadays even that is not given. In a particular district we wanted about 300 teachers after this campaign. Government gave about 100 teachers. This is not the way in which education can be spread. This must be properly looked into. Merely passing legislation or saying things would not improve the position.

Then, there is frequent change in the text-books. In my childhood days the text-books used to continue for years together. Now the text-books are changed every year; sometimes, even during the year it is changed twice or thrice. This is done only to please the text-book committee where some flatterer of the DPI would be given the contract. If you want proper spread of education, this evil of frequent change of text-books should also go.

Both education and health are State subjects. So, if we discuss them here, the Minister will say "What shall I do? It is a State subject. Please do not trouble me with these questions." Coming to health, I am glad that we have eradicated malaria. At the same time, cancer and filaria are spreading. I feel that sufficient money has not been provided by the Planning Commission for health programmes. So, that aspect must also be considered.

As regards drinking water, in Orissa they are going to charge a cess for utilising water from minor irrigation tanks. Neither the Central Government, nor the State Government, were able to supply people with drinking water in spite of all our plans. So, people dug tanks from M. I. grants for drinking water. Now the Government cannot say that because they were from irrigation grants, they must be assessed for irrigation charges. Now particulars are being collected and I apprehend that after collecting the data they will levy a cess from the people. Again, for providing drinking water, cent per cent grant should be given by the Government. Having talked of so much about socialist pattern of society, this and that, if the people do not get a drop of pure drinking water, what meaning the plans will have to those people?

Coming to railways, we have been shouting very loudly for the last so many years that there is no alternative route to Orissa. Orissa is affected by floods every year. Now if there

[Dr. Samantsinhar]

is a flood, people from Calcutta cannot come to Orissa. So, there must be an alternative route. There must be a line from Talcher to Rourkela. I hope the Ministry will provide that.

There is now some talk regarding the privy purses of the Princes and of putting some curb over them. I would say before that there must be some curb on the industrialists, on those who run their industry by taking loans from the Government. Also, there is a cent per cent apprehension that some day the industrialists may capture the Government. It has happened in one State.

An Hon. Member: In Orissa.

Dr. Samantsinhar: Sir, there must be some curb on these industrialists. I think before curbing these princes there must be some curb on the industrialists who with Government money set up business and become big men.

As regards the elections, much has been spoken, but it is my privilege to have seen two General Elections in my State during the last ten months and I know how money was spent. Money matters much and not any other thing. If our democracy goes this way, I think there is hardly any chance of its being successful in this greatest democracy of the world.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the President in his Address says:

"I wish you all success and good fortune wherever you may be."

We are extremely grateful to the President for these kind words.

An Hon. Member: It applies to you.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: We re-echo the sentiment by praying that he may live long and that his wise counsel may be available to the nation no matter in whichever capacity he may choose to work hereafter.

This being the last occasion as the President has said in his Address, we did not expect any fresh policies to be mentioned in his Address and from the attendance in the House it is evident that hon. Members have very little interest in discussing important matters. Yet, we have to debate this Address as also discuss the financial statement and the Railway Budget. I think it will be worthwhile to consider the desirability of convening the Parliament after the General Elections just to dispose of such business.

Before I deal with the national and international issues and some of the points which the President has dealt with, I would like to say a few words about the General Elections specially because it is very fresh in our minds. I do not know whether it can be safely asserted as the President has said that a great majority of our people have reposed their confidence in the Government. Judging from the results I do not think this statement is quite correct. I am not discussing the parties. Several parties including my Party have fared very badly. I am not concerned with that at the present moment. In the thirteenth year of our Republic we should seriously ponder over the tendencies, reactions and repercussions of a General Election of such a vast magnitude because what we find is that after three successive General Elections a Party is ruling over the country with a minority of votes. In the present elections they have been able to secure only 45 per cent of the votes polled, but at the same time it enables it to continue in power at the Centre as well as in the States, even in the two States where it has failed to get a majority. The fact remains that the majority of the votes polled went against the party in power. That means that the people recorded their disapproval of the way the administration of this country was being run by the Congress Party. It being the biggest party and because of the hopeless division in the opposition

ranks it has an advantage. There is no doubt about it. But I do not think any definite trend has emerged, neither can it be emphasised that the votes polled for the Congress Party are a vote for socialism because it can also be safely stated that the Congress in spite of its professions of socialism contains in its fold all elements that constitute the various trends in the opposition today. Hence, negatively thinking I would say that if the General Elections have shown anything, it is that the electorate has registered a vote of no confidence in the party in power and India would be ruled by a party which has failed to secure even more than half the majority of votes polled in the last General Elections.

I would then refer to the means and the methods employed to win elections. I do not want to use strong words, but let us be honest. Let us seriously think over and admit facts because for the five years to come none of us are going to face the elections. There is no expediency. We can seriously think about the future and search our hearts. Let us say—I appeal to all parties—whether in spirit and in letter we have employed means which can be said to be democratic, constitutional or even not dishonest. Is it not a fact that although we all profess that we are against casteism, communalism, regionalism and linguism, while selecting candidates and even while going in for propaganda we have tried to see that we appeal to these emotions so that in particular circumstances a particular candidate gets elected? I would like more than anybody else the hon. Prime Minister if he is really a faithful heir of the Mahatma to speak out the truth. It is no use accusing others. I have read in the papers that the hon. Prime Minister has taken serious notice of some poster being exhibited somewhere by some party. I do not know which party it was. It seems the Home Ministry has been asked to collect these posters and find out some ways of preventing it. They are probably

thinking of some action. But is it not a fact that much more objectionable things were done during the elections? I do not think the hon. Prime Minister is unaware of this because that has been largely done by his party.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: No.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You may say 'No', but a fact is a fact. I want to ask my hon. friend whether he knows that there has not been free use of money to purchase votes.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: It might have been done by your party.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Bribe-d voters?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: Not by my party.

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): Is it an election speech?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The sense of democracy, election laws—all these were violated deliberately both in letter and in spirit. I am not competent to speak about other States. My hon. friend was posing the question "Is it in Orissa?" I made this charge in this House after the mid-term elections and I make this charge even now. It is an admission not by me but the Chief Minister of Orissa has made a statement to the press just after the conclusion of polling that the Congress Party spent Rs. 12 lakhs for 19 Parliamentary seats, which means, on an average, Rs. 63,000 for a constituency. The law provides a limit for the candidate to spend: the maximum limit is Rs. 25,000. Of course, the law leaves the loop-hole for the party to spend any amount it likes. But is it honesty, I ask, that the party should spend a lot for its candidates?

Dr. Samantsinhar: How much did my hon. friend spend?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: My hon. friend might inspect my election return when I file it.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya : Shri Surendranath Dwivedy might do so in the case of the other candidates.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It leaves the common man in a quandary. Is it possible, when these huge amounts of money are allowed to be spent in the elections, for any common voter, who is theoretically given equal voting rights, who has also the right to become the Prime Minister of this country, to ever think of fighting elections and coming to the legislature? The money influence has vitiated the entire election procedure and has reduced democracy to a farce.

An Hon. Member: Now you have won.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I have won in spite of that.

About the government machinery the less said the better. The Prime Minister himself went to my constituency, and it was tom-tommed that he was going to lay the foundation-stone for the Paradip port which would become a major port, whereas in this House it was categorically stated that in the Third Five Year Plan there is no provision for a major port at Paradip. I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister; I asked him, "What for are you coming? Really, have you accepted Paradip to be a major port to be completed during the period of the Third Five Year Plan, or are you coming here as the Congress leader for election purposes?" He wrote me back saying, "My visit is both official and unofficial". And what did he do? There was no foundation-stone laid for the major port at Paradip; because he could not do it. But a stone was laid to commemorate the visit of the Prime Minister. As a memory of the visit of the Prime Minister to Paradip a stone was laid, and it was given out that he has laid the foundation-stone for a major port at Paradip. A great

achievement for the Congress! And on the way, in my constituency, he addressed three public meetings naming the Congress candidate who should be supported. And all these meetings were organised by the government machinery: electricity was made available, lakhs of rupees were spent. If he is honest he will admit that being in an advantageous position he has given the lead in this country to misuse and to abuse authority, to utilise government machinery for his own party purposes. It does not lie in his mouth to criticise others.

The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Sardar Swaran Singh): It is not correct. It was party machinery, not government machinery.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: These are a few hard facts which may not be palatable to many of my friends.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharya: They are no facts at all.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I would like that these things should not be ignored.

I would also like to ask this. I have heard it in Bengal also. In Orissa a direct threat was given to the village panchayats, to the villagers "Unless you vote for the Congress Party no development work would be carried on in your area".

The Deputy Minister of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs (Dr. M. M. Das): That is a lie.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Systematically it was done all over the country, as my friend here tells me. And it is a good sign in this country that our people are development minded, they want more work to be done, they are not much concerned with the other issues, even the China issue was remotest in their mind

Shri Nath Pai: (Rajapur): It was never in their mind.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The Congress, of course, did not raise any issues whatsoever; the only issue they raised was "Vote for the Congress, otherwise you are doomed, there is no development work, nothing can be done, no work would be carried on; we are in power; vote for power only; no opposition, no democracy, nothing of the kind".

Of course, the other tendencies have come up in this country, the reactionaries, the communalists. They have exploited this opportunity. We must, all of us, join to curb these tendencies.

At the same time let us be fair, let us be honest. Let the Government or—if the Government is not willing—let the Parliament set up a Commission. Let that Commission go into the entire question whether government machinery was utilised for the purpose of elections, and to what extent, what is the influence of money in the elections and such other allied matters as are necessary for helping to build up a healthy tradition for the success of democracy in our country. I hope some serious thought would be given to this problem. If that is not done there will be general frustration all round. We have seen what has happened in our neighbouring countries. We have a great responsibility not only to win elections but to make the people feel that the democratic method is the only method that would ultimately be able to deliver the goods. Therefore, if the elections and the developments in the neighbouring countries have taught us any lesson, we should immediately think of a machinery to find out all these things.

If, in spite of all provocations and malpractices, the elections have been run in a most peaceful manner the credit for it does not go to the Election Commission, but certainly the people of this country are to be congratulated for the exemplary manner

in which they have exercised their franchise.

Sardar Swaran Singh: And also the opposition parties.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: If there are no opposition parties there will be no elections.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I will now refer only to a few points regarding China. There is a mention in the President's address that uneasy relations exist between our country and China. Our border is still unsafe, the Chinese still sit tight over our motherland showing no signs of accommodation. There is no fresh development excepting that they want to renew the Indo-Tibetan Agreement, and the President says that our Government has sent a reply asking for a reversal of their aggressive policy. I only want to know what that reversal of policy means. Does it mean that if the Chinese will not commit further aggression we will be satisfied, or does it mean—which it should mean—that they should first vacate their aggression before any further negotiation for the renewal of the agreement is thought of? I want a categorical statement on this point. We must be firm; we must refuse to sit and discuss matters with a country which has been unfriendly and has been humiliating us from the very beginning. Let there be no ambiguity over this matter.

The President has also mentioned about our relationship with Pakistan. It mainly relates to Kashmir. The matter was to be discussed in the Security Council. But, the debate has been deferred. If we believe in direct negotiations, if we want to solve the Indo-Pakistan problems by direct negotiations, including Kashmir,—it should be done that way—then, it is time that we give notice to the United Nations telling them, since they have failed all these years to find out a formula or to make Pakistan

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

vacate, and because we want direct negotiations, we withdraw it from the United Nations.

I am glad that we are giving aid for road communication development in Bhutan. I hope a better communication system would enable us to have closer contact with this border country. But, at the same time, one cannot sit silent over what is happening inside Nepal. It is a matter of great concern that democracy has been butchered and all popular movements are suppressed. If there is danger to democracy just on the border of our country, it will have its repercussions and we are concerned about the matter. We cannot sit silent about Nepal. Let us arouse the conscience of the world to see that pressure is put on the authorities in Nepal for the restoration of democracy in that country.

One point more and I will conclude. I will leave it to the other speaker from our party to deal with the other problems. I want to mention only about the agricultural sector. The President hopes there has been improvement and there is going to be improvement and probably, during the Third Five Year Plan, they will be able to fulfil the target. But, I doubt that very much. Because, land reforms are yet not completed all over the country. More than that, we find that the agriculturists are not given a minimum price. As you know, in the year 1957, in the Agriculture Ministers conference, it was decided that a minimum price for agricultural commodities should be fixed. As yet, barring a few commodities, this has not been done, especially in the case of jute. The jute growers are suffering. As you know, in this House, there was a debate about it for six hours and the Government gave us an assurance that this time they would see to it that the jute growers do not suffer as a result of the policy. But, due to reasons best known to themselves, they left the jute growers at the mercy of

the jute industry, which manipulated the market, and is even now manipulating the market, as a result of which the jute growers, who produced a great quantity of jute in the hope of getting a fair price, have been deprived of the fruits of their labours. Therefore, I would say, if you really are anxious to see that the agricultural targets are fulfilled during the course of the Third Five Year Plan, it is time that you fix a minimum price for agricultural commodities.

श्री पहाड़िया (सवाई माधोपुर-रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : सभापति महोदय, राष्ट्रपति जी ने संसद् के दोनों सदनों के सामने अपना जो भाषण दिया उस में जहां उन्होंने एक तरफ देश में हुई प्रगति के बारे में कुछ प्रकाश डाला वहां दूसरी तरफ हिन्दुस्तान के आने वाले भविष्य का कुछ नक्शा भी हमारे सामने पेश किया। यह बात अपनी जगह सही है कि उन का राष्ट्रपति काल हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में स्वर्णक्षरों में लिखा जायेगा क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर चलने वाली पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं का प्रारम्भ और हिन्दुस्तान के विकास का प्रारम्भ उन के राष्ट्रपति काल में हुआ। देश की सरकार ने, जो कि संविधान के तहत उन की सरकार कहलाती है, कुछ अच्छे काम किये। उन को देश की जनता याद करेगी। इस के लिये हम उन को और उन की सरकार को धन्यवाद देते हैं, न केवल अपनी तरफ से बल्कि इस देश के रहने वाले लोगों की तरफ से।

कुछ ऐसी भी बातें हुई हैं जिन को कहना केवल रोना कहा जायेगा, लेकिन हम अपने को उन बातों से अलग नहीं रख सकते। यहां पर पिछले आम चुनावों की काफी चर्चा हुई। वहां पर जातिवाद और सम्प्रदायवाद के बारे में कहा गया। मैं उन बातों को दोहराना नहीं चाहता। मैं केवल आप के जरिये से अपने कानून मंत्री जी और इस सदन के सामने यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ

कि हालांकि हमारे इस चुनाव का जो तरीका था वह सही था, मैं नहीं कहता कि वह गलत था, क्योंकि वह हम सब लोगों की राय से तय हुआ था, लेकिन पिछले आम चुनावों का तजुर्बा इस बात को कहता है कि संसद् और असेम्बलियों का चुनाव एक साथ होना कम से कम ठीक नहीं है क्योंकि मतदाता इस बात को नहीं जानता कि वह किस को वोट देने जा रहा है। कुछ पार्टियों के लोग, कुछ गिने चुने राजनीतिक कार्यकर्ता, मतदाताओं के सामने जाते हैं और कहीं किसी पार्टी के नाम पर और कहीं किसी योजना और प्रोग्राम के नाम पर वोट मांगते हैं। इसके साथ साथ जातिवाद या सम्प्रदायवाद भी अपना मुंह ले कर सामने आ जाता है। जिन व्यक्तियों की विरादरी बहुत छोटी है बदकिस्मती से जो संख्या में बहुत कम हैं, उन का तो इस चुनाव में लड़ना रहा नहीं, और जिन लोगों के पास पैसा कम है उन का इस के बारे में सोचना भी गलत है। जो भी हो हम ने एक तरीका अख्यार किया है, मैं उस तरीके के बारे में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ।

जब पार्लियामेंट और असेम्बलियों के चुनाव साथ-साथ होते हैं तो सारे लोकल झगड़े, जिन का पार्लियामेंट से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं, सारे मसले और सारी बातें जिन का पार्लियामेंट से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं, चुनाव के साथ घसीटे जाते हैं और असेम्बली के उम्मीदवारों के साथ साथ वह नजला सारे का सारा पार्लियामेंट के उम्मीदवारों पर भी उतरता है। यह मेरे साथ ही नहीं गुजरा, सब के साथ गुजरता है। लेकिन यह बात गलत है और नहीं होनी चाहिये। मेरा कोई ताल्लुक नहीं इस बात से कि किसी गांव में सफाई हुई या नहीं, मेरा ताल्लुक नहीं कि किसी गांव में सड़क बनी या नहीं, किसी गांव में पंचायतें ठीक तरह से काम करती हैं या नहीं करती हैं। पंचायतों को ले कर गांवों में दो ग्रुप्स हो जाते हैं, तो उस से मेरा तो कोई ताल्लुक नहीं।

मैं पार्लियामेंट का चुनाव लड़ता हूँ और मेरे साथ ही असेम्बली का भी उम्मीदवार चुनाव लड़ता है। यह सही है कि देश में प्रजातन्त्र की नींव को कायम रखने के लिये पार्टियों का होना जरूरी है। मेरे साथ किसी पार्टी का कोई आदमी चुनाव लड़ता है तो जाहिर है कि उस ने जो कुछ किया है उस को ध्यान में रख कर मतदाता उस के पक्ष में अपनी राय जाहिर करेंगे वोट दे कर, लेकिन उस का नजला मेरे ऊपर भी गिरेगा। इसलिये मेरे खयाल से यह सही नहीं है और इस को बदलना चाहिये, और असेम्बली और पार्लियामेंट के चुनाव अलग अलग होने चाहियें, ऐसा मेरा निवेदन है। लेकिन अगर यह सम्भव नहीं है किसी वजह से, आप यह दलील दे सकते हैं कि आप को चुनाव की व्यवस्था अलग से करनी पड़ जायेगी और इस से आप को ज्यादा खर्च करना पड़ेगा, तो कम से कम मैं तो इस दलील से सन्तुष्ट नहीं हूँ। लेकिन सन्तुष्ट न होते हुए भी आप से कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर आप अलग अलग चुनाव नहीं करा सकते तो मेहरबानी कर के डब्बे तो अलग अलग रखवा दीजिये। हमारे विरोधी भाई ने आरोप लगाया कि मतदाताओं को दो पर्चे एक साथ दिये गये और मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ। और जगह हुआ हो या न हुआ हो लेकिन मेरे चुनाव क्षेत्र में ऐसा हुआ, जिस का नतीजा यह निकला कि जो वोट असेम्बली के मेम्बर को पड़े वही पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर को पड़े। जाहिर है कि मैं एक पार्टी का उम्मीदवार था और वह वोट मेरे लिये पड़ने चाहिये थे। लेकिन मतदाताओं का दिमाग अलग अलग होता है। वह असेम्बली में किसी को चुनना चाहता है लेकिन सम्भव है कि पार्लियामेंट के लिये किसी दूसरे को चुनना चाहता हो। लेकिन दोनों पर्चे एक साथ पड़ने से जो मत पार्लियामेंट के उम्मीदवार को मिलने चाहिये थे वे नहीं मिले। असेम्बली क्या चीज है यह मतदाता जानता है, जो उम्मीदवार सामने खड़े हैं उन में से किस को हराना है और किस को जिताना है इसे वह जानता है।

[श्री पहाड़िया]

वह जानता है कि जो उम्मीदवार सामने खड़ा है उस का क्या सहयोग गांव में कुओं खुदवाने में रहा है, या उस ने लड़के को नौकरी दिलवाने में क्या मदद की। अगर उस ने मदद नहीं की तो वह उस को मत नहीं देगा। वह जिस तरह वहां पर मत देगा अगर पार्लियामेंट का उम्मीदवार भी साथ में खड़ा है तो उस पर भी इस का असर पड़ेगा। इस लिये मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर आप अलग अलग मतदान नहीं करवा सकते तो कम से कम बैलट बाक्सेज अलग रक्खे जाने चाहियें और पचियां अलग रहनी चाहियें।

इस के अलावा मैं एक निवेदन और करना चाहता हूं कि खर्च के बारे में एक निश्चित व्यवस्था की गई है कि उम्मीदवार किस सीमा से आगे अपना खर्चा नहीं बढ़ा सकेगा। लेकिन यह बात आपने आप में सही है और इस की जांच करने की जरूरत नहीं है कि जितने खर्च की व्यवस्था है, अधिकांश लोग—कुछ व्यक्ति ऐसे जरूर हैं, जो निश्चित सीमा में अपना खर्च करते हैं, लेकिन अधिकांश लोग, चाहे वे किसी भी पार्टी के हों—सीमा से अधिक पैसा खर्च करते हैं। लेकिन यह स्मरण रखना चाहिए कि यह व्यवस्था ऐसी है कि इस में ज्यादा पैसा खर्च होना लाजिमी है। मैं समझता हूं कि दूसरी व्यवस्था में इस का चर्क हो सकता है, लेकिन इस व्यवस्था में यह सम्भव नहीं है। इस व्यवस्था को बदलने के लिये या तो कोई कमीशन या कमेटी नियुक्त की जाये, या कानून मंत्री इस मामले को हाथ में लें और अगर इस सदन में इस पर विचार किया जा सकता हो, तो ऐसा किया जाना चाहिए।

यह एक विचारणीय बात है कि असेम्बली का एक मेम्बर, जिस को कुल मिला कर साल में पंद्रह हजार रुपये मिलते हैं, पचहत्तर हजार रुपये या बीस हजार रुपये भी खर्च करता है, तो वह पैसा कहां से आता है। आज सब तरफ

इस बात की चर्चा है कि देश में भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ रहा है। मैं मानता हूं कि यह हो सकता है कि कुछ व्यक्ति अपनी हैसियत बढ़ाने के लिए पार्लियामेंट या असेम्बली का चुनाव लड़ना चाहते हैं और निश्चित सीमा से अधिक खर्च कर सकते हैं और करते हैं, लेकिन इस के बावजूद वे कर्पट न हों। लेकिन जब अधिकांश व्यक्ति, जिन के पास पैसा नहीं है, कर्ज ले कर चुनाव लड़ते हैं और जितना उन को मिलता है, उस से दुगना तिगुना खर्च करते हैं, तो स्वभावतः दिमाग में यह बात आती है कि वह पैसा कहां से लायेंगे।

मैं मानता हूं कि पार्टियां भी अपने उम्मीदवारों को खर्च देती हैं, लेकिन वह भी हर एक के लिए सम्भव नहीं है। इस लिए इस पर विचार किया जाना चाहिए और या तो खर्च के विषय में खुली छूट होनी चाहिए और या खर्च की सीमा पर चर्किंग की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए।

हम ने अपने देश में पंचायत राज्य की व्यवस्था स्थापित की। पंचायत राज्य देश में आये, इस से हम सब तरह से सहमत हैं। यह गांधी जी का नारा था और यह संविधान की व्यवस्था भी है। लेकिन पंचायत कैसे चलें, उन के चुनाव का तरीका और चलने का ढंग क्या हो, यह स्पष्ट होना चाहिए। क्या वे विकास का काम करें, या सारे गांव की व्यवस्था उन को दे दी जाये। जिन लोगों को हम विधान के द्वारा सत्ता में आने से रोकते हैं, जिन को गुंडे, लुच्चे और बेईमान कहा जाता है, वे गांव का सरपंच बन कर या पंचायत समिति का प्रधान बन कर गांव का सारा काम चलाते हैं और सारे अधिकार उन के हाथ में होते हैं। वे गांव के आफिसर के खिलाफ कान्फ्रेंडेंशल रिपोर्ट लिखते हैं। जब पुलिस के कर्मचारी उन लोगों की गलत प्रवृत्तियों के खिलाफ कार्यवाही करना चाहते हैं, उन पर मुकदमा चलाना चाहते हैं, तो पंचायत समिति के प्रधान और

सरपंच साहबान थानेदार के खिलाफ रिपोर्ट लिख देते हैं और उस का तबादला हो जाता है ।

मैं इस बात को छिपाना नहीं चाहता कि पुलिस में भ्रष्टाचार है । यह बात सही है कि जो कर्मचारी अपनी कम तन्वाहों का रोना रोते हैं, वे भ्रष्टाचार भी बढ़ाते हैं । लेकिन इस बात को छिपाया नहीं जा सकता कि सत्ता के विकेन्द्रीकरण के साथ ही साथ भ्रष्टाचार का भी विकेन्द्रीकरण हुआ है । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं पंचायत राज और सामुदायिक विकास योजनाओं का बहुत बड़ा हिमायती हूँ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि देश में वे चलनी चाहिए, लेकिन उन में जो गलत बातें हो रही हैं, अगर उन की तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया गया और उन को रोका न गया, तो देश को बजाये फ़ायदे के नुकसान होने वाला है ।

मुझे अपने चुनाव के अवसर पर यह अनुभव प्राप्त हुआ कि मैं उन लोगों के पास वोट मांगने गया और मैं समझता था कि वह गांव पंचायत का सरपंच है, पंचायत समिति का प्रधान है, इस के साथ बहुमत है । लेकिन जब मैं उन से बात कर के बाहर निकला, तो मेरे साथियों ने मुझे बताया कि वह गांव का सरपंच ही नहीं है, बल्कि एक माना हुआ गुंडा भी है और वह डकैतों से चोरी का माल लेकर बेचता है । इस प्रकार हम देखते हैं कि जिस व्यक्ति को हम अवांछनीय समझते हैं, उस के हाथ में सारी सत्ता है और उस को कानूनी रेकागनीशन मिली हुई है ।

इस लिए इस पंचायत राज्य की व्यवस्था पर विचार किया जाना चाहिए कि किन लोगों को हम सत्ता दें और कितनी सत्ता दें । जैसा कि मैं ने अभी कहा है, मैं पंचायत राज्य और सामुदायिक विकास योजनाओं का बड़ा हिमायती हूँ । मैं चाहता हूँ कि गांवों की तरक्की हो और वहां रहने वाले गरीबों और हरिजनों का स्तर ऊंचा हो । लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि इन योजनाओं से उन लोगों को फ़ायदा मिल

रहा है, जिन को नहीं मिलना चाहिए और जिन लोगों को राहत मिलनी चाहिए, उन को नहीं मिल रही है और जिन लोगों को बाद में भी सहायता दी जा सकती है, जो रोज़ी रोटी का गुज़ारा कर सकते हैं, उन को सहायता पहुंचाने में प्राथमिकता दी जा रही है । हम चाहते हैं कि बीकर सैकशनज़ आफ़ दि सोसायटी का भला हो और उन का जीवन-स्तर ऊंचा हो, लेकिन ऐसा नहीं हो रहा है । इस बात की छान-बीन की जानी चाहिए कि इस का क्या कारण है । चुनाव की ऐसी व्यवस्था से जनता का क्या भला हो सकता है, जिस में कोई भी व्यक्ति, चाहे वह गांव का बड़ा जमींदार हो, ग्राम पंचायत का सरपंच बन सकता है ? उस व्यक्ति से हम कैसे आशा कर सकते हैं कि वह भूमिहीनों को भूमि देगा ?

एक तरफ़ हम हिन्दुस्तान के सब नागरिकों को चुनाव लड़ने के लिए समानाधिकार देने की बात करते हैं, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ़ हम इस बात की जांच नहीं करते कि क्या कोई उस अधिकार का उपयोग भी कर सकता है या नहीं । समानाधिकार का उपयोग करने के लिए समान अवसर भी दिये जाने चाहिए । एक तरफ़ तो बड़े बड़े राजा-महाराजा चुनाव लड़ते हैं, जिन के पास लाखों करोड़ों की पूंजी है, जिन को सरकारी खजाने से प्रिवी पर्स आदि के रूप में भत्ते मिलते हैं, जिन का व्यक्तिगत अरसर बहुत अधिक है और दूसरी तरफ़ मेरे जैसे गरीब व्यक्ति हैं । इस अवस्था में यह कैसे आशा की जा सकती है कि लोग समानता के अधिकार का उपयोग करेंगे ?

यह कितने आश्चर्य की बात है कि गांव के नम्बरदार को, जिस को साल भर में नम्बरदारी का पचास रुपया भी नहीं मिलता है, आफ़िस आफ़ प्राफ़िट माना जाता है, लेकिन बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों और राजा-महाराजाओं को आफ़िस आफ़ प्राफ़िट नहीं माना जाता है, जिन को सरकारी खजाने से

[श्री पहाड़िया]

भत्ते दिये जाते हैं। चूंकि मैं कोई वकील नहीं हूँ, इस लिए मैं कानूनी पेचीदगियों में नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि लोगों को समानाधिकार के साथ साथ समान अवसर भी दिये जाने चाहिए। जो लोग सरकार से बड़ी बड़ी रकमें ले कर पनप रहे हैं, मुझे उन से कोई व्यक्तिगत विरोध नहीं है। वे भी हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिक हैं और मैं चाहता हूँ कि वे भी दूसरों की तरह तरक्की करें, लेकिन उन को अनधिकार चेष्टा नहीं करनी चाहिए। लेकिन इस में उन का कोई कुमूर नहीं है, क्योंकि उन की इस अनधिकार चेष्टा के लिए संविधान में व्यवस्था की गई है। मेरे लिए यह सौभाग्य की बात है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां पर पधार चुके हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि वह इस विषय पर विचार करेंगे।

इस बात से इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता है कि जब से देश में कांग्रेस की सरकार बनी है, स्वास्थ्य-सेवाओं और शिक्षा आदि की व्यवस्था की गई है और शरीबों किसानों और मजदूरों को राहत मिली है, लेकिन ऐसे गांव भी हैं, जहां आज तक पीने का पानी उपलब्ध नहीं है। मैं राजस्थान से आता हूँ। वहां पर बहुत सी जगहें ऐसी हैं, जहां पर पंचायत समितियों और सरकार के जरिये से अनावश्यक कामों में रुपया खर्च किया जा रहा है, लेकिन वहां पर कुएं के पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था नहीं की जा रही है। इसलिये इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि योजना के तहत किस काम को प्रायर्त्ती दी जानी चाहिए। कम से कम हर एक गांव में पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था को प्राथमिकता मिलनी चाहिए। मैं राजस्थान के गांवों के बारे में जानता हूँ कि वहां पर कुछ बीमारियां केवल इस लिए फैल जाती हैं कि शुद्ध पीने का पानी उपलब्ध नहीं होता है और लोगों को तालाब का पानी पीने को मिलता है। इसलिए अगर कुएं के पीने के पानी की योजना को प्रायर्त्ती दी जाये, तो इससे गांवों के सब लोगों को लाभ पहुंचेगा।

योजना बनाते समय हम इस बात का बहुत ख्याल करते हैं कि जिन के पास काम नहीं है, उन को रोजी मिल जाये और जिन के पास रहने की व्यवस्था नहीं है, उन को मकान देने की चेष्टा की जाये। लेकिन फिर भी यह देखने में आता है कि पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्र इस प्रकार की योजनाओं से बंचित रह जाते हैं। उदाहरणस्वरूप किसी क्षेत्र में कोई कारखाना खोलने के लिए सरकार की ओर से दो चार शर्तें रखी जाती हैं, जैसे पानी इतना नीचे होना चाहिए, काम करने के लिए वहां पर इतने मजदूर मिलने चाहिए आदि। होता यह है कि वह क्षेत्र उन सारी शर्तों को मंजूर कर लेता है, लेकिन न जाने कोई राष्ट्रीय समस्या सामने आ जाती है या कोई और कठिनाई उत्पन्न हो जाती है—मुझ जैसा छोटा सा आदमी उन को नहीं जान सकता—और उस कारखाने को किसी दूसरी जगह लगाने की योजना बन जाती है, जहां पहले भी कई कारखाने बने हुए हैं। कम से कम इस बात का ध्यान रखा जाना चाहिये कि जो क्षेत्र बहुत पिछड़े हुए हैं, वहां पर विकास के कामों को प्राथमिकता दी जाये। तभी हम देश में समाजवाद ला सकेंगे और देश की आम जनताको राहत मिल सकेगी। यह ठीक है कि हम देश में समाजवाद ला रहे हैं और जातिवाद और साम्प्रदायिकता खत्म हो रहे हैं, लेकिन फिर भी पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों की तरफ ज्यादा ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये। काम तो हो रहा है, लेकिन उन को पहले सुविधा दी जानी चाहिए। अगर एक आदमी दो रोटी, खाता है, लेकिन उस को घी और मक्खन नहीं मिलता है, तो उसको कुछ देर बाद राहत पहुंचाई जा सकती है, लेकिन जिस व्यक्ति के पास खाने को रोटी नहीं है, उस को रोटी मिल जाये, इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था करने की आवश्यकता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्रकार देश, जो कि तरक्की कर रहा है, और तरक्की कर सकेगा और सही रास्ते पर

चलता हुआ अपने सब नागरिकों का स्तर
ऊंचा कर सकेगा ।

16 hrs.

Shri Bai Raj Madhok: Mr. Chairman, I join with the Mover of the Motion in paying my tribute and my Party's tribute to Rashtrapati Rajendra Prasad for the great services he has rendered to this country as the first President. He has been an embodiment of the great Indian ideal of simple living and high thinking, and as President he has lent dignity to that office and set traditions which, we hope, his successor will follow in the interest of democracy in this country.

I am, however, pained to note that some of our friends in their desire to praise some people use words which are not very correct. I am second to none in my respect and esteem for Mahatma Gandhi. But when I find some people calling him 'Rashtrapita', I feel that we are insulting him. He was one of the greatest sons of Mother India. He was not the 'Father of the nation', he was one of the great sons of Mother India. Our country has had so many great sons, Ram and Krishna, Chanakya and Valmiki, Tagore and Gandhi, Tilak and Dayanand. They are all great sons of Mother India and we should call them as such. To say that our nation was born in 1920 when Mahatma Gandhi made his debut in the political scene will be wrong. Our country existed long before that: our nation existed long before that. Therefore, I would submit with all respect to my hon. friends that when they use epithets, they should use correct epithets to describe our great men.

So many things have been said in this Address. It has been said that the elections have been a great experiment and we are proud of them, that they have been conducted in a peaceful manner and so on. That is a matter for credit for our people. Of course, there have been stray, untoward incidents. But on the whole, the elections have been peaceful. That points to the peaceful and democratic temper and tradition of this country. Unfortuna-

1886 (Ai) LSD—7.

tely, while the people have done their duty, the parties and Governments have not done their duty in the matter. The elections have not been conducted as they should have been.

I have with me examples, concrete cases, where the entire democratic process has been subverted just to gain a few seats. There is the case of the Jammu and Kashmir State. There I am very pained to say, our entire Election Commission has also been brought into disrepute by the way the elections have been conducted. There not only ballot boxes were tampered with, but what is worse, ballots were distributed to some party workers and officers to be put in the boxes beforehand. Here are the ballot papers—I have got scores of them. Some Officers said. Our conscience does not permit that, and we got these from them. The truth is that there were polling booths where on the polling day heavy snow heavy rain was falling and voters had to come from distances of 20 and 30 miles. There we have been shown polling like this:

Total votes	960
Votes polled	954
Total votes	962
Votes polled	905.

Where not even 20 per cent would come, we have been shown that 905 and 954 out of 962 and 960 votes have been polled, that 95 per cent and 99.9 per cent of votes have been polled I ask: how could this happen?

Deliberately plans were made to see that certain candidates were defeated. Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, the Prime Minister of the State, said in advance that only Pt. Prem Nath Dogra would be allowed to return, and he has proved true to his words. I do not mean that candidates should not be defeated. Elections are meant for seeing who is defeated and who wins. In elections, somebody wins and somebody is defeated. But when this kind of methods are used, that brings the whole machinery of the election process into disrepute and people's faith in democracy is undermined.

[Shri Bal Raj Madhok]

I would make a strong demand that the elections in Jammu and Kashmir should be declared null and void. They have not been elections at all, but just a farce. It is a matter of shame for the whole country that in this way our country and our Election Commission should be brought into disrepute by some people who for some reason or other do not want Opposition parties to come up.

The same thing has happened elsewhere. What has happened in Punjab? There is the case of Sarhali, there is the case of Narnaul and there is the case of Thanswar. I do not wish to take the time of the House by giving details about them. But the way things have happened there has lowered the prestige of the country and undermined people's faith.

What has happened in Delhi? I do not want to go into it because I was myself a candidate. But look at the way the official machinery has been used. I would ask the Prime Minister to institute an inquiry to see how government machinery was used. Here are a number of booklets published by the Information Ministry just in January. One of them is *Rehabilitation in Delhi*. Why publish them in January and February and distribute them in thousands? Why not publish them earlier? I want to know how many institutions were given grants during election time. I want to know how many concessions were given on the eve of the elections. How much money has been spent in this way? Of course, some people are defeated in the elections. But if we are going to make elections a question of money then only moneyed people like rajas, maharajas and industrialists could stand for elections and the common man cannot be elected. If this is going to be the state of elections in this country, I ask what is going to be the future of democracy in this country.

I am not an alarmist. I am not a pessimist. But from what I have seen of these elections, I have begun to

doubt the future of democracy in this country. I therefore, most humbly ask the Prime Minister to appoint a High Power Commission consisting of Judges of the Supreme Court and others to see how the elections have been conducted, what had been the influence of money in the elections, what had been the influence of government machinery in the elections. We should go into this and see that if democracy is to continue in this country, if democracy is to succeed in this country, such things are avoided in future. Today democracy is toppling over all around us. India is the one beacon, ray of hope in this area. But democracy is being subverted in this country. There are forces which want to establish totalitarianism in this country. There are forces which want us to follow the example of China and Russia. If we allow those forces to gain supremacy, then not only will democracy be doomed in this country, not only will it be doomed in Asia but it will be doomed all over the world.

We—all democrats, all nationalists—have a high stake in democracy in this country. We have to see that those forces which are making the working of democracy difficult in this country, those forces which want to make the future of democracy dark in this country are removed.

Then there is the question of counting of votes. Strange things have happened. We have the instances of Gonda and Balrampur, two constituencies where recounting was ordered. In one constituency one candidate was leading by 1700 votes and in recounting he lost by 400 votes. It is clear from this that either the first counting was not correct or that the recounting was not correct. If there could be a difference of 2,000 between counting and recounting, it is a grave reflection on our election machinery. Therefore, we must look into these matters.

There are other things referred to in the President's Address. We have been told about China. The President said that the Indo-Tibetan Treaty is

to be renewed and that an offer has come from China for its renewal but that our Government have said that unless there was a reversal of their aggressive tendencies, we cannot do it. It is all right that we do want that China should vacate its aggression. But the question is: are we prepared to revise our entire attitude on Tibet? Actually, I feel that this Indo-Tibetan treaty of 1954, the so-called *Panchsheel* treaty, was the gravest blunder of our foreign policy. We allowed China to eat up Tibet. We could not stop that perhaps. But then after China had eaten up Tibet, after she had forcibly occupied Tibet, to accept *de facto* and *de jure* control of China over Tibet was a wrong thing.

I am a student of history. I know that throughout history China was never able to be master of Tibet. There were times when China became master of Tibet for some time and there were times when the King of Tibet, like Tsan Tsan Campo, extracted tribute from the Emperor of China. In the same way, sometimes the Turks Moghul and Afghans ruled over us. But that does not mean that our country was part of Afghanistan or Turkey. So to say that Tibet is a part of China was wrong. We have done a great wrong to Tibet by accepting *de jure* control of China over Tibet. Now the time has come to revise our policy. I appeal to the Prime Minister not to continue the treaty. That would give back to Tibet her right of independence. Of course, Tibet will not regain her independence by that. But if we say that China has no control over Tibet and they have the right to independence, today, tomorrow—in history, there is no settled fact—after 50 years or 100 years, when Tibet has the power, she can attain independence. Therefore, we should not be a party to a wrong thing. A wrong thing has been done. What is *Panch sheel* now? China has buried it deep, it can never come up again. To talk of *Panch sheel* in relation to Tibet and China is a wrong use of that word. We should not make use of a good word in talking to people who have no regard for that good word or those principles.

Reference has been made in the Address to the Kashmir problem. It has been said that the question is coming up in the Security Council. It will come up sooner or later, but the question is what we are going to do about it. There are reports that the Prime Minister suggested an agreement based on the present cease-fire line. I think this kind of suggestion, whether publicly or privately made, is wrong. Our stand is that the whole of Jammu and Kashmir is ours, that Pakistan has aggressively occupied one third of the State; so, any statement made on behalf of the Government that we are prepared to make a settlement based on the present cease-fire line goes against our interests. Our real enemy in Kashmir, is not Pakistan, it is not the U.N. or the Security Council, but the real enemy is our own policy. I come from Kashmir, and I have known the problem from its very inception, and I am pained to say that our policy there is such that it is taking the Kashmiri people farther away from India than ever before. We have not given them our Constitution, we have not given them our liberties, we have not given them free elections. Not only that. The people who rule there have developed a vested interest in separatism, and they want to put the blame for their own acts of omission and commission on the Government of India. So, the Government of India is being maligned, the people of India are being maligned, for their own acts of omission and commission. Until and unless these people are made to change their policies our position there will continue to deteriorate. My submission is that the only effective way of solving the problem now or in the near future is this, that you make Jammu and Kashmir an integral part of India. It is wrong to say that it is an integral part of India so long as the Indian Constitution is not applied there, so long as the laws there are different, so long as the citizenship law is different. You cannot go there, you cannot settle there, you cannot buy land there, you cannot get service there. Why this distinction if Kashmir State

[Shri Mal Raj Madhok]

is a part of this country? You may say this law was made by the Maharaja, but there were so many other laws also made by the Maharaja but they have been abolished. Why only this law has been preserved. I tell you there can be no integration of Jammu and Kashmir with India in this way. The people there have become so restless that even those who, because of the Praja Parishad, had become pro-India are being driven away. Some of them were put up for elections, but their nomination papers were rejected merely by saying that they were Pakistanis. This kind of thing, to say the least, is harmful and amounts almost to a treason towards this country. So, in Kashmir our policy should be reversed. It is not a party question, it is a national question. We have high stakes there. Thousands and thousands of our young men died there, shed their blood there. If because of wrong policies Kashmir goes away and something happens, it will be harmful to our country, it will be a shame to all of us. I would, therefore make an appeal to the Prime Minister—I know he loves Kashmir, he comes from there, but others also love Kashmir and know something about Kashmir—that he should reorientate, rethink his policy on Kashmir.

Then there is the question of Nepal. In Nepal we find that there is a growing anti-Indian feeling. The security of Nepal is security of India, and therefore we must see why this anti-Indian feeling is growing there. There must be some causes. We must try to remove those causes, because our own interests are very intimately linked up with the interests of Nepal. One of them is our interference in the internal affairs of Nepal. Democracy toppled over in Burma, in Pakistan, in Egypt. We did not go and give them our advice that they should have democracy there. Then why should we go and give advice to Nepal and say that a bad thing has happened there? Our interest is to see that we are on the best terms with the men who rule there, and I feel that our

policy towards Nepal should be like the British policy of masterly inactivity towards Afghanistan. Whoever is master in Nepal, we should not interfere. I know we do not interfere in the internal affairs of Nepal, but even to give the impression that we are doing so is wrong, and today, rightly or wrongly, that impression has been created in Nepal. It is the job of our diplomacy to see that that is removed and that we have the best relations with Nepal that we do not allow Nepal to go away from us towards China, because if that kind of drift or diversion in Nepal's policy towards China continues, that might spell disaster not only for Nepal, but for India also. Therefore, it is very important that we do some serious rethinking about our policies regarding Nepal.

There is reference in this Address to agricultural production and general economic development. Of course, there has been some increase in agricultural production, but that is very meagre. Actually, when we look to the needs of the country and our own achievements in the matter, they are very little. Compared to the achievements or the progress made in industrial production and agricultural production by countries like Japan and Burma, our achievements are not very praiseworthy. But still, whatever is done is done. But I say that the basic question in this country today is not whether we have more food. We need more food, but today the basic question is unemployment, soaring prices. Until and unless we can check unemployment and stabilise prices, the common man is going to suffer. And I ask: what has been done by the Government during the last 15 years to stabilise prices? Our Finance Minister yesterday said that prices had been stabilised, but that is not the actual experience. Every day prices are going up. The Home Minister said the other day in his speech that for the next 15 years prices were bound to go up. If that is so, if you cannot check rising prices, if that is

the net result of a growing economy,—it is said that in an expanding economy prices are bound to rise—what is going to be the fate of people with fixed incomes? Their income must also increase. If you do not provide for that, there is going to be frustration, there is bound to be discontent. In this matter I say that the Government must act as an ideal employer. Today we talk of a socialist pattern and plan in the name of socialism. Of course, it is not socialism at all, because the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. This name is being misused for strengthening capitalism and worst kind of feudalism in this country. Whatever the name may be, if you plan for socialism, you are going to have increasing number of people under you employment, what is your treatment of them? The Government must act as an ideal employer. Here in Delhi lakhs of Government employees, live. What is their plight? Prices have risen by more than ten points, but what have you done to revise their dearness allowance, their wages? Until and unless you revise their wages, their dearness allowance, open fair price shops where they can get the daily necessities of life at cheap rates, there can be no peace, no contentment, no enthusiasm for work in these people.

We are very thankful to the President for his Address and more than that, we are grateful to his great personality and we bow our head to him, but we cannot lose sight of these problems. I again draw your attention to the question of elections. I have seen in New Delhi a Minister going round and telling people: "If you do not vote for me, you will be starved to death, your *juggi* will be burnt down." That kind of thing happens in the capital, and then you have the check to say that elections were held fairly and freely. It is very wrong, and I appeal to the House and the Chair to see that something is done in this matter to save democracy.

I hope my suggestions will be considered carefully.

Shri Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): I join my other friends in offering my thanks to the President for his inspiring Address. He is personally a shining example of devotion to duty. The very fact that, though he was not keeping quite well, he took all the trouble of meeting Members of both the Houses of Parliament and giving them a review personally, shows the great sense of duty that he cherishes and which inspires us. Also, the mention in his Address that those who are not going to come to the next Parliament should address themselves to constructive work also strikes a responsive chord in hearts like mine. We who will not be coming back are inspired and encouraged by his advice to take to constructive work in the service of the country.

Though this session of Parliament is described as a lame duck session, the President's Address and the speeches here serve as a kind of review of what has been done in the country's economic and political fields. This review is very useful and gives a picture which is very necessary for further progress, for correction and re-examination.

There is no gainsaying the fact that several kinds of silent revolutions are taking place in this country, in various fields, be it geography, be it history, economy or trade. Take the case of geography. It may not be overstating the case. In our Plan we are diverting western waters to the east, waters that are now reaching the Arabian Sea are going to be diverted to the east and they would reach the Bay of Bengal after use.

Take the case of the rediscovery of India as I would call it. We thought that oil was available only in Assam and Burma or some such place. But, today, due to the vigorous steps taken we see that even in the West Coast, nearabout Baroda—my hon. friend from Baroda is sitting very near me—we are having oil. It is certainly not going to be an

ordinary matter. It shows that we are realising what we really possess but which were hidden. It is really a rediscovery of the country.

Similarly, on the social side also silent revolutions are taking place. There are schemes for imparting primary education to millions of children. Children of parents who have been totally illiterate are going to become literate. Parents would find that their children are socially better off than themselves and they would be getting the three Rs. The parents would view with admiration their children. The boys are seeing a new horizon. They are learning to read and write and, in due course, they would be able to rise to the occasion and the future necessities of the country.

But still, while arrangements are being made to educate these children, mere education would not do. They must be taught to learn brotherly conduct, affection and respect for one another. Provision has to be made for that also.

As things stand today, owing to the sudden increase in the number of schools in the villages, the managements are getting some boys or others as teachers. This aspect of the matter requires great attention. The moral and cultural development of the boys are not being well attended to as they should be. They are merely acquiring the capacity to read and write. It cannot be allowed to go on like this. In the books meant for these thousands, the history of our freedom fight, how we got independence, what services were rendered by our great leaders etc. are not properly mentioned, nor the subjects taught. That is why we find the tendency towards disintegration growing.

Even in the elections some of us saw how the forces of disintegration are rising. Cries of 'this in danger' or 'that in danger' immediately catch the imagination of the gullible. This

is what we have seen. This leads me to wonder whether the present constitutional set-up is adequate to deal with such dangers.

We have difficulties on our borders. Cold war is raging in the world. Our borders also are not safe. They have been occupied by one country or another. On two sides, two different countries are actually in forcible occupation of parts of our territory. This naturally adds tension to the political set-up of the country and also to those who rule this country. Internally also the constitutional machinery is facing tension.

Inside the country also new cries are being raised. With adult suffrage, any cry can pass muster for the time being. Cries of 'religion in danger' or 'community in danger' or 'caste in danger' immediately catch like fire and the country suffers seriously.

I do not know whether all would agree. But I would suggest that it is high time for us to see whether, in order to make the political structure of the country safe, we should give up this federal form of government. With the borders being occupied, with international tension remaining as it is, with the forces of disintegration coming on top frequently internally, with border countries changing to the dictatorial form of government, it really throws a great strain on the present federal set-up. With all these things we are not making much headway. A time may come, sooner or later, when we will have to see whether this huge and complicated federal form of government would stand the test of stability.

I think these federal institutions do contribute towards inter-State claims and rivalries. They give room for a number of disputes to arise. They also retard progress at times. In order to satisfy one State or the

other or to arrive at a suitable compromise decisions are kept pending.

Take the case of rivers. Our friend, Mr. Pahadia, was talking about drinking water difficulty. It is not only in Rajasthan. It is true of many parts of the country. The city of Madras itself is water served. Take the case of the harbour there. Foreign ships hesitate to come there because they have to get pure water for refilling. That is why they hesitate to come there and prefer to go to Colombo and from there they go to Australia. This is a difficulty which even ports feel.

This is not peculiar to the cities only. Even in villages it is so. In several villages in the constituency from which I come water is scarce and there is difficulty as it is in Rajasthan. We have big rivers like Krishna and Godavari. Their basins put together are as great as that of the Ganges itself. Only a very small percentage of their waters is being utilised. When some schemes are suggested for the diversion of a portion of these waters for supplying water to the capital of the neighbouring State, all sorts of inter-State disputes arise. They have to be treated as inter-State problems; and they have to be solved by negotiation, arbitration and so on and so forth. In one part the whole country is water starved; while in another part of the country where water is available, it is steadily flowing into the Bay of Bengal, and we are not able to arrive at a solution.

It is not as if this is a very minor point. Two Five Year Plans are over and we are in the midst of the Third Five Year Plan; and these inter-State disputes are there and their solution is being delayed. This is made more difficult by the federal nature of our Constitution. So, I think, in order to strengthen our country, our own defences and our own future prosperity, too much reliance or depend-

ence on the federal form of government may not be good. Some thought has to be bestowed on this matter.

I do not suggest an immediate alteration of the Constitution here. Formerly, we thought that in order to have a satisfactory form of government to satisfy all our people and to give universal contentment a federal form of government would be suitable. But, now we find that we are facing tensions, internal and external. Big power blocs are there with mass destruction weapons; and every day our leaders have to see how to avoid world conflagration. Unfortunately, we see that the unity of the country is not being developed steadily even after the severance of foreign domination. We seem to forget some of these dangers. These are big problems which Parliament will have to face. Some solution will have to be found. I feel, as I stated before, that unless the political set-up of the country is brought under one unity and a unitary form of Government is established we may not be able to face the new situations easily.

There is of course need for some kind of electoral reforms. As an hon. Member mentioned, there is the mixing of parliamentary elections with the assembly elections. This results in the blurring of the issues. I do not complain against the conduct of the candidates or anything like that. In theory the elections to the Lok Sabha are supposed to be very direct and the hon. Members are supposed to come here with the direct wish of the voters but in practice it does not happen to be so. For administrative and financial reasons both the elections are taking place together and petty local issues unnecessarily influence the parliamentary candidates elections. I can quote some interests. There is an old town with a population of 10,000, let us say; the town is very conjected. One imaginative section of the people want to establish a bus stand in the

[Shri Narasimhan]

outskirts of the town as the modern buses are big and they could not conveniently go into the town. But those who reside in the town want it to be within the town itself; they do not want to walk that distance; whether the road is narrow or not and whether it is suitable for the bus to be brought in or not, it is no consideration for them. So, there is a faction there. If an assembly candidate prefers the new place, he loses the support of the residents of the old town and he being our principal agent in the elections, if he is unpopular, we are also involved in the dispute and meet the consequences. We have to be silent on the matter. I am giving this as an illustration. In short, the mixing up of the parliamentary elections with the assembly elections has devalued the purity and the directness of the Lok Sabha elections. Even an indirect election would, I think, be better than getting mixed up with the local issues. Important issues such as the China-India friendship, or India-Pakistan friendship or the Plans—all these get devalued and minor and local issues come on top. This is not fair to the candidates nor even to the voters as we do not give them the facilities. Many hon. Members have said that many polling officers made mistakes and gave both the voting papers simultaneously; it so happened even in my constituency. Sometimes the voters did not know what to do with both the papers. There are cases where, because the polling officer asked the voters to go to the table and put the seal, they went and put the seal on the Table and not on the ballot paper. The tables bore a number of seal marks and blank papers were found in the ballot boxes. Thousands of votes have thus become invalid in each constituency. This mixing up of the two elections and the other errors in the arrangement should be removed. This gives room for officers to make mistakes though their intentions are not mala fide. They thought it better to give both the ballot papers simultaneously. Be-

cause of the new and complicated voting procedure, the process has been rather slow and perhaps in order to obviate this the polling officers gave both the papers simultaneously, the net result being that the voters in many cases did not know what to do. So, these things call for electoral reforms.

In the future, we will have to tackle the problem of disintegration which has already set in in the various States. Minor issues have become major issues and they are not viewed in their proper perspective. Great problems lie before the new Parliament and the country anxiously expects that they will bestow their best attention and face the problems squarely and properly and emerge out of them safely.

I join the others in once again thanking the President for the very excellent review given to us of the international events so that we may chalk out our future programmes on the basis of that Address.

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप (मथुरा) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर, वैसे तो मुझे राष्ट्रपति महोदय के भाषण के बारे में कुछ निवेदन करना है लेकिन चूंकि मैं चुनावों में हार गया हूँ यह लोक सभा के लिए मेरा एक बिदाई नमस्कार अथवा सलाम भी है।

पिछले ४, ५ सालों में मैं यहां पर बहुत कुछ बोलता रहा हूँ लेकिन मुझे दुःख यह है कि जो कुछ मैंने कहा उस पर कुछ अमल नहीं हुआ। मैंने अर्ज किया था कि क्यों हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी यहां पार्लियामेंट में महाराजाओं और बादशाहों की शान शीकत के साथ पधारें लेकिन फिर भी वे यहां पर छेँ घोड़ों की गाड़ी में पधारें। सच बात तो यही है कि इसी कारण मैं उस इजलास में नहीं

आया। संसद् में बोलने का मतलब तो यह होता है कि हमारी बात कुछ मानी जाय। पर मानी नहीं जाती हां एक बात मानी भी गई। मैं मानता हूँ कि पंचायती राज बनाया गया है मगर यह कैसा पंचायती राज है। उसमें आये दिन लड़ाई, झगड़े और फिसाद होते हैं। लोग मारे जाते हैं। बजाय इसके कि पंचायती राज से जनता को फायदा होता लोगों को गांव में नुकसान होता है। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि परम्परा से जो हमारी अपनी सभ्यता चली आयी है उसको तो हम छोड़ते हैं और अंग्रेजों की नकल करते हैं। उसी से सारी तकलीफें हैं। एक घर में एक बाप होता है, बीबी होती है और बच्चे होते हैं। अगर कहीं लड़कों को यह सिखा दिया जाय कि चलो लड़को तुम अपने बाप का भी चुनाव कर लो तो घर में बड़ी मुश्किल हो जागी। हो सकता है कि वह सारे लड़के मिल कर अपने असली बाप के बजाय किसी और आदमी को बाप चुन लें। ऐसा तो नहीं होना चाहिए। मेरा कहना यह है कि कुछ स्वाभाविक नेता होते हैं। अब खानदान में बाप जो है वह स्वाभाविक नेता है। इसी तरीके से हर कौम में एक स्वाभाविक नेता होता है।

इस चुनाव में जातिवाद का काफी बोलबाला रहा है। आप कांग्रेसियों से ही पूछ लीजिये कि क्या यह वाक्या नहीं है कि यह चुनाव जातिवाद के सिद्धान्त पर हुए ! जाति वालों ने अपनी ही जाति के उम्मीदवार को वोट दिया। बेहतर तो यह होगा कि जब जातियां हैं तो इन जातियों को मान लेना चाहिए और उन जातियों के जो स्वाभाविक नेता हैं उनका गांवों में राज्य बनाया जाय और उनका ही शहर में राज्य बनाया जाय। मुझे यह बात अर्ज करते पांच साल हो गये लेकिन मेरी बात नहीं मानी गई। मुझे तो ऐसा नजर आता है कि हमारे देश के लोगों ने और खास तौर से हमारे नेताओं ने एक नये दिन को कबूल कर चुके हैं जिसका नाम

डेमोक्रेसी है। यह दिन लन्दन से निकला है। यह नेता लोग लन्दन को सलाम करते हैं और कहते हैं कि हमें डेमोक्रेसी मानते हैं। अब आखिर डेमोक्रेसी है क्या बला यह मेरी सूझ में नहीं आया। मेरा कहना यह है कि इस डेमोक्रेसी को हम खत्म करें। पाकिस्तान में डेमोक्रेसी खत्म ही हो गई है उनको वहां एक अच्छा नेता मिल गया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर यहां डेमोक्रेसी खत्म हो गई तो आप को यह सब कहने का मौका कैसे मिलेगा ?

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : जी मुझे मौके जरूर मिलेंगे। अफगानिस्तान में वहां के बादशाह मुझ से सलाह लेते थे। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि मौके तो तब भी मुझे मिलेंगे !

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कहते हैं कि डेमोक्रेसी के न रहने पर भी आपको कहने का मौका मिल जायगा लेकिन हमें तो आपको सुनने का मौका नहीं मिलेगा और यह हमारी बदकिस्मती ही होगी।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : नहीं जनाब मैं आपके घर में पहुंच कर सुनाऊंगा। अर्ज यह है कि नेपाल में भी डेमोक्रेसी खत्म हो गई। बर्मा में भी डेमोक्रेसी खत्म कर दी गई। मुझे यह कहने के लिए माफ किया जाय कि अगर यहां यही हाल रहा तो यहां भी साल दो साल में डेमोक्रेसी खत्म हो जायगी। कौन नेता होगा यह तो मुझे मालूम नहीं है।

श्री पहाड़िया : माननीय सदस्य ही हो जायें।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि यहां जो हालात पैदा हो रहे हैं, वे ज्यादा बेर तक नहीं चल सकते हैं। हम लोग तमाशों, खेल कद और नाच रंग में पड़ गये हैं। धर्म तो यह सिखाता है कि जो जैसा करता है, वैसा पाता है। लेकिन हमारे कांग्रेसी भाई इस बात को नहीं मानते हैं। १९०६ से १९५२ तक मैं भी कांग्रेस में था। मैं उस

[राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप]

कांग्रेस में था, जो समस्त देश, जाति और समस्त देशवासियों की कांग्रेस थी। मुझे खुशी है कि मैं इस कांग्रेस में नहीं हूँ, जो कि राज करने के लिये और दूसरों को दबाने के लिए एक गुट बन गई है।

कांग्रेसियों ने—हम लोगों ने—अपने वक्त में अपनी कौम और वतन के लिए तकलीफें उठाईं। मैं उन तस्वीरों को देखता रहा हूँ कि हमारे कुछ कांग्रेसी भाई पैर में चप्पल, हाथ में शोला, खदर का कुर्ता घोती पहने और गांधी टोपी लगाए, भूखे नंगे घमते थे, तकलीफें उठाते थे और जेल में जाते थे। उस तपस्या की वजह से अब तक यह कांग्रेसी सरकार चलती रही है। लेकिन कांग्रेसी जिस तरह से अब काम कर रहे हैं, खुदा ही उससे बचाए। हमारे कांग्रेसी नेताओं ने जो लोग चुने, यह नहीं पूछा कि जिस आदमी को हम टिकट दे रहे हैं, वह कैसा है। वह चोर हो, वह गबन करे, औरतें भगाए, वह तो कोई हर्ज नई हो, लेकिन वह कांग्रेस में है। भला यह कोई बात है करने को ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐसे मुकाबला करना ठीक नहीं है। माननीय सदस्य किसी को ऐसा न कहें।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : मैं किसी खास आदमी को नहीं कह रहा हूँ। आप जरा मालूम कर लीजिए।

मैं ने पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को तार भी दिया था। उन्होंने फौरन उस का जवाब दिया। मैं ने अपने अंग्रेजी के अखबार में उस को छापा है, लेकिन वे बातें नहीं छापें, जो मैं ने उन को तार में लिखी थीं।

हमारा यः देश बड़ा प्राचीन देश है। पांच हजार साल पहले की हमारी सभ्यता है। जब हम सम्य थे, तब युरोप में नंगे लोग रहते थे। भारी बड़ी प्राचीन सभ्यता है। यहां

हिन्दू धर्म की सभ्यता में मुसलमान दीन की सभ्यता आ कर मिली है, भानो हिन्दू गंगा में मुसलमानी जमना आ कर मिली है और सिख सरस्वती भी आ कर उस में मिल गई तो यह त्रिवेणी बना है। यह हमारा पवित्र देश है। जनाब रईस साहब, मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि हम सब मिल कर इस देश में सच्चे मायनों में धर्म-राज्य स्थापित करें। मैं तो हमेशा से यही कहता रहा हूँ। वह धर्म-राज्य ऐसा होगा कि हिन्दू कहेगा कि यह हमारा धर्म-राज्य है, मुसलमान कहेगा कि यह दीनी हुकूमत है और सिख कहेगा कि बन गया खालसे का राज्य— हम ने कहा था कि “आकी रहे न कोय”, सो बन गया यह खालसे का राज्य।

मुझे अफसोस है कि हमारे माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने इस का कोई जिक्र नहीं किया। मैं उन को दोषी नहीं ठहरा सकता। वह महान् पुरुष हैं और बेचारे सीधे-सादे महानुभाव हैं। दोष तो सरकार का है कि उस ने उन के मुंह में क्या कुछ रख दिया।

हमारी सरकार न तो चीन का मसला हल कर पाई है, न पाकिस्तान का और न काश्मीर का। मैं ने बहुत दफा अर्ज किया है कि मैं यह करने के लिए तैयार हूँ। लेकिन पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने अपने दस्तखत से खत लिख कर कहा कि हम आप को कहीं नहीं भेज सकते, क्योंकि मेरी और सरकार की राय नहीं मिलती।

मैं ने कितनी अच्छी-अच्छी बातें अर्ज की थीं। मैं ने कहा था कि चीन और जापान के साथ मुआहिदा मुमकिन है इस उजूल पर कि हिन्दुस्तान, चीन और जापान अपनी बढ़ती हुई जन-संख्या को उन मुलक में भेजें, जहां पर ज्यादा आदमी नहीं हैं। हम उन मुलक से कहेंगे कि हम आप के मुलक की तरक्की और खिदमत करने आते हैं, हम यह नहीं चाहते कि हम आप के मुलक को लें, हम तो

आप के मुल्क की भ्रामदनी को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। इस पर कौन एतराज कर सकता है ?

जहां तक गोआ की कार्यवाही का सवाल है, सब लोग कह रहे हैं कि बहुत अच्छा हुआ। इस सिलसिले में मुझे एक कहानी याद आती है। एक आदमी अपनी समुराल गया और वहां उस ने एक चूहा मार दिया। इस घर की बड़ी औरत ने कहा कि "राम राम, यह चूहा किस ने मार दिया ? यह छोटा सा जानवर किस ने मार दिया ?" दामाद को बड़ा रंज हुआ। घर के मालिक को जब यह मालूम हुआ, तो उस ने कहा कि "बहुत बड़े भूत को मार दिया, बड़ी दुम वाले को मार दिया, बड़े दांतों वाले को मार दिया"। यह सुन कर दामाद खुश हो गया। इस लिए भ्रगर सरकार ने गोआ का छोटा सा चूहा मार दिया, तो चलिये अच्छा हो गया।

मैं यह चाहता हूं कि हम धर्म-राज्य बनायें। अगर हम सब मिल कर, सब के फायदे में लग कर, सब को सुखी बनायें, तो हमारा खालिक भी खुश होगा। हम इस तरह काम करें कि हम में किसी तरह की लड़ाई और रंजिश न रह जाये। मैं किसी आदमी के खिलाफ नहीं हूं। मैं ने पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को चुनाव के सिलसिले में लिखा कि मैं किसी आदमी के खिलाफ नहीं हूं, मैं तो बुराई से लड़ता हूं। मैं चाहूंगा कि हमारे सब भाई पार्टी-बाजी को खत्म करने का इरादा कर लें। हम क्यों लड़ें ? हम तो सब भाई हैं, इस मुल्क के बच्चे हैं, एक ईश्वर को मानने वाले हैं, हम ने इस मुल्क की खिदमत करनी है। यह क्या पार्टी-बाजी है, जो भाई को भाई से लड़ाती है। हम नहीं लड़ेंगे। आप यह इरादा करें कि हम सब मिल कर एक ऐसा देश बनायेंगे, जो दुनिया को रास्ता दिखायेगा।

हम ने यही करना है कि समस्त संसार में हो एक राज्य कि कौम-कौम लड़ न सकें, मुल्क-मुल्क लड़ न सकें, सब दीन धर्म मिल कर

बुराई से लड़ें, भलाई को बढ़ायें और ऐसी प्रथा चलायें कि गांव-गांव कुटुम्ब हो, नगर नगर कुटुम्ब हो, बड़ों का आदर हो, बच्चों से प्यार हो, हट्टे कट्टे काम करें। इस तरह हमारा खालिक भी खुश होगा, जिस ने हम को पैदा किया। हमने अपने आप को पैदा नहीं किया। हम अपने आप को जीता भी नहीं रखते। दिल घड़क रहा है, तो हम जीते हैं। हमारी बुद्धि को भी हमारे बुद्धि ने तो बनाया नहीं। जिस ने हम को पैदा किया है, वह हम से उम्मीद करता है कि हम यहां पर कुछ बनायेंगे, बिगाड़ेंगे नहीं।

Shri Tangamani: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address, Shri A. K. Gopalan, Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan, Shri Vasudevan Nair and myself had given notice of several amendments, and amendments Nos. 51 to 67 were moved this morning. Also reference was made to some of the amendments by Shri Gopalan. I shall briefly refer to some other amendments, viz., Nos. 53, 54, 58 and 60. In the address, the President was pleased to refer at page 5, para 2, as follows:

"My Government note with great relief and gratification the moves towards reconciliation on the basis of the independence of Algeria."

He then proceeds to say that he expects that there will be a settlement by peaceful methods. Although we appreciate the sentiments expressed by the President, I would like to repeat what we have mentioned in amendment No. 58, viz., the Government have failed to give full diplomatic recognition to the provisional Algerian Government. We have made several references to this on previous occasions and I thought it fit and proper to emphasise this aspect. The time has come when the Government must come forward with a gesture of full recognition of the provisional Algerian Government.

[Shri Tangamani]

In amendment No. 59, we have referred to the failure of the Government to give full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic. It is true that the German Democratic Republic is extending its help to us in various forms. They also had a stall in our exhibition here. What I have mentioned about the Algerian Government applies with equal force, if not with greater force, to the German Democratic Republic. The two Republics have already come into existence and it is very strange that one of the German Republics is yet to be recognised by this Government.

I shall now refer to the question of the settlement of Ceylon Tamils. It is of special interest particularly to persons coming from the south. I am not referring to the general problem of Ceylon Tamils, but the problem of what are known as Stateless persons, who are now domiciled in Ceylon. As the House is aware, nearly a million Tamils are now settled in Ceylon and they have not been given either Indian citizenship or Ceylon citizenship. Most of them are employed in the plantations. The House is also aware that more than a million Tamils settled in Ceylon are denied any franchise. One of the plantation leaders has been nominated to the Ceylon Parliament; that is all. The time has come for the Government of India to take the initiative in this matter. In reply to one of the questions in the Ceylon Parliament, the Ceylon Prime Minister was pleased to say that they were only waiting for moves from this Government. So, we would like to know the present attitude of this Government to this vexed problem of persons of Indian descent in Ceylon.

Amendment No. 63 deals with the question of Kashmir. We are of the opinion—our party is of the opinion—that steps must be taken to withdraw the Kashmir question completely

ready been wasted and the President, in a very painful way, has referred to certain steps taken by the other Governments who are interested in keeping this issue alive.

On the question of Indians overseas, we have received several representations from persons residing in Malaya. As the House is aware, most of these Indians in Malaya have business connections both in India and also Malaya and there is frequent interchange of communication and other things. But I am told that in the Eastern Shipping Corporation, which plies many of the ships it is extremely difficult to get tickets. Most of the tickets are sold in the blackmarket in Singapore for passengers bound for India. This matter may be looked into.

Also, about the *de jure* transfer of Pondicherry, we would like to know the present position.

Many hon. Members have already referred to the malpractices in the elections. I would refer to my amendments Nos. 53 and 54. In amendment No. 53, I have stated that the address does not show concern about the manner in which the power of money and appeals in the name of caste, religion, community and narrow provincial sentiments were used in the third general elections to influence the voters. I have read in the papers that the Muslims in North Malabar were attacked, probably for their failure to vote for the ruling party and the matter was raised in the Kerala Assembly by way of an adjournment motion. That only shows how the communal approach to the whole problem is there. When a particular minority community has failed to do a particular thing, it is threatened by those in authority.

I can give many instances. In certain constituencies in West Bengal, Muslims, who formed the minority

more or less coerced into supporting the ruling party.

Dr. M. M. Das: Can you give the name of the constituencies?

Shri Tangamani: The constituency from which Shri Indrajit Gupta was elected.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Hapur): What is the source of this information?

Shri T. V. Vittal Rao (Khammam): Shri Indrajit Gupta himself is the source.

Shri Tangamani: So far as the south is concerned, it is an open secret that more than appeals in the name of religion, appeals in the name of castes and subcastes were made. A handbill which was published by persons belonging to a particular caste was also reproduced in one of the local Tamil papers. This particular thing happened both in Tanjore and Madurai. There was also a meeting held by a particular caste group and a resolution was passed, supporting a particular candidate. In that meeting, the candidate himself was present.

In amendment No. 54 I have referred to a specific matter, viz., non-issue of postal ballot papers to parlia-

mentary constituencies in Madurai District. There are four parliamentary constituencies in Madurai District. Because the polling officers and other election officers had failed to fulfil certain conditions, the ballot papers, numbering several thousands, were not sent. I am informed that the polling officers or officers on election duty are appointed by a particular Returning Officer and two forms are sent to them for enabling them to get the postal ballots. One form is to be sent to the Returning Officer for the Assembly Constituency and the other for the parliamentary constituency. This form has got certain items. This was filled up and the ballot papers for the Assembly constituencies were received. But those who applied for parliamentary ballot papers were not given those ballot papers; they were asked to furnish the polling station in which they were employed. There is absolutely no provision for that in the application form.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member like to continue tomorrow?

Shri Tangamani: Yes; for five or ten minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may continue tomorrow.

17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, March 16, 1962/Phalguna 25, 1883 (Saka).
