

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Go to Bombay and settle it.... (Interruptions.)

Mr. Chairman: Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

17.25 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berrhampur): Sir, I do not know what I am required to do.

—————

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN
THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—
contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berrhampur): Is the hon. Labour Minister prepared to accept arbitration? Am I required to ask a question or to speak on the motion?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You are to speak on the no-confidence motion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): In the morning, the Speaker said....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You cannot get up in the middle. I am very sorry.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: As I rise to support the motion of no-confidence....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): अध्यक्ष महोदय ने इसारे से कहा था कि मैं बाद में बोल पाऊंगा। मंत्री जी ने एक बात यहां कही थी कि शायद हम लोगों ने यहां से सन्देशा भेजा है कि हड़ताल जारी रहे। यह बिल्कुल गलत है। हम चाते हैं कि हड़ताल खत्म हो।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri to speak on the no-confidence motion.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: मैं हड़ताल के बारे में कहूंगा कि सरकार कोई भी बात करने को तैयार नहीं है जब तक कि मजदूर हड़ताल वापस न ले लें।

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): He is not a signatory. He cannot speak. (Interruptions.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members cannot go on like this.

Shri Priya Gupta: Did you permit the extension of sitting of the House toady?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member perhaps was not here then; I told the House that the House would sit till 6 O'clock today.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: As I rise to support the motion of no-confidence moved by Shri J. B. Kripalani, I feel I owe an explanation to the House and to the public as to the reasons which impelled our group to lend support to both the motions of no-confidence that were tabled the other day. We first rose for the Communist motion, and for that, both in the lobbies and outside, we have been taken to task. One Calcutta paper has even gone to the length of finding fault with us not so much for rising in support of the no-confidence motion as such but for rising in support also of the no-confidence motion moved by the Communist party. This is indicative of the fact that there is a section of Congress opinion in the country which is not so much against the no-confidence motion but against any association with the Communist party.

On the other hand, we have our Communist critics who find fault with us for having risen in support of the motion that is under discussion today. But I might remind the friends of the Communist group that a no-confidence motion is a no-confidence motion against the entire Government and

nothing less or nothing more, whatever may be their reasons for moving it. But, unfortunately, the Communist party, by having tabled the motion finds itself in a position from which it wants to wriggle out. The Chairman of the Communist party outside and the Deputy Leader of the Communist party who spoke earlier this morning wanted to convince the House that the Congress Government was like the celebrated curates egg only in parts and that part is represented by the Prime Minister and the supporters of his policies in the cabinet. I would like to tell them that it is not a question of one Minister or two Ministers. It is a question of an entire set of basic policies identified with the government as whole and the way they implement those policies. Unless there is something very wrong in those policies we could not have found ourselves in the situation that we find us today.

What is the situation in the country today? I remember, Sir, of the day when we were discussing the motion in support of the emergency proclamation which was moved by the Prime Minister in this very House. I remember on that day I referred to a report by a foreign newspaper correspondent Mr. Stephen Hugh Jones of *Manchester Guardian*, who said that looking at the wonderful things that were happening in India it seemed that a giant had awakened. People had forgotten their differences, their petty squabbles. All talks of corruption was gone and everybody was determined coming forward to giving the best for the country. That was only nine months ago. After nine months what is the situation today? Here again we have to wit a report from a foreign observer who reports with objectivity, and when I read it out not many will find fault with the description that he has given of the state of the country today. This is a report from the Correspondent to *The Economist*. He says:

"Whatever the Chinese may be doing along India's frontiers, they

are certainly getting somewhere inside them. The Indian way to prosperity has never looked shabbier... and the prestige of the Congress government has perhaps never stood lower."

This is what is said in *The Economist* of 10th August, 1963, about the Congress government around which nine months ago the whole country irrespective of political differences and party differences rallied like one man. The prestige of that Congress Government, he says has never stood lower. He goes on further to recount the reasons for it:

"Its factional in-fighting, in full public gaze, which was temporarily quelled by the Chinese attack last October, is again under way in several States. In Gujarat, Congress is merely split. In Kerala, the head of the party machine is busy raking up corruption charges against the Congress Chief Minister. In Orissa, there has been a public slanging match between the rich young Chief Minister, Mr. Patnaik, and his predecessor over alleged payments from the Calcutta mining firm whose activities have already led to the downfall of Mr. Malaviya, lately India's Minister of Mines and Fuel. In Uttar Pradesh, half the cabinet does not speak to the other half and the Chief Minister has been trying to dig out his chief opponent with charges of "moral turpitude". (Meaning, it seems, a mistress). And up in Punjab the Chief Minister's principal critic was last month savagely beaten up in sight of a police station."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are concerned only with the Central Government, not with the State Governments.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: That is the concern of the Congress organisation as such. Although we are not discussing the State Governments,

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

the proclamation of emergency renders the whole government of the country a unitary government, and we have to discuss how the Congress has conducted the affairs of the country and the affairs of the nation.

Now, why has the situation come to such a pass? What is wrong with the basic policies of the Government? For that, we have to look to two or three basic things. First of all, there is the defence and security of the country. Government has been at pains to convince us that all possible steps are being taken for rendering the defence of the country stronger and for driving out the invader from the sacred soil of the country. For that they have assured us non-alignment will not come in the way and we are prepared to take arms and military help from every friendly country. But what is the help that we are getting and what is the help that is promised to us? Shri T. T. Krishnamachari made a statement the other day, reporting the views of the President of the United States and stated in his own inimitable English:

"It was mentioned by President Kennedy and Rusk that military aid to India was a venture in which many flags should fly."

That is to say, the United States was unwilling to bear the entire burden, not even the major part of the burden, and indicated that we should go with a begging bowl to other countries as well. But what is the attitude of these other countries? That also has been made clear by the *London Economist* in its issue of 8th June, where it says:

"The Conservative view to the action on India's request for arms is that a generous supply of arms might tempt India, for instance, to try to dislodge the Chinese

from Ladakh and the border clash of a small nature might grow into a big power conflict."

That is the attitude of our foreign friends, particularly those of the West, after the assessment of our needs. So, if we go on, trying to convince the people that we are getting all that we need, we will simply land the country into another disaster. The best course would have been, as the Prime Minister indicated, to build up the country's own internal strength and to regard this war against China as a long drawn peoples war. Unfortunately, in that respect also we do not find any proper steps being taken.

When we look at the economic situation what do we find? Only recently, the *Times of India* in an India-wide survey noticed that the cost of living of the lower and middle income group in State capitals and in the industrial urban areas in the country had increased by 40 per cent in the past one year. The survey considered only the basic essential foodstuffs and minimum basic services and the retail prices prevailing in the fair price shops. The rise in prices, it is stated, had been gradual over the past 18 months and the price rise of rice was larger than that of any cereal. The reason was profiteering increased levies of the Central budget, greater cost of fodder and farming, sympathetic rise of other prices and costly road transport. The rise was steeper between July and December 1962. We can easily imagine from our day to day experience what the position in August 1963 is.

What has been the basic mistake from which these results flow? I do not have much time to elaborate my point. So, I will quote an authority, whose views are generally held in respect all over the country, irrespective of political or party differences. I am referring to the opinion of Professor D. R. Gadgil on the way we have

been conducting our plans and allocating our resources. The whole thing bears quotation although it is a little lengthy. He said:—

“The allocation of heavy capital resources to certain classes operating chiefly from the biggest cities has led to a concentration of surplus in their hands, rapidly increasing their relative income and the incomes of those connected directly or indirectly with their activities. This has led to the withholding of the benefits of economic growth from the weaker sections of the community in the villages. A progressively disproportionate share of the increase in national income is thus inevitably concentrated in few hands. There has been increase to such an extent in the personal and corporate incomes controlled by the small groups of high capitalists, that they and their associates, after indulging in the highest personal consumption expenditure by modern Anglo-American standards, have sufficient capital resources to invest in the private sector in modern business.”

I cite the authority of another gentleman, the expert of the Ford Foundation because his opinion will carry conviction with some of my hon. friends on this side as well as the members opposite. I quote now the opinion of Professor Schumacher, the expert of the Ford Foundation, who says:—

“the Third Plan shows no real awareness of the problems involved in improving the standard of living of the masses. There is some lip-service to balanced regional growth..... it is abundantly clear that there is no hope of even remotely tolerable standard of living for about 85 per cent of India's population unless

there is a re-orientation of the present way of thinking of the planners about industrial development in the metropolitan areas.”

This just indicates where the basic defect lies. Unless the basic system is changed, unless it is recognised that the challenge of China is also the challenge of social revolution, that unless along with fighting the war on our borders we fight the internal social enemies of the people, the exploiters of the people, there is no hope. You will then understand why the people who sit on the top and enjoy all the fruits of power quarrel among themselves for sharing the loaves and fishes and why the people at large, the common man, goes dissatisfied and why a vague, intense and at the same time, I should say, an explosive discontent is sweeping the country at large. Do not lull yourselves, I would say to my hon. friends on the opposite side, that it is only three by-elections that you have lost. You will have your stable but remember Turkey. There the Menderes Government had an overwhelming majority in Parliament, but even Parliaments can be overthrown by the sovereign people. Do not forget that.....(Interruption).

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Do not stomach facts.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: I need not go further into these points. But I would like the Government to ponder about the vicious character of the system under which we are living. There are many friends who want to shut their eyes to affairs connected with private monopoly capital. There are the paid scribes of monopolists who trade on chauvinism and ask the common people to make sacrifices. But I will just read out to you how these gentlemen behaved. Here I have a newspaper report of the reaction to the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister about Chinese troops concen-

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

tration on the border on the Stock Exchange of Bombay. It reads:

"Bombay, August 7.—Values again crashed on the Stock Exchange on a spate of nervous selling orders and lack of support. The list opened easy with selected scrips losing sharp initial ground mainly reflecting reports of Chinese military build up on the border. Later in the session reports that the Prime Minister is reported to have told the Congress Parliamentary Party's Executive today that the Chinese forces are very near our borders and have established supply dumps and other basis, further unnerved the trading sentiment and values tumbled down all along the line on nervous unloading."

That is the patriotism that you find in the gentlemen of the stock exchanges. That is the patriotism of the monopoly capitalist groups who control the fate of the country's economy and industry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Your party has got 22 minutes. You have already taken 15 minutes. You have put up two speakers. So, you have to give in. Otherwise, the other speaker will have no time.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Unless we take courage in both hands and fight the enemy at home with the same vigour and with the same enthusiasm as the enemy outside, the future is dark. I have only to say in this context what Shri Java Prakash Narain told the country and the Government when the Chinese invasion took place. He said that we must not forget that the challenge of the Chinese is also the challenge of the social revolution. When the Emergency was proclaimed, the whole country was united and behind the Prime Minister and the Government. What do we find now? That difference, the gap, can be explained

in terms of the total failure of the Government. Here, on behalf of the whole group we have to express our complete no confidence in the policies with which the Government is identified. In that respect, to us there is no difference between Nehru and Patil and Morarji Desai. They are all cogs in the same bigger wheel. Unless that wheel turns aright, the affairs of the country can never go right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Morarka is not here. Shrimati Subhadra Joshi.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (बलरामपुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने है उस के बारे में सुबह से काफी माननीय सदस्यों ने अपने विचार प्रकट किए हैं। कई वर्षों के बाद, आजादी मिलने के कई सालों के पश्चात् जो जमातें इस प्रस्ताव को लाई हैं, उन के बारे में चन्द शब्द कहना चाहती हूं। हमारे यहां एक कहावत मशहूर है कि एक बाजा होता है और दूसरा एक शामिल बाजा होता है। जो शामिल बाजा होता है, वह क्या होता है, यह मैं आप को बतलाना चाहती हूं। लोग आर्डर दे देते हैं कि हमारे यहां शादी है और उस में ५० बाजे वाले या ४० बाजे वाले या १०० बाजे वाले चाहियें। जिस कम्पनी को यह आर्डर दिया जाता है, उस के पास यदि इतनी संख्या में बाजे वाले नहीं होते हैं तो वह किस्म किस्म के लोगों को ले आती है बाजा बजाने के लिए। उन में से कुछ तो बाजा बजाना जानते हैं और जो शामिल बाजे वाले होते हैं, उन को बाजा बजाना नहीं आता है। उन को खाली बाजा दे कर झूठ मूठ में खड़ा कर दिया जाता है और कह दिया जाता है लो जितने आदमी आप को चाहियें थे, आ गए हैं। शादी वाले समझ जाते हैं कि हमारे यहां इतनी संख्या में बाजे वाले आ गए हैं। अगर कभी शादी वाले कहते हैं कि अलग अलग से बाजा बजवा कर दिखाया जाय तो जवाब दे दिया जाता है कि शामिल बाजे अलग अलग बाजा हीं बजा सकते।

आज जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने आया है, वह शामिल बाजे की तरह का है। ये जमातें जो इसको यहां पर एक हो कर लाई हैं, इनकी कोई चीज आपस में नहीं मिलती है, न इनकी फारेन पालिसी एक है, न होम पालिसी पर ये एकमत हैं, न समाजवाद के बारे में ये एक जैसा सोचती हैं। किसी विषय पर इन की राय एक नहीं है। ये मिल कर इस को यहां पर ले आई हैं।

इन का मैं अलग अलग से थोड़ा सा जिक्र करना चाहूंगी। सब से पहले मैं आचार्य कृपलानी के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहती हूं। आचार्य कृपलानी हमारे नेता रह चुके हैं। उन के बारे में मैं बहुत कुछ नहीं कहना चाहती। पर एक आधार को कोट करना चाहती हूं। चूंकि यहां पर बहुत से आर्थर्ज को कोट किया गया है, इस वास्ते एक लेखक को मैं भी कोट करना चाहती हूं। उसने लिखा है कि इस देश में एक जे० बी० कृपलानी है और एक जे० बी० मंधाराम हैं। जे० बी० मंधाराम बिस्कुट बनाते हैं और जे० बी० कृपलानी पाटियां बनाते हैं। लेख को छोटा करते हुए आखिर में उसने लिखा है कि जब बहुत बरस हो जायेंगे और हिन्दुस्तान की भावी संतानें इतिहास पढ़ेंगी और जब जमीन खोदी जाएगी तो जे० बी० मंधाराम के बनाये हुए बिस्कुटों के खाली खोल मिल जायेंगे, लेकिन जे० बी० कृपलानी की बनाई हुई पाटियां नजर नहीं आयेंगी।

उसका नतीजा यह हुआ है, किस्म किस्म की पाटियां बनाने का फल यह निकला है, किस्म किस्म की पाटियां छोड़ने का फल यह हुआ है कि आज आचार्य कृपलानी कहते हैं कि मैं इंडिपेंडेंट हूं और आजाद उम्मीदवार हो कर जीत कर आया हूं। उन्होंने जितनी किस्म के लोग जोड़े हैं और इस से जो एनार्की पैदा हुई है, जो कनफ्यूजन पैदा हुआ है, उस कनफ्यूजन का एक नमूना सदन के सामने पेश

है। अलग अलग सब पार्टियों का एक दम से नहीं बल्कि एक दो जमातों का जिन्होंने इस मोशन को लाया है मैं जिक्र करना चाहती हूं। आचार्य कृपलानी इस को लाने वाले हैं। दूसरी जमात जो उनके साथ नहीं है, जिसने उन के साथ इस मामले में वोट नहीं दिया है पर जो उनके साथ इस की स्पोर्ट में बोल रही है वह हमारे यहां की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी है। उस पार्टी के बारे में मैं अधिक कुछ नहीं कहना चाहती हूं सिवाय इस के कि इस पार्टी के लोग पढ़ते बहुत हैं, बहस उस से भी ज्यादा करते हैं लेकिन समझने में बहुत देर लगाते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हो गया है, इसको समझने में इस पार्टी को पन्द्रह बरस लगे। चीनी आक्रमण को समझने में इसको तीन बरस लगे। कांग्रेस समाजवाद को लाना चाहती है, इस दिशा में कदम-ब-कदम बढ़ाना चाहती है और बढ़ा रही है, तो इस को समझने में अगर उसको और भी अधिक देर लगे तो कोई ताज्जुब की बात नहीं होगी। लेकिन मुझे उम्मीद है कि अगर वह समझने की कोशिश करेगी तो समझ पाएगी। अभी तो वह समझने के लिए तैयार नहीं है और इन्कार कर रही है।

दूसरी जमात जो कृपलानी जी का साथ दे रही है वह जन संघ है। जन संघ के बहुत से नेताओं ने दूसरी जमातों की तरह हमेशा हमारी फारेन पालिसी को स्पोर्ट किया है। १९६० में उस के नेता श्री डी० पी० घोष ने नान-एलाइनमेंट के बारे में कहा था :—

“A non-aligned foreign policy is best suited for India.”

इसी तरह से १९६० में जनसंघ ने जो प्रस्ताव पास किया उसमें उसने कहा :—

“The J.S. considers it advisable that the policy of non-alignment be continued for the time being.”

[श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी]

इसी तरह से उस के एक अन्य नेता श्री दीन दयाल उपाध्याय ने हमारी पालिसी के बारे में कहा :

"All other parties and sections generally endorse this policy."

उन्होंने यह भी कहा :—

"Alignment with particular blocs is tantamount to an invitation to them to gamble with our internal affairs."

आज चल कर उन्होंने ने कहा :

"By joining one block we may even become the cause of war ourselves."

उन का यह भी कहना था :—

"It is essential, in our own interests, that we maintain our present policy of non-alignment."

आज जो आचार्य कृपलानी जी की बात की जा रही है या दूसरे लोगों की बात की जा रही है इन तमाम लोगों तथा जमातों ने हमारी विदेशी पालिसी की कुछ वर्ष पहले हमेशा हिमायत की है, इसको हमेशा स्पॉट किया है। आज ये हमारी इस पालिसी के खिलाफ बोली हैं। इन्होंने कहा था कि हमारी विदेशी पालिसी अच्छी है। पर रोज रोज ये बयान बदलते हैं, रोज, रोज जमातें बदलते हैं और एक जब कोई मौका आ जाता है तो कहते हैं कि हमने तो यह बात कई तरफ पहले कह दी थी, परन्तु हमारी कोई बात सुनी ही नहीं गई।

इसी जमात की एक और बात मैं आप को बतलाना चाहती हूँ। जब गोआ की बात आई थी तो यह जमात किस्म किस्म की बात करती रही है। जब काश्मीर की बात आई तो इसी जमात के नेताओं ने कहा कि चाहे काश्मीर जाए या रहे, श्रीनगर

जाए या रहे, कम से कम जम्मू का इंटरग्रेशन हिन्दुस्तान के साथ हो जाना चाहिये। इस तरह से यह जमात काश्मीर का पार्टिशन करने के लिए तैयार हो गई थी...

श्री बड़े (खारगीन) : कहां ?

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : प्रोफेसर जी० आर० मलकानी ने १९५२ में कहा था...

श्री बड़े : कौन मलकानी साब ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (धाराणसी) : आप के जनसंघ के। आप को मालूम नहीं है ?

श्री बड़े : हमारी पार्टी के बारे में स्पेशल स्टडी कर आई है क्या ?

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : प्रोफेसर जी० आर० मलकानी ने आगमनाइजर में १४-७-५२ को लिखा था :—

"He pleaded for acceptance of the two-nation theory and partition of Kashmir. He said, 'There is no other alternative' and asked Nehru to propose partition as an alternative to plebiscite."

श्री बड़े : कहां से आप...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please hear her. You have your right to reply. She is quoting from some author.

Shri Joachim Alva: She says she is quoting from the Organiser.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : एनदर जनसंघ नेता श्री वैनकटरमन शास्त्री का कहना है :—

"If Abdullan could and does secure independence for Kashmir, he will have our congratulations and good wishes."

१५ दिसम्बर, १९५२ में आर्गोनाइजर में फिर लिखा गया :—

“With Kashmir Valley, if possible, without it if absolutely necessary, Jammu wants to accede fully.”

इस के बाद दूसरे साथी, हिन्दू महासभा . . .

श्री बड़े : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आन ए प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर । यहाँ पर जे० आर० मलकानी को कोट किया जा रहा है । पत्नी बात तो यह है कि जिन के बारे में वह कह रही हैं, वह हाउस में नहीं हैं । दूसरी बात यह है कि जिन का वह जिक्र कर रही हैं, वह जन संघ के नहीं हैं । पता नहीं किन का वह जिक्र कर रही हैं ।

Shri Raghunath Singh: She is referring to Shri G. R. Malkani.

श्री बड़े : वह हाउस में नहीं हैं ।

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): The hon. lady Member is quoting from *Organiser* which is their paper.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order in this. If he does not belong to the hon. Member's party, he can deny it.

Shri Bade: He is not present here in the House. So, how can she quote him?

Shri Raghunath Singh: She is referring to G. R. Malkani. He was in Jan Sangh when my hon. friend was not in the Jan Sangh.

Shri Bade: I was in the Jan Sangh, and I was MLA before I came here. *Organiser* is not our organ. She can quote anything she likes, but that does not represent our party's view.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is quoting somebody. If he does

not belong to the hon. Member's party, then he need not bother about it.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella): If the cap does not fit him, then let him not wear it.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा बोस : इन शामिल बाज वालों की एक दूसरी जमात है, हिन्दू महासभा । उसके नेता श्री वी० जी देशपांडे ने २५ अगस्त, १९५२ को आर्गोनाइजर में लिखा था :—

“The salvation of the people of Jammu lies in complete integration with Bharat, the mother country, and they must achieve it with the help of Kashmir, if Kashmir co-operates, without it if it does not—and in spite of Kashmir, if it opposes.”

कहने का मतलब यह है कि तमाम बात जो आज वे करते हैं, उलट करते हैं । या तो यहाँ कुछ कहते हैं, बाहर कुछ कहते हैं, यहाँ भाषणों में कुछ कहते हैं, और अखबारों में कुछ और लिखते हैं या फिर बदलते रहते हैं । पार्टियों में आते हैं और चले जाते हैं । मेरा कहना यह है कि कोई कंसिस्टेंट पालिसी जनसंघ की नहीं है । एक बात मैं जरूर जनसंघ कंसिस्टेंट है और वह है फिरकादाराना प्रोपेगेंडा करने में । आज तक उस का प्लानिंग, उस का प्रोग्राम उस का सब कुछ एक ही बात पर लगातार चला है, जब से वह बना है । कैसा हिन्दुस्तान बनना चाहिये, आर्थिक स्थिति कैसी होनी चाहिये, वे इस काम में नहीं पड़ते हैं । हर वक्त वे हिन्दू-मुस्लिम, हिन्दू ईसाई की गिनती और हिसाब किताब में पड़ रहे हैं

श्री बड़े : आप कांग्रेस में रहते हुए भी कम्युनिस्ट हैं

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : मन्दिरों और मस्जिदों का हिसाब किताब लगाते रहते हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान की वर्तमान सरकार अगर नहीं रहती है तो मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि क्या होगा। हिन्दुस्तान का पार्टिशन हुआ। लाखों लोगों के दिलों पर लगे हुए जङ्गम अभी तक भरे नहीं गए हैं। हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के मंदिरों और मस्जिदों में फिरका-दाराना आग का धुआँ आज तक हिन्दुस्तान में उठ रहा है जो हम देख रहे हैं। आज भी अगर उसी तरह का प्रचार ये करना चाहें तो अफसोस की ही बात होगी।

आज यहाँ जो शामिल हुए हैं या जो जमातें शामिल हुई हैं, उस का एक कारण है प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी या दूसरी जमातों के पास आज कार्यकर्ता नहीं रहे हैं, इन के साथ जनता नहीं रही है। जनसंघ के पास आर० एस० एस० के वालेंटियर हैं। पर उन का प्रोग्राम भी लोग समझने लग गए

हैं और उन को महसूस होने लग गया है कि ये सब मिल कर लोगों को कनफ्यूज करना चाहते हैं लोगों को मूर्ख बनाना चाहते हैं, उन को बहकाना चाहते हैं और अपना जो प्रोग्राम है, जो नाज़ी तरीका है, जो डिकटेटर-शिप का तरीका है, उस को हिन्दुस्तान में लाना चाहते हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप और समय लेना चाहेंगी ?

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी : जी, हाँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : तो आप कल अपना भाषण जारी रखें।

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, August 20, 1963/Sravana 29, 1885 (Saka).