

[Secretary]

Beedi and Cigar Workers (Conditions of Employment) Bill, 1966, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 16th February, 1966."

12.15½ hrs.

**BEEDI AND CIGAR WORKERS
(CONDITIONS OF EMPLOY-
MENT) BILL**

AS PASSED BY RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table of the House the Beedi and Cigar Workers (Conditions of Employment) Bill, 1966, as passed by Rajya Sabha.

12.15½ hrs.

DELHI HIGH COURT BILL

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for the constitution of a High Court for the Union Territory of Delhi, for the Extension of the jurisdiction of that High Court to the Union Territory of Himachal Pradesh and for matters connected therewith, be extended upto the 4th April, 1966".

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for the constitution of a High Court for the Union Territory of Delhi, for the extension of the jurisdiction of that High Court to the Union Territory of Himachal Pradesh and for matters connected therewith, be extended upto the 4th April 1966".

The motion was adopted.

12.16 hrs.

**RE. STATEMENT ON RAILWAY
ACCIDENT**

Mr. Speaker: I have received a notice about a railway accident. A statement would be made at 5 O'clock.

12. 16½ hrs.

**IMPORTS AND EXPORTS
(CONTROL) AMEND-
MENT BILL***

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Commerce (Shri Shafi Quareshi): On behalf of Shri Manubhai Shah, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Shafi Quareshi: I introduce the Bill.

12.17 hrs.

**MOTION ON THE PRESIDENT'S
ADDRESS—contd.**

Mr. Speaker: Further of the motion of thanks on the President's Address together with amendments moved thereon.

Shri Khadiilkar.

श्री काशीराम गुप्त (झलवर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय! मैं कल की एक घटना की प्रोर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। कल सारे बार बजे के करीब जब श्री दांडेकर जी अपना

भाषण समाप्त कर चुके तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय ने मुन्तलिफ पार्टीज के दूसरे मम्बरज को बुलाया। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को बुलाया वे इन्कार कर गये। जनसंघ को बुलाया वे इन्कार कर गये। फिर पी० एस० पी० को बुलाया वे इन्कार कर गये। उसके बाद मेरा नम्बर आ गया। मेरी तैयारी भी पूरी नहीं थी लेकिन मैं बोलने लग गया। पहले भी ऐसी घटनायें श्री मधु लिमये के साथ हो चुकी हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसके बारे में कोई उपाय किया जाना चाहिये। या तो विभिन्न दल अपने समय का ध्यान रखें और जब उनको बुलाया जाये तो वे बोलें अन्यथा आप कोई उचित कदम इस बारे में उठावें।

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : हमारे साथ दिक्कत यह है कि हम नान-आफिशल बिल्डर एंड रेजोल्यूशंस कमेटी में चले गये थे और अपनी एमेंडमेंट्स पेश नहीं कर सके। हमको उनको भुव करने की इजाजत मिलनी चाहिये।

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): We asked that we should be called to speak today. Why should he complain?

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair (Quilon): The point is that the respective strengths of the various parties should be taken into account.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: It was our request to the Chair; it has nothing to do with them.

Mr. Speaker: Objection has been taken to this that the spokesmen of the groups when they were called said that they would speak today; they were not prepared to speak yesterday itself when called. Of course, there is no harm in that. But such requests should be sent in advance so that they could be called at the appropriate time. That would look more graceful instead of the Chair asking a Member to speak and the Member saying that he would speak the next day.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I make it quite clear that I told the Deputy Speaker, 'Please do not call me now; call me tomorrow morning'? This happened when I was in the Chair. But when he took over and I took my seat here, again he called me. What am I to do?

Mr. Speaker: Probably what she said while in the Chair was not regarded very seriously.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Then what can be done?

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): There is a fine English song, 'What am I to do'?

Mr. Speaker: I will see that this is not repeated.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न यह नहीं है। प्रश्न तो यह है कि जो यहाँ पर पूरे हैं उन को उनकी संख्या के हिसाब से एक के बाद दूसरे को चांस मिलता है, एक के बाद दूसरे का नम्बर आता है। कर्मा कर्मा तो उसी घाडर में उन को समय मिलता है और असुविधा नहीं होती लेकिन जब घाडर बदल दिया जाता है तो असुविधा होती है। इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि या तो एक ही चांस चले और अगर ऐसी नहीं हो सकता है तो कोई रास्ता इसके बारे में आप निकालें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : एक ही रास्ता यह चलेगा कि जो चेंबर में होगा उसको अख्यार होना कि वह जिस को चाहे वह बुला ले। कोई जरूरत नहीं होनी चाहिये यह कहने की कि हमारा नम्बर नहीं आता है।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : जो तैयार बैठे हैं उनको मौका मिलना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जरूरी नहीं है कि जो तैयार बैठे हैं उन्हीं को बुलाया जाय।

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Yesterday, while dealing with the Tashkent

[Shri Khadilkar]

agreement I stated that it was a great act of diplomacy on the part of the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union, by playing this role, has considerably reduced tension on the India-China border, because now the former alignment between China and Pakistan no more remains. Not only that. The Soviet Union has entered into a pact with Japan, and thus, by a diplomatic manoeuvre of a very high order, the Soviet Union has succeeded to a large extent in isolating China. The only spot in the Asian world where there is conflict, where war is raging now, is Viet Nam.

I was reminding the House that the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru projected the image of this country as a great nation knowing full well that economically we are weak, militarily we are not very strong, but because we have the potential of becoming a super Power we need not be constrained in expressing our views on events like those in Viet Nam.

We are very much concerned with Viet Nam. Bearing in mind the fact, whatever the American statesmen might say, that there is a wide division of opinion, that all the intellectuals are against the present American policy, that a vast section of liberal opinion, including the democratic section, is not supporting the present American policy in Viet Nam, let our country give full-throated support to the People's Front which is trying to liberate Viet Nam and to the efforts that are made for the Preservation of peace.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): You are advocating a fellow-traveller policy.

Shri Khadilkar: This morning I read an authoritative statement issued by the American Embassy in which appears a reference to a common understanding between India and America of the activities and designs of Communist China. Taking a world view of events and developments, the

revolutionary changes that are taking place, I would like to know if we share the same view as that of the American administration. I do consider that the independent policy of this country, the policy of non-alignment implies that we will keep our nation clear, that our understanding of the world problems will not be in any way influenced by outside pressures. I plead that so far as China is concerned, though China has assumed a war posture, we must take reality into consideration and do everything possible to bring back this great nation into the comity of world nations instead of isolating it. Bringing it closer to the world community would ultimately change the Chinese posture of war.

Leaving aside these international issues, when I come to the home front, I must confess that it is not so much the military challenge but the economic challenge that we have to face which is more important. Yesterday hon. Shri Dandekar has depicted a picture from his side. As I said, people there take a very gloomy view of things, they are prophets of despair.

Shri Ranga: No.

Shri Khadilkar: They do not think anything good is being done in this country.

Shri Ranga: What is being done?

Shri Khadilkar: I do not not share that view.

Shri Ranga: You have become a world-famous beggar all over now.

Shri Khadilkar: There is some justification for taking a certain view which is leading us to a conclusion which is not very happy. Sir, I feel sometimes that in this country there is the danger of emergence of war lordism. It is the emergence of war lordism which was not checked in China ultimately destroyed the Chi-

nese unity and led to communism. We must take note of this. This warlordism is at various levels. Every State and even within a State groups consider as if they are independent and they are not supposed to follow a certain line of policy laid down by the Centre. I would like to refer to our food policy. Our food Minister is one of the competent and conscientious ministers in the Cabinet but he has been completely frustrated today. Why? He must honestly confess what has happened. He is trying to give explanations which are not satisfying anyone. He started laying down an All India policy invited all the Chief Ministers of the States and in that first meeting instead of asserting that we want an All India policy, he surrendered and gave up that effort. Since that time he is in search of a national consensus so far as food policy is concerned which is the most elusive thing. He is making a surrender every time.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): He is a conscientious man.

Shri Khadilkar: He is a competent person. Therefore, it is not a question of personal failure. As our Congress President had written in the special number of *Economic Review*, food like defence must be treated as a national issue. If the States fail to understand implication of this statement and act as if they are separate national entities, the unity of this country will be destroyed. Therefore, I appeal to the Food Minister and the Central leadership that the time has come for them to assert and say: this is the food policy for the country. It is not a question of this pocket of surplus or deficit. I know we are going through a period of scarcity. In scarcity States, they exaggerate the drought; the surplus states minimise their surplus. In this competition, I am afraid, many economists like Prof. Raj and others have given their views. The deficit is exaggerated, they say and ask: how long is it in keeping with our dignity to depend upon aid and generosity and

charity of the world? After eighteen years of freedom, have we not had enough time to reach self-sufficiency, to develop our resources and if necessity tighten our belts rather than go on charity missions all over the world. He will have to examine this policy. Two professors, academicians, who are closely associated with the government, Prof. Dantwala and Prof. Raj have carried on academic controversy regarding the food policy and both of them have reached certain conclusions; these must be taken into consideration. I do not think this is a party issue. It must be looked as a national issue. These professors have stated, firstly, the present zonal system must be abandoned completely and secondly, they say that a uniform minimum levy should be levied all over the country. Here, an attempt was made even to announce the minimum or the maximum prices for the agriculturist. That has not been followed. Even the purchase price is not being announced, and there is the report of Mr. Puri who had to resign in utter frustration from the Food Corporation. What does it say? The so-called surplus districts never co-operated. They consider some outside agency is trying to interfere in their internal arrangement. If these conditions are allowed to continue, I do not think this country can preserve its unity; all talk of national integration has no meaning unless the States are made to realise that they will have to function in a certain framework of national leadership and the Central leadership will assert itself; it will not be jockeyed from this side or that side because of pressures of the warlords that are coming up in this country from region to region. Unless this is done, unless warlordism is checked, this tendency is checked and rooted out at this juncture, I think this country will be faced with the gravest danger that we have ever had to face so far. (Interruption).

One more word regarding food. An attempt has been made for monopoly

[Shri Khadilkar]

procurement and for trying to check the private trade. In all humility, I would like to ask, is it possible, given the present administrative set-up? Is our administrative system capable of undertaking all the trade in food-grains? I am afraid I am not prepared to subscribe to this proposition. I feel that you will have to do it for rice. As you have said, nationalise the rice mills. Both the professors agree: nationalise the rice mills. You will get the ready stock. But so far as the other channels of private trade are concerned, you cannot function as a monopoly trader in this country at the present juncture.

The other day, I happened to preside over a lecture by a Hungarian professor at Sapru House. He is the Chairman of the National Price Board—Prof. Nagy. He confessed that while giving the total picture of their economy, even in the socialist framework, the economic forces have worked in such a fashion that they are faced with some sort of a market economy. They could not counteract it and they are trying to do everything possible. In this country we consider planning as an academic exercise: that resolutions and slogans will bring about socialism. I have no illusions about it. Have we done anything to create an instrument if we want to bring about and build, by going step by step, this socialist society? A challenge has been thrown. Have we built up an instrument of social change, social reconstruction along with these resolutions and the Plan? So long as we have failed to develop this, I think mere slogans and taking steps and talking revolutionary language will not lead us far enough. Therefore, I would confess very plainly that these things will not lead us far enough. With all our socialist measures, what has happened?

For instance, the primary financial institutions are in the hands of the

Government: the Reserve Bank, the State Bank and the LIC which invest nearly Rs. 300 crores a year. Who controls the investment committee of the L.I.C.? People are talking that we want to have credit resources in our hands. And how does the disbursement of this Rs. 300 crores of finance take place? There is a clamour for smaller industries; but the big business houses dominate all and get the lion's share of all this investible surplus. This is the position. Therefore, the time has come, realistically keeping in view the present position, to review the whole policy; do away with the State zones and try to understand the present implications of the failure of your policy. Take the academic opinion into consideration. Do not be carried away by the party view.

One more thing. On such issues, I would suggest the institution of a sort of organised all-party body here, because they will be party to your decisions and they could point out the failure and they will say why it has failed and thereby blamed for the failure. If this is done, then, we can meet the situation and the economic challenges at least partially at this juncture.

One more word and I have done.

Mr. Speaker: I only agreed with him that the time had come and rang the bell, but he is going on.

Shri Khadilkar: We are the custodians of the Constitution. I feel the time has come when . . .

Mr. Speaker: Should I ring the bell again?

Shri Khadilkar: As custodian you are the presiding authority here. If anybody feels that the spirit of the Constitution is violated in some measure, we must give some serious thought to it. In a recent judgment, Mr. Gajendragadkar, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in a small case—

the kerosene dealers' case from Kerala—made one observation. Should we ignore that? It is really an observation which makes us feel we are somewhere failing in our duty so far as acting according to the spirit of the Constitution is concerned. He said:

"the emergency powers might ultimately pose a serious threat to the basic values on which the democratic way of life in this country is founded."

When the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court makes this observation, has not the time come for this House to ponder whether this state of affairs should continue. The ex-Attorney General has called this democracy a constitutional dictatorship. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan—a non-party-man, applying his mind to world affairs and Indian affairs in a very objective and non-partisan manner—has also pleaded that the time has come. Therefore, I would appeal to you that we should take the initiative . . .

Mr. Speaker: When I take the initiative, it is not responded to!

Shri Khadilkar: We should examine the position. There is a little threat from China, but we should not exaggerate it. After winning a big victory against Pakistan and after winning peace at Tashkent, we should be bold enough to take steps so that the present emergency is put an end to, as early as possible.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is with a deep sense of sorrow and anger in my heart that I rise to participate in this debate—sorrow, because I come from West Bengal where I have seen a little boy of ten years shot through the heart because he was hungry and he had gone to demonstrate before the BDO's office, which has been turning away people from getting food for weeks and months. It was such a moving sight to see. This boy was nowhere near the police station which, the Chief Minister says, he attacked.

He even said that they had broken down the wireless station. Nothing of the sort. They were shot dead 250 yards away from the police station. When I saw that little boy, I thought of my own son who was a little boy a few years ago. I feel I must tell the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi; She also is a mother of two children. I am sure if she had seen the way this boy was shot through the heart and the lies that were told to justify this, at least that could have been enough for her to urge the West Bengal Government to institute a judicial enquiry into it immediately. I do not want to say anything more, but the people of West Bengal will not remain quiet unless there is a judicial enquiry to find out whether it was justified that a child who asked for food was killed with bullets. He was the first boy in his class. The headmaster of the school, a Congressman, gave evidence before thousands of people that he was such a poor boy. His father was an agricultural labourer. His grandmother used to go about sometimes begging for food for this little boy. The night before he had no rice because no rice was available in the market. There was no food in the house because no rice, no wheat had been distributed to them for weeks before. Before going to school in the morning he told his father: "If you can get some rice, father, cook it and keep it for me; I shall come back and take it as tiffin". That boy never returned. I could never forget it. I have seen many firings, but I have never seen such a cruel, barbarous firing as the one I have seen now. I want this House to understand that the Chief Minister repeats even after all this, a Chief Minister who did not go to the spot, when we ourselves had seen it with our own eyes, that a boy who gets to the top of a wireless station and breaks it down has to be shot down.

"Sir, to what have we come? This Government which cannot give us

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

food is giving us bullets. It is not we the Communists who say this. I know my hon. friend, Shri Subramaniam always, whenever we criticise him, says that it is due to us that smugglers flourished. I say it is his friends who are with the traders and with the blackmarketeers. He tried the same methods in Jaipur and burnt his hands once. He tried it in this House earlier and he got away with it. I think he will not get away with it now because I have seen that even Congress M.L.A's have said that no rice was given there. This House must know that Shri Humayun Kabir who went to the spot day before yesterday and addressed a meeting standing in silence as a mark of respect to those shot by firing called those boys "martyrs". Is Shri Humayun Kabir a Communist, I ask? There was Shri Dinabandhu Das the secretary of the D.C.C. and an M.L.A. and there were other Congress M.L.A's with him. There is a Congress M.L.A. who is the President of the Action Committee itself. Sir, there are things very very wrong in West Bengal. I ask my hon. friend, Shri Subramaniam to remember that on the 18th when he was uttering a joke in the Upper House saying that the professional agitators in West Bengal have become unemployed, at that very moment there was shooting down of Nurul Amin in Swarupnagar. Let them find out why these things have happened. The police are saying that they have given enough rice. Not an ounce of rice has been given for weeks to the people in Baduria. They were taking away bags of rice even within the cordon. If you go to the police station, where these events have taken place, in Baduria, you will still see lying these bags of confiscated rice on the open verandah. Even within the cordon it was said that they were blackmarketeers. They are not blackmarketeers. They ask for rice. You have no control over those big stockists who have kept stocks of rice. It is the poor man who is victimised. The

poor man has to get his food. But you do not touch the stocks of the big landholders. It is from them, a few of the poor may be smuggling rice. But thousands of others are not smugglers. They went and said that since a few days earlier, the O.C. of the thana had given the rice to the policemen from the confiscated bags, the people on Feb. 18 went to the D.C. to ask for rice for which they would pay, because rice had become scarce in the open market and there was no ration. They went in thousands. It is true that they were in an agitated mood. Blank firing was resorted to and they ran away but the police ran after them and shot them down. As they fled down to the ferryghat 200 to 250 feet away from the police station a young student was shot down. Ali Hafer a poor man was shot dead. I am surprised as to how these things could come about unless the police are trigger-happy without any compunction and yet there is no judicial inquiry. Why? No judicial inquiry is held because if there is a judicial inquiry and not a departmental inquiry as has been instituted it will be found without the slightest doubt that this was done in cold blood.

My hon. friend has talked about rice mills. What is the situation in West Bengal? These rice mills have been made the pivot of procurement. The hypocrisy of Bhubaneswar is clear to us as day light. Till 18th February the procured rice also could not be brought from rice mills to the godowns and distributed. Till 18th February there was not a grain of rice in Baduria. There was not a grain rice even on the 19th in Basirhat and Swarupnagar. What does it mean? What do you give? Only 500 grams of rice per week is given to the limited landless people who live within the borders of the municipality. Not a grain of rice is given to the people outside. Not a grain of rice is given to the landless and those who are having two, three or four bighas

of land, i.e. those who own only two-third or an acre of lands. My hon. friend, Shri Ranga, who comes from the rich delta region of Andhra cannot imagine how little a Bengal peasant can produce on these one or two bighas of land. Even they are not given their 500 grams of rice.

I want to ask Shri Subramaniam why the people of Coimbatore can be given 200 grams of rice and why we the poor unfortunate people in West Bengal, because we permitted our land to be divided and partitioned because of the independence of India, we are to get only 70 grams of rice, and that too those who are lucky to get that in rural areas. I agree with Shrimati Indira Gandhi that we want to have a national policy for food. But I want to ask her, why is it that in Vishakhapatnam people are getting 240 grams of rice per day, why the people in Coimbatore and Madras are getting 200 grams per day, why we in Delhi are getting 143 grams per day, why the people under statutory rationing in Calcutta get 129 grams per day....

Shri Ranga: You have got a powerful Press.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:..... and why only 71 grams per day is given to the people in the municipalities of West Bengal and zero grams a day to the landless labourers and peasants in the rural areas. Is this your national policy? Just because one area grows more food, is it your national policy that it should get more food than another area which is deficit in food for various reasons? One of the reasons why Bengal is deficit in food is that we are growing jute in an area which could have produced five lakh tons of rice. I ask you, is that not wealth which we are producing for India? Should we not get that amount made up from our friends, our brothers, in other parts of our Indian nation which grows more food? What is the use of talking of a national food policy, when you cannot give us a national policy of giving equal rationed quantity of rice.

The President has said:

"Measures have been taken to ensure equitable distribution of the available supplies between State and State and man and man."

Why do we oppose lock, stock and barrel this President's Address? It is because this statement is not true. Statutory rationing has been introduced in the four cities of Calcutta, Madras, Coimbatore and Delhi, and I have shown how this statement is not true at all.

Shri Subramaniam today is no longer, to our mind and to the mind of the people, the Minister of Food, he is a Minister of Beggary. He says, he has a food policy. It is something between total procurement and total free trade. He tells us that is his national policy. To us it is a policy of bankruptcy, chaos, starvation and death. His policy is to play into the hands of big traders, hoarders and blackmarketeers, a death to the Food Corporation, servility, and sell out to United States, turning India into a mendicant going with a beggar's bowl nakedly begging year after year before all the nations of the world. It is not only in this year where we have inflated and we go on inflating again and again our deficit. Today the children in Holland—I say it in all good faith—are going without a meal. They say it is for the sake of our children. I have received messages from the women of Italy saying that they want to help us. They say: "You are dying. Tell us and we will send you money. Can you tell us a village where we can feed the people?" I have told them that we cannot pick out this village or that village. If they want they can go ahead but I will not ask them to do this or that, Shri Subramaniam feels no shame. He has told us to go begging because he says that begging and self-respect need not go together. But for the Indian people it is not so. All those who criticise his policy are not blackmarketeers; nor do they want

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

to see that there is a failure of the national policy of effective State trading. We have always wanted procurement. We have offered our co-operation but that co-operation has to be sought at the right time, at the time when the harvest is on. At that time you have refused to have an all-party committee in every village. Today my hon. friend says, let us have an all-party committee at the all-India level. What will that committee do when all this blackmarketing, rice milling and all this is going on from village to village. There our Chief Minister has refused to have any co-operation. The terms of the United States are clear to us. Those who beg blindly and consistently, we know, must accept servility. That is why we have warned them again and again. Not that we are against taking food from a foreign country in a year of crisis. But our Government does not have any consistent policy; they rely completely on PL 480. I say that you have to show to America that we are self-reliant in our agricultural policy. What our policy has meant has become more clear to me during the last three weeks, because in reality the U.S.A. has attached strings. They say: do not go in for industry, go in for agriculture. When we need more fertilizers, when we need more thermal plants to produce power in order that we may be able to bring in newer and newer wells and energise them, at such a time we are told to go in only for agriculture. As we are an agricultural country, we will certainly go in for agriculture. But, at the same time, we need cheap power for power generation and fertilizers. The U.S.A. knows very well all this. It is because of the need for fertilizer that the so-called Fertilizer Deal has been made with America which, as Shri Subramaniam knows, has been termed by many people, including the President of his own party, as an anti-national deal. Now that deal has leaked out and we all know the strings that that deal contains. Today we have no pricing policy. Why is it

now left to the Americans? Why is it that our peasants are now not able to utilize fertilizers? It is mainly because they cannot afford to pay the price and, secondly, they have not got the water. These are the two basic questions. Because of this, we need our own self-reliant economy. We cannot go on taking aid at the terms dictated by U.S.A.

Actually, it is now brought out by the newspapers that Mr. John Lewis of US AID has asked from our Government for some terms in return for the aid they are giving us. In reply, Shri Boothalingam's letter says that we shall allow private enterprise, we shall allow foreign enterprise. That is why we find in the Fertilizer Deal that the Coromandel Fertilizer, an American Company, has been given not only the right of marketing and the right of fixing prices as they want, but it has also been provided that private Indian parties, in conjunction with American capital, will be allowed to establish factories here. He has asked that it should be finalized by the first day of July. He also said: I do not want you to make it public because then people may be led to agitate against this sell out. Shri Boothalingam writes back "yes, these fertilizer deals are going to be allowed". And what are the deals? We find that U.S.-cum-Indian monopolists who are entering the field of fertilizer production are Delhi Cloth Mills project (of Lala Sri Ram), Jalan project, Birla Project, Andhra Sugars project, ICI project and Madras project.

Today we find joint stock companies entering into the field of agriculture. In Madras we hear Shri Subramaniam making speeches that joint stock companies in the field of seeds must also be allowed, because that is the way of getting best results. We now find big business allowed in the whole fertilizer field. So, where is the

Bhubaneswar Resolution? Where is your resolution which you trumpeted about in Nagpur? Land reforms, peasantry, they are all forgotten.

Regarding profiteering, it is true that we have also blackmarketeers. But in my State of West Bengal what is the price that you pay to the peasantry during procurement and what is the price that Government is charging from the consumer? From the peasantry you are taking best quality rice for Rs. 24 a maund. Add Rs. 3 or 4 for milling and transport. It will come to not more than Rs. 27 or Rs. 28 a maund. The rationed price of best quality rice is Rs. 1.10 per kilo which comes to Rs. 44 a maund, a clear profit of Rs. 17. Who is the blackmarketeer? Can such a Government prevent other blackmarketeers from entering the field. It is an unconscionable profit.

The President says in his speech that we have tried to make equitable distribution of the available supplies and that we are applying science and technology to agriculture. I would like to tell you that we, people in Bengal, in the countryside are starving; our people in the cities are not getting more than 129 grams of rice. The entire policy has failed. Every person in Bengal today demands that like our brothers in Kerala, like our brothers in Coimbatore, in Visakhapatnam, in Madras, we should also be given a minimum of 7 ounces of rice which has been promised to our Kerala friends. They are already getting 160 grams.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambala puzha): We are not getting it; we have been promised.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We demand: let this Government buy this rice, if necessary, let them get it from any source. but we must get 160 grams of rice immediately. We are not second class citizens.

I would also say that the police has got to be checked. I know that it is

2486 (A)LS-6.

not a Central subject but a State subject. When we see the atrocities committed by the police which has run amuck in State after State we are compelled to make these observations. What has happened in the Banaras Hindu University? What has happened in Kerala and West Bengal? What are you going to do about it? People all over the country are saying that they have never witnessed such scenes after the Jalianwalla massacre. Ask your own Congressmen. Today their mouths are shut, but there are still come honest Congressmen. Ask them what they have witnessed in West Bengal during the last few days. I would request our Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to make a visit to West Bengal and see the situation for herself. I would beg of her to do that; if not as Prime Minister, let her go there as a woman, a mother; let her go there and see the position for herself. I can assure you that once she visits the site where the child was killed, she will ask her Chief Minister. "Restrain your police. Order a judicial enquiry." Unless that is done, the people of West Bengal and the people of India will not remain idle and their conscience will not be satisfied.

Shri Ranga: How can she ask her Chief Minister?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: She can advise, if not ask. I do not know, I am not sure, but I still hope that her advice, coming as it does from the Prime Minister of India, will be followed.

12.57 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then I come to the emergency and the Defence of India Rules. My friends from both the Swatantra Party and from the Congress Party have spoken

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

against it. As I stand to speak today, 1,000 members of my party in one district alone have been arrested because, they say, there was violence in West Bengal... (interruptions). I do not belong to any other party; I belong to the Communist Party of India. 700 people have already been arrested and we know that many more are going to be arrested. Is this the way you are going to crush the movement for food? It is we who have controlled the movement and kept it organised and peaceful. What is the worst that has happened in West Bengal? Some children have gone and broken some tables and chairs and destroyed some office papers; nothing more than that has been done. I ask Shrimati Indira Gandhi, I ask any of you: you have also children: if they misbehave, do you shoot them down or put them into jail or do you advise them not to indulge in such activities? You must remember that a hungry man can never be controlled like that, not by putting him in jail and shooting him down at any rate.

Everybody is saying that my party is in the vanguard of this movement. I say that I take pride in that. Can we not lead such peoples movement? Have Congressmen not done it earlier? I say it is a peoples movement. Your MLAs are in it, so also your MPs. In the heart of heart, everybody in my State is with it. If anything untoward happened during that peaceful movement of the people, I say it is because of a situation which you created, the same situation which the British created in 1942. You are taking away their leaders who are controlling them. It is in such a situation that the movement which is peaceful goes out of control and ceases to be peaceful. It is when you take us to jail—possibly, in the course of next week I shall also be there—and there is no one to lead them that something untoward happens. I can tell you that even now it is a peaceful movement

and we shall try to keep it peaceful in every possible way. It is to our advantage to keep it peaceful, because we want food to come and not bullets. When that is the situation, it is a matter of shame that several falsehoods have been stated by the Chief Minister. As I was sitting among a crowd in West Bengal the other day the radio says "rice has been given to the people of Bengal". 200 people shouted at me and said "see how the Government behaves".

So I say: remove this emergency and the DIR and pursue correct policies. What sense of emergency can there be when hungry men are living in the entire border of Pakistan, for Sarupnagar and Basirhat are bordering East Pakistan. In the border areas of Pakistan you are starving the people and you are trying to crush and silence those hungry people by bullets. It is not the smugglers but the hungry people whom you have arrested. It is not only the opposition parties that are sought to be crushed but today I see even Congressmen being arrested under the DIR. I say this logic will even envelope you. I say this is not the time to wreak political vengeance under the plea that the agitations started by political parties belonging to the opposition. In Bihar there was an agitation led by the C.P.I. and SSP. The PSP has also threatened to start an agitation. In all those cases action was taken under DIR will again be repeated in future. Even today hundreds of Marxist Communists are in jail. Whatever may be their political ideology or belief, I say that you cannot put them in jail without trial. You must bring them out, try and punish them if you can convince courts, or release them and give them freedom.

13 hrs.

I do not want to quote Shri Gajendragadkar who has already been quoted. Today in Basirhat people say

that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. I find that the headmaster of a school, Shri Arun Bose, who controlled the whole situation when people there were angry, has been arrested under the DIR because he was the convenor of the Sangram Committee. He is just a teacher who has never participated in politics. Not only that, today I found that one of the most famous journalists of my State, Shri Vivekanand Mukherjee, has been externed from entering the whole district of Barasat; for one month he cannot go because otherwise this Congress government will be reduced to ashes.

Lastly, I say, let us remember that we are a nation, a poor nation but a self-respecting nation. I beg of my Prime Minister, Shrimati Gandhi, not to follow the policy of begging and violence to an extent when we have to hang down our heads in shame before the world.

Shri Ranga: Your Prime Minister?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Prime Minister of the Indian people.

Shri Ranga: But she is not your Prime Minister.... (Interruption). You are in alliance with each other.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We are a part of the Indian people and the Prime Minister is the Prime Minister of India and not of the Congress Party, I hope.

Shri Ranga: What else is she?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I want the Prime Minister, Shrimati Gandhi, to realise that our people are a self-respecting people. We are not rich; we are poor. We may ask for aid, but we shall never go and ask for aid in a way that will impinge on our independence. That is why we feel agitated when we find that our Government has remained absolutely silent on the question of Vietnam. We have a suspicion in our mind that

you are not telling us the whole truth. Recently when \$100 million had been given to us as aid, we were told that there were no strings attached; but we have now proof that there are strings attached to it, we now have unearthed the Bhoothalingam letter. We now see that the statements made by Ministers in this House are dictated from U.S. aid giving agencies. It is also clear from Mr. John Lewis's statement that they are assured by the statements made by Shri Kabir and Shri Subramaniam and the assurance which they had asked for were given. We in this House when we hear these statements by Ministers take it in good faith that it is done independently, but we find the U.S. strings are attached to the mouths of our ministers.

On the Vietnam question the aid which we are getting from the United States has made us lose our self-respect; otherwise, at a time when the conscience of the world has been stirred by the terrible bombings that have taken place in North Vietnam, whatever be the rights or wrongs of the case, hundreds of bombers have gone over this little country and have bombed it, when people in the United States—women, students, professors and even politicians and senators—have cried out against this terrible savagery, when President DeGaulle has said that there should be a settlement. There must be a stopping of bombing and the settlement must be without foreign interference—that means that America has to withdraw—when President Nasser and all others have been shocked and outraged we find our Government silent, even our Government at one stage under Shri Shastri had said in so many words "Stop the bombing" and we had asked for a solution according to the Geneva accord and that Viet-Cong may be made a party. Today we do not hear a reiteration of even these three points made by Shri Shastri. Shrimati Gandhi says that we stick to our own policy. Then why do you

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

not repeat it and say it? People in the world are asking you. The Government say that we are the Chairman of the ICC and hence cannot take sides.

Let us see what was the Geneva accord? The Geneva accord was that the two parts of Vietnam are not to be eternally divided. By 1956 they had to be reunified. To say that because the North Vietnamese have come to South Vietnam, therefore the Americans can come with their bombers and bomb North Vietnam out of existence, can these two things be put on the same level? They are a part of the same people; they have to be reunified. Why was it that our Chairman of the ICC did not bring about the reunification of Vietnam in 1956, just because the USA and their puppets kept on saying that there were some infiltrators from the north? What about the military advisers that came from the USA? I charge this Government and say that our member of the International Control Commission did not behave as they should have and it did not go to the honour of India. We did not bring about a solution according to the Geneva agreement. At that time even when Shastriji spoke against this bombing, it was Shri B. K. Nehru, our Ambassador in Washington, who kept on saying that we should keep silent and kept on putting so many diplomatic pressures with a threat that unless this was done V.S aid would be cut off. Even the other day in Bombay he spoke in a very clever manner and explained the rationale behind the United States policy in Vietnam and the importance given by the United States to the task of containment of Chinese Communism. Vietnam is the main preoccupation in the United States and they are as emotional about it as we are about Pakistan, said he. So, you see that even our Ambassador pleads and explains the position of the American mind in-

stead of explaining our position. It is a fantastic position.

My hon. friends from the Swatantra Party have asked for a realistic approach. I am all for a realistic approach, but what is that realistic approach? People of Vietnam must fight for their freedom; people of Vietnam must be unified.

Shri Ranga: They should not be swallowed up by China.... (*Interruption*).

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We know that President Ho Chi-minh wants a reunified Vietnam and a neutral Vietnam. If there is an assurance that there will be a neutral Vietnam, there will be absolutely no reason.....

Shri Ranga: The wolf will swallow the lamb.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What is the regional pact that the Swatantra Party wants to enter?

Shri Ranga: We do not want the Chinese wolf to go into Vietnam.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): You want the American wolf to go there.

Shri Ranga: Yes, America is there to support the lamb.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: He wants a regional pact with Australia, Philippines and Thailand.

Shri Ranga: What happened when the bombing was stopped?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I just ask Professor Ranga, what was their position when we were fighting Pakistan?

Shri Ranga: What was the position of China? China was hobnobbing with Pakistan.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: When we were fighting China, did the fellow travellers of the United States

tell us if they could persuade U.S.A. to give us a single supersonic plane? We went and asked for supersonic planes and for arms and ammunition, did they give that to us? No. The containment of China was not important.

Shri Ranga: The containment of China is necessary.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: They sold American planes via West Germany to China. It is we who have to stand up and say, do not talk about Vietnam; the United States of America, if it gives, must give us aid irrespective of our stand on Vietnam. A self-respecting nation can only say this if it is to remain independent.

Shri Ranga: China must conquer the whole world!

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We will have to fight back upon our own. We will have to fight back diplomatically as well as militarily. If we go on building up our self-defence, America will say, "We will not give you aid; you are building up your defence, therefore you cannot be given aid". There are so many contradictions. We have to understand that we have to stand on our own feet. Let us get the aid which can help us to become self-reliant. Let us not become beggars in servility. That is what I plead. We, as the Chairman of the ICC, have the job to review our work in the past. Let us understand that we did not carry out the responsibility laid upon us by the Geneva Agreement. Let us in future see that we shall bring about an independent and neutral Vietnam. Let America get out and let there be an end to the bombing.

I once again reiterate to the Prime Minister that she may go also to see her children in West Bengal and how they are shot down. Let her see the situation there. I will again plead for a judicial inquiry and an increase of ration for the people of West Bengal. We are not second-class citizens; we are not going to tolerate being second-class citizens. We want a national policy on food.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jaipur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, need I assure my agitated sister—she has every right to feel agitated—that everyone sitting on this side of the House feels as deeply concerned about the food situation as she does? She must have noticed that whenever this party met, whether it was in Jaipur or it was here, as the party or in the executive, the first thing which engaged our attention was the food situation in the country. The sentiments which have been expressed by her are just an echo of what we have said earlier either at Jaipur or in this House.

I do not agree very much with her so far as the second part of her speech is concerned. I neither stand for the capitalism of America nor do I stand for the Communism of China. I stand for our Indian policy which is as dignified and we want to see that this policy is pursued.

Shri Ranga: Which is also just as bad.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Thank you for your little confession.

Sir, I would like to say that this year which we are completing is really packed with great events and the year which we have ahead of us is really full of new challenges and new tasks for us. I would not like to be carried away by any emotions. I wish we take a realistic assessment of the entire situation.

This year is the last year of our Third Five Year Plan and the next is the first of our Fourth Five Year Plan which we are entering in a most unusual manner without a Plan in our hands. These are very extraordinary circumstances in which we find ourselves.

I have no hesitation and without any fear of contradiction, in submitting that the year which we are closing has a balance-sheet which is loaded with assets for the nation and

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

for the Government of this country. We had that fateful aggression posed on us. Our fighting forces gave a most commendable account of great strategy, skill and unmatched valour. Our Government gave timely and bold decisions and the entire nation stood up like one man in unity, strength and great dignity. Any nation would feel proud of these achievements. This was followed by the Tashkent Agreement which, with the exception of a very few, has been commended, not only by the Congress but by both the major parties on this side of the House, the Swatantra Party as well as the Communist Party.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Practically, the whole House.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Practically the whole House. I entirely agree

I have heard an unqualified praise of the late Prime Minister. It remains only to be seen how he was received with great affection and approbation wherever he went and the faith and confidence which was showered on him. About the Tashkent Agreement, the encomiums have been coming from all the corners and quarters of this wide world. If all these encomiums are showered on the Prime Minister who had the stewardship of this great country, then surely the encomiums must be because of his stewardship of this country and the Government can legitimately take a little pride in the balance-sheet which we are presenting today.

It is really unfortunate that our food situation has been very serious and we feel deeply concerned about it. Mr. Subramaniam is certainly in a most unenviable position. I do not know what purpose would be served by asking him to resign. . .

Shri Ranga: He should not have been re-appointed.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Well, that is Mr. Ranga's theory. I may not quarrel with him. I do not know how things would have improved. As a matter of fact, we are all now in a position to impress upon the Government to take certain important measures. We have all unequivocally stated that we must have a national food policy. When we talk of a national food policy, it does not only mean just the procurement and the distribution. The national food policy will have to be much deeper and much more important. The national food policy will flow from our agricultural policy and, in the first instance, from our policy of production. I have no hesitation in saying, in making a clean confession, that we have not fared well as we ought to have done. All the reports which have gone on are that our growth of production has been hardly comparable with any worthwhile country. . . .

An hon. Member: It is the lowest.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is stated to be the lowest. We cannot go simply by saying that it is the lowest because a large country cannot be compared with a small country. There are various other circumstances. But, definitely, we cannot ignore these facts and if we want to have self-respect and the self-prestige, I may say, the self-prestige comes only out of our economic independence. The first thing to which we have got to address ourselves is our national food policy.

Sir, I also do not feel very happy about the way in which the States have behaved in this particular manner. The greatest danger today is not communism or capitalism but it is this new Statism which is coming up very much. The Government at the Centre will have to need all the strength and all the support of the Members of this House from all quarters to see that they are able to fashion an all-

India food policy and are able to execute it and implement it. We will see to it. We, in the Party, have never spared the Central Government for their lapses where we find it runs counter to our accepted policy, when it runs counter to the national interest. We always welcome any support when it comes even from the Opposition side in pursuance and in furtherance of our policies.

It was not very fair to say that in the international situation, we have not done very well. It was not charitable of my friend, Mr. Dandekar, to say that we had nobody to support except Malaysia and Singapore. I think, the Opposition will remember that they have always been making a big point that we have ignored our near neighbours. Will they not concede to me that a concerted positive effort was made by the late Prime Minister to improve our relations and bring them to the very best with all our neighbours, whether it was Nepal—the King of Nepal was here and he testified it—whether it was Ceylon or whether it was Burma. It is not my contention that the relations are as they ought to be. But, definitely, a positive effort has been made and the effort has been made with a very good amount of success.

The only two countries with which our relations are not happy are China and Pakistan. But now we have made a tremendous, a historical, change so far as our relationship with Pakistan is concerned and it will go down in history as a golden chapter.

Shri Ranga: It is a national achievement.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is a national achievement, I am talking of the nation. It is a national achievement. But it comes through you, me and much more with the Government which is in power. It could not have come but for the Government, but for the approach of the late Prime Minister. Let us not ignore that. We

never minimise your contribution to it. I am prepared to say it could not have been possible without the full and active support of the Opposition also. That is there. But let us assess it and let us concede that that has been so.

Now, let us talk about China. My friend will also concede that if any country has received the greatest diplomatic retreat and a rebuff during this last one year, it is again China. It has received a great rebuff. China was the most anxious country for the Afro-Asian Conference. They wanted to exclude Russia. But what happened? It was again China which got apprehensive and which felt that it will not be able to have its way and wanted that this Afro-Asian Conference should not come up. What has happened to China's policy in Indonesia? What has happened to China's policy in African countries? They are revolting against the Chinese aggressive attitudes. What has happened to China and its policies in Pakistan? I can understand the solitary outburst of Mr. Bhutto—he must face his country. Definitely, India's dignified and calculated policy has not been very aggressive. By diplomacy, we have done all that.

After the Pakistani aggression, our Finance Minister had gone to all the socialist countries. We were developing the best of our relations with socialist countries and it has been on record what U.S.S.R., what Yugoslavia, what Poland what Hungary and what all other countries said about us. They have behaved as our best friends. At the same time, let us not forget that by diplomacy our late Prime Minister also developed the best of the relations, to the extent possible, with U.S.A. and it is President Johnson who had paid the best tribute to the late Prime Minister by saying that this world is smaller in the loss of this great man. Nobody could have said more than what President Johnson has said. If this is not a big and thumping success, in the

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

international field, I do not know what else can be; I do not know what else will satisfy my hon. friends here.

But in the international field, what agitates my mind most is the disarmament conference and China with the atom bomb. It is most unfortunate that we are not paying this matter the due attention that it deserves, and we shall be ignoring it only at our great peril and at our cost. What is this disarmament conference? I do not see very much there except an idle, academic dialogue going on and the fact that on certain occasions, the USSR has made some positive suggestions which we value to an extent; but that is not going to satisfy us. Are we going to mortgage our independence to these nuclear powers who have accumulated and are stockpiling all the day? While they are talking about non-proliferation, they are not talking about what they are going to do to stop further manufacture and stockpiling of these things. This will never satisfy us. We shall have to find, and this nation is anxious to find, an answer to China with an atom bomb.

It is really surprising to find that we do not take notice of it while other nations are taking notice of it. Only the other day we found that the USA was taking notice of it, and the UK was also taking notice of it. In the month of November last, when the Foreign Minister of UK was going to Moscow, the UK Prime Minister had stated in the House of Commons that he would ask his Foreign Minister when he went to Moscow in the context of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, to talk to those people about the security of India because of the threat posed by China. I do not know what we have done in this regard. Our guardians are more anxious, and UK is more anxious. Mr. McNamara when he went to the NATO Conference said that they should take

note of what China would be. It is a fair assessment which has been made by the USA. Their intelligence has been very successful in this matter. We have got all our information regarding China only through the US intelligence. I do not say whether the methods they use are palatable or good or not, but anyway they have got that intelligence and that intelligence was with us. When the first atom bomb was exploded by China, it was the USA which had indicated it quite a few weeks earlier. It is their assessment that by 1967 China would have a fairly good stockpile of atom bombs, and they would also develop missiles. That is their assessment. I thought that the matter would end there, but that is also the assessment of another country, namely Japan. In Japan when this assessment was made, they had clearly indicated that China would be in a position to produce 50 bombs a year. If this is the situation then I would submit that we cannot be thrown into a sense of complacency. There must be something really positive on the disarmament front where China should be invited and there should be a real and meaningful disarmament or else this country must get prepared to meet this challenge. We shall have to take notice of this, and we cannot ignore this great danger. We had been thrown into complacency even earlier when China attacked us and we thought that nothing was going to happen. But now we learn that Shrimati Indira Gandhi herself had realised about this danger in 1954; from the observations or remarks that she had made the other day, we find that she could know about the Chinese threat in 1954 and her father came to know about it in 1955, but we were not prepared for it. Therefore, I think we cannot ignore this matter; it is a serious matter.

I shall not say very much about Viet Nam. I ask Shrimati Renu Chakravartty why she should bother

about this Viet Nam question now, because in America itself, now there is such a strong opinion on this matter. When Mr. Humphrey came here, there were no demonstrations here in this country, but there were demonstrations in Wellington when he went to New Zealand. When Mr. Hariman and others came here earlier, there were no demonstrations by me, by the hon. Member opposite and by even the communists. But there were demonstrations by the American boys. Their own Senator Mr. Robert Kennedy has said something on this matter, and Mr. Fulbright has supported him. Therefore, I am prepared now to leave this matter at that, because there is a mounting discontent in the USA itself in regard to this matter. Shastriji had very correctly outlined our policy, and now they are realising it; at that time they thought that we were talking through our hat when we said that there should be a political settlement and nothing could be settled on the battle-front. I think the Americans have realised it now that nothing can be settled on the battle-front and, therefore, there shall have to be only a political settlement, and of course, within the Geneva Agreement; that is understood. As to how they do it we need not embarrass either North Viet Nam or the USA. They may do anything to save their face, but I hope that there would be nothing else but a settlement on the lines indicated by our late Prime Minister and that the matter would be left to the people of that country.

श्री के० दे० मालवीय (वस्ती) :
सांप भी मर गया लाठी भी नहीं टूटी ।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Now, I would say a word about our general economic growth. It will have to be confessed that Government will have to do a little bold re-thinking on this subject. This is not a matter which could be left as it is. During the last fifteen to seventeen years we have learnt some lessons; the 21-days' war

has given us a new prestige, but at the same time, that war has also given us new expositions of our weakness and our dependence on others. I think that our economy should be reoriented in the sense that we should so re-organise ourselves that in the next five years, starting from now onwards, we at least should gear up our self-dependence to such an extent that our factories and other things could be kept going at least for one shift without any assistance from outside. We must see what has to be done about it and what has to be done about import-substitution, for instance, about which there is so much of trouble. I do not want to go into details for want of time; otherwise, I could have given this House any amount of detailed information as to what can be done to make this country self-sufficient, what could be done by way of import-substitution and so on. There is such a tremendous lot which can be done in this regard. We must see that whatever emergency may come and whatever may happen at least we are in a position to get going on our own; perhaps, we may not be able to go at a big speed; it may be that the train is running only at the rate of 35 m.p.h., but we must run those 35 miles absolutely on our own, and we must stand on our own legs. If we get foreign assistance we can see that the train could run at the speed of 65 m.p.h., and we may have two shifts or even three shifts or whatever is possible. We must reorient our economy in that way.

In regard to food, I have not the least doubt, with the little practical experience which I have got, that we can increase the production; and I am prepared to pledge my neck here if I do not improve the food production in my constituency and in my district by 30 per cent within two years, with whatever amount is being spent at the present moment. It is such a disjointed effort which is now being made; I must tell you that unfortunately, the weakness of the

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

administration is such that it is really heart-rending. There is no reason why the yield per acre should be such a meagre figure. At certain brighter spots it is five times more than the average yield. If it could be five times more in certain places, then it means that there is scope for a 500 per cent increase. When that is the position, do you think that we cannot have even a 30 per cent increase? At least I have examined it in respect of definite projects which I have drawn up for my constituency, about four projects which I have drawn up for my constituency, which would not involve an expenditure of more than a crore of rupees. I have not the least doubt that it is one of the best wheat-producing areas, and we can definitely increase the yield there by 30 per cent within two years' time. I, therefore, feel that we shall have to do something about it.

I cannot sit down without saying a word about the DIR. I feel very strongly about it. This is not the first time when I am saying this; even when I had spoken on the Demands of the Home Ministry a year earlier, I had spoken very strongly about this and emphasised that we should do away with those emergency provisions. There is no justification whatsoever for them. I need not quote what Mr. Setalvad has said, namely that it is a constitutional dictatorship. I need not quote what Mr. Gajendra-gadkar has said in his recent judgment. I need not quote what Shri Santhanam has written about it. It is so obvious on the cards. There is no justification to hold back 4,000 persons behind prison bars under DIR. We have forgotten that we have got the Preventive Detention Act. against which our conscience revolted some-time back. You cannot do without preventive detention; you cannot do without the present laws; on top of it, you cannot do without DIR.

This is nothing but covering up the inefficiency of Government. If the

Government gets addicted like an opium-eater to this inefficiency, it will never have the confidence to do away with it. It must show the confidence that it can do without it. I can assure this House, I can assure Government, that if they do away with it, no harm is going to come; they will rise in their prestige and nothing will happen.

Therefore, they must very seriously think about this DIR business. I am so much upset about it. I endorse every word that has fallen from every mouth to do away with the DIR provisions, particularly now in the context of the Tashkent Agreement. It is really unfortunate that even after this Agreement, there are certain people still rotting in our jails because of certain pro-Pakistani activities.

Shri Warior (Trichur): An hon. Member of this House has been detained like that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Unfortunately, I do not know the details.

But I must say that the House will redeem its honour if we do away with it. If the Home Minister feels that he cannot do without it, it is time he stepped down and somebody who can do without it got into the job.

One word more and I resume my seat. That is about indiscipline and about our educational policy. Maybe after this heated thing this subject comes somewhat at the tail end of my speech. But I attach a considerable amount of importance to it. What has happened in various universities has pained and anguished us. I think it is time something was done about it. So much is said about political influence, extraneous influence, creeping into universities. But the crux of the problem—I appeared before the University Grants Commission as a witness, and I stressed this to them—is that you have Vice-Chancellors appointed who have vested interests, who are superannuated, who are not

forward-looking, who have no rapport with the students and youth of the country. It is time we thought about this matter and did something about it. It is a small interest here, a vested interest there an alliance, a group or clique of professors and teachers which is completely ruining the entire academic atmosphere of the universities. We must do our very best to give prompt attention to this matter because it is the youth whom you have got to galvanise for the future of this country and it is in their interest and in the general interest of the country that I plead that Government take serious note of this.

It was really pathetic to find the Education Minister in such a condition. We find him a helpless man. What is this University Grants Commission for? It is just to ensure uniform standards in all universities all over the country. If they cannot do that, there is no justification for this Ministry here, there is no justification for the University Grants Commission here. Therefore, they must look into this matter and see that these cobwebs are removed.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बरा बरा भारी हूँ कि आपने समय दिया। एड्रेस को कई दफे पढ़ कर के भी कुछ समझ में नहीं आया कि इतना बड़ा देश किस तरह से धरना रक्षा कर सकता है जब कि देश के अन्दर अनिश्चय सैनिक शिक्षा नहीं है, जब कि देश के अन्दर कोई ऐसा उपाय नहीं है कि हमारे लोग कम्प्लेक्सरी मिलिट्री ट्रेनिंग से सकें। इसके अलावा आज भी मैंने देखा बहुत गौर से कि हिन्दुस्तान में किन लोगों को लाईसेंस दिये जाते हैं। लाईसेंस उन लोगों को दिये जाते हैं जो न उन लाईसेंसों का इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं न बन्दूक चला सकते हैं, न राईफल चलाना जानते हैं। आज भी लाईसेंस देने समय यह पूछा जाता है कि कितनी मानगुजारी देने हो, कितना लगान देते हो, कितना इन्कम टैक्स देते हो। बन्दूक और राईफलों के लाईसेंस के ऊपर स्टैटस पूछा जाता है। एक तरफ

समाजवाद का नारा लगाया जाता है और दूसरी तरफ आज भी यह मोका नहीं दिया जाता है कि जो नौजवान देश की रक्षा कर सकें, जिनको छाती चौड़ा हों, जिनके बाजू लम्बे हों, जो लोग देश के लिए काम कर सकें उन लोगों को लाईसेंस दिया जावे। यह दोनों चीजें मजाक मालूम होती हैं, एक तरफ समाजवाद का नारा और दूसरी तरफ मानगुजारी, लगान, इन्कम टैक्स और उसकी माली हैसियत को देख कर के लाईसेंस दिया जाना। जब तक सारे देश के अन्दर कम्प्लेक्सरी मिलिट्री ट्रेनिंग नहीं होगी, यह छोटी सी सरकार देश की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती। इस छोटी सी सरकार विचारों को तो अपने ऐशो धाराम से ही फुसंत नहीं है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस गवर्नमेंट का सत्रह सालों का इतिहास पराजय का इतिहास है। यह तारीख शिकस्त की तारीख है। किसके सामने यह सिर नीचा नहीं किये हैं? क्या नागालैंड के थोड़े से विद्रोही लोगों के सामने यह सिर नहीं झुका रहे हैं? क्या पाकिस्तान के सामने इन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान के सम्मान को नहीं बचा है? क्या चीन के सामने हमारे सम्मान को नीचा नहीं किया है? आज जब यह चीन के हमले का जिक्र करते हैं तो यागल रिज के ऊपर जहाँ कि चीन ने हमारे 38 हजार मूरब्बे मील पर कब्जा कर रखा है उमका जिक्र नहीं करते बल्कि यागला रिज से नांचे उतर कर के जय चाइना हमारे सिपाहियों का अपहरण करता है, हमारा धरना करता है तब उसको यह हमला कहते हैं। आज तक भी यह कमजोर सरकार कोई तारीख नहीं दे सकी जिसमें यह कोई प्रॉपोजिशन दे कि हम मानसरोवर बायम से लेंगे, हम कीला बायम लेंगे, हम 38 हजार मूरब्बे मील बायम लेंगे। कब तक सरकार ताशकंद के परदे में अपनी कमजारी को छिपायेगी। एक तरफ तो यह सरकार यह कहती है कि काश्मीर के ऊपर हमारी दम्भता है, काश्मीर के ऊपर हमारी साबरेन्टी है, दुनिया की आँखों में धड़ भोंकती है और दूसरी तरफ जो अपनी जान के ऊपर

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

द्वल करके हमारे जवानों ने हासिल किया था वह खाली किया जा रहा है ताशकंद के नाम पर पैकट के नाम पर । मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इतनी एनर्जी, इतनी सामर्थ्य, इतना समय क्यों नष्ट किया गया ? अगर आपको टिचवाल, कारगिल और हार्जोपीर समर्पण ही करना था तो आप राबलपिंडी में भी जाकर उनके सामने हाथ जोड़ कर के समर्पण कर सकते थे, राबलपिंडी में भी अपना पिंड छुड़ा सकते थे । आज कोई न कोई उपाय सरकार को ऐसा करना पड़ेगा जिससे कि 45 करोड़ सेटिल्साई हो सकें कि हमारी गर्मी हुई जर्मन वापस आयेगी । यह मसला जब आया था तब लोगों ने शुभकामनायें आपित की थीं 10 दिसम्बर को यहां अकेले इस मेम्बर के सिवाय, मैंने, आपके इस खादिम ने, शुभकामनायें शास्त्री जी को नहीं दी थीं । शास्त्री जी के सामने मैंने हाथ जोड़ यह कहा था कि इस बेकार काम में आप मत जाईएगा । यह रास्ता आपके लिए अच्छा नहीं है । आपकी देशभक्ति, आपका ईमानदारी, आपकी एंटीपेटि इस बात की इजाजत नहीं देती है कि आप ताशकंद की कोठियों में यह मसला हल करने जायें जो कि हिन्दुस्तान के मैदानों में हल होगा । आज भी अगर गलतों का निराकरण हो सकता है तो मैं आज भी कहूंगा कि यह कोई जरूरी नहीं है कि एक दफा किसी का हाथ भाग में जल जाय तो हमेशा जला करे । यह कोई जरूरी नहीं है कि एक दफा किसी को नुकसान पहुंचा तो हमेशा नुकसान उठाता रहे । आज भी मैं कहूंगा जैसा भगवान कृष्ण ने भर्जुन से कहा था, भर्जुन ने प्रतिज्ञा की थी कि जो मुझे गांडीव डालने के लिये कहेगा मैं उसका सिर काट लूंगा, जिस दिन अभिमन्यु का बध हुआ उस दिन युधिष्ठिर ने कहा भर्जुन, तुम्हें धिक्कार है, तुम अपना गांडीव डाल दो, इस पर भजन महाराज युधिष्ठिर का सिर काटने के लिये बड़े तो भगवान

कृष्ण ने भर्जुन का हाथ पकड़ लिया और कहा कि नासमझी में तुमने जो प्रतिज्ञा की है, नासमझी में तुमने जो वादा किया है उसको तोड़ देना ही श्रेयस्कर है, उसको तोड़ देना ही कल्याणकारी है, आज मैं भी इस सरकार से कहूंगा कि जो गलती की गई है उसका निराकरण करे ।

मैं एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ । पाकिस्तान के मुसलमानों के सामने तो आप नाक से लकीर खींच रहे हैं, हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमानों के साथ क्या सलूक कर रहे हैं ? इसी आदरणीय सदन का एक मेंबर संयद बहरु द्दजा फरिश्ता कफस इसान जिसकी एंटीपिटी में किसी को शक नहीं है, जो फूल की तरह से बोलता है, अपने दुश्मन को भी जो कभी तकलीफ नहीं देता, वह इसलिये जेलखाने के भंदर बंद है कि वह मुसलमान है ? हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमान के साथ जो इसी पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर है जिसने कभी आज तक भवहेलना नहीं की है, जिसने आज तक कभी अनुशासन को नहीं तोड़ा है, उसको सिर्फ इसलिए जेलखाने में बंद कर रखा है कि वह मुसलमान है । मैं जनना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उसके खिलाफ इल्जाम है, क्या आपके एलोगेशन है ? एक भी एलोगेशन नहीं है । सिर्फ इसलिये कि वह मुसलमान है, इसलिये उसको जेल में बंद कर रखा है । पाकिस्तान के मुसलमान के सामने यह लोग नाक से लकीर खींचते हैं लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान के मुसलमान के साथ जो सलूक कर रहे हैं वह इंसानियत से गिरा हुआ सलूक है । आज मैं फिर सरकार को चेतावनी देता हूँ कि जनता धोबे में रहने के लिये तैयार नहीं है । मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि लोगों की प्राकमण्यता को दूर करने के लिये क्या किया है, इस देश की भुखमरी को दूर करने के

जिये आपने क्या किया है, बेरोजगारी को दूर करने के लिये आप ने क्या किया है? आज भी लाखों किसान इसलिये दुखी हैं कि उन्हें समय पर बीज नहीं मिल सकता, समय पर ट्यूबवेल का कनेक्शन नहीं मिलता। सारे हिन्दुस्तान में मैं घमता हूँ! मैंने एक दिन भी कहीं नहीं देखा कि किसी एक सिनेमा घर को इसलिये बंद होना पड़ा हो कि उसको एलेक्ट्रिक कनेक्शन नहीं मिला। लेकिन मैंने हजारों और लाखों ट्यूबवेल अपनी गाँवों से देखे, वह इसलिये बंद पड़े हैं कि उन्हें कनेक्शन नहीं मिल रहा है, पावर नहीं मिल रहा है। मगर सारे हिन्दुस्तान में एक सिनेमा घर ऐसा नहीं देखा कि जो इसलिये बंद हो कि उसे एलेक्ट्रिक पावर नहीं मिल रहा है, उसको कनेक्शन नहीं मिल रहा है। कहा जाता है सारा का सारा रुपया? इतना बड़ा देश है और इतने बड़े देश का रुपया जाता है ऐयाशी में, रुपया जाता है भांग विलास में, रुपया जाता है नाचने और गाने में, रुपया जाता है उन चीजों में जिन चीजों को देश को धाव-शयकता नहीं है। बेकार के मुहकमों को खत्म किया जायगा, किसानों को अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने दिया जायेगा। किसान जब अपने पैरों पर खड़ा होगा तभी देश का मसला हल होगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस 45 करोड़ के मुल्क के लिए क्या यह बान शमन क नहीं है कि हालैंड की गलियों में भारत को घनाज देने वास्ते चंदा मांगा जा रहा है। हालैंड के निवासी आज भीख मांग रहे हैं ताकि हिन्दुस्तान के भूखे बच्चों को भोजन मिल सके? इससे बड़ी शमनाक बात और क्या हो सकती है? यह हालैंड हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश का एक तिहाई हिस्सा है लेकिन वह छोटा सा हालैंड उन्हें भोजन दे रहा है। उनके बच्चों के लिए भीख भेज रहे हैं इसमें ज्यादा शर्म की बात और क्या हो सकती है? देश को अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने दीजियेगा, देश के किसान को सहूलियत दी जाए, उसे बिजली की मुबिधा दी जाय, उसके बिजली के कनेक्शन का मसला

हल किया जाय, उसको समय पर बीज व खाद, पानी आदि मिले तो वह इतना घनाज पैदा कर सकता है, कि उसको दस मुल्क खा नहीं सकते हैं। वह दस मुल्कों के लिए उपजा सकता है लेकिन यहां तो हानत यह है कि दूसरे मुल्कों से भीख मांग रहे हैं। आज तक यह 24 अरब रुपये का घनाज मांग चुके हैं मगर उस 21 अरब रुपये में से 2 अरब रुपया भी किसानों को अपने पैरों पर खड़े होने के लिए दे दिया जाता तो किसान पहाड़ जैसे भ्रम्बार गेहूँ के लगा देते लेकिन सरकार को दूसरों के सामने भीख मांगने में मजा आता है। इस सरकार की रिपोर्ट है कि 8 फ्रीमदी घनाज की कमी है। यही सरकार यह भी कहती है कि 14 फ्रीमदी घनाज यह चूरे और जीव जन्तु खा जाते हैं। 14 फ्रीसदी को चूड़ों से नहीं बचा सकते। कनाडा के सामने भिक्षा पात्र लेकर खड़े होने हैं अमरीका के सामने खड़े होते हैं, दुनिया के छोटे छोटे मुल्कों के सामने किस तरीके से इज्जत बेच कर जाते हैं। मात्मा ग घी तो यह कते थे कि अमर देश के वास्ते एक चीज भी बाहर से प्राय तो वह देश अपने पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं हो सकता लेकिन यह नाम लेते हैं गांधी जी का, बोट मांगते बक्स गांधी जी का, किनोबा जी का, नाम इनको याद आता है लेकिन जब हुकूमत करते हैं तो पूंजीवाद के तौर पर करते हैं और उसका नतीजा यह है कि आज देश में पूंजीवाद बढ़ता जा रहा है। बिड़ना साहब से बिजली का जो खर्च लिया जाता है वह तीन नये पैसे फी यूनिट को दर से लिया जाता है लेकिन किसानों से जो खर्च लिया जाता है वह 19 पैसे यूनिट के साहब से लिया जाता है। जिन लोगों ने मरभायंदारी के जरिए से देश को गुनाम बनाने की कांशिश की है वह आज भी मडे कर रहे हैं। कब वह मोका प्रायेगा यह मैं सरकार से जानना चाहता हूँ, जब जैम गांधी जी ने यह कहा था कि वह समय प्रायेगा, जब कोई भगी का बेटा, चमार का बेटा, हरिजन का बेटा, किसान का बेटा या मजदूर का बेटा, सासन की गद्दी पर बैठेगा? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आखिर

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

वह समय प्रायेण ? हमें तो लाल, लाल ही दिखाई दे रहे हैं। जितने लाल हैं जितने बड़े बड़े लोग हैं वह दिखाई दे रहे हैं जो कि कुसियों के ऊपर आज भी भारत के भ्रन्दर बैठे हुए हैं। आज भी अगर आप मौका दें, आज भी अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान के देहातों के भ्रन्दर चले और चल कर दखें, ताशकंद के मामले को, देश की नपुंसकता के मामले को रख कर देश को इस तरीके से पिटाया गया, देश को बेइज्जत किया गया, देश को बर्बाद किया उस मामले को रख कर सामने देखें तो आज यह सरकार देश के पांच फीसदी वोट भी हासिल नहीं कर सकती है। इन बातों को सामने रखते हुए उसे पांच फीसदी वोट भी नहीं मिलेगा। सरकार यह बहाना करती है और बार बार यह कहती है कि हम क्या करे ? हमारे सामने इतनी मुसीबतें हैं जो आज की मुसीबतें हैं यह भगवान की दी हुई नहीं हैं। यह मैं मंड है। किसने आप को कहा था कि आप पंचशील पर दस्तखत करे ? किस ने कहा था कि ताशकंद के मस्विदे पर दस्तखत करें ? यह नौन बाएलेंस के प्रोग्राम को किसने चलाया ? अगर कोई कौम या मुल्क जिंदा रह सकता है तो गीता माता का जो इस सम्बन्ध में उपदेश है उस पर अमल करने से ही रह सकता है:—

“सूखिनः सत्रियाः पार्यं लभन्ते युद्धमीदृशम्”

जो खुशकिस्मत होते हैं उन को धर्म युद्ध हासिल होता है। वही कौम जिंदा रहती हैं जो अपने अधिकारों के लिए लड़ती हैं यह दुनिया का कायदा है। अगर देश और जाति को जिंदा रखना चाहते हो तो यह भावना धानी चाहिए:—

“This is my land, and I will die for it.”

जिस देश को जिंदा रहना है उसे यह श्रत लेना पड़ेगा। जो अपने अधिकारों के लिये लड़ नहीं सकते वह कभी भी देश

के भ्रन्दर या दुनिया के भ्रन्दर अपने अस्तित्व को कायम नहीं रख सकते। मैं आज सरकार से पूरे आग्रह के साथ कहूंगा और बार बार उन्हें याद दिलाऊंगा कि महज बातों से ही यह मसला हल नहीं हो सकता है। मैं फिर याद दिलाता हूँ कि अगर बच्चा बच्चा मिलटरी ट्रेनिंग नहीं लेगा अगर देश अपने पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं होगा, जय किसान और जय जवान आप कहते हैं, लेकिन जय किसान के लिये आप कर क्या रहे हैं ? जय किसान को वक्त पर पानी नहीं मिलता, वक्त पर विजली का कनेक्शन नहीं मिलता। जिसको कि आप जय बोल रहे हैं उसे ट्रैक्टर नहीं मिलते। हजारों किसान हैं जो रुपया पट्टुचाते रहते हैं लेकिन ट्रैक्टर उन को नहीं मिल रहे हैं। हजारों किसान हैं जिनको कि वक्त पर खाना, खाद और पानी नहीं मिलता है। डेवलपमेंट और डिफेंस का काम नेशनल काम है यह पार्टी बक नहीं है ? मैं फिर आप को याद दिलाता हूँ:—

“Party system of government is not only democracy, but it strikes at the root of democracy.”

जब तक यह पार्टी के हाथ में रहेगा डिफेंस का यही हाल होगा। जैसे कि नेफा में पिटाई हुई है जैसे कि ताशकंद में इज्जत बचो गई है उस से देश पाँछे हटता चला जायगा। यह खेद का विषय है कि आज शासक वर्ग मदान्ध है ? हुकूमत के नशे में मदमस्त होकर सत्ताधारि पार्टी यह काम चला रही है जिससे देश गिरता जा रहा है। मैं उनको समय रहते चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ। मैं मुखालिफ नहीं हूँ, मैं अपोजिशन का नहीं हूँ। यह ‘अपोजिशन’ का सफ्ज इंगलैंड का दिया हुआ है, पश्चिम का दिया हुआ है। हम आपके साथ थे जेलखानों में। हमने आपके

साथ पब्लिक फील्ड में काम किया था। उन के साथ हमने नमक सत्याग्रह में काम किया था, उनके साथ इंडिविजुएल सत्याग्रह में काम किया था लेकिन जब मैं ने देखा कि देश बेचा जा रहा है, देश को दूसरों के हाथों हवाले किया जा रहा है उस वक्त हमारे सामने और कोई चारा नहीं था कि उस पाप में मैं भागो न बनू। भ्राज भी हम वास्तव में ध्रापके मुखालिफ नहीं हैं ध्रपितु हम तो ध्राप के हिनैषा हैं।

“सकिम् सखा साधु न शास्तियो धिपम्
हितान्नयः संश्रणुते स किं प्रभुः

जो ध्रपने भाई की बात को ध्रपने हितैषी की बात को सच्चे हृदय से सुन कर ग्रहण नहीं करते वह कर्मा मुख हासिल नहीं कर सकते। देश के मामले को ध्राप पार्टी लाइंस पर कभी हल नहीं कर पायेंगे। जरूरत इस बात की है कि 45 करोड़ इंसानों को यह हक दीजिये कि वह इकट्ठे होकर डेवलपमेंट करें और डिफेंस का काम करें।

ध्राप यह कहते हैं कि किसी देश को एक इंच भूमि भा हमें नहीं चाहिये। बारबार कहते हैं कि किसी देश का एक कण भी हमें नहीं चाहिये। किसी देश की एक इंच भूमि हमें नहीं चाहिए उस भूमि का तो ध्रप बारबार जिक्र करते हैं कि वह हमें नहीं चाहिए लेकिन जो विदेशों के हवाल कर रक्खी है जो धर बुला कर दो है और जो यह चीनी हिन्दी भाई भाई कह कर उन को प्रदान की है और जो तिब्बत का इलाका हम ने उन को तश्तरी में रख कर भेंट किया है उस को उनसे वापिस लेने का ध्राप कभी भी जिक्र नहीं करते हैं। सरकार की जो कमजोरियां हैं वह पब्लिक से छिपाई नहीं जा सकती हैं। पांच सास पहले ध्रापने महात्मा गांधी का नाम, विनोबा भावे का नाम और समाजवाद का नाम

लेकर यह सत्ता हासिल कर ली थी लेकिन भ्राज जनता से उसे ध्राप हासिल नहीं कर पायेंगे। उत्तरप्रदेश में जहां समाजवाद का नारा बुलन्द है भ्राज भी 3000 सरकारों कर्मचारों ऐसे है जिनकी कि तनख्वाह 5 रुपये माहवार है। पांच रुपये माहवार पर हजरते इंसान को खरीदा जा रहा है। भ्रशरफुल मखलूकात खरीदा जा रहा है पांच रुपये माहवार पर और इधर हम देखते हैं कि विजलो के पंखों में बैठे हुए हैं और वह 10,000 रुपया माहवार लेते हैं और काम घाम कुछ नहीं। करप्शन की बहुत बात की जाती है? मेरी समझ में करप्शन की परिभाषा में सब से बड़ा करप्शन यह होना चाहिए कि जो कामचोरी करता है जो काम से जा चुगा है, जो परिश्रम से जो चुगाता है जो देश के नियो काम नहीं करता है वह सब से ज्यादा करप्ट है, सब से ज्यादा भ्रष्टाचारी है। जो समय वर्बाद करते हैं वह भी करप्शन करते हैं। हम इसी पार्लियामेंट में देखते हैं कि हर पन्द्रह मिनट के बाद कोरम की घंटों बजता है। ध्रब ध्राप हो बतलाइये जब ऐयर कंडाशांड हाउस में लोग नहीं बैठे रह सकते, ऐसे आइडियल कंडीशांस जब वह ध्रपनी इयुटो पूरी नहीं कर सकते तो वह खेतों और मैदान में क्या काम कर सकते हैं? सब से बड़ा जो इस वक्त ध्रापपूर्ण बात मुझे कहनी है वह है कि सरकार के मंत्रों सांग करप्शन का नारा न लगायें बल्कि प्रोडक्शन का नारा लगायें, भ्रष्टाचार का नारा न लगायें, पैदावार का नारा लगायें, भ्रष्टाचार की बात ध्रगर ध्राप बारबार करेंगे तो भ्रष्टाचार होगा। Think of the devil and he here is ध्रगर भ्रष्टाचार के नारे के बजाय पैदावार का नारा लगाइयेगा, ध्रगर करप्शन के नारे के बजाय प्रोडक्शन का नारा लगायेगा तो देश का मसला हल हो जायगा। ध्रगर ध्रा

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

पैदावार रही और पापुलेशन अधिक रहा तो देश का मसला हल नहीं हो सकता। वैसे जर्मनी में क्या चीज है? वहाँ पर जो इंसान ज्यादा घोलदा पैदा करता है उस का ज्यादा इनाम मिलता है, जो ज्यादा बेटे पैदा करता है उस को ज्यादा रकम मिलना है, जो ज्यादा संतान पैदा करता है उसको ज्यादा कोठियाँ मिलती हैं। लेकिन यहाँ हिन्दुस्तान में क्या हो रहा है? आज यहाँ देश में सारे बाजार इस बात का एतान किया जा रहा है कि जो व्यक्ति अस्पताल में जाकर पुसक बन जायेगा उस को 25 रुपये बतौर इनाम के दिये जायेंगे। पुरुषत्व पच्चास रुपये के इनाम में खरोदा जा रहा है। जहाँ वैसे जर्मनी में अधिक संतान पैदा करने को इनाम देकर प्रोत्साहित किया जाता है वहाँ यहाँ लोगों को नपुंसक बनाने को प्रोत्साहित किया जाता है। यह पापुलेशन का धोखे इस तरह के धननैचुरल तरीकों से रोकना उचित नहीं है, ब्रह्मचर्य से यह आबादी रुकेगा, सैल्फ कंट्रोल से रुकेगा, प्रात्म संयम से रुकेगा, सदाचार से रुकेगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करते हुए चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण पर मैं धन्यवाद नहीं दे सकता हूँ?

Shri T. Subramanyam (Bellary):
Sir, after affixing his signature to the Tashkent declaration, our late Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri is reported to have made an appeal that we should now fight as valiantly for the cause of peace as we fought when the war with Pakistan was going on. That is not the language of a person who was pressurised against his will to affix his signature. We are heartened and glad to see our officers and men smoothly trying to give effect

to the programme of withdrawal. There is also a news item that there is going to be a get-together between the officers and the troops on the 25th. These officers and troops fought valiantly at the front; they are now working for the cause of peace and smoothly giving effect to the Tashkent declaration. It is a lesson to those people who are critical about it: let us observe the rules of the game and play the game both in spirit and letter so that the appeal of the late Shastriji will not go in vain. The Tashkent declaration was the crowning achievement of Shastriji's patriotic career, of his service and sacrifice. An hon. Member of the Swatantra Party described the Tashkent declaration as an act of faith and he paid a tribute to Mr. Kosygin, the Prime Minister of Russia. But he said he was against the policy of non-alignment. But while he paid a tribute to Mr. Kosygin's services, he was indirectly paying a tribute to the success of the policy of non-alignment. This policy took shape in the context of the emergence of the two power blocs, each led by one of the big powers, Russian and the United States. Our late Prime Minister Nehru felt that it would be wise and consistent with our basic principles of national life to take to non-alignment. While the freedom fight was going on, the other countries of Asia and Africa looked to us as a hero; the subject races looked on and felt that the door was open for the achievement of their independence. Last year Dr. Milton Obote, the Uganda Prime Minister came here and said that if it was realised that before freedom was achieved by India the subject races were looking towards this direction and after India's freedom, the door to their freedom was opened, then one will realise how much service had been rendered by India. Since then many countries of Asia and Africa have subscribed to the policy of peaceful co-existence and non-alignment. So, that policy has completely justified itself.

But Pakistan became a member of the CENTO and SEATO but recently they feel that it has not been of much avail, the alignment has not paid them dividends. Shri Dandekar was critical of the President's reference to China. Our President says that our relations with the People's Republic of China still continue to be strained; the country has to be vigilant and strong. Mr. Dandekar says that this is too mild or an under-statement of the case. He is not familiar with the language used by our leaders in the various movements. Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Lal Bahadur Shastri—all used soft language; they did not use strong language, language of condemnation and denunciation. Mere strong language will not carry our policies to success. It is the will, strength, conviction and firmness that will carry us to success. Shastriji's life was a typical illustration of our national approach in this matter.

Recently some of us had been to Southeast Asia and in those countries also there is a strong feeling that something must be done to resist the threat of Chinese aggression and expansion. From early historical times, there has been free exchange of culture and religion with these countries and ourselves and there has thus been a fusion of cultures; there is a sense like belonging to one family or one culture in these countries in Southeast Asia. There is admiration for our secular democracy and in Malaysia and Singapore they are also trying to develop multiracial societies and they had implicit faith in the leadership of Gandhiji and Nehruji and Shastriji—and they now have of the present leadership. We pursue the cause of peace, friendliness with all countries. Many responsible leaders told us that they valued the spiritual and ethical values of India and would like these values to triumph ultimately.

On Vietnam the President says: "We are deeply concerned about the present situation in Vietnam. Any effort to resolve this conflict by peace-

2486(A)LS-7.

ful methods will receive our support". We take part in the good work that is done by the International commission for control and supervision in Vietnam. People are highly appreciative of the good work done by this commission. Today the U.K. Prime Minister Mr. Wilson is in Moscow; England and Russia are co-chairman of the Geneva conference. We have always been saying that a Geneva type of conference should be convened so that this problem might be solved I am sure Mr. Wilson will pursue this idea with the Russian leaders. Nothing will give us greater pleasure than this. Last week the U.S. Vice-President Mr. Humphrey, came here and a news item appeared then that he appealed for a medical team to be sent from India to South Vietnam. It is a very delicate and complicated matter because it is subject to other actions, reactions, repercussions and all that. But subject to other factors, and if it is practicable and feasible, I personally do not see why our Indian Red Cross should not send a team under its auspices. For instance, if there should be an appeal—I am only putting a hypothetical proposition—from North Vietnam, from Hanoi, from Ho Chi-minh, we might consider that appeal favourably, because it will be a commission of compassion, of healing wounds and not inflicting wounds, and in these matters, our country has always taken a forward march, and whenever such an appeal is made, I should presumably, of course, subject to other factors.

14 hrs.

Now, I will refer to our domestic problems. This is the last year of the Third Five Year Plan. I cannot say that the Third Five Year Plan has been a success. There has been under-production, shortfalls, in every sector, particularly in the agricultural sector, and we are told that the deficit in 1965-66 will be of the order of 12.6 million tons so far as the production of foodgrains is concerned.

[Shri T. Subramanyam]

After 18 years of freedom, it is unfortunate that we should still be having shortfalls in agriculture. Recently, in Sandur, of Bellary district, I visited some private lands where they had sown hybrid jowar, hybrid wheat and maize also. The crop was very good and the harvest was very fine, and I was told that the crop was as much as four to five times the normal yield of jowar and hybrid wheat. Similar experiments are made in Bijapur district and also in the area irrigated by the Tungabhadra project. They are showing excellent results, and I would only urge the Government that the inputs should be properly utilised so that similar results may be produced extensively.

We can easily solve the problem of food in this manner and I felt very much heartened. I appeal to the Government to utilise the agricultural department in every State and persuade them to have demonstration farms. They speak theory and merely put on paper their ideas. The papers pass from office to office and actually no work is done practically. That is the general picture in every State. Instead of that, if the agricultural department takes up demonstration farms in every taluka or every district, and gives effect to the theories, I am sure the ryots also, who are naturally conservative, will practise them. I have seen this: it has been practised.

With regard to fertilisers, our story has not been very satisfactory. We have thought of producing one million tons of nitrogenous fertilisers by the end of the Third Five Year Plan and we are nowhere near it, and now we want to produce two millions tons of nitrogenous fertilisers in the Fourth Plan. I hope that every effort will be made to reach the target now. Of course, if irrigation, pesticides, improved seeds—all these inputs—are carefully looked into, we are sure to solve this problem of food inadequacy.

Now, what is the present position? Our present position is, as I said, there is a shortfall of nearly 12.5 million tons. The United States of America has very generously and magnanimously come forward to send this quantity. We must be particularly grateful to them. We cannot be critical and use the language of unfairness. Wherever they have shown magnanimity or generosity, we should also have no inhibitions and we must be grateful to them. We must express our thanks to President Johnson and to the people of the United States who have been so magnanimous. They have promised to send us 12.5 million tons of wheat and also other grains and they are also trying to look to the port facilities for handling these grains. Shri Sanjiva Reddy is here and I leave the question of ports to him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri T. Subramanyam: Only one word more. The Fourth Plan is making a provision for the expansion of industries in the public sector. They are also trying to put in more steel plants. Shri Sanjiva Reddy was in charge of this portfolio and other Ministers, Shri Sanjivayya and Shri T. N. Singh, are now in charge of it. I will press the case of Hospet, with its unique and rare and most precious iron ore—the most precious in the world. There is availability of power, availability of non-saline water and availability of land—availability of all these factors—and so, if we do not use all these resources for putting up a large steel plant there, we will be failing our duty.

श्री बड़े (खारगोन) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के भाषण पर बैंक्स-गिबिंग का जो प्रस्ताव आया है, उस में मैं ने अपने दल की तरफ से कुछ संशोधन दिये हैं। वास्तविकता यह है कि राष्ट्रपति ने अपने

भाषण में यह कहा है कि देश का होशियार रहने और मजबूत बनाने की जरूरत है, लेकिन देश को होशियार रहना है और मजबूत बनाना है, तो वह कैसे बनाना है, ऐसा कुछ उस भाषण में उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है। इस वास्ते जब हम इस प्रस्ताव को देखते हैं तो हम समझते हैं कि इस देश में अनाज की कमी, घटता हुआ औद्योगिक उत्पादन, बढ़ते हुए मूल्य, विदेशी मुद्रा का संकट और गलत आर्थिक नीति, भारत-पाक संघर्ष और सब और अकाल पड़ गया है, फमीन पड़ गया है, इस वास्ते इन सब के कारण हम बरबादी के किनारे खड़े हैं, ऐसा महसूस होता है।

मैं सब से पहले देश की खाद्यान्न स्थिति तथा उत्पादन की ओर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करता हूँ। इस देश में अनाज की इतनी कमी हो गई है कि बाहर से 1965 तक 636 लाख टन अनाज का आयात करना पड़ा, उस का मूल्य 2.634 करोड़ रुपया हो गया। हालांकि तीन योजनाओं में काफी पैसा सिबाई पर खर्च करने के बाद भी इस अनाज लाने के भाड़े पर 70 करोड़ रुपया खर्च होगा, ऐसा कहा गया है। तो मैं ऐसा समझता हूँ कि इतना रुपया खर्च होने पर भी, 8 प्रतिशत की इस देश में कमी है, इस देश में अनाज क्यों नहीं बढ़ सकता है, जब कि 70 प्रतिशत लोग हमारे यहां अनाज पैदा करने वाले आश्रितकार हैं। हमारी 70 प्रतिशत आबादी का व्यवसाय कृषि है, जब कि अमरीका की 17 प्रतिशत आबादी, कॅनेडा की 11 प्रतिशत और आस्ट्रेलिया की 13 प्रतिशत आबादी खेती बाड़ी का काम करती है। फिर भी हमें अनाज की जरूरत पड़ती है। उस का मुख्य कारण यह है कि देश के मुख्य मंत्री अपने पास होम मनिस्ट्री रखना चाहते हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने कभी भी खेती, एग्रीकल्चर अपने पास नहीं रखा। वह ऐसा समझते हैं कि यर्ड स्नाम डिपार्टमेंट है, इस वास्ते एग्रीकल्चर पर कोई भी मुख्य मंत्री ध्यान देने को तैयार नहीं है। मुख्य मंत्रियों ने जहां जहां भ्रमण पड़ा है, होम मनिस्ट्री किस के

पास रखी गई है, पुलिस किस के पास रहेगी, इस पर ध्यान दिया है।

मैं जहां से चुन कर आया हूँ, मध्य प्रदेश की स्थिति आप से कहता हूँ। अर्थात् 43 जिलों में से 23 या 21 जिलों में अकाल पड़ गया है और उस के बाद जिन जिलों में अकाल घोषित किया गया है, उन्हीं जिलों में लैबी का भी हुक्म निकाला गया है, लैबी देनी पड़ेगी और लैबी नहीं दी तो डिफेंस आफ इण्डिया एक्ट के अन्तर्गत तीन साल की उस को सजा होगी, ऐसा उस के साथ सर्कुलर निकाला गया है। हर एक ग्राम सरपंच को कहा गया है कि यदि लैबी कोई आश्रितकार नहीं देगा, कोई किसान नहीं देगा तो उस को तीन साल की सजा डिफेंस आफ इण्डिया एक्ट में होगी। हमारे किसान भाई सब जगह कहते हैं कि हम को खाना तो देते नहीं हो, हम लैबी कहाँ से दें। इधर अकाल घोषित कर दिया है और उसी जिले में आप कहते हैं कि लैबी देनी चाहिये, और अगर लैबी नहीं दी तो फिर उस को तीन साल की सजा देंगे

श्री इयाननाल सरौफ (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : जिन के पास होगा वह देंगे।

श्री बड़े : मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि गिरदावर हुए, पटवारी हुए, जो गिरदावरी में मिश्रते हैं कि पांच या दस एकड़ में ज्वार बोई है, इसलिये पचास किलो लैबी ज्वार उन को देनी पड़ेगी, यदि नहीं दी तो जेल जाना होगा। मैं ने मुख्य मंत्री जी को इस बारे में पत्र लिखा है कि दस एकड़ ज्वार उम ने जरूर बोई है, लेकिन यह भी देखना चाहिये कि पकी कितनी है, फसल कितनी हुई है, इस की पटवारी में जांच करानी चाहिये, रिपोर्ट मंगानी चाहिये। इस की तरफ शासन ने कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। बी०डी०घो०, पटवारी, पुलिस सब किसान को जा कर कहने है कि तुम इतनी लैबी दो। आप बताये कि जब उनकी फसल हो नहीं पकी है तो वे लैबी कहाँ से दे सकते हैं। मजबूर हो कर उन को साहकार की शरण लेनी पड़ती है

[श्री बड़े]

श्रीर अपने प्रानामिंटस वगैरह गिरवी रख कर लेवो भरनी पड़ती है। इस तरह के उदाहरण भी मैंने मुख्य मंत्री के पास वहां भेजे हैं। इस प्रकार में एक अतंक उन में पुलिस ने फैला दिया है उसी प्रकार शासन का हाल है। कलकटर वगैरह का क्या हाल है, इस को भी आप देखें। वे तो मुगल एम्परर अपने आप को समझने लग गये हैं। एक विचित्र प्रकार की मशीनरी तैयार हो गई है। आज के इस वैज्ञानिक युग में ह्वील के अन्दर ह्वील श्रीर चक्र के अन्दर चक्र चल रहा है। शासन में पहले तो मुख्य मंत्री है, फिर उस के बाद उस के नीचे सफ़ेदारी है, फिर कमिश्नर है, कमिश्नर के बाद कलकटर है, कलकटर के बाद तहसीलदार है श्रीर तहसालदार के बाद नायब तहसीलदार है। तहसीलदार श्रीर नायब तहसालदार ने भी अपनी अपनी तहसील में ज्वार की मूवमेंट श्रीर कोर्स ग्रेन की मूवमेंट बन्द कर दी है। बाहर के जिलों से ये प्रेंज हमारे जिले में आ नहीं सकते हैं। जिला बन्दो कर दी गई है। इस का नतीजा यह है कि लोगों को खाने के लिये नहीं मिलता है। इस परिस्थिति के निवारण के लिए, इस समस्या के हल में मदद प्राप्त करने के लिए धरर कोई सरपंच आता है कलकटर के पास तो उस से कहा जाता है कि तुम बिना इजाजत कैसे आ गए हो, चिट्ठी लिख कर भेजो श्रीर धरर आप को अनाज लेना है तो आप दूसरे के पास जाओ। हमारी जेब में अनाज नहीं पड़ा हुआ है। वे बेचारे दिन भर बैठ कर वापिस चले जाते हैं। धरर कहीं कलकटर बाहर नहीं जाता है तो लोग नाराज हो कर यहां तक कहने लग जाते हैं कि इन की मुट्ठी भर गई है, इनको पान सुपारी मिल गई है, इसलिए इन्होंने व्यापारी की साइड लेनी शुरू कर दी है। मैं कहता हूँ कि धरर अनाज के लिए झुंड के झुंड आते हैं तो आपको नाराज नहीं होना चाहिये, लोग धरर कोई गलत बात कहते हैं तो शासन को गम नहीं होना चाहिये। यह मैंने कनेक्टर्ज को भी कहा था। मैंने दो

तीन कनेक्टर्ज को यह भी कहा था कि उनकी बीबियां धरर मेरी बीबी धरर क्यू में खड़ी हो तो पता चल सकता है कि लोगों को किन किन तकलीफों का सामना करना पड़ता है। दो दो धरर तीन तीन रोज तक अनाज नहीं मिलता है। जब ऐसी हालत पैदा हो जाती है तो आप अनुमान लगा सकते हैं कि कि कैसी स्थिति पैदा हो सकती है। वहां पर स्थिति भयंकर रूप में प्रकट हो चुकी है। हमारे यहां के किसानों का एक तो अनाज पका नहीं, श्रीर दूसरे पैकेज प्रोड्राम में बी० डी० प्रो० वगैरह ने उनमें यह प्रचार किया था कि वे केवल कपास, मूंगफली वगैरह ही बोयें। लेकिन कपास श्रीर मूंगफली का एक दाना भी नहीं हुआ है। मूंगफली भी नहीं आयी है। अब उनको यह कहा जाता है कि उनको अनाज नहीं मिलेगा, जो खेती करते हैं उनके लिए अनाज का प्रबन्ध नहीं किया जायगा। जब उनका अनाज पका नहीं तो शासन को उनके लिए क्या अनाज की व्यवस्था नहीं करनी चाहिये। केवल नगरपालिकाओं के क्षेत्रों में ही अनाज मिलता है। बाहर जो किसान हैं उनको अनाज नहीं मिलता है। उनके लिये कोई राशन कार्ड भी नहीं बनाये गये हैं श्रीर न ही उनको कोई राशन कार्ड दिये जाते हैं। मैंने मुख्य मंत्री को लिखा कि यहां भी अनाज दिनाश्री तो बड़ी मुश्किल से उन्होंने एक आर्डर निकाला कि एक परिवार में चाहे पांच व्यक्ति हों या आठ या दस, सात किलो ज्वार एक महीने में मिलेगी। सात किलो ज्वार धरर एक महीने में दी जाती है तो आप हिसाब लगा कर देख सकते हैं कि एक प्राणी के हिस्से एक धाम भी नहीं आती है हर रोज। केरल के लोगों को आपने चावल दे दिया। वहां भी चावल नहीं मिलता था या कम मिलता था। तो पूरा चावल पाने का तरीका यह है कि वायलेंस किया जाए, ईट पत्थर बरसाये जायें, एजीटेशन की जाए। धरर आप यही चाहते हैं तो जिस दिन आदिवासी तीर कमान लेकर अपने बरछे ले कर निकलेंगे तो क्या बनेगा देश का, क्या स्थिति तब पैदा होगी, कुछ

कहा नहीं जा सकता है। जहां जहां क्रान्तियां हुई हैं, भूख को ले कर और अष्टाचार को लेकर हुई हैं। अगर यहां भी लोगों की धापने खूब नहीं मिटाई अगर इसकी तरफ शासन ने तुरन्त ध्यान नहीं दिया तो यहां भी बहुत भयंकर क्रान्ति हो जाएगी। धीरे धीरे लोग यह कहने लग गये हैं कि कम्युनिस्ट लोग घण्टे हैं। कम से कम वे कलेक्टर के पास जा कर उनके दफ्तर में इंटें परधर तो फेंक धाते हैं। वे इस पर भरोसा करने लग गए हैं, वे यह सोचने लग हैं कि यह जो कांग्रेस देबता है वह बात से नहीं मानता है, वह सात से मानता है। हम वास्ते इसको सात मारने के लिए तैयार हो जाओ पत्थर मारने के लिए तैयार हो जाओ, तांडफोड़ करने के लिए तैयार हो जाओ। इस तरह की चीज को धाप रोक नहीं सकते हैं। यहां पर एक ग्राम ज्वार रोख एक प्राणी के हिस्से भाती है। इसके विरुद्ध धाप यह देखें कि मूर्खी पालन केन्द्रों में भी उनको रोज तीन किलो घनाज मिलता है। इतना ही नहीं जो अपराधी है, जो अपराध के सिलसिले में जेल गए होते हैं, उनको जेल में भी पाव भर घनाज मिलता है। हम लोगों ने कोई अपराध नहीं किया होता है लेकिन हमको एक ग्राम ही मिलता है। अपराध कर के जेल जायें और वहां जाकर घनाज लें तो क्या धाप इसको ठीक समझेंगे ?

इसी तरह से तेल का धाप लें। तेल तीन और चार रुपये किलो के हिसाब से हमारे यहां बिकता है। अगर किसी धादि-बासी को यह कह दिया जाता है कि वह धापने छिद्र के बालों पर तो तेल लगायें और पूछा जाता है कि उसने तेल क्यों नहीं लगाया है तो वह जबाब देता है कि बालों के लिए तेल कहां से वह लाये जब कि उसके पेट के अन्दर तेल नहीं जाता है। इस प्रकार की भबंकर स्थिति वहां उत्पन्न हो गई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस की ओर सरकार का ध्यान जाना चाहिये।

सरकार यह नारा लगाती है कि हुए बनाओ सिबाई की व्यवस्था से नाश उठाओ

ट्यूबवैल बनाओ, लेकिन धाप देखें कि चम्बल की बिजली ही नहीं मिलती है। चम्बल की बिजली फेल हो गई है। हुए खांदने के लिए यह कहा जाता है कि उनको पैसे मिल सकते हैं लेकिन जब किसान बैंक में जाता है तो पहले तो उसको जमानत देने के लिए कहा जाता है और अगर किसान तरह से वह जमानत दे भी देता है तो उसको जबाब मिल जाता है कि पैसा नहीं है, हम नहीं दे सकते हैं। धापने नारा तो लगा दिया, लेकिन सिबाई के लिये पैसे की धाप व्यवस्था नहीं करते हैं। पैसे हमारी गवर्नमेंट के पास है ही नहीं। वह बैंकरेंट गवर्नमेंट हो गई है। उसने वहां पर घाटे का बजट पेश किया है। उसने केन्द्र में पोवरट्टा किया है। वह कहती है कि उसके पास पैसा नहीं है कहां से वे पैसा दें ? ऐसी व्यवस्था में कैसे सिबाई हो सकती है।

धापने यह कहा था कि धाप जमानत लोगों को देंगे ताकि धान की पैदावार बढ़ाई जा सके। जंगलों में पड़ती पड़ी हुई भूमि या दूसरी जो पड़ती भूमि है वह लोगों को देंगे। लेकिन जहां तक मैं जानता हूँ कि एक टंच जर्मान भी मध्य प्रदेश में शासन ने किसी को नहीं दी है। हमारे राधे ज्ञान व्यास जी बड़ा बेट हुए हैं। उनको भी यह मामूख हांगा और वह भी बता सकते हैं कि यह बात बुझत है या नहीं। एक टंच भूमि भी किसी किसान को ज्यादा धान पैदा करने के लिए नहीं दी गई है। किसान बेचारे क्या कर सकते हैं किसान भटकते फिरते हैं। बाइबल में कहा गया है।

When they want fish, you give them serpents. When they want bread you give them stones. Here when they want bread, you give them bullets.

इस प्रकार की स्थिति है। उनको जब वे मांग करते हैं तो पुलिस पकड़ लेती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह जो जिला बन्दी है इसको खत्म किया जाए। कनेक्टर साहब की जो मन मानी चलती है, उसको रोका जाए। तहसीलदार भी धापने धापको राजा सम्भलता

[श्री बड़े]

है। उसको भी ऐसा समझने से रोका जाए। जिला बन्दी तोड़ने से बहुत सुविधा हो जाएगी। इससे मूवमेंट आफ प्रेन होगा। जहां पर फाल्सू प्रेन पढ़ा हुआ है वहां से वह उन जिलों में जाएगा जहां इसकी कमी है।

यदि आप यह समझते हैं कि बहुत से व्यापारी ऐसे हैं जो भनाज होड़ करते हैं तो मैं कहता हूँ कि उनके खिलाफ आप एक्शन क्यों नहीं लेते हैं। उनके खिलाफ एक्शन लिया जाना चाहिये। यह तो डी० आई० शासन है। यह तो बड़ी आसानी से एक्शन ले सकता है।

जहां तक मध्य प्रदेश का सम्बन्ध है, वहां होडिंग नहीं हुआ है। इसका कारण यह है कि वहां भनाज पका ही नहीं। वहां भनाज पहुंचाने के लिए शासन ने क्या किया है यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। आप बाहर से जो भनाज आ रहा है उसको वहां भेज सकते हैं। परसों मैंने पूछा था कि क्या आपके पास मध्य प्रदेश का कोई लैटर भ्राया है, वहां के फूड मिनिस्टर श्री शर्मा का कोई लैटर भ्राया है तो मुझे यह जवाब दिया गया कि अगर भ्राया होगा तो मैं उसको देखूंगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार हमारी तरफ नहीं देखती है। इसका कारण यह है कि वहां पर कम्युनिस्टों सरीखे लोग नहीं हैं जो कि ईट पत्थर फेंक सकते हों। यदि इस प्रकार की गड़बड़ हो जाएगी, इस प्रकार से बायोलेस होगा तो जल्दी भनाज भेज देंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हो, इसका आपको इंतजार नहीं करना चाहिये। जल्दी भनाज आपके वहां भेजने की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। शासन की कपनी धीर करनी में जो अन्तर है, उसको शासन को दूर करना चाहिये। इस में बहुत फर्क है। अगर यह न हो तो जनता सूखी हो जाएगी। अगर ऐसा नहीं होता है और फर्क रहता है तो जनता में क्षोभ पैदा होगा, क्रान्ति पैदा हो जाएगी।

अब मैं ताशकंद डेक्लेरेशन पर आता हूँ। आपने कहा है कि ताशकंद डेक्लेरेशन से बहुत आसानी हो गई है बहुत सुविधा हो गई है। हमारे श्री दांडेकर साहब ने कहा है ओइम शान्ति, शान्ति, शान्ति। शान्ति का जहां तक ताल्लूक है, वह तीन जगह चाहिये। शान्ति पेट में चाहिये, शान्ति लोगों में चाहिये और शान्ति देश में चाहिये। शान्ति पेट में है नहीं यह मैं आपको अभी बता चुका हूँ। शान्ति देश में भी नहीं है, इसको भी आप जानते हैं। अभी अभी बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी में पुलिस को लड़कों पर गोली चलानी पड़ी थी। इस तरह से जो गोलीबारी होता है युवकों पर, तो जो नवयुवक हैं वे कांग्रेस के शासन के विरुद्ध हो गए हैं। किसान भी कांग्रेस के विरुद्ध हो गए हैं। बड़े बड़े शब्दों में एडवर्टिजमेंट निकाल कर लोगों से कहा जाता है कि उनके लिये हम जल्दी भनाज भेज रहे हैं। बाहर से अन्न मंगाने पर आप पंसा खर्च कर रहे हैं। करोड़ों रुपया तो उसके परिवहन पर ही आपका खर्च हो रहा है। इससे शान्ति नहीं होगी। ताशकंद के बारे में आपने कहा है कि बी बिल फालो दी एप्रोमेंट इन स्पिरिट एंड लटर। स्पिरिट का क्या मतलब है? स्पिरिट कहां है? हाल ताशकंद ड्रामा का हीरो कहां है और वह कौन था वह थे लाल बहादुर शास्त्री। जूलिस सेजर में ऐसा हो गया कि जब जूलिस सेजर मारा गया तो उसके बाद उसकी स्पिरिट उस ड्रामे के पीछे काम करती थी। किसी प्रकार से शास्त्री जी का देहांत हो गया है तो क्या उनकी स्पिरिट यह काम करेगी? उन्होंने कहा था कि हम रहें या न रहें, दुनिया बेशक धर से उधर हो जाए यह गवर्नमेंट रहे या न रहे, हग हाजी पीर, कार्गिल और टिबबान से नहीं हटेंगे, कभी नहीं हटेंगे। क्या वही स्पिरिट बोलती है, उसी स्पिरिट में यह कहा था? आपने यह जो कहा था कि काश्मीर का वह हिंसा जो पाकिस्तान के पास है, हमारा है और

हम उसका लेंगे, क्या इसके पीछे भी वही स्पिरिट काम करती है ? क्या इसके पीछे जय जवान, जय किसान की स्पिरिट काम करती है ? क्या जवानों ने खून इसी वास्ते दिया था कि घ्राप वहां से हट जाय और ताशकन्द में जा कर इस तरह का समझौता कर लें .

श्री रामसेवक यादव : जय जवान, जय किसान नहीं, जय जवान घर चवन्नी ।

श्री बड़े : आज किसान "जय जवान जय किसान" को समझने लगा है । लेकिन इस के लिये ताशकन्द जाने की क्या जरूरत थी ? वह तो यहां भी हो सकता था । ताशकन्द जा कर गम्भीर परिस्थिति में, श्री शास्त्री की मृत्यु हुई है । इस के लिये जब श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री ने कहा तो उन के ऊपर साम्प्रदायिकता का इलजाम लगाया गया । लेकिन इस मूरत में तो ताशकन्द स्पिरिट यही कहेगी कि तुम बलवान बनो । जब बलवान बनोगे तभी शत्रु नीचे धारंगे और जो उसके विपरीत व जहरीले दांत हैं वह निकल सकेंगे । इस के लिये मैंने प्रमैडमेंट दिया है कि घ्राप ने सैनिक तैयारी के लिये क्या किया है ।

हम को एटम बम जरूर तैयार करना चाहिये । इस के लिये हमारे डा० भाभा ने कहा था—डा० भाभा की मृत्यु हो गई है इस का हमें दुख है—कि चीन के पास जो फौज है वह 30 लाख है, उस की हवाई फौज में 3,000 जहाज हैं, 30 पनडुब्बियां हैं और उसने एटम बम बना लिया है । हम रा पहले से यह कहना रहा है कि इस के लिये घ्राप की और से कुछ नहीं किया गया है । इस भयनक शक्ति का सामना करने के लिये घ्राप की तैयारी नहीं हुई है । पिछली नड़ाई में हमारे इतने लाल मरे हैं । एक लाल तो लाल बहादुर शास्त्री थे जो कि ताशकन्द में मरे, लेकिन मोर्चों पर

हमारी माताओं के लाल मर गये, उन की कोख खाली हो गई, हजारों के सिन्दूर पीछ गये, महिलाओं की चूड़ियां टूटीं । क्या इस का सामना करने के लिये घ्राप के यहां एटम बम बनेगा या नहीं ? घ्राप इस को देखिये कि चीन ने पिछले सोलह सालों से तयारी की है, पाकिस्तान के पास बारह सालों में अमरीका से 800 करोड़ रुपये की फौजी सहायता आई है । भाभा साहब कहते थे कि बहुत सस्ते में एटम बम बन सकता है । उन्होंने 4 अक्टूबर, 1964 को जेनेवा में अपने भाषण में कहा था कि अमर भारत सरकार चाहे तो मैं 18 मास में एटम बम बना सकता हूं और उन को हमारे जहाजों से फेंका जा सकता है । लेकिन एटम बम बनाने के बारे में सरकार की तरफ से कोई रिफरेंस नहीं है कि क्या किया जायेगा । फौजों के बारे में नेफा में सन् 1962 में जो फौजीहिता हुआ उस से सरकार की आँखें खुलीं । स्वर्गीय श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री हमारे लीह पुरु थे । मैं उन को धन्यवाद देता हूं कि वह साहीर गये लेकिन लाहीर जाने के बाद उन्होंने लाहीर को लिया क्यों नहीं उसका कारण यह बतलाया गया कि लाहीर में एक बहुत बड़ी स्पिरिट रह रही थी कि मैंने पाकिस्तान बनाया. तुम लाहीर में कैसे आते हो । वह स्पिरिट थी पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू की । वह कहते थे कि हमने पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान बनाया, वहां तुम क्या आते हो । इस लिये लाहीर नहीं लिया गया । ऐसा कहने पर कुछ कांग्रेसी लोग नाराज हो गये थे । लेकिन उम के लिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे यहां नवयुवकों को, जितने भी एबल बाड़ी लोग हैं उन को फौजी शिक्षा दी जाये । लेकिन उस के बारे में भी अधिभाषण में कोई चर्चा नहीं है । आज देश में फौजी शिक्षा देने के लिये कोई प्लान नहीं है, उस के लिये कोई तैयारी नहीं है ।

यहां पर तैयारी किस चीज के लिये होती है ? बिगट नाम के बारे में । हमारे

[श्री बड़े]

कम्यूनिस्ट मित्र कहते हैं कि वियट नाम में अमरीका बार्म्बिंग क्यों करता है ? इसके खिलाफ हमारी गवर्नमेंट घोषणा नहीं उठाती । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम को क्या चाहिए कि यह हिन्दुस्तान के इंटरेस्ट है या नहीं और कौन सी बात सैल्फ इंटरेस्ट के खिलाफ है जाती है । संसद इंटरेस्ट शुद्ध ही काइंटरेयिन उस के खिलाफ हमें नहीं जाना चाहिए । आज हमारे कम्यूनिस्ट मित्र यह क्यों नहीं कहते कि वियट नाम से चाइना को भी निकलना चाहिए और अमेरिका को भी निकलना चाहिए । जिस प्रकार का नारा वह लगाते हैं उस से काम नहीं चल सकता । यह कहना कि वियट नाम में अमेरिका बोधी है इस में अमरीका भी नाराज होता है और एशिया भी हम से नाराज होता है । पाकिस्तान से अग्ने रिजलन्स पहले से ही स्ट्रन्ड हैं, चाइना ने आक्रमण कर रखा है । परसों श्री द्विवेदी ने डिमिलिट्राइज्ड जोन के बारे में कहा था कि उस पर चाइना ने आक्रमण कर दिया है । जब लिमिट्राइज्ड एरिया पर आक्रमण होता है तो उसके ऊपर हमारे कम्यूनिस्ट मित्र क्यों नहीं बोलते मैं समझता हूँ कि वियटनाम के ऊपर बोलते हुए हमें देखना चाहिए कि हमारा इंटरेस्ट किस में है । अगर अमरीका के खिलाफ बोलने से होगा तो बैसा करना चाहिये और चाइना के खिलाफ बोलने से होगा तो बैसा करना चाहिये । एक रिपोर्ट है कि चाइना ने भी अपनी मिलिटरी वियट नाम में भेजी है । हम को कहना चाहिये कि चाइना को भी वहाँ से निकलना चाहिये और अमरीका को भी वहाँ से निकलना चाहिये । उस के बाद वियट नाम जो चाहे वह करे ।

इसी तरह से मैं समझता हूँ कि चाइना का जो आक्रमण हमारे ऊपर हो रहा है उस में हम को डर है । नाशकन्द ऐग्रीमेंट से हम को यह नहीं समझना चाहिये कि पाकिस्तान का डर खत्म हो गया । पाकिस्तान साफ

कहता है कि काश्मीर डिस्पूटेड टेरिटरी है । जिस रोज ताशकन्द ऐग्रीमेंट पर सिग्नेचर हुए उस की स्याही भूख भी नहीं पाई थी कि वहाँ के फारेन सेक्रेटरी अजीज अहमद ने कह दिया कि "बै इ नाट इन्क्लूड इन्क्लूटेडस" । 14 जनवरी और 16 जनवरी को भुट्टो कहते हैं कि काश्मीर डिस्पूटेड एरिया है नहीं तो हम ने 370 आर्टिकल क्यों रखा है ? हम यू० एन० घो० गये थे या नहीं ? हम ने सीज फायर किया या नहीं ? इस लिये यह डिस्पूटेड एरिया है । चाइना भारत के ऊपर आक्रमण करने की तैयारी कर रहा है और उस के पाम एंटम बम भी है जिस के विक्रम राष्ट्र को अपनी सुरक्षा करनी है । यह तैयारी भी इस तरह से करनी चाहिये कि एक तरफ तो फौजी तैयारी करनी चाहिये, शस्त्र का निमोषण करना चाहिये और उस के साथ साथ अन्न की वजह से जो क्षीम उत्पन्न हो गया है उस को भी शासन को ठीक करना चाहिये । खाली सामाजवाद का नारा लगा कर काम नहीं चलेगा । समाजवाद का नारा लगाने से हमारा पेट भी नहीं भर सकता । हमें खाने के लिये अन्न चाहिए । आज केन्द्रीय सरकार का ध्यान मध्य प्रदेश की खाद्य स्थिति की तरफ नहीं है, राजस्थान की खाद्य स्थिति की तरफ नहीं है । उन का ध्यान केरल की तरफ या ब्रेस्ट बंगाल की तरफ जाता है क्योंकि वहाँ की सरकारों पर पत्थर चलते हैं और लोग अन्न को छूट कर लेते हैं । मैं हाउस के सामने कहना चाहता हूँ कि बैनी स्थिति मध्य प्रदेश में हो रही है, और अगर इस स्थिति को सुधारा नहीं गया तो हमारे वहाँ भी डूमा केरल बन जायेगा ।

श्री बाजी (इन्दौर) : कृपे तभी यह लोग मानेंगे ।

श्री बड़े : दाजी साहब हमारा साथ देंगे तो हम जरूर करेंगे ।

श्री प्र० प्र० शर्मा (बकसर) : उपा-
ध्यक्ष महोदय, संसद के दोनों सदनों की
संयुक्त बैठक में दिये गये राष्ट्रपति के
अभिभाषण के ऊपर जो धन्यवाद का
प्रस्ताव हमारे भाई श्री देशमुख ने प्रस्तुत
किया है मैं उस पर समर्थन करने के
लिये उपस्थित हुआ हूँ। लेकिन राष्ट्रपति
के अभिभाषण में कई एक बातें ऐसी
हैं जिन का उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है
और उन के संबंध में मैं इस सदन का
ध्यान खास तौर से आकर्षित करना
चाहता हूँ।

इस समय देश के सामने सब से बड़ी
खमस्या खास की है, गल्ले की कमी की
है। इस संबंध में विरोध पक्ष की तरफ
से अभी जो भाषण श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती का
सदन में हुआ उस से मुझे कोई आश्चर्य
नहीं हुआ। मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ
सारे देश के लोग मानते हैं, और मेरा
ख्याल है कि विरोधी पक्ष के लोग भी
मानते हैं कि आज देश में गल्ले की कमी
है। लेकिन खान यह है कि इस गल्ले
की कमी को हम किस तरह से पूरा कर
सकते हैं, अपने ही देश में
उत्पादन बढ़ा कर के या दूसरे देशों
से जिस तरह से हम गल्ला मंगवा रहे
हैं उसी तरह से मंगवा कर आज
जोनों में गल्ले की कमी की वजह से
उत्तेजना फैल रही है, परेशानी बढ़
रही है, दिक्कतें बढ़ रही हैं, यह बिल्कुल
स्पष्ट है। खास तौर से कुछ दिन पहले
फैरल के संबंध में इस सदन में बहस
हुई। बंगाल में भी गल्ले की कमी की
वजह से हानत खराब हो रही है।
लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि देश के जितने
भी सूबे हैं उन सब में करण करीब बेसी
ही हानत है। खास मंत्री ने खास तौर
पर कहा कि जिन को सर्वन्वय म्यूटम कहा
जाता है उन के अन्दर भी अब यह

कहा जाने लगा है कि उन के यहाँ गल्ले
का अभाव है। ऐसी स्थिति में हमारे
देश के अंदर अपनी कोशिशों से, अपनी
मेहनत से गल्ले का अधिक से अधिक
उत्पादन किया जाय, इस में कोई दो
राय नहीं है। लेकिन मुझे दुःख इस
बात का है कि गत वर्ष भी राष्ट्रपति के
अभिभाषण पर और उस के पहले के
वर्ष भी मैं ने सरकार का ध्यान इस
की तरफ आकर्षित किया था कि देश
के अंदर बहुत सी ऐसी जगह हैं। मैं
खास तौर पर अपने सूबे के संबंध में
कहना चाहता हूँ और इस संबंध में
मैंने एक छोटी सी योजना अपने अंश
के संबंध में जो कि गंगा के किनारे
पर है और जहाँ की भूमि बहुत उबरा
है, सरकार के सामने रखी थी।
वहाँ पर 1 लाख 35 हजार एकड़
बमीन है जिसमें सिंचाई की कोई भी
ब्यवस्था नहीं है। अगर वहाँ पर लघु
सिंचाई योजनाओं के जरिये सिंचाई की
ब्यवस्था की जाय तो सिर्फ उस छोटे
से पीकट में कम से कम 35-36 हजार
टन एक फसल में पैदावार बढ़ सकती है।
मेरा जिला सरप्लस डिस्ट्रिक्ट है हमारे
सूबे के अन्दर। अगर छोटी सिंचाई की
योजनाओं की तरफ ध्यान दिया गया होता
खास तौर से दस से पन्द्रह हजार तक
ट्यूबवेल और पम्पिंग सेट जिनकी कीमत
40-45 करोड़ रुपये हीनी थी, अगर
सगा दिये गये होते तो पिछले एक वर्ष के
अन्दर जो रबी की फ़ाप हुई है या
जाने जाने वाली जो गन्ध की फ़ाप
हीनी मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ,
जहाँ तक हमारे सूबे में जो गल्ले की कमी है,
13-14 लाख टन की, उसकी तो पूर्ती नहीं
होती बल्कि 13-14 लाख टन और
अधिक गल्ला उत्पादन एक वर्ष में करके हम
दूसरे सूबों को भेज सकती थे।

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Send it to Kerala.

Shri A. P. Sharma: I would have sent it. In spite of the deficit, we have sent 5,000 tons rice to Kerala. तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि सरकार का ध्यान इस तरफ जाना चाहिये। लेकिन दुःख इस बात का है कि जहां पर सरकार दूसरे देशों से गल्ला मंगाली है करोड़ों रुपया खर्च करके वहां अपने देश के अन्दर खास तौर से 66-67 वर्ष के लिये एक खास योजना बनाने के लिये इंतजाम किया गया था और कहा गया था ...

श्री रामसेवक यादव : कमीशन नहीं मिलेगा उनको।

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा : मैंने अपनी कांग्रेस पार्टी की संसदीय कार्यकारिणी जो है उसमें भी इस सवाल को उठाया था और हमारे भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री लालबहादुर शास्त्री जी ने कहा था मैं उन्हीं के शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूँ उन्होंने कहा था कि बिहार और यू० पी० के लिये तो पानी ही प्राण है अगर सिंचाई की सुहायता वहां लोगों को दी जायें तो लोग अपनी जगह में सेल्फ सफिशियेंट हो सकेंगे, अधिक से अधिक गल्ले का उत्पादन बढ़ा सकेंगे, बल्कि इतना ज्यादा बढ़ायेंगे कि अपनी जरूरत से ज्यादा हो जायेगा और वह दूसरी जगहों को भेज सकेंगे। लेकिन सरकार ने इसकी तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया। बल्कि दूसरी तरफ हमारे कृषि मंत्री ने 5 सौ करोड़ रुपया का अमेरिकी

के साथ डील किया फर्टिलाइजर के लिये और उसको छूट दी कि वे अगले सात वर्ष तक जैसा चाहें, जिस रेट में चाहें बेच सकते हैं। फर्टिलाइजर का उत्पादन देश में होना चाहिये, चाहे प्राइवेट सेक्टर में हो या पब्लिक सेक्टर में हो इस विवाद में मैं पढ़ना नहीं चाहता, मैंने सीमेंट के डीकंट्रोल के प्रश्न पर बोलते हुए कहा था कि जब तक कांग्रेस पार्टी ने और देश की सरकार ने मिक्सड एकोनामी की पालीसी को अख्तियार किया है, उस पालीसी के मुताबिक चाहे वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर में उत्पादन बढ़ाये या पब्लिक सेक्टर में बढ़ाये, इसके अगड़े में मैं पढ़ना नहीं चाहता लेकिन हमें इस बात को देखना होगा ...

श्री रामसेवक यादव : चावल ज्यादा होना चाहिये कि खचड़ी मिकरड एकोनामी में:

श्री अ० प्र० शर्मा : वह तो जब आपकी सरकार होगी तो कौसी नीति बनायेंगे, वह हम देखेंगे। अभी तो जो नीति है उसके संबंध में मैं कह रहा हूँ।

तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि जहां पर उत्पादन बढ़ाने की बात है, अपने देश में गल्ले पैदा करने की बात है और दूसरे देशों के ऊपर निर्भर नहीं रहने की बात है, उस के संबंध में मैं कह रहा था कि सिंचाई की व्यवस्था और फर्टिलाइजर इन दोनों चीजों के बीच में हमें देखना होगा कि किसकी आवश्यकता पहले है। मैंने आगे भी यह कहा कि फर्टिलाइजर के ऊपर अगर ज्यादा जोर दिया गया और सिंचाई के कामों को नेग्लेक्ट किया गया, उसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं दिया

गया तो ननीजा यह होगा कि प्राज जो सरप्लस स्टेटस है और जहां सिचाई की अधिक में अधिक व्यवस्था है वही पर इसका उपयोग हो सकता है और जो डेफिसिट एरिया है, जहां पर सिचाई की व्यवस्था नहीं है, उत्पादन नहीं होगा, वह बराबर डेफिसिट ही बने रहेंगे और दूसरों की तरफ उनको बराबर देखना पड़ेगा।

इस संबंध में मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह है गल्ले के वितरण का सवाल। प्राज फूड जोन जो सूबों के स्तर पर बना हुआ है, सूबाबाइज जो फूड जोन बना हुआ है उससे हो सकता है कि जहां पर गल्ला अधिक पैदा होता हो वहां के लोगों की आवश्यकताओं की पूर्ति होती हो लेकिन दूसरे क्षेत्रों के अन्दर जैसे केरल का जिक्र हुआ प्राज बंगाल का सवाल हमारे देश के सामने है और इसी तरह से जितने भी ऐसे सूबे हैं जहां गल्ले के उत्पादन की कमी है वहां का सवाल उत्पन्न हो सकता है। तो ऐसी हाज्ज में हमें देखना है कि देश में जो कुछ भी हम पैदा करते हैं चाहे वह गल्ला हो या और कुछ हो उसका वितरण ठीक प्रकार से हो। अब हमारे सूबे के अन्दर मिनिरल रिसोर्सेस बहुत अधिक हैं, कोयले का उत्पादन होता है, लोहे का उत्पादन होता है अगरे बिहार के लांग यह कहें कि हम माइका और कोयला दूसरे सूबों में नहीं भेज सकते हैं, तो यह अनुचित बात होगी। देश के अंदर जो भी चीज उत्पन्न होती है, राष्ट्रपति जी ने कहा कि हम इन्क्विटिगल डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन का इंतजाम कर रहे हैं, मैं कहना हूँ कि गल्ले के इन्क्विटिबल डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन की बात प्राप करते हैं, लेकिन मैं तो गल्ला पैदा करने के जो साधन हैं, गल्ला पैदा करने की जो सुविधायें हैं उनके इन्क्विटिबल डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन की बात

करता हूँ। अगरे एक जगह उबादा सुविधा मिले गल्ला उत्पन्न करने के लिये और दूसरी जगह कोई सुविधा न हो तो ऐसी हालत में लोगों के बीच में एक बदधमनी फैलती है, लोगों के दिख में बेइमानी पैदा होती है और भाखीर में चल कर के जो सारा भारत एक देश है उसको एकता में भी खलल पहुंचती है। अगरे हम देश में एक समाज वासी व्यवस्था कायम करना चाहते हैं, बड़े और छोटे के बीच के भेदभाव मिटाना चाहते हैं। तो ऐसी हालत में एक सूबे और दूसरे सूबे के बीच में गल्ले के मूवमेंट के ऊपर हम इकाइयट डालेंगे और दूसरे देशों से, विदेशों से हम गल्ला मंगावेंगे तो उससे लोगों में काफी गुस्ता पैदा होगा और उसमें देश का हित नहीं होगा। इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बाहर से गल्ला मंगाने पर ज्यादा जोर नहीं दे कर के जितनी जरूरत हो उतना मंगाया जाय, लेकिन अपने देश में अधिक से अधिक गल्ला कैसे उत्पन्न किया जा सकता है इसके ऊपर काफी ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए।

मैं दूसरी बात योजना के संबंध में कहना चाहता हूँ। योजना के हमारे उपाध्यक्ष साहब अभी हमारे मंत्री हो गये हैं, हमारी पार्टी से हमारी सरकार के

एक सामाजिक सवस्य : उनका बुद की योजना तो पूरी हो गई , देश की होगी या नहीं कौन जनता है ?

श्री प्र० प्र० शर्मा : यह जो योजनामें बन रही है, इनमें परिवर्तन होना चाहिए। लोगों के मस्तिष्क में, लोगों के दिमागों के समझ में आना चाहिये कि यह योजनायें जो हैं वह दिल्ली या पटना या कलकत्ता या मद्रास या बम्बई के लिये नहीं बनायी जाती हैं, योजनायें गांधी के लिये बनाई जाती हैं, जिलों के लिये बनाई जाती हैं और इस तरह

[श्री प्र० प्र० शर्मा]

बनाना चाहिये जिससे कि जो मध्यम वर्ग के जो लोग हैं, जो किसान हैं, जो मजदूर हैं, वह लोग महसूस कर सकें कि यह हमारी उन्नति के लिये योजना बनी है और उनको उन योजनाओं को कार्यान्वित करने का मौका मिलना चाहिये। दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज जो योजनाएँ बनती हैं, हो सकता है कि योजना बनाने वाले लोगों का दिमाग बिलकुल साफ हो, उनकी इच्छाएं बहुत बड़ी बड़ी हों, लेकिन जो योजना को कार्यान्वित करने वाले लोग हैं जो नौकरशाहों हैं, वह योजनाओं को बिलकुल बिफन बनाती चली जा रही है। आज ब्लाकों के अन्दर क्या हानन है? पंचायतों के अन्दर क्या हालत है? इस बात को देखते हुए हमें यह सोचना होगा कि हमारा योजना ऐसी होनी चाहिये जो सेक्टर प्रोरियेटेड योजना हो, जो फार्मर प्रोरियेटेड योजना हो और जिस योजना से लोगों को फायदा ही सके।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में यह दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारे देश के अंदर एक तरफ तो हमने जितने भी उद्योग हैं उनको पब्लिक सेक्टर में बनाने का निर्णय किया है, अधिक से अधिक प्रागे चल कर के शायद हमारा क्या है कि हम देश में पब्लिक सेक्टर ही रखेंगे, प्राइवेट सेक्टर नहीं रखेंगे लेकिन पब्लिक सेक्टर एक तरफ तो बढ़ता जा रहा है दूसरी तरफ जो पब्लिक सेक्टर में श्रम नाति बरती जाता है वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर से भी बहुत खराब है। दुनिया के बड़े बड़े अगड़े पंचायतों के जरिये तय किये जा सकते हैं और दो देशों के बीच में अगड़े पंचायत के जरिये तय किये जा सकते हैं लेकिन अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज पब्लिक सेक्टर के उद्योगों में खास तौर से जो सरकार के मैनजमेन्ट के

द्वारा चलाये जाते हैं जिनको डिपार्टमेंटली मैनज्ड इंडस्ट्रीज कहते हैं, जैसे रेलवे है, पी० एंड० टी० है डिफेंस इत्यादि हैं इनमें आज तक पिछले अठारह वर्षों से एक मत से सभी पार्टियों की तरफ से, सभी मजदूर दलों को एक गय से मांग करने के बाद भी मजदूर और मालिक का अगड़ा पब्लिक सेक्टर में पंचायतों के जरिये तय किया जाये, इसके लिये मजदूरों को पंचायत नहीं मिल सकी है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सचिव का समय समाप्त हो रहा है।

श्री प्र० प्र० शर्मा : एक मिनट और लूंगा। कीमतों के सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। कीमतों को कम करने की आज बड़ रही हैं। राष्ट्रपति जी ने कहा है कि कीमतों को कोशिश करने के बाद भी बढ़ रही हैं। अभी हाल में केन्द्रीय कर्मचारियों का सवाल आया था। देश में कर्मचारियों के अलावा आम जनता के सामने भी मंहगाई का सवाल है और यह कहा जाता है कि थोड़े से रुपयों का मंहगाई भत्ता देने से लोगों की जो मांग है वह पूरी नहीं होती है, लोगों की जो आशाएँ हैं वह पूरी नहीं होती हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आज से चार वर्ष पहले से ही राष्ट्रीय मजदूर कांग्रेस ने रेलवे में राष्ट्रीय रेलवे मजदूर संघ की तरफ से और दूसरी जो पार्टियाँ और मजदूर संगठन चलते हैं उन की तरफ से क्या यह मांग नहीं की गई सरकार के सामने कि मजदूरों को श्रमिकों की रूपियों की शकल में मंहगाई भत्ता न दे कर जो जीवनोपयोगी चीजें हैं, एसेंशियल कमाडिटीज और लाइफ जिन्ट्स कहते हैं जिन में चावल है, गेहूँ है, नमक है, चीनी है, तेल है, खाने पीने की चीजें हैं और कपड़ा है इन तमाम चीजों को सरत दर पर श्रमिकों को मुहैया किया जाय? लेकिन सरकार ने इस बात को स्वीकार नहीं किया और आज दुख के साथ फिर कहना पड़ता है कि सुबार्ड सरकारों के दबाव में आकर

स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स के घसर में घ्रा कर, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने जो सेक्रेड पे कमीशन की सिफारिशों को स्वीकार किया था, दास कमीशन की सिफारिश जो कि मंहगाई भत्ता देने के बारे में थी उस को पूरा पूरा स्वीकार नहीं किया था लेकिन सेक्रेड पे कमीशन जिसे कहते हैं उस को स्वीकार किया था और उस के मुताबिक कर्मचारियों को जो मंहगाई भत्ता देना था उस में भी युनीलेटरल, एक तरफा फैसला कर लिया और अपनी तरफ से उन के मंहगाई भत्ते में कमी की और नतीजा क्या हुआ? आज 25 करोड़ रुपया कर्मचारियों को देने के बाद भी सरकार ने निया क्या लोगों से? असंतोष लिया। सरकार ने असंतोष खरीदा 25 करोड़ रुपया अपने कर्मचारियों को दे कर। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब कभी भी ऐसा मौका मिला है तो सरकार को मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधियों से बात करनी चाहिए। पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों से बात करनी चाहिए। और एक ऐसा रास्ता निकालना चाहिए जिस से कि लोगों के बीच में संतोष हो, देश में संतोष हो। नहीं तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, नतीजा यह होगा कि जो हमारी विरोधी पार्टियों में हमारे भाई बैठे हुए हैं, उन का काम और तेजी से घ्रागे बढ़ेगा।

गल्ले की कमी होती है तो उस के लिये घान्डीलन होता है। सरकार की तरफ से जब गलती होती है तो मैं उस की निन्दा करता हूँ। मैं उन घादमियों में स हूँ कि सरकार में जाते हुए भी अगर सरकार कोई गलती करती है तो मैं उस की निन्दा करता हूँ। सरकार को कभी भी अपनी गलती नहीं खाना चाहिए। जैसा कि बंगाल में अभी हुआ था और जगह हुआ, मैं इन बातों का समर्थन करने के लिए नहीं खड़ा हुआ हूँ लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ मैं कहता हूँ कि जो खाद्यपत्र का सवाल है या जो मंहगाई का सवाल है घ्रां जो भी राष्ट्रीय सवाल है वह पार्टियों का सवाल बना कर उस से नाजायज हाथपा उठाने की कोशिश नहीं करनी चाहिए। लोगों का शोषण नहीं

करना चाहिए। देश में संतोष और शान्ति का वातावरण कायम करने और देश किमी तरह से उन्नति के रास्ते पर चल सके इसके लिए देखना सभी दलों का काम है। यह कोई एक विशेष पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। चकि सरकार घ्राज सत्ता में है इसलिये सरकार को काम चलाना पड़ता है लेकिन जैसे और राष्ट्रीय भवाल है जैसे पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध का सवाल था सभी लोगों ने मिल कर सहयोग किया तो हम उस में जीते। मुझे विश्वास है कि यह जो मुझाघ मैं ने घ्राप के जरिए और सदन के जरिए, राष्ट्रपति के अधिभाषण पर बोलते हुए सरकार के मामले रखे हैं, सरकार उन पर गौर करेगी और इस बात की कोशिश करेगी कि यह जो परेशानी में लोगों को उकसाने है भ्रगड़ा करने के लिये उन के उकसाने में न पड़ कर सरकार शान्त ढंग से इस बात को तय करने की कोशिश करेगी तभी हमारे देश की समस्याओं का समाधान ही सकता है।

Shri Manoharam (Madras South):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, "With an aristocratic face fraught with sweetness and charm, such is the woman. Deadened shyness and in addition a shining intelligence radiating from all her features, Indira Gandhi is the very type of the Hindu woman, standing in the background and yet firm".

"We come here to one of the greatest experiences of history. It is easy to be a woman wielding power and being a queen. But it is difficult to be a woman at the head of a State and having to reckon with Parliament. What will Mrs. Gandhi do? I bet that she will not be uneasy. She will win men over and the game will be played."

"I have the intuition that Nehru's daughter, Mrs. Gandhi will be greater than Nehru in her sphere. And I have another intuition. While politicians have failed in the Kashmir problem,

[Shri Manoharan]

Mrs. Indira Gandhi will solve to the amazement of the world, thus teaching the UNO a lesson."

"To judge by her photographs, Mrs. Indira Gandhi has an iron will, an insuperable trust in herself, not because she is Nehru's daughter, but by all she holds in herself."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this is not my opinion. This poetic encomium comes from a Mauritius poet, Mr. Malcolm DeChazal. I simply quote this, not with a view to flatter her, but with a positive view to tell her that she should not fall a prey to flattery and adulation and she should not allow herself to be dominated by insidious pressures exerted by frustrated politicians around her.

As our great President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, has rightly pointed out, when he said:

"Members of Parliament, a new Government has come into power led by one you all know and who belongs to the younger generation of freedom fighters."

I know, there are people around her who may not relish her becoming the Prime Minister of the country. I request the remnants of that order to condition if not curb their frustrated and disillusioned thoughts.

I hope that the dynamism which is a prerogative or monopoly right of the younger generation will guide her to the appointed goal, that being the nationalisation of industries, socialisation of the means of production and equal distribution and the elimination of the economic disparity from society.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: What a pity she is absent!

Shri Manoharan: That is invariably the case; I do not understand why.

Sir, at the outset I must say that I am thoroughly disappointed by the President's Address which has failed to mention anything about the lang-

uage issue which has been hanging in the air for the past 18 years or more. It cannot be forgotten what happened about the same time in the last year when this nation witnessed a tragedy of tremendous importance and the culmination of sacrifice that the nation witnessed in the form of selfless immolation. I request the Prime Minister that she should understand this issue and its magnitude. Last year about 150 of our people were killed and shot like dogs by the administration in the Madras State. Unless and until this language issue engages the attention of the Government, unless and until the national languages enshrined in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution are given equal right of parity, unless and until the national languages enshrined in the Constitution are given equal play in Parliament, nobody can say that the language issue is settled and solved. My only request to the Prime Minister today is to remember the blood of our martyrs.

The second issue which I want to touch upon today is the food problem in the country. Much has been said about what is going on in Kerala. The majority of Members from Kerala have explained the position very clearly.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: You are also from Kerala.

An hon. Member: He is from Madras.

Shri Manoharan: They think they can feed the people through statistics, through facts and figures. What is expected is not given and what is not expected is showered upon by these ruling Party people. This seems to be the basic quality of the democratic socialists of this administration. Today, in the morning, also Shrimati Renu Chakravarty explained very clearly that we demand food but what is given is nothing but bullets. This attitude should be changed especially when Shrimati Indira Gandhi is in power.

On this occasion, I want to draw the attention of this House to the act of stupidity to the core and the absurdity of the highest order of the then Governor, Mr. A. P. Jain who offered his resignation when Kerala was in test and tension, trouble and turmoil. He offered his resignation and he offered his explanation also. He said that he wanted to work for Shrimati Indira Gandhi's election. No where, in no country, we can find such an idiotic parallel and, I think, it was a clear case of a gross abuse of an exalted gubernatorial position. His was a breach of trust and an utter irresponsibility. His was a misbehaviour and a mismanagement. Hence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, drastic action is called for. What sort of an action? One of the leading journals of the country has suggested impeachment, if necessary. But my request to you and through you to the Government is that such men who play with the misery of people, with the trials and tribulations of the people, should be debarred from public life. Further, in this connection, I think. . .

Shri Vasudevan Nair: He is going to get a lift. Do you know it?

Shri Manoharan: That is understandable in the ruling Party. . . .

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): That is the greatest punishment, getting a lift as a Minister. . . . (Interruption).

Shri Manoharan: Why should that at all be? Why have the Governorship at all. It involves heavy expenditure. We have been telling our country—that is the stand of our Party also—that the Governorship should be abolished. What purpose is being served except the interests of frustrated politicians of the ruling Party? Therefore, I request the Prime Minister to consider this also.

Utilising this opportunity, I want to draw the attention of the Prime Minister, in particular, to a memorandum submitted by 11 Members of

Parliament against Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, the then Finance Minister, to the President. I do not know what has happened to that memorandum. Nothing has so far happened. The argument may be given that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari has already resigned. But the resignation of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari can never be taken as an answer to our memorandum. Therefore, I request the Prime Minister to see that a judicial inquiry is instituted under the presidentship of no less a person than the Chief Justice of India, Mr. Gajendragadkar. I hope the Prime Minister will do that because in order to ensure confidence, in order to instil a good decency in the public life, this requirement is to be undertaken. Sir, in the beginning, we thought that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari resigned because of our memorandum. That was the genuine feeling of the country also. But now a third element has been introduced and it demands a full share for the resignation of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: The caravan goes on.

Shri Manoharan: My attention has been drawn to an article written in one of the leading literary journals in Tamilnad. The name of the journal is *Kalaimagal*, the Goddess of Art. I think Members from Madras State will subscribe to my view that this journal is noted for its integrity, circulation and its quality and standard. I would not have cared much had it been a yellow journal. But it is the journal of importance which is being read by thousands and thousands of people, especially intelligent section as well as intellectual section. The article was written by one Shri K. Srinivasan who is also a responsible man. I was told, of course, very recently, that Shri Srinivasan is the Parliament Correspondent representing the *Indian Express*. He contributed that article in that journal and the significance of the article is its definiteness, assertion and positiveness. Therefore, I want to read that article to you, Sir,

[Shri Manoharan]

and I hope that will be conveyed to the Home Minister for proper and immediate action. Again, it is really a sorrowful thing that our Home Minister is not present here.

Now, with your permission, Sir, I would like to quote that article.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not the entire article. (*Interruption*).

श्री मधु लिखये (मुनेर) : बोलिये, बोलिये । तमिल भी राष्ट्रीय भाषा है ।

Shri Manoharan: I will give the translation. I think, I can translate it simultaneously also.

"Sadarnamagave Shri T. T. Kekkum, Shri C. Subramania-thukkum idaiyekooda adhika abhiprayabhedam urduenbathu prabalam."

In English it means:

"It is well-known that even ordinarily between Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari and Mr. C. Subramaniam, there is difference of opinion."

"Unavupporulgal Sambardamaga Sarkar ekabhoga vartakattaik-kaiyalavendum enru Shri T. T. K. chollivandathai Shri C. Subramaniam madalmudalli sadhyam anru enru ethirthurikkirar."

It means:

"Mr. C. Subramaniam has been opposing Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari's view of State monopoly procurement as practically impossible."

Then, it says:

"Thitta kkammirronkooda Shri T. T. Keyudan Modierukkirathu."

"Even the Planning Commission has clashed with Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari."

Further, it says:

Aanal irandu chennai mardir-kalidarye erpatta Abhiprayabhedam Karanamaga, rejeenaama

cheyyum alvaku nilamai omu-triyirukkathu."

"But the difference of opinion between these two Madras Ministers in the Cabinet would not have created a condition necessitating Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari to offer his resignation."

And the article goes on to say:

"Nerukkadi Adhikarippathurku Karanakhoothar Ulthurai Mandiri Shri Nandatham. Yeppadi?"

"The responsible man aggravating the situation resulting in the resignation of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari was Mr. Nanda and Nanda alone."

श्री रामसेवक यादव : यह बहुत गम्भीर आरोप है । नन्दा जी को यहाँ रह कर उसका जवाब देना चाहिए ।

Shri Vasudevan Nair: There is a serious charge against the Home Minister. It is proper that he should be here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is for the Government to see.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: So much was said about the Home Ministry, the D.I.R., the Emergency and all that. Where is the Home Minister? (*Interruption*).

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): I rise on a point of order....

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: Let him first quote the rule.

Some hon. Members: Under what rule?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the rule?

Shri Radhelal Vyas: It is a general rule that whenever personal charges are to be made against a Member, previous notice should be given to the Chair as well as to the Government. Here, the Member is making charges.... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: The previous notice must be given to the Chair as well as to the Government. They are personal charges....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is in his official capacity. It is not a personal charge..... (Interruption)

Shri Manoharan: The only thing you can do is to give direction to the Government that the Home Minister should come.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is for the Government to reply. They will reply.

Shri Manoharan: Let me finish the article. Then, it says:

"Dehliyil pala Vadakkathiya mandirigal Anradam cheyyum Aluvaigal sambandamagakkooda Josyam ketkirargal."

"In Delhi, the north Indian Ministers are consulting astrologers even for day-to-day affairs."

15 hrs.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Again, on a point of order. I would invite your attention to rule 353, which reads thus:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply."

The words are 'against any person'; the term 'person' includes as Minister also; it does not exclude a Minister. Further the words are 'No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made'.

2486 (A)LS-8.

Shri Manoharan: I am not making any allegation of an incriminatory nature. I am not making any charges against anyone. I am simply quoting the journal.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Government are there to reply.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): The point of order is about whether the attendance of the Minister is necessary. The reply is that unless there is adverse notice, the Home Minister's presence is not necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Government are present here. They can take notice of this and then reply.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: The objection raised is only to the absence of the Home Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is only referring to an article published in a journal from Madras.

Shri A. P. Sharma: Is the article published in this journal sponsored by the DMK? Has it been written by a person belonging to the DMK? It speaks of North Indian Ministers and South Indian Ministers. But I would submit that the Ministers are Indian Ministers; there is no question of north or south in this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are all Ministers representing Government. Shri T. T. Krishnamachari is a Member of this House.

Shri Manoharan: This is not a DMK journal; this has no politics at all.

Then the article goes on to say:

"Ulthura: Mandiri Nandavukku Shri Haveliram enbavar josyer".

It says that Mr. Haveli Ram is Mr. Nanda's astrologer. I do not know who this Mr. Haveli Ram is I do not know whether my hon. friend Shri Sanjiva Reddy has one.

The Minister of Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism (Shri Sanjiva Reddy): The hon. Member is my astrologer.

Shri Manoharas: The article further says:

"Ivarudaiya pillai Shri Chamanlal etrumati irakkumatitthozilil cedupattavar."

It says that his son Mr. Chamanlal is engaged in export-import trade.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think that will do. The hon. Member need not read out the entire article.

Shri Manoharan: I am just finishing it.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): May I rise on a point of order?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the rule that has been infringed?

Shri Kapur Singh: It is rule 41?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is that rule?

Shri Kapur Singh: Please give me the book, and I shall tell you.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him show me the rule. I shall hear him afterwards.

Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma (Khammam): On a point of order. Rule 352 says:

"A member while speaking shall not—

(v) reflect upon the conduct of persons in high authority unless the discussion is based on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms;"

Shri Daji: There is no high authority involved here. That refers to High Court judges.

Shri Manoharan: The article further goes on to say:

"Iranilirinthu ularunda pazhangalai irakkumadi seyya evarukukkoduthirunda anumadiyaiduesh-prajoyanappaduthi, evar iranil shara kai vangi, avatrai angirunthe americavaipponna nadukalukkuchhattavirodhamaha etrumati seythiruppathai iranil ulla indiaththoother, munnal India vimanappadaiththalapati, airman-shal engineer India sarkarukku-ththieryapaduthinar. Adupatri erpatta vicharaniyal, Shri chamanlal orukodirupai kallappanam vaithiruppadakakum shumara ezhupathu lakshma rupai anniyachchelavaniyai basmeekaram seythiruppadakakum theriyavandadu".

Now, let me give the English translation. It is as follows:

"In Delhi, the North Indian Ministers are consulting astrologers even for day-to-day affairs. Mr. Haveli Ram is Mr. Nanda's astrologer. His son Mr. Chamanlal engaged in export-import trade. He had misused his import licence of dry fruits."

The attention of the Government of India has been drawn by our Ambassador in Iran, and the ex-Air Marshal Mr. Engineer that Mr. Chamanlal, instead of importing dry fruits to India, was sending them illegally from Iran to America and other countries. The conducted inquiry revealed that Mr. Chamanlal was in possession of Rs. 1 crore worth of unaccountable money and Rs. 70 lakhs of foreign exchange was swallowed by him. When this matter was brought to T. T. K's notice, he ordered for legal action.

Now comes an interesting stage. Mr. Nanda attempted to suppress the case against Mr. Chamanlal. Failing in his endeavour Mr. Nanda wanted Mr. T. T. K. should treat that Mr.

Chamanlal had declared his unaccountable money voluntarily. By doing so Chamanlal could be helped in escaping with 60 per cent of money. This request also was turned down.

Mr. Nanda was infuriated at this. Immediately Mr. Nanda instigated those people who were affected by TTK's financial measures to shout against him. It is noted with interest here, that the memorandum submitted against TTK was adequately backed up by Shanti Prasad Jain, Tata and Birla Group.

It is said that even the facts and figures in the case lodged against TTK were divulged through Mr. Nanda."

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Where is Shri Nanda? Let us hear what he has to say on this.

Shri Bade: The hon. Member has said that the memorandum against Shri T. T. Krishnamachari was backed up by Messrs. Sahu Jain & Co. That is wrong, for I was also a signatory to that memorandum.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Some Hon. Members had submitted the memorandum. Is it proper then to say that this was drafted by the Home Minister? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Everything that is said here will go to the notice of Government and the hon. Minister, and they will reply.

Shri R. S. Pandey (Guna): This is a serious charge to make. The hon. Member says that everything went from Shri Nanda.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is quoting from an article in a journal published from Madras.

Shri Manoharan: So far as I am concerned, I have got very great admiration for Shri Nanda himself, because it was our Home Minister

Shri Nanda who came once here and declared categorially that within two years' time he would eliminate corruption. Though corruption is on the increase, I shall have to admire the noble sentiments expressed by him.

Shri A. P. Sharma: On a point of order. I would invite your attention to rule 351 (5), which says:

"A member while speaking shall not—

(v) reflect upon the conduct of persons in high authority unless the discussion is based on a substantive motion drawn in proper terms;"

In the light of this rule; I would like to know whether what has been said does not amount to making allegations against the Home Minister and other persons concerned.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They are all Ministers responsible to the House. Government are represented here and they will reply. Why should the hon. Member be worried?

Shri Kapur Singh: On a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the rule that has been infringed?

Shri Kapur Singh: I rise on a point of order under rule 353 of the Rules of Procedure. This rule lays down:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker.....". (*Interruptions*).

Let me explain myself. I have a right to explain myself. The hon. Member has referred to the astrologer of the Home Minister by name. He has further alleged that his son, whose name has also been given, Mr. Chamanlal, I presume....

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya (Serampore): Mr. Chamanlal is the son of Mr. Haveli Ram.

Shri Kapur Singh:...is engaged in certain activities in which he can derive pecuniary advantages from the influence of the Home Minister. This is a charge of an incriminatory nature against a person who is not here to answer back, and about which no intimation has been given to you under rule 353.

An hon. Member: Is he the hon. Member's astrologer also?

Shri Kapur Singh: Let me finish what I have to say. I do not regard my hon. friend as the Deputy-Speaker; I want a ruling from the Chair, not from my hon. friend.

On this, I want a ruling from you, Sir, whether such a charge against Mr. Haveli Ram and his son Mr. Chamanlal can be made here on the floor of this House in the circumstances in which it has been made here, without complying with the requirements laid down in rule 35?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I want to speak on the point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I not want to hear other hon. Members on this.

Shri Bade: I have also a point of order and it is this.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think he has made any incriminatory statements.

Shri Bade: ...I shall support the point of order this way. He has said that the memorandum was backed up by Messrs. Jain & Co. I may point out that that is not correct, because I am also a signatory to that memorandum.

Shri Kapur Singh: It has been said that Shri Nanda, the Home Minister, has an astrologer to whom he is obliged for the prognostication of the future. It has further been alleged that his son does some sort of business in which he can derive pecuniary advantages because of the influence of Shri Nanda. I would like to know

what can be more incriminatory or defamatory than this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has said that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari had ordered the inquiry.

Shri Kapur Singh: It is about Mr. Chamanlal, son of Mr. Haveli Ram, that I am talking. They are not here to defend themselves.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : चमनलाल, हवेली राम, नन्दा, टी० टी० के० चारों चतुरगुट - इन सब को लेकर कोई एन्क्वायरी होनी चाहिये ।

Shri Manoharan: I have no axe to grind against Shri Nanda. On the other hand, I have my own admiration for him because he came out openly and made a statement that within two years he would eliminate corruption and all that, though corruption is on the increase. I appreciate those noble sentiments expressed by Shri Nanda. Throughout this article, an attempt has been made to destroy the image, if any, that Shri Nanda has. This matter should be looked into by our Prime Minister, because Shri Nanda is fully armed with the Defence of India Rules and all that. Therefore, the Prime Minister should see that something is done. Otherwise, the Home Minister who is now controlling the law and order situation will take the law into his own hands and do something extraordinary. I would request you also to give instruction to the Prime Minister to see that something is done. Otherwise, I doubt very much whether this country has any salvation at all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Your time is up.

Shri Manoharan: I must have 30 minutes.

The next point I want to deal with is the DIR and the emergency. I think even noble-minded, sober-minded Congressmen would justify the continuance of the emergency and the so-called Defence of India

Rules. Repeatedly I have been saying that the Defence of India Rules are meant for the defence of the Congress Party. Specially after the Tashkent Declaration, which our late lamented Prime Minister signed—he had gone to Tashkent and did not return alive—specially after that Declaration, if the Congress Party, the ruling Party, has got an iota of genuine consideration and respect for the late Prime Minister, it should see that the emergency is lifted and the DIR scrapped.

Another point. In the President's Address, no mention has been made about the Salem steel plant. Luckily, our Sanjiva Reddy is not in the Ministry now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is very much in the Cabinet.

Shri Manoharan: Very recently I read a press report saying that Shri Venkataraman, Labour Minister of Madras, had gone to Japan. A Japanese team has certified the feasibility of the Salem plant whereas our ex-Minister, Sanjiva Reddy, said it was not feasible.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is a Minister. You are making a wrong statement.

Shri Manoharan: This news item has created in us a sense of despair. The report states:

"It is expected that the feasibility report of the Japanese mission which undertook the study of the project will be presented to the Madras Minister during his stay here. Although the report as concluded that the project is feasible, whether Japanese assistance will be forthcoming in setting up the project is quite another matter. There is a certain hesitation to get involved in the project and the reason behind this seems to be fears about political and economic stability in India, particularly India's ability to pay."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right.

Shri Manoharan: What all right?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Your time is up.

Shri Manoharan: This is the news that has appeared. I must say that I am thoroughly disappointed that no mention has been made in the President's Address about the Salem plant. I hope the Prime Minister will do something about it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Your party's time is over.

Shri Manoharan: Please give me ten minutes more.

So far as the language issue is concerned, we appreciate the stand of our Prime Minister. Where our Home Minister, Shri Nanda failed, where our late lamented Prime Minister, Shri Shastri, failed, Indira Gandhi succeeded as Information and Broadcasting Minister because she came to Tamil Nad at that time and tried to assuage the feelings of the people of Tamil Nad. I still remember what she said at that time. She had said: 'If the language issue projects itself in such a way, I think rethinking is needed'. With this dynamism in her, I think our Prime Minister can find a solution immediately. She is quite capable of finding that.

Regarding the food situation, I reiterate my demand that Shri A. P. Jain, ex-Governor, should be debarred from public life. I would request you also to convey this to the Prime Minister. On behalf of my party, I request our Prime Minister to see that governership is once and for all abolished. A judicial inquiry should be conducted under the chairmanship of no less a person than the Chief Justice of India, Shri Gajendragadkar into the charges contained in the memorandum by 11 Members of Parliament whose responsibility is well known.

Shri Daji: Inspired by Tata and Birla—you said.

Shri Manoharan: That is the allegation.

I have also referred to the article in *Kulai Bagal* regarding astrologer Haveli Ram's son's business. I request to instruct the Prime Minister to see that another inquiry is conducted to go into that matter. I conclude by thanking you for the patience and consideration shown to me.

Shri A. K. Sen (Calcutta North West): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to support this Motion. While I do so, I am aware of the indications given by our President of many of the achievements which have been to the credit of the Government; at the same time, I feel it my duty to point out certain things which possibly require more urgent consideration not only of Government but also of Parliament and the country.

The President has rightly stressed the food situation and has said in his Address that efforts would be made for improving production of foodgrains and other agricultural commodities and also for improving the techniques of production by better use of better fertilisers and better seeds. At the same time, I have a feeling that not enough has been done or is going to be done about utilisation of wastes and the production of compost manures which can be had in very large quantities if efforts towards that direction are made.

I know myself how the Khadi and Village Industries Commission have been improving the techniques of utilisation of wastes and other forms of compost which are valuable so far as their utility as manures is concerned. While we think of importing large quantities of chemical fertilisers and also producing them in enhanced quantities in this country, we have not done enough to utilise the indigenous sources of manures and fertilisers, though they may be in abundant supply everywhere in the village. These wastes are used for nothing; all the other things which can go to make valuable composts are going waste. I would,

therefore, draw the attention of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and of the Government to the urgent problem of utilisation of our wastages and composts.

We have always been thinking in terms of imports and talking about what we intend to do about increasing our food production. I have a feeling—I think the country has a feeling and there is good reason to suppose that it is not mistaken in that feeling—that because of this stress on imports, we have not done enough for improving our production. If every year we depend on these large imports—and we are assured of them—not enough attention is given towards adequately increasing indigenous production. It is an evil which goes round and round and finds us in what we may say self-imposed limitations. We do not think of improving production as much as we can and we do not devote enough attention towards distribution. The Food Corporation was set up for the purpose of regulating the distribution side of food. It is well known that there is not all that scarcity as one would imagine there is. The scarcity occurs because those who are in charge of distribution have an advantage in bottling up supplies. The rice mills are not controlled, they are not watched, and those who are engaged in the trade of distribution are not regulated either. The Food Corporation, which was set up for this purpose, unfortunately has gone into other fields. I understand that they are now busy sorting out and grading rice, instead of trying to study the problems of distribution and bringing the necessary impact of this whole problem of distribution and the bottleneck that occurs there.

We are faced with this grave problem of our balance of payments, of the slackening in our industrial production, of the stagnation which is arising in our export trade. In one word, the entire economic outlook has been rather grim and, if I may use the expression, bleak. The external value of the rupee has depreciated beyond all

possible limits. The balance of payment has been becoming more and more adverse every year. Our experts have not been looking up, though about two years ago they were faring not so badly. What is the reason behind all this? Why should this country be facing this depression in its industry, in its agriculture and in its exports. I think serious thinking is necessary for this purpose.

Only the other day I was reading about the great revival which was witnessed in Spain since 1956. Spain was not a very advanced country. Its politics is ridden by an outworn dictatorship and its civil service is far from being efficient or honest, and yet due to the efforts of one or two men who initiated bold policies in the matter of setting up industries, attracting foreign investment and giving the necessary incentives to indigenous production and investment and accelerating the pace of saving, Spain has witnessed such a great revolution during the last six years.

We may also think of Japan, West Germany and a few other countries, leaving aside the great revival which we have seen in Eastern Europe, in the erstwhile agricultural countries like Bulgaria and Rumania. West Germany was devastated, completely shaken and broken up after the war. I remember that when I went in 1951 to Germany, first time after the war, I was so amazed to see to what straits it had been reduced. Its factories were reduced to ashes. Very little was witnessed anywhere by way of reminding one of the old Germany. When I went there again in 1956 I remember the terrific change which I saw which had come in West Germany. The change that had come about in five years was staggering. Since 1956 the rate of growth and the rate of development has been more remarkable.

It is the same in Japan. One would recollect that three-fourths of Tokyo was destroyed by the bombing of the

American Air Force. Most of Japanese industry was completely destroyed, her shipyards were completely demolished, and yet today her rate of development is possibly the highest in the world, and her revival has been a lesson in history. It shows how the united will of a disciplined nation can overcome every obstacle. It is not necessary to have great leaders. What is necessary is united will, efficient administration and imaginative policies. If we have all these three, I have no doubt that this depression which is facing us today and is seeking to destroy all our progress will be a thing of the past.

While we are thinking of our internal conditions in terms of the economy, one is reminded of a fact which has been referred to by so many hon. speakers, and that fact is administration under a state of emergency. The emergency was proclaimed when the Chinese attacked us in October-November, 1962, and if I am not very much mistaken, the proclamation was issued in the first week of November, either on the 7th or a little earlier than that. The Chinese army had broken through the Sela pass and was threatening to capture the foothills, and we were really facing one of the greatest dangers that threatened us since independence. That was in October-November, 1962. This is 1966 February, more than three years since then. In the meantime we had certainly to contend with another serious threat coming from Pakistan, which was certainly acting in collusion with China. So long as the Pakistani menace was threatening us, I do not think there was any voice heard either in Parliament or outside suggesting that the emergency should be withdrawn, but since the memorable agreement signed in Tashkent by our late Prime Minister and the change in climate which has followed, one has begun to doubt the wisdom of continuing any further this emergency. Do we really need the emergency powers to overcome the obstacles which are facing us today? Are the difficulties of an external nature or are the dangers of an internal

[Shri A. K. Sen]

nature of such a magnitude to justify either imposition or the continuance of emergency measures?

This country believe in a democratic form of government, in having a limited government, a government which listens to the voice of Parliament and of the people expressed by Parliament, and a system of government which frowns at excessive powers being utilised or exercised by the executive. We do not concede extravagant powers to the executive for a very good reason, because extravagant powers have a tendency to corrupt those who use them,—this has been the lesson of history—not because they have in fact been misused on many occasions. Even though the occasions have not been many since the emergency has been imposed, some instances have occurred. One of them has been noticed very recently in a judgment delivered by the hon. Chief Justice of India. Only the other day I was in court myself, and the words which fell from him would be a reminder to all executive authorities who want to appropriate powers and misuse them. He said that in the guise of emergency if these powers are utilised with an ulterior motive, then the basic values on which our democratic way of life rests would be completely destroyed.

I feel that this Parliament and people are behind the Government in their efforts to develop the country, to bring about a state of society and an economy which would give affluence to the common men . . .

Shri Kapur Singh: Not the people.

Shri A. K. Sen: . . . and rid him of hunger, want and poverty. All measures necessary for the purpose of bringing about that state of society would be readily supported here and outside, and for that purpose I am not yet convinced that the emergency powers are any longer necessary.

We have the Essential Commodities Act to regulate the trade in essential

commodities. We have the Preventive Detention Act for the purpose of arresting and keeping in detention those who work against the interests of the government either as espionage agents or otherwise.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): You mean interests of the government or country?

Shri A. K. Sen: Of the country. Interests of the government is a different thing. I meant the interests of the country.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Why do you want to correct him?

Shri A. K. Sen: Shri Nath Pai had no doubt as to what I meant.

Therefore, I have no doubt that the country's feeling really is concerned about the continuance of the emergency any longer. A time comes when one likes to feel that he is again free; one likes to breathe freely and one likes to feel that the executive works only in accordance with the laws and rules. That is why soon after the war in England the defence of the Realm Act was revoked. Even here the DIR rules were withdrawn after the emergency in 1945. The government has to satisfy the people and the Parliament that the urgency is such that we must have the DIR continued longer and that really such an emergency exists. The prolongation of measures like the DIR do take away a good deal from our liberty and it gives authority to the government and all officers to interfere much more with the daily routine of life, with our property and with our liberties more than the Constitution concedes to the government. Such powers are to be exercised only so long as the country feels, the parliament feels that they are necessary to maintain the very basis on which we rest. That basis may be threatened. I concede: when there is external

danger or internal danger of such a nature, these measures are necessary.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Parliament has no feeling outside that of the Ministers.

Shri A. K. Sen: It is not merely the Opposition which has expressed its doubts about the necessity of continuing the emergency. Many persons on our side, many leaders of public opinion, many professional people and many people who are not in politics have expressed their views quite frankly that these emergency measures must come to an end.

श्री विभूति मिश्र (मोदीहारी) :
उनको राज नहीं चलाना है, राज चलाना
है ट्रेजरी बेंच को ।

Shri A. K. Sen: Administration has to be run according to ordinary laws.

Shri Ranga: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend unnecessarily.... (*Interruptions*) But none of the Cabinet Ministers is here.... (*Interruptions*). I am told that there is one Cabinet Minister who is disguising himself in the back benches. Even when a prominent Member of their own party speaks, there are no Ministers here in the front benches.

Shri Daji: The Speaker has again and again pointed out that the debate on the President's Address must be attended by all the Ministers. After all to whom are we to speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Three Ministers are there.

Shri A. K. Sen: I am very happy to see a reference to our foreign policy and its success being mentioned in the Address. May I take this opportunity of congratulating our Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh. I have seen what remarkable impression he has left in the U.N. and with his quiet but firm manners he has carried on his burden with exemplary skill and ability. We have noticed sometimes unfair criticism being levelled against the way

in which our foreign relations are conducted but having been outside myself in the recent months, I have seen what tremendous impression has been created by the way our relations had been conducted inside the country and outside culminating in the Tashkent agreement. I can assure the House that we have created several excellent impressions outside. First of all; the world believes our peaceful intentions; secondly the world knows our democratic way of life and respect for liberty. Thirdly, the world sympathises with our endeavour to create a better society and a more egalitarian society based on justice, political and economic. And fourthly the world knows that we are against military pacts and that we are against colonialism in every form and shape and that wherever there is the threat of colonialism and racism our weight whatever it may be worth would always be put on the side of the oppressed. These are matters of no mean consequence and our respect in the world has not diminished. I told Sardar Swaran Singh on my return that I felt very happy and I thought so well of him and that I find by his quiet manners he has won so many friends outside. I am very glad he happens to be here because I did not inform him that I was going to make a reference to him; it is only a coincidence which draws him here when I take the first opportunity as an independent Member of Parliament, torn away from the Treasury Benches.... (*Interruptions*) to speak on this matter.

I want to add one word before I resume my seat and that is about Rhodesia. I had the good fortune to represent our government and the Prime Minister at the Lagos conference of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers which was convened under the chairmanship of the late Prime Minister of Nigeria and our good friend, Sir Abubaka. Unfortunately he is no more. There we spoke quite strongly as to what we thought of the sanctions which were imposed by England. We expressed our grave

[Shri A. K. Sen]

doubts that these sanctions alone were going to bring down the rebel regime in Rhodesia and that something more would be necessary. May I remind Sardar Swaran Singh what he told me about the attitude we have to take just the night before I left, on the night he left for Tashkent; he should give up to that and keep on continuing this strong attitude that India must exert to see that this white racialism in Rhodesia is destroyed as quickly as possible with all the measures at our command and to impress the U.K. Government. I remember how glibly Mr. Wilson talked when he said he was absolutely sure that sanctions were going to bring to their knees the government of Ian Smith within a matter of weeks. Many weeks have passed and they have not come to their knees. On the contrary they are proclaiming now, I indicated this then—that they would contravene this so called oil sanctions and other sanctions with the active connivance of the Portuguese and South Africans. That danger still remains. I have no doubt that Sardar Swaran Singh and our government would do their utmost to see that India plays as important role in the ending of the last vestige of colonialism in Africa as it did in the ending of colonialism in Asia.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I regret to say that the Address of the President this year is not only not enough to put heart into those engaged in the arduous task of uplifting this country from the stagnation in which it finds itself enmeshed but is not enough even to console anybody. It is typically a lame duck address, if I may so describe it. It contains very little and in what it contains it is singularly indifferent.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I was very happy to find that the distinguished former Law Minister made a plea for the consideration of the government

to lift the emergency. This is something which has gathered momentum in the recent months and the demand now, it would be correct to say, is a national demand. It is not confined to the sponsorship of this or that party. It does not draw sustenance intellectually or in terms of popular expression of will, from this shade of opinion or that shade of opinion. Indeed, I would be entitled to claim that the Constitution as it stands today enjoins upon the Government to lift the emergency with all possible expedition. Until the conclusion of the Tashkent agreement it was claimed, and with ample measure of justification, that a country at war could not concern itself in the same measure with the observance of the forms of law, and institutional framework which it has prescribed for itself for ordinary times. But after the conclusion of the Tashkent agreement, there seems to be no imminent and clear danger which looms large on our horizon. The test should always be whether the perils to the security of the country are imminent and clear. It is true that the Address contains the briefest mention about the need of the country to be vigilant and strong, but I am sure that it could not be adduced as a reason for continuing the emergency indefinitely. The country would need to be vigilant and strong for ever and ever, but that does not mean that the country needs to have a dispensation of the Defence of India Rules for ever and ever.

The Chief Justice and his companion judges of the Supreme Court have expressed themselves very eloquently on this matter for this is not merely a matter relating to political parties or a matter which political parties alone are entitled to express their points of view, but this is a matter which endangers the continuance of the rule of law in the country. This emergency was declared in 1962 and has been continuing ever since. It is evident that the emer-

gency is necessarily for a limited period of time, for a specified and pointed purpose and not a political lease from which perpetual benefit could be derived by any political party. Apart from the allegations that have been made about the partisan character and the reasons which impelled the Government to continue the emergency, the basic fact remains that it is contrary to the Constitution, it is repugnant to the Constitution, to continue a state of emergency for an indefinite period of time. The Chinese threat such as it is perhaps likely to continue for a very long time. We are not in a state of war or active armed engagement with China at present. The need for vigilance would continue to be a pressing one for a long time to come, but how could this justify in good conscience the continuance of the emergency in our country?

Referring to certain cases—and the case before the Supreme Court was a case of this type—the Court deprecated these cavalier detentions. I should very much like to bring the observations of the court to the attention of hon. Members on this occasion. In the concluding portion of the Judgment, the Chief Justice said:

“...when the court comes across any orders of this kind by which citizens are deprived of their fundamental right of liberty without a trial on the grounds that the emergency proclaimed by the President in 1962 is still continuing and the powers conferred on the appropriate authorities by the Defence of India Rules justify the deprivation of such a liberty, we feel rudely disturbed by the thought that the continuous exercise of the very wide powers conferred by the Defence of India Rules on the several authorities was likely to make the conscience of the said authorities insensitive if not blunt to the paramount rights of the Constitution that

even during the emergency the freedom of Indian citizens could not be taken away with the existence of justifying the necessity specified by the Defence of India Rules themselves.”

The Constitution Bench also pointed out that the tendency to treat these matters in a somewhat casual and cavalier manner which might conceivably result from the continuous use of such unfettered powers will ultimately pose a serious threat to basic values on which the democratic way of life in this country is founded.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you might recall that the Supreme Court had occasion to deal with cases of detention under the Defence of India Rules on many occasions earlier but this is the first time that the Supreme Court has come out, and the date and the timing of the Supreme Court's pronouncement coming as it does after Tashkent Declaration, is very significant indeed—with a very categorical expression. In deference to the authentic voice of the interpreters of the Constitution, in deference to all that is fair and equitable, in deference to the very foundation of the system of government to which we are committed in this country, I entreat the Government to review this matter, to reconsider whether the emergency should not be lifted now.

Only the other day, there was a volley of questions in the Rajya Sabha and I am sorry to say that in its usual routine manner, the Home Ministry stuck to its guns by justifying the continuance of the emergency without referring to the changed circumstances, without referring to the fact that the indefinite continuance of any such rules, of any such dispensation, which undermines the rule of law, is a threat to the democratic system which we practise and which is prescribed by the Constitution.

It has been said that no one can ruin England except the British parliament itself. In good conscience this Parliament must demand of the Government

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

to lift the emergency because we would not like to witness any ruination or even any injury or damage to be caused to the Constitutional framework of this country.

Reference has been made in the Address to the fact that the rate of economic growth has been declining. It is mentioned that the growth of national income which was slow in the first two years of the third Five Year Plan was speeded up with the rise of 4.5 per cent in the third year and 7.3 per cent in the fourth year. I understand that this growth rate, which was visualised to be of the order of about 11 per cent is now likely to stabilise for some years at the very unsatisfactory rate of four to five per cent. Most of us were greatly distressed to read the findings of a research body recently. These findings were that with the possible exception of Indonesia, the growth rate was the lowest in India, in the whole of Asia. I would like particularly to draw the attention of the august House to these findings. It says:

"The rate of growth of Indian economy was the lowest in Asia according to study by the Economic and Scientific Research Foundation—a private research organisation. The most unfortunate aspect of India's economic performance over the last decade is that it has been uniformly poor in every major sector of economic activity, including agriculture and industry."

"With the sole exception of Indonesia, India finds herself at the lowest rung of the ladder of economic performance, not only in overall terms, but in each sector."

This is a very dismal and distressing reading for all of us. It is not a partisan issue, though I do not see why political parties should not take advantage of such findings to assail the government. But apart from that, in a matter of this sort, the government owes an explanation to this House and the country as to why it is

that there has not only been a shortfall, but there has been a dismal failure on almost all fronts in all major sectors of our economy.

We talk now of recasting and re-orienting our plan priorities. We claim now that in the new set-up of priorities in the plan, when it emerges again from the confusion that it has been shelved in, agriculture would occupy the pride of place. We are told that our one insistent need is to become self-reliant. I am sorry to say that in spite of the fact that the Food Minister has attempted explanations and tried to give before us what appears like a blue-print of a breakthrough with the aid of technology and substantially increased inputs, the country is far from being satisfied. It seems to me that in every possible aspect of agricultural activity in our country, there is complete lack of co-ordination and determination and very little of planning. It is easy for politicians to say that they would resort to interminable satyagraha if joint-stock companies are permitted to engage in farming. But it is not equally easy for them to offer substantial arguments for the stand they take.

15.52 hrs.

[SHRI SHAM LAL SARAF in the Chair]

It seems to me that you cannot reconcile the economic performance of good farming with the clamour for levying inhibitory taxes and levies on the larger and more efficient farms. By all means we are all committed to the abolition of fiefs and feudal systems which have corroded the conscience of our community. But it does not mean that we must change over for a system of distributing land in a manner which would only undermine the possibilities of the farmer being able to perform economically with the aid of modern technology. The land policies of the government have been extremely confused. I suppose it would be right to say that they represent the

last word in inertia and confusion. The Seventeenth Amendment was brought forward with the assurance that this is the measure which is going to emancipate Indian agriculture from centuries of stagnation. Whether that constitutional amendment has been able to fulfil even a fraction of the assurance proclaimed by its proponents is a moot question.

Shri Ranga: It has destroyed the initiative of the peasant.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It is impossible to concede that further fragmentation of the already small and inefficient farms in India could ever lead to efficient agriculture in our country.

It is easy for us to indulge slogan-mongering, which has the appearance of academic respectability. It is not equally easy to recast the whole set-up of our agriculture into a more efficient and modern system. For this what you need to do is to give sufficient incentives to the farmer, to release his energies, to educate him and give him incentives to employ his education and he knows how on the farm. Today every farmer who graduates into prosperity sends his sons to schools and colleges and those children do not wish to return to their farms. The reason is, we are not providing enough incentives; we are not giving enough remunerative prices. We want to limit and curtail the initiative of the farmer. Self-reliance is a slogan with which nobody could disagree. It is in our context the essence of heroism, a heroism which we need badly. It would be right to say that unless we had the will to be self-reliant, we would never really be self-reliant. Those alone conquer who have the will to conquer and who know that they can conquer. The poverty and hunger in our country can be conquered only by a supreme effort of our national will. But is this national will sought to be energised and being brought into play for giving to the country a new look, a new incentive and a new leap forward? I am afraid this does not appear to be

the purpose of the governmental machinery.

A great deal used to be said in the name of collectives. Is it when we find that the collectives have not functioned very effectively even in those countries where they were born and baptised and the collectives did not bring what they were intended to establish—a heaven on earth—when it was found that even in countries like Russia which has been able to make tremendous progress in the field of industry, agriculture was lagging behind because they had not reckoned in formulating their policies with the human psychology, the psychology of the agricultural producers, in these countries, whether it is Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland or Russia, there has been a great deal of rethinking. Certainly it did not redound to their self-respect to have to import foodgrains from the USA—certainly they did not want to continue to import food from a country which they had been condemning on ideological grounds for a number of years. But when it became patent to the Russians, the Bulgarians, the Yugoslavs and the Polish and indeed the people of the whole host of east European countries that agricultural policies would have to be recast with the basic objective of promoting better production and not by dovetailing them into ideological dogmas. They did not hesitate to take the logical step.

Nevertheless wisdom has failed to dawn upon our policy-makers. When Dr. Radhakrishnan was the Vice-Chancellor of Banaras Hindu University, he used to say very often that there are three kinds of people. There is a class of people who make their mistakes and learn from them. They are the wise ones. Another class of people are those who learn from others' mistakes and therefore avoid making their mistakes. They are happy ones. But there is a third category of people who do not learn from their own mistakes or from others' mistakes. They are the foolish ones. I do not know why we should be so anxious to

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

qualify for this third category. It is crystal clear to any student of economics in the world that it is incentives which would be able to give a reorientation to our agriculture. Why should we fight shy of the logical implications of that proposition? Yet, I find that our emphasis is not on giving these incentives. Our emphasis is not on providing the tools of modern technology to our farmers. Our emphasis is and our anxiety is somehow to place the limits, the shackles, the fetters, the ceilings and the curtailment even before the farms have begun to be anywhere near prosperous. By all means, we need social equality. By all means, the society must enforce egalitarian measures. But, must we enforce egalitarian measures at a stage when there is no equality to be enforced, no prosperity to be shared, but an utter bleak equality of poverty? What we need, therefore, is to impart a new look to our agricultural policies.

16 hrs.

I want to add a word on co-operatives which have been claimed to be the panacea for all our ills. Mr. Chairman, co-operatives are founded on a philosophy to which I subscribed most ardently. But the experience of co-operatives in this country has convinced me that there is very little to be reaped by way of benefits from practising co-operation on any large scale. In our country, I know for a fact that co-operation and co-operative credit has been used either for political patronage or for providing pockets of influence to the more fortunate either in politics or in the economic life of the country. Co-operatives are not the instruments of the socialistic pattern of society in our country. I should like to cite the testimony of the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission itself. It says:

"The study of the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission showed that

a substantial proportion of the loans—varying from 15 to 35 per cent—had been used for purposes other than those for which they were granted. The survey revealed that 15 per cent of the short-term credit and 25 per cent of the medium credit given to farmers for acquiring land or other agricultural assets were used for non-productive purposes. In terms of the number of borrowers indulging in this 'misuse' of co-operative credit, the survey showed that the guilty formed as much as 41 per cent of the borrowers—19 per cent wholly and 22 per cent partly. The unauthorised purposes for which the loan amounts were used were mainly repayment of debts and meeting of household needs. The practice of 'diversion' of co-operative credit seems to be quite widespread, the percentage of diversion being significantly high in as many as nine States, including Madras and Andhra Pradesh. . . ."

And Madras and Andhra Pradesh occupy a prominent place in the field of co-operative movement.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Sir, I am the only speaker from my group and my group has 48 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: You have only 30 minutes. I will give another two minutes.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I will now briefly refer to the administrative reforms of which great promise was held out to the country and to this Parliament a few years ago. I recall, Mr. Chairman, that in 1962 when I rose to speak on the President's Address and when I spoke of widespread corruption not only at various levels of the administrative but also in high political places, the then Prime Minister said

that this was a figment of our imagination. Later he had to confess, Mr. Chairman, that this was not really so, and in the following year even the President in his Address made a pointed reference to the fact that corruption was rampant in the country. I do not think that during these four years of this Parliament's life anything significant has been done to eradicate corruption. A great deal of talk has taken place, a great deal of assurances have been given, a great deal of well-intentioned efforts have also been initiated but, so far as achievement is concerned, I am sorry to say that it is almost nil. There came the Santhanam Committee which gave an excellent report and then in this House there was constant questioning of the Government on these issues. Then we got a Vigilance Commission which seems not to be able to function at all effectively and now, to heap inadequacy on inadequacy, the Government has in its characteristically halting and half-hearted manner, given us a Commissioner for Grievances who has neither the powers to investigate, nor the power to hear appeals, not the power to initiate proceedings. I do not know what kind of Commissioner of Grievances has been conceived and delivered by the Home Ministry, and that also without informing this Parliament. I feel that nothing short of Ombudsman type of institution would resolve the problems in the field of public grievances and their appropriate redress. So, the Home Minister should specifically and pointedly answer this Parliament in respect of an adequate machinery for redress of public grievances.

Shri P. E. Ramakrishnan (Coimbatore): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the motion. The President in his address laid stress on two important domestic issues, namely, food crisis and foreign exchange crisis. Actually, these two problems are one and the same, relating to the economic development of this country. India as the largest democratic country in the world has taken to planning for its economic growth and development.

Our Five Year Plans aim at the annual rate of growth of 11 per cent of our national income. There has been great progress in many fields. Our national income has increased from Rs. 8,850 crores in 1951 to Rs. 15,000 crores in 1955. Our agricultural production increased in the same period from 54.9 million to 87.2 million tons. The index of industrial production went up from 73.5 to 179.5. Our industrial base has been considerably widened. The technological intensity in the country has gone up and is continuously growing. Highly sophisticated goods in the field of industry, electronics and instrumentation are today being produced. The country can justifiably be proud of the advance made in the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. There has been considerable development in our energy resources and also in our transportation facilities. The setting up of national laboratories in the country made innovation and development possible in the varied fields of science and technology.

In spite of this impressive and remarkable progress in many fields, the economy is showing signs of slowing down. The wholesale price index has increased from 112.5 in 1951 to 170.5 in 1965. The capital market, which reflects the economy of the country, is in the doldrums. The condition is so bad that industries that have been set up during the last five years have not been able to declare a dividend in spite of the fact the industry is operating in this country in sheltered conditions and scarcity conditions. The high cost in capital-intensive industries has eliminated new entrepreneurs from entering the field and, as a matter of fact, Government is encouraging monopolistic tendencies in the country indirectly.

I cannot understand the recent increase in import duty to 45 per cent of capital goods. This increase in duty on capital goods actually puts 50 per cent increase in the cost of capital-intensive industries. Some of the industries that are under implementa-

[Shri P. R. Ramakrishnan]

tion are not able to complete their projects and no new industry is able to come in the capital industries sector.

Foreign trade has not made any substantial progress in the last two years. We need foreign exchange for setting up new production. We also need foreign exchange for maintenance imports. The \$ 100 million announced by the USA recently is a welcome feature for those industries which has suffered from maintenance imports. I may not be far wrong when I say that the allocation of priorities in our Plans have been motivated more on an ideological basis than on a basis of realistic and rational considerations. The emphasis in the last two Plans has been on heavy industry. Capital intensive industries are known to have a longer gestation period. That only means that there is an inbuilt inflationary tendency in trying to put capital intensive industries.

There have been a lot of lapses in the implementation of our plans. Our public sector projects suffer for many reasons. There has been considerable delay in their implementation. Because of the tied loans most of the projects that had been set up had come as package deals and turnkey jobs. This deprived the country of the opportunity of planning it inviting global tenders and, at the same time, fitting in indigenous content wherever possible. This could have saved a considerable amount of foreign exchange and would have also given an opportunity for our people to have self-confidence in their execution.

There was no co-ordination in the planning of these various industries; therefore, there is a large capacity that is unutilised because all the industries depend on each other for their production. A large part of the capital expenditure has gone on non-productive uses in the public sector, like large townships, palatial office accommodation etc.

Capital intensive industries in the public sector have also become labour intensive industries today. Recently I had an opportunity to visit Bhilai. When Bhilai was producing 1.2 million tonnes, they were employing as much as 30,000 people. A comparable factory in Russia probably would have employed only 7,000 people. I do not know why we accept this kind of inefficiency in our labour productivity. I only beg to submit that inefficient utilisation of our labour resources would be one of the greatest dangers to our economy.

The time has come when Government should put the public sector projects on a commercially operating basis. After the Chinese aggression we had the twin object in our planning, namely, defence and development. The recent Pakistani conflict has made it very clear to us that if this country has to remain a self-respecting nation, our country's economy must become self-reliant. To have a stable and self-reliant economy, the first criterion is to have a stable price structure; in other words, there should be enough production both in the agricultural and industrial sectors. The emphasis, therefore, is on productivity.

Productivity in the agricultural sector is a function of many things. Productivity is a function of better seeds, improved agricultural implements, fertilisers, better irrigation facilities, adequate power supply, control of pesticides, credit facilities and, above all, a new orientation towards scientific methods of farming. The country must become self-sufficient in fertiliser production as soon as possible. The farmer must be assured of a remunerative and floor price as an incentive to raise production. It is too much to expect a sudden and spectacular increase in agricultural production in a short time. Raising production in the agricultural sector is a slow and steady process and no pains should

be spared to attain self-sufficiency in food. Then only there can be growth and there can be stability in our economy. The target that has been laid for the Fourth Plan of 125 million tons is by no means difficult to achieve because today the per acre yield in this country is the lowest and I am sure 20 per cent or 30 per cent rise in our per acre productivity is within the reach of the country.

In the industrial sector, productivity is a function of efficient management and modern technology. Cost is an important factor in the industrial production. In recent months, there has been a slump in the textile industry. All over the country, the marginal units closed down. In my constituency of Coimbatore, there is a great concentration of textile industry. They have faced very great difficulties in the last few months and because there was a great accumulation of stocks, the prices had gone down and as a result of the credit squeeze marginal units have closed down.

Mr. Chairman: What is the position now? Have you come across the statement of the Textile Commissioner that all stocks have been cleared?

Shri P. R. Ramakrishnan: The position still continues to be difficult because there is still a lot of accumulation and also the price is very low. The marginal units have closed down.

The textile industry is a labour intensive industry even though in many countries it ceases to be one. In the labour intensive industries, any increase in labour cost reflects in the cost of the ultimate production and, therefore, even the most efficient units can become marginal units if the labour costs continue to rise. There is a built-in instability in labour intensive industries. If this country is to have a stable economy, we should assure stable employment for our people. That means, if you

have to assure stable employment in labour intensive industries, it is necessary that we must have a stable price structure and, in turn, a wage structure and the wage structure must be linked to productivity.

Obsolescence is the greatest enemy of productivity. It is necessary, therefore, that industry should continually keep pace with the development of modern technology. This means that there must be a continuous flow of know-how into the country. At this stage of industrial development in this country we cannot but get foreign know-how come to this country in a large measure. But it does not mean that we should not develop indigenous know-how wherever it is possible. In the past, we have sought the foreign know-how and the foreign collaboration has been approved from the making of ice-cream to the making of an automobile. Indiscriminate approval of foreign collaboration is one of the reasons of the depletion of our foreign exchange resources. There is a tendency in the country now to abolish all foreign collaboration. Many people are saying now that we have got the know-how. Because some people claim that they have the know-how, there is tendency in the country that foreign know-how should not be allowed to come into this country. The pendulum has swung to the other side. I only beg to submit that this country cannot develop in technological isolation.

I am happy that a committee has been appointed under the chairmanship of Dr. Ramaswamy Mudaliar to go into this question. I do hope, in the near future, the Committee will lay down certain general principles as to what extent the foreign collaboration should be allowed and in what fields. The economy must become self-reliant as soon as possible. The Government is quite aware of this problem and I am sure the remedial steps will be taken as soon as possible so that there is both stability and growth in our economy.

Shri Karuthiruman (Gobichetti-palayam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the President's Address has laid stress on our late Prime Minister Shastriji. Though it has laid stress on the late Prime Minister, it is not in adequate terms to give compliments to our late Prime Minister. I would like to quote one of the great eminent poets who is considered to be the best philosopher and the best poet in this world. The great poet Tiruvalluvar said:

"Katchik Elian Kadum Chollallmel

Mikkurum Mannan Nilam-Kural."

It means, he is simple in appearance but he is an easily available man to everybody and he is a fit administrator. Kambar further says:

"Yaridam Pakai kollanel Enosit pin,

Poor odungum pugul odungathu."

This means that if we are the friend of all and enemy of none, we can avoid war; but at the same time, it will enhance the fame of one's country and also of oneself. This is the policy that we see in the Tashkent Pact. The Tashkent Declaration and the great mission of our Food Minister Shri C. Subramaniam to Washington, which was a successful mission, both are the fruits of the foreign policy pursued by our late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But for the non-alignment policy of the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Tashkent Declaration and the PL-480 agreement would not have been successful.

Some of our friends opposite cry against it and say that it is a matter of beggary. But may I remind them of one thing? Even the U.S.S.R., to which country many friends opposite owe political allegiance sought the help of the U.S.A. and the U.K. Poland which is under communist regime has been liberally resorting to the PL-480 assistance for many years now. Yugoslavia which is an-

other country ruled by the Communist Party is also receiving PL-480 assistance. But if we go for help and assistance to the U.S.A., it becomes beggary in their eyes, but when the U.S.S.R., Poland, Yugoslavia under communist influence and under communist regime go and seek help, it is not beggary. This seems to be a philosophy of their own. I would submit that whenever there is any need, it is necessary that we should seek help. And we have sought such assistance from the U.S.A. We thank the President of the U.S.A. and the people of America for the great help that they have agreed to give under PL-480. A friend in need is a friend indeed.

In his Address, the President has stressed the food and agriculture policy very much. This is the first time when we find that more than 50 per cent of the Address has been devoted to the food and agriculture policy. What is the reason for this? It is because of the shortage of food-grains in the country. Now at last agriculture has come to be remembered. If there is success in agricultural production, then nobody would care for the agriculturists. The plight of a farmer is unwept, un-honoured and unsung; the farmer has not been generally cared for; if there is no shortage, nobody cares for him. But because of the shortage now, at least there is a demand now that we look to the agriculturists and agricultural production.

In regard to the food and agriculture policy, I would submit that there are so many things which have to be done without which increase in production is not possible. By tabling short notice questions or adjournment motions or by making fiery speeches in the Parliament and elsewhere, and by bringing adjournment motions every day here and there, one cannot increase the food production. Let my hon. friends go to the fields and increase production there. If they could do this, then we shall congratulate them.

My hon. friends want that there should be shortage and there should be insufficiency, because then only the political parties opposite can survive; then only they can go to the platforms and say that this is the duty of the Government but Government have failed and so on. The criticism that is levelled against the Government, in my opinion, is unhealthy criticism. It is not of a healthy sort. It is not a constructive criticism. Of course, they can say that the Minister is responsible. If only the Minister had an Alladin's lamp, he would have solved the problem in a wonderful way. But unfortunately that lamp is not with us, it is not with the Government, nor is it there with anybody else. Even my hon. friends opposite would not be able to solve this problem.

Then, the question of the zones etc. is to be lifted. I believe that the mistake was committed about ten years ago. We should rectify that mistake. If only a policy of partial food decontrol had been followed, it would have been all right. It was a wrong thing that the late Shri Rafi Ahmed Kidwai did when he decontrolled food; he thought probably that there was self-sufficiency in food; that was a mistake. The step that had been taken then was a wrong step. And it is that step which has been responsible for these things today. Had they kept a skeleton procurement staff, had they kept control at certain stages, we would not have been facing such a crisis. These are things which cannot be ignored. Just to get a name, just to show that something has been done, they do away with all those things and now we have to suffer for all these things.

Therefore, the present food and agricultural policy is a welcome one. It is a long-term and constructive one. I can say that in a few years we will become self-sufficient.

Shri Thimmaiah (Kolar): That policy was good then.

Shri Karuthiruman: Now it is not suitable. Our friend, Shri Ramakrishnan has also referred to this. He has rightly said that good seed, good manuring, good ploughing, proper irrigation, proper plant protection measures using insecticides and pesticides and above all, proper price for the producers are the essential things that should be ensured. The most important of these is proper price for the producers. Unless there is a proper price paid to the producer, I am sorry no Government can solve the problem.

I say that the policy is service-oriented, consumer-oriented and so on. It is not producer-oriented. How are we able to seek the help of the USA? Is it because there the price policy is producer-oriented, because of that policy, there is an abundance of production and they have a surplus. Even taking Japan, there is a producer-oriented policy. For a ton of rice, the Government is paying Rs. 1000 and it is sold to the consumer at Rs. 700 per ton, so that they subsidise to the extent of Rs. 300 per ton. That is their policy and that is why they have got more production. Unless there is a producer-oriented policy which will be advantageous to the producer, we are not going to increase our production and help in any way to meet the food deficit. Wherever there is agriculture, the price fixed for the produce must be a remunerative price. Of course, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture has fixed a price, fair price. I can say it is a fair price; I cannot say it is an unfair price. But it is not a remunerative price. Fair price is quite different from remunerative price.

Even in regard to this price policy, there is confusion. They say 'support price', 'procurement price', 'minimum price'. As a farmer, I claim that I am producing more than two tonnes of paddy per acre for the past 25 years. I have got experience of that. I know what is the cost of cultivation. It has risen by 300 per cent. but the price fixed by Government

[Shri Karuthiruman]

or the price supported by Government is not even 200 per cent. When the cost of cultivation has risen 300—400 per cent, when it has risen from 100 points to 1000 points, the price fixed by Government is not sufficient to meet that cost. How can you expect people, in these circumstances, to take to agriculture and increase production? It is quite impossible to do it. There is a saying by Thiruvalluvar:

Elam endru asaie ehiparai

Kanin nilam ennum nallal nagum.

— Mother earth will laugh at those who say 'no' to her.

In every budget, we are raising the taxes and duties on diesel oil, power generated and so many other things. The result is that the cost of cultivation has considerably increased.

Support price is necessary when we have excess production. Remunerative price is necessary when there is a shortage in production. But here it is the other way about. Our policy is not directly proportional, it is inversely proportional. We give support price when there is shortage in production. What is called for is a remunerative price in this situation. Unless there is a remunerative price offered, the producer will go in for commercial crops and when he does so, there will be a shortage in food production.

Therefore, it is up to Government to give all facilities to the producer, to give parity in prices. Suppose I grow sugarcane; I get Rs. 2000; supposing I grow turmeric, I can get Rs. 3000 per acre. Supposing I grow any cash crop, I am in an advantageous position. But if I grow only food crop, I cannot get more than Rs. 1000 for two crops. That is the maximum I can get whereas I have to invest Rs. 600-700 per acre. Is this a profitable proposition?

There is another thing. We say now that the only solution to the problem

will be by the abolition of the zonal system and making one zone of the entire country. The zones can be abolished, but let not the Opposition Members raise a hue and cry about rise in prices. They should keep quiet, they should not hold any demonstrations whatever rise there may be in prices. They should not give any adjournment motions, short notice questions etc. Then we can abolish the zones, and not also import food.

There was originally the zonal system. The southern zone consisted of Madras, Andhra, Mysore and Kerala. The difficulty is that Kerala is highly deficit in so far as food-grains are concerned. Of course, in commercial crops it is true they are earning a certain amount of money. Two or three years back what happened was this. Madras is a marginally surplus area, Andhra is surplus, Mysore is marginally surplus. The Kerala merchants went to Mysore, Madras and Andhra, purchased all the grains, and all the grains went into Kerala. Then when the prices shot up, they sold it in my district of Coimbatore. This is why they want the abolition of zones, because they find it profitable.

But when it comes to procurement, a surplus State becomes just self-sufficient, a marginally surplus State becomes a deficit State, and a deficit State much worse!

If we want national integration, the country should be regarded as one unit not only in the matter of food, but also in utilisation of surplus water wherever it is available for generation of power etc. But whenever the question of utilisation of water comes, every State claims that the water belongs to it. Whenever the question of food comes up, they talk of national integration and say that Bengal or Kerala should not be treated as inferior. If the surplus water from the west-bound rivers in Kerala had been diverted to Madras, we could have

given one million tons of rice. If the surplus power generated in Mysore had been diverted to Madras, we could have given a large amount of millets.

Shri Warrior: Madras is the only blessed place.

Shri Karuthiruman: There should be Central River Road. They should give an order to see that that these surplus waters are utilised for the entire country, and not be given to State control only.

Finally, on behalf of 60 million peasant families I tel you that if you give us proper price and incentive, we will solve the food problem. Our great Prime Minister, Panditji, said, "success goes to those who dare and act". We shall dare and act, and success will be ours.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have read with keen interest the Address of the President, and I find that certain very important things have been omitted.

For instance, I do not know whether the President thought it fit not to mention in his Address the growing unemployment in the country. Before I comment on the other aspects of the President's Address, I should like to mention here the present unemployment position in the country, the figures in respect of those who are registered in the employment exchanges. According to statistics available, unemployment figures at the end of the Third Plan will be to the tune of 120 lakhs. What was promised to us during the Second Plan was that 8 million new jobs would be given to the unemployed. Instead of that, more than a crores are now unemployed after the completion of the Third Plan. So, I had thought that the President would mention something about unemployment in his Address and support the demand of the various Members of this House for an unemployment dole or unemployment insurance.

A scheme has been initiated and is being worked out according to the Department of Social Security called Unemployment Insurance, but all the capitalists in the country, whether representing jute, textile or any other industry, have refused to co-operate with the scheme, and I do not know what its fate will be. So, I plead that there should be some sound scheme by which unemployment can be at least minimised if not done away with. Unfortunately there is no mention about it in this report. Many hon. Members, many eminent lawyers, eminent jurists and various institutional heads have expressed themselves with one voice that this emergency should go and the D.I.R. should be repealed; they had been used indiscriminately in favour of the ruling party. The latest judgment of the Chief Justice Gajendragadkar is before us; there were other judgments of the Punjab and the Allahabad High Courts. The moment the Judges release persons and they come out of jail, they are re-arrested. Four trade union workers of Kanpur were arrested and they were released by the Allahabad High Court. They were not immediately arrested because there were questions in the House and we wanted an assurance from the hon. Home Minister, Mr. Hathi who told us there was no such intention. They were however arrested under the D.I.R. just after twenty days. I have to use strong expression and say that this is the rape of democracy. The new Prime Minister should look into this question and remedy this. I do not know whether it is a prestige issue with the Home Minister or of the Government. Shri Nanda feels very sore about it and he feels that situation in Bombay and Kanpur can be controlled by using the DIR. I pity Mr. Nanda; whenever there is a vacancy he becomes the Prime Minister; he is like the Mahabrahmin whose services are only needed when somebody dies and then only for 5, 6 or 8 days. The D.I.R. should be withdrawn or we should force the Home Minister to resign if he cannot govern this country.

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

without the DIR. There is going to be strong agitation on the use of the DIR. All the opposition parties who claim to be leftists are united on this, including some of the progressive congressmen in saying that DIR should be withdrawn immediately.

Nothing has been mentioned about the wages of the workers in the Address. On the 16th of this month, nearly 20,000 Central Government employees demonstrated before the house of the Prime Minister; they presented a memorandum showing how wages had fallen after 1949. According to the reports of many commissions, whether they be pay commissions or wage boards or survey conducted by committees, it had been established beyond doubt that the workers have not crossed even the starvation level in some of the industries like leather or jute. The wages should be revised and wage boards should be appointed for all the industries. The tragedy in our country is that even if a wage board is appointed and it submits a report favouring the workers, it is not implemented. It is the same case with the central government employees. There was some agitation and the ex-Supreme Court Judge, Mr. S. K. Das was appointed as arbitrator and he took three months and gave his award. It was somewhat favourable to the employees.

16.40 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Though it was not acceptable in toto, still, taking the word of the lamented Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, as correct, we treated it as an award, and the employees of the Central Government, numbering 25 lakhs, took that as an award, and they said, "though we do not like the entire thing, we would like to treat this as an award and we shall abide by it". But then, what is the reaction of the Government today? The

Finance Minister came to this House and expressed his helplessness and said because he has no money, he cannot give neutralisation to the tune of 90 per cent. That is a sad commentary on our various assurances and how the Government tinkers with the awards, and this shows that there is no sanctity behind the awards.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: For the agricultural landless labour, which award are you going to propose?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: After the next election, make me a Minister and I shall show the way.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): That does not mean you should deprive the others, before this starts. (*Interruption*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Everytime, agricultural labour is pitted against the Central Government employees. When the Central Government employees want some thing, we are told, "Why don't you look up to the horrible condition of the State Government employees"? When the State Government employees demand something more, the Chief Minister says, "Why don't you consider the sad plight of the corporation employees who are being paid less than you"? Then, when the corporation employees demand something more, they are asked to refer to the unemployment figures available in the Employment Exchange and are told, "At least you have got employment; see how many are still unemployed". So, that is not the way of comparing these things. There should be a minimum; there should be a minimum wage. There should be a fair wage. What we want only is the implementation of the recommendations of the 15th Labour Conference, that is, to grant Rs. 125 as a national minimum wage. That is our demand.

I am sure the hon. Ministers, especially the hon. Labour Minister, will kindly realise that every time

there is some agreement, either in the Labour Conference or in the tripartite conferences, that agreement is being violated not by the employees but by the employers and the Government,

Then there is another problem before us, and that is the crisis in the textile and woollen industries. Many textile units are still closed and especially those textile units which are manufacturing coarse and medium cloth are in the grip of a crisis because we have no foreign market and our exports have dwindled to the minimum. Recently, because of certain import restrictions, may be rightly imposed, the woollen industry in Kanpur, Dhariwal and Amritsar and all other places is in the grip of a crisis. I appeal to the Commerce Minister and the Labour Minister to kindly consider the urgent steps to be taken to overcome this crisis. Nearly 5,000 workers in Kanpur have been laid off. More than 2,000 workers in Dhariwal have been laid off, and they are on the verge of retrenchment. I do not know, if the crisis is not solved, the whole of the woollen industry will come to a standstill. I am told that imported wool to the tune of Rs. 150 lakhs is lying in Bombay and that is not being distributed only because some Minister or Ministry could not take a decision as to what will be the defence requirements! That is a sad commentary on our planning. I would, therefore, request the hon. Prime Minister to kindly consider the taking of immediate steps to see that the textile industry, and the woollen industry especially, which has become crisis-ridden now is saved and also to see that the workers are saved from further starvation.

Then, I shall refer to the commitments to the workers, the promises made to the workers. Take, for instance, the dearness allowance; take again, for instance, the fair wage question. What were the promises made by the Prime Minister and the Labour Minister? Are we fulfilling those promises? What is the benefit

that the common man derives out of the various Plans? The first Five Year Plan gave the assurance to the farmers that they will be better off. The Second Five Year Plan gave the assurance to the workers, and gave the assurance to the unemployed that they will be employed. But what were the results? More unemployment, cut in wages and freezing of wages. The third plan gave certain assurances, but monopoly has grown. The report of the Monopolies Enquiry Commission is that monopoly has helped growth of industries. If that is the conclusion of the government also, I do not know what action they will take on the Monopolies Enquiry Commission's report.

I do not support my hon. friend, Dr. Singhvi, for whom I have great regard. In a subtle manner, he has indirectly supported Birlas taking land in Punjab. Why should Birlas be given any land in Punjab? Are there no cultivators?

An hon. Member: He is landless!

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He is the wealthiest person, but no body in Birla's family pays wealth tax. He has been given 1000 acres of land and there is going to be an agitation. A senior member of the House, Shri K. D. Malaviya, has decided to go on a hunger-strike against this decision of the Punjab Government. I welcome it; let him start the hunger-strike and we shall follow him. This should be scrapped immediately because joint-stock farming headed by Birlas or Shanti Prasad Jain or anybody else will take us nowhere. Zamindari was abolished, but it will come again in the name of Birlas. Joint-stock farming will be a slur on our democracy and socialism. Mr. Birla should be disappointed and he should be told immediately that no land will be given to him and if he has no land, he has got many mills and he can work on them.

I want to say something about the charges made by Mr. Manoharan about Mr. Haveli Ram and his son.

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

You were in the Chair, Sir, and I could not follow whose son is Mr. Chaman Lal. Is he the son of Mr. Haveli Ram or Mr. Nanda? Whosoever's son he may be, he has been a worthy son and he has minted money. If he has really minted money and if that is the quarrel between the two ministers, there should be a proper enquiry immediately. If that article is wrong—so many grave charges have been levelled in that—there should be proper action against the editor of that paper.

Enquiry should be held against many ex-ministers. Today no enquiry is held for anybody. My hon. friend mentioned that the memorandum was submitted by the inspiration of Mr. Shanti Prasad Jain, Birlas and Tatas. I still stand by it. I was one of the signatories to the memorandum. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari should not escape enquiry. Let him face an enquiry and if the charges levelled against him are not proved, I am prepared to resign. Otherwise, let him further resign his seat in the Lok Sabha and contest a seat anywhere else. It is absolutely wrong to say that we were inspired by Mr. Shanti Prasad Jain. We were the signatories and we knew our job. It is a misfortune that the Leader of the House mentioned that any memorandum signed by some people should not be investigated.

Finally, we should leave this begging. We were world-famous in spiritualism and magic. Now we have become world-famous beggars. That is a sad commentary on our planning.

Shrimati Lakshmi Kanthamma: Sir, we are grateful to the President for his Address to both the Houses of Parliament. Since the Parliament met last, many grave events have taken place. The first and foremost has been the demise of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri at the time when he completed the greatest achievement of his career and when the whole nation

was waiting to give him a heroic welcome. Shastriji represented the Indian spirit in his own way. It is this characteristic in him which has enhanced his stature and prestige in the whole world and made him the apple of the eye of the Indian people.

Sir, he lived a poor man and died as a poor man. There is a peculiar Indianness in this fascinating pathos of Shastri's life and death. He was a devotee of Swami Rama Thirtha. He lived and died like a real Sanyasin.

Yesterday, while speaking on the Tashkent Agreement, Shri Kripalani quoted something about the Prime Ministers of Britain. I think there is nothing in comparison with what he read about the Prime Ministers of Britain and our Prime Ministers here. It is really under-estimating our own moral character and strength by saying that somebody, some force outside has influenced us to agree to this or agree to that. It is not proper, whether it be hon. Members on that side or hon. Members this side, to say like that. It represents the Indian character when we say something about our own leaders, that we will be forced by some outside influence. I think no force on earth has ever been able to force us to do anything through generations.

Sir, for Shri Shastri unprecedented problems were thrown up and Shastri tackled them successfully one by one, and today they are very near solution. Shastriji had humble beginnings, simplicity in life, marked religious bent of mind bordering on saintliness—single minded devotion believed in righteous thinking was a real karma yogi. If Nehru gave a modern interpretation of Gandhism, Shastri succeeded in spelling out Nehruism down to its earth components. His end is a tragedy, a magnificent tragedy given only to the choicest few. His unparalleled role in the history of India during his tenure of office will remain a work of monumental value.

In the Kutch episode he proved himself to be a man of peace. But even a man of peace cannot, have inexhaustible patience when the country's sovereignty and integrity is threatened. Having reached the pinnacle of achievement in the Tashkent Agreement, his life ended abruptly as though he was not prepared to linger any longer once the purpose for which he came was over.

Sir, much is being said for and against the Tashkent Agreement. I do not want to go into the details. Yesterday, Shri Dandekar was saying about our foreign policy, non-alignment, *shanti* and all those things. If I had the time I could have answered him about non-alignment in the new context of the world situation. Unfortunately, I do not have the time to explain all those things to him. Today there may be people who sincerely feel unhappy about this in Pakistan and also in India. I would request those people to understand and reconsider their stand in the light of the overall situation as it existed before and after the agreement.

Sir, tensions are easing and normal relations are in the process of being restored. There is a genuine desire to eschew recourse to arms in the settling of disputes and it is taking shape in the minds of the people in both the countries. All this does not, of course, mean everything. Although these things are happening, although there is a change in the thinking of the people that we should settle matters across the table, this does not mean everything. At the same time it is something which we should all accept. The points of conflict should be localised not only in the field but also, or even more so, in the minds of the people of both the countries. This is the crying need of a civilised world. Nations may have their blind spots but they need not on that account become totally blind. Let us, therefore, do our best to honour the Tashkent Agreement and see that it is implemented at the same time taking care to see that it is not a

one-sided implementation and that there is sincerity on both the sides.

The most important fact that has come to our notice during this Agreement is that both Russia and America have hailed this as a historic agreement. Apart from them, scores of other countries, belonging to this or that bloc or not belonging to any bloc have supported this and they are happy over this agreement. The other important thing is that China is fretting and fuming over this agreement and trying its best to defeat the agreement. This clearly shows that the Indo-Pakistan question has cut across the traditional bloc pattern and has even brought about another pattern in which all nations desiring peace, particularly in Asia are ranged over on one side. This side contains capitalist, socialist, Communist and other unclassified nations from the standpoint of political ideology. All of them have supported this. The only endeavour of all these nations is world peace. So, it should be India's endeavour today to consolidate this new pattern of international polarisation. We want to see that America and Russia come together for furthering the cause of peace. Our policy of non-alignment will have meaning in this context in a different line altogether. Our endeavour is to see that the forces of peace are polarised on one side.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty asked why we are keeping quiet on Viet Nam. Our opinion on Viet Nam has already been expressed. If the war in Viet Nam still continues, it does not mean that we should assume the role of an international chatterbox, going about and advising people "do this; do not do that". We have no business to assume this role. We are not the only country fostering peace. Generally it is the power which has the capacity to blast the world, it is only that power which has the capacity to maintain peace. We can play the role of co-operating with them to

[Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma]

bring about an understanding so that world peace is maintained. At the time when Pakistan attacked us, we saw that many of the countries did not say or come out with statements "this country is right or that country is wrong". In the same way, we can assume a constructive role by not accusing one party or the other. In this matter I appreciate and congratulate Shrimati Indira Gandhi for her restraint. This restraint is a sign of statesmanship and diplomacy in international politics.

In Viet Nam what were the role of Russia and China? Russia herself played a definite role, different from that of China. Does Shrimati Renu Chakravartty expect us to blame our country or shout about another country?

The President's Address has mentioned that the new Government is led by one who belongs to the younger generation of freedom fighters. The nation as a whole has full faith in Indira, our new Prime Minister. She is not a mere Prime Minister, not a mere woman Prime Minister, but the Prime Minister of one of the biggest democracies in the world. May be, because of the fact she happens to be a woman, women of the whole world might have expressed their joy, jubilation and pride over her election. But, at the same time, she is much more than that.

She has a symbolic significance in today's context. Gandhi, Nehru, Shastri, Indira, if we look at this line carefully, there is a difference of about 15 to 20 years between every two consecutive stages. This represents the evolution of Indian leadership since Gandhiji. This also represents the remarkable triumph of democracy in this country which, as prophetically stated by Nehru, has become mature enough to throw up the requisite leadership whenever the need arises. The nation justifiably expects a fresh-

ness and vigour in the tackling of problems by the new Government. People also expect past inhibitions to be got over and calculated risks to be taken whenever they are necessary.

The food problem, which has been discussed here, has been occupying the mind of every one and it is worrying every one in the country. I do not want to go into the details of it. My hon. friend, Shri Karuthiruman has stated that every country has to depend on another country when there is scarcity and there is nothing shameful in it. It is true there is scarcity. It is stated that when people are agitating for more food they are being shot down. I do agree with those who say that when there are such demonstrations the Government should sympathise with the people and should not resort to firing so easily. But in all this criticism, what is the practical solution for this problem? We should not import; we should give food to all people. Is it by magic that we can produce food? Why at the same time blame that we are beggars going about begging? There is no question of any begging. If there is any difficulty, like brother-nations or sister-nations we understand and try to help each other in all these problems.

17 hrs.

This problem of distribution should not be treated merely as a tentative measure to be resorted to at the time of countrywide crisis. While private trade is allowed to operate freely during times of bumper production, Government are called upon to shoulder the responsibility at the time of an acute shortage which is extremely unfair and which shows the Government's endeavour in a very unfavourable light.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: She may continue tomorrow.