

**Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rai Bareilly):** Before you take up the next item, may I ask the Minister of Railways one question? When he presented the Budget on the last occasion, I had requested that Volume II of the Railway Board's report should be provided to all Members, in addition to Volume I which used to be provided. I just went into the Lobby and found that this year, after my request and after his assurance that he would consider the matter, both the Volumes are missing.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** I shall check up, but my information is that the volumes have been placed in the Library.

**Some Hon. Members:** They are not there.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi:** They should not only be placed in the Library but they should be given to us, one copy each.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** I shall send the copies to the Lok Sabha Secretariat.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi:** We used to get them every year. Last year, we got Volume I. I requested the Minister to provide us with Volume II. And he said he would consider the matter, and as a result of the consideration, both the volumes have disappeared.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** What I said was that I would send the volumes to the office, and they will distribute it...

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** They should be circulated to hon. Members.

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant):** One copy to Shri Feroze Gandhi.

**Shri Jagjivan Ram:** ...and I shall send one copy to Shri Feroze Gandhi.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi:** I have got it.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** They should be circulated to all hon. Members.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members will notice that there are as many as 750 Members of Parliament in both the

Houses. All hon. Members do not read all the books that are sent to them. Therefore, those who are interested—of course, all are interested—may apply to the office, and I shall arrange to get as many copies as are necessary.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi:** Thank you.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Minister will try to provide the Secretariat with as many copies as are necessary. I shall have them placed in the Notice Office. To send them to every hon. Member may not be necessary.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** May I request the House to sit till six o'clock every day?

**Mr. Speaker:** This Session is of short duration, and the work is heavy. Therefore, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs suggests that the House may sit every day, from today onwards, till six o'clock.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram):** There is no lunch-hour and there is no break.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hon. Members are going away for lunch. Therefore, we shall sit till six o'clock every day, till the 31st inst.

#### MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now take up the debate on the President's Address.

Before I call upon Shri Thirumal Rao to move his Motion of Thanks to the President, I have to announce that under rule 21, I have fixed that the time-limit for speeches shall ordinarily be 15 minutes, with the exception of leaders of various Groups, for whom 30 minutes will be allowed, if necessary.

[Mr. Speaker]

The Prime Minister, who, I think, will reply to the debate, on behalf of Government, may intervene or reply at a later stage, and take the necessary time.

**Shri Thirumal Rao (Kakinada):** Sir, I get to move:

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

I would like to express the sense of satisfaction of this House generally, and of myself personally, on the re-election of the President and the Vice-President for a second term. Both of them have shed lustre on their high offices, one as a great *karmayogi* and a fellow-builder of independent India along with Mahatma Gandhi, and the other as a great philosopher who interpreted the great truths of our culture and philosophy in a language intelligible to the countries of the West. The country has voted in an overwhelming manner its confidence in the present leadership as represented by the President, the Vice-President, and the Prime Minister of India

In a parliamentary set-up, a general election is considered to be the election of the Prime Minister of the country, and the country has in no uncertain a manner declared once again its implicit faith and confidence in the leadership of the Prime Minister by voting him back to power for another lease of five years.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod):** May I make one submission? Some amendments to the motion are also there. They have to be formally moved, after the motion is moved. But the hon. Member is speaking on the motion now.

**Mr. Speaker:** The practice is that the Mover of a motion moves his motion and makes his speech; then, it is seconded. Thereafter, whoever wants to move his amendment may do so. I shall call the hon. Members on

by one, and they may signify whether they want to move their amendments. Then, the amendments will be treated as moved. Then, the general discussion will follow.

**Shri Thirumal Rao** may now continue.

**Shri Thirumal Rao:** The measure of confidence reposed is also a measure of the high esteem in which all our leaders are held in the country and also outside.

This sovereign Parliament is entering into the second phase of its existence as the second parliament under the Indian Republic. And I think it is time that we should have a brief retrospect of the achievements of this Parliament during the first five years of its existence.

We have passed through a decade of our existence as an independent nation. After the general elections in 1952, we have implemented the provisions of our Constitution based on adult franchise. This Parliament was elected on that basis with an extensive voting strength of 17 crores of people, which number swelled to 19 crores in this election. As a result of that election, the leadership of the country has been clothed with constitutional authority. What has been achieved during the first five years of the existence of this Parliament is something which is remarkable in the history of responsible representative government in the world.

But we need not be complacent; we need not be proud of what we have achieved. We must be conscious of what is possible under conditions that have obtained in this country under wise and old leadership. The amount of legislation that has been placed on the statute-book is prodigious. Matters which have been hanging fire for a long time, as for instance, the legislation with regard to the social customs and relations in Indian society, the property of women, marital relations etc.—which have been hanging fire from nearly 1946—have been finally decided by the First Parliament of

India in a manner that has been acceptable to the vast majority of the people.

Again, as for the question of untouchability, the abolition of untouchability has been placed on a statutory basis, making it an offence to observe untouchability. And that has been achieved as the most important item in our social programme.

A number of other pieces of legislation have also been passed during the first five years. The ideal of a society based on the socialistic pattern has been accepted. To implement that ideal legislatively, the First Parliament had taken steps to nationalise the Imperial Bank, to nationalise the insurance business in this country, and also to place on a sound footing the economy of the country with a view to eliminate inordinate inequalities between the rich and the poor.

We are now entering on the second phase. I do not want to give a detailed picture of the First Five Year Plan and its working. That Plan has shown us the way by voting an expenditure of Rs. 3,101 crores, most of which was completely spent and absorbed. The country and Government have mobilised the expert opinion of a number of economists and leaders of public opinion, and experienced administrators in the shape of the Planning Commission and all their advisers, and have evolved a Plan. The first seven years have been one continuous activity intellectually, to evolve a Plan intended for about thirty years to come.

From the figures, we have seen that the planned national income at the end of the period 1951-56 is shown to be Rs. 10,800 crores. For a country steeped in poverty, whose optimum level of subsistence is the lowest in the world, so to say, it is necessary that it has to be lifted up *en masse* to a level of average contentment and stability, economically. More than that, we have to evolve a long-range Plan.

The Planning Commission have decided that they will carry on the

planning up to 1971-76. By 1971-76, their investments would come to a total of Rs. 27,270 crores, when the per capita income which at the end of the period 1951-56 has been Rs. 281 is expected to rise to Rs. 546. In order to achieve this, we have to go on expanding our investments at the rate of Rs. 6,200 crores under the Second Five Year Plan, Rs. 9,900 crores under the Third Five Year Plan, Rs. 14,800 crores in the Fourth Five Year Plan, and Rs. 27,700 crores by the time we reach the end of the Fifth Five Year Plan. This is a very bold thing indeed, which only men of great imagination and foresight and experience can think of evolving and then working out on a practical basis through the agency of Government and with the co-operation of the public.

That is what is being achieved. But we are now passing through a very difficult period. As has been said, the assumption of this Plan is mainly based on agricultural production in this country. Even when we see the economic development of the United States of America, all their industrial prosperity is based on a continuous and continued sustenance of purchasing power derived from agricultural production. The economy of the United States has been largely—70 per cent of it is self-contained and they have got a very small margin of exports—dependent on their agricultural production. That is the basis on which we have also to depend in this country, because the basis of our very economic system is agriculture.

In the First Plan, we made a provision for agriculture and community development of Rs. 357 crores and irrigation and power, Rs. 661 crores. In the Second Plan, we have made a provision of Rs. 568 crores for agriculture and Rs. 913 crores for irrigation and power. In the Second Plan, the emphasis has been shifted to industrial development. The income derived from agricultural activities is always less than that derived from industrial activity. Therefore, the emphasis has been rightly shifted from agricultural

[Shri Thirumal Rao]

development to industrial development. We have seen in the Second Plan a provision of Rs. 890 crores for industry and mining. A concomitant and ancillary activity which develops industry and on which industry depends is transport and communications. About Rs. 1,385 crores are provided for this purpose.

The magnitude of this task is only being felt just now in the second year of the Plan. We are up against so many shortages. Yesterday and today we have been having a discussion about the food situation in the country. No doubt, prices are rising. I come from a surplus area situated between two river basins, the Godavari and the Krishna, where we see an artificial rise in food prices. What is the reason? We have released large quantities of money by way of development programmes, river valley programmes and so many other constructional activities, and that money is in circulation. We have developed a large industrial potential about the cities by our starting huge works. All this increases the numbers in industrial labour and they are receiving a little more money. There is bound to be inflation in prices. How to curb it?

Here, I want to allay the panic that is being created that there is food scarcity and deaths by starvation and lack of food. That is not the case. Poverty is always there, and the main problem of the Second Five Year Plan is to tackle this question of poverty as far as possible.

But with regard to agricultural conditions in my part of the country, I may say this. Take the low income groups. For instance, take a family of four people. These four people go to work and earn Rs. 1-8 each a day. If a family earns Rs. 250 per month, they spend Rs. 150 on their food. Now you see the cinemas working at full speed; you see the transport system working at full speed. People working in the rural side are taking to transport. A man who earns Rs. 1-8

a day does not want to walk but wants to get into a bus to go a distance of two miles. So also you find that fine cloth is used by the lower classes. It is we, the upper classes, who have set the example. Whenever the women members dress themselves in fine cloths, the lower class people, the maid-servants, also dress themselves in fine cloths. As I have already said, the cinemas are working at full speed, and lower class people, men and women, dressed in fine cloths go there; they travel by bus; they go on pilgrimages to various places with the surplus money that they have. I am not saying for a moment that they are living in a condition where milk and honey flow. But when a little money comes into their hands, they imitate the upper classes and want to spend a little more on luxuries.

We also see from the statistics furnished by the Food Minister that large numbers of people depend on coarse grains. But people eating coarse grains hitherto are trying to imitate the upper classes and going for the finer qualities of rice and wheat. This is the position.

With regard to the smaller agriculturists, my hon. friend, Shri A. P. Jain, has told us just now that they are able to hold on and are not compelled to sell the little produce that comes from the field. Let me give an example. Take a 10-acre plot in my district, which is a deltaic district. On the average, a man produces 30 maunds an acre. He produces 300 maunds. He will also have one or two acres under sugarcane which gives him Rs. 500 an acre. On the sugarcane, he makes a profit of Rs. 1,000. He takes a loan from a bank on the security of the paddy and waits for a rise in prices. I have calculated that on this score Rs. 33 crores are now financed by banks as paddy loans. At the rate of Rs. 500 a ton, about 8 lakhs tons of paddy are locked up in this manner. This creates an artificial scarcity. The man who keeps this under lock and key tells you openly that he is not going to

release it, unless the price of paddy goes up to Rs. 30 a bag or Rs. 15 a maund. That is actually what is happening in a particular part of the country. If my speech is published in the vernacular Press in my constituency, all those small landlords will rise against me and say: "This man who has taken our votes is fighting against high prices. It is today that we are receiving a little higher price. Where were these legislators when the price of rice had fallen to Rs. 3 a maund and when we suffered the vicissitudes and vagaries of climate? Today we are having a little money. What are we to do?"

Therefore, this is a problem which has to be dealt with care by Government. You cannot displease one section of the population. They are just now tasting a little rise in prices. On the other hand, you cannot also displease the large section of landless population who depend for their very existence on daily wage and are, therefore, concerned with the cost of foodgrains.

I do not want to deal with high finance and other problems concerning the huge deficit, for which the Prime Minister has appointed an expert in our Finance Ministry. Moreover, other Members of the House are competent to advise him on these matters, as to how to bridge the gap with regard to external finance or investments and also how to finance the Second Five Year Plan inside the country.

With regard to the Second Five Year Plan, I want to lay emphasis on the development of transport. We have got for a coastline of 3,400 miles only four or five well-developed ports, like Calcutta, Visakhapatnam, Madras, Bombay, Cochin and now Kandla. These are hardly enough. There is a large number of minor ports which deserve to be developed into major ports. Also, the four-fold system of road transport, canal transport, rail transport and sea transport, has to be co-ordinated and a concerted plan developed in the country. We have

recently read that the north and south of India are to be connected by canals. There is a canal system now which can easily be connected on the east coast up to Calcutta—the famous Buckingham canal which is 400 miles long. So also the road system must come to the aid of the general communications system in the country, because the railways cannot fully cater for the needs of the rising tempo of industrial development in the country.

There is another important aspect of development to which I would like to refer—the issue of reorganisation of States which was faced by the last Parliament. It was to the credit of the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel to have united India under one Constitution and one flag, eliminating all the ruling princes and making India a nation. Now, it has been given to the Home Minister, Shri Pant to face all the great difficulties that are inherent in the reorganisation of the States. We are not completely out of the difficulties of the aftermath of the legislation that has been passed by the last Parliament. But, for my part, I should like to express our sense of gratitude and gratefulness that the Andhra area has been united into one and Andhra Pradesh has been formed. The justification for the Andhra State has been found in the results that have been achieved there. I am not laying any emphasis on the linguistic aspect of it because we do not want to use an argument which has proved useful in the past. Within two years of the formation of the Andhra State we have been able to organise the Nagarjuna Sagar Project and it is being implemented. The intensity with which a particular State which has got a sort of emotional integration and ideology binding it together will work can be experienced from this.

With regard to the great difficulties that Punjab has presented, it is an achievement of the last Government and Parliament that they were able to organise the State of Punjab into a unified province, though still certain murmurs and dissentient voices are heard.

[Shri Thirumal Rao]

With regard to Bombay and Gujarat it is a difficult problem. It is not a solution that can be imposed by anybody from outside. The Gujaratis want a Maha Gujarat and the Mahashtrians want a Brihan Maharashtra; but both of them want Bombay. That is the bone of contention. Both of them claim to have succeeded in the elections on this issue. It is for both of them to unite and decide. But, as far as, I think, the Central Government and this Parliament is concerned, the verdict of Parliament is there and it cannot be undone except by Parliament itself.

Sir, I do not want to take much of your time. But I wanted to refer briefly to one or two points referred to by the President in his speech, with regard to our foreign policy. With regard to Kashmir, we need not go too far into the matter. Pakistan leadership has been trying to use Kashmir as a sort of peg to hang on its Government from time to time. It is the last resort of the Prime Minister of Pakistan, I think, to prolong his life for a short while by diverting the attention of the whole Pakistani people to India. They are not able to draw up a Constitution; they are not able to achieve stable government and they go on slinging mud at the neighbouring country, India. The recent report of Jarring is self-evident. He has come and seen things for himself. He has seen that the set-up that has been created by the power blocs of the West and the East is responsible for all these troubles there. Now, since Pakistan has definitely allied itself to the purse strings of the United States and the western powers, it has created another fresh problem for this country because of the NATO and Baghdad Pacts whereby military material is being pumped into Pakistan as a set-off against India's stability.

With regard to the stopping of the nuclear tests, our country has been one of the first to raise its moral protest against the continuance of these nuclear tests. Our Prime Minis-

ter has announced to the world that it is disastrous to humanity if these tests are continued. World public opinion has gradually veered round. In England, the Labour Party is against it. The former Prime Minister of England, Mr. Attlee has pronounced against it and public opinion in many countries, and Japan particularly, is against it. We are sure that with the leadership which our Prime Minister commands, with the prestige he commands in the world today, if we persist in this that nuclear tests should be stopped and nuclear weapons should be banned permanently from modern warfare, then there is a chance of saving humanity from the disastrous effects of these things.

I do not want to take much time of the House because this is a formal motion of thanks where more controversial aspects will be dealt with by other Members of the House. I am thankful for the opportunity you have given me of moving a motion of thanks. In this connection, I should like to place on record also our gratitude to Providence that our Prime Minister was saved from a very serious accident in January last. If we understand things properly or in a proper setting, the difference between life and death, between being and not being is so thin that we cannot realise it until the thing overtakes us. It is providential that the leadership of this country is kept in safe hands for another period of political activity.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Mathura Prasad Misra will now second the motion.

Before the hon. Member starts I would like to make an announcement. I find there are as many as 50 or 60 amendments. I would therefore request hon. Members who wish to move their amendments to please hand in at the Table within 15 minutes a slip intimating the number of the amendments which they would like to move. I would look into all of them and such of them as are in order would be treated as having been moved.

श्री म० प्र० मिश्र (बंगलूर) :  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे मित्र श्री बिस्मिल  
राव जी ने जो प्रस्ताव अभी पेश किया है  
उसका समर्थन करते हुये मुझे बड़ी खुशी  
हो रही है ।

अभी अभी दूसरे महा चुनाव से हमारा  
देश निकला है और यह मान्य है कि इस  
चुनाव में देश के कोई बीस करोड़ लोगों ने  
हिस्सा लिया । चीन को छोड़ कर दुनिया में  
कोई दूसरा ऐसा देश नहीं है जहाँ कि इतनी  
बड़ी आबादी भी बसती है जितनी बड़ी  
बाँध्या में हमारे देश में लोगों ने आम चुनाव  
में भाग लिया है । और मैं आपसे कहूँ कि  
हमारा देश न सिर्फ़ आज दुनिया का  
सबसे बड़ा और जवान प्रजातंत्र है, बल्कि  
आज की दुनिया का देखते हुये मैं यह भी  
कहना चाहता हूँ कि दुनिया में मनुष्य की  
स्वाधीनता और प्रजातन्त्र का भविष्य इस  
बात पर निर्भर करता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की  
स्वाधीनता और हिन्दुस्तान का प्रजातंत्र  
कहाँ तक सफल या विफल होता है ।

यह जो अभी बड़ा चुनाव हुआ है उसके  
नतीजे बड़े अच्छे रहे । सबसे बड़ी खुशी  
की बात यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान का दूसरा  
महा-चुनाव इतनी शान्ति और शान के साथ  
सम्पन्न हुआ । दूसरी खुशी की बात यह  
है कि इस चुनाव का ही यह नतीजा है कि  
देश को वह सरकार मिली जो सरकार कि  
देश को चाहिये थी, जिसके नेता फिर भी  
अगले पांच वर्षों के लिये पंडित जवाहर लाल  
नेहरू रहे । मैं इस बात को नभ्रता के साथ  
कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश की स्वाधीनता  
की और इस देश के प्रजातन्त्र की सबसे  
बड़ी रक्षक संस्था कांग्रेस ही है और इस  
स्वाधीनता और प्रजातंत्र के सबसे बड़े पहरे-  
दार पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू हैं । यह  
भी बड़ी बात है कि जिस संस्था ने देश  
को आजादी दिलाई, और जिस संस्था ने  
देश को एक दूसरी योजना के रास्ते पर रखा

और जो संस्था देश को प्रजातन्त्र के साथ  
साथ आर्थिक योजना के मार्ग से आगे ले  
जा रही है, और इस प्रकार दुनिया में एक  
नया और अनोखा प्रयोग कर रही है,  
उसी संस्था को फिर देश का शासन भार  
संभालने का मौका दिया गया जो कि  
बहुत आवश्यक था ।

यह भी इस महाचुनाव का नतीजा  
निकला है कि हमको राष्ट्रपति के रूप में  
राजेन्द्र बाबू मिले । हमारे देश के जीवन  
और हमारी संस्कृति में जो कुछ भी महान  
और मीठा है उसके राजेन्द्र बाबू प्रतीक हैं  
और मेरा विश्वास है कि कांग्रेस, नेहरू और  
राजेन्द्र बाबू के नेतृत्व में देश और भी आगे  
बढ़ेगा ।

इन दस वर्षों में जो सबसे बड़ी बात हम  
देखते हैं वह यह हुई है कि बड़ी कठिनाइयों  
और मुसीबतों के होते हुये भी हमारा देश  
प्रजातंत्र, स्वाधीनता और आत्मनिर्भरता के  
रास्ते पर आगे बढ़ता जा रहा है । और  
मैं आपसे कहूँ कि आज की दुनिया में  
जब कि बहुत और से प्रजातन्त्र  
और मानव की स्वाधीनता पर अंगुलियाँ  
उठ रही हैं, उन पर संगीनें तानी जा रही  
हैं, उस समय इस दिशा में हमारी जययात्रा  
न सिर्फ़ हमारे लिये बल्कि मनुष्य जाति के  
अभिमान और सुख की चोख कही जा सकती है ।  
हमारी सरकार के सामने अपनी योजना को  
पूरा करने के मार्ग में जो जो मुसीबतें आयें  
उनका उसने बहादुरी के साथ मुकाबला  
किया है । हमारे राष्ट्रपति और सरकार  
ने यह माना है कि हमारी दूसरी योजना के  
मार्ग में बड़ी बड़ी कठिनाइयों हैं, परन्तु  
उनका हमारी सरकार मुकाबला करना  
चाहती है । दूसरी योजना का यह दूसरा  
वर्ष है । पहली योजना सफल हुई । इस  
सभा में भी ऐसे बहुत से लोग हैं और बाह्य  
भी हैं जो कि पहली योजना की सफलता में  
भी विश्वास नहीं करते थे । आज भी

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

इस सभा में ऐसे लोग बैठे हैं जो कि दूसरी योजना की सफलता में विश्वास नहीं करते। ये वही लोग हैं जो कि आज से दस बीस वर्ष पहले हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी में भी विश्वास नहीं करते थे और कांग्रेस के प्रयत्नों में भी विश्वास नहीं करते थे। लेकिन यह एक बड़ी बात हुई कि राष्ट्रपति ने इन कठिनाइयों की तरफ हमारा ध्यान खींचा है और उनको कञ्चल किया है। हमारे सामने मुद्रा-स्फीति की और विदेशी विनिमय की कमी की कठिनाइयाँ हैं। कुछ लोग कहते हैं कि ये कठिनाइयाँ इतनी बड़ी हैं कि इनके कारण हमको अपनी योजना को कुछ छोटा करना होगा। उन लोगों का ख्याल है कि हमारे जो लक्ष्य हैं, टारजेंट्स हैं, उनको हमें पीछे हटाना होगा। लेकिन हमारे राष्ट्रपति ने बड़ी बहादुरी से कहा है कि उनको घटाया न जाये बल्कि कम से कम उनकी जैसे का तैसा पूरा किया जाये और यदि हो सके तो उनको बढ़ाया जाये। सरकार जो भी करे, देश का और इस सभा का यह काम है कि वह इन कठिनाइयों के कारण पीछे न हटे बल्कि आगे बढ़े। देश का यह लक्ष्य है कि हम पीछे न हटे बल्कि आगे ही बढ़ें। हमें देश की दुर्गति और देश की प्रगति के बीच चुनाव करना है।

13-46 Hrs.

[SARDAR HUKAM SINGH in the Chair]

यदि हम आगे नहीं बढ़ेंगे तो हमको अपने पुराने पानी में पड़ा रहना होगा, हमें गरीबी और जहालत में पड़ा रहना होगा। यदि हमको देश को आगे बढ़ाना है तो हमको उन लोगों की बात पर ध्यान नहीं देना चाहिये जो कि मुद्रास्फीति आदि का भय दिखा कर देश के कारवां को रोकना चाहते हैं। श्री शिनाय और दूसरे लोगों की इज्जत करते हुये भी हम उनकी इस राय को नहीं मान सकते कि हमको अपनी प्रगति धीमी करनी चाहिये।

हमको इस विषय में आगे बढ़ना है। सरकार ने जो गैर जरूरी चीजों के आयात को रोकने का कदम उठाया है उसका हम स्वागत करते हैं। लेकिन हम समझते हैं कि इसके साथ साथ हमको कुछ जरूरी चीजें और करनी हैं। राष्ट्रपति ने सादगी और कम खर्चों की प्रील की है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने भी हाल में यह प्रील की है कि दिखावे की चीजें जो कि हमारे प्रील उमरा करते हैं उनको भी रोक देना चाहिये। यह प्रील देश के पास पतुंजी है। लेकिन हमसे भी जरूरी चीजें करने की हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे समय में जब कि हम देश को बनाता चाहते हैं उस वक़्त यह प्रति आवश्यक है कि देश का उत्पादन बढ़ाया जाये। यह देश की पहली जरूरत है। ऐसे समय में सरकार को यह सोचना चाहिये था कि दिल्ली में प्रगोक होटल पहले बनायी जाये या कि उस रुपये से एक सीमेंट का कारखाना खोला जाय। इस होटल पर दो करोड़ रुपये खर्च किया गया जिसमें एक आदमी के ठहरने का खर्च भी या डेढ़ सौ रुपये रोज होता है। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को इस किस्य की चीजों का देखना चाहिये। अगर कोई दिल्ली को प्राकर देखे तो वह बड़े बड़े सुन्दर और गानदार मकान देखेगा। यह ठीक है कि मकानों की जरूरत है लेकिन जब हम अपनी दूसरी योजना को आगे बढ़ा रहे हैं तो हमको अपने नारे मानवों को उम पर लगाना चाहिये। अभी हाल ही में श्री स्ट्रूची ने कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान का भविष्य इस बात पर निर्भर करता है कि उसकी दूसरी योजना सफल होती है या नहीं।

हिन्दुस्तान का और इस दुनिया का भविष्य इस बात पर निर्भर करता है कि हिन्दुस्तान में लोकतन्त्र और पंचशर्य योजना सफल होती है या नहीं। इस प्रकार सरकार के ऊपर एक बहुत बड़ा दायित्व

धीरे एक बहुत बड़ी जवाबदेही आती है, जिस का पालन करने के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि वह देश के सामने सादगी और आस्टिडिटी का नमूना पेश करे—न केवल पहनावे और मोटरों इत्यादि के बारे में, बल्कि मकानों के बारे में भी ।

माननीय जैन साहब ने खाद्य स्थिति के बारे में जो वक्तव्य दिया है, मैं उस का स्वागत करता हूँ । मैं जानता हूँ और मानता हूँ कि हमारे देश में खेती की पैदावार बढ़ रही है और बढ़ेगी, लेकिन इस के साथ ही साथ यह भी मानना होगा कि भूमि सुधार की हमारी योजना बहुत धीरे धीरे चल रही है । जमीन की अच्छी व्यवस्था स्थापित करने के लिये जितनी शीघ्रता और निपुणता के साथ कार्य किया जाना चाहिये, उस तरह नहीं हो रहा है और इस और सरकार के प्रयत्न काफ़ी नहीं हैं । कुछ समय पहले हिन्दुस्तान का जो डेनीगेशन चीन गया था, मैं उस की रिपोर्ट पढ़ रहा था । मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को इस मामले में किन्हीं मोहों में नहीं पड़ना चाहिये और रूस और चीन की नकल नहीं करनी चाहिये कि सामूहिक खेती—को-आपरेटिव खेती—को प्रचलित किया जाय । हिन्दुस्तान को तो अपने ही रास्ते पर चलना होगा । इस सम्बन्ध में यह आवश्यक है कि ऊपर की ओर नीचे की सीलिंग क्रिस की जाय और चक-बन्दी की व्यवस्था की जाय । बल्कि मैं तो ऊपर की निस्वत नीचे की सीलिंग निश्चित करना ज्यादा जरूरी मानता हूँ । हमारा प्रयत्न यह होना चाहिये कि ऐसा किसान कौई न रहे, जिस के पास अच्छी पैदावार करने के लिये काफ़ी जमीन न हो—और इस के लिये मैं सात एकड़ भूमि को उचित मानता हूँ । मेरा निबेदन यह है कि भूमि सुधारों को जल्द से जल्द पूरा किया जाय । यह एक तथ्य है कि इस देश में चाहे जितना औद्योगिकरण हो जाय, यहां का मुख्य आधार खेती है और खेती ही रहेगी । और फिर

देश का पूरा औद्योगिकरण होने में भी अभी बहुत बरस लगेंगे, बहुत धन लगेगा और मेरे विचार में तब भी देश का पूरा कल्याण नहीं होगा । इसलिये यह अब भी बहुत जरूरी है कि योजना में खेती को महत्वपूर्ण स्थान—प्रायर्टी—दिया जाय । मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि सरकार का ध्यान धीरे धीरे इस तरफ़ आ भी रहा है ।

आज हमारे देश में अन्न-मंडक उपस्थित हुये हैं और उनके कारण मेरा प्रान्त, मेरा ज़िला और मेरा निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र बहुत बड़ी मुसीबत में पड़ा हुआ है, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि बिहार सरकार और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस का मुकाबला करने के लिये जो उपाय किये हैं, वे काफ़ी हैं और वे सफल होंगे और हमारी मुसीबतें दूर होंगी ।

जैसा कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने उल्लेख किया है, जिन क्षेत्रों में सामुदायिक विकास योजनाओं को कार्यान्वित किया गया है, वहां खेती का उत्पादन दूसरे क्षेत्रों की अपेक्षा पच्चीस प्रतिशत अधिक हुआ है । मैं समझता हूँ कि कम्प्यूनिटी प्राजेक्ट्स और सामुदायिक विकास योजनाओं को इस देश के निर्माण में एक बहुत बड़ा भाग अदा करना है । अपने ज़िले में, अपने घर के पास मैंने कम्प्यूनिटी प्राजेक्ट एरिया को दो बार जा कर देखा है । मुझे "क्रान्ति" शब्द बहुत प्रिय नहीं लगता है, लेकिन किसी दूसरे उपयुक्त शब्द के अभाव में मैं इसी को प्रयोग में ला कर कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसे क्षेत्रों में साइडेंट, ब्लडलैस रेवोल्यूशन—शान्त, रक्तहीन क्रान्ति देखने में आ रहा है । जहाँ पहले लोग स्वप्न में भी यह नहीं सोच सकते थे कि उन के कुओं के पास बाथरूम होंगे और पक्की सड़क बनाई जायेगी, लेकिन आज वे अपनी आंखों से ये चीजें देख रहे हैं । आज वहां पर विकास कार्य बड़ी तेजी से हो रहे हैं । हमारे साथी इस बात को तभी समझ सकते हैं, अगर वे स्वयं जा कर उन क्षेत्रों को देखें ।

[श्री म० प्र० मिश्र]

वहाँ अच्छे बीज और दूसरी सुविधाओं के कारण गेहूँ की पैदावार अधिक हुई, जब कि दूसरे इलाकों में वह बहुत कम हुई।

हमें इन कम्युनिटी प्राजेक्ट्स को सफल बनाना है और इस काम में अपनी सारी ताकत लगा देनी है, क्योंकि अगर हमारी यह योजना सफल नहीं हुई, तो देश सफल नहीं होगा और अगर देश सफल नहीं होगा, तो उसकी स्वाधीनता और प्रजातंत्र खतरे में पड़ जायेंगे और उस के परिणामस्वरूप सारी दुनिया में प्रजातंत्र और स्वाधीनता खतरे में पड़ जायेंगे। इतना बड़ा दायित्व इस सरकार के ऊपर है। इस चुनाव में बीस करोड़ लोगों ने इस सरकार को इतनी बड़ी जवाबदेही की जगह पर भेजा है। इस सम्बन्ध में एक बात की तरफ योजना आयोग का ध्यान उतना नहीं गया है, जितना कि जाना चाहिये था। हम अपने देश की पैदावार तो बढ़ाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं और वह बढ़ेगी, लेकिन जो आबादी बढ़ती जा रही है, उस को रोकने के लिये जितनी कोशिश की जानी चाहिये, उतनी नहीं हो रही है। मेरे विचार में इस देश की सबसे बड़ी समस्या आबादी की है, लेकिन शायद हमारे नेता इसकी गहराई को अभी तक नहीं समझ पाये हैं, मेरी राय में माल्थस आज भी ठीक हैं और दूसरे लोग गलत हैं। हमारे लाल अंडे वाले साथी—हमारे कम्युनिष्ट मित्र—कहते हैं कि यह तो एक पूँजीवादी नारा है। जब वे कहते हैं कि इस प्रकार थोड़े से लोगों के मुख के लिये इतनी बड़ी जनसंख्या को आने से रोका जाता है, तो हमें लज्जा आ जाती है और हमें संकोच होता है और आबादी के रोक धाम के यस्त ढीले कर देते हैं। लेकिन हम यह भूल जाते हैं कि लाल अंडे वाले ये लोग तब तक माल्थस का मजाक उड़ाते रहेंगे, जब तक कि वे आदमी को बन्दूक की खुराक मानेंगे और जब तक कम्युनिज्म को—अपनी सारी नीति और विचारधारा को—वे युद्ध के

आधार पर रखेंगे, जब तक उन को फौज के लिये, मरने के लिये आदमियों की जरूरत रहेगी—ज्यादा आबादी की जरूरत रहेगी, हिटलर और मसोलीनी भी यही चाहते थे। लेकिन हम को तो इस तथ्य का सामना करना है कि हमारे देश में हर रोज साढ़े बारह हजार हर महीने चार लाख, हर साल पचास लाख और दस साल में पाँच करोड़ लोग बढ़ रहे हैं अर्थात् एक नया इंग्लैंड या एक नया जापान हमारे देश में पैदा हो रहा है। इस को रोकना होगा। इस के लिये उतने ही प्रयत्न काफ़ी नहीं हैं, जितने कि योजना आयोग इस समय कर रहा है। मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, जो कुछ वर्ष तक परिवार नियोजन के विरोधी थे, अब इस के समर्थक होते जा रहे हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारी सरकार भी इस गम्भीर समस्या की तरफ ध्यान दे। अंत में मैं राष्ट्रपति के भाषण से एक महत्वपूर्ण उद्धरण देना चाहता हूँ।

राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने भाषण के अन्त में कहा है —

हमारी क्षमता और माधन सीमित है, और संसार में हमारी आकांक्ष संभवतः बहुत ऊँचा नहीं है, किन्तु, राष्ट्रीय हितों की दृष्टि से, हमारे इतिहास और परम्पराओं तथा विश्वासों को देखते हुये हम किसी और रास्ते को नहीं अपना सकते। यह सीभाग्य का विषय है कि संसार भर के सभी लोगों का यह सामान्य ध्येय और उत्कट इच्छा है।

सभापति महोदय मुझे माफ़ करेंगे यदि इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहूँ कि भाषण का हिन्दी अनुबाद इतना भदा है . . . . .

एक सार्वभौमिक सचिव: और गलत भी है ।

श्री म० प्र० विषय: . . . . . और गलत भी है कि मेरा अंगरेजी भाषण पढ़ने को वां चाहता है ।

श्री श्री० ज० डांगे (बम्बई नगर-मध्य) : यह आक्रिफिशियल हिन्दी है ।

श्री म० प्र० विषय : यह बुरी है, इसको सुधारा जाय । अंग्रेजी के शब्द ये हैं —

But neither our national interests nor our history and traditions, nor our convictions chart any other course for us. Happily for us, this is the common aim and the firm desire of all our people.

आज, जब कि हम एक नये युग में प्रवेश कर रहे हैं और अगले पाँच बरस के लिये एक नये रास्ते पर चलने जा रहे हैं, और जब कि नई नई कठिनाइयाँ हमारे सामने खड़ी हैं, सस्ते और आसान रास्ते हमारे सामने पेश किये जा रहे हैं और कहा जा रहा है कि हम पार्लियामेंटरी सिस्टम और प्रजातन्त्र के अज्ञात में क्यों पड़े और क्यों न कोई आसान रास्ता अपना लें, उस वक्त राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने देश से और दुनिया से यह बायदा किया है कि हमारे सामने चाहे कितनी भी कठिनाइयाँ क्यों न आयें, हम अपने बल पर बिश्वास करेंगे, अपने प्रयत्नों को दुगना करेंगे, अपना सारा शक्ति लगा देंगे, लेकिन व्यक्तिगत स्वतंत्रता, नागरिक स्वाधीनता और लोकराज के रास्ते को नहीं छोड़ेंगे । हम उसी रास्ते पर चलेंगे और सफलता के साथ चलेंगे ।

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both

the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 13th May, 1957."

As has already been announced by the Speaker, Members may kindly give intimation to the Table of the particular amendments they are keen to move. I will announce the numbers of those amendments and they will be treated as moved subject to their otherwise being admissible. We may now proceed with the debate on the President's Address.

14 hrs.

Shri S. A. Dange: Sir, the amendments are already there before you and, therefore, I will offer my remarks on the President's Address and the elaborate commentary as it has been given to us by the Congress Party.

On reading the Address, what strikes me first is, it seems there is an attempt to hide from the country the real state of affairs as they exist under the present Government, and I will substantiate that statement from official records and not from the newspapers of the Communist Party.

On the eve of the election we were told many things about the achievements of the Five Year Plan. One of the achievements was that food production had increased and there was almost prosperity in the country. The Congress Party went round asking for votes on the basis of those achievements. Well, the vote was given on the basis of achievements, but the voters have now to learn, two months after the vote was given, that the achievement is starvation and deaths in public maidans in Bengal. The achievements, two months after the vote was given, are shown to be starvation and high prices. How is it that the achievements were so nice as to secure a majority two months ago and the achievements are turning out to be such disasters two months after? Were the achievements falsely painted or, is the present picture falsely painted? Well, it is for the Congress Party to answer the public and answer the Parliament.

[Shri S. A. Dange]

What I want to submit is that even now there is an attempt to hide the real picture. The Presidential Address says:

"While food production has increased, and the increases have been maintained,"

So, the country has to learn that food production has increased and the increases have been maintained. Then the Address goes on to say:

"...except for the results of natural calamities, more especially in certain parts of Bihar and the eastern districts of Uttar Pradesh, we have a considerable way to go before our country becomes fully self-sufficient in food."

So, except for natural calamities in certain parts of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, the food production has increased, and people who have the illusion that they are really starving should not carry that illusion and should not die, because we are assured that food production has increased. Then, in the same paragraph it is said:

"Intensive efforts have increased food production and improved crop prospects. 'Except in the case of some of the coarse grains adversely affected....'"

everything is all right. So, naturally, those people who eat coarse grains, those coarse people, may die coarsely. But, as my friend Shri Thirumal Rao stated, many people are now eating rice and wheat and are very prosperous going to cinemas, riding on buses and all that; so they need not feel bad about this failure in coarse grains, because rice and wheat are available in ample quantities. This is the picture I get from the President's Address. The Address says that food production is increasing, things are going on nicely and except for a few calamities everything is O.K.

Even in pointing out the calamities I am very sorry to say that the Pre-

sident's Address is parochial enough. I do say that deliberately. The President is the President of the Republic. When he mentioned these calamities only yesterday, it was Bihar and certain parts of U.P. more especially. But, when we come to the statement of the Food Minister how many States have been listed? He mentions not only Bihar and U.P., thanks to the Food Minister, he mentions Rajasthan, Bombay, West Bengal and some other parts also.

The Deputy Minister of Food (Shri M. V. Krishnappa): That was not about calamities but supply of food-grains.

An Hon. Member: He mentioned eight States.

Shri S. A. Dange: Let us not count them. What is more important is.....

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): May I just point out, Sir, that when the hon. Member is speaking he should remember that the speech delivered by the President was not prepared personally by the President but by the Government. Therefore, we should..... (Interruption).

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let us hear the hon. Member.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Therefore, what I want to say is this. The hon. Member referred to the fact that Bihar has been mentioned in the President's Address, as if it was parochialism on the part of the President.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member had made it clear that he did not mean anything personally to the President. These are the views of the Government that are expressed by the President in the name of the President. Therefore, anything that is criticised here is the policy of the Government or the views of the Government. The hon. Member who is

speaking knows it and I suppose all the hon. Members know it. Therefore, the hon. Member has the right to criticise the views.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** In fact, I would have thought that it was human for the President to remember Bihar. But it is certainly not correct on the part of the Government of India, of the whole country, to mention only Bihar and Uttar Pradesh and to show that the position is very nice. I am glad to note that the Government of India as a whole has become parochial and mentions only Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.

**Mr. Chairman:** I thought that the hon. Member did not mean the President personally.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** No. I am not referring to the President; and having said this, I proceed to.....

**Shri M. V. Krishnappa:** In the statement of the Food Minister, the Minister has specifically mentioned "destruction of crops in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh". In Bombay and Kerala, if they did not mention destruction of crops, it has been mentioned that supplies of foodgrains have been sent there. That is the point. The destruction and calamities have occurred only in Bihar and in the eastern parts of Uttar Pradesh.

**Mr. Chairman:** That explanation shall have to be given when the time for reply comes.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** I have only to request that the interruption time is not calculated in the 30 minutes given to me. Otherwise, I do not mind the interruptions. As many hon. Members as possible can interrupt me if the Chair allows.

Well, in West Bengal, it is flood that is mentioned, and I thought flood is disaster and natural calamity. Leaving that point aside, what I was making out was that the picture is deliberately painted in such a way as to create complacency in the minds of

the public and not to allow the Opposition parties in the country to challenge the Government's methods of governing the country and looking after its welfare.

For example, in the month of March the picture is presented in what way? In the month of May, the picture is presented in what way? According to the white paper on the Budget presented in the month of March, agricultural production declined and foodgrains had already declined in the previous year. So, Government was aware that food production was declining even on last year's figures. It had declined from 68 million tons to 66 million tons. Government was aware, that something was happening amiss and something was going wrong. In 1953-54, the production was 68 million tons, and in 1954-55, it was 66.5 million tons. In 1955-56, it was 63.4 million tons. This is the figure taken from the White Paper given by the Government only in the month of March. So, production is declining. This is the picture that the hon. Minister of Finance was pleased to give.

Now, when this decline was being conceded, was it not natural for the Government to take steps to see that ample stocks were kept? Not only that. The Government should have rushed the grains in time to areas where there was disaster. I am not blaming the Government for the flood. Certainly, it is not in their hands. But there is no reason why they should not have taken action earlier. My quarrel is, it takes starvation deaths to move the Government and to make them rush the stocks. It takes demonstrations, it takes the peasants to go round and surround the courts and granaries in order to tell the Government that the situation is serious and that relief ought to be rushed. My quarrel is not that production has fallen due to natural calamities. I cannot quarrel with Government on that score nor can I blame the Ministers on the other side. But my blame or complaint on this question is, why did not they rush in

[Shri S. A. Dange]

any foodgrains earlier again, why should they wait until somebody among the public dies? But then, the death among the public is not important for the hon. Ministers. Such deaths are not of public importance; only deaths in private are of public importance to them. That is another matter. But then, why is it that these deaths are necessary to move the Government? Therefore, my comment is that this democracy functions only when the democrats die in streets in public, and even then, if a man dies of starvation, the Ministers might say, "Oh, it is not owing to starvation; it is just stoppage of the heart". This sort of approach is an anti-democratic approach and this approach is very well brought out in the President's Address.

I want to say that food production is painted in such a way as to create complacency in the public mind. Of course, people are given warnings, that there should be no hoarding. It is very strange to find sermons made to the people that they should not hoard or indulge in wasteful expenditure. Can an agricultural labourer hoard? Can 40 per cent. of the population in this country hoard? Can anybody tell me that any agricultural labourer who is unemployed or who gets about a rupee a day can hoard sackfuls of grain? Who can tell me that the middle-class people, living in small tenements, can have tons of wheat or hoard up lots of grains and cause prices to go high? Who are the people that the Government refer to, to whom they say "you should not hoard"? Let them say that the speculators must not hoard, and the Government knows that speculators are hoarding. But what is Government doing? The Government say that the banks should not give advances on speculation. The Finance Minister says, "we are putting restraints on the advances for speculation." Why only restraint? Why not abolish speculation on foodgrains? Why not they stop advancing money for speculative purposes? There are

any number of gentlemen in the Congress Party who, within ten minutes in the Grain Merchants' Association or in the stock exchange in Bombay, can find out on a *badla* day where speculative advances are being made and where advances are being really made for honest trade purposes. They know it, and I can tell them that if they do not know it, "please come to the bullion exchange, please come to the stock exchange, please come to the Grain Merchants' Association", and we will tell you how speculative advances are made to food hoarders and grain merchants who have nothing to do with trade as such. Therefore, why only restraint on speculation? That is my second question. Why not abolish this speculation? Why not they stop it altogether? When certain monopoly rings got into trouble on the cotton exchange some months back, Government took the step to stop the cotton exchange and stopped the transaction in cotton exchange. If they could stop transactions on the cotton exchange because certain merchants were in trouble, because certain dealers could not meet their commitments on the *badla* day, why not the Government do it with regard to foodgrains also?

Therefore, we say that the President's Address is a homily to the wrong section of the people. It should not be addressed to the people in general. It should be addressed to the hoarders in particular, because the majority of the people are not hoarding or indulging in wasteful spending. Wasteful spending, not done by millions but a handful of rich in the country cannot cause a crisis of food in the country, when especially the Government claims that food production has increased. Therefore, I say that the picture painted by the Government is not true and the slogans are not correct. Therefore, the solution also will not be correct if the same policy is pursued.

Take, for example, the way in which things are painted, mark the words even. The White Paper says: "The fall was due to less favourable weather conditions." That was in March. In May, it has become natural calamities. From "Less favourable", it has become "calamity" in two months, and this is a very rapid progress in the thinking of the ministerial benches. But now did they find it that "less favourable weather" had really become a "natural calamity" within two months? It is for the simple reason that during these two months, the peasants started surrounding the granaries; the peasants started demonstrating. People began to go to the courts and demand relief from the Government. Therefore, it was found that "it is not less favourable weather but it is a real calamity". True, it is all a real calamity. But what is the solution proposed? The solution proposed in Punjab, I learn, is that the fair price shops are being stopped and are proposed to be stopped from 15th May. Why? I venture to state that food is being made a point in power politics. I would request the Government not to treat this item at least in the life of the people as an instrument of power politics.

**Shri C. D. Pande** (Naini Tal): Neither political capital out of it for a party.

**Shri S. A. Dange**: Surely, but do not make food capital out of it. Political does not starve anybody, but food capital does.

There is a report in the Statesman to which I shall draw attention. It is said that the prices are falling in Punjab, this has got to be stopped by closing the shops. Another reason for their closure, which the Government will be reluctant to admit is that Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon's ministry, with its obvious bias in favour of the peasants—(I want to correct him and say "in favour of rich speculating capitalists") perhaps is anxious to avoid any fall in their profits." Here is a suggestion—I do not say it is a fact, though it may be—

that food is being made a point in power politics. To sum up on food—the picture presented by the address is not correct; it does not reflect reality. Secondly, the slogans are not such as would lead to the correction of the situation, because it only speaks of hoarding done by the people, whereas hoarding is done only by the speculators.

Thirdly, the restraint proposed on expansionist tendencies in bank advances should not remain at the level of restraint, but should go over to a complete stoppage of advances for speculation from the Reserve Bank of India.

Then, the question would be, what should we do? What we should do is that, instead of putting the peasants who demonstrate for supplies in prisons, better look after their demands quickly. Let us have fair price shops, as many as possible, and not suddenly stop them, because somewhere a little price fall has taken place.

Of course, there is the usual question of land reforms. We have heard of them for the last five years and we shall be hearing of them for the next five years. *Bhoodan* is one, and God bless Vinobaji if he succeeds under the present system in carrying them out. So far as ceiling is concerned, the ceiling is still in the realm of theory. They do not know exactly where the ceiling is and where the floor is; perhaps they will know it when the floor slips from under their feet next time. Therefore, I need not talk about agrarian reforms. Unless and until the peasants force the Government in each area to carry out the reforms, I am sure none of the promises will be carried out as they are given either in the Five Year Plan or the election promises of the ruling party. I would simply say, please for God's sake, carry out the reforms quickly; let the peasant have his land and let us fix the ceiling. And, temporarily, at least until the difficulty is tided over, let us completely suspend land revenue and rent collections where scarcity is prevailing.

**An Hon. Member:** That has been done.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** Only in parts.

The second point to which I want to refer is, how about the second Five Year Plan, which is supposed to rebuild the country into socialism. We are told that they are in financial difficulty and in balance of payment difficulty. On that I would say that in the President's address, a very welcome note is given, namely, that in spite of the difficulties, the working of the Plan will not be halted and that it will not be delayed, though there are demands that the Plan should be spread over from 5 years to 7 years and that certain schemes should be cut down. I welcome it as a good feature that those gentlemen who want cutting down of the Plan are not going to be given quarter in the policy of the Government of India. That is a welcome feature but only saying that is not enough. It speaks of difficulties, but how are the difficulties in balance of payment going to be resolved? I do not want discuss that point in detail now; I will do it at the proper time in the proper place. But, I would say plainly one thing that is indicated in the White Paper is that the private sector's investments are uncontrolled. How is it that the White Paper itself says that the precise figures of private investment and precise figures of advances are not available? No precise figures of anything are available, most probably, in any case, of what is happening in the realm of the private sector.

The Finance Minister laid down a certain plan in which a certain amount was to be invested in the private to make a statement that he does not know how suddenly a larger investment took place in the private sector—a wonderful method of conducting the finances of the country. If he does not know it, may I tell him a few things? There is difficulty in balance of payments which are affected by the export trade also. In the export trade, quotas for exports are

usually given, but some quota holders instead of exporting that commodity, sell the quotas in the market to somebody at higher prices. I would like to know from whichever Minister is concerned with this why this is taking place. There is a licensing committee, a quota committee and any number of secretaries. Quotas are given to A, B or C for exporting manganese or tea. Instead of exporting it and earning foreign exchange, he goes to the market and says, "We are not able to use this quota and so we will sell it to anybody who wants to buy it". There was a regular advertisement in the Times of India by a well-known firm which says, "We have got quota; we cannot use it and we are prepared to sell it." Does the hon. Minister know of this advertisement? If he does not, I will procure it for him. That firm was honest enough to advertise, but does the hon. Minister know how many people are conducting unadvertised sales of quotas?

**The Minister of Industry (Shri Manubhai Shah):** Will you give their names?

**Shri S. A. Dange:** I will give, if your secretary does not help. Therefore, so far as the Five Year Plan is concerned, please have a proper eye on the private sector. I do not want the private industries to be stopped; I do not mean that they should not be given finances, but I do not want them to run away with the allocations in such a way as to disturb the whole relation of economy between the private and public sectors. It is frankly admitted by the Finance Minister in his White Paper that he does not know how it happened. If he does not know, what is he therefor? The job should be given to somebody who knows how to do it.

I need not deal with the questions of imports at length here, as to what imports are going to be cut out and what exports are going to be allowed. Here we have developed a practice to accept all principles in words and violate them in practice. There is

quarrel over the definition of 'luxury' and 'necessity'. There is some change in that line of luxury imports for improving the finances of the second Five Year Plan. But, because the Plan is being disturbed, I do not want them to attack the standards of the working class, its wages etc. For example, it takes the Government of India months and months to decide whether retrenchment compensation, which is excluded by the Supreme Court, should be restored or not. By that time, a foreign railway company—the Parsi Light Railway Company—has run away with Rs. 30 lakhs; that is how our capital is vanishing. If you allow a foreign company to run away with Rs. 30 lakhs to England, you will certainly run short of capital and accumulations. Why does this happen? In certain lines, our investment in foreign countries also has got to be checked. All this is happening because the Ministries are not vigilant. I do not charge them just now of completely lacking in principles, because the principles are stated in the programme and certainly, I must say that they accept the principles; only the principles are not being translated into practice.

The third subject I should like to mention is the question of the States. We are told that this is a democracy. If you accept it is a democracy, please accept the verdict of democracy, of the people of Bombay State and Maharashtra to form a separate Maharashtra State and a Gujarati State. Call a round table conference as soon as possible. We are told, like the Englishmen who told us before that because the Hindus and Muslims quarrelled, we could not have swaraj, that since the Gujaratis and Maharashtrians quarrel over Bombay, you cannot have a Maharashtra State or a Gujarati State. They are trying to carry out certain lessons of the past in practice today; but that practice is dangerous. No amount of shooting is going to stop the Maharashtrians from taking Bombay. Shooters may be promoted to the higher Ministries,

because of the work they have done, but that is not going to stop the Maharashtrian people from getting their Maharashtra State and that is not also going to stop the Gujarati people from getting their Gujarati State. Therefore, we have given the vote; the vote is the verdict of Maharashtra and Bombay. Please respect the vote and respect democracy. If democracy is not respected, but is suppressed by bayonets, the answer will also be in some stronger terms. In this country bayonets are met by peaceful satyagraha. And if democracy's verdict is not going to be obeyed, then satyagraha, political general strike and hartals will again be launched in Maharashtra and Bombay City in order to tell you once more of the mind of the people. Seeing the elections in Bombay—municipal elections, legislative elections—with folded hands, we appeal to you: see what is there; see what the people are thinking and concede what they require; stop the quarrels. If the Gujarati and Maharashtrians quarrel over Bombay—I am not sure they are quarrelling, they are not—help them to come to an amicable settlement. Have a round table conference, study each other's difficulties, the Gujaratis' difficulties, the difficulties of the Maharashtrians or of Karwaris; study them, argue with them. Let us give and take and obey the verdict of democracy. That would be my prayer to the ruling circles here. For God's sake do not neglect this vote; do not neglect to read the signs, and just say we are in a majority and we shall carry on with that majority as we like. Many majorities have crumbled in the past and this majority will not be an exception to that. Therefore, on this question I am only submitting a prayer through you, Sir, to the ruling circles: Call a round table conference. Let the two interests, if they are quarrelling meet and help in the solution of the quarrel. What the Ministers are doing is to intensify the quarrels. That is what I dislike. Therefore, I request that they should immediately take this matter in hand and try to resolve the problem of

[Shri S. A. Dange]

Maharashtra and Gujarat, because theirs is the only problem left in the whole country in reorganisation of states.

When all others have got their beautiful States carved out according to their satisfaction, I would ask you gentlemen on the other side why you should deny that pleasure and that right to us. Just because we have committed the sin of rearing a beautiful Bombay amidst us? Why should you make us quarrel? Why should you not concede the demand of the people? All the people of India have got their own States. They are now speaking in their own languages, in Tamil, in Malayalam, in Bengali or Hindi, in their own States. Please allow us to do that and have our own Marathi State and Maha Gujarat State, and I am sure it will not be a distraction from the unity of the country, but will strengthen the unity of the country, of which you and we, both of us, are proud.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri S. A. Dange: The last point I wish to make is with regard to hydrogen bomb tests. We all are agreed that these tests must be stopped. We are all agreed on the efforts that the Prime Minister is making in persuading other countries to stop these tests, and abolish the atom bomb for ever. But I should like one point to be noted. It is not true that all the three atom powers that is the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom continue to adhere to a policy of tests and not agreed to stoppage of tests. The Soviet Union has already agreed that it is prepared to stop the tests. The other two have not agreed. I only want to mention that. (Interruption) If you dislike that agreement you may say so.

Shri M. P. Mishra: They agree and they explode!

Shri S. A. Dange: Thank God the Soviet explode at least in their own country; they do not explode in some other people's country. That at least you should know.

Now we agree with the Prime Minister in his efforts to persuade all these people to stop their tests. But I want to strike a little, what I may call, a jarring note. It is not necessary for the Prime Minister in order to persuade the Government of Great Britain to stop the tests to be a Member of the Commonwealth. My Prime Minister has stated many a time that if we are there we can persuade and do many good things. The good things we have seen so far is the bombing of Egypt, the denial of self-government to Malaya and massacre in Cyprus and my Prime Minister has not been able to stop the amiable gentlemen of the Commonwealth from doing these things. Therefore, the question is: is it necessary to continue any longer in such a Commonwealth, when we know that they do not hear our good advice and in fact persist in their policies of massacres and invasions. Therefore, I would tell the Prime Minister through—I would certainly wish him bon voyage when he goes out and I would certainly like him to be safe in his voyages—that I would not like him to attend these Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conferences. Personal safe journeys, yes, but let him not undertake these journeys for Commonwealth Conferences, because they are conferences in which we sit in a ring of imperialists. If it is a ring of the Bandung nations, or United Nations, where everybody sits and talks, then we should have no objection. But there is no reason why we should specialise ourselves in sitting in a Commonwealth which massacres Cyprus, Egypt, Malaya and so on. Therefore, my submission is all success to his efforts for peace; all success to his efforts to stop the H bomb; but in order to carry those efforts we should not be in the Commonwealth; we should quit the Commonwealth.

These are all the points which for the present I wish to submit.

**Shri Heda (Nizamabad):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to touch on two or three points, but before I do that I would like to refer to one point just now made by my hon. friend Mr. Dange. He said that the verdict of the people of Maharashtra and Bombay has been given in favour of Maharashtra with Bombay, and, therefore, his demand is that Government should accept that verdict and immediately take steps to have a separate Maha Gujeral State and Maharashtra with Bombay. The point is it was on the advice of the country and not on the advice even of Members of Parliament from those particular regions this House had accepted this bilingual formula.

**Shri S. A. Dange:** For giving that advice they were all defeated.

**An Hon. Member:** The House can change it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Will these running commentaries go on?

**Shri Heda:** Of course, many were firm in their conviction that Bombay should go to Maharashtra. But we conceded to the general wish of the country that the formula of a bilingual State should be tried. Therefore my humble appeal to my hon. friend Mr. Dange and other people belonging to the Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti is that they should give scope and chance for this bilingual State to work. If it does not work, then alone should they think of revising this decision. But if they go on harping from the beginning and not allow the formula to work, then I would say that in this great democracy they will be indulging in some undemocratic tactics. Therefore, the threat of general boycott, hartal and satyagraha, at the very outset of the second Parliament is uncalled for. I hope that they will take these factors into consideration and give a chance to those who are working this for-

Now I come to the other points that I desire to make. The country has seen a great reform recently; that was the introduction of the decimal coinage. All of us are very happy that the naya paise have come into force and people all over the country are very jubilant over it. But our Posts and Telegraphs Department have adopted a policy, a sort of callous policy, as a result of which there is general condemnation of the introduction of naya paise. The official calculator had given us that two annas mean twelve naye paise. But the Postal Department overnight changed the price of the envelope to thirteen naye paise, and that created complications. No doubt they would have lost some revenue—they say they might have lost a few lakhs of rupees. But what we would have lost in the sale of postal envelopes might have been gained, if not fully at least substantially, in the sale of post cards. The post card according to the old rate was nine pies, and according to the calculator it was five naye paise. I therefore think that the action of the Posts and Telegraphs Department in changing the postal rates by taking advantage of the introduction of such a big reform, was not discreet. And I hope that what they have done will be undone by some other measures.

Another complication that has been created after this introduction is this. So far as the one anna and two anna coins were concerned, there was not much difficulty. People could readily accept six naye paise for one anna, and even twelve naye paise for two annas. But the difficulty arose when you had to give two naye paise for one quarter anna coin and three naye paise for a two quarter anna or half anna coin. I think if the Government had used some imagination and withdrawn this quarter anna coin out of circulation, much difficulty would have been avoided. The half anna coin, the one anna coin and the two anna coin do not present any difficulty; the greatest difficulty that has been presented is by the quarter anna coin, and I suggest to the Government that they should consider this

[Shri Heda]

suggestion and withdraw the quarter anna coin from circulation as early as possible.

At the same time I may state that the one naya paisa coin was not put into the market to the extent that was needed. There were, rather, very few of them. Moreover, as was expressed in this House and also in the other House, the size of the one naya paisa is so small that it rather slips. If the old device—I mean of making a big hole in the centre—had been adopted, the size would have been bigger, and this one naya paisa would not have slipped and it would have become more popular. Even now, not much is lost, and I hope that they will use that device. The objection from the Government to adopting that device was that the naya paisa in that case would be used for some other purposes. But nothing is lost if people put the one naya paisa for some other industrial use. What Government will have to do would that be they will have to mint more of these coins, and the Government would have in fact been benefited by starting a small industry.

Now, I come to food production. I come from an area which is traditionally surplus in food. Telengana and the rest of Andhra Pradesh are a very rich area so far as food production is concerned. We have been told in the President's Address that about 25 per cent. of food production has been achieved. That increase is there in the course of the last five years. In the course of the last five years, I think the population would have increased hardly five to seven per cent., or at the most eight per cent. Therefore, in spite of a few calamities here and there this year and even to some extent last year, when we find that there is a tendency of food prices rising, one begins to wonder, particularly when the food prices rise in a city like Hyderabad which is surrounded by about one hundred miles to the north and to the west and by about four to five hundred

miles to the east and south-east by areas which are surplus in food production. And even in such a city recourse had to be taken for the introduction of a good number of fair price shops. Even after the introduction of the fair price shops, for the first month or two the prices did not behave properly. These are matters that the Government should look into.

I do not say that the figures as given by the Department, in the statement of the Food Minister, are not correct. But the thing is that we must feel them. I feel that the representatives of the people, whether in Parliament or in the State Assemblies, should be associated in some procedure, at some stage or other, by which they can verify the figures that have been obtained. I have toured in my own constituency and there is no doubt that I have found out that good reforms have taken place. For instance, better agricultural implements have been used; the Japanese method of rice cultivation has been used extensively. Even then, when people are told that the food production is 25 per cent. more, I see from their faces that they do not believe in those figures. Therefore, I think it will have a very nice psychological effect if the people's representatives in the Parliament as well as in the Assemblies are associated in the process of taking this census so far as food production is concerned.

The third point, which I think is again a universal one, is we are seeing that bureaucracy is working to its full, and in spite of the advent of freedom for the last ten years we notice very little change in their attitude. Even now, you make any representation, it is not looked into properly. The result is that we have to approach the higher-ups sometimes even the Ministers, and it is only after their endorsements that matters are looked into. Then again, when we get the replies, they are very evasive. Sometimes I feel that the tendency of bureaucracy is not to use common-

sense but to interpret the rules or the letter of the rules in such a way as to delay the process of getting the decision. And many times, the delays are so dangerous that they defeat the very purpose. We have to evolve some method by which early justice and early remedies would be possible.

I have seen in many offices a sentence put on the walls, a sentence by our Prime Minister. The sentence is that he is not interested in explanations; he is interested in getting things done. Therefore, we have to see that the things are done very early.

I will, just as an example of this bureaucratic working, mention one case which pertains to a Member of this Parliament. About seven years back he and a few other Members of Parliament had obtained one bungalow, what is called an M.P.'s bungalow. And after the next elections, the others opted out for the State Assemblies and he was the sole occupant of the bungalow. The deposit for the water and electricity charges in the New Delhi Municipal Committee was in the name of one of the other Members. So he wrote once, and again, that the deposit may be transferred to his name and that he was prepared to get the assent of the other Member in whose name the deposit lay. There was no reply. About three years passed in this way. And one day he received a letter in which they said, that "their Supervisor has found out that somebody is occupying this bungalow and using the water and electricity unauthorisedly" and therefore he should furnish the deposit early. The Member replied back that it was he who was insisting on this for the last two or three years, and he referred to the correspondence. To cut the story short, there was a demand for a fresh deposit. He stated that instead of the other Member taking his deposit back and his putting it in again, it would be better if there was only a book entry and the deposit transferred. But, the municipality did not accept. That Member of Parliament took the help of the

Lok Sabha Secretariat. It is gratifying to note that the Lok Sabha Secretariat sympathetically intervened and they approached the New Delhi Municipality with a request that that course may be adopted. That Member of Parliament had suggested another way out also. He said that he would not pay about two or three months' bills and that these bills may be adjusted from the former deposit and that he would pay a new deposit. Even that was not accepted. One fine morning, his water and electricity connections were cut off. He had to make a new deposit. My only purpose in giving this example was to show that the commonsense that one man's deposit could, with his consent, have been easily transferred, without any difficulty, to another man was not used and, they insisted on the letter of the rule. The letter of the rule did not permit a book transfer. In these days when we insist on banking and other advanced methods of money transactions, such a course could have been adopted. Therefore, I think the Government have to tackle with this bureaucracy and bureaucratic procedure as a national problem and I think it is national problem No. 1. I hope that these suggestions would be looked into by the Government.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam): Mr. Chairman, in moving amendment No. 37, I beg to point out that Defence is a very important subject. It takes nearly 50 per cent. of our Budget and it affords scope for training our youth in various ways. From that point of view, I beg to submit that Defence should have been given some consideration in the President's Address, particularly because, the President happens not only to be the head of our civil administration under article 53 (1) of the Constitution, but also the Supreme Commander of our Defence forces, under clause (2) of the same article. Apart from the fact that the President is the Supreme Commander of our Defence forces, it is absolutely necessary that Defence should be given a high priority in the present set-up. Our Defence forces should

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

have a sort of an assurance from the President as well as from the Government that they are protected in these days of nuclear warfare. It is also necessary that the President should have given us an assurance that in the event of a war, we have got proper defence arrangements and proper training and equipment for our defence.

In this connection, I would congratulate our Government and our Prime Minister on ensuring the best defence in modern warfare, namely, maintenance of international peace. Because, today, the best defence in a war of the atomic age, is peace and avoidance of war itself. Apart from the attempt, that is being made in the international sphere to avoid war, when we are maintaining a heavy machinery, though it is only to meet war with conventional weapons, we have to see that we have the best arrangement for defence on the one hand, and that our expenditure on defence ensures to the benefit of our social, economic and political rebuilding of our nation. From both these points of view, we have to examine the question of defence and see if there is scope for utilising the defence machinery for ensuring better defence and at the same time for ensuring better development programmes and projects.

With these two considerations in view, we have been suggesting for the last so many years that there should be some change here and there in the defence organisation to ensure better defence in an emergency and better nation-building programme during peace time. Of course, some of these suggestions have been accepted. We have an expanded National Volunteer Force now. We have also a sort of a nucleus reserve being built up. But, that progress that should be made in view of the urgency of the times is not being made. We submit that our defence organisation should be prepared at least for a war with conventional weapons, if not for a war with

nuclear weapons. From that point of view, we have been suggesting a number of things in the interests of the defence organisation. We have been suggesting from here that there should be scope for extension of Reserve units. You know that we have not even built up reserves to the extent of 1/9th or 1/10th of standing colour units. That is a way of minimising defence expenditure. In our country, we had nominal reserves. Of course, in 1919 the Mestonian Commission reported against our system of reserves. Still that was continued by the Britishers. There has been very little change even after attainment of Independence. We want that the reserves should be such that they may be capable of expansion during emergencies with one month's training.

Similarly, we have another suggestion with regard to reduction of the defence expenditure. We have in this country a duplicate officer system, namely the Junior Commissioned Officer. You, Sir, from this side of the House had moved last year a Resolution about the Junior Commissioned Officer cadre. It was a duplication introduced in this country by the Britishers, because the British officers in charge of platoons, companies or battalions did not know the language of the country, they had the system of Viceroy's Commissioned Officers. After the attainment of Independence, after the departure of the Viceroy, we have simply re-named it Junior Commissioned Officers and we have been carrying on. At the platoon level, at the company level, at the battalion level, you have a Non-Commissioned Officer, you have a Junior Commissioned Officer and you have an Officer. Today, when the Viceroy has departed, it would have been easy to reduce the defence expenditure by re-planning in respect of the Junior Commissioned Officers' organisation or the V.C.Os.' organisation. We have not done that. These are suggestions made from time to time with a view to improve the defence organisation

and minimise the cost. It is unfortunate that many of them have not been considered by the department concerned.

Then again I refer to the Ordnance factories. We have been referring here several times to them as to how there is so much spare capacity for work, how so much could be done and so on. The Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee have recommended a thorough overhaul of these ordnance organizations. Even that has not been attended to. It has been pointed out recently by the Estimates Committee how even the Baldev Singh Committee report is not being implemented properly.

Now we have got depots with very valuable material. Sometimes we are ordering some material from Western countries. Still we do not know what is the material in our depots. There has been no plan. Things are not properly kept; there is no coverage; there are no test tracks, no horse standing ground with the result that things are lying in the open without proper care and still we are going in for things from other countries.

Similarly in the matter of vehicles. We have got very valuable vehicles; I would not like to go into detail, because I had an opportunity of seeing as a Member of some Committee or other but there are very valuable vehicles imported costing hundreds of crores and still they are lying uncared for and in the open air.

Then in our country we have the Military Engineering Service. They do not do any engineering work. They are there only serving as a liaison between the Ministry and the contractors. So our Military Engineering Service is entirely dependent upon the contractors for 98 per cent. of the Military Engineering works. We have been pointing out in this House several times that these Military Engineering works can be undertaken by the M.E.S. itself and not only the M. E. works but also the civilian works

could be taken up on contract basis as they do in other countries, through M.E.S. You may be aware that in America the Alabama Dam was completed by Military engineers, but here in our country we have a dearth of engineering staff. We have no technical personnel for our big projects and yet our M.E.S. organisation is there only to serve as a liaison between the department and the contractors.

Then I wish to say something about the educational corps. In every other country education is being given the highest priority in the Defence organization, because after 3 to 5 years of service people have to go back and they have to be absorbed into civilian life. For absorption into civilian life there is special training. In the Army, Navy or Air Force services there are E.V.T. courses and so many other courses, in order to train these personnel and make them fit for civilian life. Here in our country we have not got that educational system. We had during the British rule a small educational corps. At that time the Britishers found—it was during the Second World War—that from the army point of view some education should be given to the people and they recruited some professors as Lieutenant Colonels. That was the highest grade to which they could recruit professors; they got a number of professors recruited as Lieutenant Colonels and they started the Army Educational Corps. At present the Army Educational Corps has become less in its standards than were required by the Britishers and now you have got the Army Educational Corps being run by people who do not possess the necessary qualifications to run it. The idea of having the Army Educational Corps and vocational training is that as soon as a man finishes his short term service during the period of his reserves liability as well as later on he gets himself absorbed in the nation's development drive; he joins different vocations and he is fit for work. In the United Kingdom on whose pattern we are said to have built our army, the teachers' training

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

diploma given by the army is considered suitable for civilian life for one to become a teacher. Similarly in various other vocations a certificate of proficiency and the diplomas given by the army organization are considered to be on a par with similar diplomas and degrees given by universities and civilian education courses. Here in our country, we have not yet got that system. It is for our planners to consider why they should not utilise the large personnel of youth organizations for their adult education, for their technological drive etc. It is for our planners to consider these matters. It is not merely for the defence personnel; it is not merely for the defence organization and I respectfully submit that our defence organization has not been brought up in those traditions of thinking in terms of developing national reserves.

25 hrs.

Recently, our delegation has been to China and one very great thing was their efficacy in integrating defence organization with education and with production drive in the sphere of industries and agriculture. I think these are items which our planners and the Planning Commission should take into consideration. In China they have started the army education drive in 1949; they have started with a labour drive; they have started with a grow more food drive. There the grow more food drive is successful whereas our grow more food drive started by General Cariappa when he was the C-in-C. has been given up. In their grow more food drive there is provision as to what part of the income is to be spent on a particular thing, what part goes to the regimental funds, and what part goes to the officers' mess. Here the difficulty was that when General Cariappa started the grow more food drive audit took objection as to where the money is to come from. Their objection was that the grow more food produce could not be sold because there is no provision for it in any of the acts and rules. The result was that the army grow more

food drive came to an end, whereas our delegation while in China was very happy to note that the army is doing quite a lot of grow more food work. The army is being given training in engineering, in technologies so that the army personnel as soon as they are released from their service, i.e., 3 years in the army, 4 years in the navy and 5 years in the air force, they go back and help the country in the development drive. In fact we have given certain reports; I was asked to prepare a report on defence of China; I would be placing a copy on the Table of the House and I have submitted it to the hon. Mr. Speaker. Other Members have also submitted reports on various aspects of Chinese administration. I am not comparing our country with China; I am not comparing our Government with the Chinese Government. What I am submitting is that if there is something to learn from another country, let us do it and what we have learnt from China is that they are utilising this defence organization and these defence forces for expanding education in their country and for developing their industries. They have not the technical personnel for carrying out their projects but our committee consisting of Mr. Kunwar Sen and K. L. Rao had been to see their projects and they have seen that a great deal of enthusiasm was forthcoming and much work is being done. That is a very important thing that has got to be done here also so far as we can do it.

I do concede that there is a sort of administration there, that is they have conscription, but ours is a democratic set up and we cannot do it but whatever can be done should be done and these are the things which we have been pressing from this House for five years now. We had recently been to another country, where we have seen that it is actually being done. And what we submit to our Government and to Chairman of the Planning Commission, and our Defence Minister is only what has been tried elsewhere. Why should we not try

it here, so far as it is practicable, within our limited scope?

My next point is in regard to the rehabilitation of ex-servicemen. In other countries, and particularly in the country that we had recently been to, there is a big organisation for the rehabilitation of ex-servicemen. There is a co-ordination between their Central Government, their State Governments, their Defence Departments and the municipal administrations to see that everybody who is pensioned out from the Army, or who is discharged from the Army, or the Navy or the Air Force, for the matter of that, is absorbed in civilian life. Before retirement or before discharge, the character-roll of the person, his qualifications, the special training that he had undergone etc. will be circulated to all necessary places, and till the man gets employment in civilian life, he gets his military salary. That is how every ex-serviceman gets absorbed in those countries.

But, here we have not got the training to fit a man for subsequent absorption in civilian life, nor is there a proper machinery for this purpose, except the District Soldiers' Board and the DSSA Board etc. Excepting for these machinery, we have no other machinery to see that these ex-servicemen are properly rehabilitated. People who have been commanding thousands of men, people who know how to command and how to get work done, as soon as they go out of the Army, Navy or Air Force, have nothing but starvation. That is another aspect that we have got to consider, and we have to see that something is done to see that these people are properly rehabilitated.

We know that our Prime Minister is trying his best to maintain international peace, and I concede that that is the best defence in the atomic age. But so long as we maintain a defence force which consumes 50 per cent. of our General Budget, we have got to see that we get the maximum out of

it, and we utilise it for various purposes; we have to see that we enthuse our youths, we give them new hopes, and we give them a new aspiration. I would submit that if there is any appeal, there is nothing which appeals to youth more than the opportunity or the scope for defending his country. During British rule, we were denied that hope, and even after British rule, people feel that they have no hand in the defence of the country. That is an important aspect that has to be taken note of on the one side.

On the other side, we have got to see that the efforts of all the non-official bodies like the National Rifle Association, the Scouts' organisation, the *seva dals* etc. are properly co-ordinated.

I would deal with only one point more, and then I would conclude, and that is in regard to the Military Intelligence Organisation. I would submit that this is an organisation that has got to be reorganised and developed. I had once the good fortune to meet an officer of that organisation. He was telling the guard and everybody else that he was an officer of the Military Intelligence Organisation and so on.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is the hon. Member sure that he was really a member of that Intelligence Organisation?

**Shri U. C. Patnaik:** Yes. He had his name also on his suit-case, along with the name of his regiment and so on. So, he did not leave any difficulty about that.

I would submit that our military intelligence set-up should be organised and developed, because today a war is fought not merely with weapons, whether nuclear or conventional, but more on the psychological level, through infiltration, sabotage and other things. So, we have got to have an Intelligence Organisation well integrated not only *inter se* but also with its counterpart on the civilian side, in order that we may have every

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

information about sabotage, infiltration and other fifth columnist activities inside our country and also abroad. I would, therefore, submit that the Minister of Defence should be associated with the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Intelligence Departments of the States, in order to make this Organisation very sound.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad (Gaya): I, along with all the Members of this House, suffer from fear.

Shri S. N. Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Fear of the Prime Minister?

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am of the opinion that this country is likely to be invaded by Pakistan. It was a sheer accident that Marshal Zhukov was here in the month of January. People were under the impression rightly or wrongly that Pakistan would invade this country on the 26th January. Marshal Zhukov's presence had a salutary effect.

I have been suggesting on the floor of this House for the last seven or eight years that there should be a military alliance between India, China and Russia. The question of Kashmir was always present in my mind when I made this suggestion on the floor of this House. We are responsible to the country, and we shall be held responsible to the country, and we shall be held responsible before the bar of public opinion if anything untoward happens. I speak with a full sense of responsibility when I say that a military imbalance has been created after Partition, and we have done nothing to restore the balance.

The balance can be restored only by taking military aid from Russia. A military alliance should be formed with China and Russia. I am in favour of borrowing nuclear weapons from Russia.

Shri C. D. Pande: And dollars from America.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: I am not in favour at all of taking any aid from America.

Shri C. D. Pande: We are.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: You may be, but I am not.

Mr. Chairman: That is the beauty of the democracy, namely that we have to hear other views, however unpleasant they may be.

Shri C. D. Pande: I am in favour of dollars from America.

Mr. Chairman: But let us hear the hon. Member.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: We should take military aid, and especially nuclear weapons, from Russia. I do not know how far my information is correct, I have been told, and I have gathered from the newspapers also that Pakistan has been supplied or is going to be supplied with nuclear weapons.

An hon. Member: They shall not be able to use it.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: When I suggest a military alliance between India, China and Russia, I know that military alliances in Europe have not led to fruitful results. But when I suggest a military alliance, I always have the goal of a world federation in view. A military alliance between India, China and Russia, will pave the way for the political integration of the whole of the Afro-Eurasian land-mass.

I am in favour of a joint defence council being formed at the present moment—as soon as possible,—between China, Russia and India. I mean a joint defence council consisting of the representatives of India, China and Russia.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Kakinada—Reserved—Sch. Castes): There are two Chinas.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The Chiefs of Staff of these three countries should meet and chalk out a joint plan of action, if occasion arises.

The three sentinels of humanity in general and of the coloured race in particular, Nehru, Mao and Khrushchev, should meet as early as possible. If an alliance is openly arrived at, there will be no war between India and Pakistan. Both India and Pakistan will continue to exist as sovereign entities till a world federation comes into being. But if there is no open alliance between India, China and Russia, war may break out and Russia may invade Pakistan and finish Pakistan.

**Shri C. D. Pande:** That is very nice!

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I do not want the liquidation of Pakistan.

**Shri C. D. Pande:** Why not?

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** If Pakistan is liquidated, from Constantinople to Rawalpindi, all the regions will pass within the Soviet orbit of influence. If America had given a public warning to Germany in 1914, the first world war would never have broken out; if in 1939, President Roosevelt had warned Hitler—if a public warning had been given—the second world war would never have broken out. A military alliance between India, China and Russia is in the nature of a public warning to all war-mongers and to all imperialists who are trying to subjugate the whole of the Middle East.

**Shri Bhattacharya (West Dinajpur):** Is the hon. Member sure that China and Russia will agree?

**Shri C. D. Pande:** The best thing is for Marshal Zhukov to take up permanent residence in Delhi!

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I have said that there should be a military alliance leading to the establishment of a federal union. Only a federal union can prevent war; no amount of diplomacy in the United Nations Organisations or anywhere else on earth can prevent war. War is a necessary concomitant of the institution of the nation state. It cannot be prevented by any other mechanism. If a war

breaks out, this whole planet will be shattered to pieces.

There is another alternative. The whole of the Afro-Asian land mass will emerge as one political unit under the joint leadership of India, China and Russia. I am also in favour of a military alliance between India, China and Russia because I apprehend that these three countries will fight amongst themselves either today or tomorrow.

When I suggest a military alliance, I always have a federal end in view. The nations of Western Europe in particular fought amongst themselves. The result was disaster. Where is England now? What has become of the French Empire? Germany has been divided into two. Nation states are gangsters. They fight; it is in their nature to fight. All the conditions are well set for a fight between India, China and Russia in Asia. These nations must come together if Asia is to be saved from the catastrophe that has overtaken Europe.

**Shri S. N. Dwivedy:** It is very good to hear this from a Congress Party Member.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** You are a new Member; or else you would not have made this remark.

**Mr. Chairman:** The old Member shall continue to address the Chair.

**Shri Brajeshwar Prasad:** I am sorry for this lapse.

The Baghdad Pact is bound to be liquidated. Will it be liquidated by war or by diplomatic methods? When I say 'diplomatic methods', I mean a military alliance between India, China and Russia. It will lead to the liquidation of the Baghdad Pact by peaceful means, without shedding one drop of human blood. If war breaks out, the Baghdad Pact will be shattered to pieces and the whole of the Middle East may pass into the Soviet orbit of influence. A military alliance between India, China and Russia will also prevent a political settlement between

[Shri Brajeshwar Prasad]

America and Russia. This is the greatest danger, the greatest menace of the age; if America and Russia come to a political settlement, the uncommitted nations of Asia will be divided into two spheres of influence—Russian and American. A political settlement is always based on give and take. If we are under the impression that a political settlement between Russia and America will be on some altruistic basis, we are living in a fool's paradise. The whole of South-East Asia will pass into the American orbit of influence if a political settlement is arrived at between America and Russia. The Middle East may go to Russia. This alone can be the basis of understanding between Russia and America. I cannot think of any other basis of a political settlement between the two.

I give a public warning that this political settlement between Russia and America must be prevented at all costs. Hence I suggest that India, China and Russia should come to a settlement, a military alliance. If they come to a political settlement or some military understanding, it will not lie in the power of America to dominate South-East Asia. The balance of power will be shifted? (An Hon. Member: Where?).

Shri C. D. Fande: Sumatra!

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: The hon. Member's understanding of foreign politics seems to be very crude and elementary.

Mr. Chairman: Even if that be the case, the hon. Member has to listen to him.

Shri Brajeshwar Prasad: One last point, and I will conclude. I have held the view since long, since the day I advocated on the floor of the House that there should be a military alliance between India, China and Russia, that there is no basis of agreement or understanding between India and America. The interests of India and America run poles apart. America is opposed to the political integration of the old world, and political integra-

tion of the old world, preferably on the basis of federalism, is the only solution of all the problems of Asia, Africa and Europe.

America has established her own hegemony over the new world, but she is opposed to the political integration of the old world. Twice within my own lifetime, she went to war to prevent Germany which had nearly succeeded in establishing her hegemony over Europe. There was one nation in Asia. Now she has become weak as a result of the two atom bombs dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki—I am referring to Japan. Japan tried to consolidate South-East Asia. She was wiped out by America.

Now President Nasser is trying to stabilise the Middle East. He thinks in terms of an Arab State. The English and the French were made to invade Egypt. By backdoor and shameless methods, Jordan has been brought under American control.

The interests of India and America can never meet. They are antagonistic. Unless the old world is integrated into a political unit, there cannot be any basis of settlement between America on the one side and the old world on the other. I have done.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi—East): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am afraid it is a hard and thankless task to invite the House to turn its attention to a matter-of-fact, rather mundane subject after the most fascinating and speculative tour of the world upon which the previous speaker invited the House to embark.

I speak in support of my amendment, No. 8, drawing attention to two Ordinances which have been referred to in the speech of the President. Many years ago, more years than I care to remember, when I was a student, I sat at the feet of Prof. Laski—I know many other Members in this House must also have shared that very stimulating experience including the present Defence Minister who is not in his place. Prof. Laski went to Moscow

and made a speech, which greatly upset the British public. Discussing the English quality of sportsmanship, of playing cricket, Prof. Laski made an observation, perhaps an unfair one, that the British surely played the game according to rules but that when they lost the game they changed the rules!

I must, confess that when I read within a period of one week, two Ordinances being enacted reversing the judgments of the High Court of Bombay and the Supreme Court of this country, I was irresistibly reminded of Prof. Laski's commentary on English sportsmanship. In raising today this issue of the Ordinance-making power, I realise I am not doing anything very original. In the days when we participated in the Civil Disobedience campaigns, we referred to this practice as 'Ordinance Raj'. And, as recently as February 16, 1954, this House had a serious and worthwhile discussion in a situation somewhat similar to the present—only, on that occasion seven Ordinances had been enacted, not two. Dr. Krishnaswami and an hon. Member who occupied the seat from which I am speaking made a very useful contribution by drawing attention to the way in which this power was being exercised by the Executive. This led to an excellent debate and also to a very sound proposition being adumbrated by the Speaker of the House, your distinguished predecessor, to whom reference was made only two days ago. The Speaker, the late Shri Mavalankar, then said that "it would be recognised that that is not a democratic way of doing things"—referring to the enactment of the Ordinances—and "it is only in exceptional circumstances that Government might issue Ordinances. They can, only if they must." I feel that the enactment of these last two Ordinances should not be allowed to pass altogether without protest because such a protest may, perhaps, have the helpful result of preventing this lapse becoming a bad habit which an Executive endowed with powers in any part of the world is inclined to develop. The hon.

Speaker had said that the power should be used very sparingly, but there is a tendency to use this power rather generously, forgetting that the purpose of this clause in the Constitution is to deal with an emergency.

I do not wish to enter into the merits or demerits of either the Ordinances or the judgments of the courts to nullify which these Ordinances were passed. For that, there will be another occasion when hon. Members will have their say. But I do wish to raise the general issue which is of a historic nature. It was as far back as 1389 when the British House of Commons petitioned King Richard II to abstain from using his power of passing Ordinances and by the 15th century this power of executive legislation had lapsed and had become obsolete. In our own country, this power is a relic of the Government of India Act, 1935. And when it was sought to perpetuate this power, Dr. Ambedkar—who was then piloting the Constitution—made a statement that the emergency power in our own new Constitution of the Republic of India was similar to the power of the Crown to make a proclamation of emergency under the Emergency Powers Act of 1920 in England. One has only to recall these things to realise how lightly now we are getting into the habit of resorting to the use of administrative law. The distinction seems to be overlooked between a real emergency and administrative convenience.

I am not for a moment denying the good intentions or the good faith of those who have enacted these Ordinances or who have advised the President to take this step. They undoubtedly wanted to do something which in their view was in the national interest or the public interest. But I do suggest that everything in the public interest is not a legitimate occasion for the enactment of an Ordinance. It may be that the courts of law, in this particular case, misunderstood the intention of the Legislature, as was suggested in the case of the Industrial Disputes Act, or it may not be so. It

[Shri M. R. Masani]

may be that the original Life Insurance Corporation Act was defective and needed to be improved. But surely the only body which has the power to put these matters right is this House itself. This House was due to meet in a few days' or a few weeks' time. I do submit that the correct, the properly democratic course would have been to wait for this new Parliament to assemble, to put the problem before them and meanwhile at least to "play cricket" and obey the decisions of the highest organs of our judiciary, respect for which we all wish to see enhanced and developed. Otherwise the danger is that the Government becomes the Judge in its own cause as I think has happened in the case of the Life Insurance Ordinance.

Before leaving Bombay, I had occasion to attend at their invitation a meeting of the trade union representing the insurance workers. They protested against the use of this Ordinance I can testify to the great bitterness that was felt by a large number of democratic trade unionists affiliated broadly though not officially, to the INTUC and the Hind Mazdoor Union. They felt that this was a very poor return for eschewing the weapon of the strike, for not falling into the hands of those disruptors to whom my hon. friend the Finance Minister referred in a previous debate on this matter in the House. They did not strike. They had kept away from disruptive agitation. They did not want to interfere with the smooth business of the Life Insurance Corporation and so they went to a court of law to test the provisions of the law. For a moment, they had a hard-won victory in the High Court of Bombay. They found that the fruits of that victory were snatched away from them by the Executive, which, on the one hand, made the Ordinance and, on the other, was the employer as the management of the Life Insurance Corporation. In other words, the Trade Unionists felt that the employer,

when it was the Government, set in judgment in its own cause. I do wish to stress that this is not a happy situation to arise when economic power in a planned economy inevitably gets concentrated in the hands of the State.

I feel, therefore, that in these two cases the objectionable nature of the Ordinance is heightened by the fact that in both cases an attempt has been made to nullify the decisions—in one case of the Supreme Court of India and in the other of the High Court of Bombay—of courts which to the best of their lights tried to interpret the statutes enacted by this Parliament. I do not deny for a moment the right of this Parliament to amend a statute on finding that it was not properly carried out; but for the Executive, between sessions of Parliament to claim that they can interpret the law better than the highest tribunals of the judiciary of this country is, I suggest, something which this House should ponder and which should not be allowed to pass without protest.

This, Sir, is an issue which is above party politics; it is an issue in which the liberties of this House, the prestige of this House and the democratic liberties of the people are at stake. I do appeal to this House, to the Members of this House of all parties, not to let this matter rest and on this occasion and on the occasion when the Ordinances come before the House to stress on Government that though we can see their good intentions, though we can see that they might have taken this step with the best of motives, we do believe that in future on such occasions they should abstain from intervention with the due process of law until this House is in session and can be seized of the matter.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): Sir, I join with my hon. friends who have expressed their gratefulness to the President for the Address which he delivered to the joint session of Parliament. I would beg of those friends who are inclined to be critical or

even hyper-critical to view the administration as a whole. What is that this Government has been able to accomplish during these years after the freedom? Do they not agree that on the whole, by and large, it has given a marvellous account of itself put the prestige of the country on a high pedestal and gained for it a very prominent place in the comity of nations today. To try to use a microscope to find out where there may be some undesirable baccilli or things of that sort would be a great injustice to the Government. In our search for trees, I am afraid we may miss the wood. If we try to assess Socrates, say, by the bulging eyes that he had or the upturned nose and not by the great contribution which he had made, we would be poor judges of Socrates. Likewise, here in the case of the working of this administration during these years, if we are not able to develop a sense of proportion and realise the really substantial and great achievements that the Government has to its credit, that would be doing less than justice to the Government.

The two aspects of our administration are the one relating to the national activities and the other relating to the international policy. Dealing with the international policy pursued by this country, ably piloted by the Prime Minister, one is very happy to see that there is so little room for difference among the different sections and the different parties in the land. That indeed augurs well for the future of this country.

It may be that the other side and this side are at various with regard to come domestic matters. But, on the whole we find that we are in agreement so far as our foreign policy is concerned. In some of amendments sent up in connection with this Address, there are references to Kashmir and Goa. There are fears that there is no immediate possibility of a settlement in the case of Kashmir. The question here is whether the Kashmir issue should be allowed to go on unresolved as it is or whether there should

be an effort made to give a quietus to the whole dispute so that there is a settlement once and for all. I am pretty sure that those who handle these affairs would, if possible, like to have the issue settled once for all and not allow it to hang over. But the question is: how is it possible? Has any person inclined to be critical any solution for that? It is not so easy to have a solution. No doubt, if proper diplomatic efforts are made and we are able to win over some of the powers which are befriending Pakistan, it may be possible to have a final solution. I think that we may leave that question at that.

Likewise, take the question of Goa. Any way, that is not a matter which bristles with any inconvenient difficulties for India as a whole. Even there, it may be possible for us through diplomatic channels to get an early solution. Let us hope that this is possible.

The President has referred at great length to the happy solution of the Suez Canal dispute. The situation has eased a great deal though other disputes have crept in the Middle East or the Western Asia. In regard to this particular issue, I think the part played by India has been exceptionally successful. You will find a reference to this fact in the U.K. Parliament by the Labour leaders that the Government could have done equally well or even better if they had not adopted the wrong policy at the beginning but adopted the policy which they had done today. That, I think, was the stand taken up by the Government of India and I ask whether there could be anybody who could differ with that. I think it is a matter of special gratification to us that in the whole world there is nobody other than our able, beloved and trusted Prime Minister whose aid could be sought to bring about a solution for these problems in the Middle East. That, I think, is a positive achievement for this great country on which we can well congratulate ourselves and congratulate the Prime Minister. Whether it is the Russian bloc or whether it is the

[Shri Dasappa]

Western democracies, you see that the one man who could be summoned to play the role of a good samaritan is our Prime Minister. That is a thing which my friends opposite may kindly bear in mind when they deal with this question.

I would now come to matters nearer home. Here, I would say that it would be a wrong assessment if we think that the Union Government is held responsible for everything that goes on in India. We have a federal Government. Certain subjects are more or less exclusively within the jurisdiction of the States and those are subjects which vitally concern the day-to-day life of the masses. So, we must keep a correct sense of proportion while criticising the actions of the Government. Everything hangs round the implementation of the Second Plan. I am glad to note that the Second Plan has restored the balance between attention to industries and attention to agriculture.

One of the criticisms levelled against the First Plan was that it hardly concerned itself with the development of industries. But, then there were the special problems. The food problem was very acute. Naturally, attention was diverted to grow more food and have more multi-purpose projects. Now that we have, more or less, been able to solve it to the general satisfaction, it was time for us to turn to industries. I am glad that greater emphasis is laid on industries, not only heavy industries but also small-scale and cottage industries.

Therefore, I think that the economic policy laid down by the Government is a thing which is worthy of acceptance by his House and there is nothing very much for us to find fault with it. I may with the permission of the Minister concerned, say that I am not one of those who believe in water-tight compartments of public and private sector. The question

is, how to develop the economy of the country. It does not matter whether it is the Government that does it, or it is the private sector that does it. Where, for instance, the private enterprise is not sufficiently active and forthcoming, I think there is a duty cast on the Government to sponsor those industries and build up the economy of the country. And, when I say "Government", I do not confine it only to the Central Government. I see no reason why the partnership of the State Governments should not be sought and their co-operation taken along with the public if necessary. We must see that the States are also enabled to sponsor and build up certain industries so that they may be able not only to further the economy and build it up along with the Centre, but also to that extent lessen the burden on the tax-payer. That is a suggestion which I beg to make.

The other question is one of finance. The President himself has been pleased to say that the question of finance is a thing which causes serious concern. I have absolutely no doubt that the hon. Finance Minister, whose resourcefulness everybody should certainly admire, will be able to meet the difficulty and get over the situation. I would, however, say that there is one way in which the resources could be augmented and that is by increasing our exports. I am sure the Government is doing everything possible in that direction. I am now thinking of that vast continent which, I believe, provides a very fertile field for our exports, and that is Africa. We shall not worry about South Africa, nor need we worry about the northern Mediterranean coastal areas. In between there is the vast continent almost untapped and, I believe, if a proper Commission is constituted to ascertain the possibilities and due steps are taken, we will be able to capture a large portion of the business in that field. It would be wise for us not

to tarry long in this matter and allow other States to step in. Then it will present far greater difficulties.

The other thing is about invitation to foreign investors. I am not one of those who will feel shy to get as much foreign investment as possible. But, how will foreign investments pour in? Unless we create a sufficiently favourable atmosphere for those investments, I do not know from which quarter the investments may come.

My next suggestion is about exercising economy. I would only just in brief indicate that there is room for economy, especially with regard to the class IV category in the administrative offices. I am not referring to the executive side, but I think India is the only country where we have an army, an unproductive force, in the shape of class IV servants or chaprasis. I do not think there is any other country with which we can compare ourselves. It is possible for us to exercise sufficient economy in that direction and that will have a wholesome effect.

With regard to salaries, the suggestions for Pay Commissions and so on, I would beg of the Central Government to have some consideration for the scales of salaries prevailing in the States. They are unable to pay the same scales as given here, but there is always a reaction in the States when they are confronted with the higher scales permissible in the Central Departments.

Then I come to the question of food prices. I only want to say one thing in this connection. Whenever we have to decide this rather ticklish question, we have to take into consideration the cost of production and the various items of taxation which an agriculturist is confronted with. Then alone will be able to do justice to the farmers. We must give up all hopes of having any extra production in agriculture until and unless we can assure the farmers a fair price.

There is only one other matter to which I want to refer before I close. A democracy requires a certain level of education among the voters, otherwise there is danger ahead. It is nearly ten years since we have had freedom, and if you take the statistics you will find that today not even 50 per cent. of the children of school-going age are really being educated. I am only speaking of the children. That does not do us much good. I therefore, beseech those in authority to apply their mind to this very urgent and very important factor and do what best they can.

In the end I would again appeal to the hon. Members opposite to view the whole question in its entirety and not merely in parts.

Mr. Chairman: The following are the amendments which have been indicated by the members to be moved subject to their being otherwise admissible:

Nos. 1 to 5, 7 to 14, 16, 20, 21 to 23, 27, 28, 31 to 35, 37, 40 to 43, 44, 47 to 50.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: I beg to move:—

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

“but regret that there is no reference for undertaking legislation for the amendment of the Payment of Wages Act and the Workmen's Compensation Act in favour of the workers.”

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

“but regret that there is no reference for initiating legislation governing conditions of work for workers engaged in the road transport and construction of buildings as indicated in the Second Five Year Plan.”

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

“but regret that there is no reference for the appointment of

[Shri T. B. Vittal Rao]

Wages Commission to go into the question of wages for industrial workers."

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

"but regret that there is no reference for initiating legislation for welfare of the workers employed in manganese mines as outlined in the Second Five Year Plan."

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that there is no reference to the nationalisation of foreign-owned plantations in the country."

Shri Tangamani: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that there is no reference to renaming the State of Madras as Tamil Nad in deference to the wishes and desires of the people of the State."

Shri M. B. Masani: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that Government should have resorted to the use of the Ordinance making power by the enactment of the Life Insurance Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance (No. 3 of 1957) and the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Ordinance (No. 4 of 1957) without waiting for the new Parliament to assemble."

Shri Frank Anthony: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that the Address does not deal adequately with the reasons for the present unsatisfactory food situation or with any

positively articulated food policy to prevent a recrudescence of such a situation."

Shri S. N. Dwivedy: I beg to move:—

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

(a) "but regret that no serious notice has been taken of the alarming rise in prices of food-grains and scarcity conditions prevailing in the country;

(b) that the Address fails to suggest concrete measures to remove disparities in income; and

(c) that no notice has been taken of the abridgement of the constitutional rights of the citizens".

Shri Nath Pai: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the Government's intention to respect the wishes of the people of the people of the Marathi-speaking areas of Belgaum and Karwar to be incorporated in the State of Bombay."

Shri Supakar: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret the failure of the Government to keep the prices of foodstuffs within easy reach of the common man."

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

"but regret the inability of the Government in freeing the entire area of Jammu and Kashmir State from aggressions by Pakistan."

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

“but regret the inability of the Government to remove poverty and mass unemployment in the last six years of planning.”

Shri Mahanty: I beg to move:—

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

“but regret—

(a) that the Government have signally failed in easing the situation and bringing food prices down; and

(b) that the Government have pursued no effective policy to solve the Kashmir question in accordance with the will of the people of Kashmir as expressed by the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir.”

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I beg to move:—

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

“but regret—

(a) that the Address has not laid down any definite policy about the solution of the food problem;

(b) that the Address has failed to enunciate a policy of reclaiming the fallow land whereby the millions of unemployed people of India might get employment by cultivating the land and also increase the production of foodgrains;

(c) that the Address has not laid down any policy with regard to the stopping of the use of English in official business and replacing it by Hindi, our Rashtra Bhasha, and other State languages;

(d) that the Address has not made any mention about the removal of imperialist statues from public places to museums;

(e) that the Address has not given any clear indication about helping the growth of small-scale cottage and small power driven industries;

(f) that the Address has not said anything about making education free upto higher secondary stage;

(g) that the Address has not given any indication about the unemployment problem and not laid down any policy to solve it;

(h) that the Address has not said anything about how to gradually increase and decrease the incomes of various citizens of the country in a manner so that difference of the lowest and highest income of the citizens may not be more than the ratio of 1 to 10;

(i) that the Address has not laid down any policy about the future of Goa and how to free it;

(j) that the Address has not said anything as to how the Government will solve the Kashmir issue.”

Shri S. A. Dange: I beg to move:—

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

“but regret that the Address fails to take note of the unanimous and express desire of the people of Maharashtra to so reorganise the State of Bombay as to form the State of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as capital and the State of Mahagujarat.”

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

“but regret that the Address fails to promise measures to improve the conditions of the workers and employees in the matter of wages, trade union rights and unemployment.”

[Shri S. A. Dange]

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

"but regret that the Address fails to outline concrete measures to correct the alarming food situation."

Shri Awasthi: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret—

(a) that no indication is given to the immediate replacement of English by Hindi or other State languages for official purposes;

(b) that the serious problem of unemployment is neither given any consideration in the Address nor any ways and means are suggested to eradicate unemployment;

(c) that the Address fails to suggest any means for the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society;

(d) that the Address fails to take note of the aspirations of the people of Maharashtra and Gujerat regarding creation of a unilingual Marathi speaking State;

(e) that the Address fails to mention any definite policy as to the manner of developing cottage and small scale industries;

(f) that the Address makes no mention of the reclamation of land for achieving self-sufficiency in the matter of food production and distribution of land to landless people be acquiring it from those who possess more than a certain limit and general re-distribution of land;

(g) that the Address makes no mention for improving the financial condition of the people of the lower strata of the society and fixation of pay-scales of low-paid Central Government

servants and appointment of a Second Pay Commission; and

(h) that the Address fails to make any promise of education being made free at the secondary stage and fixation of pay-scales of teachers in order to improve their lot.

Shri Khushwaqt Rai: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that there is no mention of—

(a) the deteriorating food situation in the State of Uttar Pradesh, especially in the Eastern Districts; and

(b) the reduction of the cane price in India specially in the State of Uttar Pradesh which is causing great hardship to the cane growers".

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that the Address does not take more adequate note of the graver repercussions of States' reorganisation beyond referring to the 'inevitable showing down' of the Second Five Year Plan".

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

"but regret that the Address does not throw into bolder relief the grave strain imposed by the Second Five Year Plan on the nations' economy, both internal and foreign exchange resources, nor suggests practical ways of overcoming the difficulties".

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

"but regret that the Address does not take sufficient note of the grave and widespread disaste-

faction felt on account of the high prices of foodgrains, scarcity conditions in some parts of the country and the failure of the Government to make the country self-sufficient in the matter of foodgrains".

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

"but regret that beyond a factual mention of the Life Insurance Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance 1957, the Address does not refer to the grave injustice done to the Life Insurance Corporation employees".

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

"but regret that the Address does not refer to any concrete and effective steps the Government propose to take for procuring even a temporary suspension of tests of thermo-nuclear weapons, beyond the reference to the 'Standstill Agreement' in the Prime Minister's statement to the Lok Sabha in April, 1954".

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

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

"but regret that the Address—

(a) makes no reference to the reorganisation and modernisation of the defence forces of the Union;

(b) gives no assurance that the defence organisation is provided with adequate equipment and training to protect itself and to defend the country in a modern war;

(c) discloses no programme for integrating the defence services with socio-economic planning so as to ensure greater efficiency at lesser cost;

(d) gives no indication of any proposal to expand and upgrade the educational and vocational training courses in the defence

organisation so as to facilitate the subsequent absorption of ex-service personnel in civilian activities;

(e) contains no proposal to improve and reorganise the ordnance factories on lines suggested by the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee;

(f) envisages no plan to utilise the valuable material lying uncared-for in certain Ordnance and vehicle depots;

(g) indicates no concrete suggestions for improving the organisation of Reserves and Auxiliaries so as to provide for adequate defence in emergencies;

(h) contemplate no scheme for making the youths defence-minded, by associating the defence machinery with voluntary youth organisations e.g. rifle, shooting, scouting seva dal, flying, gliding and yatching clubs;

(i) indicates no intention to provide for a suitable machinery to ensure rehabilitation of ex-servicemen in civilian life;

(j) contemplates no scheme to reorganise the recruiting machinery and associating it with the concerned civilian departments and with the general public;

(k) has totally ignored the vast scope for expanding the Lok Sahayak Sena, extending its activities as an inter-services organisation and providing for its follow-up work;

(l) has overlooked the necessity for reviving, in an improved form, the Army Grow More Food campaign;

(m) has failed to take stock of the Ordnance factories and other defence installations for

[Shri U. C. Patnaik]

purposes of specialised training for technicians;

(n) gives no indication of modernising the military intelligence services and co-ordinating them with their civilian counterparts so as to counteract sabotage, infiltration and other fifth-column activities, inside the country, and to get necessary information from outside;

(o) has failed to realise the necessity for rationalising the cadre of Junior Commissioned Officers;

(p) does not contemplate re-organisation of the M.E.S. and E.M.E. so as to undertake all military works and, wherever possible, civilian works analogous to military activities; and

(q) has totally failed to create the atmosphere necessary for national defence in emergencies  
tion-building activities  
eace-time."

**Sari Vajpayee:** I beg to move:—

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

"but regret that the Address has not referred to the mounting threat of Pakistan to the security and integrity of India, including Jammu and Kashmir".

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

"but regret that the Address does not make any reference to the growing totalitarian trends in Jammu and Kashmir which have so glaringly manifested themselves in the conduct of elections there".

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

"but regret that the Address does not make any reference to the growing discontent among the displaced people about the rehabi-

litation policy of the Government".

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

"but regret that the Address has not referred to the failure of the Government in finding a fair and just solution to the language problem of Punjab".

**Shri B. C. Kamble:** I beg to move:—

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

"but regret to note that the Government have failed to note in the Address and respect the 'will' of the electorate of the Marathi speaking people which is demonstrated in the recent general elections and also in the recent Bombay Municipal Corporation elections on the issue of establishment of Samyukta Maharashtra and to take immediate steps for the establishment of Samyukta Maharashtra".

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

"but regret to note that the Government have completely neglected to take into consideration the situation arising out of the mass conversion to Buddhist Faith by the former Scheduled Castes in different parts of our country and give new Buddhists the protection and the educational, economic and other facilities, they rightfully deserve".

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

"but regret that Government have not so far solved the problem of poverty of the Bharatiya people, nor Government have suggested any such future plan for the eradication of poverty".

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

"but regret that the Address only exhibits Government's lack

of definite policy on major problems facing our country namely that of Kashmir, Goa, unemployment and scarcity of food".

**Mr. Chairman:** All these amendments are before the House.

**Shri Raghuraj Sahai (Budaun):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I take this opportunity to offer my humble thanks to the President for his very mild, sober and well-balanced Address that he was pleased to deliver on the 13th May to the Members of both the Houses of Parliament. That Address was delivered in very moderate tones but, at the same time, he made pointed reference to some of our short-comings. I was astonished at the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition today when he tried to give to this House a picture that the Address of the President "was a misrepresentation of facts. Far from it, The President made, as I submitted, pointed reference to our short-comings, and in the course of what I am going to say I will just point out those short-comings.

He referred to the economic situation in the country, and he said it was a matter of great concern. The President is the President of the Republic. He has to speak with a very great sense of responsibility.

**Mr. Chairman:** Instead of referring to the President, it would be better if the reference is to the Address.

**Shri Raghuraj Sahai:** In that Address it was pointed out that the Central Budget was a deficit one and that the State budgets were also in deficit. Some remedies were also pointed out in the Address; for instance, that effective economies should be made; there should be planned restriction of certain imports; the export, trade should be expanded and there should be increasing self-sufficiency in industry as well as in agriculture; and savings should be utilised for production and there should be an abandonment of unproductive and anti-social habits of hoarding and speculation. Now, they were remedies that were suggested;

it was contended here that all these things should have been effected by legislation or executive action. I submit that is not the only remedy by which such maladies could be remedied. I am of the opinion that a strong public opinion is needed to effect all these things. I am one of those who think that a strong public opinion in the country is yet needed. That strong opinion has not been created so far. If there had been a strong public opinion, my submission is that the pace of progress of the first Five Year Plan would have been greater.

I would not pooh-pooh or deprecate the progress that has so far been made, but what I say is, greater progress should have been made. The country realises that we are in the second year of the second Five Year Plan. That is running smoothly, but my contention is that progress should have been greater. The cause of less progress is that public opinion is not with us, I doubt if plan-mindedness has been created all over the country, Despite the very comprehensiveness of the Plan itself, it has not been brought home to every one in the country.

Take the case of urban areas. Where is that enthusiasm for running the Five Year Plan? It is not so bad as people think it to be. But we have not tried to create public opinion for it. Now, what is the cause for this lack of public opinion?

**An Hon. Member:** Want of publicity.

**Shri Raghuraj Sahai:** There are real causes that ought to be considered. They were not able to create public opinion, because, there is still corruption in the services; there is still inefficiency in the administration; there is still delay in the execution of works and carrying out of orders. There is also a sense of insecurity in the minds of the people, both urban as well as rural. Until and unless we tackle those problems, despite the good wishes and intentions of the Government, we may not be able to achieve the end.

[Shri Raghunir Sahai]

we have in view. I know and I realise that the Government is conscious of every one of these evils. But what I wish to point out is that more attention should be paid to the eradication of these evils.

Sir, in the President's Address, reference has been made to the food situation in the country. Well, we might point it in any manner we like. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said that the attention of the Government can only be drawn when ~~democrats~~ die on the streets. Maybe, in his opinion, it may be so, but the food situation is really such as to engage the attention of every responsible person in this country. We know that a good deal of attention has been paid to the problem of raising the production of foodgrains in the country, but we find that the prices do not show a tendency of falling, and so long as the prices remain what they are, they are bound to produce discontent in the people. Think of the condition of an ordinary person or a middle-class person purchasing wheat at the rate of two seers and eight chatanks per rupee. This is a horrible state of affairs. The prices should fall down to a reasonable extent.

16 hrs.

It brings us to the conclusion that if prices should fall, production should increase. So, what is at the root of this? Where is the obstruction? Which is the bottle-neck? I say, in my humble opinion, production is not increasing, because many of our schemes of irrigation that were sanctioned three years back in the Community Project areas have not been carried out. I know of such instances in the Community Project area of Usawan in my State. I presume there may be other instances elsewhere in the country as well. Projects of bunds, projects of sinking wells, tube-wells, etc., sanctioned long ago and for which money had been allotted, have not been executed. Why? They should be executed with the least delay.

Again, production of foodgrains can only increase when we place all the necessary material for raising foodgrains in the hands of the cultivator. I was going through the report submitted by some of our friends who had gone to China. They point out that it was an equitable distribution of fertilisers, good seed, good implements, etc., that were responsible for raising the production of foodgrains in that country. We should see that in every area where foodgrains are raised, fertilisers in requisite quantities, good seed, good implements, etc., are made available to the cultivators.

Then, we should give all possible facilities for the agriculturists to sink their own tube-wells or irrigation wells. The difficulty is, money is not with them. Then, there is shortage of cement and bricks. Well, they cannot sink wells without all these requisites. We should see that all these essential articles are placed in their hands and the difficulties in the way of execution of these projects removed.

Then there is another point. Where is the requisite personnel that should be available to these cultivators? There is a limited community project staff and a limited N.E.S. staff, so that every cultivator cannot take the fullest benefit out of them. So, I would invite the attention of the Government to this matter and request that they should particularly see to it that all these facilities are placed at the disposal of the cultivators.

In the address, I find that a reference has been made that the community development blocks have made great strides. I congratulate all those who are responsible for the great strides, but I expected greater strides. My complaint is that greater strides have not been made. I say, that greater strides have not been made because of the lack of imagination on the part of many of those who are in charge of those blocks. They did not know where to start and where to end; they did not know how to

allocate priorities. Where it was a question of tackling the needs of irrigation first or taking up the improvement of communications first, they began at the wrong end and started more schools. I do not want that those who are in charge of the community development or N.E.S. blocks should lack imagination. Every block, whether community project or N.E.S., has got its different problems. Every problem should be studied first and then regular work should be started.

I wish that, as is contemplated in the second Five Year Plan, the community development blocks should spread all over the country covering every village, but there should not be lack of imagination on the part of those who run them.

**Shri Goray (Poona):** I am grateful for the opportunity that I am getting to address this House for the first time. But I am not happy to find that in the Presidential Address, there is no mention of the problem of Goa. I want to refresh the memory of this House by referring to the Presidential addresses in the years, 1955, 1956 and even the address delivered a couple of months back, in March, 1957. In each of these addresses, we find that the President has mentioned the problem of Goa in unequivocal terms.

If you turn to the Presidential Address delivered in 1955, you will find that he had said:

"My Government hope that the problem of Goa will be solved peacefully."

That hope was belied and a very grim struggle was launched by the Goans themselves. That struggle found its reflection in the Presidential Address of 1956. There you find that these strong words were used:

"The Portuguese Government have made no response and have persisted in their methods of colonialism, suppression and terror."

Let us now see the address delivered in March, 1957. There we find the words,

"...the unhappy colonial outpost of the Portuguese Government, where every kind of liberty is suppressed and economic stagnation prevails. It is the firm policy of my Government that Goa should become free from colonial domination and should share in the freedom of the rest of India."

In the light of these utterances, it is really surprising that in this address, there is no mention whatever of Goa. It is worthwhile remembering that because the Indian Government had taken up a certain attitude about Goa, certain incidents have taken place. For the last two years I was in a Goan prison. I have not got a complete picture of what happened outside, but when I came out and tried to study what had happened, I found that during these two years, not only the Goans, but Indians from all parts of this country had made the highest sacrifices, so that Goa might be liberated. It is one thing to fight under the imperialism of the British brand, but it is altogether a different thing to wage a struggle for freedom under a rule like that of the Portuguese. Perhaps it is known here that even to unfurl a plan of independence in Goa exposes you to such repression that hundreds of Goans have been sentenced to terms ranging from 10 to 20 years for this small offence. Not only that; you are brutally beaten. In addition, when the sentence is finished, your civic rights are taken away from you for 10 to 15 years. That means a young man, after spending 20 years in a Goan prison, will almost have no opportunity to live as a free citizen again.

Fortunately for us, in this House on the Congress benches, there is a brave lady who dared the Portuguese authorities and exposed herself to bullets. We congratulate her, but at the same time, we must remember that these are the sacrifices which our

[Shri Goray]

citizens have made. What was our attitude? At that time, we found that the Government encouraged such things. They were happy and proud that Goan and Indian citizens were sacrificing everything for the liberation of Goa. As late as March, 1957, we find the President saying that Goa must become part and parcel of India. But now after two months, we find suddenly that all mention of Goa is dropped. I am really surprised and I am very sorry about it. What will the Goan people think? Those who are in prison and those who are outside are keenly watching what is happening in the Indian territory. If you say a word of encouragement, they derive immense pride from it. They call themselves Indians. They say, we want to merge ourselves with India and share the happiness and sorrows of our Indian brethren. But here, when we meet in this Parliament, we find that no mention whatever is being made of their sacrifices and of their unflinching struggle for freedom. Sir, does it mean that we have changed our policy towards Goa? One of my friends, an hon. Member from Mysore, just now said that we have been very eminently successful in our foreign policy. I admit that we have been very successful so far as other countries were concerned; but when it came to us, whether it was the question of solving the problem of Kashmir, or settling our differences with Ceylon, or of solving the problem of Goa, I think not even the hon. Member from Mysore will say that we have been successful. The lacuna is very obvious and we find that nearer our home we come, the less successful we are.

Let us try to understand what the Portuguese Government is. I do not know, Sir, how many hon. Members care to read the utterances of their Prime Minister Dr. Salazaar. But when I was in Goa I had the opportunity of studying his speeches and I must say that that he has been very frank in his utterances. He has left no room for any doubts. He has told us

that there are only three courses open so far as relations between India and Goa are concerned. One is, he says, let the Indian nation consider us as a good neighbour and behave with us as a good neighbour. The other is, he says, you go to war with us. He has openly said that. He said that we know very well that if India were to declare war against us we have no chance of survival. But still, remembering the great saints of our country and the great heroes of our country we shall fight to the last man. Or, he says, there is a third course, and that is you completely neglect us; you just think that we do not exist at all. These three courses, Sir, he has suggested and I suppose we have not given sufficient thought to it. We have rejected all of them. We have a sort of a cavalier policy towards this question of Goa. We say that this is our country; this is our territory. The President of the Congress said that so long as the Portuguese are there we will consider this as a continuous aggression. Now if this is a continuous aggression, I do not know how you can neglect to take note of it and just drop all references to it. Therefore, I want to draw the attention of this House that we must not leave the Goans in the lurch.

**An Hon. Member:** What should we do?

**Shri Goray:** There are about three hundred prisoners still rotting in Goan jails, including about a dozen women who have been sentenced to twenty years' of imprisonment.

Now, Sir, the question is what should we do? I say: act as any Government will act under such circumstances. We have got the army; we have got all the resources.

**Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi):** But no guts!

**Shri Goray:** If you think that this territory is yours, and the Portuguese are there as aggressors, well, it is the duty of every Government to repel the aggressors. Supposing that you do not want to do that: if you do not want to take the extreme step, if you

think that the world forces are not in your favour, if you think that it will be too hazardous, if you have come to the conclusion that for the next five or ten years you are not going to do anything, then I say, be bold enough and tell the Goan people that we are not going to do anything for you; if you want to fight for your freedom, do it on your own strength: do not expect anything from us.

**Acharya Kripalani:** They should have known it by this time.

**Shri Goray:** That will be a bold and frank policy.

Having dealt with this question, I would like to deal with the problem which was mentioned by my hon. friend Shri Dange. I would only plead before this House that the people of Maharashtra and Bombay have democratically expressed their wish in a most definite and decisive manner. Sir, I would plead with this House: do not drive three hundred and a half crores of people, your brother citizens of India into an impossible position. The Maharashtrian people are not asking anything which you have not given to other people. Do not say that they have been the victims of lingualism. If you look at the new map of India you will find that the new map of India is based on nothing else but language. Only two provinces have been left out: that is Gujerat and Maharashtra, and if they ask that they should be given what has been given to others, I would plead with all the Members of this House, whether they belong to the Opposition or to the Government benches, "Be large-hearted; be ready to give to Maharashtra and to Gujerat what you have given to yourself." Do not have linguistic provinces for every other linguistic group and when it comes to Gujerat and Maharashtra impose a bilingual State on them.

Sir, I do not want to hold out any threats. That is not the way I speak. I would not say that I am going to do this or going to do that. But I will say in this House, which is a demo-

cratic House; please look at our question more sympathetically. Do not consider that this is only a bogey raised by the communists or socialists or by any other party because it is anti-national, but it is a genuine demand of the people. The people have shown their will. They have given their verdict and as a democratic organisation and as the representatives of the people you should be willing to be guided by their verdict.

**Shri Mahendra Pratap (Mathura):** Sir, I thought I was going to speak tomorrow. I was just writing you a slip. There are very few persons to hear me speak. But as you have kindly called me, I shall do my duty.

I may begin by saying generally that I am very sorry to see that the whole structure of the Government is the same which the British made for themselves and not for the country and the whole Government is run just on the lines that it was run under the British. We see the same collector, the same bada sahib the same captian the same policeman and the same thanedar, who yesterday were giving thrashings to our Congress brethren. Today, of course, they salute congressmen but they continue to thrash the people all the same. So, I say that this system of Government should be overhauled.

I have seen some revolutions abroad. I was that day at Budapest when the revolution of 1918 broke out. I saw with my own eyes people being killed and I had to run from the place where firing was taking place. I was in Munich when the revolution in Germany broke out. I came down to the hotel porter and asked him, "What is it?" He said, "It is only the little boys doing some mischief, you go and sleep". But the next day what did I see? All the kings had run away, the whole government was changed, and it was a red revolutionary government. Those things I have seen. I have seen things in Moscow; I was in Orel; I went through the fighting lines. I have seen something of revolutions.

[Shri Mahendra Pratap]

I was for five years in all China. And most of my friends there who were then only small people are today in the government. I had the occasion to speak from the same platform as Madame Sun Yat Sen in 1925. I mean to say this is only a preface that I know a bit of revolutions. They overhauled the whole machinery. That is the point. But here our Government just took over the government and is acting as the agent of London. This, I think, is the whole trouble.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** That is uncharitable.

**Shri Mahendra Pratap:** I have said in my amendment that in the Address of our hon. President no definite promise is made to better the condition of the people. It should have been said in so many words: we would do this, etc. I heard a great deal of "my Government, my Government". He did not even say, "your Government". I was very much astonished. I say this with all respect to the President and with all respect to our Congress brethren: I say that four-anna cap sits under the canopy of two thousand rupees I want a change.

**An Hon. Member:** Four thousand rupees.

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order, the hon. Member should not get inspiration from anywhere.

**Shri Mahendra Pratap:** The second thing is they are taxing and taxing the people. Just as some cruel people cut the hair of the sheep they are taxing the people, and the people ask, "Is it our government or the government of those who tax us?" They tax the people and they divide the money among themselves. And this they call nationalisation. I say, Sir, this is 'Governmentisation'. And this 'governmentisation' is in the interests of the government servants—with all respect to those who are drawing high pay and high salary and who are conducting the administration. I say this system should be changed. There should be no

harassment. Now we are harassed everywhere. Take octroi. What is it? Poor people come into the town and they must pay some tax. It is harassment. We go on the road, and we see there are some barricades here and there. Trucks are stopped and taxed. I mean to say there is harassment at every step, and then they tell us "this is your National Government. I say "this is your Government, not National Government at all".

So I say, Sir, this system should be changed. The Government should be overhauled from top to bottom.

**An Hon. Member:** How?

**Shri Mahendra Pratap:** Yes, it is a good question, I will answer it. I say that every village and every town should have home rule.

Now, there are people in our Congress creed who say that there should be no caste system. But there are castes. What to do? These great gentlemen who speak against castes, they carry names which denote castes. I am told that it is the etiquette of the House that we cannot name someone. So I do not name anybody. I only say suppose there is a gentleman whose name is Pandit Lakshman Maitra or something. Now, you see, 'Pandit' shows that he is a Brahmin; 'Lakshman' shows that he is a Hindu; and 'Maitra' shows that he must be a Bengali. So in our names there is caste. There is religion, there is province. So I think it is better let these castes be organised. My friend there asked "How?" This is my view: let these castes be organised from Brahmin to bhangi and bhangi to Brahmin. I may tell you, Sir, that even among the Sikhs there are castes. I happened to be born among the Jats, and I know we are related only to Jat Sikhs. So I know that the Sikhs have also castes which many people do not know. I was saying once to—again, I shall not mention the name—but I was telling some Ministers that there are Rajputs and there are Jats Martial races. And then he said, "the Sikhs?" I said, "You don't know then about the

Sikhs". Among the Sikhs there are four important castes, the Khatri who is the Brahmin of the Sikhs—the Khatri gave us ten Gurus—, then, the Jats who are the Kshatriyas of the Sikhs; then the Aroras who are the Vaisyas of the Sikhs; and the Ahluwalias who are a kind of Jats. So I said, "You don't know about Sikhs".

And among Muslims also there are castes. There are Syed and Quereshis—I know many of these names—and the Afghans and Tughlaks. There are so many castes. So I mean to say that it will be according to our culture, according to things as they are, if we organise every caste or every profession in every village and town, and let their leaders form the village government and the town government. Do you follow me?

**Mr. Chairman:** I must remind the hon. Member that it is also an etiquette of this House that the Member who is speaking must address the Chair and not indulge in private conversation.

**Shri Mahendra Pratap:** But this gentleman here asked me the question. Now I will address only the Chair. Here is a village, for instance, We do not recognise any party. We only recognise their castes. Let the Brahmins be organised, let the Rajputs be organised, let the jats or whatever other castes there are be organised. Their leaders should form the Government of the village and the town. If somebody has any other proposal, I have no objection. But, the rule of the collector and the captain, the rule of the thanedar and the Tahsildar should end. This is what I mean.

I have referred to three things here. I have said here that Germany, Turkey and Afghanistan helped us during the First World War and that it should be mentioned. Our Mahatma Gandhi was a great Mahatma and what he did, I know. I know how the British were helpful to Mahatma Gandhi's movement because they were afraid more of us who sat in Kabul and Moscow. That is another thing. I only want to say that these countries, Germany,

Turkey and Afghanistan, helped us in our freedom movement. After the First World War, I was a guest of the Soviet Government. I met Comrade Lenin and comrade Trotsky. They were very helpful after the Second World War. Shri Subash Chandra Bose walked in my footsteps. I left India in 1914; I went to Germany; I did this, I did that. Exactly the same, Shri Subash Chandra Bose did 26 years later, that is in 1940. He went to Germany; he went to Japan. I came to Afghanistan. That is the only difference, I was the First President of the First Provisional Government of India at Kabul. He was the Second President of the Second Provisional Government of India at Singapore.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member will appreciate that today we are discussing the Address of the President of the Republic of India who is there today.

**Shri Mahendra Pratap:** I am a little deaf. My age has made me deaf.

**Mr. Chairman:** I had appealed to the hon. Member to confine himself more to the Address that has been presented to the House.

**Shri Mahendra Pratap:** I only meant that it should also have been mentioned that Japan, Germany and Italy helped us in the Second World War. If there was no Subash Chandra Bose, I think we would not have got this Independence.

Coming to the third point,.....

**Mr. Chairman:** Is it the last?

**Shri Mahendra Pratap:** Yes, I was hearing many speeches about many proposals, about military, diplomacy and all that. I say, unless and until we have a world federation, a federated world Government, there can be no peace on earth. I wish that our Government adopts my plan of world federation as its creed. Just as Soviet Russia has its creed of Karl Marx and communism, just as the Anglo-saxons have got the creed of democracy and parliamentarianism, I wish that our Government adopts my creed of world federation, with unity of religions and the economy of a joint family. Our

[Shri Mahendra Pratap]

President should declare: from tomorrow every village becomes a joint family and every city will be considered a joint family. सब लोग मिल कर प्यार से प्रेम पूर्वक भाई भाई की तरह से रहते हों और सब के लक्ष को दृष्टि में रख कर काम करते हों। मतलब मरे कहने का यह है कि हमें इस तरह की सरकार बनानी है कि जिसमें एक आदमी भी भूखा न रहे और एक आदमी भी बेकार न रहे और हम सबको सुखी बनायें यह हमारी कोशिश है और भगवान से प्रार्थना है कि ऐसा हो और मैं अपने कांग्रेसी भाइयों और सब भाइयों को अपने विचार का बना सकूँ।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order; now the hon. Member should finish.

Shri Mahendra Pratap: Finished.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member referred to a certain amendment. He has not given us the number of that amendment, when hon. Members were asked to give a list of the amendments that they wished to move. Anyhow, I can allow that even now if he gives the number of the amendment that he wishes to move.

Shri Mahendra Pratap: The number of the amendment is 53.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment No. 53 would also be considered as having been moved.

Amendment moved:

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

“but regret—

(a) that no definite promise is made to better the condition of the people, to stop increasing taxes, to give swaraj to every village and town, to add a factory, a field a garden and a dairy to every village;

(b) that no mention was made of aid to our freedom movement received from Governments of Germany, Turkey

and Afghanistan during the First World War and later from Soviet Russia and from Japan Germany and Italy during the Second World War; and

(c) that the Address fails to mention that the only remedy of all the ills is World Federation.”

Shri M. Khuda Baksh (Murshidabad): Mr. Chairman, I join my friends in offering my humble thanks to the President for the excellent Address that he has made to Members of Parliament. The Address was excellent, informative and realistic. I heard some one say that the Address was misleading. I think that the Address showed commendable candour when it said:

“The economic situation, more particularly in related to the Plan, confronts us with factors which, while they do not warrant grave apprehensions, are matters of serious concern....”

It is also said that the Union and the State Government are having deficits in their budgets and that owing to many factors, there are apprehensions that we may not be able to go ahead with our Plan. Though the Address has been optimistic and has certainly not tried to lower down the targets, it has also expressed apprehension. That, I think, is certainly not misleading the House or the country. It is said that we do not want to lower the targets and that the best interests of the country will not be served by lowering the targets, or halting development. Our endeavour has to be to renew our efforts to bridge the gap and collect all the funds that would be necessary. It is said that there are factors both internal and external—I believe they may be external factors—and that there may be a diminution of the expected foreign aid. Things are not as they were when these Plans were framed. World conditions have undergone a change—in many places, a rapid

change—which has affected the Plan finances.

Referring to food, the President said that while food production has increased, certain places in the country have been affected by floods and other calamities and there are shortages. I must confess to a feeling of disappointment, and I dare say that that feeling is shared by all hon. Members coming from West Bengal, that the President, while he mentioned the names of two other States, did not mention the name of my State—West Bengal where there is acute shortage of food and where the food situation is really distressing. Bengal has suffered vastly by floods and our Prime Minister undertook a strenuous tour by helicopter to inspect the flood affected areas. Things were bad enough then, but, the situation has become infinitely worse since because the subsequent crops have also failed. Food is being rushed to Bengal, I dare say, and the Union Government and the State Government will do all in their power to meet the shortages, and probably there will not be the concern that we are feeling now, eventually.

But what is more important is that along with the food shortage, there is a grave fodder shortage. Areas affected by floods have lost all they had, and in order to save their cattle, the cultivators had to fall upon whatever they could lay their hands on, such as the tops of sugarcane etc., and they have somehow kept their cattle fed. This has also resulted, if I may say so, in a problem of some magnitude, in that the cultivators, having had to cut off the tops of sugarcane for feeding their cattle, exposed their cane to a pest known as the 'Stem-Borer'. Wide areas have been affected, with the result that the recovery of sugar has gone down to as low as eight per cent.

Our President has also told us that his Government have initiated measures to relieve housing shortages and promote housing standards. I can only say that in order to achieve what we want to, we must also be able to attract the private sector. In order to

do that, we have to go through the rent legislations obtaining in the different parts of the country and find out whether the return assured to the private sector, who would invest in the building trade, would be attractive enough, whether there are deterrents for private capital coming into that particular field of investment in the different rent control Acts obtaining in the different States of our country.

Our President has said that our relations with foreign countries continue to be friendly. I would have said in spite of the provocations offered by some of our friends, especially by some of our neighbours. During question hour, what I tried to elicit from the Prime Minister—I think I was not able to express myself fully, or he did not quite catch what I wanted to know—was that a committee of enquiry has been instituted by the Government of Pakistan. What we read in the newspapers was that a magisterial enquiry has been ordered. A magisterial enquiry is a thing entirely different from a high level committee of enquiry, which the Prime Minister said, has been ordered by the Government of Pakistan.

What I apprehended, and my apprehensions are still there, was that the Government of Pakistan might have ordered the magisterial enquiry subsequent to the high level committee of enquiry set up by them, in order to forestall the enquiry of the high level committee, because a magisterial enquiry is necessarily a court enquiry, and if a matter is referred to a magistrate for enquiry, it can be claimed to *sub judice*; and if the matter is *sub judice*, the other high level committee which may have been appointed by the Government of Pakistan cannot function. That was my apprehension. And when the Prime Minister replies to the debate, he may condescend to give this House fuller information on the point, because it affects not only the House but the entire country. The entire country is pained to read the news and is certainly anxious to know what the Government of India propose

to do about it. The most important thing to know is whether the Government of India are satisfied with the steps taken by the Government of Pakistan.

Speaking about the nuclear and atomic and thermo-nuclear bombs, the President has recalled the statement that our beloved Prime Minister made way back in April 1954 where he suggested a standstill agreement; and he has also said that opinion in favour of that agreement is gathering in the capitals of the world. This reminds me of a Bengali saying:

"Gariber katha bashi hole mishti ho;" which means in English that the advice of a poor man tastes sweeter only when it is stale.

श्री बजराम सिंह (फिरोजाबाद): अधिष्ठाता महोदय, जो अभिभाषण राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने संसद सदस्यों के सम्मुख दिया उस में अपने राष्ट्र के नव निर्माण का कोई संकेत नहीं है। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में न तो बेकारी की समस्या को हल करने का कोई संकेत दिया गया है न वह बतलाया गया है कि खाद्य समस्या को कैसे हल किया जाएगा। यदि खाद्य समस्या के बारे में कहीं कोई बात है तो सिर्फ यही है कि वह स्टॉक को रिजर्व रखना चाहते हैं, सरकार बाहर से अन्न मंगाना चाहती है। देश में किस प्रकार इस समस्या को हल किया जा सकता है, वर्तमान परिस्थिति में किस प्रकार से यहां की परती भूमि से नई खेती पैदा करने की कोशिश की जा सकती है, इस विषय में कोई संकेत नहीं है। मैं इसलिए यह निवेदन करूंगा कि राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण हिन्दुस्तान की मुख्य समस्याओं को हल करने के लिए कोई संकेत पेश नहीं करता है।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में उन चीजों के विषय में भी कोई संकेत नहीं है जिन से हमारा सारा राष्ट्र आज आन्दोलित हो रहा है, विशेषरूप से हम देखते हैं कि कुछ विषयों को ले कर उत्तर प्रदेश में जनता द्वारा एक सत्याग्रह संघर्ष चलाया गया है जिस में

सिर्फ तीन दिन के अन्दर ८०० धावपी विस्फोटार हो चुके हैं। जरा जरा सी चीजों को ले कर यह बातें होती हैं। हमारे विचार मिला होते हुए भी हम यह देख कि जिस विषय के बारे में माननीय प्रधान मंत्री यहां बयान देते हैं कि उन स्टैचूज को, ब्रिटिश स्टैचूज को हटाया जाएगा, उन्हीं को हटाने के लिए अगर कोई विरोधी लोग कहते हैं तो इस के लिए उन को जेलों में बन्द किया जाता है। धावप्यकता तो इस बात की थी कि आज भारत के नव-निर्माण के लिए राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इन सब विषयों के सम्बन्ध में एक अच्छा संकेत रहा होता। लेकिन दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इन विषयों के बारे में कोई संकेत उस में नहीं है।

अगर हम बेकारी की समस्या को ले तो सरकारी रिपोर्ट से ही यह पता लगगा, एम्- 'ग्लायमेंट मूज', नवम्बर १९५६ से यह पता लगगा कि ४,२७,३५२ व्यक्ति ऐसे हैं जिन्होंने अपना नाम एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में रजिस्टर कराया है। हालांकि मेरा यह विचार है कि सब व्यक्तियों ने जो बेकार हैं, अपने को एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में रजिस्टर नहीं कराया है फिर भी यदि यह मान लिया जाए कि इतने ही व्यक्ति हिन्दुस्तान में बेकार थे, तो भी उन की बेकारी की समस्या को हल करने के लिए राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कुछ न कुछ संकेत होना चाहिए था। हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान के अनुसार हर एक नागरिक को यह अधिकार है कि वह सरकार से यह मांग करे कि उसके लिये भोजन की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। काम की व्यवस्था पहले होनी चाहिए और अगर सरकार काम की व्यवस्था करने में असमर्थ हो तो उस के लिए भोजन की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए। परन्तु इन चीजों के विषय में भी राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कोई संकेत नहीं है। जब तक बेकारी की समस्या हल नहीं होती, तब तक कुछ नहीं हो सकता। मुझे यह सुन कर बड़ा आश्चर्य होता है, सरकारी पत्र की ओर से यह बात

कही गई, कि आज भारत में ऐसे लोग हैं गरीब लोग, जो कोर्स प्रेन अर्थात् मोटे घनाज को छोड़ कर गेहूँ खाने की प्रवृत्ति की ओर बढ़ रहे हैं, या सिनेमा देखने की प्रवृत्ति की ओर बढ़ रहे हैं, या बस में चलने की प्रवृत्ति की ओर बढ़ रहे हैं, या रेल में ऊँचे दर्जे में चलाने की प्रवृत्ति की ओर बढ़ रहे हैं। इस चीज से कोई अन्दाजा नहीं होता कि हिन्दुस्तान का कितना विकास हो रहा है, इस के कतई माने नहीं हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान आगे बढ़ रहा है। यदि हम नई सम्मता के मुताबिक कुछ बातों को आधार मान लें तो इस अभिभाषण से यह पता नहीं लगता कि हिन्दुस्तान का कोई विकास हो रहा है। विकास का पता तो इस से लगेगा कि किस तरह भूमि की समस्या हल हो रही है, किस तरह लोगों को खाना मिल रहा है और लोगों का जीवन स्तर ऊँचा उठ रहा है जमीन स्थिति आज मुल्क में है उस से यह पता नहीं लगता मुल्क में अक्सर अकाल पड़ता है, बड़े आती हैं बाढ़ों के बारे में सरकार क्या कर रही है वह इस में नहीं है। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि जब हर साल बाढ़ आती है तो उसकी रोकथाम करने के लिए यह जरूरी है कि सरकार कुछ सोचे। यदि पिछले दस साल का इतिहास देखा जाये तो पता चलेगा कि बाढ़ें हर साल बढ़ती जा रही हैं। ऐसी कोई योजना नहीं बनायी जा रही जिससे कि वह आगे न हों। हर साल बाढ़ों से लाखों गरीब व्यक्तियों के घर बह जाते हैं उनको बनाने की कोई व्यवस्था सरकार की तरफ से नहीं की जाती। तो जब तक इन सब चीजों का समावेश अभिभाषण में न हो उस समय तक यह नहीं समझा जा सकता कि आगे हिन्दुस्तान को एक अच्छा हिन्दुस्तान बनाने की तस्वीर सरकार के सामने है। हिन्दुस्तान को एक अच्छा हिन्दुस्तान बनाने के लिए हम सभी माननीय सदस्यगण जनता के बीच गये और उन से वायदे किये। यदि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में हिन्दुस्तान को अच्छा बनाने की बात होती तो मैं समझता कि एक अच्छा हिन्दुस्तान बनने जा रहा है।

जहाँ तक खाद्य समस्या के हल का सम्बन्ध है मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि जब तक हिन्दुस्तान में जो बंजर भूमि पड़ी हुई है उसको नहीं तोड़ा जाता तब तक यह समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती। देश में करोड़ों एकड़ बंजर भूमि पड़ी हुई है, आगरे जिसे की एक ही तहसील बाह में करीब करीब डेढ़ लाख एकड़ भूमि चम्बल और जमुना के दोनों ओर बंजर पड़ी है जिसको तोड़ने में सरकार का कुछ खर्च भी नहीं होगा। वहाँ की जनता कहती है कि अगर एक एक किसान को दस दस बीघा यह जमीन दे दी जाये तो वह उस जमीन को तोड़ सकता है। और सरकार से कुछ पैसा न लेगा ऐसा करने से खादर जहाँ डकैत पनाह पाते हैं खत्म हो सकती है और जो डकैतों की समस्या है वह भी हल हो सकती है। लेकिन इन चीजों का जिसे आगे एक अच्छा हिन्दुस्तान बन सकता है, जिनसे हमारी खाद्य समस्या का हल हो सकता है, उनका समावेश राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं है।

इसी तरह से बेकारी की समस्या के बारे में मैं यह निबंदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक बेकारों को काम देने की व्यवस्था नहीं होती तब तक सरकार की यह जिम्मेदारी है कि उनके खाने पीने की व्यवस्था करे। लेकिन इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था करने की बात राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं कही गयी है।

खेतिहर मजदूरों का एक प्रश्न है। हमारे देश में ऐसे खेतिहर मजदूरों की एक बहुत बड़ी संख्या है जिनके पास अपनी कोई खेती नहीं है। लेकिन ऐसी भी व्यवस्था नहीं है कि उनके वेतन की कोई दर नियत कर दी जाये। जब तक इन करोड़ों व्यक्तियों के लिए हम कोई उचित व्यवस्था नहीं करते तब तक कोई अच्छा हिन्दुस्तान नहीं बन सकता। इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था करने का राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कोई संकेत नहीं है।

टैक्सों का जो ढांचा है वह इस तरह का है कि उससे गरीब आदमी पर ज्यादा बोझ

[श्री बजराम सिंह]

पड़ रहा है और अमीर आदमी पर कम बोझ होता जा रहा है ।

16.58 hrs.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

उदाहरण के लिए मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि जब हिन्दुस्तान आजाद नहीं था उस वक्त इनकम टैक्स को रेट २००० प्रति साल की आमदनी पर थी । उसको बढ़ाकर २४०० किया गया, फिर ३००० किया गया और फिर ३६०० और ४२०० किया गया । इस आमदनी से ऊपर अब इनकम टैक्स लिया जाता है । इसके साथ ही जो नीचे के तबके के लोग हैं उन पर टैक्स बढ़ता जाता है, जिन किसानों की जोतें इस तरह की हैं कि जिनसे कोई लाभ नहीं होता, यदि उनका लगान माफ कर दिया जाता तो लोगों को पता चलता कि हिन्दुस्तान में कोई नई व्यवस्था होने जा रही है । हमारे मंत्रीगण अक्सर कहा करते हैं कि हम समाजवादी समाज की रचना करना चाहते हैं । लेकिन समाजवादी समाज की रचना इस तरह नहीं होगी कि एक तरफ तो शौकीदार को ढाई आना रोज मजदूरी मिले और दूसरी तरफ इस तरह के आफिसर्स हों जो कि दस हजार का मासिक तक वेतन लें ।

श्री फीरोज गांधी (रायबरेली) : दस हजार किसको मिलता है ।

श्री बजराम सिंह : यदि आप वेतन और सब चीजों को मिलाकर देखें तो दस हजार हो जायेगा ।

पंडित के० सी० शर्मा (हापुड़) : यह कैसा हिसाब है ।

17 hrs.

श्री बजराम सिंह : यह हिसाब समझने व जानने के लिये आपको स्कूल जाना होगा । अगर आप पूरा हिसाब लगायेंगे तो दस हजार

से ज्यादा पड़ जायेगा । तो इस तरह से समाजवादी समाज की रचना नहीं हो सकती कि एक तरफ तो इतना कम वेतन हो और दूसरी तरफ इतना ज्यादा हो । यदि समाजवादी समाज की रचना करनी है तो सरकार को यह देखना चाहिए कि देश में बड़े से बड़े अफसर और छोटे से छोटे कर्मचारी के वेतनों में दस और एक से अधिक कम का अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिए । सरकार यह अमूल मान ले कि किसी का वेतन सौ रुपये से कम नहीं होगा और दूसरी तरफ किसी का वेतन १००० से ज्यादा नहीं होगा, तो समाजवादी समाज की रचना हो सकती है । परन्तु इस अभिभाषण में किसी ऐसी व्यवस्था का जिक्र नहीं किया गया है । मैं ने इसके लिए एक संशोधन पेश किया है, २० नम्बर का ।

गोआ के सम्बन्ध में हमारे माननीय सदन के कुछ सदस्य जो इस समय हमारे बीच में मौजूद हैं जेल जा चुके हैं । उस विषय में इस अभिभाषण में कोई जिक्र नहीं किया गया है और यह समस्या किस तरह हल की जायेगी इस विषय में भी अभिभाषण में कोई जिक्र नहीं किया गया है । तो मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि इस अभिभाषण में ऐसी किसी चीज का संकेत नहीं है कि जिससे यह मालूम हो कि इस मुल्क में एक नई समाज रचना होने जा रही है या यह एक नया मुल्क बनने जा रहा है जिससे कि यहां के करोड़ों लोगों के दिलों में विश्वास पैदा हो सके ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने संशोधन पेश करता हूँ ।

श्री रामसिंह भाई दर्भा (नीमाड़) : समापति जी, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर धन्यवाद देने का जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया है उसके समर्थन में बोलने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ ।

माननीय सदस्य ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसमें उन्होंने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण का जिक्र करते हुए योजनाओं के ऊपर, हिन्दुस्तान

के अन्दर जो प्रगति हो रही है उसके ऊपर, अनाज समस्या के ऊपर और अनेक बातों पर प्रकाश डाला गया है। मैं भी उस सम्बन्ध में कुछ शब्द सदन के सामने आचरके द्वारा रखना चाहता हूँ।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में एक बात नहीं कही गयी है हालांकि हमारे शासन के सम्मुख उसकी बार बार लाया गया है और उसके कारण एक राज्य में ही नहीं सारे देश के अन्दर एक बड़ी भी आतंकवादी फिजा पैदा हो रही है। उनको तरफ में आचरके द्वारा शासन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ यह हमारे देश की डाकू समस्या है। मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश के अन्दर मानसिंह नाम का एक डाकू प्रमिड था जो दो डेढ़ बरस पहले मारा गया। लेकिन वह मानसिंह डाकू इस इलाके में कितने ही और डाकू पैदा कर गया है और आज क्या उत्तर प्रदेश, क्या राजस्थान का इलाका, क्या मध्यप्रदेश का इलाका, सब जगह डाकूओं का जबरदस्त आतंक पैदा हो गया है और इन दिनों तो वह आतंक बढ़ता ही जा रहा है। कुछ क्षेत्रों के निवासियों को वहाँ रहना तक भारी पड़ रहा है। अभी चार रोज की बात है कि खालियर से १५ मील की दूरी पर से चार आदिमियों को डाकू पकड़ कर ले गये, और उसके ६ दिन पहले दो आदिमियों को पकड़कर ले गये। जगह जगह यह हो रहा है कि गांव के अन्दर डाकू जाते हैं और आदिमियों को इस तरह से भून डालते हैं जिस तरह से कि पहले राजा महाराजा तीतरों और बटेरों को भून डालते थे। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ की हालत को देखते हुए मन में ऐसा आता है कि उस एरिया को खालों कर दिया जाये पर प्रश्न यह है कि उन परिवारों और माताओं और बहिनों को कहाँ बसाने के लिये भेजा जाये। मैं शासन से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ इस तरह की भी घटनाएँ हो रही हैं कि माता पिता बच्चों को

स्कूल भेजते हैं तो उनको डाकू पकड़ कर अपने खेमों में ले जाते हैं और माता पिता उन बच्चों के लिये परेशान होते और उन को डूँडने फिरते हैं।

इतना ही नहीं इन चुनावों में जिन हरिजन भाइयों ने कांग्रेस की वोट दिया है, डाकू लोग उनके घर जाते हैं और उनकी नाक ऊपर से नहीं बल्कि अब नीचे में काटने लगे हैं। उत्तरी मध्य प्रदेश के उन सारे क्षेत्रों में तो इस कारण बड़ा ही आतंक फैला हुआ है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे शासन को इस बात में विचार करने और आवश्यक सशक्त कार्यवाही करने की जरूरत है। उत्तरी मध्य प्रदेश के निवासियों के लिए तो यह एक बहुत ही गम्भीर समस्या पैदा हो गई है। वे लोग स्थानीय अधिकारियों और प्रदेश शासन के पास जाते हैं और कहते हैं कि हमारी रक्षा की जाये।

राष्ट्रपति महोदय के भाषण में कम आमदनी वालों के लिए मकान बनाने की योजना का उल्लेख किया गया है। इस योजना के अधीन सरकार आठ हजार रुपये लोन के तौर पर देती है, जो कि तीस वर्षों में वसूल किये जा सकते हैं। इस योजना को बताते समय यह देख लिया गया होगा कि आठ हजार रुपये से कौसा मकान बन सकता है। मेरे विचार में सिर्फ एक दे देने के बजाय सरकार को उस कीमत की मकान के लिये सम्बन्धित सहुलियतें पहुंचाने की भी व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। सरकार की यह योजना तो बहुत अच्छी है, लेकिन मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब लोगों को इस योजना का पता चला कि मकान बनाने के लिए शासन से रुपया दिया जा रहा है, तो परिणाम यह हुआ कि मकान बनाने के उपयोग में आने वाली चीजों के भाव बढ़ा दिये गये पहले इंटों का भाव तीस रुपया हुआ था, लेकिन इस योजना के शुरू होने पर उसका भाव बढ़कर बासठ रुपया हुआ तक का हो गया। इसी प्रकार लोहे और

### [श्री रामसिंह भार्गव]

सीमेंट के भाव भी बढ़ गए हैं। बल्कि उन का तो मिलना ही दुस्र हो गया है। मैंने ऐसे केस देखे हैं कि लोग मिलने पर मकान बना शुरू हुआ और उस रकम में दीवा तो बन गई, लेकिन छत नहीं बन पाई, क्योंकि ईंटों और दूसरी चीजों के भाव बढ़ गए इससे वे अपना मकान पूरा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जब गरीब और मध्यम वर्गीय लोगों के लिए मकान बनाने की योजना तैयार की जाती है, तो यह भी अत्यन्त आवश्यक है कि मकान बनाने के लिए जिन चीजों की आवश्यकता हो, उन पर नियंत्रण किया जाय। अगर आप बाजार में मालूम करें कि १९५०-५१-५२ में उन चीजों के क्या भाव थे और अब क्या भाव हैं, तो आप को आश्चर्य होगा।

हमारी पहली पंच वर्षीय योजना सफलतापूर्वक समरत हो गई है और दूसरी शुरू हो गई है, लेकिन इस अवधि में हर एक चीज के भाव बराबर बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। एक तरफ हमारा उत्पादन बढ़ा है और दूसरी तरफ कीमतें बढ़ी हैं। इससे गरीब और मेहनतकश लोग हैरान हैं कि यह क्या हो रहा है। उन के मन से योजनाओं के प्रति विश्वास उठता जा रहा है। वे कहते हैं कि हमने उत्पादन तो बढ़ाया किन्तु हमारी कीमतें नहीं बढ़ी बल्कि कीमतें बढ़ती जा रही हैं, तो फिर इस का मतलब यह है कि उत्पादन बढ़ाने और इन योजनाओं का सारे का सारा फायदा कुछ धनी और मुनाफाखोर लोगों को है। इसलिये उत्पादन बढ़ाने से हमें क्या फायदा बल्कि हानि है। हम उत्पादन के ऊपर तो काबू कर पा रहे हैं, लेकिन मुनाफाखोरी पर हमारा कंट्रोल नहीं हो पा रहा है।

अब मैं अनाज की कीमतों के विषय में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। अधिक अनाज उपजाओ आंदोलन के फलस्वरूप १९५३-५४ में देश भर में ज्यादा से ज्यादा अनाज का उत्पादन

हुआ। लेकिन १९५४ के अन्त में जब ग्लोबल वॉर से किसान के हाथ में आया क्या हुआ? हमारे देश में ही ज्वार का इतना ज्यादा उत्पादन हुआ कि हमें सारी उम्र नहीं देखा था। उस समय—१९५४ के अन्त में और १९५५ के प्रारम्भ में—ज्वार का भाव तीन, साढ़े तीन रुपए मन तक था और उसी भाव पर किसानों से खरीद कर सब पीसे वालों ने ज्वार से अपने गोडाउन भर लिए। हम ने वहाँ के शासन को कहा कि इस पर कंट्रोल होना चाहिए, लेकिन हम से कहा कि यह तो केन्द्र के हाथ की बात है। जब सारा ज्वार किसानों के हाथों से निकल गया, तो केन्द्र की ओर से ज्वार के कम से कम भाव चौर, पांच रुपए मन को बांध दिए जाते हैं और उसी ज्वार को बाद में व्यापारियों ने १०-१२ रुपये मन बेचा। मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि हमारी सब योजनायें समयानुसार (टाइमली) होनी चाहिए, ताकि उन से किसानों, श्रमिकों और कनज्यूमजें को पूरा फायदा हो सके। लेकिन होता यह है कि ये लोग एक तरफ रह जाते हैं और बीच के लोग—मुनाफाखोर—सारा फायदा उठा लेते हैं।

इसके बाद मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि शासन की ओर से लोगों की सस्ते भाव पर अनाज मुहैया करने की व्यवस्था की गई है। राष्ट्रपति के भाषण में भी इस का निर्देश किया गया है कि अनाज का आयात किया जा रहा है और गोडाउन्ज बनाए जा रहे हैं, ताकि अनाज के भाव न बढ़ें और लोगों को अनाज सुगमता से मिल सके। हम देख रहे हैं कि शासन ने कुछ जनसंख्या के आधार पर बड़े बड़े शहरों में सस्ते अनाज की दुकानें खोल दी हैं लेकिन हमारे यहाँ जो सस्ते अनाज की दुकानें थीं वे अभी हाल में बंद कर दी गई हैं। दूसरी तरफ उन जंगल और पहाड़ी एरियाज में और जहाँ काटन और मूंगफली ही पैदा होती है, अनाज पैदा नहीं होता और

धनाज की लंगी बड़े बड़े शहरों से ज्यादा रहती है, और धनाज ज्यादा महंगा मिलता है, वहां इस प्रकार की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है। उन क्षेत्रों में अधिकांश भील, भिलाड़े, आदिवासी या कुछ हरिजन लोग भी रहते हैं। उन लोगों की ग्रामद्वी और रोजी का कोई जरिया भी नहीं होता है। जब उन को धनाज लेना होता है, तो उन्हें बीस पच्चीस मील दूर शहर में जाना पड़ता है। शहरों में भी सस्ते धनाज की दुकानों से तो उन का धनाज मिलता ही नहीं है, क्योंकि वहां पर केवल शहर वालों के लिए ही व्यवस्था होती है, और परिणाम यह होता है कि किसी व्यापारी के चंगुल में फंस जाते हैं और बहुत ऊंचे भाव पर धनाज हासिल करते हैं। ऐसे क्षेत्र जहां पर केवल काउन और मूंगफली पैदा किए जाने हैं, इस लिए उन क्षेत्रों को फूड-प्रॉडिंग एरिया नहीं कहा जा सकता है। वहां पर धनाज के विषय में बड़ी कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ता है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वहां पर भी सस्ते धनाज की व्यवस्था की जाय, तो यह बहुत उचित होगा और गरीब आदिवासियों और हरिजनों का भला होगा।

श्री जगदीश अक्षयी (बिलहौर) : श्रीमान् अधिष्ठाता महोदय, कल राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने संसद् के सदस्यों के समक्ष जो भाषण दिया, उस के सम्बन्ध में मैंने संशोधन संख्या २७ रखी है। सर्वप्रथम आप के द्वारा मैं माननीय सदस्यों का ध्यान इस ओर आकषित करना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने भाषण में इस बात का जिक्र नहीं किया है कि अभी जो हमारे आम चुनाव हुए, जिन के जरिये से हम लोग निर्वाचित हो कर यहाँ आए हैं, उन का संचालन चुनाव आयोग ने किस मनमाने ढंग से किया और किस मनमाने ढंग से विभिन्न राजनीतिक पार्टियों के साथ सलूक किया।

श्रीमान् जी, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि भारतीय संविधान के अनुसार भारत सरकार

को यह अधिकार दिया गया था कि वह चुनावों का संचालन करने के लिए कुछ नियम बनावे। भारत सरकार ने चुनाव सम्बन्धी नियम बनाने का अधिकार चुनाव आयोग के सुपुर्द कर दिया। चुनाव आयोग ने मनमाने ढंग से विभिन्न राजनीतिक पार्टियों के साथ व्यवहार किया और मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि देश में कुछ प्रमुख वामपंथी पार्टियों को अपने बनाय हुए नियमों के अनुसार मान्यता प्रदान नहीं की उनको निस्टस फ्री नहीं दी गई। उसने यहाँ तक मनमाने ढंग से व्यवहार किया कि कुछ राजनीतिक पार्टियों को विशेष मुविभाष्य प्रदान की जोकि दूसरी पार्टियों को नहीं की। इस सब का परिणाम यह हुआ कि बहुत से जनता के प्रतिनिधि यहाँ पर नहीं आ सके हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन सब चीजों का जिक्र भी राष्ट्रपति जी को अपने अभिभाषण में करना चाहिए था।

राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत जो सफलतायें प्राप्त हुई हैं उनका जिक्र किया है। लेकिन मैं बड़े भद्र के साथ यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह ठीक है कि भारत सरकार ने प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत देश को समृद्ध बनाने के लिए, देश में से बेकारी दूर करने के लिए देश में भूखमरी को खत्म करने के लिए देश को उन्नतिशील बनाने के लिए योजनाओं बनाई लेकिन जो सफलता प्राप्त हुई है वह हमारे सामने है। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि मैं एक अध्यापक हूँ और जो अध्यापक होता है वह कुछ भी कहता है बड़े ही निष्पक्ष भाव से कहता है और जब वह किसी विद्यार्थी की कोपियों को जांचता है तब वह इस बात का ध्यान रखता है कि भले ही किसी प्रतिभाशाली विद्यार्थी ने किसी गणित के प्रश्न को बड़े अच्छे ढंग से हल करने की कोशिश की हो लेकिन जब उसका जबाब गलत आया तो कोई भी अध्यापक उसे परीक्षा में पास नहीं कर सकेगा। हो सकता है कि भारत सरकार ने तथा उसके मंत्रियों ने अपने कार्यकाल में बड़े बड़े काम

[श्री जगन्नाथ धवस्वी]

किए हों, बड़े अच्छे काम किए हों लेकिन जब आप उन कार्यों के फलों को देखेंगे तो आप यह नहीं कह सकेंगे कि भारत सरकार को उनमें सफलता प्राप्त हुई है। मैं यह कह सकता हूँ कि चाहे हमारे मंत्रिगण इस बात पर गर्व करें कि उन्हें सफलता मिली है लेकिन मैं तो इसके लिए उनको सी में से केवल बीस नम्बर ही दे सकता हूँ, इससे ज्यादा नहीं।

राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने अभिभाषण में इस बात की चर्चा की है और इस बात का उपदेश दिया है कि जनता को चाहिए कि वह फिजूल खर्ची से बचे। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आपने निष्पक्ष भाव से यह देखने की कोशिश की है कि फिजूल खर्ची कहां हो रही है? हमारा देश मुख्यतः कृषि प्रधान देश है और कृषक वर्ग ही यहां मुख्य रूप से रहता है। उसकी आर्थिक स्थिति आज गिरती जा रही है, आज उसकी हालत दिनोदिन खराब होती जा रही है। लड़ाई के जमाने में जिस किसान के पास एक हजार रुपया था उसके पास आज दो सौ रुपए भी नहीं हैं। आज उनके पास पैसा नहीं है। उसकी क्रयशक्ति घटती जा रही है। उसके पास आज पैसों का अभाव है। तो जिन के पास पैसा नहीं है उनसे यह कहना कि फिजूल खर्ची कम करो, कुछ हास्यास्पद ही प्रतीत होता है। सच बात तो यह है कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने अभिभाषण में जो उपदेश आज सामान्य जनता को दिया है अगर वही उपदेश अपने माननीय मंत्रियों को और बड़े बड़े अफसरों को दिया होता जिन के द्वारा बहुत ज्यादा फिजूल खर्ची हो रही है तो शायद इसका कुछ अच्छा परिणाम निकल आता और इस उपदेश का अच्छा असर भी पड़ता।

इसी लोक सभा में भारत सरकार ने एक प्रस्ताव पास करवाया था जिसमें यह कहा गया था कि इसका उद्देश्य देश में समाजवाद समाज व्यवस्था की रचना करना है। इसमें

कोई शक नहीं है कि आज हम सब समाजवाद की ही बातें करने लग गए हैं और जहां तक समाजवाद लाने का प्रश्न है इसमें कोई मतभेद नहीं है और हर कोई चाहता है कि समाजवाद आए। लेकिन केवल कह देने मात्र से ही समाजवाद नहीं आ जाता है, उसको लाने के लिए तो हमें कुछ प्रयास करना होता है। मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आया है कि इस समाजवाद को इस पृथ्वी पर, इस भारत भूमि पर कैसे उतारा जाएगा। इस को लाने के लिए हमारे सामने कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम नहीं रखा गया है। आप जानते हैं कि समाजवादी व्यवस्था के अन्तर्गत धन और धरती का जब तक उचित वितरण और उस पर नियंत्रण नहीं होगा तब तक कोई भी शासन व्यवस्था इस देश में समाजवाद नहीं ला सकती है। राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने अभिभाषण में इस प्रकार का कोई भी संकेत नहीं किया है। आज हमारे देश के अन्दर कितनी ही भूमि पड़ी हुई है। अंग्रेजों ने अपने कार्यकाल में बड़े ही मनमाने ढंग से भूमि सम्बन्धी अनेक प्रकार के कानून बनाए थे। इसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि बहुत से प्रांतों में जमींदारी प्रथा समाप्त होने के बावजूद भी आज भूमि की समस्या हल नहीं हुई है और गांवों की दशा नहीं सुधरी है। जब तक भूमि का उचित वितरण नहीं होता तब तक कोई भी समस्या हल नहीं हो सकती है और किसानों की हालत नहीं सुधर सकती। आज हमारे देश में ८०० प्रतिशत किसान बसते हैं। उनका मुख्य धंधा खेती है जब तक उनकी हालत नहीं सुधरती तब तक इस देश की धरती पर समाजवाद नहीं आ सकता और यह पत्रों में या घोषणाओं में भले ही आ जाए। इसी तरह से धन का भी सवाल है। आज आप ने राजाओं और महाराजाओं के पद तो समाप्त कर दिए हैं लेकिन आज भी उनको कितनी ही रकम प्रिवी पर्स के रूप में दी जा रही है। आप आप चाहे यह कहें कि आपने बड़े बड़े कार्यों

किया है, राजाओं और महाराजाओं को क्षम कर दिया है लेकिन मैं आपको यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में आज भी बड़े बड़े राजे और महाराजे हैं जिनको आप "प्रिवी पर्स" के नाम पर "शाही भेंट" के नाम पर करोड़ों रुपया भेंट स्वरूप दे रहे हैं। अगर मेरी स्मरण शक्ति मुझे धोखा नहीं देती तो मैं कह सकता हूँ कि आपकी ही सरकारी रिपोर्टों के अनुसार और शायद एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में यह सूचना दी गयी थी कि लगभग ३५ करोड़ रुपया राजे और महाराजों को प्रिवी पर्स के रूप में दिया जाता है। एक ओर तो आप यह कहते हैं कि आप देश में समाजवादी व्यवस्था लाना चाहते हैं और दूसरी ओर आप करोड़ों रुपया उन लोगों को दे रहे हैं जिन के पास आज भी व्यक्तिगत रूप में करोड़ों की सम्पत्ति है। इस चीज का भी राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने अभिभाषण में कोई जिक्र नहीं किया है। आज भी करोड़ों रुपया राजाओं और महाराजाओं को प्रिवी पर्स के रूप में भेंट किया जा रहा है जिसको कि बन्द कर देना चाहिए। यदि इस ओर राष्ट्रपति ने संकेत किया होता तो सम्भवतः हम लोगों को बड़ा आनन्द हुआ होता और हम अनुभव करते कि समाजवादी व्यवस्था को ठोस रूप से कायम करने के लिए कोई ठोस कदम उठाया गया है।

राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने गृह नीति के साथ साथ वैदेशिक नीति की भी चर्चा की है। उन्होंने यह बतलाने का प्रयास किया है कि हमारी वैदेशिक नीति सफल रही है और हमारे सम्बन्ध दूसरे देशों के साथ बड़े ही सौहार्दपूर्ण और स्नेहपूर्ण रहे हैं।

इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि भारत सरकार और हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री

महोदय ने अपनी विद्वता के बल पर विदेशों में जाकर इस बात का प्रयास किया कि हमारे देश का विश्व के अन्य देशों के साथ अच्छा सम्बन्ध रहे और भारत सरकार की यह जो तटस्थता की नीति रही है वह कहने सुनने में तो भले ही सुन्दर लगती हो लेकिन इसका व्यावहारिक परिणाम कुछ नहीं हुआ। मैंने जैसे आपसे पहले निवेदन किया कि भारत सरकार की गृह नीति फेल हुई है, जहां तक वैदेशिक नीति का सम्बन्ध है, उसके बारे में मुझे यह कहना है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय का सम्मान विदेशों में जाकर भले ही ऊंचा होता हो और वह स्वयं भी यह अनुभव करें कि उनकी विद्वता के कारण हमारे देश का सम्मान बाहर के देशों में हो रहा है, लेकिन मैं इस को मानने को तैयार नहीं हूँ।

मैं आपके द्वारा अरब के साथ निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि आज दुनिया में इस विषय में दो मत नहीं हैं कि आज की दुनिया दो गुटों में बंटी हुई है, एक गुट अमरीकन गुट है और दूसरा गुट रूसी गुट है। आज इन दो शक्तिशाली गुटों के बीच में सारे अन्य राष्ट्र चकाचौंध हो रहे हैं और दोनों गुटों का यह प्रयास हो रहा है कि अपनी अपनी ओर अन्य राष्ट्रों को खींचें। हमारी भारत सरकार की यह नीति रही है और उसने इस बात का प्रयास किया है कि हम दोनों गुटों को खुश रखें लेकिन जितना ही हमारी सरकार ने इन दोनों गुटों को खुश रखने का प्रयत्न किया उतना ही हम उन को खुश रखने में असफल रहे हैं। अगर हम रूस से आये हुए प्रतिष्ठियों का भारत में सम्मान करते हैं तो अमरीका में हमको सन्देह की अमरीका में हमको सन्देह का दृष्टि से देखा जाता है और अमरीका में उस के मुताबिक

## [श्री जगदीश भवस्वी]

एडवर्स कमेंट्स होते हैं और हमारी तटस्थता की नीति को सन्देह की दृष्टि से देखा जाता है। उसी प्रकार यदि हम अमरीका से प्रायेण्ये अतिरिक्त प्रतियोगियों का सम्मान करते हैं तो फिर रूस में हमारे ऊपर क्रिटिसिज्म होता है और वे हमारी तटस्थता की नीति पर शक करते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि भारत सरकार की जो वैदेशिक नीति रही है उसका कोई सफल परिणाम अभी तक नहीं निकला है और उसका परिणाम तो हमने तब देखा जब कि काश्मीर के प्रश्न को हल करने पर जनमत लेने का प्रश्न सुरक्षा परिषद् के सामने आया। जिन राष्ट्रों को हम समझते थे कि वे हमारे मित्र हैं और हमारी सहायता करेंगे, उन राष्ट्रों में से हमारा किसी ने भी साथ नहीं दिया और जिस राष्ट्र के प्रति हम विशेष निष्ठा रखते हैं वह राष्ट्र बिलकुल तटस्थ हो गया। इस तरह जनता ने बिलकुल साफ़ तौर पर देखा लिया कि वास्तव में भारत सरकार की वैदेशिक नीति का क्या प्रभाव पड़ा है। आज आप देखते हैं कि पाकिस्तान, गोआ, सीलोन और अफ्रीका आदि देशों में जो हमारे भारतीय रह रहे हैं उनको कैसा अपमान का जीवन बिताना पड़ रहा है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि यदि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय पाकिस्तान में जायें तो उनका सम्मान होगा, गोआ में जायें तो उनका सम्मान होगा और प्रधान मंत्री के रूप में डॉ० सालाजार उनका सम्मान करेंगे और अगर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय अफ्रीका जायें तो वहाँ भी उनका सम्मान किया जायगा। हमारे राष्ट्रपति महोदय वे अपने अभिभाषण में इसका संकेत दिया है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री बहुत शीघ्र ही ब्रिटिश राष्ट्र मंडलीय सम्मेलन में भाग लेने जा रहे हैं और यह तय बात है कि वहाँ पर उनका सम्मान किया जायगा लेकिन मैं आपके द्वारा कहना चाहूँगा कि इस तरह का सम्मान तो एक औपचारिक रूप में हुआ करता है और इसी से यह निष्कर्ष

निकाल बैठना कि हमारे देश का सम्मान ही रहा है ठीक न होगा। मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के माननीय सदस्यों से कहना चाहूँगा कि अगर अजि भारतवर्ष का एक साधारण नागरिक अफ्रीका में जाय तो उसके साथ तो बड़ी दुख्यं बहार किया जायगा जो मलान गवर्नमेंट किया करती थी। अगर कोई भारतीय सीलोन जाय तो उसको अधिकार नहीं मिलेंगे और गोआ में आपने देखा ही लिया कि अगर कोई भारतीय नागरिक जाय तो उसको जेलखाना मिलेगा। हमारे देश का सम्मान तो वास्तव में तब बढ़ा हुआ माना जायगा जब प्रधान मंत्री से लेकर नीचे तक का साधारण से साधारण नागरिक अंगर विदेशों में जाय तो उसका वहाँ पर सम्मान ही अन्यथा नहीं क्योंकि यह आप क्यों भूल जाते हैं कि हमारे देश का जो मतदाता और करदाता है वह सचमुच देश का मालिक है और आज बंकि ऐसा नहीं हो रहा है तो क्या यह हमारी वैदेशिक नीति की अनकलनी नहीं है। अगर भारतवर्ष की वैदेशिक नीति निश्चित रूप से स्पष्ट हुई होती तो उसने अगुवाई की होती और छोटे छोटे राष्ट्रों को लेकर वह एक तीसरा गुट बना सकता था। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जब रूस और अमरीका यह दो शक्तिशाली देश दो गुटों में विभक्त हैं और अन्य राष्ट्रों को अपनी अपनी ओर खींचने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं और हर तरीके की खींचतान कर रहे हैं, जवान से दोनों शान्ति की बातें करते हैं लेकिन वास्तव में हम देखते हैं कि दोनों अपने अपने बहाँ अस्त्र हैं अस्त्र बढ़ा रहे हैं और जंगी तैयारियाँ रहे कर हैं, तब भारतवर्ष की वैदेशिक नीति निश्चित रूप से स्पष्ट हुई होती। उसने तीसरे गुट का निर्माण किया होता और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय उसके नेता बने होते तो मैं समझता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष विश्व में अपना प्रभावशाली स्थान बना सकने में समर्थ होता।

असल में मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि हमारे भारतवर्ष की वैदेशिक नीति और गृह नीति के अन्तर्गत जहाँ योजना की बात की गई और कहा गया कि योजना सकल हो रही है, तो मैं सदन को आपके द्वारा श्रीमान् जी, बतलाना चाहूंगा कि आज एक तरफ तो योजना चल रही है और कर बढ़ते जा रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ देश में बेकारी बढ़ती जा रही है और भुलम हो बढ़ती जा रही है। हमारे देश में रिक्त बालों, तांगे बालों, टैक्सी बालों और खोमचे बालों की संख्या बढ़ती जा रही है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना अन्तर्गत सचमुच में सकल हुई होती तो इस देश में गराबों की संख्या न बढ़ती। यह द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना बड़ी आकर्षक योजना है।

Planning is going on and unemployment is going on. It is a wonderful planning that is going on in India.

राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने बहुत से तथ्यों को जो कि वास्तविक थे उनको अपने अभिभाषण में नहीं रखा और उनकी ओर मैंने जो कुछ निवेदन किया है और इस सम्बन्ध में जो मेरे संशोधन हैं, उन पर आप और इस सदन के माननीय सदस्य विचार करें और मैं चाहूंगा कि जो सही बात है उसको स्वीकार किया जाय और जो हमारे में कमियाँ रही हैं उनको स्वीकार कर लिया जाये क्योंकि इससे तो दुनिया में सम्मान ही मिलेगा और हम झूठ पर पर्दा डालने की कोशिश न करें।

**Shri Achar (Mangalore):** Sir, it is with a sense of diffidence, but with happiness, that I get up today to join the Mover in rendering our heart-felt thanks to the President. Within the limited time, I would like to touch only a few of the topics which are nearest to me, nearest to me because I come from an area in the south-western portion of our great country.

The first topic I would like to deal with is the question of the reorganisation of the States which the President has referred to. I come from South Kanara District, which originally belonged to Madras State and now forms part of the Mysore State. As I said earlier, I get up with a sense of happiness and a sense of duty also because the people in that area are extremely thankful for the policy adopted by the Government and for the formation of the new Karnataka State. This State, which was cut up in several divisions, in fact, in five different Provinces, has been unified, and I would only be voicing forth the feelings of my entire constituency, both the southern portion of South Kanara District and also Coorg, when I say that the entire constituency is extremely grateful to the President for the Address that he has given to us.

I heard a previous speaker mentioning about the several grievances with regard to the formation of the States. No doubt in South Kanara too we have our own problems. This problem has been mentioned on several occasions. I do not wish to dilate on that subject. The problem is there. I am referring to the problem of Kasergod. There was a dispute as regards the portion to the north of the Chandragiri river—whether it should go to the Kerala State or to the Karnataka State. It is not for me today to dilate on that subject. I hope this problem will be settled to the satisfaction of both the States by negotiation or by arbitration. I do not wish to say anything more on that subject. All the same, as I mentioned, I would like to tender our heart-felt thanks with regard to this problem of the reorganisation of States which has been settled happily. My entire constituency feels that one important problem has been solved so far as my constituency is concerned.

The next topic I would like to deal with is the Goan question. I am not going to touch the entire foreign policy. I will only touch the Goan

[Shri Achar]

problem in this respect, because it is a problem of a country which is very near to us. In fact, I may mention that when this agitation started, an all-party committee was formed in Mangalore and I happened to be the President of that all-party committee. Though chronology is not the main point here, I am referring to that aspect, because, so far as this question is concerned, there is not much of a difference as to the point that Goa is part and parcel of India. There is no difference on that point. It is part and parcel of India. Nobody disputes that. When the previous speaker went on dilating on the subject that the problem has not been solved, I put the question, "What is your remedy?" So far, I could make out no remedy or suggest anything. The previous speaker said that the Government should make a clear declaration that we are not going to help Goa. Supposing such a statement is made, will it solve the problem? Our comrades are mentioning often that nothing is being done so far as Goa is concerned. What is the remedy? What is the remedy that they are going to suggest? Even today, I put the same question, when that point was argued, "What is the remedy that they are suggesting?" Are they suggesting that our army should march into Goa? Or, what is the other solution? Often, it was said that our foreign policy is one of neutrality. As a matter of fact, our Prime Minister has stated several times that to be neutral is not our policy. I need not go into the question in detail. But our Prime Minister has said that Goa is part and parcel of our country and that we are going to do whatever we can. But, does it mean that we are going to declare war on that point? Are we prepared for that situation? I do not think even our friends will support that policy.

Then, what is the other solution? Often, it is repeated that the Government's policy has not succeeded. South Africa is mentioned; Ceylon is mentioned. Why not they mention

the French territories? We know Pondicherry has been taken over without a fire and without even one shot being fired. We have succeeded so far as the French territories are concerned. Why not the people who complain wait a little bit and see whether the present policy succeeds or not? We are committed to the policy of peace as has been witnessed in our relations with Korea and Indo-China. Let us wait and see whether this policy of peace will succeed or not. When we have succeeded so far as the French territories are concerned, why not they mention that? Always, they mention only those points on which we have not yet succeeded.

So far as Goa is concerned, naturally we will have to follow a policy which is consistent with our foreign policy and our national policy. It is not only with regard to one particular item such as Goa but with regard to all our problems, we have to follow a policy of peace. We are not for war, and we have tried, in every corner of the world, for preserving peace. Our President has referred to the question of Korea and Indo-China and our policy thereto. So far as Goa is concerned, no policy is suggested.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajpur): We shall show that policy when we occupy the Benches opposite. Of course, our policy of peace is being worked out in regard to Goa also and we can expect that the Goa problem will also be solved.

So far as France is concerned, we have succeeded in our policy. I put the same question: "How did we do that?"

Shri Achar: When they do not disclose that policy, I need not go into that question. Perhaps it is a policy to tag us on or to hold on to Russia.

As I mentioned, I wanted to refer only to two points: first, to the reorganisation of States and the formation

of a Karnataka area for which I am extremely thankful, and secondly, the question of Goa. I fully support the policy followed in respect of Goa.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): I beg to move:

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

“but regret that there is no mention of the recent reports of installation of a ‘Matador’ launching site for guided-missiles with atomic war-heads on Formosa and the immediate danger therefrom to the prevailing peaceful conditions in the Far East”.

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

“but regret—

(a) “that the Address contains to indication of Government’s intention of implementing the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission in respect of safeguarding the rights and interests of different linguistic groups living in various States;

(b) that the Government have failed to note in the Address and respect the will of the electorate of Orissa which is demonstrated in the recent general elections on the issue of merger of Seraikalla and Kharsawan with Orissa”.

My first amendment is regarding the test explosions of atomic weapons. I would like to submit that in the Address of the President, it has been mentioned that reports of experiments on atomic explosions continue to be received. My submission is this. It should also be taken note of that installations of ‘Matador’ launching sites for guided missiles have been erected in Formosa and that is also equally dangerous to us, because, it disturbs the peaceful conditions that now prevail in the Far East. I hope that point would be taken note of.

- While fully appreciating the policy which the President has enunciated, so far as the test atomic explosions are concerned, I would submit that these installations to which I referred to should also be taken note of. Installations of ‘Matador’ launching site for guided missiles with atomic war-heads in Formosa are really a danger to India, because that country is very near to us.

In moving my second amendment, I would like to point out that the Address of the President contains no indication of Government’s intention of implementing the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission in respect of the rights and privileges of the different linguistic groups now living in different States. The States Reorganisation Commission was very clear in its report that even after the reorganisation of States on a linguistic basis, there would be problems before the different States because several linguistic groups in different States would be left out. Though the States Reorganisation Commission also gave equal importance to this problem, when we were discussing the after effects of the States reorganisation, we did not take note of the difficulties of the different linguistic groups.

I can cite one instance. The Oriyas living in Bihar are now undergoing difficulties. When the agitation was going on in our province, we were given to understand that after the States are reorganised the rights and privileges of the linguistic groups living in different States would be respected by the respective State Governments. We were also given to understand that the education of the children of the different linguistic groups living in different States would be guaranteed. But in Seraikalla and Kharsawan recently the Oriya schools have not been encouraged. Similarly the Oriya schools in Singhbhum also have not been encouraged. I think this should be taken note of, so that much of the controversy going on between the States on a linguistic basis might be settled. If the assur-

[Shri Panigrahi]

ance is given that the different linguistic groups would have the right to get education in their own tongue, I think much of the difficulties and troubles that we are facing today will gradually vanish.

We were also given to understand that the zonal councils will take up the minor adjustment of territories between the different States, which were not settled during the States reorganisation movement. We were given to understand that the zonal council will take up the question of Seraikalla and Kharsawan, because it is a minor territorial adjustment, but it has not been done. I hope all these things which I have submitted will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Chairman: I find that the hon. Member has not given notice of his amendments Nos. 58 and 59. But since he has moved them and spoken on them, I take them as moved.

श्री यादव (बाराबांकी) : अधिष्ठाता महोदय, मैंने राष्ट्रपति के प्रतिभाषण को सुना भी और पढ़ा भी और समझता था कि देश की सारी स्थिति का वर्णन उनके प्रतिभाषण में होगा। किन्तु यह जानकर मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ कि उनमें बहुत सी जरूरी चीजें छूट गयी हैं। जो भी चीजें इस प्रतिभाषण में छूट गई हैं उनमें भाषा का प्रश्न भी बहुत प्रमुख है। प्रायः जानते ही हैं कि हमारे देश में भाषा का प्रश्न कितना जटिल है। हमारे देश में कहीं बंगला बोली जाती है, कहीं तामिल बोली जाती है, कहीं तेलगू बोली जाती है, कहीं हिन्दी या उर्दू बोली जाती है और कहीं प्रपंचोजी बोली जाती है। पहले मुझे यह प्रश्न इतना जटिल नहीं मालूम होता था परन्तु जब मैं इस सदन में आया और देखा कि यहाँ माननीय सदस्यों ने मुक्तचित्त भाषाओं में अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से और अपनी अपनी भाषाओं

में भाषण देने लगे, तो मुझे भाषा का जटिलता का पूरी तरह पता लगा। मैं थोड़ी प्रपंचोजी जानता हूँ लेकिन मैं इस बात से परेशान हो जाता हूँ कि बहुत से भाषी जो केवल हिन्दी भाषा जानते हैं और अन्य प्रांतीय भाषा जानते हैं उनको कितनी परेशानी होती होगी जब कि यहाँ अपनाही भाषा में लोग भाषण देते हैं। ती यह भाषण की एक बड़ी जटिल समस्या है। हम जानते हैं कि हमारी सरकार में हिन्दी को राष्ट्रभाषा माना है लेकिन आज देश को आजाद होने तक वर्षों हो चुके हैं पर अभी तक हिन्दी राष्ट्रभाषा के स्थान पर नहीं आ पायी है। राष्ट्रभाषा के स्थान पर आने की दो बात ही नहीं हैं, अभी इस दिशा में एक कदम भी नहीं बढ़ाया गया है। यदि हमारे देश में एक भाषा बन जाये तो देश की एकता के लिए कितनी हितकर हो और हम लोगों को प्राप्त में विचारों का, आदान प्रदान करना कितना आसान हो जाये।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य जो यहाँ पर बैठे हैं वे शायद यह समझते हैं कि हिन्दी उन पर जबरदस्ती लादी जा रही है। मैं निहायत प्रदब से उन माननीय सदस्यों से निवेदन करूँगा कि मेरा नुक़्तानजर तो यह है कि हिन्दी राष्ट्रभाषा हो और उसके साथ कितनी भी क्षेत्रीय भाषाएँ हैं उन सब को तरक्की दी जाये और बढ़ावा दिया जाये। तो आज जब कि भाषा का प्रश्न इतना जटिल है और उसके कारण यह सब बातें चल रही हैं, तो राष्ट्रपति के प्रतिभाषण में उसका जिक्र न होने से अचम्भा होता और इससे मालूम होता है कि सरकार का ध्यान इतनी बड़ी समस्या की ओर नहीं गया है।

एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि उत्तर प्रदेश जो इस देश का एक बहुत बड़ा प्रांत है, उसमें आज भाषा के प्रश्न को लेकर जन आन्दोलन हो रहा है।

कहा जाता है कि वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा है कि हमारे पास सारे टेकनालाजीकल शब्द भ्रष्ट नहीं हैं, जिनको उपलब्ध करना केन्द्रीय सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है, इसलिये हम हिन्दी को पूरी तरह लागू नहीं कर सकते। जब इस तरह की समस्याएँ चल रही हों और राष्ट्रपति महोदय के अभिभाषण में इस बात का जिक्र न हो तो यह बहुत अचम्भे की बात है।

आज हर स्तर पर, चाहे स्थानीय स्तर हो या प्रांतीय स्तर हो, हम भ्रष्टाचार का हर जगह बोलबाला पाते हैं। जो हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजनाएँ चल रही हैं शायद हमारी सरकार यह नहीं समझती कि वे किस प्रकार फेल हो रही हैं लेकिन वह दिन जल्द आवेगा जब उन्हें मजबूर होकर यह कहना पड़ेगा कि हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजनाएँ फेल हो चुकी हैं। इसका एक कारण बहुत बड़ा भ्रष्टाचार है। हर जगह भ्रष्टाचार है। इसी सदन में दामोदर वैली योजना के भ्रष्टाचार के बारे में चर्चा हो चुकी है। मैं तो यहां तक कह सकता हूँ कि प्लानिंग विभाग में जितना खर्च होता है उसका लगभग तीस प्रतिशत भ्रष्टाचार में चला जाता है। जब यह हाल है फिर भी इसका जिक्र राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं आया इसका भी अचम्भा है। इसका जिक्र राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में होना चाहिए था। आज जो हमारी पंचवर्षीय योजनाएँ चल रही हैं उनमें जनता को कोई उत्साह नहीं है। आज सरकारी पक्ष की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि यह पंचवर्षीय योजना समाज के भले के लिए है। लेकिन जनता को इन योजनाओं में कोई दिलचस्पी नहीं है। जनता को इन से कोई संकोकार नहीं है। ऐसा क्यों है? मैं निवेदन करूँगा कि इसका कारण यह है कि सरकार ने प्लानिंग विभाग को इस तरह बनाया है कि ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि वह ऊपर से लादा गया है। इन योजनाओं में गाँवों को और ग्राम पंचायतों को कोई स्थान नहीं दिया जाता है और न उनका सहयोग प्राप्त करने की

किसी प्रकार की भी कोशिश की जा रही है। यही कारण है कि आज लोगों में इन योजनाओं के प्रति उत्साह नहीं है। लोग समझ नहीं पा रहे हैं कि प्लानिंग विभाग क्या है। दरअसल यह सारा काम कुछ सरकारी लोगों तक सीमित है। कुछ नये मये महकमे खुल गये हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश में तो लोग यह कहते हैं कि यह प्लानिंग डिपार्टमेंट तो मुहकमा गुंजाइश हो गया है जिसमें कुछ लोगों को नौकरी दिलायी जाती है यह कुछ पैसे बनाने का चक्कर रहता है। लोगों के इस तरह के विचारों का कारण यही है कि जनता का सहयोग प्राप्त करने का कोई प्रयत्न ही नहीं किया जाता। सिर्फ सरकारी नौकरों के स्तर पर यह काम चलता है।

चुनाव के सम्बन्ध में सरकार के पक्ष से यह कहा गया और सरकार को बहुत बड़ी बधाई दी गयी कि इतना बड़ा चुनाव बड़ी सफलता के साथ निभ गया। मैं आपके द्वारा निवेदन करूँगा कि इतना बड़ा चुनाव हुआ लेकिन इस सरकार ने और चुनाव आयोग ने ऐसे ढंग से काम किया है कि अगर उस पर ध्यान दिया जाय तो यह सारे का सारा चुनाव रद्द किया जा सकता है। संविधान के अन्तर्गत सरकार या चुनाव कमिशन को यह अधिकार नहीं है कि एक उम्मीदवार और दूसरे उम्मीदवार के बीच में किसी प्रकार का फर्क करे। लेकिन चुनाव आयोग ने इस कायदे और कानून को तोड़कर एक रूल ऐसा बना दिया कि किसी एक पक्ष को एक चुनाव निशान मुकर्रे कर दिया जाय। अब आप देखें कि एक पार्टी या व्यक्तियों के समूह को तो एक चुनाव प्रतीक नियुक्त कर दिया जाता है।

इस के बिल्कुल विपरीत आजाद उम्मीदवारों और अन्य पार्टियों को, जिनको चुनाव कमिशन ने धाँधली से मान्यता प्रदान नहीं की है, ऐन वक्त पर चुनाव-प्रतीक दिये जाते हैं, जिसका परिणाम यह होता है कि उन को सिर्फ पंद्रह बीस दिन में ही उस का प्रचार करना होता है। यह विधान का सीधा

## [श्री पादव]

उत्सव है। यही नहीं, जो चार मास्य पार्टियाँ हैं, उन को सरकार और चुनाव कमीशन, दोनों ने मिल कर, वोटर्स लिस्ट—मतदाता सूची—मुफ्त में दे दी, जो कि लगभग सात घाट लाख रुपये की आती है और इस प्रकार चुनाव का संचालन इस प्रकार किया गया कि अगर यह मामला किसी हाई कोर्ट, या बड़ी अदालत, में जाय, या इस माननीय सदन के सदस्य ही इस पर विचार करें, तो वे इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचेंगे कि यह चुनाव कायदे-कानून के खिलाफ हुआ और अगर ऐसा न होता और विभिन्न दलों और उम्मीदवारों के साथ मान्यता-अमान्यता के आधार पर व्यवहार न किया जाता, जैसा कि किया गया है, तो चुनाव का फल कुछ दूसरा ही होता।

इस भाषण में छुआ-छूत का कोई जिक्र नहीं किया गया है। यह जरूर है कि सरकारी पक्ष के एक सदस्य महोदय ने अपने दौरान-तरकीर में इस का जिक्र किया और दावा किया कि इस सरकार ने छुआ-छूत को दूर किया। मैं आप के द्वारा निहायत प्रदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रदेश में एक वर्ष पहले विष्वनाथ मन्दिर को लेकर एक बड़ा आन्दोलन शुरू हुआ था, क्योंकि उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार की हठवादिता और कुछ धर्मन्ध लोगों के कारण हरिजन लोग विष्वनाथ मन्दिर में नहीं जा पा रहे थे, जब कि इसी संसद् ने एक अन्त-वेबिलिटी आफ़ेन्स एक्ट पहले ही पास कर रखा था, जिस के अन्तर्गत कोई भी आदमी किसी भी आदमी को अछूत करार नहीं दे सकता और अगर देगा, तो सजा पायगा और अगर कोई मुकदमा इस विषय में चल रहा होगा, तो वह खत्म हो जायगा। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन का सारे देश में बड़ा सम्मान है और यह सदन सारे देश के लिए कायदे-कानून बनाता है, लेकिन यह बड़ी विचित्र बात है कि पड़ोस के एक सूबे में, जिससे कि हमारे माननीय प्रधान मंत्री का

विशेष सम्बन्ध है, अदातल वहाँ के हरिजनों को आना देती है—टेम्पोरेरी इन्फ़रमिडिशन करती है—कि वे उस मन्दिर में न जायें। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस पार्लियामेंट की इससे ज्यादा बेइज्जती कहीं न हुई होगी, जैसी कि वहाँ हुई। इस प्रकार की बातें हो रही हैं और फिर भी कहा जा रहा है कि इस देश में छुआ-छूत का अन्त किया जा रहा है और बड़ी तब्दीली लाई जा रही है। सरकार के सभी माननीय सदस्यों और खास तौर से माननीय प्रधान मंत्री को समाजवाद शब्द के इस्तेमाल करने का बड़ा शौक है और इस कल थोड़ा जिक्र भाषण में भी किया गया है। लेकिन समाजवाद कीरी जवान से नहीं आने वाला है जब तक सम्पत्ति और धन का बंटवारा नहीं किया जाता है, तब तक समाजवाद यहाँ स्थापित नहीं हो सकता है।

एक बात और मैं आप के द्वारा निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि आज हमारे देश में प्राइम वूट—दामों की वूट—चल रही है। जो चीज किसान पैदा करते हैं और जो चीज इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स—बड़े बड़े कल-कारखानेदार—पैदा करते हैं, उन दोनों के दामों में अन्तर बराबर बढ़ता जा रहा है। जो चीज इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स पैदा करते हैं, उन के दामों में बराबर दस साल से किसी किस्म की गिरावट नहीं हुई है। हो सकता है कि कुछ वृद्धि भले ही हुई हो। मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। जब अंगरेजी सरकार यहाँ पर थी—तो गन्ना दो, पौने दो रुपये मन बिकता था और शक्कर—बीनी—नी आने सेर बिकती थी। लेकिन जब अंगरेज यहाँ से चले गए, तो गन्ने का दाम एक रुपये पांच आने, एक रुपये सात आने रख दिया गया। इस तरह बीनी का दाम घटना चाहिये था, लेकिन होता क्या है कि बीनी तेरह, चौदह आने सेर के हिसाब से बिकने लगी। चूंकि गन्ना किसान पैदा करता है, इसलिए उस के दाम घट गए और बीनी कारखानेदार पैदा करता है, इसलिए उस के

दाम बढ़ गए। जैसा कि मैं ने अभी कहा है राष्ट्रपति महोदय के भाषण में एग्जीक्यूटिव और इंडस्ट्रियल प्राइवेट्स की प्राइसिपल में जो डिस्पैरिटी है, उस का जिक्र नहीं किया गया है।

मैं एक उदाहरण और देता हूँ। शायद माननीय सदस्य न जानते हों कि अफ्रीम— जो कि शायद केन्द्रीय विभाग के अधीन है— सोलह रुपए से बत्तीस रुपए तक किसान से खरीदी जाती है, लेकिन उस अफ्रीम को बड़े बड़े ठेकेदार छः सो रुपए से अधिक पर बेचते हैं।

**श्री कासलीवाल (कांटा) :** यह गलत है।

**श्री यादव :** मैं आप के द्वारा निवेदन करूंगा कि यदि माननीय सदस्य इस बात को कांटाइडेंट करना चाहते हैं, तो हम के

लिए उन को समय मिल जायगा।  
He is an old Member, I think, and he should know the procedure. उनको अब दखल नहीं देना चाहिए।

इस प्रकार दामों की लूट बराबर चल रही है, जिस का जिक्र भाषण में नहीं किया गया है। जब तक एग्जीक्यूटिव और इंडस्ट्रियल प्राइवेट्स के दामों में कोई पैरिटी नहीं होगी, उन में कोई गिदता नहीं होगा, तब तक समाजवाद नहीं आ सकता है, चाहे उस का ढोल कितना ही क्यों न पीटा जाय।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

18.01 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 15th May, 1957.*