

THE APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL,
1962

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R.
BHAGAT):

Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1962-63, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): You are moving on behalf of Shri Morarji Desai; You are not Shri Morarji Desai, I suppose.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, as hon. Members are aware, this Bill arises out of the Grants voted by the Lok Sabha, and the sums required for meeting the expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund of India. The figures in the Bill are for the gross requirements of the Government exclusive of recoveries, and include the amounts voted on account and provided for in the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Act of 1962. The total amount to be withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund of India during the year 1962-63 is estimated at Rs. 7,956 crores. Of this, Rs. 1,583 crores relate to expenditure on Revenue Account, Rs. 747 crores for capital expenditure excluding Railways, Rs. 590 crores for disbursement of loans and advances, and Rs. 5,036 crores for the repayment of debts.

The expenditure of Revenue Account includes Rs. 1,120 crores for Civil Departments, Rs. 367 crores for Defence Services excluding Capital Outlay, and Rs. 96 crores for the Posts and Telegraphs Department. Of the major items under Civil Expenditure, mention may be made of Rs. 248 crores for payment of interest and other charges, Rs. 187 crores for Social and Developmental Services, Rs. 339 crores for grants-in-aid to States including their share of Union Excise Duties, Rs. 76 crores for the Administrative Services proper and Rs. 50 crores for public works.

Capital expenditure includes Rs. 179 crores for industrial development, Rs. 275 crores for expenditure on schemes of Government trading, Rs. 33 crores for Defence Capital Outlay, Rs. 26 crores for capital requirements of Posts and Telegraphs Department, Rs. 63 crores for the notional adjustment as capital expenditure of Development assistance from the U.S.A. including the loans under the P.L. 480 programme, which are transferred to the Special Development Fund, and the balance of Rs. 171 crores for the requirements of other departments. Gross requirements for disbursement of loans to States would be of the order of Rs. 453 crores. The provision of Rs. 137 crores has been included for loans to other parties.

Of the amount provided for the repayment of debt, Rs. 183 crores are for the market loans maturing during the year, Rs. 48 crores for other debt repayments including Sterling and Dollar loans, and Rs. 4,805 crores for discharge of Treasury Bills. As the Treasury Bills have a currency of 91 days, provision has to be made for their discharge four times during the year. This payment, however, is covered by a corresponding credit on the receipt side following their simultaneous renewal and reinvestment. The total amount of Treasury Bills outstanding at the end of 1962-63 is expected to be of the order of Rs. 1,264 crores, but by far the major portion of this amount relates to the Bills issued in favour of the Reserve Bank for replenishing Government cash balances from time to time. Full supporting details have been given as usual in the Budget documents circulated to hon. Members. The House has also had an opportunity of a general discussion on the Budget I do not, therefore, propose to take the time of the House in explaining any further the provisions included in the Bill but shall try to meet the points the hon. Members would be raising during the course of the debate Sir, with these words I move.

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, this gives us an occasion to embark on a discussion on the economic and other policies of the Government. I should, therefore, like to proceed with to begin with, the non-economic matters and then I shall touch on certain important aspects of the economic problems facing the country.

At the very outset, Sir, I would like to make one simple observation about an important aspect of the Ministry, the Central Ministry, that we have today. The hon. Prime Minister made a public statement in order to persuade the State Chief Ministers not to have big-sized Ministries. He expressed his dislike for such big-sized Ministries, but now today we have here at the Centre a Council of Ministers plus Parliamentary Secretaries, which come to about sixty. I think the number will go on increasing.

Normally, Sir, one would not mind if more Ministers were needed for fulfilling and discharging functions and certain responsibilities, specified responsibilities, with the expansion of the State activities in different spheres, but we have today a situation in which we have got more Ministers than portfolios. That is why you have a Minister without portfolio. Well, Sir, I do not quarrel on principle in regard to this matter provided we know what exactly are the functions of the Minister without Portfolio; the Parliament is entitled to know. Must we wait all the time for speculation in the public press or for *durbars* of the Ministers to understand what are the specific functions of a Minister without Portfolio? We are in the dark. Well, Sir, it is an interesting experience that in our country Ministers are in abundant supply and the supply usually is, even from the point of portfolios, far greater than the number of portfolios. The Prime Minister, naturally, has set not a very good example before the country and the State Ministries.

Then, Sir, I would like in this connection also to mention one other factor that immediately after the elections we heard the Prime Minister speaking quite a lot about the emergence of right reaction in the country, but I would like to know whether he took that into account when he was choosing his personnel for his Ministry, or is it that there is no fear of Right reaction within the Congress Party or that there is no danger of the Congress Party at the Ministerial level being invaded by the "fellow wanderers", to use Mr. Morarji Desai's phraseology, or the "fellow travellers of the Right reaction" if not the Right reactionaries themselves? It seems that that aspect of the matter was not taken much seriously by the Prime Minister while he was telling the country that after the third general elections the Right reaction has emerged in strength and in size.

Now, Sir, we have a large number of Deputy Ministers. We would like to know what are their functions. You do not require to spend Rs. 1,750 per month as salary in order to get certain supplementaries answered on certain questions put in this House evaded. I would like the Deputy Ministers, if you must have them, to be given better assignments. It seems to me that it is the Secretaries who carry on the work and the Deputy Ministers in fact have much less power than the Secretaries, the permanent officials in the administration. Such a state of affairs is no good in a parliamentary set-up. Therefore, my submission here is, if you have to have these Deputy Ministers at the cost of public money, give them a little more power. I would not like them to be any way inferior, in point of law or in point of fact, to the Secretaries of the Departments.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): How does he say that a Secretary is superior to the Deputy Minister?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I say this thing because I find that sometimes

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
 even when the Deputy Ministers or Ministers of State want to do good things they come up against the Secretaries of the Departments who do not allow or who rather prevent good things being done. I know that the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues enjoy real powers in this matter but why should it not be that the Deputy Ministers and the Ministers of State also be given a little more power, real power, and power should be decentralised at the Ministerial level in the Council of Ministers itself so that the country knows that here is a body of responsible men and women? This is very important from the point of view of democracy and parliamentary institution. Secretaries, for example, are not closely connected with the people, they are not responsible directly to the people, and what is more, they are not orientated towards the interests of the masses while even the Congress Party Deputy Ministers who are there have to face the electorate, meet the people, meet members of the Opposition and as such they come in touch with the people closely and that in itself is a factor of impotence which makes them somewhat responsible and gives them a little awareness of the interests of the people. Therefore, from that angle also it is important that the Deputy Ministers should be given more power and not merely made either a decoration or an arrangement in order to suit the convenience of the ruling Party. Despite the fact that I sit on this side of the House, I am all in favour of Deputy Ministers and Ministers of State being given a little more Power, real power so that under no circumstance are they subordinate in point of fact or in practice to administration—Secretaries, Joint Secretaries—I.C.S. and other officers.

Then, Sir, I would not like, for example, the Secretaries to rule the country by a ministerial proxy. If the Ministers have no real power, except two or three chosen ones, then it means that so far as the Council of

Ministers, Deputy Ministers and State Ministers are concerned, the bureaucracy is ruling the country by proxy. I would like this administration by proxy to end—Ministerial proxy I have in mind.

Let me now deal with another important aspect, the situation in Kerala, from the constitutional angle. Sir, as you know, the Government in Kerala came into existence on the negative thesis of anti-communism. Naturally such a government could not be expected to work as indeed it is not working. The Ministers are accusing each other publicly. They are calling names at one another. One is calling the other a liar. Even when a Cabinet meeting was held you will find the Ministers or Deputy Ministers saying that no such meeting was held. On the 12th June a meeting was to be held of the Cabinet of Kerala to discuss the question of schools but the meeting had to be abandoned really because the Ministers were quarrelling amongst themselves, but ostensibly on the ground that the Minister had to attend somebody's marriage.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:
 Are we discussing Kerala here?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please do not disturb. Now, I put it to you, Sir, from the point of view of constitutional propriety—our Constitution lays down the principle of collective responsibility. How is this collective responsibility discharged when the Ministers are questioning not only each other's policy publicly and openly but calling each other names, abusing each other, charging each other and so on? Now, I tell you that this is a state of affairs which has brought the Ministry to a point where it does not function. Therefore, our submission is that such a Government has ceased to exist from the point of view of constitutional law. Imagine in England the Home Minister accusing the Prime Minister and yet continuing and *vice versa*. But here we find the

Home Minister walks out of the Ministerial house and makes open allegations against the Chief Minister of Kerala and yet both of them keep together. The only binding factor is the anti-communism of this unholy alliance. Therefore I would submit that the Central Government should ask them—I am not asking the Central intervention but the Central Government should advise them—to resign and save our Constitution from defamation and dis-repute. What will happen after that we shall see but now it stands to reason that, having failed to function together, having failed to solve any problem and in view of the fact that they quarrel every day openly in the Press and on the platform, they should resign. We therefore demand the resignation of this Ministry and we call upon the Central Government to show a little regard for the parliamentary institution and ask the Congress Party to get out of the Ministry and disband the Ministry. I would like to know what the Governor is doing in Kerala. The Governor is the constitutional representative of the President of India. I should like to know what advice the Governor is giving. In such a situation the Constitution gives the Governor power to dismiss any Minister and even tell them to resign. In a situation like this why it is not being done in Kerala, we do not understand at all.

Now, Sir, let me come to the question of the Home Ministry. I start with the question of integration. Now, communal riots are taking place in the country. The incidents at Malda have been shocking. I may tell you that what the Prime Minister said here was an understatement but I am not going into it any more. But the situation was serious and it was because of the goodwill of all non-communal forces belonging to all parties and to some extent also on account of the efforts of certain elements in the Administration that the situation was brought under control

and West Bengal was saved from the spread of such riots; but the potentialities of that danger are still there.

Similarly, Sir, we have seen such things occurring in other parts of the country. I should have thought that the meeting of the Integration Council that was held would particularly discuss the question of concrete steps and measures to give protection—I make no ambiguity here—to the Muslim minorities in the country because as far as communalism is concerned the danger today from the communalism of the majority community is more than that of the communalism of the minority community. Both of them undoubtedly must be condemned but I do not see any concrete measures being worked out with a view to meeting the situation. I should therefore like Integration Councils to be formed at the State level where the leaders of the various secular parties and others could be associated with the leaders of the Government party to formulate common measures in order to face such a situation and what is more in order to prevent such a tragedy from occurring at all. It is more important but no step is being taken.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I should like to draw the attention of the Government to what is happening in Tripura. In a village called Ampa (Amarpur) a large number of Muslims are being thrown across the border into Pakistan on the suspicion that they are Pakistani nationals. Among them there are many people whose names appear in the electoral rolls and indeed who have participated in the last three general elections in the country. I have before me a memorandum submitted to the Prime Minister on this subject and that memorandum signed by a Member of Parliament of the other House and by the Communist Party of Tripura contains 101 names of persons, giving addresses and so on, who have been treated as Pakistani nationals

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

but who have been on the voters' list and participated in the last three general elections. There may be—and there are—some Pakistani nationals because infiltration takes place and if they are removed or asked to get out of the country and go to Pakistan, I can well understand that but why on earth should other people who are Indian citizens by every criterion, be so treated, arbitrarily, caught hold of and deported to Pakistan or pushed out of the country? That is what has started from the 4th June and I have got here the full report. I would like to know what steps the Government take in this matter. This does not speak well of national integration. I charge the Tripura Administration of indulging in pure and simple communalism in this matter and I would implore Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to go to Tripura immediately personally, or if he is not in a position to go, to send Mr. Datar, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs to personally deal with the situation. I am sure nobody in the House would like any Muslim being thrown out of this country simply because he is a Muslim even though he may be a voter in the last three general elections and as such a citizen of our country. So that point should be noted by the Ministry.

Then, Sir, we hear about the code of conduct being discussed in the Integration Council meeting the report of which has been placed here. A code of political conduct is a nice thing. I should like to draw the attention of the Government to certain matters which are alarming. Political murders are taking place. In the 24 Parganas an important Muslim member of the Communist Party, a member leader of the District Council, was assassinated, shot dead, immediately after the elections. Then recently, Mani Khayal, another member of the Communist Party in Howrah was speared to death in front of his wife, mother and

children on the 5th of June, this very month. This matter is under investigation but I am not concerned with the investigation part of it or the legal part of it but this is what is happening. A Communist Party member who was engaged in welfare activities, co-operating with all parties and all sections in order to stop smuggling and other anti-social activities, has been speared to death and the charge is that among the assailants were seen some members of the Congress Party; they are local people. I do not blame the Congress Party as such in the country but it is a matter for the central leadership of the Congress Party which takes an important part in such a discussion on the code of conduct to see whether this charge is right or wrong. If today Congress Party men in the districts and villages are in a position to shoot people and commit political murders of this type, well, Goodness alone can save morality in public life in our country. Recently, again, on the 22nd May a person named Nurul Hussein was found unconscious in a steel trunk in an incoming passenger train at the Howrah station and what is the story behind it? Mr. Nurul Hussein is a worker of the Howrah Jute Mill and he gave evidence before the Wage Board on Jute. After the evidence had been given he was threatened by the labour officer of the mill and was told that his life was in danger and that he would be taught a lesson. Then suddenly it was found that he was missing. The workers suspected something foul but the police would not look into the complaints that were being made but on the 22nd May, as I have mentioned, a steel trunk in a train at Howrah station contained his body in an unconscious state. Today Nurul Hussein has made a statement in the court of law in which he has related the whole story, how after that giving of evidence before the Wage Board, he was threatened by the Labour Officer of the jute mill, how he was kidnapped and detained in a

house and made unconscious and how when he regained consciousness he found himself in a hospital. He had been discovered in a steel trunk. How long are we going to put up with such things? It is not as if the Railway Ministry is not involved in such things.

There is every reason to suspect that enquiry is sought to be hushed up by the local administration because over them the jute mills have a great pull. This is what is suspected, that the entire working class of West Bengal is agitating over this matter. Of course, this matter has come up before the court of law and the court will decide it. But are we going to put up with such a situation in this country when trade union workers can be kidnapped and brutally and cruelly murdered?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): The Railway Minister says that when such crimes occur, they are not the responsibility of the Railways

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: His responsibility is also there and he should assume it. The body was found in the train. So the crime has to be looked into by the Railway Authorities also. Certainly the State Authority should be there. But the Railways should be asked to be associated with the investigations, more especially when from this side of the House we say that we suspect certain kind of manipulations on the part of the mill authorities who have got influence over the local police.

These are some of the examples I have given.

The other day, on the 28th of May, Motilal K. Chaudhuri, former secretary of a distillery Union and leader of the bustee movement was murdered in broad daylight, again with the police doing very little or nothing. Such political murders are taking place. Serious allegations have been made against certain elements in the

ruling party and certain sections of the police. It is not a question of this being a State subject. The matter is undoubtedly a very serious one and the Central Government should take adequate steps in this matter and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri should personally look into these three cases that I have brought before him, from the point of view of investigating them in the true interests of the country and its democratic political life.

Now crimes are taking place in Delhi. The Delhi Administration has failed to do anything in this matter. But we are not surprised, for the Delhi Police are one of the most inefficient police going on earth. They certainly are good when they line up to receive the Rashtrapati. They are certainly good when they stand by and the Prime Minister's pilot goes sounding the siren. But they are absolutely worthless and useless when it comes to the question of prevention of crimes or the detection of crimes. What can they do? Come to the Communist Party Office here, where I a humble man, an insignificant man works, and you find a whole bunch of policemen there all the time. They probably watch on Mr. Nambudiripad, Mr. Dange and myself. Have we become such dangerous criminals that we should attract this police force? No wonder when the C.I.D. men are utilised thus, ruffians, kidnappers, robbers and others are at liberty to do what they like in this great Capital of ours. Certainly the Central Intelligence men have got better work to do than watch on such men like us and waste their time and energy. If they have none, they should find some other job. Why should they waste their time and energy in this manner? I am told from very knowledgeable quarters that even Ministers are now being watched. I know it and I tell you that with all sense of responsibility that in this regime, even Central Ministers are watched. I have got it from very knowledgeable quarters. How can you then have

[Shri Bhupash Gupta.]
the police looking for criminals? Perhaps Mr. Morarji Desai may say it is necessary to have a watch on the Ministers, because he suspects them, some of them, to be "fellow-travelers" or "fellow-wanderers". I do not know, but this is a serious matter.

Here is an interesting thing about the police administration. I find this in a Calcutta paper. A district magistrate came across a police report during his stay at Bolpur in the first decade of the century. I will quote:

"One will be surprised to read a few lines to this effect:

'Baboo Rabindranath Thakur, son of a Calcutta Zemindar, is a terrorist. He frequently visits Bolpur. He makes bombs. I am keeping strict watch.'

This is the report of a police man about Poet Tagore and this was brought to light by the district magistrate. The question is: Have the police changed after this? The same kind of policemen who discovered Rabindranath Tagore to be a terrorist, preparing bombs instead of writing poems, the same policemen are there, or their disciples, now keeping watch on men like Mr. Nambudiripad and myself, and even cabinet Ministers. How on earth can they deal with crimes and the criminal activities of criminals here in Delhi? I would request Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri to become, for a while, the Director of Central Intelligence, the head of it, rather than the Home Minister, because I think then more lives would be saved, less rapes would be committed and less houses would be burgled and we will have a little peace and tranquility in this great city of ours.

Then Sir, I come to the question of victimisation. The Prime Minister spoke about victimisation and the screening of officers. Here I would like to draw your attention—since

this matter is now under the consideration of the Cabinet—to a Calcutta case of Shri Deb Kumar Seth, B.Sc., who was appointed to a certain Department of the Government by the Public Service Commission. He had very good testimonials from all those with whom he had been working or who had been his teachers. The Public Service Commission, naturally gave him the appointment that he deserved. He was appointed as Assistant Controller of Weights and Measures. And then this matter went to the Police Department. He was appointed Assistant Controller of Weights and Measures, because he had good certificates that he had collected, and everybody was satisfied with the certificates that he had submitted to the Public Service Commission. One was from a gazetted officer of the West Bengal Government, Deputy Director of the School of Tropical Medicines. There was one even from the Chairman of the West Bengal Legislative Council who had given a certificate in his favour. Taking all this into account, the man was appointed. But then he was subsequently dismissed from service. When the matter was raised before the West Bengal Assembly, the Chief Minister of West Bengal said this:

"I do not think anything wrong in it. When the Communist Party forms the *Bikalpa Sarkar* they may drive out every Congressman from the Administration, if they want to; that makes no difference. But so long as this does not happen, you have got to accept the provision of the law as we understand it."

Here is the Chief Minister who says "As long as we are here, we shall drive out anybody we like, if we think that he had anything to do with the Communist Party, or is suspected of political activities." Since when did this become the law of the land? This is what Dr. B. C. Roy, the Chief Minister himself said

in the West Bengal Assembly on the 27th of March this year. I have got it from the Proceedings of the Assembly. Now, where do we stand? Here, this gentleman who was appointed, made it clear that he had no political connection at all. At one time he belonged to the Communist Party, but that was many years ago. He had given up all connection with political parties and he had been serving the Government and also working with distinguished men, distinguished men who gave him testimonials and so on. After all that, he is victimised in this manner and this is what is happening in this regime.

These are some of the matters I would like to deal with. I have just mentioned a few things as far as the political side is concerned.

Now I would like to deal with the economic side. Let us leave Mr. Morarji Desai's anticommunist fulminations. He is anti-Communists we know and nothing on earth can change Mr. Morarji Desai. Therefore, I would not waste time dealing with that. Let us turn to the economic situation as it is. What is the situation with regard to the foreign exchange? External assistance is estimated at Rs. 2,600 crores, excluding the doles under the Public Law 480. That is to say, 25 per cent of the total plan outlay is made up of external assistance. So you can well understand what happens to the Plan if something goes wrong on that score, since many of our projects are dependent on external assistance coming to this country in time. If one project is delayed, there is a chain reaction and other projects suffer and the scheme of planning gets halted. That is what happens. Whereas we should have had a good tempo in the second year of the Third Five Year Plan, we are having a slowing down in many fields and the policy of excessive dependence on the West has come home to roost in this manner and Government is not thinking of doing anything radically to change the policy as far as we can make out. In the middle of the Second Five Year Plan also

there was a foreign exchange crisis and, therefore, the crisis that we are facing today is nothing new but this Government is not learning anything from experience. Only last year, Mr. Morarji Desai made a statement in this very House on foreign exchange and he said, speaking about the Aid India Club. "I have now every reason to feel confident that the requirement of the external aid set out in our Third Plan will be forthcoming". Mr. Morarji Desai was showering praises on the Aid India Club in this manner and he said that the total quantum of aid promised at the Consortium meeting was \$2,286 million or roughly Rs. 1100 crores. "I should like to take this opportunity of expressing our deep appreciation and thanks to all the countries which have joined in the common endeavour, particularly the United States of America, which has agreed to provide nearly half the total amount of aid promised at the Consortium meeting." Now, that statement which he made last year addressed to the Chairman of this House was full of excessive hopes as far as he was concerned and he did not warn the country of the situation that we are facing today. He made another statement in the other House, a copy of which has been laid on the Table here, within six months. There should be some seriousness in the matter and the seriousness today is much greater than it was last year. The foreign assets have dwindled to about Rs. 100 crores as against Rs. 128 crores only in May this year and we have hardly anything to fall back upon. The cushion of reserves is gone and practically we have to live from hand to mouth. Such is the situation now. There was no step taken in this period, between last year and now, in order to meet the situation. I would like to know why this happened.

Now, I hold two men responsible for this. Government is responsible but one is Mr. Morarji Desai, the Finance Minister of the country and the other is Mr. B. K. Nehru, Commissioner-General for Economic

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Affairs, now Indian Ambassador in Washington of the television notoriety. Either they concealed facts deliberately or they permitted themselves to be fooled by the Americans. It cannot be denied that they did not understand anything. If they did not understand, then they should say so because the latest meeting of the Aid India Club has made it absolutely clear that these two great shrewd gentlemen had been practically fooled by them, unless, of course, it is their contention that they knew that such things would happen but chose to keep things in the dark from Parliament and from the country. This is what I would like to make very clear to this House. Now, Sir, the Aid India Club has come all out to blackmail India and if any country in the world wants to blackmail India, Mr. Kennedy might ask it to join the Aid India Club. I would not like Mr. Morarji Desai to shower praises and sprinkle rose water on such a Club whose intention has been exposed in the course of the last few days. They have decided to make a hold-up of the Plan. They say that money will not be given. They only talk of postponement but it is not postponement of the decision made last year. Last year, commitments were made with regard to the grant of Rs. 1100 crores but they have decided not to pay the money in order to put pressure upon the Government of India, influence and browbeat the Government to move in the direction in which they would like the Government to move. Are we to submit to this kind of thing? Are we to put up with a Finance Minister who is not wise enough to warn the country and Parliament of the impending situation, a situation which any man with a little common sense, any man who has got business instinct should foresee? At least, the Finance Minister of the country should have known better than he has done unless I impute motives to him and I do not wish to impute motives to him in this matter. The Finance Minister, as I said, was gullible enough in which

case it is not a very good proposition, and he was fooled. We cannot have a gullible Finance Minister when he deals with such type of persons, businessmen, double-dealers in the Wall Street or in Bonn or in the city of London. Either he was gullible or he had decided to keep things dark from us in the expectation that things would come round and he would come on top. Well, Sir, it is a serious matter for the Congress Party to consider. When the Aid India Club was meeting, this Government never gave us a warning and yet The Washington Post, five days before the Aid India Club meeting, forecast that the Aid India Club would not take the decision to fulfil the commitment that had been made earlier to India. Why did the Government not warn this country? Parliament was in session, the other House, and the country should have been told of the situation or of their understanding of the situation. Nothing of the kind was done. The country had to wait till The Washington Post came out with an editorial of this kind to inform us of what was coming from the Aid India Club and ultimately the Aid India Club's deliberations showed that it meant to blackmail our country. Why are we having a Finance Minister and a whole bunch of Deputy Ministers? Must we look to The Washington Post in order to understand the financial problems of the country or are we to depend on Ministers of the Government which is responsible to Parliament? This is the question that I put before the nation today. As you know, Sir, at about that time or a couple of weeks earlier, discussion took place in the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee which initially made a cut of 25 per cent. on the India aid appropriations proposed by President Kennedy. What was the nature of the speeches made there while making this cut? It was that India must be punished because of its policy on Goa, India must be punished because of its non-alignment policy, India must be punished

because of its attitude towards Kashmir, India must be punished because it is having good relations with the Soviet Union, India must be punished because it wants MIGs from the Soviet Union. When the Americans are giving supersonic jets to Pakistan, they want India to match Pakistani supersonic jets supplied by the American friends with Dakota planes. Not only this but I also read in the papers that another point of irritation for the authorities of the United States is Mr. Krishna Menon. Now, who should be our Defence Minister is also a factor for them before they consider the question of aid and this matter was discussed openly before the hearing of the entire world in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The New York Times and other papers reported it and one Senator, I think Senator Symington, said that India did not deserve such assistance because of the folly of Prime Minister Nehru and the crime of Defence Minister Krishna Menon. Today, the Bill has been passed and the cut has been partially restored, or rather the cut has been reduced to 10 per cent. Now, they say that no Marxist Government should be given assistance and what a Marxist government is has not been defined by them. Not only a Communist government but any government which according to them pursues any socialist policy should be debarred from getting economic aid from the United States of America. They have excluded Yugoslavia from getting any aid and they have told other countries, 'Should you talk about the socialist pattern of society or should you have socialist sentiments, you will be faced with a situation when American aid even if it has been committed will be withheld'. This is what we have been told. Another American Senator has said that they understand—those who fought for the restoration of the cut—that India must be given assistance in order to keep India on the side of the United States, to build it as a counter-blast to socialism in Asia. This is how they view this matter. We have become,

as far as the Americans are concerned, a pawn in their political game, and the American bipartisan policy, as far as economic assistance is concerned, is to keep India on their side, to create economic levers, pressures, interference and blackmail in this manner. While it is a matter of tactics whether Mr. Symington says one thing or somebody else says another, some want a cut of 25 per cent., while others want a cut of 10 per cent., all are however, agreed that India must be dragged into the orbit as far as possible, if not today at least tomorrow India should be brought under their pressure and influence. This is a serious matter and yet Mr. Morarji Desai tells us that economic aid from the West does not have any strings. The Hindustan Standard, a paper which is pro-American in many ways, had to talk of economic strings and another paper of the Goenkas, The Indian Express, by no means a Communist one, it is anti-Communism defined, has gone into the motives to discover strings in the American aid. Now, what do you see here? It is distressing.

In such a situation here, we have had a memorandum submitted to the European Economic Community by the great Government. Now, I should like to deal with it. I am told that Mr. Sandys is here or will be here in a matter of few minutes. I believe. Well, first of all, I would like to tell Mr. Sandys—he should be told by the Government—that the time is past when they can run with the hare and hunt with the hound. If they have chosen to hunt with the hound of the European Economic Community then they should stop trying to run with the hare, i.e. the Government of India. This I would like to be stated clearly to Mr. Sandys who has come here on behalf of the Government of the U.K., I am told, to persuade India to line up behind the European Common Market and also to persuade India, according to press reports today originating for England, that India should not buy Soviet MIGs. I wonder if we have become an international emporium for

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
all these politicians from the Western countries to come and tell us what we should do and what we should not do. Is it that we do not have common-sense, understanding, patriotism, wisdom and foresight that we require these gentlemen coming and telling us as to how India should fashion its economic policy and what policies she should pursue in world affairs? I do not know. The Government have submitted a memorandum and I will point out to you that I have never read such a shocking and disgraceful document as the memorandum submitted by the Government to the European Economic Community. They say, speaking of the Rome Treaty and its implementation, "The Government of India...are aware of the role played by the historic movement towards close economic integration in strengthening the economies of Member States and fostering their capacity to contribute to economic expansion and social progress both at home and abroad". Then, they say in the European Community, "we have to shape the Rome Treaty, we are doing good to yourself and we are doing good to others." It will mean progress not only at home in the countries which are members of the European Economic Community, but also abroad. This is in clear contradiction of even what the Government itself has said. The Prime Minister in this House said that Britain's decision to join the European Common Market was a body blow for India. You will find it in the records of the proceedings. Then, in the other House only on the 14th May, he said in connection with the External Affairs Ministry's debate:—

"It will do us some harm. More important than that, this is a first step in a particular direction, the direction being a certain measure of growing political solidarity between those countries. I do not know what this will lead to. But I fear it will not lead to anything good. I am talking about political solidarity."

This is what the Prime Minister of the country said. Then, at the Press Conference, some time earlier he said that the European Economic Community was a contrivance in order to control the undeveloped countries. This is what he said. That is one of the statements of the Prime Minister of India and this is what is written in the memorandum which they have submitted to the European Economic Community. I would like to know whether this memorandum was discussed in the Cabinet, whether the Prime Minister sanctioned such a certificate to the European Economic Community which contradicts his own utterances in this House and in the other House, in Parliament and outside in this country. I would like to know who makes our economic policies, the Prime Minister of India, or is it that we are living in a state of double-talk, when the Prime Minister will say one thing and Mr. Lall, when he goes to the European Economic Community at Brussels, will say quite a different thing. I would like to know where we stand. What is your policy?

Here, Mr. Chairman, I would invite your attention to an article published in Britain by Miss Jennie Lee, widow of Mr. Bevan, as you know, a prominent Labour Party Member. She is a Member of Parliament. This is what she writes:—

"On the contrary, one of the most formidable counts against joining is that its architects and chief supporters plainly, indeed blatantly, commend the Common Market as a weapon in the cold war."

This is what has been written by a Member of the British Parliament, belonging to the Labour Party, and these servile, flattering and psychophantic utterances are being made by the Minister, who was assigned the responsibility of submitting memoranda to the European Economic Community. I should like to know where we stand. One thing only can be

done. The European Economic Community, which as an appendage of NATO, is an attempt on the part of the Western Powers to bring about a greater financial combination of international monopoly, to exploit in the member-countries the working people, and keep the underdeveloped countries in a state of continued helplessness and control them, as the Prime Minister put it. Why are we today servile to the Economic Community, I would like to ask? It is a breach of faith with the people that our Minister, Mr. Lall—whatever he may be, Economic Adviser or Commissioner—should have carried this document, of shame, of indignity and dishonour to the world at large and spoken to these people in England, when the working people in Italy, in France, in Brussels, in Britain, are fighting with their back to the wall against the European Economic Community. Despite the declarations of the Prime Minister of the country, he goes and cringes before them and tells them 'Give us some concessions; you are excellent people, good samaritans'. What else could be a greater disgrace for our country? Therefore, I would demand here a complete change in policy. And I can tell you that the other day Mr. Shah said that with the Community countries in our trade we had a surplus of Rs 5 crores in 1950. Today we have a deficit of Rs. 135 crores and I can tell you that India imported from West Germany in the last decade goods worth Rs. 537 crores and we exported goods worth only Rs. 92 crores. This is the export market. And if Britain goes into the European Community, it would mean greater competition it would mean trade barriers, it would mean restrictions on our quotas and exports and so on all along the line. India submits to this blackmailing methods and exploitation of the Western Powers. America wants Britain to come there, so that all the Western capitalist countries are packed into the European Economic Community, with America holding the key and

controlling the destinies of the underdeveloped countries and of the working people of those countries. I would like to know where we stand.

Then, I come to the foreign exchange position. Apart from other things, this Government do not know even how to utilise the foreign exchange. In the First Five Year Plan they had not utilised foreign exchange worth Rs. 192 crores. They could not utilise it. In the Second Plan they could not utilise the foreign exchange, the foreign assistance worth about Rs. 943 crores. The unutilised balance of external assistance available up to October 1961 comes to Rs. 1386.86 crores according to the survey of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and not according to the Communist Party's publications. This Government is incompetent even to draw on the assistance that is offered to us, that is given and allotted to us, in time, so that we do not carry a backlog in this matter and carry it over from one Plan to another. However, that is the position.

In this connection what is the position with regard to our foreign trade? What happened in the first year of the Second Plan? Our balance of payments deficit was Rs. 283 crores in the first year of the Second Plan. It rose to Rs. 355 crores in the first year of the Third Plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid we will have to adjourn now. If you wish to continue, you can do so after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2.30 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

Shri BHUPESH GUPTA: I may mention here that in the Second Plan we had drawn upon our reserves to the extent of Rs. 600 crores, and in the last decade the total foreign exchange deficit or the balance of payments deficit came to about Rs. 2000 crores. Today we are in the midst of a situation when we have nothing to draw upon. As I have told you, our reserves have come down to barely Rs. 100 crores. Naturally this situation has to be met in all seriousness. I may draw your attention to the various official statements in which it has been pointed out that our external trade or export trade with the ECM countries is more or less stagnant at 7 per cent, whereas our import trade is naturally increasing because we have to import machineries and so on. Now the problem is one of how to meet the situation. I submit, Madam Deputy Chairman, that we cannot meet the situation within the framework of the European Economic Community or by being an appendage to the European Common Market. What we need is reorganisation and diversification of our external trade. Undoubtedly we must have export promotion, but then export promotion should not be made into a means for the monopolists in our country to earn extra and super profits that way. Undoubtedly legitimate incentive and encouragement should be given. But what I find is that, taking advantage of the present situation, the Indian Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry and others of the big money are trying to wrest undue concessions from the Government in the name of export promotion. My view in this matter is somewhat different. I should like the external trade, specially the export trade, to be undertaken increasingly in the State sector so that in the foreseeable future—the sooner the better—the State becomes decisive in the matter of external trade, specially export trade, and import trade as well. This one point I would like to make.

Then I would like to further expand our trade with the socialist countries and other non-aligned countries. It is quite clear that our possibilities of expansion by way of export trade in the western market are very limited, and the intensification of the Economic Community and the operations of the Common Market would still restrict the possibilities that are not very good even as they are today. Therefore, it is all the more important today that we take effective measures for the expansion of our trade with the socialist countries and other non-aligned countries. I think we should in the present situation curb invisible exports from our country in the shape of dividends, profits and other remittances that are made. We have to take more permanent measures to reduce remittances abroad. It may be said that then the foreign capital would not come. I think that that argument is exploded. If you look at Indonesia or Cuba or even U.A.R., you would find that these measures have not resulted in the contraction of their economic development or the availability of greater foreign assistance.

Then I think an inventory of all foreign assets of India should be taken, I mean the assets abroad specially of the Indian Princes. Sometime back there was a statement that they had accumulated wealth of about Rs. 6 crores held as foreign assets, in foreign countries. Everybody knows that it is of much higher order. Therefore, an inventory should be taken of all assets held by Indians in foreign countries, Princes and others as well, more particularly the Princes. This should be done. Indian nationals, including the Princes, should be called upon to declare their foreign assets, whatever they may call them, on pain of criminal prosecution and imprisonment. I do not think that if there is provision only for punishment by way of fine and so on, the Indian Princes or the multimillionaire class would

declare their assets, but I know that this class is a class of cowards. Therefore, if you put the threat of putting them in prison for a while, then I believe many of them will declare their assets in order not to be on the other side of the prison wall. This should be done. Therefore, I want a reorientation of this policy.

Gold reserve in the country amounts to about Rs. 1000 crores in bullion. We have gold worth Rs 3000 crores out of which it is said even by the Finance Minister that Rs. 1000 crores would be held in bullion, and much of it illegally. It is possible for an active and energetic Government to devise ways and means, including criminal prosecution and jail punishment, to discover the secret gold and mobilise it in the national interest. We want them to disgorge the bullion and make it over to the exchequer for the advancement of the country. We do not like the multi-millionaire class to live or to sit on the top of the bullion at the cost of the nation. These are my concrete suggestions, and I can give more.

Now I should like to deal with another aspect of the matter. First of all I may draw your attention to the fact that we are in a situation which is much more serious than meets the eye. Now there has been a recent review of the implementation of the Third Plan. The picture is not at all satisfactory. As I said, the tempo is slow. Our cotton production has declined by 8 lakh bales in the current year as compared to the previous year. We are below the target. Food production has only gone up from 79 million tons to 80 million tons in 1961-62, and this is considered to be a very small achievement by the Planning Commission, although Mr. S. K. Patil, the champion of braggadocio in economic and political matters, would like to have it otherwise. Now we have set a target of 100 million tons by the end of the Third Plan, that is, a rise of 21 million tons.

Certainly this is not how we can progress. Assuming that in the next year we have another 2 million tons, we cannot attain the target that way. Therefore, we are not going to attain the target at the rate at which we are progressing. It is quite clear that there is some divergence between the approach of the Planning Commission and that of Mr. Patil in this matter. One believes in inescapable statistics, the Planning Commission; another believes in unvarnished bluff, that is what Mr. Patil stands for. Would the Prime Minister kindly tell us who is right, Mr. Patil or the Planning Commission? No wonder they express dissatisfaction at this rate of progress. In irrigation we are minus 1.6 million acres against the target of 2.5 million acres. Regarding fertilisers we have supplied in 1961-62 only 2.96 lakh tons, much less than what we should have done. The target was 4 lakh tons. Cement production is below the annual target by 1 million tons. In steel production, by 1961-62 we should have 3.57 million tons of steel. We had 3 million tons, that is, 557,000 tons less. These are all official figures. Therefore, you see, Madam, that in a number of major items we are not up to the targets, annual targets; in fact, we are much behind the targets. Naturally the targets will not be fulfilled and the situation would be made all the more critical on account of the the foreign exchange difficulties. Now, Mr. Morarji Desai, in the other House while replying to the general discussion on the Budget, dragged in the Soviet Union—wholly uncalled for—and indulged in slanders against a friendly country. For the first time in recent years, a senior member of the Government speaking for the Government and from the forum of the State launched such a spite campaign against so friendly a country as the Soviet Union. I do not know what the Prime Minister feels about it. But this is certainly not the way to cultivate friendship with other nations, certainly not the way to reciprocate the good gesture on the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]
 part of the Soviet Union. I never see Mr. Morarji Desai saying anything against the U.S.A. or the Aid India Club. He has only bouquets for them, showers of praise and so on. But whenever he gets an opportunity—even if he does not get an opportunity—he drags in the Soviet Union to malign and slander it on the basis for example, of an American book "The Soviet Taxation" by Holzman. I have looked through this book. It goes up to 1953, and even in this book, certain good statements have been made because facts cannot be absolutely ignored. It is an anti-Soviet book. Mr. Morarji Desai does not seem to have gone through this book. I would like to know from him how many pages this book contains, if he were here. Presumably, some Secretary has passed on the book to him and he thought that it was a handy anti-Communist Bible to launch an attack, as a member of the Government, in the forum of the State against a friendly country. Here I must deal with a few facts. Mr. Morarji Desai was misleading the country. Now, facts are there. He gave certain figures about the various taxes. He said that monies were collected through indirect taxes. Well, he confused the turn-over tax with the indirect tax. First of all, I must point out to you that the profits of the socialist production organisations in the Soviet Union came to about 1,318 crore roubles in 1940 and 5,650 crore roubles in 1960. The revenue is derived mainly from the factories, industrial units, farms and so on. In percentage, whereas in 1940 the revenue was coming from 93 per cent. or so—the percentage of total profit is there—in 1960, it was 89 per cent. About 90 to 92 per cent. of the profits from the factories and other productive organisations go to the nation's budget in that way instead of going into the pockets of the capitalists. You have an entirely different situation in our country. After production, the capitalists take their share of profits, dividends and interests etc. The landlords take their

share. As Prof. Raj pointed out how 3 per cent. of the rural population in our country took away about 33 per cent. of the increased production amounting to Rs. 600 crores, as a result of the total increase in the agricultural sector of the order of Rs. 1,700 crores or so. That is what he pointed out. Mr. Morarji Desai completely ignores all these factors.

Again, Mr. Morarji Desai did not talk about the *per capita* income of the people. In the last five years, the national income of the people of the Soviet Union has gone up by 50 per cent. and the *per capita* income has gone up by 120 per cent. in the last ten years. No unemployment, free education, free medical service, extremely low rent related to wages, old age pension for all—these are provided for in the Soviet Union's budget. Mr. Morarji Desai briefed by the American authors forgot all that although it was open to him to consult Soviet books. If he has not got any, with your permission, Madam Deputy Chairman, I shall present him with such literature for his edification and enlightenment.

Now, in these last five years 4,000 million roubles were spent for increasing the wages. This is the position. In 1960, the first stage in the abolition of taxes began, the reduction amounting to 360 million roubles. In 1961, it was 400 million roubles. By 1965 the population will be tax-free. That is in the programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Mr. Morarji Desai was either ignorant or had been very badly briefed by his misleading Secretaries or the Deputy Ministers, if I may say so.

He referred to the turnover tax. In the Soviet Union, you do not have a turnover tax on many items like milk, fruits and certain other items of necessities of life. Turnover tax is imposed on electricity and so on, the consumer of which is the State. The State pays the tax, not the consumer. The turnover tax should not be confused with the union excise duties that

we have in our country. Now, the line of the Government here is to cut the consumption of the poor working people through prices, taxes, low wages, etc. Exactly the opposite is being done in the Soviet Union. Now, their planning is for raising the standard of living of the people, raising the wages, reduction of the existing taxes leading to their final abolition, reduction of prices, provision of many amenities, etc. And hon. Members should know—Mr. Morarji Desai should know at least, instead of reading American books—that after 1970, all the workers in the factories and the farmers at work will be getting free meals supplied to them. This Communism promises to the people of the Soviet Union, and Mr. Morarji Desai gets a book of this kind from the antiquated collection of American authors, which goes up to 1953, and tries to enlighten the House by no other than such a publication. Well, Mr. Morarji Desai should know that there is a Prime Minister in the Soviet Union also and—if he likes—a Finance Minister also. He can get the materials from them. Why does he go to the United States to get the materials about the Soviet Union, to talk about the Soviet taxation system? Some day we shall find some one talking about the Indian society and the Indian Five Year Plans on the basis of a book written in Portugal by one of Salazar's men. We do not like such things, we cannot like such things.

Mr. Morarji Desai then took the extraordinary course of creating a red herring here—'fellow-wanderer' and 'fellow-traveller'—and he said that they were in his party, the Congress Party. It is a slander on the Congress members. Congress members, when they hold progressive views, when they express progressive ideas, criticise wrong and bad policies, need not be fellow-travellers of anyone except. They need not be the fellow-wanderers of anyone except

the suffering and toiling masses. Why does Mr. Morarji Desai come out in this manner to defame his partymen? That shows that in Mr. Morarji Desai, McCarthy gives more than in anybody else. Is this the technique of Mr. Desai to demoralise the party, to demoralise Parliament and create a situation when free and frank discussion by both sides of the House cannot take place. Does Mr. Morarji Desai know that the Americans praise him as the up and coming man, that they are calling Jawaharlal Nehru a fellow-traveller and Krishna Menon a crypto-communist? Now, Mr. Morarji Desai, being a Gandhi-ite here as he claims to be, should know better. After he came from the U.S.A. why are there such outmoded, discredited methods to malign and denounce his party men and to silence criticism there? It is not for me to provide an answer for it on behalf of the Congress Party, but certainly we are concerned with a Minister on the one hand attacking the Soviet Union on the basis of an American book and on the other taking resort to the tactics of McCarthy in order to frighten and scare away his own people. What are you to say, hon. Members opposite? Is it a tribute to you? Why should he say 'fellow-wanderer' and 'fellow-traveller'? You stand in your own right, you have your own views. You are certainly entitled to express them as you like. If I were to treat my party members in this manner in any place, in an Assembly or in Parliament or even outside, I should be hounded out of the party leadership the next day. But the Congress Party has today become such a tolerant body that when the leaders malign and slander their own members and give them bad names in order to hang them, it tolerates it. This is what I say.

Now finally I would like to say this. Mr. Morarji Desai wanted to make out; "Oh, the situation is improving in the country. Why? You look here. Ten lakhs of people pay taxes, and in the category of Rs. 3,000-5,000 income bracket, one lakh more pay taxes than

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

before." Assuming that ten lakhs of people have improved their condition in the country, it comes to '23. Here you see an interesting thing; this '23 took away 9 per cent. of the increase in the national income if you calculate it that way. Does it not show where the money is going? Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru went to Himmatnagar and on February 10 he spoke there. And what did he say? He said that the capitalists have made more money in this country under the Congress rule than they had made in the past 100 years. Whom am I to believe? Mr. Morarji Desai who is briefed by the Americans, or Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who is not briefed by the Americans—I should like to have an answer from someone in the Government. Then Mr. Iengar of the Reserve Bank made a statement saying that money was going to a smaller section in the rural sector. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan pointed out how 80 per cent. of the rural population live on an annual income of less than Rs. 1,000, and about 20 per cent. or so are in distressed condition. As unemployment is growing in the country, consumption standard among the poorer people is getting less and less. And are they not material for judging the situation in the country—this is what I would like to ask. Therefore Mr. Morarji Desai is entirely mistaken. Even if I accept his statistics for income-tax, it only shows that concentration of wealth is moving around a section of ten lakhs of people or one million people whereas there are 443 million people in the country. So what about others, the workers, peasants, the middle-class, the toiling people? And he has no answer; he has no time for that.

Then again it is wrong to talk about the companies because in the index figure he gives about company finances, partnerships are not included, private ownerships are not included, many building companies are not included, speculating companies are not included. Again he leaves out all that thing in order to show: "You

look here. Here are these companies. The State sector is also growing because it has an investment of Rs. 500 crores." But out of that Rs. 500 crores Hindustan Steel alone accounts for over Rs. 400 crores. Therefore, in the industrial sector the State sector exists in a very negligible way. I do not want to say much but I would like to add one thing. This is Mr. Morarji Desai's approach. Well, look after Mr. Morarji Desai. Otherwise you may come to grief. This is what I say. I do not mean it personally—I have no personal quarrel. He brings into the Congress Party and the Government dangerous politics, and his Ministry of Finance is steamrollered into such policies and approaches which are contrary to the broad national interests. That is my fear. That is why every time Mr. Morarji Desai has spoken on political and economic subjects you see how he comes up against the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru. The Prime Minister may be tolerant for his own party reasons, but the country cannot be tolerant when he, Mr. Morarji Desai, violates the fundamental principle of collective responsibility in Cabinet Government, parades his own views, introduces his own approaches and tries to get away with it. We must bar his way. This is the way of perdition. This is what I say.

One thing more and I finish. I may draw the attention of the House to another fact. Ford Foundation has given some money for the improvement of the city of Calcutta, and under it the Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organisation has been set up. Lt.-Gen. D. M. Chakravarthi was appointed there by Dr. B. C. Roy as the Chief Executive Officer, but Ford Foundation said: "No, you dismiss him and have some other." The controversy went on for some time and the matter came to the Central Government and ultimately of course his appointment has been retained. But the point I want to stress here is that Ford Foundation had the temerity to tell the country and the

Government of the country as to who should be the Chief Executive Officer. Well, if that is so today what is the guarantee that tomorrow the American millionaires, who are doling out cash in this country, will not tell us as to who should be the Prime Minister of the country? Even when they were running down Mr. Krishna Menon, the Defence Minister, recently, over Aid India and other matters and for his performance or activities in the United Nations, they were praising Mr. Morarji Desai. They drew a distinction between Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. Krishna Menon and not for nothing. The Americans, whatever else they may be, they are not fools—I can tell you that much. This is the situation we are in. I do not wish to say anything more, Madam Deputy Chairman. All I can say is that the Appropriation Bill is going to be passed, but there is no orientation of the policy of the Government. There is no realisation of the situation that we are facing. With the knocks that we are getting from the Aid India Club, the European Common Market and in the American Senate we do not still seem to wake up to the dangers and realities of the situation and review and re-examine our policies so that we can formulate truly patriotic politics, fearless policies, and stand up to any kind of brow-beating and bullying on the part of anybody and build our country. The nation cannot be mortgaged in this manner step by step to the Americans or others. I do not say that the nation is mortgaged today, but the process has started. The American introduced this economic aid and so on in order to create levers of economic pressures and so on in the country, and at least over the M.I.G. affair and the European Aid business you have seen how they stand exposed today. Mr. Sandys is here. I wish somebody was in the Government to tell him that time is past when India could be treated in this manner, that we are fourteen years old in our independence, that we are a country with friends in the

Soviet Union and in other socialist countries and newly liberated countries, that we are not alone in this world today, that we have got vast resources in men and material and that we know how to shape our destinies according to our desires and needs. The Americans and the British have no right to go on a deputation to our Ministry of External Affairs to tell us not to buy M.I.Gs., and where not to buy, things, from which to buy and what not to buy. It is an insult to us. Suppose we lead a delegation to the White House tomorrow to tell them what they should sell, what they should not sell, how they should behave, whom they should appoint, how would President Kennedy like it? What is right for President Kennedy is right for us. What is a moral international code for him is equally a moral international code for us. Therefore there cannot be double standards, and more especially we must not be a party to bartering away the honour and dignity of the country. This is what I have to say.

I hope again that the Government would think over this matter and that our benign Prime Minister would not live in the ivory tower of unrealities. He must come down to earth, look at his Minister, see things as they are going on, look into the affairs of the Ministry and the Secretaries and the secretariat of the Government attached to the various Ministries. He can easily take the co-operation of the Members opposite, who are not sitting on the Treasury Benches, share counsel with them, evolve policies in order to tide over the difficulties and go ahead in the making of our nation.

Thank you.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion but wish to make a few observations in relation to certain demands made on behalf of some Ministries. Madam, before I do so, I want to make a general observation. The progress made

[Shri G. S. Pathak.]

by the nation is evident from the various booklets published by the Ministries, is evident from the speeches made by the Finance Minister, from our Third Five Year Plan and so on.

3 P.M.

And it is not necessary to say that the face of the whole country has changed on account of the policies of the Government. The success of these financial policies is a tribute to the energy, acumen and ability of the Finance Minister. The position that we have attained in the international circles is a tribute to our international policies. Facts speak for themselves. Go to the country and see how the face of the country has changed. I will not detain, Madam, this House on the general progress made by the country. It is futile to level criticisms against the financial and other policies of the Government. I shall make some specific observations about some of the demands. Let me take up the Defence Ministry first.

Madam, the amount of the Demand is not excessive. In the conditions in which we are living it could have been reasonably greater. We are faced with danger from two nations. Pakistan's claim is not even statable in terms of law. International law and international society do not recognise religion as the basis of any claim to territory. Pakistan's claim to the territory of our Jammu and Kashmir State is not statable at all. It has not been stated in terms of law so far by anybody. We find from the report of the Ministry of External Affairs that we have been subjected to continuous threats from Pakistan year in and year out. The report says:—

"... Till the end of November 1961, Pakistan armed forces or their agents were responsible for 405 incidents involving firing along or

across the cease-fire line on the Jammu-Sialkot border. This is over five times the number of such incidents reported in the corresponding period in 1960. The Pakistan press and radio and the 'Government of Azad Kashmir' revived an intense campaign against India. This attitude was also reflected in the public statement of Ministers of the Pakistan Government and even of President Ayub during his tours in various parts of the world."

Now, Madam, taking advantage of our strained relations with Pakistan, China has violated the traditional international border. It does not require any great knowledge of international law and affairs to know that the crest of mountains and the watershed used to be, and has always been, the traditional boundary between the countries situated like China and India. Taking advantage of the friction between Pakistan and India, China has grabbed about 14,000 sq. miles of our territory and has declared an intention to grab many times more. Now the result is that we have to face danger from two sides. That requires vigilance, that requires preparation and even preparation for war. On the 14th of May the Prime Minister made this statement:—

"Therefore, one tries to avoid war unless it is thrust upon us. Whether we avoid war or not we have to prepare for war and we prepare first to defend those areas and to recover them."

It is a matter of gratification that the Government is alive to these dangers and have taken suitable steps in order to defend our freedom and our territories, because if we cannot defend our freedom, if we cannot defend our territories we cannot live as a free nation and we do not deserve to live as a free nation. Therefore, the efforts of the Defence Ministry, the achievements of the Defence Ministry which you find in the booklet published by it are achievements and

efforts upon which the Defence Ministry deserves congratulations.

Madam, as I said, we are living in critical times. Not only we but the whole world is facing a crisis today. Countries which have been traditionally non-aligned like Sweden have also taken steps in order to defend themselves in case of necessity. We find that Sweden is spending not less than 25 per cent. of its budget on its defence. It has got one of the finest air forces. By legislation it has required all new houses which may be built to contain air shelters. I am not suggesting that we should be scared by the dangers which we are facing or that we should build air shelters as Sweden has done or as United States has done. What I am saying is that the Defence Ministry should take greater measures, although it might result in greater expenditure, in order to defend the country whenever the necessity arises.

Recently it has been reported by Reuter that Pakistan is engaged in space research with the aid of rockets supplied by the United States. These rockets have been named Rahbar I and Rahbar II, and they have been sent up as high as 80 miles. The ostensible reason given is the making of research in atmospheric conditions. That may be so. But it is also well known that space research can always be turned to military purposes, without any difficulty, and I hope that the United States of America, while it has over-armed Pakistan, is not assisting Pakistan in the same way in which the NATO armies, for example, have been trained. There is a rocket or missile known as Long John in the NATO army and the armies there are trained in the use of this rocket and it is well known that in a few minutes this rocket can be equipped with war-heads. We have been opposed to atomic tests. We have been opposed to the use of all kinds of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. But if war comes and if we are engaged in a

conflict, we will have to use conventional weapons in the defence of our country. The very nature of conventional weapons has changed of late. Rockets and missiles which may be used even without nuclear war-heads, could be a part of conventional weapons. Therefore, we have got to institute research in the way of finding out means for defending our territories against rockets and missiles. I speak subject to correction, but I do not find any reference to research in this direction, on a higher scale in the booklet prepared by the Defence Ministry, and the country is entitled to expect that in the matter of all conventional weapons we should be up-to-date, so that we may be able to meet the dangers effectively, if an occasion arises.

SHRI SATYACHARAN (Uttar Pradesh): May I enquire what the hon. Member means by conventional weapons? Does he mean that we should be up-to-date in the matter of conventional weapons or electronic weapons, that is to say, the new weapons that have come into vogue?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I have already explained that I am using the expression "conventional weapons" as opposed to nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. The very nature of conventional weapons has changed of late.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: It means that he includes electronic weapons.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: And Canberra bombers that cannot take off.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Madam, China has made great technical and scientific progress in recent years. No country from the West, could have supplied China with war materials. It can only be Russia. Therefore, if there is a war between us and China, we will have to face the weapons made with the

[Shri G. S. Pathak.] assistance of Russian engineers, because no western country has supplied any weapons to China or has furnished engineering assistance to China. Therefore, Madam, while congratulating the Defence Ministry on the work that it has done, I feel that there is more work yet to be done before we are able to defend the country properly.

As regards the controversy about the M.I.G. planes, the question is not purely a political one. The question is both political and technical. In the United States, some people have linked it with aid and an opinion has been expressed that we should not be allowed to purchase or that we should not purchase the M.I.G. planes, because they might be used against Pakistan. That is one opinion. The answer is obvious. If Pakistan is not going to attack India, there is no question of any weapons being used by India against Pakistan. Therefore, this reason is a futile reason and the contingency contemplated cannot arise, unless Pakistan were to attack India as it very often threatens to do. It has been said in some quarters that India has been receiving aid or is making purchases from the West, in particular from Great Britain, and the Russian instructors might learn some secrets. This again appears to be a hypothetical reason, because we have got to defend ourselves against weapons which have been acquired by Pakistan from the U.S.A. and also against weapons which have been prepared by China with Russian aid, though Russia might not be giving that amount of aid to China today, as it did earlier, still Russia is the only country which could have given aid of this kind to China. Therefore, we must confine ourselves to our own necessities and confine ourselves to the matter of principle. We should not be swayed or over-persuaded by considerations other than considerations of our defence, and we should be guided by our

technical experts, by the Air Chief and others in this matter.

Coming next to another Ministry—The External Affairs Ministry—I have got one or two observations to make. They are in relation to the policy regarding the appointment of our Ambassadors abroad. There are four important Embassies, that is obvious, namely, China, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States. And there is one important Mission also namely our Permanent Representative at the United Nations. The policy of the Government, as I understand, was and probably is—it continues to be so—that these offices should be filled from two categories of persons, (1) those who are drawn from public life in India and (2) those drawn from the official cadre. We had from public life persons like Dr. Radhakrishnan, Mrs. Pandit, Dr. Panikkar, Sir B. N. Rau and others. They made very useful contributions . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Even in Russia, in China. I will tell you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir B. N. Rau?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: He was the Permanent Representative of India at the United Nations.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras): Dr. Radhakrishnan?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: He was in Russia.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: As Ambassador?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Yes please.

(Interruptions.)

You have not followed my point, if I may respectfully say so. Now, what I am saying is that if you draw people from public life, they have got

a certain contribution to make. They have got a breadth of outlook and they are able to represent the culture of the country better than the official class. The official class itself has gained a lot through service and experience. They have got their ability and they have got their training so that each class can make its peculiar contribution in the service of the country. We know that when Sir B. N. Rau was the Permanent Representative of India in the United Nations, it was universally acknowledged that he enhanced the dignity not only of our country but also of the United Nations. When Dr. Panikkar was in China, he gave information to our Government which had never been given by the Missions of even the British and the United States. I do not know about the United States but certainly not by the British.

SHRI ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Information which has never been utilised.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: We are not concerned with it. We are concerned with this that there should be in this service people drawn both from the official class as well as from public life.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Elaborate it a little. We cannot follow.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: If you wait for a few minutes, you will . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It should not be philosophy.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I will never risk any philosophy with you.

Now, Madam, I do not say that the Government is not following this policy. I hope that there will be no shift from it because people in public life have also made contributions which have given credit not only to those men in public life, men and women in public life, but have also given credit to our country.

SHRI ANUP SINGH: May I ask one question?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, we are completely in the dark, and are very intrigued. Men and women in public life, etc., is all right but what is it all about?

SHRI ANUP SINGH: I was going to ask the hon. Gentleman as to why he hesitates in saying that the Government of India is not following that policy. He mentioned four important places. Obviously, three of them have been filled from the services and the policy, as I see it, is to progressively eliminate public men from these posts. Why does he hesitate to say so?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Pathak, you have to be precise, you understand, otherwise the Judges would not give the decree in your favour.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I never treated you as a Judge. You are just a Barrister. I assure you that in saying what I have said I am not casting any reflection on the ability or the efficiency of the present incumbents.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Incumbents of what?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Incumbents of offices in the Embassies. I thought that the context could have shown that. Now, they are able men. What I have said is in relation to the general policy. They are able men and they are discharging their duties and their functions in the ablest and in the most efficient manner.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: We could not follow the point that you have been making so far.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: The point that I have been making is that Government policy has been that people should be drawn from public life as well as from the officials. That is the point.

SHRI N. M. ANWAR (Madras): For all diplomatic assignments?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: That goes without saying.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, coming to the question of administration of justice, I have got to make one or two points.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore you want, Mr. Pathak, the present Ambassadors, at least some of them, to be replaced by others.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: No, not to be replaced. You have completely misunderstood me. I have told and repeatedly told the House that I am not dealing with the individuals. I am dealing with a policy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Madam Deputy Chairman, it cannot be such an easy matter.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: That may be done in Russia or in other countries but it cannot be done here.

SHRI SATYACHARAN: On a point of clarification, what I believe the hon Member is probably referring to is the present imbalance between these two sectors, careerists and men drawn from public life. That is what he means, I think.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I am grateful. I find I have been understood.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It cannot be Ambassadorial life to be replaced by public life.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Now, about the administration of justice, I have got to say . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, we are on a firmer ground.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: That was still firmer, if you had understood it. I am sorry to say it.

The Law Commission Report was submitted on the 26th September, 1958. I had the honour of being a Member of that Commission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What happened to your Reports?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Why are you so impatient?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Some Secretaries may be using them as pillows. There is a shortage of pillows I am told.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Some recommendations were made on certain principles. They were based on certain principles. No one has ever challenged those principles. The main principle was to secure the independence of the judiciary which is the very basis of our democracy. The principle was that a Judge should not seek favour from the executive and should not entertain any fear from the executive. That was the principle and this independence of the judiciary distinguished the judiciary from the executive. Now, various recommendations were made in the Commission's Report and some of them have not yet been implemented.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Pathak's love's labour lost.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I am mentioning this for the reason that when I went to Madras State recently, in conference, I was told by a certain section of the Madras Bar that certain things were happening there which were not right. What I was told was that the retired District Judges were entering into competition with the junior section of the Bar and the result was that there were serious difficulties. A commission is ordinarily given to a junior member of the Bar. It brings in a remuneration of a few rupees. Now, retired District Judges and Subordinate Judges were seeking

those commissions. The result was that not only the dignity of the office of a District Judge or a Subordinate Judge was lowered but the junior section of the Bar was also affected. Higher up, recently a dignitary of the Bar made an observation that when the Chief Justice and the Judges of the High Court after retirement start practice in the Supreme Court the result was that the junior section of the Bar was not developed. Now, all these difficulties would not have arisen if the recommendations of the Law Commission had been implemented. So far as High Court Judges are concerned, the recommendation was that their age limit should be increased to 65. If the Government increases the age limit to 62, that does not solve the question. The District Judges' age should be raised to 58. There should be no appointment after retirement because if you appoint Judges after retirement and give them certain jobs, the result is that they start looking forward to those jobs when they are in office and that has got a demoralising effect. If you want to have an independent judiciary in the country—and no one can deny that that is the *sine qua non* of a democracy . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What is your view if the Judges aspire to be Governors after retirement or even Ministers?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Let me finish my sentence. It is common courtesy that you allow other people to finish their sentences.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Elaborate it.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Therefore, Madam, the submission is that the recommendations—I will not elaborate them—made by the Law Commission should be implemented. That is the point that I wish to make.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All the recommendations as an integrated whole?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time has run out; please wind up.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Some of it has been taken up by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have taken that into account.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: In one of the speeches made by the Finance Minister he said that there should be a tighter check on evasion of income-tax. I entirely agree. Evasion of income-tax is an anti-social activity.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How is the thing going to the Supreme Court?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I think I must ignore you now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think so.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: This is a very welcome suggestion made by the Government. And I say that if your object is to remove disparities in income, that object is bound to be defeated unless the loopholes are plugged and unless you are vigilant enough to check the manoeuvres of the tax-evaders.

Thank you.

श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर (म्हण प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभापति महोदया, हा सदन के सामने जो विनियोग बिल आज प्रस्तुत हुआ है और जो पाम होने जा रहा है, उसमें सम्बन्ध में चर्चा करते हुए अच्छा होता कि हम अलग अलग विभागों पर चर्चा करें किसे निर्णय पर पहुँचें। परन्तु यह सम्भव नहीं है, इसलिए मैं कुछ विभागों के ऊपर ही अपने विचार प्रगट करना चाहता हूँ।

जब हम देश की हालत देखते हैं, तो वह बहुत गम्भीर पाई जाते हैं। पिछले दिनों चर्चा करते हुए यह बात बताई गई थी कि देश

[श्री रमेशचन्द्र शंकर राव खांडेकर]
 मैं मंहगाई दिनों दिन बढ़ती जा रही है। लेकिन उत्तर में माननीय वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि ऐसी कोई बात नहीं हुई है। अगर मैं एक उदाहरण सदन के सामने रखूँ तो आपको आश्चर्य होगा। मैं जब पिछले महीने इन्दौर गया था और एक माचिस खरीदने गया तो मुझको माचिस बहुत मंहगी खरीदनी पड़ी। जब मैंने उससे कहा कि क्यों भाई, यह माचिस मंहगी क्यों बेचते हो, हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने तो यह बतलाया है कि दिल्ली में माचिस का वही भाव है, तो उस पान वाले ने कहा कि आपने वित्त मंत्री जी दिल्ली में बैठते हैं, उनको माचिस उसी भाव मिली होगी। लेकिन आप जैसे जैसे देश के अन्दर जायेंगे आपको मालूम पड़ेगा कि क्या स्थिति है और आपको इससे भी ज्यादा पैसा खर्च करना पड़ेगा। कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि जब हम कोई टैक्स लगाते हैं या कोई कर बढ़ाते हैं तो उसका असर भावों पर पड़ता है। चाहे सही, चाहे गलत कुछ लोग उस का फायदा उठाते हैं, या कुछ लोगों को इससे उतना पैसा बढ़ाना पड़ता हो, लेकिन उसका असर सामान्य जनता पर निश्चित रूप से पड़ता है।

देश की आंतरिक स्थिति के बारे में काफी कहा जा सकता है, मगर समस्याभाव के कारण मैं उस पर कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता।

जहां तक देश के बाहरी प्रश्नों का सवाल है, सब लोग जानते हैं कि हालत कैसी है। हमारे बार्डर्स पर चीन और पाकिस्तान की ओर से खतरा है। नागालैंड का सवाल है। और भी बहुत से सवाल हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में लोक सभा में कई प्रश्न उठाये गये प्रधान मंत्री महोदय भी कुछ नाराज से हो गये और काफी झपट हुई। तो चाहे बाहर की हालत हो, चाहे अन्दर की हालत हो, देश की स्थिति बहुत नाजुक है और यह कहना मुश्किल है कि सरकार को इसकी जानकारी है या नहीं। जानकारी तो जरूर होनी चाहिये, लेकिन उसकी गंभीरता वह नहीं जानती है, ऐसा मालूम पड़ता है।

आज मैं इस चर्चा में सिर्फ शिक्षा विषय के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। हम को स्वतंत्र हुए १५ साल हो गये, लेकिन शिक्षा के बारे में हमारी कोई दृढ़ नीति नहीं हो पाई। जब हम ने समाजवाद का ध्येय बनाया है और वह भी लोकशाही समाजवाद डेमोक्रेटिक सोशलिज्म हम चाहते हैं, तानाशाही का समाजवाद हम नहीं चाहते हैं, तो हमारे लिए यह बहुत जरूरी हो जाता है कि हम इस देश की निरक्षरता को हटाये, इस देश को साक्षर करें। अगर साक्षरता के डेमोक्रेसी का कोई मतलब नहीं रहता है। बहुत से लोगों ने देखा होगा कि पिछले चुनाव में किस तरह से लोगों ने व्यवहार किया। किसी ने टेबिल पर ठप्पा मारा, किसी ने सातों नामों पर ठप्पा मारा, और किसी ने बैलट पेपर के पीछे ठप्पा मारा। कहने का मतलब यह है कि कोई काम ठीक तरह से नहीं चल सकता है जब तक कि लोग साक्षर न हों। तो सब से पहले हमारे लिये शिक्षा की नीति को दृढ़ करना, उसको कायम करना और उसको सुधारना जरूरी है। अब हम डेमोक्रेटिक सोशलिज्म की बात करते हैं तो उसके साथ राष्ट्रीयता का सवाल आ जाता है। अब तक हमारे में राष्ट्रीयता नहीं है तब तक समाजवाद की बातें, लोकशाही की बातें सब हवा की बातें रहती हैं। इसलिये अगर किसी बात की सबसे ज्यादा आवश्यकता है तो वह शिक्षा की नीति में सुधार की आवश्यकता की बात है।

अब शिक्षा के बारे में जो परिस्थिति देश के सामने है वह जरा आप देखिये। जो यहाँ युनिवर्सिटीज हैं उनके बारे में देख लीजिये। हर युनिवर्सिटी राष्ट्रीयता का अखाड़ा बनी हुई है, उनमें रीजनलिज्म है, फ़ैशनलिज्म है और कोई किसी तरह का काम नहीं करती है। उनका रिपुट कभी ठीक तरह से दिया नहीं जाता है और उसमें काफी अक्षमता होती है। लेकिन जो सब से दुखदाई बात होती है—वह जैसा कि हमारे माननीय मित्र ने कहा, वहां न्यायाधीश

के एप्वाइंटमेंट के बारे में है और वह मुझे सबसे दुःखदाई बात लगती है। आप देखेंगे कि सागर युनिवर्सिटी के उपकुलपति, जबलपुर युनिवर्सिटी के उपकुलपति ये बनाये गये और नागपुर युनिवर्सिटी में तथा और भी अन्य युनिवर्सिटियों में जो हाईकोर्ट्स के जजों रिटायर होते हैं वे वायस-चांसलर्स बनाये जाते हैं। जब वे वायस-चांसलर्स बनते हैं तो मेरा व्यक्तिगत आक्षेप किसी हाईकोर्ट के जज के खिलाफ नहीं है लेकिन यह प्रणाली बहुत गलत है। यह जो न्यायाधीशों का एप्वाइंटमेंट उच्च पदों पर होता है वह सब से ज्यादा खतरनाक सिद्ध होता है चाहे वह अम्बेसेडर पोस्ट पर हों, या फारेन पोस्ट पर हों या और जगह हों। न्यायाधीशों से हम जो अपेक्षा करते हैं कि वे निष्पक्ष न्याय दें उसको देखें। हम उनको अगर यह बात कही गई कि उन्हें रिटायर होने के बाद कोई बड़ा पद मिलने वाला है तो उसमें निश्चित रूप से बाधा उत्पन्न होगी, ऐसा मेरा विश्वास है। मेरे मित्र ने जो कहा कि लॉ कमिशन की जो सिफारिश है कि हाईकोर्ट के जज को रिटायर होने के बाद न तो प्रैक्टिस करने का अवसर मिलना चाहिए और न किसी उच्च पद पर उनका एप्वाइंटमेंट होना चाहिये, उसको मानना चाहिये। वह ठीक बात है। मुझे मालूम है कि इतर रिटायरमेंट का आर्डर होता है और उतर वे इंडिस्ट्रियल ट्रिब्यूनल के जाते हैं या वे जजों के जाते हैं या अम्बेडर हो जाते हैं या वायस-चांसलर हो जाते हैं। और इस तरह से उनके सामने बड़ा एग्योर रहता है। उनका सारा लक्ष्य, उनका सारा दिमाग इस बात पर होता है कि रिटायर के बाद किस पद पर जायेंगे। जो एप्वाइंट करने वाले हैं उनको किस तरह से खुश किया जाय इस पर उनका सब ध्यान रहता है। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह नहीं है कि न्याय मिलने में बाधा होती है लेकिन फिर भी न्याय मिलने में बाधा हो सकती है। एम्बेडली होती है या नहीं, यह मैं नहीं कह सकता,

लेकिन जब हमारे हाईकोर्ट के जजों के सामने रिटायरमेंट के बाद बेट कहिये, या प्रलोभन कहिये, होता है तो न्याय मिलने में निश्चित तौर से बाधा हो सकती है।

अब युनिवर्सिटीज के बारे में जब हम विचार करते हैं तो एक और बात हमारे सामने आ जाती है और वह उनके लोवेशन का प्रश्न है। बड़े अफसोस की बात है कि कुछ प्रान्तों में बहुत सी युनिवर्सिटीज बन गई हैं और कुछ प्रान्तों में उनकी स्थिति बिल्कुल नगण्य सी है। जिस प्रदेश से मैं आता हूँ उसके बारे में अगर आप देखेंगे तो पायेंगे कि इतने बड़े प्रान्त में जो चार अलग अलग यूनिट्स हैं उनमें सिर्फ़ तीन युनिवर्सिटीज काम कर रही हैं। सागर युनिवर्सिटी जो है वह रेजिडेंशल युनिवर्सिटी है और उज्जैन युनिवर्सिटी जो है उसकी हालत यह है कि अगर किसी युनिवर्सिटी की बदतर से बदतर हालत है तो वह मेरे खयाल से उज्जैन युनिवर्सिटी की है। जिन गांवों के बारे में कहा जाता है कि हमको युनिवर्सिटी चाहिये, वहां उसके लिये एटमासफेयर है और वहां काफी फैंकलटीज है वहां युनिवर्सिटीज नहीं दी जाती हैं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि युनिवर्सिटी ग्रांट्स कमिशन की नीति क्या है। मुझे मालूम है, मैं ग्वालियर में युनिवर्सिटी एसोसिएशन का मेम्बर था और हमने युनिवर्सिटी की डिमांड रखी तो कहा गया कि साहब, ३५ लाख रुपया लीजें। क्यों साहब, किस बात के लिये ३५ लाख रुपया लायें। यह पैसा लाकर देने का क्या बात है। आपको मेरिट्स पर विचार करना चाहिये कि वास्तव में यहां युनिवर्सिटी हो सकती है या नहीं। वहां विद्यार्थियों की पर्याप्त सख्या है या नहीं। फैंकलटीज है या नहीं। जगह है या नहीं। साधन हैं या नहीं। लेकिन यह सब नहीं। बस, ३५ लाख रुपया दीजिये—पहले तो ३५ लाख रुपया था और अब उसके बजाय ५० लाख रुपया करने लगे हैं। तो यह कैसी बात है। यह मेरी समझ में नहीं

[श्री रमेश चन्द्र शंकरराव खांडेकर]

आया। उज्जैन से इंदौर ३० मील पर है लेकिन मैं ने कल अखबारों में पढ़ा कि मध्य प्रदेश में इंदौर में और रायपुर में युनिवर्सिटी होने जा रही है। ३० मील पर ही एक दूसरी युनिवर्सिटी खोलने का क्या कारण है? मैं स्पष्ट कहता हूं कि मैं इंदौर के खिलाफ नहीं हूं मैं किसी क्षेत्र के खिलाफ नहीं हूं, लेकिन जो नीति इस मामले में बाँटी है, वह गलत है। जहाँ युनिवर्सिटी की मांग होगी वहाँ वह नहीं दी जाती है लेकिन वहाँ ऐसा हो सकता है कि कुछ काम चल जाय और थोड़ी दूर जाने पर युनिवर्सिटी मिल जाय वहाँ पर युनिवर्सिटी की बात की जाती है और युनिवर्सिटी कायम की जाती है। तो यह हालत युनिवर्सिटी की हो गई है।

अब, सेकेंडरी एजुकेशन की बात देख लीजिये। श्री ईयर्स कोर्स की बात को ही देख लीजिये। श्री ईयर्स कोर्स इलाज में बनाया गया था कि विद्यार्थियों का बर्तन कम हो और हायर सेकेंडरी होने के बाद उनको कोई लाइन मिल जाय, लेकिन यह सब कुछ नहीं हुआ। पहले उनको एक ही परीक्षा देनी पड़ती थी लेकिन अब विद्यार्थियों को तीन परीक्षाएँ देनी पड़ती हैं यानी श्री ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स में पैसा कमाने का एक धरा हो गया है। स्टैंडर्ड को देखिये तो वह गिरता जा रहा है। मुझे खुद मालूम है, मैं एजुकेशन सोसइटी का मैनेजर था और मेरे पास एक आचार्य मशहूर दण्डगस्त ले कर आये लेकिन वह डि लाइन की दरखास्त भी डीन से नहीं लव पाये थे। मैंने उन से कहा कि आप अंग्रेजी में नहीं लिख सकते हैं तो हिन्दी में ही लिखिये, लेकिन वह हिन्दी में भी नहीं लिख पाये। तो जिस विद्यालय के प्रिंसिपल की यह हालत हो उसके लिये

क्या कहा जाय। मैं ग्वारियर के शासकीय कालेज के प्रोफेसर को बात कह रहा हूँ कि वह डिग्री कोर्स का सपोर्ट भी डीन तरह से नहीं लिख पाये जब कि वह उसके प्रोफेसर थे, उसको पढ़ाते थे। तो यह हालत आज एजुकेशन की हो रही है। फिर, यह श्री ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स जो आपने चालू किया है उसको अभी तक सारे हिन्दुस्तान ने नहीं माना है। उदाहरण के लिये बड़े प्रदेश ने श्री ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स को अपने कैरेकुलम में स्थान नहीं दिया है। बम्बई युनिवर्सिटी ने भी इसको नहीं माना है। तो इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि यह जांच की जाय कि इन में कोई तथ्य है या नहीं। ऐसा तो नहीं है कि श्री ईयर्स डिग्री कोर्स, युनिवर्सिटियों के लिये पैसा कमाने का एक धरा हो गया है, यह पैसा कमाने का एक जरूरी खजाना है।

हायर सेकेंडरी स्कूलों की हालत बहुत खराब हो रही है। जो मल्टी परपज स्कूल होने हैं उन के लिये लाखों रुपये का अनुदान दिया जाता है, मल्टी परपज स्कूलों को एडि-कल्चर के लिये सैतड़ों और हजारों रुपये की ग्रांट मिलती है लेकिन वहाँ एक छोटा सा जमीन का टुकड़ा है और वहाँ थोड़ी सी बेंचो बाड़ी करते हैं और इस तरह से मल्टी परपज स्कूलों में सैतड़ों और हजारों रुपये बर्बाद किया जाता है, खर्च किया जाता है।

युनिवर्सिटी के सम्बन्ध में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। जब ग्वारियर में युनिवर्सिटी की मांग हुई तो उसे पुराना दिया गया और अभी तक वहाँ पर इन के लिये एजुकेशन हो रहा है। पता चला तो वहाँ इस बारे में कम्पलीट हड़ताल हुई लेकिन उसके ऊपर न तो प्राचीन सरकार का ध्यान गया और न केन्द्रीय सरकार शिक्षा विभाग ने उसके लिये कुछ किया और

उसके उत्तर में यह हुआ कि इंदौर और रायपुर में युनिवर्सिटी होने की खबर अस्त्रबार में पढ़ने को मिली ।

[जहां तक प्राइमरी एजुकेशन की हालत का प्रश्न है उस के लिये हमारे सामने आंकड़े रखे जाते हैं कि साहब इसके लिए इतना रुपया खर्च किया गया और इस साल इतने प्राइमरी स्कूल खोले गये । लेकिन यह कोई नहीं देखता कि वाकई में उस में कितने विद्यार्थी पढ़ने को आते हैं । कई देहातों के स्कूल बंकार पड़े हुए हैं, वहां कोई विद्यार्थी नहीं जाता है । वहां पर न तो कोई मास्टर पहुंचता है, न वहां कोई बिल्डिंग है और न वहां कोई फर्नीचर ही है । तो इस दशा में आप कैसे कहेंगे कि हमारी प्राइमरी एजुकेशन बढ़ रही है । अगर कोई सब से बुरी बात हुई है तो वह स्त्री शिक्षा के बारे में हुई है । देहातों में आप जाइये तो आप देखेंगे कि वहां स्त्री शिक्षा के बारे में जो काम हुआ है वह बिल्कुल नगण्य है । लेकिन आपके सामने जो रिपोर्ट्स आयेगी उस में यह बतायेगे कि स्त्री शिक्षा की प्रगति इतनी बढ़ी है, यह इतनी परसेंट बढ़ी है । शहरों की बात छोड़ दीजिये, शहरों में स्त्री शिक्षा की प्रगति हुई है लेकिन आप देहातों में चले जाइए तो वहां पर न तो मास्टरनियां हैं और न विद्यार्थिनियां हैं और न उन के बैठने के लिये कोई जगह है । दिक्कत यह है कि जो मास्टरनियां हैं वे तो वहां जाती नहीं हैं क्योंकि पढ़ी लिखी और ते देहातों में जाने से घबड़ाती हैं । खास कर मध्य प्रदेश के उत्तरी हिस्सों में

4 P.M. जहां पर डाकुओं की समस्या है और महिलाओं में परदा सिस्टम है वहां इधर उधर जाने में वे वैसे ही हिचकिचाती हैं । और ऐसी जगह जब वे जाती हैं तब उनको वहां पर रहने के लिये स्थान नहीं मिलता है ।

अभी मुझे मालूम पडा है कि केन्द्रीय-शासन ने, शिक्षा मंत्रालय ने, कुछ लेडी टीचर क्वार्टर बनाए हैं । हमारे क्षेत्र में कुछ

लेडी क्वार्टर्स के लिए व्यवस्था हुई है लेकिन उनका उपयोग ठीक से नहीं हो रहा है । कुछ तो ऐसे अधूरे बने पड़े हैं कि उनको पूरा नहीं किया गया । जो बने हुए हैं वे बाहर गांवों पर दो दो मील, डेढ़ डेढ़ मील दूरी पर हैं जहां वे रह नहीं सकती हैं और उनमें भी वहां के लोकल बाडीज के अफसर वगैरह ने कब्जा कर रखा है । जो पैसा केन्द्र की ओर से खर्च किया गया है वह इस तरह से पूरा वेस्ट हुआ है ।

बेसिक एजुकेशन के बारे में कई मतों के चर्चा हुई और यदि मै गलत नहीं हू तो हमारे सभापति महोदय ने कहा था कि जिस तरह से बेसिक एजुकेशन इस देश में चल रही है उसका कोई परिणाम नहीं निकलने वाला है । लेकिन अगर उस पर सच्चाई में, सिन्नेयरली, काम किया जाय तो उसको यश मिल सकता है, वह यशस्वी हो सकता है । मौजूदा परिस्थिति में बेसिक एजुकेशन "फोर्म" सा है, उसको गांधी जी के नाम पर ध्वजा कहिये । पैसा बसाने की बात हो रही है ।

माननीय उप सभापति महोदय, अब शिक्षा मंत्रालय की लैंग्वेज पालिसी के बारे में मैं दो शब्द कहना चाहता हू । इस देश में बड़ी विचित्र बात हो रही है । कभी हम कहते हैं अंग्रेजी हटा देंगे १९६५ के बाद कोई अंग्रेजी नहीं रहेगी । कभी कहते हैं वह एमोमियेट भाषा होगी । कभी कहते हैं, हिन्दी ही रहेगी । और हिन्दी कैसी होगी उसके बारे में भी आप स्पष्ट नहीं हैं । दस साल तक इन्फार्मेशन एण्ड ब्राडकास्टिंग मिनिस्ट्री की हिन्दी पालिसी चली, अब कोई और दूसरी पालिसी चल रही है । मैं यह स्पष्ट बात कह देना चाहता हू कि मैं न हिन्दी के विरोध में हू न अंग्रेजी के विरोध में हू । मैं बिल्कुल हिन्दी का पक्षपाती हू और चाहता हू कि वह इस देश की राष्ट्रभाषा होनी चाहिये । हिन्दी ही राष्ट्र

[श्री रमेशचन्द्र शकरराव खाडेकर]

भाषा होनी चाहिये इसमें कोई सशय नहीं है। लेकिन वह हिन्दी कैसी होनी चाहिये, इसके बारे में मुझे स्पष्ट मालूम होना चाहिये। जो भाषा सब लोग बोलते हैं या जो मैं बोलता हूँ, आप बोलते हैं, सब लोग बोलते हैं, वह राष्ट्रभाषा होनी चाहिये; न तो वह पंडित की भाषा होनी चाहिये; न वह अरबी फारसी होनी चाहिये। यानी हिन्दी और हिन्दुस्तानी का बिला वजह झगडा नहीं पैदा किया जाना चाहिये। भाषा किसी के ऊपर थोपी नहीं जा सकती, उसका अदर से विकास होना चाहिये। ऐसी स्थिति में हमारा शिक्षा मंत्रालय आज तक कोई निर्णय इस बात पर नहीं ले पाया कि हमारी भाषा कौन सी होगी। इस देश की भाषा कौन सी होगी, कौन सी भाषा में पुस्तकें लिखी जाये, यही अभी निश्चय नहीं हो पाया है। पहले हमने कहा था कि एक और राष्ट्र भाषा प्रचार समिति की हिन्दी है और एक और हिन्दी साहित्य सम्मेलन की हिन्दी है, तो इसका परिणाम यह होता है कि हिन्दी के खिलाफ वातावरण पैदा होता है। इसलिये मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्र भाषा के बारे में, लैंगुएज पालिसी के बारे में, एक स्पष्ट नीति होनी चाहिये, जिससे यह मालूम पड़े कि हम आगे की तरफ बढ़ रहे हैं या पीछे जा रहे हैं। स्पष्ट नीति न होने के कारण ही यदि कोई साहित्यिक भाषा में लिखता है तो पड़ताई हिन्दी कहने लगते हैं और रेडियो पर वह हिन्दी बोली जाती है, तो कहते हैं कि समझ में नहीं आती। अगर हिन्दुस्तानी के या उर्दू के शब्द रख देते हैं तो कुछ लोग कहेंगे यह उर्दू है, इसको हम नहीं समझते हैं। तो कोई एक निश्चित नीति होनी चाहिये और इसके बारे में शीघ्र ही विचार हो, तो अच्छा होगा।

अब शिक्षा मंत्रालय में कई कमेटीया बनी हुई है। मैंने रिपोर्ट देखी तो मालूम हुआ कि कई कमेटीयों की मीटिंग तक नहीं हो

पायी। कुछ की रिपोर्ट आई है, लेकिन वह बैसी की बैसी पड़ी है। उनको इम्प्लीमेंट नहीं किया गया। शिक्षा विभाग द्वारा जो राधाकृष्णन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट थी उसके बारे में भी कोई स्पष्ट नीति नहीं हुई है। इसलिये अब यह समय आ गया है कि हम पूरी दृष्टि से विचार करें और शिक्षा सम्बन्धी नीति निर्धारित करें। इसके सिवाय और कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है।

नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन के बारे में भी दो शब्द मैं कहना चाहता हूँ। नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया। अभी हाल में नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन काउन्सिल की मीटिंग भी हुई। लेकिन अगर नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन की जिम्मेदारी सबसे ज्यादा किसी के ऊपर है, तो वह शिक्षा विभाग के ऊपर है। शिक्षा विभाग अगर इसी ढिल-मिल नीति से काम करेगा तो नेशनल इन्टीग्रेशन की बजाय डिसइन्टीग्रेशन होगा। हमारी कोई नीति न होने से आप जानते हैं यनीवर्सिटी तक में, हमारी अलीशठ यूनिवर्सिटी में, क्या हुआ और अन्यत्र प्रान्तों में क्या हो रहा है? इसका कारण यह है कि हमारी कोई खास नीति नहीं है, इसलिये हमारा जो लक्ष्य है, वह उल्टा होता जा रहा है और देश में जो साम्प्रदायिक, भाषावादी और अन्य तरह की फूट डालने वाली प्रवृत्ति है, उसको बढ़ावा मिलता जा रहा है।

अब शिक्षा विभाग में ही ऐसे कई इन्स्टीट्यूशंस हैं—मैं नहीं कहता उनमें दोष है—लेकिन जातिपात के ऊपर बने हुए हैं। शिक्षा संस्थाओं के नाम इस प्रकार देखने को मिलेंगे—अप्रवाल विद्यालय, जैन छात्रावास, माहौर वैश्य सभा। यदि हम वास्तव में इन्टीग्रेशन चाहते हैं तो इस तरह की बातों को समाप्त करना चाहिये और एक बात निश्चित रूप से कहना चाहिये कि हम सब एक हैं, हम भारतीय हैं, हम एक राष्ट्र के हैं। इस तरह का वातावरण बनाना चाहिये। आज इस तरह का वातावरण नहीं बना हुआ

है। सामान्य जनता और सरकार दो अलग अलग चीजे बन गई है। जनता यह मानने लगी है कि सरकार अलग चीज है और हम अलग है, इसलिये जो एक सामञ्जस्य पैदा होना चाहिये, जो एक आत्मीयता पैदा होनी चाहिये, वह नहीं हुई है और यही कारण है कि शिक्षा विभाग की नीति में परिवर्तन की आवश्यकता है।

शिक्षा विभाग द्वारा पहले एक नेशनल डिस्प्लिन स्कीम चली थी। वह बहुत अच्छी स्कीम है, लेकिन उसका विस्तार जिस तरह से होना चाहिये था वह अभी तक नहीं हो पाया है। उस स्कीम का विस्तार और अधिक होना चाहिये, उसको हर जगह, हर स्कूल में चालू करना चाहिये और उसके द्वारा एक ऐसा वातावरण होना चाहिये कि हम राष्ट्र के नागरिक हैं, और हमारे ऊपर जिम्मेदारी है, इस राष्ट्र को बनाने की।

शिक्षा विभाग के बारे में इतना कहने के बाद मैं साधारण तौर पर दो चार शब्द और कहना चाहता हूँ। आज हम देखते हैं, हमारे सरकारी कार्यालयों में, विभागों में, जनरल इनफ़िशियेन्सी हो रही है और भ्रष्टाचार का भी बोलबाला है। यहाँ तो वह उतना नहीं मालूम पड़ता है लेकिन लोगों की आम शिकायत है कि जब नीचे जाइये पटवारी, पटेल तक और तहसीलदार तक, तब मालूम पड़ता है कि उसका कितना भीषण स्वरूप है। न्यायालयों में हम रोज़ घूमते हैं और हमें मालूम है कि जब तक दो चार रुपया नहीं देते, तब तक कोई छोटा मोटा काम भी नहीं करता। वारन्ट आठ आठ दिन तक नहीं निकल पाते हैं। तो इन सब चीजों की जांच करने के लिये एक मशीनरी होनी चाहिये, जो भ्रष्टाचार को रोके और इनफ़िशियेन्सी, जो सब जगह फैली हुई है, उसको दूर करे। भ्रष्टाचार और इनफ़िशियेन्सी को देखते हुए डर लगता है कि कहीं यह जो

“एडीफ़िस” खड़ा हुआ है, वह कभी गिर न जाय। इसलिये उपाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं सचेत करना चाहता हूँ कि इस दिशा में स्थिति अधिक गम्भीर है। हम प्रगति जरूर कर रहे हैं, लेकिन वह प्रगति ऊपर ऊपर की है, लेकिन नीचे से हमारी जड़ें कट रही हैं।

इतना कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

श्रीमती उपसभापति महोदया, मैं एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल का समर्थन करते हुये अपने कुछ विचार सूचना एवम् प्रसारण मंत्रालय के सम्बन्ध में प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ।

अभी हाल में यह बात प्रकाश में लाई गई है कि हमारे वर्तमान सूचना व प्रसारण मंत्री महोदय की इच्छा है कि जो भाषा आल इंडिया रेडियो में हिन्दी में प्रयोग की जाती है, उसकी नीति में परिवर्तन किया जाय। कोई विशेष कारण मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि यह चमत्कारिक रूप से आज हिन्दी भाषा का दोष उनको कैसे मालूम हुआ? आज पन्द्रह वर्ष से हिन्दी भाषा के सम्बन्ध में जो नीति आल इंडिया रेडियो में चली आ रही है बड़ा आश्चर्य है कि इतने अरसे में न सरकार को यह पता चला कि इस भाषा में कोई दोष है, न जनता को पता चला, न किसी राज-नैतिक दल को पता चला कि इस भाषा में दोष है। आज क्या कारण हुआ कि मंत्री के बदलते ही यह बात देश के सामने रखी गई कि जो भाषा आल इंडिया रेडियो में प्रयुक्त की जाती है, वह जनता की समझ में नहीं आती है, वह भाषा क्लिष्ट है और उस भाषा को बदलना चाहिये।

गवर्नमेंट को इसके लिये विशेष कारण बतलाने चाहियें। हमारे देश में प्रजातन्त्र है और गवर्नमेंट का यह कर्तव्य है कि वह

[श्री भगवत नारायण भागवत]

जनता की राय इस बारे में ले ले। गवर्नमेंट को इस बारे में जनता का ज्ञान निश्चित रूप से प्राप्त कर लेना चाहिये। सरकार को चाहिये कि अगर यह भाषा दोषपूर्ण है तो वह जनता को बतलाये कि इसमें यह कमी है और सरकार इसको इन कारणों से बदलना चाहती है? ऐसा कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी भाषा में संस्कृत के शब्द बहुत आते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष में ऐसी कौन सी भाषा है, जिसमें संस्कृत के शब्द नहीं आते हैं? संस्कृत भाषाओं की जननी है। बंगला, मराठी, मलयालम, तैलगू, तमिल और कन्नड़ भाषाओं में ज्यादातर संस्कृत शब्दों का बाहुल्य है। अभी एक मित्र, जो दक्षिण क्षेत्र के रहने वाले हैं—इस समय सदन के अन्दर नहीं हैं—उन्होंने मुझे बताया कि मलयालम भाषा में ८० प्रतिशत शब्द संस्कृत के आते हैं। मुझे स्मरण है कि जिस समय भारत का संविधान बनाया जा रहा था, तो जब उसका तीसरा पारण चल रहा था, उस समय ५० कमलापति त्रिपाठी जी ने शुद्ध हिन्दी में अपना भाषण दिया। उस समय संविधान सभा के सभापति हमारे लोकप्रिय नेता डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद थे। उन्होंने दक्षिण के कुछ सदस्यों को बुलाकर पूछा कि आप इस भाषण को किनना समझे हैं? तो उन्होंने कहा कि हम इस भाषण को ९० प्रतिशत समझे हैं। यह तो दक्षिण के सदस्यों की बात थी, जो उन्होंने उस समय कही। तो गवर्नमेंट की यह राय न मालूम कहां से आई, किसने उसको यह राय दी कि हिन्दी भाषा अच्छी तरह से नहीं समझी जाती है। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दी भाषा का तोड़मरोड़ किया जायेगा, तो बेश में एक बड़ी त्रिकट समस्या उपस्थित हो जायेगी। देश में ही नहीं, गवर्नमेंट के सामने एक बड़ा भारी प्राबलम आ जायेगा और उसको हल करना उसके लिए कठिन हो जायेगा। आज देश में हिन्दी के

प्रति लोगों की कितनी श्रद्धा है, हिन्दी की प्रगति के लिये लोग कितने लालायित हैं, इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर गवर्नमेंट को अपनी नीति निर्धारित करनी चाहिये। आल इंडिया रेडियो केवल गवर्नमेंट के कामों के प्रचार के लिए ही नहीं है कि जो गवर्नमेंट के कार्यकलापों का ही प्रचार करे। गवर्नमेंट अपने इस विभाग के द्वारा भाषा में ऐसे शब्द लाये, जिसको वह ठीक समझे, यह ठीक नहीं है? आल इंडिया रेडियो के द्वारा साहित्यकारों का शिक्षण होता है और साहित्यकारों को प्रोत्साहन मिलता है। अनेक प्रकार के शिक्षण का कार्य उसके द्वारा होता है और साहित्यिक आलोचना होती है। अगर गवर्नमेंट की नीति यह हो कि उसमें शुद्ध हिन्दी का प्रयोग न हो तो प्राचीन ग्रन्थों की अथवा ऐसी पुस्तकों की जो आलोचना होती है वह रेडियो के द्वारा नहीं हो सकेगी। रेडियो के द्वारा हमारे प्राचीन कवियों के भजन गाये जाते हैं। क्या गवर्नमेंट यह चाहती है कि जो भजन सूरदास, तुलसीदास और मीराबाई आदि के उतमें सुनाये जाते हैं, उसकी भाषा में परिवर्तन किया जाय? यदि गवर्नमेंट आल इंडिया रेडियो द्वारा यह नीति निर्धारित करना चाहती है कि शुद्ध हिन्दी का भारतवर्ष से बहिष्कार कर देना चाहिये तो उसे स्पष्ट रूप से इस बात को सदन के सामने रखना चाहिये। उसे सदन के सामने साफ कहना चाहिये कि हम हिन्दी भाषा का बहिष्कार करना चाहते हैं और हम ऐसी हिन्दी को रखना चाहते हैं जिसमें एक भी संस्कृत का शब्द न हो और हमारी बंगला भाषा ऐसी रहेगी, जिसमें एक भी संस्कृत का शब्द न हो, हमारी मलयालम, कन्नड़, तैलगू, तमिल आदि भाषाओं में से संस्कृत शब्दों को बाहर निकाल दिया जायेगा। गवर्नमेंट इस बात को साहस के साथ तो कहे, ताकि देश उसका मुकाबला कर सके। अगर इस समय भारतवर्ष में कोई और भाषा होती,

जिसको सारा देश चाहता तो शायद गवर्न-
मेंट की दूसरी नीति होती। परन्तु जो
हमारे संविधान की घोषित नीति है कि
हिन्दी राष्ट्रभाषा होगी और जिसके लिए
गवर्नमेंट कहती है कि हम हर तरह से
उसकी प्रगति करना चाहते हैं और दूसरी
ओर यह कहती है कि आल इंडिया रेडियो
की जो भाषा है वह क्लिष्ट है—यै क्लिष्ट
नहीं कहता, मैं तो शुद्ध हिन्दी कहता हूँ
अगर गवर्नमेंट की यही नीति है, तो जो
समाचार पत्र देहातों में जाते हैं उनकी
भाषा में भी परिवर्तन करना होगा। अगर
कोई समाचार पत्र क्लिष्ट हिन्दी भाषा
लिखता है तो उसको ज़ुर्म करार दे देना
चाहिये। इस चर्चा के लिए एक कानून बना
दिया जाना चाहिये कि जो समाचार पत्रों में
क्लिष्ट हिन्दी भाषा का प्रयोग करेगा उसे
सजा दी जायेगी। जो क्लिष्ट भाषा में
पुस्तकों लिखे उनको भी सजा दी जायेगी।
अगर ऐसा नहीं किया जाता तो गवर्नमेंट
की नीति एक पोली नीति हो जायेगी।
अगर सरकार की अपनी नीति को दृढ़ता
पूर्वक चलाना है तो वह स्पष्ट रूप से कहे
कि संस्कृत मिले शब्दों को हिन्दी में कोई
भी स्थान नहीं मिलेगा। लेकिन मालूम
ऐसा नहीं होता, यह एक बड़ी विचित्र
बात है। यह बात हमारी समझ में नहीं
आती है कि आल इंडिया रेडियो द्वारा
भाषा पर यह कुठाराघात क्यों किया
जाता है। और दूसरी ओर हम
देखते हैं कि हमारे सदन की जो कार्य-
वाही है, जो हिन्दी में छपती है, जो हिन्दी
में प्रश्न छपते हैं, गवर्नमेंट की जो
पुस्तक पुस्तिकाएँ निकलती हैं, उसकी
भाषा क्या है? उसकी भाषा वही है जो
आल इंडिया रेडियो की भाषा है।
गवर्नमेंट वास्तव में इस बात को मान चुकी
है और गवर्नमेंट की यह नीति निर्धारित
हो चुकी है कि जो असली हिन्दी का रूप
है उसकी प्रगति होगी और उसको हर जगह
स्थान मिलेगा। आज अगर मंत्री महीदय

अपनी इस नीति से बाहर जाते हैं, तो मैं
समझता हूँ कि इसका विरोध सदन के
बाहर भी होगा। अगर यह नीति मन्त्रि-
मंडल द्वारा निर्धारित की गई है तो उसका
स्पष्ट रूप से वक्तव्य इस सदन में देना
चाहिये कि यह नीति किस प्रकार से
निर्धारित हुई? कोई भी देश जिसकी
अपनी भाषा है यह नहीं चाहेगा कि दूसरी
भाषा को लाकर अपनी भाषा को विकृत
रूप में सीखे। इंग्लैंड वाला अंग्रेजी भाषा
में रूसी भाषा का सम्मिश्रण नहीं चाहेगा।
इसी तरह से रूस वाले रशियन भाषा में
अंग्रेजी का सम्मिश्रण करे, तो वह शुद्ध
रशियन भाषा में नहीं बोली जायेगी।
लेकिन यह भारतवर्ष का दुर्भाग्य है
कि इस देश में यह कहा जाता है कि हिन्दी
भाषा को आल इंडिया रेडियो में स्थान
नहीं मिलेगा। आश्चर्य है। हमारे यहां कई
विद्वान दक्षिण के बैठे हैं, हमारे श्री दातार
जो संस्कृत के बड़े विद्वान हैं, जिन
के बारे में लोग कहते हैं कि वे हिन्दी नहीं
समझते, लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि वे शुद्ध हिन्दी
समझते हैं और अच्छी संस्कृत लिख सकते हैं।
यह तो कहने की बात है कि दक्षिण के लोग
हिन्दी नहीं चाहते हैं, यह बात गलत है।
इसी सदन में मेरी कई सदस्यों से बातचीत
हुई, इस समय वे यहां पर नहीं हैं। एक रोज़
श्रीमती नल्लामुत्तु रामामूर्ती मुझसे कहने
लगी कि मैं आपके प्रश्नों को बड़ी दिल-
चस्पी से सुनती हूँ। यह बात उन्होंने अंग्रेजी में
कही। मैंने उनसे कहा कि मैं तो हिन्दी में
प्रश्न करता हूँ, आप किस तरह से मेरे प्रश्नों
को समझती हैं? वे तुरन्त हिन्दी में बोली
कि मैं आपके प्रश्नों का आशय भली प्रकार
समझ लेती हूँ। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि लोग
यह कह देते हैं कि मद्रास, मैसूर और बंगाल
के लोग हिन्दी नहीं समझते, लेकिन यह बात
गलत है। अगर आप हिन्दी भाषा में उर्दू
के शब्द रख देंगे, तो वह भाषा नहीं समझी
जायेगी। अगर बंगला, मराठी या दक्षिण की

[श्री भगवत नारायण भागवत]

दूसरी भाषाओं में दूसरी भाषा के शब्द रख दिये जायेंगे जैसा कि अभी हाल में हिन्दी के बारे में किया जा रहा है, तो वे भाषाएँ भी नहीं समझी जा सकेंगी। जो भाषा सविधान ने स्वीकार कर ली है, उसको ही प्रोत्साहन मिलना चाहिये। अगर सरकार अपनी इस नीति को बदलना चाहती है, तो मेरा उससे निवेदन है कि वह साफ शब्दों में इस सदन में ऐलान करे। सरकार आल इंडिया रेडियो की ही भाषा में क्यों परिवर्तन करना चाहती है। सरकार के जो प्रकाशन निकलते हैं, हमारी सदन की जो कार्यवाही छपती है, मंत्रालयों के जो प्रतिवेदन निकलते हैं, उन सब की भाषा में परिवर्तन किया जाना चाहिये। केवल आल इंडिया रेडियो की भाषा बदलने से कोई लाभ नहीं होगा? मैं जब उत्तर प्रदेश में पचायत राज का सचालक था, तब मैं ग्रामीणों के सम्पर्क में काफी आया। मैं कहता हूँ कि गावों में जो रेडियो लोग लगाये हुये हैं, क्या वे बेवकूफ हैं कि अगर वे हिन्दी भाषा नहीं समझते तो उस पर इतना रुपया खर्च करते? गावों में जो पुस्तकालय हैं और जिनमें हिन्दी के समाचार पत्र और पुस्तकें जाती हैं, क्या उनकी भाषा को वहाँ के लोग नहीं समझते? अगर गावों के लोग हिन्दी भाषा को नहीं समझते तो इस तरह के पुस्तकालयों की माग न होती? तो मैं स्पष्ट रूप से गवर्नमेंट से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह अपनी इच्छा को गलत रूप में देश के ऊपर न मढ़े, जिससे कि देश में एक बड़ा बबडर खड़ा हो जाय। सरकार को इस बात पर गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये और इस बारे में जनता की निश्चित रूप से राय लेनी चाहिये।

अब मैं एक दो बातें गृह-मंत्रालय के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR A SUBBA RAO) in the Chair]

गृह-मंत्रालय ही एक ऐसा विभाग है कि जो समस्त मंत्रालयों के जितने कर्मचारी हैं, उनको मुस्तकिल करने का भार उसके ऊपर होता है। गवर्नमेंट की रिपोर्ट देखने से ऐसा मालूम होता है कि हमारे देश में बड़ी सख्या में ऐसे कर्मचारी हैं जो अभी तक मुस्तकिल नहीं किये गये हैं और न उनकी मुस्तकिल किये जाने की भविष्य में कोई आशा है। गवर्नमेंट के आकड़ों से पता चलता है कि कुछ विभाग ऐसे हैं, जिनमें केवल पाच से दस प्रतिशत तक कर्मचारी मुस्तकिल हैं। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि पाच प्रतिशत कर्मचारी मुस्तकिल हैं और कुछ विभागों में १५ से २० प्रतिशत तक मुस्तकिल हैं। मैं रिपोर्ट के अनुसार कह रहा हूँ कि ऐसा कोई विभाग नहीं है, जिसमें ५० से ७० प्रतिशत तक कर्मचारी मुस्तकिल हों। केवल रेलवे का एक विभाग है, जिसमें ७० प्रतिशत कर्मचारी मुस्तकिल हैं। तो इतने बड़े-बड़े मंत्रालयों में जहाँ हजारों की संख्या में लोग हैं और वर्षों से वे अस्थायी चले आ रहे हैं, उनको स्थायी करने के लिए कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की जाती है, यह बड़े आश्चर्य और दुःख की बात है। ऐसे-ऐसे केसेज आपको मिलेंगे कि कुछ कर्मचारियों की २६ वर्ष की सर्विस हो गई है और वे कनफर्म नहीं किये गये, कुछ रिटायर हो गये और रिटायर होने के बाद कनफर्म किये गये और बाज बाज मर गये, उसके बाद उन के कनफर्मेशन का आर्डर निकला। इस बात की ओर बहुत ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। बात यह है कि जो हमारे राज्य हैं, जो हमारी प्रादेशिक सरकारें हैं, वे यहीं से इशारा पाती हैं। उनका कहना है कि जब केन्द्र में इतने ज्यादा टेम्पोररी सर्वेन्ट्स हैं तो हम अपने कर्मचारियों को क्यों मुस्तकिल करें। इसी कारण से उत्तर प्रदेश में और और प्रदेशों में ऐसे-ऐसे लोग हैं, जिनका

पब्लिक सर्विस कर्मशन से चुनाव हुआ और जिनकी २०, २५ साल की सर्विस हो गई है, किन्तु वे भी मुस्तकिल नहीं किये जा रहे हैं। यह सोचने की बात है कि हमारे देश का शासन कौन चला रहा है। क्या हमारे मंत्रीगण चला रहे हैं? अगर आप सूक्ष्मदृष्टि से देखेंगे, तो आप यह अनुभव करेंगे कि जो नीचे स्तर के सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, वही सारे शासन को चला रहे हैं। अगर वे न हों, तो मिनिस्टर लोग यहां बैठ कर क्या करेंगे या कमिश्नर और डाइरेक्टर जनरल क्या कर सकते हैं। तो उन बेचारे छोटे कर्मचारियों के लिए सरकार को इतना ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि उनके हृदय में इस बात का समाधान हो कि हम मुस्तकिल होंगे, हमको पेंशन मिलेगी और हमारा भविष्य उज्ज्वल है। अगर यहां ऐसा किया जाये और इसी प्रकार का एक आदेश राज्य सरकारों को दिया जाय, तो वहां भी इस नीति का पालन हो। आज सब जगह इतना अमंतोष कर्मचारियों में है कि जिसकी कोई हद नहीं है। मैं नहीं जानता कि कहां तक आपको मालूम है, लेकिन मुझे इतना मालूम है कि पिछले चुनावों में कई जगह सरकारी कर्मचारियों ने असंतुष्ट हो करके यह निश्चय किया कि हम कांग्रेस को वोट नहीं देंगे और यह हुआ। कम से कम उत्तर प्रदेश में यह अवश्य हुआ। एक और यह बात है और दूसरी और गृह विभाग ने एक नया कायदा यह बना दिया है कि जो टेम्पोररी गवर्नमेंट सर्वेंट हैं, वे अगर दूसरी जगह नौकरी करना चाहें, तो उसमें बाधाएं डाली जायें। किसी नौकरी के लिए साल में एक दरखास्त वे दे सकते हैं। यह उनके ऊपर एक नियंत्रण लगा दिया गया है। इधर तो आप उनको मुस्तकिल न करें, बीस-पच्चीस वर्ष वे इसी तरह पड़े रहें, और उधर अगर वे अपनी उन्नति के लिए

कहीं दरखास्त देना चाहें, तो आप उसमें टांग अड़ा दें कि तुम दरखास्त नहीं दे सकते हो। हम चाहे नौकरी से निकाल दें, लेकिन तुम आगे तरक्की नहीं कर सकते। यह बड़े अचम्भे और अन्याय की बात है कि आपने टेम्पोररी गवर्नमेंट सर्वेंट्स न ऊपर यह नियंत्रण लगाया है कि वे कहीं दरखास्त नहीं दे सकते। इसके सम्बन्ध में मैंने प्रश्न भी किये थे और दातार साहब से पत्र व्यवहार भी किया था, परन्तु उसका कोई असर नहीं हुआ। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इसके ऊपर फिर से विचार किया जाय। एक टेम्पोररी गवर्नमेंट सर्वेंट, जो एक महीने की नोटिस देकर निकाला जा सकता है, वह अगर उन्नति करना चाहता है, तो उसके ऊपर क्यों रोक लगाई जाती है। ऐसा कौन सा सरकार का नुकसान हो जायेगा, जिसके कारण ऐसा प्रतिबन्ध लगाया जाता है।

मैं दो शब्द गोआ, दमन और दीव के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूं और ये हैं कि जब से उनका समावेश करने भारतवर्ष में हुआ है, तब से कई बार इस बात का समाचार निकला है कि उनके सम्बन्ध में योजना बनाई जा रही है। काफ़ी समय हो गया है, तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना भारत में आरम्भ हो गई है, इसलिए मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि प्लानिंग कमीशन ने क्या इस सम्बन्ध में कोई योजना बनाई है और सरकार के पास भेजी है या नहीं? अगर नहीं भेजी है, तो शीघ्रातिशीघ्र भेजना चाहिये। इसके साथ साथ जैसे कि और प्रदेशों में सामुदायिक विकास योजना है, उसका प्रसार वहां भी शीघ्रातिशीघ्र होना चाहिये। वहां के लोग स्वयं इसके इच्छुक हैं। समाचार पत्रों के देखने में ऐसा मालूम होता

[श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव]

है कि वहां के लोग चाहते हैं कि जैसी भारतवर्ष के अन्य प्रदेशों में विकास योजनाएं चल रही हैं, वैसी ही उनके वहां भी शीघ्रातिशीघ्र लागू की जाये।

SHRI M. M. SUR (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, out of the Consolidated Fund of India it has been proposed in the Appropriation Bill to spend Rs. 7,956 crores. The figure appears to be very large, but when it is noticed that over Rs. 5,000 crores have been allotted towards repayment of debts which are, as explained by the hon. Minister, for repayment of Treasury Bills, and Rs. 900 crores are for grants in aid to States, loans and advances by Central Government, interest on debts, payment of States' shares of Union Excise Duties, then it boils down to only Rs. 2,000 crores for meeting the expenses of the different Ministries including Defence, which also includes a large amount of capital expenditure, and when you take into consideration the fact that the cost of everything has gone up five times, both labour and materials, then the Rs. 2,000 crores again reduces itself to only about Rs. 400 crores, which includes the expenditure of all the Ministries and also the capital expenditure of the different Ministries, and it is a very modest figure. Also the capital expenditures incurred by the different Ministries will bring in revenue—these are investments and are not expenditures.

On examining the collection of revenues under the different heads, which is about Rs. 1,000 crores, it has to be observed that the Union Excise Duties are bringing us about half the amount. In the previous year it was Rs. 416 crores whereas this year it is

expected to be Rs. 523 crores. In fact that is going to be the biggest source of revenue for years to come and you would not be surprised if the Central Excise gives us Rs. 2,000 crores with all the developments that we expect in the coming years, when all our capital investments bear fruit, the steel factories and the other big undertakings that we have. When there are more small industries not only in the urban areas but also in the rural areas, the products of the industries will augment this Union Excise revenue. In this connection I have to make one observation and it is this. So far we have been collecting revenues mainly from these few heads, Customs, Corporation Tax and Income-tax. The Estate Duty and the Gift Tax have not yielded much revenue, and this Income-tax also was expected to dwindle because the disparities of income will gradually get reduced and the higher income group will not yield that much revenue as it was doing in past years. In fact we are expecting only Rs. 68 crores from the tax on income and Rs. 178 crores as Corporation Tax, which includes not only big private industries but also Government-owned or public sector industries and, in fact, when these public sector industries are in full production, then this corporation tax will also increase. But it is a case of Government paying their own tax, not the people. But then the revenue will be mainly from these Union Excise Duties. But in administering these tax collections we notice that for collecting Rs. 200 crores from Customs we have to spend about Rs. 4 crores as Establishment expenses. Similarly, for income-tax collections we have to spend Rs. 6 crores and for Union Excise Duties we have to spend Rs. 9 crores. Therefore, proportionately we are spending very much less in collecting Union Excise Duties than in other spheres. Although collection of Union Excise duties is to be made from big entrepreneurs, in the coming years it is going to spread over many millions of small entrepreneurs.

Whereas presently we are collecting income-tax from one hundred thousand people, we expect Union Excise duty to be collected from two hundred million people. Everybody will be benefited by the planning and there will be production centres almost everywhere. There will be comparatively small producers who will be producing consumer goods for the people, and they will gladly pay a little share from their extra income which they will be able to make because Government have offered facilities to them.

Sir, the collection of Union Excise duty has expanded very much but its administration has not been properly geared up. A few weeks ago I had occasion to bring in some cases of hardship to the notice of the Member in charge of the Board of Revenue of that department. He took immediate action. He was very kind and sympathetic. He did all that he could do. But at the lower level the administration has not been properly trained. They have not been educated, they have not been trained how to collect taxes properly without harassing the people. Income tax is being paid by the people who have incomes over a few thousand rupees whereas the Central Excise duties are being paid by the people who will never pay income-tax because they will never come up to the standard where they will pay income-tax. Perhaps their annual income will not be more than Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,000. Still many millions of them will be paying excise duty. Therefore, the administration has to be such that we have got to train those people, we have got to tell those people how to fill up forms, how to apply for rebate that they are entitled to get. In the cases that I was mentioning, they had been overcharged to the extent of more than their subscribed capital and the matter is still pending. Not that every small man is able to bring his case before the Board of Revenue. Therefore, the hardship is there and

unless the hardship which is experienced by the people through the administration of the Central Excise collection is removed, it is bound to bring in severe reaction, and perhaps we would not be surprised if the appeals and court and High Court cases in the coming few years become most unmanageable.

After the report of the Income-tax Investigation Commission it was decided that the returns filed by small income-tax payers filled on their own will be accepted without questioning them and they will be charged accordingly. Why not depend upon the goodwill of the people, upon the inner goodness of man? Our Indian culture lays stress on innate goodness. Indians have been good for centuries and it is because of this goodness that we have been able to absorb so many people, so many nations that came to our country. That is how their culture was transformed into our culture, that is, Indian culture. Depend on that greatness of our people and see that the administration is geared up in a way that inner goodness is developed, that they pay taxes, particularly Union Excise duties which we are going to collect from many millions of people. Let them pay of their own accord, out of their inner nature, out of goodwill. Out of their gratefulness they should pay it and not through any coercion as it happens now as if they are still in the British days. Today tax collectors work only with the spirit of collecting taxes and not with the spirit of service. So, in the administration of Central Excise particularly, the subordinates have to be trained like that. We have to approach the people and tell them what taxes they have to pay and what rebates they are entitled to. We have to help them in every possible way. In the Department of Industries they have opened Service Institutes and training centres where technicians are being trained. After their training is over, it is the duty of these trainees to help those who start small

[Shri M. M. Sur.] industries. The latter are helped by Service Institutes. They are advised about the machinery that they should use, about the investment that would be necessary and so on. Even during the course of production if they have any difficulty they run up to these Service Institutes for guidance. These Institutes are there to help them, to solve their problems. So, let us take that attitude in the matter of tax collection also. We are endeavouring to develop small scale industries in our villages. Let us have this Central Excise administration spread out in a way that it helps the people in filling up their forms enabling them to pay the requisite tax without any coercion. You should also tell them how they will get their rebate and so on.

Regarding the other things that are here I do not think I have to say much on them. We have here Interest on Debt and Other Obligations and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt and Payment of State's Share of Union Excise Duties. Considering that we have a very expanded Ministry the total expenditure may be considered very reasonable.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 1962 and in doing so I wish to make a few remarks. I was listening to the speeches made here, especially to the marathon speech made by my good friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, and I was wondering whether he was speaking on the Appropriation Bill or whether he was trying to convert the Congress Party into the Communist Party. Thus a certain amount of confusion was caused in me by his speech.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala): Even otherwise you are confused.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Anyway, it is for the Government to answer Mr. Gupta, if any answer is needed.

Now the present-day concepts of Budgets and appropriations are diffe-

rent from those of the previous regimes. Now it is not merely a question of balancing the income and expenditure. It is a question of essentially promoting the economic growth of the country. If any Budget did not function effectively in promoting the growth of the country, that Budget need not be called a Budget at all. Therefore, from the point of view of economic growth of the country, this Budget has got to be considered.

In this connection it is worthwhile examining a few facts to see how our economy has behaved, especially since the inception of the Plans, these Five Year Plans, as we call them. If we do that, I am sure we will see that there is cause for us to be proud of our Budget and the way our finances have been managed, especially in the era of planning. Our national income at the 1948-49 price level was Rs. 8,880 crores in the beginning of the First Plan. It rose to Rs. 10,480 crores towards the end of the Second Plan and by 1960-61, it came to Rs. 12,690 crores. Thus, towards the end of the Second Plan, the national economy rose by about 43 per cent which roughly works out to an annual increase of 4.3 per cent. Of course, we aim at increasing the national income by 5 per cent and when we have increased it by 4.3 per cent, it is no mean achievement, according to me. This is not all. We have set for ourselves very high targets and goals and during the next 15 years a growth of 6 per cent per annum has been envisaged. The effort, therefore, that we have to put forward, is really enormous. At the end of the Third Plan, we have to see that our national output goes up to Rs. 19,000 crores. Of course, ours is perspective planning and at the end of the Fourth Plan we are aiming at a national output of Rs. 25,000 crores and at the end of the Fifth Plan an output of Rs. 33,000 crores or Rs. 34,000 crores. What does all this mean? It means increasing the happiness of human beings. This, of course, is a foregone conclusion. Naturally, when we are aiming very high, we should not

grudge making sacrifices. This broadly is the picture of the economic aspect of this country that we are keeping in our mind and our achievements, as I said, were no mean achievements. I am sure that with the experience that we have gained we will do still better in times to come.

I would now like to speak with particular reference to the agricultural economy of our country. As the House knows very well, nearly 50 per cent. of the national output comes from agriculture and nearly 300 million people are directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture. Therefore, if we do not make enormous progress in the agricultural sector, our economy is bound to remain backward. During his reply to the debate on the President's Address our respected Prime Minister was making a reference to Punjab and Bihar and he was stating how in spite of the concentration of big and huge industries in Bihar, Bihar was lagging far behind Punjab which had no big industries to boast of. The reason for the greater progress made by Punjab was very reasonably attributed to the progressive or prosperous agriculture that is practised in Punjab. Punjab has very progressive agriculture side by side with a large number of small industries. Therefore, Punjab shows enormous progress compared to Bihar which has a greater number of big industries concentrated there. This goes to show that it is not merely the presence of big industries that can promote the growth of the country or increase the prosperity of the people. Agriculture being the premier industry in the country, it has got to be improved and improved at a very rapid rate. If we do not do that, we are bound to be far behind the times.

Now, what does improvement in agriculture mean? According to me, essentially it means increasing the average per acre yield of the land. Only when we do that can we say that we have improved or we have progressed

in the agricultural sector. It is true that we started with 50 million tons of foodgrains and we have now come to nearly 80 million tons of foodgrains. But this, according to me, is not on account of the increase in the per acre yield. This increase has been due to the enormously huge number of irrigation projects that we now have. The irrigation potential in the country has been increasing enormously and this increase in production is on account of that one factor. That is why we have been able to increase the production by nearly 30 million tons. I do not deny that in the agricultural sector also enormous improvements have been made. But is this improvement on account of the improvement of all the 300 million people? Is it on account of their understanding the scientific principles of agriculture that we have been able to bring about this increase in production? No. I am prepared to say that it is certainly not on account of the improvement in the general level of agriculture that this increase has been effected. It is only on account of the irrigation potential, according to me, that this increase has been brought about. That means that the prosperity of the country as a whole cannot be brought about even with the increased irrigation potential. By the end of the Third Plan we will be able to irrigate only about 90 million acres out of the 340 million acres under cultivation in this country. That means again that nearly 250 million acres will still remain under dry cultivation. Unless these 250 million acres of land do produce more per acre, backwardness in agriculture is sure to persist. This backwardness will disappear only if improvement in each acre of land is effected. Therefore, I say there is nothing that we should gloat about so far as the agricultural sector is concerned. Our backwardness is the same. After all, if we examine the countryside, we find that there is hardly one million improved ploughs. What is all the technological advance that we talk about, if the primary implements that are needed for scientific agriculture are not provided in the country? What is this

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]
science and technology that we talk about?

This matter relating to agriculture I would like to put in a slightly figurative way. Agriculture is the hand that feeds the country. Unless this hand is made strong, unless science and technology that are talked of so much these days, are applied by each and every farmer in this country, our prosperity in the agricultural sector will be a myth, according to me. We are now importing comfortably four million tons of foodgrains from America and we get ourselves satisfied that there is no more problem to be solved. A certain amount of complacency has come about in the country, in the Government, in public life and in Parliament that there are no more problems of agriculture to be solved. I would here like to utter a mild word of warning that our agriculture has not made any progress in terms of science and technology ever since the introduction of the Five Year Plans.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:
Have you gone to Punjab and seen the tractors working there?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY:
They are not even a few thousands. What do you talk of tractors? I have got the figure of the tractors available in the country. The agricultural hand that feeds has got five fingers just as a human hand has five fingers. The human hand functions with the assistance of five fingers and it is a very well recognised fact that in agricultural production programmes the important points are irrigation, soil conservation, manures, improved seeds and additional area and plant protection. These are the five fingers through which agricultural hand functions. I have said before that the approach to the agricultural problem of the country is not correct. I would like to repeat my remarks with regard to agricultural programmes. So far as irrigation is concerned, it is all right that

you are attempting to do your utmost. Every river, every small rivulet has been surveyed and the irrigation potential has been increased enormously. There is still some scope for increasing the irrigation potential. They are tapping the sub-soil water and the process goes on. It is quite a healthy one and I have nothing to comment upon it. I have got to say a few words about soil conservation. Huge experiments were conducted for nearly a decade and a huge book is before the Government of India. It is a fact that on account of the practice of dry farming schemes alone a hundred per cent. increase in the yield could be effected. I would here like to refer to some of the experiments which have been conducted in Hagri, Sholapur and other places which are typically dry tracts of the country. During the period 1934-35 to 1940-41 various experiments were conducted in Hagri, Manjeri, Sholapur and other places over a period of seven years and these go to show that the increase which could be effected by scientific dry farming method alone is something like this. I would just refer to the actual experiments conducted. A quantity of 191 lbs. of *chulam*, a grain grown there, was obtained as against 90 lbs. obtained by the local method, an increase of hundred per cent. Similar is the case with regard to straw where also it increased by hundred per cent. These experiments were conducted in those places over a period of seven years and it has been conclusively proved that by the adoption of scientific methods of dry farming alone, we can increase the yield by hundred per cent. Let us see what is happening in the country. Either these experiments are wrong or the scientific methods of dry farming have not reached the farmer. This means that there is a lacuna in the implementation of the Plan which is very very great indeed. Talking about dry farming methods, I cannot understand why the Planning Commission should have prescribed only 22 million acres when the entire area is 250 million acres. I cannot really understand it. If after three Five Year Plans you will have only 22 million

acres, when are you going to improve all the rest of the 225 million acres is a thing which I have not been able to understand. Therefore, Sir, I say that the approach to the agricultural problem is essentially very defective. Then comes soil conservation. Why not every acre that is under cultivation be put under dry farming? What is the difficulty? Is it that your staff is not able to understand the problems of the country? You have nearly 40 thousand village level workers, you have an extensive agricultural extension organisation and a big paraphernalia covering every village and still you are not able to do anything. How long will you take to complete this task?

(Time bell rings)

I was asked to speak for half an hour. I am sorry, with your permission, I would like to say and that is why I have been taking . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. A. SUBBA RAO): You can take five minutes more.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I was planning to speak for half an hour

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. A. SUBBA RAO): There are other speakers.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: The approach to the dry farming methods is highly defective. Similar is the case in regard to soil conservation. Soil conservation requires to be done not only on dry farms but on every acre of land that is available, arable land, even forest land. Four or five hundred million acres—I do not know how much we have; I have got the figures but I have not the time to refer to them—but all that the Third Five Year Plan fixed was a target of 11 million acres. When are you going to apply soil conservation? At this rate, how many Plans will you take? Therefore, I say that the approach is defective. Coming to the problem of seeds, seed is the most important part of agricultural

operations. We have our research stations which have produced improved seeds for every variety of agriculture, wheat, paddy, ragi, whatever it is. Disease resisting variety they say, higher yielding seed they say, for every variety they have got. I visited Pusa recently and found that for every variety of crop they have got improved seeds. Whether it be paddy land or wheat land or sugarcane land, every acre of land should have been put under improved seed. What do I find according to this report? 148 million acres is all that is provided for being put under improved seeds. Is this the way? What is the difficulty? You have a seed farm for every Block and you have a huge Block staff, agricultural staff, Panchayati Raj, Zilla Samitis and everybody doing the job of agriculture but nobody is improving it. So, the approach, the understanding itself is defective according to me. Under seeds, it is not 150 million acres which should have been aimed at but all the 350 million acres. I now come to the question of manures. I now come to manures. That is the most important finger; that is the thumb of agriculture. There is a proverb in Telugu which says that even a mad man—why talk of any scientific agriculturist—if he puts plenty of manure into the land he can grow enough. So the manurial resources are very important. Now, what is happening to our manurial resources in the country? The Plan as such makes reference to fertilisers and to the manufacture of fertilisers as if fertilisers alone would solve the manurial problem of the country. I know for certain that fertilisers injudiciously applied will produce more harmful effects. Instead of increasing the output, they will damage the land. I know of several instances, hundreds of thousands of instances, where land has been permanently damaged on account of injudicious use of fertilisers. Who is doing this job and who is advising the agriculturists? Nobody advises them. If they get some money, immediately they go and buy two, three, four or five bags of fertilisers and put

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

it on the land and the result is that all prospects of any further improvement of the land are ruined even though initially he may get a good crop by the application of fertilisers. Very often foreign countries are taken as guide for this purpose. They apply enormous amount of fertilisers to their land but there is an essential difference between land in the European countries and land in our country. The land in the European countries is moist most of the year with the result that green matter grows there enormously. For centuries it has been growing and getting itself absorbed in the land. There is plenty of humus, organic matter, in that soil and fertilisers go in good combination with this organic matter and it will help the crops to grow well. So there the land is not damaged by the fertilisers whereas in our country most of the time, for eight months in a year, our soil remains dry, bone-dry, and there is no organic matter. On the other hand whatever organic matter is already there is oxidised and burnt up. That is the situation here. Once the Agriculture Minister himself asked me, 'What do you think of European soils? They apply plenty of fertilisers.' True; they do it but conditions there are different from our conditions. After all, without organic matter in the soil even fertilisers will not do anything. If anything, they will do great damage. That is the situation here and this aspect has not been understood. I wish the Agriculture Minister was here; I could have mentioned this to him.

Now, when we examine the Plan, what is the approach we find to the agricultural problem? Have they bestowed sufficient attention to the natural manures that are available in the country? Are we doing all that is necessary to conserve and preserve the manures obtained through domesticated livestock? Then there are the wastes of human beings. Mahatmaji himself had referred in 1934 to the wastes of human beings. He had cal-

culated then that if all the wastes of human beings were collected properly and applied to agriculture, there would be no famine in this country. That was what he had said. He had put the value then at about Rs. 40 crores and now it should be much more. Of course, I have calculated all the figures in an article published in the Economic Review and it comes to several crores of rupees. The value of the manures that could be obtained from human wastes in the country comes to about 400 million rupees. Anyway, I do not want to go into all those details and bore the House. Anyway there is great potential. According to my humble understanding, by way of farmyard manure alone we can have 16.5 million tons of nitrogen through domesticated livestock all of which is fed by the resources of agriculture in the country against which the Planning Commission estimates that only one million tons of nitrogen can be obtained through farmyard manure. That means 15 million tons of nitrogen are allowed to be wasted. That way, how are you going to rebuild the country's agriculture? We are wasting the 2 million tons of nitrogen obtainable through human wastes, 3 million tons by way of growing green manure and another 3 million tons by way of compost making. According to me the country's potential of nitrogen is about 25 million tons. Our application at the present time to the soil is said to be about 2 million tons whereas through crop output we take away about 3 to 4 million tons of nitrogen. Even according to the Planning Commission at this rate our soil is being impoverished by two million tons of nitrogen every year. When that is the case, I ask, is there any hope for agriculture in this country? Having grasped the problems in their true perspective, are we attempting to solve them correctly? No. That is the position today.

Then there is another little finger and that is plant protection. Even there you sow crop in 350 million

acres and you provide for plant protection for 50 million acres in five years. Is this wisdom? According to me, it is not.

Thus there is a great defect in our approach to our agricultural problems. Unless we tackle these problems correctly in their correct perspective our agriculture is sure to remain very backward for all time to come. The fact that we have increased agricultural production by 40 or 45 per cent need not be a consoling factor at all because whatever increase has been achieved is mainly due to the potential of irrigation that has been created in the country. Instead of single crop, you now grow double crop and that is how you have effected increase in production. That by itself cannot remove the poverty of the agriculturists. We would remain backward for all time to come. That is my criticism so far as agriculture is concerned.

Now, I want to say a word or two about animal husbandry. Animal husbandry is the handmaid of agriculture and what is happening to animal husbandry? In 1956 we had taken statistics of the livestock in the country and in 1961 we have again taken statistics and there has been an increase of about 10 per cent of our livestock in the country. No country possesses so many heads of cattle, domesticated livestock, as India. We possess the greatest number of human beings and also the greatest number of livestock. All have to be fed through agriculture; all have to depend on the produce from land. What is the pressure that we are creating on land? Can this good earth bear all this pressure that we are creating? What is happening to our livestock? I have calculated in an article published very recently that more than 50 per cent. of our cattle starve. The yield of our cows is the lowest in the world. They are the poorest fed and the greatest in number. What is more unhealthy than this situation?

Therefore, I say that on the one hand we have to reduce our cattle population and on the other hand we have to put more milk into each one of the cattle and get more milk. That is the surest way.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. A. SUBBA RAO): You have only two minutes more.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I am just concluding. Now, if I could tell this House what we have done in Bangalore, it would be worth while. We started with cows having a milk yield of 2 to 3 pounds. We imported bulls from foreign countries which have higher potential for milk yield. Today the milk yield in Bangalore is 20 pounds a day with dry period reduced considerably. This is science; this is application of science. This is the scientific method of approaching the problem.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Pradesh): What is the number of cattle there?

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: It is about 30,000 with a yield of 20 pounds a day. Our Agriculture Minister himself was pleased to inspect the project and see what was being done. Only last night when I was having tea with Mr. A. P. Jain who visited some of our farms, he said that the cattle in Bangalore were better housed than even people elsewhere. That was what he said. I mean no aspersion on anybody. I am only telling that within 25 years we have effected an increase of ten times in milk yield per cow and if the country as a whole could copy this there is sure to be prosperity in the agricultural sector. Otherwise if we go on following old methods we cannot tackle our problems.

Sir, I would like to say one thing. I happened to be one of the members of the Expert Cattle Committee and I made bitter criticism in it with regard to the key village schemes and their failure. Ninety-nine per cent.

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]
 of the key village schemes were failures and we had mentioned this fact well in time before the Third Plan was finalised and still the key village scheme continues to find a place in the Third Five Year Plan. It was not an individual opinion. The entire Committee agreed that 99 per cent. were failures. What is the glowing feature about the key village scheme? Under that scheme every key village is given a jeep in which the staff go about for coffee and tea and things like that. Things have not been done properly. This is what is happening to animal husbandry. This is what

is happening to agriculture. There is complacency. A very dangerous mood of complacency is prevailing in the country. I would utter a mild warning that this is a very dangerous complacency and it is better that we open our eyes sooner than later.

Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (Dr. A. SUBBA RAO): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Saturday, the 16th June 1962.