

THE SUGAR (REGULATION OF PRODUCTION) RULES, 1962 AND AMENDMENT THEREIN

DR. P. S. DESHMUKH: Sir, on behalf of Shri A. M. Thomas, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Food), under section 7 of the Sugar (Regulation of Production) Act, 1961:—

- (i) Notification G.S.R. No. 72 dated the 15th January, 1962, publishing the Sugar (Regulation of Production) Amendment Rules, 1962.
- (ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 218, dated the 14th February, 1962, publishing the Sugar (Regulation of Production) Amendment Rules, 1962.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3478/62 for (i) and (ii).]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO DR. A. R. MUDALIAR AND SHRIMATI RUKMANI BAI

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the following letter dated the 8th March, 1962, has been received from Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:

"I am leaving on the 12th March, for Geneva, to attend a meeting of the Committee on Conventions and Recommendations of the International Labour Organisation. It is expected that the work of the Committee will be completed by the end of March. I shall therefore be unable to attend the Session of the Rajya Sabha. May I request you and my colleagues to give me leave of absence for this session?"

Is it the pleasure of the House that Permission be granted to Dr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

No hon. Member dissented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

I have also to inform Members that the following letter dated the 9th March, 1962, has been received from Shrimati Rukmani Bai:

"I submit that I have just now received summons for the Rajya Sabha Session commencing on the 12th March, 1962. I am unable to attend this Session due to long illness. I therefore request you to grant me leave of absence for whole of the current session."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Shrimati Rukmani Bai for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session?

No hon. Member dissented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued.

श्री पी० सी० सेठी (मध्य प्रदेश) : माननीय सभापति महोदय, कल मैं, निवेदन कर रहा था कि भोपाल में हेवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स की जो हड़ताल हुई थी, वह एक चुनावी हड़ताल थी। इस सम्बन्ध में माननीय लेबर कोर्ट ने जो फैसला दिया है, उसको बहुत ही संक्षेप में मैं आपके सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ :

"...while admitting the application of the management for the declaration of the strike as illegal, it has remarked that the entire action of the trade-union and other employees of the project in resorting to strike is illegal, unwarranted, indefensible and against the interests of national productivity and cannot be sustained on any reasoning."

यह इस बात को साबित करता है कि भोपाल के अन्दर चुनाव को दृष्टिगत रखते हुए यह हड़ताल आयोजित की गई थी और केवल यही नहीं, बल्कि आम तौर पर हमारे साम्यवादी साथियों के द्वारा, जो बड़ी-बड़ी श्रृंखलाएं भारी उद्योगों की कायम हुई हैं, उनमें इस प्रकार की कार्यवाही की जाती है। भिलाई के अंदर जहां एक तरफ इतना भारी उद्योग कायम हुआ, वहां उसके साथ-साथ कामगरों को भी सहूलियतें मिलीं। उन्हें अच्छी आसाइशें और पगार की और रहने की सुविधाएं आदि प्राप्त हुईं। भिलाई के अंदर क्या हुआ, यह भी छिपा हुआ नहीं है।

भोपाल में भी यदि कोई जाकर देखे, तो मालूम होगा कि एक समय जहां पर वीराना था, आज वहां कितनी बड़ी फैक्टरी काम कर रही है और कितनी मुष और सुविधा वहां काम करने वाले कामगरों को है? लेकिन इसके बावजूद भी भोपाल के अंदर आये दिन हड़तालें आयोजित की जाती हैं। माना कि जो कामगर हैं, उनको जितनी भी सुविधाएं चाहियें, वे आज हमारे देश में पूर्ण रूप से उपलब्ध नहीं हैं, लेकिन इसके बावजूद भोपाल के अंदर यदि कोई जाकर देखे, तो मालूम होगा कि रहने की आसाइशें हैं, अस्पताल हैं, स्कूल हैं और अच्छी तनख्वाहें हैं। वहां टेक्नीशियन्स और इंजीनियर्स इतने बड़े पैमाने पर काम कर रहे हैं। इतने बड़े कारखाने में आये दिन हड़ताल करवाना, इससे देश के उत्पादन को कितना नुकसान होता है, यह हाल ही में लोक सभा में माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने जो आंकड़े दिये हैं, उनसे जाहिर है। उस कारखाने में पच्चीस, अट्ठाईस दिन तक हड़ताल हुई और उसके कारण उत्पादन की दृष्टि से जो नुकसान हुआ, वह सरकार को

लगभग तीस-पैंतीस लाख रुपये पड़ा। इस प्रकार सरकारी उद्योगों में हड़ताल कराने की जो नीति है, उसके बारे में माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में कुछ भी संकेत नहीं किया और यह एक दुःख का विषय है। लेकिन आप देखेंगे कि हमारे इन भाइयों की एक नीति है कि चाहे निजी उद्योग हों, चाहे सरकारी उद्योग हों, उनमें वे इस प्रकार की कार्यवाही करते रहते हैं। हम देखते हैं कि जहां देश में इस समय एक ओर उद्योगों की इतनी बड़ी श्रृंखला कायम हो रही है, जैसे दुर्गापुर और भिलाई में हैं, वहां बजाय इसके कि लोगों के अन्दर संतोष व्याप्त हो, आये दिन वहां एक प्रकार का गुस्सा और एक प्रकार से लोगों को भड़काने की नीति के अनुसार काम किया जाता है और उससे देश के उत्पादन को भारी नुकसान होता है।

मैं इन साथियों से पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या आज चीन में ऐसी दशा उत्पन्न हो गई है कि वहां कामगरों की कोई मांग बाक़ी ही नहीं रह गई है और सारी की सारी मांगें पूरी हो चुकी हैं और उनके लिये जिस प्रकार के स्वर्ग की कल्पना की जाती है, उस प्रकार का स्वर्ग कायम हो चुका है? लेकिन चीन में हड़तालें नहीं होती हैं, चीन में हड़ताल करने की बात नहीं कही जाती है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि साम्यवादी रूप में क्रांति के बाद कितने हड़तालों के नारे लगे और जिन लोगों ने हड़ताल के नारे लगाये, उन लोगों का क्या हथ हुआ और उनके साथ किस प्रकार का व्यवहार किया गया? ये तमाम चीजें हैं, जिनकी ओर हमें ध्यान देना है। लेकिन हमारे देश में यह हो रहा है कि जलूस निकाले जाते हैं, सरकारी उद्योगों और सरकारी रेलों पर, सरकारी ट्रामों पर, आये दिन पत्थर फेंके जाते हैं और

[श्री पी० सी० सैठी]

कारखानों में हड़ताल कराने की योजनाएं बनायी जाती हैं। जब शांति स्थापित करने के लिये पुलिस कोई कार्यवाही करती है, तब फिर हाय-हाय मचायी जाती है और यह कहा जाता है कि पुलिस ज्यादाती कर रही है।

माननीय सभापति महोदय, जब हेवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स में हड़ताल की गयी और वहां शांति स्थापित करने के लिये जब पुलिस ने एक-दो बार कदम उठाया, तो न केवल भोपाल में, बल्कि सारे मध्य प्रदेश में जहां-जहां साम्यवादी दल के द्वारा समर्थित लोग चुनाव लड़ रहे थे, वहां-वहां उन लोगों ने पुलिस की उस कार्यवाही को लेकर जलूस निकाले और आंदोलन किया कि पुलिस हमारे साथ बड़ी सक्ती का व्यवहार कर रही है। पुलिस को इस प्रकार का व्यवहार नहीं करना चाहिये। वह कोई निजो उद्योग नहीं है और अगर वहां पर कोई नुक्सान होता है, तो वह किसी व्यक्ति की व्यक्तिगत सम्पत्ति का नुक्सान नहीं है, बल्कि राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति का नुक्सान है। ऐसी पूरत में जो इस प्रकार की कार्यवाही की जाती है, उसको रोकना और उसके खिलाफ जनमत जाग्रत करना इस सदन में और सदन के बाहर हर व्यक्ति का कर्तव्य है, ताकि इस प्रकार की कार्यवाहियां, जो हमारे मित्र इस देश के अंदर आये दिन किया करते हैं, वे न हों और लोगों का ध्यान उस तरफ से उठ-कर दूसरे निर्माणकारी कार्यों में लगे। इसका यह मतलब नहीं है कि वैधानिक तरीके से या वैध तरीके से कामगरों की जो मांगें हैं, उनकी तरफ ध्यान न दिया जाये और उस संबंध में कोई कार्यवाही न की जाये। लेकिन जब देश एक संकट की स्थिति में हो तब इस प्रकार के उपायों का अवलंबन करना वांछनीय नहीं है।

इस संबंध में मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि पिछली दफा हम देख चुके हैं कि सारे देश में आवश्यक सेवाओं में, जैसे रेलवे आदि में, हड़ताल कराने की योजनाएं बनाई गई थीं जब कि हमारे देश पर आक्रामक कार्यवाहियां हो रही थीं और हमारी सीमाओं पर खतरा था और हमारे नौजवान उस खतरे का सामना करने के लिये वहां पर मौजूद थे। उस समय अगर देशव्यापी हड़ताल हुई होती और उनमें रेलें और तमाम प्रकार के प्रावागमन के साधन बन्द हो जाते, तो हमारे देश की क्या स्थिति होती। यह विचार करने का प्रश्न है। इस दृष्टि से आप देखेंगे कि इस प्रकार की जो कार्यवाही की जाती है, यह नितांत अनुचित है और उसकी पूरी रोकथाम होनी चाहिये।

माननीय सभापति महोदय, दूसरी बात जिसकी तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं और आपकी भाषित सदन और सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं, वह यह है कि माननीय राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने आम चुनाव की शांतिपूर्ण समाप्ति पर जो सतोष प्रकट किया है, वह अपनी जगह उचित है। उन्होंने ठीक ही कहा है कि हमने अपने लिये एक उदाहरण स्थापित किया है और अप्रत्यक्ष रूप से लोकतन्त्रात्मक शासन-प्रणाली में संसार की आस्था को बढ़ाया है। यह वास्तव में एक बहुत ही उचित बात है। जब एक तरफ एशिया के अन्दर हम चारों तरफ नज़र उठा कर देखते हैं और भारत के चारों ओर भी नज़र उठा कर देखते हैं, तो हम यह पाते हैं कि वहां पर प्रजातन्त्र और जम्हूरियत गिर रही है। साथ ही अफ्रीका में हाल ही में नवोदित स्वतन्त्र राष्ट्रों में जिस प्रकार प्रजातन्त्र की हत्या हो रही है, उसको भी हम देखते हैं। ऐसी सुरत में भारतवर्ष में तृतीय आम चुनावों का

शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से सम्पन्न होना और इतने बड़े पैमाने पर २१ करोड़ मतदाताओं का चुनाव में भाग लेना, यह प्रजातंत्र की एक जबरदस्त सफलता है और इससे न केवल भारतवर्ष में प्रजातन्त्र में आस्था बढ़ी है, बल्कि भारतवर्ष के आसपास जहाँ लोग प्रजातंत्र को एक अच्छी शासन प्रणाली मानते हैं, वहाँ भी लोगों की आस्था प्रजातंत्र के अन्दर बढ़ी है। ऐसी सूरत में राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने चुनावों के शांतिपूर्ण सम्पन्न होने की दृष्टि से जो एक संतोष व्यक्त किया है, वह अपनी जगह ठीक है और उसमें हमको खुशी मनाने की आवश्यकता है। साथ ही जिन लोगों ने चुनावों की व्यवस्था के अन्दर बहुत अच्छे तरीके से काम किया और चुनावों की व्यवस्था को सम्पन्न कराने के लिये दिन रात मेहनत की, वे लोग भी हम सबकी तरफ से धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में चुनाव को लेकर कतिपय बातें और कतिपय आलोचनाएँ इस सदन में की गई हैं। एक बात तो यह कही गई है कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने जो अपने अभिभाषण में यह कहा कि चुनाव के परिणाम-स्वरूप मेरी सरकार को अपनी आन्तरिक तथा विदेश नीतियों के प्रति विशेष विश्वास प्राप्त हुआ है, यह उनको नहीं कहना चाहिये था। ऐसा इस सदन में कहा गया है। दूसरी बात यह कही गई है कि इस चुनाव में कांग्रेस पार्टी ने बहुत व्यय किया है और तीसरी बात यह कही गई है कि चुनाव के नतीजों से यह जाहिर हुआ है कि कांग्रेस को जनता का पूरा विश्वास प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है।

माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने भाषण में जो यह कहा कि चुनाव के परिणाम-स्वरूप उनकी सरकार को—जिसका कि वह प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं—अपनी आन्तरिक और विदेशी नीतियों के प्रति जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त हुआ है, वह कोई अनुचित

बात नहीं कही है; क्योंकि सभापति महोदय, मान लीजिये कि केन्द्र के अन्दर कांग्रेस पार्टी को बहुमत प्राप्त नहीं होता और ऐसी दशा में यदि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में यह कहा जाता कि मेरी सरकार को जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है, तो क्या माननीय सदस्य, श्री भूपेश गुप्त, उस बात का विरोध करते? मैं मानता हूँ कि उस बात का वह कदापि विरोध नहीं करते? लेकिन जब राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने अपने अभिभाषण में यह बात कही कि मेरी सरकार की नीतियों को जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त हुआ है तो उसको अनुचित बताते हुए उन्होंने अपनी एक व्यवस्था दे दी और यह कहा कि उनको यह नहीं कहना चाहिये था। वास्तव में राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I did not say that. I said that the President's Address says that a great majority of the people have supported. I pointed out that only 46 per cent. had voted for the Congress; the majority did not vote. I want that correction to be made, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The President did not say, if I remember right, "majority". The President only said "a significant.."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir, he said, "great majority of the people". Sir, otherwise, I would not disturb the President unnecessarily. If this correction is made, it is all right.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): His colleague, Mr. Ramamurti, said that.

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : माननीय सभापति महोदय, रामामूर्ती जी ने जो बात कही थी उसका समर्थन श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी ने भी यहां किया था।

माननीय सभापति महोदय, जहां तक खर्च का प्रश्न है, यह बात कही गई है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने बहुत खर्चा किया है और इस प्रकार से यहां प्रजातंत्र स्थापित नहीं हो सकता है। यहां कतिपय महानुभावों ने यह भी कहा कि जब इस देश की औसत आमदनी ३७५ रुपये हो, तब यदि इस प्रकार के भारी भरकम खर्चें चुनाव में किये जायेंगे, तो फिर प्रजातंत्र कैसे जीवित रह सकता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यदि ३७५ रुपया वार्षिक आमदनी वालों का प्रतिनिधित्व इस प्रकार से करने का अगर उनका इरादा हो, तो फिर इस सदन में कैसे यह सवाल पैदा करने की बात उनके लिये ठीक होती है; क्योंकि उनकी आमदनी ३७५ रुपया है और जो उनका प्रतिनिधित्व करने का दावा करते हैं उनकी, मैं समझता हूं कि माह में उनसे अधिक आमदनी और खर्चा है। तो यह प्रश्न इस प्रकार से उपस्थित नहीं होता है। ८ हजार रुपये की जो सीमा निश्चित की गई है, जो कि उसकी अधिकतम सीमा है, उतना ही कांग्रेस पार्टी ने सब जगह खर्च किया हो, यह कोई जरूरी नहीं है। मुझे अपने ही जिले के बारे में और अन्यत्र कई स्थानों के बारे में ऐसा विश्वसनीय जानकारी है कि जहां पर दो-दो या तीन-तीन हजार रुपये में असेम्बली के चुनाव लड़े गये हैं और इस प्रकार से कम खर्चों के अन्दर भी चुनावों की व्यवस्था हुई है। हां, कतिपय जगहों में काफ़ी ज्यादा खर्चें हुये हैं, वहां ८ हजार रुपये तक भी हुए होंगे, लेकिन, कोई यह नहीं कह सकता है कि साम्यवादी पार्टी के लोगों और उनके द्वारा समर्थित लोगों ने इस प्रकार के खर्चें नहीं किये हैं। इंदौर में श्री राम सिंह से साम्यवादी समर्थित उम्मीदवार ने चुनाव लड़ा है और उसमें उनका बे-हिसाब खर्चा हुआ है। जितनी मोटर गाड़ियां राम सिंह जी के पास थीं, उतनी ही साम्यवादी समर्थित उम्मीदवार के पास भी थीं। गांव-गांव में उनकी भी जीपें थीं। चन्दा अगर कांग्रेस को मिला है,

तो उनको भी मिला है, हां, चाहे उनके पास चन्दा कहां से आता है, इसका कोई हिसाब न रहा हो, लेकिन यह कहना कि साम्यवादी पार्टी को चन्दा नहीं मिलता है और कांग्रेस को मिलता है, ठीक नहीं है। कांग्रेस को जो चन्दा मिलता है, उसका हिसाब रहता है और जो इनको चन्दा मिलता है, उसका कोई हिसाब नहीं रहता है। तो जो यह कहा जाता है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी चन्दा लेकर के चुनाव लड़ती है, यह महज कांग्रेस को बदनाम करने की दृष्टि से आक्षेप लगाने वाली बात है। वास्तव में कम खर्चों में भी कांग्रेस ने चुनाव लड़े हैं। ऐसे उदाहरण मौजूद हैं, जहां कि साम्यवादी और साम्यवादी समर्थित उम्मीदवारों ने बमुकाबिले कांग्रेस उम्मीदवारों के काफ़ी खर्चें किये हैं तो इस प्रकार की जो बात कही जाती है, वह उचित नहीं है।

तीसरी बात, सभापति महोदय .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: Thank you, Sir.

SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, I consider it a proud privilege to be able to place before you and this House some ideas about the gracious Address delivered to both the Houses of Parliament by the President. The first subject on which I would like to address you is about planning and the importance of agriculture in planning. It is an undeniable fact that ours is a predominantly agricultural country and if we concentrate on agriculture many of our foreign exchange problems will be greatly reduced. Our exportable articles are only those which we used to export in the past and the income derived from the export of those commodities has not shown any marked increase with the result that it is not possible for us to pay for the heavy imports that we are making

for the purposes of industrial development. Therefore, Sir, I would urge the Government . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have not even been able to export our Princes. They are now for domestic consumption!

SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN: I would urge that greater emphasis should be laid on agricultural produce. We can be self-sufficient in our dairy products; we can improve our cattle wealth. If we do that, our milk-products would be such that we may be able to export them all over the world. Take into consideration, Sir, a small country like New Zealand or some of the other countries where they produce milk-products and export them right up to 7,000, 8,000 or even 10,000 miles and beyond. Now, ours is a very large country and nature has no doubt richly endowed us with very fine pastures which can be developed. We have hill tracts and we have fertile lands where we can grow every kind of fodder. If we utilise our capacity to grow food for our cattle then it is possible to increase our dairy products and if we do that we may be able to export them and earn foreign exchange. I submit that it is important that this aspect of the agricultural progress of the country should be given due consideration. I do not say that it has not been given due consideration. I was myself a member of a committee in my own State and we have made some recommendations in the State of Uttar Pradesh. They are being implemented but the wish is that in the implementation of those recommendations more energy should be imported. We are grateful to the Minister sitting here in charge of Agriculture for whatever he is doing. I trust that whatever I am saying now will be further incentive to him to do something more.

(*Interruption by Shri Bhupesh Gupta*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You do not even stand up to interrupt. That is not right.

SHRI AKHTAR HUSAIN: The subject on which I am going to address is something which concerns him and that is about strikes and the holding up of production in our industrial establishments. If we can only get the co-operation of the Leader of the Communist Group and his followers, inside and outside, to prevent the holding up of production in these industrial enterprises by necessary strikes, we may be able to produce more and have self sufficiency and surplus in our country to be able to export to places outside our own country and earn a little more of foreign exchange.

The next point on which I would like to address you is about Goa. We are deeply grateful to the Government for having incorporated Goa in the Indian Union. It was a great achievement and it is comparable with no other achievement in the international field. We did it with the least amount of bloodshed and in a manner which shows great credit to the way in which we proceeded about this business. The Portuguese had very powerful friends; they had their colonial friends in other countries with whom we are on very friendly relations and we had to tread this ground very carefully. And I am happy that the Prime Minister has been able to make a gift to the second Parliament of free India of Goa. It is to be compared with the great integration of the Princely States which was done immediately after the attainment of independence. That was a great achievement and I submit that the House must place on record its grateful thanks to the Government for having brought about the integration of Goa with the motherland.

Sir, there is something to be said about another neighbour, Nepal. I am very grateful to the Prime Minister for the manner in which he is trying to encourage the people of Nepal to cast off some of their suspicions which must have been created by people who are interested in

[Shri Akhtar Husain.]

seeing that Nepal and India do not get on well together. The recent statement of the Prime Minister has been well received by the Nepalese and they have expressed their high appreciation of the conciliatory attitude. Of course, our Government's attitude has all the time been conciliatory towards the Nepalese. We know that the Nepalese are our own kith and kin and that some interested parties have been trying to create bad blood but I trust that when the reported visit of the King of Nepal takes place the Prime Minister will be able to explain things to him and our cordiality with that ancient kingdom who are so close to us will be restored.

With these words I express my thanks to the President for the gracious Address that he has delivered and I hope that the country's relations with foreign Powers will continue to improve, our industrial peace will be established, our agricultural produce redoubled and the country would be on the right road to prosperity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, before the Prime Minister speaks we have a small submission to make. I am very glad that the Prime Minister will be replying to the debate but during the last two days when we were discussing the Prime Minister was not present. I think it is not a good practice. The Minister who replies to the debate, even if it be the Prime Minister, should make it convenient to attend and to listen to the debate. I know that he would have read . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has read the proceedings.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . the proceedings but parliamentary practice is parliamentary practice. That is what I point out to you. Now, it is for you to consider it. As I said,

I am glad that the Prime Minister will be replying to the debate. We welcome it but at the same time we would have very much liked, we would have appreciated it better, if he had been here to listen to the debate at least for part of the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes; Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, what the hon. Member opposite has just said, I fear, has a certain relevance but I would like to assure him that I could not come here because I was engaged in the other House but I have taken the trouble of reading through most of the speeches delivered in this House in the course of the last two days. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Especially Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: . . . especially Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's. I confess, after reading his speech and after reading the vast number of amendments which he has proposed, it has left an impression of great confusion in my mind and it seems to me that instead of dealing with the major things, referred to in the President's Address, that have been happening in the country, he is obsessed by some idea that in Kerala something has happened which necessitates some kind of change.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The same obsession from which the Prime Minister suffered two years ago!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I am afraid his idea of parliamentary government is somewhat limited.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Sir. I follow the same standard the Prime

Minister laid down in 1959. Tell me where I am wrong.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: None of his large number of amendments relating to Kerala or indeed the others too have any relevance at all at the present moment. I do not propose to discuss Kerala. Matters are decided either by a majority in this House or a majority in the Assembly there obviously. His saying that at a particular election the number of votes cast should be seen and should determine the future of the State is rather extraordinary; it puts an end to parliamentary government. It may be one does not know why votes are cast. There are many reasons why they are cast. In the present instance, taking the elections as a whole, one would say that the success of the Congress Members coming to the Lok Sabha has been remarkable, astounding.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Where. in Kerala also?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: Everywhere; I am talking about India And people not very well disposed to us have said so in every country where they have seen all these figures. It is astonishing but the point is even here one sees that votes are cast in Assembly elections often for domestic reasons, local affairs, local matters, personalities. In regard to general policies the votes for the Lok Sabha are supposed to be more important. They may be also, and they are no doubt, affected by many factors but the general policies are governed by the Lok Sabha and it has so often happened, as it has happened in this particular election, that many persons have been returned to the Lok Sabha while from the same area some people opposed to those who have been returned to the Lok Sabha have been returned to the Assembly because different considerations apply. It is impossible to analyse all these considerations why votes are cast and if

they are analysed what result flows. It puts an end to parliamentary government if we do not take the result in India or in a State as represented in the Assembly or Parliament and proceed accordingly.

Now, Sir, this session of Parliament is called by various names—as it has been used in America—lame duck, etc., but it is rather, shall I say, extraordinary that the President should have delivered an Address to this session and maybe within a month or so shall deliver another Address to the new Parliament. In view of our Constitution at present that was inevitable. Obviously, it would have been better if he had delivered one Address instead of two but the Constitution says that at the first meeting of the Parliament in the year he must deliver an Address and obviously it is desirable that when the new Parliament meets he should also deliver an Address. So within a month we are going to have two Addresses from the President. Now, there is no harm of course in the President delivering two Addresses or as many as may be necessary but I am merely pointing out that the Constitution compels us to do this although it may not be wholly necessary.

Now, the present Address which the President has delivered and which, of course, I need hardly remind the House represents the views of Government, has necessarily to deal with past events. To some extent it refers to the future too, but much more to what has happened in the past. One may discuss the past here. One may disagree with what the President has said about some facts or figures that are given. It is after all a question of facts and figures. And naturally, as I said, the Address represents the Government's views on the various subjects dealt within this Address. The Address has dealt with a number of matters relating to foreign affairs and to domestic affairs. In regard to domes-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

tic affairs certain facts have been given about the growth in agriculture, industry and other matters. I suppose the House will accept those facts because they are facts. But it is always open to any Member to say that we have not gone fast enough or some wrong tendencies have arisen in the country and it will be fairly easy for any one to find out lacunae and faults in the working of the administration during the last year or more, because there are plenty of lacunae and plenty of things which we do not like.

If you look at the whole problem of India, it is obviously a tremendous problem, a colossal problem, the number of people, the objective before us of raising all these 440 million people to a certain level, higher level of living, to get rid of their poverty, etc. It is a tremendous problem, which depends certainly on the policies of the Government, certainly also on the reaction of those policies on the people, that is, how far the people themselves labour to put an end to those evils. No amount of Government action can put an end to them, unless the people co-operate. Almost this would be applicable to any government and more especially in a democratic government it just cannot be done. And it is a matter of satisfaction that the people have co-operated in a large measure in these measures, in these steps that the Government has taken, not sometimes as much as we would have liked, because one fundamental thing must be borne in mind. Our progress is governed not by enactments, by Government's measures—although it may be affected by them—but by the hard labour put in by the nation. It does not matter who is there in the Government, if hard labour is not put in, the country will not go ahead, and that applies to any policy, any country, socialist, communist or capitalist or whatever it may be. It is the labour that counts in the end and

determines the direction in which we go. Obviously the Government can give a certain direction, but the fulfilment, the implementation of that policy partly depends on Government's action but largely on popular action. That is why in all the reports of the Planning Commission stress has been laid on popular co-operation or whatever the words used there are. That is one of the main reasons why Panchayati Raj has been instituted which decentralises power to a certain extent and gives the people, the millions of people in the villages, the panchas and the panchayats, considerable authority, and what is more important gives them a sense of participating in this great adventure, a sense of doing things which they want to do. These questions, therefore, become, apart from the political aspect and the economic aspect, huge psychological problems, how to affect vast numbers of people, how to make them feel that their future is concerned with this, that it depends on what they do and so on and so forth. It is no easy matter to make hundreds of millions of people function in this way.

Now, I may mention one fact that forcefully came up before my mind during the recent election tour that I made of India; it was an intensive tour largely within three and a half weeks. Within that period I covered the whole of India, in a sense from Kashmir, Jammu rather, to Kerala and I had this picture of India before me in a concentrated way within a short time. Of course, I travel otherwise too. There are many impressions that I derived, many favourable impressions and some unfavourable. One thing that I specially noticed was that the areas in India, which used to suffer from the big zamindari, big taluqdari and jagirdari systems, had not picked up quickly enough. Although those systems are no more—the zamindari, jagirdari and taluqdari—they have so influenced the people that it is not easy for

them to pick up quickly. They are picking up slowly. In the other areas, what might be called in the old days as the ryotwari areas, they are picking up much more rapidly. It shows how a certain land tenure system, a certain organisation of the people has an effect on them, and they have suffered for ages past from this big landlord system. They cannot easily get out of it. It affected the elections. I am not talking of the result of the elections, but one could see the fear of those people. They were not quite confident that they should do as they wanted to do. So, the problem of India, apart from the important things that we discuss here, the direction in which we should go, the objectives to be aimed at, the steps to be taken towards that end, becomes fundamentally of pulling out vast numbers of people from ways and habits of mind which are out of date today. I do not want them to lose their contacts with their own country or the past. Of course, not. We would cease to be Indians if we did that and we would lose something very valuable, but maintaining the past contacts and keeping their feet on the soil, they have to adapt themselves to the modern world. In the smallest things, whether it is a plough they use, they have to use a better plough. They do not and you will see again that in the zamindari areas they do not use better ploughs. In the other areas they do use it. It is just because they have more spirit in them. They have not been crushed so much by these past systems under which they have suffered. This is a tremendous problem.

It is very easy to make a long list of the failings in the country, of the Government's failings or failings of the administration, but one has to look at these matters in a comprehensive way, see what the trends are. Most of the trends are good in this country. Some are bad. There is no doubt that the country is progressing, agriculturally, industrially, educationally, economically. There is no doubt about it. Well, you may say that it

should progress even more. Well I agree with you that it should progress even more. Nobody can challenge that. But it is progressing and progressing well. I would go further and say that it is set on going along a certain path and even if Governments—whatever the Governments may be—make a large number of mistakes, nobody can divert it from that path. I have no doubt about it, because generally people have begun to realise that that is the path. It may be delayed. It may be obstructed, but it is bound to go there. If we say that the path is industrialisation, well it is going to be industrialisation, whatever some people may think about it. If it is towards a larger measure of socialism, I have no doubt that it will go that way. One may differ as to the measure of socialism, as to the pace, but it is bound to go that way. There are certain features in the situation in India which nobody can challenge, whether he likes them or not. So far as education is concerned, one may say that there is not enough education in the country, and yet the impression I got during my tour was of the tremendous pace of increase of schools all over. Everywhere I went I saw schools. The schools may not be too good, possibly not, but it makes a vast difference to have these schools of these children in uniforms, some kind of uniform, smart looking, well fed and generally cheerful, to the previous conditions when they wandered about the streets and did nothing at all. I think it is one of the biggest revolutionary changes that are coming about in India. All these things have revolutionary significance, whether it is education or whether it is Panchayati Raj. They may change here and there. Panchayati Raj is a mighty experiment. It might not succeed all over India, in every part of India, but the conception is a tremendous one, and it is succeeding somewhere and it will succeed in the major part of India. You can pick out here and there and say that it has not succeeded. Some Panchas might have misbehaved as anybody has

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

misbehaved. Even an exalted person like a Member of Parliament might misbehave.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Even members of the Government.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU
Even, if I may say so, a member of the Communist Party might misbehave. I would beg of the House to consider this entire background, this enormous country with an enormous population on the move, on the move in a certain direction which I think is the right direction. Many people stumble and fall. Many people make mistakes. Many people betray the objective we aim at. All this is happening, and yet the whole trend is forward and in the right direction. What we are rather worried about is the pace of change, because there are certain trends here in India and many trends in the world which may create difficulties for us unless the pace is faster, fast enough. That is the main problem. I do not think there are many many people, there may be some of course, who challenge the whole trend of India at the present moment which way it is going. They may criticise many aspects of it, many failures. In fact I would say that the main thing we have to look after is not so much in the present stage the different policies—we have laid down policies—but the implementation of those policies, the carrying them out, because there is always this danger, and perhaps the danger is greater in India than elsewhere, of our thinking that when we lay down a policy, it will automatically be implemented and it will go ahead, not realising that implementation is essential. Writing or delivering a speech and laying down high policies is not adequate. That is an important thing of course, but in the implementation and otherwise too we may make the policies a little fuller of content and improve them here and there. But the real importance is giving a full body to what we have laid down.

May I say here too, and here I agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta on his amendments that this election has brought out as indeed they were before there too the fact of various fissiparous tendencies in India, various communal tendencies in India, which I think is very bad for the country. There are many other things that are bad I think, but this thing I particularly think is bad because it tends to promote certain primitive instincts in us, a certain habit of mind which has been there for a long time, which comes up in different forms, and now it seeks to come up in a political form which is bad. But nevertheless looking at it again, the whole picture, take these elections on this enormous scale. It is really extraordinary how these vast elections have been conducted. There have been errors, there have been mistakes, there may have been misdeeds, but taking all in all it is extraordinary how peacefully and well they have been conducted, and the mere organisational part of these elections was tremendous, and I think those who are responsible for this organisation deserve great credit for it. Look at this again in the context of things that are happening in the world and round about our own country. Is there another country in Asia—indeed I would go further, I would include Europe too and other parts of the world—which presents such an example as India did during these elections? In Asia of course there is hardly a country which has elections. Whether good elections or bad they do not have them, and it is unfortunate that this should be so. But in spite of this general trend in Asia that we should function in a normal way and in such a big way and carry it out and do it tolerably well is something which has struck the world greatly, struck even the many people, many of our critics in the world, and made them realise with a certain measure of admiration how India is carrying on.

Now, Sir, in regard to foreign affairs or in regard to anything, the

most important today, I have no doubt, is disarmament looking at it from a world point of view, because if there is no disarmament, the world will naturally drift more and more towards conflict, towards war, and undoubtedly if there is war, it will be a nuclear war, and possibly a war like that brought on without even a declaration of war. Today the major fear of big countries—small countries are also afraid of it, but they have no choice anyway—the major fear is a surprise nuclear attack. All their policies are based on preventing a nuclear attack or even a surprise attack and, if it takes place, to survive adequately to be able to give, to return that attack and to wipe off the other country. These are the basic policies when they consider the problem of disarmament. Today, therefore, disarmament has become a question not of reducing armament by 10 per cent. or 15 per cent. or 20 or 25 per cent. If this basic fear remains, it does not matter how much you reduce it, because it does not require, as the figures are given, thousands of nuclear bombs possessed by the big nuclear Powers; a quarter of them are enough to wipe off the world or wipe off another country. So, one has to deal with this disarmament question always keeping in view this tremendous fear of the other party attacking, giving a surprise attack, and if it does give a surprise attack, it should not succeed in wiping off this country so that it can retaliate in a bigger way. It is a rather inhuman way of looking at things when the calculations are made quite calmly, even putting down that a hundred million people will die in the first twenty-four hours but after the hundred million another hundred million will remain and how can they so function as to destroy two hundred million of the other side.

12 Noon This type of calculation goes on. It really is amazing how very able persons devoted to the progress of the world can think quiet-

ly in terms of one hundred million people dying and this leading to the destruction of two hundred million people on the other side. It is obvious that in a war like this, quite apart from the tremendous destruction involved, the world will be quite different afterwards. Nobody can say who will win or who will lose. It is totally immaterial as to who is supposed to win or who is supposed to lose. But everybody is supposed to lose. The world will lose, and the world will be completely different. If you imagine several hundred millions of people being liquidated or destroyed with practically all the centres of civilisation destroyed, well, the world will be very different. It will neither be a capitalist world nor a communist world nor anything, it will be something entirely different. Maybe it may go back to thousands or hundreds of years and lead some kind of a primitive existence.

For all these reasons, disarmament has become a very vital and urgent problem, and this conference that is being held in Geneva, the 18-member conference, is of the highest importance. It is important not only because the subject is important but the manner of holding it. I mean to say, the succession of events which has led to it has invested a great importance to it. If this fails, then it will not be easy to come back to it. Some time or the other the world will have to come to disarmament—there is no doubt—unless it destroys itself beforehand. But failure in this conference will be, well, very harmful for the future of the world, and the immediate result will be those major Powers trying their best not to disarm but to arm themselves further to experiment with nuclear weapons to find out, to have greater information about them, so as to meet the perils which they consider will come from the other party. And it is not much good blaming either party because I am quite convinced that the major countries—

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
and, of course, the minor ones also—want disarmament, want peace. It is not that they object to it. But the fear that any steps taken by them may put the other party in an advantageous position prevents them from taking those steps. On the whole, I think that we need not lose hope. We need not be too optimistic because too much of optimism makes one complacent, and the position is not one which leads to complacency. But the fact remains that there is some reason for hope because all the people—the governments and the people—are beginning to realise more and more the consequences of this kind of war.

If I may say so, the worst possible approach to this question, as to every other question, is the approach of the cold war. Fear and hatred are the necessary results of that approach. It is not through that approach that any successful result will be found out. But you cannot put an end to it because the cold war itself is a result of that. Risks have to be taken. And the greatest risk of all is not to have disarmament, not to come to an agreement about these matters. But naturally, the risks that are taken are to be calculated risks and I think that if once the corner is turned and there is progress towards disarmament, the pace might well be fairly rapid. Therefore, I attach the greatest importance to it, and it is for this reason that we have sent a very strong team to this conference. To begin with, it was proposed, as the House will remember, that this would begin with a meeting of the heads of the Governments or the States. I think there was a great deal in that suggestion, that is to say, to emphasise the importance of this, to draw the world's attention to it, and presuming that those people would be free, would have their authority to come to an agreement, it might have facilitated an agreement. And I still think it is desirable for them to

meet. But I am not quite sure if at this early stage, to begin with, it should take place or whether it is better for them to meet somewhat later. In any event, it was not at all possible for me to go because of these elections and this Parliament meeting. Today, in fact, the conference is meeting. How could I go during this situation in India when Parliament is meeting? So, I expressed my inability to go. I saw the force of the argument which led to that proposal being made, and I suggested that perhaps I might be able to go at the end of April or in May.

Now, if by any chance the world can agree to disarmament, it will then colour our thinking in regard to all problems—the world's thinking—because this covers every problem. Take a simple problem like Goa. Of course, Goa is out of the picture as a problem. But the whole trouble about Goa has been that Portugal was a part of the NATO alliance, and Portugal had provided some important bases to the NATO Powers in the Atlantic Ocean and this no doubt governed their thinking. They could not take any steps against Portugal because they might lose those bases especially, and other considerations also came in. Now, if this question of always being prepared for war is not present in the minds of nations, it will lead them to think of colonial territories, such as remain, differently. Today hardly any colony is valued as a colony because people know a large number of them have become free. But even those that are not free—excepting the Portuguese colonies which have to be put in a special category by themselves—are not important, so important, from the point of view of political or economic matters. They are always important from the economic point of view to some extent. But it is not enough. That would not induce people to hold on to them, but what does induce them is the consequence

in a war as to what will happen. If either has got a base there, or they intend, they are afraid that they will fall into the influence of the other party, and this results in some of these Powers sticking on to the remaining colonies. So, all these matters become easier of solution if progress towards disarmament is made. I hope, therefore, that this conference in Geneva will lead to some progress. One cannot suddenly expect it to end with complete agreement. It may take a long time before it comes to that. But I think in the course of the next month or two, it might well indicate which way it is going. I should like the House to remember that in fact, the resolutions of the United Nations agreed to by the parties, chief parties concerned, as well as the individual proposals made on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union are remarkably similar in many respects. It is remarkable that while we talk about these great conflicts and suspicion, how the proposals—although they differ of course—have so much in common—one is surprised that after reading all this about the conflicts he finds so much in common. So there is some hope and I am sure every country will make every effort to make good there.

Now apart from that, in foreign affairs, the references in the hon. Members' speeches have been to China, and to Pakistan especially—naturally they concern us very much more—and I am asked by some hon. Members opposite to say definitely and precisely and rigidly what I shall do about Pakistan or China. Well, I beg to say that it would be the height of folly for any person in authority, or even for a person not in authority, to be exceedingly rigid about the approach to these difficult international problems. I have said—and I shall repeat it—that it will be our endeavour all the time to settle such problems, as we have with Pakistan or such grave frontier

problems that have arisen because of the Chinese incursions into Indian territory, peacefully. But even settling them peacefully may require, it does require a certain strength. We have to build up that strength—we are building it up—and if we cannot settle them peacefully, we shall have to consider what we can do, because it is not at all wise for anyone to think in terms of a major war which might affect the whole world situation apart from our own. But we have to be prepared for everything, and at the same time we should make every effort to settle these things peacefully.

As the House perhaps knows, I have again sent an invitation to the President of Pakistan, which I had originally made a year and a half ago when I went to Pakistan, which was subsequently repeated. I do not pretend to say that our invitation, or his accepting the invitation will suddenly put an end to all our disputes. But it helps, and every step taken will be helpful, because all these problems are not so much of territory here and there, but of a certain psychology that governs a nation's activities.

There is Nepal. We have been much distressed lately about the charges made by Nepalese papers and Nepalese Ministers against India. We have, as a matter of fact, gone a good long way not to interfere in any way in Nepal. We have continued our help to Nepal—our economic help, etc.—fully, as we used to. But the fact remains that there is discontent in Nepal—I cannot say in what measure it is. The fact that it should be so is not surprising having regard to what has happened there, and that discontent has given rise to internal trouble in Nepal—again I cannot say in what measure that is. Now to accuse us of fomenting that trouble is really, it seems to me, very extraordinary. We have said clearly, right from the beginning, that we are not going to interfere, that we will not allow any arms traffic between India and Nepal—any arms to be taken

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]
in—that we will not allow India to be made a base for any kind of armed attack, but subject to all that, the people, that is the Nepalese in India, can function, under the law, under our Constitution, as they like. But if they offend against the law, we shall take steps against them. It is a little difficult for other countries, which have not got the rule of law, to understand this, just like the Chinese who seem to imagine that we can issue orders to all our newspapers to do this or that—which is ridiculous—because they can do so. So, the Nepalese Ministers seem to imagine that we can spirit away, we can arrest anybody, pass orders against him, whether we have any factual proof or not. So, we have written to the Nepalese Government that if they send us any proof of any incident, we can catch hold of the person, we will take action. But they have not sent us anything except vague allegations which, on enquiry, we find to be baseless or grossly exaggerated. Here also the original idea came from the Nepalese Government that the King of Nepal might come here. I welcomed that; I was glad of that and I issued an invitation to him to come. But I have not had a definite reply except vaguely stating that he would like to come—he did not know when. And if he comes, we shall be glad to have talks, because we attach importance to our relations with Nepal being good. We as individuals or as a Government, as both, would like Nepal to progress, and to progress well according to the way that they think best. But we are not going to interfere—it is for the Nepalese to do what they like.

Now, I do not know if I should take much time of the House in regard to internal matters which have been dealt with by the President, and the President has been pleased to say in his Address about the progress made internally, in agriculture, in industry, etc. Those are facts—there is no doubt about it, and I feel personally that in regard to agriculture, to which we have and we do attach the greatest

importance, we have very probably turned the corner; we are doing well; the actual results are fairly good, but the trends are even better, which indicate that the results would be much better later. And again, even in regard to agriculture, we can do much, but finally it comes again to the same old thing, that is, we have to change the minds of hundreds of millions of people in this country, to modernise them to some extent, modernise them in the shape of using better ploughs, better seeds, better this, better that, to have a little self-reliance in them. Of course, Government should help. But to look upon it as a pure matter of Government changing the face of India is not correct. I do not think even in an authoritarian regime that can be done very easily, though of course at a great cost it may be attempted. But it has to go through; it takes time to change their thinking, and I feel that the most important thing is the educational process, and the large number of boys and girls especially, that are going to schools—and many of them will go to colleges—will bring about that change. Meanwhile we should go ahead, and I do not mean to say that it is a question of such education alone. Well, I have seen some very modern peasants and farmers who are totally uneducated—it is not a question of education alone. I never forget my own district of Allahabad and I was criticising their production which was low in the ladder. I regret to say that Allahabad is one of the backward districts in India—it has about 8 or 9 maunds of wheat per acre; when I was criticising it at a meeting, a man got up—that of the Kurmi class, an ordinary old type tenant—peasant now—who said he had produced 50 maunds in one acre of his land—five times practically the average of India—and in other places it has been 60 and gone up to 70 even. So, it is not a question of just school education, although education releases the mind certainly—it helps—but otherwise too. I have often said, my test of agricultural progress in India is: How many people use the new ploughs? That is the question I put

to every farmer that comes to me: "Do you use the new plough?" And all the other paraphernalia is secondary to me; it comes, it helps, but the new plough represents to me a new mind behind that plough, a new awakening to modern methods, and so on. But I do think that is taking place in India and therefore I expect great things.

Now, one thing I should like to say. I think the Finance Minister in the course of his Budget speech said yesterday that I am a great believer in industry, in modern machinery, in heavy industry, being the base from which other forms of industry will grow. But the fact remains that higher standards—if you wish to achieve fairly quick results in achieving higher standards—must come from agriculture, from agricultural growth, because there are some places in India or some States which are full of heavy industry and yet which have the lowest *per capita* income. Heavy industries will no doubt ultimately produce higher incomes, but it will take some time; the places which are high up in our list of *per capita* incomes are the agriculturally good States, not the industrially good States—that has to be remembered, and agriculture, if it improves in that way, immediately results in higher income all round. I can assure the House that no one realises the importance of agricultural progress more than the Government does; we are anxious. It is absolutely no good saying "agriculture first, industry second" because the whole thing has to go together. Agriculture wants modern industry to help it; otherwise it cannot go on. It wants fertilisers and all manner of things. But agriculture is more important, and in dealing with agriculture all this business of Panchayati Raj becomes important not only in itself but because of its effect on agriculture, and co-operatives become important.

In the election and elsewhere there has been a great deal of talk about joint farming, telling people that their land would be taken away by the

Government. It has been rather an unfair practice. A person may be for or against joint farming; we can say so. But how anybody can be against—it passes my comprehension—how anybody can be against what we say that where the people desire it and are willing to have it, they could have it. How anybody can oppose it you cannot imagine because it is left to them to decide. I am convinced that that is the right way, and it is not I alone but many people who have nothing to do with existing politics in India or elsewhere say so because conditions in India are such that with small holdings they cannot be modern-minded unless they function in a larger way, and a larger way can only come through large holdings which we have put an end to. The only other way is to make a large collection of small holdings, which is co-operative farming. And we have said that first of all it can only be done with their consent. Secondly, even if they have consented, it will be open to them at a later stage to draw themselves out of this co-operative union. I cannot understand how anybody can criticise; yet this has been criticised.

I was astonished reading some time ago the speech of Rabindranath Tagore which he delivered in the year 1911 or roundabout at a political conference in Bengal in which he advocated joint farming. There was no political element in it. He did not think of it merely as a method of progress. He said that they could not do anything with small, little holdings. And what is more, he tried to put it into practice in his own zamindari. So, we must look at these things apart from this political conflict. It is unfortunate that people should bring in these matters. It should be considered objectively to which I can see no objection. I can see some objection to people being forced to do it. Well, I think even if it is a good thing the element of psychology will be there that they will not work, they will not do it. I do not want to force them. You cannot force people to work in that manner whole-heartedly. It is

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

left to the people concerned. Even if they agree, they are open to go out of that later. So, there can be no objection to it. So, these are the various things.

But apart from that, multi-purpose co-operation is of the utmost importance, and I entirely agree with the report of the Agricultural Commission appointed, I forget, about thirty years ago by the British Government in India which came to the conclusion that without co-operatives there was no future for the Indian farmer. I agree with it hundred per cent. So, agriculture is going ahead and I hope that the pace will go ever fast.

In regard to industry, small industry has shown remarkable progress, spectacular growth. "Spectacular" is the word used by the World Bank people who are not used to using strong language. They said small industry in India, specially in certain parts of India like the Punjab, parts of the South, had shown "spectacular growth".

Now, the big industrial schemes that we have included in our Third Plan are there for you to see. I believe that it does not matter how much power we produce, we shall always be short of power. There is so much need for power in India that if we devoted all our energies to power production, even then we will be short of it. Power is the key to changing the countryside and to the growth of industry and to everything. We are rather sorry—I am sorry at any rate—that we have not done more for power than we have actually done. Of course, it is increasing and we hope more will be done. In this connection I might point out that atomic energy, looked at from the point of view of power, is becoming more and more feasible and more and more important. From the latest figures I have seen, it is easily comparable to thermal power and sometimes it is cheaper than thermal power. It is not a question of a comparison between the two

But even if we have thermal power, a great deal of it, because of the need to develop power we shall have to use atomic power. For the present we are only having one or two, or maybe three ultimately, atomic power stations. Steel is another thing of which, however much we may produce, we shall be short. Steel again is the basic thing. Power and steel are the two basic things.

I do not know if I need refer to one thing. Some hon. Member talked a great deal about funds collected by the Congress for the elections. I hope that he will let me know because I am totally unaware of the figure he has given. I am connected with the Congress rather in an important way but I am totally unaware of the crores and crores. Where are these crores. I do not know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Dr. Roy knows.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give me some.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I honestly do not know. Naturally, I can tell with some authority about the money we have in the central fund of the Congress. I know that. But when he talks about these crores—I cannot speak obviously of any District Congress Committee collecting something or some provincial committee doing it—I do not know. But the whole thing is so fantastic, the figures that are given out here are so utterly wrong that I am surprised that any person should make those statements here

SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA (Rajasthan): On a point of explanation I may also say that in Jaipur it was said that I was given over a lakh of rupees for election at Jaipur by the A.I.C.C. It is totally wrong. Everywhere people say that I was given one lakh of rupees. It is totally wrong.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: To my knowledge the lady received Rs. 2,500/- to get a jeep.

THE MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI MEHR CHAND KHANNA): For fighting the Maharani with crores and crores of rupees.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Maharanis and Maharajahs have become destitutes!

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: We need not go into personalities but it is a fact that vast sums have been spent. I cannot guarantee how much out of the three thousand candidates everyone has spent; I do not know because we do not have it to give them and we have not given it. On the other side much larger sums have been spent, very much larger.

One criticism is made, an important criticism, that owing to our planning the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer. This is partly true. It is not true to say that the poor are growing poorer because they are not. It is true that a certain number of rich people, almost a handful of them, not in large numbers, are growing richer. Now, this is partly the automatic result of planning. One may take some steps to diminish them but it is there. As the nation is growing dynamically, industries are growing, and people grow richer. One may tax them as much as one likes but they get a surplus for building further industries; they get more economic power. We have appointed a committee some time ago with Prof. Mahalanobis as the chairman, to consider this question. I regret that that committee has not reported yet. They found—it is not their fault—that the subject was highly intricate and they wanted more time to consider it. I have no doubt that their report would help us to deal with this question. But it is wrong to say that the poor are now poorer. They are not. The evidence of one's eyes shows that. We cannot guarantee that out of the 400 million people of India, people are not poor—of course they are poor—but they are better off than they were. We see that. I shall say

that they are better fed, better clothed and as one or two ordinary tests indicate, there are literally millions of bicycles about in all the rural areas. That itself is a sign of the change for the better. Millions go by buses. All these are signs of a slightly higher standard. It is not enough—that is true—but it is there. (*Interruptions*). The hon. Member here reminds me that plenty of people drink tea now which they did not do before. They go to the cinemas. I do not know if the rural people go to the cinemas as they have not got them there. But it is true that a certain measure of economic power is concentrating itself which is against our Constitution which says that accumulation should not be encouraged. At the same time in our efforts to stop that, we must not stop the economic growth. That has to be remembered because we have, at the present moment, got into a dynamic phase in our economy and that must be continued even though it may give rise to some unevenness, to begin with. Gradually we shall deal with it. That is more important than stopping the sources of economic growth.

Some reference was made by some hon. Members to the visit here of the wife of the President of the U.S. We welcome the visit. The visit was merely an informal and private visit but in any case such a visit cannot wholly be a private visit when the public are so much concerned. We are very happy at her coming here. She has left Delhi now and she will come back for a day here to say 'Good-bye' and then she will go away. Her visit has been a very short one but we are glad, both for personal reasons and larger reasons—that she could come here and we are sorry that her visit has been such a short one—of course she was not keeping well. We hope that she will be able to come again and we hope that her distinguished husband—the President—will also pay us a visit.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Prime Minister said something about

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

the disarmament question. He said that it might go on towards the end of April or the beginning of May. I do not know exactly whether it has been arranged. But certainly, is it not better, in view of the situation, that the Heads of the States or of the Governments meet much earlier, because in the preliminary stages a deadlock may come or some solution may be found? I would like to know whether in this connection the Prime Minister wrote to the Heads of the other States that such a meeting should take place at an early stage of the Conference.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No, I did not send a circular letter to all the Heads of Nations but naturally with some of them we correspond and we sent them a copy of our reply and how we felt about it. The meeting of the Heads of States will only be important if those major Heads got together, obviously. What the suitable time will be for it will have to be decided by them. All I said was that I could not go before the end of April.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thirty-four amendments have been proposed for this. Seven of them I have disallowed. I will put the amendments to vote.

The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take into account the clear and massive shift in popular support that has now taken place in Kerala in favour of the main Opposition party, namely, the Communist Party and its democratic allies who contested in the Third General Elections to Lok Sabha and secured both more votes and seats than the Congress and the P.S.P. put together.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take into account the fact that in the Assembly constituency-wise count of the present election results in Kerala, the Congress and the P.S.P. together have not won the winning number in more than 42 constituencies whereas the Communist Party and its democratic allies which contested the election as a single-front have won a winning number of votes in the overwhelming majority of the total Assembly constituencies.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the failure in the Address to take note of these developments in Kerala is fraught with serious dangers to our Parliamentary and democratic institutions.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not show concern about the manner in which the power of money has been used in the General Elections.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that the Government apparatus and the advantages which the ruling party enjoys by reason of its control of the Government have been used for electoral ends of the ruling party.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due note of the appeals in the name of religion as well as appeals to communal, caste and narrow provincial sentiments in the Third General Elections to influence the exercise of franchise.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address neither takes any note of the serious allegations that have been made regarding malpractices and corruption in the elections nor does it promise any enquiry into such allegations.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address misses the fact that a number of members of the Union Government, while conducting their election campaign, took recourse to statements against friendly countries like the Soviet Union and made remarks and observations not in consonance with the Government's declared policy towards such countries.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that members of the Government in many cases made appeals in the name of caste, religion, etc. or caused such

appeals to be made on their behalf in their election campaign.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the disturbing growth of the communal forces in certain parts of the country as demonstrated in the elections nor does it indicate any steps to meet the situation and combat communalism.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due cognizance of the fact that the growth of the communal forces is a grim challenge to national integration nor does it point out that in order to promote national integration, these centrifugal, communal forces must be confronted by all those who stand for national integration and democracy.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that it does not take note of the emergence of feudal and other extreme reactionary forces in the country's political life nor does it call upon the people to stand up to these retrograde forces and fight them back in the interests of democracy and progress.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

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

[Mr. Chairman.]

granting of democratic set-up and responsible Government to Manipur, Tripura and Himachal Pradesh."

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not indicate any constructive measure for dealing with the situation which has arisen in the Heavy Electricals in Bhopal so that the legitimate demands of the workers in this public sector project are immediately met.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due cognizance of the violations of the Code of Discipline by the employers including the management of the State-owned undertakings.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due note of the rising trends in the prices of a number of essential commodities.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take any note of the behaviour of the Governments of the U.K. and the U.S.A. in the Security

Council and otherwise over the question of the liberation of Goa, Daman and Diu in December, 1961.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not recognise the harmfulness of India's establishing diplomatic relations with the European Economic Community.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not promise full diplomatic recognition to the Algerian Provisional Government.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not still recognise the need for giving full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due note of the continuance of certain pro-Portuguese elements in Goa, Daman and Diu in important positions.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take due note of the fact that certain sections of the Western Press openly supported the forces of extreme Reaction and the opponents of India's foreign policy during the General Elections.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the Government's views on such open interference in India's internal affairs or whether it made any representation to the Governments of the countries from which these papers and journals are published.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not firmly lay down that the Government of India does not any more recognise the jurisdiction of the United Nations Organisation in regard to Jammu & Kashmir which clearly and irrevocably is a part of India nor does it propose any steps to withdraw this question from the United Nations or at least to freeze it so that the interested parties are not in a position to make any move against India.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that the U.N. Forces in the Congo have not been in a position to ensure the implementation of the U.N. resolution regarding the withdrawal of foreign troops and the unity and independence of Congo and further that the Indian

troops stationed there have not been allowed to fulfil their role in this respect.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address incorrectly states that the General Elections have renewed assurance and confidence placed by the great majority of our people in my Government....' whereas the fact is that the majority of the electorate has exercised its franchise not in favour of the party which is in control of the Government.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'but regret that the Address does not take into account the danger of anti-secular forces which intervened in the election throughout the country'

The motion was negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

'that the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 12th March, 1962.'

The motion was adopted.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): May I, with your permission, bring to the notice of the Prime Minister that we had a lot of trouble regarding his statement that these are the days of not bullock-carts but of cycles? Some people adopted 'cycle' as the symbol of the Congress and they said that it was the latest sign of the Congress and not 'bullocks'.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let us not go into the question of bullocks and cycles.

THE HINDI SAHITYA SAMMELAN BILL, 1962

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (DR. K. L. SHRIMALI): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to declare the institution known as the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan having its head office at Allahabad to be an institution of national importance and to provide for its incorporation and matters connected therewith be taken into consideration."

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI K. K. SHAH) in the Chair]

I would like briefly to give the background under which this Bill has been brought forward by the Government. The House is aware that this institution has been in existence now for nearly half a century. It was established in 1910 and since then it has rendered very valuable service for the promotion of Hindi and through holding various conferences, it focussed the attention of the country to the great importance of Hindi as a national language. The institution has rendered valuable service in various other ways also. It has been conducting examinations. It has also been affiliating institutions which are doing similar kind of work in the field of Hindi and it has branches in various parts of the country. The institution has also built up a library which probably contains almost all the books which have been published in Hindi so far and it has a valuable collection of manuscripts. I understand that it is one of the best in the whole country. It conducts various examinations and these examinations have been recognised by the Government as equivalent to Matriculation, B.A. etc. It has also on its rolls a large number of members—various kinds of members—people who have made donations up to Rs. 1,000 and also those who pay a subscription of Rs. 300 as

well as those who pay an annual subscription of Rs. 12. Unfortunately some differences have arisen among the members and the activities of the institution have been paralysed. After the declaration of Hindi as the official language, it was thought by the Sammelan that it was necessary to amend its constitution. Therefore, at the Hyderabad session of the Sammelan held in 1949 a resolution was passed for the amendment of the constitution of the Sammelan, and a committee of 21 members was appointed to frame the rules and place its recommendations before a special session of the Sammelan to be held at Patna. This committee did prepare a draft constitution for the Sammelan and it was placed before the Patna session of the Sammelan. But unfortunately, at this session differences arose among the members and after a good deal of discussion it was decided ultimately to entrust the framing of the constitution to a committee of eleven persons, with this proviso that a constitution signed by eight members shall be deemed to be approved by the general session of the Sammelan. This committee prepared a constitution and it was considered by the session at Kotah of the committee held in December, 1950. At this session differences arose among the members and somehow or the other, the Sammelan has not been able to hold its session, on account of these rival groups which have practically paralysed the whole institution.

The situation now is that the institution is in the hands of an official receiver. He has done good work, but obviously at the present moment because he is only an honorary person looking after the institution, he cannot give much time and the institution has not been doing the work for which it was established several years back. Various efforts have been made to bring about some kind of a settlement, but all these efforts have failed. Ultimately the Uttar Pradesh Government had to intervene and pass the Act of 1956. This Act was also in the nature