

(b) 1,20,310 according to the 1956 All-India Livestock Census. The proportion of stray cattle has not been surveyed, nor can such survey give any authentic information, as the number of stray cattle fluctuates with the number of owners who let loose their cattle. It has, however, been roughly estimated that there are about 6,300 stray cattle in the municipal limits of New Delhi, Delhi and the Delhi Cantt.

(c) No such survey has been conducted.]

12 NOON

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REPORT OF INDIAN DELEGATION TO THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF W.H.O. REGIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SOUTH EAST ASIA

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH (SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Indian Delegation to the Eleventh Session of the W.H.O. Regional Committee for South East Asia held at New Delhi in September, 1958. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1173/59.]

NOTIFICATION PUBLISHING AMENDMENTS IN THE PREVENTION OF FOOD ADULTERATION RULES, 1955

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 23 of the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954, a copy of the Ministry of Health Notification G.S.R. No. 1211, dated the 9th December, 1958, publishing certain amendments in the Prevention of Food Adulteration Rules, 1955. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1186/59.]

NOTIFICATIONS PUBLISHING AMENDMENTS IN THE CENTRAL EXCISE RULES, 1944

THE MINISTER OF REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (DR. B. GOPALA REDDI): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under section 38 of the

Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, a copy each of the following Notifications of the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) publishing certain amendments in the Central Excise Rules, 1944: —

- (i) Notification G.S.R. No. 95, dated the 24th January, 1959.
- (ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 119, dated the 31st January, 1959.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1196/59 for (i) and (ii).]

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE DELHI PANCHAYAT RAJ (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message-received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha: —

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Delhi Panchayat Raj (Amendment) Bill, 1959, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th February, 1959."

Sir, I beg to lay a copy of the Bill on the Table.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

SHRI AN AND CHAND (Himachal Pradesh): On a point of order, Sir, I wanted to make a submission. I have moved an amendment, No. 15, to the President's Address. Mr. Deputy Chairman disallowed it. I have not been able to know the grounds on which it was disallowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You come to my Chamber. It will be explained.

SHRI AN AND CHAND: AS far as I know so far as the May's Parliamentary Practice is concerned . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not discuss it here. I will explain to you in the Chamber.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): Sir, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. Let him come to the Chamber. I will explain to him the reasons.

DR. A. N. BOSE (West Bengal): It is a matter for the whole House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There has been a ruling on the question given some years ago and that is being followed systematically. So far as I remember, what I said was that matters which are not directly discussed in the President's Speech are not to be given in the form of amendments etc. but in the speeches which you make you may refer to them. That is the ruling which, I think, I gave in 1952 and that has been followed systematically year after year. But, of course, there is a way by which you try to circumvent and say, "It is regretted that there has been no mention about this, that and the other."

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, you have been good enough and very flexible in this matter. We have given very many things. I hope it might be considered in your Chamber.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Since you have said that the ruling had been given four or five years ago, I may point out that in the year 1956 or so an amendment was moved with regard to the bilingual State of Bombay. No mention of it was made in the President's Address at that time and that amendment was voted upon and division was taken on that. Therefore, Sir, that is the precedent and it has been there. Not only that has been the case, but also in other matters as well amendments have been moved regretting the

omission in the Address of the President. That being the precedent established in the House, I would like to know as to why this particular amendment has been . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dhage, there might not have been specific reference to the Bombay State but the general question of States reorganisation was mentioned by the President in his Address. Therefore, all particular problems under that head were allowed but if there had been no reference to the States reorganisation, I would even then have disallowed it.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Can our rights under the Constitution be less than those of the Members of the House of Commons in the U.K.?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sometimes more and sometimes less as provided in our Constitution.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Under the Constitution it is clear that we have the same rights, and in the House of Commons motions regretting the omission of certain subjects in the King's Address are accepted by the Speaker.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): May I point out, Sir, that if matters which are not mentioned in the Address are allowed to form the subject matter of amendments, then the flood gates of all manner of subjects can be thrown open and hundred or two hundred or five hundred amendments can be tabled by different Members in respect of matters which have been left out of the Address or have not been touched? Nobody can prevent any Member from bringing any matter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How is that relevant to the proposition before us?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: The reason why this kind of a thing is allowed is that the Government brings up a motion of thanks with regard to the President's Address which reveals the policy which is adopted by the Government.

[Shri V. K. Dhage.] It is left to the Opposition to initiate discussion with regard to what is not the policy of the Government, and the initiative rests with the Opposition. That being the case, the practice has been followed in the House of Commons as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is what I said in the year 1952 at the very first meeting?—

"Now, I find, the next subject in the agenda is the discussion of this motion. I would like to invite the attention of this House to the constitutional provisions on the matter. Article 87(2) of the Constitution of India says that provision shall be made by the rules regulating the procedure of either House for the allotment of time for discussion of matters that are referred to in such Address. It is emphasized there that the matters referred to in the Address shall be the topics for discussion. The same is reiterated in rule 13 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business which also says 'for the discussion of the matters referred to in the President's Address'. Rule 14 says that the Council shall be at liberty to discuss such matters referred to in such Address on a motion of

Thanks It is repeated again in rule 19 that the Chairman may allot time It is my anxiety that there should be a free, frank, and full discussion of all the topics raised in the President's Address. I know from the list of amendments that have been given to me that strong views are held on different questions. And it is my desire that full freedom should be given for the expression of these views on both sides. If such a thing is to happen, then we have to concentrate our discussion, and not allow it to fritter over a large number of amendments. That is a request which I have to make to you. Will it be possible for the groups to come to an understanding as to what the amendments are, which they would select for discussion? Or, if it is not

possible, then I have to take up amendment after amendment and say which of them can be brought under the constitutional provision, even by a great stretch of imagination, even subjects remotely connected with the topics mentioned by the President . . .

. . . I just want to draw your attention to certain fundamental things . . .

That is to say, whatever has a bearing on what the President has said, either directly or indirectly, may be moved as an amendment. But whatever has absolutely no bearing on any topic in the President's Address cannot be moved as an amendment, though you are free to refer to these things in the speeches which you make. That is what I said at the very first meeting in 1952 when we took up the President's Address for debate, and we have followed it all these seven or eight years. I am not referring to what May's Parliamentary Practice may have said. Why should we always be bound down by the practice followed elsewhere? We are an independent House and we follow our own Constitution and Rules of Procedure.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Bombay): Mr. Chairman, I spoke just a minute before we adjourned yesterday. I was saying that the President's Address reads well. It is printed well but unfortunately it is disappointing particularly to the region where I come from. We cannot at all feel enthusiastic about it. We have been singled out, so to say, out of the States that form the Union of India, the States that have themselves voted for a unilingual State have voted for a bilingual State for Bombay; that is the injustice against which both the States that have been forced to come together in this manner have been protesting. The result has been that progress in the State is being held up. Nobody is able to concentrate on the work. There are provincial rivalries, regional rivalries and human nature being what it is, a certain area feels justifiably that

work in that area is completely neglected while work in other areas is going on very fast.

Sir, I give you a very concrete example, We hear so much of the Koyna scheme. It is going to do a lot of good to Bombay State. I do not deny it but when you consider the feeling of people in that region, you will appreciate my point of view. The Bombay Government have not only gone on very well on the Koyna in regard to the Second Plan but have already taken in hand the Third Plan part of the scheme, without the approval of the State Legislature, whereas schemes in Gujerat, very important schemes particularly from the point of view of the existing food shortages, schemes set out for the First Plan, have not progressed at all. During the last session of Parliament we had a consultative committee of the Planning Commission and therein I asked - whether the committee was aware of the progress of the first phase of the Tapti River Scheme, what is called the Kakrapara Project. Shri V. T. Krishnamachari cut short the discussion by saying straightway that the scheme was completely in a mass. He agreed with my criticism that the scheme was taken in hand without proper levels being taken and that it would have to be redone completely if it was going to be of any use. Why does this happen? After all, it is the same set of engineers that are in charge of both the schemes. Why is work being done efficiently in one area and why is work not being done efficiently in the other? Why is there room for allegations that work is being deliberately badly done in another area? That is not only the case with the river valley projects. Look at roads. The condition of roads in Gujerat is deplorable. We are told that certain roads are being built, the Bombay-Ahmedabad road for instance; they call it a national highway, and we call it is national *hai-hai*. If you drive and drivethrough that, you will agree with me that that is a better term to call by. Every motorist would know to

110 R.S.D.—4

bis peril Why I would call it like that and I would invite you to go and have a trial. You compare the number of roads and highways that you find in Gujerat with what you would find in other areas of this bigger bilingual State of Bombay.

My point is not only regarding this case but in regard to the normal functioning of the State. We have emphasised for so many years that a national government can function in an efficient manner only if the people know and understand the functioning in their own language, how it functions. What do the people of Gujerat feel? What do the people of Saurashtra feel? Saurashtra did not have the taste of the bigger bilingual State so far until the last elections. What do the people there feel? They used to go and complain to the Chief Minister rightaway from any corner of Saurashtra and go back home the next day. Their grievances were attended to. Today, they have to go to Bombay and when they go to Bombay they have to speak in a different language. Then, the big Secretariat of the bigger bilingual State of Bombay is not as big a mirage or an image as the Secretariat here but it is soon developing into that phase and the people who go there get completely lost. They do not know what will happen. Therefore, it is that they, whom the country looks upon as the spiritual heirs of Gandhiji, the Bhoodan workers have been advocating very strongly the breaking up of this State. In weeklies, Dada Dharm-adhikari has written very strongly and I was using the very same phraseology that he had used, that it is unfair for the thirteen States who have voted for unilingual States for themselves to have forced a bilingual State of two States, Maharashtra and Gujerat on us. I think it was Mr. Deokinandan who tried to interrupt me yesterday and talked of Bombay. Well, I must remind him that in 1948 . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The thirteen States did not force it.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: All the people coming from the thirteen States voted for a bilingual State of Bombay, people who voted for uni-lingual States for themselves voted for a bilingual State for Bombay. That is what I am pointing out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We voted for a break-up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Mr. Deokinandan threw in the apple of discord. I was the solitary exception who spoke against Shri Shankarrao Deo in 1948 when he first made this claim on behalf of Maharashtra at a small meeting of fifty people in Bombay. Congressmen did not take the warning that I gave. Some of them might have but they did not work for it and we lost. The last elections were fought on the issue of Bombay City being either a separate State or going to Maharashtra and they lost. Let us recognise it as sportsmen. After all, in any game or election, one side loses and one side wins and if the country is to progress, the side that loses must recognise that it has lost. Otherwise, how will democracy function here? The Congress Party did not want Bombay to go and they lost the election to Parliament, the election to the Legislature and the by-elections that followed. In the election to the Municipal Corporation of Bombay which was clearly fought on this one single issue, whether Bombay should go to Maharashtra or not, the Samiti won and the Congress lost.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): I want one clarification. The hon. Member rightly pointed out that in a democracy one must take his defeat gracefully. The Mahagujarat Janata Parishad lost to the Congress on the bilingual State issue and they should take the consequences very gracefully.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Yes, but my friend has interrupted without knowing the facts. The Mahagujarat Janata Parishad is agreeable to abide by the verdict of the people. The pro-

test of the Mahagujarat Janata Parishad is against the shooting, the indiscriminate shooting of the people who came to protest. That is the protest. Well, you want an enquiry in Kerala about firing but you shirk an enquiry in Bombay. In Bombay, the firing was illegal and the people who were responsible for it should have been prosecuted. No regular order by a police officer was given; the order was given by Congressmen and the policemen on duty were just obeying the orders. Therefore, you have this agitation in Gujarat. You will not have peace in Bombay State until . . .

SHRI T. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): That is your version.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN (Bombay): Would the hon. Member apply the same rule about Bombay to Gujarat? The verdict went against him in Gujarat and went against the unilingual demand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on to the argument.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I was mentioning this because in the present set-up of Bombay State no progress is possible. I was only developing the argument, when my friend-opposite was interrupting me and I was trying to explain the position to him only. I say that even the elections that are going on to the municipalities and local bodies show clearly which way the wind is blowing. It is very evident that in one single State in the whole of India you will not be able to run a bilingual State. The sooner you break it up, the better it will be.

Then, I was pointing out how Gujarat feels that it is being neglected. I was coming to the next point which is a very material point for the development, and from the point of view, of Gujarat, and—if the House is in a mood with an open mind—from the point of view of the country, that is, the oil find in Gujarat. Oil and gas have been found in abundant quantities in Gujarat. Why are they not being developed? This is not a new

thing. The presence of oil and gas has been known for many, many years. But because Bombay is under this setup, the area is being neglected completely. I have tried to raise the question on the floor of this House. But long before that experts in drilling had come to this country and had submitted their plans. The late Mr. Dhin'bhai Desai, who was our country's Ambassador in Switzerland, sent experts here because it was suggested to him. The Rumanian experts, who had come, had told us that they had come to advise us, to show us the way, if we wanted on Government basis or on private basis. But this was neglected. They had to go away because Government was badly advised. And they stayed in Delhi for more than a year and went away in disgust. I protest against the manner in which the country's interests were being sacrificed by a few officers and their cliques. I need not say anything further about them because what they are at least the country now knows. The development of gas and oil in Gujerat will mean something very great for the whole country. In this matter Pakistan has stolen a march over us. Whatever we may say about their political order, in Pakistan they have got presence of gas. They are utilising it by laying a pipeline 150 miles. They are using it for industry. What are we doing? Gas has been there in the palace of the Maharajah of Baroda for many, many years. It was the influence of the Burmah Oil Company that led to the suppression of this information. Today the position is exactly the same. There were efforts to drill oil in Saurashtra by private persons, by a firm of motor engineers, motor dealers. But they were also suppressed because the Burmah Oil Company had a pull with the previous Government as they have a pull with the present Government. The suspicion is that it is because this Government has employed people who were very small fry in the Burmah Oil Company as their experts and advisers. Where do their loyalties go? If their loyalty was to India, the progress of drilling, the progress of exploration in

the whole area of Gujerat would not be so slow. I am not quarrelling whether it should be in the public sector or the private sector. I have got entirely an open mind. I want development, whether it is in the public sector or private sector. For three years a person from Saurashtra has been asking for a licence to open a refinery. He has been sent from pillar to post. He has been asked to produce his bank reference; he has been asked to produce his bank guarantee. He has produced all these. He has been put to so much expenditure. After two years he was told of the policy of the Government that they were not going to allow oil refineries in the private sector. I ask: Is this the way to run an efficient Government? Why do you put your citizen to such expenditure of going abroad, of getting letters from international banks, getting expert advice, getting agreements for collaboration? And then they have had to write that our Government have decided that they will not allow it. Why does not Government take advantage of it? Government can do it in the private sector, taking advantage of all his papers and his agreements. Government should get along with it. My charge against the Government is that they have been neglecting this. They have been misdirected, misguided. If anybody wants to look at the facts with an open mind, with eyes open, it is the same with the production of food as it is with oil—in the matter of exploiting the natural resources of gas and oil in Gujerat.

One more point I will make. On that point you will perhaps be one who will appreciate my point of view . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not appreciate or depreciate.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: But he has to address you only, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But he need not say that I am appreciating that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: You are an educationist. You are connected with the Universities . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Go ahead.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I thought you would appreciate what I say best in this House. In the Guje-rat region we have three Universities. There is a University at Ahmedabad; and there is a University at Baroda. The Baroda University was established out of the funds of the Maharajah. It has got ample funds. Bombay Government also contributes amply to it. The University of Ahmedabad was largely the handiwork of our late Speaker, Shri G. V. Mavalankar, who collected all the money, which was the nucleus, purchased the land and made everything for that University. The Universities are doing well. With the blessings of Gandhiji, under Sar-dar's guidance, there was a son of Gujerat who built a University with hardly any assistance from the State Government, much less from the Centre. At first people began to laugh at him. They said: Are you going to build colleges by selling bricks and mortar? He said, he would, and he did. In the space of nine years, he built up a complete University. The Government of Bombay willy-nilly had to recognize the University and legislation was passed, by which the Sardar Vallabhbhai University was established. Even while doing so, the niggardly attitude of the State Government was that they would not be able to give us any grant. Now, the Government have agreed to give grants. Now, the University Grants Commission has recognized his work. The Chairman of the University Grants Commission has not only recognized his work, but has co-opted the Vice-Chfircellor on several of the committees of the University Grants Commission. He said there publicly that he had riot seen a University where people knew how to use funds to the utmost. His experience was rather the other way. I published a little booklet on the birthday of the Vice-Chancellor. I have got a large number of copies. If people are interested, I will be only too glad to supply. The point is that in this souvenir I have

got messages from the Prime Minister of India, from the President of India, a long message from the Chief Minister of Bombay. Also, Mr. Patil was kind enough to send a message. You were also kind enough to sent a message. There were so many others. But in contrast to what is done at Baroda and Ahmedabad, where the Vice-Chancellor, Mrs. Hansa Mehta, very rightly was continued for three terms—the first term was for three years and she continued for two terms more—Shri H. V. Divetia was appointed and he continued for two more terms, both were continued for nine years, the Vice-Chancellor who built up this University, Sardar Vallabhbhai University—I do not know whether that was his fault—was dislodged summarily. Somebody else was appointed in his place. I am coming to that later. But there was not even a semblance of consultation or asking as to who was to be appointed. In December 1957, Mr. Chavan, the Chief Minister of Bombay was at Vallabh Vidya Nagar . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): It is a State matter.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: In December 1957, the Chief Minister of Bombay, Mr. Chavan, was there. He promised there publicly: 'I recognize the work that you have done and we will do nothing'—he spoke on behalf of the Government—the Government of Bombay will do nothing' without consulting him at Vidya Nagar . . .

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: May I know, Sir, whether he can discuss Mr. Chavan? Mr. Chavan is Chief Minister of Bombay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He cannot discuss his discretion or his action in this House.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am not discussing his action. I am pointing out what happens in a bilingual State. Two Vice-Chancellors can be continued for nine years when

they sit in a University where they have pull with the Cabinet. A man who gives a University out of his life blood, by doing service to the country, is pushed aside summarily. And who is appointed in his place?

* * * *

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should not enter into personalities or characterisations of persons.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I am pointing out this only in contrast to what is being done. Here is somebody who gives you a University, for which the University Grants Commission has expressed appreciation, for which large grants are coming in. The man who has done this work is pushed aside and somebody else is appointed. Why is it done? It is done because they want active support for their policy. They want to make this University a place of support for the Government. It is wrong in principle, and Universities should be kept out of politics. (*Interruptions.*) I was Chairman of the Charutar Vidya Mandir for the last few years. I resigned in November because I decided to offer *satya-graha*. I offered *satyagraha* in January. Sir, that is how we look upon educational institutions. But look at what the State Government is doing. I want to point out as an example the many atrocities that have been perpetrated on Gujerat under the present regime. I say that there is no reference in the President's Address to these. That is our disappointment. We would have expected the President to have taken note of these in his Address. As a matter of fact the President was coming to deliver the first Convocation Address, and when these things were pointed out to him, he dropped the visit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not introduce the name of the President also.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Unfortunately, Sir, it is the President's Address that we are criticising. So I have to introduce it.

♦♦expunged as ordered by the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not in this connection.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am only mentioning a fact.

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : (मुम्बई) :
६ करोड़ रुपया गुजरात के लिये खर्च हुआ है,
तब भी आप उनको झूठा बताते हैं।

श्री डाह्याभाई बी० पटेल : आपने क्या
६ करोड़ किया है ? आप क्या बोलते हैं ?
आप को कुछ समझ नहीं है कि आप क्या बोलते
हैं। आप क्या बात करते हैं ?

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : आप क्या बात
करते हैं ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Patel, your time is up. Shrimati Seeta Yudhvir.

श्रीमती सीता युद्धवीर (आंध्र प्रदेश) :
सभापति महोदय, मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभि-
भाषण का हार्दिक स्वागत करती हूँ और धन्य-
वाद भी करती हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण
में हमें एक क्रान्तिकारी युग की याद दिला दी
है। सचमुच, इस थोड़े से अर्थ में हम ने
चारों ओर तरक्की ही तरक्की की है
और योजनाएँ बना कर बेकारी को दूर करने
का प्रयत्न किया है। इसके लिये मैं सरकार
को हार्दिक बधाई देती हूँ।

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

मगर, मुझे यहाँ पर कुछ सदस्यों से यह सुन
कर आश्चर्य होता है कि उनको उसमें कोई
अच्छाई नजर नहीं आती। श्रीमन्, थोड़े
अर्थ की बात है कि यहाँ से एक जनैलिस्टो
का जत्था अरब गया था और वहाँ पर दमिष्क
में जब वह फुटपाथ के ऊपर एक तरफ जा रहा
था तो दूसरी ओर कुछ महिलाएँ भी वहाँ से
गुजर रही थीं। उन्होंने जब उन लोगों को
हिन्दुस्तान की पोशाक पहने देखा तो वे दौड़ती
हुई उनके पास आई और पूछा कि क्या आप

[श्रीमती सीता युदवीर]

लोग हिन्दुस्तान से आये हैं, क्या आप लोग नेहरू के देश से आये हैं? तो उन्होंने कहा कि हाँ, हम वहाँ से आये हैं। इस पर झट उन्होंने उनके कोट को पकड़ कर कहा कि नेहरू तो हमारे भी लीडर हैं, सिर्फ आप ही लीडर नेहरू नहीं हैं, हमारे भी हैं। इससे हमें ज्ञात होता है कि बाहर हमारी कितनी इज्जत है। बगदाद में जब क्रान्ति हुई तो उस समय वहाँ की सरकार ने घोषणा की कि जो पाकिस्तान के लोग यहाँ पर रहते हैं वे अपने घरों में बन्द रहें, हम उनकी रक्षा नहीं कर सकेंगे और उस वक्त हिन्दुस्तानियों की यह हालत थी कि जब वे लोग अपने क्रान्तिकारी जलूम निकालते थे तो हिन्दुस्तानी लोगों को अपने कंधों पर बिठा लेते थे और नेहरू को तस्वीर को उठाये फिरते थे। इसी जर्नले ने जो कि बाहर गया हुआ था, यूरोप का भी दौरा किया। कई जगह पर उनकी बिल्कुल तलाशी नहीं ली गई और यह कहा गया कि ये हिन्दुस्तान के लोग हैं, इनकी तलाशी लेने की जरूरत नहीं है। जब वे किसी शहर में शॉपिंग कर रहे थे तो वहाँ के दुकानदार ने कुछ चीजें उनको मंहगी दीं, तो बाहर से जो आदमी यह देख रहा था वह झट से आ कर कहने लगा कि तुम को मालूम नहीं है कि ये हिन्दुस्तान के लोग हैं, ये हमारे परम मित्र हैं और इन 6 देश की तरक्की को देखते हुए हमारा सिर इनके आगे झुक जाता है, इनको मंहगी चीजें क्यों दे रहे हैं? तो, श्रीमन्, यह सब कुछ देख कर हमें सम्राट अशोक के उस जमाने की याद आती है जब कि हमारी इज्जत बाहर के देशों में बहुत थी और उसके बाद आज का समय आया है जब कि हमारी उतनी ही इज्जत बाहर के देशों में हो रही है। सचमुच, अगर हम इस तरह से तरक्की करते रहे तो हमारी इज्जत और भी बढ़ जायगी।

हमने छोटे छोटे उद्योगों से लेकर बड़े बड़े उद्योगों में भी तरक्की की है, कारखाने लगाये हैं, प्लानिंग भी किया है और हमारी जो

नीति है, वह भी एक आदर्श की नीति है और हमने अपने को समाजवादी ढाँचे में बदलने का प्रयत्न किया है। मगर, श्रीमन्, कुछ समस्याएँ ऐसी हैं जिनकी वजह से दिल को थोड़ी सी चोट लाती है और उनमें सबसे पहली समस्या है, भ्रष्टाचारी की समस्या। हम देखते हैं कि लोग हमारी सरकार को ब्लेम करते हैं। मगर मैं कहती हूँ कि सरकार का इसमें क्या दोष है? हाँ, उसकी नर्मदिली जरूर है कि वह ऐसे लोगों से मनुष्यता का व्यवहार करती है जो कि पशु से भी गये गुजरे होते हैं। एक पशु जब खाना खा लेता है, जब उसका पेट भर जाता है, तब वह कभी भी भ्रष्टाचारी की तरफ नहीं देखेगा। मगर कुछ लोग हमारे देश में ऐसे पनप गये हैं जिनका कि पेट कभी भी भरने में नहीं आता है। वे हर साल गांवों में जाकर ११ रु० और १२ रु० मन गेहूं खरीदते हैं और फिर वही गेहूं दूसरी जगह पर ३० रु० और ३२ रु० मन में बेचते हैं। इसी तरह जो विदेशी गेहूं सरकार की ओर से दिया जाता है, जिसे कि उन्हें सस्ता बेचना है, उसमें भी मिलावट करके, गन्दापन ला करके जनता को तंग करते हैं। श्रीमन्, आज की स्थिति यह है कि कुछ लोगों को छोड़ कर, कुछ वर्ग के लोगों को छोड़ कर, सभी लोग या तो देशी गन्धुम के महंगाईपन से या विदेशी गन्धुम के गन्दापन से तंग आ रहे हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा एक सुझाव आपके सामने है कि अगर हमें सारे प्लान को पूरा करना है, अगर हमें उद्योगों को आगे बढ़ाना है, अगर हमें इसी तरह से धीरे-धीरे उन्नति के पथ पर जाना है तो हमें इसके लिये कोई कानून बनाना ही पड़ेगा। मेरे कुछ साथी कहेंगे कि यह कानून तो एक बहुत बड़ा कठोर कानून होगा, मगर कई बार दुष्टता को दूर करने के लिये कठोर कानून बनाने की जरूरत महसूस होती ही है। वह कानून यह हो कि जो लोग भंडार भर कर अनाज को दबा कर रखते हैं, या जो लोग खाने-पीने की चीजों में मिलावट करते हैं, उनके लिये कम से कम १० साल के कारावास की सजा हो और जो उनकी सम्पत्ति हो, वह जब्त हो जाय। अगर

ऐसा रहे तो मैं नहीं समझती कि उनकी यह हिम्मत हो सकती है कि वे इस तरह से हमारे देश में एक हाहाकार पैदा कर दें और नकली, बनावटी किस्म की, तंगी को पैदा कर दें कि जिसकी वजह से हमारे मजदूर रोते हैं। हमारे मजदूर का जब पेट जलता है, वह जब काम करने के लिये जाता है और जब उसे यह याद आता है कि उसके घर में फ़ाँका है तो वह सोचता है कि मैं यहाँ आकर मजदूरी कैसे करूँ। उसमें ताकत नहीं रहती है। उसे एक तरह की कमजोरी महसूस होती है। तो, श्रीमन्, अगर इस तरह से हमारी सरकार कोई कानून बनाती है तो निश्चय ही उनमें उत्साह आयेगा और उनके अन्दर खायें हुए अन्न का जो खून बनेगा उससे उनमें शक्ति आयेगी।

हमारे कुछ भाई इस बात का भी विरोध करते हैं कि ग्रामों में जो सहकारी समितियाँ बनती हैं उनकी भी क्या जरूरत है और कृषि के लिए जो ज़मीनें मुक़र्रर करना है उसके लिये भी वे विरोध करते हैं और जो हम यह एक सुझाव रख रहे हैं कि राज्य सरकार अनाज का व्यापार अपने हाथ में ले ले, उसका भी कुछ लोग विरोध कर रहे हैं। मेरी इन लोगों से प्रार्थना है कि आप लोग पार्टी से ऊपर उठ कर देश की समस्याओं को हल करें और देश के कार्यों को बिगाड़ने का प्रयत्न न करें; वरन् उसको सुधारने का प्रयत्न करें।

श्रीमन्, शिक्षा के बारे में मेरा एक छोटा सा सुझाव है। जहाँ तक आर्थिक अवस्था का सम्बन्ध है हम देखते हैं कि सचमुच हम आर्थिक अवस्था में तरक्की कर रहे हैं। तो उस अवस्था में तरक्की करते हुए हमें यह भी प्रयत्न करना चाहिये कि कम से कम मैट्रिक तक की शिक्षा फ़्री हो। शिक्षा के बारे में यह आवश्यक है; क्योंकि न जाने किन गरीब माताओं की गोद में राम, कृष्ण और नेहरू जैसा दिमाग रखने वाले बच्चे पल रहे हों, मगर गरीबी की अवस्था के कारण उनके दिमाग आगे नहीं बढ़ पाते हों और उनको ऐसी सुविधायें नहीं मिलती हों जिनकी वजह से वे आगे बढ़ कर देश के

निर्माण में अपना हिस्सा बटा सकें। अगर यह मुफ्त शिक्षा दी जायगी तो सचमुच आज हम लोगों को—आज यह एक पुकार है कि नये लोग हमारे मैदान में काम करने आयें, नया ब्लड आये—नये ब्लड को ताकत दे सकें हैं और जहाँ तक प्राइमरी शिक्षा का सम्बन्ध है, उसमें हमें अघेड़ उम्र की महिलाओं को ही टीचरी के पद पर रखना चाहिए। जिन महिलाओं ने अपनी बीती हुई उम्र में देश का कार्य किया है, देश की उन्नति के लिये कार्य किया है, वे अपने संस्कार हमारे बच्चों में पैदा करेंगी, जिससे हमारे भावी नागरिकों का जीवन संस्कृतिमय और संस्कारमय होगा और हमारी राष्ट्रियता की भी रक्षा होगी।

DR. P. J. THOMAS: (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the President's Address was rather a cautious appraisal of the conditions obtaining lately. But the hon. Member from Madras who moved the motion of vote of thanks has painted rather a rosy picture of the whole thing; at any rate, as regards the economic situation, he has certainly gone too far in his complacency.

"^fie President spoke about improvement in regard to certain industries like caustic soda, insecticides, machine tools, etc. And also of the great improvement made by the code of discipline which was agreed upon between the different labour organisations last year. In the field of industrial development, I quite admit that we have made great progress in regard to iron and steel, thanks to foreign countries, Germany and Russia, which have helped us in regard to Rourkela and Bhilai. And they worked very hard and showed an example to the people of this country. Similarly, certain other things have been done.

But the proper standards of judging our industrial development are not these. The first and the foremost thing is that this country should be able to produce the equipment for industries itself and thus become independent of the foreigner; be it iron

[Dr. P. J. Thomas.] and steel or fertiliser or any other thing, we are still depending upon foreign assistance. What has happened in other countries? Let us take China. China started much later than India in making steel, but she is now-producing eleven million tons of steel and she is also making her own machinery and equipment. She does not require any large foreign assistance. Even some South American countries have done a similar thing. We may have a different ideology from that of the Chinese, but you will find that not only have they done this, but they have also developed small-scale industry so much. We have been talking of this for so many decades. But in this country, the functioning of small-scale industries on a high technical level has been very badly neglected; very little progress has been made in this country in spite of all the talk that we have been giving on that subject. And in China, they have put up blast furnaces in the communes, in their villages, and these are run in a small way to produce steel. They have also produced fertiliser this way. Here, we require foreign assistance even for starting a new fertiliser factory. There, they are doing it even in the villages. In these matters, our progress is very limited. Of course, there are causes for this and I will come to them later on.

The second test is employment. What has been the state of employment? We had hoped to employ about 8 million people in the Second Five Year Plan period. What has been done so far? The results are very unsatisfactory. Today, we have got much more unemployed and the number is increasing. From recent reports, you will see that the number of unemployed people is increasing very rapidly. What about Kerala? We cannot bring down the number of unemployed there—the number is increasing—because we have got schools everywhere and every year, you find crowds of youths coming out of the

schools. They may not all get registered for employment and therefore, the statistics given by the Government are rather incomplete. Unemployment has been increasing terribly for the last few years among the educated people. We give them education and then they claim posts in the Government or in industries and we are not giving them employment. The consequence is disappointment and discontent.

Sir, these are the two real tests in my opinion, and on these two tests, we cannot be very complacent about our recent economic progress. We are certainly very backward and we must be very ashamed of it, as a matter of fact. We talk about the labour code of discipline. What happened in the last year? What happened in Jamshedpur very soon after the code was accepted at Nainital? There was destruction of valuable property. What happened at the ports? There, workmen who are getting very good incomes, had been creating trouble and destroying property. Take the State of Kerala. During the last one year, valuable industries which have been producing most important export items like cashew nuts, and earning foreign exchange were in considerable difficulty on account of labour troubles which were absolutely unnecessary. Similarly also it is the case in regard to tea gardens. For a month production was put off and we have lost thereby over a crore of rupees in foreign exchange. It is a very important industry from many points of view. As a matter of fact, all over India last year it has been very bad in the matter of labour-lost days. When the figures come, I believe this will prove correct and will show a record in the matter. As for Kerala, this has been terrible because of the working days lost, as the Governor himself pointed out the other day. What has been the cause of it? It is because of the rivalry between the trade unions in the various concerns, not for economic but for political purposes. If politicians run the country

in that way, certainly it cannot advance economically in any way.

Coming to the food front, in the First Five Year Plan we hoped to do great things. When we were advising the Government to carry out practicable methods of production, it thought of huge dams. What happened by these? Where are we now? During the last ten or eleven years, we have wasted Rs. 1,200 crores of foreign exchange for foodgrain imports. We could have made our people produce more. As a matter of fact, even in regard to producing the multi-purpose food, about which our Prime Minister has been talking a lot the need for utilising things like tapioca for making this food was stressed and in Mysore, a laboratory was started for producing this. What has come out of that? For several years, we have been talking about it. If only we can produce it on a mass scale and distribute it—call it macaroni or multi-purpose food—it would be much more useful. But nothing has been done. Why? Because we are not pushing things ahead properly. There is a lack of initiative, lack of boldness, in the matter, and we only talk, talk and talk. That is all.

Lately, our Food Minister was sure of a bumper crop and said that prices would fall. What has really happened? We have seen in papers news about rise of prices. In Madras, the State from which the hon. Member who opened the debate comes, what has happened during the last few days? There the prices have been going up, in spite of this being the harvest season. Harvest is more or less over, I believe, in many places, but yet prices have not come down; they are going up. And in several parts of Madras State, prices have gone up so much that there was an uproar about it in the Assembly, the other day, and the matter was discussed. Even then, people are talking that prices have come down, even in the present House.

If things are going on like that, how are we to manage? We are talking

of controlling the prices in many ways. State control, stabilisation of prices and all these are talked about. Very well.. But have you carried out these things into practice? I think the whole matter is moving slowly. The conception of the State managing such things is all right provided the Government is properly organised, provided there is proper perseverance for this. Unfortunately, in this country there are too many talkers, and in the Government we have not built up a proper administrative apparatus.

Sir, lately we have been talking about agrarian reforms. And we have gone ahead with it and we have given momentum to it. But what has really been done about it and what are the consequences of all that? Of course, we are all for agrarian reforms. We all want that the intermediaries should go. We all want that land should be given to the tillers. But the actual tiller is now being put to great inconvenience, because he is asked to agree to the joint farming system. Of course, there can be no objection to it provided somebody can convince him about it. But so far, Sir, the general opinion in the country has been against it. What are really the consequences? Sir, we find that production has been considerably reduced. We should give land to only those who really can cultivate it, and not to those who take it and later on sell it away.

So much emphasis has lately been laid on co-operation. Well; I warmly welcome it. But have we not been working co-operation during the last 50 years? Service co-operatives have been in operation in the country for a long time. Any effort to make them active is to be welcomed. But much ideological talk has been going on lately about joint farming and pooling holdings, with the result that there is already considerable doubt and dismay among large numbers of tillers. Agricultural production has been considerably undermined. The Government's intention is to pass on from service co-operatives to joint farming. But the Government has not realised the

[Dr. P. J. Thomas.] difficulties involved in this change. Let us at least demonstrate to the people by actual tillage of land on that basis. Perhaps only in States like Bombay and Madras these service co-operatives are running properly. In many other regions they are not running properly. Now, we talk of joint farming. The idea is excellent. I certainly welcome it. But have you provided any enthusiasm for this to the people? Without enthusiasm no such thing can be done and there can be no progress at all. Unless people are enthusiastic about it, they won't be able to do anything in the matter. And what are the consequences of lack of enthusiasm? Cultivation has terribly suffered. Of course, I agree that something can be done provided we can convince people that there will be more and more production by the method of joint farming and also they will be able to get larger incomes. But since the Government is going to fix prices at a lower level, what is the encouragement for the tillers? Let us therefore make some demonstrations about this method of joint farming so that our peasants can be tempted to adopt this. Let there be some co-operative joint farming societies. Unless that is done, we cannot do much about it. The wise thing for Government to do is to carry out successful experiments by implementing the plan.

Now, Sir, the talk is largely about the establishment of a socialist order. All of us are for it. Nobody in this House is against it. And also the Government is determined to carry out that socialist order on a democratic basis. The assurance that it will be done on a democratic basis is also heartening to most of us. But what has been our experience so far of democratic planning in the country? Have we been able to carry out our Five Year Plans properly on a democratic basis? Let us really examine the whole thing. We will be able to find that actually production has considerably been upset because of lack of enthusiasm.

It was by hard work and strict discipline that something like socialism had been achieved in other countries, whether in the Western Bloc or in the Eastern Bloc. It was by working 15 or 16 hours a day that Russia and China could succeed in rapid industrialisation. The same was the case in England and America formerly. But here can you imagine engineers working for 16 hours a day? In Germany and other places the work in Government offices begins at 8 o'clock.

Then, Sir, if we want rapid industrialisation, we have to step up capital formation, which is very important. Capital formation means that a part of whatever we produce or earn has to be set apart for further production every year. But in this country we are having shorter and shorter hours of work at the beginning of our industrial career. How can capital formation be stepped up in this way? How can our rapid industrialisation programme succeed in this way? We have made rash promises to our people; we have said "Oh, tomorrow you are going to have a welfare State." Thereby we have made our people rather idle and indifferent. And still, go-slow methods are being adopted by the labour classes. Surely, Sir, we cannot achieve substantial progress in this way. People cannot get employment unless capital formation is stepped up. A great economist of Sweden, now here, Gunnar Myrdal, has said that India is trying "to create a socialist welfare State directly out of poverty." We had promised our people that they will get their food and clothing and house-room, if they worked hard. But who has worked hard? Much of the product raised has gone to a favoured class of employers and factory workers. The result is that production and employment have not gone up, and the millions of unemployed are unable to get employment. Who knows if such people will start rebelling because it is quite necessary that people should live . . .

(Time bell rings.)

So, in these matters we must do a little hard thinking and rather than give more ideological talks, we must go into facts. We must create enthusiasm among the people by showing results and something must be done rather than talk. I do hope that at least now, when things have come out—in the last few weeks much has been brought out—we must realize that mere talk will not be of any use. Democracy must be carefully regulated or guided in some reasonable way, and it is only then that we can implement the Five Year Plans successfully. I am certainly for democratic planning. We want a socialistic order but it can only come by hard work and it requires sacrifice. But this calls for proper leadership in the country. Only then we can push up. Thank you.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : आदरणीय उपसभापति जी, पूज्य राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के सम्बन्ध में मेरे लिए बहुत कुछ कहने की गुंजाइश दिखाई नहीं देती। राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण स्पष्ट है, पूर्ण है और बहुत ही सुन्दर है। राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में गत वर्ष को लक्ष्य करके, हमारा आगामी कर्तव्य क्या है, उसे स्पष्ट रूप से बताया है। आप जानते हैं कि सैकड़ों दिक्कतों से हम गत वर्ष लड़ते रहे और बावजूद इसके हमने खूब तरक्की की, हमारी पैदावार बढ़ी और हमारे उद्योग बहुत बढ़े। इतने उद्योग बढ़े और इतनी पैदावार बढ़ी कि जो चीजें हम पहले बाहर से मंगाते थे, अब हम ही उनको बाहर भेजने लगे हैं। गांवों की तरफ देखिये। हमारी कम्युनिटी डेवलपमेंट की योजना की वजह से देहातों की भी काया पलट हो रही है। हमारी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना बड़ी तेजी से आगे बढ़ रही है और तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना की नींव डाली जा रही है।

राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण की तफसील में जाना मैं आवश्यक नहीं समझता; क्योंकि आपने उसे सुना है, आपने उसे पढ़ा है। परन्तु मेरे कुछ भाइयों को यह रंज है कि उसमें बहुत सी बातें नहीं लिखी गईं। मैं नहीं समझता कि

क्या मेरे भाई राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण को भानमती का पिटारा समझते हैं, या किसी मदारी का थैला कि जिसमें से जो चाहा वह निकाल लिया। अमेंडमेंट्स को जब मैं देखता हूँ, तब मुझे यह दिखाई देता है कि हमारे भाई इस अभिभाषण से क्या-क्या अपेक्षा रखते थे। ये जो आपके सामने तरमीमें हैं, इन तमाम तरमीमों की ओर ध्यान दिलाने के लिए मेरे पास वक्त नहीं है। खास एक तरमीम की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान खींचूंगा और वह है बम्बई बाइलिगुअल स्टेट के सम्बन्ध में। आपने देखा होगा कि तीन तरमीमों पेश हैं। उन तीनों तरमीमों का रूप एक ही है; केवल भेजने वाले तीन अलग अलग फ़रीक हैं। एक हैं हमारे भाई कम्युनिस्ट, दूसरे हैं हमारे भाई जसवन्त सिंह और तीसरे हैं हमारे विद्वान् भाई डा० काणे साहब। कम्युनिस्ट भाइयों के लिए कुछ कहना तो मेरे लिए फिजूल है; क्योंकि बात यह है कि वे तो तोड़ना ही जानते हैं, जोड़ने का काम तो शायद ही उन्होंने कभी किया हो। मेरे भाई जसवन्त सिंह इस वक्त यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं। मुझे उनकी तरमीम को देखकर कुछ अचरज हुआ और संस्कृत का एक श्लोक याद आ गया :

“संगतौ संगदोषेण सतोपि मतविभ्रमः ।
एकरात्र-प्रसंगेन काष्ठ-घंटा-विडम्बना ॥”
पड़ोस में बैठने का फल मिल गया, नहीं तो मेरे भाई में और कम्युनिस्टों में जमीन आसमान का अन्तर है।

श्री मुल्लंग गोविन्द रेड्डी (मैसूर) :
अंग्रेजी में ट्रांसलेशन कर दीजिये।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : यह तो संस्कृत में है और आप संस्कृत जानते होंगे। तीसरा अमेंडमेंट है डा० काणे साहब का, जो महामहोपाध्याय विद्वान् हमारे प्रांत के हैं, जो बम्बई हाई कोर्ट के जज रह चुके हैं, और जिस वक्त बम्बई बाइलिगुअल ही नहीं, ट्राइ-लिगुअल प्रांत था, वहां की कास्मोपोलिटन यूनिवर्सिटी के वाइस-चांसलर रह चुके हैं। मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ कि जब उनका अमेंडमेंट प्रांतीयता से सम्बन्ध रखता हुआ नज़र आया।

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

मैं इस बाइलिगुअल बम्बई के सवाल को यहां नहीं छेड़ता, परन्तु मैं कल से यह देख रहा हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण से कोई खास सम्बन्ध न होते हुए भी, इस सवाल को तूल दिया जा रहा है। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में दो भाषण सुन चुका हूँ। एक भाषण कल मेरे भाई जसवन्त सिंह का हुआ। जिस वक्त मेरे भाई जसवन्त सिंह जी बोल रहे थे और मैं सुन रहा था तो मुझे यह ख्याल हो आया कि ये किसी की बकालत तो कर रहे हैं परन्तु मुबबिकल से इन्होंने पूरी मालूमात तक नहीं ली है, यानी जिसकी बकालत कर रहे थे उससे मालूमात भी ले लेते कि संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र में क्या परिस्थिति है और संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र कहते किसे हैं। संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र का आज प्रतिनिधित्व कौन कर रहा है? जो बातें वे बोल रहे थे उन बातों की उनके पास मेरी समझ में कोई बुनियाद नहीं थी। उसके बाद मेरे भाई डा. ह्याभाई पटेल खड़े हुए। वे बड़े गुस्से में थे। मैं नहीं समझ सका कि वे इतने गुस्से में क्यों थे और गुस्से में होने का कारण क्या था? परन्तु आप समझ सकते हैं कि जब मनुष्य को गुस्सा आता है तब वह बैलेंस नहीं रख सकता। गुस्सा चीज़ ही ऐसी है कि मनुष्य बैलेंस नहीं रख सकता। उन्होंने बहुत सी बातें कहीं। हर एक बात का जवाब देना भी ठीक नहीं होगा और उसके लिए यह जगह भी ठीक नहीं है। बहुत सी बातें उनकी इस सदन के योग्य भी नहीं हैं और इस सदन से सम्बन्धित भी नहीं हैं, परन्तु उन्होंने कहीं। दर्द कहीं हो रहा था और वे बतला रहे थे कहीं। वे दवा ऐसी जगह पर खूब रहे थे जहां दवा देने वाला ही नहीं था। वे बम्बई स्टेट की बातें कर रहे थे, बम्बई के चीफ मिनिस्टर की बातें कर रहे थे, बम्बई की पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० की सड़कों की बातें कर रहे थे, लेकिन मैं समझ नहीं सका कि सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट से इन तमाम बातों का क्या सम्बन्ध है?

अब मैं एक दो बातें आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ। कल आपने कहा कि बम्बई

राज्य में डिमोक्रेसी धूल में मिल गई, 'विल आफ दी पीपुल' ठुकरा दी गई। मैं आप से पूछना चाहूंगा कि 'विल आफ दी पीपुल' किसे कहते हैं? जिस वक्त बाइलिगुअल बम्बई कानून पार्लियामेंट में करीब करीब एक मत से पास किया गया, क्या वह 'विल आफ दी पीपुल' नहीं था? १७ करोड़ मत-दाताओं की चुनी हुई पार्लियामेंट में पास किया हुआ कानून यदि 'विल आफ दी पीपुल' नहीं है, तो क्या चीज़ 'विल आफ दी पीपुल' हो सकती है? मैं नहीं समझ सकता। दूसरी बात यह है कि उन्होंने कहा कि पार्लियामेंट को क्या अस्तित्व है किसी राज्य के निजी प्रश्न पर विचार करने का। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश की भलाई और बुराई की जिम्मेदारी किसकी है? क्या बम्बई राज्य की है या हिन्दुस्तान सरकार की है? हिन्दुस्तान सरकार का यह कर्तव्य है, किस राज्य का विस्तार क्या हो, वहां पर क्या व्यवस्था हो और किस तरह का ढांचा हो जोकि समूचे देश की बेहतरी को आगे बढ़ा सकता है, यह जिम्मेदारी सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की है न कि बम्बई स्टेट की। साथ में संरक्षा का भी सवाल है।

बम्बई स्टेट को भी लीजिये। हर वक्त यह कहा गया कि बम्बई शहर में कांफेरिशन हमारा है तो बम्बई शहर ही बम्बई राज्य है? मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि गुजरात में क्या है? मैं आपसे कहना चाहूंगा कि १३२ मेम्बर्स हैं गुजरात के बम्बई असेम्बली में। डा. ह्याभाई ने इतना विरोध किया और जो आगबबूला होते रहे, उनसे मैं यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि आप के बम्बई असेम्बली में कितने प्रतिनिधि हैं? महागुजरात समिति किसका प्रतिनिधित्व करती है? १३२ सीट्स में से १०२ सीट्स कांग्रेस ने जीती हैं और ३० सीट्स महागुजरात समिति को और एकाध दो इंडिपेंडेंट्स को मिली हैं। उसके बाद गत वर्ष में गुजरात में जो ३ या ४ बाइएलेक्शंस हुए, वे चारों बाइएलेक्शंस कांग्रेस ने जीते हैं।

श्री सालजी पेंडसे (मुम्बई) : महाराष्ट्र में नहीं जीते हैं ।

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I am coming to that also, my friend. 'Don't be anxious of that.'

तो १३२ सीट्स में से जब १०२ सीट्स कांग्रेस प्राप्त करती है तब गुजरात का कांग्रेस प्रतिनिधित्व करती है या यह मेरे भाई प्रतिनिधि बन करते हैं ? यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ । उसके बाद दूसरी यह बात है कि गत वर्ष गुजरात और सौराष्ट्र के सब लोकल बोर्ड्स का एलेक्शन हुआ । करीब १३ या १४ लोकल बोर्ड्स हैं । आपने एक लोकल बोर्ड का जिक्र किया और बाकी सब भूल गये, क्योंकि वे तो बहुत गुस्से में थे, समझ नहीं सकते थे कि कहां जा रहे हैं । तो इन सब १५ लोकल बोर्ड्स में से—एक लोकल बोर्ड को छोड़ कर—गुजरात में सब के सब लोकल बोर्ड्स कांग्रेस ने जीते हैं । मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह 'विल आफ दी पीपुल' नहीं है ? जब यह 'विल आफ दी पीपुल' है और इस 'विल आफ दी पीपुल' के जो नुमाइंदे आज बम्बई में बैठे हैं उनकी सलाह से अगर कोई गुजरात की किसी यूनियर्सिटी का वाइस चांसलर नियुक्त किया जाता है, तो मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि इसमें कौन सी गलती है ? नुमाइंदों से पूछा जाय या जो नुमाइंदे नहीं हैं उनसे पूछा जाय, यह मैं जानना चाहूंगा । यदि बम्बई राज्य के चीफ मिनिस्टर ने श्री बाबूभाई पटेल की नियुक्ति की है, तो मैं जानता हूँ और समझ सकता हूँ कि जो गुजरात के नुमाइंदे हैं उन सब की सलाह से ही की होगी, बिना वहां के नुमाइंदों की सलाह के तो कर नहीं सकते । फिर मैं यह नहीं समझा कि जब अहमदाबाद और बड़ौदा यूनिवर्सिटीज की नियुक्तियां चाहान साहब बहुत अच्छी कर सकते हैं, तो आनन्द यूनिवर्सिटी की क्यों नहीं कर सकते ? जो आदमी दो काम अच्छा कर सकता है, वह तीसरा काम क्या बिगाड़ देगा ? मेरी समझ में नहीं

आया कि यह आर्ग्यूमेंट क्या है ? तो आप देखेंगे कि गुजरात में आज भी बाइलिगुअल वालों की ओवरव्हेलमिंग मेजारिटी है और देहात में है, सब जगह है । हां, मेरे भाई डाह्याभाई पटेल यह समझते हों कि अहमदाबाद ही सारा गुजरात है तो फिर उनकी बात ही विचित्र है ।

अब आगे चलिये, महाराष्ट्र की बात लीजिए । महाराष्ट्र में यह तो चाहते हैं कि नाग विदभं आ जाय, मराठवाड़ा आ जाय, सब आ जाय और संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र बन जाय । पर जब कोई विवादात्मक सवाल पैदा होता है तो तब सिर्फ महाराष्ट्र का नाम बोला जाता है, विदभं मराठवाड़ा को भूल जाते हैं । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज महाविदभं का क्या मत है ? वहां के ६३ नुमाइंदे या प्रतिनिधि आज बम्बई असेम्बली में हैं और ६३ में से कांग्रेस के ५८ हैं । 58 out of 63. किसको रिप्रेजेंट करता है महाविदभं ? दूसरे, मराठवाड़ा की ४० या ४१ सीट्स में से ३० कांग्रेस की हैं तो किसको मराठवाड़ा रिप्रेजेंट करता है ? हां, मैं मानता हूँ कि पुराने बम्बई राज्य के जो १२ जिले हैं, महाराष्ट्र के उन १२ जिलों में जरूर सार्मति की जीत हुई है, परन्तु सारे संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र को लीजिये, अकेले महाराष्ट्र को लेने से काम नहीं चलेगा । अगर सारे महाराष्ट्र को लेंगे, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र को लेंगे, तो आपको पता चलेगा कि समूचा महाराष्ट्र बाइलिगुअल के पक्ष में है न कि उसका विरोधी है और उन १२ जिलों में भी २ जिले ऐसे हैं जहां कांग्रेस की बड़ी जीत हुई है । एक जिले में ८० टका सीट्स पर कांग्रेसी चुन कर आये हैं और दूसरी जगह ६५ टका सीट्स पर । तो यह कह देना कि बम्बई राज्य की जनता बाइलिगुअल राज्य के विरुद्ध है, सच नहीं है । यह सत्य से बहुत दूर है । इससे ज्यादा मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : जरा नागपुर के एलेक्शन के नतीजे की बात भी बता दीजिये ।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : जी हां, वहां जो अभी आखरी फैसला हुआ, वह आप जानते हैं। वहां से अपने साहब कांग्रेस के टिकट पर जीत कर आये हैं।
By how many votes has he won? By 58,000 more votes.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): He says he is for Vidarbha, not for a bilingual State.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : आज तो बाइलिंगुअल के लिये हैं। अगर आपने उनके स्टेटमेंट को देखा होगा तो महाविदर्भ के बारे में उन्होंने यह कहा है :

"I stand for a bilingual State and when the question of the bilingual State being divided comes up, then I will talk about Maha Vidarbha."

That is his statement.

दूसरी बात यहां बम्बई एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की कही गई। बम्बई के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के ऊपर हमला किया गया, मुझे दुःख है। सारी दुनिया आज बम्बई के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की तारीफ कर रही है। यही नहीं—जो भाई अभी मुझसे पूछ रहे थे, मैं जानता नहीं लेकिन मेरा खयाल है कि वह प्रजा-समाज-वादी हैं, उनको मैं याद दिलाऊंगा कि—कुछ दिन हुए अहमदाबाद में आचार्य कृपलानी जी ने कहा कि Bombay is the best administered province in India.

चाहता हूं कि जो हमारे साथी नहीं, जो कांग्रेस के नहीं, जो कांग्रेस के बाहर हैं और कांग्रेस के खिलाफ हैं, जो प्रजा समाज-वादी पार्टी को चला रहे हैं और प्रजा समाज-वादी पक्ष के एक रहनुमा हैं, वह अगर ऐसा

कहें, तो इससे बेहतर और अच्छी और कौन सी तारीफ बम्बई सरकार की हो सकती है, जो कि आप चाहते हैं ?

दूसरी बहुत सी बातें कही गई, उन के बारे में भी मैं कुछ शब्दों में कह देना चाहता हूं। फाइरिंग की बात कही गई। मैं उसको यहां लाना नहीं चाहता। बहुत पुरानी बात हो गई है और कई बार यह बातें यहां हो चुकी हैं। परन्तु मेरे भाई डा. ह्याभाई पटेल यह कहना भूल गये कि अभी कुछ महीने पहले अहमदाबाद में जो फाइरिंग हुई उस की जुडीशियल इन्क्वायरी हो रही है और वह आज के बम्बई राज्य के चीफ मिनिस्टर ही करवा रहे हैं। यह कल की बात उन्होंने छिपाई और चार या पांच वर्ष पहले की बात कह दी। तो इस तरह से मिसलीड करना मेरे ख्याल से ठीक नहीं है।

कोयना और काकड़ापारा की बात...

(Time bell rings.)

A few minutes more, Sir. At the most five minutes.

श्री उपसभापति : एक बज कर बीस मिनट पर खत्म करें।

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN : I shall finish within five minutes.

कोयना और काकड़ापारा की बात कही गई। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि कोयना की जो योजना है, वह वर्ल्ड बैंक से कर्जाले कर चलाई जा रही है और आज तक बम्बई राज्य में ऐसा कोई आदमी मुझे दिखाई नहीं दिया जिसने कि बम्बई राज्य की असेम्बली में यह सवाल खड़ा किया हो या कहीं बाहर कि आज किसी तरह का पक्षपात गुजरात के साथ या महाराष्ट्र के साथ किया जा रहा है। यही कहा जा रहा है और यह तीसरे लोग कह रहे हैं। गवर्नमेंट सर्वेड्स कह रहे हैं, विरोधी दल कह रहे हैं कि हमारी बम्बई गवर्नमेंट का काम बहुत ही निष्पक्षता से चल रहा है। जब उन्होंने

कैम्बे में तेल की बात कही तब तो उसे सुन कर मुझे हंसी आ गई। कैम्बे के तेल से बम्बई राज्य का क्या सम्बन्ध है, यह मैं नहीं समझ सका। उससे सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट का सम्बन्ध है। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट वहां लाखों रुपया खर्च कर रही है। वहां मशीनों के लिये करोड़ों का खर्च हो रहा है और सब बातें हो रही हैं। मैं नहीं समझा कि यह क्या हो रहा है कि आयल भी इस बाईलिंगुअल में घसीटा जा रहा है। यह सारे देश की भलाई का सवाल है और सारे देश की भलाई के लिये भारत सरकार यह सब कुछ कर रही है। ऐसी हालत में इस तरह की ऊटपटांग बात को बीच में ले आना, किसी तरह से भी ठीक है, ऐसा मैं नहीं मानता।

अब आखिरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि यहां पर डा. आभाई पटेल जी ने यह कहा कि वे कुछ वर्ष पहले इसके खिलाफ थे कि बम्बई महाराष्ट्र को दिया जाय। जो कुछ हो, आदमी बदलता रहता है और बदलना भी चाहिये। परन्तु, चूंकि श्री शंकररावदेव का नाम उन्होंने लिया, इसलिये उसके बारे में मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूं कि शंकररावदेव वही शख्स हैं जिन्होंने बाईलिंगुअल स्टेट की मांग को सबसे पहले जाहिर किया और बाईलिंगुअल का सवाल हिन्दुस्तान में और महाराष्ट्र में खड़ा किया था। यदि शंकरराव की बात डा. आभाई मानते हैं तो क्या मैं उनसे अपेक्षा कर सकता हूं कि वे शंकरराव का अनुकरण करें? परन्तु जैसा मैंने कहा, दर्द कहीं और है और दिखाते कहीं और हैं।

आज दुःख है कि इस देश में सत्याग्रह के नाम से कितने मोर्चे लगाये जाते हैं, सत्याग्रह किया जाता है। कितनी सत्याग्रह के नाम से घुम है? महात्मा गांधी कहीं सुन रहे होंगे तो दुःख प्रकट करते होंगे कि उनके सत्याग्रह के इतने सर्वोत्तम साधन की कितनी छीछालेदर इस देश में हो रही है। अहमदाबाद में और न जाने कहां-कहां सत्याग्रह के नाम से मोर्चे

हो रहे हैं। परन्तु मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि इस तरह से आप बहुत दिन तक दुनिया को धोखा नहीं दे सकते और भले ही आप सत्याग्रह का नाम पुकारते रहें, यह सत्याग्रह नहीं बल्कि आपका दुराग्रह है।

(Time bell rings.)

आखिर में, मेरी एक ही प्रार्थना है कि जब हम राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर विचार करने बैठे हैं तो हमें उन बातों की ओर अधिक ध्यान नहीं देना चाहिए जो राष्ट्रपति जी खुद कह गये हैं, न हमें उसमें सुझाव देने की कोई आवश्यकता है। परन्तु सरकार को दो-एक बातें कह देना मैं आवश्यक समझता हूं और वे ये हैं कि द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना को देखते हुए बेकारी का सवाल हल नहीं हो रहा है। यह कहा गया था कि १५० लाख आदमी हमारे यहां पांच वर्ष में बेकार रहेंगे और हम इस पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तर्गत ८० लाख लोगों को काम दे सकेंगे। आगे चल कर ८० लाख के ७० लाख हो गये और ७० लाख के गत वर्ष, चार महीने पहले, ६५ लाख हो गये हैं और मैं सुन रहा हूं और पढ़ा भी है कि अभी तक २५ लाख लोगों को हम काम दे सके हैं। कहां अस्सी लाख को काम देना था और कहां २५ लाख को ही काम दे सके हैं। तो बेकारी का सवाल दिन-ब-दिन बढ़ता जा रहा है और यह बेकारी का सवाल ऐसा है कि जो इस देश में शान्ति लाने में और प्रगति होने देने में एक बहुत अड़ंगा या संकट पैदा करने वाला है। इसलिए मेरी सरकार से प्रार्थना है कि बेकारी के सवाल को लक्ष्य में रखते हुए तृतीय योजना को इस बिना पर, इस बेसिस पर बनाया जाय कि उसमें नीचे के लोगों की सलाह ली जाय, जैसे कि कम्युनिटी ब्लॉक की, एडवाइजरी कमेटीज की, सलाह ली जाय कि वे क्या चाहती हैं, उनकी क्या अपेक्षाएं हैं, उनके क्या टार्गेट्स हैं। इस प्रकार तृतीय प्लान को नीचे से ऊपर ले जाना होगा, तब कहीं जनता में तृतीय प्लान के प्रति उत्साह पैदा हो सकेगा। धन्यवाद।

SHRI N. M. LINGAM (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Address of the President to both Houses of Parliament has been characterised by some Members of opposite as stale, uninspiring and matter of fact. Sir, it is forgotten that the President gives annually a sober assessment of the achievements and a review of what is proposed to be done in continuation of these achievements for the development of the country and for the welfare of the people. Looking at the account given by the President in his Address, even the most perverted among us cannot deny that the country is forging ahead. To mention even a few of the items in the President's Address, we cannot but feel a thrill passing through us at the way we are going ahead. In the field of atomic energy, for instance, we are the leaders in the East. This has been conceded by the most advanced countries in atomic energy. For purposes of harnessing atomic energy for peaceful purposes we are in the vanguard among the undeveloped countries. That is a thing which we are legitimately proud of.

Then, Sir, in mineralogy—in tapping hidden resources for industrial development—we are making rapid progress. New deposits of coal, copper and gypsum have been discovered, and in Cambay and other places oil has been struck. These are matters over which the nation, and this Parliament in particular, can feel gratified.

Sir, the National Laboratories, which were established soon after Independence throughout the length and breadth of the country, are functioning very well. "They have harnessed", in the words of the President, "the results of their research to production >y erection of pilot plants, particularly for the development of coal resources for the steel plants, raw materials for refractories, and in assisting the private sector in certain problems."

Sir, we have made headway in industrial production, especially in machine-tools, penicillin, insecticides,

soda caustic, sewing machines, Dicycies and electric fans. I cite these things by way of illustration because every Member has gone through the Address of the President. These achievements, although they are part of the Second Five Year Plan, are, by any test, significant, and it is clear that they are assisting our industrial development and making the nation advance. I fail to see how any Member could say that we are not forging ahead. It is true that considering the programme ahead, considering what we have yet to achieve, considering the stupendous problems in raising the standard of living of the people, what we have yet to do is a great deal, but that need not prevent us from taking stock of what we have done.

Sir, certain Members on the opposite side criticised the foreign policy of the Government. They said that our foreign policy had failed miserably and much of the ills that we were experiencing in Kashmir, in Goa, and in our relations with Pakistan, were attributable to the way in which our foreign policy had been handled. Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to speak to the House that if there is any field of our national activity in which we have won universal acclaim, it is in the conduct of our foreign relations.

Sir, in the beginning of our Independence, when for the first time we handled foreign policy, it was thought that we were dabbling with the question of our foreign relations. It was a stupendous problem to adjust our relations between the two power blocs. The Russians thought that we were, at best dreamers and at worst camp followers of the West. They gave expression to such feeling in the beginning. On the other hand the West thought that we were near-Communists and fellow-travellers with the Eastern Bloc. But the steadfast way, the unswerving way, in which we have pursued the non-alignment has proved to the world that it is not mere neutrality that we are pursuing, we are making a positive contribution to the solution of problems. Sir, it is

to the credit of the Prime Minister who handled, and who continues to handle, the foreign policy, that we have, to some extent, contributed not only to the solution of world problems, but also to the easing of tensions and to the raising of India in the estimation of the world. He, as the principal architect of our freedom, has chosen this medium to voice the feeling, the sentiment, of India and has succeeded in a large measure in convincing the world of the real intents and purposes of our country.

Sir, the world cannot be taken in by hollow words. We cannot deceive the world by pious platitudes and homilies and anyone here in this House or outside who has had the opportunity to go abroad would have found that the standing of our country is high. Even in the councils of the United Nations, next only to the voices of the two power blocs comes the voice of India. It is not because of our military resources, not because of our material power that we have attained this position. Sir, let us all agree that after Independence, we have raised not only our own status but also we have, in however humble a way, contributed to the solution of world problems by the superb handling of our foreign relations. I need not take the time of the House in going through specific problems like Kashmir, Goa and Pakistan. It is enough if I say that we should adhere to this policy. The world must know that we do not belong to any power blocs, that we have our own independent policy to follow. I think that the first phase of our relationship when our attitude was suspect is over and we are now beginning to be listened to with more and more respect and, whatever the future may be, it is our duty to confront the world with the challenge of goodwill and sincerity, fellowship and peace. This has not paid immediate dividends but in the long run, it will pay, pay us and pay the world. So, let us not say that we are not prompt in dealing with Goa or Kashmir. It was easy for us to take up arms against Goa and in a trice we 110 RSD—5.

could have occupied it, we could have occupied Kashmir too, but our policy is entirely different. We are against the settlement of disputes by aggression or by the force of arms. So, Sir, so long as we hold on to this policy of confronting every problem with goodwill and sincerity and an attitude of peace and fellowship, we need not be afraid that our policy will fail. As long as this policy is followed, all problems are bound to be solved and it is only patience that is required on the part of the House and the country to see to the fruition of our labours.

Sir, while we have reason to congratulate ourselves on the way in which we handle our foreign relations, when we have made significant progress in industrialisation and in the other nation building activities, there are certain aspects which cause disquiet. Sir, I will be failing in my duty if I did not draw the attention of the House to some of these fields where we have not made good. Sir, I refer to the price structure. The wholesale prices are today 15 per cent, or 16 per cent, higher than they were on the eve of the Plan and our Plan made the assumption that the price line would be held firmly. Then, Sir, it is estimated that at the end of the Second Five Year Plan there would be a backlog of 7.5 million of unemployed to be provided for because, during the last three years we have not been able to provide employment as envisaged in the Plan. Taking even the effects of the working of the Second Five Year Plan in social terms, we find that in the urban sector, the business classes have gained while the fixed income groups have lost in terms of real income. The working class seems to have kept its ground. So, in spite of widening employment opportunities, the problems of under-employment and urban unemployment continue and indeed, they have been aggravated. Sir, in the rural sector, the landless are worse off. It is the weaving class that has been helped mainly because of the subsidy given by the Government to the charkha programme, khadi and the handloom industry.

[Shri N. M. Lingam.J

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N.

SAPRU): in the Chair.] Sir, it is thus clear that the distribution of income has not been uniform nor has unemployment been solved to the extent envisaged in the Plan. In spite of our taxation, our resources position has become unsatisfactory because each sector in our national activity is vying with each other for more and more wages and the additional taxation that we have embarked upon is absorbed by the higher national wage bill. There is no corresponding public saving in the nation. Sir, these are disquieting features in the economy of the country and it is the duty of the Government to tell us, tell the House and the nation, how they are going to get over these problems, how they will mobilise resources immediately for the next two years of Plan and, in the long run, for the Third Five Year Plan because the country knows—the House knows—that our foreign exchange position is very bad, the balance of payments position is unsatisfactory. We have drawn our sterling balances to the last pie and the additional taxation is absorbed by the rising wage bill. So, " Sir, unless productivity increases, we cannot get out of the quandry in which we find ourselves. Already the Plan has been pruned and we talk now in terms of a bigger outlay for the Third Five Year Plan. I do not know how the Government is going to face the problem. To me, it is quite clear that unless we have far-reaching institutional changes, far-reaching policy changes, far-reaching changes in the administrative set-up, we cannot face the challenge before us.

Sir, we have reached a critical stage in the development of the country. We have not only embarked upon planning but we have done it democratically. We cannot compel people as in certain other countries. Prof. Thomas was talking in one breath about the production of steel in China and in another breath was saying that he was against co-opera-

tive joint farming as proposed by the Government. Sir, it is not enough if we look at the problem in such an uncoordinated way because not only in the course of planning are we up against this wall of diminishing resources but also in the method of planning we are averse to compulsion in any form. So, it is the greatest challenge that we are faced with and I would submit to this House that unless now, not only for the fulfilment of the Second Five Year Plan but for laying the foundations of the future plans as well, we have far-reaching changes in our policy and in institutions, we cannot effectively cross this hump of under-development. I would suggest in this connection that agricultural production should be increased. That is agreed on all hands, by all sections of the House, but, Sir, it is not realised that the benefits, the incentives, that we give to the agriculturists do not reach every ryot. For instance, it is common knowledge that the ryot wants credit, fertilisers, improved seeds and proper marketing facilities but, Sir, has the Government seen to it that these facilities are extended to every ryot? It is agreed that these facilities should be extended. So, if you want to embark on a scheme of agricultural expansion, if you want, as decided by the conference of Ministers of Agriculture, that we should double our production by the end of the Third Five Year Plan, it is the duty of the Government to see that all these facilities are placed at the doors or within the reach of every producer. I am not saying anything at the moment about the land reforms and ceilings. They are a separate subject by themselves. But in the meanwhile Government have to see to it that these facilities are extended. Unless these are effectively extended production is bound to suffer, however pious our hopes, however ardent our aspirations, may be.

Then, Sir, about the proposed land reforms and ceilings and co-operative joint farming, criticisms are being made by certain sections in the

country and in the House. But they do not offer any alternative solution. There are only two alternatives. We either follow collective farming as in the totalitarian countries or the communes of China, or we have this co-operative joint farming by which we can pool our resources together, initially through service co-operatives and then through joint farms. There is no other way of organising our people, the bulk of whom have small holdings ranging from two acres to ten acres. Experience in some of the countries which have adopted this method is a guide to us in this direction. Even if it is by trial and error, we have to launch upon some such organisation of the people because the greatest asset of our country is its man-power. Unless we utilise that to the full, unless we increase agricultural production to the maximum, all our plans for economic development are bound to founder. If we increase agricultural production, the surplus can be saved and invested in the Five Year Plan. On the other hand, if we continue to depend on import of food-grains, even the meagre resources at our disposal are going to be frittered away in the import of foodgrains. So, agricultural production is the key to the future of our country. If it is to succeed we have no alternative to resorting to joint farming on a cooperative basis. Let us bungle and fail. If we fail let us all sink together.

I want to ask the critics of this programme what alternative they have to offer. It is by hard work, by education, by propaganda, that we can make the peasant realise that his salvation as well as the salvation of the country lies in this method. The community development programme is already working¹, lifting the whole countryside by efforts of this nature, and it is up to us, up to every Member of this House, to go to the farmers, to the villages, and see that the farmer takes enthusiastically to this programme and that production goes up.

Then, Sir, much is said about austerity and savings in public expenditure and reduction in the cost of governmental work. During the debate on the Re-appraisal of the Second Five Year Plan, the Minister for Planning was telling us that he had under consideration a comprehensive scheme for economy. But I have not, the House has not, heard anything either from the Planning Minister or from the Home Ministry any significant scheme for effecting economy. I would suggest in this connection that the Government create immediately a cell which will concern itself mainly with scrutinising Government expenditure in all these departments and cutting ruthlessly unnecessary and superfluous expenditure. All sectors of the Government have to be in tune with the new tempo of our activity and our attitude towards development. We have to cut everything to the bone if this nation has to go forward. It is not a moment too soon when such an undertaking has to be launched by the Government.

Sir, these observations are offered not in a spirit of carping criticism, but I think these are problems which have not been mentioned in the President's Address. And it was not expected that he should mention them. Unless we take note of these things the Plan may not succeed. The Plan is one as if we have mortgaged the entire resources of the country to the Plan and the Plan reveals these major weaknesses. I need not repeat them. There are no indications in the President's Address as to how we are going to get over these weaknesses. So, I earnestly trust that in the reply to the debate the Ministry concerned will be good enough to tell the House as to how they propose to take the country over these stupendous hurdles. Hurdles as they are, they are meant to be overcome. But let us not stint in our praise for what we have achieved, because what we have achieved is tremendous and we are marching ahead, we are forging ahead. Let us give a word of cheer to the people, to the country, from the

[Shri N. M. Lingam.] forum of this House that their future is safe in the hands of the Government, that the Government is doing all that is in its power to raise the masses. Let us not also delude ourselves into thinking that the millennium will be ushered in tomorrow, because it is a long and arduous process. Even according to the present tempo of development, it is bound to take another 15 years to double our per capita income. So, it is no use saying that tomorrow the masses will have all the amenities and all the luxuries of civilized life. Let us convince them that we are on the right road, that we require their co-operation and that in the meanwhile there is no *mantra*, there is no shortcut to prosperity, that everyone has to do hard work, all political parties, all the sectors of society.

In this connection, I would like to say a word to political parties arrayed against the Government. They are patriots; they want to see that the nation goes forward, but it is a sorry spectacle to see that they exploit every occasion when Government is in trouble. I refer to one of the incidents which took place recently, the incident which took place in Jamshed-pur or in Kerala. These are local disputes involving labour and the employer. But the political parties tried to take advantage of the situation for political purposes. Unless we rise above these petty political considerations in questions affecting national development, our progress is bound to be retarded. Because as I said, at the outset, the challenge before us is very great. The next two remaining years of the Plan and the period of the Third Five Year Plan are the most critical in India's history. And let not the world say that at this critical hour the country failed. But judging from our achievements, we have made good and we are bound to make good ultimately. It is our faith in the country and in her future that is going to build us up. However much we may do, whatever legislative measures we may pass, whatever plan

we may have, ultimately it is the people, it is the sense of dedication, it is the hard work of the people that is going to pull the nation out of this morass of under-development. And we have faith in the people. We believe in them. There is no use saying that one sector is corrupt, that we cannot advance unless the capitalist class is liquidated, or we cannot advance unless we follow a certain ideology. Ultimately for any purpose, for any undertaking to succeed, it is / the character of the people that matters. We have faith in the character of the people. If we do not have faith in the character of the people, in the nation and its future, let us not plan at all. If we have faith in the plan and in the people, let us go with silent confidence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : The hon. Member must bring his remarks to a close. His time is long up.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Thank you very much. I close now.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the President's Address which was delivered to a Joint session of both the Houses of Parliament has left me cold. I was not impressed by the Address. On the other hand I shudder to think that the President and his Government have not placed before us any active steps which they are going to take to solve the burning problems of the country.

The mover of the Motion of Thanks to the President and some of the Members who preceded me had some praises for the achievements of the Government during the past year. Sir, the one thing for which this Government stands condemned is regarding the food policy. For the last ten or eleven years they have not been able to solve this problem fairly and squarely. The prices have gone up so much that many people in the country are today on the point or

starvation. In spite of the fact that again and again this problem has come up before this House and before the other House, and in spite of the fact that agitations have taken place, the Government have not been able to solve this problem, because they have no fixed policy. They appoint committees after committees, but their recommendations have not been adhered to and they have not been implemented.

Sir, recently, I understand, the Government appointed a committee called the Nalagarh Committee, and in their report I find that the Agriculture Departments at the Centre and in the States have not been functioning properly. Again, the question of increase in the production of food has not been properly dealt with. The facilities that have been given to the ryots have not been adequate, and most of all the important thing is that radical agrarian reforms have only remained on paper and have not been implemented. I am glad to learn that recently the Congress has taken a decision that these agrarian reforms should be implemented.

Regarding the food prices, Sir, if it is left to the whims and fancies of the market, it is impossible to control these prices. On the one hand, prices should be stabilised as recommended by the Asoka Mehta Committee, and fair prices should be guaranteed to the producer. On the other hand, the soaring prices should be checked. The Government have announced that wholesale trade in foodgrains will be undertaken by the State. Even though more than four months have elapsed since their announcement, no definite scheme has been placed before the House, and they have not undertaken wholesale trade in food-grains which alone could curb this rising of prices and provide food at cheaper rates to the consuming public.

Sir, while I welcome that there should be a ceiling on agricultural land, I really do not understand why the Government of India, especially the Prime Minister, is not thinking in terms of imposing some such ceiling

on urban incomes. He is reported to have stated that for the present it is not possible to do so. Unless and until simultaneous action is taken on these two fronts—it is impossible to convince the ryotwari class that a ceiling on lands will be beneficial while the industrialists and the urban people are allowed a free choice in their sphere. Sir, in urban areas there are persons whose monthly income will be more than a lakh of rupees per month. I know, for instance, that a person who owns buildings in urban areas will be getting Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 20,000 per month as rent, whereas a poor ryot will not get anything like that. Therefore, unless and until the Government, if it is really serious about a socialist pattern of society, brings forward a measure for imposing a ceiling on urban incomes also, the objective of achieving a socialist pattern of society will not be fulfilled.

Sir, after Independence we all expected that there will be no unemployment problem in the country. In spite of the First Five Year Plan and three years of the Second Five Year Plan, the unemployment problem has not improved at all. On the other hand the unemployment problem is becoming a very serious problem. The number of unemployed is going beyond a certain limit, and it has become impossible for educated persons who do not get any employment under Government or private agencies to pull on. The figures that have been indicated by the Employment Exchanges are very meagre. There must be millions and millions of people who are unemployed both in the rural and in the urban sectors.

Sir, some speakers who preceded me said that the question of the Bombay State should not be raised at this juncture. The States Reorganisation Commission gave its report. It suggested separate Maharashtra and Gujarat States and a separate State for Bombay. Because the Central Government and some persons in Bombay yielded to the vested interests, they were not prepared to include Bombay in the State of Maha-

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.] rashtira. Therefore, this bilingual State of Bombay was born. Sir, we must take into account the verdict of the people. The people of Bombay have in unequivocal terms expressed that the City of Bombay should be incorporated in Maharashtra when it is formed. When that is the will of the people, when that is the verdict of the people given in the elections that were held to Parliament, to the State Legislature and to the Municipal Corporation, it is but right that Parliament should respect that will and see that the bilingual State of Bombay is split up and that Maharashtra with Bombay City as its capital is formed. Sir, the report of the States Reorganisation Commission has indicated that the States are to be formed on the basis of language. But there were certain areas and certain elements in some of the States who did not speak the same language of the State in which they were placed. Therefore, it was stated that boundary commissions were going to be appointed to solve these border issues. But unfortunately the Central Government is not appointing any boundary commission to solve these border issues. The Central Government is not evincing any interest in this matter; on the other hand it is allowing the States to fight each other. We must cry a halt to this deteriorating situation. It is, therefore, necessary that a boundary commission should be appointed to solve all the border issues that are now in dispute between Bombay and Mysore, between Mysore and Andhra, between Andhra and Madras and between Mysore and Kerala. Then only the problem can be solved satisfactorily. Sir, in the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission it is said that in spite of the formation of the States on the basis of language, certain linguistic minorities are going to remain in almost all the States. Therefore, their interests should be safeguarded by the President. The linguistic minorities are not treated properly in some of the States. The Central Govern-

ment and the President have not bestowed the interest that is necessary, and the promise that they held out that the interests of the linguistic minorities will be safeguarded has not been kept up. I urge upon the Central Government to see that the interests of the linguistic minorities in all the States are safeguarded irrespective of the fact whether the State Governments are doing it or not.

Members of Parliament both here as well as in the Lok Sabha have been urging since 1952 that we should cut away our links with the British Commonwealth. It is a mockery to continue in the British Commonwealth. We have declared ourselves as an independent sovereign republic and to continue our links with the British Commonwealth . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:
Commonwealth of Nations, not British Commonwealth.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: It is a Commonwealth where the interests of Great Britain are safeguarded; it is a Commonwealth where we are subjected to the dictates of Great Britain. Whether they have elected to call it 'British Commonwealth' or not, it is all the same British Commonwealth. There are no common interests among the members of this Commonwealth. We have not been treated properly in this Commonwealth. Whenever Indian interests come up, the members of this Commonwealth do not support the Indian interests. How can we have a partnership in this Commonwealth when South Africa is continuing to treat us in a very niggardly way? When South Africa has refused to respect the decisions of the United Nations Organisation, how can we allow ourselves to be called members of this Commonwealth? Great Britain does not try to support the just cause of India; on the other hand, it encourages South Africa. Again, whenever the question of India came up, Great Britain did not stand by us. When the question of Kashmir came up, Great Britain did not stand by us.

It was only left to Mr. Khrushchey and other leaders of Soviet Russia to state categorically and unequivocally that Kashmir is part and parcel of India. But Great Britain with whom we have this Commonwealth link has not made any categorical statement on that point. On the other hand, it is helping Pakistan.

Again, Sir, with regard to Goa, the part played by Great Britain and America is not very happy. On the other hand, they have a common link with the Portuguese authorities. They have entered into a pact with them—the NATO Pact. When the question of the liberation of Goa comes up, whenever we raise this issue, they do not support us. For the last four or five years, the Indian Government has been saying again and again that we will take Goa only by peaceful means. What are the methods they have been adopting for this, nobody knows. What influence they are going to exert on Portugal or any other authority, nobody knows. It looks as though the Government of India will give up Goa and that it will be part and parcel of Portugal. On the other hand, some Members yesterday suggested that we even did not protest when Portugal tried to get the support of America.

Regarding Kashmir, I would like to make some observations. Our Election Commission has no jurisdiction over Kashmir. It is very important and vital, if you are really interested that there should be democracy, there should be freedom of speech, freedom of association, that the jurisdiction of the Election Commission should extend to Kashmir. Otherwise, it is quite possible that the ruling party can so manipulate elections that it will continue to hold the majority in the State legislature. There are allegations and allegations, charges and charges, made against the Government of Kashmir that elections were not free and fair. To allay those allegations and also to see that democracy is functioning properly, that elections are held in a fair and free

manner, the jurisdiction of the Election Commission should extend to Kashmir. I do not mean to say that we should impose this decision on the Kashmir Government or the people of Kashmir. But we should persuade Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad and the Kashmir Government that it is in the interests of both India and Kashmir that the jurisdiction of the Election Commission should extend to Kashmir. Similarly, the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court should also extend to Kashmir. We are receiving alarming reports that civil liberties are curtailed, that freedom of speech is curtailed; that freedom of association is curtailed. When a leader of the eminence of Mr. Asoka Mehta went to Kashmir, he was manhandled. It was a shame both to the Kashmir and the Indian Government that such a thing should have been allowed to happen under the very nose of the so-called democratic government of Kashmir.

Sir, things are not happening as we all think them to be in Kashmir. Recently, I read a report in the papers that one of the important members of the General Council of the National Conference who happens to be the brother of the Prime Minister of Kashmir issued a statement which says that there is no civil liberty there and that the present General Secretary of the National Conference is trying to overthrow the present Prime Minister of Kashmir. This sort of move is likely to happen in all Muslim countries—brother fighting the brother. But Kashmir is part and parcel of India; it has acceded to India and we have accepted that. When that is the position, we should take more and more interest in the affairs of Kashmir. Further, it is the frontier State and it should not become the chess-board of imperialist powers who are waiting to see that something is done in Kashmir. So, instead of being complacent or thinking that everything is all right in the "Kingdom of Denmark", we should not keep quiet but see that something vital is done and that Kashmir which

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.] has acceded to India is part and parcel of India and that it functions as any other State in India.

The President has stated that the Official Language Commission of Parliament has submitted its report. There is a hue and cry in this House as well as in the other House and also in this part of the country that Hindi should be the official language and that here and now it should be imposed whether people are willing for it . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Why this hue and cry in Parliament on this official language issue? The Constituent Assembly accepted Hindi as the official language of India.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, I know, because Parliament is manned or controlled by a certain chunk of people. These people who are hailing from the Hindi States form a majority—a brute majority. These Members who hail from the Hindi-speaking areas want to impose it on people who are not willing . . .

श्री पा० ना० राजभोज : गलत बात है ।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: That is what I am telling you. People in the South, people in Bengal and Aasam are not prepared to tolerate this imposition and if in their fanaticism and enthusiasm they try to impose this language on those unwilling people there might come a day when certain States who are not willing to tolerate this sort of domination might try to proclaim themselves as independent and separate themselves from these Hindi-speaking people. I do not want that such a thing should happen. We should be cautious and we should be patient. When they advise us that we should have patience, I would advise them that they should learn to be patient in this particular matter if not in other things.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Have you given this advice to your leaders and to Dr. Lohia?

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: I am not one with Dr. Lohia in this particular proposition.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Then condemn him.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, it is madness whether it is Dr. Lohia or Mr. Sheel Bhadra Yajee; it is madness to impose this Hindi on unwilling people. We agree that Hindi should be the official language but we have to see that people take to this gradually and not in the manner in which these people want it to be done. For some time to come it is not possible for us, and it is not good either, to give up English. Because English happens to be the mother tongue of British people, we should hate it—that should not be our attitude. It is one of the world languages and for the last century and more we have been taught English and it is not proper that we should give up English all of a sudden.

Then there is one significant step mentioned in this Address: "The basic unit of our democracy, the Panchayat, is being provided with increased resources and functions." I am glad that some sense has dawned on the Central Government and that they are going to make the village panchayat a basic unit. So far the State Governments were doling out some grants to these panchayats and they were not . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I must remind you that you have almost exceeded your time.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Yes; I am closing, Sir, This panchayat is a very vital unit of our democracy and we should give it as many powers as possible, including the powers of the police, and also the resources. At least 25 per cent, of the States and Central Government income should go to the local bodies, the village panchayats, the district

boards and the municipalities. Twenty-five per cent, of the total income of the States and the Centre should be shared by these three important local units. Then only our democracy will thrive and thrive well.

Sir, when we are surrounded by countries where democracies have been killed, where dictatorships have come into power and are holding sway, we must guard against such things happening in India. For that we must ensure that domination of one party or the domination of one person is not there and then only the democracy that we all cherish will be nurtured. Thank you.

مولانا ایم - فاروقی (انٹرنیشنل):

جنتاب وائس چیمبرمین صاحب - آج دستور کے مطابق ہم نئے سال میں پھر داخل ہو رہے ہیں - جو دستور ہمیشہ سے چلا آتا ہے اس کے مطابق ہمارے ہندوستان کے محبوب پریسیدنٹ کے ایڈرس کے بارے میں آج اس ہاؤس میں غور کیا جا رہا ہے اور اس کے بارے میں اکتھ چھائی کی جا رہی ہے یا تائید کی جا رہی ہے - آج کا سال کوئی نیا سال نہیں ہے بلکہ جب ہم سال شروع کرتے ہیں تو ہم یہ دیکھتے ہیں کہ جب ہمیں آزادی ملی تھی اس وقت سے اب تک ہم نے جو سفر کیا ہے اس میں ہمیں کیا کامیابی ہوئی کہا تکلیفیں اٹھانی پڑی ہیں اور کہا ہمارے نقصانات ہوئے -

آپ کو یاد ہوگا کہ سنہ ۱۹۴۷ء

میں جب ہمیں آزادی ملی تھی یعنی ہندوستان اپنا ہوا تھا تو ہماری ہر چیز لگی ہوئی تھی - ہماری انڈسٹری ہماری صنعت و حرفت - ہماری تعلیم - ہماری اقتصادیات اور

ہماری مالی حالت سب خراب اور بگڑی ہوئی تھی - ہمارے پاس فارن ایکسچینج یعنی باہری روپیہ بالکل نہ تھا وہ جو کچھ تھوڑا سا لڑائی کا بچا ہوا اسٹریلنگ پڑا ہوا تھا اسی کو ہم تھوڑا بہت استعمال کرتے تھے - غرضیکہ اس وقت ہمارے سامنے جو چیزیں تھیں وہ سب بگڑی ہوئی تھی اور ہمیں انہیں بدلنا تھا - جس پارٹی نے حکومت لی اس نے صورت حال پر غور کیا اس لئے کہ اس کے کاندھوں پر بڑا بوجھ پڑا تھا - کیونکہ ایسا ملک اس کے ہاتھ میں آیا جس کے پاس نہ تعلیم تھی نہ صنعت و حرفت تھی نہ انڈسٹری تھی اور نہ ہی اس کی مالی حالت اچھی تھی آپ جانتے ہیں کتنی بڑی آبادی کا یہ ملک ہے کوئی معمولی تعداد انہیں ہے - ملک کے آزاد ہونے کے ساتھ ہی اس کے اوپر ایک اور بہت بڑی مصیبت پڑی تھی کہ ملک تقسیم ہو گیا تھا جس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوا کہ باہر سے لاکھوں کی تعداد لوگ یہاں آئے اور لاکھوں کی تعداد میں یہاں سے بھاگ کر گئے - جو یہاں آئے وہ بھوکے فلیکے تھے - ان کے پاس نہ کھانے کو تھا اور نہ پہلے کو تھا - تو ہمارے سامنے اس طرح کی مشکلات پیش آئیں - یہ تو ہماری اس وقت کی داستان ہے جبکہ ہم نے اس آزادی حاصل کرنے کے بعد اپنی

[مولانا ایم - فاروقی]

تعمیر کی جانب سفر کیا تھا -
سنہ ۱۹۴۷ سے لیکر اب تک کے سفر
کی ایک ایک منزل آپ کے سامنے
ہے - آپ نے سنہ ۱۹۴۷ کے بعد اپنے
سفر کا پورا جائزہ لیا اور سنہ ۴۸
میں پرکھا کہ اس سال کیا کیا
گیا - پھر اس کے بعد سنہ ۱۹۴۹
میں آپ نے کیا کیا اور ہر سال آپ
کے ہاؤس کے سامنے ہر سال کا جائزہ
دکھا جاتا رہا آپ نے کانستبل ٹیوشن
بدایا - آپ نے ٹیموکریٹک گورنمنٹ
بدائی - آپ نے انڈسٹریز میں ترقی
کی - آپ نے ان سب چیزوں کے
بارے میں شری امولک چل دی
سے کل پوری تفصیلات سنی ہوئی -
بہر حال یہ چیز ہر شخص کے
سامنے ہے کہ اتنی تیزی سے مدت
میں ہمارے ملک نے کیا کیا ترقی
کی ہے - اس چیز کی مثال ایشیا
کیا یہاں تک کہ یورپ کا بھی کوئی
ملک نہیں پھس کر سکتا - روس کا
ملک جو سب کی نظروں میں چوتھی
کا ملک ہے جس کی بڑی تعریف کی
جاتی ہے اس نے بھی ۴۰ سال تک
فاقہ کر کے مصیبتوں کو جھیلنا اور
طرح طرح کی تکلیفیں برداشت
کیں تب جا کر وہ آج اس حالت پر
پہنچا -

سب سے پہلی چیز کسی ملک
کے لئے اس کی پیداوار ہے اسے بڑھانا

اور درست کرنا ہوتا ہے - ہمارے ملک
میں پیداوار دو طرح کی ہیں - ایک
تو ذراہتی ہے، کھیتی ہے، ان کے غلہ
ہے اور دوسری پیداوار ہمارے ملک
کی ہی نہیں بلکہ ہر ملک کی
اس کی صنعت و حرفت ہے کہ کس
قسم کا پروڈکشن اور کس قسم کی
نکاسی وہ اپنے مال کی کرتا ہے -

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : एक पैदाوار घर
में भी होती है जो बहुत हो रही है ।

مولانا ایم - فاروقی : وہ پیداوار جو

ہوتی ہے وہ کچھ بہت مفید نہیں
ہے اس لئے میں اس کا تذکرہ نہیں
کرتا - خیر یہ دو چیزیں آپ کے سامنے
بہت صاف تھیں - جہان تک کہ اس
ملک کو صنعتی بنانے اور انڈسٹریلائز
کرنے کا سوال ہے یہ ایک بہت بڑا
کام آپ کے سر پر تھا اور اب بھی ہے
اور اس میں جو سب سے بڑی مشکل
تھی وہ یہ تھی کہ آپ کو موجودہ
دنیا میں جس قسم کی انڈسٹری
کھڑی کرنی تھی جس قسم کی صنعت
و حرفت کو فروغ دینا تھا اور جس
قسم کی پیداوار کو بڑھانا تھا اس کے
لئے بڑی بڑی مشینوں اور بڑے بڑے
کارخانوں کی ضرورت تھی اور مشینوں
کو خریدنے کے لئے آپ کے پاس روپیہ
نہیں تھا - مشینوں کے خریدنے کے
لئے آپ کے پاس نہ تو قابو تھے نہ
استورنگ تھے - کچھ تھوڑا بہت پہلے

کا پڑا ہوا تھا اس کو ابھی تک آپ کلم میں لاتے رہے - ایسی حالت میں آپ کے لئے یہ ایک بڑا مشکل سوال تھا کہ آپ کس طرح اپنی پیدوار کو بڑھائیں - اور اگر آپ اپنی پیدوار کو نہیں بڑھاتے ہیں تو ہم اس کھچڑ میں پڑے رہتے ہیں جس کھچڑ میں تین سو چار سو برس تک انگریزوں اور باہر کی حکومت نے ڈال رکھا تھا - اس سلسلہ میں میں مبارک باد ہوں گا اور یقیناً قابل مبارکباد ہے وہ ایڈمنسٹریشن وہ حکومت اور وہ لوگ کہ جنہوں نے اس کو اس اچھے طریقہ پر سنبھالا جس کی مثال کم ہی جگہ پر ملے گی - اس سلسلہ میں لوگ اعتراض کرتے ہیں کہ باہر سے جن لوگوں نے مدد کی ہے انہیں بھی کچھ غرض تھی - تھیک ہے ان کی غرض تھی اور جو غرض ان کی تھی اس کو انہوں نے دوسرے ملکوں کو ایڈ دیکر نہایت اچھی طرح پورا کیا - لیکن ہمارا کمال یہ تھا ہماری سیاسی سیاست کا کمال یہ تھا ہماری وزارت خارجہ کا کمال یہ تھا کہ ہم نے ایڈ بھی باہر سے حاصل کیا اور ایلے کو کسی بلدھن میں نہیں رکھا - کالم ۳۷ میں آپ نے دیکھا ہوگا کہ ہمارے پریسیڈنٹ صاحب نے اس چھڑ کا حوالہ دیا ہے کہ اس وقت بھی طرح طرح کی باہری امداد کے باوجود ہم اپنی آزادانہ سیاسی پالیسی رکھتے

ہیں - اس کے ساتھ ساتھ ہماری فارن پالیسی کی یہ بھی خوبی دیکھیں گے کہ جو دو گروپ ایک دوسرے سے لڑ رہے ہیں یعنی جو ایک ڈیموکریٹک گروپ اور ایک سوشلسٹ گروپ آپس میں لڑ رہے ہیں ان دونوں سے ہم اسوقت مدد لے رہے ہیں اور ہم نے ایلے کو کسی معاہدہ یا بلدھن میں گرفتار نہیں کیا ہے -

اس تعریف اور خوبی کے بعد ایک چھڑ ضرور قابل توجہ ہے اور وہ یہ ہے کہ آپ کے کندھوں پر جو قرض کا بھار بڑھتا جا رہا ہے اور آئندہ جو انٹریسٹ کا بھار پڑے گا وہ ایک نہایت مصیبت کی چھڑ ہو سکتی ہے - آپ نے دنیا کی تاریخ میں دیکھا ہوگا مصر اور مڈل ایسٹ اس چھڑ کا شکار ہیں کہ جب باہر کی حکومتیں روپیہ دیتی ہیں اور مدد کرتی ہیں تو جیسا کہ فاکٹر احمد صاحب نے بتلایا اس کا آئندہ نتیجہ قاسمیتیں ہوتا ہے - اس لئے ہمارے پریسیڈنٹ صاحب نے اس بات کی جانب اشارہ کیا ہے کہ ہماری پالیسی یہ ہے کہ جہانتک ہو سکے ہم باہر کے بوجھ کو کم کریں - اور باہر کے بوجھ کو کم کرنے کی سب سے بڑی صورت یہ ہے کہ جو کارخانے آپ کے ہیں ان کارخانوں سے زیادہ سے زیادہ مال نکالے اور ان کارخانوں سے زیادہ سے زیادہ مال نکالنے کا ذریعہ یہ ہے کہ جو مال نکالنے والے مزدور ہیں ان میں

[مولانا ایم فاروقی]

اور کارخانہ داروں میں چاہے وہ پرائیویٹ ہو یا پبلک ہو تعلقات اچھے ہوں۔ یہ چیز ہماری حکومت کے سامنے ہے اور اس وجہ سے آپ دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ طرح طرح کے قانون لہبر کو خوش کرنے کے لئے لہبر کی حالت کو درست کرنے کے لئے ان کی ویلفیئر کے لئے ان کو زیادہ سے زیادہ تلمذ و تہذیب دینے کے لئے اور ان کی ویلفیئر کو بڑھانے کے لئے ہماری حکومت بنا رہی ہے۔ گوپی قریب ہو سکتی ہیں آپ دیکھتے ہیں کہ کوئی نہ کوئی قانون اس قسم کا پاس ہوتا ہے جس سے لہبر کی حالت درست ہو اور لہبر کے معاملات سنبھالیں۔

یہاں پر ایک اور چیز قابل توجہ ہے اور وہ یہ ہے کہ اس وقت ہماری صنعتی زندگی کا دار و مدار لہبر اور کارخانہ داروں کے تعلقات پر ہے۔ مگر ہمیں نہایت افسوس ہے کہ ساتھ کہنا پڑتا ہے کہ آج جو گ یہاں بیٹھ کر سہایتا اور مدد کا وعدہ کرتے ہیں کہ ہم پروڈکشن بڑھانے میں ترقی کے کاموں میں پندرہ سالہ منصوبہ میں صنعت و حرفت کو فروغ دینے میں چاہے ہم ایوزیشن کی پارٹی میں ہوں یا کسی پارٹی میں ہوں پوری مدد کریں گے وہ لگے اپنے کردار میں ملکہ ڈال کر دیکھیں تو ان کو یہ اندازہ ہوگا کہ انڈسٹریل ایمریا میں کس طرح وہ

طرح طرح کی غلط فہمیاں مزدوروں میں پھیلتے ہیں۔ وہ مزدوروں کو غلط سمجھیں دیتے ہیں کہ ہم تمہارے لئے سونے کا پہاڑ بنا دیں گے ہم تمہارے لئے یہ آسانی ہم پہنچائیں گے اور یہ سہولت ہم پہنچائیں گے اور یہ کہتے ہیں کہ تمہارے ساتھ کارخانہ دار اچھا سلوک نہیں کرتے۔ خاص طور پر پبلک سیکٹر میں اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہوتا ہے کہ اسٹرائیکس جو ہوتی ہیں وہ ۷۵ فیصدی غلط ہوتی ہیں۔ لہبر کا دماغ ۷۵ فیصدی غلط راستہ پر جاتا ہے بلکہ بے جایا جاتا ہے۔ کیا کوئی صاحب آج کہہ سکتے جو چاہے انڈسٹریل ایمریا میں کمیونسٹوں کی طرف سے یا کسی دوسری پارٹی کی طرف سے کام کرتے ہوں کہ جمشیدپور میں جو کروڑوں روپے کا نقصان کرایا گیا جس سے ہندوستان کے پروڈکشن پر کروڑوں روپے کا بہار پڑا اور جس سے مہینوں اور برسوں تک جو وہاں کے کام کرنے والے تھے ان کی حالت درست نہیں ہوئی اس میں کیا کسی طرح کا بھی انصاف ہے۔ لہبر کی جتنی اچھی حالت جمشیدپور میں تھی اور جتنی فسیلٹیز جتنی راحت اور آرام کی چیزیں ان کو میسر تھیں اتنی کہیں اور ملک کے لہبر کو نہیں تھیں۔ وہاں محض ایک ذرا سی بات پر جبکہ بالکل مصلحت ہونوالی تھی چھوڑا کرایا گیا۔ میں

اس سلسلہ میں اور زیادہ نہ کہہ کر صرف یہ عرض کروں گا کہ اس وقت اتھارٹی کا مسئلہ ہمارے سامنے ہے۔ اگر ہم اپنی پروٹکشن کو نہیں بڑھاتے ہیں اگر ہم اپنے پیسوں پر نہیں کھڑے ہوتے ہیں اگر ہمارا مال باہر نہیں جاتا ہے تو آپ یقین چاہتے کہ بعد میں جو ہمارے اوپر قرضے کا سود کا بھار پڑے والا ہے وہ ہم برداشت نہیں کر پائیں گے اور وہ چھڑ ہمارے لئے بہت تکلیف دہ ہوگی۔ اس کے لئے ہمیں کلدہ سے کلدہ ملاکر دیانتداری سے ایصالداری سے اور خلوص کے ساتھ اس راہ میں مدد کرنی چاہئے۔ یہ میں ماننا ہوں کہ لہجہ کا سوال بہت اہم ہے لیکن اس کے ساتھ ساتھ یہ بھی نہیں ہونا چاہئے کہ ہم ووٹ حاصل کرنے کے لئے غلطالہین اختیار کریں اور مزدوروں کو غلط کام کرنے کے لئے آمادہ کریں اور پھر اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہو کہ ہمارا پروٹکشن کم ہو جائے۔ بہر حال اس خطرہ کی جانب میں آپ کی توجہ دلاتا ہوں۔ ہلدوستان کے لئے یہ فارن ایڈ ایک بہت بڑا خطرہ ہے اور اس کے لئے ہم سب کو ملکر کوشش کرنی چاہئے کہ ہمارا پروٹکشن بڑھے کیونکہ اس خطرہ سے نجات کا بھی ایک ہی راستہ ہے ہم نے پہلا پلنچ سالہ منصوبہ چلایا اور جیسا کہ بہت سے لوگوں نے بھی کہا کہ وہ منصوبہ کامیاب رہا۔ اس کے بعد دوسرا منصوبہ اب چل رہا ہے اور تیسرے کی جانب ہم قدم بڑھا رہے

ہیں۔ ہمیں امید ہے کہ اس میں بھی ہمیں کامیابی ہوگی۔ دوسرا سوال جو میں نے آپ کے سامنے پیش کیا تھا۔

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्र) : आपका वक्त खत्म हो गया है।
मोलना ایم - فاروقی : پانچ منٹ اور -

श्री उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रकाश नारायण सप्र) : से मजबूर हूँ।

मोलना ایم - فاروقی : آپ دوسروں کو پانچ منٹ دے چکے ہیں اور میں اس سے پہلے ہی ختم کر دوں گا۔

ہاں۔ تو میں عرض یہ کر رہا تھا کہ جہان تک غلہ کا سوال ہے اس کے لئے بہت سی اسکیمیں بنی ہیں اور وہ بنی چاہئیں لیکن ہوم منسٹر صاحب یہاں بیٹھے ہوئے ہیں اور ان سے میں اپنے مشورہ کے طور پر یہ عرض کروں گا کہ جہان تک غلہ کا سوال ہے اس کے لئے ہم فیکٹس اور فیکٹس سب دیکھتے ہیں لیکن اسکے بعد عملی طور کے اوپر ہمیں کوئی نتیجہ نہیں ظاہر ہوتا ہے۔ اس لئے میں یہ چاہتا تھا کہ کچھ قانونی نقطوں کو نظر انداز کر کے ایڈمنسٹریٹو پوائنٹ آف ویو سے اس پر غور کرنا چاہئے اور اپنی طاقت کو بڑھانا چاہئے بہت سے قریب کے ملکوں کی حالت کا مطالعہ کریں جہاں کہ ملٹری گورنمنٹ قائم ہو گئی ہے۔

[مولانا اہم فاروقی]

انہوں نے معلوم نہیں کس طریقہ کے اوپر کام کیا کہ وہ تھوڑے دنوں کے لئے نتیجہ خیز ہوا اور تھوڑے دنوں کے لئے اس کا نتیجہ برآمد ہوا۔ اس لئے اس مسئلہ پر اس نقطہ نظر سے بھی غور کرنا چاہئے۔

تیسری چیز مجھے اپنی فارن پالیسی کے بارے میں کہنی تھی اور وہ یہ تھی کہ اس بارے میں تو کوئی دو رائے ہی نہیں کہ ہماری فارن پالیسی اچھی ہے یا ہماری فارن پالیسی کامیاب ہے۔ لیکن میں ایک اور خطرہ محسوس کر رہا ہوں بہت ممکن ہے کہ اس خطرہ کی جانب میرا دماغ شری متھائی کے حال کے معاملات سے گیا ہو۔ کچھ ایسا خطرہ معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ ایک فرقہ کے لوگ ملے رہتے ہیں چاہے وہ ہندوستانی ہوں یا ہندوستان کے باہر کے رہنے والے ہوں یعنی جو کھیٹھلہلسٹ برادری کے لوگ ہیں وہ ہر جگہ ایک ہی طرح کا کام کرتے ہیں۔ مجھے یہ ایک نیا خطرہ معلوم ہو رہا ہے کہ بہت دنوں سے دنیا کی کھیٹھلہلسٹ برادری ہندوستان میں اس قسم کی کچھ چیزیں ضرور کرنا چاہتی ہے جس طرح سے کہ دوسرے ایسٹائی ملکوں میں ہوا ہے۔ مجھے کوئی وجہ نہیں سمجھ میں آتی ہے کہ کہوں مستر متھائی کا معاملہ

اس طریقہ پر ابھوا اور اس طریقہ پر اٹھایا گیا۔ اتنی سب تقریروں ہوئیں اور اس کے بعد جو چیزیں سامنے آئیں وہ بڑے بڑے سرمایہ کی تھیں اور اسی کے ساتھ ساتھ یہ بھی کہ وہ ایک فارن کمپنی کے ملازم بھی تھے۔ یہ سب چیزیں ایسی ہیں جو فیکٹس تو نہیں ہیں لیکن خطرات ضرور پیش کر سکتی ہیں کہ پیچھے سے اندر سے کچھ چیزیں ایسی کی جا رہی ہیں باہر کے رویے کے ذریعے سے باہر کے ایڈ کے ذریعے سے باہر کے ملکوں کے آدمیوں کے ذریعے سے جو کہ کم سے کم ہمارے یہاں بھی آئندہ کسی قسم کا دستبردیں پیدا کر سکتی ہیں۔ اس وقت جبکہ دنیا کی جو آب و ہوا ہے جو انٹرنیشنل سیاست ہے اس کی حالت دن بدن عجیب قسم کی ہوتی جا رہی ہے جو جو ملک قیموکریتک تھے جن جن ملکوں میں بادشاہت تھی آج وہاں تمام ملگری رول قائم ہو گیا ہے۔ میں مبارکباد دوں گا کہ اس وقت جبکہ تمام دنیا میں ایک خلفشار مچا ہوا ہے تب ہمارا ایڈمنسٹریشن ہمارا ہوم ڈیپارٹمنٹ مضبوط ہے اور ایک اسٹیبل اور مضبوط گورنمنٹ قائم کئے ہوئے ہے اور ہم آگے بھی امید کرتے ہیں کہ ہم سب ملکر ہر ایک پارٹی کے لوگ ہندوستان کو آگے بڑھانے کی کوشش کریں گے۔ شکریہ

†[मौलाना एम० फारूकी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : जनाब वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, आज दस्तूर के मुताबिक हम नये साल में फिर दाखिल हो रहे हैं। जो दस्तूर हमेशा से चला आता है उसी के मुताबिक हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के महबूब प्रेसीडेंट के एड्रेस के बारे में आज इस हाउस में गौर किया जा रहा है और इसके बारे में नुकताचीनी की जा रही है, या तार्ईद की जा रही है। आज का साल कोई नया साल नहीं है; बल्कि जब हम साल शुरू करते हैं तो यह देखते हैं कि जब हमें आजादी मिली थी उस वक्त से अब तक हमने जो सफर किया है, उसमें हमें क्या-क्या कामयाबी हुई, क्या तकलीफें उठानी पड़ी हैं और क्या हमारे नुकसानात हुए हैं।

आपको याद होगा कि सन् १९४७ में जब हमें आजादी मिली थी यानी हिन्दुस्तान अपना हुआ था तो हमारी हर चीज लुटी हुई थी। हमारी इन्डस्ट्री, हमारी सनतो हिरफत, हमारी तालीम हमारी इकतसादियात और हमारी माली हालत सब खराब और बिगड़ी हुई थी। हमारे पास फॉरेन एक्सचेंज यानी बाहरी रुपया बिल्कुल न था। वह जो कुछ थोड़ा सा लड़ाई का बचा हुआ स्टर्लिंग पड़ा हुआ था उसी को हम थोड़ा बहुत इस्तेमाल करते थे। गर्ज कि उस वक्त हमारे सामने जो चीजें थीं, वह सब बिगड़ी हुई थीं और हमें उन्हें बनाना था। जिस पार्टी ने हुकूमत ली, उसने सूरतेहाल पर गौर किया, इसलिये कि उसके कन्धों पर बड़ा बोझ पड़ा था क्योंकि ऐसा मुल्क उसके हाथ में आया जिसके पास न तालीम थी, न सनतोहिरफत थी, न इन्डस्ट्री थी और न ही उसकी माली हालत अच्छी थी। आप जानते हैं कि कितनी बड़ी आबादी का यह मुल्क है, कोई मामूली तादाद नहीं है। फिर मुल्क के आजाद होने के साथ ही इसके ऊपर एक और बहुत बड़ी मुसीबत पड़ी थी कि मुल्क तकसीम हो गया था। जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि बाहर से लाखों की तादाद में लोग यहां आये और लाखों की तादाद में यहां

†[] Hindi transliteration.

से भाग कर गये। जो यहां आये वह भूखे-नंगे थे उनके पास न खाने को था और न पहनने को था। तो हमारे सामने इस तरह की मुश्किलात पेश आईं। ये तो हमारी उस वक्त की दास्तां हैं जबकि हमने इस आजादी को हासिल करने के बाद अपनी तामीर की जानिब सफ़र किया था। सन् १९४७ से लेकर अब तक के सफ़र की एक एक मंजिल आपके सामने है। आपने सन् १९४७ के बाद अपने सफ़र का पूरा जायजा लिया और सन् ४८ में परखा कि इस साल क्या क्या किया गया। फिर इसके बाद सन् १९४९ में आपने क्या किया और हर साल आपके हाउस के सामने हर साल का जायजा रखा जाता रहा। आपने कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाया। आपने डेमोक्रेटिक गवर्नमेंट बनाई, आपने इंडस्ट्रीज़ में तरक्की की। आपने इन सब चीजों के बारे में श्री अमोलब चन्द जी से कल पूरी तफसीलात सुनी होंगी। बहरहाल यह चीज हर शख्स के सामने है कि इतनी थोड़ी सी मुद्त में हमारे मुल्क ने क्या-क्या तरक्की की है। इस चीज की मिसाल एशिया क्या, यहां तक कि यूरोप का भी कोई मुल्क नहीं पेश कर सकता। रूस का मुल्क जो सबकी नजरों में चोटी का मुल्क है, जिसकी बड़ी तारीफ की जाती है, उसने भी ४० साल तक फाक करके मुसीबतों को झेला और तरह तरह की तकलीफें बर्दाश्त कीं। तब जाकर वह आज इस हालत पर पहुंचा। सबसे पहली चीज किसी मुल्क के लिए उसकी पैदावार है, उसे बढ़ाना और दुस्त करना होता है। हमारे मुल्क में पैदावार दो तरह की है : एक तो जरायती है, खेती है, अन्न है, गल्ला है, और दूसरी पैदावार हमारे मुल्क की ही नहीं बल्कि हर मुल्क की उसकी सनतो हिरफत है कि किस किस्म का प्रोडक्शन और किस किस्म की निकासी वह अपने माल की करता है।

श्री शीलभद्र याज्ञो : एक पैदावार घर में भी होती है, जो बहुत हो रही है।

मौलाना एम० फारूकी : वह पैदावार जो होती है वह कुछ बहुत मुफ़ीद नहीं है, इसलिये

[मौलाना एम० फारूकी]

में इसका तजक़रा नहीं करता। खैर, यह दो चीज़ें आपके सामने बहुत साफ़ थीं। जहाँ तक कि इस मुल्क को सनती बनाने और इंडस्ट्रियलाइज़ करने का सवाल है, यह एक बहुत बड़ा काम आपके सर पर था और अब भी है। और इसमें जो सबसे बड़ी मुश्किल थी वह यह थी कि आपको मौजूदा दुनिया में जिस किस्म की इंडस्ट्री खड़ी करनी थी, जिस किस्म की सन्तोहिरफ्त को फरोग देना था और जिस किस्म की पैदावार को बढ़ाना था, उसके लिये बड़ी-बड़ी मशीनों और बड़े-बड़े कारखानों की जरूरत थी। और मशीनों को खरीदने के लिये आपके पास रुपया नहीं था। मशीनों को खरीदने के लिये आपके पास न तो डालर थे न स्टर्लिंग थे। कुछ थोड़ा बहुत पहले का पड़ा हुआ था। उसको भी अभी तक आप काम में लाते रहे। ऐसी हालत में आपके लिए यह एक बड़ा मुश्किल सवाल था कि आप किस तरह अपनी पैदावार को बढ़ायें और अगर आप अपनी पैदावार को नहीं बढ़ाते हैं तो हम इसी कीचड़ में पड़े रहते हैं। जिस कीचड़ में तीन सौ, चार सौ बरस तक अंग्रेजों और बाहर की हुकूमत ने डाल रखा था। इस सिलसिला में मे मुबारिकबाद दूंगा और यकीनन काबिले मुबारिकबाद है वह एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन, वह हुकूमत और वह लोग कि जिन्होंने इसको इस अच्छी तरीका पर सम्भाला जिसकी मिसाल कम ही जगह पर मिलेगी। इस सिलसिला में लोग ऐतराज करते हैं कि बाहर से जिन लोगों ने मदद की है उन्हें भी कुछ गरज़ थी। ठीक है, उनकी गरज़ थी और जो गरज़ उनकी थी उसको उन्होंने दूसरे मुल्कों को एड देकर निहायत अच्छी तरह पूरा किया। लेकिन हमारा कमाल यह था, हमारी सियासत का कमाल यह था, हमारी फारेन पालिसी का कमाल यह था और हमारी बज़ारत खारज़ा का कमाल यह था कि हमने एड भी बाहर से हासिल किया और अपने को किसी बन्धन में नहीं रखा। कालम ३७ में आपने देखा होगा कि हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने इस

चीज़ का हवाला दिया है कि इस वक्त भी तरह तरह की बाहरी इमदाद के बावजूद हम अपनी आज़ादाना सियासी पालिसी रखते हैं। इसके साथ साथ हमारी फारेन पालिसी की यह भी खूबी देखेंगे कि जो दो ग्रुप एक दूसरे से लड़ रहे हैं यानी जो एक डेमोक्रेटिक ग्रुप और एक सोशलिस्टिक ग्रुप आपस में लड़ रहे हैं इन दोनों से हम इस वक्त मदद ले रहे हैं और हमने अपने को किसी मुहायदा या बन्धन में गिरफ्तार नहीं किया है।

इस तारीफ़ और खूबी के बाद एक चीज़ जरूर काबिले तबज़्जह है। और वह यह है कि आपके कंधों पर जो कर्ज़ का भार बढ़ता जा रहा है और आइन्दा जो इन्टरेस्ट का भार बढ़ेगा, वह एक निहायत मुसीबत की चीज़ हो सकती है। आपने दुनिया की तारीख में देखा होगा मिश्र और मिडिल ईस्ट इस चीज़ का शिकार हैं कि जब बाहर की हुकूमतें रुपया देती हैं और मदद करती हैं, तो जैसा कि डाक्टर अहमद साहब ने बतलाया, इसका आइन्दा नतीजा डामीनेशन होता है। इसलिए हमारे प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने इस बात की जानिब इशारा किया है कि हमारी पालिसी यह है कि जहाँ तक हो सके हम बाहर के बोझ को कम करें और बाहर के बोझ को कम करने की सबसे बड़ी सूरत यह है कि जो कारखाने आपके हैं उन कारखानों से ज्यादा से ज्यादा माल निकालें और उन कारखानों से ज्यादा से ज्यादा माल निकालने का जरिया यह है कि जो माल निकालने वाले मजदूर हैं उनमें और कारखानेदारों में, चाहे वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर हो, चाहे पब्लिक सेक्टर हो, ताल्लुकात अच्छे हों। यह चीज़ हमारी हुकूमत के सामने है और इस वजह से आप देख रहे हैं कि तरह-तरह के कानून लेबर को खुश करने के लिये, लेबर की हालत को दुस्त करने के लिये, इनकी वेलफेयर के लिये, इनको ज्यादा से

ज्यादा तन्ख्वाह देने के लिये, और इनकी बेजोड़ को बढ़ाने के लिये हमारी हुकूमत बना रही है। करीब-करीब हर सेशन में आप देखते हैं कि कोई न कोई कानून इस किस्म का पास होता है, जिससे लेबर की हालत दुस्त हो और लेबर के मुआमलात सुलझें।

यहां पर एक और चीज काबिले तवज्जह है और यह है कि इस वक्त हमारी सनती जिन्दगी का दारोमदार लेबर और कारखानादारों के ताल्लुकात पर है। मगर हमें निहायत अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज जो लोग यहां बैठ कर सहायता और मदद का वायदा करते हैं कि हम प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने में, तरक्की के कामों में, पंचसाला मनसूबा में सनतो हिरफत को फ़रोग देने में, चाहे हम अपोज़ीशन की पार्टी में हों या किसी पार्टी में हों, पूरी मदद करेंगे, वह अगर अपने घिरेबान में मुंह डालकर देखें तो उनको यह अन्दाज़ा होगा कि इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया में किस तरह वह तरह-तरह की गलत-फहमियां मजदूरों में फैलाते हैं, वह मजदूरों को गलत उम्मीदें दिलाते हैं कि हम तुम्हारे लिये सोने का पहाड़ बना देंगे, हम तुम्हारे लिये यह आसानी बहम पहुंचाएंगे, वह सहूलियत बहम पहुंचाएंगे, और फिर यह कहते हैं कि तुम्हारे साथ कारखानादार अच्छा सलूक नहीं करते। खास तौर पर पब्लिक सेक्टर में इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि स्ट्राइकें जो होती हैं वह ७५ फ़ीसदी गलत होती हैं, लेबर का दिमाग ७५ फ़ीसदी गलत रास्ते पर जाता है, बल्कि ले जाया जाता है। क्या कोई साहब आज कह सकते हैं, जो चाहे इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया में कम्युनिस्टों की तरफ से या किसी दूसरी पार्टी की तरफ से काम करते हों, कि जमशेदपुर में जो करोड़ों का नुकसान कराया गया, जिससे हिन्दुस्तान के प्रोडक्शन पर करोड़ों रुपये का भार पड़ा और जिससे महीनों और

बरसों तक, जो वहाँ के काम करने वाले हैं, उनकी हालत दुस्त नहीं होगी, उसमें क्या किती तरह का भी इन्साफ है? लेबर की जितनी अच्छी हालत जमशेदपुर में थी और जितनी फेसिलिटीज़, जितनी राहत और आराम की चीजें उनको मयस्सर थीं उतनी कहीं और मूलक के लेबर को नहीं थीं। वहां महज़ एक ज़रा सी बात पर जब कि बिल्कुल मुसालिहत होने वाली थी, झगड़ा कराया गया। मैं इस सिलसिला में और ज्यादा न कह कर सिर्फ यह अर्ज करूंगा कि इस वक्त इन्डस्ट्री का मसला हमारे सामने है। अगर हम अपनी प्रोडक्शन को नहीं बढ़ाते हैं, अगर हम अपने पैरों पर नहीं खड़े होते हैं, अगर हमारा माल बाहर नहीं जाता है तो आप यकीन जानिये कि बाद में जो हमारे ऊपर कर्ज का, सूद का, भार पड़ने वाला है, वह हम बर्दाश्त नहीं कर पायेंगे और वह चीज हमारे लिये बहुत तकलीफदेह होगी। इसलिये हमें कन्धे से कन्धा मिला कर, दयानतदारी से, ईमानदारी से, और खलूस के साथ इस राह में मदद करनी चाहिये। यह मैं मानता हूँ कि लेबर का सवाल बहुत अहम है लेकिन इसके साथ साथ यह भी नहीं होना चाहिये कि हम बोट हासिल करने के लिये गलत लाइन अस्तिथार करें और मजदूरों को गलत काम करने के लिये आमादा करें। और फिर इसका नतीजा यह हो कि हमारा प्रोडक्शन कम हो जाय। बहरहाल इस खतरे की जानिब मैं आपकी तवज्जह दिलाता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान के लिए यह फारेन एंड एक बहुत बड़ा खतरा है और इसके लिए हम सबको मिलकर कोशिश करनी चाहिए कि हमारा प्रोडक्शन बढ़े; क्योंकि इस खतरे से नज़ात का भी एक ही रास्ता है। हमने पहला पंचसाला मनसूबा चलाया और जैसा कि बहुत से लोगों ने भी कहा, वह मनसूबा कामयाब रहा। इसके बाद दूसरा मनसूबा अब तक चल रहा है और तीसरे की जानिब हम कदम बढ़ा रहे हैं। हमें उम्मीद है कि इसमें भी हमें कामयाबी

[मौलाना एम० फारूकी]
होगी। दूसरा सवाल जो मैं आपके सामने
पेश किया था . . .

श्री उपसभध्यक्ष : (श्री प्रकाश नारायण
सप्र) : आपका वक्त खत्म हो गया है।

मौलाना एम० फारूकी : पांच मिनट
और।

श्री उपसभध्यक्ष : (श्री प्रकाश नारायण
सप्र) : मैं मजबूर हूँ।

मौलाना एम० फारूकी : आप दूसरों को
पांच मिनट दे चुके हैं और मैं इससे पहले ही
खत्म कर दूंगा।

हां, तो मैं अर्ज यह कर रहा था कि
जहां तक गल्ला का सवाल है, इसके लिए
बहुत सी स्कीमें बनी हैं, और वह बननी
चाहियें, लेकिन होम मिनिस्टर साहब यहां
बैठे हुए हैं और इनसे मैं अपने मशविरा के
तौर पर यह जरूर अर्ज करूंगा कि जहां तक
गल्ला का सवाल है, इसके लिए हम फ़ैक्ट्स
और फ़िगर्स सब देखते हैं, लेकिन इसके बाद
अमली तौर के ऊपर हमें कोई नतीजा नहीं
जाहिर होता है। इसलिए मैं यह चाहता था
कि कुछ कानूनी नुक्तों को नज़रन्दाज़ करके
एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव पाइन्ट आफ व्यू से इस पर
गौर करना चाहिए और अपनी ताकत को
बढ़ाना चाहिए। बहुत से करीब के मुल्कों
की हालत का मुताल्लया करे जहां कि
मिलिट्री गवर्नमेंट कायम हो गई है। उन्होंने
मालूम नहीं किस तरीका के ऊपर काम किया
कि वह थोड़े दिनों के लिए नतीजा खोज हुआ
और थोड़े दिन के लिए इसका नतीजा बरामद
हुआ। इसलिए इस मसला पर इस नुक्ता
नज़र से भी गौर करना चाहिए।

तीसरी चीज़ मुझे अपनी फारेन
पालिसी के बारे में कहनी थी और वह यह
थी कि इस बारे में तो कोई दो राय हैं ही नहीं
कि हमारी फारेन पालिसी अच्छी है या

हमारी फारेन पालिसी कामयाब है। लेकिन
मैं एक और खतरा महसूस कर रहा हूँ।
बहुत मुश्किल है कि इस खतरा की जानिब
मेरा दिमाग श्री मथाई के हाल के मुआमलात
से गया हो। कुछ ऐसा खतरा मालूम होता है
कि एक फ़िरका के लोग मिले रहते हैं चाहे
वह हिन्दुस्तानी हों या हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर
के रहने वाले हों। यानी जो केपिटलिस्ट
बिरादरी के लोग हैं वह हर जगह एक ही
तरह का काम करते हैं। मुझे यह एक नया
खतरा मालूम हो रहा है कि बहुत दिनों से
दुनिया की केपिटलिस्ट बिरादरी हिन्दुस्तान
में इस किस्म की कुछ चीज़ें जरूर करना
चाहती है जिस तरह से कि दूसरे एशियाई
मुल्कों में हुआ है। मुझे कोई वजह समझ में
नहीं आती है कि क्यों मिस्टर मथाई का
मामला इस तरीका पर उभरा और इस
तरीका पर उठाया गया। इतनी सब तकरीरें
हुई और उसके बाद जो चीज़ें सामने आईं
वह बड़े-बड़े सरमाया की थीं और उसके
साथ साथ यह भी कि वह एक फारेन कम्पनी
के मुलाजिम भी थे। यह सब चीज़ें ऐसी हैं
जो फ़ैक्ट्स तो नहीं हैं लेकिन खतरात जरूर
पेश कर सकती हैं कि पीछे से, अन्दर से,
कुछ चीज़ें ऐसी की जा रही हैं — बाहर के
रूपये के जरिये से, बाहर की एंड के जरिये
से, बाहर के मुल्कों के आदमियों के जरिये
से—जो कि कम से कम हमारे यहां भी
आइन्दा किसी किस्म का डिस्टर्बेंस पैदा
कर सकती हैं। इस वक्त जब कि दुनिया की
जो आबोहवा है, जो इन्टरनेशनल सियासत है
इसकी हालत दिन-दिन अजीब किस्म की
होती जा रही है। जो-जो मुल्क डेमोक्रेटिक थे
जिन-जिन मुल्कों में बादशाहत थी, आज वहां
तमाम मिलिट्री रूल कायम हो गया है।
मैं मुवारिकबाद दूंगा कि इस वक्त जब कि
तमाम दुनिया में एक खलफ़ात मचा हुआ है
तब हमारा एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन, हमारा होम
डिपार्टमेंट मजबूत है और एक स्टेबल और
मजबूत गवर्नमेंट कायम किये हुए है। और
हम आगे भी उम्मीद करते हैं कि हम सब

मिल कर हर एक पार्टी के लोग हिन्दुस्तान को आगे बढ़ाने की कोशिश करेंगे । शुक्रिया ।]

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, the President^ Address le-aves (out of account certain major facts in the Indian situation and in the world situation of today. One such major fact has a close bearing on our national security which we can afford to ignore only at our peril. Not that we should get panicky over it, or alarmist over it, but it is necessary that we should take note of these facts so that we are properly forewarned and so that the people in our country may also become aware of the danger lurking ahead and they may become vigilant and alert for the preservation of our independence and for the maintenance of our liberty and freedom, and the forces outside also, and the trouble-shooters, may know as well how we intend to face and view these developments.

On the last Republic Day, Mr. Vice-Chairman, on the 26th of January, in Karachi, with the active participation of the United States of America and under the direct initiative and leadership of the United Kingdom, the Baghdad Pact countries, or what remains of that Pact, those countries, met at Karachi and Sir, sixteen persons came from the U.S.A. under the leadership of that redoubtable Mr. Loy Henderson whom we in India had occasion to know and whom the people of the Middle East know only too well. They were there in full force and they discussed and took some decisions. One decision which they took is that the central military organisation of the Baghdad Pact must be strengthened, which means a nuclear weapon centre in Teheran, which means just now the supply of military equipment of all kinds to Pakistan, which means the coming up of warships not only in the Persian Gulf area, but in the waters of the Indian Ocean. They took another decision and it is this. They wanted

to link up what remains of the Baghdad Pact with the N.A.T.O. of the West and the S.E.A.T.O. of the East. What does it mean? It means that the non-aligned countries of this region, including our country, Burma and Indonesia, all these non-aligned countries are, as it were, encircled and the cold war has been brought not only to our doors, but right into our midst. The other decision which this Baghdad Pact Conference at Karachi took was to link up these three military blocs. The third decision they took was about this so-called Anti-subversion Committee of the Baghdad Pact and we know what work this committee has been doing in the whole of the Middle East countries, how military dictatorships have been thrown up in all these countries. And we also know that this Anti-subversion Committee of the Bagdad Pact has decided to take active steps in pursuance of what is known as the Eisenhower Doctrine to fight, what they call, internal subversion. We have got the rich experience of the countries of the Middle East in recent years. And we know and understand what exactly to function of this Anti-subversion Committee of the Baghdad- Pact means. More than that and on the top of it all, we hear of projected talks for bilateral military pacts between the U.S.A. and the countries of the Baghdad Pact, Pakistan especially, Iran and Turkey. Now, all these things must have significance to our territorial integrity and to our national security. I am not suggesting that all these recent developments are the direct results of the foreign policy that we are following now. The results of our foreign policy have to be judged in a broad aspect. I am not suggesting that all these recent developments to strengthen themselves on the part of the military blocs are the results of our foreign policy. We have the actual experience of the last few years, how imperialism in Asia and in the Latin American countries has been receding especially in the Asian and African countries—the traditional

[Shri Perath Narayanan Nair.] reserves of imperialism for the last century and more. There they feel the ground slip away from underneath. The nations of Asia and Africa more especially are asserting themselves. But imperialism is trying to stage a come-back, as for instance in Suez or Lebanon or Jordan, and they have been thrown back. They have been thwarted and they have been foiled. Still there is that danger and it is only prudence that we took note of these dangers that are there and imperialistic powers may embark on any military adventure. It may be that no immediate threat is there. We have heard also the powerful voice of the Soviet Union and of the Chinese Republic unequivocally coming forward against these military pacts, bilateral or multi-lateral or whatever they may be. In the present day world it may be just wishful thinking on their part, but all the same it is well that we take note of the fact that American warships are plying in our Indian Ocean waters, that there is already a proposal to station, what they call, the American Fifth Fleet in the Indian waters. Also, in Pakistan bases are rising up; so also in the Near East in Teheran. This additional military equipment which America, especially the United States of America, is sending to Pakistan gives tongue to the military dictator in Pakistan to utter words against our security. It is necessary that we take note of these things. Not only should we take note of these things, I would like to know from the Government of India what information they have regarding these projected bilateral military pacts, what repercussions they would have on our own internal security and what steps they have taken to inform those responsible as to how we view these things.

The President In his Address has suggested that our relations with all countries are friendly. Well, our relations are friendly, we are non-aligned, Good. But then the relations, the attitudes of certain powers

to us, are not friendly. It is not friendly that round about in our own waters there must be foreign ships plying. So, our attitude being friendly to these countries must not lead us to misunderstand the attitude shown by some of these imperialist powers, more specifically the United States of America, especially in the light of the decisions they have taken at the Karachi Conference of the Baghdad Pact countries. They are not friendly. We must make it clear in unequivocal terms that these actions, these activities, can in no way be considered by the people of India as a friendly attitude.

Sir, right in the Middle East what is happening? In a country like Oman the freedom-fighters are slaughtered. Even Red Cross representatives are not allowed to visit the persons—where on thousands of freedom-fighters there is bombing and all that sort of thing, even today. These things are not just imaginary. They happen right before our eyes even today, and it is well that we take note of these developments and also of those who are responsible for bringing these threats to our very doors and inside our own country.

Sir, we have been so much preoccupied with the loans and aid given by some of these Western powers that we do not seem to be quite alive to the dangers to our State. The President in his Address has stated that "to tide us over our temporary difficulties", as he put it, of our Plan crisis, these aids and loans from these Western countries have been very helpful, and he has expressed his gratitude. There is one thing. In a way, to tide over our temporary difficulties some of these loans and some of these aids might have been helpful, but there is another side to the picture and we will do well to take note of these things. The President has said that no political conditions are attached to these aids and loans; negotiations are conducted on the basis that no political conditions are attached. Well, maybe, in the actual text

of these agreements no political conditions are mentioned in concrete terms, but we have to view these things in the general background of the world situation, and imagine what motivates them to render us aid and what results, in concrete terms, they produce inside our own country.

Sir, I have a bunch of press cuttings to show as to what exactly is prompting these Western countries to lend us these aids. Here is an article in the Manchester Guardian of December 4. Again, there is the article of Aneurin Bevin in the Tribune about the nature of and the necessity for these aids. The speeches of well-known businessmen of United States, including that of Mr. Oliver Frank, Chairman of the Lloyds Bank—it has appeared in our papers—and the reports of the World Bank teams are before us.

Sir, I will just refer to one of our own Indian economists, Mr. Anjaria, Chief Economic Adviser to the Government of India, in his speech at the Lucknow Economic Conference, who, as reported, drew attention to what he calls the tying-strings attached to these loans and to the gentle pressures to mould our domestic policies which accompany these things. He also added that presumably included in these gestures is the device that in our internal policies we should follow sound orthodox monetary and fiscal policies which, according to Mr. Anjaria again, will keep us where we are. Sir, there may be no concrete political conditions attached to the text of the agreements but here is the background to show how these aids have affected our own Indian economy.^

Sir, we are speaking about the crisis of the whole Plan. Well, there is crisis, but that crisis is more in the public sector than in the private sector. It gives a pointer for us to understand how these aids, loans, have been working in India which has adopted a mixed economy with emphasis on the public sector. You

know, Sir, the private sector is gaining the upper hand. It is to be noted that during the first three years of the Plan all the investments in the private sector have been over fulfilled. They have run away with our foreign exchange. You cannot deny that and what happens to the public sector? Sir, we had in the strategic public sector, I think, contemplated an investment of 520 crores of rupees plus about 60 crores of rupees or so through the National Development Corporation—about 600 crores in all. But out of this, in the public sector, over Rs. 200 crores we have been obliged to spread over the first year of the Third Plan. And, some of those projects included in the public sector have been deferred indefinitely. That is the thing. In the light of the advice tendered by Mr. Eugene Black and the World Bank team and in the light of what has passed at the confabulations of the consortium of creditor nations we can understand how actually this aid has upset our own planned calculations. We have to draw a lesson out of this.

Apart from that, Sir, whatever economic aid they give is more than washed away by the additional defence expenditure we are obliged to incur because of their political policies of military aid which they rush to our neighbouring country. Now, Sir, it is not that this external pressure alone has affected our own economy. Vested interests in our own country have taken the cue from this. We hear a lot of hue and cry raised against the national concerted drive which we are undertaking to have quicker development of our economy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : I wish to remind the hon. Member that one hour and 45 minutes were allotted to his Party. Forty minutes have already been taken by Dr. Ahmad and the hon. Member has already taken more than fifteen minutes. There are two more speakers from his Party.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: I would take some more minutes, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) : That would involve a cut in the time of other hon. Members of his Party.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: All right, Sir. I may not take more than ten minutes.

Now, Sir, this pressure from the vested interests here has also been increasing. We heard some refreshing talk at Nagpur quickening the tempo of development, about ceiling on agricultural holdings, about co-operative organisation of agriculture and a big bold plan of an investment of about ten thousand crores of rupees. An impression has been sought to be created that this time the ruling party means business but then, Sir, when we come to examine the actual implementation of things which are necessary for quickening the tempo of development, what do we find? Inside the ruling party itself, there are vested interests even about the question of ceilings. Leading industrialists like Shri H. P. Mody, let alone well-known leaders of the Congress, are coming forward by and by opposing this idea. If it is a question of State trading, it is scuttled. Already, our experience is that the marketable surplus has disappeared from the market. Even if it be a question of extending the scope of the State Trading Corporation, taking over a few more sectors of our trade—in all these things—we find a concerted drive against these trends. If we have some prejudged notions about democratic socialism and authoritarianism and other things, we are not going to find any solution for these things. The question is how the democratic forces in this country can be united to meet this onslaught if the vested interests. Unless we take a definite stand about land reforms, about the control of trading

in food, about the curbing of private profits, nothing much can be done in the realisation of our social aims. The President in his Address has said that measures are taken for the effective participation of the people in the implementation of the Plan and in construction activities. Now, what is our experience? Of course, we appoint certain committees, the Balwantrai Mehta team included. They made certain recommendations, some of them really very good, regarding the decentralisation of authority, regarding the vesting of more effective powers in the village panchayat and so on. But, Sir, what is the actual experience? How many States have implemented the recommendations? Sir, the vast majority of the State Governments in India have pigeon-holed the recommendations and such of those as have implemented the recommendations have watered down the recommendations to such an extent that they cannot be of much use. This is what we find. Within our limited experience of Kerala, we can say this. Of course, our Panchayat Bill is in the offing following the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Committee but already we have made a beginning by giving powers to the people. Ail-Party Committees have been constituted and with all the limitations, the urges of the people are surging forward and they flock together and show initiative in working out these national construction activities, in irrigation works, road-building, production of green manure, etc. They must be an eye-opener to us all as to how, given the initiative, given the prompting—even the slightest encouragement—the creative energies of our people can be brought forward.

Now, Sir, before I conclude, I must refer to one or two things relating to the State of Kerala. The difficulty of food production has been referred to from this side already by the first Speaker, Dr. Ahmad. I am not going into the details of this subject but*

then the way in which this problem has been handled by the Central Government has been a source of deep concern to us in Kerala.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

A.11 along, there has been an element of uncertainty about the policy followed by the Government of India. For example, a zone has been created in the South and I want to know from the hon. Minister as to whether Kerala, the heavy deficit State of Kerala, can have a first claim on the marketable surplus in India. Or, is the Government of India at least - prepared to give us a link-up between the purchasing machinery set up by the Government of India and the selling agencies that are in existence in the State of Andhra Pradesh? Sir, it is a really disturbing news that all the marketable surplus is going to be procured by the Central Government with absolutely no guarantee to the Kerala State that the legitimate needs of Kerala would be met. This has created deep concern among the people of Kerala and I want a categorical statement from the Central Government as to how exactly this position stands at present. This morning the hon. Minister said that there was absolutely no difference between the estimate of the State Government and that of the Central Government in regard to the marketable surplus in Andhra Pradesh but, Sir, the estimate of the State Government is six lakhs of tons whereas the estimate of the Central Government, as has appeared several times in the papers, is about nine lakhs of tons. This itself lends an element of uncertainty to the advantage of the speculative interests in this trade. Now, Sir, if that zone is there, we want to know definitely whether we can have a first claim on that marketable surplus. If the Central Government enters the market and begins to purchase through the ordinary functioning of the normal market, then it will be well nigh impossible for the State of Kerala to purchase any rice.

There have already been difficulties as the Minister knows and so, there is no use shutting our eyes to that question.

In regard to some other minor things also, the people of Kerala are feeling deeply concerned. Take, for example, the question of sleepers. Traditionally, Kallai has been a big centre in our State. That place has been supplying these sleepers for the railways. That has been stopped now while we are importing sleepers from Australia and other countries. This has repercussions on the people of Kerala. I want the Central Government to revise its policy about this question.

In that backward region, our State Government has certain plans for participation with private enterprise in regard to certain industries. This has been going on and that has been the policy not only of the present Government but of the previous Governments as well. Now, I understand, the Planning Commission, may be the Central Government also, come in the way and that acts as a bar to the industrialisation of the State.

I am not referring to the 3 P.M. inordinate delay which the

Government of India show in giving assent to some of the Bills there. In these things especially we have to create a sense of confidence in the people and we have to draw out the best from every section. Only if we follow a bold policy in regard to these, we can call for the democratic urges of our people and see that the Second Plan, or such of it as remains, is fulfilled and we can embark on a really bold Third Five Year Plan.

Thank you.

DR. P. V. KANE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are grateful to the President for the very comprehensive and detailed Address that he has been pleased to deliver. But as no amendments are allowed with reference to matters which are not touched

[Dr. P. V. Kane.] upon in the Address, I have to say something a little later on. The President has very well given the objectives of our policy on page 2:—

"The principal objectives which we have accepted are: a substantial increase in national income, rapid industrialisation, expansion of employment on a sufficient scale, and a reduction in inequalities of income and wealth."

These are the principal objectives of our policy during the last ten years or so and will continue to be during the next few years. And he emphasises that the most important problem is that of food production and that is so. We are supposed, from time immemorial, to be a very good agricultural country, and if as an agricultural country we import about 3 million tons, as we did during the last eleven months of 1958, we cease practically to be really an agricultural country. Generally, all people require food, clothing, shelter, education and health. These are the five necessities of every kind of people. Some countries are not blessed as we are in the sense that we have big rivers and a vast territory. England, for example, has very little agriculture, but has managed for three hundred years—I do not use a very harsh word—to be imperialistic in carrying away everything from the countries under its control. Thus she has managed for three hundred years. But we are wedded to peaceful means. We do not want to have anything to do with others' territory. We only say that our territory should not have aggression perpetrated on it. So, we are a sort of *Panchsheel* ourselves. Other people may give lip loyalty to the idea of *Panchsheel*. But if we look underneath the surface, you will find that idea is only in words. It is only in name and nothing more. So far as food is concerned, our Government is looking only at one end. But there is another end. You will notice that they are trying to have much more food produced in the country.

It is all to the good. But how are we sure that some 20 or 50 or 80 years hence we shall be in a position not to import? You will notice that the law has been stated to be that population increases in geometrical progression and food production increases only in arithmetical progression. At present we are 360 million people. Every year 5 to 6 million mouths are added. And experts tell us that at the end of about 80 years from today, our population will be double of what it is now. Supposing you produce twice as much food as you do now, in the distant future, 70 or 80 years hence, you will be nowhere. You will still have to import food in larger quantities than at present. Now it is 3 million tons, then it will be 10 million tons. So, you must work at the other end, how to reduce the population or keep it in check. Government, so far as I know, have taken no steps in that direction. There is family planning or something in the air. But I do not think Government has done much in that direction. And that is nothing but a pin-prick for the whole problem. The whole problem is how to control the growth of population, particularly in poor areas, where there is not much food and where the population is very big. In the West they solve it in this way. Contraceptives are used like anything, and they have family planning also. The other day I had been to America and found that there generally women are married between 20 and 22 and they generally have three children on an average. By 28 the coming of children stops. But here the position is that we have our tradition. For the last thousands of years our tradition has been to have as many sons as possible. You will find a Vedic sage invoking the blessing for the newly married bride in these words:

"<<i>i>wt ppr^ 4(dir+r<<(%<i>f<i>f

He invokes God to bless the young married bride to have ten sons and that her husband would be the-eleventh (male) in the house.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: No daughter?

DR. P. V. KANE: I am coming to that, just two minutes more. Ten sons and the father, that is the husband, will be the 11th, or the captain it seems. I do not know whether the ancient Indians played a game like cricket or anything of that kind. If there had been any game like cricket in which 11 persons would play, they would not have had to go to a selection committee. This was the ideal in ancient time.

Now, as regards the daughter, I shall explain. Indians of those days, the ancient Aryans, were a fighting, conquering race. So, they had a very low opinion of daughters. They said—I shall not quote many verses—the son is as if the father himself:

“आत्मा वै पुत्रनामासि ।” शतपथ ब्राह्मण
१४-६-४-२६;

“सखा ह जाया कृपणं हि दुहिता ज्योतिर्ह
पुत्रः परमे व्योमन् ।” ऐतरेय ब्राह्मण ३३-१ ।

A daughter is poverty and indignity. That was the idea. Even now I suppose you have to pay dowry. Somebody is bringing a Bill against dowry. And in my boyhood or in my college days there was a Bengali girl who killed herself...

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : How, you don't say, these ten sons were to come from?

DR. P. V. KANE: That I cannot say. I can tell you *Sastras*. Somebody asked about daughters. They did not welcome daughters. Then, another man came forward. He said ten sons are too many. So, he introduced a reform. I do not know his name, but he said eight sons are sufficient. Therefore, he gave a reformed blessing:

“अष्टपुत्रा सौभाग्यवती भव ।”

'May you have eight sons and blessed wifehood.'

That continues till now. Whenever young married girls come to me for my blessings, I have to ask them whether I should bless them in the traditional way or whether they would like eight sons. They say, do not give any blessing. We want sons, but this number is too much. They say in the *Vedic* verse:

'He having plentiful progeny entered ill-

‘बहुप्रजानिर्ऋतिमाविवेश ।’ ऋग्वेद
१-१६४-३२ ।
luck (or misery).'

I have therefore invented a very good new blessing. I tell them:—

“अष्टपुत्रा सौभाग्यवती भव ।”

You may have as many sons as you like. They have now accepted this new form of blessing.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI B. N.
DATAR) : As many or as few?

DR. P. V. KANE: The blessing is given by me to them. *Yatheshf*, as they like...

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: There is also another way of "blessing". Instead of the word *Putra*, they say *Pati*.

DR. P. V. KANE: That is in our modern idea of words. Now, I say that we have always been changing. Do not suppose that we have flouted this law. Then, another man came, Brahaspati. He was the teacher of gods. They asked him: What is this? You treat daughters like chattel. So, he said:—

“यथैवात्मा तथा पुत्रः पुत्रेण दुहिता समा ।”

'The son is the father himself (reborn), a daughter is equal to a son.'

[Dr. P. V. Kane.] 'So, that is the present legislation that we have got. Just as the son is like the father, daughter is equal to the son. That was said by me, but nobody accepted it. Now, during the last few years the daughters have been placed on the same footing and I see that women are placed on a higher footing than men in some respects as regards property.

My point is that our population has increased like anything. Therefore, Government should produce more food. I am an old man and I do not know anything about these contraceptives. I think family planning would be a humbug. It may be a good thing for the rich. But the poor people have to live in hovels, in single rooms. Probably, there is no other game for them except the indoor game. I do not think that family planning is going to succeed except by the method of contraceptives. The word 'contraceptives' is an anathema to many. As an old man having some knowledge of ancient times up to modern times, I say one day, when I am no more, we shall have to resort to contraceptive methods. Otherwise the growth of population cannot be checked. In the meantime over this food problem our debt is increasing. They are very good people who say "we supply you all the money which you pay us in thirty years". They take from us an interest of 5 per cent, or 6 per cent, or something like that. Those rupees are given to us practically as a loan. They give us their produce which they sometimes do not need. In America if they do not get good prices for their agricultural produce, they burn it. It is manure for them. Many people are dissatisfied with the wheat sent to us from foreign countries. I do not know anything about it. I find in the papers many things said about the wheat that has been bought by us from America and Canada.

My point is that we must produce more food. That is the first thing to be done, leaving aside all other things.

Otherwise, we are doubly dependent on other countries. There will be no political strings, as my friend on that side was saying. Actually, we are debtors to foreign countries whose policies are different from ours. They will be pressing us for payment of arrears. Food is the first problem to which the Government must give its attention. It cannot be solved by importing food. That is what I wanted to say. It can be solved by producing food ourselves.

Then, Sir, the President has said in his Address towards the end, in paragraph 53: "It is the policy, and it will continue to be the endeavour of my Government, to seek in all possible ways to uphold the dignity and independence of our land and people and to promote our unity and social well-being and to build a democratic and socialist society, in which progress is sought and attained by peaceful means and by consent." These are very excellent sentiments. Suppose we are told by our leaders: "We follow democratic ways, we do not want pressure tactics", and all that. Anybody can speak like that. What are the democratic ways? Democracy means submission of the *ysjfl* of the minority to the will of the majority. That is literally the meaning. Majority includes all sorts of people, even illiterates. It is one of the directive principles of the Constitution that within ten years there will be free and compulsory education for all children up to the age of 14. I do not know whether even half of that aim has been achieved. I do not know if that will be achieved within even twenty years or more. Even if all the children become literate twenty years hence, then also the total illiteracy would still be 40 or 50 per cent. These are the electors, these are the people to decide whether X's policy is good or Y's policy is good. How can they decide that? Nobody is going to lecture to them everyday asking them to vote for this or for that party. They will simply be told "I am voting for the 'oxen', you vote

for the 'oxen', and nothing more. In Marathi the word *bail* means a stupid fellow. The point is he should apply his mind as to what kind of policy he should support. He is incapable of doing it. What I am pointing out is that this is no doubt very good. But the Government is there, it is supposed to contain all the wisdom and most of our people want to have something done quickly. They are gentlemen in a hurry, most of them if not all.

Then, Sir, look at the kerosene tangle. Even during World War II, 1939 to 1945, there were no long queues for kerosene in Bombay during those six years. Now there are queues. There is long waiting in the cold wind. What is it due to? Government declared a 5 per cent cut, but the hoarders declared a 50 per cent cut. Your declaration is only in your mind. This policy is very bad. This thing is a necessity of life. If you say that everybody should eat 5 per cent less, is anybody going to observe it? It is absolutely impossible. Already we are underfed, and even if you say 5 per cent only, that is meaningless, that means more undernourishment and more famished people. You should never have done it. Simply because you want to save some foreign exchange, you have done it, and this is not the way to do it. After all a great deal of mischief has been done. Whenever a policy of this kind is adopted, it should be put into effect slowly. We are a big continent. We were under the heel of foreigners for several years. Don't be in a hurry that way. In fact the whole of India had been under the heel of invaders from 1200 to 1947, > practically the whole of India, except Vijayanagar and Maratha for some time, only a short time of a fifty years or hundred years at the most. You have allowed strangers to come and stay here for a long period of time. So don't be in a hurry.

Then, Sir, the word 'co-operation*' is used in several contexts—co-opera-

tive community, co-operative food production, and so on. I do not understand what is meant by co-operative food production in the context of our illiterate people. The point is that co-operation is the same thing as democracy. You have to submit your will to the will of the majority. You may one day be able to convert that majority into a minority. But that is a process of time. Till then you are submerged. I have had some experience of co-operation in Bombay and everywhere the case is almost the same except one or two instances. There are always people who manoeuvre things, who have got money. I am particularly acquainted with the co-operative building societies. Any venture will be successful if there are good men at the helm of affairs. Farming is an individual business, at least in our country. For example, suppose you ask a village co-operative to do something and it agrees. What have they got? They have only two hands. Bullocks cost Rs. 500 in my parts. I do not know about other places. Government must give them tractors or whatever will plough their field. Then they have no fertilizers, and they have no money to purchase them. Everything will have to be supplied by Government. So, let Government say: "We will supply everything to everybody, whatever you require, but the cost of such supply will be a charge on whatever you produce." Looking at the habits of our people I do not think that cooperative farming is going to succeed in the immediate future. I am not talking of the distant future.

Another point that I want to place before you is that the Government's measures should not be attacked. Why? We can topple down the Government by our votes and our Constitution allows us freedom of expression, freedom for propagating our views and freedom of assembly provided we are peaceful. Suppose a lot of people assemble here that is nothing; so long as they are peaceful, you cannot interfere under the Constitution itself. You at once proclaim

[Dr. P. V. Kane.] section 144. That is wrong. When they become non-peaceful, violent, Government has ample power. They can shoot them, they can lathi-charge them and do so many things. But do not lecture to the people. You cannot lecture to the people and improve them on this particular point.

As regards the question of bilingual province, I say, what is democracy if a bilingual province is not made into a unilingual one? Remember, I have been a lawyer for 46 years. Thousands of people have come and talked to me. The mind of the Maha-rashtrian people is that this position will take the form of a stigma and indignity to them. They are all bad fellows. Nobody can trust them unless they are yoked like a bad bull with another big bull. That is the iron which has entered into the soul. They are poor fellows. All the money is in Bombay. They are only workers; they are hewers of wood and drawers of water. It is for the leaders to take into account this thing that no peace will be there. I assure you. I have spoken to hundreds of common barbers and *dhobies* and all sorts of people. They ask, "Why are there no 'two provinces' anywhere else now? Madras had once three within it. Why did they divide it?" Take the case of Mithila or Bengal. There was kiteflying there. They were going to be joined. The very first by-election destroyed that thing. These are the people who do not want a combined multi-lingual province. You say, "The Maharashtrians are bad fellows; let them be kept united by yoking them to somebody else, so that they would behave properly." I do not want to go into all the things that my friend, Mr. Patel, has said. Theft is the principal thing. The people feel that it is an indignity, a slight and a stigma on Maharashtrians that they could not have a province of their own. Government itself brought up a Bill for three provinces—Bombay City, Maharashtra and Gujerat—everything separately. At once, the whole thing changes with-

out consulting the people primarily affected. So, that must go.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: May I know if the people of Vidarbha are also feeling like that?

DR. P. V. KANE: Mr. Patel does not want it.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: No, no, I am talking of Vidarbha being a part of Maharashtra.

DR. P. V. KANE: Let Vidarbha be separate if they so think. My point is,, we do not want to join with another province, when there are so many provinces—thirteen or twelve of them—each on linguistic basis. Have the whole of India divided into ten provinces? Never mind how many languages are there in each. I have no objection. But if you go on a linguistic basis, then you must apply that principle everywhere.

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. P. JAIN): Sir, the hon. Member who preceded me, Dr. Kane, has admirably summed up the objective of our food policy—we must be self-sufficient and that self-sufficiency must be achieved through greater production and control of population. We should stop the import of food from abroad. None of us is happy about the import of food from abroad and if in the past we have had to import food, that was because of absolute necessity. Our attempt has all along been—and will continue to be—to produce all that we need and a little more.

Now, there has been constant criticism on the front of food production. I will not go into the figures of all the past years. But during the Second Five Year Plan, I would submit, our production of foodgrains has been going up. In the last year of the First Plan the production of food was about 65 million tons. In 1956-57, it rose to 68-7 million tons. 1957-58 was a bad year, particularly, the like of which we did not have during the last thirty years, and production went

down to 62 million tons. We have got preliminary estimate of the *kharif* production of this year as compared to the final estimate for 1957-58, at 43 million tons, the preliminary estimates for this year—1958-59—are about 48 million tons. That is, we are five million tons better. So, it cannot be said that on the food front we have done nothing. The prospects of the *rabi* crop are good and if nothing untoward happens, I think that the total production this year should be of the order of 70 million tons or more.

Apart from this, certain very important steps have been taken. We have recently taken a decision to gear up the administrative machinery at the State level and I do hope that the implementation of this reorganisation scheme will soon begin to bear fruits. "We have also clarified the picture of the agricultural set-up in our villages, namely, that each village must be covered by a co-operative society. This must be a multi-purpose co-operative society dealing with supply, credit and marketing and also services which are common to the farmers. After a proper climate for co-operation has been created, we propose to have joint farming. That is a somewhat distant goal.

Then, Sir, we have also examined 'our schemes of production and we have come, as a result of past experience, our successes and failures, to certain conclusions and we have fixed a somewhat ambitious target. I hope that by the end of the Third Plan, our production would have been increased by a hundred per cent. I have toured quite extensively in the countryside and I find that there is an awareness and consciousness among the farmers to produce more. The Community Development scheme is also having its effect and the various schemes—I need not go into details—are now well on the ground and are producing an impact on agricultural production. I am glad to say that the *rabi* campaign has been quite a success which is borne out by the condition of the crop. "We are now starting another *kharif*

drive. These are some of the things that we have done and I am hopeful that our agricultural production would go up.

On the population front, I am sorry to say that much has not been done. On the contrary, the percentage of increase per year in population has now become higher. According to demographic trends in the year of census, 1951, it was estimated that our population was increasing at the rate of 1*25 per cent. As a result of the health and sanitary measures which we had adopted during the First and the Second Five Year Plan, the death rate has gone down. That is a good thing, but the birth rate continues at the old level and our population is increasing nearer to 2 per cent, per year now. The emphasis which the hon. Dr. Kane has laid on the control of population and family planning is a correct one. Our position today is something like that of a bottomless barrel. While we produce more, it goes down because our population is increasing at a very fast pace. It has been correctly said that the only solution to our food problem is to produce more. I have already submitted that our agricultural production has been going up. But as we have not been able to increase it sufficiently, our difficulties continue. It is a very legitimate question—the one put by Dr. Ahmad—if our agricultural production is going up, why is it that we are having high prices? I want this House to have an idea of the consumption of cereals in different parts of the country. Broadly speaking, our country can be divided into two divisions—the predominantly rice-eating regions and the predominantly wheat-eating regions. Coarse grains are an important part of our cereal, but they do not occupy the same dominant position as these two principal foodgrains do. Now, Sir, of the total production of cereals in this country, rice accounts for about 50 per cent, and wheat about one-third of the production of rice. In 1957-58, particularly in the North, our rice crop suffered heavily and there were great

[Shri A. P. Jain.] difficulties about both the availability of rice and the prices in a large number of States. Fortunately, Sir, this year we have a very good crop of rice, and the rice prices have considerably gone down. In September last year, the rice prices had reached the peak level of more than 100 points. Now they have come down to 91-5 points. Last year, about the same time, the level of the price was about 100 points. As compared to both the peak prices as also the prices prevailing at the corresponding time of the last year, the price of rice has considerably gone down. I do not know of many places or perhaps of any place where the price of rice is not substantially lower than what it was last year.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: From Calcutta rice has disappeared.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Luck'ly, Sir, I anticipated the question which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has raised.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): Are these the prevailing prices?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I am talking of the prevailing prices. Now, Sir, in Calcutta, last year, the average price on the 24th February was Rs. 26. It is Rs. 21-16 now. These are the latest figures which the Food Minister of West Bengal has handed over to us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The entire Opposition walked out because of these wrong figures.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): Last year, Sir, the price of rice *kichili chamba* in Madras per measure was Rs. 0-15-6. It went up to Rs. 1-1-6 and today it is Rs. 1-4-0.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Sir, I will verify these figures, because I am not aware of them.

Then, Sir, we come to the wheat area. There is no doubt that the wheat prices are really high. They were 97 points in February 1957. Then they

came down to 84 points in March 1958-when they began to rise again. By December 1958 they went up to 114-4 points, and at the end of January they rose to 129-9 points. Now, Sir, the House is well aware that the wheat crop and the gram crop were very badly affected last year. As against the production of 9'3 million tons of wheat in the year 1956-57 the production in 1957-58 was 7*7 million tons. There was a substantial fall, and this happens to-be the lean part of the year when generally these prices have a tendency to go up.

DR. H. N. KUNZRU: Does the Minister mean that prices of wheat generally go up in December?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: From December onwards they go up generally. That is what the price trends always indicate. Now, the fact that this is the lean part of the year and there was that short production last year has given spurt to the prices of wheat and gram. Well, we have taken some measures to control this trend. We distributed 37 lakh tons of foodgrains out of which wheat was about 29 lakh tons. This was done in the year 1958. At an average, Sir, we were issuing about 3 lakh tons of foodgrains per month. Now, we are running about 48 thousand fair price shops all over the "country. We have prohibited the flour mills from purchasing wheat in the market, because the bulk purchases made by the flour mills were having a great impact on the market prices. The mills are now being supplied overseas wheat, and they are selling wheat products at control rates. For instance, Sir, in Delhi these mills are selling it at the rate of Rs. 15-81 per maund. The traders have been licensed and returns are being obtained from them. We have also procured foodgrains under the new powers that were given to us on the basis of three months' average. Certain restrictions with respect to advances by the banks against foodgrains continue, and also certain restrictions have been placed on the movement of food-grains. Well, I do not say that these

measures have completely succeeded in checking the upward trends, but they have certainly helped in easing the food situation.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh): How?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: By maintaining these supplies.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: On the contrary, Sir, the prices are going up.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Well, there is no doubt that the prices were high. But the upward trend has been arrested, and particularly in Uttar Pradesh, Sir, the wheat prices are slowly going down.

Then, Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Jaswant Singh, raised the question of the wheat zone. It is true that the western zone consisted of Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Bombay. According to certain normal production trends, this was a self-sufficient zone. But last year, on account of shortages in production this self-sufficient zone became heavily deficit. We were faced with the alternative of either splitting the zone into three independent zones of States or maintaining the zone. We thought that it would not be proper to split up the zone at a time when the difficulties of Bombay were great, and for many months we went on resisting the splitting up of the zone. Ultimately, when we found that in the balance it may be advantageous to split up the zone into three States, we have done it. But I must confess that although we have taken this decision on the balance of advantages and disadvantages, none the less, I do not feel very happy that at a time when the scarcity of wheat is so pressing, any State should be deprived of its imports, as Bombay is being deprived of its supplies from Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. Fortunately, the prospects of *rabi* crop are good and if nothing untoward happens, our troubles are likely to be over in a few weeks' time, say 6 to 8 weeks' time.

Now, a question has been raised about Kerala. The hon. Member Shri Perath Narayanan Nair said that we had been following a very indefinite policy towards Kerala. I am thankful to my friend Shri Z. A. Ahmad for having laid emphasis on the production aspect, of the food problem. Now as I said, the food problem can be solved only by producing more. I am sorry to inform the House that during the three years that the Communist regime has been there, the production in Kerala has been almost stationary. In the year 1956-57 it was 8-73 lakh tons, in 1957-58 it was 8-74 lakh tons . . .

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Who has supplied you the figures?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: The Kerala Government.

(Interruptions.)

My friends need not be upset though the facts may be upsetting for them.

(Interruptions.)

According to the estimated figures for 1958-59 it is 8-75—that is, during the three years, the increase has been about 2,000 tons. Now that is the main difficulty of Kerala. They are not concentrating on the production. Even so . . .

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Does the hon. Minister deny that Kerala is deficit to the extent of 7 lakh tons or 50 per cent, of its needs?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I don't accept the figure of 50 per cent, or 7 lakh tons. It is deficit and heavily in deficit, that I agree but the deficit is due to the fact that Kerala . . .

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: It is given by the Kerala Government and you don't accept it?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: No.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: The other things you accept.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI A. P. JAIN: The main difficulty of Kerala is that it is not increasing its production and if it had been doing it, its deficit would have gone down. Let us see . . .

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: It is increasing human production.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Let us see how we have treated Kerala. I can say with safe conscience that if anything, we have treated Kerala very generously, the southern zone is a surplus zone. We have allowed the Kerala • Government and Kerala merchants to make their purchases from anywhere they like in the zone. There is no restriction. Not only this, but we have helped them in making purchases.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: They have benefited at the cost of Andhra also . . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY
(Andhra Pradesh): Yes.

SHRI P. A. SOLOMON (Kerala): All the surplus you have purchased from there.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I am coming to it. I have said that Kerala is in a surplus zone and according to estimates, the southern zone is surplus by about 4 lakh tons after meeting the requirements of all the four States of the South.

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Are these supplied by the State Governments that it is over-all surplus in the southern region?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Yes. What do the hon. Members want us to do? We created a zone primarily for the benefit of Kerala so that its deficits may be procured from that zone. If there is a surplus in the zone available over and above the requirements of the four States, am I to leave that surplus there to rot? I have to buy that surplus and to take it to other regions. There are certain kinds of rice grown

in Andhra, the fine and superfine rice which never had a market in the South and which were traditionally exported to Bombay, Saurashtra, Calcutta and certain other parts in the northern region. That quantity may be 2 lakh tons or 2½ lakh tons or even more. What is to become of this rice? We are procuring that or some other rice. There is no rigidity about the figure of 4 lakh tons or any figure. Our policy is this that we want to help the Kerala Government to make purchases according to its requirements. Whatever is surplus to southern region, we want to take to other States. That is the only rational policy and what has been done during these last three months? The Kerala Government have purchased 10,000 tons of rice in the month of December, 15,000 tons in the month of January and in the month of February, they have entered into a contract to purchase 25,000 tons. Now this 50,000 tons is by no means, a small quantity. We have also assured the Kerala Government that if they are unable to buy, we are prepared to issue orders to the millers to sell to the Kerala Government at the controlled rates. What else do they want us to do? It is very unfortunate that . . .

SHRI PERATH NARAYANAN NAIR: Is that assurance given?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I am stating that in the House. What does he want? It will do no good for me to talk against Kerala Government, it will do no good for the Kerala Government to talk against the Centre, and it will do no good for the hon. Members to talk against the Centre or against anyone else. We want to work in a co-operative spirit. I know the difficulties of Kerala. I will treat Kerala as I am treating all other States. Let there be no suspicion. Let them not entertain any doubts that the Centre will discriminate against them. It will be an unfortunate thing if I discriminated against any of the States and if at all I have discriminated, I have discriminated in favour of Kerala.

Now, some points have been raised by my friend, Shri Ahmad. Shri Ahmad said that we did not mean to undertake State trading seriously. There he is one with the traders. The traders say that State trading is not possible. The traders say that there are certain difficulties, physical difficulties, organisational difficulties, and other things. Shri Ahmad says that we don't mean it. At least there they agree that State trading is not coming. I want to assure Shri Ahmad that we are very serious about State trading. We mean to implement it, we mean to implement it effectively and forcefully. It is a very big thing, it involves the handling of not less than 15 to 20 million tons of foodgrains. It means the storage, it means finances, it means the organisational set-up. Now, we want to proceed in a manner that our scheme of State trading does not come to grief. We want to go ahead with assurance. What have we done? Shri Ahmad said that we were intending to procure only 10 per cent, of the market surplus. I am sorry at his ignorance. The Prime Minister and I have on occasions, on more than one occasion, stated that we propose to purchase 2 million tons of rice. The total production of rice in this country is of the order of 28 to 30 million tons. Out of this, leaving aside the small dealings in the villages, mundies and *hats* of small quantities, the market surplus is of the order of 7 million tons. Out of the 7 million tons, we have made arrangements to procure 2 million tons. That constitutes about 30 per cent. Shri Ahmad said that we must secure 50 per cent, in order to control the market conditions effectively. I accept that we are not yet in a position at present to purchase 50 per cent, but the purchase of 30 per cent., I hope, will place us in an effective position to control the market conditions and that cannot be said to be a small thing. He has again said that we have started purchasing from the millers but we have thrown the farmer at the mercy of the millers. That is, the miller is at liberty to obtain or buy from the farmer at any

110 RSD—7.

price but we have assured a price to the miller. Again that remark is based on want of correct information. Wherever we are purchasing rice from millers, we have also provided that the farmer can sell paddy to the Government agents at the corresponding price. I would like to make the position clear. In Madhya Pradesh we are buying rice at Rs. 15 a maund from the miller. The State Government at the same time is purchasing paddy from the farmer at the rate of Rs. 9 or a few naye paise this way or that way, and I may inform the hon. Member that the Madhya Pradesh Government have purchased as much as 40,000 tons of paddy under this scheme. That, by no means, is a small quantity. I submit that we are giving full and effective protection to the farmer as regards the prices at which he supplies paddy to the miller. It is open to the farmer not to go to the miller but to sell his paddy to the agent of the State Government. What more can we do?

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: But the price at which the miller will buy from the farmer has not been fixed by the Government.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I am sorry that in spite of all this explanation my friend has not been able to fully understand the position. The position today is this. The State Governments are buying paddy direct from the farmer, and because it is open to the farmer to go to the agent of the State Government and sell his paddy at Rs. 9, there is no reason why he should go to the miller and sell at Rs. 8½- the same quality of paddy. With this arrangement, I do not see how the charge can be levelled against us that we are not giving protection to the farmer.

Sir, these are some of the points that have been raised. I know that conditions in certain parts of the country, particularly in the wheat-growing areas, are difficult, but we are doing our best and we will continue to do our best and I hope that with the

[Shri A. P. Jain.] arrival of the next harvest which is not very far off—only a few weeks ahead—conditions will improve and the difficulties through which our people are passing now will disappear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Is the hon. Minister aware that according to the official forecast in the West Bengal State, the deficit for the current year would be 9,55,000 tons as compared to 8,00,000 in the previous year?

SHRI A. P. JAIN: Are we to deal with each individual State's deficit, with this figure or that figure and figures that are sometimes disputed?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you gave a very rosy picture of the forecast for the current year. Now I gave the figures from a rice-producing State and these are the official figures that I gave.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is only a forecast, at any rate.

SHRI A. P. JAIN: The information that we have got is that the rice crop in West Bengal is very good, the rice crop in Assam is very good, also in Bihar it is very good and Orissa also has a very good crop. Surely the patch of area in Bengal could not be left out when the crop in all these surrounding areas is good.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister.

DR. Z. A. AHMAD: May I know the reason why . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called the Prime Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let him ask his question. He can ask and the Prime Minister himself is yielding. You can ask him. The Prime Minister is a ways very considerate in such matters.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am grateful to you for allowing me to intervene at this stage in this debate. It was my intention to speak at the end of the discussion; but I discovered suddenly today that this will be continued on Monday next here in this House and unfortunately I shall not be in Delhi. on Monday next. So, I ventured to speak now.

I have not been present here most of the time during this discussion thus far. But I have endeavoured to find out what has been said and have seen some of the reports of the speeches and some of the notes made. Many matters have been referred to which separately and individually have importance, no doubt; but they tend rather to blur the big picture that the President's Address *is* supposed to present to the country. I think it is always important for us to look at things in the right perspective and not lose ourselves in one thing, however separately important it might be. Of course, some things are most important. Here is the food situation about which my colleague was just speaking. Nothing can be more important than the food situation in the country. It is obvious. I shall not say much about it except to assure the House that our Government is very very far from being complacent about food matters at any time. It is too vital a matter and only those who are completely oblivious of what happens all around can be complacent. That does not mean that we cannot err or we have not erred occasionally with regard to this matter or the arrangements we have made. But as the House knows very well, we have had to face three bad years and we are just beginning to turn the corner with the good rice crop wr. have-and the good wheat crop of next season. We have come to some-rather important decisions with regard to State trading and other matters, not directly connected with food, with the organisation of our

land system, co-operatives and the rest which, I think, are intimately connected, really and ultimately, with the food problem and with the business of distribution. When we said we are going in for State trading in the wholesale tirade, we were— and I repeat what my colleague said—completely earnest about it and we are going to pursue it to the end. But then we pointed out that while we came to this decision, we had no real apparatus for it. Therefore, inevitably we had to go to licensing, authorising some of the old wholesale dealers to buy rice on behalf of the State. That is not a very satisfactory arrangement. We cannot easily control all these wholesale dealers. And secondly, it is obvious that they do not like this change in our policy, and when you make an individual or a group responsible for carrying out a policy which is not to his or its interest, difficulties arise, undoubtedly. But there is no help for it at this stage for us. If we had developed our co-operative organisation a little better as we hope to do, then these difficulties would diminish and ultimately fade away completely. And so from this point of view, apart from others also, it is essential that we should develop our co-operatives in villages and elsewhere.

There has been an argument—I may refer to it although that question, I believe, has not been raised here—about the so-called joint cultivation. Now, what we have said is, we call for service co-operatives in every village in India and union co-operatives above them. But we have said that our objective is joint cultivation which we hope to come to, naturally with the approval and consent of the farmers. But we are going to concentrate on the service co-operatives, for obvious reasons, practical as well as other. We cannot jump into that without compulsion. We do not wish to have that type of compulsion. Indeed, if we did wish, we would fail. But convinced as we are that in the situation in India at

present with small holdings, very small holdings—I am not raising a question of high principle but the practical question—with conditions in India, I believe it is essential to have larger units to be farmed together, not one or two acres or three acres, so that they can take advantage of modern techniques, implements and resources. Therefore, personally I am convinced that this is the right course. We can never make any considerable progress in farming if our units are small and we can only have big units by having big landlords or through co-operatives. When we rule out the big landlords, we are inevitably driven to co-operation. We hope that as these service co-operatives spread out all over the country and joint cultivation also takes place here and there, the example of that and the results that flow from it will themselves be the greatest arguments in favour of joint cultivation. In fact, hon. Members might be surprised to know that even now in India there are many hundreds and possibly more than a thousand or nearly two thousand joint cultivation farms. I cannot say, I have no figures to show the success they have attained— all of them—but some of them, I know, have succeeded very well. In fact, they have come to me—the farmers—and told me. We are at present going through a process of change, transition.

4 P.M.

Naturally, there are many individuals, groups, classes if you like, who do not like this change and who, therefore, criticise it. I am not imputing any motives to them. But they criticise it because they thought along certain lines, and they, I suppose, are convinced that such a thing will not be good for the country. They have a right to criticise it. I do not complain of that, but I am merely pointing out the difficulties that we have to face when we have to function temporarily through the very agency which does not like what

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] is happening. This is an illogical position, but there is no escape from it. Any attempt to put an end to that would have meant temporarily—we have no agency at all—some kind of chaos on the food front. That has been our difficulty. Again, in some places foodgrains have gone underground—petty hoarding but on a wide scale, large number of people hoarding it which makes a big difference. And, it may be justifiably said, perhaps, that if we had taken some other steps, this might have been a little less. I am not going into that question, but I am trying to put before the House this 'question of food in its larger setting. Fortunately, we have this bumper crop of rice this year, and we hope to have a good wheat crop later. So, we have an opportunity of changing over under relatively fair conditions. I hope that we shall be able to build up large stocks of foodgrains, and meanwhile develop these co-operatives through whom we shall deal. Meanwhile, of course, even the temporary high prices of wheat are distressing because, after all, one cannot tell a hungry person that we shall get him a meal next week or next month. It is absurd to tell him like that. It is distressing, and steps should be taken and are being taken to meet the situation. I regret that in this matter we do not get the co-operation of many people in the business—people who hoard or who cause higher prices or sometimes who wish to exercise that pressure on Government or agencies so that prices may be raised. All that is happening. But, fortunately, this cannot be of long duration, because certainly by the end of next month, when the new crop comes in, this policy will not help them—those who are hoarding and keeping back. So, I hope that we shall give relief even in this intervening period, and by the end of next month or even perhaps a little earlier arrive at a stage when we can take adequate measures to meet most of the difficulties that might arise then.

Some of the other points mentioned—and they have been raised in the series of amendments—are the normal ones, if I may say so—Goa, Pakistan and the like. Well, it is true that Goa is not mentioned in this Address. Not that Goa is forgotten by anybody. We cannot forget, nobody in India can forget it. But at the same time I do not understand what any hon. Member expects us to say about Goa. Possibly some might think that some brave words might be helpful—and sometimes brave words are helpful—but brave words by themselves might have the opposite result if they are merely words. Our policy in regard to Goa is absolutely clear. We can never agree to, or tolerate, the idea of any foreign foothold in India, and by India I mean not the Union of India as it is today, but that Union of India plus Goa which is part of India whosoever may at the present moment be there. At the same time we have said that we shall try to achieve our end through peaceful methods, not only as a matter of principle but as a matter of practical politics. In the world, as it is today, it is dangerous to try to solve problems by military methods. No one knows where it may end. And if we try to do it, it would be a negation of the policy that we have proclaimed and tried to act up to through all these years. I realise that is distressing. I realise, above all, that it is exasperating. Sometimes we find—even now—that in spite of this policy of ours large numbers of political prisoners exist in Goa—some of them still Indian nationals, others may be technically Portuguese nationals, but they belong as much to India as anyone else. It is distressing that they should be kept there, and kept there under very bad conditions. Now I do not like to criticise other countries, but this House knows that this problem of Goa, well, is connected obviously with Portugal itself, and the conditions in Portugal are not a bright and shining example of freedom, liberty, democracy or anything. In fact, it is the exact opposite of that and it becomes tied

up with other problems in the v^oorld. So, while Goa may be a small piece of territory in India, but not at present belonging to India, it is tied up with all kinds of major problems in the world and to seek a solution of it by military methods in the wider context of the world would be to ignore all this wider context and to give up the policy we have sought to pursue. That policy has, I believe, been more and more understood by other countries. The fact that in Portugal itself things have happened which have elicited the strong disapproval of most countries itself indicates the state of affairs in Goa. If in the so-called mother or father country, i.e. Portugal, this kind of thing happens, what can you expect in a colonial territory which belongs to it here or in Africa?

Then, about Pakistan. There are various amendments expressing displeasure because we are continually, it is said, trying to appease Pakistan, because we do not hold up the honour of India with sufficient force and claim. Well, Sir, I do not quite know what to say about it, about this matter, because the Pakistan problem or the problems of Indo-Pakistan relations are always with us. We are constantly dealing with them, whether in the shape of questions and answers in this House or in many other ways. We can never forget it. It is too near a problem, near not only geographically but in so many other ways that we just cannot get away from it even if we want to. But when we are charged with appeasing Pakistan—on the other hand other people, of course in Pakistan, charge us with something the very opposite of this—what exactly is the fact or, at any rate, the policy we seek to pursue? What does appeasement mean? If appeasement means trying to win over Pakistan, trying to be friendly with Pakistan, trying to create an atmosphere of friendliness between us and help the solution of problems, then certainly

we appease Pakistan and we will continue to appease Pakistan. If appeasement means giving up any right of ours, giving up any principle of ours or surrendering to any threat, then we are entirely opposed to that and we shall always be opposed to that. So, these words do not have any particular meaning; it depends on how you approach a problem.^s Sometimes something happens which exasperates us, irritates us and we react for the moment strongly; sometimes something happens which on the whole has a more favourable reception. Well, we react accordingly but the basic policy is something bigger than that.

Now, talking about immediate issues, a certain announcement the other day by the Pakistan Government has been welcome to us and that was an announcement giving directions to the broadcasting stations in Pakistan that they should not indulge in anti-Indian propaganda and, to some extent, as far as I know, that direction has been observed thus far. Well, we welcome it and we always try to avoid this kind of mutual recriminations. These are all reactions, expressions from time to time but the basic questions are deeper, as the House knows. The most basic question is this: India and Pakistan, being what they are, geographically, historically, culturally and all that, should obviously have a common policy of co-operating with each other, to be friends with each other; they may go their different ways that they like politically or economically but they should not be hostile to each other all the time. We suffer, both of us. It is now a dozen years since partition and the passions of those days have cooled down to some extent and we can view the problem with a measure of objectiveness but that does not and cannot mean any question of surrendering the basic right or interest of India or surrendering to threats from the other side. We have to find some i kind of balance between these and,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] at any rate, whatever we may say or feel, I believe that in the relations of India and Pakistan, as I hope in the relations of other countries, there should always be an attempt at a friendly approach and we should avoid recrimination and condemnation. I realise that we cannot always do that. Sometimes truth compels us to say something which is not of liking to the other party but even the bitterest truth could be expressed in non-bitter language at least. To some extent we learnt that in our apprenticeship under Gandhiji and, in this connection, may I say this? Many of the amendments here protest against the Address not having said this or that, not having said, let us say, about the Baghdad Pact or the attempts at a bilateral treaty between Pakistan and the United States of America or something that has happened in Africa or in Western Asia. All these amendments are in terms of condemnation, recrimination and brave words and gestures. I would hope that we would grow out of these somewhat immature references to difficult problems. I can understand strong feelings sometimes about things that are happening but the major thing is that we do not help even in solving the problem or even help going towards a solution. Either we realise that we must solve problems, whether they are world problems or internal problems or we feel that a conflict is inevitable and, therefore, we should keep our swords shining and bright and should be up and about all the time. We must decide which kind of approach we should make. Now, I am not discussing the problem. I am not for giving up of any principle which we consider important but what I am discussing is the manner of approach, either holding to our principles yet not being offensive and trying to soothen, or, the other way of using threatening language and threatening gestures which has become so common in the world today. I would beg of this House and our country in this matter, quite apart from anything

else, to at least remember the way in which Gandhiji dealt with his declared opponents of the time, against whom he was struggling.

Having said this, I dispose of, if I may say so with respect, the various amendments dealing with what the President has not said in his Address. They do not like many of the things that are happening in the world. We also do not approve of the Baghdad Pact; we never approved of it and we have expressed that many times. We do not approve of all these military alliances and we have viewed with apprehension the military aid that has been given by the United States to Pakistan because we have felt that that was something which had an unsettling effect. We believe that all these military pacts instead of ensuring security wherever they had come, perhaps, I will not make that sweeping remark, but certainly I would say that most of these military pacts to the East or to the West of India have had an unsettling effect and even the existing security, such as it was, has been lessened and not increased. We have expressed that. So far as the Baghdad Pact is concerned, and this military aid that has been given to Pakistan, it has been our firm opinion that this has not been good for anybody concerned, to no one I say, not to India, not for Pakistan and not for the United States. We have expressed that very clearly but it is no good our condemning anybody about it. I believe, in fact I am certain, that our views are felt in the United States and further that they have had some considerable influence. We are, if you look at this wide world, in a curious state today in regard to international problems and all the minor problems, whether it is the military aid to Pakistan, whether it is the Baghdad Pact or the NATO or the SEATO or the Warsaw Pact, are all offshoots of the basic struggle, of the basic tug-of-war that goes on between the two major groups. I do not propose at this stage

to discuss this matter except again to affirm that the policy that India has followed in this matter, that is the policy of non-alignment, has, I believe, not only justified itself completely but has been appreciated by many people who used to criticise it previously and it has won recognition—even where people did not like it. I do believe that it is along those lines that we can render some service not only to ourselves but to the world and we propose to continue it fully. It is only when we are in some matters rather friendly to another country, the country opposed to it imagines that we are weakening in our policy of non-alignment, while it is our declared policy, intention and objective to try to be friendly all the time to all the countries. Again, I repeat, friendliness does not mean giving up a principle or an interest, because a country that is friendly through fear is not friendly at all. That is not friendliness, if you are afraid of the other party and you shape your policy because of fear. Just if I may quote, in another context, even Gandhiji who was such an apostle of *Ahimsa*, said he did not believe, he did not accept a man calling himself a *satyagrahi*, who was a coward or who was afraid. That is not *satya-graha*. In fact, he went further. He said if you have a sword in your heart, it is better to take it out and use it than talk softly outside and keep the sword in your heart and be false to yourself and to others. So, it is not through fear that way, I hope, we have these policies or that we are trying to "be friendly with others but because we do believe that that is the best way of putting across our own ideas to the others, because that opens the minds of others, makes them receptive to I—what we have to say. When two countries are hating each other, minds are closed and no one can influence the other, and you have a basis of fear than which there can be no worse companion for an individual or a country. The situation is pretty serious all over the world. Nevertheless, there are some signs, some ray of hope. I And may I say that I welcome the fact i

that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, will soon be going to the Soviet Union for talks there? I do not mean to say that some sudden settlement is going to emerge from that. Problems are much too intricate and difficult, but all these visits, even if they tend to lessen tensions somewhat, even if they encourage just talks with each other, are helpful and, therefore, are to be welcomed.

Now, Sir, I would draw particular attention to some parts of the President's Address which endeavour to look at these problems in the larger perspective. There is, of course, the domestic part—what we do in India—and that concerns us most, that concerns us not only directly in regard to our domestic situation, but even in regard to foreign affairs, international affairs; it concerns us, because if we are to play any effective part in world affairs we can only do so if our domestic situation is strong and united. Otherwise, we do not count. We see many other countries today which are not free from a good deal of domestic problems where situations are fluid, which means that they cannot exercise, or their voice does not carry, much weight elsewhere. Therefore, from every point of view, it is the domestic situation in India that is the most important thing for us. In this domestic situation, we deal with problems as they arise, food situation, this, that and the other. But we must have longer goals. What are those? One, of course, may be defined, to some extent, as the Five Year Plans. Now, I should like to draw the attention of this House to a sentence in the President's Address, paragraph 6, after talking about the Second Plan:—

"Our Second Plan is only part of the whole process of planned development of our economy. The steps we now take are but stages along the long and arduous road to planned prosperity and my Government, through the Planning Commission, have already initiated consideration

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.] and studies of the Third Plan. It is hoped that by the end of the Third Plan, a sound foundation will have been laid for future progress in regard to our basic industries, agricultural production and rural development, thus leading to a self-reliant and self-generating economy."

Now, what exactly does that mean? It means that if we progress, as we would like to progress, by the end of the Third Plan, we will have established, what the President has called, a self-generating and self-feeding economy. That is, we will have crossed the barrier from the stage of under-• development to a stage when we begin to develop with the very impetus of what we have done. That does not mean solution of all our problems. Of course, not. Five Year Plans will come one after the other, raising us to higher levels. But it does mean crossing that dreadful barrier which separates an under-developed country from a developing country, developing through its own resources. It means, if we have to give effect to this, that we have to make a mighty effort in these seven years from now—two years of the Second Plan and five years of the Third Five Year Plan in order to achieve this end. It means, first of all, on the agricultural front success, success not merely in producing enough food for us, self-sufficiency as it is called, but more than that, so that we should not remain at the mercy of a bad *monsoon* or some other natural catastrophe, so that we may not have to depend upon other countries, so that we can even export it where we can and get other things in exchange. That is basic to the position.

The other basic thing is a sound foundation of heavy industry because if we industrialise, as the President says we must, industrialisation can only proceed on the basis of certain well-known heavy industries being established, whether it is iron and steel, whether it is machine-making industry and the like. That is to say,

if we want an iron and steel plant in the Fourth Plan, or indeed in a part of the Third Plan, we should be able to manufacture that complete iron and steel plant in India. And I mention that because that is— a big plant. That means other plants too. It does not mean that we will not import from abroad. Of course, we will. It does mean that we can carry on without anybody's help after that and the words used in this Address are: We will have established a "self-generating economy".

I need not tell this House, as hon. Members must know very well, that this assumes a tremendous effort. It is not a question of words or resolutions, but of organised, combined, united and continued effort. Only then can we bring this about. That is the picture placed before this House on behalf of the Government.

And what are the objectives, apart from the basic objective, which is stated towards the end of the Address:—

"It is the policy, and it will continue to be the endeavour of my Government, to seek in all possible ways to uphold the dignity and independence of our land and people and to promote our unity and social well-being and to build a democratic and socialist society, in which progress is sought and attained by peaceful means and by consent."

That is the basic objective. But immediately the principal objectives which we have accepted are: —

"A substantial increase in national income, rapid industrialisation, expansion of employment on a sufficient scale, and a reduction in inequalities of income and wealth."

Those are the four basic things, to which is added: —

"The Government will continue to aid and support small and cottage industries."

That is added lest we thought that that is not included in rapid industrialisation. I believe in rapid industrialisation, the heavy industry and the rest of it coming. Without that I do not think we can ever industrialise ourselves. But I equally believe in the conditions that exist in India now and that will exist in the foreseeable future, in this widespread effort at small and cottage industries being developed all over India and more especially in our rural areas. And our instructions to the Community Development movement today are first to concentrate on food production; secondly on cottage and small industries. Of course, there are ever so many other things that we have to deal with. Each is inter-related. You cannot separate one from the other. It depends on how you approach the question. For instance, education becomes basic. You cannot make any progress on any front without education. And I sometimes feel that although we have said a great deal about education, in spite of that, perhaps we have not done quite as much as we ought to have done, because it is basic. Health again becomes basic in whichever way you look. You have to advance on a variety of fronts. If you advance on one front, something else comes and attacks you on the flanks, on the sides. All this can only be done by a planned effort to the best of our ability. No planning is perfect or can be perfect. It is full of mistakes because it deals with uncertain and human factors, factors beyond our control, international factors. Nevertheless not to plan is really admitting failure and allowing things just to drift. You cannot progress by drifting and by merely good wishes or by slogans.

Now, I should like to draw the attention of the House to one or two other matters. Of course, the House knows well about the starting of pig iron production in Rourkela and Bhilai a few days ago. That is in a sense a significant moment in the history of our industrialisation, the first big

step. We have done many things, but that is the first big step, and it does not mean that we can relax but it will certainly after a year or so help us greatly in our future advances.

Then, the House also knows about the situation in regard to our oil exploration. We have met with a greater success in the initial stages than we had a right to expect. But we are still, let us remember, in the initial stages. We are sure of oil, it can be a certainty, but we cannot say without greater drilling and exploration as to what the reserves of oil are. It is important to know how much they are, but we are sure of them, and that is something. We are sure of it also in parts of Assam apart from those which are being exploited now. We have decided on a new refinery being set up in Assam and another at Barauni in Bihar.

I should like to repeat here what I have said previously that one of the most satisfactory features about this oil exploration has been the remarkable progress made by our own young engineers who are doing this work. We started from scratch. We had never done this ourselves, and oil, in fact, in most countries in the world has been run by large combines, big trusts. So, we started from scratch and we got hold of some young men, young scientists, young geologists, and after two years or so they have turned out to be first class men for this particular work, not only technically first class but full of enthusiasm for this work. Only recently I heard of a very high tribute paid to our Oil and Natural Gas Commission workers by a very eminent and expert authority from the United States.

Then, atomic energy. It is a curious thing which always reminds us of this country of ours, and of how varied it is and how it manages to live in every century at the same time, not only in the mediaeval ages but in the pre-mediaeval ages and also in the middle of the 20th Century. You find everything here, from the latest technique

LShri Jawaharlal Nehru.] to the oldest. I do not know, but I suppose gradually this will change no doubt; but still we have an enormous capacity for co-existence in this country. Anyhow, whatever other backwardness there might be—and there are many emblems of it in India—in atomic energy we are fairly well advanced. I am not comparing ourselves, of course, with great countries like the United States of America, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, or the other countries like Canada and France, but considering our general economic state, it is really most gratifying to note that very considerable advances have been made in the development of atomic energy, and we are thinking now and have decided on an atomic power station. One thing to which the President refers is that for the first time, less than two weeks ago, our uranium plant produced atomically pure uranium metal, which is significant in our atomic energy development work.

The House knows also the great progress we are making in producing all kinds of things in our ordnance factories.

One matter which often exercises Members' minds here is the question of rehabilitation, more especially those from East Pakistan. It is a matter which we should always bear in mind because of the human factors involved. It has surprised me very greatly that some hon. Members appear to be dissatisfied with the tremendous schemes that have been launched for rehabilitation at Dandakaranya, I should have thought that this Dandakaranya scheme was a visible sign of the extreme importance that we attach to this problem of the unfortunate displaced persons who have come from East Pakistan, to give them opportunities of growth which they could not have anywhere else, ■whether they remained in East Pakistan or West Bengal or anywhere. But apart from that, it is well known that there is precious little room in West Bengal for a large scale rehabilitation

apart from what has been done. It has surprised me therefore that objections should be raised and agitations should be started against the closing of the camps and the removal of those in the camps to these new sites for rehabilitation. Personally, I should have thought that keeping people on dole is a very bad thing, not only for the country but more so for them. It is a bad thing. They deteriorate, and they are a tremendous cost, unproductive cost, to the nation, but somehow we could do nothing else and we carried vast numbers of people on doles at a very great cost, at a cost which does not produce anything in the end for them or the country. So, we had to come to this decision. We ought to have come to it long ago. Anyhow we had come to the decision to wind up these camps and rehabilitate these people in other places, in other States and at Dandakaranya. Of course, when we say that, it does not mean that incapable people, children, women, etc., will not be cared for. Of course, they will be cared for. But they stand apart.

Finally, Sir, I would point out that all these great programmes that we see in perspective and that are around us cannot be realised without a very great deal of co-operative effort. No Government, however wise and well meaning it might be, can succeed without that co-operation, and I do not presume to say that the Government I have the honour to preside over is so wise and so brilliant as to solve all the problems of India. In the measure that we succeed it is only because of the co-operation received from the people of India, and I do appeal to this House and to others outside this House that, while we have every right to hold our opinions, to criticise Government's policy, in the broader tasks before us—they are not party tasks, they are national tasks—in this tremendous adventure we seek the cooperation of all.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Bombay) :
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the

President very rightly in his observations brought forward the achievements of the Government during the year which is coming to a close and ■ one and all will have to be proud of it. Also, he has deemed it fit to go into the future working of the Government also.

Sir, in the sphere of the steel industry, the Bhilai plant and the Rour- j kela plant have progressed satisfactorily. In the case of nuclear energy, we have before us a clear picture of the progress that we have made. The food situation, as we see, is also going to be better because we have before us a very nice crop. But I must say that the President has not mentioned the stresses and strains through which we have passed during the past year and through which we are going to pass now. No doubt, production has gone up, but at the same time the rate of production has also gone down. In the last three years, that is, 1955, 1956 and 1957, the rate of production was increasing at the rate of eight per cent, whereas now it has come down to round about 3·5 per cent. That aspect of the question also is necessary to be looked into. We have our plan of Rs. 4,500 crores and without the necessary resources there would be a gap of nearly Rs. 200 crores as estimated by the planners. By way of expenditure ■ which has gone up, we will have a gap of nearly Rs. 150 crores to Rs. 200 crores more and that brings us to about Rs. 350 crores to Rs. 400 crores needed for the completion of our Second Five Year Plan, and the President has not been good enough to tell us as to how these resources are going to be found. One and all will agree that in order to save our Second Five Year Plan, we have already risked our Third Plan. How are we going to save our Third Five Year Plan also from want of resources? As we know, we have to repay our foreign commitments to the tune of nearly Rs. 100 crores to Rs. 125 crores every year, which we have undertaken to do. Therefore, I would have been happy if the Presi-

dent had mentioned all these points, as to how we are going to find money and fulfil our targets under the Second and the Third Five Year Plan.

An hon. Member of this House this morning had drawn attention to a matter which, according to me, would not strictly have fallen in the President's Address for discussion. But since it has been mentioned, I think that it should not go unchallenged. It was said that the bilingual Bombay State had been imposed against the will of the people of the State. This, according to me, is not a fact. It was also said that elections to that bilingual State—both legislature and the municipalities—have been lost by the Congress Party. This is also not a fact. I want to prove to you by facts which are before me that in the district local body elections in Gujerat, out of 16 places, the Congress had won a majority in 15 places. Also out of ten or eleven municipalities, they had a majority in all barring one. So far as the district local boards were concerned, out of 576 seats, the Congress had won 507. So far as the municipalities were concerned, out of 321 seats, they had won 163.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Where?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: In Gujerat.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: In Maha Gujerat.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: In the local school board elections, in eleven school boards, out of 116 votes, the Congress had polled 101. These are the achievements of the party in power.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How many seats have been won by the Federation of Chambers of Commerce and Industry?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: They never contested any seat there and therefore, the question does not arise.

Looking at the results of the Legislative Assembly in the State, I want

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai.] to point out that there were sixteen by-elections and the Congress won eleven. Also, we have the Lok Sabha elections in which 22 seats were contested and we got 17 seats. What does this show? This shows that the majority of the people are with the Congress and the majority of the people have endorsed the decision which this august body has taken about the bilingual State of Bombay. Let me once again point out that out of all these seats, the Janata Parishad got only 36 in the district local board elections, only 38 in municipalities and only nine in school boards and the rest got five in the district local boards, 35 in municipalities and only three in school boards.

The hon. Member who spoke this morning said that the President did not go to the Anand University and attributed motives to him. If one were to lose sight of any fact, one could do it very conveniently. It is a known fact in this country that Marshal Tito, President of Yugoslavia, was to visit Delhi and therefore, the President had to cancel his visit to the Anand University. But at that time, His Excellency the Governor of Bombay went to Anand and what was the result? The hon. Member had not criticised, and expressed his regret for, what happened there. How was the Governor received and treated by the students and other elements there? Is it the discipline which is expected of students of a University? I am sorry that nothing has been said by the hon. Member on this point.

Sir, it was also said that the new Vice-Chancellor who has come now— Shri Babubhai Jasbhai Patel—has no qualifications, this is also untrue. He is a double graduate of the Bombay University. He was as a member connected with the Senate of the Bombay University for several years. The simple fact that he was defeated in the last election does not mean that he should be quite unfit to be a Vice-Chancellor of this University.

Mr. Balabhai Patel who was the founder of this University, was he not first defeated in the Parliamentary election? He was defeated. In spite of this, the same Bombay Government appointed him as Vice-Chancellor. I have nothing to say against that gentleman. He has done immense service to that institution and he will be remembered for a long time to come for the service which he has rendered.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: By removing him from there?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Nobody is expected to be permanent in, one seat. It is not the monopoly of one individual to do service. There are people and people who will be coming and going, who will be rendering service.

* * * » *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chinai, you may not refer to all those things which he has said.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: * * *

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Chairman has expunged those remarks. So, you need not speak about them.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: It was not fit for a person of this House to have cast reflections on any other person outside this House who could not reply to the debate. Sir, I am thankful to you for having said that.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, Mr. Chinai is entirely misrepresenting me. I would like to correct him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: No Gujarati Chief Minister would have dared to make that appointment.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Sir, it was also said that in the bilingual State of Bombay Gujarat had been

* * * Expunged as ordered by the I Chair.

neglected in the matter of roads and irrigation. Sir, I have an authentic report from one of the Gujarati members of the Cabinet, who is luckily here in this city today, that at least an equal amount, if not more, has been spent on irrigation and roads in Gujarat. Well, Sir, I am coming from Gujarat and I am quite satisfied that everything has been going on quite well and there is no question of any partiality whatsoever, as it has been made out by my hon. friend.

Sir, about the Koyna Project it has been observed that the Third Five Year Plan has been taken up in the Second Five Year Plan period itself. But if a building of five floors is to be put up and if you want to expand it in future and provide for ten floors, then certainly there must be solid foundation for these ten floors. After all, Sir, solid foundation will have to be laid before you plan to expand anything. If you do not do that now and if you leave it for the Third Five Year Plan, there is going to be considerable delay for the necessary energy which is required to be produced during that Plan which comes into action, after a few years.

Sir, one point more and I have done. That is in connection with the food situation in this country. The food situation, according to me, Sir, has gone wrong not because there is not enough food, but because there is a crisis of distribution. I am firmly convinced that this situation has been more or less created because the decision about State trading has been taken without actually having any scheme before us as to how we are going to distribute. We should have announced our decision with regard to nationalising of food trade only after formulating some scheme ready to be implemented. But we did not do that. The result is that merchants are not buying any foodgrains from the farmers.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: If they are not hoarding foodgrains, well and good.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: There may be some people who may be hoarding foodgrains. But I am here not at all defending them. I am only putting forward my views. We ought to have drawn up some scheme before announcing our decision to nationalise it. Now, the position is that the crop is not being accepted from the farmers by Government also. And it has its impact on certain other commodities also, for example, textiles, because the farmers have not been able to dispose of their crop and no cash is coming forth to them. Therefore, Sir, my humble suggestion to the Government is that they should expedite the scheme and go ahead with it so that the crop should come into the market. Only by that way these prices would come down and there would be an equal distribution. Food is the first necessity of the people. Then comes clothing. Both of them are intermingled. In order to save the situation, Sir, the Government must come to some final decision without any further delay.

Sir, one word more in connection with our rising expenditure. It has been noticed from year to year that our expenditure has been rising, because there is so much zeal to have scientific advancement in our country. But I find that sometimes things overlap, and therefore, Sir, it would be better if the Government—whether it is some Secretary to the Government or a scientist in the field of science—sees to it that there is no duplication and whatever we invest we do it in a proper way and we judge the likely results well in advance so that we may not have to suffer or repent later on. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI AN AND CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am glad that the Prime Minister, in his speech made to the House, laid so much emphasis on the internal problems. He was pleased to say that in so far as health and education were concerned, not much headway had been made, or the Gov-

[Shri Anand Chand.] ernment had not got a very brilliant record to show. As he was saying that, Sir, my mind turned back to what we may call the basic problem, so far as the people of this country were concerned. I would like to enumerate them in order of necessity—food, clothing, shelter, health and education.

Now, Sir, what is the position, so far as food is concerned? I will try to go into them seriatim. The Food Minister was at pains to explain as to what steps the Government were taking to have a more rational distribution and to try to put down these prices. He was very sure that with a good harvest coming in, the prices of foodgrains would steadily fall down and everything would be rosy. But what I would like to ask in this connection is: Is the Government, even after eight years of planning, going to depend upon the vagaries of weather? So far as the production of cereals in this country is concerned, we know that monsoon is the main agent. Sometimes, you will have a good monsoon and sometimes a bad monsoon. Any overall picture, therefore, of the productivity of foodgrains in different areas depends on the vagaries of weather. Now, Sir, what is the substitute? The substitute should be small-scale and large-scale irrigation. But the question is: After eight years of planning and having spent crores of rupees on these irrigation projects, are we still going to look to the weather and say that because the crop is going to be good this year, therefore the food situation will be easy, or because the weather was bad during the last two years, therefore we had this difficult food situation? Well, that is something, Sir, to which I am not willing to subscribe. I know that certain difficulties are there. I know that there is no magic wand in the hands of the Government to get a plentiful supply of foodgrains. But I am surely not going to subscribe to the view that we in this country, after eight year, of planning, still depend on weather conditions, so far

as our plentiful supply of foodgrains is concerned. There is no doubt, Sir, that prices are rising. There is no doubt that people are experiencing great difficulties in the availability of foodgrains. In the area from which I come—I submitted that even in the debate on the question of foodgrains—prices in certain places are more than Rs. 45 a maund even today. Of course, it is true that we are neglected, we are far-flung, and therefore we do not get the advertisement that is given to other larger States. But it is a fact that prices are rising, and it is also true that they have not come down, in spite of the best efforts made by the Government so far.

Now, Sir, the second question relates to cloth. It has been admitted in the President's Address itself.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may continue on the next day. Now, there is a message from the other House.

*

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE PHARMACY (AMENDMENT) BILL,, 1959

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Pharmacy (Amendment) Bill, 1959, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th February, 1959."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The-House stands adjourned till 11 A.M.. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 13th February 1959.