

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]
only will I withdraw but I will apologise.

Therefore, Sir, the question is, these planners must be aware that if a country is to progress nationally, patriotically, it must progress on the basis of its own strength. We can take loans temporarily. And now I am very happy to find that the Government has resolved to come to my point of view. So far as the food position is concerned, there are two heartening sentences in the President's Address. It has gladdened me very much and that is, it is essential that self-sufficiency in food should be attained. Sir, in the food debate in this House I made a pointed reference to this fact, namely, that no country will be free if food is to be imported. The best thing is food. If you go about begging for food to other countries, we must have enough resources to supply manufactured goods to them so that the trade will be balanced and so that we may not be under any obligation to any country. Therefore the attempt to make ourselves self-sufficient in food is the noblest thing I have seen in the President's Address and I heartily welcome it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will take more time?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you will continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock till half past two of the clock.

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE REQUISITIONING AND ACQUISITION OF IMMOVABLE PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL 1958

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 Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property (Amendment) Bill, 1958, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th February, 1958."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, I was referring to our Commonwealth relationship. Now, I wish to say that so long as you are in the Commonwealth your statement of a socialistic pattern of society to be introduced in this country is a farce and a fraud because in the very set up of things private investors from foreign countries are operating in our land and they are allowed to carry away loot called profit from our State. Therefore, so long as that concept of investing private property by foreigners and allowing the private enterprise is continued with a view to make gains and those gains are allowed to be exported from this country, you can never usher in a socialistic State. A socialistic State, as I conceive, is a State where there is no private enterprise, all according to his needs and each according to his capacity. If this thesis is accepted then only there can be real and genuine nationalisation of key industries as well as other industries in this country and there cannot be any private and public sector. Probably this is a negation of socialism you may coin this term and put it to the public for their swallowing. I am not prepared to accept it. It will

be like dangling a carrot before the donkey. It will follow the man, it follows the carrot to some extent; but even the donkey when it finds that the carrot is not coming to its mouth will start kicking. The people of this country may follow the Congress on this wrong thesis of a socialistic pattern of society for example, but the masses are awakening. When they are awakened, they will find that this is a fraud on them and there is no more use to follow this. And then real socialism will be ushered in by people who genuinely believe in socialism and who will not allow foreigners to exploit this country and loot, as well as the local industrial magnates. When a situation of that type comes, then we will usher in a new socialistic pattern of society, to the welfare of humanity, which will be able to enjoy the fruits of their labour.

Now, I come to the Plan and the core of the Plan. We started with a Plan. The Plan was ambitious, as I said. Then we find that the resources are not enough and our resources are frittered away by swindlers in various departments. And we find that in the so called nationalisation of insurance, about which I spoke in this House eloquently, even those funds are being given to swindlers or other speculators. And when some private enterprises make counterfeit shares, duplicate shares, triplicate shares and their history is known in the Government of India's Commerce and other departments, such shares are bought, sought for, by the money, which is the sweat and blood and labour of the people of this country, who have spared and invested in the form of policy premium. I ask, is it socialism? Is it nationalisation? It is 'robberisation'. That is the word I say with regard to that particular incident. Therefore, are we to encourage—I ask my hon. colleagues in this House and I ask everyone, that is, any businessman or every kind of people—are we to encourage robberisation or nationalisation? This is State capitalism. Five crores are given away to some institution. They

have acquired and appropriated all the funds that were in private hands which were running genuinely and decently the insurance companies and then one man at the top sits there, passes an order for which he has no business. He is not entitled even under the law. Take Rs. 4-1/2 crores. This is my gift to you. My friend, you are a counterfeiter of shares, so, let me give you. There are certain statements given that Rs. 25 lakhs is the loss. But I may tell you for your information that the loss is not Rs. 25 lakhs. It is one crore and fifty lakhs rupees. You may ask me how. I will tell you. The point which you should remember is whether the shares that you have received are genuine. So long as there are counterfeit shares, who can say which is a genuine share and which is a counterfeit share. Nobody can know. Therefore, I have written off Rs. 1-1/2 crores from the Life Insurance Fund. Is it our policy . . .

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): But Mr. Mundhra is prepared to buy them back.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: By offering them counterfeit shares, I perfectly agree.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA (Madras): At Rs. 10 lakhs profit.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway, we are now concerned with the President's Address.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Therefore, I will stop at it. Now, I will come to the Plan. Now, Sir, we made out a Plan. We wanted to work it. Then, we found all of a sudden that our pockets are empty. We went with a begging bowl. And not only that. Then we had to prune the Plan. When we started pruning the Plan, we have come to the 'core of the Plan'. Now, what is the core? The President has said it will be known to the Members of Parliament in course of time. But I know what is the core. Now, that core in course

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

of time will become a skeleton and that skeleton will ultimately like the magician's work disappear into the cupboard.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: It is a hard core.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Hard core, soft core and cupboard. All these things will fall in line one after another. Therefore, if this Plan period is to be successful, I give a concrete idea. And last time the Finance Minister said these are dangerous doctrines, which cannot be accepted by the Government. Why? What are the dangerous doctrines. I do not say you appropriate all the British interests in this country. I say plug the profit being taken from this country to the other country for a period of five years. I give you Rs. 750 crores as money to augment the Plan work. Here I am safe even then. I am not asking you to kill them. I am not asking you to drive them out. Those who are here, let them take to Indian standard of life. Those who are here let them make money and give it back to us. Don't allow this money to be exported from this country for a period of five years till our Plan becomes successful and we are able to pay back the dividend. Then they can take it back if they like. What is the dangerous theory I am propounding? I am more or less asking for a moratorium on export of capital from this country. Is it wrong? I give you always constructive ideas. If it is a point which can be accepted without any kind of demeaning yourself, why don't you accept it? That is what I am asking.

There is another loophole. Money is going out of this country through the export and import trade. They are mostly in the hands of foreigners. Nowhere in the world you can find foreigners controlling the export and import trade except in this unfortunate country. I decidedly say 'unfortunate' because they are so well established and entrenched in this

country that you do not go anywhere near them. One company alone makes Rs. 5 crores profit every year. And you can look at the statistics of the exports allowed, through the Reserve Bank and through smuggling operations, to see how much money goes out of our country. They represent the blood, toil and tears of India. I want to put a stop to it. Can you do it? I welcome it if you do it.

Now, Sir, I come to the States' problems. I do not find any mention about the States except the Naga land. I am happy that Kashmir is not included here. It is well. I agitated and I say when once an accession has been made to India by the then authority that accession is complete. You were wobbling. There was no need for you to refer to the Security Council at all. You were guided by a foreigner, Mountbatten, for bringing ruin to the country. Pakistan became a free State. Kashmir acceded to India and it is part of India. Like Madras, Bengal or any other part of India, it is part of India. Therefore, the idea of your reference is completely wrong and in future if it appears in the foreign affairs debate, mind you it is to your own burial and to your own detriment. It can never form part of a debate on foreign affairs in this House.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: Can it appear now in the foreign affairs debate?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Can Madras appear in the foreign affairs debate? Suppose I ask a question. Kerala is run by the Communists today. They are doing it much better than the previous rulers. Now, suppose Ceylon attacks Kerala and Bandaranaike sends an army to Kerala, does it at once become a matter in foreign affairs for us to debate, I ask you? In the same way, is not Kashmir a part of India? And if Kashmir is attacked by somebody, your duty is to repel the attack and see that it is ours. That is the point. There is no point in reverting to anything else.

We now come to the States and inter-State relations. I pleaded once and I tell it here now—when I said that they can have Regional Parliaments, it was watered down to Zonal Councils. Our Home Minister wants the Malabar police to shoot at the Andhras and the Tamilians. He does not want the Regional Parliament. That is a wrong principle. I suggest that that will ease the country's language problem today. We should know that. If State Assemblies or Provincial Assemblies are there, if over the State Assemblies there is a Zonal Parliament—I mean Zonal Parliament not Zonal Council—consisting of the States of the south, Madras, Kannada, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala, with a single unitary Chamber, and if election takes place to that Zonal Parliament, then all these States will come together, discuss their problem and come to a mutual understanding. Water will be given by Kerala to Madras and we will give them food in return. Andhra will give us water and we will give them cement. In this way, economically and industrially, each region can be integrated and to that extent the work of the Central Government will be minimised.

Sir, I will tell you how the integration of the country should be kept up, how the union of the country should be kept up. Defence, Foreign Affairs, Communications and Currency, these four subjects will be the Central Government's responsibility. There will be not a *functus officio* President but a functioning President. A functioning President will be responsible for administering the whole of India with the help of a Council of State elected by these Assemblies. Zonal Parliaments will be there for the four regions.

There is a widespread feeling throughout Andhra, throughout Tamilnad and throughout Kerala that the planners have given niggardly allotments to these States. The

allotments must be based on population. It cannot be in one way as you like in one area and in another way in another area. These questions will not arise if the Zonal Parliaments are bestowed with power to collect enough revenue to develop those regions. If regional development takes place, they can mutually adjust, and they will speak in four languages in that House, not in fourteen languages. We have laid down fourteen national languages. It will take time for others to assimilate my Tamil. They may like to read it.

In this connection I would plead with the Government of India that they must have Language Universities in important centres. Sir, you will be surprised to know that when I made a visit to the United States of America, the Foreign Affairs Department representatives greeted me "Iyer, Varungo, Namaskaram, Eppo Vandel". The meaning of this is "You are welcome. When did you arrive? Our salutations to you." I was taken aback. I asked them from where they learned Tamil. They said "we are assigned jobs in South India, in Ceylon, in Malaya. Therefore, there is a Chair in the Harvard University for teaching people Tamil." Sir, will you be surprised to know that one man went from here and took a Doctorate in Tamil in the Harvard University? So, why this fanaticism and quarrel on language? I want my Indian brethren to learn as many languages as possible. Therefore, if a Language University is started by the Government in every important centre, first of all we will give teaching in languages to be known, and such of those who want to learn those languages must be made to learn those languages. Then we will have all foreign languages, English, French, Italian, Russian, and so on and so forth, all important languages. So, where is the difficulty in our Parliament being divested of some of its powers in this way? Now the election is more or less a fraud. One and a half lakhs of people are

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]

to send one representative to Parliament. Out of five local people one man is sent up. Therefore, for the diversification and simplification of governmental functions, I visualise, if not today at least tomorrow, a three-tier government: The Assembly as the base, a Zonal Parliament which will be a unicameral legislature, and a Council of State elected by the Assembly members with a President who is the President of India, who will be functioning as a President and not sleeping as a President.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No Lok Sabha?

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: There will be those four Regional Sabhas. This work is not all-embracing, that is to say, you are dividing the work of financial matters, economic and other matters between those Zonal Parliaments, and therefore there is no need of a pilgrimage to Delhi by every man from every part of the country. The Centre will be concerned with the integration of the country, will be responsible for the defence of the country, will be responsible for the communications of the country, will be responsible for the currency of the country, and that will enable them to work less so that there will be more cohesion and more matter of fact work . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to amend the Constitution.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: I am suggesting let this be done. Some idea is being thrown out. Let it work.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are 25 speakers. So finish quickly.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Two minutes more. When this system is adopted, there will be a rational outlook with regard to elections. Now every one who has to come to Parliament will feel that it is a cumbersome process

but it has to be worked out. When it is a question of Parliaments being established on a zonal basis, it is going one step further. There is a Parliament for four States and those four meet together. The integration is here, as I said. I will have another occasion for explaining it further.

Sir, there is no reference in the President's Address about political opponents being put in prison. I have got one man in view—that is a deliberate mischief done by the Madras Government in putting a political opponent in prison—I mean Muthuramalinga Thevar. I ask you earnestly, you have judicial enquiries on so many matters; you have not made a judicial enquiry into this matter in spite of repeated demands by the public. Five people have been shot down with their hands tied to their backs and their eyes blindfolded. There is no judicial enquiry on that. It is unjust and it will aggravate the trouble in the South if you do not concede to our demand.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: It is an established fact that . . .

(Interruptions.)

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Are you the judge and the prosecutor?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with that.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Now, Sir, when so much is done, I have to congratulate the President for telling certain salient features which are welcome to all of us. There is no party difference, there is no quarrel on that issue. There must be self-sufficiency in food and the Prime Minister's endeavour is to be welcomed. But planning and other things are to be done in such a way as to make them conform to our requirements and our opportunities.

Freedom struggle once begun.
Bequeathed from the bleeding sire
to the son,
Though baffled is always won.

Sir, I look forward to the day when our country is free from the tentacles of the Commonwealth and is really, truly independent, devoid of foreign exploitation and swindle.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, it is a conventional thing that on the President's Address we consider the achievements of the Government during the past year and the programme laid before the country for the coming year. In considering this I would first of all begin by welcoming that part of the President's Address where reference is made to the fact that our country has proclaimed that we are not going to produce atomic weapons or acquire them from other sources. I think there is a world opinion growing that these nuclear tests are very dangerous and if humanity wants to survive, it is most essential that these nuclear tests should be stopped as early as possible. So on these two points there is no difference of opinion. But I would have very much welcomed, when we are so keen on the disarmament of the world, if our Government had taken a lead in the matter and reduced our expenditure on Military matters. Sir, we are spending on Military matters beyond our means. We are diverting the much needed funds for the Second Five-Year Plan to Military expenditure. And therefore if we are really sincere about disarmament and if we want to preach to the world that they should adopt the policy of disarmament and they should reduce their expenditure on the army, it is most essential that we should set the example by reducing the expenditure on the army in our country. During the last two or three years there has been a phenomenal increase in our expenditure on the army, and I would have much welcomed if the President had given an indication in his Address that in future we are going to reduce our expenditure on the army.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Why have any army at all?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Probably a day will come in this world when the world will have a common police force and there will be no army. Let us hope and wait for that day. But till that day comes, a small army may be kept and may be allowed.

Well, Sir, then I come to the home matters. All my amendments have been more or less confined to matters relating to the home front, and in regard to this, my task has been very much simplified. I would request the hon. Congress Members to carefully read the hon. Prime Minister's speech which he delivered to the Party on Sunday last. It is worth reading because it is a series of confessions regarding the mistakes committed by the Government in the past.

Sir, I will begin with the very first thing. It says:

"(1) in spite of larger production of foodgrains in 1956-57 by 6 per cent and exceeding the peak year of 1953-54, the food prices are pretty high in many parts of the country leading to under-feeding of the poorer section of society;"

The hon. mover of the motion very eloquently tried to plead that some people had got the habit of eating too much and people who looked thin ate too much. I do not think this type of vague remarks can help us very much. Sir, the United Nations Organisation conducts a research, and it has been by common consent adopted that the food content is to be measured by the number of calories in the food taken by the common people of a particular country. As you know, Sir, year after year it has been pointed out that in our country the average number of calories in the food consumed by the common man is about 1,500 to 1,600, while for a normal and healthy man 3,000 calories are required per day. I now leave it to the hon. mover of the motion to satisfy himself whether he considers

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

the diet containing 1,500 calories to be under-feeding or over-feeding. I maintain, Sir, that there has been some reduction in the price of food-grains because the index number has come down from 426 to 422. What is the advantage, Sir, if the common man saves about half an anna per month on his food item, or even one anna per month? We want a substantial reduction. On the contrary, the income of the common man has not increased proportionately. It is a relative term. We want somehow or other that food consumed per day has 2,500 calories; and that food is a balanced diet. And unless you give that type of food, there is no point in saying that the prices are coming down. By how much? By possibly one naya paisa per seer or so.

Then, Sir, I have sent another amendment about the community projects. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the statement by the Prime Minister that the primary object of the community projects is to increase food production. That is the primary object. Of course, the Government can encourage the project workers to devise methods for increasing food production and helping the agriculturists in other ways, as that is the primary object. And side by side, of course, they can improve their huts, improve their water supply position and build a few roads by honorary labour or build a school probably by honorary labour. But the primary object of all community projects is to increase food production. Has food production gone up on account of the community projects or not? Sir, the Balwantrai Committee had been appointed. It made a very good report, and now we are probably going to change our methods of community projects. We are now going to have panchayats and with the help of the panchayats and the new schemes we might be able to increase food production. But what will be the verdict? It will be that for the last 10 years we had been

following some methods which were not successful, and the community projects stand condemned. Sir, we have been showing round these community projects to all foreigners and telling them that this is the biggest contribution of India to village life, and now after 10 years we are forced to confess that this scheme has been unsuccessful and it has been a failure, and now we are going to adopt some new methods.

Sir, the world has advanced very greatly in scientific and technological matters, and if we try to compare the pace of progress in our country with what was the pace of progress one thousand years ago, that will not be fair. Our country is making some progress; nobody can deny that fact that we are making some progress. But my whole grievance is that the rate of progress is too slow. This rate of progress might have been all right a hundred years back, but with the present scientific and technological knowledge this rate of progress is too slow, and if we do not advance as rapidly as at least some of our neighbouring countries are advancing, for instance China, what will be the justification? It will be no consolation to tell the people "Look here, we are a democracy; democratic methods are inefficient methods, and because we have a democracy, we must have inefficient methods, and therefore the rate of progress must be slow." Well, that will be no justification. Our progress should be rapid, and that is only possible if we become alive to the situation and take proper steps as the situation demands.

Sir, I was just saying that we are living in this scientific and technological age and we have got so many national laboratories on which we are spending crores and crores of rupees. There are about 13 or 14 National Scientific Laboratories and there are 33 Universities. We have also got the University Grants Commission which is spending crores and crores of rupees in the shape of aid. But what

is the net result? Are we advancing scientifically? Are we doing research work commensurate with the expenditure that we are incurring on these institutions? I am afraid that the answer will be in the negative. The answer will be that the scientific research and the scientific progress of all these national physical, chemical and various other laboratories and of the universities is very meagre. They are not making any significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge. In this age other nations are sending their satellites and sputniks into the outer space. There is another satellite sent by the U.S.A. This satellite represents the highest form of scientific knowledge. It can only be done when the country and its scientists have attained a level of knowledge which is over and above what we are at present aspiring for or we are at present aiming at. The number of science graduates that is produced in the U.S.S.R. exceeds the number produced in the U.S.A. But if we compare our progress with that of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., the number of scientists that we are producing is considerably lower than what they are producing, of course, compared to our population and to our performance. So, Sir, my amendment regarding universities and laboratories does not need any further explanation.

3 P.M.

Then, there is the question of the administrative organisation of nationalised industries. We will have another occasion to discuss the affairs of the Life Insurance Corporation but in a general way, when we are nationalising industries, we will have to evolve a set-up of administration which can produce efficiency, which can produce results. The hon. the Prime Minister, in his speech, has said:

"It raises very extraordinary questions, this enquiry which certainly had not struck me till they came up. It had not struck me at all and I doubt if they struck most

other people. But in the course of the enquiry strange questions came up and we shall have to consider all those."

They all relate to management of industries. It is very easy to nationalise industries, but it is very difficult to produce goods economically from nationalised industries. And here the basic defect lies in our whole policy of recruitment. You will be surprised to know that many highly qualified Indians trained in foreign countries cannot get jobs in our country. They have got to go to foreign countries for this. They have got to go to the countries where they learned, where they studied. It is common knowledge that qualified Indians can get about \$800 or \$1000 p.m. in the U.S.A. or in any other foreign country, while, if he seeks a job, here, he will be offered only Rs. 350. The result is that we have to man all our industries with second-rate people, with third-rate people. All the highly qualified people first of all do not want to remain in India. They get better jobs outside India, and those who remain in our country, they also get high salaries from the foreign firms here. In a foreign firm they will easily get about Rs. 1,200 p.m. while in Government service they will get nothing more than Rs. 350 p.m. Since our President has been kind enough to refer to the setting up of industries, I am throwing out this suggestion. If you set up industries, they should be properly managed, and unless they are properly managed, we are going to lose money on them.

Regarding the State Bank of India, I have got this to say: We want greater food production, and the biggest obstacle in the way of greater food production is the lack of credit facilities in rural areas. Some time ago, there used to be the money-lender. He used to charge exorbitant rates of interest but he provided credit at the time when it was needed. If credit is needed now from a co-operative

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

society, the farmer has got to wait for six months. A farmer has lost his bull, and he has to purchase a bullock, and if he wants credit, it takes six months for him to get that credit. I know that when the State Bank of India Bill came up before the House, the hon. the Finance Minister assured us that 1000 branches would be opened all over the country, that the State Bank was going to supply rural credit. Well, what is the result? How many branches have been opened by the State Bank of India since the Bill was passed? Possibly 15 or so, or at the most 20. But the promise was that 1000 branches would be opened.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): Where are you going to get the personnel from?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: If you want to nationalise, you will have to think out in advance. Do not take a step without analysing the consequences. If you have no plans or schemes but just embark upon a venture without any planning, it will lead to bad consequences, and that is what is happening. I entirely agree that there is always an explanation, a reason, why this could not be done, that could not be done. But in the words of the hon. the Prime Minister, we are not concerned with explanations and reasons why a thing could not be done; we want performance. When the President representing the Government of India is gracious enough to give us an Address in which the achievements of the Government are mentioned, we have a right to ask, we have a right to say that the achievements are only on paper, that the real achievements have not yet been attained. Regarding personnel, there are small banks all over the country, non-scheduled banks, hundreds of them, situated in small urban areas, each with some personnel. What would be the harm if all these non-scheduled banks are absorbed in the State Bank of India? You will be able to get the personnel of these banks situated in the urban

areas and transfer them to the rural areas, to the branches of the State Bank of India opened in the rural areas. That is a good method of doing it but it is not followed.

Then, I come to another item, the irrigation projects. We have got huge irrigation projects on which we have spent nearly Rs. 900 crores in the First Five Year Plan and we are going to spend another Rs. 500 or Rs. 600 crores in the course of the Second Five Year Plan, making a total of Rs. 1,500 crores on these projects. They are very big projects. You must have read only a couple of months back the statement of the Chief Minister of West Bengal that our irrigation projects are ready, water has been impounded, water has been flowing in the canals, but that there is no use for that water, and water is going to waste, because the land has not been developed. Our method is that we have an irrigation project, but we never think whether the land is fit to receive the water. After all, dry land cannot be converted overnight into wet land. It is not that water just flows and the dry land becomes wet land. The President has referred to the big irrigation projects. The mover of the Motion also very proudly said that we have got such big projects, that all the leading men of the world coming to India, go to Bhakra Nangal, they admire Bhakra Nangal, they admire Damodar Valley, and so on. We all feel proud and show these to foreigners as the achievements of this country, but they are achievements only on paper. I do not refer to the huge waste that has gone on in the construction of these projects, how the estimates prepared in 1948 were revised in 1950, then in 1952 and so on. Year after year revision has been going on and the result is that the cost of the projects has more than doubled. Side by side with it, of course, some information about leakages also comes to us. There is a scandal going on about Bhakra Nangal. Some people say that nearly Rs. 10 crores have been lost on account of fraud on the part of the contractors

and engineers. The same thing is talked about Hirakud, Damodar Valley and so on, but leaving aside the money lost by fraud, the money lost by the revision of plans is enormous. What is the purpose of irrigation projects? To irrigate land. Can any hon. Member stand up and say that because of these big irrigation projects so many acres of land have been irrigated, that the lands which were having single crop, are now having double crops and that the yield has been doubled or trebled? Can any hon. Member get up and say that? Yes, we have the projects and they are multi-purpose projects. We have produced some electricity out of them, some, not very much. And that electricity is being utilised really for replacing thermal electricity, not for adding to the thermal electricity. In most cases it is a case of replacement and supply of electricity to the urban areas which is not very important.

I come next to the Second Five Year Plan. The President has referred to the Second Plan and the hon. Member who preceded me has pointed out that the Plan is an ambitious one. Well, I do not agree with that. I think if we are to progress, we must have ambitious plans, because other countries are progressing very fast and if we do not progress fast, we will be left behind. The world will not wait for us. Therefore we must have the Second Five Year Plan and an ambitious Plan. But what have we done for mobilising our internal resources? I am glad some foreign aid is coming to us and in spite of our ill-management of the import policy during the last two or three years and our frittering away of our foreign exchange, still, on account of the foreign help and aid, the very acute position of our foreign exchange has been partly solved and with the assurance that further foreign aid may be coming to us, that part of our difficulties has been postponed for some years now. Here again, as the Prime Minister has stated very clearly, they are loans and they will have to be

repaid, whether after two years or after 3 years, and they can be repaid only by increasing our exports over our imports. These industrial concerns must produce goods which can be sold to foreign countries at remunerative rates. We can sell even today our textiles to foreign countries but the rates are so low that it is not paying, it is not remunerative and we cannot export. Similarly, if we are to export our steel and cement, we must be able to produce them at such prices that when they are exported to foreign countries we can make a profit out of it and earn foreign exchange.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: Our steel is the cheapest.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: We are just now thinking that our steel is the cheapest. But when the new plants go into production and the cost is calculated, the position may be different. Just now it is paper calculation and we are thinking that our steel is going to be the cheapest simply because our labour is cheapest. We do not realise that in spite of American labour being ten times dearer than our labour, motor cars made in America are cheaper than those produced in India, and I think the same thing will apply to steel. We have been assured by our Government that steel is going to be cheapest in India and we will be able to export a million tons of steel to foreign countries which are waiting for our steel. Later on, after four or five years when the steel plants have started production, the Prime Minister will come forward and say, "We made some mistake in the calculations and our price of steel is very high and we cannot export it"; and of course, we will forgive the mistake.

As I was saying, we have not mobilised our internal resources. Our taxation policy has been of such a nature that there is not much internal resources to be mobilised. Even if we get foreign exchange, that does not solve the difficulty. Suppose we get

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

the machinery for the 3 steel plants, still we have to spend on their construction and working in India, on the organisational work in India an amount more than the amount spent in importing the machinery. After all, the whole machinery is not coming from foreign countries, and a large part of the machinery will have to be found from within India and they will have to be made in India and for that we want internal resources. Shall we be able to find the finances required for their completion, in India? Then again, take the case of the Railways. Of course, we will have an opportunity to discuss the subject when the Railway Budget comes up, but the Railways form an integral part of the Second Plan and if they do not deliver the goods, the Second Five Year Plan will fail just on the basis of communications and transport.

Sir, I have referred to and explained almost all the points underlying my amendments and so I will conclude by saying that I wholeheartedly welcome the reference in the President's Address to the banning of nuclear tests and the non-use of atomic weapons, but on the home front I am thoroughly disappointed at the rate of progress made by our country. The summing up of the achievements of our Government during the year 1957 and the prospects for 1958 as laid down in the President's Address may be all right on paper, but the progress is so slow that I am very doubtful of achievement.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wholeheartedly associate myself with the mover of the Resolution in paying my thanks to the hon. the President for the Address he has delivered to both Houses of Parliament. As has been stated on the floor of the House, the Address tells us what we have achieved and what we are going to do in the coming year. There is no denying the fact that after reading the Address, one gets a feeling of thrill. It is exhilarating reading. It has given

us a word of cheer and it has also given us a word of hope.

The difficult situation through which we were passing some time back has admittedly been tided over and we do hope that we will be able to fare much better in the coming year. We are told by the President that our production has increased and it is admitted on all hands that it has increased. We only differ as to whether it should not have increased more. We are also told that the price level in the country has been maintained at a fair level and our foreign exchange position has also improved. As a matter of fact, the number of achievements which stand to the credit of this Government should make any government proud of its achievements.

The criticism which has been levelled from the Opposition benches is not to the basic policy which is being followed by the Government. The friends opposite are only differing here and there on some methods which are being followed. All that I say is that the policy of this Government, their policy on foreign affairs as well as their policy on the internal front, has been accepted by all concerned and we can . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): And the Mundhra affair?

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: . . . feel some pride on it. I would only beg of my friends on that side to name any government which launches on such huge programmes and yet does not make mistakes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: . . . which land it in such enquiries.

SHRI J. N. KAUSHAL: Mistakes are bound to happen. We are trying to improve the lot of the people in the country.

We are planning on various fronts and it is admitted that we lack technical personnel and we lack other expert knowledge but then all these things are not going to come in the twinkling of an eye. On the one

hand, we try to be very ambitious and, on the other hand, we say that we are very ambitious and that we are going beyond our means. I do not know. There is a contradiction in thought. Either our Plans are ambitious or they are not. My friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, was saying that in fact they are not ambitious and if they are not, they ought to be. But then, the other friend who spoke before Mr. Kishen Chand, was saying, "Why should we go about with a begging bowl to other countries? If we do not have enough finances, why make these plans"? This by itself shows the confusion in the minds of the Opposition whereas Government is very clear in its mind. It has framed plans according to the needs of the country and is trying to find the finances from all sources whatever. It is trying to find finances from its own sources and any country which has launched such programmes of economic prosperity has always to look to other friendly nations for help and there is no harm in it. We in fact are very grateful to the nations which are trying to assist us in our hour of need and the country will always remain grateful to them because India has a tradition of gratefulness. The other criticism which Mr. Kishen Chand was levelling was like this. He said that he welcomed very much the declaration of the Government that they will under no circumstances produce or accept atomic weapons but then he also said that we should try to curtail our Army expenditure, that we should curtail our Defence expenditure. I do not know what this means. The expenditure needed for the normal defence of the country has nothing to do with the production of atomic weapons. I am quite sure Mr. Kishen Chand is not suggesting that a country should not keep that much of Armed Forces which are needed for the protection of its shores and for the protection of its boundaries. The real danger to the world is from the production of atomic weapons which threaten to annihilate civilisation, which threaten to annihilate humanity. India has declared from house-tops that unless all the big nations of the

world adopt the doctrine of co-existence, unless they take measures to ban the production of atomic weapons, there is a chance of a big conflagration from which no country will be able to escape. As has been declared by our Government, under no circumstances will we produce atomic weapons although we profess that we probably have acquired that skill. I think this is setting an example which the other nations of the world could follow.

Whenever we try to assess the achievements and shortcomings of a particular Government, we should be reasonable and we should not try to judge them as we behave on a political platform. On a political platform we do feel that as reasonable prudent legislators we have to give to the Government whatever is due to them and if there are some failings, my submission to the House is that they should be taken in the proper light so long as the intentions of the Government are as they should be of a national Government. Even if we have some failings here and there, the country should put up with them. I actually have no grievance because the people of the country by and large have given their wholehearted support to the basic plans which we are pursuing.

One call to the nation which has been given by the President in his Address is that the country should save more, there should be more of savings on the domestic front and there should be more production of all types of commodities. I am quite sure that if the people of the country co-operate with us in both these things most of our difficulties will be solved and we, as Members of Parliament, whether on this side of the House or on the other side, have a part to play in that direction in trying to seek the co-operation of the people. Even the Members of Parliament from the Opposition should do this because they are as much interested in the country as we are and since we are all at one with the idea that the solid foundations of the country are being

[Shri J. N. Kaushal.]

laid on so many fronts, we do hope that the co-operation of the people will also be coming in abundance and more so, the co-operation of the Members of Parliament because it is for them to mobilise public opinion and mobilise it for the betterment of the country.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to one reference in the President's Address to the Report of the Language Commission which is being considered by a Committee of the Parliament. Well, all of us know that language is a very delicate matter and on the question of language, sometimes ugly situations have arisen in the country. Recently, in Punjab, there was an agitation for the protection of Hindi and we are all glad to know that that agitation has been called off on account of the effort made by the Government of India. I would only beg of the Government to pursue that effort and to see that such traces of bitterness disappear from that matter. I would also like to appeal to all Members of Parliament again to play their part in restoring communal harmony which sometimes suffers because of the controversy on the question of language. Although we should keep language absolutely apart from communal harmony, unfortunately it does get mixed up and it is again for leaders of public opinion to see that people do not mix up the two things because language which is spoken by one community does not become its own preserve. It is as much the language of the nation as it is the language of the particular community.

For a proper integration of the country, we had organised our States on the consideration of language. On that matter also, I have one submission to make and that is, as our Prime Minister has been saying again and again, that emotional integration of the country is most needed because physical integration and the removal of geographical barriers are just a way to achieve that bigger integration

which is known as the emotional integration. On that matter again, I have one submission to make and that is that the bigger units in which smaller units have merged have a part to play in that direction. Sometimes, it so happens that the smaller units do not get their proper share at all in the administration or in the Services and, as a result, real good which ought to flow from the integration of States sometimes does not come about. On that matter, the Central Government has to play its role and the Central Government has to watch to see that the interests of the various integrating States are properly protected because it is only then that a proper sense of cohesion comes about and the people can feel a sense of oneness and unity which is very essential for the planned growth of the country and the economic prosperity of the people.

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the keynote of the President's Address is a high sense of complacency which, I am afraid, does not conform to the realities that we find existing in the country today. He has tried to make out that his Government, through appropriate measures, has succeeded in tiding over the difficulties that were confronting us. This is a rosy picture which he has tried to paint. It has not helped us to bring down our failings and try to correct them.

We are glad that in the matter of industrial production we have gone up. We are also glad that we are making progress in the execution of our projects and in particular in the construction of our steel factories. In all these matters we are glad and we want these things to progress. But this is only part of the picture.

Now, when we speak about industrial production, there is another aspect which we should consider. What is the position of employment? If the figures given by the Employment Exchanges can be taken as an indication, after two years of the Second

Five Year Plan, the employment position has deteriorated. By the end of March, 1956, in the live registers the number of unemployed was 7·05 lakhs, but now on November 30, 1957, it was 8·86 lakhs. The difference is 24 per cent.

Again 18 textile mills have been closed and the workers are on the streets. With regard to the handloom industry, even though we have made progress in the matter of production, failure to find markets has created a very difficult situation for the industry itself. Again, this is the case not only with the handloom industry but with many of the small-scale industries, for example, the coir industry in our State.

Now another factor which I think the President has rather ignored in his Presidential Address is the fate of the Second Five Year Plan itself. I do not hold the view that we have an over-ambitious Plan. We did not expect according to the Second Five Year Plan more than 10 per cent. of investments from our national income. If you compare the figures of Ceylon you find that during the post-war period they have succeeded in investing more than 12 per cent. In Japan the percentage is more than 25.

Again, with regard to the increase in the national income we expected only a 5 per cent. increase. So you cannot say that we had an over-ambitious Plan. And today nobody is speaking in terms of the Second Five Year Plan. All of us are discussing about the core of the Plan, about pruning the Plan, about the crisis in foreign exchange, about the crisis in resources. This is a very serious state of affairs and it is our responsibility to look deeper into the question. I do not agree that the crisis of the Plan is concerned only with foreign exchange. If you look into the figures you will find that even in the matter of small savings we have miserably failed. It was a hundred crores of rupees that we expected through small savings; we could collect only 39 crores within the last nine months.

Again, with regard to taxes, have we succeeded in imposing taxes in order to implement the Plan? We have not. As far as the States are concerned, excepting in one State, no attempt was made to raise revenues through new taxes, and it was really unfortunate that one of the Central Ministers, when he visited that State, went to the extent of blaming the Government for raising new taxes.

Again in the matter of small savings if the Governments take and, of course I agree, if the Members of Parliament and other public workers take an active interest it would be possible to raise larger amounts. That was the experience in our State. Recently an attempt was made there and it has proved that if proper approach is made it would be possible to raise the money through small savings. In all these matters, in the matter of raising resources, not only in the matter of resources including foreign exchange, in every sphere they have failed. That is to be admitted. Again we have to look into why this crisis in the foreign exchange is.

Now according to the statistics published by the 'Economic Review' it seems that out of an allotment of Rs. 760 crores allotted for the private sector for five years, Rs. 560 crores have already been expended during the last two years, and my friend who spoke before me has pointed out that almost always this foreign exchange was misused. I shall not go into details but suffice it to say that you have upset the entire strategy of the Second Five Year Plan by playing into the hands of the private sector.

Recently the Prime Minister was saying that our Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, has succeeded in creating the proper climate for foreign loans. What is the climate that he has created? He has been emphasising and over-emphasising that the private sector is quite safe in India and that all kinds of encouragement will be given to the private sector. I am not against giving encouragement to the private

[Shri Govindan Nair.]

sector, but it should not be at the expense of the public sector. Unfortunately that is what is happening recently.

Now, of the Rs. 110 crores which we have succeeded in getting from U.S.A., it seems Rs. 88 crores are for the private sector, which means that the private sector dominates in our economy, and it has been admitted by the Governor of the Reserve Bank that of the industries only 3½ per cent is in the public sector and 96½ per cent. is admitted to be in the private sector. In short the Government is giving all aid to the private sector and the monopolists to strengthen themselves. This policy cannot help us to reach the goal of socialism which the Congress Party was trying to preach during the last few years.

Again if you look at the investment policy, which has been very well revealed during the recent enquiry regarding the Mundhra affair, here again, when we were straining for funds in the public sector we had been playing into the hands of the speculators. I do not want to go into those details because, I hope, we will get another opportunity here in this House when that enquiry report is placed here for discussion, but I want to point out only this that the entire policy followed by the Government was one which defeated the very strategy of the Second Five Year Plan. Then with regard to the food situation it has been said that we have been in a position to tide over the situation. Is that a fact? It is true the Government has recently decided to stop the fair price shops. Actually, the position in the countryside is different. It has been admitted by all that because of drought various parts of the country are almost on the verge of famine conditions. What is the position in Rajasthan? What is the position in Eastern U.P.? What is the position in Kutch? What is the position even in Bihar? In all these areas because of drought we have been seriously affected. Is there anything

in this Address to show that the Government is seriously concerned in tackling this problem? I do not see anything there. Of course, it is said that the Government is aiming at self-sufficiency. Is it an impossible thing for us to achieve self-sufficiency in food? Not at all; because there are more than 120 million acres of waste land and fallow land and in the villages 10 per cent. of the agricultural workers are unemployed. If you can organise these people, if you can help them, if you can utilise them to produce more food, it would be possible for us to solve our food problem.

Now, this question of food is connected with land reforms. It has been often repeated by the Congress Party that they are for land reforms but during these last ten years unfortunately they have failed to bring in any land reform worth mentioning. But the reason for this has also been given by no less a person than the President of the Congress. Sir, one should owe basic loyalty to the basic ideals one preaches. Unfortunately, in many States the Congress is manned and controlled by landed interests that they have hitherto failed to . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): Question.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Kerala): The answer is here.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: The reason is that they do not want to touch the goose that lays the golden eggs for the Congress Party. That is the reason; there is no other reason why you have failed. Not only for the last ten years, but if you remember the Karachi resolution, you have been demanding land reforms from that time onwards but, as I said, even after all these years you have not succeeded because of the hold of the landed interests. Otherwise, what is the reason for your failure? Our Government in Kerala has made a humble attempt in bringing forward a land legislation but unfortunately even after the Gauhati Congress the Congressmen in our State do not seem to

give their wholehearted support to this step.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Even before Gauhati we had land ceilings in West Bengal, P.E.P.S.U., Saurashtra and other States much earlier.

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: The real question is, if you are serious about solving the food problem, you cannot solve it unless the land relations are changed and unless the ruling party takes interest in this. Of course, I know it is not a subject of the Centre but the ruling party has a voice in the matter of State legislation and as such if they want, they can do it. Unless that is done, I do not think all this talk about self-sufficiency will take us anywhere.

Then in the present context, it is deplorable, as has been pointed out by one of our friends here, that 60 per cent. of the water which we have got by spending crores of rupees is not utilised for agricultural purposes. How can we justify this? 60 per cent. of the water which has been produced as a result of spending crores of rupees, even when we are faced with such difficulties, is not made use of for agricultural purposes. Again if you look at the position of co-operatives, which are meant to help the agriculturists, what is the progress we have made? It is really disappointing. Unless these questions are properly tackled, this talk of self-sufficiency will not lead us anywhere.

Now, our friend on the other side was referring to the language question. I am glad that now the ruling party has gradually drifted to a correct position. But in order to get into that position, a big agitation in Punjab was necessary and the struggle led by the Dravida Kazhagam in the South was necessary. Why is it so? I feel that it is the wrong approach from the Centre that is responsible for all these difficulties. You have to accept the diversity in India; you should also understand that in spite of political

changes there is an underlying unity of India also. You should not be taken away that diversity is the only feature. That is not correct. You should not forget that there are different languages, that there are different cultures and that all these which go to enrich Indian culture must be respected and developed. The scant attention paid to that is responsible for the present state of affairs. If a Bengali feels proud of his language, if he feels that his language is richer than Hindi, why should any other Hindi-speaking people feel angry about it? If the people in Tamil Nad feel, and rightly feel, that they have a very rich language which withstood even the influence of Sanskrit, we should also feel proud of that language and help to foster it and develop it. Is that your approach? Unfortunately, it is not. I do not think anybody will disagree that we should have a common language and I believe that nobody will disagree that that common language should be Hindi, but the way you try to impose it makes even your friends your enemies. If you can stop that, if you can have a realistic approach, if you encourage the different regional languages for growing and flowering, then gradually with goodwill I am sure the entire nation will accept Hindi as the common language.

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING PATIL (Bombay): What should be the approach?

SHRI GOVINDAN NAIR: Just opposite to that which you have been following. Now, our friend was referring to the fact that India has been divided on a linguistic basis. Everybody thought, especially some Members on the other side thought, that this division into linguistic provinces will affect the unity of India. Now, it is more than a year. Let us examine what the result is. Has it affected the unity of India? I am sure it has only strengthened the unity of India. But there is one place, one State—I mean the Bombay State—which is not organised on the basis of languages.

[Shri Govindan Nair.]

The result is, you know, that there is discontent among the people there, both among the Gujarati section and among the Maharashtrians. Well, we were all speaking about the decision of the Parliament. We were also telling that if it was not acceptable to the people there the Parliament would reconsider. Unfortunately, nothing has been mentioned in the President's Address to show that the popular will of the State of Bombay will be respected. Are you waiting for the people there to agitate, to fight for it? Then, you know that things have to be decided democratically. Then, you know that you cannot go against the will of the people. Why don't you do things with a grace. Why don't you, when you have allowed all the other people in India to have their States on the basis of language, allow the people in Maharashtra and in Gujarat to have States according to their language? I believe better sense will dawn on those people who are at the top and they will concede these linguistic provinces both to Gujarat and Maharashtra.

Now, about the foreign policy, it is all well-known that we fully support the policy that is pursued by this Government. In this connection, I want to make only one remark. We are faced with a very serious situation. Now, our friends, the U.S.A., are arming the SEATO nations and the Baghdad Pact nations. They are trying to arm them with atomic weapons. In spite of all the peace talks, even a person like Kingsley Martin is doubtful whether America can retrace its steps from its race of armaments. Recently he has made it clear that the entire economy of America is now based on these war materials, war industries. Again, no less a person than Bevan has recently told us that the way they have found to get out of the recess in which America has been placed is by spending more on defence. So, it is not only a question of war or peace. It is a question of maintaining the economy

of America with the war industries and this armament race should go ahead. In this context India has a big role to play. The President in his Address was referring to the numerous hon. friends and guests we had during the past one year. This shows the great prestige India has gained by following this policy of peace. It shows the great place India has already occupied in international affairs and as such it is our duty to see that the tension that exists today is lessened and I believe that India will play a very effective role in future and that it will lead to a summit conference which will help to ease the tension.

पंडित अल्लू राय शास्त्र (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

उपसभापति महोदय, श्री व्याम जी ने जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया है, मैं उसका हार्दिक समर्थन करता हूँ और इस अवसर का लाभ उठा कर कुछ एक-दो बातों की और मैं सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ।

सब से पहली बात, जिसकी ओर मैं ध्यान दिवाना चाहता हूँ, उसका उल्लेख राष्ट्रपति के इस अभिभाषण के छठे वाक्य-समूह के अन्दर है, अर्थात् सूखा का जो प्रकोप इस देश के कुछ क्षेत्रों में बराबर रहा है उसकी ओर। उत्तर प्रदेश का पूर्वी भाग इस बीमारी से वर्षों से कष्ट पा रहा है और अभी आज ही अखबारों में इस बात का वर्णन है कि एक स्त्री आम की गुठली के चूरे की रोटी खा कर मर गई है और उसके सम्बन्ध में जो जवाब उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा में वहाँ के एक मंत्री महोदय ने दिया, उसमें उन्होंने कहा कि यह भुखमरी की मौत नहीं है, स्टार्वेशन की नहीं है। आम की गुठली का चूरा कोई आदमी तफरियन नहीं खायेगा। सूखे के कारण उस क्षेत्र की बहुत दिनों से बड़ी दुर्दशा है। इस बात का संतोष तो अवश्य है कि सरकार अपने अन्न भंडार को पूरा करके उन कठिनाइयों से जनता को राहत देती है लेकिन इस दिशा में बहुत कुछ

करन की आवश्यकता है। राज्य सरकारों को पूरी शक्ति लगा कर अन्न उत्पादन की ओर विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये और तभी यह समस्या हल हो सकती है। जब तक राज्य सरकारें केन्द्र के ऊपर अवलम्बित रहेंगी कि वह कहीं से अनाज लाकर दे और केन्द्र बाहर से अन्न मंगा कर गेहूँ की सस्ती दुकानें खोल कर काम को चलाना चाहेगी, तब तक इस समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता है।

दूसरी बात इस अभिभाषण के बारहवें वाक्य-समूह में है। उस वाक्य-समूह में कई बहुमखी नदी-घाटी योजनाओं का उल्लेख है। सिंचाई के लिये, विद्युत शक्ति उत्पादन के लिये, इन योजनाओं का जो काम देश के भिन्न भिन्न भागों में चल रहा है, उसका कुछ वर्णन इसमें है।

मैं इस अवसर पर रिहंद बांध की ओर सरकार का विशेष रूप से ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। रिहंद बांध सारे उत्तर प्रदेश के बड़े भारी भाग को और बिहार के बहुत बड़े हिस्से को सस्ती विद्युत शक्ति दे सकता है। उद्योगों के विकास में उससे बड़ी भारी मदद मिल सकती है और उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों में जो सूखे के कारण भूखमरी का बराबर रोग चलता रहता है, उससे राहत मिल सकती है। यह योजना बहुत दिनों से कार्यान्वित होने की आशा उत्तर प्रदेश के लोग लगाये हुए हैं, लेकिन उसमें प्रगति बहुत कम हुई है और मैं नहीं जानता कि इस पंचवर्षीय योजना में उसका भाग्य क्या होगा। इस अभिभाषण में उसका एक विवरण न पाकर, उसका उल्लेख न पाकर मुझे थोड़ी निराशा हुई है और मेरी इस निराशा के साथ सारे उत्तर प्रदेश के लोगों को निराशा होगी। आज उत्तर प्रदेश या मध्य प्रदेश का प्रश्न नहीं है। सारे देश की अथवा सारे देश में जो आवश्यकताएँ हैं उनकी ओर सब तरफ से मांग होती है। सरकार के लिये यह कठिन होता है कि एक साथ उन मांगों को पूरा कर सके। लेकिन

रिहंद बांध की ऐसी योजना है जिसमें थोड़ा सा रुपया व्यय करके यदि सरकार थोड़ा सा ध्यान उधर दे, तो उसके कारण उत्तर प्रदेश की उत्पादन शक्ति बहुत बढ़ती है। इसलिए इस ओर मैं ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि रिहंद बांध की तरफ सरकार ध्यान दे।

दूसरी बात जो मेरी दृष्टि में है, इस समय उसके बारे में मैं नहीं जानता कि इस प्रतिष्ठित भवन में कभी भी वह कही गई है या नहीं या दूसरे देशों की पार्लियामेंट्स में उस प्रश्न की ओर ध्यान दिलाया गया है या नहीं। मैं शायद पहले पहल यह बात कह रहा हूँ या पहले कभी कही गई हो तो आज मैं उसी को दोहरा रहा हूँ, लेकिन वह एक आवश्यक बात है जिसकी ओर मैं सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। वह २२ वें वाक्य-समूह से पैदा होती, जहाँ पर सरकारी कर्मचारियों की बीमा योजना की बात मैंने देखी। उस योजना का मैं बड़ा स्वागत करता हूँ मेरे दिमाग में यह बात आती है कि सरकार का ध्यान इन प्रतिष्ठित भवनों के सदस्यों की ओर, उनकी कठिनाइयों की ओर किसी रूप में जाने की आवश्यकता है या नहीं। बहुत सोचने विचारने के बाद और डरते डरते कि कदाचित् इस भवन की प्रतिष्ठा के अनुकूल न हो, मैं सदस्यों की ओर सरकार का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उनको कुछ सुविधा पहुंचाने की आवश्यकता है।

श्रीमन्, जब यह बात मैं आपके समक्ष रख रहा हूँ तो मेरी निगाह में कुछ ऐसे सदस्यों की आकस्मिक मृत्युएँ हैं, जो हमने देखीं और जिसका सदमा हमको लगा। लोक सभा में चिनारिया साहब गुजर गये, देवी दत्त पंत जी की आकस्मिक मृत्यु हो गई। यदि इन भवनों में जो सदस्य आते हैं, अगर यह मान लिया जाये कि वे सम्भ्रांत परिवार के, पूंज-पति लोग या ऐसे लोग हैं जिनके पास काफी खजाना है घर का, तब तो दूसरी बात है नहीं तो हमको यह सोचना होगा कि जिन सदस्यों के जीवन का एक विशेष स्तर

[पं० अलगू राय शास्त्री:]

हम अपने ही कायदे कानूनों से बनाते हैं, उनको रहने के लिये विशेष प्रकार के फ्लैट्स और बंगले दे रहे हैं, उनको एक खास किस्म की सैलरी मिलती है, उनको सफर के लिये फर्स्ट क्लास का टिकट फ्री मिला हुआ है, जिससे वे सारे देश में चल सकें, उनको डेली एलाउंसस मिलते हैं, तब भी उन सारी ग्रामदलियों को मिला कर जोड़ लिया जाये और उनका सब व्यय देख लिया जाये, जो उनको इस तरह की जिंदगी बसर करने के लिये करना पड़ता है, तो आप देखेंगे कि उनके पास कुछ भी नहीं बचता है। उन सदस्यों को छोड़ दजिये जो सम्पन्न हैं, व्यवसाय करते हैं, उद्योग करते हैं, पूंजीपति हैं, उद्योगपति हैं, क्योंकि यदि सदस्य के मानी यह है कि उसी वर्ग से लोग यहां आये तब तो मेरा यह सब कहना व्यर्थ है, लेकिन यदि चौबे स घटे लगा कर सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में समय देने वाले लोग जनता के प्रतिनिधि होकर यहां आते हैं तो जो उनके जीवन का स्तर है उसको देखते हुए उनका आकस्मिक मृत्यु के बाद उनके ऊपर जो लोग आश्रित हैं उनके लिये कोई व्यवस्था सोचनी चाहिये और उसको सोचना सरकार के लिये अनुचित नहीं है। हर लोक सभा के सदस्य को कायदे में २५,००० रुपया प्रति पांच वर्ष में खर्च करने का अधिकार है, अर्थात् सरकारी नियमों के मुताबिक अपनी सीट लड़ने के लिये २५,००० रु० तक एक आदमी खर्च करके आ सकता है। इसीलिये यह यह सीमा रखी गई है, क्योंकि कांस्टिट्यूएँसी के अंदर सफर करने में इतना खर्चा होता है। तो सारी आमदनी देखी जाये तो २५,००० रुपया कहां से लायेगा एक आदमी चुनाव लड़ने के लिये। कांस्टिट्यूएँसी से कांटेक्ट रखने का खर्चा उसके ऊपर अलग है। दिल्ली को हर मंहीं चीजें उसने सामने हैं, यहां रहने के लिये एक खाम तौर-तरीका उसका है। तो इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए अगर वह यहां गुजर जाना है, उस हालत में वह आदमी जिसको फर्स्ट क्लास का पास

मिला हुआ है, जिसमे वह सब जगह आ जा सकता था, मरने के बाद उसकी बीबी बच्चे को थर्ड क्लास में भी जाने के लिये पैसा नहीं निकलता। मैं यह निवेदन किया चाहता हूं कि कोई न कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। मैं निश्चित रूप से नहीं कह सकता कि वह क्या हो लेकिन एक मामूली सुझाव दे सकना हूं जो कि मैं कहूंगा इतदिक है, सिर्फ इशारा मात्र है। तो मैं इस ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि यदि इन दोनों भवनों के सदस्यों को हम लोक सेवक संघ का सदस्य मानने हैं, जन सेवक संघ का सदस्य मानने हैं, जैसा कि ये हैं, इसमें मैं पूंजीपति लोग और साहबजादों की वान नहीं करना, तो वे लोग जो यहां अपना पूरा समय देकर काम करेंगे, जो यहां न त्रिजारत कर सकने हों, न कोई दूसरा काम कर सकने हैं, क्योंकि उनको विधान के कामों में पूरा समय देना है और विधान द्वारा सरकार क्या कर रही है उसकी सूचना, जब उनको छुट्टी होती है तब अपने अपने निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की जनता को देनी होती है और दौरा करना होता है, इसलिए ऐसे लोकसेवकों को उनकी आकस्मिक मृत्यु के समय अथवा उनकी वृद्धावस्था के समय कोई न कोई ऐसी योजना होनी चाहिये, जिसका भार सरकार पर हो। जैसे सरकार मैलरी देती है, जैसे डेजी अलाउंस देती है, जैसे रहने के मकानों में रियायती किराया देती है, जैसे टेलीफोन उन्हें फ्री दिया है, कुछ खास कौल तक उनको माफ है, ये सब सुविधाएं दी गई हैं, वैसे ही जो एक और आवश्यक सुविधा सरकार को देनी चाहिये, वह यह है कि आकस्मिक मृत्यु हो जाने पर, उनके लिये न कफन के हेतु चंदा करना पड़े न परिवार के आश्रित लोगों को परेशान होकर स्टेशन स्टेशन पर घूमना पड़े या मेम्बरों की दया पर निर्भर करना पड़े। मैं इसलिये यह कहता हूं कि अगर जिस प्रकार का जीवन एक माननीय सदस्य को बिताना पड़ता है, वह जीवन अगर उसको बिताना है और जिसको बिताये बिना काम नहीं चल सकता है इस

वर्तमान युग की बदली हुई परिस्थितियों में, तो यह भी एक आवश्यक बात हो जानी चाहिये कि सरकार किसी सदस्य के सदस्यता ग्रहण करते ही पांच वर्ष के लिए उसकी एक ऐसी बीमा की योजना करे कि जिससे उसको पांच, छः हजार रुपया उस बीच में मिल जाय और सरकार उस बीमा की धनराशि को उसे दे दे। बीमा करने में कुछ खास प्रतिबन्ध होता है आयु का, स्वास्थ्य का। यदि ये सब चीजें बाधक भी हों तो भी दूसरे ढंग से इस तरह की कोई बात होनी चाहिये कि उनके लिये एक ऐसी बचत योजना हो जो आकस्मिक संकट काल में सदस्यों के काम आये और जब वह रिटायर होकर जाने लगे तब सरकार की ओर से भलमनसाहत के तौर पर सम्मानित जीवन बिताने के लिए सहारा होना चाहिये। यह बोझा सरकार के ऊपर होना चाहिये और इसके लिये सरकार को कोई व्यवस्था करना चाहिये। इस बात की ओर मैं सरकार का ध्यान आज दिलाना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि मैं ऐसे मित्रों को जानता हूँ, जो ऐसे संकट में पड़े हैं और दूसरे दिन से ही जो संकट उनके परिवार के ऊपर आ गये वे असह्य थे, दयनीय थे और जो कि अशोभनीय भी थे। उन चीजों को देखकर मैंने हिम्मत की, बहुत साहस किया, बहुत सोचा-विचारा कि न मालूम जनता में मेरे इस विचार का क्या रिएक्शन होगा, क्या रिएक्शन अपने सदस्यों में ही हो, कि मैं उनके सम्बन्ध में ऐसी बातें कह रहा हूँ। यह सब जानते-बूझते हुए भी मैंने यही सोचा कि इस बात को कहना चाहिये और इस भवन में इसका जो रिएक्शन होगा ठीक ही होगा, और जगहों में भी अच्छा ही होगा।

मैंने यही उचित समझा कि सरकार का इस ओर ध्यान खींचा जाये और वह कोई न कोई ऐसी योजना बनाये, जिससे सदस्यों को या उनके आश्रितों को आकस्मिक संकट काल में कोई बाधा असह्य न हो जायें और

उसको दूर करने के लिये कोई न कोई व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये।

इतना कहने के बाद मैं केवल एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ, जिसका संबंध ३५-वें वाक्य-समूह से है। इस वाक्य-समूह में बगदाद पावर्स ने जो शस्त्र-अस्त्र काम में लाने के लिए बड़े राष्ट्रों और शक्तियों से मांग की है उस पर राष्ट्रपति ने उचित आश्चर्य, खेद और दुःख प्रकट किया है। सही बात यह है कि आज जो आदमी मानवता को इस रूप में चैलेंज देना चाहता है, अपनी शक्ति को बनाकर, अपने को बलशाली बनाकर दूसरों पर आक्रमण करने की योजना बनाता है या सोचता है, वह क्षमा किये जाने लायक नहीं है। जो शक्तियाँ, राष्ट्र शक्तिशाली है, और इस प्रकार की सामरिक सहायता दूसरे राष्ट्रों को देते हैं वे बड़े भारी अपराधी हैं। राष्ट्रपति ने इस ओर अपना आश्चर्य और खेद प्रकट करके एक बड़े महत्वपूर्ण विषय की ओर उन राष्ट्रों का ध्यान दिलाया है। जिन राष्ट्रों में इस प्रकार की शक्ति है, वे सामरिक सहायता देकर लोगों को उकसाते हैं और लड़ाई कराके स्वयं तमाशा देखते हैं। लोहा, श्रम जिन लोगों के पास है, वे उद्योग प्रधान देश हथियार बनाते हैं और इन हथियारों के लिए मार्केट चाहते हैं ताकि उनके हथियार बिक सकें। इस तरह के राष्ट्र हथियार बेचते हैं और खून की कीमत चुकानी पड़ती है उन राष्ट्रों को, जो कि शान्तिप्रिय राष्ट्र हैं। इसलिये जो भारत की शान्ति की नीति है, उसकी दृष्टि से यह बात बहुत महत्वपूर्ण कही गई है कि जो शक्तियाँ पैकट बनाकर, संगठन बनाकर अपने डिज़ाइन्स अपनी योजनाएं ऐसी रखती हैं, जो सामरिक है, आक्रमणकारी हैं, वे राष्ट्र मानवता के प्रति अन्याय कर रहे हैं। जो राष्ट्र ऐसे राष्ट्रों को सहायता देते हैं, वे भयंकर अपराधी हैं क्योंकि वे मानवता के प्रति अन्याय करते हैं और उसमें खूनखराबा की जिम्मेदारी उन पर आती है। आज जब प्रश्नोत्तर हुआ, तब यह बताया गया कि पाकिस्तान के कुछ

[पं० अलगू राय शास्त्री:]

लोगों ने हमारे तीन चार आदमियों के ऊपर जो एक किस्ती पर थे गोली चलाई, लेकिन वे बचकर निकल गये। इतिफाक की बात है कि वे लोग नदी में कूद गये और अर्ध-जान जोखिम में डालकर भाग गये। पाकिस्तान वालों ने उनकी किस्ती को अपने कब्जे में कर लिया। तो इस तरह की प्रतिकार की भावना मनुष्य के खून की यह प्यास लज्जाजनक है। मुझे खेद हुआ, जबकि प्राइम मिनिस्टर जी ने यह कहा कि ऐसी घटनाओं के बारे में प्रोटेस्ट किया जाता है लेकिन ये तो कुत्ते बिल्ली के मामले हैं। कुत्ते बिल्ली का सवाल नहीं है, वे हमारे नागरिक हैं और हमारे ऊपर हमला होता है। कुत्ते बिल्ली के सवाल का आदमियों के सवाल में कैसे मेल बिठाया जा सकता है। पाकिस्तान में इस उत्तर का क्या असर पड़ सकता है? प्राइम मिनिस्टर के नाते उनके लिए यह घटना महत्वपूर्ण नहीं है, यह एक नगण्य प्रश्न है, मुझे बहुत अफसोस हुआ सरकार ने पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ प्रोटेस्ट किया। मैं यहां पर प्रोटेस्ट करता हूं इस बात का कि यह सवाल उठता है कि चार आदमियों के ऊपर गोली चलाई गई तो क्यों चलाई गई? इस प्रकार के प्रोटेस्ट करने का परिणाम कुछ नहीं निकलता है। लेकिन मेरे सामने यह एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है। द्वितीय महायुद्ध किस कारण हुआ, एक राजकुमार के ऊपर हमला किया गया और सारे विश्व में युद्ध छिड़ गया। यह विश्व युद्ध तो एक देश के नागरिक की रक्षा के सम्मान पर हुआ। इंसान मर जाता है, लेकिन उत्तर्क मान-मर्यादा का सवाल रह जाता है; इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे नागरिक के ऊपर प्रहार हुआ है, उस पर आक्रमण हुआ है, उस चैलेंज को पूरा राष्ट्र शक्ति के साथ . . .

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, we got the impression that they were smugglers. The Prime Minister said that they were smugglers. I suppose that

if they were smugglers, then . . .

PANDIT ALGU RAI SHASTRI: There was no question of smugglers.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): He said that they were smugglers.

PANDIT ALGU RAI SHASTRI: They were not smugglers. No doubt there had been some cases of smuggling.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: That was one of them.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: At least that was my impression.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: This is very unfair. That was not his idea.

PANDIT ALGU RAI SHASTRI: May not be so. But that was my impression.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It is a wrong impression.

पंडित अलगू राय शास्त्री : यह साबित नहीं हुआ कि वे स्मगलर्स थे, यह जबाब नहीं था, यह आपका इम्प्रेसन हो सकता है। मेरा इम्प्रेसन यह होता है कि कुत्ते बिल्ली का सम्बन्ध उन लोगों के साथ नहीं जोड़ा जा सकता है। इंसान इंसान है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर इस तरीके पर इन राष्ट्रों की आक्रमण करने की प्रवृत्ति रही, तो इन राष्ट्रों के साथ मैं समझता हूं कि इस तरह का एंटीट्यूड अपनाना होगा कि वे अपने इन डिजाइनों पर कामयाब न हों। मेरे कुछ भाई कहते हैं कि यह तो स्मगलर्स की बात थी, तो फिर प्रोटेस्ट करने का सवाल ही नहीं उठता है। प्रोटेस्ट किया गया, फिर कहा जाता है कि स्मगलर्स की बात थी, ये दोनों चीजें एक साथ कैसे हो सकती हैं। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब के समर्थन में जो भाई कहना चाहते हैं और मुझे जैसे गरीब को डिस्टर्ब करते हैं मैं उनसे निवेदन-पूर्वक, कहाना चाहता हूं और जिम्मेदारी को लेकर कहना चाहता

हूँ कि यह ना मुनासिब है। यह इस तरह का सवाल है जिसमें सैकड़ों रुपया खर्च होता है जवाब को निकालने में। हमारे नागरिक पर प्रहार किया गया उसके लिए प्रोटेस्ट किया जाता है। जवाब यह देते हैं कि उसका परिणाम कुछ नहीं हुआ और फिर यह बोलते हैं कि यह तो कुत्ते बिल्ली जैसा मामला है। तो इस संबंध में, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे राज्य जो आज लड़ाकू बने हुए हैं, पिस्तोल और बंदूक दिखाकर आँक फेंकना चाहते हैं, उन राष्ट्रों को मुतनवे करना चाहिये कि उनके ये डिजाइन ठीक नहीं है। जब हम इस तरह की बात को साइटली लेते हैं तब उन लोगों का उत्साह बढ़ता है। वे समझते हैं कि इस तरह की बात हमारे लिए कोई महत्व की नहीं है। जब हम उनसे प्रोटेस्ट करते हैं तो जवाब नहीं देते हैं। आप कह सकते हैं कि परिणाम कुछ नहीं हुआ है। इसका जवाब यह हो सकता है लेकिन इसमें कुत्ते बिल्ली को इंसान से मिलाना ठीक नहीं है। सिवाय इसके कि इस मामले को लाइली लिया जाय ताकि कोई झगड़ा बखेड़ा न हो। शायद हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब इस बात से प्रेरित हुए हैं कि इस नन्हें से सवाल को लेकर कोई झगड़ा बखेड़ा न हो जाय। झगड़े बखेड़े से बचने की कोशिश में झगड़े बखेड़े होते हैं और नागरिकों को दबाया जाता है। इसलिए जो राष्ट्र इस तरह के पैक्ट बनाकर डिजाइन बनाकर शक्ति और संगठन बनाकर और सहायता लेकर लड़ना चाहते हैं वे मानवता के प्रति अन्याय कर रहे हैं, यह मैं कह रहा हूँ। इस निवेदन के साथ मैं राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण का स्वागत करता हूँ और हार्दिक समर्थन करता हूँ। अगर इस सम्बन्ध में मैंने कोई अनुचित बात कही हो तो आप से क्षमा चाहता हूँ :

given the prominence that they deserved. I am speaking chiefly of the economic situation, especially the Five Year Plan and all the things connected with it. Well, I do not say that there is a crisis in the country. There are some people, economists included, who speak of a crisis in the field of foreign exchange. But personally I do not believe that there is a crisis, nor do I believe that the present Plan is over-ambitious. But unfortunately we had not made sufficient preparation, administrative and otherwise, for carrying out our Plan, and therefore we are, really speaking, in difficulties. There is no use minimising those difficulties. I do not think the President has given sufficient prominence to that aspect of the matter. At this time our people should know what they have to do to get out of the present difficulties.

Now what is the fundamental position today? What are the difficulties? In my opinion, the basic difficulty is regarding foodgrains. Now the question of foreign exchange today is an important one; we have been exhausting our foreign exchange resources. This is due to large imports of foodgrains from outside, and also defence material. But this latter cannot be avoided. The other can be, should be. The internal situation is also due to lack of foodgrains in adequate quantities. It is said that food prices have gone down. Yes, probably of wheat, and not really of rice. There is no indication of a downward trend in the prices of rice. The population is increasing and people are eating more and more foodgrains, and we cannot expect that we can tide over our difficulties so easily. The Foodgrains Enquiry Committee has told us that in the next few years we will require two or three million tons of foodgrains at a cost of Rs. 150 crores per annum. This is a very big sum indeed. Rs. 150 crores per annum to be spent on import of foodgrains! Now, there are people who think that by increasing production, we can tide over our difficulties. This is apparently the opinion of Govern-

DR. P. J. THOMAS (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, there are some very heartening things in the President's Address. But I am afraid that certain other realities have not been

[Shri P. J. Thomas.]

ment also. But I do not think it is practicable, if you mean all the foodgrains that you require. Why do I say so? It is because in the first place, foodgrain production is not a profitable thing as we control the prices and there is no encouragement given to the agriculturist to grow more foodgrains. Secondly, harm is being done by hasty agrarian legislation. It is said that by merely bringing about land reforms, we can increase the production of foodgrains. On the other hand, its immediate effect will be to reduce production. That has also been our experience in the past. People who were producing much in the past are awestruck by the big promises made by the Congress and other political parties about blindly giving the land to those who work on it. It may be justifiable provided we can do it in peaceful way. Mr. Govindan Nair rightly said that, if the Government wanted to increase production, they must give the waste and fallow lands to unemployed agriculturists. We must colonise young people in forest and poromboke lands, where they should be given all facilities to cultivate and become good farmers. What has been done in this matter has been very little, so far as I know. Thirdly to increase the production of foodgrains, especially of rice, you must have favourable weather conditions, but too often weather conditions are not favourable. Therefore, it is difficult to have an assured production of foodgrains in the country. That is why in the past also we did not depend too much on rice but on other cheaper grains, dry grains as they are called, which are easier to raise and also on tubers like yam, tapioca and so on, in the South. In my opinion, there is no real dearth of food in the country. If you mean by food only one or two food grains like rice or wheat, there is dearth, but is it reasonable to expect that a country should be fed only by a particular foodgrain like rice? Take Maharashtra and Gujarat where people have diversified their food. They eat wheat, rice,

other foodgrains, pulses and so on. In fact, those people are not a burden to this country at all. The trouble comes chiefly from the south and also from the east, States like Bengal and Bihar. These are the States which are causing all this trouble. In those states there are people who eat rice as if it is absolutely the only food. Can any Government tolerate this? Why does not this Government stop this? In my opinion, the only way of getting over our difficulties about foodgrains is by reducing the quantity allowed to each person. In the past I remember that six ounces were being used per head but today even twelve ounces is too small. People have got into the habit of filling their entire stomach with one foodgrain. Cannot this be stopped? The fear is that in a democratic State like ours, you cannot make unpopular demands on people. Surely, if you want to tide over this difficulty, you have got to give up such cowardice. I am not speaking of regimentation, though even in a democratic planning, some regimentation is required. If you really want to have effective planning, this must be done. In my opinion, merely talking of socialisation of foodgrains, and of increasing the production of foodgrains is not adequate. The Asoka Mehta Committee believes in some socialisation being carried out but to what extent? Whether it is wholesale or partial, to my mind it is no solution at all. We must really make a very bold and definite effort to diversify our diet, particularly in the east and in the south. And this is practicable.

Then, I come to another point. Our plan has been framed with the goal of a socialistic pattern of society, of equalisation, and the way we have been thinking of carrying this out is to allot part of our production of consumer goods to small agencies, to the small-scale and cottage industries and so on, and also use the co-operative method in order to bring into production many more people who can engage in self-employment. Unfortunately in this direction our success has

been very limited. On the other hand, the private sector has gone ahead, and in fact if in this country we have had increased production at all, particularly in industry, it is largely due to the private sector. This is not to say anything against the public sector, but it is true that the private sector has come to the help of this country, and they deserve credit for that. China has increased her industrial production much more than India has done, because she has been carrying out a really planned type of production.

Many people talk of equalisation, but what do we actually find in the country? There are a few large cities with increased industrialisation, better housing, big demand for labour, and so on, but this is only in cities and in areas near large industrial factories, that too in certain States only. In the other areas, in the smaller towns, in the rural areas, there is hardly any increase in employment. As a matter of fact, as pointed out by one speaker, the unemployment situation has certainly gone worse. The statistics given by Government sources are disturbing, particularly in some States that I know of, for example Kerala, where unemployment has become worse in the last two or three years. The equalisation that we have hoping for, the encouragement to the small scale producer, the encouragement to cooperative effort—all this has been too slow; I do not think that we have made much progress in the matter. This is largely due to the fact that there has not been popular enthusiasm. The Prime Minister has been talking of emotional integration. Emotional integration can only come if there are younger people coming forward, people who are capable of enthusiasm. Also we require officers of a different type. Unfortunately the officers often are of the old type, old people who have been engaged only in file work. I have seen lately addressing a study group of N.E.S. Block officers. I did not find very much life in them. I also remember addressing groups of university students and they were much more active. In the N.E.S.

Blocks, mostly you have people of the old type. They are familiar only with files. We have to find younger officers, officers who have imagination, people who know the countryside. Find such people and give them the opportunity. That is the only way of really advancing in the matter of rural improvement. I agree that much of our effort has failed on account of lack of enthusiasm.

What has happened? Take for instance the plan for loans for construction of houses for the low-income groups. The Government of India has been providing for large grants for this purpose. But in some of the States, particularly in one which I know of, till a year ago, much of the grant has been utilised for making houses for clerks and officers. Very few private individuals could utilise this help because when ordinary people apply for loans of that type, it is a very difficult process, taking several months and unfortunately, these people after spending some money, simply give up the effort. Therefore in the districts, not many houses had been built, but a good number of houses were built in the capital itself for Government servants, for in this case naturally it is a comparatively easy matter. It was intended chiefly for the common people but they could not benefit by it.

In my opinion, if any good beginning is to be made in the uplift of the common people, we require younger people to co-operate and work together. I have long been suggesting that. In China they bring together young people, people between the ages of 15 and 25 or 30, and they work and line together in camps. We must also settle people in townships so that they may carry on small-scale industries, after first giving them some training and some employment so that they may be able to maintain themselves. In fact the starting of that kind of work-cum-training camps is also the only way for building up a new manhood and also making the

[Shri P. J. Thomas.]

people production-minded, and we can really produce a set of people who can carry out our plans. In China they have done it, and very successfully. In fact, million of young people are there living in such camps and they are even taking up contracts for construction works from Government. Unless we do some such thing, I do not think it is possible for us to carry out our Five Year Plan properly.

One more point, Mr. Deputy Chairman, before I conclude. We are discussing now this short Address by the President. In my opinion, there is need for something more substantial. Every year or even every half-year, it is necessary that we should have an economic report published by the Government and placed before Parliament so that Parliament may look into the whole matter in time. It will be not only in the matter of the completion of plans already made, but also in the matter of modifying the plan. Parliament must know where the shoe pinches and what the matter is with the various plans. That can be done if there is an economic report, like the one issued in America by the President every six months in which you find expert both government experts and outside experts joining together and reviewing the whole economic position and giving their appraisals so that the country may know what defects there are and how they can be rectified in the next six months. In my opinion, such a report can be of great use. In fact, its place cannot be occupied by the President's Address or by the White Paper published by the Finance Ministry along with the annual budget. They are certainly very inadequate and we want something fuller. We must know about the economic policy in relation to the Second Five Year Plan and we must know where the shoe pinches and what the difficulties are. Then the country will know, and Parliament will know what have been the defects of the past six months and what

should be done in the coming six months. This will be a guide for the Government and the people. I am not clear what precisely should be done but I feel that there is need for something more than the discussion on a simple Address by the President, something much more comprehensive should be prepared by Government every six months or at least once in every year, so that the country may know what had happened in the past six or twelve months. Finally, we must try to carry out our work through co-operative organisations. If we do that then the younger people will become active. At present they do not know much. It is only criticism that they hear. What happened in the past few months. There was all talk of crisis everywhere. But actually there was little of it and it had a psychological effect which was bad. People started thinking that everything was going wrong. That was not the case. That was simply because of the critics. If we have proper economic report as suggested before, then the officials and the public could join together and see the position and push the plans through. Our Plan can certainly be worked and we must stand by the Plan. In my opinion that is only possible if we carry out some of the suggestions that I have made. First and foremost, the country must know what the difficulties are and how they could be overcome. Secondly we must have officials of the right type and we must train up younger people in bodies, even in military bodies or organisations, if necessary, make them work hard and thereby train up a new manhood in the country.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH (Rajasthan):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, I support the Motion moved by Shri Jai Narain Vyas. The President's Address gives us, Members of Parliament, an opportunity to review the achievements of the Government in the year that has gone by and offer our suggestions and criticism on the policy to be pursued. Within the time available to individual

Members it is rather difficult to speak on all the subjects referred to and therefore, I will take up only a few items and express my views thereon. In doing so I would first of all like to refer to some of the criticisms of hon. Members opposite that they had levelled against the Government and I will try to answer them.

One thing that was said at the very beginning was that India should not remain in the Commonwealth. To me it rather appears very strange that after ten years of the Country's independence, we still have people in the country who oppose the foreign policy of the country. We all know, Sir, that the foreign policy that the Government of India is pursuing has got the unanimous support of all parties in the country, irrespective of the ideals that they profess. What exactly is this policy that the Government of India has been pursuing? That we must bear in mind. We all know the way in which our country got independence, I mean the non-violent way we got our independence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI) in the Chair.

That was a unique event in the world's history. Mr. Chester Bowles who was formerly America's ambassador here has written a book called "New Dimensions of Peace" in which he has said that there were three important revolutions that took place in the twentieth century, namely, the Russian revolution, the Chinese revolution and the Indian revolution and he says that the Indian Revolution is the completest democratic revolution that has taken place in human history. It has ushered in new values. New conventions have been established in the international world. The way India got her independence has done credit both to India and to England. Therefore, I simply fail to understand what our friends opposite mean when they say that India's remaining in the Commonwealth is something preposterous.

In fact, we are as free as any one, though we are in the Commonwealth. When I searched for an answer to this question I remembered the hon. Member saying that he has left wearing Khaddar because Members on this side wear Khaddar, and that gave me the answer. Because we on this side are for remaining in the Commonwealth, therefore, not on political reasons or anything of that sort, but because we think so, he thinks that to remain in the Commonwealth is bad. This is the sort of mentality that has accentuated this criticism from Members from the other side.

We must pause and think of what we have achieved in these last ten years.

I make bold to say that we have made progress in every walk of life in the last ten years. We can say that progress has been slow or that we have not done something which we ought to have done. There may be causes of omission and commission on the part of some individuals, on the part of some parties but that should not detract us from appreciating the development we have witnessed in the country. One such criticism was that the unemployment is increasing daily. To some extent when the population is increasing, an increase in unemployment is also inevitable but we must bear in mind that most of the figures that we are quoting are not correct and I will just explain how it is. Formerly, there was not the habit among the people to get themselves registered in the Employment Exchanges but now a lot of people go and get themselves registered in the Employment Exchanges and so, the figures of unemployment are increasing; but then that is not the actual fact. Employment is being given to the people and so, the number that we get is rather deceptive. We must bear that in mind when we criticise Government on this account.

[Shri Vijay Singh.]

Then there was the criticism that we are giving too much to the private sector and figures were quoted to show that the public sector gets only 3½ per cent. whereas the private sector is given 96½ per cent., but then the hon. Member forgets that both the private and the public sectors are under the control of the State. In fact, as we know, the trend in modern economic development both in Russia as well as in America is towards the ideal where there will be private enterprises as well as State control. We see in Russia the tendency to give more initiative to the individuals and the tendency as seen in America is to have more of State control. Therefore, merely to quote figures for private sector and the public sector is not, I think, very correct. We should bear the broad fact in mind that overall there is the control of the State in the economy of the nation and that we are progressing in the way in which we want. May be, as I said just now, there may be mistakes here and there but overall there is progress.

Now, Sir, I would like to point out some other points that I have in mind. The keynote of last year's affairs is the stress on our economy. Some people have begun to say that we have too ambitious a plan. In a few words, I would like to give my ideas of this Plan and as to how we are justified in placing the objectives and ideals before us. The second Five Year Plan, as we all know, has initiated a process in the country and that process is that after a certain number of years, the economic progress in India should become automatic. In this connection, I would like to read before the House a quotation of Mr. Roston. He says, "The process of economic growth can usefully be regarded as centring on a relatively brief time interval of two or three decades when the economy and the society of which it is a part transform themselves in such ways that that economic growth is subse-

quently more or less automatic." Now, we want, in the course of four or five Five Year Plans, in the course of 25 or 30 years, that we must reach a stage of economic development when the further economic development will become automatic. If we are not to plan in that way, then our planning will have no meaning. Therefore, when we speak about the second Five Year Plan, we have to bear in mind that that is just a part of the long process which will be spread out over twentyfive years. Let us see that what is the picture that is going to emerge before us after twentyfive years. We all know, Sir, that the *per capita* income today, if I am not wrong, is 281 and after twentyfive years, we expect that this *per capita* income will be 546. Now, though this figure appears to be something like more than double of the present *per capita* income, if we look at things in the context of the world situation, we will find that this is a very modest figure. There is a very interesting book by Mr. John Strachey, "Contemporary Socialism", and in that book, the British author goes on to describe what is the minimum economic and social standard that is essential for the functioning of democratic institutions in any country. He goes on to say that a certain economic standard is essential for people if they want democratic institutions to function in the country because, if there is no economic progress, if people are not economically well off, a mere political programme has got no meaning. In that book, Mr. Strachey gives the example of Italy and he says that the minimum economic standard should be just below that of North Italy and just above that of South Italy. I tried to compare the economic standards of the *per capita* incomes of North and South Italy and from the book itself it is found that it is something like 2,000 rupees per head. We see that even after twentyfive years, we cannot reach that standard which the British author wants us to reach. We have laid down in our Constitution

that we want a democratic form of Government to function in the country. If we want to stick to that ideal, if we want to follow the way of life that we want to follow then this sort of economic development in the country is most essential. Therefore, again there is no question that the second Five Year Plan is over-ambitious. I think the target that we have placed before us is rather modest and this we must and we will achieve. We are living in a country, we are living in a world, where there is keen competition from all sorts of countries. There is our neighbour, China. She is having economic progress in a particular way and we are having economic progress in another way but there is friendly competition between us. China is under a totalitarian form of Government but India is under a democratic form of Government but even then there is this friendly competition. If China outstrips us in economic development, then take it from me, Sir, that we shall have to bid good-bye to the democratic form of government. Therefore, if we want the democratic form of Government to survive in the country, the modest target that we have placed before us must be fulfilled. We must tighten our belts so that we might live in prosperity, not only we but our children and our children's children.

Now, Sir, I would like to say something about the food problem. I am well aware of the fact that the food problem is uppermost in the minds of several Members and most of the Members speaking on this side or that side have touched that point. I have not much to say in this matter but will make two or three observations. One observation that I want to make is that though we might criticise the Government for not solving this food problem, by and large Government has succeeded in tackling the food problem. I say "by and large" because we all know the condition

104 RSD—6.

that existed when the Britishers left. Thanks to the present Government, no such situation has been allowed to develop in the country. In this matter of the food problem, Sir, I have one or two suggestions to offer and they are: We must take note of some fundamental facts so far as this question of prices of foodgrains is concerned. There are two parties, the producers and the consumers. In my opinion, Sir, there is no conflict between the interests of the producers and the consumers. The simple laws of economy are there. If the demand is more and supply is less, prices will rise, but if demand is less and supplies are more, then they will naturally fall down. This natural law of economy will prevail and if it does prevail, there is no conflict. But the trouble comes when the middlemen come there. We all know that at the time of the harvest, prices are low. The grain is then hoarded by the middlemen. When the harvest time goes off, prices again rise when the middlemen sell the grain so that the cultivator is the loser and the gain does not go to the consumer also. That gain practically goes to the middlemen. One basic factor about the food policy that the Government has to bear in mind is that unless and until we assure a minimum price to the cultivator, he will not have any incentive for more production. Our Delegation that visited China . . .

SHRI SONUSING DHANSING
PATIL: Remunerative price.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Of course, remunerative. Our Delegation that visited China observed this fact and they have reported that the Chinese peasant is assured of the minimum price. My friend, Mr. Patil says that this must be the remunerative price. He is an agriculturist and knows well that the prices must be remunerative, yet if you want to take the best out of a man, then certainly you must give him the best. If you are not going to give him the best, he will not

[Shri Vijay Singh.]

produce what is best in him. There is then the problem of land reforms. I do not agree with the Members on the side of opposition when they say that there is no progress with land reforms, because the intermediaries have been abolished everywhere in the country and this has been achieved in a way which is an example to the rest of the world.

Now the problem of ceiling is there. In matters of a ceiling on land holdings I just like to put before this House that we must have a criterion for fixing a particular ceiling because, if we are going to put a very low ceiling and consequently we are going to allow a very low income in agricultural sector, most of the people will not remain in the agricultural sector and they will drift to other walks of life. So there must be uniformity in the scope to earn income, and when we are going to fix a ceiling, there must be this consideration as to how much income and what standard of life we are going to allow to the agriculturists. If we forget this basic law of economics, the result will be that agriculture will come the concern of those who will be the least fitted to carry on agriculture, to improve agricultural production by applying modern means and applying modern scientific methods. To say that we will allow a certain acreage everywhere is, I think, not the proper criterion because the quality of and return from land differs sharply from one place to another. For example, if you fix the ceiling at thirty acres of land it may be quite good in a State like U.P., but the same thirty acres in the desert of Jaisalmer will not bring an income of even five annas. Therefore what I suggest is that the Planning Commission should give a direction that a certain amount of income should be left with all agriculturists. It will be in the interests of those who have got no land as well as in the interests of those who are big cultivators. Today there is uncertainty in the minds of the people and the big cultivators

do not know what will happen to their land, and therefore they are not making improvements. Consequently, production suffers. This is therefore just one suggestion that I wanted to make.

Another suggestion is that if we want more agricultural production we should have more irrigation facilities. I need not dilate at length on this point because the utility of irrigation for improved production is well known, and we can rightly take pride in the fact that we have the river valley projects and big dams which are unique in the world. But one thing, Sir, I like to say in this connection, and it is this. Many of our dams have been constructed, but their water is not properly utilised and that is because the channels to carry the water have not been constructed. The Estimates Committee and various other authorities have commented on this and they have said that we must fully utilise the benefits that accrue from the construction of these dams across the rivers. This is what I wanted to submit about the food problem.

Then, Sir, I shall be failing if I do not mention the report of one of the important committees, and that is the Balwantrao Mehta Committee Report which is before Parliament as well as with the Government. This report is a very exhaustive one and deals with some of the fundamental questions regarding administration and the community development projects. It is not possible to deal with this report in the few minutes that are at my disposal. I would like to say this much that we are all for decentralisation and devolution of power because, up till now, though we meet here in Parliament, we can hardly deal with many of the subjects which touch people vitally in the country side. It is not even possible in the State Legislatures to deal with these subjects, to make the people feel

that a new change of Government has taken place in the country and that we are adopting new ways of life, and I think decentralisation and devolution of power as suggested by the Balwantrai Mehta Committee is most essential and I am in wholehearted agreement with it. In this connection I like to offer two suggestions. In the Balwantrai Mehta Committee Report they have said that we must give the right to vote even to the officials who will be represented on the panchayat samities. I think, Sir, that this is not good. If we place officials and non-officials on the same footing, much of the meaning of voting and democracy and free elections will be lost because thereby the Government will again come to control these elected bodies, which is not correct in my opinion.

Another thing about this devolution of power and decentralisation that I want to suggest is that many of the State Governments, practically all the State Governments, are hesitant to part with the power that they have got. This is a tendency that is to be observed everywhere. Therefore it is for the Centre to give a proper direction to the States and see that what is in the national interest is uniformly applied and uniformly acted upon in all the States.

There is, Sir, one more point that I like to say. In the year that has gone by we have witnessed certain unfortunate tendencies in our national life, fissiparous tendencies either in the name of linguism or provincialism, and some type of agitation or other has raged in the country from the beginning of the year, for example, the Dravida Kazhagam movement in the south, the linguistic movement going on in the Punjab or the Naga Hills' agitation that was going on in Assam.

The President has mentioned in his Address that a separate Naga Hills unit has been created. I hope, Sir, that that is only a temporary measure. Ultimately the aim that should be before us is that the nation should be

welded into one homogeneous unit. These separatist tendencies that are developing in the country, I submit, are very harmful for the nation, and I do hope, Sir, that we shall deal firmly with these fissiparous tendencies that cut at the root of the integrity of the nation, which we all cherish.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to say something about the backward States. This is a subject on which I have been speaking off and on when I get an opportunity to speak in this august House. There are some States in India, Sir, which are economically very advanced, and there are some States in India which are economically backward. Most of the States which can be classed as backward States are those States which were formerly under the Indian princes. They have been recently integrated and, as a matter of fact, the integration of those States is not as yet complete.

Now take the case of Rajasthan. Though Rajasthan has been completely integrated we heard recently that the capital of Rajasthan was going from Jaipur to Ajmer. This brings instability there. There is that big State of Madhya Pradesh. Its capital has newly been built at Bhopal, but things have not settled there as yet. This sort of instability that we find in these different States is not good for the economic development or any other development that you want to have in these States.

The other thing about the backwardness of these States is that the Centre has not paid adequate attention for the economic development of these States. I take the case of Rajasthan railways. Now, as we all know, the railways in these Indian States were built with the money that was given by the ex-Rulers of these States which in turn was the money paid by the people of the former Native States, which was not so in the case of the Provinces, for example, in U.P. or Bengal or elsewhere. Now the Centre has acquired those resources. So those resources have been taken away from us but we

[Shri Vijay Singh.]

have not given them anything in return.

Now there is another thing. Many of these States—I am speaking of Rajasthan particularly—used to produce salt. Now a hundred years ago when the Britishers were ruling, in this country, in their own interests and for their own benefit, they took away the salt-producing right of the people and many of the treaties that were concluded a hundred years ago are the cause of the economic ruin of these backward States, and those treaties are still followed. Though we are independent now, and there is no question of Britishers or the former Indian States, that past legacy is still with us. Many of the salt works that were going on in these States were stopped as a result of those treaties, and the States, so to say, were in back waters. They have now come into full force and they have come into the stream of life that is flowing in India. As Gandhiji used to say, there was double slavery in these States in the British days but now, when these States are a part and parcel of India, we expect that the same sort of treatment will be meted out to these States as is meted out to other States. When I say this,

it should not be taken to mean that I cast any reflection on any policy of the Government. I simply mean to say that that was one of the causes for the backwardness of these parts and that that part of the country which has remained neglected up till now should receive favoured treatment from the Government because the strength of a chain, as we all know, is in the weakest link, and these backward States are the weakest link in our chain of national development, and any attention that we devote to them, all that we do for the development of the backward States, will ultimately result in the development of India as a whole. I may point out to this House, Sir that there are vast potentialities of development so far as many of these Indian States are concerned, which only require the helping hand of the mighty Government of India.

I thank you for the time you have given me. With these words I support the Motion of Thanks.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. B. JOSHI): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 13th February 1958.