

से प्राप्त हो जायेगा। इसी भावना के साथ मैं इस अभिभाषण का स्वागत करता हूँ।

डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जो हमारे राष्ट्र के राष्ट्रपति हैं उनके अभिभाषण के लिये मैं उन्हें फिर अपनी हार्दिक बधाई प्रस्तुत करता हूँ। मेरा विश्वास है कि यह सम्माननीय सदन, ऐसा प्रजातन्त्रीय और वैधानिक व्यवस्था वाला सदन, जिसके समान शीर्षस्थ और कोई सदन नहीं है, एक स्वर से अभिभाषण का स्वागत करेगा और अपने कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा। मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे इतना समय दिया।

REQUEST FOR ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF PANDIT ALGU RAI SHASTRI'S SPEECH

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, before you call on the next speaker, I may submit that some of my comrades, who do not understand Hindustani, feel that a lot of important material has been given by Pandit Algu Rai Shastri. I therefore request that an English translation of his speech should be circulated to us tomorrow morning.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—continued

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I deem it a very great privilege to second the motion of thanks to the President for the Address that he delivered to both the Houses on May 13. I feel like also conveying my thanks to Mr. Shastri for so exhaustively covering the field that he has really lightened my task. However, I would like to utilise this opportunity by elaborating on some of the points that he has made and making a few observations more pertinent to the international field.

At the very outset. I would like to say, Sir, that looking at the list of amendments that have been presented here it appears that the movers of the amendments have as usual, missed the point as to what the Presi-

dent's Address is supposed to be. For instance there is a reference to the effect that the President's Address has not shown sufficient awareness of the near-famine conditions in India, that the President has failed to focus attention on the problem of Kashmir, that no reference has been made to Goa, and so on and so forth.

DR. R. B. GOUR: But all these are facts.

DR. ANUP SINGH: They are facts. Nobody denies them. They are very important but if every Presidential Address, every succeeding Presidential Address, were to make a reference, even a casual reference, to all things which are important both in the domestic field and in the international field, it would not be a Presidential Address; it would be a catalogue, an encyclopaedia. A Presidential Address, in my view, is supposed to sum up in a few words the paramount tasks that confront our people in the domestic field and in the international field. As for the details, certainly the Minister for Food will take care of the problem that confronts us. The Budget speech of the Finance Minister has taken sufficient notice of the shortage of foreign exchange, which has been mentioned in one of the amendments. Likewise, each and every point mentioned in the amendments will be taken care of and dealt with by the various Ministries. I submit, therefore, that the Presidential Address is not called upon to catalogue these things, report upon them and to suggest solutions. There is one small paragraph in the Address, and for the benefit of those who have missed the point, I would like to read it out:

"That tasks that confront us both at home and abroad are not only considerable but at times appear overwhelming. But these tasks have to be faced, difficulties surmounted and objectives achieved if the fruits of independence are to be ensured to our people and if we are to help the world being spared the continual stress and horror of impending catastrophe."

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

That, Sir, succinctly sums up the Government's approach to our problems. So far as I can see, the Address is permeated with a sense of realism and imagination. It takes note of the domestic problems that we are facing and that we have to face; it also takes note of the impending international problems, but it strikes a note of optimism and calls upon the people to show courage and determination in solving them.

So much, Sir, for the general observations about the Address. Mr. Shastri has given some very useful figures about the food problem. I do not want to go into it here. I also would not make any elaborate reference to the Kashmir problem either, except to say that so far as I can read, from the casual reference to the Kashmir problem in the Address that Mr. Jarring had come and gone, that he visited this country twice—and saying nothing more—I take it that no new recommendations, no new proposals, have been made by the Indian Government to the distinguished visitor. It was made very plain by our Prime Minister that we have made our position very clear at the Security Council. We received the guest with the hospitality that he must command, but our position which needs no emphasis or reiteration is that Kashmir belongs to India and that, so far as we are concerned, the chapter is closed. I think that the reference made by Mr. Jarring that the changing situation had added to the complexity of the problem is a very clear recognition of the stand that we had taken. I am not one of those who feel that we have made no mistakes, but those mistakes were on the side of generosity and magnanimity. For instance, I feel that we should not have taken the matter to the Security Council, but it does not serve any purpose to rake it up now. Having taken it there, we could not possibly extricate ourselves now. Having taken it there, we could not possibly extricate ourselves now. We have shown great patience, and I think we

should take comfort in the fact that after a great deal of misunderstanding, after a great deal of hostile criticism of the policy that we have sought to pursue, the world public opinion by and large is beginning to appreciate our position much better than it did before. To find that out, you have only to read some of the articles in the European press, notably in Sweden, Holland, Denmark and in the countries of South America. I am very happy to note that even some of the American papers are beginning to see that the Indian position was unassailable so far as the question of aggression was concerned. In a recent article which I am sure Members must have seen, Mr. Bevan who visited India has shown great appreciation of our stand. He has said that when he went to Pakistan, he saw nothing else but a people virtually in love with hate, which he had never seen anywhere else. I think that one of his comments about the failure of Pakistan to appreciate our standpoint is at least an implied compliment to us. He says that the Pakistan Government is obsessed with Kashmir because they have devoted very little time to plans for developing their country as India has been doing to ameliorate the conditions of the Indian people. He also says—I cannot quote his exact words—that another reason why the Pakistan leaders are obsessed with Kashmir is that they seem to have very little else to do. This is one of the skilful devices to divert the attention of the people who are demanding better housing, better food and better clothing. I submit, therefore, that we need not worry about Kashmir any longer. We have made our position clear and I think it is unassailable, and if our critics still continue to refuse to appreciate our position either for lack of understanding or in many cases by deliberately ignoring realities, there is very little that we can do about it.

Another aspect, I think, about the international problem which I should touch upon is the much-discussed

Eisenhower Doctrine. I think that the implications of that Doctrine are so great that minor problems here and there concerning different countries pale into insignificance. The Eisenhower Doctrine in the beginning looked very vague, perhaps deliberately vague, and innocent. It only postulated that, if a country wanted help in self-defence, in defence from Communist aggression, American help would be immediately forthcoming, and it appeared that there was absolutely no harm in any country giving military aid and for that matter, financial aid, to the victim of aggression. Without looking into the terms of the American National Security Act, many of us in India and elsewhere missed the real significance of that Doctrine. The National Security Act lays down in so many words that the American Congress would sanction funds for the help of those countries only whose foreign policy conforms to the policy of the United States of America. It means that any recipient of this help in this envisaged contingency must first show by acts and deeds that it conforms to American foreign policy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you take more time?

DR. ANUP SINGH: I would like to take another 15 or 20 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

The House re-assembled after lunch at half past two of the clock, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

DR. ANUP SINGH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, before we adjourned I was trying to interpret the implications of the Eisenhower Doctrine particularly in its application to the countries of the Middle East. I made the observation that ostensibly and as a declared policy the original purpose was to help the under-developed countries and if that had been so, there would have been very little room for any kind of doubt and

criticism. But unfortunately as in its application the doctrine has unfolded itself, it has given rise to a great deal of misgivings and criticism. In its application in the Middle East it is quite clear to the people concerned there, barring a very few people in the ruling group and cliques, that the main purpose of this economic and military aid is to jeopardise and destroy the growing unity among the Arab countries.

I am not suggesting that that unity is about to be consummated but I have personally seen enough evidence among the people in those areas whose main concern today is to forge closer links among themselves, to pursue an independent policy, to seek economic aid without any strings—these are the people who are now witnessing for the first time the dawn of freedom and an opportunity to build themselves. Not very long ago, one of the leading American Socialists, Mr. Ronald Niebour, a very great theologian, held in very high esteem among the liberal sections in America, wrote an article in the 'New Leader', a prominent weekly in America, where he discussed the Eisenhower Doctrine—and I want to emphasise that this gentleman is a socialist, a great liberal, humanitarian and internationally-minded. In discussing that in that article he said that—and I am just quoting from memory—"we should not make the mistake", obviously referring to the American Government and the American people, "of even remotely and indirectly adding to the prestige of President Nasser." He went on to say: "But of course, we should not be so crude as the British and the French have been." The meaning is very clear as to the person who is disliked not only by the British and French, who is very much disliked, I am very sorry to say, by the policy-makers of America and every attempt has been made up till now to discredit him in the eyes of his people. When I spoke on foreign policy last time, I said that I came back from Egypt with the firm conviction that any attempt to overthrow Nasser either by subversion

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

from within or from any kind of attack from outside is doomed to failure because those people are united behind him.

Not very long ago, Walter Lippmann who cannot be accused of any bias in favour of Nasser or any liberal policy—he is a thorough-going Republican, one of the most conservative columnist that I know of but also one of the most brilliant analysts of international affairs, writing in the 'Herald Tribune', one of the leading American dailies, had this to say:

"It is time to stop fooling ourselves that the United States is engaged on a large-scale programme to promote the development of under-developed countries. What we have now is primarily and overwhelmingly a programme to subsidize our military alliances."

This shows clearly the inner purpose and the meaning of the Eisenhower Doctrine.

Mr. Bevan wrote also not very long ago in the "Tribune" and this is what he said and I think it is a very significant observation:

"U. S. is swinging away from Europe and redirecting its aid chiefly to Asian countries. Back in 1953, Europe's share (of the aid) amounted to 66 per cent. of the total. Last year (that is 1955) it was only 8 per cent. In contrast, the proportion going to Asia soared in 1956 to some 70 per cent. Who gets the most? By a strange coincidence 78 per cent. of the £200 million going to nations east of India was distributed among South Korea, Formosa and South Vietnam—the three most bitterly anti-Communist countries."

"We find the same political influence at work in other ways. Pakistan received £36 million while India, with a population five times as large, got only £20 million last year."

I suggest that these quotations be considered very seriously. They indicate that the real purpose of this so-called financial aid is to subsidise and to bolster up the military alliances with the declared view of containing Communism but actually it is an encroachment upon the growing independence of the Asian countries.

Now, I would like to say just a few words about the present situation regarding the nuclear weapons and the deadlock over them. India perhaps was the first country to draw the attention of the world about the menace and asked for a halt of the tests and the manufacture of these weapons. But our voice is very feeble. It can only have moral and ethical effect without being able to exert any pressure whatsoever. As we are hearing now, the danger has been not only recognised but very clearly pronounced by all the scientists. Over fifteen leading scientists, German, French and British and quite a large number of leading Americans have called the attention of the world to the growing menace and these scientists significantly enough have refused to co-operate with the further manufacture or testing of these weapons. I am sure you must have noticed, Sir, in the press today that one of the leading pacifists from England, Mr. Harold Steele, is on his way to the Christmas Islands where the British hydrogen bomb is going to be tested, and all over the world there is growing awareness that unless something is done to halt this menace to human life, all other problems and all other conflicts of ideologies are utterly meaningless because, if the human race is wiped out, there will be nobody to argue whether Communism is better or Capitalism has a greater future for the people. Here again, Sir, I notice with very deep regret that the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Lloyd, merely dismisses the protests on the part of the scientists, on the part of the religious people and the mass of people all over the world. He said that these misgivings and these protests were very largely

organised and fomented by the Communists. If you go through the list of these scientists. Sir, I am sure you will discover that not one of them is a Communist. All of them are first and foremost and primarily scientists of very great repute, and to dismiss their findings is, I think, if I may be permitted to use the word, rather irresponsible on the part of a person so highly placed as the British Foreign Secretary. Right at this moment, Sir, there is a growing movement in Japan, among the people there who know from first-hand knowledge the impact of atom bomb. Not very long ago we had one of their representatives, a leading scientists, here who told us that practically all the leading organisations in Japan, the labour unions, the Women's Federation, the religious people, the Buddhists, and the political parties, all of them were united in this demand, in this appeal to the conscience of the countries that have the hydrogen and atom bombs, to rescue mankind from this impending disaster. In the month of August they are planning to have a world conference and they have suggested the setting up of preparatory committees in all the countries of the world and the countries that have already been invited to set up the committees include the United States also, the Soviet Union, China, Norway and a number of other countries and I will not mention the other names for fear of taking too much time. The Japanese people have already set up the preparatory committee for the convening of the world conference. There is a growing movement there to put an end to all testing of nuclear weapons. They are even willing to sacrifice their lives by going to the area of testing the bomb so that thereby they can rouse the conscience of the world, and at this juncture I would suggest that we make our own humble contribution in this respect. We have taken a very active and leading part in convening conferences. We have taken a prominent part in many of the committees and commissions of the United Nations and I think, at this juncture, there cannot be a more

timely and constructive contribution than the calling of an Asian-African conference with the sole purpose of mobilising Asian-African people for a ban on the manufacture of nuclear weapons and for the abandonment of their tests. I know there is a feeling in some quarters that we should not have another conference if it does not stand the chance of coming up to the high standard of unanimity that was achieved at Bandung and there is a fear that it might pull down what we achieved at that time. I, Sir, do not share this misgiving, first and foremost because the agenda will not include any controversial subjects on which there could be great likelihood of divergence of opinion. The sole purpose of this will be to focus attention on the danger of the nuclear weapons, and I am practically sure that no country in Asia and Africa will have the moral courage to go against the collective will of the people of these continents. Now why should the initiative come from Asia and Africa, it may be asked. It is primarily because Asians were the first victims of the atom bomb, and I am afraid that we will continue to be the guinea-pigs of further experiments. Of course we are not participants in this mad race for the production and testing of these deadly weapons. We are not in that race, but we are the people who are likely to be more affected by them than anybody else. Now one might ask legitimately: What will this conference accomplish? Certainly it will have no sanction and no power to induce or coerce any of the powers to stop their production but, Sir, if we believe in the moral force—I am sure that we do—if we believe in the efficacy of spiritual force or the combined force of public opinion which will, in this case, represent the vast millions of people, I am sure that this will have a far-reaching effect. It may not induce the countries that are immediately concerned with the manufacture of these weapons, but I am sure that a large part of the people in Europe and America and South Africa will respond to the call, and this

[Dr. Anup Singh.]

exerted pressure will be almost irresistible. I would therefore, Sir, take this opportunity of recommending the convening of this conference to our Prime Minister and request him to take the initiative. It is rather presumptuous on anybody's part to suggest a course of action to our Prime Minister who has a great instinct to seize an opportunity to channelise public opinion and accomplish something I hope he is thinking already along these lines. I have only ventured to suggest that, so far as one individual could think, I think the time is right here and now to convene such a conference. It will send a wave of enthusiasm and hope among the people all over the world.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to say just a few words about the disarmament discussions that are going on in the five-power sub-committee under the U.N. Commission. There have been hopeful signs of some kind of agreement between the Soviet and the American. I say 'hopeful' because Secretary Dulles said not very long ago that this 'is' one of the most serious attempts at disarmament. Likewise the Russian spokesman have hailed it as the first great attempt, after the Second World War, to accomplish something really worth while. Unfortunately the progress lately has been rather slow. The Russians offered a plan. I would not like to go into the details of it except to indicate that it aimed first at a very drastic reduction in the conventional weapons and simultaneously a declaration for abandoning the use of nuclear weapons. The American response seemed to be very hopeful though, all of a sudden, the British have offered a plan of their own which, if carefully scrutinised, turns out to be nothing else but a rehash of the Russian plan.

I would have preferred that a serious discussion clause by clause continued on the Russian plan and with compromises here and there, additions and deletions, some-

thing could have been accomplished but the British plan has more or less confused the issue. I am not attributing any motives but I have a very strong suspicion that because the British were under great fire and criticism for insisting upon the carrying out of these tests, to counteract that pressure of public opinion they wanted to show that they have a plan of their own and that they are as anxious as anybody else to accomplish something in this sphere.

Now, the Russian plan has been criticised by its critics who say that the emphasis is largely on the conventional but not on the nuclear weapons as it logically should have been, but I think these critics forget that for a very long time Russia insisted that the banning of the nuclear weapons should come first and that it should take precedence. But this offer, I think given in good faith, was rejected outright by the Western Powers who said that this will give Russia an advantage because at that time the Russians, according to them, did not have the potent nuclear weapons. But now that Russia is recommending that, they are rejecting it. I would therefore recommend that the Western powers—the Americans and the British—should seriously consider the Russian offer and I am sure something might be accomplished.

Lastly, reverting to the domestic field, I would just like to say this that only recently we have witnessed one of the most remarkable free elections by the largest electorate in the world, and I think we can be legitimately proud that the basis of a parliamentary and democratic form of Government has been firmly established, but that, Sir, only applies to the machinery. If our Republic is going to be a real democratic free Republic, our people—and I would refer particularly to those in high positions and of high caste—will have to recast their entire outlook and begin to behave as democrats. In our administrative machinery we have made many

changes, many innovations, but the gulf between the people and the Government continues. There have been serious complaints by some people, probably out of sheer desperation and bitterness, that they do not find any difference between what the conditions used to be under the British and what they are now. Some of them go even further and say that they are worse but that, I think, is an exaggeration. It can be appreciated and understood only if we realise that these people for the first time have become conscious of their political rights and therefore their disappointment will naturally be proportionate to their expectation. They expect more and unless you meet their new demands, you are not likely to satisfy them by patching things here and there. The complaint of the average person, so far as I can see from the little tours that I have made, is that he does not get justice expeditiously, that there is great harassment. He finds that the attitude of the officers has not changed and unless these things are given due consideration and unless there is a recasting of our own mental attitudes, our progress will be very slow. The same thing applies to the social attitude. Even those people who profess and subscribe to this socialistic pattern, I think, fail to realise that this does not mean mere economic equality but it also means friendly and comradely attitude towards each other.

In this respect I would just wind up by relating a little incident that I encountered the other day. I was coming out of the Constitution House when I saw four or five persons—apparently clerks—going to the office on cycles, chatting with each other. They ran into, rather collided with a vendor of milk, a young boy, who was coming, who was right behind them. I was fully convinced that it was not his fault; the fault was entirely that of these four or five people who were swinging back and forth but the most outstanding thing was that all the five of them got down

and two of them slapped him and shouted at him: साइकिल कहाँ से

लाये, तुम्हें साइकिल किस ने रखलाई

I intervened and grabbed one of them by hand and said, 'you dare not touch this boy any more' and his immediate response was: आप कौन हैं साहब

I said, 'whatever I am, does not make this slightest difference but you five should be ashamed of yourself because I am sure that if he had been well dressed and going on a neat cycle, perhaps all five of you would have instinctively and voluntarily apologised to him but because he is not well dressed, because he is poor and he is a vendor, you have the audacity and the arrogance not only not to apologise to him but to abuse him.' And I asked them to make a little contribution so that the boy could be compensated for his milk and I was very happy that they did it. Sir, I relate this incident to bring out the point that unfortunately this is one of our national traits that we cringe before anybody who is slightly higher up socially, economically and politically but we kick the person who is slightly below us. I think it is about time that as free people, living in a free Republic, living in this new age, we transformed our attitude. Unless we do that, the whole paraphernalia of administrative and other schemes will not have the impact that they should have and the poor and the humble man will not feel the glow of freedom that by this time he should. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion that has been moved and seconded is:

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

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

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]

Now, there are 19 amendments to this motion and three of them, Nos. 13, 16 and 17 are out of order.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I move:—

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

'but regret to note that the Address has not expressed grief at the near famine conditions in certain parts of the country due to rising food prices and low purchasing power of the people.'"

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

'but regret to note that the Address has not laid greater stress on rural housing.'"

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

'but regret to note that the Address has not laid stress on the worsening of the foreign exchange position and the remedial measures necessary for it.'"

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

'but regret to note that the Address does not state categorically the position of Government regarding the Jarring Mission and its effects on Indo-Pakistan relations.'"

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

'but regret to that the Address is silent about the positive steps to be taken by Government to create a larger area of peace and canvass world opinion against nuclear tests and for banning of nuclear weapons.'"

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address far from reflecting the deterioration in the economic situation and the suffering of the masses takes a complacent view of the state of our economy.'"

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

'but regret that the Address neither fully recognises the deterioration in the food situation which in some States borders on near famine conditions nor proposes any effective measures to combat scarcity, hunger and destitution on the part of millions.'"

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

'but regret that the Address fails to take note of the still rising prices and of further growth of unemployment and does not propose any effective steps to arrest them.'"

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

'but regret that the Address speaks lightly of slowing down of the Second Five Year Plan activity in the first year and does not examine the real causes of this slow down nor does it indicate any effective remedy.'"

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

'but regret that the Address speaks of foreign exchange difficulty of our country and does not suggest a satisfactory solution for it.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not recognise the need of

revision of the Government's policy in regard to the bilingual State of Bombay in favour of the popular demand for the formation of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital and Maha Gujarat."

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

'but regret that the Address does not nail down the fact that the so-called Kashmir problem is largely the creation of Anglo-American imperialism and that its solution does not lie within the framework of the Security Council resolutions within whose orbit the Jarring Commission too functioned.'

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

'but regret that the Address does not still see the necessity of India's breaking away from the Commonwealth of nations when Britain, following its aggressive adventure in Egypt, is now engaged in carrying out Hydrogen bomb tests off Christmas Island in defiance of world public opinion.'

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

'but regret that the Address does not take note of the fact that development of Ports and coastal shipping are not given proper attention.'

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

'but regret that the Address does not reflect the grave anxiety in the country and the world on continued H'bomb tests nor does it voice the universal demand of immediate end to these tests and a destruction of all the stocks of Atom and Hydrogen bombs.'

SHRI N. B. DESHMUKH: Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address fails to take note of the unanimous and express desire of the people of Maharashtra to so re-organise the State of Bombay as to form the State of Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as capital and the State of Maha Gujarat.'

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion and the amendments are open for discussion.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are discussing this Address by the President to the joint session of both Houses of Parliament under the gloomy shadow, I should say, of the taxation Budget that has been presented to the House yesterday. Sir, the Address itself, as has been remarked in the other House and as every one of us felt when it was delivered, was very uninspiring and the taxation Budget that has come is the logical culmination of the trend that has been revealed in the Presidential Address. Sir, my friend, Mr. Algu Rai Shastri, tried to instil some enthusiasm into the Address through the enthusiastic speech that he has delivered as an agitator that he was and I feel my friend Dr. Anup Singh has tried to meet some of the shortcomings of the Address by his, I should say, experienced and expert discourse on the international situation and the foreign policy that our country has to adopt and particularly on the steps that our country should take in the present situation and by his suggestion for an Asian-African conference. Sir, the House would remember that last time when we were discussing the foreign affairs statement given by the hon. Prime Minister, such a suggestion was made in this House and such a suggestion has been arising in the minds of the people who are seriously perturbed

[Dr. R. B. Gaur.]

about the situation developing in the Asian countries. And this suggestion our Party definitely commends and we wholeheartedly support the suggestion that here and now is the time—already we are late—when such an Asian-African conference must be convened to tackle the most non-controversial, in fact, the most vital issues that face the Asian-African countries in the form of the threat that we have from the Western imperialists in the shape of atomic warfare that they are planning. I would deal with this question at a later stage.

Let me begin straightaway with some of the very burning domestic problems that we feel and our amendments reveal are not properly spotlighted in the President's Address. I quite agree with my hon. friend, Dr. Anup Singh, that we should not expect the President's Address to be a catalogue of problems or an encyclopedia of all the grievances that we are suffering under. We do not expect it of course. I think he credits that much of intelligence to us. In regard to the amendments that have been moved by either our Party or the Praja Socialist Party or my hon. friend, Mr. Deshmukh, of the National Democratic Party, there is a general unanimity of approach in all the amendments that have been suggested to the Motion of Thanks. That unanimity among us here and the sympathetic response that it is evoking on the other side—which was reflected in the speech of my friend, Dr. Anup Singh himself—must be taken into consideration and must be given serious thought.

Now, Sir, we have had some mention of the food situation and the economic situation in the President's Address. The other day we have had in this House, as well as in the other, a statement by the hon. Food Minister giving us, or supposed to give us certain details about the food situation obtaining in the country. We feel that the Address, as it is coming after the second general elections in the

country, the Address that is delivered before a new Parliament that has come into existence after the general elections, shall have to take into consideration certain experiences and certain new elements that have been instilled into the new Parliament which my friend, Mr. Algu Rai Shastri has agreed and conceded. It reflects the demoralization in which the ruling party is steeped, maybe because of the caste monster that they themselves have created maybe due to the failure and defeat of some of their stalwarts,—which was the defeat and failure of some of their policies—it is that demoralization that we see, even reflected in the President's Address. The President's Address certainly does not reflect the growing urges among the people. The people have not only their sorrows but also their joys. Our people have not only got their difficulties but also the necessary courage that they could muster to fight those difficulties. The President's Address is surely expected to give us not only an idea of the gravity of the situation obtaining in the country, but also an idea as to how we are to face that situation. In fact, when this Address is coming to us after a new Parliament has come, when the general elections have revealed that certain policies of the Government, of the ruling party, that have been followed during the last five years have been defeated, this Address should mention to us that those policies have been changed or reversed or modified or revised. But we see that neither the wine is new nor the bottle is different. This is the basis of the uninspiring nature of the Address that has been delivered to us. Concerning the food situation, the Address says that some difficulty is there in Bihar and some difficulty is there in eastern U.P., as if there are only Bihar and eastern U.P. in the whole of India, as if the difficulty is existing only in one State and part of another State. The other day the hon. Food Minister had a talk with the Members of Parliament coming from Bengal. Obviously things are not happy over there. Yet there is no

mention about it. The hon. Deputy Minister for Food toured the southern States recently and there were certain problems that were posed before him. I do not think that Government was unaware of the situation obtaining in the south. Therefore, the food problem is neither a problem of only Bihar and part of U.P. nor is it a problem that could be brushed aside as the creation of certain fractional or some political acrobats in this country. We have been given certain average figures. We are not people who believe in this sort of random sampling and averages—average production, average consumption, average acreage, everything average. And if I could tell the House, Shri Vinoba Bhave has given a very good example. He has explained the question of average in a very good manner in the Sarvodaya Sammelan in Kerala. He said, the average depth of a river is three feet and let us try to cross it. The average depth of the river is three feet. Let the hon. Food Minister try to cross it. He will get it in his neck. The problem is not of average figures; the problem is not of average food consumption in this country; the problem is not of average food production in this country. If that sort of averages are to be calculated, well, we will have an average socialism between monopoly capitalism on the one side and abysmal poverty on the other. Therefore, we do not have any faith in these average figures and in fact these averages are meant only to deceive us. Let us see why the food prices are rising. They say the people have begun to eat more. I do not know how the statisticians sitting in the Food Department of the Government think that people are eating more. Of course, all of us are laymen, but we know, every one of us know our own people. And let us sit down and think and find out to what extent the common people are eating more. I do not think this matter was told to the people during the elections, when they wanted their votes—"Well, gentlemen, you are eating more. Therefore, the food prices have gone up." I do not think anybody had the

this thesis to the people when they were trying to fight for their election victory. It is not so. There are certain basic factors, certain important issues involved, certain important policies are involved in this question, in this deterioration of the food situation. First, the food prices are going high. Scarcity conditions are developing in parts of the country. Of course, we agree that the second crop particularly in the various States has been good. Here and there due to certain natural calamities the crop has failed. We quite agree. For example, in Andhra Pradesh, we do not think that the second crop that is just to be harvested is in any way a bad crop. In fact, it is a very bumper crop, except of course in parts surrounding Hyderabad city where the recent hailstorm had destroyed the crop. We do not see the reason why there is this rise in prices even in the background of such good crops.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): More money in the hands of the people.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): And the elections.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Dr. Raja had a very bitter experience of the elections. Sir, let us examine this question that the deficit financing that is leading to inflation itself has got certain role to play in the rise of prices not only of food but of other commodities also. In an uncontrolled economy this must be seriously thought of. Not only that, we have decided not to have controls. The economy is not controlled, the prices are not controlled, and at this stage with the injection of more money as a result of the deficit financing that you have resorted to, the tendency to hoard has come to prevail. There is no check on it. The tendency to hoard, without resorting to forceful procurement of grains or control of prices, could be checked only by another method, and that is the Government itself entering the market and purchasing the grain

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]
and selling it. Unless the Government musters courage and enters into the grain market, it will neither be able to stem the rising prices nor will it be able to check the tendency of hoarding.

Sir, let me give you an example. Bezwada is in the heart of the rice bowl of Andhra Pradesh, and in Bezwada today you find that food prices are so high that the people are crying for fair price shops. There are no fair price shops in Andhra Pradesh except in Hyderabad. Every city in Andhra Pradesh is crying for fair price shops—Guntur, Bezwada, Rajahmundry, everywhere. Why it is so in spite of the fact that that is the area which is the rice bowl of our State? That is because the tendency to hoard has increased. There is no check on the prices, and the rising prices have increased the appetite for more profits through hoarding the grains and selling them afterwards. The Government will have to find a way out, and the only way out is—nobody wants forceful procurement and nobody wants control of prices—the only method is Government will have to enter the grain market. Not only that, certain policies of the Government shall have to be modified.

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): Will it not lead to rise in prices if the Government enters the market as purchaser?

DR. R. B. GOUR: It will not increase the prices because the Government will purchase not through the medium of any middleman but directly from the peasants on the basis of negotiated prices. Therefore, there is no fear on the score that if Government enters the market it will lead to an increase in prices. Sir, unless this method is adopted, there seems to be no other alternative to check the tendency of hoarding and raising the prices and profiteering on the people's food.

Sir, there is another policy that the Government has been following which has to be revised. The banks are

advancing loans on grains. In fact, Sir, the banks had agreed not to do it, they had even stopped it, but they have started it again. Now this must be stopped. (*Interruption.*) The loan is not going to the peasant. Let me tell you, Sir, that the loan is going to the middleman who is taking the grain from the peasant. The middleman is taking the loan from the bank on the basis of that grain. The bank first decided not to advance the loan, but later they have changed their policy. They have again resorted to advancing the loans. These are the problems, these are the policies that have to be examined. When we want that the food situation should be tackled, it is not merely a question of import, it is also a question of internal reorganisation of our own distribution machinery.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: You are not opposed to any advance being given to peasants but you are opposed to advances to traders.

DR. R. B. GOUR: The Reserve Bank has already a scheme to advance loans to the peasants. That kind of rural credit is a different scheme altogether. This particular device of advancing loan on the grain is utilised mainly by the merchants. The other rural credit is a different machinery altogether.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): This is what is known as the key loans system—the commercial banks advancing to the merchant class.

DR. R. B. GOUR: One more observation, Sir, in this connection. I think Government must very seriously examine their own distribution machinery for grain. They have got their Central Storage departments. They have got their administrative machinery in the States. For example,—I have no experience of other States—let me tell you the experience that we have in Hyderabad, the Capital city of Andhra Pradesh. I hope my friend, the Deputy Food Minister, will not find fault with me if I repeat here

what I have already told him—and probably with his help certain decisions have already been taken in that State to check this, but I would just tell him this as an example, and may be in some other parts of the country similar things might be happening. Now, Sir, there in Hyderabad two institutions got 20 tons of wheat a day. One is a factory and another is a relief association. There is no check whether these 20 tons of wheat that the factory is taking are all of them converted into atta and the whole thing is being sold. There is no check whether the entire 20 tons of wheat that is going to that particular relief association is going to the fair price shops. There are fair price shops, of two kinds: those that are licensed shops, and those that are run through this particular association. There is no check-up and there are very serious allegations against both the factory and this particular association. How is the license for the fair price shop granted? I am sorry the method adopted is not a good method. A certain Congress Committee or a certain trade union leader belonging to a particular trade union organisation recommends that a particular shop caters to the need of the poor people. A license is therefore granted to it. The hon. Minister will bear with me when I tell him that many fair price shops did not exist for which licenses had already been granted.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: They exist on paper.

DR. R. B. GOUR: In the records. You will find boards on houses, but no grain is there. When the grain is sold, when that house is open for sale of the grain, nobody knows. *(Interruption)* Anybody could come with me, I do not know whether the board exists, but evidence will be secured to that extent. In a particular locality, on the house of a particular lawyer there was a board of a fair price shop. But there would be no grain there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was he a Congressman?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Whether that particular gentleman is a Congressman or not I do not know, but he may be a friend of a Congressman. This whole machinery has to be very seriously checked. I was told by the Deputy Food Minister in Hyderabad when I met him that the quota of these two institutions was being cancelled. It is good that he has taken that step. But I want another guarantee from him to the effect that the shops will not be closed because the quota has been cancelled. In fact I suggested that the Municipal Corporation might take over the whole thing. The Fair Price shops' administration in cities should be taken over by the municipal corporation as is done in Bangalore. This thing is also very serious. Corruption, mismanagement and lack of check-up in the administration machinery of our own Central storage and distribution channels have to be very seriously examined and concrete steps—and immediate steps—shall have to be taken to meet these defects.

Next I come to the other important problem and that is unemployment. According to the figures that we get from the employment exchanges as published in the journal 'The Employment News', on 31st December 1956, the total number of unemployed in the live registers all over the country was 7,58,503, whereas on 28th February 1957, the total number is 7,74,811. From the figures that we get, we see that to the extent of a thousand, the number of placements of educated unemployed has increased, but the number of unskilled unemployed is rapidly growing. For example, on 31st December 1956, the number of unskilled unemployed as registered in the employment exchanges all over the country was 3,88,423, whereas on 28th February 1957, the number has shot up to 4,04,502. The question of educated unemployed is not very much better. For example, if you go into the figures, you will find that the placements have hardly increased by a thousand in the case of educated unemployed. The question of unskilled unemploy-

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

ment is a very serious one and the main bottleneck is the lack of a co-ordinated attitude towards technical training of the unemployed and the industrialisation of the country. We do not know what the industrialists want; we do not know what kind of a technical training has to be given. The whole problem of unemployment is not tackled in a very serious manner. Not only that, employment exchanges are becoming very unpopular and people are getting tired of these employment exchanges. The whole employment policy, the policy of industrialisation and of co-ordinating cottage industries with large-scale industries and the whole attitude should be seriously examined and the whole policy has to be very thoroughly gone into. In fact, during the General Elections, this problem was seriously posed. Even Congress leaders, when they went for their election purposes, just could not face this question. They were faced with a barrage of questions on this problem of unemployment. In the election campaign, we have gone to the people; we have known their urges; we have known their desire for employment; we have known that they do not want to be workless, useless. After the General Elections, we are meeting here. But here, in this Address to the new Parliament, the approach to tackling the unemployment problem is missing—we do not see anything about it. The policy has to be changed in this regard. This policy of the Government would certainly not bear fruit. We do not see any change in the policy of the Government in relation to finding more employment. It is not a simple thing; it is not a smaller matter. Placements have also gone down. Placements in December 1956 were 13,658, whereas in February 1957, you have got only 12,827. Even the placements are going down. Registrations are increasing and this situation is not an easy thing that could be brushed aside or ignored. The President has spoken—and I should say in a very light way—of the

slowing down of activities in the first year of the Second Five Year Plan and there, in a very small way, just said "There has been some inevitable slowing down in the first year of the Plan." Well, some mystic inevitability has been attributed to the slowing down of the Plan activities "resulting partly from the reorganisation of the States." What about the other parts? Reorganisation of the States is one. Well, there were States which were not reorganised. Uttar Pradesh refused to get divided into an Agra State. But what happens to Uttar Pradesh. They tell us that in Uttar Pradesh or in Bihar which were not affected by the reorganisation of States, the Second Plan activity has gone down. You could tell us why.

SHRI KRISHNA MOHAN PYARE SINHA (Bihar): What about Bihar?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Even Bihar was not very much affected. How did reorganisation of States affect the situation? The factory was not taken from one State to another. A road that was constructed was not taken away from one State to another. Certain allocations and reallocations create problems; such problems can arise and have arisen and even these problems of allocation and reallocation were tackled even before the reorganisation actually took place. They were on the agenda of the Development Councils and of the Planning Committees of every State. Therefore, you cannot brush the problem aside by saying that merely the reorganisation has affected inevitably certain Second Five Year Plan activities. There are other causes. Those causes are that the planning is not creating any enthusiasm. The whole approach to the Plan has to be revised. You speak of more average national income, because factory owners have increased their profits. Therefore, the average national income goes up. True. But has it really increased the material well-being of the people? If that happens, only then will the people be enthusiastic about any Plan.

Now, the whole thing has to be looked at from this angle and a revision shall have to be there. For example, during the General Elections, we went to every village. We went to every town and every locality and we met every adult. Did we see any enthusiasm in them even for the achievements of the First Five Year Plan? Did we see any enthusiasm in them about any material benefits that they have garnered during the first year of the Second Plan period. From this angle, from the point of view of material achievements of the people, the whole thing has to be seen.

The second thing that has to be seen is: are we tapping the necessary resources—the available resources—to finance the Plan. The other angle from which our First Five Year Plan or the Second Five Year Plan has to be re-examined is whether we have our own resources or we have to be dependent upon somebody else for resources. Now, Sir, on this point I would not dilate much because when we discuss the Budget itself, this problem will be dealt with rather in detail. I do not want to waste your time and the time of the House, but would like to say just one word. You are not tapping the resources in our country. You are only trying to finance by imposing indirect taxation on the people and through deficit financing. Indirect taxation and deficit financing hit the people. By letting loose inflation and higher prices, what you are looking to is foreign investment. You are looking to foreign investments in our country. Everybody in the country is aware of the foreign exchange position. I am also serious that we have got a shortage of foreign exchange. Very well, Sir, what is the remedy? Very simple—cut your imports, increase your exports. Everybody in the country would like to see the position improved. Yes, we must cut out imports of luxury goods. We must see that we export to earn the maximum foreign exchange. But is it so simple as that? Does it touch even the fringe of the basic factor

involved in the foreign exchange shortage? What we have to see is the unequal trade from which we are suffering. A certain amount of inequality has been imposed upon us. And that we have inherited from the days of British enslavement itself. That is a sort of Imperial Preference that is there. Our volume of export is bigger than the value we get for it. The volume of imports is less than the value we pay for it. This is the inequality which has been imposed on us and this inequality has to be tackled. Let our patriotic economists think about it.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Who are they?

DR. R. B. GOUR: There are many in this country. Books are coming, pamphlets are coming and people are speaking. Let us examine this question. There is a demand raised in this country and also in this House that let us nationalise the foreign trade so that we can bargain better with the authority of the State whenever we deal with the foreign countries in these trading matters.

So, Sir, this foreign exchange shortage or the crisis in foreign exchange is in fact the basic crisis in our foreign trade. That is to be tackled. Unless this inequality in our foreign trade that we suffer from is tackled from a national angle, from a patriotic angle and from an angle of equality with all the people in the world, we will not be able to solve this question of foreign exchange.

Then, Sir, I would like very seriously to draw the attention of the Government and the Congress Party requesting them to very seriously re-examine their decision on Bombay. We have seen the general elections. Earlier you could say that a certain number of mischievous communists have done something in the streets of Bombay. You tried to calm them down through your non-violent bullets. Today you cannot say that. From your partisan angle you re-examine the whole case, you re-examine the whole matter.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: (Bombay): The majority in Gujarat and Marathwada has voted for the Congress.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I think the Congress Party has been misled by Mr. Deokinandan Narayan because he had all along opposed Samyukta Maharashtra.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I did not oppose.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will have your chance Mr. Deokinandan Narayan.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, they think that Marathwada and Vidarbha have voted for a bilingual Bombay State just because Congressmen have been elected in a majority there. But, Sir, if you go to the depth of the problem, then you will find that politically-conscious Maharashtrians and politically-conscious Gujaratis did not want this bilingual Bombay. Let them put their hand on their heart and let them say whether they have not lost their politically-conscious vote. Let us not talk in terms of certain backward people having voted for castes.....

SHRI S. D. PATIL (Bombay): Has the hon. Member the limited concept of Maharashtra of twelve districts?

DR. R. B. GOUR: There is an obsession in the minds of certain people that linguistic States means the division of India or to talk in terms of linguistic States is to talk in terms of parochialism.

“जो भूमिहार से टकरायागा

वह चूर चूर हों जायेगा”

Those who gave this slogan in Uttar Pradesh.....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Sir, why is he so kind to Bhoomihars?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sharma, you will have your chance.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am not kind. I am just reminding my friends how

they have conducted their election campaign on the basis of casteism. Sir, the most backward masses have fallen victim to these prejudices which have been instilled deliberately. So, let them think in terms of the politically-conscious vote. Where has that vote gone? What has happened to it? Let them see how Poona has voted, and how Bombay, the City of Bombay, has voted. You painted Maharashtrians as cannibals who would eat away Gujaratis. But in fact, in the Bombay Municipal Corporation elections you have seen that Gujaratis have been elected on the Samyukta Maharashtra ticket. You want to pit Gujaratis against Maharashtrians. In Bombay you want to paint the picture that Maharashtrian means the devil. And you say that the decision of Parliament is the decision of the country. (*Interruptions.*)

Sir, let them not try to interrupt me like this. They have lost the case and that is why they have resorted to interruptions.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): The truth is unpalatable to them.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Yes. Therefore, Sir, it is time now for them to reconsider this matter. Any delay would be very costly and they will have to pay more. With regard to this issue, Samyukta Maharashtra with Bombay as capital shall have to be formed, and similarly Maha Gujarat also. (*Interruptions.*) This bilingual business is simply the creation of a pathological mind. To think that two languages brought together means the unity of India and a linguistic State means the division of India is not a normal thinking.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Is it bordering on lunacy?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, we have a multilingual India. We are all citizens of this country. We have common cultural values; we have common political heritage; we have common

national feelings; we have common economic ties and so many other common things. Let me frankly tell my friends from U. P. that in the South there is a feeling that the politicians in Uttar Pradesh do not understand the linguistic urge of the South, and let me also add that they are poor linguists, because the South Indians can easily pick up Hindi whereas my friends from Uttar Pradesh can hardly learn Telugu or Tamil. To their mind, unity of India means unity of Uttar Pradesh and unity of Uttar Pradesh means unity of Agra and Oudh. Therefore, Sir, let us not take these Uttar Pradesh politicians seriously.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to say a few words on this question of Goa. My friend, Dr. Anup Singh, has already spoken on the international situation so well that I need not add anything to it. Sir, you have ruled our amendment on Goa as out of order. That is all right because you have done it according to rules. But there is only one point which we have got to say in regard to this matter. It is a national issue. Sir, the Prime Minister had promised in the debate last time that he would consult Members of Parliament and evolve a proper policy in respect of Goa. Now we fail to notice anything in that direction. And you remember that on this issue there is no difference in the country. In fact, if at all there is any criticism of the Government on this issue, it is this that they are not dealing with the foreigners in a proper way. That is all. So, let us find out a national policy and let us find out a national approach for this national problem and let us take some national steps to solve this problem and thus remove this blot once and for all.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): What do you suggest?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Well, I for one am not so irresponsible as to suggest anything here on behalf of my Party. Let us examine it in a meeting of

Parliament Members. It is not an issue on which I should say something and my friend the Deputy Minister for External Affairs should immediately get up and say "Gentleman, you are wrong". It is therefore I suggest that there should be a meeting of the Members of Parliament and that meeting should be held very soon so that we can discuss the matter there in a proper atmosphere threadbare and evolve a suitable policy. That is the only thing that we want

Now, Sir, in relation to international issues, well, I have nothing to add to what Dr. Anup Singh has said. But, Sir, we feel, and very sincerely feel, that the situation, as it is developing in West Asia, is a very serious situation. By the way, let me tell you one thing. This term 'Middle East' should be dropped. 'Middle East' is the term of Europeans because it is middle to them. Let us have 'West Asia' as the term for ourselves. For us in this country 'Middle East' is 'West Asia'. So, with this explanation I will be using the term 'West Asia' only. After all, what is this Far East, the Middle East, the Near East etc.? That is only from European standards. Let us not have those standards. We are free people.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: That is what I doubt.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Let us talk. . . (Interruption) . . . The days now have changed. So, Sir, this West Asian situation has to be studied very carefully.

There is another point which Dr. Anup Singh did not mention; I do not know why. That is the situation in East and South East Asia created by the reported decision of the American Government to arm Japan and the Kuomintang with nuclear weapons. That is a serious menace not only for East Asia but for entire Asia. They are carrying on a diabolical policy of pitting Asians against Asians, of arming Asians against Asians for enslaving Asians. Last time when I said this when the Foreign Affairs

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

Debate was going on, the Minister without Portfolio who was replying to the debate, took exception to my statement that the American Government was following an obnoxious policy, a diabolical policy. He refused to agree with it. But let us see what is happening? What is the agreement that they have reached with the South Viet Nam Government? What is it that they are doing with the Kuomintang? What is it that they are doing in Jordan in West Asia? What is it that they are doing in South Korea? They are serious matters and fraught with serious dangers to Asia. Therefore, we shall have to take necessary measures, and it is time to convene a conference of Asian-African countries and to see that this challenge is met. We always say that peace is indivisible. Let us save the peace when there is time. This morning in the papers we have seen two statements of policy, one by Mr. Bulganin and another by Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. Bulganin says that international tension should be eased and for that purpose a summit conference of the heads of States should be held and all preparations should be made for this. Mr. Eisenhower does not want the easing of international tension. He calls upon his people not to vote down the Defence Budget, because even in America there is a move that the Defence Budget must be slashed. These are two contrary statements and explain two contrary motives. We are partisans of peace and therefore we shall have to uphold our demand, our desire, our suggestion, that an international conference should be convened to discuss and thrash out the various problems and come to a decision and thus ease international tensions. I know that in doing this we will be charged with partisanship. All honest people throughout history have been charged like this, and so let us not be frightened of charges like this. Therefore, in the interests of peace, in the interests of Asian solidarity, in the interests of defending the freedom that many of the Asian countries have achieved recent-

ly and in the interests of promoting the freedom of those Asian countries which are still under foreign domination it is necessary to convene an Asian-African conference at an early date and to take very serious and more positive steps to intervene in the international scene and see that the top leaders of the world meet in a summit conference and come to some agreement to stop the nuclear tests and move further to completely liquidate all atom and hydrogen bombs. With these few words, I commend our amendments to the House.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the motion moved by my friend, Mr. Algu Rai Shastri, from Uttar Pradesh, and seconded by Dr. Anup Singh from Punjab. In doing so, I venture to invite the attention of this hon. House to paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the Address of the President. In the very beginning of his Address, he has tried to rivet our attention on the economic situation, the difficulties with regard to foreign exchange, and has appealed to the public and, in particular, to the Members of Parliament that the country looks to them for a lead. I will quote paragraph 7.

"Members of Parliament: The country looks to you a great deal for that sustained and special effort in support of the policies and endeavours which my Government will initiate in this behalf, which will help us to surmount difficulties and to achieve success."

The difficulties are those that he had mentioned in paragraphs 4 to 6. Since he delivered his Address, we have had the advantage of the Finance Minister's Budget speech yesterday at 5 P.M., in which he has imposed a number of new taxes in all sectors of life in this country. Now, Sir, when the Second Five Year Plan was under discussion, I happened to be a member of the Committee of Parliament which was dealing with resources, and I happened to belong to that school which thought that the target of the Second Five Year Plan

was much too big for our resources, internal as well as external, and the alternative that I along with others who agreed with me suggested was that we should fix a series of priorities and cut down those which were non-essential and in the alternative, that we should extend the period of the Plan to six years or seven years. Parliament, after debating the whole issue, unanimously agreed in both the Houses that the targets of the Second Five Year Plan as laid down by the Planning Commission should be carried out. When Parliament came to that decision, it had before it the Minute of Dissent written by Prof. Shenoy as well as by one of the Members of the Planning Commission, Mr. K. C. Neogy. Both these gentlemen had also warned that the target was much too big for the resources of this country. However, Parliament took that decision, and after that decision, we have had a general election in the country; the Second Five Year Plan was before the country, and the country by an overwhelming majority approved of the Plan and returned this Party in greater numbers in the Lok Sabha this time than was the case last time. Therefore, it is too late in the day to ask the Finance Minister or the Government of India to scale down the targets of the Second Five Year Plan. We, as a people and also as a Parliament, are now committed to the execution of this Plan, wherein a target of Rs. 4,800 crores was fixed. It is now, I believe, increased to Rs. 5,200 crores or Rs. 5,400 crores. Now, when we have agreed on that basic point, then we must find the resources to implement that Plan. For some time we had debated also the question of deficit financing which, of course, is a euphemism in modern parlance for the printing of notes. When we need money, we issue Treasury Bills, and notes are issued by the Reserve Bank. This sort of thing cannot go on for ever. It was tried at one stage in England in the thirties in a particular situation. It may have done its purpose. It does no doubt help in an undeveloped

economy to a certain extent to give a little injection, to give a little stimulation. As the Finance Minister's predecessor in his office said, it is like a poison and has to be used very carefully as a medicine, not as food. To develop a long-term plan, you cannot therefore live on this drug. It becomes necessary, therefore, that we should avoid deficit financing to the utmost of our ability.

We must be prepared to make whatever sacrifices are needed to implement the Second Plan. Therefore, I submit, starting with these two assumptions, namely, that the plan target has got to be implemented and secondly the deficit financing has got to be avoided both in the interests of the economy as well as of progress, we are left with only one opinion viz., to impose taxes. I know that our present Finance Minister, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, as a man of conviction and what is more important, has the courage of his convictions. That is why I think, in living memory, he is the one Finance Minister who has come out with this bold and courageous plan of imposing taxation to the tune of Rs. 93 crores in one single year. Because, please remember that right upto 1939-40—the war year—the total budget of the Government of India was between Rs. 90 to Rs. 100 crores. In fact it dwindled once to Rs. 80 crores. Therefore to impose tax of the dimension of Rs. 93 crores in one single year requires tremendous courage and I must congratulate him for the step that he has taken because it was the least that any Finance Minister could do, faced as he was with the circumstances which I have just narrated.

With the imposition of these taxes the uncovered deficit dwindled down from Rs. 365 crores which actually increased to Rs. 367 crores, to Rs. 278 crores. That itself is a great help. I believe the Government should take immediate steps; when we are taking such drastic measures to tax every sector of society, from the rich to the poor, it becomes a duty, in fact a trust

[Shri J. S. Bisht.]

that the money that we raise is spent as carefully and as economically as possible.

In the general elections, I too had, along with other hon. Members of our Party and other parties also, to go into the country, to the villages and towns and everywhere. The people did not mind these taxes but the grievance is that some of the money or a lot of money is being wasted. There was the grievance with regard to corruption on the lower levels of the officialdom and what is more, that there was considerable wastage. Every official, even a small official, seems to be having a jeep or a land-master and is running about burning all petrol and spending on T. A., D.A. etc. and the work is being rushed through in the months of February and March in order that the money may not lapse as if the tax-payer's money is meant to be sacrificed ruthlessly and mercilessly, whatever happens. Therefore it becomes necessary for the Government, both at the Centre and in the States, at all levels to see that all the money raised and spent in all these plans is fully utilized. I know from practical experience in administration in the local authorities that we cannot guarantee in public administration a full return or 100 per cent. return for the money that is spent but we would be satisfied if we get even 90 per cent. return. The complaint is that we are not getting even 60 per cent. and that is a serious charge; because we had the Railway Anti-corruption Committee to enquire into this matter and they said that the money that was being made by even an ordinary goods clerk and the station-master was more than the pay of the Members of the Railway Board. That is said about many other Departments too. We know that in Hirakud the Chief Engineer and a number of engineers were found guilty of this sort of malpractices and we also know that in Bhakra-Nangal there are 17 engineers who are to be prosecuted or charged. Probably my friends from

Punjab may be knowing better but I suppose the matter is under investigation for a very long time. That is why I say that in our anxiety to get these things to be executed, we must be careful. There are men, may be engineers or contractors or station-masters or in other walks of life, who are only too anxious to exploit that situation for their own personal benefits. Therefore I would appeal to the Government that they should set their hand to it.

Also I would say here that in the Finance Ministry itself the Department of Income-tax which is now armed with large powers for imposing this new tax on wealth, on expenditure etc.—that Department—is not free from corruption. We see, as all Members must be seeing with their own eyes, what is happening there. The position of the Income-tax Officer today is greater among the richer classes than the position of the Collectors in British days. He is worshipped like a lord. Every word of his and every command of his is obeyed by the rich class. Why is that so? It is only because corruption is rife there. May be, not all of them but a very large and substantial section of it is so and that counts for a large number of evasion of taxes. Prof. Kaldor estimated it to be Rs. 200 crores. May be, that is an exaggeration but there is no doubt that at least Rs. 40 to 50 crores a year was being evaded on the tax structure that existed till now. I am therefore very glad that the hon. Finance Minister has taken this drastic step of taxing every sector of society. I am very pleased but I would be still more pleased, as I pleaded last time, when I see that all the recommendations made by Prof. Kaldor are implemented. In fact I find most of them are being implemented and I hope that by the time the next budget comes in, the other recommendations of Prof. Kaldor will be implemented because that is the most scientific system of taxation that has so far been recommended in this country.

Now I have only one complaint that he has taken up certain portions of Prof. Kaldor's recommendations but dropped others because that is a scheme to be taken as a whole. If it reduces somewhere, it increases somewhere. He recommended, for instance, that the income-tax and surcharge should be brought down on the top level to about 64 per cent. I see that the hon. Minister has brought it down to 77 per cent. There is not much harm in that . . .

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: It comes to 84 per cent. with the surcharge . . .

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Generally, it is 77 per cent. Now in the other budget later on he may bring it down to that level but at the same time he recommended, for instance, the imposition of expenditure tax and the imposition of capital gains tax and the imposition of tax on total wealth. Those have been levied. That is a very good and welcome step but he also recommended the abolition of the Estate Duty. I am also one of those who think that it is a very unscientific mode of taxation because under the Estate Duty when a man dies and his heirs inherit property, we take some share but by imposing this tax on total wealth, you are already taking a share of it gradually. So I should say that this is an Estate Duty in another form spread over a number of years which is a more scientific mode of taxation. Besides, our experience is that after the passage of the Estate Duty Act we got nothing out of it. Most of the people either gifted away the property or created Trusts. Then to tackle that sort of evasion of tax, Prof. Kaldor recommended that a gift tax should also be levied. It has not been levied just now and I hope that in the future budgets, because of our developing economy, this year's outlay on this Plan is about Rs. 900 crores and I think in the next year and in the year after it may rise to Rs. 1,100 and Rs. 1,200 crores and he will need money, a gift tax must

be levied, whether it comes in the form of tax on gift or will or in any other form. But it must come in but at the same time the Estate Duty Act should be abolished.

We must therefore welcome the whole scheme of the Budget. From the papers it appears that some people were very much stunned by the scheme of taxation. I don't know what they expected because they were very loud and vociferous so far as the fixation of target of the Second Plan was concerned. Everbody wants everything to be done—new roads, schools, hospitals, new machinery, steel plants, railway tracts etc. Certainly we want that because the people in the backward areas and in the rural areas who have never had the Community Projects schemes or the N.E.S. schemes, are very anxious that those benefits should be extended to them and when the people are enfranchised and when we have adult franchise, it means that the people are the masters of our Government. Therefore we must satisfy our masters. In order to satisfy them we must step up all these schemes for the amelioration of the people. I

4 P.M. would not go into the details of this Budget, Sir, except to say that I wholeheartedly support the whole scheme of taxation as laid down by the Finance Minister in his speech.

Now I come to the another point that my friend of the Communist Party just now raised with regard to the food problem. I think he was rather a little confused. There were certain points in his speech with which I quite agree. One is that the food production in the country has increased. I have got here in my hand a statement made by the Food Minister the other day. For instance he says that in 1951-52 the production of cereals was about 43·5 million tons. In 1956-57 it has gone up to 54·8 millions. Incidentally I would ask the Deputy Minister for Food who is here why is

[Shri J. S. Bisht.]

there a difference in this very statement on the very first page. You say in that very place that in 1956-57 the total production is 56·2 million tons...

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FOOD (SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA): That is the actual production and in the next paragraph it is the average of the five years that has been given.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: But there you say that for 1956-57 it is 54·8 millions.

SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA: It is the quinquennial average, the average of the five years.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Very well. Now this shows that there is a continuing increase in production. This morning in answer to questions they said that imports were decreasing. Therefore it shows clearly that it is not shortage of foodstuffs in this country. Marginal shortage there is, and it is always bound to be. It may be 2 per cent, it may be 3 per cent or at the most it may be 5 per cent, on account of natural calamities, floods, droughts and other things. But the main deficiency is not of food shortage. The deficiency is due to the fact that in the last year of the First Five Year Plan, that is to say, in 1956-57, we went in for a very large dose of deficit financing. Now when you injected such a volume of money into the economy of the country, it was bound to have its effect for which, in fact, we raised a cry in the December Session and again in the March Session. I think it was also in the Budget Session last year, and the cry was raised that the prices of foodgrains were rising due to large scale deficit financing and that there should be a halt to it and that the money should be raised by taxation and loans. But the then Finance Minister and the officials of the Finance Ministry could not be dissuaded and they persisted in this until they were faced with the stark reality that prices could not be controlled thereby. At that time they boasted that they would take

very strong measures and that very soon the price level would be brought down to its normal position. But they failed to accomplish it. Strangely enough the Food Ministry was persistently pleading that that rise in prices was due to deficit financing. It seemed as though these two Ministries were then at cross purposes. Today there seems to be better co-operation and these charges are not being levelled against each other. But the fact remains that this rise in prices is due to deficit financing. The hon. the present Finance Minister is going to reduce the extent of deficit financing. He has plainly said so that he does not like it. He has also plainly said so in his speech yesterday....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA: Does not a little increase in the price of foodgrains help the agriculturist to get the benefit of the extra money that is thrown into the market?

SHRI J. S. BISHT: No. Then, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister himself said yesterday that deficit financing of the dimension recommended by the Planning Commission in the Second Five Year Plan will not take place. At least as long as he is the Finance Minister we are assured about that and that he would raise money by other means. He has raised bank rate by half a per cent, which means more money will come by way of savings, and by loans and by raising taxation he is bound to raise the internal resources, and when we strengthen our internal economy, external aid and foreign capital are bound to come in, and the position will ease. But my friend Dr. Gour was floundering when he said Government should go into the market and buy. I could not quite understand what is the economics underlying this. How can the Government go in? It is not a question of bidding against one another. The people are hoarding because the prices are rising. This is a natural phenomenon. When prices rise, the tendency is to hoard. It is not only the *bania* in the bazaar who is hoarding; it is the peasant, the cultivator who is also doing it. He

has got the capacity now to hoard, to withhold, to stock the foodgrains until the prices go further up. Therefore this will go on as long as the prices do not stabilise. The obvious remedy was of course that the Government should go in for compulsory procurement. If you go in for that and then sell it in the market at a certain rate that would be resented, and because that is very unpopular and the peasantry resents and resists this compulsory procurement, the Communist Party wants to have the popularity of both the worlds. He did not want to say that and he had no obvious remedy for that. For that we will have to wait a little, until this new method of taxation and reduction of deficit financing bring about this result. But I hope that the Food Ministry will see that fair price shops are increased in all those areas, wherever there is rise in prices. I remember that there were 25,000 fair price shops in those areas where the prices were soaring high and I hope that in other such areas also more shops will be opened. In many areas I myself saw that there was a very large queue in front of those shops. So I would submit to the Food Ministry that when you open fair price shops you should see that their administration is bettered, the people should be better looked after, I mean the shops should be properly supervised so that the stock is not sold among their own friends and is not distributed as patronage to those whom they like. Everyone should get a fair deal. Also the hours for which the shop is open should be increased so that everybody gets it. Specially those who have an income of less than a hundred rupees per month, I think, they should be given a sort of ration card, a sort of preference so that they are assured of getting their quota of foodstuffs from the fair price shops. It is in the interests of Government itself as, if you cannot assure this supply to the poor people, then you will not be able to resist the pressure from them for higher wages and higher wages means higher costs of production and in the case of State-

owned industries higher expenditure for the Government on account of having to pay a higher wage bill. Therefore opening of these fair price shops should be one of the cardinal weapons in the hands of the Food Ministry to keep down the food prices.

Then, Sir, there was another point raised with regard to foreign trade. My friend, Dr. Gour, was saying that we are suffering in the matter of foreign exchange, on account of the difficulties of some foreign trade. He could not quite clarify what he meant by it. I could not also quite follow what he meant by it. It is said that we inherited it from the British days; I do not know, because in those days, in the days before the War, our balance of payment position was always favourable. It is unfavourable only now, because of the import of heavy machinery for production purposes, and that is what is creating this gap in the balance of payment, and this will continue until we get along manufacturing our own heavy machinery after the initial difficult period is gone over. I must say that the Government should try its best to secure this on deferred payment system. I understand that the British traders have agreed to it; at least that is what was reported in the press, that they have agreed to a seven-year period for deferred payment, but that the German traders who came here are still not agreeable. I believe they are still insisting that it should not exceed a five-year period. Now new industries are coming up in the private sector and there are many sugar industries sponsored by co-operative societies in Bombay and Madras and there are some sugar mills in U. P. also that are coming up. They have got the licence and everything else but the difficulty is with regard to foreign exchange with which to get the plant and machinery from abroad. Now on that I hope the Government will try to negotiate as good terms as possible because the capital expenditure should not be made unnecessarily high. You may secure deferred

[Shri J. S. Bisht.]
payment over a period of seven years but if the rate of interest is very high it means that a machinery or a plant which should normally cost one crore of rupees

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): It would be 15 per cent more, 15 to 25 per cent. more

SHRI J. S. BISHT: If it is 15 per cent more I should say it is fair but if it cost 50 per cent more it would be prohibitive. If it is 15 per cent over seven years, a plant which should otherwise cost a crore of rupees will now cost a crore and 15 lakhs of rupees.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Plus interest.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: At $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: That is too much. That is what I was saying, namely, that we should negotiate terms and arrange for deferred payment basis in such a way that the capital cost on this basis does not exceed too much the amount that we would pay if we had the required foreign exchange and the machinery were imported. For example, a plant which would otherwise cost us a crore of rupees would, if it is deferred payment over seven years at that rate of interest, would cost a crore and fifty lakhs of rupees.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: More than that, I should think.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Much more.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: That is no benefit, I mean to say, that will be very hard on our economy. And our private sector will suffer very badly. Therefore I would appeal to the Government so to arrange this matter of deferred payment that the rate of interest is at least kept down so that the total cost should not exceed, say, 25 per cent., at the most 20 to 25 per cent.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: We have no credit in the world and the other countries will not give on this basis.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: For that purpose we should try to be friendly with countries that can help us. Here I do not wish to go into the question of foreign policy but I was rather surprised by the remarks made by my friend, Dr. Anup Singh. He is not here at present but I thought he was making out a case for the Communist Party because that is the case of the Communist Party. Every move that is made by the free democratic world is painted in such colour as if it is a sort of conspiracy against the whole world or against the whole of Asia. That proposition I totally repudiate; that is not the position at all. We are not interested in any block; we are not interested in the American block or the British block and we are not interested in the international Communist block either. Our policy has rightly been—and that has been unanimously approved by both Houses of Parliament as well as by the whole country—that we should remain neutral, non-involvement is a better term so to say. We do not want to get involved in any of the power politics of those blocks; whatever may be their manoeuvrings, we are not going to get entangled with them. Our main task is to build up our own country. Our voice in international politics will be heard when we are a strong people and we can be a strong people when we are militarily strong. And we can be militarily strong when we are industrially strong. So first things should come first. We should first look to our own interests. God has not appointed us policemen of the whole world or of West Asia or of East Asia. First of all we are responsible to our own people; we are responsible for the safety and security of the 400 million people who have elected us and sent us into Parliament and the legislatures. Their interest is paramount and their interest requires that we should remain non-involved in

this power politics. We want to be out of these power blocs. That was the policy pursued even by America in the early stages of her independence. So why should we go out of our way and say something which may hurt somebody? You may be saying the truth. If you say to a blind man, 'you are blind' he becomes angry. What do you gain by that? When we are not a big power, when we have not got the strength to impose our will, what is the use of saying something which only irritates some body and which does not help us in any way? We may be right, but we must see to our own good. We are interested in getting as much foreign exchange as possible, as much foreign aid as possible, from all possible sources, but without strings. Whether it is from this bloc or that bloc, it does not matter but it should be without strings. We should be our own masters.

Now, we have entered into an agreement with America and but for that agreement today the food position might have been very bad. There might have been starvation deaths as happened during the Bengal famine when one and half to two million people died. But for this aid we would have been helpless and this has saved us a lot of foreign exchange, some Rs. 172 crores I think. That is something to be thankful for. After all, we must remember one thing. If we were to give similar help to other people, say to Burma and other countries, how would we feel? We would have to get the money from out of the pockets of our own ordinary people, lower middle class people or middle class people. Similarly, if America wants to help us that money is being raised in that country from all categories of people. So I submit that if a people are helping us, no useful purpose would be served by our trying to side with some other group whose interests are entirely different, whose interest is merely the great game of power politics and who wish to have one group or the other on their side. I believe everybody is

interested that this largest democracy in Asia—a bloc of 400 million people—with all its potential power should be in their bloc because that will tilt the balance of power in their favour but it is not in our interest to be pawns in the game of power politics. Therefore I would appeal to my hon. friends, those who play into the hands of the Communists, who want to swallow their propaganda, rod, line and hook, that we will have to be very careful and that we will have to look to our own interests first and to our immediate needs, our needs of fulfilling the Five Year Plans, our needs of increasing food supplies, our needs of heavy machinery and all these things. We know there are only two or three countries that can really help us. With these words, Sir, I do submit that the President's Address has given us a good guidance for our future work.

There is only one last point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House and that is the question relating to the urban population. Sir, you must have noted and the House must have noted that in the last general elections it was in the cities of India that we as Congress Party suffered the worst. Somehow, the intelligentsia and the middle classes in the cities seem to have turned away, not because they favour other parties but just to show their resentment. And one of the main causes for this is, I believe, that the housing, sanitary and living conditions in the cities are really bad. No real planned attempt has yet been made to improve them. Even Government officials, when they are transferred from one place to another, have to fend for themselves. On transfer a person is not able to get a house in the new place. Even in places like Delhi, if a man is transferred to this place from Madras, he has to leave his family in Madras because he is not able to get a house even in Delhi where the Government of India is spending two to three crores a year in buildings. If that is the position in Delhi, in the cities in the provinces the position is worse.

[Shri J. S. Bisht.]

Housing conditions are bad and there are slums. I would therefore invite the attention of the Government to paragraph 15 of the Address in which it is said: "My Government have initiated measures to relieve housing shortages and promote housing standards, slum clearances and Plantation Housing Schemes and housing for low-income groups and subsidised industrial housing." I would submit that this should be given top priority because if a man's living conditions are not good, if he is forced to live in dingy places, if the rent is high and if it eats away a good slice of his limited income, he would not be friendly to any Administration that fails in this primary task. I therefore hope that in this matter the Government will take energetic steps to see that the slums in the cities are cleared, that the drainage and water supply improved and that the housing conditions bettered especially of low income group people. With these words, Sir, I wholeheartedly support the Motion moved by my friend Pandit Algurai Shastri.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the hon. Mover of this Motion spent most of his time in quoting Sanskrit slokas and most of us could not follow a word of what he was saying; whether he was supporting his Motion of Thanks or not, was not clear to us.

DR. R. B. GOUR: He was trying to compensate the lack of substance.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, it was seconded by Dr. Anup Singh and with a great part of his speech I am in full agreement. As a matter of fact he was advocating the cause of the Opposition and he was trying to find fault with the President's Address in ignoring the world situation. Only Mr. Bisht has spoken in favour of the President's Address but a great part of his speech was devoted to the consideration of the Budget proposals placed by the hon. Finance Minister yesterday. Regarding President's

Address he has spoken only about urban housing. That is the only point which he has put forward, about urban housing. Well, Sir, I have sent in certain amendments. We have the fullest respect for our Rashtrapati and we are grateful for having given us the Address. This Address is really a statement of the policy of the Government and in so far as it is a statement of policy of the work done during the past year and the programme of work in the coming year, in so far as it relates to that programme, we have certain objections. Therefore, we are only criticising the programme placed by the Government in the mouth of the Rashtrapati.

All the hon. Members who have spoken so far have laid great stress on the food situation. The hon. Minister made a statement two days back. This morning during Question Hour from the Congress benches a series or barrage of questions were asked on the food problem. How much is being imported? Why there is scarcity of rice and wheat in this area and that area? The hon. Minister has made a statement. But it is not a very nice way of presenting statistics. The hon. Minister is giving averages for five years. Why he is giving those averages, I will point out in a second. He has nicely arranged them in the form of averages. The average production of cereals is 43 million tons; 44 million tons; 47 million tons; 49 million tons; 52 million tons and 54 million tons. Anybody reading these figures will get the impression that there is a progressive increase. The general public will get that impression. And the hon. Minister has presented the averages for five years in order to create that impression. Now, I quote from the Government of India "Agricultural Statistics of Reorganised States". This book was published by the Government only three months back and from it I give you the cereal production for the last five years. I am sure you will be surprised with them. You had got the impression

that it is a continuous progress—ten per cent increase, five per cent increase, two per cent increase. I am only talking about cereals and so quote from page 65, column (12), total cereals. It begins from 1949-50, giving the food production. I only give in millions, the rest of the figures I do not give, because the decimal point is confusing and the people do not get any idea. The figures are:—

(Million tons)

1949-50	45
1950-51	41
1951-52	42
1952-53	48
1953-54	57
1954-55	55
1955-56	52

That means that 1953-54 was the peak year when the production was 57 million tons, and then from 1953-54 it has been continuously coming down. It has come down from 57 million tons to 55 million tons and then to 52 million tons.

SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA: It has gone up this year.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: This year's figures are not firm. This year's figures are only estimates: Let us wait till the final figures come in. It is quite possible, when the final figures come in, that there would be a fall. I am merely trying to show that when you put up certain statistics before hon. Members, let us be honest with ourselves. If everything is right with food, if hon. Members are satisfied, I would not have heard so many supplementary questions from Congress benches which I have been hearing during the last two days. That shows that the minds of hon. Members from Congress benches are not fully satisfied with the facts and figures that are given, at the present moment. It would have been far better if the hon. Minister had stated that 1953-54 was a peak year when

the production was 57 million tons and that it has come down during the last two years. It is on account of this coming down that we are feeling the pinch, that we are feeling the scarcity. From 57 million tons to 52 million tons, hon. Members can realise, it is a ten per cent reduction. And when there is a ten per cent reduction, naturally the food position will be difficult. Our production is a marginal production. We are just on the verge.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU) in the Chair.]

Even a slight deficit will upset the balance. So, if we have peak production we can just carry on. But if the food production goes down by ten per cent, naturally the food position becomes very hard. I think it will be honest to give figures which throw light on facts rather than by some jugglery to give increasing averages for five years. We are not interested in averages for five years. The hon. Member who spoke on this side, very clearly pointed out that we are not interested in averages. In one part of the country there may be a surplus. How does it help the millions of people who die in some other part of the country where there is scarcity and they do not get food? Will it be any satisfaction that in some other part of the country there is surplus stock? Will they be satisfied? we are not interested in the averages for five years. We are only interested that in the month of May in certain parts of India there is great scarcity of food. Now, if you read the statement, there is a mention of nearly eight States out of fourteen States. There are four or five States which have not been mentioned. They are small States. The net result is that in this enumeration of eight States it covers nearly 70 per cent of the population. If areas with 70 per cent of the population are suffering, what consolation will it be that there is a surplus in the remaining 30 per cent of the country?

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

Sir, what is the solution? We are importing foodgrains. In the First Five Year Plan the Government went on giving us hopes. We are building very big dams, very big irrigation projects. We spent Rs. 900 crores in the First Five Year Plan. We have set apart Rs. 600 crores in the Second Plan for the irrigation projects. I would like to know from the hon. Minister that during the last one or two years so much land has come under irrigation which is now giving us two crops instead of one crop and, therefore, producing so much more. Then I will be satisfied. Then I will realise that after all we have spent so many hundreds of crores of rupees and extra land has come under irrigation. I know that under Damodar valley nothing has come; under Hirakud nothing; Bhakra-Nangal nothing. I come from Andhra Pradesh where we have got the Tungabhadra project and not an acre of land has—benefited by irrigation from that. The result is we are not taking proper steps for increasing food production and during the last two years it has actually come down by as much as ten per cent. In climatic conditions there is a cycle. We have periods of good rainfall followed by years of drought. From 1950 till 1955 they were years of good rainfall and food production went on increasing. We took credit for it. The Congress Government took credit for increased production of food, not realising that it was due to the monsoons. If they bring in more land under irrigation, it will be human effort; we will realise that something has been done by our Government and we are reaping its benefits. If it is only rainfall, you are dependent on monsoons. If it is good rainfall, there is good harvest; if there is bad rainfall there is bad harvest. It is not any part of human effort.

Years ago certain hon. Members suggested that the Government must set up big godowns. There is price fluctuation. At the time of harvest, the prices are low and some time after the harvest, the prices go up. And

if in important places there were godowns with stocks of food, they could so distribute foodgrains that the price level was kept steady. I am very glad that the Government has accepted that. They have set up warehousing corporations and probably they are going to stock foodgrains. But the question was asked of my hon. friend where will the foodgrains come from? In our rural society sixty per cent of the population has got no land, or less than two acres of land. That sixty per cent of the population has to purchase foodgrains, even in the rural areas. We should not assume that everybody in the rural area produces his own food and eats his own food. Even in the rural area sixty per cent of the people have to purchase food. It is only 30 per cent. of the people who have got 10 acres or more. Those 30 per cent. of the people are self-sufficient for their own food, and they have a margin of money to stock their foodgrains. They have become the hoarders, not the 70 per cent. of the rural population which has got only 2 acres or less. They cannot do that. The families which have got 10 acres and more utilise the foodgrains produced for their own consumption and they hoard up all surplus. What is to be done? We have followed a land revenue policy by which we charge a uniform land revenue from everybody, whether he holds 1 acre or 20 acres. The man who holds 1 or 2 acres finds it a great hardship to pay any land revenue. There has been an insistent demand from the rural areas that, as you give an exemption limit for income-tax purposes, you should give them an exemption limit up to 4 acres. They ask that there should be no land revenue up to 4 acres, that above that you should charge land revenue in kind. Formerly we were not taking land revenue in kind because we had no warehousing facilities, we could not store those grains. Now we have got that facility, we have got godowns. Why should we not collect from all owners of land in excess of 4 acres land revenue in kind? It is better than procurement, it is better

than compulsory acquisition, it is better than rationing. If you take land revenue in kind from people who own and cultivate more than 4 acres of land, you will have your godowns full of foodgrains and you can distribute them not only in the urban areas but in the rural areas also.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay). Why do you want to fix the limit at 4 acres?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: What I said was that there should be an exemption limit. If you do not want it at 4 acres, you put it at 2 acres. Regarding income-tax, there is no income-tax on less than Rs. 3,000. Likewise I would ask the hon. Food Minister or some other Minister that some minimum may be fixed for which there should be no land revenue. I think that a man who owns only 2 acres of land and cultivates it should be exempted from all taxes.

In the rural areas the food prices are even higher. In the rural areas the suffering is more acute than in the urban areas. For urban areas the hon. Minister immediately despatches the imported foodgrains or the collected foodgrain from the rural areas. What is the condition of the poor peasants who do not own any land, the landless labourers in the rural areas who work only 100 days in the year? My hon. friend suggested that the consumption of food was going up, that the villager was eating more food than he was eating before. He made this suggestion in spite of the fact that the villager does not get work for more than 100 days in a year and that also at very low rates of wages. With very low rates of wages and working for only 100 days in a year, if an hon. Member suggests that the poor peasant in the rural area is eating more foodgrains and that is why there is a shortage, well, I think it is the height of travesty of truth.

SHRI S. D. PATIL: What you said was the old state of affairs. It is not so now.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: According to the hon. Member who interrupted me, the conditions have now changed, everybody has got 10 acres of land. We have got nearly 30 crores of people in rural India and suddenly land has increased tenfold. I am surprised at the hon. Member's suggestion. 25 crores of acres are the total area under cultivation—it may be 26 acres. Our rural population is 30 crores and, assuming five members to a family, there are 6 crores of families. I fail to understand the arithmetic how 6 crores of families can all be happily settled on 25 crores of acres of land.

SHRI S. D. PATIL: Your remark that only 100 days are available for a rural worker is not a fact.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: According to the hon. Member they are working for more than 100 days, they are getting work for 365 days, they are quite happy and they are getting plenty of employment. I will be very happy if that were so, and I will leave it to the hon. Members to judge for themselves whether my statement is correct or the interruption of the hon. Member.

The hon. Prime Minister when in a happy mood says that our food production had gone up by 40 per cent. I think he was not satisfied with 15 per cent, it became 25 per cent, now it is 40 per cent., and the latest hope is 100 per cent. Food production must go up by 100 per cent. Well, there is the Sindri Fertilizer Factory supplying fertilizer, it is being used by our agriculturists, and the food production has gone down by 10 per cent. That is the result. I suppose the hon. Prime Minister by some jugglery of statistics is going to raise the food production by 100 per cent. Then the millennium will be reached and we all will be very happy.

Then, Sir, the President's Address says something about the Community

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

Development Projects and the National Extension Schemes, how they are bringing benefit, how food production in those areas where these schemes have been introduced has gone up, how the people there are all very happy and nicely settled, how their problems have been settled, and so on. I have gone not only during the elections but much earlier to a large number of Community Projects, and hon. Members must have gone and seen with their own eyes the utter waste of Government money in these projects. Sometimes a patch is put on a mudwall here and a mudwall there, possibly some very small narrow lanes four feet in width are paved with bricks—that is what is done. If you create enthusiasm in the villagers, they will probably build a school by their labour. Of course their labour will count towards 50 per cent of the cost and 50 per cent will be paid by the Government in cash. But actually if you take the whole cost of the building, it is really less than the amount spent by the Government, and the contribution of the villagers in kind, that is in the shape of labour, is zero. Our Congress Ministers are satisfied that everything is O. K. in the village areas, that everything is going on nicely, that the Community Projects are bringing them happiness. I will be very glad if that was so. It is a sheer waste. See the condition of rural housing. In almost 90 per cent of the villages women have to walk two or three miles every time to the village pond to bring the dirty water for drinking and household purposes. They have to bring five or six pots of water and for this they have to walk ten or twelve miles. You can imagine their plight. Yet we know how it is very easy to have an overhead tank and distribute water. There is plenty of underground water in our country. But our attention is focussed on the urban areas. Out of 5 lakhs villages in the rural areas, the hon. Food Minister was once very happy to inform us that 10,000 villages had now got some provision for

drinking water. At this rate we will have to wait for another hundred or two hundred years when all villages will have tap water in their houses. And what sort of houses they are? In 90 per cent of the cases they are having thatched roof with no ventilation, with a door probably 3½ feet high through which men have to crawl in.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: No ventilation or all ventilation?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: They want no ventilation at the top but ventilation at the sides; but reverse is the condition. Yet we say that we are tackling the problem properly. There is unemployment in the villages. They pass their time idly. We do not utilise their labour in building the houses. If the Government diverted the efforts of the Community Development Projects and the National Extension Schemes towards construction programme in the rural areas, so that they utilised the idle hours of the villagers in constructing pucca houses, that will be much better. A pucca house only requires burnt bricks.

The brick does not require the mud to be brought from a distant place. The Government has only to provide some coal. Even that coal is not required because rice-husk is generally used for the brick klin and rice-husk is available in plenty all over the country. This is the situation. We have gone on wrong lines about the Community Projects and National Extension Schemes. Why? Because they are our showrooms. If any foreigner comes, we take him round and say, "What a new idea we have got—this Community Project!" He talks to the villager and the foreigner gets some impression and gives us a patting saying "You are doing very good work; a new idea; wonderful idea." Probably, he is very happy in his own mind that the Indians are getting more backward and are continuing in their backward state. This is the impression created—so much for our ability.

Then I come to the question of foreign exchange. Our Government has evolved a very nice policy of deferred payments. They say, "You must get deferred payment" and when you are importing machinery, you must have deferred payment so that you have to pay Rs. 170 instead of Rs. 100 for everything you purchase. Not every country is prepared to give us deferred payment. Only one or two give us. They, first of all, charge 15 per cent. extra on the quoted price. That is the first charge. Then, they want interest at a fairly high rate, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., on the amount. So, by means of deferred payment, we are really paying 15 per cent. plus $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for what we import. An hon. Member on this side spoke about that. Our economy is still a colonial economy. He used the word 'Imperial economy'. An hon. Member from the other side immediately raised an objection to this. He really meant colonial economy. Why did he say that about deferred payments? The cost of machinery has gone up by nearly 100 per cent. during the last seven or eight years. We are importing machinery paying double the price. The price of our goods which are going out—jute goods, tea, etc.,—has gone up, but only by 15 or 20 per cent. The price of our exports has gone up by 20 per cent. and the price of our imports by 100 per cent.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: 400 per cent.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I do not want to state it to be 400 per cent; I will be content with only 100 per cent. What will be the result? There will be an imbalance in our foreign exchange position. The imbalance has been created on account of the import of these things and the export of raw materials. During the Korean war—that one year—the price of our exports went up. We were very happy. We got a favourable foreign exchange position that one year because all the world started stockpiling our goods and we were exporting them at a high price. We

were getting very fair prices for our goods and we got big export markets. Immediately that condition was over, we are again in a bad situation. That is one factor.

The second factor is that we are permitting investment of foreign capital in our country. We are encouraging foreign capital; we are giving foreigners every kind of encouragement. Well, I am definitely against it. I have stated frequently that I do not mind borrowing from foreign countries at a fixed rate of interest which should not exceed 4 per cent. But I am against foreign investments, because after all, when money is invested in our country and when they start industries, they will make large profit and the profit will have to be repatriated. If the profit is at the rate of 10 per cent., they are not taking only 4 per cent. but they are taking away 10 per cent. interest in the shape of profit. So, we have a drain on our exchange position in the shape of this profit which has to be repatriated—not only the profit, but the principal also has to be repatriated. The result is that our foreign exchange position is going from bad to worse and we are making it worse still by agreeing to deferred payments and paying double the price for our machinery.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: What is your remedy?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Well, there is no point in my outlining my plan. It is all right for the hon. Prime Minister to say that we did not import steel plants in 1950 and we committed a mistake. But now we have got to pay four times the price for the same steel plants. We committed a mistake that we did not industrialise our country at a moment when the prices were the lowest. The Liberty ships were selling at the rate of Rs. 10 lakhs each—and that was only five years ago. They were going abegging and our industrialists, our steamship companies, everybody, drew the attention

[Shri Kishen Chand.]
of the Government that we might purchase Liberty ships at the rate of Rs. 10 lakhs. This has appeared in almost every paper.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We had to concentrate more on food.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Suppose you were purchasing 100 Liberty ships at the rate of Rs. 10 lakhs each, the whole thing would have cost Rs. 10 crores and I do not think it would have affected the food situation, when we are importing on the scale of Rs. 300 crores.

SHRI S. D. PATIL: Which is the biggest industry in the country?

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAMDU): Order, order.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I will answer everything but if I go on answering, my trend of argument will be lost and it will take too long a time. I will only say that the opportunity may recur. We are purchasing Liberty ships from the U.S.A. They have kindly agreed to consider our request and the Bill is before their Senate to give us ships at the rate of Rs. 35 lakhs each, provided we guarantee that the ships would be used only for coastal shipping. I wanted to get it clarified by a supplementary question this morning and it was clarified that they would be used for coastal shipping only and we are paying Rs. 35 lakhs for each! Only five years ago, the cost was Rs. 10 lakhs. You let the opportunity at that time slip out and now ask me, "What is your solution?" Give me a little more time and later on, on some other occasion when the Budget is discussed, I will in greater detail explain what my remedy is. I am just now talking about the President's Address and he has not referred to that section of it.

Well, Sir, hon. Members have said that the Congress Party approached the nation and the verdict of the nation has been in their favour. I agree with them and I congratulate them whole heartedly for the success that they have had in the General Elections. But I just give you one note of warning that less than 50 per cent. people voted in the General Elections and the Congress secured less than 45 per cent. of the votes polled. You can calculate what it means out of the total voters in the country. I do not say that any other party is better organised or has got the capacity of the leadership to take up the Government. The Congress Party is better organised; they have better leadership to carry on the Government. But in their own interests, I am just pointing out that they should not be very happy to have secured only 30 per cent. of the total voting strength of the country. Out of 200 million voters, only 60 million have cast their votes for the Congress Party. The rest of the people did not go to the polls. Why did they not vote for the Congress? Because they were not satisfied with the programme of the Congress Party and there was no other party which had a better programme or better leadership. So, they said, "We shall sit at home."

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Far-fetched ideas.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Well, unpleasant truths are always far-fetched. (Interruptions.) I am admitting that the other parties are not so well organised. I am just placing certain facts. Hon. Members may think over them seriously and come to any conclusion. I am pointing out that it is a legitimate thing. They can collect funds because Party funds are a recognised thing. The Chief Minister of West Bengal can collect Rs. 2 crores. Some other Chief Minister can collect Rs. 50 lakhs. It is all legitimate and above board. It is permitted by our Constitution. But just consider this thing. On the one side you have got such

large sums of money. I have got experience only of the Hyderabad city, and I can tell you that I attended a few of the Congress meetings, and not a word of the Congress programme or the Five Year Plan was stated in the election meetings. It was all a portrait of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, his leadership and the bad situation that has been created by our Government in Kashmir and how the whole country is in danger, and therefore the people must again support the same Party which had blundered in the matter of Kashmir. (*Interruption.*) Every hon. Member can see in his own constituency. It was always followed by either a *quawali* or a *Buru katha*, and there was music party right up to 2 O'clock in the night. Such was an election meeting. And I leave it there. Other parties cannot get even a few thousand rupees. The election law should be so changed that the Election Commission does most of the things. The candidates have to distribute chits and do so many other things, that the expenses go up. It is a fact, Sir, that many hon. Members from Congress benches have won their seats after spending money running into very high figures, approaching lakhs and sometimes even exceeding lakhs, and they were pitted against candidates of other parties who could not afford to spend more than a few hundred rupees.

Sir, this time there is, in the President's Address, not much mention about our foreign policy because the problem has been quiet for some time. A year or a year and a half back we were blowing the trumpet of Panchsheel everywhere; we were influencing certain nations. Some lady Members have still got that vision and they mention about it. But that is another matter. (*Interruption.*) One hon. lady Member spoke on the Copyright Bill and she waxed eloquent about the Panchsheel. But I did not see any relevance in it. The rest of the hon. Members do not mention it. Now the Panchsheel is more or less forgotten, because the world goes on.

The great powers, of course, toy with India and with our hon. Prime Minister in mentioning him very honourably and consulting him but it ends there. The world goes on. The world politics goes on and the great powers, in their antagonism, in their cold war, make preparations. But what are we doing? What is our programme? I think we should have given up the idea of that Panchsheel.

Sir, in the United Nations there are 80 Members. What have we really done to create a positive force, not a physical force, but a force of numbers in the United Nations wedded to this idea of peace? We should have taken certain positive steps for bringing together a large number of these 80 nations who are members of the United Nations to form a group, not a warring group, not a fighting group not a group with atomic weapons.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Speeches do not create groups.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: That is part of the approach. The United Nations Organisation has been created only to give a forum for the nations to express their opinion, and in that way, influence each other by speeches to which the hon. Member has referred with ridicule. The Eastern Bloc and the Western Bloc are today equipped with atomic weapons ever ready to fly at each other's throat. I submit, Sir, that the speeches extolling the spirit of co-operation and pointing out the danger of nuclear weapons to the world are very important. If our representative had properly stressed and presented the case properly, I am sure, Sir, that we could have influenced the world opinion. Either we think that the majority of the nations that are represented at the United Nations are for war or we believe that they are for peace. If the majority of the nations are for peace, have we made any effort for bringing them together to create a world opinion in favour of peace, in favour of banning all nuclear weapons? We have not

[Shri Kishen Chand.]
done anything. We talk something about the Panchsheel and then keep quiet. I submit, Sir, that it is a policy of non-involvement resulting in neutrality and sitting on the fence. It is not a positive and dynamic policy of peace, a policy of full co-operation, a policy with a goal and a purpose and a message to the world, a message of peace and a message of goodwill. I humbly submit, Sir, that if our hon. Prime Minister and our representative to the United Nations had put in proper efforts, we might have succeeded in gathering a group of nations wedded to the idea of world peace who might have, in season and out of season, tabled motions and resolutions and delivered speeches in the United Nations in favour of banning nuclear weapons and ushering in an era of peace in the world. But we have not done anything. We are now, on the contrary, finding that a Western Power is equipping with nuclear weapons and storing these nuclear weapons in some countries of Eastern Asia. I cannot consider Formosa to be a big nation. It is a very small island with a few lakhs of people. Our Government has recognised the Peoples Republic of China. And when the Western Power is arming that small island of Formosa with nuclear weapons, we have not raised our voice against it; we are keeping quiet. South Korea is being given nuclear weapons and we do not open our mouth because we are a neutral nation. We find that Viet Nam is being given nuclear weapons. Are we very proud of our Panchsheela that we are keeping our mouth shut when these small nations of Eastern Asia are being armed with nuclear weapons? This is our record, Sir.

Then I come to Kashmir and the Jarring mission to which the Rashtrapati has referred in his Address.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): Please try to finish now. You have had more than 40 minutes.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I will finish it in another five minutes or so. The Jarring mission came. I submit that our relations with Pakistan are going from bad to worse. The latest events about the campaign of hatred, the handcuffing of Indians belonging to the High Commissioner's office, all these events show that the relationship is getting from bad to worse. And what is the result of our complaints?

Actually for the last seven or eight years Pakistan is holding one-third of the State of India in its possession, and yet we talk of negotiations. We never say that we are not prepared to talk even one sentence with Pakistan till that one-third part of the Indian State is entirely handed over to India and restored to Kashmir. What is the point in discussing about Kashmir when a good part of that territory is wrongfully held by Pakistan? Still there are negotiations and year after year some delegation comes and we go on discussing. From 1950 our first condition should have been—and our Government should have insisted that we are not prepared to talk even one sentence until that part of Kashmir, which is occupied by Pakistan and which rightfully belongs to India and which is an integral part of the Indian territory, is restored to India.

(Time bell rings.)

I submit, Sir, that there are a series of omissions in the President's Address and we are very much disappointed by the President's Address. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU): As there are still a large number of speakers, the House will sit through the lunch hour tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 17th May 1957.