

14.43 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE  
PRESIDENT—*contd.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The non-official business is over. We will now resume the debate on the President's Address. Shri R. G. Dubey.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das** (Darbhanga): He has gone out thinking probably that non-official business will take a little more time. I hope he will get his chance after he returns.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Shri Bhanja Deo.

**Shri L. N. Bhanja Deo** (Keonjhar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to express my gratitude to the President for the very excellent address; that he delivered to us just on the eve of his departure from this high office which he held for all these years in such a manner that from every side of the House he received great honour and respect for the way he discharged the responsibilities of this very high office which he rightly occupied for all these long years.

While I express my gratitude to him for this address, which is not so long as we have been accustomed to all these years, probably because he had just delivered another address to this august House before the last Lok Sabha was dissolved, in the context of the discussion on the address that the President delivered to us, I express my sentiments, or rather agree with hon. Shri Dhebarbhai when he said that we have not done enough as we ought to have done; we have done much, but it is not enough as we should have done for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. I come from a region in which there are larger number of people belonging to the Scheduled Tribes particularly hon. Shri Dhebarbhai had visited that part just a year ago to find out how we should develop those areas, which I

might call potentially dangerous areas, because they were neglected for historical as well as geographical reasons in the past for a long period, and it is time that we do something for this region to remove this danger, particularly in the region I come from, that is, the eastern region of Orissa, where we have a large number of people belonging to both Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. I have said for both historical as well as geographical reasons. I have said historical reasons in the context that before Orissa was recognised as a separate State, due to our association with bigger States, probably we were neglected; I have said geographical reasons because these are the areas where people from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes took shelter when they were oppressed by people belonging to highly cultured societies. So, they were driven to these hilly tracts which, though lacking in amenities at present, could, in times to come if enough money is usefully spent in those areas, be developed so as not to be a drag on our country but be a constant source of supply and economic development because though this area is now economically backward, it is supplying agricultural produce to the tune of 8 lakh tons, which is exported every year to meet the deficits of other areas. Therefore, this area can, in times to come, with proper irrigational facilities, be developed into a granary State of India. I hope I will not be incorrect in saying that if we have proper pest control measures and save those tracts from floods which, unfortunately, make a chronic visit to the State I come from—almost every year of course, it is not possible to have dams across all the rivers that we have there; at least one dam has been constructed at Hirakud; there could be a subsidiary dam at Tikarpara—I am sure the coastal region can, in time to come, be developed into a granary of India in the eastern region.

At present though agriculture has received a stimulus during the last

[Shri L. N. Bhanja Deo]

two Plan periods, as I said, enough has not been done in the matter of pest control. Pests destroy nearly one-third of our produce. If we give better prices to the agriculturists which now the middleman robs him of that, I am sure that we can put back the money that we will be earning by exporting food from that area, for the agriculturists in the shape of better storage, silo and irrigation facilities and can, at the same time, develop this region to the betterment of the agriculturists by a dam at Balmela which will also produce power.

Even if the area is developed by irrigation and power, it does not generate the necessary economy there as it should generate self-sufficiency which is the aim of our Third Plan because we lack both in railways and in transport facilities because of which we are greatly handicapped. That is why it is very necessary that this region which is earning a very large amount of foreign exchange by exporting manganese, iron ore and other minerals in which it is very rich should be developed. But, I am afraid, sufficient money is not being put back for developing rail and road facilities in this area to step up further earning of our foreign exchange capacity about which the hon. Finance Minister has spoken both in this Budget speech and in the On-account Budget speech which he made before the last session of the Second Lok Sabha.

As you know, Sir, even if we have railways because of the recent dearth of wagons in that particular sector which is known as the Baril-Barajamda sector linking the mineral area where I come from to Calcutta Port it is so heavily congested due to the movement of iron ore and coal traffic for meeting the requirements of the steel mills that are situated in that area that it is not possible to export enough manganese and iron ore from this area to meet the foreign exchange requirements of our Union as a whole.

What has to be done to remove this congestion? One might ask me that question. The only alternative to remove the congestion from Calcutta Port, I would say, is to have a subsidiary outlet by developing Paradip Port to which our new Government in Orissa has given the first priority so that we can safely send out our manganese and iron ore to foreign countries and thereby help both the Central and the State Exchequers.

What are we doing to develop this Paradip Port? Of course, our Government is considering to have an express highway connecting the mineral belt of Sukinda with Jajpur-Keonjhar Road which in time is going to be connected with Paradip Port. An 'Express highway' is very good, but to have a highway of that capacity will take a much longer time and will require very big finance than will be required for expanding the railway from Barbil to Jajpur-Keonjhar Road which is hardly 100 miles as the crow flies. The Jaipur-Keonjhar road should be connected with Paradip by express highway. There is a valley and even if through that valley the line is extended it would not cost the Union or the State Government so much as the express highway would cost right through from Barbil. No doubt, the express highway to some extent would relieve the congestion in that area, but it would not meet all the requirements that a railway would, augmented by the highway.

There is another handicap in that particular area in the matter of mineral development. Probably, the small or the marginal mine-owners will soon close down their mines if the Union or the State Government does not come to their help soon. They had expected that the STC would come to their rescue because they are now monopoly dealers in iron ore and to an extent also canalise the export of manganese. It is natural for miners to expect protec-

tion of the interests of the marginal or small mine-owners. I might say that even the big mine-owners and big exporters are coming to a stage when they might also have to close down because due to the dearth or lack of railway wagons it is not possible to move any ore from there. It is piling up at the rail-head and the letter of credit which usually a mine-owner gets from the exporter is not available unless this ore is removed to the docks. But it is not possible to remove all the ore to the docks and there is a very big piling going on at the docks and there is a very big piling going on at the railhead. There is no banking facility in this particular area so that banks could advance money against the ore delivered at the railway plots. Besides this, the STC also does not give any financial assistance unless it is against firm sales and the ore is removed to Calcutta docks. So, we are moving in a very vicious circle in that area. This will mean big unemployment arising in that particular area because a lot of Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes people find employment in the mines other than agricultural labour. They do their agricultural operations for some part of the year and thereafter move into these mining areas to find supplementary income for augmenting their very poor income from their own agricultural lands.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member's time is up.

**Shri L. N. Bhanja Deo:** I want a few minutes more.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** He can take two minutes and finish.

**Shri L. N. Bhanja Deo:** Sir, give me five minutes more.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** No.

15 hrs.

**Shri L. N. Bhanja Deo:** Then I would draw the notice of the Govern-

ment through you, Sir, to another factor to which many hon. Members of the House have already referred to, that is, the rise in prices. We have recently given our Central Government employees something in the shape of dearness allowance to a tune of nearly Rs. 12½ crores. Of course, we are very happy that their demand in this regard has been met. But what has been the upshot of all this? Soon after they got this dearness allowance, the prices have again shot up everywhere in Delhi specially in commodities that are the necessities of life. I do not know why this happened. Thus, whatever we have given them in the shape of dearness allowance we have taken it back from them in the shape of inflation and rising prices. It is now time that we think of some measure to stabilise the prices. Hon. Shri Dhebar Bhai also said that something has to be done to stabilise the prices so that our economy may grow and not try to take back from our fixed income groups of the benefits we gave them in the shape of dearness allowance. Sir, I thank you again for giving me this opportunity and I conclude by expressing my gratitude to the President for the very illuminating Address that he has given us on the eve of his departure reminding us of the great tasks that lie ahead of us and I hope his guidance will be available to us, though he might be relinquishing his office of President. The example which he has set in the discharge of his very high office, I am sure, will be a guide to persons who come after him and his example will be a burning light to guide us during times of trial and travail that we have to pass through during the coming five years.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as a policy statement for the coming year the current Address of the President now under discussion is a most disappointing document. I do not think there is anything in it which merits discussion or debate after we discussed the

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

previous Address of the President in March last. I may be pardoned for saying so. I feel the manner in which this debate is taking place shows that it has almost become a ritual.

Sir, when I say this I do not mean any disrespect to the President who is held in high esteem all over the country. But unfortunately today the leadership of the Government is in the hands of those who either refuse to think or have lost all capacity to act. Sir, we are meeting in the new Parliament. After the third General Elections people were anxious to know how the new Government were going to tackle problems, what new and dynamic lead was going to come from Parliament. But so far as this Government goes, it has lost all capacity to act at the proper time. A Government should have faith and conviction in the country's objectives; it should also have the will and ability to carry out those policies firmly and effectively. So far as the country's objectives are concerned, the President has very rightly underlined them. He says:

"As I said in my last address, it is the objective and purpose of my Government to follow steadfastly firm policies and to implement effective measures to establish in our land a democratic and socialist society. Thus alone will national progress and increase in productivity be synonymous with social justice, and dynamic progress will be peaceful and our country will march with firmness and speed."

There is no objection or opposition so far as these objectives are concerned excepting perhaps from forces which do not want any progress in this country at all. But I would like to put a question whether the composition of the Government really reflects the desires of the people. Sir, most of them are old, who live in the past rather than think for the future.

I would put this question: how many of the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Treasury Benches today have an abiding faith in socialism or socialist way of life? I sincerely feel that if these objectives are to be achieved persons at the helm of affairs must be such as who believe in those policies. They say it is a continuity of policy. But I would say it is continuity with vengeance.

Let alone the Centre: look at the different Ministries formed in different States of India. There are any number of Ministers. Our democratic apparatus has perhaps become more expensive than in any other country. I am told that in West Bengal every fourth Member of the Assembly is a Minister. And this advice to have large Ministries has gone from the Centre that Ministries in the States should be broad-based, broad-based not to carry out policies, broad-based to see that all groups, castes, sub-castes, regions and differing groups inside the organisation are represented in the Ministry so that there is no serious threat or trouble to them during the five years they are going to be in office. It is only to avoid trouble; it is only to satisfy the varying and conflicting interests, not because of particular policies they represent. It is only to satisfy these elements inside the organisation that the Ministries are formed. What can you expect from such Governments? It will be idle to think that the country's administration in the coming years would be such as would cover fresh grounds and people will have a better and satisfying life. This is out of the question so far as this Government is concerned.

Sir, we take pride in our achievements in the international sphere. There are no two opinions in the country that we should lose no effort to support the policy of disarmament or support proposals for the cessation of nuclear tests. We condemn such tests—whether it is Soviet Russia or the United States of

America, who ignoring world opinion entirely, go on carrying out these tests. But I fail to understand this. Can our Government really take pride in their achievements in the international field when you look into the problems in which we are directly affected?

Take the question of China. There is no indication in this Address that we are going to take any steps whatsoever to repel the aggression. In regard to Kashmir, we do not know where we are. The question is again going to be debated in the Security Council. It seems the Defence Minister who is going to lead our delegation in the U.N.O. mentioned in Madras that our attitude will be determined after knowing what Mr. Zafrullah Khan has to say. But India's permanent representative at the United Nations, Shri C. S. Jha, is reported to have said that there can be negotiations on the basis of the cease-fire line. We want the Kashmir question to be solved as early as possible and we prefer direct negotiations. So far as this country is concerned the integration of Kashmir with India is complete and final. We want to know whether the Government has made up its mind and attitude that negotiations on the basis of the cease-fire line could take place. So far as the question of repelling the aggressors is concerned, probably our Government have become experts in sending protest notes. So many protest notes they will be sending to China also. But no steps whatever are going to be taken for any positive measures to vacate the aggressors from our country.

I would also like to make a reference to Nepal. We have been urging in this House that we shall have better relations with our neighbouring countries. We are happy that the King of Nepal came here. I do not know whether he has returned wiser and has changed his mind and decided to restore the democratic form of government there. That is, of course, their business. But we are very much

concerned with the developments in Nepal because they are our close neighbours. In this connection, I want to ask a question. Just before the King of Nepal came here and had a discussion with our Prime Minister, on the eve of the King's visit to India, some news correspondents, two Indian journalists specifically, were expelled from Nepal. The reason for the expulsion of the journalist who was expelled on the 9th April seems to be that "his despatches in the newspapers have caused a strain on the friendship and good relations between India and Nepal". I want to know whether we have asked Nepal through our Ambassador or in the course of talks tried to ascertain as to what is the particular despatch in the newspaper concerned which has really strained our relationship. We cannot shut our eyes to things like this. I hope the Government will take up this matter.

About the economic situation and our achievement of socialism, the President has said:

"Our planned economy is the basis of our material development and of the maintenance of a dynamic, social and economic equilibrium."

So far as planned economy is concerned, it has come to stay and it is bound to play an increasing role. Apprehensions are expressed not because of planned economy but, I would say, because of lack of planning of priorities that should be taken up. With the growing State power and the phenomenal growth of the private sector it is now evident that the economic foundations are not leading us actually to a socialist State but to something else. We are speaking so much about the Plan. An ambitious plan itself does not result in the establishment of a socialist order, and I agree with my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur that the mere enlargement of the public sector is also not socialism.

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

The main test of our Plan would be how far we have been able to remove the disparity, the inequality, in the society and what steps actually are going to be taken in that regard. I do not want to enter into an argument here whether the poor have become poorer or the rich have become richer. But the fact remains that the difficulties of the common man have grown much more than what they were before. There is ample evidence to show that the rich are getting richer, and the concentration of economic power is going apace as a result of the economic development in the country as well. It is known to everybody that industries with rapid-growth potentialities are left in the private sector and are exploited not by the entire private sector but by some established houses which are making quick and fantastic profits. We have evolved a system of foreign collaboration. It is not on governmental level only; it is open even to private enterprise to go in for it. And the system is such that only the established houses secure the benefit. Easily they get these foreign advantages, and as a result today these few houses occupy commanding heights in our economy. They easily get the foreign loans, the government security and guarantees are easily made available to them. So it is no wonder when we see that the small *entrepreneurs* or the younger sections who enter into the arena of industry get a very small fraction of the advantages that are available for the development of industries in this country. I am told that the Planning Commission and the Company Law Administration have worked out some charts regarding the interlocking of companies and the consequent concentration of economic power. If these are published probably we will be in a position to know which are the real beneficiaries of the so-called socialist pattern of society. It will probably be a surprise to many if that report is published. I challenge and I ask the Government to publish that report. In this connection, I would also like to

know what happened to the Mahalanobis Committee which was entrusted with the task of going into the question of distribution of national income. I am told that although their investigation is not complete, from the small data that are before them they have come to the conclusion—it is again the same thing—that the beneficiaries are a very few. That is why that report is not being published or is delayed.

I would not go into the details of the other matters referred to in the Presidential Address. But again, in paragraph 7 the President, and the Government through the President, seems to give an impression that the food situation is gradually improving and that agricultural production is also steadily moving up. These are all statistics, and they are lost in the statistics, probably forgetting the real facts of life. I feel that agriculture would continue to remain a bottleneck unless we, at this stage of our development, seriously think of reorienting our attitude and revise our plan completely. The land reforms are not yet complete. What the agriculturist needs is a good price, fertilisers and water. All these problems have to be tackled in a more comprehensive manner. The agriculturist must also be given some incentive. Even in the Soviet land, for industrial production, the workers and technicians are given incentives. Unless the agriculturists are given incentives, agricultural production is not going to increase. Further, without giving him any incentive, there are additional tax burdens in the shape of water rates, betterment levies and other things. Our planners argue that they are getting the benefits of community development and other things and if additional resources are to be obtained, they must be obtained from the rural population. That is a strange argument.

About industrial production, I will not say much. But, I would like to point out what are the priorities that we have fixed. It seems, even in the

public sector, there is a competition now between the Defence Ministry and the Commerce and Industry Ministry as to who will produce the peoples cars, janata cars. We have become prestige-conscious. Because other developed countries have janata cars, this and that, we must also have them, without having any relation to the conditions of our people. What we need in this country are not any peoples cars, janata cars, which are beyond the reach of the common man, but cheap bicycles or things like that, which do not receive attention when industrial production targets are fixed. We are enamoured of television and all other things. Probably we won't look modernised and developed enough if we do not go in for these things. Therefore, I think that the priorities in these matters should again be changed and we must, in the coming years, revise them in such a way that the immediate needs of the people can be met.

Because of this economic pattern which gives more and more power to a few persons, we find in the political sphere also, money power is having a great influence. In the elections it was the experience of everybody. The Congressmen may not have the courage to speak out, but they also feel the pinch. Power is more centralised today in a few hands. We talk of the Panchayati Raj. I do not know what sort of Panchayati Raj we have in mind. Panchayat: as they have been conceived and as they are functioning today, according to me,—I may be excused; I am all for Panchayati Raj—I feel they are acting as mere instruments of the Congress party.

**An Hon. Member:** Question.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** They are becoming political instruments, because, more and more, the Congress is uprooted from the villages. There is no organisation; no Mandal committees exist now after Shri U. N. Dhebar's exit from the Presidentship. Therefore, for political power, they

depend more and more on the panchayats. For their Parliament or Assembly elections, these panchayats are being utilised as the real instruments for the success of the party.

**Shri Mohammad Tahir** (Kishanganj): Are panchayat elections held on a party basis?

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** They say that they do not want parties to come into the picture. But, every effort is made to see that none but the ruling party, party in power, is in power in these panchayats also. Even at places, I can say in Orissa, the Panchayat Act was amended to see that for five years to come, the present sarpanches or chairmen of the panchayat samities etc., continue, because, most of them are Congressmen. I want to know this. As Stalin was having his conveyor belts, no power, no authority. I ask this question. Is the Government prepared to give the panchayats statutory rights for planning, for finances, for distribution and other rights: statutory rights and obligation? It must have a place in the Constitution itself. Then only new leadership may emerge and the panchayats will have the right and courage and we will find a change the nature of the democratic pattern in this country. Therefore, we must be very clear in our mind as to what sort of Panchayati Raj we want. If we are really for Panchayati Raj, let us amend the Constitution, so that these rights are given to the panchayats.

I am all for national unity. I join my friends who have expressed the desire that at this time there should be national unity. But, I want to ask what happened to the decisions of the National integration conference. Firm decisions were taken. Not only the different parties, but men, very eminent persons from different spheres attended the conference and the decisions were to be carried out both at the Centre and the State levels. I

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

want to know whether the state machinery has been set up. I want to repeat one of the decisions, a very noble one. Regarding education, it was said:

"Education should develop in the young a sense of mission, a repugnance towards dominating over others and a civilised pattern of social behaviour; it should aim at creating integrated individuals."

So far as these things are concerned, there should be no difference whatsoever. Then, it was said in the conference:

"The conference felt confident that the implementation of its decisions and recommendations would help in preserving the integrity and solidarity of the nation and in promoting national integration."

I want to know what steps have been taken. Rather, we have failed. I do not want to repeat. From the different tendencies that have developed in the country, I feel that we are failing to take firm steps to stop them.

Lastly, my appeal will be, let us be honest. If we really desire that this country should develop a sound, healthy political atmosphere, then, the code of conduct that was agreed upon in the National integration conference should be scrupulously followed by every party. I will read a para in that agreement of all the parties who were represented there. It was said:

"Political power, at any level, should not be used for furthering the personal interests of members of one's own party or to harm the interests of members of other parties."

I will not elaborate this point. Let them search their hearts and ask themselves whether they are following it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri P. R. Patel.

Shri R. G. Dubey: I regret I was absent; I came running; I was two minutes late.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Very sorry; lost your chance.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): Sir, I rise to support the Motion of thanks. The agriculturists of the country will be grateful to the President for his reference to the agriculturists in para 7 of his Address, even though the reference is a small one. He should have said much more. He must have said regarding the burning questions of agriculturists and agriculture. For whatever he has said, the agriculturists will be ever grateful to him.

15.30 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO in the Chair]

He has said that agricultural production is steadily moving up. That shows that he is not satisfied with the agricultural production in our country. The targets that we have achieved have been far behind the targets that we had set before ourselves. I shall not go to the other items, but I shall touch only one item, namely cotton.

In the Second Five Year Plan, our target in respect of cotton was 65 lakh bales. But the achievement was only 51 lakh bales. During this year, we have been able to produce only 45 lakh bales, whereas our requirement is more than 65 lakh bales today. So, we have failed in our achievements in the Second Plan.

In the Third Plan, our target is 70 lakh bales. But our beginning in this first year of the Third Plan has been so miserable that we could produce only 45 lakh bales. Why should this be so? Why has production not increased in this country? I am of



the opinion that if we sincerely desire and if we take proper steps, we can double our agricultural production within five years. But the responsibility for not having achieved the target lies, I think, in the policy that we follow towards agriculture and the rural parts of the country.

In this connection, I may be excused if I refer to one particular thing. Take the case of any State, for example. A person who is properly qualified for the Labour Minister's post is one who has put in some work in some labour organisation, who knows something of labour, who is well in touch with the labour problems, who is with the labourers, and who looks to the interests of the labourers. That is the policy that is followed at the Centre and in the States. But let us consider the qualifications of an Agriculture Minister. That man seems to be the best fitted who does not know anything of agriculture, and who knows nothing of the real conditions of the agriculturists. And it is a disqualification if he has worked in any farmers' organisation; that becomes his greatest disqualification. This kind of attitude requires change, because unless the Minister of Agriculture goes to the villages, sits with the agriculturists and looks to the interests of the agriculturists and feels one with them, the real incentive will not be there.

Then, let us consider also the question of the price policy. In 1951, we had fixed floor price and also ceiling price for cotton. From 1951 to 1962, we have seen so many changes. Take the case of a labourer. He is getting much more today, in 1962, than what he was getting in 1951. Take the case of a carpenter, or the case of any labourer; take the case of even a government servant. He is getting much more than what he was getting in 1951. But, so far as the agriculturist growing cotton is concerned, the ceiling price was fixed in 1951; even though he has had to pay more for agricultural implements, even though he has had to pay more for

crude oil, even though he has had to pay more for labour and various other things, the price that was fixed in 1951 has generally continued to be the same even today. It is the same even in the year 1962. What is the policy that we are following? Do we want more production? Do we want to fulfil our targets? Are we giving incentives to the agriculturists in this way when we are not prepared to give them their due?

In the Third Five Year Plan, we have laid down the policy that should be followed. This policy will be found at page 323 of the Plan. There, we find that:

"The assurance of minimum remunerative prices for important cereals and cash crops like cotton, oilseeds and jute over the period of the Plan will provide the necessary incentives for increasing production, thus adding to the effectiveness of the various development programmes provided for in the Third Plan. With this object in view, decisions regarding the prices at which Government should buy and sell, should be taken sufficiently in advance of the sowing season."

In other words, the decision should be taken not at a time when the agriculturists have parted with their produce. Today, Government are thinking of raising the ceiling price of cotton, when the agriculturists have nothing to sell. This will benefit not the agriculturists but only the traders.

Further, we have said in the Third Plan that:

"Where floor and ceiling prices are fixed, they should be related to the requirements of production, and the range between the minimum and maximum prices should not be too wide."

Now, let us consider whether this policy has been implemented. We have completed one year of the Third

[Shri P. R. Patel]

Plan. But what about remunerative minimum prices? Is there any agency to fix the remunerative minimum prices? We are only talking of fixing and raising the ceiling price, but not of the remunerative minimum price. Actually, it should not merely be a remunerative minimum price, but the agriculturist should be fully rewarded for his labour and investment etc. and he must also have some profit. But has such a thing been done? Have we done anything on these lines during the Third Plan? If we continue like this, then at the end of the Third Plan, we shall have to say that we are sorry that we could not reach our target, and our achievement is very low. So, my submission is that we must change our policy in regard to the fixing of prices.

Here, I may be excused, if I refer to a passage from *Towards New Horizons* by Mr. Pyarelal. At page 60 of his book, he says that:

"Practically, all 'rural reconstruction schemes' that one hears of these days devised by Governments, whether capitalist or socialist, have one thing in common. They are all dominated by commercial considerations and therefore by money values. They provide palliatives; they do not touch the root of the problem. Take, for instance, 'marketing schemes'. They operate as 'concealed subsidies'; sometimes, they become schemes for the restriction of production. Then, there are 'price-fixing machinery' and schemes for providing rural credit. Price-fixing inevitably leads to similar demands from powerful industrial interests and gives rise to a sort of a 'political price war' in which the peasant finds himself up against, what a writer has called, 'anti-rural' solidarity of urban elements—industry, commerce, and the town proletariat—at war with each

other but at one against the non-organised or poorly organised peasants'. Their common slogan of 'cheap bread' and low cost of living, puts them in the same cry against the farmers with the result that in the struggle for higher wages between capital and labour, it is the peasant and the rural population that suffers."

So even today price fixing is done. Who are consulted? The millowners and others. I want to know why the farmers' organisations are not consulted, why persons working in these organisations are not consulted. Persons conversant with the problems of the farmers are not consulted. The result is that price fixing becomes in the interest of the commercial and industrial concerns. In order to avoid these things, my request is that we should have a committee or commission on the Tariff Commission lines. Let that body go into the details regarding the cost of production and all those things and fix the prices of all agricultural commodities. If this is done at the time of the sowing season, it would be doing justice to the agriculturists.

There is another thing. Today the cry is that prices are soaring high and the agriculturists are making money. If we look into the accounts, into the cost of production and come to the conclusion that the price of, say, wheat should be Rs. 6 and not Rs. 7, the agriculturists shall not have to complain against anything, because the price is calculated after examination by a third agency. Even the persons who have to pay more for wheat or other things will not complain because they will know that this is the cost of production to the agriculturists. In this way, we can do something in this matter.

Today what do we find? Because of our policy in regard to cotton, our production is very low.

**Dr. Mr. S. Aney:** May I know whether the acreage under cotton is shrinking?

**Shri P. R. Patel:** It is less today by 5 per cent than it was a year ago. The yield in India is 90 lbs. lint cotton per acre. The world average is 278 lbs. The US average is 465 lbs., the USSR average 650 lbs. and the Pakistan average 185 lbs. Compared to these, our average yield is much low. We cannot put more land under cotton cultivation. In our country, 1,95,18,000 acres of land were under cotton cultivation. Out of these, 25 lakh acres are irrigated. So the unirrigated land is more. In 1957-58 the acreage under cotton cultivation was 1,99,96,000 acres. In 1961-62, it came down by 5 per cent to 1,18,86,000 acres. So the acreage is going down. The yield is not rising. You will be astonished to know that our yield is the lowest, while the acreage under cotton cultivation is the highest in the world.

The only way open to us is to double our production. We cannot put more land under cotton cultivation because we have to raise so many other crops. So my humble submission is that we should change our policy towards agriculture.

I would suggest something more. It has been said only yesterday that the price we pay for our cotton is higher. But the *Times of India* in an editorial very recently has said that after all, there is little sense in paying a high price to the cotton farmer abroad while denying it to the farmer at home. So we are paying less to our farmer for cotton.

I had a talk with certain friends and they told me that we are paying much more, sometimes 100 per cent and sometimes 50 per cent more for cotton of equal staple coming from abroad whereas our cotton is not inferior in any way so far as the staple quality is concerned.

I may be excused if I refer to one thing more, with your permission.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member's time is up.

**Shri P. R. Patel:** Then I thank you for the time given to me.

**Shri Sham Nath (Delhi—Chandni Chowk):** Mr. Chairman, I consider it a great privilege to be allowed by you to make my first speech today to support the Motion moved by my hon. friend, Shri Harish Chandra Mathur, for offering respectful thanks of this House to the President for his gracious Address.

The most significant aspect of this Address unfortunately was the melancholy fact that it was the last Address which the President delivered to the two Houses. It was in July last that the Rashtrapati fell ill and his illness caused a sense of uneasiness, anxiety and concern all over the country. But by God's grace, after many months he rallied and his recovery was complete in the month of November, and he resumed his duties. Soon thereafter, the President declared his intention to step down from his high office. On the eve of his retirement, what tribute can the nation pay to this great son of India whose services in the cause of the country's freedom and later during the period when the Constitution of our Republic was on the anvil will ever remain enshrined in the pages of India's history? His qualities of head and heart, his lofty idealism, his dedication, his simplicity and selflessness will ever be a source of inspiration to his countrymen in difficult times ahead. The magnificent Rashtrapati Bhavan will ever bear testimony to the simplicity and humility with which he adorned the highest office of the land for a period of about twelve years.

We are, however, fortunate that he will be succeeded by another eminent son of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, whose intellectual attainments, learning, scholarship and deep study of oriental and occidental philosophies have

[Shri Sham Nath]

made him a highly respected international figure. The nomination of Dr. Radhakrishnan for the office of President has been universally acclaimed. The President, through his office and in his person, is a symbol of the nation. Dr. Radhakrishnan happily combines the tradition of Indianness with a modern, catholic outlook, representing the kind of synthesis that we seek in national life.

The Prime Minister recently fell ill for the first time after he assumed office as Vice-President of the Viceroy's Executive Council in 1946, and it was natural that his illness caused a sense of uneasiness and anxiety all over the country. It is a great blessing that Panditji's life has been one long spring. Happily its spirit still colours his mind. But on the physical plane, the whispers of autumn cannot remain unheeded and he, I respectfully submit, should reckon with the fact that the future of this country and possibly the course of history is linked up with his longevity and leadership.

In a parliamentary democracy, it is a unique privilege to be called upon to form a Government for the fourth time, and it is still a greater distinction to be invited to form an administration for the fourth time in succession.

It will be in the fitness of things if we, at this stage, did some stock-taking of our past performance and re-stated our objectives for the future. Our achievements are undoubtedly considerable, whatever the Members of the Opposition Parties in this House or outside may say, because while the neighbouring countries have come under the heel of military dictatorship, our country can take legitimate pride that our institutions of democracy have shown great vitality and vigour. The industrial progress which this country has made is really considerable. The standard of the

people is gradually rising and the nation has at least one worry less than it had five years back, inasmuch as the Portuguese enclaves have been liberated. The Akali agitation was fortunately dealt with firmly by the Government, and a welcome step was taken last year by the Prime Minister when he convened the National Integration Conference. In Kerala, a couple of years back, on the dismissal of the Communist Ministry, the Congress formed a Government in alliance with the P.S.P., and besides this, Orissa consolidated its position during the last year as a result of mid-term elections.

But during the last five years which were of tremendous importance to our young democracy, a number of our serious failings were also prominently visible. There were riots at different places in the country, and last year too there were riots in Assam and causeless rioting in Aligarh and some other places. The D.M.K., which is a potential danger to the integration of the country, has emerged in the last election as a bigger force. Although a separate State has been established for Nagas, trouble there still continues. Chinese aggression is continuing and, as a matter of fact, is expanding. As the Prime Minister stated in this House in the month of November, the Chinese have established three new posts in Indian territory, and there has been some further aggression thereafter too.

The President's Address, in view of his having delivered an Address last month, could not have contained anything more, but I am constrained to say that there was a serious omission therein, as it did not contain any reference to the most important problem that we are facing in this country, and that most important problem is the rapidly rising population of this country. In my view, whatever may be our plans, whatever we may do to improve the standard of living, we cannot succeed in our objectives un-

less we are able to take effective steps to check the rapidly rising population in the country.

Another ill from which we suffer is undoubtedly widespread corruption. And sometimes one feels that there is a character crisis of which we are the victims. Another enemy of our progress is inefficiency. Inefficiency takes many forms known to us. By far the worst is the chronic habit of not taking decisions. It almost seems sometimes that the Government exists for the sole purpose of discovering reasons for not allowing a man to go ahead with his work and for that the administration often finds something or other in its regulatory rules with which it has armed itself. Some ambitious schemes during the last few years have been victims of red tape. Sometimes one sees that quick decisions are not taken either because the responsible officers are not vested with the necessary and requisite powers to take decisions or they have not the courage or the will to take any responsibility and decide things.

In the same way, ideological approach is another hindrance. The two sectors, public and private, are considered natural enemies, and the well-being of the one contemplated at the expense of the other.

In my view, if we have to progress, we have to give reasonable incentives to industry and we have to solve the difficulties which the industrialists suffer from; and we have to create a proper climate for industrial progress because the growth of industrial units is very necessary in the interests of greater productivity.

16 hrs.

Transport, coal and power are other basic impediments to the successful fulfilment of our Third Plan. The problem of foreign exchange is also very serious.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member should conclude now.

**Shri Sham Nath:** I will take one or two minutes more, Sir.

And, since the problem of foreign exchange is linked up with exports, it is very necessary that we should do all that is possible to make all those commodities and articles which we export, competitive in the overseas markets.

There are no two views that our railways have underestimated the transport requirements of the Third Five Year Plan. In my opinion, it is very necessary that proper measures should be taken to increase the manufacture of rolling stock. Then alone would it be possible to remove the existing bottlenecks which are proving impediments in our way to progress.

The President has asked us to maintain the high traditions which the previous Parliaments have established. He has further asked us to exercise our capacities of deliberation, analysis, constructive criticism, vigilance and dedication in the task of nation-building for which Parliament has both the continuing and ultimate responsibility. I hope the words of wisdom which the President spoke to us and the advice that he gave us will stand us in good stead in the difficult task that we have to perform as Members of this House. And, I have no doubt that the President who guided the destinies of this country during the last 12 years will be with us for many more years to come and we will continue to get inspiration and guidance from him.

With these words I support the motion moved by my hon. friend, Shri Mathur for offering thanks to the President.

**Shri Swell (Assam—Autonomous Districts):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am a new-comer to this House and this is the first time that I am opening my mouth. I think, therefore, it is in the fitness of things that I should express my thanks to you for having afforded me this opportunity. I represent a minority, the Hill Tribal community of Assam. And, I felt very much encouraged by what the Speaker said on the day he was elevated to his

{Shri Swell}

high office that his concern, in order to safeguard democracy in this country, would be that he would give due weight to the voice of the opposition and the minorities.

As you are aware, I have an amendment to the Motion of Thanks to the President which I have moved. I would like to say that the amendment is one of vital importance to me and the people whom I represent. I feel strongly about it all the more so because this is not a new thing. We have been talking about it, negotiating about it with the Government for the last 2 years or so; but nothing substantial, nothing worth the name has come out from those negotiations. There is, therefore, the temptation of being excited about it. But, yesterday, the Speaker was good enough to point out to my more experienced colleague, the hon. Member of this House, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, that he should set an example to us the newcomers by keeping the etiquette of addressing you and to check the tendency of directing our remarks to the members sitting opposite. As far as I am concerned, I shall cooperate with the Chair in maintaining the decorum and etiquette of this House.

I would first refer to what the Mover of the Resolution, my hon. friend, Shri Mathur had said.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** The name should be pronounced as **माथूर** and not

**माथूर**

Shri Swell: I may be excused for not being able to pronounce the name correctly. I shall learn by and by.

He had expressed the hope that this country would never be disintegrated. I share with him his optimism.

16.08 hrs.

{MR. SPEAKER in the Chair}

He had also the kindness to say that if the country should not disintegrate, then, it was our duty that we should pay heed to the voice of the minorities very much more than we are doing now. I hope that what I say in this

House will be given due heed and consideration by this House.

The President, in his Address, has outlined the broad policy of his Government. He has also high-lighted the few things that the Government has done and proposes to do. Of course, I agree with the spokesman of the Government party that all the possible things cannot be mentioned or covered by the President's Address. But, I am particularly struck by the two sentences, in his Address in which he had invited us and called us, the Members of this Parliament, to a united endeavour in the service of our common motherland. He has also charged us with a continuing and ultimate responsibility to build the nation. I whole-heartedly respond to that invitation of the President. But, I also submit that it is specifically because we the hill people of Assam want to take our full share of responsibility in the duties of the nation, because we want to function as the full and free citizens of India, and not to be reduced to a position of second class citizens in our own State that we have been asking for a separate State of our own. The tendency in this country today is that whenever a person talks and demands his right he is told: you are preaching separatism. I am not preaching separatism. I want this House to understand me and my people and therefore, it is perhaps necessary that I should shortly refer to the background of the political situation in Assam.

Before the advent of the British the hill areas of Assam were never part of Assam politically, socially or economically. Also, it was the British for their own administrative convenience who jumbled us up with the rest of Assam. The foreign British rule was never acceptable to us. If I may mention in this House, it was we in the Hills of Assam who first fought the war of Independence on Indian soil in the year 1836. One of our kings, Tirot Singh whom the present Government of India has recently thought it right to honour

and who, I believe, will find a place in the history of the national movement in this country when it comes out, fought the British in the year 1855 with the intention of throwing them out. That was a few years before the first war of Independence was fought in this land. But the British jumped us up, as I said, and after they left, during the last fifteen years our people, either because they have been living with their friends, the Assamese for so long or because they believed in the many pious professions, especially on the part of the Congress leaders of Assam, willingly agreed to be a part of Assam. But that experiment of 15 years has been a complete failure.

I am conscious that the time allotted me for a debate like this is limited. Otherwise I feel the temptation of going over the entire history in Assam as it related to us, the hill people, in the last fifteen years. But I request the House to recall for the moment the few tragic things that happened in Assam during 1960-61. I am not for a moment suggesting that we should be discussing certain things which are the proper subjects of the State Government but I am referring to these things because they are the background by which you will be able to understand why we are now demanding separation from Assam. I would like you to recall for the moment the insanity that seized the language maniacs in Assam in the summer of the year 1960 who roamed about freely in the entire plain area of Assam, committing murder, rape, arson and what not, while the non-violent Congress Government of Assam stood by and spent its time happily in the olympian heights of Shillong, the partisan attitude of this same Congress Government in Assam in shooting down, losing no time, the men, women and children in Cachar when the Bengalis there stood up for their own language and also the utter disregard of the wishes of the non-Assamese speaking minorities in Assam when they pushed through the language Bill

declaring Assamese to be the sole official language of Assam against the appeals and protests of all non-Assamese people. That was not a temporary insanity that seized the people. But it was the explosion of something that had been burning down in their hearts, the desire to dominate the rest of Assam, to impose themselves on the minorities of that State.

I am not mentioning this here for the first time. I would like to refer to the leader of the House, the Prime Minister, as also the late Home Minister of revered memory, Pandit G. B. Pant, with whom we have had some occasions of discussion and negotiations and who knew our difficulties and our feelings and who had on various occasions expressed not only appreciation but also his sense of appreciation of justice of our demand. I am sure the Prime Minister is aware of these things. But our misfortune, the misfortune of the minorities and the hill people of Assam is this, that while we have in our Prime Minister a truly great man, a man with a heart big enough to feel for the different sections of people in this land, a man, who, many will agree, provides today the one anchor sheet of democracy in this welter of languages, castes and conflicting interests, yet unfortunately for us he is also a man of conflicting loyalties and he is, if I may be excused to use that term, a sort of a Hamlet who cannot take a quick decision on a problem even when he is convinced that a thing is right. From what I have seen of him in the Assam affairs, I feel that the Prime Minister either because of his goodness or whatever may be the reason has the habit of waiting till the first act of the tragedy is staged before he takes action or concedes to a demand. I would remind the House that some time back there was the demand for establishing an oil refinery in that State. The Prime Minister and his Government vacillated and wavered until some sort of a political crisis was brewing in that State and a few desperate people started becoming violent. Then it was agreed

[Shri Swell]

that the oil refinery should be in that State. Again some times in April in 1960, the Prime Minister on his visit to Assam had occasion to rebuke the Assamese language protagonists for precipitating something that would harm the larger interests of the country and yet just a few months later in the months of June and July when the desperates among the language protagonists became violent and started riots which my friend there just now had referred to, the Prime Minister gave the green light to his party in Assam that they should bring in the Bill to the State assembly. I feel that the same story may be retold in other words with regard to Nagaland. I am of the opinion that if the Government had been quick enough and had had sympathy and imagination to understand the aspirations of the hill people much of the tragedy that occurred in Nagaland could have been avoided. However, I see today that they are waking up to a belated wisdom. I find that they will be bringing a Bill in this very session of this Parliament to constitute Nagaland as the 16th State of India. I congratulate the Government for doing this and I believe that this act of theirs will usher in the process by which what has happened in Nagaland will be a thing of the past, by which the Nagas will be able to make use, in the task of nation-building, many of the great qualities with which they are endowed. But my submission to you is this: if you are granting Nagaland, a State of their own, what objection is there, what sound reasoning and argument have you got, to refuse the same thing to us, the Hill people? Our population is four times more than that of Nagaland. Our area is blessed with tremendous natural resources. I may mention for your information that the entire water resources in Assam are situated practically in our hill areas. The area runs to about 30,000 square miles. If you take into consideration the NEFA and other tribal areas whose people have expressed their wish to

be one with us if such a State is to be constituted, there cannot be any other sound argument on the part of the Government to refuse us a separate State. Our people are highly literate. We do not have the unholy backlog of caste and class which exists in other parts of the country.

Sir, I am conscious that when I talk of these things the ready answer on the part of the Government is that "you are preaching the disintegration of the country." Sometimes I get annoyed with that. There is this kind of snobbery that stalks the land, the snobbery practised by the people who sit astride the seat of power, and that is the snobbery of talking against separatism and 'disintegration' without trying to understand the practical implication of these things in the hilly areas.

What I am asking is this. We want this House to bring us rapidly in line with the stream of national life in this country, but if you box us up in Assam with Assamese as the official language, you confine us to the backwaters of the Brahmaputra; you keep us in a state of frustration in which if we do not eat ourselves up we shall truly explode. On the other hand, by giving us a sense of freedom to function for ourselves, we shall rapidly develop ourselves and be able to come in line with the stream of national life.

To prove that we are sincere about this, I would like to draw the attention of the House to this thing. In one of our resolutions on the language issue, we had said that we were prepared to accept any one language that is acceptable throughout the whole of India as the official language of Assam even if that language is Hindi, although Hindi will be quite foreign to us; because we feel that thereby we and the Assamese would be on an equal footing. We feel that thereby we would be in touch with the whole of the country and be in line with



the national stream in the country, and thereby we shall be coming forward and developing ourselves. To us, a separate State does not mean going out of Assam; a separate State does not mean separation. The words "emotional integration" are a mockery to us. When we feel that something is being imposed upon us, when we feel that the Government is not doing anything to give us that sense of freedom of sharing in the responsibility, the words "emotional integration" are a mockery.

I would then like to draw your attention to another thing, namely, the last general elections. One of the speeches on behalf of the ruling party was made by Shri U. N. Dhebar this morning—a person whom I used to know from a distance and never had an opportunity of coming in close contact with—and he expressed that the Government had not done all that was necessary, that was fair, to the minorities and the tribal people. I am happy to see that that sense is dawning on the part of the Government. He had also drawn the attention of the House to the general elections.

On the eve of the general elections, our Prime Minister came to Shillong, my home town, and gave an address in which he urged the people to vote for his candidates, the Congress candidates. We have very great love and respect for the Prime Minister. In other circumstances we would love to abide by what the Prime Minister says. The Prime Minister did not understand us, and because he did not understand us, we thought we should do something by which we could make him understand us. I know that the Prime Minister's name is a great force in this country. I know that he has abilities to win the elections for his own party. Practically—if I may be excused for saying so—many of us think that the Congress rode to victory on the shoulders of the Prime Minister. His election writ runs through the entire length and breadth of the country, but it did not run in our hills.

I tell you that practically every Congress candidate set up in these hills was knocked off his perch including one of the redoubtable ministers of the State Government. 53 per cent of the people voted in favour of separation from Assam, whereas only 27 per cent voted for the Congress which wanted the hills to remain with Assam, the rest of the votes having gone to the Independents who also made separation from Assam their election issue. I tell you that the Congress had tried all the means, fair and foul, to win these elections. Yesterday, my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee had occasion to read from a publication of the Congress in Bengal in which certain corrupt practices alleged to have been practised were mentioned. I would like to mention before this House that similar things like that were practised in our hills. In one of the constituencies—the North Cachar constituency—in which the Congress won by a bare majority of 15 votes and that too because of the postal ballot, the President of the North Cachar District Congress Committee had brought out a leaflet in which he had said things which were completely false; He had said that voting against the Congress would be voting for the communists and a vote for the communists would mean sharing common wives and property.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli):  
Shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Swell: That is something for my hon. friends, the communist Members here, to answer. But to us, it was an unfair thing. This was the kind of thing that was practised by the Congress. But in spite of these things, we gave a right reply to it.

I shall conclude in one or two minutes. The Prime Minister is an advocate of democracy. He is a great democrat because he listens to the voice of the people when they express themselves democratically. Now, my question to him is whether—now that the people had expressed themselves democratically through these elections

[Shri Swell]

—he would listen to our voice. That is a big question to this House; a big question to this country; a big question to the Government; and hence I approve and support the amendment to the Motion of Thanks.

With these words, I resume my seat.

**Shri Daji (Indore):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, speaking after the general elections, we must all be conscious that the next five years are going to be crucial for our country. These years will determine the shape of democracy and the nature of development that we want to achieve. Therefore, all those who are interested in the social and economic development of the country must accept this challenge and we must go forward to lay firm foundations for a proper orientation of the social development of our country. From this angle, I regret the address lacks in determination, it is complacent and commonplace.

Before I go over to the other matters, let me first of all refer to a matter of great moment and request the Government in the reply to this debate itself to declare the recognition of the Government of Algeria, and exchange of diplomatic representatives with the Government of Algeria. Recognition of Algeria now brooks no delay, not even a day's delay. 34 countries including Pakistan have recognised Algeria by now. Recognition today would be a friendly act; recognition tomorrow will be only a diplomatic *fait accompli*. By recognising Algeria today, we shall be enhancing our own prestige in Africa. In the Middle-east, people are looking to us for a lead; it is our moral responsibility when particularly French colonies are fighting a last ditch battle even now to turn the wheels of history. We expected that this Address would contain a reference to it. Even now we request the Government in the reply to this debate itself to announce our recognition of the Government of Algeria.

The President has pledged his Government in the Address to take effective measures to establish a democratic and socialist society. We welcome this. Here is common ground between all honest Congressmen, who want to work for socialism and democracy, and us and many other forces sitting opposite the Congress benches. But the question is, people have got tired with the precept preached by the Congress. People want practice. Tested on the touchstone of practice, this determination and claim of building a democratic and socialist society miserably fall to the ground.

I want to put one heart-searching question to the Members opposite. Have you ever discussed and evaluated....

**Mr. Speaker:** That question also must be put through the Chair.

**Shri Daji:** Yes, Sir. Has it occurred to us why in this third General Elections, 15 years after independence, 15 years after you claimed that you have abolished zamindari, jagirdari and princedom, after 15 years of planned development, right reactionary and communal forces have grown so powerful that they have become a major challenge to the Congress Government in at least five of the States? I beg to say these are dangerous developments. These forces stand for the very negation of socialism, planned development and democracy and are a danger to the orderly development of our country.

Not only is this a question of internal reaction, but with the internal reaction is aligned foreign reaction and we cannot blind our eyes to it. *Washington Post*, writing on the election results of North Bombay said, "Krishna Menon won; all the rest of us lost". Who are the rest of us with whom the *Washington Post* sympathises? What right has *Washington Post* got to bracket itself with any persons of Indian origin? Foreign reactionaries take this keen interest in

our elections and their friends in India are not ashamed to emerge out into the open and constitute a growing challenge to the forces of socialism and democracy.

This is a matter of concern to all sections of our honest, democratic and socialist people. It ought to be; I do not know whether it is or not. I, therefore, put this question. Why have these forces raised their head after 15 years of independence? The root cause lies in the socio-economic power which they still wield. Not a single prince has been defeated in this election. Whether he has stood on Congress or Swatantra ticket or as an independent, wherever a prince stood from his own area, he won.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I defeated one.

Shri Daji: Not from his own area?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: From his own area.

Shri Daji: One exception may be there; the exception only proves the rule. Today a veteran leader of our national movement, Dr. Katju of Madhya Pradesh has been forced to go for adoption to the Raja of Narsingarh for getting elected once again to the State Assembly. Can he not find any other constituency, but to get himself adopted from a young boy, fit to be his grandson? Without adoption from Narsingarh, he cannot seek election to the M.P. Assembly! Has the Congress come to this? Is it not a matter for concern for all of us who stand for democracy and socialism and for values of orderly planned development in our country? If this reaction has risen today, the responsibility is also of the Government. You allowed them fat privy purses. You have allowed them social and economic power; you have allowed them prestige. With this prestige, they are now emerging out and trying to intervene in our national life.

Here is common ground. Let us unite against this growing threat of right reaction and communal forces.

My friend from Mandasaur said that there has been progress of prices, progress in unemployment and there has been progress in communal riots. I come from a State which has witnessed so many riots in the last few years. Here is a copy of the judgment of the Magistrate of Jabalpur. All persons charged with the riots have been acquitted and the police case has been quashed. Here is a certified copy of the judgment. I want to know who is responsible for the 12 lives lost in Jabalpur? Who is responsible for that firing? All these are matters which call for a reply and which call for a probe.

First of all, a Minorities Commission must be appointed in the Centre and in the States to protect and safeguard the interests and rights of minorities. Yesterday my friend, Shri Mukerjee, referred to the demand of the Madras State to be called Tamilnad. There is another small demand for the Sindhi language to be included in the Eighth Schedule. You are not able to meet that. This is not the way of fighting right reaction and communal and fissiparous tendencies. This is not the way of emotional and national integration.

Another danger is the rapid growth of monopolies. Seven houses in our country control 35 per cent of the corporate assets. One of the big houses is spreading its tentacles in many States including Madhya Pradesh. I said it in the State Assembly and I repeat it here: the name of my State may be changed from Madhya Pradesh to Birla Pradesh. The son of the Chief Minister, the son of the Finance Minister, the son of the Chief Secretary, the brother-in-law of the Chief Secretary, the brother of the Secretary, are all his employees. They are not kept in any technical posts. They are PROs—Public Relations Officers, whose only work is to go about the Secretariat of Madhya Pradesh, pocketing licences and leases. When this is the state of affairs, economic considerations entering politics and also playing inside the group politics of Congress, we are nearing our Doomsday.

[Shri Daji]

These are the roots of reaction. You cannot simply shout against the growth of right reaction, as the Prime Minister has been doing after the elections and yet continue to maintain these roots. If you are sincerely afraid of the growth of right reaction, make common cause with those who stand for socialism and fight these roots. Otherwise, there will be danger to us. Let us all unite; let us all, who stand for real socialism and will of the people, unite in time before we are altogether overtaken.

Then, Sir, complacency is so great that it is claimed in the Address that the prices have been stabilised. If the prices have been stabilised, why the recent announcement increasing the D.A. of Central Government employees? This announcement itself shows that the prices have not been stabilised. A study made by the West Bengal Government shows that in March 1962 the price of rice rose by 15 per cent and the prices of fish and vegetables by 30 per cent. Day before yesterday's papers carried the news that the Government have decided to raise the coal price. In addition, we have the increase in passenger fare and freight charges in the railways. There are the inflationary pressures of the budget and taxation proposals. These are not going to lead to price stabilisation.

Then, the Address speaks of production having increased. We welcome it. We are all very glad. But where has this increase in production gone? We were told more than a year back that a committee has been appointed. May I suggest that the House appoints another committee to find out where that committee has gone? That committee has very admirably gone underground with a dexterity which would be the envy of any revolution. For 1½ years that committee simply vanished. We do not know what it is doing. The result is that the growth of production with the growth of prices concomitantly has led to the growth of profits and a little, a very

little change in the wage pattern leading to the worsening of the life of the people.

Sir, the Government has obliged us with a very small handbook. The trends show that mining profits have gone up from 121 to 291, in jute it has gone up from 150 to 506, in steel it has gone up from 157 to 318 and in engineering it has gone up from 116 to 396. And, the wages in textiles have gone up by 25 per cent, in jute from 6 to 10 per cent, in engineering by 16 per cent and the cost of living has gone up by 128 per cent. Therefore, the conclusion arrived at by the Government's own committee appointed to study the movement of wages in the Plan period is:

"It appears from an analysis of awards and agreements that there was no significant movement in the total emoluments received by workers in most of the major industries."

This is the Government's own conclusion, and this is a disturbing conclusion. On these foundations we cannot build socialism. You do not call it socialism, where I work and others rob me.

A recent study in the trend of national economy undertaken by an eminent economist Mr. H. F. Lydall, has shown that one per cent of the population in India pocket 11 per cent of the national income, 5 per cent pocket 23 per cent of the national income, 10 per cent pocket 34 per cent of the national income and 50 per cent of the population are left to distribute the remaining 25 per cent of the income. And, for finding out this, that committee on national income is still doing something. We do not know what it is doing.

Therefore, the total picture presents the danger of growth of production, growth of profits, growth of prices, fall in real wages and a worsening in the conditions of the people.

Again,—I quote from the Government's own Plan study—it is pointed out that incomes higher than Rs. 2 lakhs have gone up between the two Plan periods by 371 per cent and the lower incomes, post-tax incomes in the lower brackets, have gone down by 3 per cent. This is said in the Government's own Second Plan Study Report. If this is the trend, we do not build socialism on this. This is not what we call socialism by any stretch of imagination—call it Indian socialism or call it world international socialism or call it by any name.

**An Hon. Member:** Congress socialism.

**Shri Daji:** It may be Congress socialism—I do not know.

Then comes unemployment. Unemployment is a danger that must be faced very squarely. The review report published by the Director-General shows that in the first year of the Third Five Year Plan, actual employment in organised sector of industry covering more than 25 workers has gone down by 1.37 lakhs. Therefore, in the first year of the Third Five Year Plan, instead of the employment position improving, we find the employment position deteriorating. This is just the beginning of the Third Five Year Plan. This is a dangerous situation and we must combat it. I suggest that Government should have immediately announced at least some relief. To start with, let them announce a pool of Rs. 50 crores as a relief to the unemployed. That shall be the minimum gesture that we shall be able to expect from the Government, so that it serves the unemployed.

One word about the public sector. Public sector undertakings are the growing sinews of our new developing economy. They may not be equal to socialism, as rightly pointed out, but they are our hope. How are public sector undertakings being run? They are manned by retired, dotting officers. Officers found unfit for any

other department are supposed to be fit to be the managers in the public sector undertakings. And, these officers do a very bad job of it. I may, Sir, with confidence and with responsibility, divulge to you that they do not even shirk from bamboozling the Prime Minister himself. Some months back the Prime Minister came with great fanfare for inaugurating the launching of electric motors for Heavy Electricals, Bhopal. Not a component, not a part, not a nail was, actually speaking, manufactured at Bhopal. But the target date had to be shown. The officer concerned had to show that he had maintained the target date, as otherwise his job would go. So English-made motors were brought, merely got painted in Bhopal Heavy Electricals, labelled overnight as made in Bhopal and showed to the Prime Minister which he inaugurated the next day with great fanfare. He lectured to those very workers who painted it overnight saying that he was very proud that they manufactured it at Bhopal. The workers were laughing in their sleeves, laughing both at the Prime Minister and the officers. I am repeating this story with responsibility. I dare say that I challenge a probe into this so that the whole dirty thing gets off. It is not an easy matter to do such a thing, to play such a bamboozling trick on the Prime Minister, and it should not be allowed to go lightly. I am giving this only as an example.

Sir, sometimes we find strike in Bhilai, lock-out in Rourkela, trouble in Heavy Electricals etc. Have we ever found out why it is so. We on this side are ready to run the public sector undertakings as the pride undertakings of the country. But the officers of the wooden-headed bureaucracy will not allow us. I am not here to complain again and again merely about strikes. May I report to you, Sir, and through you to the House, that after the last strike in the Heavy Electricals, Bhopal, the workers responding to the call of Pandit Nehru and Reddy observed a production fortnight in which they have

[Sari Daji]

troubled the normal production. Yet, the attitude of the bureaucrats remain what it is. Not only that, different State Governments inter-meddle in the affairs of the public sector. Therefore, we demand that the labour relations in the public sector be taken over by the Central Government uniformly throughout the country so that the workers get a fair share and by getting a fair share they can contribute their own mite and thereby take increasing share in the production of the country.

A question was raised by my hon. friend here. It is again and again said by the Government that the democratic opinion shall be respected. This was the advice given by the Home Minister in Punjab. I want to ask: "Will you not follow the same pattern, the same principle regarding the Marathi-speaking areas of Mysore? Shall we not merge them into Maharashtra, since unequivocally every seat there has gone against the Congress on this very specific issue of merger of the Marathi-speaking areas of Mysore into Maharashtra? Will you apply different standards in different territories? Are you not going to employ one principle uniformly?" These are, Sir, some of the questions which require elucidation.

Then I come to the point about democracy. Sir, democracy is not only a mantram to be repeated *ad nauseam*. But the autocratic tendencies of the police raj have to be combated. The other day we heard the story about the firing in Andamans. We were given a story, a fantastic story as I was listening to it, that for two hours the police battled with the crowd with lathis and hose pipes, and the men could not control the fire. The crowd kept quiet for two hours, not a single policeman was injured, not a single constable was killed. For two hours the crowd battled with the police without the police getting even a scratch, and in return they fired and killed six persons. Can you believe such a cock

and bull story? What about the Allahabad firing, the tortures in the lock-up and the anti-Communist climate which you are creating? The teachers in West Bengal are screened by police officers despite the assurances of the Chief Minister. In Kerala the man selected by the Public Service Commission is not being appointed to a judicial post despite the protest of the judiciary and the PSC. Is this the way we build democracy? I repeat, Sir, that it is not a question of this or that party. Today it may be the Communist Party. Tomorrow it may be the other Opposition parties. May I remind you, Sir, that police tortures in police lock-up have not only been practised against the Communists? Even against the movement of Father Vadakkan, a known anti-Communist of Kerala, when he launched the agrarian agitation, even his followers were tortured in the lock-up. Once this process of autocracy starts, it does not stop here or there.

Lastly, may I point out to you the various circulars issued by the Madhya Pradesh Government to show to what extent they can go. In one circular addressed to all college principals the Secretary of Education has written very clearly and unequivocally not to encourage Communist speakers being invited by the schools. Circular No. (2) reads very obnoxiously. We take the Soviet help. The Soviet Government is helping us to build at Ranchi, at Bhilai and in the Machine Tools Factory. Here is the Government of Madhya Pradesh which says in a circular issued to all college libraries:

"Government have taken a decision that literature propagating Communist propaganda by magazines such as *Soviet Bhoomi* or other documents published by the Soviet Embassy, New Delhi, should not be subscribed to by Government college libraries."

This is a Government circular signed by the Secretary of Education, sent to

all the colleges. This is witch-hunting; this is not democracy. Shall we stop it or not?

Therefore, I submit, the President has said that we want to build a democratic socialist society. Here is common ground between us. We are concerned with the growth of communal and the like reaction, and rightly so. When these forces grow, then planning, socialism and democracy fall over-board and everything that we cherished during our national movement go over-board. So, how do we go about building a democratic socialist society? For building a democratic socialist society we have to place an inspiring ideal before the people and take energetic steps for building that unity between all the forces that stand for socialism in our country so that together we can march forward to that goal; as together we fought against imperialism, today we have to fight for socialism, fight for democracy, fight for planned progress, fight against poverty and backwardness of our country. That cannot be fought by Congress utilising the State machinery for personal or party purposes, merely utilising the machinery for strengthening its own party, trying to subvert democracy in the name of democracy. By forging unity with all the progressive forces we have to march forward. If that is the goal then you require a radical programme. The people have given you sufficient mandate so that you take a step forward. If you adopt a progressive orientated policy, you shall not find support lacking from various sections of the House and outside also. It is for you to do. Otherwise, all this tall talk of democracy and socialism will only mean making a mockery of socialism, democracy and progress.

**Shri K. L. More** (Hatakanangle):  
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to express myself on the Motion of Thanks moved in this august House. I am really happy to associate myself with the kind sentiments expressed by many of my friends here and I

also join them in paying my tributes to our revered President for his very valuable address.

The President has given us a very valuable document which will guide us all in future and he has awakened us to the duties that lie before us. In his address he has given a correct picture of everything that has been done and what is to be done in future. In para 3 of his address he has stated:

"The country has made progress in many fields even during the short period between that occasion and now when I have the privilege to welcome you."

So, we have a correct picture of the progress that has been made by the party and the Government representing that party. Many of the hon. Members from the opposite side have criticised the Government by saying that the progress is not adequate, the Government is not proceeding according to the Plan programmes and that there is no satisfactory progress. I want to say that I have come fresh from my constituency, which is a rural constituency, and I am very happy to note that the electorate has given the verdict to prove that the Government is going on the right path for achieving the highest good for the country.

Before I deal with the other points, I would just like to mention one thing, and that is with regard to our revered President who had delivered this address. I find that we were very very glad when he gave us a very valuable advice. He said that it is through united endeavour in the service of our common motherland that we can progress and along with it he gave us inspiration when he said "This is the last occasion on which I shall address you as the President of the Republic" by saying:

"I now bid you farewell and leave you to your labours . . ."

when we became very sad. I pray that his valuable advice will be avail-

[Shri K. L. More]

able even though he is not with us as our President. Really, we cannot forget him and we will always be grateful for his valuable services to the nation.

I will now refer to some of the points mentioned in the Address. Before that, I will just say that there is omission or no reference to the working of the safeguards provided in the Constitution for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Part XVI of the Constitution has clearly laid down that the interests of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes should be watched vigilantly and protected. We would have been pleased had he made a reference to these weaker sections of the population. Of course, a short reference to them would have given inspiration to this class and would have had great effect on the nation as such, but we find that there is no reference to them in the Address. Of course, I may add here that the Government has done a great deal towards the amelioration of the condition of the people belonging to these classes.

17 hrs.

But we should not be complacent with regard to improving the lot of

these people. The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes have been given so many facilities but the problem is so vast, the magnitude of the problem is such that had there been any other Government it would not have done so much as has been done by this Government. That we admit, but still, we should not be complacent and we must go ahead. The Head of the State should give the utmost priority to such questions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Would the hon. Member like to finish today within the next two or three minutes or would he like to continue on the next day?

**Shri K. L. More:** I will like to continue on the next day.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then he might continue on Monday.

The House stands adjourned to meet again on Monday, the 30th April, 1962, at 11 O'clock.

17.01 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, April 30, 1962|Vaisakha 10, 1884 (Saka).*