

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

AMENDMENTS TO AIRCRAFT RULES

The Minister of Communications (Shri Jagjivan Ram): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following Ministry of Communications Notifications making certain further amendments to the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937, under sub-section (3) of section 5 of the Indian Aircraft Act, 1934:

- (i) Notification No. 10-A/48-51 dated the 23rd April, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No. P-12/52.] //
- (ii) Notification No. 10-A/8-50, dated the 31st March, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No. P-13/52.] //

CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE
(SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898."

The motion was adopted.

Dr. Katju: I introduce the Bill.

GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL
DISCUSSION—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members are aware that the time-limit for each Member is 15 minutes, and one hour or more for the hon. the Finance Minister for final reply. Today is the second day of the discussion.

Shri P. T. Chacko (Meenachil): The other day quite an important person here was moralizing on the virtues of not opening one's mouth in Parliament. He told me that I need not worry myself about the problems relating to my State; he also said that everything that we wanted would come to us as freedom came to us. It is that tone and the ring in that tone that I resented to. He seems to think at least that so far as we people, about ten million in my State, are concerned, freedom was a gift from somebody from somewhere else. I want to tell him that I was not the

son-in-law who came wooing his daughter when he had become rich. I wish to say that we paid in full the price for the freedom which we have achieved, and also for that which we have yet to achieve.

The other day, a Deputy Minister was answering a question of mine in the House. The question was whether the Government have taken any steps to encourage the export of, and also to regain the lost market for, Indian pepper. The Deputy Minister said, "the only thing is to pray for it; there is no step which the Government can take. If the foreign demand is less, we cannot help it." I have no quarrel with his prayer. I only wish that he gets more time for praying. Nay, even the entire time for his prayers for the good of the country.

There also I recognise that ring and that tone of the voice of Imperial Delhi. He also said that he was not aware of any complaint regarding the quality of exports in that commodity. I have with me the Report of the Export Promotion Committee which clearly said that exports of such commodities should be increased, and also that the quality should be improved. But it was a report by certain people, not a report made by Ministers, and probably it may not have had any value for that Deputy Minister.

I am giving these instances because in all such cases, I recognize that tone of the voice of Imperial Delhi. I thought, that the Government of India's policy is to encourage the production and export of commodities by which we could easily earn foreign exchange. I may also be permitted here to read a portion from the Export Promotion Committee's Report. It is stated in paragraph six: "Wisdom would lie in attempting to obtain from the soil besides a certain minimum of cereals those crops which will benefit our agriculturists as well as our foreign exchange position."

Again, in paragraph eight it is stated: "It may generally be said that it is better to increase the area under such crops as will fetch a good price directly or after processing, in the export markets than merely to concentrate on increasing the area under food."

Due to geographical conditions in my State, it is not possible for us to produce sufficient food. But it is possible for us, provided proper encouragement is given, to produce much more commodities for export than what we

produce now. My hon. friend the lady Member from Trivandrum was saying the other day that our State produces almost 67 per cent. of the food we needed. I beg to submit that that information is incorrect.

Kumari Annie Mascarene (Trivandrum): It is a matter of opinion.

Shri P. T. Chacko: The hon. the lady Member was a Minister in our State in 1950 and if she knew that our State produced about 67 per cent. of the food which we require, I think, she could have taken steps at least to provide us with seven ounces of ration a day at least during the time she was a Minister. The fact is that we produce hardly one ounce of food per head per day, if rationed equitably. Such is the condition in my State. At the same time, we are producing commodities which are exported, mainly plantation crops, like tea, pepper, cardamom, coir, lemon-grass oil, ginger, betelnuts etc. For the year 1951-52, the quantity of commodities which were exported from that State alone amounted as follows:

Coir, about Rs. 10.5 crores,
 Pepper, about 20.6 crores of rupees,
 Lemon-grass oil, about Rs. 1.8 crores,
 Cardamom, about Rs. 1 crores.
 Ginger and turmeric, about Rs. 2 crores,
 Tea, a good portion of total exports worth about Rs. 94 crores.

The State is rich in its plantation crops, minerals and timber. But with all the efforts to grow more food and with all the propoganda, I wish to submit, it is impossible for us to become self-sufficient in food even in any future. So, if an equitable view of the matter is taken, my submission is that we have to be provided for. Whenever we approached the Government of India with grievances like this we used to get very good assurances. For example, as my hon. friend, Mr. Thomas, said, the Krishnamachari Committee made a recommendation that about 75 per cent. of the loss which the State incurred by the purchase and sale of foodgrains should be given as a subsidy to the State. I have gone through every page of the Budget Demands for Grants and I have not found anything provided, earmarked, as subsidy to my State. But I am glad to say that I am informed that my State will be given about three crores of rupees as subsidy from the lump sum of Rs. 15

crores provided for. But I submit the loss which the State incurs every year even this year, will be much higher than that. In the matter of food, may I submit that our housewives are not satisfied with any assurances.

Then again another instance. As regards article 371. I remember that Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel himself gave us an assurance that Travancore-Cochin State would be exempted from the operation of that article. Here when a question was put by my friend, Mr. Sreekantan Nair, the Home Minister, said that he was not aware of any such assurance. He, being an eminent lawyer, could have better told us that there is no value for an assurance like this, when there is a clear provision in the Constitution regarding this matter. Such is the way in which my State is often treated.

As regards food, in 1950 we were asked to purchase food from certain States, Part A States, in India. We had to pay for the rice we purchased from Uttar Pradesh Rs. 22-2-2 per md. when the controlled price per md. was not more than Rs. 11-8-0. In our parts, this is called black-marketing, but I do not know by what name it is known in Uttar Pradesh. However, a State which is producing much of the commodities that earn foreign exchange for India is asked to purchase rice from another State much above the controlled rate. I am surprised why we were asked to do so. This year we are not allotted any rice from Uttar Pradesh, but we are allotted a good amount from Madhya Pradesh and I am told that we will have to pay about Rs. 15 per maund. I am not quite sure about it. The poor agriculturists in my State where they cultivate paddy in the Vembanad Lake six to eight feet below the water level, at great risk and cost get only Rs. ten per md.

I wish to say a word about the plantation industry. Unfortunately, many of my friends here look upon this industry with a certain amount of prejudice, probably because of the unfortunate fact that the growth of the plantation industry was coupled with the growth of colonialism here and elsewhere. But I would like to submit that excepting for tea and rubber all other plantation crops are produced by small scale growers. For example, pepper, coconut, ginger, turmeric—all these are produced by small scale growers and in the case of ginger, turmeric and such other crops even people without a bit of land are

[Shri P. T. Chacko]

producing them. Even in the case of tea and rubber, I wish to submit, instances are not rare, where the so-called estate measures only about 15 cents. Even rubber and tea are also produced in my State by very small growers.

Now, this is a very important industry. About 23 per cent. of the total export trade of India is accounted for by the plantation industry and also not less than 35 per cent. of the hard currency earnings are accounted for by the plantation industry. My only submission is that the Government of India should take more interest in the plantation industry. My friend, the hon. Mr. Basu, was stressing the need for encouraging the tea industry. He was describing the conditions of the industry in Darjeeling. The conditions are not different in Travancore-Cochin, if not worse. The entire plantation industry is facing a crisis. My submission is that the Government of India should take more interest in fostering this plantation industry. May I say, it has become a national necessity.

I have a word to say about my friends on this side, that is the opposition. It has almost become a practice by the time we were in this House, to mutually abuse—the Communists abusing Congressmen and Congressmen almost abusing Communists here. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri P. T. Chacko: That is exactly what is happening in the country, at least in my State. My friends the Communists are complaining about the want of freedom in this country. It is strange—I know that they want freedom to end freedom; and they want democracy to end democracy. I know the sort of freedom which they would like to have. But in spite of all that I would like to submit that mere anti-Communism will not save us. It serves no purpose. We stood for a revolution in this country and we have liberated the forces of social change.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will remember that this is an occasion for discussion on the Budget. So irrelevant political issues, however important they may be, need not be brought in and time taken.

Shri P. T. Chacko: Sir, one more minute. This is a very important matter. I am coming to the nation-building activities contemplated in the

Budget during this year. I want to stress that we are going a bit slow. The forces of social change which are liberated by us are there. Supposing the Government are not utilising those forces of social change, what is to happen tomorrow? My submission is, we slow down the pace of revolution, and help anti-revolution. Governments should take care to ally themselves with the forces of social change. Otherwise they will be utilised by the Communists. My submission is that the Government should allot more money to nation-building activities and see that the revolution is completed.

Shri Khardekar (Kolhapur *cum* Satara): As the time allowed for discussion is very limited I will confine myself only to three important matters—the matter of food, the matter of defence and the matter of education. As you know, they are concerned with life, death and the progress of the country.

I am tempted to make one general remark about the Budget and that is that it is honest, it is over-cautious and it is far too careful. It lacks imagination, there is nothing to excite, nothing to make a song about unless my friend Mr. Chattopadhyaya is tempted to write a skit on it. (*An Hon. Member:* Why not a dirge?) I very much liked the remark of my friend Mr. Gopalan who said that a Government which does not feed its people has no right to be there. But although it is a very good statement, it is inclined to smell or smack of platitude, unless we are able to show effective ways and means of bringing about this particular change. A remedy was suggested by Mr. Gopalan, that we should have one-third instead of one-half of the Budget for Defence. I think it is a suggestion bordering almost on irresponsibility.

I come now directly to the food question. The Finance Minister has stated, perhaps due to public pressure, that he is inclined to subsidise milo. I do not know what milo means. Milo is food really for research but is it really food for man or animal? If rich persons eat milo, I think that would be all right, because along with milo they can eat half a dozen other good things. But if a poor man eats milo, to use a Marathi expression, he will be "melo" very soon. If the poor are to starve, let them starve but let us not insult them in the bargain. Poverty after all is a crime, as aptly described by Bernard Shaw, and as such the poor are criminals and criminals

should suffer. But we in this country have a very different notion of poverty and thanks to Gandhiji we have learnt to glorify poverty. Gandhiji called the poor Daridra Narayan. Unfortunately in this land of Gandhiji some of his followers are inclined to revile and ridicule poverty by referring to the hungry looks of poor persons. But I may say here that some of them have hungry looks, for they have hunger not for crumbs of bread but for crumbs of governmental favour.

I intend to offer a rational and human approach to this problem. Merely glancing at the Budget one finds that we have Rs. three crores and odd surplus on the revenue side but really there is an overall deficit of Rs. 75 and odd crores. When we say that we want to subsidise food, we have to consider one very important question. Do we want to subsidise only for urban areas or also for rural areas? The argument that in the past we subsidised only for urban areas is no argument at all. It is wrong that we should not learn by our mistakes. If we are to subsidise we must subsidise for urban as well as for rural areas, the villager as well as the town Johnnie. As you know the villager is poorer and generally eats twice as much as the person in the town. You have only to invite me for a meal to be convinced about this, because I live in a village. If we are to subsidise at all we must subsidise both for the urban and the rural areas. Otherwise there should be no subsidy at all.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

10 A.M.

Certain suggestions have been made by a number of people as to how this problem can be solved. One important suggestion is that we should resort to deficit financing but I personally think that that would be almost impossible, because deficit financing would mean raising the taxes and I think we have about reached the limit of taxation. Then the next question would be to resort to foreign aid, which necessarily means American aid and we naturally shout it down. We cannot have the cake and eat it too. Personally I am also against foreign aid. So long as we are not able to stand on our own legs firmly it would be wrong to resort to foreign aid. At present we are really on our knees. We are a tottering democracy and if we invoke foreign aid, it means foreign domination masquerading as charity, humanity, friendship and the rest of it. If you resort to loans, it would be again introducing the trends of inflation and that would prove a very great danger.

There are some persons who say "Wipe out all the projects, particularly those which are going to materialise in the future". It is very easy to condemn such people by saying that they want us to mortgage the future for the present, that they want us to forget the question of values, that they want to put an end to permanent and future good for the present and temporary good. But why is this particular attitude? It is because of certain psychological factors.

Reading the Finance Minister's speech one feels that in spite of his honesty, brilliance and cultural bearing, there is that lack of human touch. The Finance Minister has applied his mind to the food problem as a scientist applies his mind to a purely scientific problem. What is required is human understanding, commonsense and an earnest desire to solve the problem.

The second psychological factor which we have to remember is that people really have lost confidence in the Government. When I say this I do not for a moment mean that people have more confidence in any other party. The fact that the Congress has been returned in greater numbers is proof that people have more confidence in the Congress as far as the elections went. But there are certain reasons why people have lost their confidence in the Congress. The Government have not lived up to their professions. Look at the number of pompous declarations made by the Government. Some years ago, it was declared and loudly too that by 1951 or 1952 India would be self-sufficient as regards food. Another very responsible Minister again pompously and loudly said that within five or ten years there would be electricity in every town and village, probably in every cottage. What dazzling and electrifying nonsense it has proved to be. Look at the grow-more-food campaign. I think it has produced a lot of gas but no grain whatsoever.

Then there have been loud professions and talk about the *Ram Rajya* that is being established. Particularly on my side leading Congressmen, persons like Shanker Rao Deo, have been talking about *Ram Rajya* being introduced in India. I will just give my experience of *Ram Rajya*, as I heard one villager talk to me about it. I do not think he had read my friend Mr. Atre on the point. After he had heard the eloquence of Mr. Shanker Rao Deo he asked me if I had any idea as to what *Ram Rajya* was. I said that I had no idea whatever and

[Shri Khardekar]

that I was not particularly fond of *Ram Rajya*. Krishna is my God. He began to talk about his conception of *Ram Rajya*. There was only one Ram and one Sita in the *Puranas* or the Hindu religious books. To some of these Congress leaders Rama seemed to be in every town, in every lane and every cottage. The problem today is such that unfortunately the poor Ram has no *dhoti*, probably because some of the villagers cannot afford it. Mother Sita has to go out in borrowed clothes and oil for the hair probably is used for the Diwali festival only. And as for Lakshman, he is scratching his body all over because, being a very obedient brother and loyal brother, he allows all the rice and good rations to his brother and to Sita and he eats only milo and as a result of milo he has rashes and boils all over his body. As regards Lava and Kusha, poor kids, they are shut at home; they cannot afford to go to school because they cannot pay the increased fees, and when a neighbour asked them why they did not go and the neighbour offered to pay them some money they still could not go because they did not have enough cloth to cover their loins. So that is the idea of *Ram Rajya*. And a number of people talk so loudly saying that of course the Congressmen are there because the people elected them. Of course the people elected them, but if one were to analyse this particular thing, well, because the question has been raised again and again I might just state my views within half a minute: that it is an organisation, a powerful organisation for a long time, with plenty of funds; then it is the party in power and that matters a lot with the illiterate; more than that, the indiscriminate use of two great names, the sacred name of Gandhiji and the name of Jawaharlal Nehru; over and above that the most important factor, the flying visits of Jawaharlal Nehru at the time of elections for cashing his popularity in favour of candidates worthy and unworthy.

Then, if we are to resort to these food subsidies it really means we have to manage to have about Rs. 90 crores—and ninety crores how are we to get? I think the Finance Minister has stated that he has made provision for Rs. 15 crores. Then, it is possible, if we really try to study the problem, that we should really make those States which are not making proper use of their revenues to get the revenue as they ought to get. They should fall in line with certain other States. There are certain States, particularly states

like Bombay and Madras which because of their moral fads and foibles have been literally throwing away tons of money into the Arabian Sea on account of moral fads such as prohibition. And when it is a question of life and death, why should people be fed on these moral principles? It is actually the limit of human folly to legislate for the morals of mankind. It is the duty of the Government to force such States to fall in line with other States. I am glad to state here that the Prime Minister did go all the way from Delhi to Poona to instruct, to advise the Ministers and the legislators of the Congress Government for bringing about this particular reform, that is putting an end to prohibition. But the Prime Minister talked in a language which the legislators and the Ministers could not understand. He talked about priorities, he talked about first things being first and so on, that is, he talked about values—but you cannot talk about values unless people have a certain amount of mental and moral development, and therefore, his words were just pearls cast before certain things and could not be appreciated. The point is that the devil may quote the scripture and the Bombay Ministers likewise quoted the Constitution, article 47 of the Constitution, the Directive Principles. My submission is because it is the Congress Party that is in power in Madras and Bombay what should be done is that they should be forced, pressure should be brought on them, to give up this prohibition. Secondly what should be done is that if that is not possible the Constitution should be amended. It is not right that people should be made to suffer because some persons are moral children, and although I am from Bombay I say this: the Government of India should not pay a farthing to Bombay unless Bombay shows some sense. I am not here to play to the gallery; a representative is not a weathercock, he is not there merely to please the voters. Where the voters and his constituency and the State are wrong it is absolutely his first duty to give his conviction.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): I am glad that I am getting this opportunity to participate in the Budget discussion. A reference was made by the previous speaker from Kolhapur about me that I raised the slogan that in about ten years' time every large village in this country would be provided with electricity. I still repeat that slogan. The hon. Member may be pleased to note that whatever was the supply of electricity on 1st January, 1947, within 4½ years it has increased

by 27 per cent. Whatever I am saying about the particular Ministry of which I had the good fortune to have the reins I can predicate the same thing about all the other Departments constituting the Government. Everywhere production has increased and it is on the strength of achievement and not on the strength of Gandhiji's name or on the popular personality of the Prime Minister so much that we, Congressmen, have won at the elections. Speaking for myself, I have never referred to these personalities in about five hundred speeches that I delivered throughout the districts of Maharashtra—everywhere I referred to the achievements of the Government. Although I am not unmindful of the fact that more would have been possible, whatever was achieved was no small dividend on the efforts and endeavours made by the Government. I would therefore ask my friends on this side; let us not spend our valuable time in discussion more than is absolutely necessary, let us do our best for the common man who has suffered through ages from poverty, squalor, ignorance, and once we have put down the greatest enemy, namely the foreign rule, these minor enemies are our concern and let us by joint efforts, whether one is red, pink or white, abolish that poverty which has been the curse of the Indian population right from the ages. Even during the time of Ashoka poverty was there. The masses were never without poverty. Ashoka built pillars and wrote edicts but poverty continued. The Moghuls raised Taj Mahal but poverty continued. The Britishers established railways and highways and poverty travelled quicker but it did remain. But today I have the confidence and the hope that we will be able to abolish poverty for the simple reason that the status of the common man has become different today from what it was in the ages past. A Sanskrit poet has said that when he was born he thought poverty was the twin and he wanted to get rid of him. He went to the Ganges, took a dive; he came out and poverty came out with him. He went to Narmada and the same thing happened. When he went to Delhishwar and entered the portals poverty ran away and no more was the poor. The same thing has happened today. What has happened today is that the common man who was neglected, denied and disinherited has come into his own. He feels a sense of self-respect when the high and mighty in the land go to his doors for franchise—the merchant and the millionaire from Bombay toured the villages of Rajasthan and Baswada, for what purpose?

An Hon. Member: To get the votes.

Shri Gadgil: They coaxed him and cajoled him and tried to tell him that he had become the real owner, the swami of this country. Now, it is up to those who have been returned with his franchise to translate those promises into concrete achievements, so that the primary needs of food, clothing and housing may be met substantially in the course of the next five years. The test that I propose to apply to the Budget is not the ordinary test which has been applied for so many years. I do not look upon the Budget as merely some jugglery of figures. I want to know to what extent it is going to bring into actual existence those ideals which have been embodied in the Directive Principles in our Constitution. If by this test the Budget is found to be up to the mark, then I shall give full support to the Government. It is possible in the next five to ten years to meet these primary needs of food, housing and clothing, given the will and the determination of the Government and the co-operation of the people. This age-long poverty can be eliminated; this age-long ignorance can be abolished.

What is wrong with our food problem? A number of suggestions have been made and I do not want to add any more. But I feel that this problem can be solved by adopting two approaches: one the short-term and the other the long-term. In the short-term approach, things will, I think, decidedly improve if the Government takes courage in both hands and enforces a uniform policy of procurement and distribution. The statistics published by the Government will show to the House that the surplus States are not playing fair. In fact, the percentage of procurement in deficit provinces is high, whereas the percentage in self-sufficient and surplus provinces is low. If India is one country, then why is it that this problem of feeding every citizen is decentralised to the disadvantage of the have-nots? Is it because they will get less? Assam, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Madhya Bharat and Orissa are some of the self-sufficient and surplus States. Food is ample in these States. But Bombay and Madras suffer the most. They suffer both quantitatively and qualitatively. If Bombay produces 40 or 50 per cent. of the textiles in this country, would it be fair for the Bombay Government to say, "We will not release any textile goods for the provinces where no textile mill exists"? But the people and Government of Bombay are fairminded and they say, "No. This is a problem which must be

[Shri Gadgil]

tackled on an all-India basis" and they have agreed to come into the scheme of distribution which assures a fair share to everybody.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East): After making cent per cent profit.

Shri Gadgil: These profits will soon be deprived if you keep up the noble traditions that have been established since the last four years.

Now, the same policy ought to be adopted in the matter of food. Even as it is, it is possible to procure more food in Madhya Pradesh, Assam and Orissa and give immediate relief to the deficit provinces. As you know, in the case of salt the Government have divided the whole country into certain zones on the one hand to secure a fair distribution of salt and on the other to see that the transport facilities are not disturbed. In the same way, Government should divide the whole country into certain zones and so far as Bombay is concerned, I suggest that Bombay and Madhya Pradesh must constitute one zone, so that much of the distress of the Bombay population will be reduced.

Now, about the subsidy, much has been made both here and outside. As I scan the Budget, I am convinced that the decision taken by the Finance Minister is correct, and although my hon. friend from Kolhapur thinks that it is not human, I am convinced that it is human in the greater and larger interest of the country. If you spend what you have today today itself, then all those nation-building works and those multi-purpose river projects which are meant to give water for irrigation, power for industry and employment all round, will have to slow down. The question is that if we sacrifice something here and there now, then in the next five to ten years our next generation will be better off, just as the past generation underwent some sacrifices for the attainment of freedom and as a result we are reaping the benefits. Similarly, is it not a moral obligation of the present generation to deny itself to some extent some comfort, so that whatever is saved now will be invested in the better prospect of the future which will undoubtedly be great, in my humble opinion? Therefore, the decision taken is on the whole correct, and yet you will find that the subsidy proposed to be given is Rs. 25 crores in addition to an expenditure of Rs. ten crores for minor irrigation. I should like to tell my hon.

friends that even if it comes to taking less—say ten ounces—we should be prepared for it, in order that we will have underwritten our future to a great extent.

But I am one with those who argue that there should be an equality of sacrifice. The Government has to see that there is no lopsidedness; there is no inequity; there is no injustice done to a particular area, so that abundance reigns in another. If on these principles the present arrangements and adjustments are reviewed, I have not the slightest doubt that everyone of us, every section of this House, can go to the people and say, "Look here, this is what is being done for the future".

One of my hon. friends said just now that in certain areas certain crops cannot be grown. I agree. It is therefore necessary that we must not leave things in a sort of free economy or *laissez-faire*. There is the greatest necessity today for planning right from the beginning in all the three spheres of production, distribution and consumption not only in the agriculture but in the industrial field also. Now, what is the meaning of the Five Year Plan? I am not unmindful of the deficiencies, or other matters in it which may not be to the taste or liking of many of us, but one broad fact emerges from the last election, viz., the electorate has pronounced that no more will India have free economy; no more will the policy of *laissez-faire* continue. Today, it is a small step. I do agree also that the Five Year Plan can be made more dynamic, more pronounced in the doctrinaire sphere. So far as I am able to see, I am happy to note that the electorate at the last General Elections, a few months ago, has definitely returned a verdict that the country is no longer for free economy. The investing classes and the industrial classes should take note of this fact that when you have established political democracy, the man who has the right to vote, the man to whom even the Prime Minister had to go at his door-step, the man to whom the millionaire sitting there had to go, the man to whom the rich, the most learned and the most literate man had to go will not agree to the position that he is sovereign today and yet he has to go hungry. He will use this democratic power; he will use this political democracy for the achievement of social democracy and for the removal of economic inequity.

I am told that in this Budget there is no fresh taxation. So far as I understand the scheme of the Budget,

just as a tiger takes a little time to have another leap my friend the Finance Minister this year has not proposed any taxation, but I am certain knowing him as I do, that even if he does not want to, the force of events will be so overwhelming that he will have soon to revise his policy of taxation. I still believe—in fact with me it is a conviction—that the richer classes can be taxed more without any detriment to investment or industry. If they say that taxation in India is too much today they are playing the same usual political game which is played by other parties. I am glad that taxation is no more a mere instrument of fiscal policy, but it is an instrument to redistribute national dividend, so that the inequalities and inequities that face us will be substantially done away with. The death duties question is hanging since 1946 and between 1946 and today many rich men must have died and we have been deprived of a fair share of the inheritance they left to their children. I would therefore ask Government to proceed with it quickly. There may be difficulties in the administration of it, as there are difficulties in the administration of every law. But what right has a rich man to leave the whole inheritance to a son or grandson without any consideration for his ability or to his character. If you want to become a lawyer, it does not pay you to say that I am the son of a lawyer; you have to qualify for the examination, pass it and be enrolled. You cannot practise medicine on the ground that your father is a successful doctor; you have to pass an examination. But here you may be mad, lunatic, a loafer or anybody, but if you happen to be the son of a rich man you get the entire inheritance. I want to know—is it social justice? After all what has the dead man to do with property? He is dead and gone—he has nothing to do with it. As the great Sanskrit poet has said:

धनानि भूमौ पशवश्च गोष्ठे । भार्या
गृहे बंबुजनीशमशाने । देहः चित्तायाम् परलोक
मार्गे । अनुगच्छन्ति सुकृतान्येव ।

You leave behind your car in your garage, your money in banks, your wife at home, your relations in the grave-yard, your body on the pyre, and your good-deeds only follow you.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon.

Member evidently refers to the rich man, not me.

Shri Gadgil: So far as the poor man's death is concerned, the country is less by one. So there is no difficulty about the poor man. All that he leaves behind is good deeds—nothing more than that. He is incapable of doing bad deeds normally. Death duties is a method to remove inequalities and inequities in the economic sphere.

The Five Year Plan is something in which everybody should take interest. I would urge my friends on my extreme right that it is all right to criticise the Government here and there, but it must be your concern—as I know it is—that the standard of the poor and the down-trodden must go up. Will it go up by merely picking holes in the plan? Certainly you have a right as citizens and as representatives elected by certain sections to criticise. But after all when the decision is taken, the highest parliamentary traditions require that you must accept that to be your own decision and take the full moral responsibility thereof. The common man does not understand the marginal theory of value; what he wants is more food, more clothing and more housing. Incidentally, I do not think India cannot produce adequate cloth for her population. The history of the textile policy for the past five years is one of increasing and decreasing production. I want to tell the House and the Government, since a major decision has been taken to have a planned economy, that planned economy cannot work without a proper system of control. If the control is not working satisfactorily today, the alternative is not to abolish that, but to have better control, because unless there is control the shortages will work havoc. If you want to enlist the moral and material resources of this country and integrate a plan in which you want to assure fair wages and fair standard of living to everyone, it cannot be done unless the principal means of production are owned and controlled by the Government. Let us, therefore, understand the implications completely. I ask you: is it difficult to manage 400 mills in this country by Government? When you can procure grains from millions of tenants, I ask in all fairness, is it impossible? Not in the least. We have recently passed the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act under which Government can take over an industry if it is mismanaged. I want this House to consider seriously whether a similar provision should not be made

[Shri Gadgil]

in the Tenancy Acts of the provisions, whereby if a tenant mismanages his land that land should be taken over and made the nucleus of a collecting farm. Land is the property of the State, just as this country is our property. We are tenants at life. We go away, but the country and the community continue. Similarly, tenants must cultivate their land according to a plan. You cannot have too much of cotton and too little of cereals. There must be a plan not only between the various crops, but there must be a plan between the population that is subsisting on agriculture and the population which must be made to subsist on industrial undertakings. All those things are possible. These are the possibilities of the Five Year Plan. Hence I support this Budget because the Budget has made provision for all the projects. But here I would make my humble suggestion to the hon. the Finance Minister that, if not now some time hence, he should have a separate memorandum giving the financial aspect with relation to the Budget of the current year so far as the planned economy or the Five Year Plan matters are concerned.

I do not want to take more time. You have already been good enough. But I have a claim as an ex-Minister and as one of the most senior Members of this House to have a little indulgence of this House. I hope I have not transgressed it. I therefore do not want to say much more. But I again want to appeal to my friends here that if they co-operate heartily, whatever their objective, it is achieved. But if they say no, because the Five Year Plan has been framed by the Congress Government and therefore it must be sabotaged. I think that is not a democratic attitude. I have still faith, I know some of them very closely, some of them are my friends socially and otherwise, and I appeal to them that that great objective, namely the service of the poor, the service of the common man can only be achieved if we all join together. Just as the poet has said that there are two ears but the hearing is one, there are two eyes but the seeing is one, there are two lips but the voice is one, there are two hands but the clap is one, in that spirit I would appeal to my friends: you may criticize, you have a right to propagate your doctrine, but when it comes to the serving of the vital interests of the poor, let us forget that we are this or that, let us remember that we are His Majesty the Voter's humble servants

Shri R. K. Chaudhury (Gauhati): On a point of information from the hon. ex-Minister, may I know from where he has got the information that food is ample in the State of Assam—is it official information or information gathered by him?

Shri Gadgil: There are two good proofs for it: one the figure of my hon. friend and the other the statistics published by the Government of India.

Shrimati Khongmen (Autonomous Distts.—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): I am grateful for an opportunity afforded to me to take part in the general discussion of the Budget. But before I say anything about the Budget I should like to contradict my hon. and learned friend, the speaker who had just spoken before me and who said that Assam has sufficiency in food. I come from that State and I know how our people have been suffering for the last few years. It is true that Assam used to be a surplus State, but not now. And I want to say for the information of the House and the hon. Member that rice is selling at Rs. 45 a maund even now.

I shall now come to the Budget. The Budget has been characterized by the hon. the Finance Minister himself as a wait-and-see budget. And to my mind this is a true description. I for one would like to wait and see the result and effect of calculations and anticipations of our financial expert, which our Finance Minister undoubtedly is. But when one is content to wait and see, one needs to feel assured as to how the common man's lot is going to be affected. For this we shall have to look into the pilot projects, the community projects, the Five Year Development Plan, which I venture to think form part and parcel of the Budget itself—although these are extended beyond this current year under review. There can be no doubt that if these projects and plans are duly executed and satisfactorily completed the average standard of living of our countrymen will be considerably improved and their burden appreciably lightened. A thought, a reflection—a trifle looking back on this aspect of the matter brings me a sort of cold apprehension, I must confess. Quite a number of schemes of good nation-building work were taken in hand by our Governments, both in the States and at the Centre, during the last four years. Let us take for instance the grow-more-food campaign and the effort to

lessen corruption in public administration. Opinions will differ as to whether we have been able to achieve any appreciable measure of success in this direction. We could only the other day galvanize large masses of our countrymen to action which called for very great suffering and sacrifice. Why is it that we cannot imbue the same people today with an enthusiasm, a zeal for such an essentially life-and-death matter as the grow-more-food campaign in the present set-up of our country? I should not venture to tread on thorny ground; but would earnestly ask everyone of us here to find out the "why" of it, and take steps betimes.

Having said this, I would confine my observations on the subjects of one, the Tribal problem with particular reference to the North-Eastern Frontier Tribes, and secondly, the problem of advancement of one half of our population—I mean the women. Assam did not occupy a very important position in the map of India till the Second World War, when the Japanese captured Singapore—once considered to be unassailable—took Burma and marched into India through the North-Eastern frontier. I may tell the House that two-thirds of this State is covered over with hilly area, inhabited by various Tribes and under all stages of development.

The problem of the North-Eastern frontier is the problem of the Tribes. Apart from the humanitarian aspect of the question, let there be no mistake that if India is to be defended against any foreign invasion from the North-Eastern Frontier side, the problem of the hill Tribes has to be carefully and tactfully handled. The British rulers studied this problem carefully and it yielded them rich dividends. Now, the hill Tribes live a very simple and primitive life and their manners and customs generally are also primitive. Almost all the hill tribes are hard-working and freedom-loving. Some of them, who live in towns and villages near the highways, received good education but a majority of them have not the advantage of coming into contact with modern civilization in any way whatsoever. While the percentage of literacy among the Lushais and Khasis is as high as those of the people who live in the plains of Assam, literacy among the Mikirs, Abors, Dapas, etc. is perhaps less than one in a thousand. Social customs and political institutions also vary from Tribe to Tribe and place to place. But it may generally be said that the institutions governing them are democratic and based on some sort of elec-

tion. The relation between most of the surrounding Tribes and plains people was generally friendly and cordial before the advent of the British. There were treaties of friendship between some of the powerful hill Tribes and the Ahom rajahs, who were reigning over Assam for 600 years, before the First Burmese invasion took place. Since the British took over Assam, they took carefully planned steps to isolate the hill Tribes from the inhabitants of the plains. They set up inner and outer lines between the hills and the plains which could not be crossed with impunity. Six months rigorous imprisonment for one to cross this line without previously obtained permission was indeed considered a light punishment. The net result of this segregation and isolation together with pernicious political propaganda against the plains people has been, that the Tribes generally are in complete darkness, abject poverty and frightfully suspicious of the plains people around. Some foreign Christian missionaries, however, brought education to these hill people here and there. Thus we find oases of educated Christians among the hill people, few and far between. The then rulers never cared for the uplift of the people, particularly those of the hill Tribes. So we find an absolutely naked people, and head hunters, after 120 years of British rule. The legacy they left in some of the Tribes who live in these hills is one in every ten persons is suffering from leprosy and other skin diseases. Judged by the result till now, the approach to those hill people, after the departure of the British, does not appear to be very correct somehow. There appears to be a flaw somewhere. The proud, sensitive and freedom loving Nagas should not have been agitating as they are doing now, if these people had been handled with understanding and sympathy. It is time that our Prime Minister who is also the beloved leader of our nation deals with the problems of the tribals with affection and understanding.

Communication, education and health require urgent attention. It will not do if the Centre simply allots the sum. The selection of personnel for the hills is a matter of vital importance. Self-seekers, it may be noted, are no assets but only a liability to hill service. Whether the Centre or the State makes the selection, it has to do it carefully, because hill people are not very easy to deal with, if they once dislike a person or a cause. There is water scarcity in certain hill areas, in spite of Assam being the wettest place in the world. Arrange-

[Shrimati Khongmen]

ments should be made for water supply. Above all, a scheme should be evolved and worked out to make the hill Tribes somehow self-sufficient in the matter of their food, especially for those who live on the border of Pakistan. My justification for taking so much of the time of the House is that if you neglect these hill people, you cannot defend India from this side.

I should like to ask what is the percentage of literacy amongst women in India? Then what percentage of total expenditure for education in India is for female education? I have not the statistics with me, but I can say without fear of dispute that the expenditure incurred by Government for schools and colleges for girls is less than one sixth of what the State spends for boys. It is sad to find that there is no special provision for the advancement of women in the Five Year Draft Plan. I fervently pray that serious attention of Government may be given to female education, so that they may come forward, well-equipped to shoulder their responsibilities along with their men.

Shri Chattopadhyaya (Vijayavada): We have been hearing a number of maiden speeches; but I am afraid I shall have to make a bachelor speech.

People wonder why a poet has dared to come into Parliament. They always tell me that a poet should be concerned with beauty and joy, why should he be concerned with politics. But, do not the people realise that politics is necessarily mixed up with the artist's view, because, the artist's view of life is the artist's view of the people in general, and the artist is a politician whether you like it or not. I remember a verse.....

Shri S. A. Khan (Ibrahimpattam): May we have the artist's view on the Budget!

Shri Chattopadhyaya: I am coming to the Budget in just a minute; do not grudge it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member evidently wants to make the Budget an artistic piece.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: I think it is high time we introduce some art in our politics. Art has no place in politics, nor politics in art, which is as good as saying that wife and husband are apart.

Before I take up one or two points in the Budget, I should like to make my position clear as to why I am sitting on these Benches rather than on those. I am not a Communist, as my nephew said the other day. Perhaps people mistake me for a Communist because I look intelligent. I am not an immunist either as many of my friends are. I am not immune from the great forces that are at work in this country. Ever since I was of that height, in the times of Gopala Krishna Gokhale, I had revealed a sense of patriotism which has remained with me throughout my life. I remember those few lines I wrote when I was eight years old—I am coming to the Budget—written when I heard our revolutionary being hanged when he fought against the British Imperialism. Allow me to quote those lines, because, I want to justify my position on this Bench.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am willing to hear the whole speech in verse.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: When I am lifeless and upon the pyre.

My ashes will arise and sing in joy.

Which will proceed like music from the force. Weep not, my country, for this patriot boy—

Why weepest thou, though thou now captured be,

I'll rise again and smash the bonds and set thee free.

This is what I wrote when I was eight years old. Ever since then I have loved my country as much as anybody else, who claims to love his country.

Coming to the Budget, I have always believed in sound life and joy. I entered the national movement along with so many others and fought in the years when Mahatma Gandhi was alive and when he inspired the country. I prepared some songs for the movement, songs which have been on the lips of these friends:

शुद्ध हुआ है जंग हनारा,
भारत को हम नचानेवाले,
शेर जगत में मचानेवाले,
अपनी शक्ति से नचानेवाले,
विषमय श्वेत भुजंग ।

In those days, I also fought. But, why is it today that I am addressing the House from this side of the House? It is because I was thoroughly disillusioned in the Congress. It is a great

pity to have to say so; but I was thoroughly disillusioned. That is why I am here. I have pledged my allegiance to the Congress; but I am convinced that it has betrayed the trust that the people had rested in it. To this, what greater witness could there have been than the present Budget? At last I have come to it.

11 A.M.

What has the Budget to say? Let us take food. It says in essence that if the people have no food this year, we really cannot help it. It was the Prime Minister who, only two years ago, shouted from the house tops, did he not, that we shall be self-sufficient in 1952. Did he not say to the whole world in no equivocal terms that he would be prepared to see the whole country die of starvation if he could not bring about self-sufficiency? What has happened?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Election promises.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: We are given promises of the continuance of poverty, suffering, starvation. We are told that we are going to continue to get loans; we are told that we are going to continue in that state, and that the intensity is going to increase. That is one thing.

Then we come to Education. Education is no less a problem than food. For, education is the mental food of the country. Without food, without education, you do not mean to suggest that the nation can continue to live. What has happened in the field of Education. How much of the Budget has been allocated for Education and Health. One per cent. of the total Budget or 1.6 per cent. of the total Budget for such important and emergent matters as Education and Health.

Hon. Members: State subjects.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: What happens now? Education has been so neglected. Schools are so few. The students are in such a condition and the teachers so low paid. You find art and culture neglected in a manner which I consider despicable. Look at the condition of the artists. I claim to represent the artists. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, friend, I am sorry to have addressed you, Sir, as friend. It may be unparliamentary. You will please forgive me. Look at the condition of the artists in this country. I am in touch with the artists in the whole of the country. As such I believe I am here to represent them. The condition in which artists live is something appalling. These is no

security; there is no encouragement. If there is any encouragement at all and there is any grant given to any institution, they are institutions which only propagate anaemic and reactionary forces and ideas. I say that, because, I am convinced I am in a better position in this House to speak on behalf of artists than almost any one present here.

Some Hon. Members: Oh!

An Hon. Member: It is for others to say that.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: It is very little that is given to education, which shows how badly we need it, because we are interrupted at every turn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order; that kind of indirect aspersion may also be avoided. The hon. Member is an artist.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: I am sorry, Sir, I should like to suggest that we take far more interest in the building of our nation on a cultural level. We have no theatres in India. I have had the dishonour of working in many Indian theatres. I use the word dishonour absolutely calculatedly, for most of the theatres I have had the dishonour of working in. I would describe as lavatories. Pardon me, Sir, for this word; it may be an unparliamentary word. I wish more attention would be paid and more assistance given to the building up of national theatres in this country. We have no national theatre and we talk of nation-building. The theatre is a very important weapon for the building up of ideas, a marvellous weapon for our own national improvement. What are we doing? We are doing nothing whatsoever. We are doing absolutely nothing. Whenever there is any progressive thinker, or a progressive writer, or an artist, you may be sure that he is not encouraged. I have been connected with groups that have come out with progressive ideas. They are of the people and represent the problems of the people for the people. But such things were resented and they have not received any support. Unless we are able to give a start to this aspect of national life, we shall be dwindling very rapidly, as indeed we are doing. Now, by saying progressive literature, or stating that progressive artists are not encouraged, I do not mean your progressive artists who are just what are called decadents. A progressive artist is a national entity. You cannot be progressive unless you have your roots deep down in ancient culture.

[Shri Chattopadhyaya]

We have to dig our roots into ancient culture without which we can never hope to build anything new in this world. But there are so many things in ancient culture which we have got to comb out. In the process of development, our ancient culture has to be combed, and good things taken and new things built on that foundation. It is not enough to say everything ancient is wonderful, and we should preserve that at the cost of progress. I for one, am a stickler for ancient culture. I love my nation as anybody here claims to love it. I love it equally. I therefore feel very strongly that we should be able to have institutions started in order to bring about a powerful factor in this country which will be conducive to the growth and the health of the nation.

I would like to say that certain things have come to my notice very recently. We talk of neutrality. We say we are friends with all nations. Yes, I hope we were. But, of course, you are trying to put on a show of friendliness. I see that a cultural delegation is sent to China. I see that certain things happen which give the colour of neutrality. But I would like to ask why we are practising thought control in this country. You will be shocked, I suppose, to hear—or, you would not be shocked; perhaps you are used to it—that now literature from all parts is supposed to come into India. You have U.S.A.'s literature backed with millions and millions of dollars allowed freely to move about in the country, to move about as if it belongs to it. When it comes to Chinese or Russian literature, there is a stringency, an application. You will not believe it. I have in my hand a certain item of news which was published in the *Swadhinata*, a progressive Bengali daily published from Calcutta. The news item stated:

"It is understood on reliable authority that the Railway Department of the Government of India has introduced a policy of discouraging the sale of Soviet literature in the different Railway book-stalls."

In plain language this means stoppage of the sale of Soviet books at these stalls. It further states that a circular to this effect has been issued to the different Zonal General Managers of the Railways. As if to prove the correctness of the above report, a well-known firm of book-sellers having a chain of book-stalls in various Railway stations has cancelled its order to the Soviet Union, an illustrated

magazine devoted to the peaceful constructive activity of the Soviet people. This action of the Government comes at a time when Soviet and Chinese literature is becoming gradually popular among the people as is evidenced by the increasing demand in recent months. Side by side, you are encouraging *Time, Life*; you are encouraging *Time, Life*; you are encouraging *Readers' Digest*; you are encouraging *True Romance*, dealing with rapes and murders, inciting war. Are we going to stop literature that deals with beasts? Are we bent on stopping any propaganda for peace? We say we are a peaceful country. We certainly stand for the ideals of peace. We have always been a peaceful nation—I am afraid a little too peaceful. But what I would like to ask is what does this mean? Does it mean that you have got to have thought control? Thought control, birth control, all kinds of control. I suggest that you might shoot down men, you cannot shoot down ideas. You can shoot down thinkers, you cannot shoot down thought. I therefore warn my friends on the other side, the Treasury Benches. They do not understand. I would say that we be allowed complete freedom to study what we like, to read what we like, to see what films we like. Now again, in the question of films, you find a Censorship Board composed of men and women, the majority of whom, I am sure, know as much of film making or the film industry as I know of Greek. We must have sensible people on the Censorship Board. What is the meaning in saying: "No, we will not allow an Indian film which deals with drink and dacoity", and then allowing films from outside which incite youngsters to war. With the result that the children in every home today love to handle pistols, because we are a nation of peace and we stand for the encouragement of peace. I suggest, therefore, we have more attention paid to peace, peace propaganda in this country. It is no use your saying peace is manoeuvred by the Communists. Well, if the Communists have manoeuvred peace, you take your hats off to them. I think they have done a sensible thing. Therefore, I suggest that we take no sides, and that we be allowed to establish our contact with the whole world. I love the world, I know the Americans, I love the American people. I love the British people, I love the Chinese, I love the Russians, I love the Australians—people I mean.

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore):
There you love the Governments.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: I love my own country, and if at all I refer to Russia or China, you may take it from me I refer to these countries only because there is so much to learn from these countries. I have been to Russia; I know. I can talk with authority, in fact, much more than most people here. I have seen the educational systems at work there, I have seen the cultural system at work there, the happiness and the joy of the people, the collective farms in Russia. I have seen what progress the whole country has made in these years. It is no use your challenging me. You have no eye-witnesses; you are only ear-witnesses.

Shri Venkataraman: All conducted tours.

Shri Chattopadhyaya: Conducted indeed over 15,000 miles. Am I to believe then that in Soviet Russia the trees are made of paste board?

We are spending half the Budget against defence—defence against whom, may I ask? Is it against some foreign power? Is it against Pakistan? Well, it is not enough to say just: we are having defence; anybody, somebody might come. If it is Pakistan, she will not come alone. She must have somebody to back her up. How then can our second class army withstand this first class army, if we do at all. No. I realise why the defence has taken up so much of our wealth. It is there to defend that country against the possible uprising in the country. Due to historical logic, it might bring people to such a pause that they might rise and say "We can suffer no more; we will stand this no more". And when they rise like that, you will have that Defence Army to shoot them down. History repeats itself, I will warn you as a writer, as a visionary I warn you history repeats itself. In other countries, where the armies have been kept and supported in order to defend themselves and to be used against the people later, they have when the momentous time came, come over to the people and become the people's army. Do not forget that the army consists of people drawn from our own people. Therefore, I think, that this warning might be timely.

I thank you, Sir, for giving me these few moments. I do not want to take up more of the time of the House. I found that our ex-Minister had spoken like a poet; he quoted profusely from other people's works. I hope the House has not minded my quoting from my own works.

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): When I sat listening to the two brilliant speeches that have just been delivered, one by Mr. Gadgil, and the other by my hon. friend Shri Harindra Nath Chattopadhyaya, both speaking in poetic language, I thought perhaps it may be with a little sense of diffidence that I can address this House. I want to make a few observations on the speech of Mr. Gadgil. We are in agreement with many of the things he said. When he said that there must be equal distribution of wealth here, and that all classes of people must bear the burden of taxation equally, and that we must build the future with a view to relieve the poverty of all citizens, these are sentiments to which we also offer support.

But my difficulty is this. Our Congress Ministers, and many of our Congress leaders give expression to fine sentiments, they place before the people beautiful ideals, beautiful concepts like the 'Welfare State' and 'Co-operative Commonwealth'. All these are beautiful concepts. But when they come to the implementation of these ideals, they fail. They talk, but they do not act. That is our quarrel. And that is the tragedy. He asked in very soft and moving words, for co-operation from this side of the House. I can assure him that if it is a case of relentlessly carrying out these concepts, the idea of a Welfare State or Co-operative Commonwealth, then every one in this House will stand by the Government. But if it is used only to hoodwink the people, to hide your conservatism or reactionary attitude, then we are not with you. I say this, because today many of the ideals for which the Congress stood, have been sacrificed. They are not being implemented in the spirit in which they were made at first.

I want to bring one point to the notice of the House, and particularly Mr. Gadgil, who is not here at the moment to hear me, and that is this: Great achievements in history are not made through profit motive. Today we know the ills that prevail in this country because of your lop-sided economic policy and profit motive. We know what happened during the days when we were fighting for freedom under the glorious leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. We were then able to generate in this country, the motive of disinterested public service, on such gigantic scale that people even from outside used to say that Gandhiji was able to mould heroes out of the common clay of India. Today when we are building a free India of our conception,

[Shri Damodara Menon]

are we able to release that motive of disinterested public service, and suppress the profit motive that is parading our country? For that, this Government will have to take very stern measures. When we want to release this disinterested public service motive, we must set an example. Who must set an example? The people who are at the top of the Government, the leaders of the nation.

When we speak of economy, when we say that there must be austerity on all sides, not only on the poor section of the people who are called upon to suffer privation to build for the future, but also on the leaders of the nation, when we say that there must be all round austerity in the name of economy, our Finance Minister comes and says 'It is under examination'. Then, there are friends for whom I have the highest respect, who say "What do you gain by reducing the salary of these high officers? After all, if you distribute them it may not produce any difference in the economy of the country, you may not be able to raise the salary of the lower-paid staff even by a pie". The other day, when my hon. friend Mr. Anandan Nambiar referred to the high salary drawn by the Members of the Railway Board, my hon. friend Mr. Venkataraman said "After all, if we reduce the salary of these high paid officials, what difference is it going to make in the pay-scale of the lower paid staff?" It is not in terms of the money that we shall save by reduction of the salary of these high paid officials, that we must assess the value of reduction but it is in terms of the psychological change that will prevail in the country, namely, that every section of the community, including the leaders of the nation, in fact everybody is undergoing privation and suffering for a common cause. Unless you release that energy, and you set that example, I can assure you that your schemes will not succeed.

There is another point which I would like to refer to. We are having a number of grand schemes, the Five Year Plan and many other grand schemes. We are wasting a lot of money on them. I say wasting money, because even according to the report of the Estimates Committee, we know the plans are not working according to schedule. When we are borrowing money from outside for the sake of the future generation, there must be economy, and we should take care to see that every pie of it is spent properly and not wasted. Why can you

not realise that we must do that immediately? Again, we have a number of magnificent buildings; we have our National Laboratories; we have made them very grand. When foreign tourists come, when foreign experts come, we can show them these buildings, like the Taj Mahal. But what is the amount you are spending upon these buildings and how much on instruments for research? I have heard that in Japan, there is a rule that there must be a proportion between the container and the contained. You are spending large amounts of money on these buildings; at the same time, you are not providing these buildings with the necessary equipment. I had a friend who spent all his earnings, nearly 25,000 rupees, on a magnificent mansion and having built it he found that he had nothing to live by and now he is mortgaging it. Are we also going to follow that policy here in building these things? Can we not begin humbly and then see that our scientists get the necessary equipment, even though they might not have to do their research in magnificent structures? Can we not do that? Are we not taught that way by Mahatma Gandhi?

Now, when I am at this point, I want to refer to another fundamental issue. Here we are having an economic policy. Our leaders, say, and so does the Government, that it is a mixed economy that they are trying to have in this country. Now, I say it is not a mixed economy; it is a mixed-up economy. I would say further that it is a muddled economy, because you are not sure how you are going to plan and allocate industries in a proper way. You say you believe in cottage industries, in decentralised industries. What is your scheme? How many primary industries are you going to allocate to cottage industries? Have you made a scheme like that? Your reports say we want to make things here, produce things in our cottage industries so that we may sell them outside in America, fine things like shawls and carpets. The products of our cottage industries should be used by the people here because our economy requires it.

The Finance Minister himself has said that we have mainly to depend upon foreign loans to build. He says that our attempts to raise capital here—a loan of a hundred crores—have not been much of a success. We got only 50 crores and today therefore he has not made provision for a greater loan. He has made provision

only for 25 crores this year. About the small savings scheme, it has remained practically stationary. Therefore, our economists say capital in India is shy. I do not think capital in India is shy. Will you go about taxing the rich and getting the capital necessary for the country? But that is another question. Admitting that capital in India is shy, then what is the way for us to build for the future, to release mass energy for constructive effort? How are you going to do it? Our insistence on small scale industries, decentralised industries, is because of this. We have manpower in abundance in this country; that is our greatest wealth. We have to utilise that. Therefore you have to plan industries, not capital intensive but labour intensive, and when you plan labour intensive industries, you have to think in terms of small-scale industries. Today the Census report shows that people who live on land, who are dependent on land, are about 26 or 27 crores. The pressure on land is very heavy. Now when you are planning for the future, unless you relieve this pressure on land, I am sure there will not be any progress. You will not be able to give full employment for the people, and we must plan for the future on the basis of full employment. Otherwise, this manpower is going for waste.

Now, I want to close my speech with one item—in fact I wanted to begin my speech with that—and that is about the food subsidy. Much has been said about it. My hon. friend, Mr. Shiva Rao who opened the debate on Friday paid a handsome compliment to the Finance Minister and said he showed considerable courage in stopping the food subsidy. I am not an expert in the use of the English language. I do not know whether I can call this act of stopping the food subsidy and making it impossible for the lower income groups of our country as well as the labourers to purchase food, an act of courage. If that is courageous, I do not know. My knowledge of English is limited, but if I were to use an expression, I will call it callous, because, Sir, you cannot call upon the people to forego food and build for the future. Food is a necessary item. What did Mahatma Gandhi say? Mahatma Gandhi said, if I may remind my hon. friends, that even God Himself will not dare to appear before the starving man except in the form of food. Today how are you appearing before the starving people of this country? You are appearing before them in the form of promises and plans; not in the form of food. I know the answer will be that we are having

37 P.S.D.

a store of food, we are accumulating food. But should you not also see that the food available here is within the reach of the purchasing power of the worker and the unemployed?

Now, my friend here said that till now subsidy was given only to industrial areas and also heavily deficit areas, and that rural areas must now be brought under subsidy. The Finance Minister also in his speech has referred to this and he said that there is an insistent cry that rural areas also must be rationed and if we undertake the liability, our burden will be to the tune of about Rs. 90 crores or Rs. 60 crores minimum. I say we are all for the rural folk benefiting by subsidy. In industrial areas and heavily deficit areas, we knew we were making a distinction, and what was the rationale of that distinction? We felt the people in industrial areas were not producers of food but producers of something vital for the interest of the nation and if they are not able to get cheap food, this factor of food price will enter into production and the price of the products of industry will go high and other people will suffer. It was with the knowledge that we were showing a distinction in this matter that we first introduced food subsidy in industrial areas. Therefore, this is no new problem. The Finance Minister has trotted it out as a new thing. We know our economy today is such that we cannot have imports on a gigantic scale from outside. We also know that if we want to build for the future we must save something today. But when we know that, we must see that we make such allocation of the existing funds that the shock which the people may receive as a result of your sudden stoppage of the subsidy may be cushioned off for a period of time I am sure if we allocate some 15 or 20 crores of rupees for food subsidy, then it will be possible for us to reduce the price of food in those industrial areas and heavily deficit areas. We will in the long run benefit by such an act, because then only we can keep the country satisfied and also impress on the workers and the other sections of the population that they must really undergo some sacrifice and build for the future. Today when we demand that such allocations should be made, there are people—Mr. Gadgil himself was one—who would say that more sacrifice must be made now and we should tighten our belts and build for the future. That cry will not go home to the people. What are you finding all over the country? Why should the Government shut their eyes to the agitation that is going on in the

[Shri Damodara Menon]

country? Everywhere—I mean in Bombay and other places—*satyagraha* is being conducted with a view to getting the price of food reduced. You may say it is all political agitation. That is a short and, I may say, prejudiced view of the matter.

People here feel that they are starving, they cannot get food, and unless you give them that you have no right to govern. That is really the position.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Another opportunity will be given to the hon. Member.

Shri Damodara Menon: I wanted in fact to refer to two or three more items, but as my time is up, I resume my seat.

Shri Datar (Belgaum North): It is not necessary for me to deal with different aspects of the Budget inasmuch as they have been dealt with by a number of previous speakers.

The first and most important aspect of the Budget is that it is realistic. We have heard speeches in this House which related to an unreal world but we have to come down to a realistic world and to a realistic economy. During the five years after Independence we have passed through almost Himalayan difficulties. Under the circumstances it redounds to the credit of the Central Government and the Finance Minister, that they have brought order out of chaos to a very large extent. Five years in the life of a nation is not a long period and under the circumstances we have to see to what extent the present Government have been able to stabilise our economy, and in that respect you must take into account not only what they have achieved, but what they are *bona fide* likely to achieve during the next five years. When we take these into account we find that the Budget is placed on sound foundations and therefore I support it.

I shall now deal with some other matters. I should first like to make a reference to a few expressions used, such as *Ram Rajya* by the Members of the Opposition. This expression has been misused and my friend Mr. Khardekar from Kolhapur made a reference to it in rather deprecatory terms. *Ram Rajya* does not mean a benevolent despotism or any particular kind of autocratic rule. Gandhiji for the first time made this expression popular and he said that there ought to be *Ram Rajya* in democracy and that under democracy there would be

a switch-over from autocracy of any kind. Rama was not a despot at all. He only ruled as a trustee for the people and was prepared to sacrifice himself to the utmost extent, even to the point of giving up his wife. That is the kind of Rama we had. If my friends on the other side would care to read the portions of the *Ramayana* which deal with public life or the happiness of the people in his kingdom, they would easily accept Rama even under the present circumstances, so far as the greatest good of the greatest number of people is concerned. It is under such circumstances that *Ram Rajya* has to be referred to.

There is another characteristic of Rama which should also be noted. Though actually Rama was carrying on the administration, yet he did so from a spiritual view-point, because, it was common ground that both the temporal and spiritual life are one. In other words, life is one and therefore it has to be planned and lived in such a way that we take the common people to the highest elevations. That is stated in the famous verse of Vidyanaraya, who was a statesman-saint in the days of the Vijayanagar Kings. He says that saints need not go into the forests; they should live amongst the people and take part in the public life of the country. This is that interesting verse:

“ज्ञानिना चरितुं शक्यं सम्यग राज्यादि
लौकिकम् ।”

Swaraj and public administration should be carried on by real saints keeping in view the ideal that life is one and indivisible.

I would now make a reference to a few points as briefly as possible. The first is the necessity for the abolition of the three classes of States—Parts A, B and C. This introduction of disparity between States is a matter of great heart-burning so far as Parts B and C States are concerned. You are aware that this classification is not based on any considerations of either progress or development so far as the States are concerned. Even in Part A States there are fairly backward areas also. As to Part B States, we have Mysore and Travancore-Cochin, where the administration is efficient, and is at a high pitch. Part C States are the relics of the former one-man rule under the British regime. The time has come when this injustice so far as

Parts B and C States are concerned, should be removed. There is no reason why a counsellor should be appointed to advise the Ministries in Part B States and why there should be a Commissioner in Part C States. The best solution would be to abolish the whole classification and bring all the States together under one type of administration.

In passing I would make a reference to one point. We have the smallest State, Coorg, as against U.P. which consists of 51 districts. These disparities should be gradually removed and we must have compact provinces. To do so there ought to be reorganisation of the existing heterogeneous provinces in the South on a proper basis and that would be the linguistic basis. This has been accepted all along and the time has come when we must tackle it boldly. We are fighting shy of the problem, and we in Karnatak are the worst sufferers, so far as the present demarcation of the provinces is concerned. Formerly, when we had numerous States, we were divided between 21 different States. Since the merger of Deccan States our area is brought within the compass of five provinces. What is now necessary is that the Government of India should undertake immediately the preliminary measures essential under article 3 of the Constitution. The Government should appoint Boundary Commissions, fix the boundaries properly, and constitute handy provinces. I am sure the State administrations would then reach a higher level. Otherwise you will have multi-lingual provinces like Bombay. Even Shri C. Rajagopalachari and Swami Ramanand Tirtha of Hyderabad stated that there ought to be a revision of the boundaries of the provinces.

Now I should like to refer to certain problems common to Bombay. In Bombay State we have a very large coastal belt—called the Konkan—which stretches from Bombay in the North to Travancore in the South. It has got very great potentialities, and so far as Karnatak is concerned we have North and South Kanara districts, which are neglected by the administrations of both Bombay and Madras. The potential resources of that area are not exploited at all and the communications are very poor. Under the circumstances, when you take into account the fact that the Planning Commission has taken the decision that there ought to be an equitable and regional development of all parts of India, it is the duty of the Government of India to develop the whole of the Konkan area. Just near

the coastal belt we have also areas which are called popularly Malnad areas. The previous Government had appointed a Malnad Development Committee and they had called for an interim report. That report was not accepted and the whole committee had been shelved. My suggestion is that it should be revived and the Malnad portions of Bombay, Madras, Mysore and Coorg should be more fully developed. The East coast in Madras has been thoroughly developed to a very large extent, but unfortunately for us the West Coast below Bombay has not been developed at all. Therefore, I would suggest to the Central Government to initiate measures for a proper development of the coastal belt as also the Malnad areas.

So far as the irrigation projects mentioned in the Planning Commission are concerned, you will find that the Planning Commission has decided to spend Rs. 450 crores on irrigation in five years. Out of that amount you will find that the whole of the Bombay State consisting of the three linguistic areas of Gujerat, Maharashtra and Karnatak gets only Rs. 39 crores. Coming to the southernmost districts of the Bombay State we find that here there were no irrigation projects at all—during the last 100 years of British regime we had only Rs. 14 lakhs spent on irrigation in this Karnatak area as against Rs. 20 crores spent over the rest of the Bombay State. Under these circumstances I would urge upon the present Government and the Planning Commission to give more to the major irrigation schemes that have been accepted already by the Planning Commission. I mention the Ghataprabha irrigation project. It consists of two or three parts: one is the right bank canal, the other is the left bank canal, and we have to construct two big storages. The total amount that is required for it is Rs. 30 crores. Out of that you will be surprised to find that a small amount of Rs. 4-50 crores has been vouchsafed by the Planning Commission to be spent during the next five years over this project. So, it is not possible for us to get any major portion of this irrigation scheme brought under operation during the next five years. Irrigation, you are aware, has been given top priority. Therefore, this Ghataprabha irrigation scheme ought to be taken in hand fully and implemented in the course of the next five years because thereby the food problem would be solved to the extent of about one million tons. That is a point which may kindly be noted.

[Shri Datar]

So far as airlines are concerned, we have not got any airline except one that passes from Bombay to Bangalore which stops at Belgaum. But so far as Belgaum is concerned we have not got any civil aerodrome at all except a landing place belonging to the military department. Therefore it is absolutely essential that Hubli should be developed as a good aerodrome. It stands midway between Bombay and Bangalore; it is also going to be the centre of the North zonal system of the Southern Railway so far as the northern metre gauge system is concerned. Therefore, Hubli is a place where there ought to be an aerodrome with full facilities. We are glad that at Mangalore in South Kanara district, in Madras State, which is also part of Karnatak, there has been a scheme to construct an aerodrome, but so far as Hubli is concerned I suggest that it also ought to be developed and that it ought to be included in the Five Year Plan.

I am going to refer to two questions which bear on education. One is the grants to the new Universities started in India. In Bombay we had one University, but during the last five years, thanks to the Congress Government we have got six statutory Universities, and the Government of Bombay are not in a position to extend financial assistance to the extent that these infant Universities require. In fact, I am almost of the opinion that University education ought to form part of the Central list of subjects, and not necessarily of the States List. All the same, I am glad to hear that the Central Government are going to appoint a Grants Committee, and I hope that a larger number of grants will be given to all these Universities.

On the same question of education, I should make a reference to the Osmania University. The Osmania University in Hyderabad was developed as an Urdu University. So far as the sixteen districts of Hyderabad State are concerned, half the area is Telugu speaking. Five districts are a Marathi speaking area, and Karnatak speaking area is three districts and odd. In spite of these three languages, Telugu, Marathi and Kannada being the regional languages, they were relegated to the cool shade of absolute neglect and Urdu was developed. We are now informed that this Osmania University is going to be turned into a Hindi University and is going to be taken over by the Central Government. So far as the taking over by the Centre is concerned, we have no objection to it. So far as the making it

into a Hindi University is concerned, there also, we may have no objection, provided proper facilities are given for the spread and development of Telugu, Marathi and Kannada, because they are the regional languages. During the last three or four hundred years, in the State of Hyderabad, all these languages and the nationals of these languages were absolutely neglected. My submission on this question is that even if it be turned into a Hindi University, the Hindi character of the University should be such that the interests of the regional languages are safeguarded. If the question were to be solved in any other way, then, we have no objection if the State of Hyderabad is completely disintegrated, and the three portions handed over to the three proposed States of Andhra, Karnatak and Maharashtra. This is a question which should be taken in hand. I am confident that all these problems will receive the careful and proper attention of the authorities concerned.

Dr. Ansari (Bidar): I shall try to be as brief and take as little time of the House as is possible for a novice in parliamentary debates to do so. I feel that any honest appraisal of the general Budget must be done from one and the only angle, and that is how best can it be used as an instrument of economic progress. The concept of economic progress is inextricably linked up with the problem of welfare of the people as a whole, more so in a country like India where poverty is the bane of our existence. It requires the maximum, but rational and deliberate, utilisation and exploitation of natural resources for increased production and better distribution and this is what is meant by planning.

I submit that the Central Budget, particularly the capital Budget is the direct instrument of planning. The capital expenditure of Rs. 121 crores for various projects and schemes for planned economic development is a commendable achievement in itself. It will bring about the implementation of such great schemes as Sindri, Damodar Valley, Chittaranjan and various other projects. Some of these projects are similar to and even greater than those which were undertaken in the Soviet Union in the late twenties and were called by Lenin as their "Socialist Islands heralding the dawn of a new era". But for these great projects and many more alike of national importance we shall have to pay a price. We have to make a

choice between paying the price now for future prosperity and progress of the country by taking up the projects and building them for the good of the people as a whole or abandoning them for small immediate gains and other palliative measures to relieve distress here and there but ruin all hope of recovery and be instrumental in creating a dismal and a very very unhappy future for the coming generations. It has often been the irony of history that the future is generally discounted for the present. Those who have done so have gone under. Let us not make that mistake.

After independence, the first task before our National Government was to achieve political consolidation and avoid economic disintegration. When the new Government took over, the forces of political disruption both within and without India were feverishly working to destroy the political unity of the country. Similarly, sectional economic interests were using methods of pressure tactics to achieve their selfish ends and thus hamper the economic unification of the country. The Leader of the House, winding up the debate on the President's Address, gave in his own inimitable way a very lucid survey of the happenings of the last four or five years, and the difficulties that our leaders had to face and the obstacles they had to surmount. I need not therefore go into them. But I wish to point out that the Government, constituted as it was, successfully surmounted those difficulties and solved the problem of political and economic unity of the country, which is the pre-requisite of all planning.

Here, may I be permitted to point out that in France after the great French Revolution it took them a decade and an era of Napoleon's dictatorship to achieve this end. In recent history, in the Soviet Union it took them eleven years to consolidate their political gains. We on the other hand have done this within five years. Is this not an achievement which we can be proud of?

A Planning Commission was constituted to draw up a Plan for the economic development of the country and in the framing of this Plan some of our topmost financial experts and economists were associated. Members of the Planning Commission were acutely aware of the limitations of planned economic development in an underdeveloped country. The Commission had to choose between realism and popularity and it is good that they chose realism rather than

popularity. Neither history nor the critics will accuse the members of the Planning Commission of dreaming rosy dreams. They have adopted a realistic approach and their feet are firmly planted on solid ground.

The Commission has produced a Five Year Plan—a very important document and at the same time a very important event. Maurice Dobb, one of the topmost leftist economists who is also an expert in Soviet planning makes the following comment on the Five Year Plan:

“One cannot but praise the lucidity and judgment with which the Plan is composed and the frankness and the ‘expertise’ with which it states before the reader a number of significant issues. That the issue of planning should be officially set before the people of India in this way is no doubt an important event.”

The authors of the Five Year Plan have been accused of having no philosophy, but anyone who has read the Plan will agree that through its pages runs a single theme and that is to raise the standard of living of the people through collective national effort. That is the main philosophy as well as the strategy of the Plan and there can be no better and no greater philosophy than this. It has to be worked out through the effort of the people and for the people.

May I here suggest to the Government that it should always keep in mind that the crux of any successful Plan is the intimate understanding and the closest co-operation between the Government and the people? In order to have the fullest co-operation of the people, the Government must show a natural regard for their aspirations, the first and foremost of which is the building up of a new social system, giving them new hopes and a new meaning to their lives.

The authors of the Plan have very rightly emphasized that we must peacefully evolve a new system, that is to say, the system of mixed economy where the best points of the two systems, that is, socialism and capitalism, are very judiciously combined. One of the assumptions of the Five Year Plan is the system of mixed economy. Mixed economy, may I submit for the benefit of my hon. friends on the extreme left, was accepted by the Soviet Union and Soviet leaders between the years 1921-28 and is the major plank in the policy of our great neighbour, China.

[Dr. Ansari]

Lenin described the period of 1921-28 in Russia as "the period of transitional mixed economy which was an advance on the present state of affairs and economically immeasurably superior". Lenin further named it as "State capitalism which was a gigantic step forward in which inevitably elements of both capitalism and socialism would be mixed—that is, by taking the co-operation of those cultured capitalists who agree with State capitalism". I am quoting from Lenin's *Collected Works*.

12 Noon

If you will permit me, Sir, I will now say a few words about foreign aid. The Plan envisages a public expenditure of Rs. 300 crores from foreign countries and invites foreign capital for investment in this country. My hon. friends on the Opposition Benches have repeatedly criticised the policy of inviting foreign capital to India and advocated the confiscation of the existing foreign investments. Nothing can be more ruinous than this, because the internal capital formation is so miserably low that the rate of economic progress without foreign finance will have to be considerably slowed down, which nobody wants. My hon. friends on the extreme left have laudably spoken about Soviet planning which many of us on this side of the House also admire. The Soviet Government also welcomed foreign finance for their planning, because they could not progress within the limit of their own resources. Here once again I quote Maurice Dobb on the Soviet attitude towards foreign aid in the early period:

"For certain enterprises, particularly where foreign capital was involved, proposals were canvassed for the creation of mixed companies in which the State and the private capitalists should participate jointly. For example, the Russo-Dutch Syndicate was created for the extension of railways in the Donetz region."

This is from *Soviet Economic Development* by Maurice Dobb.

May I suggest to the Government that whether foreign aid is coming forth or not, whether we have enough resources or not, a plan can only be implemented by the people themselves. Their needs must be communicated to the Government and the Government must communicate to them the decisions and actions through a reliable agency. The introduction of community projects is a step in the right

direction. Democracy must be taken to the people who are illiterate. They must be educated in democracy. That is the only way of successful democratic planning.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I must confess that I cannot congratulate our distinguished Finance Minister on the Budget that he has presented. It is a strange welfare State indeed in which in this, the first democratically elected Sovereign Parliament, the very first gift of the hon. the Finance Minister to the starving millions of India is the reduction of the food subsidies. I am really surprised and shocked to know that the ex-Minister of the Government Shri Gadgil—

ते तं भुक्त्वा स्वर्गं लोकं विशालम्
क्षीणे पुण्ये मर्त्यं लोकं विशन्ति

—who has become our equal after having enjoyed the heavens of office should preach a sermon to us that even though we may be starving today, we should not mind it because our sons and grandsons may enjoy out of our starvation today. My question is whether we are made to starve so that our sons and grandsons may enjoy happiness, or are we forced to starve so that one party may remain in power and so that its bosses, the capitalists and industrialists, may not be touched? It was contended here that the great lion or tiger of the Congress was just taking rest in order to pounce upon the capitalists, but my own feeling is that this tiger is in the cage of the capitalists. He has been financed in the last elections by the industrialists, the capitalists, the princes etc. They have financed the Congress. (*Some Hon. Members: Question.*) I know it for a certainty and I ask the Congress Government: why is it that in this the first Budget no fresh taxation has been proposed? I want to challenge the Congress Party if it is prepared to join hands with the Opposition Party in abolishing all privy purses.

An Hon. Member: Which Opposition party?

Shri V. G. Deshpande: The party to which I have the honour to belong. I challenge the Congress party which has given tickets to a large number of princes, black marketeers, mill owners and industrialists in the last general elections. On behalf of my party I challenge the Congress that it has not

the courage to economise the expenditure on administration. I have found that the only item on which they could economise was on the food subsidy that was being granted for the benefit of the lower middle classes and poorer classes living in the cities. I am not in a mood to congratulate the Finance Minister for having balanced the Budget. He may have balanced the Budget of the Government of India; but he has completely unbalanced and confused the budget of a large number of families living in the cities. My own test of a really good Budget is that it must look to the welfare, the economic well-being of the society as a whole and should not restrict itself to the revenue and expenditure of the Government. I find that this same approach, the perverse approach is reflected in all aspects of administration of this country.

Much was made by our Finance Minister about reduction in the prices—what is known as slump. I do not know whether the planned policy of our Government is responsible for the present slump, or whether its roots lie somewhere else. But even taking for granted for argument's sake that our Government is responsible for the present slump, it is very strange that the slump has not given any advantage to the lower middle classes and the poorer classes of people. While songs are being sung regarding reduction in prices, we find that the prices of our food-stuffs are increasing. So far as reduction in prices is concerned, I know how the agriculturists were hit the hardest in the districts of Berar, Madhya Pradesh. The cotton markets there were closed for weeks; but our Central Government did not go to their rescue. I can quote quite a large number of instances where our Government has not cared for the economic well-being of the country.

In Madhya Bharat, the province from which I have the honour to be elected, there was a controversy regarding the selection of a capital; the controversy was between Gwalior and Indore. People could not settle among themselves. They came to the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and he was appointed arbitrator. And what a strange award our Prime Minister has given! When I read that award I am reminded of a story of a girl. The girl was being wooed by two suitors. The poor girl could not decide as to whom she should marry and in exasperation and despair she referred the matter to her old uncle, thinking

that he would act in her best interest. And what did the uncle do? Instead of choosing one suitor from among the two, he gave a decree that the girl shall marry both. Similarly, our Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister, instead of choosing one city to be the capital of the province has given an award that both the cities will be the capital. And again he has divided the year into months—as was done in the case of Draupadi in *Maha Bharata*—and decided that for four and a half months one city will be the capital and the other city will be the capital for the remaining seven and a half months. But our Prime Minister has never cared to know what would be the strain on the poor tax-payer of Madhya Bharat. I have been told that it will be a strain to the tune of about Rs. seven lakhs. Then again this duality of capital will result in the poor clerks being forced to maintain two establishments, one at Indore and the other at Gwalior, their children suffering in their education, etc. All this is being done in order to please the cliques that are sitting at Gwalior and Indore. I want to bring to the notice of the House another fact regarding the selection of the capital. The representatives from Gwalior who were elected on the Hindu Mahasabha ticket—almost all the Congress candidates there were defeated—were not consulted before giving this award. What I want to bring to the notice of the House is that in our administrative policy never a moment's thought is being given to the economic well-being of the people.

The Finance Minister has said, and perhaps rightly said, that they cannot reduce the expenditure on defence. I am not one who wants to reduce the expenditure on defence. In fact, I want the expenditure on defence to be increased. My own feeling is that our Army, Navy, and Air Force should be developed in such a way as to be on a par with the fighting forces of first class powers in the world. But here the Army is maintained because they are afraid that there may be war in Kashmir. There may be trouble in Kashmir. For the last four years we have spent millions of rupees on Kashmir; we have spilt the valuable blood of our Army. With what result? We have been told at the end of four years by Shaikh Abdullah that this Parliament has no jurisdiction over Kashmir. Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee and my hon. friend Mr. N. C. Chatterjee have raised points here regarding the citizenship of residents of Kashmir and whether this Parliament has got jurisdiction

[Shri V. G. Deshpande]

over Kashmir. That question has still not been answered satisfactorily and we are going on spending money without any result.

I was unfortunately not present here during the debate on Kashmir—perhaps, I may have been in jail. A challenge it appears was thrown to us to show a single instance of persecution in Kashmir. I want to answer that question. Not one but there are several instances where there have been persecutions in Jammu and Kashmir—not on communal matters, mind you. There was an article in a newspaper written by Mr. Sant Ram, who is the Secretary of the Praja Parishad of Jammu and Kashmir. He had alleged that thirteen persons had died of starvation. He was arrested and prosecuted and here is the judgment of the magistrate where he has said that he was satisfied from the prosecution evidence itself that there were deaths due to starvation. These are the grounds on which Praja Parishad workers are arrested, detained and it is given out to the world that these are the people who foment communal trouble and that is why they are being suppressed and repressed. The real fact is that the party in power is not prepared to tolerate any opposition.

Here I have got another order against Pandit Makhanlal who is under detention for the last six months and the period of whose detention is again extended. It is to be noted that no grounds for his detention were supplied to him. The same charge can be levelled against our Home Department also. We are spending huge sums on police; but what is the use? There is not the same amount of safety and security of life as existed before. There cannot be any better illustration of my accusation than the assault that was made on one of the Ministers of the Government of India while he was travelling by train. Our police and our Home Department are mainly meant to suppress the political adversaries of the Congress.

Within the last four years, I know that more than one lakh men have been arrested and detained in prisons without trial and it is a disgrace and shame on any Government, particularly the free Government of India which arrested and detained a patriot of Veer Savarkar's order. After arresting such great leaders and patriots this Government wants to parade before the public as a democratic Government.

I was speaking of Kashmir. In Kashmir our Government is making so much publicity of the right given to the people for deciding their future. I want to ask our Government, if they are prepared to concede the right of self-determination to territories acquired after the signing of the Instrument of Accession for Part B States, why the same principle is not being applied to the Hyderabad State also. If it is the desire of the people of Kashmir that Maharaja Hari Singh should not remain there and it is the desire of the people there that Kashmir should be administered in a particular manner, the Government of India knows very well that it is the established and declared will of the people of Hyderabad that His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad should be deposed and the Hyderabad territory should be disintegrated into three linguistic areas. But our Government does not apply the same principle to Hyderabad because they know that it will displease certain sections and communities. Our strange and perverse secularism has one meaning in the case of one community and an altogether different meaning in the case of other communities. It is this reason, this inconvenience and embarrassment caused to the Government in the case of Hyderabad which is coming in the way of forming linguistic provinces all over India.

Then, my friends on the Congress Benches have at considerable pain and labour told this House why they have been chosen in these elections. An Election Commission has been formed in this New India for conducting all these elections. Their claim is—the accusation was made that they were elected on the names of certain leaders—their answer was that they have been elected on account of the services they have rendered to the country. My contention is they have neither been elected on account of the services rendered by them, nor have they been elected on account of the names of these leaders. They have been elected because there was power in their hands, and with the votes of certain minorities.....

An Hon. Member: What about you?

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I have also got that power: it is a power of morality, a power of patriotism and a power of service.

I was stating that in the last General Elections I know that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's name did not help them so much, but I know that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's position as Prime Minister did help the Congress in the last elections. Why was he elected President of the Indian National Congress just on the eve of the General Elections? Why was an aeroplane of the Government of India placed at his disposal, in which he travelled all over the country? And the illiterate masses, who had been granted adult franchise for the first time, confused his position as the President of the Indian National Congress with the Prime Ministership of India. I know how Ministers mis-used their power. At Gwalior there was a complaint against a Minister of Communications who was caught red-handed before the Returning Officer and before the D.S.P., using the vans and weapon-carriers of the Government. The Returning Officer when confronted said "I am helpless, it is not a cognizable offence". These Returning Officers who happen to be executive officers working under the Ministers could not go against them and prosecute these Ministers. In regard to the recent by-election in Gwalior I had written to the Election Commission saying, "There are complaints about tampering of ballot boxes from all parts of the country and my request is that all these ballot boxes should be wrapped up in a cloth and seals of the agents of the different candidates may be pressed on them". The answer to this was, "We cannot see our way to accede to your request". I know that in spite of this governmental pressure, in spite of the money of the capitalists, the Congress has failed to get more than 44 per cent. of the votes in the last General Elections. Even though we are in a minority I know that I am representing and speaking the voice of the majority in the country when I say that this Government has failed on every front and unless the Government makes a fundamental and radical change in its approach to all problems, the country's future is dark.

Shri Gopala Rao (Gudivada): I wish to present before this House the people's point of view. We are discussing the Budget here while millions and millions outside the House are anxiously and keenly observing the proceedings taking place in this House. For the first time after a Parliament elected by the people has come into being, our Budget session is going on. It is therefore natural for the millions of the people in the country to expect

with anxiety and hope a better future for them from our discussions.

We have to see whether this Budget can become the instrument for economic progress and prosperity in the country. What is the criterion or the measuring rod for characterizing a particular budget whether it is a People's Budget or a budget which is profitable to certain persons other than the people? I say that the criterion or the proper test is to see its effect on the life of the people. We have to see whether this Budget is going to solve the unemployment problem, whether it is going to solve the economic problem and lessen the burden on the people, whether it is going to tax the rich, whether it is going to raise the purchasing capacity of the millions. These are the criteria by which you can characterize the Budget.

Broadly speaking, this Budget is in no way different from the Budgets presented by the previous regime. What are the general features of the Budget? Strictly speaking, here is the basis for the catastrophic policies that are being pursued by the Government for the last five years. The people's food subsidy has been reduced, fifty per cent. of the Budget is allotted for military purposes, there is no taxation on the rich, there is no relief afforded to the people. These are the main features of the Budget. And there is no proper development of industries or improvement in production. As far as the Five Year Plan is concerned I have to say that it is not a plan for the development of the country or for improving the life of its people, but it is precisely a plan for the preservation of the existing pattern of agrarian economy in the country for a long period. The budget is based mainly on the help of foreign capital and those capitalists are successfully seeing to it that there may not be any possibility of a change in the agrarian economy so that a free market will be open to them for a long period for exploiting this country and for keeping this country in a condition of backward economy. That is why I say that unless there is a basic change of policy, basic change in the economic system, there is no hope of fulfilling successfully this Five Year Plan. For the success of the Plan, the pre-condition is radical reforms in the economic system. Whether in the rural sector or in the agrarian sector, or other sector, unless there is a radical and basic change in the fundamental economic system, the Plan intended for the people's welfare cannot be implemented. The Plan can be successful only when the

[Shri Gopala Rao]

people, whom it is intended to benefit, co-operate. If the Plan were for the people, it could be successfully implemented by the people and for the people. This Plan completely aligns itself with foreign capital and does not effect any basic changes in the economic system of the country. That is why the other day one of my friends correctly remarked that this Plan creates no enthusiasm in the country. This plan cannot mobilize millions of people to successfully implement it. On the other hand, there is disappointment in the country against this Plan and an air of relief abroad. This Plan is intended to help the imperialists. If this Plan is based on an agrarian basis it cannot help to build our economy. Therefore, I say that if the Plan is to be implemented properly and perfectly and in the interests of the people, it must have their co-operation. That is completely lacking. Will the Government make basic changes in their policies? No. It is determined to depend on the decadent forces. They are simply safeguarding the British interests. They are maintaining the feudal autocracy. There is almost the landlords' rule in the countryside. I ask, how in these circumstances this Five Year Plan which is to be based on people's co-operation, be successful?

I wish to bring to the notice of this House as I come from the Andhra Province and the issue of linguistic provinces has been there for a very long time. The people of my province—30 millions of them—have been and are fighting for the last 30 years for national independence as well as for a separate province. I can say that this is almost nearly a half century old problem. Millions of the people are trying to achieve a separate linguistic province for the last three decades. This Government have so many times accepted and advocated the separation. In 1913 a resolution was passed by the Andhra Committee that they must have a separate linguistic province. The All-India Congress Committee 30 years ago accepted this basic principle; they not only accepted it but they were actively advocating it. All the provincial Congress Committees were based on the simple principle of linguistic provinces. Otherwise, I ask, what was the necessity for organizing a separate Andhra Congress Committee? That is why the people were expecting from this Government that their long cherished goal of having a separate province would be fulfilled. Un-

fortunately after the advent of the Congress to political power, the people were thoroughly disappointed. Whenever there is an agitation by the people of the country for a separate province, committees are being appointed, promises are being given as if something is going to be done. If you review the Congress Administration during the past five years, as far as these things are concerned, we have to characterize it as a period of broken promises. Peculiar arguments are advanced by certain responsible leaders so far as the linguistic province is concerned. They say that the demand for a separate province is characterized by narrow provincialism, and anti-nationalism. It is an unfortunate affair. Can any person with a sense of responsibility say that our demand is based on narrow provincialism? For 40 years the people are demanding for a separate province. At the same time they were fighting as a vanguard of the national movement at all stages. You cannot characterize it as narrow provincialism. In 1920 the Telugu people were at the helm of affairs in the no-tax campaign. In 1930 thousands of peasants, workers etc. joined in the national struggle. At the same time, they were demanding a separate province. Nobody can characterize it as narrow provincialism. It is part of nationalism and if it is narrow provincialism, how can that nation stand at the head of every movement that was launched by the National Congress and other political parties which were fighting against Imperialism? It was fighting for every progressive step that was being taken in the country. I shall give one glaring example. In the last election Mr. Harindranath Chattopadhyaya who is a well known poet was elected from Vijayavada though he is a Bengalee. That shows that the people are above provincialism. That shows their national ideology; they are for peace and they are for a democratic India.

Therefore, I say you cannot refuse the demand of 30 million people for a separate province. The other day representatives of the United Karnatak party met the Prime Minister on this issue. There is the Maharashtra issue, Aikya Kerala issue, etc. There is the United Samyuktā Karnatic, Vishala Andhra and other issues. These are burning problems. Unless we solve the main problem, properly and peacefully, there is no scope for the existence of a powerful and democratic India. Many big arguments are being advanced against this. Some people say that as a principle, they accept

it but when the question of action comes, they refuse to act. I say a united India can be realized only with linguistic provinces. Some say that the demand of linguistic provinces is to disintegrate India. Certainly not. Now India is divided into 28 States. If a redistribution of States takes place on the linguistic provincial basis, there will be 15 or 16 provincial States having their nationalities separate with plenty of scope for development with their own culture, literature, traditions etc. That is why I request the House to take note of the gravity of the situation, rise to the occasion and fulfil the promises which were given for the last 30 years so that new nationalities, especially Vishala Andhra, United Maharashtra, Samyukta Karnataka, Aikya Kerala may play their proper part. The Budget completely ignores this reality. It is based on a different basis.

As far as the other aspects of the Budget are concerned.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may reserve them for another occasion.

Shri R. G. Dubey (Bijapur North): I rise to give my wholehearted support to the Budget proposals submitted by the hon. Finance Minister to this House.

Before I proceed to discuss the Budget proposals, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Members to certain remarks made by some Members on the Opposition Benches this morning. I listened to the speeches right from the Communists to the Communalists and Capitalists. This morning, before I made up my mind to support the Budget, I was musing as to what attitude I should take. But, when I saw the picture, the united front of the Capitalists, Communists, Communalists, (*An Hon. Member:* And the Hindu Maha Sabha) in their criticism of the Congress Government, I thought that the Congress Government is on the right track in so far as they have adopted the *via media*, the golden *media*, in presenting the proposals.

My hon. friend Mr. Chattopadhyaya made a very emotional and poetic speech and incidentally mentioned that there is no encouragement for art in this country. It is easy to make such emotional speeches and arrest the attention of the people. I personally think that the claims of the Members of the Opposition are based on emotions rather than on reason. Yesterday, my sister Annie Mascarene

said that the Opposition Members ought to be treated with respect and consideration as it is the case in England and America. May I ask in all humility the Members of the Opposition whether the Opposition in this Parliament is trying to observe the corresponding conventions established in England or America? Are they behaving in the same responsible way? Their whole aim seems to be.....

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: On a point of order, Sir. There is no representative of the Finance Ministry on the Treasury Benches.

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): I represent the Finance Ministry at the present moment, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are a number of hon. Ministers here.

Shri R. G. Dubey: I want to know from the Members of the Opposition whether they are really keen about the future welfare of mankind in this country. How are they going to do? Do they want to offer constructive suggestions? Mr. Chattopadhyaya mentioned that he is not a member of the Communist Party and that he is an independent thinker and that he wants to criticise the Budget in that perspective. We are used to the strategic-way of the Communist Party to divert the people. (*An Hon. Member:* They are fellow travellers) —they are fellow travellers as my hon. friend reminds me—to exploit public opinion. I do not mind if they have any public opinion behind them. I may put this question, what is the position of freedom and human liberty in Soviet Russia? There is no such Parliament there which discusses and debates and freely deliberates in Soviet Russia. If a man criticise Comrade Stalin, even if he were to say so to his wife and children, in his own house, the next day, you could find him behind the prison bars.

Then, these very friends talk of democracy in this country. I am surprised and I really feel that their whole motive is not to cherish democracy in this country, not to nurture democracy in this country, but to do away with democracy. In the course of thousands of years, this is the first time that we are having a Parliament based on adult franchise wherein millions of people have voted and have returned us to the Legislatures. This is the supreme body. It is known in every part of the world that we are having democracy. Let me tell the

[Shri R. G. Dubey]

Members of the Opposition that the freedom that we enjoy in this country, that the freedom that the Congress Members enjoy within the framework of the Congress Party is more than what they are enjoying in Soviet Russia.

Now, I turn to some of the criticisms made by the Opposition Members. Their criticism is that it is not a common man's Budget, that the Budget does not make provision for tax relief, that essentially the tax structure is the same, and that there is no radical change. I do agree with the criticism. But, I want to know whether the Congress Government, in the conditions as they are today, was expected to introduce any major changes in the taxation structure. I would like to quote a passage from Karl Marx on this occasion.

An Hon. Member: A devil quoting the Bible.

Shri R. G. Dubey: He says:

"Justice can never rise superior to the economic conditions of the time."

So, whatever high ideals or high thoughts we may place before the country, the question is, can we implement those ideas, can we implement those principles in action, when the social conditions and economic conditions of the time lag behind. India was liberated only four years ago. Then came the Partition and the movement of refugees; then the question of minorities and the transplantation of population. There was transfer of population in Turkey and the Balkan nations. But, the magnitude of the transfer of population that we witnessed in India is something unheard of in the history of mankind. Then, came the dislocation in the transport system.

I crave your indulgence and the indulgence of the House to quote another passage. (*An Hon. Member:* Quote 50 passages). Soviet Russia is held as an ideal country. No doubt, many Congressmen also considered Soviet Russia as one of the ideal nations. That does not mean that we respect the ideals of Soviet Russia in every respect. I may also tell the hon. Members that the moral prestige and authority that Soviet Russia held in pre-war days, before the Second World War is not there now. Soviet Russia was considered the liberator of mankind before the Second World War.

That is not the position today. Look at the attitude of Soviet Russia towards Yugoslavia, for instance. Obviously no one could say that Marshal Tito is a reactionary or a counter-revolutionary. Look at the attitude of Soviet Russia towards the smaller nations of Europe or the Middle East countries. The other day it was said that India need not be afraid of any country because you have as your neighbours ideal countries. No; we are afraid. Today, Soviet Russia also is considered to be having aims and policy which are open to suspicion.....

An Hon. Member: Are we discussing the Budget?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Anything can be discussed on the Budget; foreign policy, etc.

Shri R. G. Dubey: The question is this:

"Shortage of fuel, of materials and of food combined to bring about a disastrous fall in industrial productivity. The transport and industrial difficulties, which were enough to baffle the boldest and wisest efforts, caused congestion and dislocation in the administrative apparatus, which reacted upon and worsened the economic situation. Starvation or semi-starvation grievously lowered the intensity of work, the efficiency of the individual worker, swelled absenteeism and encouraged petty theft and speculation as means of supplementing starvation rations."

Regarding inflation, you see the figure that is given here.

"In October 1920, the purchasing power of the Rouble was no more than 1 per cent. of what it had been in October, 1917."

For the last four or five years, we were clamouring that we must have a fall in prices. Now, here is a Finance Minister who has brought it about. With due respect to his predecessors, I must say that Mr. Deshmukh is the first Indian Finance Minister who could assess the situation and strike a *via media*, and who has introduced a measure of stability in the financial situation of the country, and has succeeded in maintaining an equilibrium. Now you say, give us subsidy. You want subsidy for the cities. You cannot make a distinction here; you must also give subsidy to the rural areas which means an additional

sum of Rs. 90 crores. We are facing a deficit Budget. I want you to examine whether in the present economic conditions this is possible. If you want to grant subsidy to the extent of 90 crores, that would mean that you have again to print currency notes to that extent. That would raise the question of inflation, and the devil of inflation will raise its head. The first and most important thing for us is to check this currency inflation. I really thank the hon. Finance Minister—not because I am a Congressman but as a citizen of this country—I think he has gained control over the situation. Here is a man who has got courage. I know that it means hardships and suffering to the citizens in this country for some time to come. But you people in the year 1942, when it was a war, and while we were fighting for the liberation of our country, for the imaginary danger of Fascism, you asked us to work more to help the British war effort; now when this national Government is straining every nerve to bring increase in production, to bring more land under cultivation, you say you want subsidy. I must give a warning to those who believe in the radical method that if you want to bring down Pandit Nehru's leadership in the country, you are paving the way for Fascism, you are opening the doors to counter-revolution.

The other day one of our friends said this is a bureaucratic Government. Is there any sense in it? Can you tell this a bureaucratic Government. Is it not based on adult franchise? Is it not based on the popular verdict of the people. If you call this autocracy, you have committed a mistake. Today in India you cannot have a better leader than Pandit Nehru. But you are trying to bring down his Government. I very much doubt your talk about democracy. You do not want democracy in this country.

I agree with Shri Gadgil's view that the Planning Commission's report is a very modest document. We stand not for a free economy. We stand for a controlled economy which means a go-by to commodity or capitalist economy. We have made a beginning. That is a step in the right direction. You cannot produce history in a day.

Regarding land reforms, I am surprised at what some of the Socialist Members said with such great force regarding land reforms. When an amendment was made to amend the Constitution to pave the way for land reform, these very Members raised

objections against amending the Constitution, saying that we had no regard for constitutional propriety. And today those very Members are questioning about our *bona fides* to introduce land reforms. But we know our duty towards the masses of this country. I know what is being done is not enough. Redivision of the land on an equitable and rational basis is necessary. That will be done. From what I read in the papers the Working Committee of the Congress is considering seriously about the introduction of agricultural reform on co-operative basis.

You are talking about why India remains in the Commonwealth. Have we lost our integrity, have we lost our independence, have we lost our sovereignty? In what way? We are having an independent stand on all questions. Take the Tunisian question. Take the Chinese question. If Soviet Russia can remain in the U.N.O. even though it is dominated by imperialism, and still pursue policies in the best interests of its own country, I do not see any reason why India should not remain in the Commonwealth and take the advantage.

Lastly, I want to say a word or two about the province from which I come. I have the privilege to come from Bombay Karnatak. I endorse the statements and expressions made by Shri B. N. Datar in respect of Karnatak. Karnatak, the south end of Bombay State, has received a step-motherly treatment. It is backward in respect of transport, communication and in every other way. Karwar is very rich in forests. Nobody has cared to tap the resources. I come from Bijapur. I have the privilege of representing Bijapur. We are talking about Rayalaseema. I may say Bijapur is in the same category as Rayalaseema is. Rayalaseema, Raichur district, Bijapur, parts of Sholapur—the whole of this zone is in the famine area. I have some doubts about the methods the Planning Commission is adopting. The Planning Commission has left out this famine zone completely. Bijapur is rich in soil. It has five rivers. It alone can supply grain to the Bombay State to the extent of one-third of its needs. I do not see that Government is doing anything about it. During the last 67 years I find that there were 23 famines or situations of scarcity in Bijapur. In 1943 there was the greatest famine in Bijapur as the famine in Rayalaseema today. Even then, no permanent or long-range scheme has been introduced in Bijapur. I want to draw the attention of Government that they

[Sari R. G. Dubey]

should see that this money on planning is not wasted. Instead of wasting money here and there, they should have a scheme which would cover the whole famine zone, and see that they do something on a long-range basis.

श्री एम० पी० मिश्र : कई दिनों से इस सदन में गरम गरम भाषणों की अच्छी आतिशबाजी देखने को मिली है। मुझे तो सब से अच्छी तक्रारी अपने कवि मित्र श्री हरेन्द्रनाथ चट्टोपाध्याय की लगी। बड़े जोश के साथ उन्होंने भाषण किया और मैं सोचता रहा कि अगर किसी कवि के हाथ में किसी मुल्क की किस्मत बनाने को सौंप दी जाय तो उस देश का भविष्य कैसा होगा। मुझे एक क्रिस्ता याद आ गया। कवि की उपमाओं के सहारे किसी चित्रकार ने एक तस्वीर बनाई, एक रूपसी की, एक सुन्दरी की। तो उस ने उस में उस के बालों की जगह सांप लगा दिये, आंखों की जगह हिरन लगा दिया। तो मैं सोचता हूँ कि मेरे मित्र श्री हरेन्द्रनाथ चट्टोपाध्याय के अनुसार अगर देश का भविष्य बनाया जाय तो वह भविष्य भी वैसा ही बनेगा।

मेरे दोस्तों ने, जो खास कर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की तरफ से यहां आये हैं, सरकार पर बड़े बड़े आरोप लगाये हैं। श्री गोपालन ने कहा कि सरकार सब कुछ करना चाहती है, लेकिन लोगों को रोटी देना नहीं चाहती। भोजन उन का एक हथियार है जिस के सहारे वह हमारी सरकार पर हमला करना चाहते हैं। ठीक है, देश में भोजन की कमी है, ३६ करोड़ मुंह हैं और इतना अनाज नहीं है कि सब को खिलाया जा सके। लेकिन जब यह सवाल सामने आया और प्लानिंग कमीशन (Planning Commission) ने अपने खर्च का सब से अधिक हिस्सा खेती पर खर्च करने का फ़ैसला किया — और यह प्लानिंग कमीशन ने बिल्कुल ठीक

फ़ैसला किया है कि इस देश में सब से ज्यादा जरूरी चीज यह है कि देश की खेती को, देश की कृषि को आगे बढ़ाया जाय, और उसका विकास किया जाय—तो हमारे दोस्तों को इस बात की बड़ी शिकायत हुई कि जहां धन का सैकड़े पीछे ३० रुपया खती पर खर्च किया जा रहा है वहां १०० में से सिर्फ ६ रुपया उद्योगों के विकास पर खर्च किया जायेगा। लेकिन इस बात को भी सोचना है कि इस देश में उद्योगों के विकास से, औद्योगीकरण के जरिये से, देश की हालत कैसी होगी, जिस औद्योगीकरण के आधार पर संसार के और और मुल्कों का विकास और उद्धार हुआ है। देखने से तो ऐसा मालूम होता है कि औद्योगीकरण का ख्याल, औद्योगीकरण का प्रोग्राम, बड़ा आधुनिक है। लेकिन आज इस सन् १९५२ में तो यह ख्याल, यह विचार बहुत पुराना पड़ चुका है। और जहां तक हिन्दुस्तान का सवाल है, औद्योगीकरण से तो इस देश का सवाल हल ही नहीं हो सकता। औद्योगीकरण के रास्ते से इस देश को उस दशा पर पहुंचने में १०—१५ वर्ष लगेंगे जहां कि आज ब्रिटेन और अमेरिका हैं। और वह भी इस देश के रुपये से नहीं हो सकेगा। किसी विदेशी ताकत के, किसी विदेशी हुकूमत के पैसे की मदद से इस देश का औद्योगीकरण हो सकता है, चाहे वह अमेरिका का पैसा हो, या सोवियत रूस या चीन का हो। और इतने समय तक इस देश के लोगों को बड़ी मुसीबत झेलनी पड़ेगी और उस के बाद भी इंग्लैंड के पैमाने का इस देश में औद्योगीकरण हो गया तो क्या होगा? जहां तक हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों का सवाल है १०० में से १५ को शायद उस औद्योगीकरण से रोजगार मिल सकेगा। बाकी ८५ क्या करेंगे? यहां बड़ा मझाक उड़ाया जाता है पापुलेशन कंट्रोल (Population Control) का। लेकिन तब

तक तो इस देश में ६ करोड़ आदमी और बढ़ जायेंगे, एक पूरा जर्मनी आ जायगा। इसलिये औद्योगीकरण इस देश का कोई उद्धार नहीं कर सकता। यह ख्याल पुराना पड़ गया है। इसलिये हम प्लानिंग कमीशन को और किसी बात के लिये नहीं तो सिर्फ़ इसी बात के लिये बढ़ाई देते हैं कि उस ने सही जगह पर, देश की ठीक नब्ज़ पर अपना हाथ रखा है और कहा है कि देश में हम सब से ज्यादा धन कृषि के विकास पर खर्च करेंगे। मेरी राय में इस देश में एक ही उद्योग को आगे बढ़ाया जा सकता है, इस देश का एक ही औद्योगीकरण हो सकता है और वह यह है कि इस देश की खेती को आगे बढ़ाया जाय।

भारत के लोग अपनी जीविका, अपनी सभ्यता और अपनी संस्कृति खेती से ही पैदा कर सकते हैं। और खेती को आधुनिक ढंग से ही उन्नत किया जा सकता है। इसी नाते जो बजट हमारे वित्त मंत्री ने पेश किया है उस का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। वह बजट हमारे प्लानिंग कमीशन के आधार पर बनाया गया है। यह ठीक है कि हमारी सरकार अपना अधिकांश धन खेती के विकास, और उत्तरोत्तर विकास पर खर्च करने जा रही है लेकिन इस के साथ साथ हमारी सरकार और चीजों को भी करने में लगी हुई है। और कई तरह की स्कीमों चला रही है। लेकिन मैं एक निवेदन अपनी सरकार से करना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि इस देश का उद्धार खेती के विकास पर निर्भर है तो उस के लिये हमें गांवों की तरफ अपना ध्यान केन्द्रित करना होगा। गांवों का उद्धार करना होगा, क्योंकि यह खेतिहर देश है और यहाँ का मुख्य उद्यम खेती है। सिर्फ़ रुपये से ही खेती का उद्धार नहीं हो सकता है, और रुपये मात्र से ही खेती की उपज और पैदावार नहीं बढ़ायी जा सकती

है। और यह बनी बनाई योजनायें भी कुछ नहीं कर सकतीं। मेरी समझ में इस की उन्नति में जो सब से बड़ी बाधा है वह हमारी नौकरशाही है और आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हमारी सरकार के लोगों को और नौकरशाही के लोगों को शहरों की मनोवृत्ति को छोड़ कर गांवों की मनोवृत्ति पैदा करना होगी और यह जब तक नहीं होगा तब तक हमारी अवस्था नहीं सुधरेगी। हमारे सरकारी लोगों में गांवों की मनोवृत्ति पैदा होनी चाहिये। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जब तक हमारी सरकार के चलाने वाले, वह मिनिस्टर हों, या हमारे सरकारी अफसरान हों, गंवई नहीं बनते हैं, जब तक उन की मनोवृत्ति, रहन सहन, सब गांव वालों की तरह का नहीं हो जाता है तब तक कुछ नहीं हो सकता है और हमारी खेती की उन्नति नहीं हो सकती है। इस के लिये सब से बड़ी जरूरत यह है कि हम लोगों में, जनता में, उत्साह पैदा करें। खेती और गांवों की उन्नति सिर्फ़ सेक्रेटेरियट (Secretariat) के प्लानों (plans) से नहीं हो सकती है। पैदावार तब बढ़ेगी जब हम किसानों के मन में जी तोड़ कर काम करने का उत्साह पैदा करें। मेरे पहले कई दोस्तों ने जिक्र किया कि जमीनें किसानों में बांट दी जायें। वह तो ठीक है और अब तो जमींदारी प्रथा उठ रही है। लेकिन इतना ही काफी नहीं होगा। प्लानिंग कमीशन को जल्द फ़ैसला करना होगा, सरकार को जल्द फ़ैसला करना होगा कि हर बड़े किसान के पास ज्यादा से ज्यादा कितनी जमीन रह सकती है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ३० बीघे से ज्यादा किसी के पास जमीन न रहे। बाकी जमीन को गरीब लोगों में, बेजमीन लोगों में बांट देना चाहिये। लेकिन यह भी याद

[श्री एम० पी० मिश्र]

रखना है कि मिर्क जमीन बांट देने में ही काम नहीं चलेगा। इस देश में जहाँ बीस करोड़ एकड़ जमीन है वहाँ छत्तीस करोड़ आदमी बसते हैं। और इस तरह एक आदमी पर एक एकड़ जमीन भी नहीं पड़ती है। हमें गांवों के भिन्न भिन्न उद्योगों को बढ़ाना होगा और खेती को सहयोग के आधार पर संगठित करना और आगे बढ़ाना होगा। यह नहीं कि हमारे अफसर दिन भर मोटर में सफ़र करें, बड़े बड़े महलों में रहें और सारी रात रोशनआरा क्लब में काट दें। जरूरत यह है कि हमारे मिनिस्टर और सरकारी अफ़सर गांवों में जायें और वहाँ पर कुछ काम करें जिस से किसानों में काम करने के लिये उत्साह पैदा हो। मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री से भी बहुत अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह उम महल में जिस में पहले अंगरेज कमान्डर इन चीफ़ रहता था, रहना छोड़ कर एक ऐसे छोटे से घर में रहें जहाँ एक खेत का टुकड़ा हो और जिस जमीन पर वह स्वयं कम से कम दो घंटा काम करें ताकि सारा देश उन के इस कार्य का अनुसरण कर सके और काम करने लग जाये।

I P. M.

हमारे कई दोस्तों ने विचारों की स्वाधीनता और नागरिक स्वतंत्रता पर बड़ा जोर दिया है। और हमारे भाई श्री हरेन्द्र नाथ चट्टोपाध्याय ने बड़े जोर से कहा कि इस देश में लोगों के स्वतंत्र विचारों पर नियंत्रण लगाये जा रहे हैं। यह ठीक है कि वह विदेशों में घूमे हैं और पन्द्रह हजार मील की यात्रा कर के लौटे हैं। लेकिन जहाँ तक स्वतन्त्र विचारों का, नागरिक स्वाधीनता का, प्रश्न है मैं यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि सन् १९४७ से आज तक हमारे देश में जितनी नागरिक स्वतंत्रता रही है उतनी निया के किसी भी देश में नहीं रही है।

मुझ को इस बात की बड़ी खुशी है कि इस चुनाव के पहले और इस के बाद भी नज़रबन्दों को छोड़ने की नीति सरकार ने अपनाई है। उस का हम स्वागत करते हैं और वह सही नीति है। हम जनतंत्रात्मक प्रणाली को मानने वाले हैं। लोकताज में प्रिवेन्टिव डिटेन्शन ऐक्ट (Preventive Detention Act) कोई स्वागत योग्य चीज़ नहीं हो सकती। वह तो शर्म की चीज़ है। मुझे खुशी हुई यह जान कर कि नज़रबन्द छोड़े जा रहे हैं और मैं तो चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में एक भी नज़रबन्द न रहे। लेकिन लोग कहेंगे कि क्या किया जाय, स्थिति ऐसी है कि उसका प्रयोग सरकार को करना पड़ता है। हमारे अपने देश में एक ऐसा वर्ग है जिस का जनतंत्र में विश्वास नहीं है और जो उसे मिटाने और खत्म करने के लिये दूसरे मुल्कों से मदद तक ले रहा है। लेकिन इस के बाद भी मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमें ऐसी फ़ासिस्ट (Fascist) ताकतों से जो दुनिया में तानाशाही कायम करना चाहती हैं, लड़ने के लिये इस हथियार का प्रयोग नहीं करना चाहिये। और यह तरीका नहीं है तानाशाही ताकतों से लड़ने के लिये और उन को जवाब देने के लिये तानाशाही तरीकों, कानूनों और हथियारों को अपनायें। तानाशाही का जवाब हमें जनतंत्रात्मक तरीकों और जनतंत्र से देना चाहिये। और इंग्लैंड इसका बहुत बड़ा उदाहरण है। उस ने डेमोक्रेसी से इस का जवाब दिया। वहाँ के लोग पढ़े लिखे और शिक्षित हैं और समझदार हैं। उन्होंने डेमोक्रेसी के पक्ष का साथ दिया और सन् १९५० और १९५२ के चुनावों में पार्लियामेंट में एक भी कम्युनिस्ट नहीं पहुँचा। यह तानाशाही को डेमोक्रेसी का जवाब है। सोवियट रूस में—जिस के चारण बन कर यह हमारे कम्युनिस्ट मित्र आये हैं और बड़े फ़ूज़

के साथ सोवियट रूस का जिक्र करते हैं— कितनी स्वाधीनता है, यह हम खूब जानते हैं। वास्तव में वहाँ कितनी स्वतंत्रता है और किस तरह वहाँ सरकार विरोधी तत्वों को दबाया करती है और उन का दमन किया जाता है यह भी हम जानते हैं। हम भी वैसे तरीका और रास्ता अख्तियार कर सकते हैं लेकिन मैं तो अपनी सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन तानाशाही ताकतों को रोकने का हथियार जनतंत्र ही हो सकता है और मेरी तो यह मांग है कि एक भी नज़रबन्द जेल में न रखा जाय, इस प्रीवेंटिव डिटेन्शन ऐक्ट को वापिस ले लेना चाहिये। और हमें इन तत्वों का जनता के मोर्चे पर, राष्ट्रीय मोर्चे पर, और राजनीतिक मोर्चे पर मुकाबला करना चाहिये, जिस तरह से हम ने इन का मुकाबला पिछले आम चुनाव में किया और उन की हम ने शिकस्त दी। अंग्रेज़ी सरकार से लड़ने में और आजादी प्राप्त करने में हमारा विश्वास जनता की ताकत पर रहा है और आज भी जरूरत इस बात की है कि ऐसी प्रतिक्रियावादी ताकतों से, जो समाज को बर्बाद करना चाहती हैं, लड़ने के लिये हम को जनता की शक्ति में भरोसा रखना होगा। इसलिये हम चाहते हैं कि यह प्रीवेंटिव डिटेन्शन ऐक्ट वापिस लिया जाय और सारे नज़रबंद छोड़े जायें और हम अपने विरोधियों को वाल्टेयर की आवाज़ में अपनी आवाज़ मिला कर कह सकें :

“I disagree with every word that you say, but I shall defend with my life your right to say it.”

इसलिये हम अपनी सरकार से कहना चाहते हैं कि यह दमन की नीति प्रीवेंटिव डिटेन्शन की नीति हमारे पक्ष को कमजोर करने वाली है और उस का जल्द अन्त होना चाहिये।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि यह जो प्रेस ऐक्ट बना है वह भी वापस ले लिया जाय। हमारी सरकार को जनता में पूरा विश्वास होना चाहिये और प्रजा की ताकत, डेमोक्रेसी में उस को विश्वास होना चाहिये। इस मौके से फायदा उठाते हुए, सरकार ने जो प्रेस कमीशन बिठाने का निश्चय किया है, उस का स्वागत करता हूँ। आज लोग नागरिक स्वाधीनता और पत्रों की स्वाधीनता के बारे में खूब चिल्लाते और शोर मचाते हैं। लेकिन विचारों की स्वतंत्रता और नागरिक स्वाधीनता तो उसी दिन खत्म हो गई जिस दिन कि देश के तमाम अखबार पूंजीपतियों के हाथ में पहुँचे। बहुत थोड़े अखबार दूसरे लोगों के हाथ में हैं और पत्रकारों की क्या हालत है? पत्रकार कहते हैं कि सरकार हमारी स्वाधीनता छीन रही है, लेकिन पूंजीपतियों ने उन की स्वाधीनता पहले ही छीन ली है। वह स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक लिख नहीं सकते और अपने दिल की बात चाहने पर भी नहीं कह सकते। चाहे कम्युनिस्ट अखबारों के मालिक हों या किसी और के, सब की हालत एक सी है और उन को मालिकों की मर्जी के मुताबिक लिखना पड़ता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार पत्रों में काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों की हालत सुधारे ताकि गरीब पत्रकारों की हालत अच्छी हो और उन की स्वाधीनता उन को वापिस मिल जाय। और हमारे पत्र पूंजीपतियों के हाथ से निकल कर फिर स्वतंत्रतापूर्वक देश तथा समाज की सेवा कर सकें और जनता के हित की चीज बन जायें। और हमारे देश में सच्ची स्वाधीनता और विचारों की स्वतंत्रता तभी स्थापित होगी।

इस के साथ साथ मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ और वह है कि इस बजट

[श्री एम० पी० मिश्र]

के सम्बन्ध में हमारे भूतपूर्व मंत्री श्री गाडगिल ने कहा कि यहां अभी भी अमीरों पर और टैक्स लगाया जा सकता है। मैं गाडगिल साहब से सहमत हूँ। जो टैक्स लगाये गये हैं उन में सँकड़े पीछे पच्चीस ही ऐसे हैं जो साफ़ साफ़ डाइरेक्ट टैक्स (Direct Tax) कहे जा सकते हैं, बाकी सँकड़े पीछे पछत्तर टैक्स इन्डाइरेक्ट हैं और जिस का सारा भार गरीब जनता पर पड़ता है। यह मानना होगा कि इस टैक्स का वितरण इस देश के लोगों पर बहुत गलत ढंग से जारी है। थोड़े दिनों से सरकार से यह मांग की जा रही है कि इस टैक्स की प्रणाली को बदला जाय और उस की जांच के लिये एक टैक्स एन्क्वायरी कमेटी (Tax Enquiry Committee) बैठाई जाय। अभी तक इस के सम्बन्ध में यद्यपि सरकार ने कई दफ़ा आश्वासन दिया लेकिन इस कमेटी के बैठाने की दिशा में कोई कदम उस ने नहीं उठाया। यह टैक्स लगाने की प्रणाली बिल्कुल पुरानी और रद्दी हो गई है। वह प्रणाली हम ने अंग्रेजी राज्य से ली है। इस को बदलने के लिये टैक्स एन्क्वायरी कमेटी की बहुत ज़रूरत है जो वैज्ञानिक आधार पर टैक्स की पद्धति को लाये। हम मानते हैं कि इस देश में अमीरों पर और भी टैक्स लगाये जा सकते हैं। यह ज़रूरी है कि डेथ ड्यूटी (Death Duty) जितनी जल्दी हो सके लगाया जाय। उस के न लगाये जाने से हमारे देश में राम पैदा हो रहा है कि हमारी सरकार हमेशा अमीरों का फ़ायदा ही सोचा करती है और गरीबी का कुछ खयाल नहीं करती।

हमारे फ़ाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर ने अपील की है कि आने वाली पीढ़ियों के सुख के लिये हमारे गरीब लोग कुछ परेशानियाँ झेकें। हमारे देश के लोगों से यह कहना

कि आप और भी त्याग कीजिये, बलिदान कीजिये, खास कर सँकड़े पीछे ८० आदमियों से जो ज़मीन से चिपके हैं, जो भूखे हैं, नंगे हैं, आठ दस आउंस हम जिनका राशन देते हैं। यह चीज़ हमें बड़े मज़ाक़ जैसी मालूम होती है तो अपने अन्दर यह क्षमता लायें कि और त्याग कर सकें, इस के तो यही माने हैं कि वे भूखों मरें, वे बरबाद हो जायें। नये देश के बनाने के लिये मेहनत करना हमारे लिये ज़रूरी है। लेकिन जो मेहनत करेंगे उन को खाना नहीं मिलेगा तो वह कल क्या करेंगे। उन्हें भोजन चाहिये जिस में वह भरपूर मेहनत कर सकें। इस लिये गरीब जनता से मंत्री महोदय की अपील एक मज़ाक़ सी लगती है। मैं तो कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह अपील तभी शोभा देती है जब यह त्याग करने के लिये उन से कहा जाय जो लोग सुखी हैं, जो टैक्स के सँकड़े पीछे पच्चीस रूपय भी देने को तैयार नहीं हैं। मैं पूछता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार के हृदय में उन ऊंचे स्तर के लोगों के लिये दया क्यों है। वे थोड़े से लोग हैं जिन को सुख के सभी साधन उपलब्ध हैं। वे त्याग करें जिस में देश के करोड़ों लोग जी सकें। उन्हें यदि थोड़ी तंगी भी होती है तो उन की कोई विशेष हानि नहीं होगी। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश की अच्छा बनाने के लिये ज़रूरी है कि वह जोश पैदा किया जाय, उस जोश को वापस लाया जाय, जिस उत्साह और जोश के साथ हम ने अंग्रेज़ों को भारत से हटाया, जिस उत्साह और जोश के साथ हमने कंधे से कंधा मिला कर देश को आगे बढ़ाया। आज उसी उत्साह और जोश की ज़रूरत है। आज इस की ज़रूरत है कि सरकार की मनोवृत्ति में, सरकारी लोगों की मनोवृत्ति में, मंत्रियों की मनोवृत्ति में, और सरकारी अफ़सरों

की मनोवृत्ति में आमूल परिवर्तन हों ताकि हम गांवों में जा सकें, हम गांवों में बैठ सकें में तो चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मिनिस्ट्रों के पास दो घर हों, साल में छः महीने दिल्ली में रहें और छः महीने गांवों में, एक महीना दिल्ली में और एक महीना गांवों में या एक हफ्ता दिल्ली में तो एक हफ्ता गांवों में जा कर काम करें। वह इस लिये काम करें कि सारा देश काम करे। वह इस लिये काम गांवों में करें कि सारे देश में उत्साह बढ़े।

में मनोवृत्ति बदलने के सम्बन्ध में एक और बात कहना चाहता हूँ और वह है बड़ी बड़ी तनख्वाहों के सम्बन्ध में। जिस देश में आदमियों को पूरा भोजन नहीं मिलता वहाँ के राष्ट्रपति की तनख्वाह दस हजार हो, या जिस देश के लोगों को पूरा कपड़ा नहीं मिलता वहाँ के मंत्रियों की तनख्वाह ३५०० और ४००० रुपया हो यह कहाँ का न्याय है। मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने न्यूक गाड़ी की हटाकर अब हिन्दुस्तान टैन ले ली है। ज़रूरत है कि यही प्रवृत्ति वह हर जगह लाये हर पुरुष उस भावना से काम करे जिस भावना से कभी महात्मा गांधी अपने आश्रमों को चलाते थे।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri M. P. Mishra (Monghyr North-West): Sir, for the last few days we have had occasion to listen to some very fiery speeches. The speech of my poet friend Shri Harindranath Chattopadhyaya I liked best of all. He delivered his speech very vigorously and I wondered what the future of a country would be if its destinies were entrusted to a poet. I am reminded of a story. On the basis of similes used by poets an artist painted a picture of a beautiful young woman. He painted snakes where her hair was and painted deer where her eyes were. Similarly if we proceed to shape

the future of the country in the manner suggested by my friend Shri Harindranath Chattopadhyaya this future would also be like that picture.

My friends of the Communist Party have levelled serious allegations against the Government. Shri Gopalan said that Government wanted to do everything except giving bread to the people. The food issue is the only weapon with which they want to attack the Government. I agree that there is food scarcity in the country and that the foodgrains available are not sufficient to feed 36 crore mouths. But when this question came up for consideration and the Planning Commission decided to spend the major portion of the income on agriculture—and the Planning Commission has rightly decided that the foremost necessity of the country today is to improve and develop its agriculture—many friends complained that while 30 per cent. had been earmarked for agriculture, only 6 per cent. were to be spent on the development of industries. But it is also to be considered in what manner would the development of industries and industrialization, on the basis of which other countries of the world have advanced, benefit this country? Outwardly the idea and the programme of industrialisation appear to be very modern. But today in 1952, this idea, this concept, has been outmoded and so far as India is concerned, industrialisation cannot solve her problems. It would take India 10 to 15 years to reach the stage Britain and America occupy today in the field of industrialisation. And this industrialisation also can be achieved not with the help of money obtained in this country, but with the aid of some foreign power and with the monetary aid of some foreign power, whether that foreign power be America or Soviet Russia or China. During the intervening period, the people of this country would have to bear many hardships, and supposing industrialisation on the scale obtaining in England is achieved here, what would be the position then? Fifteen per cent. of the people might succeed in obtaining employment, but what about the remaining 85 per cent? Here population control is scoffed at. But by that time there would be an increase of 6 crores in the population, an increase totalling the entire population of Germany. Therefore, industrialization cannot benefit this country. This idea has been outmoded. We congratulate the Planning Commission, if not for anything else, then on this fact that it has put its finger on the right spot and has

[Shri M. P. Mishra]

said that the greatest amount would be spent on the development of agriculture. In my opinion the only industry which is to be developed is agriculture and the only industrialisation which can be carried out in this country is that of agriculture.

The civilisation, culture and the livelihood of the people of India are rooted in agriculture, and agriculture can only be developed by modern methods. Therefore I welcome the Budget presented by our Minister of Finance. This Budget has been drawn up on the basis of the Planning Commission's Report. It is true that Government proposes to spend the major portion of its income on the development and improvement of agriculture, but, at the same time, it is engaged in other activities and is implementing many other schemes. I would like to point out to the Government that the welfare of the country depends on the development of agriculture. For this purpose, we shall have to devote our attention to the villages and improve the conditions prevailing there, because the agriculturists live in the villages, and the major industry of the country is agriculture. With money alone, agriculture cannot be developed and the produce increased. And these ready-made schemes also cannot be of much use. In my opinion, the greatest obstacle in the way of the development of agriculture is our bureaucracy and what is needed is that the members of the Government and the members of the bureaucracy should shed their urban mentality and adopt the mentality of the villages. Until this takes place, our condition would not improve. Our officials should inculcate the rural mentality and the rural way of thinking. My point is that until the leaders of our Government, whether Ministers or Government officers, become rural-minded, until they adopt the rural way of life, nothing can be achieved and our agriculture cannot be improved. The greatest need in this connection is that a new enthusiasm should be created in the minds of the people. Improvement in the conditions of agriculture and of the villages cannot be made merely through the plans of the Secretariat. Production would increase only if enthusiasm to work hard is created in the minds of the *kisans*. Certain previous speakers have suggested that land should be distributed among the *kisans*. That is a good suggestion, but the Zamindari system is being abolished now. But this alone won't do. The Planning Commission

and the Government will have to lay down the maximum acreage of land a particular *kisan* can possess. I am of the opinion that this land should not exceed 30 *bighas*. The rest of the land should be distributed among the poor people, the landless people. But it should be borne in mind that mere distribution of land won't do. While the extent of land in this country is 20 crore acres, the population is 36 crores. It amounts to less than one acre per head. We have to encourage the different cottage industries and re-organize and develop agriculture on co-operative lines. Our officers should give up the habit of riding in motor cars all day, living in palaces and spending the night in the Roshanara Club. They should go to the villages and with their work set an example there which should infuse a new spirit in the *kisans*. I would also suggest to our Prime Minister that he should leave the palace formerly occupied by the English Commander-in-Chief, and take up residence in a small house, which should have a small piece of land adjoining it and on which he should work for at least two hours every day, so that the whole country may follow the example set by him.

Many hon. friends have greatly stressed the need for freedom of expression and civil liberties and my friend Shri Harindranath Chattopadhyaya has stated that freedom of expression is being curbed. He has travelled abroad extensively and has just returned from a 15,000 mile tour. But so far as the question of freedom of expression and civil liberties is concerned, I cannot help saying that the civil liberties which have been enjoyed by the people in this country since 1947 have been unprecedented in the world and have not been enjoyed by the people of any other country. I am glad that Government has adopted the policy of releasing detenus, before and after the elections. This is a sound policy and we welcome it. We believe in democracy. The Preventive Detention Act is not a thing which can be welcomed in a democracy. It is a shameful thing. I am glad at the release of detenus and I want that there should not be a single detenu in the country. But it will be remarked that Government is helpless, because circumstances demand the use of the Act. In our own country, there is a section of the population which has no faith in democracy and which even goes to the length of seek-

ing aid from foreign countries in order to destroy it. In spite of that I would say that we should not use this weapon to oppose even these fascist forces which are out to establish totalitarianism in the world. It would not beneve us to employ totalitarian methods, laws and weapons to counteract and fight the totalitarian forces. We should reply to these forces by democratic means and by democracy. England is a very fine example of this. They counteracted these forces with democracy. The English people are educated and intelligent. They sided with the forces of democracy and in the elections of 1950 and 1952 not a single Communist was returned to Parliament. This is the answer of democracy to totalitarianism. We know well the extent of liberty in Soviet Russia, whose praises our Communist friends always sing and as the agents of which they have come here. We also know now much freedom is really allowed there and how the Government suppresses and crushes the opposing elements. We can also adopt the same methods and the same tactics. But I would suggest to the Government that democracy is the only weapon to defeat these forces of totalitarianism and I demand that nobody should be detained and the Preventive Detention Act should be withdrawn. We should face these elements on the peoples' front, on the national front, and on the political front, just as we opposed them in the last general elections and inflicted a defeat on them. While fighting against the British Government and struggling for freedom we relied on the people's strength, today also we should rely on the people's strength in order to fight the reactionary and anti-social forces at work. Therefore, we want that the Preventive Detention Act should be scrapped and all the detenus released so that we might be able to say to our opponents in the words of Voltaire, "I disagree with every word that you say, but I shall defend with my life your right to say it." This policy of repression and of preventive detention weakens our case and it should be done away with soon. In this connection, I would also press for the repeal of the Press Act. Our Government should have full faith in the people and in democracy. I also take this opportunity for congratulating the Government on its decision to set up a Press Commission. There is a great deal of talk these days about civil liberties and the freedom of the Press. But the freedom of expression and civil liberties ended on the day when all the newspapers of the country passed into

the hands of capitalists. There are very few newspapers under the control of other people. And what is the condition of journalists? They say that Government is snatching their liberty, but it has already been snatched away by capitalists. They cannot write freely and cannot reveal what is in their minds even if they want to do so. All the newspapers, whether owned by Communists or others, are sailing in the same boat and they have to write according to the dictates of their proprietors. I would like the Government to improve the condition of working journalists and restore their liberty, so that our newspapers should be freed from the control of the capitalists and should again become an instrument of service to the society and the people. Only then will true liberty and freedom of expression be established in the country.

I would also like to say one thing more in connection with the Budget. Shri Gaugu has said that still more taxes can be levied on the rich. I entirely agree with him. Only 25 per cent. of the taxes levied can be called direct taxes. The remaining 75 per cent. are indirect taxes, the burden of which has to be borne by the poor masses. It will be admitted that the incidence of tax in this country affects the people unequally. Of late a demand is being put forth that the taxation structure should be modified and a Tax Enquiry Committee should be set up to inquire into it. Although the Government has many times given assurances in this connection, yet no step has been taken for the formation of this Committee. This system of taxation has become entirely out of date and useless. It was inherited by us from the British. A Tax Enquiry Committee, which should introduce a system of taxation based on scientific principles, is extremely necessary to replace the old system. We agree that more taxes can be levied on the rich in this country and that death duties should be imposed as soon as possible. Their non-imposition leads the people to believe that our Government thinks only of the benefit of the rich and does not care for the poor.

Our Hon. Minister of Finance has appealed to the poor people to bear some hardships for the sake of the welfare of the coming generations. Is it not a joke to ask our people, especially those eighty per cent. among them, who are entirely dependent on land, who are hungry, who are naked and whom we give only eight or ten ounces of rations, to make most sacrifices? To ask them to make more

[Shri M. P. Mishra]

sacrifices means that they should starve and perish. Hard work is necessary for rebuilding the country, but now will the people be able to work hard if they do not get two square meals a day? Adequate food is necessary for hard work. Therefore the hon. Ministers' appeal looks like a big joke. This appeal should be addressed to those who are well-to-do and who can afford to pay taxes amounting to 25 per cent. I ask the Government why it has a soft corner in its heart for the people of the upper classes. The number of those people who have every comfort at their disposal is very small. Sacrifices on their part would enable crores of people to live. If they stint themselves a little, it would do them no harm. Therefore, that courage, and that enthusiasm with which we drove the British out of India and led the country forward, shall have to be shown again for rebuilding the country. The mentality of the Government, the Ministers and the Officers needs to be transformed. They should devote all their energies towards the betterment of villages. I would even suggest that our Ministers should have two houses, one in Delhi and the other in the villages. They should stay in these houses alternately for a period of say six months, one month or one week. The example set by them of the work done there would be followed by the whole of the country and it would create a new enthusiasm among the people.

Speaking about the change in mentality there is another thing to which I would like to draw attention, and that is the high salaries drawn these days. Is it not highly unjust that while the majority of the people in the country cannot afford two square meals a day and cannot afford to clothe their bodies adequately, the President should draw a salary of Rs. 10,000 per month and the ministers should draw a salary of Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 4,000 per month. I am very glad to see that our Prime Minister has given up his Buick and taken to Hindustan Ten. This mentality needs to be fostered everywhere. Every person in the country should work in the same spirit in which Mahatma

Gandhi at one time used to run his Ashrams.

MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATES

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following two messages received from the Secretary of the Council of States:

- (1) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (5) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to return herewith the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, which was passed by the House of the People at its sitting held on the 28th May 1952, and transmitted to the Council of States for its recommendations, and to state that the Council has no recommendations to make to the House of the People in regard to the said Bill"; and
- (2) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to inform you that the Council of States, at its sitting held on the 31st May 1952, agreed without any amendment to the following Bills which were passed by the House of the People at its sittings held on the 23rd and the 28th May 1952, namely:
 - (i) A Bill to repeal the Saurashtra (Abolition of Local Sea Customs Duties and Imposition of) Port Development Levy Ordinance, 1949;
 - (ii) A Bill to amend the Displaced Persons (Claims) Act, 1950;
 - (iii) A Bill further to amend the Calcutta Port Act, 1890".

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Tuesday, the 3rd June 1952.