

interests of small and medium-sized units, in this particular field. May be that the National Carbons are not faced with any competition worth the name.

The Taxation Enquiry Commission has also approved of the present scheme of differentiation in favour of small industries and has suggested a periodic review of the concession so that the policy in this respect may keep in step with the changing needs of economy. In the course of such reviews, it will be examined whether the differential tariff system can be extended to any other industries.

I shall close now by repeating that the budget tries to implement the first phase of the next Five Year Plan and I am assuming that by and large the House will approve of the Plan which they now see in draft outline, and we are raising revenue only to cover the development side of the Plan and are relying in a tentative measure, shall we say, on deficit financing to a certain extent, in regard to financing the investment portion. I have allowed about one-third of the expenditure as not possibly or likely to be incurred and that we have to rely both on direct and indirect taxation for the purpose of financing that part of the Plan which is contained as expenditure in this budget. I hope, therefore, that the budget will, in due course, be approved without any material changes by the House.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### DRAFT BILL ON REORGANISATION OF STATES

3 P.M.

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant)** : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the draft Bill on the Reorganisation of States in the form in which it is being referred to the States under article 3 of the Constitution. A copy of the draft Bill will be supplied to the Members also either today or tomorrow. [Placed in Library. See No. S—105/56]

##### APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS (CIVIL) 1952-53 AND AUDIT REPORT, 1954 (PART II)

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat)** : I beg to lay on the COMMERCIAL APPENDIX TO APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS (CIVIL) 1952-53 AND AUDIT REPORT, 1954

Table a copy of each of the following papers under article 151(1) of the Constitution :

(1) Appropriation Accounts (Civil) 1952-53 and Audit Report, 1954 (Part II) ; [Placed in Library. See No. S—94/56]

(2) Commercial Appendix to the Appropriation Accounts (Civil) 1952-53 and the Audit Report, 1954 [Placed in Library. See No.S—95/56]

**Mr. Speaker** : The House will now take up the Private Members' business.

#### COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

##### FORTY-SIXTH REPORT

**Shri Altekar (North Satara)** : I beg to move :

"That this House agrees with the Forty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th March, 1956."

Shri Narasimhan is on his legs to speak on the Resolution on Prohibition for which there are 3 hours and 29 minutes. All the time that is available today, of course, will be taken by this Resolution, but should this Resolution come to a premature end, then there are Resolutions in the Report for which time allotted is stated therein. I commend this Report for this acceptance of the House.

**Mr. Speaker** : The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Forty-sixth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th March, 1956."

*The motion was adopted*

#### RESOLUTION RE. FIXING A TARGET DATE FOR PROHIBITION

**Mr. Speaker** : The House will now proceed with the Resolution re. Fixing a target date for Prohibition, moved by Chri C. R. Narasimhan on the 2nd March, 1956. The time allotted for the Resolution is 3½ hours. The time so far taken is only one minute. So the balance is 3 hours and 29 minutes.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri) :** Total prohibition is a subject which is very well known to the hon. Members of this House. It is not my intention, while moving this Resolution, to weary the Members by talking on the virtues of prohibition or other aspects of prohibition which are not quite germane under the present circumstances. Apart from it, prohibition itself is a great cause to most of us; I may even say, a sacred cause and no championing of it is necessary at this stage. The greatest of our men, Mahatma Gandhi, whom we proudly call the father of the nation, has himself championed it and there is no need again to expatiate on the virtues of prohibition at this late stage. No doubt, here and there some interests may, through the press and other propaganda, attack prohibition and the functioning of prohibition. But I do not think it will in any way affect the cause which has become part of our national policy. All that those interests may put forward from one angle or another is only a sort of guerilla tactics which will in no way affect the main strength and stability of this policy. But the object of my moving this Resolution here is that we should at this juncture, when we are on the eve of the Second Five Year Plan, find out, examine and discuss and come to a conclusion as to how we have to achieve total prohibition throughout the country. Since a rough draft of the Plan will come very shortly before us, I think the time is opportune. Apart from it, knowing that the problems relating to total prohibition are very urgent, the Planning Commission itself has appointed a very high-power Committee to go into the question and the report of that Committee also has been before the country and it was circulated here also a couple of months back. That Committee, presided over by one of our ablest leaders, has given a very good report. I am sure many of our Members here would have read it. But I must say, to my disappointment, that the Planning Commission itself has not carefully appreciated the points made by the Committee. It is a matter of great regret for me that to a considerable extent it has not been appreciated by the Planning Commission. What they have actually recommended is far short of the expectations of those who have held prohibition as a sacred cause and amongst those who have been working for it I include many of our great leaders who are now

occupying the Treasury benches even today.

As to prohibition, it is generally said by those who are opposed to it that it has failed. I do not for a moment agree that it has failed. But even for argument's sake accepting that to some extent it has failed to succeed, what does it mean? It is not that prohibition has failed. I say prohibition has not failed and will never fail. We have failed prohibition. That is the main point to remember.

**Shri Gadilingana Gowd (Kurnool) :** It is a cottage industry in Andhra.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan :** What is the meaning of the failure of prohibition? My friend opposite interrupts with a lot of spirit behind his viewpoint. But I have to say that the failure is our own failure. How is it that prohibition has failed? We have passed legislation after legislation to implement that policy. But that policy has not succeeded. Why? Because our officers, the public co-operation and governmental action were not in full unity of purpose; some were indifferent, others were insincere and so on and so forth. Therefore, prohibition has failed. What does it mean? It means that if we decide on a broad policy and if we try to pursue it we shall succeed. But our countrymen, both official and non-official, have not geared themselves up to the necessary requirements. My point is that the failure is only a symptom that officials are corrupt. People evade laws. These are symptoms and not the disease itself. If as a result of this condition prohibition fails today, tomorrow other good measures will also fail. Therefore, unless we deal with this problem, not only prohibition but the Second Five Year Plan and the succeeding Plans, but all our other laudable measures, which we bring here, are likely to fail. Therefore, let us not simply pooh-pooh prohibition simply because it has failed. Let us find out the basic cause, the basic disease rather than simply be deluded by the symptom. If we allow this state of affairs to go on, the symptom will overtake us and we will not be able to escape.

As regards prohibition, all of us know the history about it. All our great leaders were and are behind it. I can only say that if in spite of all these

good and favourable circumstances, we do not get the strength and recover from the present inertia, it will be a very suicidal policy.

The object of planning is to implement the Directive Principles of State Policy, and Prohibition being one of the State policies it is necessary for us to go boldly and without fear. There are amendments proposed to various effects. Some of them suggest even going back on it. Therefore I take the liberty of emphasising the importance of the Directive Principles of State Policy in the context of the present Plan.

According to the Dean of the Faculty of Law, Delhi University, what are these Directive Principles of State Policy? He says:

"I feel that the Directive Principles or State Policy constitute not only a proclamation—a promulgation of principles—but also a pledge by the framers of the Constitution to the people who elected them, and that not to implement them will constitute a breach of faith with the people and will render a vital part of the Constitution practically a dead letter."

This is the view of the Dean of the Faculty of Law, Delhi University. If we do not fulfil this obligation, I will only describe it as a great betrayal.

What is, after all, prohibition? I shall quote from the report of the Committee of Shri Shriman Narayan:

"Prohibition is a piece of protective legislation. It removes the 'agency which deprives men and women of their physical well-being, mental equilibrium and economic status'."

And the report itself goes on quoting the great English statesman, Gladstone who said:

"It is the province of Government to make it easy for men to do right and difficult for them to go wrong. In determining what is right and what is wrong, public welfare is the supreme law."

The report in the relevant portion says:

"The excise system confronts the poor man with the liquor shop wide open. It invites him to do wrong. Prohibition, on the other hand, makes it possible and even easy to do right. It may

not be out of place to use the old adage that it is better to hunt evil than to be hunted down by it."

The Planning Commission itself, as I said before, has defined the object of planning in terms of the Directive Principles and planning to mean co-ordinated development in various fields. The Committee under Shri Shriman Narayan, dealing with this, concluded:

"We are of opinion that in order to focus the attention of all States to this end and to mobilise popular sympathy in favour of prohibition, it is necessary to fix a definite target date for bringing into effect complete prohibition throughout the country."

They went round the country, consulted important public men. They consulted Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Shri Dhebar, President of the Congress and Rajaji and many others. And they all insisted that prohibition should be enforced at once. Acharya Vinoba Bhave was of the opinion that the entire country should be under prohibition in one year from now. In his view this interval should suffice to provide for the preparatory legislation and for other necessary administrative arrangements. We must take inspiration from such persons. We must not simply dismiss their words as some idealistic advice which is impracticable. Unless we work and strive to execute them we, particularly those who belong to the ruling party and are on this side of the House will have no function to fulfil here. The object of Congressmen, if I may venture to say in general, is not merely to capture power for the sake of power; it is to make social life free from exploitation, to make it honorable, peaceful and progressive. Failure in election may be looked upon as defeat. But failure to enforce such a great measure as prohibition will be disastrous. As I said before, if we do not bring it about as soon as possible and with full vigour, it will be a national betrayal.

Generally against prohibition it is said that bootlegging has increased. My friend opposite, at the very outset interrupted me and tried to bring to my notice events here and there. But repeal of prohibition will not solve bootlegging and illicit distillation. Illicit distillation does not exist only in areas where total prohibition exists. Even in other areas where excise laws are

[Shri C. R. Narasimhan] operating, where Government as a State is interested in collecting revenue from the sale of toddy, for running the State, even in those States bootlegging is a problem. In this connection the experience of America is of interest. There prohibition has been repealed. Has it resulted in bringing down bootlegging? There is a relevant report. A person who has knowledge of that and the conditions here writes like this :

"If wet advocates in India think they will solve the problem of bootlegging and the sale of illicit liquor by repealing prohibition they will have a sad awakening if prohibition should ever be voted out. We have discovered this fact in the United States. During our prohibition days we were assured by the repealists that all of the ills besetting our country would vanish if only prohibition were repealed, and all of the crime and lawlessness attached to bootlegging and the sale of illicit liquor would come to an end. Prohibition went. Have bootleggers and the sale of illicit liquor disappeared in America?"

No, they say. And Senator Estes Kefauver, Chairman of the special Committee to examine the corruption, said :

"Without fear of contradiction, I say that corruption continues today on a scale that makes the corruption of prohibition days look like kindergarten play."

Some Americans have estimated that for every legal distillery in America there are today a hundred illicit stills and that these bootlegging places are turning out illicit liquor at the rate of 18 million gallons per year. What is more, instead of eliminating bootleggers, these enemies of respectable society are being arrested at the rate of about a thousand a month. If you want to get rid of bootleggers and illicit liquor, repealing prohibition is not the way to do it. The United States has learned from experience that such a step only causes bootlegging to flourish.

That is the experience of America. And this kind of situation will be our own fate if we do not pursue boldly the policy of prohibition. If prohibition is withdrawn—God forbid, and I do not think the country will allow it—it will not solve the illicit distillation problem. In areas where prohibition is not enforced and where the excise laws are

operating, even there the illicit liquor problem is very serious. One way of terminating it and making the people's welfare improve is to introduce prohibition there also. Under the Second Five Year Plan, huge sums of money, according to our Indian standards, in astronomical figures, are going to be spent and mighty industrial factories are to be established, and that too mostly in the north. That is one of the grievances of the people from the south. If in the north, as we see from the figures circulated, huge sums are going to be spent, should we not control the welfare of the wage-earners. If all the vast sums that are being spent go into the pockets of the industrial workers and they are not helped to abstain from drinking, will it not be a sheer tragedy? Would it not amount to taking away with one hand what we give with the other?

Quite a few of the States agree to pursue a policy of prohibition. Public opinion is behind such a step. But, they hesitate and are in a dilemma owing to financial difficulties. My own submission is that they should boldly approach the Finance Commission and ask for proper allocation of resources to implement the directive principles of State policy. The Centre cannot disown any responsibility. Article 47 of the Constitution says : that it shall be the duty of the State to enforce prohibition. What is the definition of 'State' in that chapter? 'State' includes the Centre, the provinces, the local bodies and even the judiciary. Therefore, the Centre has to play its part in this matter. If the States ask the Finance Commission to properly allocate resources in order to enable them to carry out this programme, it will only be a natural thing. There are certain other areas where famine and flood are endemic and relief works on a large scale are carried on there. It is a pity that we should spend money on relief work and there should be drink also claiming all the sums or a lion's share. In this connection, the Prohibition Committee in its report says how in the Bhakra Nangal area toddy shops were opened, and all the labourers went direct to the toddy shops on the pay day, and spent all the money. The same thing seems to have happened in Chittaranjan also. These are the pointers. Where we start new projects, it has become a habit to open these shops also. I do not know why it is done. It is a great tragedy

that such things are done in spite of the directive principles of State policy and in spite of the fact that we are wedded to prohibition. This shows that we lack caution. This is a very serious thing.

In the Planning Commission itself, the target date is avoided. They seem to think that a certain amount of flexibility is needed. I say this is self-delusion. This kind of flexibility is a misnomer. It is nothing but vacillation. By our delay, we are merely shelving the issue. I appeal to the Cabinet and the Minister of Planning, who is a firm believer in Gandhiji's twin policy of rural uplift, khadi and prohibition, to support this not only in one aspect, but also the other aspect, and boldly launch a programme, recommending it to all the States, making our country's names famous throughout the world for the success of this gigantic experiment which has had partial success in various parts of this country. I hope the other Members who follow me will give me strong support in this measure.

**Mr. Speaker:** Resolution moved :

"This House is of opinion that Prohibition should be regarded as an integral part of the Second Five Year Plan and recommends that a target date be fixed by the Planning Commission for completing nation-wide Prohibition."

**Dr. Ranao Rao (Kakinada):** I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"While supporting the principle of prohibition to reduce the harmful effects of drinking, this House notes with grave concern the methods of its implementation in various States and is of opinion that prohibition should be introduced in a phased programme progressively, keeping pace with the Second Five Year Plan, improving economic standards of life, the education and cultural level of the people and also granting full employment to those thrown out of jobs, due to prohibition."

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy (Chittoor):** I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following shall be substituted :

"This House is of opinion that complete Prohibition throughout the country should be kept a long term objective which should be achieved :—

(a) without unduly upsetting the finances of the State Governments and the Central Government :

(b) by enforcing strict temperance laws ; and

(c) by intensive propaganda among the people over a prolonged period in order to obtain active co-operation from them."

**Shri Gadilnagana Gowd :** I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"This House is of opinion that the working of the Prohibition in certain States has proved that prohibition is complete failure and that illicit distillation has become a cottage industry, and therefore advises the States which have introduced prohibition to scrap off prohibition and advises the other States not to hastily introduce prohibition without training the people and propagating to them bad effects of the prohibition."

**Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga Central):** I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"This House is of opinion that prohibition should be regarded as an integral part of the Second Five Year Plan and to that end recommends that an expert Committee be appointed to go into the question of financial implications that it will create in various States with a view to suggest ways and means to make good the financial loss consequent on the introduction of prohibition on a target date."

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"This House is of opinion that prohibition be regarded as a national policy of social reform to be implemented during the Second Five Year Plan and to that end recommends that a Committee

[Shri D. C. Sharma]  
consisting of experts and representatives of States be immediately appointed to go into the question of financial implications involved with a view to suggest ways and means for meeting the loss of revenue that it will entail in various States."

**Shri N. M. Lingam** (Coimbatore) :  
I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"This House is of opinion that prohibition cannot be a success unless introduced throughout the country and that steps should, therefore, be taken by Government to bring the entire country under total prohibition by the end of the Second Five Year Plan period at the latest."

**Shri Thimmaiah** (Kolar—Reserved—Sch. Castes) : I beg to move :

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted :

"This House is of opinion that the State Government having in view the financial implications and the importance of prohibition should try to introduce the prohibition at different phases and in the meanwhile carry on intensive propaganda among the people to obtain their co-operation for its implementation."

**Shri K. C. Sodhia** (Sagar) : I beg to move :

That in the Resolution before the words "Prohibition should be regarded" insert the word "total":

**Shri A. K. Gopalan** (Cannanore) : I am not moving the amendments.

**Shri Jhulan Sinha** (Saran North) : I beg to move :

That in the Resolution for the word "completing" substitute "simultaneous introduction of".

**Shri Dabhi** (Kaira North) : I beg to move :

That in the Resolution for the words "completing nation-wide Prohibition" substitute "the introduction of complete prohibition throughout the country".

**Mr. Speaker** : All these amendments are before the House.

**Dr. Rama Rao** : I shall first read my amendment to remind the hon. Members about the main points. This is a substitute resolution for the resolution moved by my hon. friend Shri C. R. Narasimhan.

"While supporting the principle of prohibition to reduce the harmful effects of drinking this House notes with grave concern the methods of its implementation in various States and is of opinion that prohibition should be introduced in a phased programme progressively, keeping pace with the Second Five Year Plan, improving economic standards of life, the education and cultural level of the people and also granting full employment to those thrown out of jobs, due to prohibition."

Fortunately, the atmosphere in our country is very favourable to prohibition. Therefore, there is no use comparing our country with America with regard to prohibition. So, I need not go into the various reasons for this atmosphere. This is generally accepted. I will say only a few words about those who oppose prohibition altogether.

One of their arguments is, drink is food, let the poor people, the workers and others have their food. It is a very unrealistic statement and argument. Nobody is silly enough to go in for a drink for the sake of food. If they go in for it, it is for the kick it has. So much so, people do not want to drink *neera* or this and that. Therefore, let us be clear that they drink alcohol or toddy and other things for the intoxication that it gives. Whether it is mild or severe, let us be clear about it.

**Shri A. M. Thomas** (Ernakulam) :  
What about the vitamin content ?

**Dr. Rama Rao** : There are vitamins in so many poisons. Of course, scientifically, in toddy there is, but not in alcohol. In brandy and other things, the real strong things, there is no vitamin.

**Shri Gadilingana Gowd** (Kurnool) :  
So, toddy you may allow.

**Dr. Rama Rao** : No, it is only an argument. That does not mean you can drink. Therefore, because something in it is good you cannot embrace something which is dangerous. Therefore, I

do not think it is necessary for me to argue in this country and this hon. House that as far as India is concerned, there is absolutely no justification for alcoholic drinks.

Before I go to the other point, let me remind my hon. friends that in the history of human civilisation, human evolution of mind and culture we have developed a certain number of higher faculties. Drink starts with dulling the highest faculties and gradually, according to the dose, other faculties, even physical and muscular activity are interfered with. Therefore the arguments that it is food, it is a stimulant, it is good and energetic, it gives pleasure are all very fantastic arguments. The only question I put to myself and other friends who are strong believers in prohibition is: are we faddists justified in denying drink to our friends who like to sport their glass of brandy in our faces?

**An Hon. Member:** And get the kick out of it.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** They call it the pleasure of life, that it makes life worth living. Society means social life, civilisation means restriction of individual liberties. We restrict so many poisons, we restrict suicide, we restrict so many things. So, if we consider these alcoholic drinks as poison, whether mild or strong, we have to put restrictions in the interests of society.

In this connection, I asked myself the question: suppose my son asks me: "What is the harm if I drink once in a way?" There is no harm except complications. Therefore, I prescribe to society what I prescribe to my son: do not touch it to be on the safe side.

Generally it is accepted that prohibition is good, the alcoholic drinks are bad for our society in India. There is no difference of opinion in the vast majority on that. There are a few people who think this is all nonsense. Anyway, we will leave that.

Now, I come to the implementation of prohibition. That is the main thing. About prohibition, at least in this House with probably two or three exceptions there is no difference of opinion about its desirability. But how to enforce it and what are our experiences in the places where it has been implemented? We want to see that prohibition is a success, but how to do it? What is the condition?

I have already said that I am a firm believer in avoiding alcoholic drinks, not touching them. I am a teatotaler, and I want everybody to be a teatotaler. But the point is when we see how it is enforced, we believers in prohibition have to hang our heads in shame. We cannot be blind to realities, we cannot be blind to facts.

We start prohibition in Madras and Andhra, throw lakhs of people out of employment, toddy-tappers and others. Then we go to them and say: "You are unemployed, you have no food, you starve for the sake of our good, for society". But they will not oblige us by starving. Unless we show them alternative employment, unless we bring in land reforms and other things so that employment is increased and all those unemployed people are employed, prohibition is bound to be a failure, because immediately they take to manufacturing alcohol in their huts. In Andhra in my district and in many districts I hear—in Tanjore it is the greatest—this is practically a cottage industry.

One eminent citizen whose name I do not want to mention now, went about in my district, crossed a river and there were some side shops. He wanted to test the existence of distillation and he asked for a drop. In a few minutes one man came dressed like an ordinary cooly and said: "Yes, Sir, how much do you want?" He said: "We want five bottles, we want to go to the next town five or six miles away, we want to have some *maja* in the rest house as usual". The reply was: "You drink as much as you like, you drink like a fish I do not mind, but if you take alcohol in bottles...."

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan:** He is addressing you, Sir. Drink as much as you want.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** In quotations. He said: "You drink as much as you like, but to take it is difficult." This is the point. He said: "If you take me in your car, I will give you half a dozen bottles or any number." He was surprised. They were big officers. The fellow is dressed like a cooly, and if he is in a car the alcohol is safe, whereas if these big officers go with the bottle, they will be checked. Then he asked him the reason. I will not give all the details. He said: "There is an understanding between us and the

[Dr. Rama Rao] police. If they see me in the car, they will not stop it. It is safe. If they do not see me in the car, they will stop the car and check it".

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair]

Shri Shree Narayan Das: Have you ever met thieves ?

Dr. Rama Rao : Thieves ?

Shri Shree Narayan Das : Yes.

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda) : Every day !

Dr. Rama Rao : The point is that the way it is enforced has brought prohibition into contempt. That is the important point. Every cottage is a small distillery, and people who are thrown out of employment have taken to this lucrative job. They may go to jail once in a way for a few days or a month, but they have regular fixed contribution to the police, and the police distribute it regularly and systematically. That is how prohibition is brought into contempt.

The trouble is this. These thousands of people have taken to this lucrative job of distilling alcohol. Even if you put strong efforts tomorrow, it will be difficult to check it. I will give you a medical example. If you spray DDT in insufficient quantities the mosquitoes resist it and afterwards it will be very difficult to destroy them even if you use tons of DDT. Therefore, the ineffective, abortive and corrupt way in which prohibition is being enforced has brought prohibition into disrepute, and is spoiling the whole cause of prohibition. Therefore, the difference between my resolution and the original Mover's resolution is this : unless we are very clean, take up the employment question along with this, it is no use talking about prohibition. I am a firm believer in prohibition, but that is not the point. Prohibition is spoiled and brought into contempt by failing to create the social atmosphere, and atmosphere in the sense that you must give them cultural improvement, you must give them employment, you must have the people's co-operation. Therefore, I commend my resolution and I would request my friend to accept my substitute resolution, because the actual principle is accepted. We all want prohibition and he also cannot deny...

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam) : How is it that the Communist Party in Andhra advocated scrapping of prohibition.

Dr. Rama Rao : I spoke on several platforms asking that prohibition be scrapped. Why ? I have already told you one instance how prohibition has been brought into contempt, how every cottage is a distillery, how people are unemployed, how Government is losing Rs. 5 crores.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan : You were wanting me to co-operate. Please come to that aspect of it.

Dr. Rama Rao : I will just answer this point as to why we opposed and now favour the scrapping of prohibition. Prohibition is dear to us. People must not drink. Suppose there is someone who is dear to us and close to us. Suppose he dies. What can we do ? Just take him to Nigambodh Ghat and cremate him. So, when prohibition is brought into contempt, is half-hearted, when there is loss of revenue and all sorts of things, we thought the best thing would be to scrap prohibition at that stage. But here I say if we give alternative employment and do these things, prohibition would be successful. Prohibition is good for the country. It is no use simply giving lectures on prohibition, showing cinema asking people not to drink, and putting up sign-boards in large numbers. Along with these, some steps should be taken for providing those people with alternative employment also. The law must come to their rescue and put an end to the drinking habit.

I support prohibition subject to these observations. If prohibition has to be made a success, then there is no alternative but to look to the details. We have to proceed cautiously in this matter, if we are to make a success of it. What has happened in America is no guide for us. We can make a success of it if we attend to these details. If it fails, it is our defect.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan : May I seek one clarification from the hon. Member ? He stated that a certain amount of unemployment would be caused, and that should be removed before prohibition is enforced. May I know from the hon. Member the total number of persons who will be affected by this prohibition policy by being saved from liquor as compared with those who will be thrown out of employment conse-



quent on the enforcement of prohibition? Which number will be greater, the number of persons who will be thrown out of employment, or the number of those who will be benefited by it?

**Dr. Ramā Rao :** I accept my hon. friend's argument that a larger number will be benefited by prohibition. But I have already said that the smaller number—and that does not mean only a few persons, but thousands and lakhs—will not oblige us by starving. That is one reality which we have to face. Therefore, if the details are not attended to in regard to providing alternative avenues of employment for them, then the whole prohibition policy will be a failure.

**स्वामी रामानंद तीर्थ (गुलबर्गा) :** सभापति महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव इस सभा के सामने रक्खा गया है उस का समर्थन करने के लिये मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। अब यह केवल चर्चा की बात नहीं है कि इस मुल्क में मद्यपान जारी रहे या बन्द किया जाये। यह तो जो प्रगति का रास्ता हम ने निश्चित किया है उस का मूलभूत सिद्धांत है। अब हम ने मद्यपान के निषेध करने का प्रवन्ध स्वीकार कर लिया है। अब तो सवाल यह है कि किस क्रम से, तेजी से या आहिस्ता आहिस्ता, इस को अमल में लाया जाये। मैं यह समझने में असमर्थ हूँ कि जो क्रमिक पद्धति बताई गई है उस को किस तरह से स्वीकार किया जा सकता है। अगर कोई चीज बुरी हो, हानिकारक हो, तो जितनी जल्दी हो सके उतनी जल्दी उस को हटा देना चाहिए। अब तो हमारी विचारधारा इस दिशा में होनी चाहिये कि जो विचार मद्यपान रोकने के विरोध में आते हैं उन को कैसे हटाया जा सकता है।

एक सवाल हमेशा सामने आता है। जब कमेटी का दौरा चला जिसके सदर हमारे दोस्त श्रीमन्नारायण जी थे तो मुझे उसके सामने निवेदन करने का मौका हासिल हुआ। मुझ से यह पूछा गया कि जो करोड़ों रुपये का घाटा हर स्टेट की ट्रेजरी (कोष) में आयेगा उस की पूर्ति आप किस तरह से कर सकेंगे? मैं ने जवाब दिया कि यह सवाल ही नहीं उठ सकता है। अगर आर्थिक प्रगति और नैतिक तथा सामाजिक प्रगति में विरोध होता है तो मेरी नम्र भावना यह है कि मानवता के नाते हम को आर्थिक पहलू को कुछ नजरअन्दाज करना पड़ेगा। अगर नैतिकता और मानवता को हमें कायम रखना है तो इस के सिवा कोई मार्ग नहीं है। मैं

प्रोहिबिशन (मद्य निषेध) के सवाल को केवल आर्थिक पहलू से देखने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ। अगर हम इस सवाल को मानवता की दृष्टि से देखते हैं तथा मनुष्य की जो अवस्था होनी चाहिये अगर उसमें मद्यपान के कारण कमी होती है तो उस पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना ही चाहिये, उस को बन्द करना ही चाहिये। मेरे दोस्त यहां नहीं हैं जिन्होंने एक एम्बेन्डमेंट (संशोधन) दिया है। उन्होंने अभी जब कि श्री नरसिंह बोल रहे थे कहा कि यह तो आंध्र की काटेज इन्डस्ट्री (कुटीर उद्योग) हो गई है। मैं आंध्र की बात तो अधिक नहीं जानता लेकिन तैलंगाना की बात बहुत अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो स्थिति तैलंगाना में है वही लगभग आंध्र में भी होगी। तैलंगाना में प्रोहिबिशन की यह स्थिति है कि हर मकान में बच्चे से लेकर बूढ़े तक सीदी पीते हैं। मुश्किल से ही कोई एक्सेम्पान (अपवाद) वहां पर मिलेगा।

**कुछ माननीय सदस्य :** यह ताड़ी है ?

**स्वामी रामानंद तीर्थ :** ताड़ी नहीं है। ताड़ी अलग है सीदी अलग है। यह पाम ट्री से निकलता है जिस से कि नीरा निकलता है।

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जब हर मकान में यह दुर्व्यसन आज फैला हुआ है तब अगर आप ग्रेजुअलनेस (धीरे धीरे) से उसको दूर करने की सोचते हैं तो सोचने से ज्यादा समय आपको इस को कामयाब बनाने में लगेगा। मेरा खयाल यह है कि इस में जिलम्ब नहीं करना चाहिये। जब विनोबा जी तैलंगाना में भूदान पद यात्रा आरम्भ करने जा रहे थे तो उन्होंने तैलंगाना के लोगों को एक सन्देश दिया। आज मुझे वह प्रसंग बहुत अच्छी तरह से याद आ रहा है। उन्होंने दो बातें कहीं: हिन्दी सीखो और सीदी छोड़ो। तैलंगाना के लोगों को उन्होंने यह आदेश दिया कि हिंदी सीखो और सीदी छोड़ो। आज यह दुर्व्यसन ऐसा नहीं है कि किसी खास समाज में या किसी एक सेक्टर में घुसा हुआ हो। जब आम तौर से यह रिवाज समाज में पाया जाता है तो जो आप ग्रेजुअलनेस की बात कहते हैं वह मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। अगर पूरी मानवता नष्ट हो रही है तो उसको बचाने के लिये आप को रेडिकल (आमूल) और रिबोल्युशनरी मेजर्स (क्रान्तिकारी उपाय) लेने चाहिये और यदि इस सम्बन्ध में आर्थिक सवाल को कठिनाई बताई जाती है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि जब आप करोड़ों रुपये की प्लैन यहां बना रहे हैं तो उस में आप को उस घाटे को घुंजाइस भी रखनी

## [स्वामी रामानन्द तीर्थ]

चाहिये, उस की पूर्ति भी करनी चाहिये जो कि प्रोहिबिशन के कारण हो। इतनी हिम्मत तो हमारी प्लैन में होनी ही चाहिये। अगर आप प्रोहिबिशन के टार्गेट्स बढ़ाते गये और हर मकान में बच्चे से ले कर बूढ़े तक मद्यपान के आदी होते रहे तो आर्थिक व्यवस्था तो गड़बड़ होगी ही, लोगों का स्वास्थ्य भी नहीं रहेगा और लोगों को आरोग्य भी प्राप्त नहीं होगा। इस लिये जो एमेन्डमेंट (संशोधन) मेरे दोस्त डा० राम राव ने यहाँ प्रस्तुत किया है मैं उस की ताईद करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ।

आप यहाँ अनएम्प्लायमेंट (बेकारी) का सवाल उठाते हैं। ठीक है, ऐसा हो सकता है। लेकिन जो आप के लोग हैं जिनके बेकार हो जाने की सम्भावना है उनके लिये और जराय (साधन) निकाले जा सकते हैं। लेकिन यह कहना कि चूँकि लोग बेकार हो जायेंगे इस लिये मद्यपान को रोकने का जो सवाल है उसको आहिस्ता आहिस्ता लिया जाय, उस के लिये आहिस्ता आहिस्ता कदम उठाये जायें, यह कोई जमने वाली चीज नहीं है क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि जब कभी आर्थिक और सामाजिक तथा नैतिक पहलुओं में टक्कर हो जाती है, सघर्ष हो जाता है तो आर्थिक पहलू गिर जाता है। क्योंकि आखिर अगर जो हमारे मानव मूल्य हैं, जो ह्यूमन वैल्यूज हैं जिन के लिये यह डेमोक्रेसी (प्रजातन्त्र) है जिन के लिये यह फंडेमेंटल राइट्स (मूल अधिकार) हैं जिन के लिये यह कानून हैं, जिन के लिये यह रिपब्लिक है, जिन के लिए हम जिन्दा हैं और जो सब कुछ है, वे उसी में हैं, वे अगर चले गए तो फिर किस लिये हम प्रोग्रेस (उन्नति) चाहते हैं। बम्बई में जा कर देखिये। लोग तो कहते हैं कि वहाँ पर यह जो प्रोहिबिशन है यह फेल हुई है। मैंने स्वयं वहाँ पर जा कर देखा है और मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि वहाँ पर यह फेल्योर (असफल) नहीं हुई है। फेल्योर यह उन लोगों के लिये हुई है जो पैसा खर्च करके किसी ढंग से उसको हासिल करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जो ग्रैंडर-डाग (अभाग) हैं, जो समाज के नीचे स्तर का है, जिस के उत्थान के लिए यह प्रोहिबिशन है, उसका फायदा हुआ है, उसकी मानवता रक्षित की गई है और वह ऊँचा उठा है। आप आज भी जा कर देख सकते हैं हर वक्त मैं और हर जगह इलिसिट डिस्टिलेशन (अवैध मद्यसार) हो रहा है। यह तो आपकी और हमारी समाज की परिस्थिति का रक्त है। तो सबाज में एक दोष है। इस लिये जो इसके

खिलाफ चलता है और कुछ प्रयत्न करता है उसका प्रयत्न भी अघूरा रहता है। यह कोई उस दोष को दूर करने का तरीका नहीं हो सकता है। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमिश्न और प्रान्तीय सरकारें तथा सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट इस बात की कोशिश करें कि जो दोष है, जो यह दुर्व्यसन है, वह ग्रेजुएलनेस से खत्म नहीं हो सकता है। मैं ने सिग्नेट नहीं पी, मैंने शराब नहीं पी। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि जो सिग्नेट पीने के आदी हैं अगर उनको यह कहा जाय कि अब आज आप चार डजन (दर्जन) रोजाना सिग्नेट पीते हो तो पहले ४० फिर ३० फिर २० और इसी तरह से कम करते जाओ और इस तरह से इस आदत को छोड़ दो, तो वे ऐसा नहीं कर सकेंगे। मैं मानता हूँ कि एक्सेपशन्स (अपवाद) हो सकती हैं। ऐसे लोग भी हो सकते हैं जो एक आदत को धीरे धीरे छोड़ सकते हैं। लेकिन अगर कोई एक दम एक साथ किसी आदत को छोड़ता है तो उसमें उत्थान की ताकत आती है जोकि ग्रेजुएलनेस में नहीं होती। यह मानवीय स्वभाव का अनुभव है।

इस लिये आज इस सदन को यह तय करना है कि जो प्रोहिबिशन है जिस को हम ने फंडेमेंटल (मूल) चीज माना है उस को लागू करने के लिये एक टारगेट डेट (निश्चित तिथि) फिक्स (निर्धारित) करना जरूरी है, ऐसा मैं मानता हूँ। क्योंकि मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर अधिक समय तक हम ने ढील दी तो वह आर्थिक व्यवस्था जो हम बरकरार रखना चाहते हैं हम रख नहीं सकेंगे। आज जो इस आदत में फंसा हुआ है और गिरा हुआ है और दुबल हो गया है यदि हम उस के लिये डेमोक्रेसी और इकोनॉमिक एंड सोशल जस्टिस (आर्थिक और सामाजिक न्याय) लाने की नहीं सोचेंगे तो हमारी जितनी भी बातें हैं वे सब व्यर्थ होंगी। इस लिये मैं जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया है, उस का हार्दिक समर्थन करता हूँ।

**Shri Dabhi :** I rise to wholeheartedly support the Resolution moved by my hon. friend, Shri C. R. Narasimhan. I do not think that Government would have any difficulty in accepting this Resolution.

**Mr. Chairman :** Before the hon. Member proceeds, may I just request those hon. Members who want to participate in the debate to take not more than ten minutes, because there are very many hon. Members who want to speak?

**Shri Dabhi :** As I said, Government cannot have any difficulty in accepting this Resolution. While discussing the recommendations of the Prohibition Inquiry Committee, the Draft Outline of the Second Five Year Plan says on page 180 :

"For many years a considerable section of public opinion has urged that prohibition of consumption of intoxicating drinks and of drugs injurious to health should be carried out as an essential item of social policy. In article 47 of the Constitution, this has been already accepted as a directive principle. . . In the consideration of any basic social policy, financial considerations, although of great practical importance, are not to be treated as decisive in character. What is important is that the programmes should be so formulated that they can be implemented successfully over a period. . . While the direction we be common, there is room for a degree of variation in the steps to be taken in different parts of the country according to local conditions and circumstances".

I can quite concede that it may not be possible to insist that identical steps should be taken by the different States. I also concede that it is rather difficult to accept the target date of 1st April 1958, though I am personally of the opinion that there should not be any difficulty in accepting this target date. It may be the 1st April, 1959. But I do not understand how, if we are really and sincerely for implementation of the policy of Prohibition, we can evade this decision by offering one excuse or another. Still there are those who say that they are theoretically not opposed to the policy of Prohibition but that we must still take some time to implement the policy. We must remember in this connection that the programme of Prohibition was the most important constructive programme on the platform of the Congress during our struggling for independence. We know that it is for this programme that tens of thousands of our countrymen went to jail and suffered lathi blows and thousands of our women also went to jail and suffered indignities at the hands of the police and liquor licensees. We also know that in 1920, the Congress pledged itself to the policy of Prohibition and this was again renewed in 1930 in the

fundamental resolution of the Karachi Congress. So we must know that we are pledged—at least the Congress is pledged—to the policy of Prohibition for the last 35 years. Therefore, we must now either implement this policy or say that we do not want to implement this policy. Otherwise, there is no use giving excuses for postponing this question of implementation of this policy. My hon. friend, Dr. Rama Rao and others like him have a stock argument—they are really opposed to the Prohibition policy though they pay lip-sympathy to it—that illicit distillation has increased in several areas as a result of Prohibition. If the argument is that where there is no Prohibition, in wet areas, there is no such increase and everything is all right, figures show to the contrary. My hon. friend, Shri C. R. Narasimhan has already stated that fact. He referred to the Report of the Prohibition Inquiry Committee. I may again quote from this Report. At page 13, the Commissioner of Excise, West Bengal—where there is no Prohibition at all—has stated before the Committee as follows :—

"As regards illicit distillation, I find from my experience that the crime has lately increased abnormally."

4 P.M.

In Madhya Pradesh and other places also, where there are wet areas, the Report has given figures to show that in the wet areas the extent of illegal distillation has considerably increased more than in the dry areas.

What are the conditions in the wet area? This has also been stated at page 40 of this Report. It is worth reading and I draw the attention of the House to the state to which we have been reduced in those areas and where we are going. At page 40, this Report says :

"For instance, the Excise Commissioner of West Bengal was positive that 'the evil of drink has spread alarmingly amongst the younger generation and even among some of womenfolk of the upper classes in Calcutta'. The Delhi State Government reports that 'students coming from well-to-do families have picked up the habit of visiting hotels where liquor

[Shri Dabhi] is served. Some women belonging to advanced families have also been noticed to have taken up the drinking habit though their number is quite small."

This illustrates that drink, year after year, is growing and it is habit-forming and it is needless to say that once the habit is formed it is hard to obliterate this craving. So, if we really want to implement that policy, we must fix some target date—may be one year afterwards—but we must fix the date by which there would be complete prohibition throughout the country.

There is only one more point which I want to impress upon the House and upon the Government. Prohibition is a State subject and there may be some difference of opinion as regards the final date. But, I want to ask from Government where is the difficulty in fixing a target date for those areas like Delhi which is to be a Centrally administered area and also in the Defence Services? On the contrary, the Committee has reported that some representatives from the Armed Forces told them that there are not very many people who drink and that the proportion of people who drink is very much less and that they are prepared to fall in line with any policy of prohibition. So, there would not be any difficulty in implementing the policy; and that would be setting an example for the other States also to follow. I do not think there will be any difficulty for Government if they are sincere in implementing this policy. It is only in the Defence Services and other services that it is very easy to implement this policy because they believe in discipline. So, I hope that Government would see their way to implement this policy in the Defence Services and try to reason with the other States to fall in line and implement the policy as early as possible. They will be setting an example to other States if at least within the next 2 or 3 years they introduce total prohibition in Delhi, where liquor is being sold in chemists' shops even, and also in the Army, Navy and other Defence Services.

**श्री एम० बी० वैश्य (अहमदाबाद—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) :** सभापति महोदय, हमारे मित्र शराब बन्दी का जो रिजोल्यूशन (संकल्प) लाये हैं मैं उन का स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं गुजरात

से आया हूँ। वहाँ पर हम मजदूरों के पूज्य महात्मा गांधी जी ने यह आन्दोलन चलाया था कि मजदूरों को किसी भी तरह शराब न मिलने पावे। हमारे यहाँ अहमदाबाद और गुजरात के हजारों मजदूरों ने शराब की दुकानों के अगले सत्याग्रह किया और हजारों की तादाद में जेल गये। हम तो यह आशा लगाये बैठे थे कि जब स्वराज्य होगा और महात्मा गांधी और कांग्रेस का राज्य होगा तो सारे हिन्दुस्तान में कहीं भी शराब की एक दुकान भी नहीं दिखाई देगी। आज बम्बई और मद्रास ने तो अपने क्षेत्र में शराब बन्दी कर डाली है लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान के और भागों में तो अभी भी शराब मिलती है। जब मैं यहाँ चार-पांच बरस हुए आया था तो मैं यह आशा ले कर आया था कि दिल्ली तो हमारे देश की राजधानी है, वहाँ तो शराब की बन्दी होगी। लेकिन यहाँ तो हर जगह शराब मिलती है। पार्टियों में शराब दी जाती है। हम लोग जो गरीबों और मजदूरों में काम करने वाले हैं वे तो इस को देख कर हताश हो जाते हैं। हम तो यह समझते हैं कि गरीबों की दशा सुधारना है तो उस के लिये सब से पहला कदम यह होगा कि मजदूरों से शराब दूर रखी जाये। कई लोग यह तर्क करते हैं कि शराब बन्द करने से राज्य को घाटा होता है और उस को पूरा करना कठिन है। अंग्रेजों के जमाने में शराब से जो पैसा आता था उस से हमारे बच्चों को पढ़ाई होती थी। क्या स्वराज्य के जमाने में भी हम उसी तरह से रुपये आने पाई का हिसाब लगाया करेंगे आज आप अहमदाबाद में जाकर देखें कि जिन मजदूरों ने शराब बन्दी के कारण शराब पीना बन्द कर दिया है उन की हालत कितनी सुधर गई है, अब वह अपने बाल बच्चों को अच्छी तरह से पढ़ाते हैं और पालते हैं और उन की गरीबी भी बहुत कम हो गई है। शराब के कारण गरीब और भी गरीब हो जाते हैं। आज इस से ज्यादा नुकसान गरीबों को ही हो रहा है। पैसे वाले तो कम शराब पीते हैं। शराब की दुकानें खोल कर हम गरीबों के सामने एक लालच उपस्थित करते हैं। एक कवि ने ठीक कहा है ;

खाना, घिसना, सूचना, तीनों पाप निशान,  
तीनों पाप निशान, अफीमों, गांजा जैसे  
मधु, मांस, परनार, नरक सम जानो तैसे।

एक तरफ तो कवि यह कह रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ हमारी सरकार अभी भी यह सोच रही है कि अगर हम शराब की बन्दी करेंगे तो बहुत नुकसान होगा। और लोग बेकायदे शराब पियेंगे।

भेरा ख्याल है कि बेकायदे पीने वाले तो बहुत कम होंगे। हमारे महात्मा गांधी जी की आत्मा आज स्वर्ग में बैठी क्या कहती होगी। आज आठ साल हो गये लेकिन वे लोग जो कि कांग्रेस के नाम पर सरकार में बैठे हैं उन के पेट में से पानी तक नहीं हिलता कि बापू ने किस लिये स्वराज्य की आराधना की थी, किस लिये हजारों मजदूर और नौजवान जेलों में गये थे। उस का मुख्य कारण यही था कि बापू जानते थे कि अगर हम अपने देश में शराब बन्दी कर देंगे तो इस से गरीब सुखी होंगे। पैसे वाले तो अंग्रेजी राज्य में भी सुखी थे, वे आज कांग्रेस के राज्य में कैसे दुखी हो सकते हैं। लेकिन गरीबों को और उन के बच्चों को आगे बढ़ाने के लिये शराब बन्द होना जरूरी है। हम ने पूज्य बापू के आगे प्रतिज्ञा की थी कि अपना राज्य होते ही हम शराब दूर करेंगे। लेकिन अभी आठ साल हो गये लेकिन अभी तक हम ने और खास तौर से हमारी सरकार ने बापू की प्रतिज्ञा को पूरा नहीं किया। कम से कम अब तो यह तय कर देना चाहिये कि इतने वर्षों में हम पूर्ण रूप से शराब बन्द करने वाले हैं। राजाजी मद्रास में बैठे शराबबन्दी करने के लिये चीखते हैं और पूज्य बापू जो हमारे बीच में से उठ गये हैं, सदैव के लिये आवाज लगाते रहे। शराब सम्बन्धी समिति सारे देश में घूमि और इस विषय पर अच्छी तरह से सभी लोगों से बातलाप किया और उस ने भी सरकार से अपनी रिपोर्ट में यही सिफारिश की कि शराबबन्दी लागू होनी चाहिये, लेकिन मुझे यह खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि शराब बन्दी को लागू करने की सरकारी नीति जरा ढीली रही है और उस के लिये इस कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट से और नेहरू सरकार से मंत्री प्रार्थना है कि उन को कम से कम यह शराब गरीबों के हित के लिये, गरीबों को बचाने के लिये और उन के बालबच्चों की उन्नति के लिये बन्द ही करना चाहिये।

**Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** I have moved an amendment to the Resolution of my friend, Shri Narasimhan. The main purport of my amendment is to stagger the programme of prohibition in such a way as to make it more effective in the country. In moving this amendment I do not want to be construed or misunderstood as a person who is even a little bit less enthusiastic about prohibition or the enforcement of it than the hon. Mover or any other Member of this House.

Let me first of all say that I have got great faith in this programme of prohibition. But it is a very sorry spectacle for me to see that the prohibition law is repeatedly broken in almost all the provinces where the law is in operation. The reason is not very far to seek. I think it is an accepted theory that any social legislation of the nature of the prohibition law, for instance, should have at least the active support of 80 per cent of the population. As far as the prohibition law is concerned, though a large number of people may not have any fixed views on the subject, they view this programme with a great deal of apathy. They are neither in favour of it nor against it. Our problem now is to educate the public in such a way that they easily comprehend the evils of liquor and then actively co-operate with the Government in enforcing the law.

I could analyse and tell the House the various classes of people who are in opposition to this programme of prohibition. There is one class of people who say that as a result of the enforcement of the prohibition policy by the Congress Governments in various States, the burden of taxation on the common man has greatly increased. The taxable surplus is very little in our country and the taxation policy of the Government as a result of the prohibition policy has reached the very optimum, and all this is due to a few or a handful of addicts who have got a fad for this policy. This is one class of people who have a strong opposition to the prohibition policy. It is not very difficult to set at rest the criticism of this class of people. It is well known and all of us have accepted that the revenue derived from liquor is blood money, and that view has gained great currency in this country. It is not necessary for me to try to defeat the arguments of this class of people.

There is another class of people whose arguments cannot so easily be overcome. It is those who say that if the prohibition policy is to be enduring, that is, not in the immediate future, and if you consider the number of years that this policy has to stay in this country, then you must see that the bulk of the population of our country are actively interested in the enforcement of the prohibition policy. As we see, we cannot escape from the fact that, although we desire our prohibition policy to be enforced as early as possible and as effectively as possible, there are at

[Shri Vishwanath Reddy]

present a large number of people in our country, particularly in the areas where prohibition is in vogue, who simply do not want this policy so much. That is why they are having an attitude of complete apathy to this programme. How to educate these people is the main problem. As the Mover of the Resolution himself has admitted, it is not prohibition that has failed, but we have failed prohibition. I welcome this statement of the Mover of this Resolution. This statement clearly indicates the main canker in the enforcement of the prohibition policy. The purport of my amendment is also to see that we educate the country in such a way that they take active interest in it. I need not here detail the various ways by which the prohibition law is broken in the various States and the various expedients that the anti-social elements are following. I am not worried about that provided the bulk of the population side the policy of the enforcing authorities when an anti-social or un-social element indulges in such an activity. But it is very regrettable that the bulk of the population do not simply care to consider how greatly these anti-social elements injure our national character. This is to be met only by propaganda and education over a long period. If we try to enforce prohibition throughout the country when the people are in such a state of apathy, it is very difficult to see that this policy will be enduring. The public opinion sooner or later will be so much against the policy that we will be forced to go back on that very policy and we might be forced even to scrap our prohibition laws. That is more dangerous or more unwarranted than staggering of the programme.

It has also been said that all the political parties are in support of this policy. I have no doubt that all political parties are really interested in seeing that prohibition is enforced one day or other. But to some of them it is just an ideal; and to some it is practical politics. As far as the Congress Party is concerned, they feel that it is practical politics, whereas the bulk of the opposition parties feel that it is just now in the stage of a fad, in the stage of an ideal. It should be staggered in such a way that the real and effective co-operation of the people of this country is obtained through education. Therefore, I too feel that unless a great deal of co-operation is available

from the people of this country, it is very difficult to enforce programme of this nature which is essentially a social legislation. As I have already said, social legislation can only be enforced when the bulk of the population are actively behind it. I submit that at the present moment the bulk of the population are not actively behind it. Therefore, I do feel that this programme should be gone through with a great deal of caution and a little more slowly than is envisaged in the Resolution.

#### POINT OF ORDER RE : PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad)** : On a point of order, Sir, the hon. Minister for Home Affairs placed a document, a draft Bill for the reorganisation of States, on the Table of the House. Anyway he said so at about three o'clock or five minutes past three. But I find that the copy is not on the Table of the House. Is it in order that a document laid on the Table should not be available to the Members during the sitting of the House ?

**Mr. Chairman** : One of the hon. Members of this House took it on loan saying that he would return it after some time.

**Shri Kamath** : Is it proper ? In the House itself one should see it.

**Mr. Chairman** : It was just lying on the Table. Since he said he would return it, it was thought that he would return it and it would be available for other hon. Members also and so the Speaker allowed him perhaps on the assumption that he would see it in the House and return it. A search is being made for the hon. Member and the copy. According to the Minister of Home Affairs a copy will be available to the Members today or tomorrow.

**Shri Kamath** : The practice moreover is that as soon as a copy is laid on the Table, simultaneously copies go to the library but there is no copy in the Library either.

**Mr. Chairman** : I can understand it. It should be as the hon. Member says. But so far as the copy on the Table is concerned, I have explained how things have happened.

**Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam)** : May I in this connection humbly request you for one thing ? The hon.