

Home Minister stated that copies would be available today or tomorrow. Having regard to the importance of the Bill and the anxiety displayed by all Members of every section of this House, I would humbly request you to direct the Government to supply copies today itself because it is such an important Bill.

**Shri Kamath :** Some of us are leaving Delhi today.

**Mr. Chairman :** The wishes of the hon. Members have been voiced by Shri Kamath and Shri Thomas and I think Government will do the right thing. It will be supplied to them as soon as possible.

**Shri Kamath :** This is setting up a bad precedent. It is not available on the Table or in the Library.

**Mr. Chairman :** It should not only be in the Library. All Members are anxious that it should be supplied to them and I have said that it will be done as soon as possible.

**Shri Kamath :** It may mean Monday even. Who knows? Tomorrow is a holiday and the day after is Sunday.

**Mr. Chairman :** I also was very anxious to see it.

**Shri A. M. Thomas :** The Chairman himself went from place to place.

**Mr. Chairman :** I think it will be supplied today or tomorrow and whatever has been said in this House will be taken note of by the Members of the Government.

**Shri Kamath :** I want your ruling. A document is laid on the Table of the House but it is not made available to the Members when the House is sitting.

**Mr. Chairman :** This rule was not broken. The Speaker allowed the copy to be lent on the presumption that it would be returned soon. A search is being made for the hon. Member and the copy and as soon as it is available, it will be here. Now let us proceed with the Resolution.

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

**Shri A. K. Gopalan :** I support the amendment moved by Dr. Rama Rao and oppose the first original Resolution moved by Shri Narasimhan. In oppo-

sing that, I have to make it clear that I am not opposed to the principle of prohibition. The motion moved by Shri Narasimhan says that a target date should be fixed by the Planning Commission for completing nation-wide prohibition. A date may be fixed after one or two years and within that period there should be nation-wide prohibition. That is the idea behind it. As far as this subject is concerned, it is not a question of a ruling party. It is a national question. So, if it is suggested that only the ruling Party is interested in this, it means that others are insincere about it. I think it is not correct to say so. We oppose it because we know what the facts are. If it is enforced in the other parts of the country as it is being done in certain places now, there will be no effect at all; it will be worse. That is why we want a phased programme to implement it.

I will give an example. Today in Malabar there is prohibition. In Travancore-Cochin, there is no prohibition in some districts. Supposing this Resolution is accepted and a date is fixed and prohibition is enforced in the whole of that State, I am sure certain people who live on toddy-making in my State and Malabar and some other parts of South India will go out of employment. In Travancore-Cochin there is acute unemployment and the people are suffering very much. A community of people are engaged in this work in the South. If this is enforced within one year or two years, without any training for these persons, certainly it will adversely affect them. Not only that. It will also be unsuccessful. They will go to Malabar where illicit distillation is almost like a cottage industry. They will learn how to do it and they will adopt it. This Resolution while talking about fixing a target date does not talk of the places where priority should be given, how it should be enforced and how to remove the defects found in certain places where it has been enforced already. I have no time and so I will not go in great detail but this is what the Andhra Prohibition Enquiry Committee say in their report :

"In the villages we have visited, we were told that most of the old addicts continued to drink. New addicts have also joined them... while drinking was formerly confined to the lower classes in villages and urban areas, the drink habit

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

has now extended into the lower middle classes. Classes of people which did not previously drink have also taken to drink, including even Brahmins and Kashatriyas. To a small extent, women and children have also learnt to drink, as drink is available at home and even made there and not merely sold in public shops as before. Such illicit arrack has been known even to have caused deaths besides damaging health and producing diseases of heart, lungs, stomach, etc.... In the result drunkenness has decreased but the drink evil has not decreased to any large extent. It has spread over a wider section of society and also to new classes. The drink consumed is more injurious to health than before."

As I said I have no time and so I could not go into the other aspects of this report and also the Resolution of the Congress Working Committee. It is definitely said in it that we have to find out how it has affected the people and whether it has been a failure. I may also say that after the appointment of the Andhra Prohibition Enquiry Committee, there was also an enquiry in the whole of India.

In Madras also some enquiry was made and French polish was required to be sold after obtaining a licence because it was found, if some water was added to that, it would give some intoxication and that was used by the people. In the plantations in the Nilagiris these things happen. They call it orange essence or mango essence and when it is banned they make some other essence and it costs Rs. 2 or Rs. 3 per bottle.

As far as the economic position of the people who are addicted to it is concerned, these people are today spending more. The pity is that they are spending more on a thing which is more injurious to their health. These things are done with the connivance of some people who enforce prohibition. There are so many cases in courts which go to reveal this. An excise peon is one who gets about Rs. 25 or Rs. 35. So, he has admitted that by helping these people he will get some more money. Therefore, as far as those who enforce prohibition are concerned we have seen that, unfortunately, today they are those

who are not at all helpful and they are those who encourage it. I do not want to go into the other question. I only want to say that those who say that there must be strict prohibition and that drink is an evil, even those who preach it, are taking drinks. So the ordinary people think that they can say that drink is an evil and at night take some drink. When we say that drinking is bad there must be some propaganda about it.

Today prohibition is only by law. There are no other methods. There are no methods attempted to raise the cultural level of the people. There is no propaganda made as to why they are going to have prohibition. That propaganda was there before but today it is not there. So, prohibition if it is going to be implemented as it is there today in some of the States like Madras, Bombay and other places—it should be in the same way because there is nothing to show that the administrative machinery will be changed and other methods will be adopted—it is not going to improve the economic condition of the people. It may be that the condition of 5 or 6 families might have changed, but as far as the whole country is concerned it is not going to improve. As far as Andhra is concerned this report has definitely said that it has not, economically, socially or as far as health is concerned, improved the condition of the people.

There are two reasons, in my opinion, for this. One reason is—especially I know of my State—that in a place like Kerala those people who are engaged in it form a special community. They are very poor and have no work at all. So with prohibition they will find that they have no work at all and when they find that such preparations will give them some more money though there is a risk they will certainly go for it. Therefore, the condition of the people, the standard of living of the people, the education of the people, the cultural level of the people will have to be taken into account. Then those who want to enforce it must be those who really believe in it and who want to see that prohibition is there. They only will encourage the people to see that those people who drink do not go in for it. So there is the administration side as well as the economic side and that is the reason why it has become a failure.

If there is any dispute about the failure of prohibition the practical examples are there. Even if there are 5 per cent. of 10 per cent. as example where it has definitely not improved the economic or other condition of the people then certainly in saying that a target date must be fixed for enforcing nation-wide prohibition without considering the question where it should be done, how it should be done and what changes must be there, I think total prohibition as it is proposed by the mover of the resolution is very very harmful.

Not only that, as far as the question of unemployment is concerned if you do not look into that it will be a bad thing. When we do a good thing we have to make some sacrifice. But those people who have to make the sacrifices must have that understanding and they must have that level. Without that if you ask them to make the sacrifice and tell them: even if we cannot find jobs immediately for you and you have no jobs you will have to starve—because it is a good thing to preach to those people who are educationally backward, also in importance and also economically bad—I think it will not be good.

Then again, as I have already said in South India it is a whole community that has been trained in this. If it is implemented in the places where prohibition is not there now then certainly the question of unemployment becomes very great.

I want to say one other thing with regard to South India. Take for example coconut. First of all coconut juice is very sweet and it is very good. It is not at all injurious to health. If you take it fresh it is just like tender coconut and it is very good. If you allow it to remain for two or three days then it gets fermented and it is only then that you get the intoxicating qualities. So with the prohibition of toddy instead of taking this tender coconut if they are forced to take French varnish and other things, if the people are made to starve then I do not see how it will help the society or the people. Again, now only the elders go to the toddy shop and drink but when prohibition is there elders won't go there and in the house everybody in the family including the children will be preparing in the evening for drinking. Everybody will have his share now.

Therefore it is only giving an opportunity to the children and others in the house to use drinks.

In the end I would say that we certainly agree to the principle of prohibition, but as it is working today and in the present form if we are only pushing up prohibition and fixing a target all I can say is that in the whole country everywhere you will find small cottage industries developing and it will only be a sort of employment to people. The purpose will never be served. In principle we agree to it. We say it must be done but only on the basis in which Dr. Rama Rao has explained in his amendment. I support that amendment but oppose the other part of the resolution regarding a target and completing it within a certain time.

श्री जी० एच० देशपांडे (नासिक-मध्य) : सभापति महोदय, नशाबन्दी के बारेमें जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया है, मैं उस का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। भारतवर्ष में जो यह नशाबन्दी का इरादा है वह बहुत देरसे चला आया है और बहुत पुराना है। हमारे आधुनिक भारत में जब से राष्ट्रीयता का प्रादुर्भाव हुआ है, उसी समयसे हमारे नेताओं ने हमारे सामने जो चीजें रखी थीं उन में से नशाबन्दी को एक प्रमुख स्थान प्राप्त था। मेरे सुबे में लोकमान्य तिलक जी पैदा हुए और उन्होंने अपनी जिन्दगी के बहुत बरस पहले ही जो राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन चलाया और जो प्रोग्राम (कार्यक्रम) देश के सामने रखा उस में उन्होंने नशाबन्दी को बड़े जोरसे पुरस्कार किया था। उन के बाद लाला लाजपतराय, बिपिन चन्द्र पाल और जो दूसरे पुराने नेता आए उन्होंने भी नशाबन्दी का बहुत जोर से पुरस्कार किया था। महात्मा गांधीजी ने तो जब से वह कांग्रेस में आये उसी समय से इस को बहुत महत्त्व का स्थान दिया था। मुझे याद है 'यंग इंडिया' में एक बार उन्होंने लिखा था कि मैं कोई भी अधिकार लेना नहीं चाहता लेकिन अगर कभी मुझे कोई अधिकार मिल जाये और मैं आध घंटे के लिये डिक्टेटर बन जाऊँ तो एकही काम करूँगा और वह यह कि नशाबन्दी को जारी करना उन्होंने एक बार लिखा था कि यदि आदमी नैतिक नीति से गिरता है तो आम तौरपर नशाबन्दी के कारण ही गिरता है। इस लिये उन्होंने इस का बहुत पुरस्कार किया है। जब हम आजाद नहीं हुए थे उस वक्त नशाबन्दीको इतना महत्त्व दिया गया था कि लोग शराब की दुकानों पर जाकर

[श्री जी० एच० देशपांडे]

पिकिंटिंग (घरना देना) करते थे और गोलियों का शिकार भी बनते थे। इस को लागू करवाने के लिये बहुत से आदमियों ने एक भारी कीमत भ्रदा की। बाद में हम जब पावर (सशक्त) में आये तो इस को लागू करने में कोई देर हमें नहीं करनी चाहिये। मैं उस सूबे से आता हूँ कि जिस सूबे ने पहले से ही कुछ न कुछ इस बारे में किया है। सन् १९३७ में मैं बम्बई में कॉन्सिल में गया था। वहाँ हमारे नेता बाला साहब खेर थे। आप जानते ही हैं कि वह गांधी जी की जो तत्त्व-प्रणाली है उस को मानने वाले हैं। उन्होंने अब इस सवाल को उठाया तो बम्बई में कुछ आदमी ऐसे थे जो कि बहुत पैसा कमाते थे, ठेकेदारी करते थे, बहुत धनवान थे, उन्होंने इस का कड़ा विरोध किया, सख्त विरोध किया। २७ महिने के लिये हम ने जो प्रयोग किया और इस दौरान जो काम किया, वह जितना सख्त और जिस दृढ़ता से इस का विरोध हो रहा था उस को देखते हुए संतोषजनक ही कहा जा सकता है। यह प्रोहिबिशन बम्बई और अहमदाबाद में पहले पलत हुआ। हमारे दोस्त गोपालन साहब ने अभी आन्ध्र की एक रिपोर्ट में से कुछ पढ़ कर इस सभा को अवगत कराया है। मैं उन को यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हम ने सन् १९३७ में अहमदाबाद और बम्बई में जो प्रयोग किया और उस में जो सफलता प्राप्त की है, उस की जो रिपोर्ट्स यहाँ पर बिद्यमान हैं। यदि माननीय सदस्य उन को पढ़ेंगे तो उन को मालूम होगा कि कितनी सफलता हमें वहाँ प्राप्त हुई थी। अहमदाबाद और बम्बई में जो आर्गनाइज्ड लेबर (संगठित श्रमिक) हैं, जो काम करने वाले कामदार हैं, उन को इस प्रोहिबिशन से बहुत लाभ हुआ है। मैं यह भी देखता हूँ कि बम्बई और अहमदाबाद में जो इंडस्ट्रियल एरियाज़ (औद्योगिक क्षेत्र) हैं, वहाँ जो कामगार हैं, उन का जीवन-स्तर भी ऊँचा उठ रहा है और उठ चुका है। और यह जो तरक्की हो रही है उस का कारण मैं तो यह मानता हूँ कि हम प्रोहिबिशन कर रहे हैं उसी से यह तरक्की हो रही है। पहले मैं ने बम्बई में देखा था कि मजदूरी की मजदूरी बढ़ जाती थी या कोई दूसरे कनसेशन (रियायत) मिल जाते थे लेकिन उस से उन के परिवारों को कोई लाभ नहीं होता था, उनका स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग (रहन-सहन का स्तर) नहीं बढ़ता था, उन को जो कुछ ज्यादा मिलता था वह शराब में चला जाता था और उन के परिवार के लोग बड़े दुख में रहते थे। अब अगर

मिलान किया जाये तो उस के उस समय के जीवन में आज के जीवन में बहुत बड़ा अन्तर हो गया है और इसका बहुत बड़ा श्रेय प्रोहिबिशन को ही है। जब से बम्बई में प्रोहिबिशन लागू हुआ है तबसे सारे सूबे में तरक्की हो रही है। मैं यह नहीं मानता कि बम्बई में हम सौ टक्के कामयाब हुए हैं। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि इल्लिसिट डिस्टिलेशन (अवैध मद्यसार) हो रहा है। लेकिन फिर भी आज जो बम्बई की हालत है वह प्रोहिबिशन के पहले की हालत से कई गुना अच्छी है। प्रोहिबिशन को पहले हमारे यहाँ गांवों में जो बुराइयाँ भरी हुई थीं उन में बहुत कमी हो गई है। मैं ने यह भी देखा है कि जिन गांवों में शराब पीने वाले लोग बहुत हैं वहाँ सुधार नहीं होता है। लेकिन मैंने खुद देखा है कि जिन गांव वालों ने शराब पीना छोड़ दिया है उन की हालतमें बहुत सुधार हुआ है।

अभी हमारे दोस्त गोपालन साहब ने कहा कि यह काम सरकारी कानूनसे होने वाला नहीं है। मैं भी इस बात को मानता हूँ। और मैंने देखा है कि जहाँ भी हम को कामयाबी हुई है वहाँ उसी समय हुई है जब कि कानून की मदद करने के लिये सामाजिक कार्यकर्ताओं ने जोर लगाया है। एक देहात में मैंने देखा है कि जब वहाँ कानून के द्वारा शराब बन्द करने का प्रयत्न किया गया तो सफलता नहीं मिली। उलटे वह बुराई और बढ़ गई। लोगों में वैमनस्य बढ़ गया। बाद में हम ने दूसरा यत्न किया। जो व्यसनी आदमी थे उन की एक लिस्ट (सूची) बनाई और देखा कि उन के परिवार में कौन रहता है। उन के पास गये। उन के घर में गये, उन की गालियाँ सुनीं। लेकिन सामाजिक कार्यकर्ताओं ने उन से जा कर कहा कि आप के गांव में इतना पैसा व्यर्थ जाता है, इसी लिये गांव की हालत में सुधार नहीं होता है। उन को बतलाया कि यह शराब पीना उस के लिये अच्छी चीज नहीं है, और उन को समझाया कि हम उन के वंरी नहीं हैं, उन की भलाई चाहते हैं। दो-चार कार्यकर्ता दो-चार हफ्ते वहाँ रहे, बहुत से अच्छे अच्छे आदमियों ने शराब पीने वालों के पैरों पर सिर रखा और इस प्रकार उनसे नशेबाजी छड़ाई। उस का परिणाम यह हुआ कि उस गांव से १६००० रुपया पापुलर कंट्रीब्यूशन (सार्वजनिक अंशदान) के रूपमें एक स्कूल के लिये प्राप्त हुआ और अभी आठ दिन हुए मुझे एक पत्र मिला है जिस से पता चलता है कि उसी गांव से ३० हजार रुपया एक तालाब के लिये पापुलर कंट्रीब्यूशन के रूपमें और प्राप्त

हुआ है। तो मेरा कहना यह है कि बम्बईमें प्रोहिबिशन करने से हम को लाभ ही हुआ है हानि नहीं हुई है। यह अवश्य है कि इस काम में कठिनाई बहुत होती है। लेकिन फिर भी मैं कहता हूँ कि यदि बम्बई सूबे में लोगों की आर्थिक स्थिति में सुधार हुआ है तो उस का बहुत बड़ा कारण यह प्रोहिबिशन ही है। अब वहाँ लोगों की परचेजिंग पावर (ऋयशक्ति) बढ़ गई है और वे ज्यादा कर दे सकते हैं। प्रोहिबिशन से वहाँ कोई नुकसान नहीं हुआ है।

अधिकारियों में भी अब पहले से बहुत सुधार है। मैंने तो कुछ ऐसे पुलिस अधिकारी देखे हैं जिन्होंने इस प्रोहिबिशन के लिये अपनी कुर्बानी दे दी। पहले कुछ अधिकारी पैसा लेते थे लेकिन उस में भी बहुत सुधार हुआ है। यह मैं मानता हूँ कि इस में पूरी सफलता प्राप्त होने में समय लगेगा, लेकिन इस कारण हम को हताश नहीं होना चाहिये। अगर आज सफलता नहीं मिलती तो कल मिलेगी। जो कदम बम्बई सूबे ने उठाया गया है अगर उसको पीछे हटाया जायेगा तो इस से देश को बहुत हानि होगी। मैं तो कहूँगा कि बम्बई को नमूना मानकर दूसरे सूबों को भी वैसे ही कदम उठाना चाहिये। तभी हम को सफलता मिलेगी। हर बार जब हम यह चीज सामने लाते हैं तो हमारे दोस्त गोपालन कहते हैं कि इस को तो एकदम करना चाहिये, इस के लिये आंदोलन करना चाहिये या नहीं करना चाहिये कि इस को दो बरस में या पांच बरस में करना है। मैं भी उन से सहमत हूँ। मैं नहीं समझता कि कोई इस के खिलाफ है। लेकिन इस काम में सफलता पूरे तौर से तभी मिल सकती है जब कि गवर्नमेंट इस और कदम उठावे और सारे लोग संगठित रूपसे पूरे उत्साह के साथ उस की मदद करें।

मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

**Shri Khardekar (Kolhapur cum Satara):** I find myself nearly on the horns of a dilemma. I am being pulled on both sides—moral and human, and there is a history for it. In the Constituent Assembly, when this matter was being debated, when after 40 speakers had spoken in support of the directive principles, and when the 40th speaker declared most vehemently that there would not be a single soul in this country who would dare oppose prohibition, my humble self did rise and did make a fairly long speech in opposing prohibition.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan:** I have that speech here, with the Sanskrit sloka.

**Shri Khardekar:** I hope you will learn something from it. Since then, right upto this day, on occasions proper and necessary, I have continuously and consistently opposed it. But today, even when Shri A. K. Gopalan and others—I would not say they are hard-boiled communists—are supporting it, all my opposition has melted into the thin air. After all, man is dynamic and not static. Change is inevitable and I realise my folly. As you know, in jurisprudence, crime plus punishment is equal to innocence. In morals, I say that sin plus repentance is innocence. Today, I speak with a pure heart and I am sincere.

There are certain reasons for which I still put forth my opposition. I would like really that prohibition should be introduced, but I want to point out the difficulties, and therefore, if my criticism is constructive, I hope you will give me a few more minutes.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** A good bargain.

**Shri Khardekar:** There are certain advantages and benefits of prohibition in a wrong and inverted way to which also I would refer, because the dangers must be faced and not avoided. Knowledge, seasoned by experience, is wisdom. I will give you a few humble words of wisdom. I have quoted a number of examples to ridicule prohibition. I will take one such to show the dangers which prohibition has to face and which prohibitionists must be aware of.

It is only two years ago that a lawyer friend of mine invited me to pay a visit to a fisherman's village near Bombay. I accompanied him. I wanted to see the simplicity of the life of villagers. This lawyer was to be consulted in a case relating to prohibition. We sat in a house which was really very comfortable and not far away. It was right more or less in the centre of the village. The police chowki was about a hundred yards from there. And they served us fish and other good things to eat. I found seven or eight of them, nice, well-built people with silk shirts. A bottle would come, a bottle would disappear. Old bottle would go away, giving place to new. In about an hour and a half I found seven or eight bottles had come and gone, magically. I did ask them, "How is it? The police chowki is just there?". They said, "Yes,

[Shri Khandekar]

there are the policemen, they are our watchmen: if the Government pays them this much, we pay them five times that". I asked, "How can you afford all this?" They said, "Before prohibition, subjecting ourselves to all the hazards of the seas training ourselves day in and day out, myself, my brothers and nephews, we used to make about fifteen to twenty thousand rupees. Now, smuggling from Goa and resorting to illicit distillation, we easily make eighty to ninety thousand a year." By way of ridicule I once gave another example to prove that this was the way that the Bombay Government spend fifteen crores of rupees and put sixty crores into the people's pockets.

My point is these are facts and we must see how to improve our administration and how to make this reform work. Because, normally it is very easy to say that it is foolish to legislate for the morals of mankind. But where people are such that it will take ages for education and so on to bring them to the right line, we must try to see how by co-operation with a number of other people this particular reform can be effected. And the reason for this is—I do not know how many Congressmen follow those ideals—those who go in for moral reform must themselves be certain of their morals. Gandhiji's name has been mentioned now and again. What are Gandhiji's principles? Prohibition, Khaddar and the like, they are important to Gandhi but I do not think they are the essence of Gandhi. The essence of Gandhiji lies in love of truth, in self-sacrifice and service. Other things and mere trippings. If the primary things—Swamiji talked of values—if these values are firmly fixed, the secondary things will flow automatically. According to critics, they are—even I am—rather sceptical about the virtues of so many of our Congress friends who take the name of Gandhi in season and out of season. Because I find their words and actions are not the same. For instance, take love of truth. We very often hear from our great leaders, we hear them talking about ends and means and the necessity of keeping them pure and noble. At the same time we find such great people utilising the king of goondas to win elections for them in places like Andhra. These are facts which cannot be denied. There are so many things we talk about. Then we talk of socialistic pattern of society, and we simply go on

mortgaging a city like Bombay to a handful of capitalists. I doubt the sincerity of these great men, and I doubt whether they really follow Gandhiji in the essentials of Gandhism. As apostles of peace in the world and disciples of Buddha here they do not mind killing their own people, and if an enquiry is demanded, they say, in the name of healing up wounds, "Where is the need for an enquiry?". To accuse people without proving that accusation, to be a prosecutor and a judge at the same time and to deny even an enquiry—well, these things raise doubts and suspicions and make us sceptical. Social reform must proceed from a very powerful moral basis. Why did people follow Gandhiji? Not blindly, but because they could see light, sincerity through and through. I do not mean all the followers are bad; I do not say that. But what I mean is the majority, and particularly those who are at the top.

Therefore, my sincere appeal is a reform is necessary. But those who want moral reform must be moralists themselves. Otherwise, there is no use getting intoxicated against intoxication, because there are things other than liquor that go to the head—and power is one. I hope those in power will not get power-intoxicated.

**Shri Dabhi** : Has my hon. friend supported the resolution?

**Shri Khardekar** : Yes, I did, but with all the qualifications.

**श्री श्रीमन्ना रायण (वर्धा)** : सभापति महोदय मुझे खुशी है कि इस सदन में शराब बंदी के सम्बन्ध में आज चर्चा करने का अवसर मिला है। मुझे इस बात की भी खुशी है कि ....

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi** (Nellore) : May I request the hon. Member speak in English? Because those who do not understand Hindi may then follow him.

**Mr. Chairman** : I have to make an announcement. The copy of that was asked for by Shri Kamath has come now from the press; it has been obtained just now. Any Member wishing to see it can consult it.

**Shri B. S. Murthy** (Eluru) : The copy has come, but Mr. Kamath is lost!

**Shri Shriman Narayan** : Sir, in order that at least the Mover of the Resolution may understand what I say, I shall speak in English.

I am happy that this House has an opportunity to discuss prohibition in some detail. Prohibition has been one of the most important programmes in constructive work ever since 1920. But I think the Planning Commission after appointing a Committee gave us a chance of studying this in all aspects and in all thoroughness. Now I would not go into the details of that report, because it is already before the House and Members have had the opportunity of studying it. But I would take up a few points which are generally discussed and which betray some ignorance as well as some misunderstanding.

The first question that is generally discussed, and which was also raised in this House today, is the question of illicit distillation. We had the opportunity of going round the country, meeting all kinds of people in almost all the States. I can say without any fear of contradiction that this phobia of illicit distillation is very much exaggerated. People say it has become a cottage industry. Well, what is wrong with cottage industries? Why do you damn cottage industry by comparing it with illicit distillation, as if cottage industry is a very bad thing? It was absolutely wrong.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I have to say that it was Minister Katju who first said that.

**Shri Shriman Narayan:** Whoever it may be, I am not defending anybody. I would say there is illicit distillation—there is no use shutting our eyes to that—just as burglary, thefts and dacoities. But it is on such a large scale?

The Ramamurthi Report which Mr. Gopalan quoted was, I am sorry to say, written after one month's hurried tours, and it is not proper for any committee to reach conclusions without going into the whole thing very thoroughly.

There is illicit distillation. But on detailed enquiries we found that of the persons who were addicted to drink, about 10 to 15 per cent. of the people still try to evade the law. So far as public opinion is concerned, it is very clear that all the women are against it, definitely against drinking; that is fifty per cent. Of the rest, as I said, 10 to 15 per cent. of the old addicts, not all of them, would try to get drunk somehow because they are hard addicts. We have to pity those people. They have to be regarded as sick people. In this report our approach has always been

humanitarian. It is no use trying to be very hard on them. Of course the law has to take its course, but we have to arrange for some institutional treatments. Just as we treat a person who is sick, who is ill, through clinics, we can treat these people also through clinics. But, to say that many people are against it, that the number of people who are used to drinking has increased is, I must say, highly exaggerated, and betrays either gross ignorance of facts or a studied distortion of facts.

5 P. M.

So far as those States which introduced prohibition and found a number of difficulties, like Bombay and others, are concerned, I would like to place one point before the House. Unless you make prohibition nation-wide, it can never succeed. How can it? You want one State like Bombay or Madras to go ahead with prohibition surrounded by States which have no prohibition at all, and the borders are thousands of miles. How much police can one State keep for checking smuggling? Therefore, it is absolutely necessary, if you want to make prohibition a success, it must be nation-wide and the phases of programme should also be more or less uniform. I am very sorry to note that although a number of States, when we met them, conceded this and said that if you want to make prohibition really successful, make it uniform, now have come out to say, you will have to adjust it to our convenience. If it is a matter of convenience, if it is a matter of finance, to which I shall refer later, this will never come up. From 1920 onwards we have been thinking about it. It is now 1956. Half a century more will pass away very easily. If we want to do it, we must properly phase it. Smuggling and illicit distillation will also disappear only when we tackled it properly and according to a definite programme.

I quite agree with the hon. Members that the main point is enforcement. You will find that almost half of the report of the Prohibition Enquiry Committee deals with the question of enforcement. It is not that we shut our eyes to that point. It is a very important point. Because, even a good thing, if it is not properly enforced, will fail. So far as enforcement is concerned, the Committee has tried to give ask them, "How is it? The police

[Shri Shriman Narayan]

is administrative, legal, and the punitive aspect. The law is effective in many respects. But, we have suggested a number of points in which that law must be improved. Secondly, administration is defective. We do not keep any special officer in charge. We have recommended that there should be an administrator of prohibition for each State, a person who really believes in that, and not regards it as just routine like other things. We have also pointed out that the other aspect, that is the educative aspect should be given a very prominent place in the programme. Therefore I would appeal to all Members of this House, constructive workers' institutions, social welfare institutions, governmental and non-governmental agencies that it should be tackled with concerted action on all fronts. If we really expect the police to do it, it will never be done. The police has to do it because the arms of law are wide. Unless the police tackle it, it is no use of leaving it to the social workers. The police must help. But, it is absolutely true to say that the social workers and constructive workers in this country and all political parties should take up this work. I am glad to find that even the Communist Party friends admit that prohibition is good. They only say that it has to be done in a constructive way. We are all for it. We hope that at least in this they will not create any kind of difficulties on a party level.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan :** Never.

**Shri Shriman Narayan:** Shri A. K. Gopalan stated, and I welcome the statement, that this is a national programme. At least in this programme let there not be any differences. If they want to make some alteration, let it be made, I do not mind that. If they want to change the target date, let it be made. No date is sacrosanct. If they want to make it a year or two later, I do not mind, personally, provided there is a will to do it. If you only want to change the date because there is no will to do it, it means nothing. Every State will say, where is the money, please give us more time, we cannot do it. If some of the States do not go forward, the others also will not. Take the State of Delhi. The Chief Minister of Delhi has been saying, what good is it to me to enforce prohibition if I am surrounded like an island in a sea of drink. The target date has to be very carefully fixed. If

you leave it to the States, nothing will happen. I do expect that once the Planning Commission or the Government have fixed a target, that date should be adhered to. Unless there is a will to do anything, there will be no way out. The nation has to develop a will to do things. It is here that you will have to seek the co-operation of all parties and I think it will be forthcoming in an ample measure.

About employment, in the report we have given a number of suggestions. Who will say that we should leave these people unemployed? Then, they will turn into criminals. Therefore, we have pointed out in the report that the Government of India and the States Governments should take up cottage industries and village industries and other employment, such as public works in areas where especially these people will be affected in large numbers. We must go ahead with these construction programmes and village and small-scale industries in a planned fashion and absorb these people. I will be the last person to say that they should be thrown out to the winds. No nation can do it. No Government can do it. There is no difference of opinion on that score. But please do not make employment an excuse for putting this off. After all, who are these unemployed people? Who are the people who are to benefit by prohibition? Certainly the poorest sections of the people. If we have at heart the good of these poorest sections of the people, we should not make employment a bogey. The employment question has to be tackled and will be tackled.

Coming to the replies to our questionnaire and examination of witnesses, I must say with great pleasure that it was really inspiring when representatives of the defence forces came before us. They said,—they went away within 15 minutes—that they came to tell us, "Please, for heaven's sake, do not make us an exception; if the Government and the people in a free country fix a target and give a programme, we shall not lag behind". They also went on to say, because the army is disciplined, we will carry out the programme more effectively and successfully. That is a very great thing. In no country, I think, the army officers will say that. I am only trying to point this out to you because I feel that to compare India with other countries, including the U.S.A. is



not fair. Are the ancient cultural traditions of this country and those of other countries similar? In this country alone, I think, drinking is regarded and has been regarded for ages as an evil. I do not think that in any other country—they may say it is bad on medical grounds—it has been regarded as a kind of moral evil or sin. In this country, an overwhelming majority of the people admit that it is bad. They regard it not fashionable, although in the big cities the so-called advanced people may regard it as fashionable. It is that spirit of the nation, that moral fibre of the nation which makes the army people also say that they will not lag behind. They are as enthusiastic as anybody else. This is very heartening feature of our country. I think we should not try to compare our conditions with those of other countries and say, if it has not succeeded elsewhere, how can we succeed. If it has not succeeded elsewhere it is the more reason that we should try to make it a success in this country. If we can give a lead in many other things, why not in this? When we made this report, we felt that it is only India that can show the way to the world. No other country can do it. Therefore, we had expected that the Government and the people and all parties would join hands in this great venture and great experiment.

So far as finance is concerned, I am very sorry that the whole pattern of finance and our way of thinking somehow does not make us realise the absurdity of the situation. People say we will lose Rs. 44 crores per year. Well, that is the revenue that we are getting today, but it is not realised sufficiently that if one person gives you one rupee in revenue, in excise, he spends three rupees more on drink. That is to say, easily the drink bill will be about Rs. 150 crores. If you enforce prohibition, that means the people save Rs. 150 crores. There may be a leakage, I do not mind if it is Rs. 140 crores or so. The national exchequer may lose Rs. 40 or Rs. 44 crores, still there is a gain of Rs. 100 crores. It may not be a visible gain, but do we go only by rupees, annas and pies? Can we not see how prohibition directly improves the condition of the poorer sections of the people? We have only to go to Bombay or Ahmedabad or Madras or Saurashtra. We can see very easily how the condition of the people has improved. No State should feel that only their budget is important, their revenue and expendi-

—23 Lok Sabha

ture. They do not see the saving of money by the people. Therefore, I say, even from the financial point of view the nation saves Rs. 100 crores directly every year. You may not see that in your budgets, but you will see it on the faces of the people and in their families and their womenfolk, how they feel about it.

We went to a number of places. All the women have told us: "For Heaven's sake, please do it,—for our sake, for the sake of the children, for the sake of the family." They do not look at your budget, whether it is inflated or slightly more or less.

The Taxation Enquiry Commission also made it very clear and I am here to say that even that expert body has said that in matters of prohibition finance should not be the main consideration. And still we find our States replying: "If the Centre pays us, we will do it", as if it is none of their concern to do it, as if their people and their welfare are mortgaged to the Government of India. I really do not understand why States should try to think in traditional terms, in stereotyped fashion why they should still think in terms of income and expenditure, debit and credit and only things which appear on paper and in the budgets. I have no doubt that even if you want to make the small savings movement a success, and if you really want to do good to the people directly here and now, prohibition will go in that direction. This cry of loss of revenue is a cry which is based on complete misunderstanding and a distortion of the whole situation.

So far as the target date as suggested by us is concerned, I would like to say a few words in explanation, because it is not easily understood why we fixed 1st April, 1958.

There were many people who thought that a reform like this has to be done quickly because even medical experts pointed out that if a person wants to give up an evil like this, he must give it up suddenly. Experienced doctors in Bombay and elsewhere told us that if a person is addicted to drink and if you give him less and less, it is a torture, physical and mental. But if that man makes up his mind and develops a will to do it, he does it, that is all. He might feel rather uneasy for a few days,

[Shri Shriman Narayan] but he does it and he comes and tells the doctor : "You have given the right advice. I have given it up.". And the people who are asked to give it up slowly, gradually, never give it up. We have also referred to a very important Chinese saying about this philosophy of moderation and gradualness. The Chinese saying is that first a man takes the drink, then the drink takes the man, then the drink takes the man. First the man takes the drink, but then it is the habit that goes on taking the man. So, if you go on delaying it, it will be very difficult for these people to give it up later on, because even if you go on reducing the quantity of drink it becomes very difficult for them, and then they go underground and resort to smuggling and all these things you find in the big cities. Therefore we thought if the nation is really determined to do it, two or three years would be quite sufficient to prepare the ground. The enforcement machinery is already there. The police is there. Only we have to give them some special training, then some educative process also could be there. Thousands of constructive workers are in the country who have been working ever since 1920. They do not need much of schooling and education in this. They know it. And if you want to have it on a nation-wide scale it will be only fair to those States which have already introduced it many years ago not to put off the target too far. And we thought that if we had it on 1st April, 1958 it would be a practical proposition.

As I said, I do not mind if for the sake of accommodating all the States in the country you make some alteration by a year or two, but if you alter it much more and leave it vague, as I said, it will lead to nothing. It is better to say frankly and plainly that we do not need this experiment, we do not believe in it, rather than try to evade the issue by leaving it to the States and to their sweet will. Therefore, I do hope that the Planning Commission and the State Governments, because after all it is a State subject, will give it all the serious consideration that it deserves and will not try to put off the target too far.

I think personally that at any cost during the next five years, by the end of the Second Five Year Plan period, we must have complete prohibition in this country even if we want to find the necessary financial resources for our

planning. Therefore I regard it as essential even from the financial and monetary point of view.

I had the opportunity of touring with Vinobaji recently on foot, in the interior to places where generally nobody goes. It was a painful sight to see. On the one hand Bhoodan lands are being distributed to the landless people. While money is given to them by the Governments and local panchayats and municipalities, but more than half of it is going down the gutter. If you do not introduce prohibition all these things fail, because whatever extra money you put in the hands of those people is misused because you give the temptation. How can you blame these people? After all, they are human beings, and they also say : "You give us the temptation, therefore we are used to it". As I told you about the saying, the man becomes helpless, a helpless victim to it. Therefore, the best thing is to wean away these people as quickly as possible, not to allow too much time to pass. In this House there is no difference of opinion on the main principle. That is a great thing for any country where all parties are united on principles, and once we are united on the main policy, I do not think it will be fair to the nation and to the people, especially the poorer sections, to delay this too long.

**Shri B. S. Murthy** : I rise to support the motion moved by my friend Shri C. R. Narasimhan. It is a good augury that he is the Mover of this resolution, because Rajaji can be said to be the Father of Prohibition in India.

**Shri Sadhan Gupta** (Calcutta South-East) : He is the brother of prohibition.

**Shri B. S. Murthy** : It was in 1937 when he was the Chief Minister of Madras State that he inaugurated prohibition, and it was also a fortunate coincidence that the Minister at that time was a Harijan. This Brahmin on the one side and the lowest man in the Hindu community, a Harijan on the other, joined hands to give the message of hope that prohibition alone can do justice to the toiling toiling masses of India. I have been all along with them in my humble capacity and I have seen great enthusiasm in the masses. After all, prohibition is a gift which the national Government can give not to the rich, but to the poverty-stricken, the lowest strata of our society. Therefore,

I do not think there is any argument which can be put forward against the introduction of prohibition, but everybody says this way or that way that they have got a number of difficulties. Even my hon. friends Shri A. K. Gopalan and Dr. Rama Rao have said that prohibition is good and that it must be introduced. But we are hesitating because we are afraid that we may not succeed. And they say, look at Andhra, look at Madras and look at Bombay they have not been successful, therefore we are hesitating. That is the argument that they have advanced. But let me ask: "If it is not possible to make prohibition a success, then what is it that we can make successful?" I consider that the first social evil that could be removed is prohibition. . . .

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan :** The social evil is drink.

**Shri B. S. Murthy :** I stand corrected. The drink evil should be removed, and for that prohibition is the only panacea.

My hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan said that the Ramamurthy Committee's report contains a lot of facts to prove that prohibition in Andhra was not successful. I refute it. I am glad that Shri Shriman Narayan was able to point out that justice was not done to the Andhra public. I know how that report was written, and with what haste it was written. Even tours were not made. They merely gathered certain material which was available, sat together and wrote the report and handed it over to the Andhra Government who were very anxious to place it on the Table of the Andhra Legislative Assembly. So, such a report could not be depended upon.

The question of prohibition could be discussed on three main considerations, namely the unemployment resulting as a result of the introduction of prohibition, the loss of revenue and the difficulties that have to be faced while implementing the policy of prohibition.

As far as unemployment is concerned, it is a bogey that has been raised by my hon. friends, because there will be no unemployment provided.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan :** Provided there is employment.

**Shri B. S. Murthy :** Government are able to take care of it. In Andhra, they are trying to take care of it.

First of all, in the rural areas, the main occupation for the people is to draw toddy. Even today toddy could be drawn, but it could be converted into *neera* or malt. If Government come to the rescue of these people by organising co-operative societies for the sale of *neera* and also for converting that toddy into malt, then there will be greater employment opportunities for the people, and I am sure the question of unemployment will not be there.

Further, there are many acres of *banjar* land in this area. Why should not those lands be distributed amongst the people who are not willing to have any other occupation?

**Shri A. K. Gopalan :** But they are not distributing it.

**Shri B. S. Murthy :** So far as the question of loss of revenue is concerned, Shri Shriman Narayan has said that there is no loss at all. Are we entitled to accept money which is tainted, that is to say, the blood-money drawn from these people who are not able to make both ends meet? In Salem, in Chittoor and other districts where prohibition was in force during 1938-40, I had occasion to visit some of the *cheries* where the lowliest of the low live. Four or five months after the introduction of prohibition, I was able to see that almost every family was able to show us more clothes, more etables and even more money. So, there is no question of loss of revenue at all. It is a question of giving more money into the hands of the poor people who toil from dawn to dusk. Especially, the agricultural labourers and the workers in the factories do require the protection of Government from being tempted to drink and waste their money.

I ask in all sincerity: What moral right have Government got to place temptation before them and say it is our national policy, drink if you want, because we cannot stop it, and we are afraid that we shall not be in position to enforce prohibition? I say that Government have no moral right at all. Therefore, they should take the earliest opportunity to see that complete prohibition is introduced in all part of the country. As has been stated already, at present Madras State is having prohibition, but Mysore State is not enforcing it. . . .

**Shri Thinnaiah :** Half of it only.

**Shri B. S. Murthy :** The Andhra State is enforcing it, but not the Orissa State. It is a sort of hide-and-seek game which is being played by people who are trying to help illicit distillation.

**Shri Keshavalegar .**(Bangalore—North): Mysore has also enforced it, but not completely.

**Shri B. S. Murthy :** Mysore has gone only half the way.

Coming to the last point, namely the difficulties in way of implementing the policy of prohibition, I would like to point out that they are just a bogey, because the poorer sections of the people are willing to accept it, and it is only the upper middle class people who are trying to tempt them with illicit distillation and arrack and other things.

Formerly, only the lower classes were drinking, but now even Brahmins and Kshatriyas have started drinking. The reason is that they are able to make more money, and this money is tempting them to taste a little bit of the very arrack which is giving them a lot of money. Whatever that may be, we have no right to think that prohibition could not be introduced immediately.

I appeal to the Planning Minister as well as the Cabinet to honour the pledges given to the nation, to the poor sections. We have told the world that prohibition will be our main theme, as soon as we get independence. In order to redeem those pledges, we have to

take courage in both hands, and see that it is introduced as early as possible, in any case not later than 1958-59.

**Shri Gadilingana Gowd :** I beg to move.

"That in the amendment proposed by me, for the word 'Prohibition' occurring at the end, substitute 'drinking'."

**Mr. Chairman :** Amendment moved :

"That in the amendment proposed by Shri Gadilingana Gowd, for the word 'Prohibition' occurring at the end, substitute 'drinking'."

**Shri L. Jogeswar Singh:** (Inner Manipur): Prohibition has got a mixed reception in certain parts of Assam, Manipur, Tripura and the tribal areas. So far as the plain areas of Assam, Manipur and Tripura are concerned, there is no difficulty in enforcing prohibition. But so far as the hill areas are concerned, it is difficult to introduce it, for the tribal people will find it difficult to give up the habit of drinking.

**Mr. Chairman :** I take it that hon. Member will some time.

**Shri L. Jogeswar Singh :** Yes.

**Mr. Chairman :** The hon. Member can continue his speech on the next occasion. The House will now stand adjourned.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Half Past Ten of the Clock on Monday the 19th March, 1956.*