

Mr. Chairman : Shri Ajit Singh will continue on the next day. I now call upon Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury to move her motion.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE
MEMBERS' BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS

FORTY-EIGHTH REPORT

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhury (Nabadwip): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Forty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 28th March, 1956."

Mr. Chairman : The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Forty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 28th March, 1956."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE: FIXING A
TARGET DATE FOR PROHI-
BITION

Mr. Chairman: The House will now resume further discussion of the Resolution moved by Shri C. R. Narasimhan on the 2nd March, 1956, regarding fixing a target date for Prohibition.

Out of 3½ hours allotted for the discussion of the Resolution, 2 hours and 31 minutes have already been taken up and 59 minutes are left for its further discussion today.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh may continue his speech. Before that, may I know how long the Minister would like to take? 4

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): About 30 to 40 minutes (*Interruption*).

Mr. Chairman: The position is this. There are only 59 minutes. The Mover would like to have a few minutes for his reply.

An Hon. Member : He wants five minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Does the Minister want 40 minutes?

Shri Keshavalengar (Bangalore North): Even in Private Members' Resolutions, the Minister takes away all the time. . . .

Mr. Chairman: There is another Member who is on his legs and he must be given his chance. Kripalaniji also wishes to speak and I suppose the House will be interested to hear him. Therefore I would request the Minister to tell me if he will be satisfied with 30 minutes.

Shri Nanda: I will be satisfied even with less than 30 minutes if the hon. Members do not wish to hear the Government's point of view in the matter.

Some Hon. Members: We want to hear the Government view.

Mr. Chairman: The only other alternative will be that we shall have to extend the time further. Let us see about it.

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): 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 recommends that the Planning Commission should formulate the necessary programme to bring about nation-wide Prohibition speedily and effectively."

Mr. Chairman: Amendment moved:

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 recommends that the Planning Commission should formulate the necessary programme to bring about nation-wide Prohibition speedily and effectively."

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh (Inner Manipur): I was saying on the last occasion about the target date for prohibition. I have my own misgivings whether it will be effectively applied. I agree in principle but I want that prohibition should

[Shri L. Jogeswar Singh]

be enforced in a phased programme and it should not be introduced on a country-wide basis.

Regarding this matter I want to speak about the tribal areas of Manipur, Tripura and Assam. In those areas, the conditions of the people are quite different from the conditions of tribal people obtaining in other parts of India. The Prohibition Enquiry Committee has not visited this part of the country—Assam, Manipur and Tripura—and it is quite ignorant of the conditions obtaining in those parts. This ignorance was revealed by the fact that when the Committee published the map of India where prohibition is introduced and is going to be introduced, it put the name of Manipur on the map of Tripura and the name of Tripura on the map of Manipur. The members of the Enquiry Committee have done injustice by giving wrong names to the different States in this way and it shows that they are quite ignorant of the facts obtaining in those parts of the country. In this matter unless you go there and assess the position of the tribal people, you will not be in a position to say anything about the conditions that really obtain there, because there are inaccessible areas, mountaineous and tribal areas in those parts which are beyond the amenities of the modern life and the people there resort to drink by habits, by customs and by traditions. Every home usually resorts to taking home brewed beer made of rice. Whenever any festival takes place, everyone usually takes beer. It is very cheap, it is less costly and at the same time it hardly injures their health as they have generally temperance and is comparatively less intoxicant. In the interior parts of the tribal areas, people do not get either tea or lime juice or any kind of such food. After a day's hard labour, they sit together and have their drink of country-made beer; they do not procure alcoholic drinks. So the position of the tribal people should be taken into account—social, economic and political conditions that obtain there. They are good citizens but their economic conditions are so bad that they are not in a position to procure any eatables or a good substitute in place of the country-made beer. It is one of the essential factors which should be taken into account. So, prohibition should not be introduced for the time being in that place.

It is not possible to change their cus-

oms, traditions and habits so suddenly. There should first be psychological and cultural integration with the rest of India. A reorientation of their cultural and social outlook is necessary. For all these things, you should first send a cultural and social mission there and explain the evils of drink. If they are convinced that it is injurious to their health and they should give up this obnoxious habit, they will try to change their customs. The Christian missions have done very good service there. The Christian converts there are not allowed to drink and if they do then they are boycotted and turned out from the society and so they never drink. It is because of the lack of interest in their affairs and because of their poverty, they are given to drunkenness. So, these areas in the Second Five Year Plan should be economically, culturally and socially developed. There is a network of social and health service all over India. If you have such service in the tribal areas and if a cultural and social mission is sent there to explain the evils of drink and other things, there will, in course of time be no difficulty of prohibition. Before doing that, you cannot enforce prohibition in those areas.

Mr. Chairman: Your time is up. There is very little time.

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh: Five minutes more; I will finish. Opium addicts are restricted to licence holders. This can be done away with if those people are taken care of by medical men. If they are not supplied their daily quota, they feel almost like dying. Another point with regard to the consumption of *ganja*. Some days back Shri Gulzarilal Nandaji presided over a conference of sadhus. If he convenes a meeting of all sadhus living on the slopes of the Himalayas and these sadhus pass a resolution that *ganja* consumption should be prohibited in all the pilgrim centres, then I think no one will smoke it. In every pilgrim centre, there is licit consumption of *ganja* and it should be prohibited gradually, in these ways.

Now, coming to my State of Manipur, there is some difficulty only in the hilly areas. I am only explaining the conditions in hilly areas. The people there in the plains have been accustomed to prohibition for centuries; there is therefore, no difficulty of prohibition being introduced there. It is only the hill people in some tribal pockets in the valley who will be affected if this is introduced. There is a section of the population who

are distilling spirits and they produce liquor and that is their only profession. If their licenses are cancelled and they get no alternative employment, they will be unemployed. Whenever you introduce prohibition in Assam, Manipur and Tripura, these people—I am talking of Manipur—whose name is Lois, will become unemployed and distillation of liquor is their only profession. They should be found alternative employment; that is my point; I have no objection to prohibition.

Shrimati Khongmen (Autonomous District.—Reserved-Scheduled Tribes): Sir, I want to ask one question to my hon. friend. He wanted to help the tribal people and to raise their economic condition. I want to ask, if all the rice is allowed to be freely used for brewing liquor what will be left for their consumption?

Shri L. Jogeswar Singh: I am not saying that all the rice. . . .

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member has herself answered the question.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur *cum* Purnea): I must make it clear in the beginning that I am a teetotaler not because of Gandhiji but because of heredity. Fortunately, just like many people here, I cannot trace my heredity to the Rishis who used to regale themselves with the spirituous liquors and with many other things which we did not do today. But so far as I can trace my heredity I am a teetotaler.

The present form of prohibition is something new in India. It was mooted by Gandhiji. It is not that before that there were not reformers who wanted prohibition, but as in everything else so in this, the social reformers when they came to the platform took care to see that they had their usual peg of whisky or other such drink and from the platform they preached prohibition, as even the early Congress leaders preached Swadeshi wearing the costliest suits from the most fashionable shops. Gandhiji's approach to this question was different. He viewed it not only from the moral point of view but also from the social, economic and political point of view. He, therefore, made it into an item in our programme for gaining political liberty. For him political liberty had no value unless there was economic

equality and social and moral reformation. Prohibition was only one item in an all comprehensive programme.

Now, the question arises, can this one item be acted up to while the rest of his programme is neglected or given scant attention? He wanted this prohibition to be a part of in an all-round reform towards the simplification of life. But if life gets more complicated, more complex, more costly then I am afraid this prohibition will not effectively work. If we have to go in for prohibition, we must go in for certain other things that Gandhiji wanted. That means, moral reform, social reform and economic uplift. Unless it is linked with these I am afraid prohibition will fail. I feel that so far it has not succeeded as it ought to have or as it could have if the whole programme of Gandhiji had been worked out by the people and by those in authority.

Today's prohibition rests mostly upon police and law. You want people not to drink and you want to deal with them if they drink through the police that is corrupt itself. It often happens that if you want unlawful liquor your best chance of getting it is to approach the police.

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): Or the excise people.

Acharya Kripalani: If those who advocate this kind of prohibition give more attention to the police and purify it then there may be some chance of success.

However, this does not mean that I am against prohibition. I feel if there is one country in the whole world where prohibition can be successful it is India. Many of the higher castes do not drink, unless they have got thoroughly westernised. Many westernised people would not dare to drink at home or keep liquor at home. They will go to clubs, they will go to restaurants and hotels and there they will drink. Our women folk do not drink at all. I know they are learning the habit in Delhi. I know, they sometimes go tipsy on the road. But when educated, rich and so-called fashionable and cultured people get tipsy and descend to the lower levels of animals I have no sympathy for them, rather I enjoy the fun. It is only when poor people drink and they spend away the substance of their earnings on drink that I feel sorry and sympathetic.

[Achatya Kripalani]

One gentleman who was sitting by me in a party and was drinking some kind of liquor. He asked me: 'Kripalaniji you don't mind my drinking?' I said: "You are not fouling my mouth that I should mind it. Your mouth is your concern." But, I am much concerned with the poor because this has a very bad effect upon them, upon their families, upon their livelihood and upon their children.

As I said, this is an item in a social programme. It affects society as a whole. If it did not affect society and if it was an individual question I would not have cared and my reply to anybody drinking would have been the same I gave to the gentleman who was drinking, that it was not through my mouth he was drinking and that his mouth was his own concern. But, this is a social problem. It is a question of the poor of India. We have a social duty to perform. The higher classes and the educated classes have a social duty to perform. What is that social duty? The Gita says: as the big people do, as the cultured and educated people do, so the poor also. I do not for a moment believe that a rich man having a small peg in the evening would be very much affected by that (some rich people are not affected by a bottle even!) but the social effect of this, their example, is very bad for the poor. Therefore, Gandhiji began his reform not through the police but by tackling those who were the leaders of people; and how many leaders of people who used to drink in those days gave up drink! Because they gave up drink, what happened was that Mahatma Gandhiji's programme was more effective than the prohibition programme today. He used to send for the leaders of the people, leaders of the Scheduled Tribes and leaders of other communities. He used to talk to them. He used to convert them. When they were converted, they used to have meetings of their panchayats, and there, they voluntarily passed resolutions that they would not drink, and they did not drink. I am sure that Gandhiji spread the cult of non-drink more than our legislation has done or our police has been able to do. Although I want prohibition, yet I want that this moral aspect this social aspect, this reform aspect, should not be lost sight of. There must be incessant propoganda and more must be spent on propoganda than on the police and the legal machinery. If that is done, I think

that prohibition will eminently be successful in India. Otherwise, what will happen is, you try it for a few years and will then abandon it and declare it to be unsuccessful as they did in America. The result of that would be that in one country, where prohibition could be most successful, because of our timidity and bad methods we made it impossible. I would therefore suggest to the Government that they should in this matter adopt the methods that Gandhiji used in his lifetime.

But, if the authorities must rely on legislation, they must see that the police is first reformed. Or, do they believe that only thieves can catch thieves? If that is their wisdom, nothing need be said. But if they believe that it is only honest people that can catch thieves then it is better to begin first with the reform of the police.

Then there is another thing. If prohibition is to succeed in India, it must be throughout India. It has been seen in some States, that when prohibition was introduced in some districts and it was not introduced in other districts, it became impossible to carry it through in those districts where it had been introduced by law. I shall give you a concrete example. There are two cities near each other in Uttar Pradesh—Kanpur and Lucknow. There is prohibition in Kanpur while there is no prohibition in Lucknow. However anybody who wants to have a drink from Kanpur goes to Lucknow. The prohibition policy is thus frustrated. As it is impossible to make prohibition successful in one district and leave the rest of the State unaffected, so, I am afraid it would not be possible to have prohibition in one State and leave the other States of India unaffected by it.

There is yet another point which the Government must consider. If they allow the army to go on drinking they cannot ask the civilian population not to drink, because the army has more responsible duties to perform than even the civilian population. Army men must keep their brains cool. If you allow them to drink you only make your army headquarters the bottlegging centres for the civilian population.

One thing more you have to do. If you want prohibition, then it must not be in the mean fashion in which it is carried on today. It would have offended

Gandhiji if he had seen that when we invite guests we give them soft drinks, but when they invite us we go and gorge ourselves with spirituous liquors. Our foreign embassies are not allowed to serve drinks in any party. Yet, when our foreign representatives go to the parties of our foreign hosts they drink heavily. This, I say, is something very mean. Either we do the thing in the right style or we do not do it at all. I do not know whether it will be possible for this Government to see that there is prohibition in the army, and to see that their officers, when they go to foreign embassies, do not drink and to see that as when we invite people we do not serve drink, when they invite us we do not accept drinks. Unless all these things are done, I am afraid this prohibition programme will not be as successful as it was designed to be by Mahatma Gandhi.

The Government can have the present kind of prohibition and say that they are following in the footsteps of Gandhiji but they are not doing what he wanted to do in integral way. I would suggest to those who are interested in prohibition not to copy what Delhi has done today—that from such and such a day liquors will not be served in such and such restaurants and that liquors would not be served in such and such clubs, etc. If they meant business, they should have met the restaurant keepers; they should have reasoned with them and they would reason with their customers. They should have gone to the clubs and they should have met those who frequent those clubs. They should have called a general meeting of the members. They should have kept the social aspect of prohibition before them. They should not have told them that drink is a sin and that they would go to hell if they drink. Nobody is thinking of hell or heaven nowadays. They must have shown them the sociological effects of drink and told them, “you may drink, but consider the effect it has upon society and especially upon the poor?” They must argue with them on that basis. But if they argue with them on the puritanic basis that drinking is a sin that it is a spiritual sin, then, I am afraid they will not succeed. Those who want this reform must show them the sociological effects of drinking. Every part of the people has to be approached in a particular way. The poor people may be approached in other ways—that it is morally and economically bad for them.

But if you tell a man who is getting Rs. 4,000 a month that drinking is morally bad—he generally commits no crime and is too afraid to be seen a drunkard and he regulates his drinks—he will say, “What are you talking? You are talking nonsense. I have been drinking ever since I know and it has no bad effect on me, neither economically nor morally. I am an average man.” Therefore it is to impress upon him the social point of view—that it is not he that we have in view but the poor and that it is his example that we are thinking of.

I believe that it is right that even a time-limit may be put upon to the carrying out of the prohibition policy for the whole of India. But during that time all the things I have suggested must be done. The problem must be approached from every angle, and not merely through law and the corrupt guardians of the law. That will not be the proper approach. I would again say, lest it might be misunderstood, I am all for prohibition. I am also for a time-limit. I only want that the question be approached in the spirit in which our Master approached it, in the way he showed us and there is no other way possible.

Shri Nanda: I shall make an attempt to explain the point of view of Government in relation to the debate on this resolution. My task has been made very easy by the contributions which hon. Members in the House have made. Without exception, all sections of the House, I find, are united in their stand on this question of prohibition, and as regards the position of Government in this matter, it will suffice for me to say that it is also in line with that stand. I felt very much heartened to hear the speeches made by Members, especially the last speech that we have just heard. It is not simply because Members have offered overwhelming support for this policy of prohibition, but it is because of the balanced and realistic manner in which they have approached this question. They have not lost sight of the difficulties and dangers attendant on the pursuit of prohibition. There is however one firm conclusion that this policy has to be pursued.

I may in a few words explain the approach of Government to this problem, because many questions have been raised which call for an elucidation of Government's position in this matter. There are certain aspects of this question of prohibition which are beyond

[Shri Nanda]

controversy now. Is it desirable or proper on considerations of personal freedom and personal rights?—we are not discussing that now. Our Constitution has settled that for us; we are not discussing the merits of our Constitution. There cannot be two opinions that this is a matter which we have to pursue to the conclusion and to a successful conclusion. It is perfectly clear that the Constitution in its directive principles has placed a fundamental duty on the citizen not to drink; there is also placed a fundamental obligation on the State to see that conditions are created by which the evil of drink is eradicated altogether. There was just now an observation from the hon. Member Shri Kripalani, about approaching this subject from the point of view of sin. Personally, I believe it is not in the sense of any theological sense of sin that we should approach it—no, not from a limited narrow moral view of it. It is because of the terrible social and economic damage, the consequences that flow from it, that we should do away with this evil. It is in that light that we should see it.

As the hon. Member pointed out there are some people who can afford to drink, and sometimes, they at any rate believe that, no visible harm or damage is being done. Well, we may leave them out if it were not for all those other consequences to which reference was made by Shri Kripalani. We have in our mind, as he has, those large numbers of people in the country who are poor, ignorant and helpless. I am intimately associated with the working classes and I have seen what is happening. People after a hard day's work, in a stage of fatigue with nothing better to turn to them, have this temporary stimulus of drink. They have a false belief that it does them good. There is the temptation. They are really being driven to drink, forced to drink. No Government, no community, has any right to place this temptation in their way. This temptation should be removed from them. The rich people of which mention was made, especially those who can afford to spend on drink, on them also a duty is cast that they should not place temptation in the way of others. It is the duty of Government to remove those temptations. Then there are people, rich or not, who have a social prestige. What they do is imitated by others. It is a kind of infective influence and it is very necessary that they should

consider others, as ignorant, poor and helpless people, and not set a bad example for them. It is in this light that we should consider this matter.

Some hon. Members the other day spoke about financial and revenue considerations. No doubt, we attach a great deal of importance to revenue, and any amount of money which we can save for the plan is certainly essential for us.

[SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTY
in the Chair]

But consider the matter further. After all what is this money that we are going to spend on the Plan for? We spend on health, education and other social welfare schemes. But if we destroy initially the welfare of the poor people, those who can least afford to pay, or spend on such things, and then we take the benefit of education and these welfare opportunities,—probably not to them, it may be to others—we ruin their lives and offer this little bit of solace, that is no good at all.

Therefore, I personally believe that prohibition itself is the most powerful instrument of welfare and as long as we feel convinced that it is feasible, that it will succeed, then considerations of finance should not detain us or delay it. There is the problem of adjustment on the financial side. That of course can be taken care of. But on the ground of loss of revenue, I do not think any argument can legitimately be raised. Shri Kripalani referred to a few things which I believe should be brought home to everybody. There has to be a national policy—it cannot succeed otherwise. It cannot be that it is not good for people in Bombay or Madras to drink, while it is good for them to drink in other places. It cannot be. Similarly, it cannot be that, a section of the community can drink, while the other cannot. Ultimately it will have to be on a national basis in every sense of the term. They are however, problems of implementation to which I will refer presently. He also said,—I am referring to Acharya Kripalani—it has to be an integrated approach. I agree with him completely in this. It is not simply because Gandhiji started it, or it was a part of our struggle or it was a part of the constructive programme related to that struggle, it is because it is essentially an element in the social

order which we are trying to create. The various elements of development in our plans are intended to lead up to a social order, we call it a socialist order. It arises directly from the directive principles. But, these principles have to be seen in their totality. We cannot isolate prohibition from the other things. Therefore, I agree that we have to take an integrated view of prohibition. As far as I remember that article in the Constitution, there is also mention of nutrition and health probably in the same clause. That was the approach of those who made the Constitution. This is the approach which has to govern all our actions in this matter.

So far as policy is concerned, it is not therefore open to discussion. There is, however, the other important aspect of the matter. We want genuine prohibition, real prohibition and not a name, a shadow of it. It cannot be said that prohibition is today completely successful. It is not. Therefore, the question arises that, to the extent it is not successful, more powerful methods have got to be devised so that it may succeed. I have confidence that that can be done. It was on the background of this view of the situation, on the background of the consciousness that the progress made in the country in this matter is not adequate that that step was taken by the Planning Commission. A Committee was appointed to examine the whole situation, to see what difficulties are being experienced and encountered and recommend ways and means of making prohibition successful. This Committee was appointed on the 16th of December, 1954 and it has made its report on 10th of January, 1955. Hon. Members must have read this report. It bears evidence of care and labour. There is a comprehensive scheme which has been evolved by this Committee. The Planning Commission considered this report and certain conclusions have been reached on this. I hope hon. Members have seen this part of the Draft Outline of the Second Five Year Plan in which we have set out the attitude of the Planning Commission in the first instance. Later on, it has been endorsed by the National Development Council. I do not know how much time I have. I might have liked to mention some of the things which have already been stated here, and which are of great consequence. For example, the appointment of a Central Committee in order to review the situation from

time to time, various Prohibition Boards to be set up in the States, I shall mention some important items in the programme; discontinuance of advertisements, inducements for the stoppage of drinking in public. It is very important; as I said, we have to stop this infective influence of drinking by people who enjoy a social prestige of some kind. There are several other things suggested here: the setting up of a technical committee to draw up a phased programme, reducing the number of shops, reducing the number of days on which the shops are open, reducing the quantity, progressively reducing the strength of distilled liquor. This is the programme which has been approved of by the National Development Council. In pursuance of that, a letter has been already issued to the States. So that it will be seen that it is not simply that we have got the report, but action is being taken on that.

The question that arises out of the resolution is, how soon we are going to complete this programme of prohibition.

I would like to know how much of time I could take. Much more time was taken up by other Members. I had asked for 30 or 40 minutes. I have taken only 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The House has to reconsider this Resolution till five minutes past 4. I will put it to the House whether, in its opinion, it considers that there should be an increase in the allotment of time for this Resolution.

Some Hon. Members: Half an hour more.

Mr. Chairman: Shall I take it that we increase the time by half an hour? Is that the general consensus of opinion?

Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister may continue. He needs 20 minutes more?

Shri Nanda: Yes.

I am answering the question which has been raised in the Resolution and in the several amendments: how soon we are going to implement the recommendations of this Committee. The Resolution mentions a certain date. Before I deal with the question of the date, I would like to refer to an aspect

[Shri Nanda]

of the matter which has an intimate bearing on the question, what would be an appropriate target for this purpose.

This aspect relates to the process of implementation, enforcement of whatever we decide on. The Committee went into this question in great detail. They took notice of the fact that there were weak spots in the administration of the prohibition policy and programmes wherever it has been adopted. They never made a claim that it was successful 100 per cent. It was not possible to make that claim. But, on the other hand, there is also a great deal of exaggeration in presenting the other picture, that is, how far prohibition has not succeeded. Certain persons, whether they may have a bias one way or the other, or not, when they come in contact with the dark aspect of the matter, that is, illicit distillation, smuggling corruption, etc., they are overwhelmed by them, and they cannot but feel and say that prohibition is totally unsuccessful. This is, however, not the whole picture. It is true that there is an amount of illicit distillation. But, greatly magnified reports reach us. It is also a fact that as enforcement progresses, it would be natural that a larger number of cases are detected, up to a point. Afterwards when the peak is reached, there should be a decline. Otherwise it means that gradually the whole programme of prohibition will be destroyed. The latest position as I know from Bombay is, last year, the number of offences was about 20 per cent. less than in the previous year. There is a decline in the number of offences. But, that is one part of it. There is the positive aspect of the matter. I have personal knowledge of a large number of families of the working classes to whose life prohibition has brought peace and joy. Particularly the womenfolk know, and feel that the whole way of living has changed. It is not a small number of people; it is a very large number of people who are benefited by prohibition. But, one thing is clear. The odds against prohibition are heavy. We should recognise that because there is a large stake in it.

4 P.M.

Huge amounts of money are involved in it, and therefore all anti-social elements get together to exploit the situation. The Committee recognised that fact and the Committee found that there were ways also of combating this and of dealing with the situation so that

this challenge to prohibition is met effectively. But, if it is to be met effectively it must be seen clearly that a price has to be paid for it. Prohibition can succeed certainly in our country. It should succeed, but a price has to be paid, and that price is unstinted effort on the part of the administration and the people. Regarding the administration, I do not take a light view. I think the police and other wings of the administration have to make a great deal of contribution to the success of the policy and programme of prohibition. But, as was pointed out, some deficiency is there which has to be removed, but the greater part, of course, is that of the people. The bulk of the people must be behind it, not in a passive sense. It is all right to say that the people are in sympathy with prohibition. That kind of inactive sympathy is not enough. The feeling, the urge, of the people in favour of prohibition has to be mobilised. There has to be a conscious, active, even aggressive attitude on the part of the people—aggressive, of course, not in any violent sense, but they should feel that it is not enough that they are not drinking, but if there is anything going on which is in violation of the policy of prohibition, they must feel that they have a responsibility in the matter. In that way we have to forge the sanction of public opinion, active public opinion. If that is not done, I must personally express my own opinion that it will not be possible for prohibition to succeed. Therefore, it is in the measure that we are able to make active that moral purpose of the community behind and in support of prohibition that prohibition can succeed.

Furthermore, it is necessary that there should be an integrated approach, concerted action—in our National Extension Services, Community Projects, everywhere, from all directions the people and the administration have to collaborate.

I have to answer finally the question of the date. I have explained our approach. I have explained how keen we are that we should have prohibition and successful prohibition. Then the question is when, what should be the date. Here, as I explained, the policy that Government has agreed to is on the basis of the recommendations of this Committee, and even in this matter so far as the essence of the recommendations of the Committee is concerned,

we agree. There is no difference. The difference is only regarding the form and the method of carrying out that intention. Should it be done in a year or two? Should we put the target a year or two hence? I for one would say clearly and explicitly that it is not possible, feasible—not because we because we believe in gradualism, or in slow progress in this matter. I do not do so. I think gradualism is totally opposed to the whole concept of prohibition. If you let time elapse, the habit will spread, more people will become addicted. It will become more and more difficult to deal with the habit of drink effectively. Anti-social elements will get entrenched. I think it is very unfair to all those States which have prohibition that while they are dealing with the situation in a bold way, there are States on the border which are all the time jeopardising the success of their programme. It is also true that by how more than a fourth of the population and more than a third of the area of the country are under a programme of prohibition, and others are stepping in. For instance, Coorg, Rajasthan has a programme of reducing the shops now. Also Bhopal and several other places are going ahead. Something is being done in Delhi. Therefore, it is not possible to prolong and postpone the application of prohibition very much but the question is: can it be done in a year or two. I do not think so. I shall explain the reasons.

We have a limited amount of administrative energy, also the capacity of the people for organised social action has its limitations. If all this energy and all the capacity of the people were available for the programme of prohibition. I would say let us have it done in a year. I am sure it would succeed in a year. But there is so much else to be done. I would like to quote the report of the Committee itself. I would like the warning given in the report to be carefully heeded. It is on page 47:

"It has been pointed out that the target dates are easy to realise only when they are related to the actual conditions which prevail and indeed grow out of them. The experience of prohibition States has shown that two primary difficulties have to be dealt with. First is the creation of an active public opinion which will help in enforcement.

The second difficulty arises from vested interests and lawbreakers. These difficulties should be attended to before the target date. It is of the utmost importance to see that all steps which are contemplated, legislation, enforcement machinery and educational effort, are undertaken in proper time."

These things have to be done. It is not a question of mechanical date, not a question of an arbitrary date. It has to be on the basis of a judgment as to what effort it will take, how much time it will take to do all these things. But then, does it mean there should be no target, at all? No. I think we should have a target, but that target will have to depend upon a proper study of the conditions in each State, and that study should start immediately. It should be a study for each State. My personal approach to the matter—not only personal, but this is the approach adopted by the Planning Commission and by Government—is that if you adopt one date for the whole country, the implication is that in the State which is the weakest in the matter—and Members know that there are States which have a heavy proportion of the revenue coming out of excise—conditions may be much more difficult than in other areas. Therefore, if that date has to be a realistic date, it will have to be a date which is applicable and acceptable to the weakest State. Why should we adopt a date like that? That means really delaying the success of prohibition. I would like that if a State thinks that it can have it tomorrow, then it should be tomorrow. There may be another State where they need a longer time, then it may be a year hence. Therefore, the targets fixed have to be in relation to the conditions in each State.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): A State may say that it requires 15 years.

Shri Nanda: That question is a very legitimate one. My answer is it should not be left to the States it should not be left to them entirely. There is a provision for a Central Committee. There is here a recommendation that a committee may be appointed in the States for working out a phased programme. So, it is not that the intention is that the matter should be allowed to drift. It is the same basis which has been suggested for the country as

[Shri Nanda]

a whole. The only modification that I am suggesting is: apply that not to the country as a whole immediately. Apply that immediately to all the States instead of waiting for a remote date for the country as a whole because that target will have to be a target which will be, as I said, appropriate to every State, to the last State. That is really not helping prohibition. It is rather hindering the progress of prohibition. We should not wait for that date. It may be that some States will be ready for complete prohibition only five years hence, but there may be others ready two years hence. So, it will have to be a series of targets, and I would take it that that ultimate target is the target for the whole nation.

I have tried to explain the approach to the target. It is not an escape, not an evading of a difficult question, but a proper, real, earnest approach to the problem, so that we can have prohibition effectively through out the country in the least time, at the earliest time, with the maximum speed, and I do not think hon. Members will disagree with that approach.

Shri K. C. Sodhia (Sagar): What is the ultimate limit?

Shri Nanda: I have answered that question. Anybody can think of anything. Is it to depend upon the number of persons, the majority in favour of a certain date, or is it to depend upon the approach suggested in this report, that it has to be on the basis of a study of the conditions, for certain pre-conditions have to be satisfied. I say that it is for all of us to see to it that there is no avoidable delay.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Some time-limit may be laid down, such as five years or ten years or something like that. Otherwise the same thing will go on repeating.

Shri Nanda: The time-limit will be there, but that time-limit cannot be given this moment. It will have to depend upon a study, investigation and proper enquiry into the possibilities. If hon. Members are satisfied with just a date and they are not bothered about what happens afterwards, then a date can be given easily. But actually, that would be the best way of killing prohibition. Those who are really earnest and sincere in making prohibition a success will approach the problem in a different way.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): If it is intended to make prohibition a success, then is it not essential to guarantee alternative employment to those that are thrown out of employment?

Shri Nanda: I am coming to that. That is an incidental question, and that is an important question too. We have a duty towards those who are going to be deprived of their occupation or employment as a result of the prohibition programme. We have a duty to them which we should perform. That is to say, we should try and find out work for them. We should be in touch with them, and we should try to exercise our moral influence on them, because left to themselves they can be the worst enemies of prohibition, those very people can become the people who will do the illicit distillation and all that. But one thing I would like to say is that we cannot wait to proceed with the prohibition programme until everyone of these persons is employed. I agree, however, that a programme for employment for these people should be an integral part of the whole programme of prohibition, and the two should proceed side by side. This is my answer to the hon. Member's question.

Shri Tek Chand: With your permission, may I put one question to the Minister?

Mr. Chairman: An one-minute question.

Shri Tek Chand: Apart from illicit distillation, may I know when Government propose discontinuing distillation in their own distilleries? Government themselves are distillers. There are Government distilleries; and Government also give licences to companies such as the Dyer Meakin. Do Government propose to stop their own licit distillation?

Shri Nanda: The answer is obvious. Of course, that is what is intended to be done. But the other consideration is that we have to see that this licit distillation is not replaced to a larger event by illicit distillation again. That is the whole question we are discussing.

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Distt.-South): May I put one question?

Mr. Chairman: This is not question hour. Let the Minister proceed.

Shri Nanda : There is one aspect of it which is really important. It is not that all the distillation by Government will stop tomorrow, because that will mean that that is a target date for prohibition. But there are ways in which Government have to help in this programme of prohibition more than they can in any other way. I have found in some of the projects that I have visited that the moment the project starts, a liquor shop also starts. We have to stop that sort of thing. This has happened in several places and it has led to very bad results.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: You overwork the people. Therefore, liquor is necessary for them. You make their life more pleasant.

Shri Nanda: We have to stop that sort of thing. What I am saying is nothing new; it is already provided for in the recommendations which have been accepted.

Now, I come to the point raised by the Member from Inner Manipur in regard to the map. It was not the committee's fault; it was the fault of the persons who made the map; they misplaced these regions.

So far as the tribal areas are concerned, there is a special policy which has been elaborated, and that is embodied in the report. So, the considerations which were stated by the hon. Member have been kept in view, and a proper policy has been stated here.

I have taken all the time that I was entitled to. I shall now close my remarks with one or two observations. Hon. Members of this House, belonging to all parties, have expressed themselves strongly in favour of prohibition.

Shri L. Jageswar Singh (Inner Manipur): Side by side with prohibition in the tribal areas, may I know whether Government are applying their mind to the question of the economic betterment of those people?

Mr. Chairman: There is no time left now. I think the Minister may proceed and conclude his remarks.

Shri Nanda: With wholehearted and full support from all sections of the House, I take it that we can expect it as a very good augury for the success of the prohibition programme.

Shri A. K. Gopalan had asked the other day whether this was a programme for the ruling party. If it were a programme for one party alone, then it can never succeed. It has to be a programme for all parties, for the entire nation, and I believe it will be pursued and taken up in that spirit. And we have to pursue it in that spirit. Shri A. K. Gopalan is not present here at the moment, but I might convey this to him. He said, "We accept it in principle." Now, a nation which wants prohibition cannot have two minds about it. It has to be clear about it. But when the principle is accepted, action will have to be taken to ensure the success of this programme. There has to be a will to prohibition; there has to be a faith in prohibition, and the rest is all a matter of effort. I hope that effort will be forthcoming in India.

We are told that other countries have not succeeded. I do not think we should be deterred by that. India can give a lead in this matter. My own feeling is that although it is a difficult task, yet we can make a success of it; it will depend upon the amount of unity that we can muster in the country, the amount of effort that we put forth; and having brought about that unity and having made that effort, we shall have achieved a big thing in this country; we would have developed a unity and a strength in this country through this prohibition programme. And a successful programme of prohibition will make our country big and strong.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): When I initiated this debate, I did so with the object of knowing where prohibition stood in the Second Five Year Plan, and whether it would be integrated with the Plan itself.

Several amendments were moved to my resolution. And that was but natural, because the problem itself was a very vital and complex one; there were various aspects to the question, and therefore they had all been touched upon in the various amendments.

Judging from the trend of the discussion, the way in which the House has treated this matter and the manner in which the Minister has handled this subject, I think there is great hope for prohibition in the coming few years. But it must be remembered that in the coming years, we are going to spend

[Shri C. R. Narasimhan]

colossal sums of money; as I said in my opening speech, we are going to spend almost astronomical sums of money. When so much money is being spent and put into the pockets of the people, unless the prohibition feeling is encouraged among the people, there is a great danger of the malady spreading further. Since our object is at some date or other to stop altogether the drink evil, the sooner we do it, the better it will be, for unless we take action beforehand, that is to say, before putting this huge sum into the pockets of the people, the problem will go out of hand.

Just as in defence they say that the best form of defence is to start with an offence, likewise I would say that in our battle against prohibition also, we have to start with an offence; that is to say, we must begin with an integrated programme, and go forward boldly and definitely.

From the discussion that has taken place, we find that this House wants the planners to proceed forward steadily. Therefore, there cannot be any retreat; all retreat is cut off by the enlightened public opinion which we ourselves have created all these years through propaganda and sacrifice.

So, let a scheme for prohibition be formulated. That is what I want the Minister to consider. Then, all else will follow. Let us not be side-tracked by the so-called failures and the problem of finance. There is a lot of meaning in the couplet of Rahim which Shri Feroze Gandhi quoted the other day while he was speaking on the insurance Bill. He said:

तरुवर फल नहीं खात है, सरुवर पियत न पानि

'The tree does not eat its own fruit, the river does not drink its own water'. Let not the State tempt its own people to ruin from drink.

I would like to say a word about so-called failure. Several things have failed. Co-operation has failed—has not succeeded fully. But do we give up the method of co-operation in uplifting the economic condition of the villages? The Reserve Bank is going ahead with expenditure of more and more money for this purpose. In the same way, let not a temporary failure discourage us. Let the same spirit prevail in all matters.

I would now ask the Minister whether he accepts my Resolution or not.

Shri Nanda: I think it was evident from what I said that although the spirit of the Resolution is entirely acceptable, the wording is such that I would prefer the amendment moved by Shri K. P. Tripathi.

Mr. Chairman: It has not yet been moved.

Shri Nanda: It is on paper.

Mr. Chairman: So I take it that the hon. Minister is not prepared to accept the Resolution as it has been worded by the Mover.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: If the hon. Minister is prepared to accept the amendment of Shri K. P. Tripathi's, I would also gladly accept the amended form of the Resolution. I request that you waive the rules, if necessary, to allow this Resolution to be passed in the amended form.

My final submission is that Prohibition being the greatest boon of Gandhiji to the landless proletariat, we should help them to realise its benefits to the full. I hope the House as a whole and those hon. Members who have moved other amendments will co-operate with me in getting the agreed amendment of Shri K. P. Tripathi's moved and passed.

Mr. Chairman: Shri K. P. Tripathi has not moved his amendment. The notice came very late. Since the hon. Mover as well as Government are prepared to accept his amendment, I propose that Shri K. P. Tripathi be allowed to move his amendment but without having the right of making a speech.

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): I beg to move:

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

"This House is of opinion that Prohibition should be regarded as an integral part of the Second Five Year Plan and recommends that the Planning Commission should formulate the necessary programme to bring about nation-wide Prohibition speedily and effectively."

I am not making a speech.

Mr. Chairman: Amendment No. 15 is moved. There is one amendment, No. 16, which has not been moved. But I do not think either the hon. Mover or the Government accepts it.

Now I shall put the amendment moved by Shri K. P. Tripathi to the vote of the House. If this is carried, then all other amendments as well as the original motion moved by Shri C. R. Narasimhan will be barred.

Dr. Rama Rao: Before you put that amendment to the vote of the House, may I request you to read out my amendment, which I think, the hon. Minister should be able to accept? My amendment, while accepting the principle of Prohibition, only specifies the employment aspect.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. Minister prepared to accept it?

Shri Nanda: I have stated very categorically our stand regarding employment. The rest of the contents of that amendment are absorbed in the amendment we have accepted.

Mr. Chairman: In view of the fact that the hon. Minister is not prepared to accept the amendment moved by Dr. Rama Rao, I propose to put Shri K. P. Tripathi's amendment to the vote of the House.

The question is:

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 recommends that the Planning Commission should formulate the necessary programme to bring about nation-wide Prohibition speedily and effectively".

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: All other amendments are barred.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL STATE UNDERTAKINGS

Shri G. D. Somani (Nagaur-Pali): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee be appointed by the Government consisting of independent persons having the requisite knowledge and experience, including some industrialists and businessmen, to examine the important aspects of the industrial and commercial undertakings and multi-purpose projects of the Central and State Governments, whether organised on Departmental lines, or as public corporations, or as public or private limited companies with instructions to submit their findings and recommendations to Parliament. The terms of reference of the Committee shall as follows:

(1) to examine the planning, development policy and targets fixed and reallocated in the case of each of them, and to recommend appropriate basis for future policy in respect of these matters;

(2) to find out whether the capital cost of each of them is commensurate with output and direct benefit bestowed upon the community;

(3) to examine the capital cost of each of them and find out if the expenditure has been according to estimates and whether such capital costs are reasonable, especially as compared to capital cost of comparable units in the private sector;

(4) to examine the cost structure of each of them, and also the efficiency of operation of each of them, and report whether any of them are likely to show profits or losses after providing fully for all expenses and for basic and extra (not initial) depreciation at rates prescribed in the Indian Income-Tax Act, 1922;

(5) to examine the pricing policy of each of them and ascertain its propriety;

(6) to examine their accounting methods to report whether they are on business lines and give a correct picture of their position, whether they are written in a way that enables critical examination of the financial results, whe-