

members of Parliament be appointed to enquire into and report within six months, how far the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution have been applied in the legislative and administrative actions of the Union Government and the State Governments".

is three hours. Now, that you are putting the motion to the vote of the House, I suggest that the time for this resolution may be reduced from three to two hours.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This resolution is not part of the report that is now coming up for the approval of the House. The report that has now come up for approval does not contain the resolution mentioned by the hon. Member. So, let that report be approved first.

The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT
OF COMMITTEE ON WORKING
OF DIRECTIVE PRINCIPLES OF
STATE POLICY—Concl'd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now resume discussion on the resolution moved by Shri Tushar Chatterjea on the 17th August, 1956, regarding Directive Principles.

Out of three hours allotted for discussion of the Resolution, 2 hours 59 minutes are left. Shri Tushar Chatterjea may continue his speech.

Shri Gidwani (Thana): I move that the time allotted for this Resolution may be reduced to two hours and that the discussion may be concluded at 4.45 P.M. today.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Anand (Purnea cum Santal Parganas): May I suggest that out of the time allotted for

this resolution, one hour may be taken away, and the remaining period that may be available today, say, 15 minutes, may be taken and utilised for the second Resolution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The motion made by Shri Gidwani is that the time allotted for the first Resolution be reduced by one hour and that discussion on it be terminated at 4.45 P.M. If the House approves of it, I have no objection.

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, the discussion on the first Resolution will conclude at 5.45 P.M.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): This Resolution affects several Ministries—the Home Ministry, the Labour Ministry, the Health Ministry, the Education Ministry and so many other Ministries. The directive principles of State policy refer to very many different subjects as you know very well. I find that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs alone is present. I feel that he is *functus officio* in regard to this subject.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Rather, he represents all Ministries. Both the things may be true—either he represents none or he represents all.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I represent the other Ministries.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even then, I would advise the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that he should get help from some other Ministries and he should ask some Ministers to be present.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): This is a matter in which all Ministries are represented, because it deals with the directive principles of State policy. We find that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs alone is here. Of course, he will note such part of the discussion as he may like. But so far as the other Ministers are concerned, what will they know about this discussion

[Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava]

when they are not present? The Members will have to address perhaps vacant House, without any Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already asked the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to get some more Ministers. Shri Tushar Chatterjee will proceed with his speech.

Shri Tushar Chatterjee (Serampore): In this House, many a time we have discussed matters relating to the Constitution, and generally, we raised technical questions about the Constitution whenever the Constitution is referred to in this House. I have tried to make a departure from that approach. I have raised fundamental matters of the Constitution. I have raised the question of the directive principles of State policy, mainly because I feel that so far as the people in general are concerned, they understand not so much the technicalities of the Constitution as those fundamental matters that relate to their daily lives. By Constitution, they mean and feel that some change should come by way of the new set-up. They understand that some glorious prospect of life would be indicated by the Constitution. Therefore, when the generality of people want to judge this Government, they generally turn to the directive principles, for it is the directive principles that really hold out a glorious prospect for the people. The people want to have a change for the better through the Constitution. They want to feel some change from the old British regime. Therefore, the sacredness of the Constitution lies in the directive principles.

In this respect, we all feel that the people are completely disappointed. Go to any common man. He will tell you that so far as his life is concerned, he does not feel any difference from the state of affairs that was existent during the British days. Generally, the people as a whole want to breathe a new atmosphere. But all the problems of his life not

only still remain unsolved but in many respects those problems have become more complicated than ever before. The problem of uncertainty of work, the problem of inadequate income; the problem of discrimination in opportunities of life, the problem of health, the problem of education—every problem not only remains unsolved but has become more acute, and for the common man life has become more burdensome and more difficult than ever before. This is the condition, when, by the directive principles, our Constitution solemnly proclaims to the people that it will be the endeavour of the State to secure for them the right to work, the right to a living wage and the right to property and means of livelihood and the right to better life. These declarations are there in the Constitution. When ordinary people look to these declarations, and when they judge their own living conditions, they get completely disappointed. They cannot but feel that these solemn declarations have been, for all practical purposes, not directive principles but only decorations to the Constitution.

I therefore feel that it is high time that we reviewed the whole position. This is the time to do so, when we are embarking on the national reconstruction through the second Five Year Plan for which the people are the main asset. The Government always asked the people to do their bit for the State, but is it not also natural that the people will also ask of the Government as to what the Government have done for them, and how far the Government have acted up to the pledge enjoined upon them by the Constitution. Therefore, it is necessary that this question should be studied and reviewed.

To come to concrete points, I will first of all refer to that part of the Directive Principles which says that the State shall direct its policy towards securing that the citizens have the right to an adequate means

of livelihood and to another part where it is stated that the State shall endeavour to secure to all workers work, living wage etc. This right to work and adequate means of livelihood is the main issue on which there is country-wide discontent. We all know that the problem of unemployment has not only not decreased, but has increased. I can give Government figures from which we come to know that as far as survey has been made, 78 lakhs are unemployed and during the next five years 100 lakhs more will come up as unemployed seeking jobs. As far as practical calculation goes, the Second Five Year Plan can give jobs only for 100 lakhs or so and that means that the unemployment position remains the same or, if a more practical calculation is made, it is aggravated. This general phenomenon sufficiently indicates that on the most vital issue, the Government has failed to act up to the pledge that the Constitution has enjoined upon it. If we look to the special nature of the unemployment, we must say that Government has definitely deviated from the Directive Principles. The special nature of unemployment is, as apart from general unemployment, unemployment caused by retrenchment that is increasing in number. In factories and Government-controlled concerns, retrenchment is taking place and people who are rendered surplus do not get any alternative jobs. If Government were serious about acting up to their pledge given in the Directive Principles, at least they should have done this much, namely, ban retrenchment by law or severely control retrenchment or impose proper conditions for retrenchment. We have repeatedly made that demand in this House. We demanded legal action in matters of retrenchment; we wanted a legal ban on retrenchment. But, those requests have not been paid heed to. Not only that; whenever we raise questions in this House during Question Hours about the Government's duty to provide surplus hands with alternative employment; always the reply we get is of such a nature which

shows that Government does not want to take into consideration seriously the plight of the surplus workers.

Just at the moment a very large number of technical hands are under orders of retrenchment in the Damodar Valley Corporation, in Ordnance factories and in many Government concerns. As far as D.V.C. workers are concerned, as long as 1½ years back, we referred the matter to the Planning Minister and we asked him to formulate such timely plans by which the prospective surplus people would be reabsorbed in different projects. As long as 1½ years back a timely warning was given. I was present during that discussion and I distinctly remember the Planning Minister saying at that time, "Yes; such a thing should be done". He asked all the officers concerned to prepare a thorough report by which a proper idea can be had as to how many hands can be absorbed in the various projects. One and a half years have passed and now when the D.V.C. people are on the verge of starvation, 2,000 people have been retrenched; they have been compelled to start a movement and a number of them are fasting for getting their grievances redressed. Now when we approach the Planning Minister, he says, "Yes: we should formulate such an integrated plan, but it takes time. Suddenly we cannot do anything". That means Government is not at all serious about evolving a scheme by which even its own employees can be absorbed in different projects in a planned way. Reabsorption is within the competence and jurisdiction of the Government; it is a thing which Government can do if only the Ministers apply their minds properly to the problem. Government do not care about the pledge they have given to the people about the right to secure work. It is only because they do not care for those things that they do not act properly and apply their mind seriously to these problems.

I now come to the question of rationalisation. Government has sup-

[Shri Tushar Chatterjee]
ported rationalisation in certain industries. Especially in the case of the jute industry, Government's support to the rationalisation policy is a gross violation of the Directive Principle which says that Government should strive to secure work for the people. In the jute industry, rationalisation policy has been started only to guarantee high profits to the employers, although it means about 50,000 workers being rendered unemployed. It is only because the jute bosses want more profits that in the name of the crisis of the industry Government has approved of this policy. To show how the Government is really callous about this unemployment problem in the jute industry, I can give you another example by which I can prove that in cases where there is no question of bosses, Government acts properly. Take, for instance, the biri industry. In that industry, the Government have come forward with a Bill to ban machine production, because machine production will cause serious unemployment. Why the same principle was not applied in the case of the jute industry? In the case of jute industry the modernisation does not in any way increase production; it does not in any way help the people of India in general; it only relates to better profits and lower cost of production, thus increasing the profit of the bosses. It is only to satisfy the bosses that you have started this modernisation in jute industry although it means unemployment for 50,000 persons whereas in the case of the biri industry, where there are no big bosses, you have not introduced that. Is this the way to respect the directive principles of the Constitution?

I will refer to another matter. Some days back, in this very House, I put a question to the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry about the result of the 2½ per cent. ceiling of looms in jute industry. I asked: how does it affect the workers and how many workers will be rendered unemployed by the decrease of work? The Commerce and Industries Minis-

ter replied that no question of unemployment arises out of this because this will affect only temporary workers, baddiwalas, and he stated that if baddiwalas got on unemployed, it does not matter much and Government need not take that into consideration. As if baddiwalas are not human beings and their unemployment position need not be taken into account! This is the attitude of the Government towards the question of securing the right to work to all the workers.

The plight of the middle class people is more serious. As we all know, the unemployment problem is eating into the vitals of every middle class family. In every middle class family boys get educated only to increase the burden of the family. They go to Employment Exchanges as if the Employment Exchanges seem to provide them with jobs. Everyone knows that the Employment Exchange is a big farce at least as far as the unemployed is concerned, as far as the job-seeker is concerned. From the Government figures I have gathered that not more than 10 per cent. of the applicants could get jobs at any time and for that too, he will have to wait for four years, five years and even ten years. Then, if you are fortunate, you can get a job; it may be for six months or it may be for a year or so. Go to any job-seeker and just ask him: you get yourself registered in the Employment Exchange so that there may be prospect of job in future; he will simply laugh at you. Surely, these Employment Exchanges are a big farce.

I come from West Bengal and in West Bengal the refugee problem is acute. If you read any daily paper of West Bengal, not a day passes when you will not find what horrible stories appear in the papers about the conditions of the refugees. What is the condition of the refugee families? If you go to Calcutta you will find that refugee families are living on Calcutta streets. If you go to Howrah platform you will find there cases of refugee women who

have given birth to children on the platform. Refugee families are being sent here and there: Womenfolk are being sent to Saurashtra, we do not know for what purpose. They do not get any provision there and there is no means for livelihood there. They go there on hopes.

Government sometimes accuse us by saying: you are creating trouble among the refugees. Government also sometimes accuse the refugees that they create troubles. It is no amusement to create troubles for nothing. If you go to a refugee house you will know in what horrible condition they are living. They live just like cattle, just like cats and dogs in the Calcutta streets. They move from door to door of the Government offices, only to come back disappointed and when they, in utter desperation, in utter disappointment, ask something or raise their demand, they only get lathis. This is the condition there. Some days back the Calcutta Statistical Institute made a survey and their report is that more than two-thirds of the total refugee population are in need of employment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can, at the most, allow the hon. Member half an hour. The hon. Member must be aware that now we have got one hour and fortyfive minutes. I will have to call the hon. Minister at 5 o'clock and then the hon. Member might also like to reply in 15 minutes' time.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: I do not want to reply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he does not want to reply, I will give him another ten minutes. But there will be only one hour for the hon. Member.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: Now, leaving the question of unemployment, I come to the question of living wage. The directive principle says that the State must secure living wage for the workers. In that matter what has the Government done? The Government, far from determining the living wage, has not even accepted our

demand for setting up a wage commission. In the Second Five Year Plan it is proposed that a wage census will be taken. At the present moment, from the Government documents, from regular journals, we know what is the wage position. Only the other day I was reading the Indian Labour Gazette, most probably, April 1956 issue, in which it was stated that in Bombay there is as low a wage as Rs. 20 per month. Regarding the wage position we need not wait to take any census. It is high time we should provide a living wage to the workers. But the Government has not done so. Not only that, in the Labour Acts, that is, either in the Factories Act or in the Industrial Disputes Act or in the Plantations Act or in any labour Act, you won't find any such provision by which at least some proper judgment about the determination of wage can be made. You won't find that sort of provision in the Labour Acts. What is the position now? Determination of wage depends entirely on the desire of the employers and if the workers can bargain with strength, of course, on the bargaining capacity of the workers. It is high time that according to the directive principles, the Government should come forward to make some minimum provision by which living wage can be guaranteed.

Now I come to another question, the minimum wage. The Minimum Wages Act is there. Here is a report of the Parliamentary debates appendix VII of the Fourth Session, 1953. In this report, you will find, there is an exhaustive list of the industries in which the Minimum Wages Act is in operation. If we are to believe this report, then all over India in most of the industries the minimum wage is granted already; workers are already getting the minimum wage. Let any one from the Congress side or the Ministers investigate. He will find that at least in 50 per cent. of the cases, minimum wage is not actually given to the workers although the report says that everything is all right. This is the executive way of treating this directive principle. Even

[Shri Tushar Chatterjea]

if there is the Minimum Wage Act, the State Government does not care to see whether it is properly implemented or fully implemented or not.

4 P.M.

I come to another point. I know living wage and minimum wage cannot be granted all of a sudden unless other measures are taken. Our grouse is this. Some days ago, a very important resolution was tabled to remove disparity in income. But, that resolution was also turned down by the Government.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: No, no. My substitute resolution to lessen the disparities was accepted.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: The proposal for removal of disparities in income was not accepted here and now by the Government. That task has been avoided. If the directive principle of the Constitution is to be respected, the minimum that the Government should do is to remove the disparity. Only if steps are taken in that direction, other steps also can be taken.

What is supposed to be the general economic policy of the Government? The directive principle is that the operation of the economic system should not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment. What is the position? Has anything been done to check concentration of wealth? Nothing.

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla):
Of course.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: I say, just the opposite thing is being done. It is true, national income has risen. But at the same time, the purchasing power of the people has gone down. That means clearly that the increase in national income is the result only of concentration of wealth in a few hands. Take the figures of profit. I have collected some figures only. In one tea company, the profit has risen by 150 per cent. during 1953 and 1954. In another tea company, the profit

has risen by 125 per cent. in 1953 and 1954. In the Caledonian jute mills, the profit has risen by 300 per cent. during the same period. In another jute mill, 100 per cent. In the Tata Iron and Steel Co., there has been a 100 per cent. rise of profit between 1953 and 56. In the Calico mills at Ahmedabad, the rise is 600 per cent. in 1954-55. If this is not proof of concentration of wealth in a few hands, what else can be proof, I do not know. What has the Government done to check the concentration of wealth? We demanded a ceiling to be put on the profits. That demand was turned down. We demanded a complete abolition of the managing agency system. But, in the amendment of the Company law, by an indirect method, the managing agency system has been sought to be retained.

It is common experience how the small industries are suffering. I come from West Bengal. A very large number of engineering industries are there; also a number of mechanic shops. A large number of people are trying to push forward in industrial enterprises. But, because of the pressure and weight of the monopolists, they get suppressed and they can not go ahead. What has the Government done to release this potential energy of the people in the industrial field? Government has done so little that it cannot be said that Government has conformed to the directive principle. There are certain agencies, the Industrial Finance Corporation, the State Financial Corporations, the National Industrial Development Corporation and all that. I ask how many of the corporations help the actually needy small concerns. The provisions have been made in such a way that even if you want, you are not able to give a loan or subsidy to a very small concern. A certain capital is necessary, a certain guarantee is necessary, and it is impossible for the small-scale industries to fulfil all these conditions, to get any benefit.

I can give you another example. Take the National Industrial Development Corporation. From the Government papers I find that it is proposed to give a good amount of money to help the Indian Jute Mills Association. Every one knows that the Indian Jute Mills Association is a monopoly concern and it is one of the biggest monopolies in India. The jute industry is in the grip of a small number of concerns. They have got enough of money. You are giving money to them; but you are not giving money to these indigenous small concerns which can flourish only if they get help from the Government.

There is the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. This Act gives wide powers to the Government to control and regulate industry in the interests of the people if the Government so desires. What I want to know is, what exactly the Government has done in exercise of the powers vested in them under this Act. Only the other day, questions were raised in this House about the soap industry and about the rubber industry. The replies that were obtained were that Lever Brothers were getting most of the benefit that the Government could give. The indigenous soap industry is going down. The Dunlop Co. is getting all the benefit, of getting the monopoly of the rubber trade. The other industries are suffering. I know about the belting industry. In my district, there are a number of indigenous belting industries. They have left their production capacity idle. Under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, the Government is giving licences to foreign companies to produce different types of belting while the Indian companies in Calcutta are clamouring for the support of the Government. That has not been given and they are suffering. Is this the way that concentration of wealth is being checked? Is this the way in which means of production are being distributed for the common good or is it just going in the direction which is just opposite to what the directive principles have sanctioned?

I shall deal with two or three minor points and finish. About education, the directive principle is that in 10 years, that is by 1961, all boys up to the age of 14 should get compulsory free education. The Education Minister himself admitted that it is an impossible thing to fulfill. In the matter of education, it is not a question of moving in a particular direction. It is a question of setting a definite target date for the completion of particular things. I want to know what the Government has thought about this incompleteness or slackening and what steps it is going to take to remedy that.

In the directive principles it is definitely stated that men and women should get equal wages, but in the collieries, in plantations the wage rates for the men and women differ. That difference should be removed immediately by law. The Government has not done that. The other day when one hon. Member tried to bring forward a Bill to that effect, that Bill was not accepted. Even the President's sanction was not given. I cannot understand how the Government respects the directive principles. If the directive principles want to do a particular thing and if that thing is pointed out by a non-official Member, the Government instead of accepting that, rejects it. I do not understand what exactly is the attitude of the Government.

I do not want to touch many other points. Only, the last thing I want to say is this, that Government should seriously consider whether their basic approach to the people is correct or not, whether they will remain satisfied by keeping the directive principles on paper or whether really they will be up and doing to translate them into action. The people in India want to feel a real change in their conditions of life. Otherwise, what is the meaning of this national Government? This change in their conditions of life can be brought about only if in every aspect of governmental activity, in every

legislation that idea is there that to the best of Government's ability the directive principles are to be followed. If that seriousness is there, if that sincerity is there, and if that idea pervades the whole governmental machinery, then and then only this change can be brought about, but I am sorry that has not taken place and is not taking place. Therefore, I urge that a proper enquiry should be made to study every law, every executive action and to study every aspect of governmental activity and every aspect of people's problems and see how far the Government has failed to respect the Constitution and how far it should be corrected.

With this appeal I commend my Resolution to the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of fifteen members of Parliament be appointed to enquire into and report within six months, how far the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution have been applied in the legislative and administrative actions of the Union Government and the State Governments."

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

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that Government of India should inquire into and report within three months, how far the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution have been applied in the legislative actions of the Union and State Governments."

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

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that Government of India should place

on the Table of the House a statement, on the first day of the next session of Lok Sabha showing how far the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution have been put into practice so far as the legislative policies of Union and State Governments are concerned.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that Government should set up appropriate authorities to examine and report to Parliament, how far the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution have been applied in the legislative and administrative actions of the Union Government and the State Governments."

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

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that the time is now ripe for the Government to lay on the Table of the House a comprehensive statement showing the extent to which the Directive Principles of State Policy have been so far implemented by the appropriate Governments."

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that the Union Government do prepare a comprehensive report on how far the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution have been carried out by it in its legislative and administrative actions, call for similar reports from the State Governments and submit them to Parliament within six months."

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

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that a Commission consisting of members of Parliament and some selected citizens of India be appointed to inquire into and ascertain the extent to which it has been possible to enforce and implement the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution with a view to finding out the difficulties experienced in implementing them and suggesting remedial measures so as to fully give effect to these principles within the shortest possible time."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The original Resolution and the six amendments are before the House now for discussion.

May I have an idea of the number of Members who want to speak on the subject? There are thirteen Members and I have got 60 minutes. The House just now gave me this direction that I might call the hon. Minister at 5 O'Clock. Now, I can call him at 5-15.

An Hon. Member: 5-30.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will require half an hour I suppose.

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): At least.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore I will have to call him at 5-15. There are full 60 minutes for thirteen Members.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Three minutes each.

Shri Datar: Will you kindly reserve at least ten minutes for other Ministers or Deputy Ministers who have to intervene. Only ten minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Either I have to disappoint half the number, or they should be satisfied with five minutes

each. What would be the better course? I do not think any hon. Member will be able to do justice unless he is given at least ten minutes.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): The whole purpose of this resolution is to direct Government's attention to this question by criticism of its actions and Government as well as the Government supporters can justify that there is no foundation for this kind of criticism. So, the time must be so distributed, not necessarily that the Minister answers every question or every criticism. That way it will be better.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. In no case should an hon. Member take more than ten minutes.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: While hearing the Mover on the Resolution I was wondering whether India was a country worth living in. His speech is full of superlatives and hyperboles and gives the idea to us that this is a country going from democracy to dictatorship, that the conditions existing here are far worse than those in the British days. I was not surprised. It would have been a surprise for others who were new to this country and did not know the facts prevailing here.

As the time is very short, I would like to touch only a few points which are so apparent and could be known and seen even by friends who are not so wise as Shri Tushar Chatterjea but are even ignorant. Article 38 of the Constitution which is the main article round which all others revolve asks for a social order in which social, economic and political conditions should prevail. This Parliament has adopted as our goal a socialist pattern of society to which all our legislation, all our efforts and all our energies are devoted.

My friend said that when a resolution was moved in this House to reduce the disparity in incomes it was rejected. I would very humbly remind my friend that a substitute motion moved by me was accepted by

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

the House which *inter alia* states that the disparity in incomes prevailing in different parts of the society should be lessened by Government. It is true that I, my friend and the Government differ on the ways and means by which to achieve it. Some of my friends feel that overnight or over a month or within a period of thirty days which they would prescribe the head of everybody who belongs to the privileged class or is more fortunate than the common man should be chopped off, his property should be confiscated. Government may say that they would go at a rather leisurely pace. I in between would say that we should adopt measures which are not leisurely or which chop off the heads of people, but should take the example of the Socialist Government that was in Britain. By reforming the tax system we should have a reduction in the disparity of incomes. While moving my amendment I had pointed out to the House that it has not been possible in any country of the world to find out a golden method by which disparities can be reduced, but nonetheless the fact remains that as the socialist pattern is our aim and goal we have to adopt means which would reduce the disparity in incomes. And for that we are taking measures.

Compared to the First Five Year Plan, in the Second Plan we have widened the public sector to a great extent. We have seen that nationalisation of certain industries is going at a very rapid pace. We have seen that the State Bank of India and the insurance business have been nationalised. Like my friends we too feel that we cannot cast our lot in the hands of those handful of persons who are controlling everything and that the businesses in this country should not be allowed to continue as they are but should be nationalised, or they should be asked or called upon to work for the common good. That is being done. We feel that our policy in this regard is being followed quickly.

It is said in article 39, that the ownership and control of the material resources should be so distributed as to subserve the common good. Here, again, differences are there on the method, the pace and other strategies to be adopted. But so far as the goal is concerned, it remains the same, and we are moving towards that.

Then, our Industrial Policy Resolution has been restated. If my hon. friend would look up that resolution again, he will find how far schedule A therein has been widened. My hon. friend Shri T. B. Vittal Rao who is looking askance at me would find the answer to his question in that resolution. We have been trying to take over those Industries and minerals which are more important from the strategic point of view, and which should be exploited for the common good, which, in fact, we are doing at the moment.

Then, article 44 says that we should have a uniform civil code in our country. I think, by bringing forward several pieces of legislations, we are trying to reach that goal in our country. The most important of these legislations was the one which we had recently passed, and to which my hon. friend the lady Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, had given her enthusiastic support, namely the legislation which gave the right of inheritance to the daughter. Then, we had passed also the marriage laws.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): That was just a fraction.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: The question is how we can convince our friends that we cannot run as they run, simply to fall after a few steps. I would ask my hon. friends to recollect what we are seeing over and over again, namely that the countries which had tried to quicken their pace are now coming back to their former stride; they are coming back to their

senses. So, it is no good trying to achieve social and economical justice by having a bloody revolution or by quickening the pace. Even the countries which had quickened their pace are now coming back. So, let us take a lesson from those countries, and let us not commit the same old mistakes which they had committed.

Here, we are in a country, which wants to go ahead, and which wants to implement the Second Five Year Plan with the cooperation of all. Here are not the instances where people can conveniently die in bed or be kidnapped willingly. Here, we have to move forward with the co-operation of all, and that is why we do not find here the type of food riots that took place in other countries.

Then, my hon. friend have said that when people go forth to voice their grievances, they are faced with bullets and with lathis. If my hon. friends want to take law in their own hands, and defy the supreme will of this Parliament, which is expressed in legislation and in acts which are being implemented by the executive authority, and if they want that they should be allowed to do as they like here or outside, then, naturally lathis and bullets must have their course.

But I feel that here is a country where we are trying this big experiment in the most democratic way, an experiment which is a unique and novel one not only in this country but in the whole world. Let my hon. friends point out any country where within a short span of five to ten years, an increase of 18 per cent in the national income has been achieved. Let them point out any country where they have a Five Year Plan where that target is to increase the national income by 25 per cent.

I feel proud of my country, and I feel that the Directive Principles of our Constitution have been implemented; I would not say, fully, because there are shortcomings. And so far as these shortcomings are concerned, I am prepared to agree with

my hon. friends. But let my hon. friends also agree that it is not a Government which is moving from democracy to dictatorship, but it is a Government which is trying to do its best to implement the Directive Principles of State Policy.

So far as unemployment is concerned, I am prepared to agree with my hon. friend. The unemployment problem is there. I feel that at the end of the Second Five Year Plan, when we would be seeing our programmes implemented, the unemployment position will remain the same; we shall have been able to provide employment only for 8 million people, and there would be about 5 million left still unemployed, as is the position at the end of the First Five Year Plan. So, on this point, I feel that we have not fully justified ourselves in regard to the implementation of the Directive Principles.

Similar is the case with education. We have not been able to show anything which will indicate that we are going at a speed which will justify compulsory primary education. The Constitution lays down ten years as the period within which free compulsory education should be provided. But we have not made much progress in this behalf.

Then, again, I agree with my hon. friend Shri Tushar Chatterjea when he says that the article, which lays down that a living wage should be secured for everyone has not been implemented. We are still at a very low ebb in regard to the securing of a minimum wage; in the face of this, a fair wage or a living wage is still a far cry. I agree here with my hon. friend Shri T. B. Vittal Rao, that this article has to be implemented. I hope the Labour Minister will do his best to secure a living wage for the labourers. Of course, so far as the maternity welfare in some industries are concerned, some relief has been given to the workers. But nonetheless, as a humble labour worker, I would point out that the implementation has not been very satisfactory.

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

On the whole, I feel, that in spite of the shortcomings, our country has achieved a tremendous progress, of which any country and any people can be proud. The picture drawn by the Mover is completely clothed in hyperboles and superlatives. So, I would urge that let us take a rational and objective view. The objective view is that much has been implemented, though there are still more things to be implemented.

Shri Raghavachari: I rise to express what I feel about an important matter like this. I find that this occasion is taken as an opportunity by one section simply to criticise the administration and then say that nothing has been done, and by the other side to say that everything has been done, though they would say by way of lip-sympathy that some shortcomings are still there. I would ask all my hon. friends to look at the question from an objective point of view.

I feel that those who go about to justify that all the Directive Principles have been complied with are talking with the tongues in their cheeks or having some guilty conscience are not yet speaking the truth as they really feel and in their private talks generally admit.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: The question does not arise.

Shri Raghavachari: I feel this is not an opportunity simply to criticise. I find that there has been an awareness that we must improve the country and the lot of the people here. Some things are being done in this direction. It is stupid or foolish to close our eyes and say that we have done nothing. It is not so.

What I would urge is that we must judge this matter by keeping in view the administrative and many other aspects of it. Judging in the light of this, I, for one, feel that, it must necessarily depend upon our economic capacity, how much money we can raise, how much money we can

utilise usefully. The income of Government has gone up tremendously. Similarly, the expenditure also has gone up. But my feeling is that much of the expenditure is on an extravagant scale, and it has become impossible for anybody who wishes to criticise or find fault with Government not to say that the expenditure must be carefully examined, and retrenchment effected. We find that there is more establishments, there is more appointments, and there is more wasteful items of expenditure, and very little work is really being turned out in the distant village where the ordinary man lives. For the purpose of advertising, we may talk, but really, the work undertaken and achieved is very little, though the expenditure is very high. I feel that retrenchment in administrative machinery is the only way to ensure expenditure of the increased income in a useful way. But, unfortunately, that is not to be found.

Within the brief time at my disposal, I shall give just one or two examples. Take the case of the much-advertised community projects. Crores of rupees are being spent on them. But I have not found much satisfaction after seeing the real work turned out in the community projects throughout the country. I wanted to find out whether there had been any real improvement at least in those projects which had been started as pilot projects some eight or ten years ago.

I took the trouble of going and visiting village after village. Take Etawah, a much advertised thing. I was very happy to find that there has been some change and some good use of the Community Project there. But I also went and saw Faridabad. I was dissatisfied with many things there; it was a hopeless disappointment.

Shrimati Khongmen (Autonomous Distts.—Reserved-Sch. Tribes): What about tribal areas?

Shri Raghavachari: I have not seen them.

Therefore, the Community Project—not the name of it—is a good thing I have already expressed disapproval with the name 'Community Projects Administration'. It should be *Gram Punar Nirman*. But now I am not so much concerned with that. I am more concerned with the actual work done.

One of the directive principles requires that agricultural operations should be based on economic and scientific lines. So much has been achieved; so much money is spent on fertiliser factories. I do not say that nothing useful has come out of it, but it might have been spent more usefully in the villages and more benefits could have been given.

Let us take medical relief. We have a Minister who never believes in the indigenous system. She went on all these four years, working hard and acting and talking against the Indian system and condemning the system. But during the last one year she was forced to accept that she is thinking of doing something. Why not encourage our indigenous system which is cheap, where drugs can be had everywhere, where doctors can be trained easily and cheaply? But you bring costly things from foreign countries. It may be very good. But the question is: what is the maximum benefit that you can turn out with the little money that you have in the short time that you have at your disposal.

Then coming to education, it is said in the directive principles that within ten years you must do a certain thing. But what is it that is being done? This morning we heard question after question about basic education. As I was listening to the supplementaries and Government's replies an impression was left in my mind as if the Members desired that it had better be dropped as it is not going to be practical. So in regard to education, there is not much achievement. In regard to medicine and medical relief, there is not much and

so in other things, too there is not very much.

Then let us take decentralisation of administration. At the beginning of self-government, almost at the very first stage, is the village panchayat. But no panchayat is really functioning effectively and usefully in the village. Why? They have no money. If the Government had made a rule that one-fourth of the revenue collections from each village would be handed over to the village panchayat for utilisation for the benefit of the village, the results would have been quite different. But now it is all centralisation, centralisation and centralisation. All kinds of activities from great Delhi to the village is swallowing up the funds.

It looks to me that, apart from talking by way of criticism and saying that nothing is done, if the directive principles are actually put into practice and shown to function on earth, the earth would become heaven. The directive principles are so nice that if all of them were brought into operation, this would be the result. One generation is not sufficient for that; a number of generations will have to strive for it. This is an ideal that is kept before us, that we must reach that goal, and it certainly requires crores and crores of rupees and years and years of labour and millions and millions of people to work it. But the unfortunate thing is that we have lost that urge, that missionary spirit to work for the common good. It has now all become a question what pay a man must get and what benefits he can get. The whole atmosphere has changed from one of service to one of converting the few years or the few days that we have into something that will go into our pockets. That is the unfortunate thing which has resulted in far less effective work in the country.

Therefore, I would even now urge Government—without simply saying that nothing is done—seriously to think over this and see that every pie is spent on things that really result

[Shri Raghavachari]

in some good to the people, and not indulge in costly administration, costly toys and costly shows. We have got various Research Institutes. Take the Central Food Research Institute. I spent all the time one day in Mysore in it. It is a huge institution, a palace, and has a big establishment. But what have they really contributed. Some advertisement about ragi malt,....

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Synthetic rice.

Shri Raghavachari:..cowdung plant and things like that—absurd things in a practical way.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): Cowdung plant is very important.

Dr. Raghavachari: For the last 12 or 13 years this propaganda has been going on. The Indian Agricultural Research Institute in Delhi says that a cowdung plant has been invented and all that. It says that cowdung can be converted into gas and every peasant-household can go on cooking and lighting. For 15 years this has been only propaganda, on paper, and pamphlets. Nowhere do we actually see anything.

It is unfortunate that many of these Research Institute have to be centres where a number of people are regularly paid on the first of each month their salary and nothing is turned out. This is the greatest disappointment.

Dr. Rama Rao: An Institute is not a factory.

Shri Raghavachari: But in one respect, the directive principles have been fully followed. That is so far as article 51 is concerned, in the international sphere we work for peace. Our Prime Minister has been doing something to bring about work peace. It has brought us credit in the world. Sometimes—to be honest to myself—I feel that it is this work that is being done and that is being

appreciated by the world that has made us lose our heads and remain unmindful of the fact that more time, more attention and more real work should be done inside the country. But this inside work is not so much our concern as international glamour.

Something is being done, but I wish more would be done in the internal world, not in the international world.

श्री श्री नारायण दास : जो हमारे संविधान के निर्देशक सिद्धान्त हैं उनके सम्बन्ध में जो प्रस्ताव हमारे माननीय मित्र ने उपस्थित किया है उसके लिए हम उसके आभारी हैं, क्योंकि इस प्रस्ताव द्वारा उन्होंने इस सदन को मौका दिया है कि वह अपने पिछले नौ साल के कामों को इन सिद्धान्तों पर कैसे और देखे कि संविधान के निर्माताओं ने जिन मौलिक सिद्धान्तों को सार्वजनिक जीवन में लागू करने का निर्देश दिया था उस निर्देश का कहां तक पालन किया गया है। इस प्रस्ताव का यह उद्देश्य नहीं है, जैसा कि हमारे माननीय सदस्य ने बताने का प्रयत्न किया कि इस दिशा में अब तक कुछ नहीं किया गया है, न केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, न राज्य सरकारों ने और न उन विभागों ने इस दिशा में कुछ किया है जिनके ऊपर इन सिद्धान्तों को सार्वजनिक जीवन में उतारने का उत्तरदायित्व है। मैं समझता हूँ कि पिछले नौ सालों में इन सिद्धान्तों को राष्ट्र के जीवन में उतारने का प्रयत्न अवश्य किया गया है और अनेक दिशाओं में हम बहुत आगे बढ़ गये हैं। जैसा कि श्री माननीय वक्ता ने बताया अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में, शान्ति और सुरक्षा के लिये देशों के आपसी संबंधों को मित्रतापूर्ण रखने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान ने जो प्रयत्न किये हैं वे सचमुच सराहनीय हैं। इसलिये जहां तक अनुच्छेद ५१ का सम्बन्ध है यह कहा जा सकता है कि हम तेजी के साथ बढ़े हुए मुसलमानी के साथ बढ़े

हैं। लेकिन मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इस समय जब कि हम दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना का निर्माण करने जा रहे हैं हमको देखना चाहिये कि हमारे संविधान के चतुर्थ अध्याय में अनुच्छेद ३६ से लेकर ५१ तक में जो निदेशक सिद्धान्त दिये गये हैं उनपर अमल करने में केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, या राज्य सरकारों ने, संसद् अथवा विधान मंडलों ने या स्थानीय संस्थाओं ने कितनी सफलता प्राप्त की है। हमको देखना है कि इन नौ सालों में इन निदेशक सिद्धान्तों को सर्वसाधारण के जीवन में कहां तक लागू किया गया है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि सरकार का इस प्रस्ताव के सिद्धान्त को मानने में और मेरा जो उस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में संशोधन है उसको मानने में किसी प्रकार की हिचकिचाहट नहीं होनी चाहिये। आज जब कि हम दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना पर अमल करने जा रहे हैं और हमको अपने संविधान पर अमल करते ६ वर्ष हो गये हैं हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि राज्य के किन किन भागों में हमारे संविधान में जो निदेशक सिद्धान्त उल्लिखित हैं, उन पर कैसा अमल हो रहा है और आज जो हमारे समाज का उपेक्षित और दलित भ्रम है और जिसकी कि हम आज तक उपेक्षा करते आये हैं उस शोषित और दलित वर्ग वालों को ऊपर उठाने के लिये हमारे भारतीय संविधान में जो हमको निदेश दिया गया है उसको हमने कहां तक पूरा किया है और निभाया है; उस विषय में छानबीन की जाय और वह छानबीन इस सदन के सदस्यों द्वारा की जाय जो निष्पक्षता-पूर्वक बिना किसी तरह का भेदभाव के अपनी रिपोर्ट सरकार और संसद् के सामने रखे या जो स्थानीय संस्थाओं हैं उन संस्थाओं के सामने रखे ताकि यह मालूम हो सके कि हमने कहां कहां गलतियों की हैं। किस और हम द्रुत गति से आगे बढ़े हैं और किधर हमारी रफ्तार धीमी रही है इस तरह की छानबीन करने का प्रस्ताव प्रस्तावक महोदय ने अपने उस प्रस्ताव में रक्खा है और मैं उनके साथ इसमें पूर्ण सहमत हूँ और

मैं इसलिये उनके प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

जब से मैं इस संसद् में आया हूँ तब से मैं बराबर इस तरह के प्रस्ताव जैसा कि मेरा आज संशोधन पेश है, सूचना देता आया हूँ कि एक कमिशन जिसमें संसद् के सदस्यगण और देश के कुछ चुने हुये और योग्य व्यक्ति शामिल हों, बैठाया जाय जो कि इस बात की जांच करे कि हमारे कांसटीट्यूशन में जो डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपलस दिये हुये हैं, उन पर कहां तक अमल हो पाया है और उनके अमल में लाने में जो बाधाएँ पड़ती हैं उनकी भी जानकारी कराये और उनको हटाने के वास्ते अपने सुझाव पेश करे ताकि शीघ्र से शीघ्र संविधान में जो निदेशक सिद्धान्त हैं, उन पर पूरी तरह से हर क्षेत्र में अमल हो सके। लेकिन दुर्भाग्यवश मेरे इस प्रस्ताव को बिलेट में प्राथमिकता नहीं मिली और यह सौभाग्य मेरे माननीय मित्र को नसीब हुआ कि उनके इस प्रकार के प्रस्ताव को बिलेट में पहला नम्बर मिला जिसके कि परिणामस्वरूप आज वह हमारे सामने विचारार्थ पेश है। मैं माननीय सदस्य को इस तरह का प्रस्ताव लाने के लिये बधाई देता हूँ। उसके विषय में सरकार से मेरा यह निवेदन है कि वह इसका पहले से ही विरोध न करे और यह मान कर न बैठ जाय और संतोष कर ले कि हमने जो कुछ डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपलस (निदेशक तत्व) में दिया हुआ है, उनको पूरा किया है और हमको उस दिशा में और कुछ करना शेष नहीं है। आज अगर हम ध्यानपूर्वक जो निदेशक सिद्धान्त हमारे संविधान में उल्लिखित हैं उनको देखेंगे तो पायेंगे कि हमें अभी बहुत कुछ करना शेष है, और मैं तो कहूँगा कि अगर आज हमारे देश में एक भी आदमी इसलिये भूखा रहता है कि उसको काम नहीं मिलता है हालांकि वह करना चाहता है, तो हमने निदेशक सिद्धान्तों का पूरी तरह पालन नहीं किया है और यह चीज कि

[श्री श्री नारायण दास]

हमारे बीच में एक ऐसा आदमी मौजूद है जो कि काम करना चाहता है लेकिन उसको काम नहीं मिलता है और वह भूखा रहता है, यह हमारे लिए जो इस संसद में चुन कर आये हैं और इस सरकार के लिए जो जनता के प्रति उत्तरदायी है, शर्म और लांछन की बात है। आज हम इस संसद भवन और नई दिल्ली में बैठ कर यह संतोष नहीं कर सकते कि सब कुछ ठीक चल रहा है जब कि हम देखते हैं कि हमारे ग्रामीणों की और विशेषकर उनमें जो श्रमिक हैं, वे खून पसीना बहा कर चौबीस घंटे खेतों में मेहनत मजदूरी करते हैं लेकिन तब भी उनको पेट भर भोजन और तन ढांकने को कपड़ा नहीं मिल पाता है और ऐसी अवस्था में इस सरकार के लिये इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करना या यह कह देना कि हमने तो सब काम कर लिया है और हमें ज्यादा कुछ नहीं करना है, ठीक नहीं है। अब मैं जैसा कि हमारे विरोधी भाइयों का मत है कि इस सरकार ने कुछ नहीं किया है, उसको तो मैं नहीं मानता हूँ लेकिन साथ ही साथ मैं यह कहे बगैर भी नहीं रह सकता कि अभी हमें बहुत कुछ करना शेष है और हमें संविधान में जो निदेशक सिद्धान्त दिये हुये हैं, उनको पूरी तरह अमल में लाने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये और ऐसा होने पर ही हम कह सकेंगे कि दरअसल मैं जो संकल्प हमने अपने संविधान के प्रीएम्बल (प्रस्तावना) में किया है कि देश और समाज के जीवन के हर एक क्षेत्र में सामाजिक, राजनैतिक और आर्थिक न्याय होगा और हमारे देश में सर्वत्र समानता का वातावरण होगा और हर एक को फलने फूलने और उन्नति करने का समान अवसर मिलेगा वह पूरा किया है। उदाहरणार्थ मैं आपसे पूछना चाहूँगा कि क्या आज एक गरीब से गरीब आदमी को ऊंची से ऊंची शिक्षा मिल सकती है? मेरा कहना यह है कि आज इसकी सुविधा नहीं है और यह बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण बात है कि जो संकल्प हमने

अपने संविधान के प्रीएम्बल में किया हुआ है, उसको पूरा करने का प्रयत्न करें और जो सरकार आज सत्तारूढ़ है और जो जनप्रिय सरकार है उसका और इस संसद के सदस्य-गण जिनको कि जनता ने अपना प्रतिनिधित्व करने यहाँ पर भेजा है, उनका तो विशेष तौर पर यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि वे सरकार का इस ओर ध्यान दिलायें और इस बात को देखें कि सरकार उनको पूरी तरह अमल में लाती है और अगर वे ऐसा नहीं करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वे अपने कर्तव्य से च्युत होते हैं।

अन्त में और अधिक न कहकर मैं अपने संशोधन का समर्थन करते हुये यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जांच हम इस बात की न करवायें कि सरकार इस बात को करना चाहती है कि नहीं बल्कि जांच इस बात की करवायें कि सरकार ने उन निदेशक सिद्धान्तों को अमल में लाने का जो प्रयत्न किया है, उसमें उसको क्या क्या कठिनाइयाँ पेश आई हैं और उन कठिनाइयों को कैसे दूर किया जा सकता है, उसके सम्बन्ध में वह कमिशन अपने सुझाव पेश करे ताकि हम उनको जीवन के हर एक क्षेत्र में पूरी तरह लागू कर सकें। इस तरह का कमिशन बैठा कर उसके द्वारा जांच कराने का तात्पर्य सरकार के कामों की निन्दा करना नहीं है और न ही सरकार के लिए यह प्रतिष्ठा का प्रश्न होना चाहिये बल्कि सरकार को इस तरह के कमिशन को इस रूप में देखना चाहिये कि उसके द्वारा वह अपने अब तक के किये गये कामों का सिंहावलोकन करवाये और कमिशन (प्रायोग) इस बात की छानबीन करे कि हमने उन निदेशक सिद्धान्तों को राज्य के विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में, राज्य के विभिन्न भागों में चाहे वह पार्लियामेंट (संसद) में हो, चाहे विधान सभाओं में हो और चाहे स्थानीय संस्थाओं में हो किंचि हद तक लागू किया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आज इस अवसर पर और अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। कि मैं बहुत कुछ कहना चाहता था और ऐसा करने की वजह यह है कि इस प्रस्ताव पर बहुत से माननीय सदस्य बोलने के इच्छुक हैं। मैं केवल इतना ही कहूँगा कि सरकार जो मैंने संशोधन रखा है या जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने इस समय पेश है, उसके सिद्धान्त को मानकर एक कमिशन या कमेटी द्वारा इस बात की छानबीन करवाये कि दरअसल मैं हम उन निदेशक सिद्धान्तों को कहाँ तक अमल में ला सके हैं और उनके अमल में लाने में क्या क्या कठिनाइयाँ अनुभव हुई हैं और उनका किस तरह से दूर किया जा सकता है ताकि आगे चलकर उन पर पूरी तरह अमल किया जा सके और जल्दी से जल्दी हम अपने मकसद को प्राप्त कर सकें। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपने संशोधन का समर्थन करता हूँ।

Shri Dasaratha Deb (Tripura East):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, so far as the Directive Principles are concerned, there are many good points embodied in the Constitution which one can appreciate. But the main question is this, whether these Directive Principles are implemented in practice. That has got to be examined. This is a vast subject and I am not going into detail with all the matters but I only want to deal with those Directive Principles which relate to the Tribal areas and especially the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes.

It is stated in the Constitution itself that the policy of the Government is to foster an all-round development of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, in the educational sphere, in the economic sphere and in many other walks of life. Now, let us see how this question of implementation in the educational field is tackled in the Tripura State so far as the Tribal people are concerned. I should say that it has been grossly violated in the Tripura State. There

is a principle that Government should undertake to educate the tribal people within a limited period. But the main obstacles that stand in the way of making rapid progress in this respect have not been touched at all in the Tripura State.

One of the main difficulties for the tribal people in the Tripura State in the matter of their education is the language difficulty. That difficulty has not been removed as yet and not a single attempt has been made to remove it. There is a constant demand from the tribal people that these Tribal students should be taught at least up to the primary standard through their mother tongue. But that was not accepted. Not only that. There is one other difficulty in the Tripura State. Since the integration, almost all the primary teachers have been recruited from the non-tribal people and not a single one from the Tribal people because there is an imposition of educational qualifications. There is the restriction that only matriculates and not below matriculates will be recruited as teachers in primary schools. In the Tribal areas, boys of 7 and 8 years do not understand any other language than their mother tongue. So, education itself has become a farce in our area. At least one tribal teacher—may be less than a matriculate—should be recruited in all these primary schools to make the boys at least understand what they are taught. Our experience has shown that non-matriculate Tribal teachers have been more beneficial and more useful to the Tribal boys than qualified teachers in the primary schools.

Another question is of Tribal rehabilitation. Of course, Government has formulated a policy to rehabilitate the Tribal people of the Tripura State who practically do shift cultivation in our villages. In this five-year period only some 2,000 tribal families have been rehabilitated, and that rehabilitation also is not satisfactory. You will find that

[Shri Dasarath Deb]

some discrimination has been followed in the tribal rehabilitation, because in the case of a refugee, he has been given Rs. 2,450 as agricultural loan, but in the case of a tribal person, there is provision only to give him Rs. 500 as a grant. These people are going to be rehabilitated on the same pattern of lands and they have to bring those lands under cultivation and the cost will be the same. But why is this discrimination followed in their rehabilitation? In the case of tribal rehabilitation, that is, the Jhumia rehabilitation scheme, there is only rehabilitation on land, and there is provision for an agricultural loan, but there is not a single provision for giving them business loans or business *cum* agricultural or business *cum* industrial loans. That means that the Government of India do not intend to improve the lot of the tribal people and to bring them into business life.

There is great difficulty here. Even the refugees who are getting their business loans have got the opportunities of opening shops in the market started in the tribal areas, but not a single tribal man has ever started such a shop due to want of money, due to his being very poor. This is a serious difficulty. There is a Directive Principle in the Constitution that all kinds of exploitation should be abolished. You know that the tribal people are very poor and have no means to find their livelihood. They are always the worst victims in the hands of the Village Mahajans, and in their *Dadan* system, the rate of interest is 300 to 400 per cent. For example, this year, which is a critical year for Tripura State, the peasants or the tribal agriculturists were compelled to sell their jute in advance at Rs. 5 per maund, and now jute is being sold at Rs. 20 or Rs. 25 per maund. You may imagine how much interest they have to pay to the Mahajans and what amount of loss they had to incur by selling their jute in advance.

Another thing that I want to point out here is about the security on land. There is a long standing dispute on land between the tribal people of Kanchanpur area and a big non-tribal organisation called Swasti Samiti. This dispute continues for the last 7 or 8 years, and whenever we approach the Minister and raise the question even in the House, we are told that the matter would be settled very soon. All sort of attempts and arrangements are being made, but still the dispute is continuing there. That is the fate of the tribal people.

During the Maharaja's rule—perhaps it was 1353 Tripura era—a survey of land was made and 1950 square miles of area was reserved exclusively for the rehabilitation of the tribal people. It was a standing circular of the Maharaja that no non-tribal people should be rehabilitated in that area. Out of that area, 300 square miles were released for the rehabilitation of other people. Now, most of the lands were released either for the rehabilitation of non-tribal people or for the forest reserve land of Government. Practically the 1950 square mile area does not exist at this stage for the tribals. That is the treatment that the tribal people are being given.

Our request is that Government must take special care to provide education as well as facilities in the economic and other fields and also rehabilitation, because these Directive Principles may be decorative in the Constitution, but if they are not implemented properly in that area, the tribal people will not get any benefits out of them.

Shri Tek Chand: So far as the place of Directive Principles is concerned, whether in our Constitution or in several other constitutions of other countries where they have been incorporated, they are in the nature of ideals to be achieved, they are in the nature of targets towards which the policies and the actions of the Government are to be directed they

5151 Resolution re. Appointment 31 AUGUST 1956 Central Excises and Salt 5152
of Committee on Working
of Directive Principles of
State Policy
(Amendment) Bill

are a manifesto of human aspirations and ideals. Therefore, I can well sympathise with people who are anxious that these ideals should be as speedily realised as possible. There are also others who are critics purely with a view to carping at.

When I heard the speech of the author of this Resolution, I was a little amazed. Everything that he was saying was with a view to darkening it. He seemed to be seeing everything that was dark, forgetting that things were not dark but his own mental glasses were tinted with dark hues. It is the change of outlook that is required and not that everything that he saw was in fact black.

Dr. Rama Rao: Close your eyes and everything will be dark.

Shri Tek Chand: That is your way of doing things. On the other side, I must warn that everything is not rosy either. If you were to examine it from a correct perspective, the progress achieved is creditable having regard to the fact that the time at the disposal of the makers of the Directive Principles and all those who are called upon to pursue them is short and that the limits of the economic capacity of the country are to a large extent restricted. But within the scope of these limitations, within the pale of practical possibilities, the achievements made within the short time have been remarkable.

4-59 P.M.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

It is true that a lot more could have been done. To that extent I find myself in agreement with the remarks made by my hon. friend, Shri Raghavachari. He has invited the attention of the Government to wasteful expenditure. He gave an excellent suggestion that care should be taken that every penny of the taxpayer's money should be utilised to the optimum advantage, and any

holes through which the nation's funds are being drained should be plugged. That is a suggestion well worthy of the notice of Government.

But when we turn actually to the various provisions.....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may stop at this stage. I am just now calling Shri T. T. Krishnamachari to move his motion, and after that hon. Member may continue his speech.

CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT
(AMENDMENT) BILL*

5 P.M.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, and I would like, with your permission, to make a brief statement about this Bill.

The House would recall that in proposing an all round enhancement of six pies per square yard of the excise duty on cloth, in the last Finance Bill, the then Finance Minister had pointed out in justification of his proposal, that the steadily expanding demand for mill-made cloth, in spite of a year of record production, had resulted in a substantial reduction in stocks of cloth with mills. He had also referred to the rise in prices of agricultural commodities. These trends have continued during the post-Budget period, and prices have risen even beyond the limits justified by the increase in the duty.

The House is also aware, in framing the Second Plan, the encouragement to the handloom sector in the interest of larger rural employment has resulted in the adoption of a somewhat restrictive policy in regard to

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II Section 2, dated the 31st August 1956, pp. 803-6