

[Shri Sarangadhar Das]

from 50 or 60 miles away and are taught exactly the same way as we are taught. I consider that it will not take you very long to find out that these children will feel themselves uprooted from their surroundings. They will not want to go back to their villages, to their community because those villages do not have the amenities that they enjoy in these *ashram* schools. I can remind you of what has happened to us, caste people who have been educated in western ways in towns and cities. Do we want to go back to the villages? Why is it everybody cries nowadays, 'Go back to the villages'? That is what is happening to the tribal people, the tribal children who are taken to these *ashrams* and are given a certain amount of Hindu culture, Hindu history and Hindu *shastras*, and this is absolutely wrong. That destroys their spirit of independence, their straightforwardness, their truthfulness and all the good qualities that the tribal people have and that we do not have. All those qualities are destroyed in these *ashrams*. And, that is why I say that this approach is not at all scientific and that the Government and the Commission should re-think in this matter, and anthropologically adopt a plan for the education of the tribal people.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may stop at this stage. He may continue the next day.

4 P.M.

#### RESOLUTION RE UNEMPLOYMENT

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now take up Private Members' Business. Let us now take up the Resolution of Mr. Gopalan.

Any hon. Member on his legs?

**Pandit S. C. Mishra** (Monghyr North-East): Yes, Sir. I have not yet finished my speech.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Pandit Mishra.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy** (Salem):

May I make a submission before that? This discussion has been going on for five days now. How long will this go on?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This has been going on for five days, and as many as 8 hours 22 minutes have been spent already. At the old calculation, it is two full days at the rate of 4 hours per day. Now five days have been spent, and I propose, after Pandit Mishra concludes, calling Mr. Mukerjee, and after that, let us take up the amendments.

**श्री नवल प्रभाकर** (बाह्य दिल्ली—रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियां) : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट कमिश्नर की रिपोर्ट पर तीन घंटे का समय बचता है यह कब होगा ?

**मिस्टर डिप्टी स्पीकर :** दूसरे दिन होगा ।

**श्री पी० एन० राजभोज** (शोलापुर—रक्षित-अनुसूचित जातियां) : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, टाइम ज्यादा मिलना चाहिये, बहुत इम्पार्टेंट है ।

**मिस्टर डिप्टी स्पीकर :** अच्छा, देखेंगे ।

**श्री पी० एन० राजभोज :** अच्छी बात है ।

**Pandit S. C. Mishra:** On the last occasion, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I was saying that grandiose statistics that are very often provided by the hon. Finance Minister are no indication of the employment or the unemployment situation of our country, for the Ministers take into consideration what are called 'coastal statistics' and leave out of consideration completely the picture that prevails in the hinterland, and, therefore, they think that they are providing some new jobs or some new employment, but the new industries oftentimes are throwing out of employment many more people. I will give here only a few figures which

will show how many more people are being displaced for each kind of industry that exists in our country. The latest figures say—

Primary industries other than cultivation, mining and quarrying employ—24 lakhs.

Mining and quarrying industries employ—5 lakhs.

Processing and manufacturing of foodstuffs, textile, leather and products thereof—51 lakhs.

Now, Sir, on this point I wish to say that regarding the industries under the third head, for each one of these industries, for each one who is supposed to be employed, not less than 5 to 10 men are thrown out of employment. Our country has got a kind of economy and our country has got a mode of production prevailing. Our country is not like America; it is not even like Russia. It is not a country like America where they have half as much population as we have and 2½ times as much land as we have. Therefore, if we blindly follow them, the only result will be a huge destruction and, therefore, I want to ask of our Government and the people who manage the State, because I know that the old methods of production cannot now prevail; they shall have to go.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. There is too much of talk in the House.

**Pandit S. C. Mishra:** The only question for consideration before the House is—I appeal to all Members who sit behind the Treasury Benches to consider—whether this change-over from the old methods that existed to the new methods that have to come, cannot be warded off, whether this matter is to be left unplanned or is to be left to be decided by the struggle of what they call 'the strong eating the weak' or whether we can regulate them and put them under

some sort of planning. I had given as an instance the State buses that are being run in towns. I will take another example of the loom industry. Even this day we had a question and we know that our Government is levying a cess to protect the handloom industry, but—I appeal to all my friends once more—have we set up any law in this country, if we want to protect handlooms, that no more new looms shall be allowed to be added in any of the new cloth mills? If we are sincere, we must adopt one of the two courses. It has been accepted and it has also been, I think, tested during all these years of competition that hand weaving is the industry which can, to a very large extent, compete with the mills. They are not easily extinguished and with a little patriotism, with a little help and with a little rationalisation, they can survive. If on the one side we raise some levy and give them some subsidy and on the other we do not put any check on the throat-cutting production by the mills, then the looms cannot survive. I don't mean to say that all the new modes of production that can be brought into existence here have been established now. Then will come the time when we can allow that competition, but before that, if we allow this cut-throat competition, we certainly are not doing any good to our country. I will ask my friends to consider for themselves and to demand of those people whom they have made the managers of the State. Don't take my advice. They might fix some priorities. By priority, I mean, we must now quickly decide whether all the capacity that we have for starting new industries should be allowed to grow unplanned or whether there should be a plan for this purpose. Take the example of the cloth machines. Suppose we say that no replacements shall be made on those machines—if they wear out, let them go out—the capitalists, who have all got back the full value of the machines and got it in their banks in the shape of 'wear and tear account', 'depreciation account' etc., have fully been paid and they are not affected. Now,

[Pandit S. C. Mishra]

let our Finance Minister or this Government make a law that no more investment shall be made on looms and all that money may be invested on iron and steel—iron and steel is an industry of great importance and I know when Mr. Saha gives his advice on it, the reaction on the other side is quick. If he is a scientist, he will be beaten by a rod of common sense. Then they say that he has not got common sense. If he is full of common sense, then somebody will stand up and say that he is not an expert. On this side, if some of our experts talk, then they are beaten by the rod of common sense. If I am a man of common sense, then they say 'you are not an expert'. So you are having it both your own way. Suppose you agree and make your own catalogue and say that anybody investing in any of these categories shall have the full protection of the Government, shall have everything that he will desire, but anybody going out of these categories shall not be allowed to replace the industries. That is still existing somehow in this country.

In my part of the country there is a saying that a half-blind cat—a cat with one eye—will only hunt in the household. Our Indian industrialists are becoming like those one-eyed cats. They only hunt what is existing in our country. I know they do it, and they find it the easiest thing to attack the existing industries and hunt them out. Therefore, if really the Government is serious, and if our friends really consider that we are thinking of creating new employment, then, my suggestion and advice will be that very quickly a schedule should be drawn up by which every farthing, every penny, of capital should be encouraged to be invested there, and the people investing in these industries should have all help from the Government. But, without doing that, what are we doing now? We are having plans for coco-cola, plans for drinks, plans for assembly of cars,

plans for cinemas and plans for so many things—wasteful things. There is no method. Therefore, I say it is not at all planning in the real sense. I know you have taken up some river-valley projects, and perhaps, the State buses. Well, the river-valley projects, so far as they go, are good, but even there, there could have been a difference in the ways that have been adopted. Of course, our neighbour China is also there. Have you not received reports from there that wherever the river-valley projects have been taken up on hand, the bulldozers are being employed for the removal of slush and the men are employed for the rest? How are these bulldozers employed here? If, instead of bulldozers, thousands of people could take up the job. Cannot they be employed? Let the Finance Minister and the Planning Minister realize that work which can be carried out by indigenous methods shall not be carried out by foreign imported machinery. If indigenous methods are adopted, I do not think anything will fail, nor a dam become weaker!

**Ch. Ranbir Singh (Rohtak):** Seven lakhs only on Bhakra.

**Pandit S. C. Mishra:** I say whether bulldozers are there or not—if they have not bought them, perhaps 14 lakhs of people might have been engaged. Do you think that because seven and odd lakhs of people are employed in the Bhakra-Nangal project, no more people will be required? If that is not your idea, we can employ more people. If your idea is "we are entitled to refuse employment to others," then of course, it is credit to you!

I therefore say, Sir, that unless this question is decided, we cannot progress. The first question is: the new industries should be supplementary and additional—not destructive to the indigenous industries that are already in existence.

I shall make one more suggestion, and that is about the redistribution of

land, as Mr. Rajabhoj suggested. Certainly, so long as the industries do not flourish, land is the biggest asset. Therefore, when the Planning Minister or the Finance Minister says that the redistribution of land will only divide or increase unemployment, I say they are very sadly mistaken. I will give you a few concrete examples. The grow more food campaign was going on for five, six or seven years. Though there is a chart or plan of the wells that have been sunk by the grow more food department,—well, they are only on paper, and I do not say much about that—but I have seen with my own eyes that there have been wells sunk by the grow more food department in various places and yet what has happened? Government said, we will give only 50 per cent. for those wells. Then the result was that only rich men could sink such wells, and now nobody is making use of those wells. I say that wells that have been sunk by the grow more food department are lying idle all over the country. On the other hand, if the proposal of my friend Mr. Rajabhoj or my proposal were taken into consideration, much should have been achieved. If you give just two acres of land roundabout each well to one family of a landless labourer and say, "My friend, in five years you will have this land and the well, but for each year you must give me 20 maunds of such and such produce as you raise." Do you know, Sir, it will work like a miracle? I will finish.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have given you a little more time.

**Pandit S. C. Mishra:** I will take only two minutes more. I have one more suggestion. I say all countries have created incentives like this, and therefore, if this land could be given to such landless people who work with their own hand and feet, they would be willing to take up the work. If you say to them that such and such a quantity should be produced in five years, ten years, or some such period, and then the land shall become yours, then production shall improve like anything—beyond measure.

Then, one word about unemployment of the educated people. Our Education Minister has found out a good thing. He said that educated people should try to follow their hereditary occupations. Well, he has found that that will be the solution. On the one hand, all the hereditary occupations are being destroyed, and, on the other hand, we have grown sick of our educated people. I say, Sir, that you should take each village as one unit, and, as I have said, for a group of ten acres, one graduate can be employed. But you should give the village some powers. We are having village panchayats, but they have no powers. They are like people who have to be watchers of the property of others. If you give the village panchayat the rights over the property of the village and over the lands that are situated round the village, then things will improve. In that case, each village will at least require one graduate. He can be the foreman of the village, the father of the village or say, a brother of the village. I know that if this is agreed to, lakhs and lakhs of graduates will be found and they will be willing to work like this in the villages.

**An Hon. Member:** Finally, the master of the village.

**Pandit S. C. Mishra:** One graduate cannot master a village, but just as you transfer people, let him be there for five or ten years in the first instance, and you can shift him afterwards. There is no question of his becoming a zamindar, but I think educated people can be given good work on the lines suggested by me. With these few words, I conclude.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta North-East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, as I participate in this debate, I notice a strange lack of interest on the part of the treasury benches, and I do not understand how it is that when a vital resolution of this sort is being discussed and the time for discussion is prolonged because of a desire on the part of the majority of this House—I do not understand how, even in those

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

circumstances those Ministers who are directly concerned with this matter are not present. I miss, Sir, in particular the very deceptively cherubic presence of the Finance Minister because, I hope, at any rate.....

**The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shri M. C. Shah):** I represent the Finance Minister.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** I do not wish to bandy compliments across the floor of this House, or, I would perhaps have been persuaded to say that he is a very good substitute. In any case, I am sorry that Government does not appear to be as interested in this matter as they ought to have been. But one very important purpose has been served in that the attention of the country has been focussed not only on the existence of this problem of unemployment which is so acute that everybody knows all about it, but on the utter ineptitude of the Government of the day which, Sir, had to wait for this resolution to be given notice of before it came forward with an amendment, somewhat surreptitiously, I should say, suggesting that there should be an amendment of the Five Year Plan which was tomtommed so ardently only the other day. I do not know, Sir, if there is any such precedent in parliamentary history in any other country. The Five Year Plan was a basic document which we discussed in this House only a year ago. The Five Year Plan was to be amended, but Government comes forward with the first intimation of its desire to amend the Five Year Plan only after a non-official resolution was given notice of in this House.

Now, Sir, occasionally official voices have tried to pipe in, to suggest somewhat furtively, that the unemployment problem has been exaggerated, and I think the Finance Minister also has tried, in his charming fashion, to say the same thing. But the cruel fact of the increasing misery of our people is such that we have found acknowledgment of it by the Government repeatedly, particularly in the speech of the hon. Minister for Planning that this

is our problem Number One, this is our major problem. Gruel centres in Madras for migrant weavers, or the fact of unemployment of more than two thousand qualified medical men in West Bengal, unemployment of seamen and air pilots, of trained workers in ordnance factories and shipyards, all these things are so much a matter of common knowledge that nobody can deny the fact of the existence of this very acute malady in our body politic.

It is necessary, Sir, therefore, to try if we can, to find out certain remedies and begin to apply them. And there I say, Sir, that the atmosphere is occasionally sought to be confused by certain references to the problem of over-population. I heard my hon. friend Prof. Sharma the other day saying that the problem of population is the biggest hurdle that we have to cross. Now, Sir, increase of population in this country has not been due, as many of these writers, especially from the United States of America suggest, to some special oriental philo-progenitiveness; it is not the result of Eastern sexuality, or a heathen addition to polygamy.

Now, Sir, the percentage of growth of population in our country has been lower than in the West. India's population increased three-fold between 1750 and 1941. But the population of the United Kingdom in that period increased over five times in spite of large migration. India's rate of increase today is about the same as Holland's. In 1894 Germany's birth-rate was 36, compared to India's 34. Now, Sir, I have found in the *Eastern Economist* an article on 'Unemployment' which says:

"Even granting that all the married people capable of procreation take a solemn pledge today to stop having any children and abide by that pledge, which is obviously impossible, the intensity of the problem will continue for at least two decades, although it may be gradually reduced."

That, Sir, is the position. Who does not want family planning, if we can manage it? But to put the cart before the horse, to beat our breast and to worry our hearts out over this problem is not only unwise but also entirely mischievous; that would just be following certain ejaculations about Asiatic 'gooks' multiplying like rabbits. A supposedly scientific book called "Road to Survival" by a man called Vogt says: "Asiatics breed like rabbits and that is the biggest single problem in the world today".

Following this kind of Western ejaculations if we tell our people who go without food, without clothing, without shelter, that they should practise the refinements of contraception, that is a cruel joke, that is something which our people will not possibly tolerate. This is a matter which is so often forgotten and if we think that the main emphasis should be put on the problem of population, then we are putting the cart before the horse; we are not trying to tackle the problem as we ought to tackle it. We are accepting the logic of these imperialist spokesmen, who want us to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, who want us to be cannon fodder, who want us to be subjects of their exploitation. We have to cut across that ideology; we have to come out of the grip which it has got over us and then and then alone can we solve the problems which are facing us today.

Sir, when the question of unemployment is being discussed, I think first of my own city of Calcutta where scenes are being enacted of destitution, of misery of horror. Whoever goes to that great city can see it for himself. I find, Sir, in an official document, the Report of the Census Superintendent of West Bengal, certain statements which come to me as a revelation, which shows how at last there is beginning to dawn on certain official minds some appreciation of the real problems which confront us today. Now, I am quoting from a fortnightly, or perhaps weekly, called *West Bengal* which is published by the Government of West Bengal and sent

to all Members of Parliament I presume, or at least to West Bengal Members of Parliament. It carries the date 19th November 1953. The Census Superintendent says:

"The Permanent Settlement hangs like a millstone round the neck of this population. Agriculture has become a losing battle, a habit or way of life devoid of hope and improvement. . . .

All this is intimately bound up with land reform and the question of redistribution of land because a stage has been reached when, according to the Land Revenue Commission (1940), palliatives—a little improved seed, a little irrigation, a little extra manure or a little improvement in marketing facilities—will not improve the situation or maintain the improvement for any length of time."

My grouse against the Government is that they are exactly doing these little things, petti-fogging little things and claiming profound appreciation of their wonderful activities!

The Census Superintendent goes on to say:

"A 'shocking revelation' is that the proportion of earners to total population has been declining steadily in agricultural and total livelihoods since 1911. What is more alarming is the almost stationary proportion of the population in non-agricultural livelihoods since 1911, which indicates how the excess population, steadily squeezed out in increasing numbers from agriculture, remains unabsorbed in non-agricultural livelihoods and goes on widening the fearful gap between the total population of employable age and the population employed in earning a living."

He goes on further to say:

"It appears that the old urban centres of industry and commerce have rapidly decayed. The reason

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

why the new towns have failed to enrich the country in which they are established, have failed to bring about a satisfactory rural-urban inter-dependence. to contrive true and comprehensive points of contact between rural and urban combines, but instead have helped to perpetuate a dualistic economy, is far too obvious to make a mistake about. It is the domination of foreign capital."

Writing in *West Bengal* the Census Superintendent of that State has said that the domination of foreign capital and the land system of the country are the two main reasons which have brought about our present distress. When we, Sir, talk about domination of foreign capital, a laugh arises in certain quarters in this House. But I tell you, Sir, it is very important for us to go down and find out what exactly are the difficulties that we are facing. It is no good merely tinkering with the problem as we are going on doing all the while. That is why, Sir, I want the Government of the day to turn their attention to the really drastic and fundamental problem.

Now, Sir, as far as professional economists are concerned, academic economists who want to follow the old way of thinking and of acting, there is the opinion of Dr. Matthal, who speaking a few days ago at a Commerce Graduates' Association somewhere said that what was needed today was a very comprehensive recasting; what the Government has succeeded, however, in doing is to start, to rake up a new quarrel, so to speak, between the private sector and the public sector, to start again the hare of a new controversy which they cannot solve between the interests of large scale industry and small scale industry. We find also Government having already brought about a contradiction between the interests of the Indian producer and the Indian consumer. This you can see in the con-

troversy over the question of things like soap, which the Indian Soap Manufacturers' Association want to be protected against the depredations of foreign capital. And then again, Sir, there is a conflict over agrarian reforms, especially in regard to the question of ceiling in regard to land holdings. I found also something that is very fantastic, which is almost impossible to believe could happen in any country, in any ordered Government. I find, Sir, that Shri (he used to be a Knight of the British Empire) V. T. Krishnamachari, who is Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission, said that "it is commonly felt that owing to welfare legislation labour costs have increased, with no corresponding increase, rather decrease in output, and that the diversion of surplus labour in some fields into useful directions has become impossible. This requires careful examination and remedial action". My friend Mr. Giri, I am sure, has made a note of these things. It is a reflection made by the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission. I do not know, constitutionally speaking, in what relation he stands to Government, and whether he has any right to go about the country making pronouncements which obviously differ from the views of the Cabinet or at least the majority of it, the vocal section. He goes about saying this is what is happening. He tries to placate those interests which are also represented in the House and who come forward and say: give more concessions to the industrialists; give us greater liberty, licence to retrench workers if we choose; take away whatever concessions you have given to workers by means of recent legislation. That is the kind of thing they are saying, and this is what the Vice-Chairman of the national Planning Commission, a person holding a high office, is saying. It is peculiar. It is a kind of thing to be seriously guarded against. It is a thing which flourishes only because there is no real principled approach to this point as far as the Government is concerned. If the Government knew its own mind it

would not have brought about a situation where a crack-up of the entire situation is indicated.

This was again to be found when you, Sir, were actually presiding over the deliberations of the House and the Finance Minister was speaking. And he was giving figures about the number of people employed in certain places. He was almost gloating over it. He never does; at least he would never like his being described as gloating over it. He was giving certain figures, that in the textile industry employment has increased from 819,000 in July to 821,000 in August, an increase of two thousand, three thousand, four thousand and so on and so forth. There was a friend of mine sitting here who is unfortunately not here at the moment. This is God's truth, as the Finance Minister was speaking, I passed on a chit to him where I wrote, what used to be taught to English school children when they were quite young so that they could say it very quickly and their pronunciation might be very clear:

How much wood would a wood-chuck chuck,

If a wood-chuck could chuck wood?

They were asked to say it quickly. When the Finance Minister was saying how much employment you can get in this country if you get it in this way, this is what came to my mind, namely, "how much wood would a wood-chuck chuck, if a wood-chuck could chuck wood"? If Government could provide employment, how much employment it could provide—that was the wonderful speculation that came to my mind. That friend is not here at the moment. Otherwise he would vouch for it.

He said something also about community projects. But he did not say how much of a hoax...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not know if all the "chucks" of the hon. Member have been noted down there by the Reporters!

**Shri Sinhasan Singh** (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): Sir, he may repeat it once again so that we may hear it.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Sir, I was saying about the hoax of the community projects. And these community projects are being advertised as furnishing much wider volumes of employment. I am quoting from a Bombay journal, *the Economic Weekly* (which has not the slightest suggestion of leftism) which says: How far is the rural welfare scheme going to contribute to the solution of rural employment or add to the volume of useful employment in the villages? What are they going to do? What are the trainees in these community projects, after completing their training or apprenticeship at State expense, going to do? They will require some capital for starting business. And secondly, if they succeed, they will have to market all their products. What are their sources of finance? Where is the market for these goods? All these questions are simply brushed aside. You, Sir, asked some pertinent questions of the Finance Minister on that day. It was said that Bhakra-Nangal is employing so many or the D. V. C. is employing so many. But what exactly is going to happen afterwards? Are you really laying the foundations for a sound economy so that we can develop in the right way? But of course nothing of that sort was done. I am sorry, Sir, I have a few more things to say and I would ask your indulgence for a little more allocation of time to me.

I know that as far as we are concerned there are certain long-term remedies which we have in view. And those long-term remedies naturally will not be supported by the Government of this day. But, as Lord Keynes once said, in the long run we are all dead, particularly the unemployed who will die earlier and faster. We came with certain short-term remedies, and they are roughly these. We said, allocate fifty crores of rupees as relief. This was ridiculed as 'dole'. You know, Sir, the history of unemployment insurance in England or



[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

other countries. Workers pay out of their own pocket as insurance money, they get it back in times of unemployment. And yet it is called a 'dole'. That is the kind of expression of ridicule which they use in order to put a wrong interpretation on the whole thing. We say this is relief. Give us relief. When Mr. Giri brought forward that Bill in pursuance of that Ordinance regarding the ban on retrenchment in the textile mills or when the ban on retrenchment as a whole came forward, when the question of compulsion of mills to pay a certain sum of money for involuntary employment came up, we supported it. It did not go far enough, but we supported it. What is wrong in giving relief when the need for relief comes first? You might say: where is the money going to come from? There is money galore, I should say, if you know where to look.

With Krupps-Demag, the German combine, we have entered into an agreement. On the 18th of September the *Eastern Economist* wrote: "It seems incredible that the consultants' fee of Rs. 2,10,00,000 is to be paid in this case for technical knowledge on processes old, well-tried and fully available within the country." This sum of Rs. 2,10,00,000 could have been paid easily into Indian hands. We did not do it. There is the matter of privy purses for the Princes. Five crores and eighty lakhs of rupees are represented by the privy purse. There can be a cut there. There are the Income-tax investigation results. They could be pursued properly. We could get a lot of money. There are safe deposit vaults all over the country in big trading centres. We can lay our hands on them. In the Tata-Birla Plan it was said: There is Rs. 1,000 crores of hidden money in the country; out of that if we could get Rs. 300 crores, etc. This was said in 1944. If they could get Rs. 300 crores of hidden money in 1944, surely they ought to get Rs. 1,200 crores in 1953. But they do not do anything of that sort.

It is our responsibility. It is Government's responsibility to find out where the money gets hidden and ferret it out and use it for purposes which are necessary for the sake of the country.

Then we say: ban retrenchment altogether, ban closure. Government has moved half-heartedly, very timidly, very hesitantly, possibly because of the V. T. Krishnamacharis in their camp. Anyhow Government has moved somewhat. You should go full steam ahead if you stand for the interest of the people. Put a moratorium on all peasant debts. Sir, the Deputy Finance Minister is nodding his head approvingly. Put a moratorium on peasant debts. You will get some kind of relief as far as these people are concerned. Let there be a ceiling on monopolist profits, foreign as well as Indian, at 6½ per cent. Go back and recall the days of 1948 and your own Industrial Policy. Then you will realise that there is nothing very foolish, nothing very lunatic in this suggestion. Why do I say this? I say this because, I find this from *Capital, Commerce, Eastern Economist* and all that kind of papers. The Bengal Coal company, run by Andrew Yule & Co., has a paid-up capital of Rs. 1,20,00,000. In five years 1945—49, its net profit amounted to Rs. 3,10,00,000. Its latest annual profits were more than 50 lakhs. I find there is a company called The Indian Cable Co., Ltd., run by foreigners. Its total share capital is Rs. 166.77 lakhs. Its reserve fund is Rs. 50 lakhs and other funds 55 lakhs. In the year ending 31st March 1953, its gross profits amounted to Rs. 1,04,23,881. This is how they make their money. I see, in the year 1951, the foreign banks made a profit of Rs. 319 lakhs, more than half the total profits made by all Indian Banks including the Imperial Bank, which is not an Indian Bank at all. This is the way in which foreign people are behaving and they have credited only Rs. 196 lakhs of their net profits to their respective countries in 1951. Look at the reserves of the jute mills.

I remember making in this House a quotation which was sought to be countered by the Finance Minister, but which he could not. An article in *Capital* in 1951 said that in a good year, in a well organised year, the jute companies could make a net profit of 50 crores. That is perhaps impossible according to the present set-up. But, this is what they say: provided things were run properly, and everything was oiled properly, they could make a profit of 50 crores. Most of them are foreigners, almost all of them, the people who have been exploiting our country, for how long, we do not know. That exactly is the situation which has been going on for long, which we cannot tolerate now.

These are some of the suggestions which were given: put a ban on repatriation of foreign companies profits. Then, of course, we shall go ahead really, truly and properly. Of course, let us have road and rail development. Let us open out areas like Rajasthan, Orissa, Madhya Bharat. You know, Sir, from the producer to the consumer, the prices increase by 25 per cent., people have told me, because of lack of transport. Government talks about increase in food production, and industrial production. But, what is all this increase? Why not have more basic industries? In regard to this, the Chairman of the Railway Board, Shri Badhwar made a statement on the rolling stock position of Indian Railways during 1954-60 only the other day. He said: "notwithstanding the very acute shortages of material, particularly steel, and the almost complete lack of supporting industries in the country", Railways are doing well. There is shortage of steel; there is complete lack of supporting industries in this country. If this is the position, go ahead with basic industries. Then, naturally, the possibilities of employment would increase; they would expand beyond recognition.

I see that from time to time Government says some very good things. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the other day,

said somewhere: we should be completely dependent on ourselves. But, I say this is callous cynicism in action, and a sort of sanotimonious sentimentalism in words. That is what you are doing. There is employment in plenty for those people who somehow get on the right side of certain people in authority. I have here,—I am sorry to have to ask for your indulgence for a little more time—material supplied to me by the Minister for Commerce and Industry which suggests that there is in Bombay a Director in the office of the Textile Commissioner who is not even a matriculate, and who has no technical qualifications. I can give his name; the materials are all here, supplied by the Minister for Commerce and Industry. Employment is found for this sort of people. Employment is not found for the masses of our people, who are really great-hearted and who are prepared to go down the pits and mines. They work there because they have to keep the wolf from the door. They are ready to go; but you don't give them bread; you give them stone instead. That is why I warn the Government. This is what the *Eastern Economist* has written in a leading article: the age of impatience has begun. The age of impatience has begun today in point of space in Calcutta, which city I happen to represent in this House. The age of impatience has begun and the misery of our people is such that you can no longer play with them. Suffering is no longer the badge of our tribe. Because you are in the Chair, Sir, I am reminded of what I read in the *Udyoga Parva* of the Mahabharata, where the sage Samvara says:

पतिपुत्रवधादेतत् परमं दुःखमब्रवीत् ।  
दारिद्र्यमिति यत् प्रोक्तम् पर्यायमरणं हि तत् ।

"Patiputravadhadetat paramam-  
dukksamabraveet

Daridryamiti yat proktam parya-  
yamaranam hi tat."

Poverty is a degradation and a disease; it is death by degrees. "Paryayamaranam" is something which is even.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

worse to women than the death of the husband or son. That is the way in which our ancients looked upon poverty. They hated poverty because it brought degradation along with it. That is why I say that we should go ahead with these ideas which will inspire real activity in the cause of the people. We should have the feeling which the poet expressed, "the misery of the world is misery and will not let them rest". That is why I say that our people will not rest till the footling little pretenders to power over our people are pushed off the pedestals of oppression which they occupy so ostentatiously today.

**Shri Raghuramalah (Tenali):** Before you call upon another speaker, Sir, may I make a small submission? This question has already been debated at length. I beg to move:

"That the question be now put."

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

"That the question be now put."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is an amendment: No. 30 by Shri C. D. Deshmukh. I will put it to the House.

The question is:

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

"This House is greatly concerned over the growing unemployment in the country and is of opinion that, with a view to increasing employment opportunities in the country, Government should take steps to revise the Five Year Plan suitably and to adopt immediately such measures as are necessary for the purpose."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is in substitution of the original Resolution. All the other amendments are barred. They are all to the original Resolution. Nothing more is to be done. The new

Resolution takes the place of the old Resolution. The House will now take up the next Resolution. Shri D. C. Sharma.

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur Distt.):** May I raise a point of order at this stage, Sir? The point is that it is the practice of the House that no Resolution should be carried over to another session if the session is prorogued. The Constitution lays down in article 107 that a Bill pending in Parliament shall not lapse by reason of the prorogation of the House. That is, if a Bill is pending, it shall not lapse, all other business shall lapse. Our Rules of Procedure lay down....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** That is the point of order?

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** The point is that an exception has been made in this case. This Resolution has been carried over from the 4th to the 5th session irrespective of the fact that the 4th session was prorogued. I submit that this practice should not be allowed because this has been only an exception. In support of my point of order....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** May I respectfully say to the hon. Member that he has missed the bus? It is too late. We have carried the Resolution. There has been enough discussion for over 5 days, when he could have raised the point of order. Any point of order should be raised then and there. Whether any gentleman is speaking or in possession of the House or not, it is immaterial. As soon as a point of order is raised, all other business of the House will be suspended until the point of order is disposed of. That is the importance of a point of order. We have finished this Resolution. We are taking up another Resolution and I have called upon Shri D. C. Sharma to move his Resolution. In between, what is the point of order?

**Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** What I want to submit is this. There are other Resolutions which are pending in this House

and if possible, these resolutions may again be carried over. Therefore I want to suggest that no other resolution which may be pending should be allowed to be carried over to the next session if there is prorogation.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. The hon. Member will wait with patience until some other resolution is carried over to the next session. Then he can raise the point more emphatically and with renewed vigour and show to the House that it is out of order. The Chair is not called upon to give rulings hypothetically. There is no case now before the House. Let us proceed. The hon. Member will have his chance when another resolution is carried over like that. He can then make a submission and leave it to the Chair. The matter will be discussed. Now, Shri D. C. Sharma.

**RESOLUTION RE: APPLICATION OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT TO JOURNALISTS**

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** I rise to move my Resolution which I believe, Sir, every Member of the House knows already. But, Sir, while doing so....

**Sri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur Distt.):** Please move the Resolution.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that all journalists in the employ of newspaper organisations in the country should be brought within the purview of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), which may be amended, if necessary, for the purpose."

While moving this Resolution, I think, I run three risks. In the first place, it may be said that by moving this Resolution I am playing to the gallery.

**Some Hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I may submit, Sir, that all my life I have belonged to a profession where my business has been to play to the benches, and to

very few benches, Sir. When I look at the many benches in this House, I feel very nervous because I am not used to so many benches. Therefore, Sir, as a teacher I cannot be expected to do anything of that kind.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** Are you accustomed to empty benches?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I have been a good teacher all my life and my students have always come to my lectures in very large numbers.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir,** the other day—I think it was yesterday—I read a speech by a very eminent person in this line, who, while referring to a question in the other House, said that it had been stage-managed. I think, Sir, these words are very unfortunate and they cast some kind of reflection on Parliament. I can assure you that this Resolution which I have put forward cannot smack of anything of that kind. It is not at all stage-managed. It is, if at all, ballot-managed. If at all, it is destiny-managed. If anything at all, I think it is God-managed. It is the luck of the ballot that has brought this Resolution to the top, and therefore I think I am perfectly justified in moving this Resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member has taken three minutes in this preamble.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** May I know, Sir, how many minutes you will give me?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Fifteen minutes.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I am so sorry. I thought I had ample time.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All right. I will give him 20 minutes, because he is the Mover.

**Shri S. S. More:** Speak to him in the terms of columns because he is discussing journalism.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** I have my reasons for moving this Resolution, and it is this: In the first place, I am haunted by the memory—very sad memory—of a student of mine who took to journalism. He was, if I may