

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

2013

2014

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 18th June, 1952.

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

8-15 A.M.

CONSTITUTION (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Biswas: I introduce the Bill.

DELIMITATION COMMISSION BILL

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the readjustment of the representation of territorial constituencies in the House of the People and in the State Legislative Assemblies and for matters connected therewith.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the readjustment of the representation of territorial constituencies in the House of the People and in the State Legislative Assemblies and for matters connected therewith".

The motion was adopted.

Shri Biswas: I introduce the Bill.

REPEALING AND AMENDING BILL

The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to repeal certain enactments and to amend certain other enactments.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to repeal certain enactments and to amend certain other enactments."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Biswas: I introduce the Bill.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

DEMAND No. 78—MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION.

DEMAND No. 79—EXPENDITURE ON DISPLACED PERSONS

DEMAND No. 80—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION.

DEMAND No. 125—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION.

Mr. Speaker: We shall now proceed with the further discussion of the Demands for Grants under the control of Ministry of Rehabilitation; the cut motions have already been moved yesterday, and the discussion was going on. The discussion will continue today up to 9-15 a.m. when I shall call upon the hon. Minister to reply.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: (Calcutta South-East): Yesterday we had a fairly exhaustive debate on the Rehabilitation Budget. There was one feature of the discussion yesterday, which I cannot but emphasize. Somehow, the distinction between the Government Benches and the Opposition Benches disappeared, and Members spoke freely from out of their hearts. I take it that all those who spoke, no matter whether they belonged to the Government or the Opposition Benches, were actuated by one motive and one alone, namely, how to solve this very gigantic

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

problem which has assumed national urgency. I would therefore earnestly request the Government to examine the criticisms with an open mind. I am glad the hon. the Prime Minister is here in the House today, because he will be able to appreciate the various view points which have been urged before the House. No one ignores the colossal nature of the task with which the Government was confronted five years ago. This was a problem which has had no parallel in the world, millions of people moving out from one territory to another, and the great problem naturally at the first stage was how to afford them relief. But still the question of rehabilitation did come up and the problems of people coming from Western Pakistan and Eastern Pakistan were not similar to each other.

Yesterday some references were made that more has been spent on refugees coming from Western Pakistan than from Eastern Pakistan. I look at it from an entirely different point of view. This has not been done deliberately. But it was thought that those who came from Eastern Pakistan—and there the movement started somewhat later—might go back to their own homes, and it might not be necessary to start the work of rehabilitation. Whether that was rightly assumed or wrongly assumed is not a matter on which I am going to say anything just now. But apparently a distinction was made on that basis. Now one general observation which I would like to make is this. It is one thing to make payment to the sufferers and another thing to ensure that actually they are rehabilitated. The hon. Rehabilitation Minister said in his broadcast talk two days ago that a colossal sum has been spent. Undoubtedly, bearing in mind, India's financial resources, Rs. 150 crores is not a small amount. But if I may remind Government, in the United Kingdom after the last war about 1000 million pounds were spent, that is to say more than Rs. 1000 crores were spent not as loans, but as grants for rehabilitating and compensating sufferers on account of the ravages of the last war.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh (Amravati East)
It was Rs. 1300 crores.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: It is not the amount alone that matters, but how has the amount been spent? Therefore, while on the one hand there is this array of figures, the claim of the hon. Rehabilitation Minister that 90 per cent. of the work has been done already, on the basis of statistics, I think we find when we move about in

all parts of India among refugees that there is a spectacle of distress, of suffering, of misery, of frustration giving us an entirely different picture. I have moved in many parts of India during the last few months, and naturally I have come across many refugees coming from all parts of Pakistan, and I found that their actual rehabilitation has been meagre. I am not blaming anybody in particular. I have often felt that Government by merely paying out doles or loans will never be able to effect rehabilitation. There is a big gap between actual payment of compensation and the process of help and rehabilitation. One suggestion was made that Government should work through co-operatives, and money as a rule should not be paid in instalments. I know the reason why that has been paid—I need not go into details here—but actually a sum of Rs. 400 or Rs. 500 paid in four or five instalments naturally encourages the receivers to eat up the money, and that is not utilised for rehabilitation purposes at all.

In many cases houses have been built—may be houses of a poor type—but still some shelter—but the people living in these houses have no employment. In many cases loans have been given for starting some rehabilitation work but they have no shelter. There have been numerous such cases where there has been maladjustment. The hon. Minister in his note has stated that employment has been given, and that nearly about 180,000 people have been offered employment through Governmental agencies. But if you analyse the figures, quite a large bulk of them have been given temporary jobs and conditions of service which are much inferior to what they were obtaining in Pakistan. And many of them today are being served with notices of retrenchment. So practically on the one hand you offer them some scope of rehabilitation and within a few months you take that away. As was pointed out yesterday, nearly 100 crores of the 150 crores that you have spent is on the basis of investment that is to be paid back by the refugees. In some cases they are to be recovered through distress warrants and those operations have already started. In other words, people who have just rehabilitated themselves are being compelled to sell whatever they have in order to meet the demands of Government. Now, these are symptoms of administrative weakness, the application of a right policy in the wrong way which is creating a good deal of distress among the people. Schemes for educational aid and technical training also have been badly implemented judged from results.

I shall not go into details but I shall confine myself to a few major points. The first, naturally, is about the evacuee property and compensation. Now, here, let us look at the matter dispassionately from two points of view. One is our utter failure to persuade Pakistan to behave in the right way. When one reads the broadcast talk given by the Rehabilitation Minister two days ago, one naturally feels sorry for him; but one also feels ashamed that a member of a free Government should be compelled to talk in that sort of helpless way, viz., we have appealed to Pakistan to do the reasonable thing, we even made a generous offer asking Pakistan to pay whatever it can, but everything that we said has been rejected. And the Rehabilitation Minister adds that it is not with regard to this matter alone but with regard to so many other matters that we get no response whatsoever from Pakistan.

Now, what is the reason why Pakistan is behaving in this way? Pakistan wants to grab those properties worth so many hundreds of crores or several thousands of crores of rupees without paying anything. I would draw the attention of Government—already, I believe, Government knows it—to a private member's Bill which is now pending in Karachi. I have got a copy of the Bill here. The Bill provides that anyone who acquired property after 1943 may be called upon by Pakistan to explain how this property came into his possession. "All properties, movable or immovable, acquired by any individual or firm since the first day of January 1943, of which the owner or proprietor cannot account for the sources of acquisition as being lawful shall be treated as illegally acquired". The onus of proving title, even if a man is in possession of a property for years will not be on the challenger but on the lawful possessor. And there is a clause providing that all these properties should be forfeited to the Pakistan Government to be distributed in such manner as the Pakistan Government may decide. Of course, it is a private member's Bill, as I said. But still this is a disturbing symptom as to how Pakistan is proceeding. On the one hand, the permit system is about to be introduced in the eastern zone; on the other hand, there is this Bill pending before the Pakistan Constituent Assembly; in the third place, you have the persistent refusal of Pakistan to recognise its legitimate duty to pay us compensation on any reasonable basis that the Indian Government may suggest to it.

Leave aside what Pakistan has not yet promised to pay. Take those numerous cases where Pakistan has accepted the liability to pay, and how has Pakistan behaved during the last four years? You have the question of payment of pensions, the question of realisation of rents of properties in Pakistan and making six-monthly adjustments, outstanding claims regarding provident fund, post office savings bank and then the dues of private individuals from undivided India which has now formed part of Pakistan. In respect of every one of these matters, agreement—solemn agreement—has been reached between the Indian Government and the Pakistan Government. I have not been able to calculate to the pie the amount which is due from Pakistan to these sufferers, but it will certainly come to about one crore of rupees which is due from Pakistan or more.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): One thousand crores.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Only one crore. One thousand crores or more is the value of the properties which Hindus and Sikhs have left behind. I am talking of dues which are payable by Pakistan against Indo-Pakistan agreements on specific issues. While we are playing our part, and making payments, systematically they do not. Now, this is a sign of utter helplessness. I would beg of the Prime Minister—I know, Sir, he may say, "Well what is the remedy if they do not listen to us?"—with regard to these and all other matters some day we have to cry a halt, some day we have to find a remedy. After all it is weakness and imbecility that guide us. How long can we go on accepting kick after kick, humiliation after humiliation and say "We are helpless; we cannot do anything"?

Now, this is what Pakistan is doing. What is it that we are doing? What is the nature of our own evacuee laws? Compare the evacuee laws in Pakistan and in India and see how rigorous the Pakistani evacuee laws have been made. Even properties belonging to legitimate evacuees who have gone back to Pakistan are liable to be taken away from them if the Pakistan Government considers that such properties are required for the purpose of the Pakistan Government. And how many people have got back their properties? Then take our own evacuee laws. How liberal we have made them, liberal not in the interests of the refugees but liberal in the interests of those Mussalmans who have decided to leave India and go away to Pakistan. I know the history—how

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

the law which was first drafted was suddenly altered at the instance of certain sections of Muslims in India and how it has operated on the poor refugees. The total pool has come down from five or six hundred crores of rupees to 75 or 100 crores of rupees. Of course, we have not got the exact figure, but what an astonishing diminution that we have ourselves agreed to suffer because we wanted to placate a section of Muslims who have decided to leave India and go away to Pakistan. Take the houses which are available in Delhi. As one solitary example, about 3500 evacuee houses have been declared by the Custodian as evacuee property to which refugees are entitled, but they are not being distributed amongst refugees. Several thousands of such applications today are pending before the Custodian and the matter is not being decided there.

This is how we have been weak—it is no use blaming Pakistan alone—how we have been halting. For the purpose of what? For the purpose of maintaining the secular character of our State, for the purpose of maintaining some queer notions of justice or what is it? I cannot understand. These people have gone away and they do not wish to come back. But we are going on with our law which is extremely harsh against the genuine and legitimate interests of the refugees themselves.

Take the case of the recovery of abducted women. Is it not a shame, a national humiliation, that 1500 Hindu and Sikh girls are still with Pakistani officers? That is the figure which my hon. friend, Mr. Gopalswami Ayyangar, gave last year. How many of them have been recovered? I am not talking of thousands of those girls who have been taken away by the ordinary Pakistani citizens. Pakistani officers have 1500 Hindu and Sikh girls. We have recovered some, but the age group was given by one hon. Minister sometime ago; we have not recovered the younger women. Is it an accident, or is it deliberate? And what is it that we are doing? Only two days ago the Punjab High Court declared the Recovery of Abducted Women Act as illegal and we went out of our way—I do not know who are the persons responsible; I am sure the Prime Minister could not have done it, but we must know who those persons are—and have taken away these women and handed

them over to Pakistan. Under law could we have done it? Is it justice? Yesterday some such individuals whose wives have been taken away came to see me and they showed me copies of their petitions. They were married long before partition; they have children and still they have been snatched away from their houses and their families and sent to Pakistan. I would beg of the Prime Minister to consider this, because I know that he cannot approve of such action.

The other day we had a terrible disturbance here over the attempted marriage of a Hindu girl with a Muslim. That was defended on the ground of secularism. Now, if a Muslim girl had been converted to Hinduism before partition, married to a Hindu or Sikh and they have lived together for years, under what cloak of secularism do you snatch away that girl and send her to Pakistan against her will? You cannot do it. But you have done it. I do not know who has done it. But still these are extremely grave symptoms of the reckless and fantastic way in which our Government and responsible persons are moving, creating confusion in the minds of the public and making it difficult for them to support Government even in matters in which they may be entitled to our support.

Let me say a few words on the East Pakistan situation. The hon. Minister in his note has stated that there the situation has now been largely solved. I would beg of the Government. I would earnestly urge upon the Prime Minister to lay his hand on this very vital issue. God forbid, if the situation worsens again, I do not know how it will affect, not West Bengal, but the whole of India. We have to be careful. I do not quarrel about the figures. I know the Prime Minister does not like my attitude regarding Pakistan and East Bengal. But I would like him to understand the situation—the suffering and agony from which I suffer—not I alone, I am not speaking individually, but many others—because of our inability to solve the matter which it is the duty of a free Government to solve. I am not going to quarrel about the figures. It is said that 25 lakhs of people have come away from East Bengal. I challenge the accuracy of the figures. I hesitate to use the word “challenge”; but I doubt the veracity of the figures. I put it mildly. Why do you not look at the Pakistan Census Report issued last week? In that Census Report the Pakistan Government itself has said

that there are 92 lakhs of Hindus living in East Bengal today. Now, Pakistan will not reduce the number; Pakistan would like to announce that a large number of Hindus have not left Pakistan. There were about 1,30,00,000 Hindus in East Bengal on partition. So, on the figures supplied by Pakistan there will be at least 30 plus eight, 38 lakhs, and not 25 lakhs. You cannot say that 13 lakhs were killed in the 1950 riots. About 50,000 Hindus were killed in East Bengal in the February riots of 1950. You cannot say that about eight or nine lakhs have just evaporated or disappeared. There is something wrong. But let me not quarrel about the figures. First, let me ask you what you have done about the rehabilitation of the East Bengal refugees. I would ask Shri Ajit Prasad Jain to refer to the figures which he has given. He has said that 3,37,000 families have been rehabilitated on land, settled on land—that was his broadcast talk.

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): In rural areas.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: He says that 3,37,000 families have been resettled in rural areas on land, and he also says that 16 lakhs of people have thereby been rehabilitated. Now, I ask seriously: how much land has each got? Is it one acre, two acres, or three acres? If it is three acres, ten bighas of land, you must require at least 30 lakhs of bighas. Where is that 30 lakhs of bighas of land to come from? Assam, or West Bengal, or Orissa, or Bihar? What is this joke about—that 3,37,000 families have been settled on land? That was the broadcast given the day before yesterday? If you divide the total of about rupees eight crores, you get about Rs. 225 per head. Rs. 225 given to a family to go and find the land—because land has not been given; that is not mentioned anywhere in the report; it is mentioned with regard to the West Pakistan people. This, however, I leave aside. Then, agricultural implements and special requirements—for all these, the magnificent sum of Rs. 250! And in one word you say you have solved the rehabilitation problem of 16 lakhs. If you leave aside the 16 lakhs and calculate the other figures given in the report, you claim nearly 1,20,000 have got aid, and what have you done for them? You have given some loans, some technical education or given some other aid. But actually 90 per cent. have not been rehabilitated. You have paid money in dribbles. And in some cases there have been charges of corruption; the whole amount has not reached the pockets of the sufferers; somebody has to come

in and has to get a share. Actually, if you talk of rehabilitation, very few people out of these 18 lakhs have been rehabilitated. Their misery and suffering are appalling.

There are the colonies to which reference was made by one hon. Member yesterday. Now, these colonies have been set up on unauthorised land by a few lakhs of these refugees who have worked wonders there. They have worked wonders there, and they have not been able to get any assistance from Government. I mentioned this matter last time. If the landlords have to be compensated, I do not mind. But do not unsettle them, because they have settled themselves in a magnificent way by their own efforts. Look at Assam. I have no time to take you through all the details. I have got heaps of letters and telegrams here, and reports from our workers. So far as the two Assam Members are concerned, one from Cachar side and the other from Gauhati side, they both spoke yesterday in a miserable tone about the failure of rehabilitation in Assam. And do not forget that one portion of Assam is under our direct control. If failure comes there, it is our failure; it is the failure of the Government of India. What has happened with regard to settlement on the tea estates? Nearly 600 people died, and about 2,500 fled away from these places. Land has not been given, and there is nothing but misery and humiliation and frustration. Then, with regard to the various parts of Assam, the plea is: land is not available. This has become a puzzle. Some people say that land is available in Assam. The Assam Government says that no land is available. Cannot the Government of India get hold of the report of the Geological Survey of India which was made a few years ago and which is in the hands of the Government, and there specific mention is made of the total area of cultivable land which is available in Assam, but which will not be handed over to the refugees? The same story has come from Bihar. I know the Minister said last time that "if you do not want to go and settle outside, we cannot do anything for you". Go and see what the people have to put up with. I was coming to Delhi; I was coming from Howrah Station, and they dragged me to their places. No human being would live there. Even animals would refuse to live in the manner in which those people were living there. Their children before my very eyes, were getting their food—or whatever you call it—from dustbins. Do you mean to say that any human being would degrade

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

himself to that extent just for the pleasure of it, for the fun of it? They are men who have left their hearths and homes and have come away as beggars, and they attempted to get themselves rehabilitated in some part of India. It is only because they did not succeed, it is because everything was going against them, that they came away. We have to look at the problem from the human point of view. We have to get into their hearts and find out why it is that they are resisting, and then alone shall we be able to solve this problem.

What about the future? There are more than 90 lakhs still in East Bengal. I am not quarrelling with the Prime Minister about the accuracy of the figures. Let us leave statistics alone for the time being. But the horrid situation is there. I have got here the report of the Bengal Government to indicate how thousands of people have come there during the last month. And they are coming, not through Sealdah alone, but through other areas. There is the proposed passport system. There is the consistent policy of the Pakistan Government to squeeze out the minorities. You have got to make up your mind. Do you believe in your heart of hearts that they can live there. My hon. friend Mr. Siva Rao went there some time ago. Ask him. Not for the purpose of carrying on propaganda. Ask any one who has visited East Bengal. There is my friend Mr. Biswas. Ask him. He has studied the question. Does any one seriously believe that Hindu minorities can live in East Pakistan? That is the major issue we have to face. What rehabilitation can you do? You have spent Rs. 150 crores. You may spend something more. I do not know whether the Finance Minister or the Rehabilitation Minister is responsible for the stopping of consideration of applications for loans from people who came from Pakistan prior to February 1950; they have been told last week that their cases will not be considered. Thus, with one stroke 30,000 applications have been nullified. That is your policy. It will become even worse if another few lakhs come. But perhaps all will not come, because the vast majority will embrace Islam; they would rather accept conversion than take the risk of coming to India and dying on the streets of India. I know their minds. I have seen them. They are bitter. They say there is nothing here for them. You say that so many people

have gone back. I have got here the report of one district, the district of Barisal, where the figures were collected with the help of persons who have recently come away. Out of ten lakhs of Hindus, about seven lakhs have come away from that great district of Barisal—Barisal which was the home of your freedom movement. The House has forgotten it. I will refer to that glorious incident in the town of Barisal some 45 years ago when boys were attacked, where *lathi* struck, because they cried *Vande Mataram*. There stood Aurobindo Ghosh, there stood Bepin Chandra Pal, there stood Surendra Nath Bannerjee. The boys were singing *Vande Mataram*. They were attacked by the District Magistrate and the police force. They ran into the pond and the police force charged them. And it is the British officer who writes that the blows were so given that the water of the pond changed from white to red. That is Barisal. And from that Barisal, people have come away. Even today, there is one man who is living in accordance with the strict doctrine of non-violence. He is Satindra Nath Sen, whom, I believe, the Prime Minister knows. A more ardent follower of Gandhiji you cannot find in the rest of India. He stood before British bayonets alone without even a *lathi* and forced the British to surrender 25 years ago in the famous struggle of Patuakhali. Where is he today? He is in jail, a security prisoner. Look at the other security prisoners who, like Abdul Gafar Khan, are suffering. How many M.L.As. are in Jail? Does the Prime Minister know that there are 150 security prisoners in East Bengal, and the only charge against them is that they are Indian agents?

Shri A. C. Guha (Santipur): They number 500.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: I got the figure about a few months ago. There are 500 people who are detained there. And the only charge against them is that they are agents of India. We are a free India. Is it not our duty to understand from Pakistan what sort of work these people were doing as agents of India for which they are made to suffer? We must know how we are going to deal with that situation. How are we going to rehabilitate 30 or 40 lakhs of people? One hon. Member from the Congress party said yesterday that they have to be rehabilitated in their own homes. That was the demand. We have played with the matter for quite a long time. We have

done our best to rehabilitate those who wanted shelter in our country. We have done our duty. But time is running short. Thirty or forty lakhs of people who will be hounded out of their homes and put on the roads will set a problem. We are not in a position to receive and rehabilitate them. This is a first class international issue. I know that gallons of tears have been shed for various countries outside India, for example Tunisia, Korea and what not. Let us shed our tears as much as we can. But my plea is, keep a few gallons for those people who have suffered with you and who have made you free and to whom you gave assurance after assurance. I can see that this is nothing but a breach of faith. It was the stirring words of the Prime Minister and Sardar Patel, which I carried with me when partition took place that although they were being separated, their case would not be forgotten. They would be protected and if necessary they would be protected in Pakistan. That was the statement which the Prime Minister one day made here on the floor of this House sitting in that same place. I beg of him to consider this matter not for the sake of these people alone but for our sake, for the sake of India's peace and stability and for the sake of the freedom of humanity. If you are unable to solve this problem, these people will come and will come in such large numbers that they will destroy the peace and stability of India. The red signal is here. Just as you have rung the bell, the signal has also come here and that red signal indicates that you have to wake up. You will have to tell Pakistan that we will not accept these homeless refugees to be turned out in the shameless way. They have to be protected in Pakistan. After all what harm is there if we tell them—the Pakistan Government—that they have failed to function as a civilised Government. We partitioned the country not as a result of war. It was partitioned by agreement on certain basic fundamentals and if those basic fundamental principles are being violated, certainly we can never tolerate that. I am not blaming the people of Pakistan. We have to distinguish between the two. It is not against the Muslims that we are saying all this, but the Government that is functioning there. It is an international demand that we can put forward that our country's future and present are in jeopardy and we will not tolerate this sort of behaviour. But if Pakistan still persists and does this, then we will have to take charge of the people. "We" means the Government of India. We shall have to do that whatever be the

consequences. A few words like these will make them behave better.

Then about this passport system that is now going to be introduced. It pained me to find that the Government of India has agreed to discuss details of this matter. Although it opposed this matter in principle, yet it has now agreed to discuss this matter in detail. I say do nothing of the kind. You tell them frankly: "We do not accept this passport system. If you do it, you do it at your own risk. We will do what we can. We are a free country and we can deal with the situation as it develops". But in spite of that, serious compromises have started. I know that Pakistan is extremely anxious to get some sort of a loose formula applied to the border areas. Why? Because on both sides a large number of Muslims is living. So for their benefit they think that some loose formula is necessary and that is why they are cajoling the Indian Government and saying "Let us discuss the details". I say, do not fall into the trap. Stand on your principles and tell them that we will manage our own affairs. There is no question of a bilateral agreement. As I said in the beginning, these matters—the rehabilitation problem and various administrative questions arising therefrom—are matters of such a fundamental importance that we cannot afford to have a quarrel between the Government as such and the Opposition as such. Let us sit together. Let us discuss the matter. There are many matters which we cannot discuss in the open. But let us have a national policy adopted bearing in mind our past sufferings and experiences and bearing in mind the grave potentialities of the future.

As regards the Rehabilitation Ministry, one concrete suggestion I would like to make. Let a Commission be appointed. We must have a Commission working for about two or three months to find out how much of these Rs. 150 crores has actually been fruitfully utilised, and these grievances which are coming from all parts of the nation regarding the unworking nature of the rehabilitation. Let us go into all these things with an open mind and within two to three months we will be able to get a true picture and then advisory committees should be set up representing the refugee interests in all parts of the country to deal with small and big matters. Here you are having a fight about the Queensway stalls. This is how people's feelings and passions are roused. If we just sit round the table, all these things can be settled satisfactorily. Whatever action the Government wants to take, I suggest

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

you put the onus on the refugees themselves. A small representative committee of an advisory character can sit with the Government and deal with these matters.

But apart from this rehabilitation problem, this bigger issue—the prevention of the bigger mischief—that is now coming must be taken in hand earnestly and that the Rehabilitation Minister cannot do it. That can only be done by the Prime Minister.

I shall conclude by saying that we are behaving in a way in which people behave foolishly in a ship which has got many holes and which is attacked by pirates engaged in the task of picking more and more holes. The holes are becoming larger and larger and the ship is sinking. If you have to save yourselves, you have got to prevent the holes being picked to your ship. You will have to turn the pirates out. Otherwise the ship will sink; if you simply try to pour out the water flowing into it. It is not West Bengal or Punjab or the affected areas that will sink but the whole of India will sink. And so far as the humanitarian point of view is concerned, I cannot think of any particular topic so grave, so urgent in importance as this question. We are bound to stand by these people and let us do so honourably, fearlessly and in a manner which will do credit to us as a free country.

Shri A. C. Guha: After the speech delivered by Dr. S. P. Mookerjee mine will be a feeble voice and my words are hardly expected to attract the attention of the House. But I like to say that I share the feelings and the sentiments given expression to by Dr. Mookerjee. I come from East Bengal and Dr. Mookerjee mentioned about the Barisal incident that took place 47 years ago. I cannot but remember that I was present at that incident. I saw the brutalities perpetrated on young men. Though myself not quite able to take part in the movement, yet I was one of the volunteers and I saw our leaders keeping those wounded young men before our eyes giving us lessons of patriotism and service to our nation.

I like to mention a few words about the East Bengal refugees. I do not like to go into the details or to go into anything that may rouse passions and sentiments. Only I would like to draw the attention of the Government and particularly of the Prime Minister to certain facts which I have got more or less from my personal experiences or

from the Government of West Bengal. In the course of some questions here, the hon. Minister of Rehabilitation has admitted that small loans, house-building loans of Rs. 500 are given in instalments ranging from one year to 18 months or so. You can well imagine how a house can be built at a cost of Rs. 500, and if the second instalment is given after a year or fifteen months no house can be built and therefore it is natural that the refugees may eat up the amount. Here I have a letter from the Chief Minister of West Bengal saying that it is due to the Central Government not allotting money in time. I cannot understand why the Central Government should be remiss in this matter. Upto the end of May, 1952 the West Bengal Government has advanced nearly a crore by way of loans to these refugees and it has not received a single pie from the Central Government. Similar is the case with small trades loans. I am told last year the West Bengal Government at one time had to advance about Rs. 2.50 crores by way of loans to the refugees. The West Bengal Government cannot be expected to give the loans all at one time. I hope that the hon. Finance Minister will see that the money sanctioned by this House may be allotted in time so that the refugees may be benefited and the money may be spent for the purpose for which this House has sanctioned it.

I have seen cases when there has been too great a hurry in the realisation of these loans. In some cases where the last instalment was granted only a few months or a year earlier, distress warrants, and sometimes even body warrants have been issued for the realisation of these loans. I do not understand why Government should simply act as a banker with respect to the refugees. These are loans only technically speaking and I ask the Government to take a broader view of things and not to be usurious and too exacting about the realisation of these loans. Maybe it is due to the over-zealousness of certain officials that distress warrants or body warrants were issued, but the Government policy and directive should be specific and should lay down that no such haste should be shown by any officer and in this case the officers concerned should be asked why body warrants should have been served on refugees who could hardly be taken as rehabilitated.

The hon. Minister of Rehabilitation has stated in his broadcast speech that as far as refugees from West Pakistan are concerned he considers the problem practically solved, and as far as

those from East Pakistan are concerned he has taken credit for their rehabilitation much beyond what he deserves. I have moved about refugee colonies, I have seen refugee camps. As far as camps are concerned there is no question of rehabilitation and huge sums of money are wasted by keeping the refugees there and forcing them to pass idle lives. In certain camps I have seen agricultural people living for two years or more. When these camps were originally intended to be simply transit camps to keep refugees only for six weeks, why should the Government have kept them, particularly agricultural refugees, for one year, eighteen months or even two years in those camps, giving them doles and forcing them to pass idle lives? Those refugees themselves have told me that their entire future has been ruined by their life in these camps.

As regards the colonies I would ask the Prime Minister as well as the Minister of Rehabilitation to go and see how the Government sponsored colonies have been faring and at the same time see how the private colonies have been doing. I have seen a large number of private colonies built up by the private enterprise of refugees and I have seen them quite prosperous. In one colony nearly 2,000 families have been rehabilitated simply by their own private enterprise; whereas hardly one Government-sponsored colony has been successful. Why? Because the whole policy of Government has been defective. I particularly mentioned the Prime Minister because I think he has a greater aptitude to see things from the human point of view, not merely from the administrative point of view. So I would request him to spend a few days and see the conditions of these refugee colonies, Government sponsored as well as private colonies and see the difference between the two.

9 A.M.

Only a few days ago a spokesman of the West Bengal Government stated that rehabilitation facilities in West Bengal have reached saturation point; so for the remaining East Bengal refugees some other avenues have to be discovered. They have suggested that Assam and Bihar should be opened up. I know even the Prime Minister has failed to persuade the Assam Government and the Government of Bihar to take East Bengal refugees; but, as has been said by the Prime Minister often, rehabilitation is a national problem and should be solved on a war basis. No parochial sentiments should be allowed to impede the progress of rehabilitation. Because there is a certain per-

centage of Bengali-speaking people in Assam or Bihar, these Bengali refugees should not be banned in these two States. I do not think Government should tolerate such an attitude. As regards the Indian Tea Association Scheme Cachar it was a direct charge of the Central Government. I would ask the Finance Minister to institute an enquiry to find out what amount of money has been squandered there and who is responsible for it. The whole scheme has failed, so many people have died. They have been duped by the officers and by the Rehabilitation Ministry. They were given false promises which have not been redeemed. They were given promises that so much agricultural plots of land would be given to them but they were actually not given. So the entire thing which was a direct charge of the Central Government should be enquired into by a high-level committee.

Another point is that in most of the refugee areas in West Bengal near-famine conditions exist. A condition of distress exists more or less for the entire population but it is more pressing and hard for the refugees because physically or financially they have no reserve to fall back upon. So I would ask the hon. Minister to take special care about these refugees and give some relief to those in areas of distress.

The next point I would like to mention is that the houses which have been built by the Government are poor structures which are not habitable. The hon. Minister said in the House, and it is also mentioned in the report, that two townships have been built in West Bengal, Fulia and Habra-Baigachi. It is better the hon. Minister drops Habra-Baigachi from the category of a township—it is only an apology for a township. They have built some structures which can hardly be called buildings or houses fit for habitation and most of the buildings are leaky. Even half of them have not been occupied and many are lying unoccupied as yet because they are not fit for habitation.

In this House a comparison was made yesterday between what has been done for refugees from West Pakistan and those from East Pakistan. I too would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Rehabilitation to the comparative State of affairs existing on both sides. I do not for a moment suggest that enough has been done for the West Pakistan refugees or even the barest minimum has been done for them, but what little has been done for them has not even been attempted to be done for the East Pakistan refugees.

[Shri A. C. Guha]

Another difference between the two problems is that for West Pakistan refugees at least you have got an idea of the whole problem, the problem has more or less been stabilised. You know the size and the enormity of the problem. But in the case of East Pakistan refugees you have not got even that. You do not know what will be their number. Twenty-five lakhs has been given as the number who have come from East Pakistan. Of course, I do not like to accept the number that has been mentioned. I think it should have been more. But even if I accept this number, there are yet 93 lakh Hindus in East Bengal and I think our Deputy High Commissioner in East Pakistan and our Minister of Minority Affairs would testify that our people in Eastern Pakistan are not in a position to continue there. They are not tolerated. I think our Government also will testify that it is the policy of the Pakistan Government to squeeze out the East Bengal Hindus. Only the other day, the Prime Minister admitted in the House that the Hindus in East Bengal were not getting a fair deal.

I want to remind him of the assurance that he gave to the East Bengal Hindus that they would get security either in their own homeland or in the alternative in India. I am afraid the Prime Minister has not been able to give them that security which he assured them he would get for them in their own homeland. The only alternative left now is to give them security here. The Government of India should take charge of these 93 lakh Hindus from East Bengal. I say this with a sense of responsibility and with some inner knowledge about the state of affairs in East Bengal. I come from East Bengal myself, and there are many political friends of mine who are working in East Bengal. I have some connection with East Bengal, which cannot be easily cut off. Therefore, I know the state of affairs there.

Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee was mentioning about the detenus. Five hundred of them are Hindus and two thousand are Muslims. The whole attempt of the East Bengal Government is to crush progressive ideas and they feel that so long as the Hindus are there, they will act as the pioneers of progressive ideas. So they are determined to crush the Hindus. When the language movement began, I know for certain that the Hindus did not take part in it and yet the leaders of the Hindu community were detained.

While the Muslim leaders are being gradually released from detention, the Hindu leaders continue to be detained. Considering all this we can conclude—it would not be possible for Hindus to stay there. These 93 lakh Hindus should be given some place of security in India, or let there be a declaration, definite and unequivocal, from this Government that it has absolved itself of all responsibility for them. It is no use giving dubious hopes to these people. The Prime Minister has called them our kith and kin, the bone of our bone and the flesh of our flesh. I would ask him to redeem the assurance of security that he gave them. I would ask him to remind himself of the pledge he gave them.

Lastly I would like to state that these refugees who have come and will be coming from East Bengal must be readily absorbed by other provinces. The Government should not allow provincial and parochial feelings to stand in the way of rehabilitating them. We have won our freedom through the sacrifice of these East Bengal Hindus, and the Hindus and Sikhs of the Punjab. They agreed to the partition, knowing full well that thereby they were likely to incur an enormous amount of suffering and humiliation. They were ready to undergo these sacrifices in order that the rest of India might be free. They expected that they would get some asylum, some sanctuary, somewhere in the other parts of India. Therefore, we should not forget our responsibility and our obligation towards these refugees. I again beg of this House and of the Government to see that these refugees are rehabilitated in other parts of India, because conditions in West Bengal are such that the province cannot take any more refugees.

Mr. Speaker: I think there are only five minutes more left and no speech is possible within this short time. I shall therefore now call upon the hon. Minister to reply.

Shri Meghnad Saha (Calcutta North-West): I had given my name to speak on this Demand. Yesterday I was squeezed out and today also I am squeezed out. An hon. Member whose name was not on the list has been allowed to speak. I, therefore, protest against your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is new to Parliament and therefore what he has said can be tolerated, to some extent. I do not take a serious notice of it just now. He should know that no hon. Member has a right to

protest against the ruling of the Speaker. An hon. Member's first and only duty is to submit to it and if he is dissatisfied he has other remedies under the rules. He can move a motion for the removal of the Speaker or some such thing, but that is a different matter. Next time if such language is used, I shall have to take a serious notice of it and ask the hon. Member concerned who passes such remarks to withdraw from the House.

Now, coming to the merits of this particular case, the hon. Member will remember that it is not the absolute right of any Member to be called upon the moment he rises. It is not his right either to be allowed to speak on every occasion on which he wants to speak. This is not because of any arbitrary character of the powers of the Speaker, but because of his position as the guardian of the rights and privileges of the entire House and of each hon. Member of the House. He has to adjust his discretion to the convenience of the entire strength of the House, namely, 500 hon. Members. All the 500 Members cannot obviously be given a chance, which would be the case, if the hon. Member's presumption that the moment a Member rises he should be given an opportunity, is accepted. He may rise twelve times or fifteen times and obviously it cannot be accepted that he must have a chance on all the occasions. Speeches have to be spread out, and I may repeat what I said earlier, that it is within the discretion of the Chair to call upon hon. Members from among those who rise.

The difficulty is that each hon. Member thinks as though he is the only person who has got something important to say and the rest are bound to sit in silence and hear him. That is a wrong notion. Just as he is anxious to speak, there are many others who are anxious to speak, and they must also be given an opportunity. Generally, the practice I have been following is this. I am trying to give an opportunity to hon. Members who have not spoken in this House and who, to my mind, should be given an opportunity to express themselves so that we may know what kind of stuff their speeches constitute. I am sure, the hon. Member who raised this protest has had opportunities more than once—on other subjects, of course. Therefore, he should be liberal enough to give opportunities to other hon. Members in the House, and this is exactly what I have said also to some of the old Members of this House who have expressed a great urge to speak. Some of them are dissatisfied also, but that cannot be helped. Thus, the hon.

Member will notice that there is no occasion for any protest and if he views the situation in that setting and considers the importance of the rights and privileges of all the other hon. Members, he will see that he must not try to catch my eye every now and then. If he does so, he will have only disappointment. Therefore, I am taking this opportunity to appeal to all hon. Members not to press such claims which place the Chair in an awkward position and perhaps make hon. Members also feel very uncomfortable. I do not know, but some of them might be feeling hurt also but there is no help for it.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury (Gauhati): I want to raise a point, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Sarmah (Golaghat-Jorhat): I beg leave of you, Sir, not to make a speech, but to enter a protest against certain insinuations made against the people and the Government of Assam by the two previous speakers. These insinuations are not justified by facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. In such matters, hon. Members always have the opportunity of giving an explanation in two or three sentences.

Shri Sarmah: That is what I want to do.

Mr. Speaker: That is never denied.

Shri Sarmah: These insinuations are not justified by facts, as will be borne out by the Sri Prakasa Committee report. (*Interruption*). Assam received and provided for more refugees than she really can.

Mr. Speaker: That is enough. He need not dilate on it.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: I want to make a respectful prayer to you. May I point out.....

Mr. Speaker: He had his chance yesterday to speak.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: I do not want to make a speech. I only want to point out that I have been in this House for the last several years and my seat was over there in front. Now, I have been demoted and shunted to a back bench and you have definitely allotted seats to the Members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Being a senior Member, he must allow opportunities to the other Members of the House.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: If it is decided that I should sit in a back bench,

[Shri R. K. Chaudhury]

then as a back bencher, I should be allowed to sit wherever I like. You have not allotted seats to senior hon. Members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is speaking more under pressure of heat and impulse. Even after assessing the facts, I may tell him that I have not allotted any seats to any individual members...

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: There are members.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have not allotted. I cannot do so, because the total number of seats available is less than the total number of Members. Every seat is numbered. I believe the seats are about 447. (Interruption). Order, order. The hon. Member will hear me.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: The difficulty is that you do not allow senior Members to sit in the front benches...

Mr. Speaker: Does he want to hear the facts or will he proceed on his own imagination? I am just explaining the whole situation. I want an opportunity to explain to the Members of the House. There are 499 Members and 447 seats including some chairs. Therefore, obviously, it is not possible to allot each Member a seat. From the point of view of the Speaker, it is desirable that I allot a seat to each Member because I can identify the Member immediately he stands from the plan that I have with me, but that is not possible. Therefore, I had to allot seats, not technically party-wise or technically group-wise but to a certain set of Members and I have allotted them *pro rata*. In the *pro rata* seats, though the names might have been mentioned, even the persons or blocks who have got the allotment of seats know that the numbers are mentioned for the sake of facility of identification of the seats and the distribution is entirely left to them, that is seats numbered so and so allotted to a particular group, say, the Communist Group. Another set of numbers allotted to the Democratic Group, Independent and so on. And all the seats that remained thereafter, after allotting the *pro rata* seats, not the total number, have been given to the Congress Party. Each party is left to itself to choose who should sit in the front and who should sit in the back. So the Congress Party is given perfect freedom of allotting the various seats and the positions. It is not the business of the Chair and the Chair would not like to go into the question of who is

senior and who is junior; and again seniority cannot necessarily be assessed by the number of years a Member has been here. There are various considerations which are there for the party to take into consideration and not for the Speaker. If the hon. Member has any grievance, that though he has been here for several years, he has been allotted a back bench seat, he should address that grievance to those who are in charge of the Congress Party and not the Speaker. I am not concerned with that at all. There need be no argument on the point. That is a matter entirely for the Congress Party to adjust within itself and not for the Speaker. No question on that point could be raised in the House because the Speaker has not been responsible for allotting this or that seat to any Member. All Members who are sitting in the back benches may sit in the front or even where the Government Members are sitting and I should have no objection. It is for the party itself to decide and not for the Speaker. So the hon. Member...../

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: I most humbly apologize to you for having raised this question. Since I know that it is the desire of my Leader that we senior Members should sit in the back benches, I do so.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He need not raise a point of argument between him and the Leader of the House on this occasion. They are not relevant to the proceedings of the House.

श्री पी० एन० राज भोज : मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरी जगह ७० नम्बर की थी। उस पर सरदार हुकम सिंह बैठे हुए हैं।

[Shri P. N. Rajabhoj (Sholapur—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, I want to submit one thing. My seat number was 70 and that has been occupied by Sardar Hukam Singh now.]

Mr. Speaker: I think we should not take the time of the House in points of no consequence which could be better adjusted outside the House.

सरदार हुकम सिंह : मेरे बखिलाफ शिकायत नहीं होनी चाहिये। मैं पीछे जाने को तैयार हूँ।

[Sardar Hukar Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): There should be no complaint against me. I am prepared to go to the back benches.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

An Hon. Member rose—

Mr. Speaker: Let us be serious over the point. There is no use in giving information.

An Hon. Member rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. No information is required by me. I have already decided. The subject for discussion is Rehabilitation and the hon. Minister is going to reply. Order, order, will the hon. Member resume his seat?

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : जो लोग किसी ग्रुप में नहीं हैं उन के बारे में क्या किया गया है ?

[**Shri P. N. Rajabhoj:** What has been decided about those of the hon. Members who do not belong to any particular group?]

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I was saying that we are still in the process of formation of groups. I got intimation some days ago that so and so has changed from this group to that group, that there is an addition of so many Members to so and so group and there are mergers also. The situation is a fluid one and a changing one and, therefore, I have said that, for the time being, substantially, this is the allotment. Let us see how these loyalties and changes develop and ultimately by the very process of accommodation, Members may acquire the right to a particular seat in a group so far as that group is concerned. It is not the concern of the Chair and let there be no discussion on the point.

Shri A. P. Jain: I have been listening with all earnestness and attention to the speeches that have been made yesterday and today in regard to rehabilitation. Too many things have been said and, during the time allotted to me, it may not be possible for me to cover the entire subject. Nevertheless, I want to assure hon. Members that if I fail to reply any point here it should not be taken to mean that I do not propose to give attention to it. I shall look into all the suggestions that have been made on the floor of the House and try to accommodate as many of them as possible.

Much of what has been said in regard to rehabilitation as such has been provoked by my broadcast speech and by another report published by my Ministry. It has been said by more than one hon. Member that I have laid claim that the entire problem of the West

Pakistan refugees has been solved and that the problem of East Bengal refugees has been very nearly solved. I have my own views about the achievements and the shortcomings of this Ministry. Every now and then when questions have been asked in this House, I have stated facts and what I have done in the course of my broadcast speech and in the report is a bare statement of facts. I dare say that both my speech and the report are remarkable for their objectivity. I have purposefully refrained from drawing any conclusions or giving my opinions.

I shall refer to a part of my broadcast. I posed the problem, somewhat to this effect: "How far has the Government succeeded in achieving its objective, namely, rehabilitation". Then I say: "I should let the facts tell their own tale". All that I have done in this broadcast is to give bare facts. I challenge any hon. member of this House to question even a single figure that I have given here. The figures given here are correct—every one of them to the last digit.

Shri Meghnad Saha: On a point of order, Sir. You have given the number of refugees as 26 lakhs. I want you to explain how you have arrived at that figure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member must address the Chair. What is the point of order?

Shri Meghnad Saha: You have taken the Hindu population of East Bengal.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri Meghnad Saha: My point of order is about the figure given for the number of East Bengal refugees. I was going to discuss this matter in detail. It was 117 lakhs in 1941. That is taken

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Will the hon. Member kindly resume his seat? / Any point of order must refer to the procedure and not to the substantive argument that he is putting forth. At the end of the speech, if he so likes, he can ask for certain information, without trying to make a speech in support of his own view. Otherwise, under the guise of a point of order, anybody can stand and interpose an argument. That is not the proper procedure.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: On a point of order, Sir. It has been the practice of this House, and it is the practice of all parliamentary institutions, to

[Shri R. K. Chaudhury]

allow Members to intervene in the course of a debate and ask for information. That has been the procedure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member does not hear or does not attend. Unfortunately, he is so full of his own ideas that he does not take care to hear or consider what is said.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: I am at a distance, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I never said that there was no right of asking for information. All that I said was that that cannot be asked under the guise of a point of order. That is the point.

Shri A. P. Jain: Then, I refer to para 3 of the report where the claim which my Ministry has made in respect of rehabilitation is stated like this :

“A stage has been reached when displaced persons have by and large adjusted themselves to their new environments and it may be said that with the further economic development of the country, they will undoubtedly find their rightful place in its life.”

Displaced persons from West Pakistan have been in this country for five years now. They are an industrious lot; they work hard. Many of them have established themselves in trade. Others in services. Nearly half of them have settled on land. As I shall explain to the House presently in the course of the speech, they have settled themselves on land fairly well. It is pretty clear that during the course of these five years, displaced persons have settled themselves in this country and with the further economic development programmes, they are going to improve their lot. What is there to take exception to in this statement? In fact, I am sorry that some of my friends, who have been leading refugee opinion, persons who have been earnestly interested in the welfare of refugees, should have been upset by my broadcast speech. If they get the impression that much of the problem in the West has been solved, what is wrong about it? Why should they be agitated? I have merely stated the facts and those facts are the correct facts. It is for hon. Members and for those who heard the broadcast to draw their inference. If their inference is that a very large number of refugees or an overwhelming majority of the refugees from the West, and a large number of them in the East have been settled—maybe

that they have not acquired their old status in Pakistan, yet they are living, earning their bread, marrying and producing children—what is wrong about it? An hon. Member said.....

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is that rehabilitation, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us be serious over the question.

Shri A. P. Jain: An hon. Member said that the Minister is applying too much of his brains and very little of heart. Apart from what I have said in the course of my broadcast and in the report, I want hon. Members of this House to judge the rehabilitation work in two sections, one in Delhi and another in connection with technical and vocational training which has also been criticised by some hon. Members, by two living and moving facts. One of these living and moving facts is my hon. friend Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani. Another is the Exhibition of handicrafts and things produced in the vocational centres by refugee men and women, which is being held in Patel Nager. I would request hon. Members to pay a visit to that place so that they may have a first hand knowledge whether this Ministry has achieved anything in the sphere of vocational technical training or it has all been a boast.

When I say that the achievements and the shortcomings of my Ministry should be judged by the presence of Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani in this House, the point is this. She has been very closely associated with my Ministry. She was the Director or Secretary or something higher up in the Central Relief Committee which was functioning in close collaboration with my Ministry.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): It is not a Government organisation; it is a private organisation.

Shri A. P. Jain: She is on the Rehabilitation Finance Administration. She is a member of the Appointment Committee for Claims Officers.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Is this a list of Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani's rehabilitation?

Shri A. P. Jain: There is hardly any sphere of my activity with which she has not been associated. The fact that she has been returned to this House by the New Delhi constituency, where one out of every three is a refugee, is a tribute to the fine

work which she has done in rehabilitation in collaboration with my Ministry.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Am I to take it that I am a nominated Member?

Shri A. P. Jain: If the achievements of my Ministry with regard to vocational training have to be judged, I would request the hon. Members to spare an hour to pay a visit to the exhibition in Patel Nagar.

Then, I come to the general approach to the rehabilitation problem. I consider it a national problem, an all-India problem, and the whole country has to bear the burden. It is not a problem of West Bengal or of the Punjab. It is a problem for the whole of India. It is not a sectional problem either. It is a problem that should not be looked at from a party point of view. It is a humanitarian problem. So far as my Ministry is concerned, it has been functioning on that basis. In some of the most important committees, I have taken good care to associate persons who do not see eye to eye with us politically. Even persons who have made it a profession almost to abuse my Ministry and me in season and out of season, have been associated with some of the most important committees. Persons belonging to the Jan Sangh are working in close collaboration with my Ministry and they are on my committees. I would request hon. Members not to make rehabilitation a party question. I shall have something more to say about that a little later.

Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee has covered a very wide ground, far in excess of the purely rehabilitation problem during the course of his speech. In fact, many other hon. Members have done the same thing. A very rough analysis of the speeches will show that a vast variety of suggestions have been made. My hon. friend Mr. Algu Rai Shastri gave an entirely new definition of rehabilitation. I thought that language was invented to serve as a means of communication between human beings so that one may understand another. If the dictionary meanings of all the words are going to be upset, and if the hon. Member attaches new meanings to words perhaps the common medium, so useful to human being, between him and others would collapse. He said that rehabilitation does not mean settling a person in a place other than from where he has been up-rooted. To my mind, rehabilitation includes that a person may be settled in a place other than from where he has been up-rooted. He

said that this problem could be solved only when the refugees who have come from West Pakistan or from East Pakistan are sent back to their homeland and resettled there, and that this problem of refugees cannot be solved until that is done. He cited something from what Gandhiji had said. But he has refused to look at the problem from the conditions in which we are living. Are the refugees—I say in particular about the Hindu and Sikh refugees who have come from West Pakistan—prepared to go back to West Pakistan? Dr. S. P. Mookerjee, during the course of the General Elections, raised the cry of the unification of Pakistan and India, and he knows it to his cost how his suggestion was received in Punjab. Dr. Mookerjee, as also some other hon. Members of this House, have raised the broad issue of the relations between India and Pakistan. Dr. Khare said this Government has been following a weak-kneed policy, it must change its policy, it must adopt an attitude—that is what I infer—of war, or threat of war. Another hon. Member has said that though we might not start an actual war, yet let us hiss about war—*hunkar maro*. Another hon. Member said that we must take the question of canal waters with evacuee property, and we must stop the canal water until the evacuee property question is solved. Last of all, Dr. S. P. Mookerjee has suggested the rather startling proposition that the Government of Free India should undertake the protection and the welfare of the minorities in Pakistan. Now, may I ask . . .

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is not my suggestion. It was made by Mahatma Gandhi in the first instance.

Shri A. P. Jain: May I ask Dr. Khare or Dr. S. P. Mookerjee or any other hon. Members who have made these suggestions if they are helping the rehabilitation of the refugees psychologically or economically? We know that very many things have happened in the past, things which we did not want to happen, things which have happened in spite of our efforts. We also know that Pakistan has not played the game either in the matter of the evacuee property or in giving due protection to the minorities, but then, should we lose our head? Should we make suggestions which would make the life of the minorities in Pakistan all the worse? Is that going to solve the problem? That is the question that I want to pose to Dr. Mookerjee. This threat of war, this rattling of weapons, this shouting will not help

[Shri A. P. Jain]

them. I say that so far as this Government is concerned, it has been doing its best to secure a life of honour and security for the minorities in Pakistan.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): How can pouting help us?

Shri A. P. Jain: Now, something has been said in this House about the Prime Ministers' Pact of April, 1950. That, as the hon. Prime Minister has stated more than once, had a limited object, and to a very large extent, it succeeded in appeasing the situation. I have got the figures of the railway traffic. Figures are very often questioned by hon. Members sitting on the other side, but I assure the hon. Members that these figures are very carefully collected and they are as accurate as any statistics could be.

Pandit L. K. Maitra (Nabadwip): As arithmetic itself.

Shri A. P. Jain: From 12th April, 1950, right up to the end of April, 1952, 39,55,036 Hindus have come from East Pakistan to West Bengal; 38,45,686 persons have gone from West Bengal to East Pakistan, leaving a net balance of 1,09,350. As we study the figures from month to month, we see that the number of persons going from West Bengal to East Bengal grows larger and larger in volume except under certain special conditions, for instance, when some riot or some such thing happens.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Has the Government ever cared to enquire why the people are going and why they are coming? Then alone will the Government be able to know the psychology that is working in the minds of the people. The figures alone cannot help us.

Shri A. P. Jain: Coming to other things that have been said in this House, I know that there are shortcomings, there are defects in the rehabilitation scheme, and no rehabilitation scheme can be perfect, either from the side of Government or from the side of refugees. I have been trying my best to improve wherever there was scope for improvement, wherever there was capacity in me to improve. But I beg of one thing from the hon. Members: not to adopt Miss Mayo's mentality in judging the work of this Ministry. Hon. Members will remember that Miss Mayo wrote *Mother India*. Most of the things that she said in *Mother India* were sub-

tantially correct. She talked of *Devadasis*. She talked of child marriage. She talked of child widows. She talked of child prostitution, and she talked of goats being sacrificed in the *Kali Mandir* in Calcutta. She talked of buffalo sacrifices and so many other things. She talked of inhuman treatment towards the Harijans. Many of the incidents which she mentioned were correct. One hon. Member, Mrs. Renu Chakravartty said that at Sealdah Station she saw a woman who was vomiting blood. She was a T.B. patient and she did not know where to go. Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani has also mentioned some individual incidents. She said that there are people living in the *mohallas* of Delhi, refugees in very wretched condition. I am prepared to accept all this. I do not say that every refugee has been given the house that he deserves. I know that in this town of Delhi there are about 20,000 or maybe more—of displaced families living in wretched hutments built on public road-sides and in other places. I am not happy about that. More than four or five years have expired, yet their misery has not ended. I can assure the hon. Members that I have been doing my best to find a shelter for them, and I have succeeded in finding shelter for about 90 per cent. of the population. While I would like criticism, constructive criticism, to be offered, this distorted picture, this ugly picture painting the whole work as something bizarre, does not help anybody.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Nobody has said that.

Shri A. P. Jain: Sometime back, I think about 18 months back, I raised the question: What, after all, do we mean by rehabilitation? And on a number of occasions when some questions were asked of me, or during the course of the debate, I said that there is no fixed definition of the word rehabilitation. To me it may connote one thing, to you it may connote another thing. I was expecting hon. Members to give me some idea of what they mean by rehabilitation. I have tried to answer that point. Some hon. Members opposite have been upset over what I have said about rehabilitation. Does rehabilitation mean that every body must be restored to his *status quo*, that is, a zamindar who was doing zamindari in Pakistan should be a zamindar here, that a person who was carrying on a shop there should carry on a shop here? Does it mean that a person who was a very wealthy person on the other side must be restored to the same status? Does it mean that a man who was living by begging there

or who was sharing a room with his goat or cow should be relegated to the same wretched type of living accommodation? I said that no problem can be solved by restoring the *status quo*. As I have been dealing with this problem, I have come across great difficulties. Take for instance the point raised by Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani with regard the zamindars. She has stated that the zamindars coming from West Pakistan who owned lands outside West Punjab or who were not of West Punjabi extraction, have not been allotted lands so far. She made a complaint of it. Now look at the conditions in India. India has decided and definitely decided to liquidate zamindaries. In the light of this, how can these people be settled as zamindars here?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Nobody has asked that the zamindars from Pakistan should be given new zamindaries here.

Shri A. P. Jain: It has been continuously said not here only but elsewhere by the zamindars' association, that the same status should be given, that is, they must get zamindaries here.

Then again, there is the question of the middle class shopkeepers. There were too many of them in West Pakistan. When they have come to India, there is no capacity for so many shopkeepers to be absorbed here. We started therefore a scheme for vocational technical training. Unfortunately the Sindhis have not responded to it, in spite of the fact that we have provided stipends of Rs 30 or Rs. 35 per mensem to each person, in spite of the fact that we have set up a large number of vocational training centres. They are not coming there. Many of them come and then desert. Here again, an economic adjustment is necessary. Now take the case of the East Bengal refugees. There were a large number of them who were working as intermediaries between the landlord and the actual tiller of the soil. These are the persons who find it most difficult to rehabilitate themselves. They have not been used to physical labour. They are not sufficiently educated to do any office work. And they are the biggest problem before us. So, no rehabilitation can be done on the basis of *status quo*. What we want to do is this: We want to take the best out of the man, we want him to fit into the social order, so that he may make a living for himself, and enrich the country thereby. That is what I said in my broadcast speech two days back. I said, that any rehabilitation based on the restoration of

status quo, besides being impractical would not fit into the new social order we are trying to create in India. Government's constant endeavour is to set up displaced persons as useful and self-supporting citizens, and to create conditions and opportunities for their eventual assimilation in the main currents of India's economic life. That is the objective which we have in view, and for which we have been working. I want my work to be tested from this objective.

Coming to some specific issues in respect of West Pakistan refugees, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani has raised the question of rural rehabilitation. She said that the land allotted in India was of an inferior quality. She also said that although zamindars coming from West Punjab and of West Punjabi extraction have been allotted lands here in the East Punjab and PEPUSU on the basis of the lands left behind in Pakistan, other zamindars have not been allotted lands on a similar basis. So far as the quality of the lands is concerned, I think her criticism is substantially correct. The quality of lands on this side is comparatively inferior. But we reduced all the lands to a common measure known as a standard acre, that is, all the lands in West Pakistan and all the lands in East Punjab and PEPUSU were reduced to a common standard. According to that the land in the East Punjab and PEPUSU was 24.33 lakhs of acres, as against 38 and odd lakhs of acres of land left behind by displaced persons, so that what we have is roughly about two-thirds. This land has been distributed among persons who owned lands on the other side. We have applied a graded cut, the cut being 25 per cent. in the case of persons who owned ten acres or less, and in the case of persons who owned more than a thousand acres of land or more they got only five per cent. of their land in excess of 1000 acres. That seems to have very much upset my hon. friend Sardar Hukam Singh who generalized by saying that only five per cent. land has been allotted. I submit that it is an incorrect statement. In certain cases, when people owned very large areas of land, only five or seven per cent. may have been allotted, but to a majority of the landowners, about 75 or 80 per cent. of them, the cut has been only 25 per cent. I am sorry for the cut, but we could not help it. About 33,000 families of the displaced tenants have also been settled in East Punjab. The condition of those who did own lands in West Punjab and who were not of the West Punjabi extraction is not so bad as seems to have been painted. We issued a notification in December 1950 calling upon every

[Shri A. P. Jain]

land-owner of West Pakistan who was not a West Punjabi or of West Punjabi extraction, to indicate whether he wanted to do cultivation in India with his own hands, whether he had been doing cultivation in West Pakistan or not. We also invited applications from persons doing agriculture as tenants or otherwise in Pakistan, who had also wanted to do cultivation here. We received a large number of applications, and about 57,000 persons have been allotted land. Now, what is the area that has been allotted to each of these persons? Over 12 acres of land. Please remember that the average holding in India is only 3.5 acres, as against this we have allotted 12 acres of land. I do not guarantee that all these lands are good lands, I do not say that all are irrigated lands. But just as in working out the average for the whole of the country, we take into account irrigated lands, as also un-irrigated lands, rich land as poor lands, so in this case also we took into account all types of land. I say that this has by no means been a mean achievement. It has been quite a bit of satisfaction. I have moved among these people. I have gone to their villages, and if anybody among the refugees have felt the blessings of rehabilitation, it is these persons, because most of these persons are men whose fathers, grand fathers and great-grand fathers had been working on the fields as non-occupancy tenants, as landless labourers, who had never had any security of tenure, who were kicked about from one piece of land to another. Now each of them has got from eight to 32 acres of land for himself.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: But why were not the principles that were followed in East Punjab and PEPSU applied to them?

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Shri A. P. Jain: A very pertinent question has been asked—why have we not followed in the rest of India the same principle, the principle of quasi-permanent settlement, which we followed in the Punjab? So far as Punjab was concerned, there was an agreement between ourselves and Pakistan that they would supply us all the revenue records and we would supply them all the revenue records. On the basis of that agreement, all the revenue records were exchanged. We knew the area of each holding, we knew the quality of land, we could work out the area left behind and we could distribute land on that basis. In the case of Sind, Bhawalpur and the North West Frontier Province, those records were not available.

Mrs. Kripalani, I am afraid, is labouring under a misunderstanding. She said that we have done nothing and we are doing nothing about these land-owners.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I did not say that.

Shri A. P. Jain: I am sorry, I stand corrected.

We have invited claims from the land owners who have not come under the purview of the quasi-permanent settlement and those claims are being processed. When those claims are processed, they will also get their share.

What its shape will be, I am not in a position to say. But I may assure my hon. friend, Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani, and others that I am as keen to protect the interests of the Sindhis and the Bhawalpuris and the North West Frontier people as of the Punjabis. When I was in Simla a few days ago, we decided in the meeting of the Joint Rehabilitation Board of the Punjab and PEPSU that any land that would be received in future by redeeming mortgages would not be allotted to Punjabis but would be set apart so that the cases of the Sindhis, Bhawalpuris and the North West Frontier people could also be taken up when these lands were being allotted. I cannot undo everything that has been done during the course of five years. But I can assure the hon. members that so far as I am concerned, all the refugees from whatever part of Pakistan they may be coming are equal and I want to give them equal justice. May be that a Punjabi may think more for himself, may be that a Sindhi may think more for himself, but so far as I am concerned, they are equal.

Coming to the question of housing, the figures are given at the end of the booklet. In the west we have provided houses first by allotting evacuee houses. 1,79,000 evacuee houses have been allotted to 14,70,000 persons. I admit that there is a certain amount of over-congestion. There are about 100,000 houses which are evacuee property and which are in the hands of the tenants who have been staying there since the 15th August 1947.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: What about vacant evacuee houses which have been declared as evacuee houses?

Shri A. P. Jain: I am coming to that. When these houses become gradually available for the refugees, I think much of the congestion will

be removed. Then we have built 1,14,000 houses and tenements and in addition there are 37,000 houses. In these two, 7,50,000 refugees have been settled. Many of them are single room tenements, others are two-room tenements; a few are three-room or four-room and still fewer five or six-room tenements. It has often been said that a single-room tenement is too small a thing. I partially admit that criticism. But then I have to distribute the money which I have over as large a number of persons as possible, and I think we have not done too badly. My Private Secretary who had recently gone to Israel, has seen some of the colonies there himself and has collected some figures. On the basis of those figures I can say that our housing programme, both from the point of view of accommodation and quality, compares very favourably with what has been done in Israel and about which so much is being heard. Jewish money from all over the world has poured into Israel and yet let us see how our achievements compare with theirs. They have also mostly allotted single-room and two-room tenements. The built-area in Israel is 320 sq. ft; our built-area of a single-room tenement is 340 sq. ft.—20 sq. feet more. I am not boasting about it.

10 A.M.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Then let us settle the Israelites in India.

Shri A. P. Jain: That is for you to do and not for me. The double room built-area in Israel is 400 square feet; our built-area is 690 square feet—about 75 per cent. more.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): What is the size of India compared to that of Israel?

Shri A. P. Jain: It is a very interesting proposition—that the house must conform to the size of the country! If a country is ten times the size of another country, then the size of a house in that country must be ten times the size of a house in the other country—a very wise proposition! (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri A. P. Jain: Now, about gainful occupation and employment. We have given some figures of employment. We have said that 1,60,000 persons have been provided employment through Employment Exchanges—80,000 in the Central Government, State Governments, local bodies, etc. We have also given the figures of small loans and of Rehabilitation Finance Administration loans and of

vocational and technical training. The general criticism has been that although we have given them these benefits, yet we have not been able to give the figures of the persons who have actually availed of these benefits and who have rehabilitated themselves as a result of the assistance we have given. I see the force of that criticism. I am not prepared to say that all the 1,60,000 persons who have been provided employment through the Employment Exchanges have been given permanent employment. I also know that there has been a certain amount of overlapping. Some persons who have received employment in the Central Government or the State Governments have secured it through Employment Exchange. But I have given these figures to give some idea.

Similarly with loans. We have given small loans to 1,56,000 persons for purposes of small-scale industries. That average works out to Rs. 600—by no means a substantial figure. I also know that in some cases the loans have been miserably small. But then you cannot surely say that nobody has benefited by these loans. A very substantial number has benefited.

About technical and vocational training which has been given to more than 50,000 persons in the west, I confess that we have no satisfactory organisation for the follow-up. We have no statistical or research bureau which can give results of actual achievements. It will be a very useful thing. We should be guided more by achievements and results than by figures of assistance. But that is a big question. That requires a big organisation. It is desirable, but whether I shall be able to set it up I do not know. But I have done something to assess the results actually achieved. It has been admitted practically on all hands that our results in the West have been better than in the East. A statistical and economic survey of the East has been conducted. I have arranged for a similar survey for the town of Delhi through Dr. Rao, one of the most eminent economists in India. I am arranging for another survey in Bombay through Dr. Kumarappa of the School of Social Sciences. A survey has been conducted in the Punjab. Unfortunately it has been defective. It is being revised. While I did not succeed in setting up a statistical and research bureau, yet I have tried in another way to assess results, and the results that have been achieved in the East will give some idea of what we have

[Shri A. P. Jain]

been able to do. The families have been divided into different income groups. For instance persons with incomes from Re. one to Rs. 50. The number of persons who were in this and other income groups in East Pakistan and West Bengal has been ascertained. In the Rs. one to 50 group the number of families before migration was 42,232—percentage 9.8. The number of families after migration was 1,30,144—percentage 31.9. This means that there has been impoverishment. Between Rs. 51 and 100, the number of families before migration was 1,29,836—percentage 30.3; after migration, the number was 1,50,126—36.4 per cent. Here there has been a shift; men with larger incomes have come down to this group. Between Rs. 100 and Rs. 250: before migration, 1,78,697—41.6 per cent; in India, 109,438—25.5 per cent. Between Rs. 251 and 500: before migration, 58,047—13.5 per cent.; in India, 21,990—five per cent. Between Rs. 500 and 1,000: 15,105—3.5 per cent; in India, 3,895—0.9 per cent. Above Rs. 1,000; before migration 5,408—1.3 per cent.; in India 697—0.2 per cent.

Now, these statistics have been worked out from the information given by the displaced persons. Very often it has been found that people are apt to exaggerate their income on the other side. Nonetheless the result of these statistics shows that a fairly large number of persons are in the same income group in which they were before. With regard to the others whose status has been depressed, I do hope that with the further development of the country and the improvement of its economic condition these persons will strengthen their economic position. When a plant is uprooted, even if you put it in a much more fertile soil, first it withers; it suffers from the effects of uprooting, and it is only after some time that it strikes roots. Similarly these people.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: If they live till that time!

Shri Meghnad Saha *rose—*

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may reserve his questions and ask them afterwards.

Shri A. P. Jain: A few specific questions were raised and I will answer them. One is the question of the Queensway stall-holders. Four hon. Members—Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, Pandit Nandlal Sharma and Dr.

Mookerjee—raised their questions. I suggest, let us not make rehabilitation a party question; let us look at it from a national point of view. Now, what is the case of these Queensway stall-holders? I think Dr. Mookerjee should listen, because he has raised that point. These gentlemen were given these shops on the clearest understanding that they were temporary structures set up by the roadside only for a few years. Any hon. Member can go and have a look at the type of structures that they are, and he will reach no other conclusion but that they are temporary structures.

An Hon. Member: Let them be made permanent.

Shri A. P. Jain: Do not be in a hurry.

An Hon. Member: They are everywhere..

Shri A. P. Jain: That is not so. These persons have been there for over two years. And Rs. 3,81,163 stands as arrears of rent against these persons.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): May I know whether Government refused to receive the rent? I can prove it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member is too exuberant. I have been repeatedly requesting hon. Members to reserve whatever questions they want to put till the end of the speech. Let there be no interruption in the middle of the speech. The hon. Minister will certainly answer as many of the questions as possible.

Shri A. P. Jain: The total amount so far paid by them is Rs. 14,666 as against the arrears of Rs. 3,81,163. These persons have refused to fill in the agreement. They came to see me. I was ill at the time; I had a sprain in the back, and I could not move from my bed. When they came, I sent word that there was no question of their being immediately removed. They could go and carry on their work. They would not move. They said: "We must have it in writing that we shall never be removed". And they squatted at my place up till 9-30 in the night. Then they made a nuisance of themselves—I use the word "nuisance" deliberately—with the Chief Minister of Delhi and the Rehabilitation Minister of Delhi. They staged a demonstration here. I want to make it clear

that a refugee or a section of refugees, whoever they may be, will not gain merely because they want to create an agitation or because they want to observe a *hartal*, or because they want to take out a procession, or because they want to squat at the house of a Minister. These questions must be decided on their merits. I am prepared to discuss this question with any hon. Member, and I say that so far as these people are concerned, they will never get a guarantee that they are not going to be removed. They will be removed. But the question is this: when are they going to be removed? If they persist in this agitation, if they do not want to carry on business, if they want to observe *hartal*, it would be better that the end of their and my worries should come earlier. I shall remove them sooner.

Again, take the case of the Irwin Road stall-holders. That case has been pending before me for the last two years. I have discussed it often. I know that there are a certain number of shops which do not have full custom. I do not accept Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani's figure that only 56 persons have custom and others have none. Yet I accept that some of them have no custom. Now, when they came to see me, they said: "We do not want to work on the Irwin Road". I made a good offer. I said: "Here are a number of rehabilitation colonies". At that time, remember, Vinay Nagar, where there are now 200 refugee shopkeepers doing good business, had not been filled up. I offered them those shops, and I said: "I am prepared to remove you; I am prepared to take you in batches to different colonies". They said: "No. We shall not go there. We want shops to be constructed in the Park in front of Regal Cinema". That is an impossible proposition. Now they are there because they wanted to be there. I was prepared to take them to other colonies. I am prepared to take them to other shopping centres wherever shops are available. But surely I cannot accept the proposition that merely because a refugee wants shops to be built at a particular place I must do it. That is an impossible proposition. Let it be clearly understood, now and for ever.

Another question about the Kitchen barracks has been raised. It has two aspects. One is that these barracks have been given by the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry and they have been given to them as to other Government servants. They are not given by the Rehabilitation Ministry. I would not transgress upon the sphere of my hon. colleague.

Perhaps he will answer it if a question is put to him or during the course of his debate. About the rent and other things, I do not know on what basis the terms have been fixed. But that raises also a general question. What should we do with regard to the displaced Government servants? Now about two years ago a conference of the Rehabilitation Ministers of India was called and we fixed certain priorities according to which we give accommodation in our newly constructed houses. Our category 'A' was persons who have been living under canvass roof or ram-shackled houses—some sort of a structure made of iron sheets or wooden planks by the roadside or on public lands—persons who have been living in *dharamsallas*, schools, hospitals and public buildings, persons who have been living in religious places, temples, *masjids*, churches etc. We gave them top priority. Now in Delhi I have already built about 25 or 30 thousand houses and tenements and yet my problem of this category has not been completely solved. There are about 20 thousand families yet awaiting shelter. The displaced Government servants are living in some sort of accommodation provided by another Ministry. What is the idea? Should I cut down the housing provision of category 'A' and give it to them? Are they worse sufferers than category 'A'? I say surely not.

But of course one more question remains to be answered. If any of them is retrenched or is superannuated and is thrown out of the house provided by the Works Ministry, what should be done in that case? I accept—although so far we have made no provision for them—the force of the suggestion and I will include these persons among those who have high priority in the allotment of houses. Let me once again make it clear that this category will consist of only those persons who have lost the houses given by the Works Ministry as a result of retrenchment or superannuation and not because they leave their houses.

One more point about the refugees was raised: the postal insurance policies. Mrs. Sucheta Kripalani was slightly wrongly informed. There was an agreement between us and Pakistan whereby we agreed to accept the liability for the payment of policies on a territorial basis according to the domicile of a person as on the 31st March, 1948. It means that if a person has migrated to India before the 31st March, 1948, then we took an absolute responsibility for the payment of his policy. If a per-

[Shri A. P. Jain]

son migrated to Pakistan before that date, then Pakistan took absolute responsibility for the payment of his policy. But then there were persons who came after that date. We again assumed the responsibility for paying them an interim relief at the rate of Rs. 100 per month for a period of six months from 1st September, 1951 or until the date of payment of the dues by Pakistan, whichever may be earlier. Thus there are two schemes. One for the payment of the full amount of the policy provided the man had migrated before the 31st of March 1948 and another for the interim relief if he had migrated afterwards upto a particular date. And as soon as we have settled our accounts with Pakistan, we shall make the full adjustment. I think that is enough.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Do you expect to have a settlement with Pakistan?

Shri A. P. Jain: Well, it is reciprocal. There are policies on this side and there are policies on the other side. I am not so hopeless about this.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The hon. Minister is absolutely hopeless about other matters.

Shri A. P. Jain: You may take it in any way you like.

Then about the Provident Fund Account: the point made out was that the amount due from us to Pakistan and the amount due to us from Pakistan were very nearly equal. Why do we then pay only 50 per cent. of the Provident Fund? The reason is this that we have no papers with regard to the Fund—to the deposit of the individuals. They either file some sort of an affidavit or give some sort of collateral evidence which is not conclusive evidence and therefore in order to be on a safer side we have only assumed liability for 50 per cent. Now some verification of claims has been exchanged in about 1100 odd cases for this side and about 1200 or 1300 or 1400 cases for the other side. In those cases we have made payment. As soon as verification is done we shall make full payment. I think the interim payment scheme is good enough for giving relief. So far about the Western Pakistan.

About the East Bengal now very many things arise. I know that things in East Bengal are not so much under our control as in the West Pakistan and there is a good histori-

cal reason for that. Migration in East Bengal started in October 1946 and it continued rather slowly in one form or another upto the end of 1949 when there was a huge spurt of persons migrating. Until 1949 some sort of assistance was certainly given but the Government had not assumed full responsibility for the rehabilitation of the persons who had come before 1st January 1950. Their number roughly was about nine lakhs in West Bengal. Since 1st January 1950 another 12 lakhs had come. Now these figures have been questioned. These are the figures based on the census and to my mind they can be said to be the most accurate figures. Now when you consider the question of expenditure which we have incurred or you consider the amount of rehabilitation that we have achieved, you cannot compare our achievements in the East with the results in the West. In the West our rehabilitation is five years old and in the East it is only two years. If you have to compare the result of the East, I think the relevant period for the West would be the end of 1949 or the beginning of 1950. I plead guilty to certain charges made by my friend, Pandit Mahtta. We have not been able to give enough figures about loans, housing etc., but I have tried to work out some figures since he made his speech. Let me take up housing. I am speaking on the authority of the statistical survey. There are 4,29,272 displaced families in West Bengal. 54,875, that is 14.7 per cent., are living in houses owned by them, on the land owned by them or on the land taken on lease by them. That is not any problem because they own the houses.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That includes colonies on unauthorised land?

Shri A. P. Jain: No, no. I am coming to them presently. Then there are 45,802 families living in rented houses. They are also not an immediate problem but some of them might become a problem when ousted. Then 44,212 families are living with relatives. They are a problem. 1331 families live in dharamsalas. They are also a problem. In unoccupied houses 76,893 families are living. They are not a problem unless they are removed from there because they are living in houses vacated by the Muslims. Now on the basis of these statistics 75.4 per cent. are not an immediate problem and the remaining 24.6 per cent. are. I will say something about those living on trespassed land. They have been engaging my attention and I have discussed this

question, if I remember correctly, with my friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. About 15,000 odd families are living or squatting on the land of others in the city of Calcutta. The policy which we have evolved with regard to these trespassing families is that wherever the land does not exceed a certain limit in value we will acquire the land and we will readjust these colonies in such a manner that there are properly built roads, sanitation, lighting, etc. We have already started work and a few colonies have been surveyed, the head of each of the families has been photographed and we propose to acquire the lands in those colonies.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Can he just give us some names of those colonies? We know of none.

Shri A. P. Jain: I will. We have surveyed two colonies. There might be some colonies where the land is too valuable, which we cannot afford to buy. There are lands worth Rs. 2,000 per *kattha*, Rs. 3,000 per *kattha*, and Rs. 4,000 per *kattha*. We have to remove them but we shall try to remove them to as near a place as possible. In fact some of the landlords have approached me saying that they are prepared to give a portion of the land for building purposes. I have got some such offers which are being examined. I can assure the hon. Members that it is none of my intentions to throw these persons far away from their present places where they are making some sort of a livelihood. I shall try to settle them either on those very lands if it is within our means or on lands as near as possible.

Then, our building programme in Bengal is not so bad as has been made out by some hon. Members. Pandit Maitra asked the question: While we have done a lot of construction in the West why do we follow a different policy for the East—that is giving a plot of land and some money for construction. That question has been answered by some of the Members on the Opposite Benches. The centage charge is high; at one time it used to be as high as 15 to 20 per cent. I have been trying to bring it down, and I have been able to bring it down to eight per cent. In the case of any constructions done from the Relief Fund I do not pay them centage charges. Then there is always the contractor's profit in what you build. Again, whatever we build conforms to a particular pattern. It is monotonous. Therefore, in West Bengal we followed a different policy. We said, "Here is a plot of land, here is the money. You build it according to your taste".

Loans to 1,56,000 families have already been given. I confess that if you ask me how many of these 1,56,000 have built houses I cannot give you the figure. I felt that this important information was lacking even before my hon. friend raised this question. When last time I went to Calcutta I instituted an enquiry, a house to house enquiry, to find out how many of these loans have been availed of and how many houses constructed. But I am dealing with a huge problem. I have got neither the staff nor the resources to cover all the aspects.

Pandit L. K. Maitra: You agree with me. My grievance was that you have no such machinery. But what about the programme? You were saying you had some sort of building programme for these refugees in West Bengal.

Shri A. P. Jain: I have said so. We have advanced loans and I have stated how we are going to deal with the squatters' problem.

Pandit L. K. Maitra: No, no. You talked of a building programme.

Shri A. C. Guha: The question is whether Government has got any building programme for East Bengal refugees.

Shri A. P. Jain: In general, I do not want to undertake any large-scale construction there. I want the refugees to build on a self-help basis. That is my policy.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Would you make building material available to them?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes, at controlled rate.

Shri A. C. Guha: May I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that only Rs. 500 is given as house building loan in the rural areas. Will that amount be sufficient for building any house?

Shri A. P. Jain: Let me continue. Pandit Maitra raised another question: While our brochure says that we have sanctioned Rs. 4.24 crores for loans, we do not say how much is actually paid. A good, nice question. I have collected the figures. In West Bengal Rs. 2,64,00,000 has actually been paid. In Kachar Rs. 54 lakhs, in Assam Rs. 5 lakhs, in Orissa Rs. 7 lakhs, the total being Rs. 3,30 lakhs, or 75 per cent. of the sanctioned amount. Out of the housing loans Rs. 7,05,00,000 has been paid to 1,54,000 families.

[Shri A. P. Jain]

But one question arises about West Bengal which I want hon. Members to answer. Hon. Members coming from Bengal have spoken with two voices. Some of them have said Bengal is oversaturated; Bengal wants a *lebensraum*, a living space under the sun; it has no more capacity to absorb more refugees. I must take them outside Bengal. On the other hand, an hon. Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty said, "You are taking away Bengalis outside Bengal". I want Bengal really and seriously to decide this question with more or less unanimity and once for all. Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee of all the persons knows what efforts I made to find a place for the Bengal refugees outside Bengal. At a very early stage, about eighteen months ago, I appointed an officer of the rank of a Joint Secretary to go to different States and to select sites for the rehabilitation of the displaced persons. He visited Mysore, Hyderabad and Madras and found out very nice and huge pieces of land. I understand the difficulties of the Bengal refugees—their language difficulty, their environmental difficulty, the difficulty about climate to which they have been used, etc. I did not want to take them to a place where other people would not be able to understand their language.

Shri Meghnad Saha: May I ask the hon. Minister...

Shri A. P. Jain: Let me finish first and then the hon. Member can put his questions.

I wanted to create huge colonies. The Chief Minister of West Bengal himself visited Mysore. There were more than one lakh acres of good, fertile land, with plenty of rainfall. He issued a notice under the signatures of a large number of Bengalis living in Mysore that the Mysoreans were treating them well, that the land was good, attractive land; and that Bengal refugees must go there. We also started construction of houses. But then the Chief Minister of West Bengal said that the Bengalis were not prepared to go there. Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee could not persuade them to go there.

Then, again, we sent about 25 or 26 thousand of these refugees to Bihar. Of them, eight thousand have returned.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: Why? What kind of treatment did they get?

Shri A. P. Jain: I am coming to that: do not get upset. To Orissa we sent another 24 thousand and 16 thousand have returned. I shall give you the reasons. In U.P. we set up a colony for about 500 families and only 300 families have come. About 200 holdings are lying vacant and I now propose to send Punjabis there. We set up a home in Chunagarh and of the large number we expected would go there, only 600 actually did, with the result that the overall charges nearly doubled up.

Now, I am asked to state the reasons for this state of affairs. I will give you the reasons. Bengalis find it difficult to accommodate themselves in new environments.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: That is not so.

Shri A. P. Jain: I will give you concrete facts. It is no use merely saying "That is not so".

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Did the hon. Minister ever care to consult them and find out why people who went to those places have returned, and what they are doing?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes. I have consulted them. I have talked to them. I went to those camps and I asked them, "Why do you want to go back? Why have your friends gone back?" I put these questions in a camp at Charmari in Orissa.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: But that camp is in West Bengal.

Shri A. P. Jain: I am not sure about the name, but it was a place in Orissa. I may be mistaken about the name. Let me tell you the reply I got. They said that early in the morning when they got up and saw the hillocks, they felt mortally afraid of them. They could not bear the sight of the hillocks. I have got it in writing, with their signatures.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee indicated dissent.

Shri A. P. Jain: It is no use shaking your head.

Furthermore, they said that there were no huge rivers. They said, "We want the Padma". Now, Sir, I cannot create a Padma. They wanted plenty of rainfall.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: This is the stock argument.

Shri A. P. Jain: It is not the stock argument. I challenge Dr. Mookerjee to disprove these facts. Let him bring

Bengali refugees and settle them outside Bengal. I will give as good a land as is available in India. Let him make the men stick there.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: How many went to Andamans?

Shri A. P. Jain: Only 2,000.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: And how many stayed on?

Shri A. P. Jain: Even from there, about 200 or 300 have returned.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: So, they are prepared to go to Andamans but they are not prepared to stay in any part of India. Is that what you suggest?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes, that is a fact.

This is one difficulty. The other difficulty is...

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: One of occupation.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: And the treatment by the Government.

Shri A. P. Jain: The other difficulty is that the Bengalis are not able to adjust themselves to new climatic conditions.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Let us sit down and discuss the matter.

Shri A. P. Jain: I have discussed it, but the hon. Member has never been able to offer any solution. I have not discussed once or twice, but I have discussed tens of times. I want to know whether the Bengali refugees are prepared to make up their mind to stay where they are sent. In fact there have been political influences at work. Certain political parties have sent notes to the persons who went to Orissa and Bihar, and we have intercepted some of them, asking these refugees to come back to West Bengal because they want them to vote for themselves. That kind of thing has been going on. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot say that Bengal has reached saturation point and call back the people who are sent out.

There are many other questions with which I would like to deal, but I have got just five minutes more and I shall deal with evacuee property and compensation, about which much has been said. These subjects are engaging the attention of large numbers of hon. Members. About evacuee property many things have been said and most of them, I may say, are absolutely

baseless. We were charged of frittering away the evacuee property pool. That is wrong. When we have restored any properties, we have done it publicly. We issued a notification. Times without number, questions have been asked and have been answered. Our policy is perfectly clear, so far as evacuee property is concerned. Every citizen of India, whatever may be his religion or faith, has equal rights. No Muslim citizens of India will be discriminated against as a result of the evacuee property law. The property of those who have gone away to Pakistan has become evacuee property and is in the pool. A notification, issued under section 52 on 3rd July 1950, entitles certain classes of persons to the restoration of their property. Those who went away to Pakistan but returned before the introduction of the permit system and those who have come back before a certain date under a permanent settlement permit—only to those two categories of persons their properties have been restored and no others. I think no Government can follow any other policy. You cannot follow a policy of unnecessarily creating a sense of insecurity in any section of your citizens. And if any provisions of an existing legislation create a sense of insecurity to any section of our people then those provisions must be amended. On the contrary, if any person has gone over to Pakistan and his property has become evacuee property and gone into the pool,—in such a case, his property is not going to be returned merely because he puts in a claim.

Questions have been asked about the disbursement of compensation, about the total value of the evacuee property etc., and more particularly about the total value of the claims admitted. I have given certain kinds of figures, but not the other figures which I think it is not in the public interest to disclose at the moment. I can assure the House that I am as anxious to work out a scheme of compensation as any other hon. Member of the House. I have been doing my best. I have been trying to pilot schemes. I have worked out figures, but I want to come before this House with a definitely made-up scheme. I do not want to serve half-cooked dishes. Disclosure of facts during formative stages is not a good thing. It is not in the interests of the country. I have known that sometimes when I gave figures, Pakistan has misused those figures. They had misused them for the purpose of creating prejudice against us in countries outside. I hope to come out with the scheme during the course of this year which will give a full picture of what we propose to do, how we are going to distribute

{Shri A. P. Jain}

the compensation, what is going to be its quantum. I am sorry at this stage I am not in a position to give any more information. Have faith in me and I will not disappoint you.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The hon. Minister has not referred to Assam at all.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no time. He will take another opportunity. (*Interruption*). Order, order. Many hon. Members should not speak at the same time.

Shri Velayudhan: The hon. Minister just stated that about Rs. three lakhs by way of rent will have to be realized from the stall-holders on the Queensway, Punchquin Road and Irwin Road. May I know whether the Minister is aware that when this rent question was in the court and the court decided that they should pay only about Rs. 16 instead of Rs. 30, the Delhi Municipality refused to receive this rent. The Delhi Municipality fixed the rent only after six months of their occupation of the shops. But they issued an order to these refugees in the meantime saying that they must give it in writing that it is a temporary structure and the refugees will live there only temporarily, which they refused.

An Hon. Member: Is it a point of order or a speech, Sir?

Shri Velayudhan: You do not know what is a speech and what is a question.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member should address the Chair.

Shri Velayudhan: I am addressing you Sir. The hon. Member has not understood what my question is.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has put sufficiently elaborate questions with some reasons and arguments. He is now only supplementing his reasons. He has put the question and that is enough. (*Interruption*) Order, order. Is it the desire of the hon. Member to make a speech and supplement the questions with arguments. Instead of hearing the hon. Minister's answer at this stage?

An Hon. Member: What is the question?

Shri A. P. Jain: I have reason to believe that the refugees are raising one dispute after another. They are creating all kinds of trouble in the court and outside in order to withhold the payment. That is exactly my complaint. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. It is not a question hour. Hon. Members will kindly understand the scope of the debate. I am not prepared to allow any more questions for this reason that all points of view have been expressed. If other hon. Members had no opportunity, they ought not to utilise this occasion to put all questions and make a speech on them. The hon. Minister has already taken more than 1½ hours to answer the various points of view and if something more remains, another opportunity will occur when he will explain those points. As hon. Members are aware there is the question hour for which questions can be tabled. Then they can table short notice questions or they can talk to the hon. Minister. I am not going to encroach on the time allotted. It has been encroached to the detriment of other Ministries.

Shri R. K. Chaudhury: Two Members of this House from Assam, including myself, raised certain special points about the refugees in Assam. The hon. Minister has not referred to them at all. May I know whether he has got anything to say about the Assam refugees?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have asked him not to say anything. I am not going to allow even the hon. Minister to say anything more, because the time already allotted to the other Ministries has been taken up. There will be another opportunity. This is an endless affair. I would not allow three or four days to be spent over a particular Ministry. I will put the cut motions to the vote of the House. First Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani's cut motion.

The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Rehabilitation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The House divided: Ayes, 72: Noes 280.

Division No. 53

AYES

[10-53 A.M.]

Achalu, Shri
 Ajit Singh, Shri
 Bahadur Singh, Shri
 Banerjee, Shri
 Basu, Shri. K. K.
 Boovaraghasamy, Shri
 Buchhikotaiah, Shri
 Chatterjee, Shri Tushar
 Chattopadhyaya, Shri
 Chowdary, Shri C. R.
 Chowdhury, Shri N. B.
 Damodaran, Shri N. P.
 Das, Shri B. C.
 Das, Shri Sarangadhar
 Deo, Shri R. N. S.
 Deshpande, Shri V. G.
 Doraswamy, Shri
 Gam Malludora, Shri
 Girdhari Bhol, Shri
 Gopalan, Shri A. K.
 Gurupadaswamy, Shri
 Hukam Singh, Shri
 Jayaraman, Shri
 Kandasamy, Shri
 Kelappa, Shri

Khardekar, Shri
 Khare, Dr. N. B.
 Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
 Lal Singh, Sardar
 Mahata, Shri B.
 Majhi, Shri Chaitan
 Mathuram, Dr.
 Menon, Shri Damodara
 Mishra, Pandit, S. C.
 Missir, Shri V.
 Mookerjee, Dr. S. P.
 Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
 More, Shri S. S.
 Muniswamy, Shri
 Mushar, Shri
 Naidu, Shri N. B.
 Nanadas, Shri
 Nathani, Sri, H. R.
 Nayar, Shri V. P.
 Punnoose, Shri
 Raghavachari, Shri
 Raghavaiah, Shri
 Ramnarayan, Singh, Babu
 Bandaman Singh, Shri

Rao, Shri Gopala
 Rao, Shri K. S.
 Rao Shri P. Subba
 Rao, Shri Vittal
 Reddi, Shri Madhao
 Reddi, Shri Ramachandra
 Reddi, Shri Ewara
 Rishang Keshing, Shri
 Saha, Shri Meghnad
 Shah, Shrinati Kamendu Mati
 Shakuntala, Shrimati
 Sharma, Shri Nand Lal
 Singh, Shri R. N.
 Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
 Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
 Suriya Prasad, Shri
 Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
 Swamy, Shri N. R. M.
 Trivedi, Shri U. M.
 Veeraswami, Shri
 Velayudhan, Shri
 Verma, Shri Ramji
 Waghmare, Shri

NOES

Abdus Sattar, Shri
 Achai Singh, Seth
 Achint Ram Lala
 Achutan, Shri
 Agarwal, Prof.
 Agarwal, Shri H. L.
 Agrawal, Shri M. L.
 Akarpuri, Sardar
 Alagesan, Shri
 Altekar, Shri
 Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari
 Ansari, Dr.
 Athana, Shri
 Azad Maulana
 Baldev Singh, Sardar
 Balkrishnan, Shri
 Balmiki, Shri
 Bansal, Shri
 Barman, Shri
 Barupal, Shri
 Basappa, Shri
 Basu, Shri A. K.
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhakta, Darshan, Shri
 Bhandari, Shri
 Bharati, Shri G. S.
 Bhargava, Pandit M. B.
 Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
 Bhatkar, Shri
 Bhawanji, Shri
 Bheekha Bhal, Shri

Bhonsle, Major-General
 Bidari, Shri
 Birbal Singh, Shri
 Bogawat, Shri
 Borooah, Shri
 Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
 Brohmo-Chowdhury, Shri
 Buragohain, Shri
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Charak Shri
 Chatterjee, Dr. Susiranjan
 Chaturvedi, Shri
 Chaudhri, Shri M. Shafice
 Chaudhary, Shri G. L.
 Chaudhury, Shri R. K.
 Chavda, Shri
 Chettiar, Shri Nagappa
 Chettiar, Shri T. S. A.
 Chinaria, Shri
 Dabhi, Shri
 Damar, Shri
 Damodaran, Shri G. B.
 Das, Shri B.
 Das, Shri B. K.
 Das, Shri Ram Dhani
 Das, Shri S. N.
 Das, Shri N. T.
 Datar, Shri
 Deb, Shri S. C.
 Desai, Shri K. N.
 Deshmukh, Shri C. D.

Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Deshmukh, Dr. P. S.
 Deshpande, Shri G. H.
 Dholakia, Shri
 Dhulekar, Shri
 Dhusiya, Shri
 Digambar Singh, Shri
 Dube, Shri Mulchand
 Dube, Shri U. S.
 Dubey, Shri R. G.
 Dutta, Shri S. K.
 Dwivedi, Shri D. P.
 Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
 Ebanezer, Dr.
 Elayaperumal, Shri
 Gadgil, Shri
 Gandhi, Shri M. M.
 Gandhi, Shri V. B.
 Ganpati Ram, Shri
 Garg, Shri R. P.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Ghulam Qader, Shri
 Giri, Shri V. V.
 Gohain, Shri
 Gopi Ram, Shri
 Gounder, Shri K. S.
 Guha, Shri A. C.
 Gupta, Shri Badshah
 Hari Mohan, Dr.
 Hazarika, Shri J. N.
 Hem Raj, Shri

Hembrom, Shri
 Ibrahim, Shri
 Islamuddin, Shri M.
 Iyyani, Shri E.
 Iyyunni, Shri C. R.
 Jain, Shri A. P.
 Jajware, Shri
 Jangde, Shri
 Jasani, Shri
 Jayashri, Shrimati
 Jethan, Shri
 Jha, Shri Bhagwat
 Jhunjhunwala, Shri
 Joshi, Shri Krishnacharya
 Joshi, Shri Liladhar
 Joshi, Shri M. D.
 Joshi, Shri N. L.
 Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
 Kajrolkar, Shri
 Kakkani, Shri
 Kale, Shrimati A.
 Kanungo, Shri
 Karmarkar, Shri
 Katju, Dr.
 Kazmi, Shri
 Keshavalengar, Shri
 Keskar, Dr.
 Khedkar, Shri G. B.
 Khuda Baksh, Shri M.
 Kirolikar, Shri
 Krishna Chandra, Shri
 Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Kureel, Shri P. L.
 Lal, Shri R. S.
 Lallanji, Shri
 Lakshmayya, Shri
 Laskar, Prof.
 Madiah, Gowda, Shri
 Mahodaya, Shri
 Maltra, Pandit, L. K.
 Majhi, Shri R. C.
 Majithia, Sardar
 Malaviya, Shri K. D.
 Mallah, Shri U. S.
 Malviya, Pandit C. N.
 Malviya, Shri Motilal
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Masuodi, Maulana
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Mathew, Prof.
 Mehta, Shri A. L.
 Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha
 Mehta, Shri B. G.
 Mishra, Shri Bibbuti
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mishra, Shri Lokanath
 Mishra, Shri M. G.
 Mishra, Shri S. N.
 Misra, Pandit Lingaraj
 Misra, Shri R. D.
 Miera, Shri S. P.

Mohd, Akbar, Shri
 Morarka, Shri
 More, Shri K. L.
 Muchaki Kosa, Shri
 Mudalliar, Shri C. R.
 Murl, Manohar, Shri
 Musafir, Giani, G. S.
 Muthukrishnan, Shri
 Nair, Shri C. K.
 Namdhari, Shri
 Narasimhan, Shri C. R.
 Natakadkar, Shri
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma
 Nesamony Shri
 Nevatia, Shri
 Nijalingappa, Shri
 Pande, Shri C. D.
 Pannalal, Shri
 Pant, Shri D. D.
 Parmar, Shri R. B.
 Pataskar, Shri
 Patel, Shri B. K.
 Patel, Shrimati Maniben
 Patil, Shri S. K.
 Patil, Shri Shankaragauda
 Pawar, Shri V. P.
 Pocker Sahab, Shri
 Prabhakar, Shri N.
 Prasad, Shri H. S.
 Radha Ramani, Shri
 Raghubir Sahal, Shri
 Raghubir, Singh, Ch.
 Raghunath Singh, Shri
 Raghuramalah, Shri
 Rahman, Shri M. H.
 Raj Bahadur, Shri
 Ram Das, Shri
 Ram Saran, Prof.
 Ram Subhag, Singh, Dr.
 Raman and Shastri Swam
 Ramaswamy, Shri P.
 Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
 Ranbir, Singh, Ch.
 Rane, Shri
 Ranjit Singh, Shri
 Rao, Diwan, Raghavendra
 Rao, Shri B. Shiva
 Razmi, Shri S. K.
 Reddy, Shri H. S.
 Reddy, Shri Janardhan
 Richardson, Bishop
 Roy, Shri B. N.
 Rup Narain, Shri
 Sahu, Shri Bhagabat
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
 Saigal, Sardar, A. S.
 Sakana, Shri Mohanlal
 Samanta, Shri S. C.
 Sanganna, Shri
 Sankarapandian, Shri
 Sarmah, Shri
 Satish Chandra, Shri

Satyawadi, Dr.
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sen, Shrimati Sushama
 Sewal, Shri A. R.
 Shah, Shri R. B.
 Shahawaz Khan, Shri
 Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
 Sharma, Pandit K. C.
 Sharma, Prof. D. C.
 Sharma, Shri K. R.
 Sharma, Shri R. C.
 Shobha Ram, Shri
 Shukla, Pandit B.
 Sidhananappa, Shri
 Singh, Shri Babunath
 Singh, Shri G. S.
 Singh, Shri H. P.
 Singh, Shri L. J.
 Singh, Shri M. N.
 Singh, Shri T. N.
 Singhal, Shri S. C.
 Sinha, Dr. S.
 Sinha, Shri A. P.
 Sinha, Shri Anrudha
 Sinha, Shri B. P.
 Sinha, Shri C. N. P.
 Sinha, Shri G. P.
 Sinha, Shri Jhulan
 Sinha, Shri N. P.
 Sinha, Shri S.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Sinhasan Singh, Shri
 Snatak, Shri
 Sodha, Shri K. C.
 Somana, Shri N.
 Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
 Suresh Chandra, Dr.
 Syed Ahmed, Shri
 Syed Mahmud, Dr.
 Tek Chand, Shri
 Telikar, Shri
 Thomas, Shri A. M.
 Tiwari, Shri V. N.
 Tiwari, Pandit B. I.
 Tiwary, Pandit D. N.
 Tudu, Shri B. L.
 Ulkey, Shri
 Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Daya
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Vaishya, Shri M. B.
 Varma, Shri B. B.
 Varma, Shri B. R.
 Vartak, Shri
 Venkataraman, Shri
 Vidyalnakar, Shri
 Vijaya Lakshmi, Shrimati
 Vishwanath, Prasad Shri
 Vyas, Shri Radhelal
 Wodeyar, Shri
 Zaidi, Col.

The motion was negatived

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the other cut motions to the House.

The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Rehabilitation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Rehabilitation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Rehabilitation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Rehabilitation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Rehabilitation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Rehabilitation' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third Column of the order paper in respect of Demands Nos. 78, 79, 80 and 125 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[As directed by Mr. Deputy-Speaker the motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below.—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND No. 78—MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,00,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Rehabilitation'."

DEMAND No. 79—EXPENDITURE ON DISPLACED PERSONS

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,72,92,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Expenditure on Displaced Persons'."

DEMAND No. 80—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 19,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of Rehabilitation'."

DEMAND No. 125—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,00,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Rehabilitation'."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now we will take up Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply, and also the Ministry of Production. Hon. Members are aware that these two have been split up, and now put under different Ministries, but all the same discussion now on one question will dovetail into the other, and as it is not so clear and

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

it may not be possible to separate the one from the other, what I propose doing is, subject to the acceptance of the House, that the Demands relating to both these Ministries may be placed before the House along with the cut motions relating to them, having a common discussion relating to both these Ministries fully. Then, the day, may be kept for the discussion of the Demands and the cut motions. The hon. Ministers will each address the House tomorrow in the Question Hour, half an hour each, if the House so agrees to waive the Question Hour. Thereafter, the Labour Ministry may be taken up for consideration.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Question Hour should not be dispensed with.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the House is not agreeable, it will not be dispensed with. If Question Hour is dropped tomorrow, it may not be necessary to put it off on any day hereafter. The circle will end tomorrow, that is, only tomorrow's Question Hour will be given up in which case the Hon. Ministers may address the House tomorrow out of the Question Hour, half an hour each.

The next Ministry as originally proposed is that relating to Health. I understand it is proposed to carry over Health to the last day and keep it for two days along with Finance and Planning, on Tuesday and Wednesday the 1st and 2nd July. Therefore, Labour will be taken up tomorrow, for the whole of the day. As originally arranged, Labour Ministry has to be taken up on Thursday the 19th June from 11-30 to 1 P.M.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Including the reply of the Labour Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I agree. From 11-30 to 1 P.M. was allotted originally. If it is taken up tomorrow, it will be taken up from 9-15 right up to 1 P.M., and the House can sit for half an hour or two hours more if necessary. Therefore, it is proposed to finish the entire Demand tomorrow including the reply of the hon. Minister so that from day after tomorrow the Question Hour may be there, and according to the programme, we will be able to get through the various Ministries. If this is all acceptable to the House—giving up Question Hour tomorrow, postponing consideration of Health . . .

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt—South): To what date?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: 1st and 2nd July, along with Finance and Planning—some time will be allotted for Health—then taking up Labour tomorrow from 9-15 and finishing it by one o'clock.

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Distt.—East): Then Sir, Demands for Finance and Planning for which two days have been allotted, will be retrenched, or cut down to that extent that we discuss this Health Ministry. How much will be cut down?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The time will be announced later and the period would be allotted to each particular Ministry or particular subject.

Shri A. C. Guha: Previously, Finance was given two days. Then Planning has been added, and now again, Health. That means Finance will have only one day. I think, Sir, time for Finance should not be retrenched. The House should be given full opportunity to discuss Finance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Leader of the House is also here, and I am sure he will take all these matters into consideration. If some more time is necessary, we can sit for another half an hour. It is not as if we are in want of time. Hon. Members can go on till mid-night if they want. We will finish it that day.

Now, we will take up both these together—the Ministries of Works, Housing and Supply and Production.

DEMAND NO. 95—MINISTRY OF WORKS, PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,27,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply'."

DEMAND NO. 96—SUPPLIES

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,72,04,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Supplies'."

DEMAND No. 99—OTHER
CIVIL WORKS

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,11,26,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Other Civil Works'."

DEMAND No. 100—STATIONERY
AND PRINTING

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,41,45,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

DEMAND No. 101—MISCELLANEOUS
DEPARTMENTS AND EXPENDITURE UNDER
THE MINISTRY OF WORKS, PRODUCTION
AND SUPPLY.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 38,23,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Departments and Expenditure under the Ministry of Works, Production and Supply'."

DEMAND No. 130—NEW DELHI
CAPITAL OUTLAY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,44,91,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'New Delhi Capital Outlay'."

DEMAND No. 131—CAPITAL OUTLAY
ON BUILDINGS.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,08,07,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Buildings'."

DEMAND No. 97—SALT.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 88,15,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Salt'."

DEMAND No. 98—STAMP CANCELLING
AND PRINTING INKS MANUFACTURING
FACTORY.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,97,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Stamp Cancellling and Printing Inks manufacturing Factory'."

DEMAND No. 132—OTHER CAPITAL
OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF WORKS,
PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,64,02,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Works, Production and Supply'."

Policy

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampur):

I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Policy and Government undertakings.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour):

I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sindri Fertiliser Factory

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-North-East): I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Ministry of Works, Production and Supply' be reduced by Rs. 100."

To supply lands freely to agricultural and poor peasants for production of Salt.

Shri Mohana Rao (Rajahmundry—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Salt’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Distribution of Salt fields to salt labourers and poor fishermen for production of Salt in order to remove monopoly system.

Shri Rajagopala Rao (Srikakulam): I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Salt’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Policy in State-sponsored industry.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Works, Production and Supply’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If there are any cut motions, which individuals or groups of Members wish to place before the House, they may kindly move them.

Government Industrial undertakings

Dr. Amin (Baroda West): I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Ministry of Works, Production and Supply’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All these cut motions are now before the House.

Shri K. K. Basu: I support the cut motions that have been placed before the House. I would like to deal with the subjects that fall under two Ministries, under the present arrangement. I would like to deal first with the functioning of the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry. It is well-known that in the C.P.W. Department, as it has come to be known, there are many things to be said, especially corruptions, nepotism and other misdeeds. I do not want to go into details here. In the building and construction work that is generally undertaken by this department, often, proper checking up is not done. I should like to give in this connection one example, which the hon. Members here personally know about the construction of the flats meant for the use of the Members of Parliament. I happen to occupy one of these C type flats in the North Avenue. The other day when I wanted to wash the floor, I found that the water dipped down to the ground floor and the other Member who was staying downstairs had to come and say to me “Please do not do this”. I do not know how these flats have

been built. I am not an engineer, but as a professional man, I had something to do with housing, and from the little experience that I gained, I dare say that looking at the construction that has been done in these flats, I do not know whether these houses will serve as long as we are Members of this House or one fine morning all of us may not be here in this world.

I find from the report that many of the works which formerly were looked after by the C.P.W.D. have now been transferred to private contractors, and a large number of workers have been retrenched. It is well known as to how the contractors work, and how they make sky-rocketing profits out of this.

Another thing that I would like to refer to is the allotment of quarters for the subordinate staff working in Government offices. In the report of the Estimates Committee last year, certain comments were made about the allotment of quarters to class IV and class III staff. It has been said also that those who belong to the superior staff are allotted quarters while the interests of the inferior staff are not taken into account. As you all know, it is the poorer classes who find it very difficult to get accommodation. As I do not want to go into details, because time is short, I would only refer hon. Members to the report of last year's Estimates Committee, where severe criticism has been made about the functions of the Estate Officers, and the complete complacency with which the Estate Officers put forward the points before the Estimates Committee. That shows clearly the attitude of the Government and especially the administration in charge of the vital problem of housing. Housing is a thing which does not affect a particular class only. This morning, we had a general discussion on the housing of refugees. They want houses for these refugees who have no place to live in. The common man, the ordinary worker and the staff in the ministerial offices are also in the same condition. From the reports I could not gather whether the staff who belong to the Parliament Secretariat, who are expected to work from 7-30 A.M. to six P.M. daily have enough accommodation. It seems they do not have any Government accommodation.

Then in this Housing Department, there is provision for a research section. I do not know what results their research has achieved, except their research in the matter of the pre-fabricated houses, which has become

a well known and colossal scandal before the country. It seems from the report of the Committee that housing constructions are often done without considering the climatic conditions and other peculiarities in our country. About the contractors, and the special favours given to them, most of the Members, I suppose, have enough experience of them.

The Estimates Committee has also referred to the overabundance of superior staff. We all realize the meagre resources in India; in view of the fact that we want to build the India of future, we have got to save, and not fritter away our resources on overabundance of superior staff without enough work.

With regard to stationery and printing, the stationery has been purchased at a rate which is not competitive enough in the open market. This year also we find that for accumulation of stocks of stationery for six months, a special grant of nearly Rs. 30 lakhs has been made. I do not exactly remember the figures, but it is roughly about that. The criticism has been made that the proper procedure with regard to buying in the competitive market has not been properly followed.

Now about the printing business. We, the Members of the House of the People and the Council of States, are the purchasers of the pads and envelopes, and from our experience we can say that they are much too costly. I do not mean that we the Members should have them at a lesser rate, but at least the cost should be such that we find in the competitive market. It shows that in the working of this department we do not take into consideration the economic aspect of the business.

In this connection, I should like to mention something about the Calcutta Stationery Department. It is a huge department. The other day a report appeared in the Press, and representations have also come to us that large-scale retrenchment has been going on for the economic management of this department. In the same context, there is another report that the staff who are there, the surviving workers, are made to work extra hours to cope with the work of the department. I cannot follow why on the one hand there has been retrenchment and on the other there has been overworking of the existing staff.

In this connection, one more criticism has to be made. That is also referred to in last year's Public Accounts Committee report. It is about

the loss on account of demurrage that Government suffered due to non-clearance of the imported goods from the port at the proper time. These are Government undertakings and it is the duty of the Government to see that the department is run on proper and efficient lines and there is no wastage of public money.

Another point has also been strongly criticised by the Estimates Committee of which you, Sir, were the presiding officer. It is about the Nasik Press. It has been repeatedly said that the situation of the Press at Nasik is definitely uneconomic because of the lack of raw materials and lack of market, the main centre of Government being at Delhi. It has been urged in the same report that the Press should be located at Aligarh or some such central place. In spite of that, in this year's Budget there is a provision on this account. I do not know how the Government ignore the considered opinion of the Estimates Committee.

One more point about the Publication Branch. The publications that come out are not always available in the market. I have personal experience of the Calcutta Stationery and Publication Department. They have even a Publications Officer. But when an Act is published, no copy is available even within three or four months. When you write to them, they say it is out of stock. I have got several letters from people saying that the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act—such an important Act—was out of stock with the department. I do not know how Government think of running the administration in this manner.

There is one point that I have to urge about the Disposal Department. Large stocks are lying idle when there are so many demands for construction work from the Rehabilitation and other departments. I do not know—it has also been adversely commented upon by the Estimates Committee—when there is so much demand for these materials how things are allowed to rot and a large establishment maintained on account of this department.

Then I come to the Stores Department in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. We find from reports that the quantity that we purchase is not so much as warrants the maintenance of an establishment of such a huge department. Last year purchases made in the U.S.A. on food account were of about Rs. 54 crores and the rest lumped together was Rs. 3½ crores. Food has to be purchased on an inter-State or inter-Governmental level, but the

(Shri K. K. Basu)

maintenance of the Stores Department costing several lakhs of rupees for other things is extraordinary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has completed his time. He has already taken 15 minutes. I find myself in a difficulty if I allow more time.

Shri K. K. Basu: Two minutes more. Sir

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One minute more.

Shri K. K. Basu: Then I wish to refer to the salt excise. The operation of the licensing system has also been adversely commented upon by the Estimates Committee. In order to pamper a few individuals, the interests of a large number of people are sacrificed. I do know what is the heritage of the Congress Government with regard to the salt duty. Why then they have imposed salt cess? And the revenue derived from this source is unfortunately appropriated to general revenues and I consider it as abominable.

Due to pressure of time I do not propose to refer to other matters. But I must contradict the statement made the other day by the Leader of the House that there is an abundance of metallurgical coal in India. So far as I remember, geologists are of the view that even under existing demand, it is only good for 75 years.

I wish to say a word about the Sindri Factory. The capital expenditure on it is certainly huge. From an estimate of Rs. ten crores it has shot up to Rs. 23 crores. There is no arrangement for proper utilisation of the by-products.

I shall not refer to pre-fabricated houses for want of time and that has been amply discussed.

Coming to the machine tools industry, there has been a persistent demand for the construction of machine tool factories. When there is so much need of the basic material, steel, I do not know what is the necessity for these machine tool factories which can very well be served by the industries in private sector.

I hope the Government will kindly consider the suggestions I have made and act in the interests and according to the capacity of our nation and must not fritter away the limited resources we have.

श्री सी० के० नायर : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पहले भी चाहता था कि बजट पर या रिहैबिलिटेशन (Rehabilitation)

के बजट पर बोलूँ लेकिन अभाग्यवश इस के लिये मुझे मौका नहीं मिला। अब मुझे इस विषय पर बोलने का मौका आप ने दिया है और मैं इस के लिये आभारी हूँ। यह महकमा ऐसा है जिस के अन्दर तीन विभाग हैं, एक तो वर्क्स (Works है, दूसरा हाउसिंग (Housing) और तीसरा सप्लाय (Supply)। पहले यह वर्क्स, माइन्स एंड पावर (Works, Mines and Power) का महकमा था और उस के बारे में सब को मालूम है। यह वर्क्स डिपार्टमेंट (Works Department) सनातन काल से चला आ रहा है और उस में हमशा करप्शन (corruption) निपोटिज़्म (nepotism) और खराबियां रही हैं। इसीलिये मैं वज़ीर साहब से ख़ास कर यह दरख़वास्त करूंगा कि जो रिसर्च डिपार्टमेंट (Research Department) इस विभाग के लिये नियुक्त किया गया है उस विभाग को यह ख़ास हिदायत दें कि इस के बारे में पूरे तौर पर रिसर्च करें कि कौन कौन से तरीक़े वैज्ञानिक दृष्टि से हम निकाल सकते हैं जिस से कि यह विभाग शुद्ध हो जाय और ठेकेदारों वगैरह की ज़हनियत बदल जाय। इस अनुसंधान से हमारे देश को बहुत बड़ा फ़ायदा होगा। आप को मालूम है कि वर्क्स डिपार्टमेंट के मातहत कई करोड़ रुपया बरबाद हो रहा है। जितना काम आज हो रहा है उस से कई गुना ज़्यादा काम हम उसी पैसे के अन्दर कर सकते हैं बशर्त कि हमारे लोगों की ज़हनियत में, मनोभाव में थोड़ा फ़र्क आ जाय। लेकिन उस मनोभाव में, उस ज़हनियत में, हम ने अब तक कोई फ़र्क नहीं देखा। वर्क्स डिपार्टमेंट में हमेशा यह देखा गया है कि जहां कहीं रिडक्शन (Reduction) या रिट्रेंचमेंट (Retrenchment) का सवाल आता

है जहां कहीं रेशनलाइजेशन (Rationalisation) का सवाल आता है तो सब से पहले गरीब से गरीब जो मजदूर हैं, जो वर्कर्स (Workers) हैं, उन के ऊपर कुलहाड़ा चलता है। यह अच्छी बात नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में शुरू से, शायद अशोक के जमाने से या उस से पहले से हमारे मजदूर बारहों महीने सड़कों को सफा करने या रोड़ा तोड़ने या कूटने का काम करते आये हैं और पुस्त दर पुस्त से, सदियों से, यह बेचारे यही काम करते आये हैं। यह बारहमसिया हैं और बारहों मास यही काम करते रहे हैं लेकिन अब स्वराज्य मिलने के बाद उनकी आंखों में भी कुछ रोशनी आ गई और वह समझ रहे हैं कि हां अब राम राज्य आ रहा है, हमारी भलाई का वक्त आ रहा है, मजदूर किसानों का राज्य आ रहा है और हमारी कुछ सुनवाई होगी लेकिन नतीजा बिल्कुल उलटा हुआ। रिट्रैचमेंट का जहां कुलहाड़ा चलता है तो यह सब से पहले बारहमसियों के ऊपर आता है।

इस के बाद ओवरसियरों (Overseers) का दूसरा नम्बर आता है। इन पर भी जब कुलहाड़ी रिट्रैचमेंट की खत्म हो जाती है तो दूसरे किस्म के जो एस० डी० ओ० (S.D.O.) और इंजीनियर्स हैं उन के ऊपर आती है। मगर अक्सर देखा गया है कि इन लोगों के ऊपर सब से अन्त में आती है और कुलहाड़ी कमी चलती ही नहीं है। क्योंकि यह लोग अपने काम की खूबी और काबिलियत दिखाने के लिये सब से पहिले खर्च में जो कमी करते हैं वह इन गरीबों के ऊपर कुलहाड़ी चला कर ही करते हैं। मुझे इस तरह की बातें बहुत मालूम हैं और बहुत से मजदूर जो इस प्रकार रिट्रैच किये जाते हैं रोते हुए हमारे पास आते हैं। इसलिये मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह कहूंगा

कि वह इस बात की ओर खास ध्यान दें कि जिस समय रिट्रैचमेंट किया जाता है उस समय सब श्रेणी के लोगों को रिट्रैच किया जाय और सब का बराबर का हक आये। खास कर सब से नीचे श्रेणी के जो मजदूर हैं उन का हक ज्यादा हर वक्त सामने रहना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात मुझे हाउसिंग (Housing) के बारे में कहनी है। हाउसिंग अभी तक किसी एक महकमे का खास विषय नहीं बनाया गया था। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नई मिनिस्टरी का नया काम है। इस का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। इस से पहले जो हाउसिंग का डिपार्टमेंट था वह पी० डब्ल्यू० डी० (P.W.D.) का एक हिस्सा था। लेकिन इस को जनता के सामने लाने के लिये इस को खास स्थान दे दिया गया है और इस का नाम भी वर्क्स, हाउसिंग एण्ड सप्लाय बना दिया गया है। मैं इस का स्वागत करता हूँ। अभी तक हाउसिंग का जो काम होता था वह सिर्फ सरकार के जो बड़े बड़े अफसरों के लिये मकानात होते थे, उनकी जो ज़रूरतें होती थीं उन पर ही विशेषकर ध्यान दिया जात था। उस के बाद जो सरकारी मकानात बनाते थे उन पर ध्यान दिया जाता था और आज कल रिहैबिलिटेशन की वजह से जो बहुत से मकानात बनाये जा रहे हैं उनकी ओर विशेष ध्यान दिया जा रहा है। यह सब अच्छी बातें थीं। लेकिन अब हाउसिंग का एक महकमा और खास विभाग बन गया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अब हाउसिंग के ऊपर गवर्नमेंट जल्दी ही ध्यान देगी और जितनी खाली ज़मीन पड़ी है, उन पर मकानात बना कर जनता को देगी।

मैं सरकार के सामने एक मसला रखना चाहता हूँ। इस समय दिल्ली में करीब ३५ लाख से भी ज्यादा आदमी शहर के

[श्री सी० कें० नायर]

अन्दर रहते हैं। उस में से कोई ५३ लाख रिफ्यूजी हैं। इस के अलावा कोई दस लाख आदमी यहां पर छोटा और बड़ा काम करने वाले हैं। यह लोग दिल्ली के, पंजाब के, उत्तर प्रदेश के, राजस्थान के और दूसरे सूबों के रहने वाले हैं। अगर उन की हालत को देखें तो जहां पर वह रहते हैं वह मकान बहुत ही खराब हैं। इस वक्त आप को मालूम है कि हमारी हुकूमत एक किस्म की एक वेलफियर स्टेट (Welfare State) अपने आप को कहती है। अगर वेलफियर स्टेट में गरीब आदमियों को रहने के लिये किसी प्रकार का इन्तजाम न हो सका तो यह बहुत अफसोस की बात हो जाती है। हमारे पास बड़े बड़े नौकरी करने वाले, व्यापारी और बहुत बड़े बड़े अच्छे गवर्नमेंट सर्विसेस कांग्रेस दफ्तर या रिहैबिलिटेशन के दफ्तर में आ कर मकान मांगते हैं। बहुत ठीक है कि वह मकान मांगते हैं, रिफ्यूजी होने के कारण वह मकान मांगने के हकदार हैं। उन लोगों के वहां पर मकान थे। कुछ भाइयों के साथ तो मुझे रोज बहस करनी पड़ती है। मैं उन से कहता हूँ कि जब तुम अच्छी तन्स्वाहा पा रहे हो १०० रुपया, २०० रुपया, ३०० रुपया और ५०० रुपया माहवार, तो क्यों नहीं तुम लोग किराया का मकान ले कर रहते। आप इतना जोर क्यों देते हो कि गवर्नमेंट ही मकान दे और गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर इस तरह से ज्यादा बोझ डालना नहीं चाहिये। लेकिन वह ऐसा नहीं समझते हैं। वह रिफ्यूजी होने की हँसियत से अपना यह हक समझते हैं कि सरकार हम को मकान देगी। बात दुस्त है। उन्होंने कई लाख और करोड़ों के मकान अपने पाकिस्तान में छोड़ दिये हैं और इसलिये वह यहां पर मकान के लिये हक मांगते हैं। लेकिन उस वक्त में उन लोगों

से कहता हूँ कि भाई अगर दिल्ली में थोड़े आदमी होते तो उन सब के लिये मकान का बन्दोबस्त हो जाता। मगर यहां तो २०, ५०, १०० आदमियों का सवाल नहीं है, यहां तो कई लाख आदमी पड़े हैं। इतने आदमियों के लिये गवर्नमेंट कहां तक इन्तजाम कर सकती है। इसलिये मैं हुकूमत से यह बात खास तौर से अर्ज करूंगा कि जो यह हमारे भाई यहां पर आये हैं उन को रिहैबिलिटेड करने के साथ ही साथ शहर के बेवर गरीबों के उन के रिहायश का भी इन्तजाम अच्छी तरह से होना चाहिये।

असल में देखा जाय तो यह जो हमारा हाउसिंग का सवाल है वह केवल दिल्ली का ही सवाल नहीं है बल्कि इन देश के ५० लाख गांवों का सवाल है। यह तो एक बड़ा विशाल प्रश्न है। इन को हर्ने अच्छी तरह से हैंडल (handle) करना पड़ेगा। लेकिन शुरू में यह काम शहरों से करना चाहिये। शहरों में भी खाम कर दिल्ली से जो कि सारे देश की राजधानी है और जहां पर मकानों की बहुत कमी है वहां पर यह काम शुरू किया जाना चाहिये।

मैं समझता हूँ कि आप सब लोगों को यह मालूम होगा कि दिल्ली में एक इम्प्रूवमेंट ट्रस्ट (Improvement Trust) है। उस का काम यह है कि बेकार जमीन को साफ कर के इम्प्रूव (improve) करना है और उस के प्लॉट्स (plots) बना कर लोगों में तर्कसीम करना है। तर्कसीम भी जो होता है वह सिर्फ नोलाम के ज़रिये होता है। इन का नतीजा यह होता है कि जी अमीर और पैसे वाले होते हैं वह ही इन जमीनों को खरीद सकते हैं और मिडिल क्लास (middle class) के लोगों को कोई भी मौका इन जमीनों के

खरीदने का नहीं मिलता है। यह दरमियानी लोग और पिछड़े हुए लोग इन जमीनों से महकूम रह जाते हैं और उन के अपने रहने के लिये कोई जमीन नहीं मिल पाती। हम लोग आज इस सदन में बैठे हैं और इस सदन में करीब ७० और ८० फ्री सदी देहाती जनता और गरीब जनता के नुमाइन्दे हैं। हम हमेशा यह दावा करते आये हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की हुकूमत गरीब जनता के लिये होनी चाहिये। इसलिये हमें चाहिये कि जहाँ तक हो सके सब से पहिले दिल्ली में रहने वाले गरीब तबक़े के वास्ते मकान का इन्तज़ाम करें। इस के साथ ही साथ हम को यह भेदभाव भी दूर करना चाहिये कि जो प्लाट्स सिर्फ़ अमीर का मिलते हैं वह अब से यहाँ की पिछड़ी हुई जनता को भी मिलें और वह भी नीलाम का लाम उठा सकें। इस तरह से हम गरीबों को कुछ जमीन दिला सकेंगे। इन तमाम कामों को जल्दी करने की आवश्यकता है। हो सकता है कि हम एक दम इस काम को बड़े पैमाने पर न कर सकें लेकिन किस तरह से शुरू किया जाय यह तो सरकार खुद फ़ैसला कर सकती है।

इस वक़्त तुर्कमान गेट के पीछे का हिस्सा जिस की करीब तीन हजार की आबादी है, वहाँ से गरीब आदमियों को निकाल दिये जाने का फ़ैसला किया जा रहा है। उन को वहाँ से निकाल कर उस जगह पर नये प्लाट्स, सड़कें और मकान बनने वाले हैं। वह लोग कुदरती तौर पर दीड़ कर हमारे पास आते हैं और हम से कहते हैं कि हमारे साथ इन्साफ़ काजिये। इस पर हम ने कहा कि तुम लोग बेफ़िक्र रहो, अगर तुम्हारे वास्ते रहने का स्थान नहीं दिया गया तो दिल्ली की हुकूमत को रहने का क्या हक़ है ?

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : बहुत ठीक है।

श्री सी० के० नायर : इसलिये उन के लिये बाहर रहने का इन्तज़ाम अवश्य होता। वहाँ पर प्लाट्स जरूर बनें, मगर जो अपने छोटे छोटे मकानों में जो कि पुराने बादशाहों के जमाने से बने हुये हैं और वह गरीब लोग वहाँ पर वर्षों से रहते हुए आ रहे हैं अगर आप उन को वहाँ से हटाना चाहते हैं तो कम से कम उन को गूजर बसर करने के लिये जगह तो दी जानी चाहिये। उन के जो मकान ५० और ६० गज की दूरी पर हैं और बहुत छोटे बने हुए हैं उन को भी आप छीन कर उन को वे घर-बार कर रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं सरकार से दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि उन की जमीन को लेने वक़्त उन गरीब लोगों का खास ख्याल रखना चाहिये। आज दिल्ली शहर की आबादी दिन पर दिन बढ़ती चली जा रही है और मकानों का मसला बहुत ही खराब होता चला जा रहा है। अगर हमारी सरकार अभी से इस मसले की ओर ध्यान देगी तो तब वह कुछ हद तक इस मसले में कामयाब हो सकेगी।

एक फ्लैट के माने यह समझे जाय कि बेशक वह जमीन आसमान में ही क्यों न हो, लेकिन उस हिस्से पर आदमी का राइट (right) उस की ओनरशिप (ownership) मान ली जाय। अगर तीन हजार घर वहाँ से हटाये जाय और अगर हम सिर्फ़ एक हजार ही मकान वहाँ बनवा सकें तो हम उन को दो फ्लैट्स और मिला कर तीन हजार बना सकते हैं और उन तमाम गरीबों को मौक़ा दे सकते हैं। इसलिये इस प्रकार के काम के लिये मैं फिर यही दरखास्त करूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय अपने रिसर्व डिपार्टमेंट को हिदायत दें कि वह अपने रिसर्व में इस क्रिस्म की कोई भी अच्छी

[श्री सी० के० नायर]

चीज निकालें जिस से गरीबों का उपकार हो और हम उन को जवाब दे सकें।

वक्त निकलता जा रहा है। मुझे एक दो बातें और कहनी हैं, वह सप्लाई (Supply) के बारे में हैं। सप्लाई का महकमा बहुत बड़ा महकमा है, इस में कई करोड़ों की खरीद फ़रोस्त होती है, ज्यादातर खरीद होती है। मेरी इस महकमे से यह प्रार्थना है कि ज़ितनी भी खरीद हो वह हिन्दुस्तान में ही हो। कच्चा माल तो यहां से होगा ही, लेकिन जो मैन्युफ़ैक्चर्ड आर्टिकल्स (manufactured articles) हैं, उन के बारे में भी जो होम इंडस्ट्रीज (Home Industries) हैं, जो घरेलू धंधों का सामान है उस को पहले प्रैफ़रेंस (preference) देना चाहिये। जैसे कल हमारे कामर्स मिनिस्टर ने फ़रमाया था कि हमारे दिल में होम इंडस्ट्रीज के लिये सब से पहला स्थान है इसके लिये उसी तरह मैं उम्मीद रखता हूँ कि सप्लाई मंत्री भी इस पर खास ध्यान देंगे। असल में महज़ सस्ता सप्लाई हासिल करने का ही हमारा मक़सद नहीं होना चाहिये, हमारा यह मक़सद होना चाहिये कि सप्लाई से जो बितरण होने वाला धन है वह गरीब से गरीब आदमियों में बँटे और गरीब से गरीब आदमियों को उस से लाभ हो। जैसे एक गज या एक थान खादी को ही लीजिये। खादी एक ऐसी वस्तु है कि उसका एक एक पैसा रोटी के काम में जाता है, उस से घी नहीं खरीदा जाता, घी की गुंजाइश ही नहीं है। जो धुनहा रुई धुनता है और जो बुनकर कपड़ा बुनता है उसको मुश्किल से एक डेढ़ रुपया पल्ले पड़ता है और वह पैसा उन्हीं के पास रहता है। इस तरह खादी और उसी तरह जो घरेलू धंधे हैं उनकी कमाई का पैसा असली गरीब भूखे लोगों के पेट में जाता है। इसलिये

गवर्नमेंट को इस का खास ध्यान रखना चाहिये। बेशक सामान कुछ घटिया क्यों न हो, बेशक सामान कुछ ज्यादा क़ीमती क्यों न हो, लेकिन पहले हम को उन को प्रैफ़रेंस देना चाहिये और सप्लाई डिपार्टमेंट ज़रूर अपना कर्तव्य का पालन करे। इन तमाम महकमों के मंत्रियों को यह ख्याल रखना चाहिये कि हम एक वेलफ़ेयर स्टेट (Welfare State) बनाने की तैयारी कर रहे हैं, एक बहुत बड़ी क्रान्ति जिस को हम पुकार रहे थे, उस की तरफ़ यह पहला क़दम है और यह हार्जिसिंग डिपार्टमेंट उस पर खास ध्यान दे।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): Sir, I had a desire to speak on the general budget or rehabilitation budget but unfortunately I did not get a chance. Now you have given me the opportunity and I am grateful to you for that. This Ministry consists of three departments—Works, Housing and Supply. Formerly it was the Works, Mines and Power Ministry, as we all know. The Works Department has existed for a very long time and has always suffered from the evils of corruption and nepotism. Therefore, it is my earnest appeal to the hon. Minister that the research section appointed for this department should be specially instructed to find out scientific ways for the purification of this department and for changing the mentality of the contractors and others. This research would do a great deal of good to our country. Crores of rupees are being wasted under the Works Department. With a little change in the mentality of the people we can get much more work done than what we get now done with the same amount of money. But we have so far seen no change in their mentality. It has always been seen in the Works Department that whenever there is a question of reduction or retrenchment, the first victims are the poor labourers. This is not a good thing. I think that in India from the earliest times, probably from the time of Asoka or even earlier, labourers have been engaged all the year round for clearing roads or breaking stones and bricks and they have been doing this work for centuries from genera-

tion to generation. This was their work for all the twelve months but since independence they have become somewhat enlightened and have begun to think that time for their deliverance has come, that their grievances would now be heard with the coming of *Ram Rajya* and *Kisan-Majdoor Rajya*, but things have turned to be otherwise. The axe of retrenchment is first of all applied to them. Then comes the turn of overseers. When the axe of retrenchment has done its work over them, it falls over S.D.Os. and engineers. But it has often been seen that their turn comes the last and they rarely come under the axe. The thing is that they try to show their efficiency and worth and in doing so their first item of economy happens to be the retrenchment of these poor labourers. I know many such cases and the labourers thus retrenched come to us with tearful eyes. Hence I would request the hon. Minister to keep this thing in view and see to it that whenever the question of retrenchment comes up, all should be treated on an equal footing and people of all the categories should be retrenched. In fact the interest of the poor labourers should always be kept above that of others.

Then about housing. Housing was not so far made a specified subject of a Ministry. It has now been made a new subject under the new Ministry and I welcome this arrangement. Formerly, this department of work was a part of the P.W.D. But it has now been given a special place under the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply which is a very welcome change. So far the main attention in this connection has been paid to the construction of houses for big officers of the Government. Then used to come the turn of other Government houses. Today special attention is being paid to constructing houses for the purpose of rehabilitation of refugees. This was all good. But now housing has come under a special department of a Ministry and I hope the Government would turn their attention to relieve the general housing scarcity and build houses for the people on all available land.

I want to put some facts before the Government. Delhi has at present a population of above 15 lakhs. Of this, about 5½ lakhs are refugees. The rest 10 lakhs of the people are engaged in big or small pursuits. They have come from Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan or other States. If we look to their living conditions, we would find that the places they live in are very unsatisfactory and their houses

are very bad. Our Government calls this country to be a Welfare State. But if in a welfare state, the poor people could not be provided with accommodation that would be a sorrowful thing. Well-placed servicemen, businessmen and Government servants come to the Congress Office or Rehabilitation Office and request for houses. They demand houses as of right, being refugees. In many cases, I have to argue with them. I tell them that when they are getting fair salaries of Rs. 100, 200, 300, 400 or Rs. 500, why should they not live in rented houses but they insist on their provision by the Government thus putting on them unnecessary burden. But their view is different. In their capacity of being refugees, they think it is their right to get accommodation from the Government. And they are right. They have left in Pakistan houses worth crores of rupees and therefore they demand houses here. But then I tell them that they would have been provided with houses had Delhi not been so much populated, that it was not a question of a few hundred persons but of lakhs of them and it was not practically possible for the Government to make arrangements for such a large number of people. I therefore request the Government that along with rehabilitation of refugees, arrangements must also be made for sheltering the poor and homeless persons of the city itself.

Seen in the right perspective, the housing problem is not merely the problem of Delhi alone; it is the problem of the five lakh villages of India. It is a very stupendous problem. We shall have to handle it with prudence. But we must begin with the cities and particular attention should be paid to Delhi which is the capital of our country and where this problem is very acute.

As all of us are aware, there is an Improvement Trust in Delhi. Its function is to develop the waste lands and divide them into plots and give them to the people. The plots are given only through auction, with the result that only the richer class of people can purchase them while the middle class people are deprived of a chance of getting these plots. Of all of us who have assembled here, nearly 70 or 80 per cent are representatives of the villagers and the poor men. We have always claimed that the country's Government should be run in the interest of the poor. Therefore in the matter of housing we must give priority to the poorer class of Delhi. Then, we should also eliminate this method by which the well-to-do people get advantage over the poorer class in

[Shri C. K. Nair]

respect of the sale of plots. But we must take quick action. We may not be able to take up the work all at once on a big scale, but the Government themselves can decide as to how could it best be done.

At present, decision is being taken to acquire the area behind Turkman Gate. It is a locality inhabited by nearly 3000 poor persons who will be turned out from there. Naturally, they come to us and demand justice. We have to tell them that if they were not given alternative accommodation, the Delhi administration will have no right to continue.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-ghat West): Quite right.

Shri C. K. Nair: Therefore, you may divide that land into plots, but these poor people, who have been living there for generations in their small houses, must be provided with alternative accommodation. I forcefully appeal to the Government to give justice to these people whose lands are going to be taken away. The population of the city of Delhi is increasing day by day and the problem of housing is assuming a serious shape. The Government can face it successfully only if they attack the problem right now.

The main thing is the right of ownership. Therefore, if 3,000 families are dislodged from there and if we only construct 1000 houses each containing three flats with the right of ownership of each flat to one family, we can accommodate these poor persons. I would therefore once again request the hon. Minister to instruct his research section to make researches in this connection and find out something new so that the poor people may be benefited.

Time is nearing up. I have to say one or two things regarding the Ministry of Supply. Supply department is a very big department where transactions worth crores of rupees take place. Mostly they are purchases. I appeal to this Department to make all the purchase within the country. Raw materials are here already; so far as manufactured articles are concerned, preference should be given to things made by home industries. The Commerce Minister yesterday declared that he had assigned first place to the home industries. I hope the Minister of Supply will also take up the same position. In fact, our aim should not merely be to procure things at cheap rates, our aim should be a fair distributicn

of wealth by which even the poorest people may benefit. Take, for example, *Khadi*. Each pice given in purchase of *Khadi* goes to the man for his bread, his bare necessity. There is no place for butter in it. The weaver who gins the cotton and prepares the cloth hardly earns a rupee or a rupee and a half a day and that money remains with him. The same thing may be said about *Khadi* and other cottage industries. The earnings from these industries go to the poor hungry people. No doubt some of the cottage industry articles may not be of very good quality, they may not be cheap even, but we must give preference to them and the Supply Department must do its duty. All the Ministers should bear in mind that we are trying to establish a Welfare State, and are going to bring about a great revolution which has been our declared aim. This would be the first step towards that and the Housing Department must pay special attention to it.

Shri B. Das (Jajpur-Keonjhar): With the advent of the new House of the People an atom bomb fell on the former Ministry of Works, Production and Supply. It was split into two and we have got the much desired and much clamoured for Production Ministry as one of the Ministries and somehow the former Ministry has now become the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry. I am a little bit doubtful and I do not understand why Housing was put to that Ministry because it was the only Ministry that takes three departments and proclaims it from house top. Perhaps it wanted the old phonetics to continue. I congratulate both my new friends who have become Ministers of the two portfolios and I am glad both of them are new and have come with freshness of mind and have no past affection for any particular theory or particular system of working of the Government of India.

I will only say one or two words about the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply. We have heard a little criticism from my friend on the right. I have no criticism to level on the floor of this House. I ask the new Minister with his freshness of mind to read the reports of the Public Accounts Committee for the last two years. They were designed during our independence days. The Public Works Department, which is one of the biggest wasteful Departments in the Government of India, is to continue to be known as "Works". The Public Accounts Committee has recommended that the representatives of the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Works and the Auditor-

General should meet and should frame rules about placing of contracts so that the Central P.W.D. will work more honestly and will conform to the standards of financial control over expenditure and not merely appoint engineers and build buildings which do not earn even its own repairing charges. The hon. Ministers do not pay any rent. But those friends like me who pay house rent find that the rent paid does not meet the repairing charges. Of course the contractors pay some income-tax to Mr. Deshmukh but the P.W.D. Housing Factory does not pay the Centre any income-tax but at the same time it adds to the losses of the Government because maintenance cost of those houses is not derived through the rents. I was a member of the Public Accounts Committee which had stressed on almost every Ministry to frame rules for contracts. But it is my misfortune—I am here for 28 years—to find that the Government of India, whether it is the former ruling class or my own Congress Government, have not been able to frame those rules for contracts or standard contract forms either in regard to P.W.D. contracts or purchase of stores by the Supply Department. Since the days of the Second World War many defects have crept in in the Supply Department. Unfortunately we find the representatives of the Supply Ministry in foreign countries—be it in New York or be it in London—do not exercise their proper functions due to interference by Ambassadors. Now about our Ambassadors, let them be highly paid Ambassadors. It does not matter to me. Parliament is there to see that whatever money it has sanctioned is properly spent. But it was my misfortune to observe that in certain cases the Ambassadors have set at naught the functions of the Supply Missions and the India Stores Department. I hope my friend who is new to this Ministry will apply new methods to tackle these problems. *(Interruption)* This has become only a spending and wasteful Department. If correct exercise of the Minister's control is made there will be saving of crores. I will not say lakhs or thousands, but there will be saving of crores if I include all purchases of the Defence Ministry and other Ministries that are sailing under individualistic colours.

Now I come to the Production Ministry. I was asked to speak on this. It has been our objective that a Production Ministry should be created which would serve us in "War and Peace". When the second World War was over those who were responsible for wasting huge assets of India under

various disguises and for purchasing the huge war stores at 1939 prices—thereby causing the big inflation in India, saw to it that production on peace basis did not continue here in peace time. I am glad that the Production Ministry has been created. I am also glad the Minister is a man who comes from Mysore State where India achieved real production against the opposition of the suzerain power and against the opposition of many people like me and others. Well, what happened? The war was over long ago but the Defence industries have not been yet transferred to my friend, Mr. Reddy. In Jubbulpore they have got two factories. They tried to manufacture road-rollers just after the War. God alone knows what was the price of a road-roller manufactured at the Jubbulpore Defence factory. The same things happened everywhere. The Defence Ministry's factories did not turn over to peace time production. If the Government of India have come to the happy decision that we shall have a Production Ministry, and all State-owned industries shall be placed under the Minister of Production, what is the secret that separates the Production Minister and the Defence Minister, my friend, Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar? This old shibboleth of the Britishers—the hush hush policy should not be copied and imitated and stated too often in this House or outside.

[PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA
in the Chair]

My friend, the Minister of Production has got a number of industries under him. Some of them are really State industries but others are unwanted babies. I do not know how the unwanted baby—the Government Housing Factory was handed over to him. The Production Ministry perhaps does not know its antecedents. This House has reverberated with our views expressed on the failure of the housing factory. Why was that baby handed over, unless it be to please my friends on the right who are most anxious to have houses? I think my friend, Mr. Nayar, is anxious for more housing. Yes, housing there should be but it should be commensurate with our capacity and should not be undertaken to please any foreign adventurer in this country. On the other hand, there are one or two more babies. He has taken charge of the D.D.T. factory, the Penicillin factory, the Paludrine factory. These are very good industries. I think the hon. Minister's private secretary will have to buy a medical dictionary to spell penicillin, paludrine and other foreign medicine names. But they are not State industries. Of

[Shri B. Das]

course, in a moment of warmth the Prime Minister agreed to start these industries. But a Committee must be appointed to examine whether such industries can last. I care a hang if we get any help from the U.N.O. or from the W.H.O. towards building up these medical factories, but the question is will they last after ten years? Will they remain ten years after? I do not want to talk here about the Health Ministry. The Health Ministry has not encouraged indigenous national medicine industry. No *Ayurvedic*, *Unani* or *Homoeopathic* industry is advocated in India on the ground that these are not scientifically controlled—as if any imported fellow does. We know what Dr. Koenigsberger was! The man who was drawing Rs. 500 in Mysore drew here Rs. 2,500 for which, of course, my hon. friend's Ministry was not responsible. At that time my hon. friend, Mr. Gadgil would have liked to control it but it was not handed over to him—then he would have controlled its extravagance at an earlier date. And now my friend is holding the baby which Rajkumari Amrit Kaur has handed over to him.

12 Noon

The Production Ministry should aim at production. It envisages the complete co-operation of labour. I have heard my friends on the right who are more anxious for the interest of the labour community and fraternity. But they do not say produce the minimum. Let there be a committee to fix the minimum that a man must produce before he gets his minimum wages. But I have been unfortunate so far to see that sort of co-operation in my friends who sit on my right or on my left, who advocate leadership of labour. My hon. friend, Mr. Giri the other day spoke of conciliation and of labour welfare. What has happened, I do not know. I commend to him a conciliation measure, that is contained in the report of the Working Party of the Coal Industry. The report of the Committee was unanimous. There were three labour leaders on it, one of whom was a Socialist, Shri Sarang-dhar Das, who knows it well, the other two were members of the Indian National Trade Union Congress; then there were three representatives of employers and three Government representatives, and I was the odd member that was there. We have recommended in Chapter VI how conciliation can be adopted between employers and labour and how there will be no strikes. I will be very glad if my friends on the right who have come

here to improve the conditions of Indian labour read it. Well, we have placed that report before the Government and those recommendations are before them. My friend will tell us whether his Ministry has accepted the chapter on conciliation, whether his Ministry has consulted the Defence Ministry, the Labour Ministry and the Communications Ministry (Posts and Telegraphs).

Talking of the Communications Ministry, I do not understand why it should manufacture telephones. If we have created a Production Ministry and appointed a Production Minister, let all production be under that Ministry so that there will be standardisation of wages, standardisation of production; if a worker gets Rs. five he must produce so much minimum. My experience in the Coal Working Party has been that production was no concern of the workers and the labour leaders who appeared before that Committee, nor do the Members who speak in this House satisfy us that they believe in a minimum production—they talk of living wages, housing and all that, but they do not talk of production on which the prosperity of the nation will depend.

As I am on coal, I shall talk a little more about it. With my twenty-nine years of experience of the Government of India, I can say that this is the only report—a very minor and small report—on coal which has been accepted by the Government of India. A large share of it goes to the ex-Minister Shri Gadgil, and I congratulate the present Minister for accepting the major recommendations contained in the report and for giving effect to them. In this connection, I wish to voice my strong indignation at the continuance of the European employers in most of the collieries and other industries. Though the capital is Indian, they are all managed by European concerns. To my misfortune, I found that these European controlling magnates did not allow their employees to vote during the last election. They obstructed the exercise of rights of franchise, and one of these happens to be the Chairman of the Indian Mining Association who poo-hooed the report of the Coal Working Party, though unfortunately for him the Government of India have accepted that report a good deal.

I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that production must cover all spheres of any State industry. Owing to certain past legacies, the Government did not

manufacture benzol. Even in the private sector the Tatas who have established a huge coke oven factory did not start a by-products benzol manufacturing section. There is some old legacy from the Defence Ministry. Some General had ruled that any by-products that might be manufactured from coal, say, benzol, should only be made available to Burmah Shell at one anna net profit. I asked the Ministry in private to enquire into it. They consulted the Defence Ministry, and the Defence Ministry could not trace the file in order to know who that military Johnny was who compelled us to part with benzol at this low rate. My own view is that in view of the existing coke ovens in India and in view of the big one that we are going to start newly for supplying coke to the Sindri Fertilizer Factory, we should at least supply the one million gallons of petrol that is necessary for our security purposes to the Air Force. Why should benzol be sold to Burmah Shell at this rate of one anna profit? It is with that end in view that we recommended in para. 290 that the Government of India should at least reduce the cess on indigenously manufactured benzol. That does not satisfy me, although it satisfied the Committee. Why should Burmah Shell get that advantage, now that we have got two petrol refineries in contract with foreign firms—one with Burmah Shell and the other with Standard Vacuum? We should not bend down. Either we are a sovereign nation, or we are not. We should not allow Burmah Shell to exploit something that happened some time in 1925.

I want to say a word about the State Trading Corporations. This Parliament has not approved the State Corporation that has been, or is going to function at Sindri. The Public Accounts Committee has made definite and specific recommendations in this behalf, and we have suggested—and this is the practice in other nations of the world—that whenever Government wants to put the ownership of a factory under State control, Government must get legislation passed in Parliament. Whether the Auditor-General will have complete control over the accounts, or some private auditor will have it, this House should determine and not give up its authority. Of course, the Auditor-General is being charged with the audit of the accounts of all State Corporations. I know much about these State Corporations and I do not wish to take up more time. I wish only to tell the hon. Minister that I hope and trust that both he and the Economic Committee of the Cabinet will examine the proper constitutional

aspects and whatever State Corporations are brought into existence they should be brought into existence on an authorised and constitutional basis.

I have only one more thing to say. I welcome the fact that a pig iron plant will be put up in Orissa. I know it is coming and it is coming in Orissa and not in Madras as some friends wanted the other day. I therefore welcome it.

An Hon. Member: Lucky man.

Shri Raghavaiah (Ongole): Before I come to the subject proper, I would like to point out that the report of the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply reached us only yesterday. That shows how negligent the Ministry is in regard to the amount of criticism that it should expect to receive from the House—criticism which will enable it to improve its activities.

Coming to the subject proper, I would like to deal with the C.P.W.D. from the point of view of the workers. The work before this department is really very large, judging from the report that has been supplied to us. More buildings have to be constructed and more works have to be put up. The upkeep and maintenance of the existing works is another big task which requires a large number of workers. The number of workers employed in the C.P.W.D. in 1946 was 16,000. After the lapse of six years, 10,000 workers have been retrenched. Only last month 60 workers were retrenched from two circles. While retrenchment is going on at this rate the Ministry does not care to note that the upkeep and maintenance of the existing works demands a large volume of labour. It forgets that it has to tackle new works in the future. To give you an example, take the lawns of the Central Vista. The Government has defrauded the public exchequer by employing contract labour and letting the work out on contract. We all know from our experience what interest a contractor takes in any building construction. His main motive is to make money and not to look to the decent housing. Further out of the 20 per cent. marginal profit that has been left to a contractor, much of it is shared by the higher ups in the administrative machinery of this Department, while thousands of actual workers do not even get a minimum wage. Thus the workers are left to the mercy of these vultures—the contractors who ask the workers to live on starvation wages.

Then I wish to say something about the method of exploitation that is taking place in this Department.

[Shri Raghavaiah]

Supposing 20 workers are employed in some work, we find actually that ten workers are working on the spot and five will be working in the engineer's office and five will be nowhere and the wages of these five workers are drawn by the engineer. This is how the exploitation is going on. I can cite any number of cases. Suffice it to say that in this department for the present there are two cases with regard to the nature of which nobody can dare to disagree. The punishment has already been awarded but it has not been implemented. With regard to the Wells' case, it was on April 30, 1951 that the Deputy Minister of Works, Production and Supply, in reply to question No. 3635 by Pandit M. D. Upadhyay, stated in Parliament that the question whether the officials concerned with Wells' case in the Delhi Aviation Division be criminally prosecuted or not, was under Government's consideration while in the other—Hangerettes' case—departmental action was being taken against one of the officials. About one year has elapsed and no action has been taken against the delinquent officials as stated by the Deputy Minister in Parliament. On the 11th October, ex-Minister, Shri Gadgil in reply to a short notice question, No. 152 put by the hon. Shri R. K. Sidhva stated that it had been decided to take departmental action against the official—a Sub-divisional Officer—involved in Wells' and Hangerettes' cases. I ask: How is it that cases of 1942 and 1947 brought to the notice of Government in 1947 and 1948, and admitted by them to be true in 1951 were not finally disposed of till April 1952? Is it not a denial of the fundamental right of equality before law? Is it not a violation of one of the articles of the Constitution by which the Ministers along with hon. Members take their oaths before assuming office? I can cite many cases of this type but the time at my disposal is short.

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in the Havelock Square, in the Capital itself, graduates and matrics are employed for manual labour. We know very well how these people can do manual labour. They are employed for the simple reason that they happen to be the friends and relatives of the higher officers. They are employed there and they receive their wages for turning out no work. Can nepotism go further than this? There is a great need to maintain the various works. The employees of the C.P.W.D. who have completed one year of service should be

made permanent. There is the necessity to build three or four times the number of existing buildings. Secondly, as they are all Central Government employees and as the cost of living in Delhi is high, I request the hon. Minister to apply the Central Pay Commission scales relating to pension, allowances and give them the facilities of quarters etc.

As I have stated previously, if the contractors are asked to undertake the construction of houses, they will sabotage the housing scheme itself. I will just give one or two examples in this connection. I refer to the Panchmuk barracks in the city and they are not fit for human habitation. I have myself seen them. The second example is that of the C.P.W.D. employees' quarters which are on the verge of collapse. No alternative accommodation is provided for them. The third example is the housing in Kotlam. They have built two storeyed buildings and the upper storey does not receive any water at all. This is the way Government goes on with its housing scheme. I can cite any number of glaring examples, but the time does not permit me to do so.

It has already been stated in the printed report that 75 per cent. of the employees of Government have got to be provided with accommodation and this year, I think, 1300 or so are going to be provided with accommodation. The total number of houses in which the employees have got to be accommodated is 46,188 and only 18,000 are provided till now. This again shows that there is a great necessity for the employment of any number of labourers besides those who are already on work. In view of the badly needed housing accommodation and the upkeep and maintenance of buildings that have already been raised, the necessity of making the employees permanent and the employment of extra labour is there. When the situation regarding housing is such, there is a regular retrenchment. It is a strange paradox to see how retrenchment can be effected while the necessity for the employment of extra labour and making permanent the present labour employed in the housing and other schemes is there. I would also like the hon. Minister to explain this wonderful paradox with which the House is faced today.

Then I would like to draw the attention of the House to the Printing and Stationery Department. Here also there is retrenchment going on. The need for more printing and the employment of more staff is there. Just be-

cause the Second World War is over, employment does not cease to exist. On the other hand many States have merged into India and the amount of work that we have to turn out in this work of national reconstruction is great. In view of all this, the Ministry does not realize the necessity of making all the people employed in the department permanent, or at least those who have completed one year's service. It does not care about the employment of more labour, especially of classes III and IV.

Another revealing fact is that a committee has been appointed to look into retrenchment and reorganization in the Printing and Stationery Department. This committee has suggested that there should be an increase in the number of the gazetted officers. During war time it did not suggest the increase of workers—classes III and IV—even by one. Again after the war this committee suggests that there should be retrenchment in classes III and IV workers while not even a single officer has been suggested for retrenchment by this committee.

That the necessity for turning out more work in this department is there can be seen even by a blind man. Even in this case also, it is re-organisation for retrenchment and not re-organisation for turning out more work and meeting the demands of the Government and the people. In the name of economy and such other wonderful words, parliamentary phraseologies and governmental terms this retrenchment is being effected. I put a simple question: is it economy at all—not to speak of bad or good economy—to retrench workers at the cost of loss of work and at the cost of not meeting the demands of the people and the Government officials? I appeal to the hon. Minister of Works, Housing and Supply to keep in mind the one factor that retrenchment is not at all a necessity today because the amount of work that we have to turn out to meet the demands of the Government and also of the people is a thousand times greater than it was during the war or before the war. Hence, the question of retrenchment does not arise at all; on the other hand, the problem of making the employees permanent and the problem of employing more labour are there. If the Ministry entrusted with this work is trying to evade this problem, it will be doing a greater injustice, perhaps the greatest injustice, not only to the people, but also to the Government itself. I hope that the hon. Minister will certainly realise the importance and necessity of carrying out the work before the country, and stop retrenchment.

I would like to stress one main point. He has got to explain the various cases that I have cited here. If it is necessary, I will lay a copy of these cases on the Table of the House. I believe printed copies must have been received by the Ministry; if they have not been received, I am prepared to submit copies also.

One last point, Sir,.....

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. The hon. Member has already taken more than fifteen minutes.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : श्रीमान्, आज से २३२७ वर्ष पेश्वर चाणक्य से लोगों ने पूछा कि जो अर्थ शास्त्र आप ने लिखा है उस का नाम राज्य शास्त्र क्यों नहीं रखा। उन्होंने कहा कि राज्य का मूलाधार अर्थ है। जैसे कि शरीर के षट् चक्रों का मूल मूलाधार चक्र होता है उसी प्रकार राज्य का मूलाधार अर्थ होता है। अर्थ का मूल उत्पादन होता है। जब तक कोई देश उत्पादन की समस्या को अच्छी तरह से हल नहीं कर लेता तब तक वह अपनी किसी भी समस्या को हल नहीं कर पाता। इंग्लैंड ने इस प्रकार सन् १७७६ में इंडस्ट्रियल रिवाल्यूशन (Industrial revolution) के द्वारा अपनी समस्या हल की थी। आज हमारे सामने जो सब से बड़ा सवाल है वह यह है कि हम अपनी आर्थिक समस्या को कैसे हल करें। महात्मा गांधी ने जो आन्दोलन आरम्भ किया था उस आन्दोलन के दो आधार थे, एक राजनीतिक और दूसरा आर्थिक। दोनों धाराओं को साथ ले कर के वे आगे चले थे। वे राजनीतिक अंग को पूरा कर सके। हिन्दुस्तान को आजादी वे दिला सके लेकिन आर्थिक अंग वे पूरा नहीं कर सके। यह उतरदायित्व हमारे ऊपर है कि हम उस आर्थिक अंग को पूर्ण करें। इसीलिये सन् १९३१ में जब महात्मा जी ने अपना आन्दोलन आरम्भ किया तो उन्होंने उसे आर्थिक पहलू से आरम्भ किया,

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

जिस का सम्बन्ध साधारण से साधारण व्यक्तियों से होता है—अर्थात् साल्ट (नमक) । हमारे विरोधी भाई ने गवर्नमेंट की नमक नीति पर बहुत आक्षेप किये हैं । यह हमारा सौभाग्य है कि करीब एक सौ वर्षों के पश्चात् वह दिन हिन्दुस्तान में आया है कि हम ने उस में पूर्णता प्राप्त की है । पूर्णता ही नहीं प्राप्त की, बल्कि हम ने इस साल जापान को १६ लाख मन और पाकिस्तान को चार लाख मन नमक भेजा है । सन् १९५५ में हमारा उत्पादन ७ करोड़ १३ लाख मन था और सन १९५२ में हमारा अनुमान है कि ७ करोड़ ५० लाख मन नमक हमारे यहां होगा । हमें तो अपनी मिनिस्ट्री को धन्यवाद देना है कि एक सौ वर्ष के पश्चात् वह समय हिन्दुस्तान में लाई जब कि नमक की समस्या को हल करने में हम सफल हो सके । हमारे भाइयों ने तीन; कट मोशन (Cut Motions) इस नमक के बारे में दिये हैं । एक मोनोपोली (monopoly) का प्रश्न उठाया गया है कि नमक स्टेट की मोनोपोली है । जहां तक मेरा अर्थशास्त्र का अध्ययन है, मोनोपोली चार प्रकार की होती है : एक प्राकृतिक (नेचुरल), दूसरी सामाजिक (सोशल), तीसरी वैधानिक (लीगल), चौथी वालंट्री (ऐच्छिक) । प्राकृतिक मोनोपोली है जैसे चिली का सोडियम नाईट्रेट, सोशल है जैसे गैस (gas), वाटर (water) और एलेक्ट्रिसिटी (electricity), लीगल (legal) है जैसे दक्षिणी अफ्रीका में हीरा, ब्राजील का काफ़ी, वालंट्री (voluntary) मोनोपोली है जैसे अमेरिका इंगलैंड में ट्रस्ट और जमनी में कार्टेल सिस्टम (Cartel System) । लेकिन आज तो हिन्दुस्तान

के सावरेन पीपुल (sovereign people) है और नमक की इंडस्ट्री राष्ट्र की इंडस्ट्री है लिहाजा इस में मोनोपोली का प्रश्न नहीं उठता क्योंकि जो लाभ होता है वह किसी एक व्यक्ति को नहीं जाता, एक कारपोरेशन (Corporation) को नहीं जाता बल्कि उस का लाभ सारे लोग उठाते हैं ।

एक हमारे दूसरे भाई ने टैक्स (tax) के बारे में कहा है कि जहां तक टैक्स का सवाल है हमारे ऊपर से टैक्स का भार कम नहीं हुआ है । मैं उन को बतलाना चाहता हूं कि आजादी के पहले प्रत्येक व्यक्ति ३ आने ७ ४ पाई नमक टैक्स के रूप में सरकार को देता था लेकिन आज केवल ४ : ४ पाई वह टैक्स के रूप में देता है । अर्थात् आजादी के पहले एक व्यक्ति जितना टैक्स देता था आज उम का १/१० हिस्सा टैक्स के रूप में देता है । जो कट मोशन इस हाउस में मूव (move) होने वाले हैं उस का मैं उत्तर देना चाहता हूं । उन्होंने कहा है कि साल्ट के जो खेत हैं वह छोटे छोटे खेतियों को दे दिये जायें । जहां तक खेत देने का सम्बन्ध है इस का ताल्लुक तो राज्यों से है । हमारी गवर्नमेंट जो पालीसी एडाप्ट कर रही है, उस में उस की मोनोपोली है, किन्तु साथ ही साथ दूसरे लोगों को भी नमक बनाने का अधिकार दिया गया है । गवर्नमेंट ने यह किया है कि जो छोटे छोटे उत्पादक थे उन से कहा है कि आप लोग को आप-रेटिव फ़ार्म कर लें । अब मैं आप को आंकड़े दूंगा कि जो छोटे छोटे उत्पादक हैं उन्होंने सन् १९४९ में तीन लाख मन नमक पैदा किया था सन् १९५० में १३ लाख मन नमक पैदा किया था और सन् १९५१ में २५ लाख मन नमक का उत्पादन किया है, इस प्रकार

से आप देखेंगे कि जो छोटे छोटे प्राइवेट कारखाने हैं उन्होंने भी नमक का उत्पादन तीन वर्ष के अन्दर आठ गुना किया है। अब इस से अच्छी गवर्नमेंट की ओर क्या पालीसी हो सकती है।

तीसरी बात हमारे एक भाई ने सिदरी के बारे में उठाई है। इस में सन्देह नहीं कि २३ करोड़ इस में लग गये जब कि नौ करोड़ की स्कीम थी लेकिन किसी कार्य को उस के फल से, उस के परिणाम से, देखना चाहिये। दस करोड़ रुपये साल का फर्टीलाइजर पहले बाहर से आता था लेकिन आज वही दस करोड़ रुपये का फर्टीलाइजर (fertilizer) हम सिदरी में उत्पन्न कर रहे हैं। तीन वर्ष के अन्दर ३० करोड़ रुपया देश का आप बचा रहे हैं, २३ करोड़ रुपया खर्च कर के। इस से अच्छी अर्थ नीति दुनिया में और कौन सी हो सकती है कि जो १० करोड़ रुपया हिन्दुस्तान के बाहर जाता था उस रुपये की आप ने रक्षा की और आप ने कुल इनवेस्टमेंट (investment) किया २३ करोड़।

अब जहां तक उत्पादन की मिनिस्ट्री का सम्बन्ध है उसके पास केवल १४ फॅक्टरियां हैं और इन १४ फॅक्टरियों में से सिर्फ छः ऐसी हैं जो चल रही हैं और आठ ऐसी हैं जो कि अभी बन रही हैं। जैसा कि एस्टीमेट (estimate) है किसी का काम सन् ५४ में जा कर पूर्ण होगा और किसी का सन् ५३ में पूर्ण होगा। जिन्होंने कट-मोशन मूव किये हैं उन से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि यह नई मिनिस्ट्री है, अभी उत्पादन की तरफ हम ने एक कदम बढ़ाया है। अभी और हमारे पास केवल ६ फॅक्टरियां हैं। मगर इन ६ फॅक्टरियों में कोई ऐब हो तो बताइये लेकिन इधर उधर की बात तो की गई परन्तु १४ में से ६ फॅक्टरियां जो चल रही हैं उन के विषय में एक शब्द भी

नहीं कहा गया कि इन में क्या दोष है। अगर सभ लौटा करनी हो तो कांस्ट्रिक्टव समालोचना होनी चाहिये। आप को यह समझ लेना चाहिये कि देश की रक्षा जैसे सेना करती है उसी तरह से देश वालों को भोजन केवल उत्पादन से ही प्राप्त होगा, केवल कहने से ही प्राप्त नहीं होगा। हमारा आप का सब का एक कर्तव्य है कि आज हम हिन्दुस्तान में इंडस्ट्रियल रेवोल्यूशन की तरफ अपना ठोस कदम उठायें। यदि हम हिन्दुस्तान में इंडस्ट्रियल रेवोल्यूशन लाने में सफल नहीं होते तो मैं आज कहूंगा कि जो आजादी आप ने ली है उस आजादी का कोई अर्थ नहीं है।

एक बात में आप से और कहूंगा कि जहां तक प्रोडक्शन मिनिस्ट्री का सम्बन्ध है इस के जिम्मे जितनी प्रोडक्शन की चीजें हिन्दुस्तान में हैं सभी उस के अन्तर्गत आनी चाहियें। यह बात ठीक नहीं है कि १४ फॅक्टरियां तो प्रोडक्शन मिनिस्ट्री में दे दें, कुछ थोड़ी सी इंडस्ट्री (industry) के अन्तर्गत चलायें, कुछ डिफेंस (defence) के अन्तर्गत रहें। इस तरह से कोई कोऑर्डिनेशन (Co-ordination) नहीं हो सकता। अतएव हमारी यह प्रार्थना है, और सुभाव है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जहां तक प्रोडक्शन का सवाल है सब विभाग प्रोडक्शन मिनिस्ट्री के अन्तर्गत आने चाहिये।

(English translation of the above speech)

Shri Raghunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central): Sir, 2327 years ago people asked Chanakya as to why he had not called his *Arthshastra* by the name of *Rajyashastra*. He replied that the basic foundation of the State was *Arth* or finance. Just as the foundation of the *Shatchakra* of the human body is *Muladhar Chakra*, similarly the foundation of the State is *Arth* or finance and finance is based on production. Unless a country solves the problem of production satisfactorily, it cannot solve any of its problems. England solved its problems through the Industrial Revolution of 1776. The biggest

[Shri Raghunath Singh]

problem before us today is how to solve our economic problem. The movement started by Mahatma Gandhi had two aspects, political and economic. He advanced on these two fronts, but he could achieve the political objective only. He achieved independence for India, but he could not achieve the economic objective. The responsibility of completing this task devolves upon us. When Mahatma Gandhi started his movement in 1931, he started it from the economic point of view, a point of view affecting the life of even the humblest of individuals i.e., the question of salt. My friends opposite have strongly criticized the salt policy of the Government. It is our good fortune that after nearly 100 years, India has seen the day when she has become self-sufficient in respect of salt. She has become not only self-sufficient, but has this year even exported 16 lakh maunds of salt to Japan and four lakh maunds of salt to Pakistan. In 1951 our production of salt was 7 crore and 13 lakh maunds and the estimated production in 1952 is 7 crore 50 lakh maunds. Our Ministry deserves to be congratulated on the fact that it has after a hundred years ushered in a day when we have been able to tackle our salt problem successfully. Some of my friends have given notice of three cut motions in connection with salt. The question has been raised that salt is the monopoly of the State. So far as my knowledge of economics goes, monopoly is of four kinds:—1. Natural, 2. Social, 3. Legal, 4. Voluntary. Sodium Nitrate of Chile is a natural monopoly; gas, water and electricity are social monopolies; diamonds in South Africa and Coffee in Brazil are legal monopolies and the Trusts in England and America and Cartels in Germany are voluntary monopolies. But the Indian people are sovereign today and the salt industry is a national industry. Therefore the question of monopoly does not arise at all, as the profits do not go to a particular individual or to a corporation but are shared by all the people.

Another friend speaking about the taxes has said that the burden of taxation has not been lightened. I may tell him that before independence, every person had to pay to the Government Annas 3, Pies 4·7 as Salt Tax, but now one has to pay only 4·4 pies as tax i.e., only 1/10th of the previous amount. I wish to reply to the cut motions which are to be moved in this House. One of them suggests that the salt fields should be distributed among the small cultivators. So far as the distribution of fields is concerned, it is a subject

for the States to deal with. The policy adopted by our Government involves a State monopoly, but at the same time other people have also been given the right to make salt. Government has asked small producers to adopt co-operative farming. These small producers produced three lakh maunds of salt in 1949, 13 lakh maunds in 1950 and 25 lakh maunds in 1951. It will be realized that even the small private factories have increased their production eightfold in three years. No policy of the Government can be more commendable than this.

One of our friends has raised the matter of Sindri. There is no doubt that instead of costing Rs. nine crores as envisaged in the scheme, it has cost Rs. 23 crores, but every action should be judged from its results. Every year fertilizers worth Rs. 10 crores had to be imported from outside, but today we are producing the same quantity of fertilizers in the Sindri Factory. By investing a sum of Rs. 23 crores, we have saved Rs. 30 crores in three years. There can be no sounder economic policy in the world than this that the flow of Rs. ten crores out of India has been stopped by means of an investment totalling only Rs. 23 crores.

So far as the Ministry of Production is concerned, it has got only 14 factories under its control. Out of these 14 factories only six are working and the remaining eight are still under construction. According to estimates, some factories would start working in 1954 and some in 1953. I submit to the movers of the cut motions that it is a new Ministry, that it is our first step in the direction of production and that we have got only six factories at present. Let them point out the defects which they find in these six factories. They have not said a word about it. If criticism is to be made, it should be constructive criticism. It should be borne in mind that just as the country depends on the Army for its defence, similarly the people depend on production for their food. By simply making speeches one cannot get food.

Today our duty is to take effective steps in the direction of an industrial revolution in India. If we do not succeed in bringing about an industrial revolution in India, then I would say that the independence we have achieved would become meaningless. I would also suggest that all matters relating to production in India should be entrusted to the Ministry of Production. It is not proper that 14 factories should be under the Ministry of Production, a few under the

Ministry of Industry and some under the Ministry of Defence. No co-ordination will be possible in this manner. I, therefore, suggest that all work relating to production should be entrusted to the Ministry of Production.

Shri N. R. Naidu (Rajahmundry) : At the outset, I would like to say that I and some of my friends in this House, being new to politics and parliamentary life, are exactly in the same position as that of a bride facing her husband for the first time in her life and we require and deserve a delicate handling. With these words of request, I would like to say a few words on the cut motion, dealing with the production policy of Government, which is the same as the cut motion tabled by me.

It is agreed on all hands that the crying need of the hour is increased production in the industrial as well as agricultural sectors. Therefore, the creation of this new Ministry to deal with production, be it in the limited sphere of State-owned industries, is highly welcome. However, it is to be seen whether the present spasm of enthusiasm for greater production will exhaust itself in being felt or whether it will be canalised into concrete forms.

The Presidential Address which announced the birth of this new Ministry did not indicate the Government's approach to this vital problem of production. It means Government have never given thought to it. Perhaps, the idea is that providing a separate Ministry itself will solve the problem. At this rate, I am afraid, we will be adding to the joke of Switzerland having a first lord of admiralty and Nazi Germany a Minister of Justice!

Then there was the Presidential order which re-allocated the various subjects to the different Ministries. It merely stated that all industries in the public sector except those covered by other Ministries would come under the Production Ministry. This would reduce the present Ministry to almost a residual Ministry. In India today, thanks to the sea-change undergone by the Prime Minister on his assumption of power, the public sector is becoming small. We have reached a stage when it is not known whether the Government of India itself comes under the private sector or public sector, for it is widely referred to in business circles as Hindustan 15, 1952 model. It is not without justification that

Government's independence of big business is doubted. What some Congress leaders call intuition today is in reality inspiration from the big money bags. They wanted decontrol in 1947 and Government found an excuse for conceding their demand, which brought the textile mill-owners a harvest of Rs. 100 crore profit. Recently, they wanted upward revision of coarse cloth prices, and Government fixed that without even an enquiry into the alleged increase in production costs. Worse still, Government borrow their economic policy also from the Birla House. Some time ago, the *Eastern Economist* propounded the theory of rural prosperity, and thereafter, Finance Minister after Finance Minister repeated it parrot like. The same is the case with regard to labour productivity in the country. It is a bee in the capitalist bonnet that the foreign worker is more efficient than his Indian counterpart, and therefore paid better. Let me quote from the report of the Government Labour Investigation Committee, better known as the Rege Committee, in order to show that it is not correct:

"It has been fashionable for a number of years now to justify the low wage level of the Indian industrial worker on the ground of his alleged inefficiency. Numerous comparisons have been made in an attempt to suggest that an average Lancashire girl in a weaving shed does the work of six Indian operatives etc. Such opinions usually emanate from individual employers who desire to sweat their labour. In this country however very few turns and efficiency tests are taken in order to ascertain the efficiency of the worker. It must be realised the efficiency in the weaving shed of cotton mills referred to above does not depend upon the efficiency of the operatives alone, but is largely dependent also on the efficiency of the machinery, the lay-out of the plant, conditions of work, and what is most important, efficiency of the management itself."

This is the real truth behind it.

Our friend Dr. S. P. Mookerjee revealed in 1949 when he was the Industries Minister at the Centre that Rs. 400 crores were required for removing the backlog of demands accumulated in the Railways and other industries. According to the *Tata Quarterly*, in the textile industry, as much as 40 per cent. of the existing machinery is due for replacement. In the Tata Iron

[Shri N. R. Naidu]

and Steel Co., it is revealed that machinery worth Rs. 17.3 crores, out of a total of Rs. 24 crores, is due for replacement. In other words, more than 60 per cent. of the machinery is obsolete. How, then, can productivity be high?

Some of us hoped that Government would commit themselves on some of the vital issues which have a direct bearing on production, but not a word has been said about the policy. I beg to submit that production cannot be considered *in vacuo*. The price policy of the Government and the distributive machinery contemplated by Government have a considerable bearing on the subject. In the absence of a well-defined and integrated policy of control covering all those spheres of economic activity where supply and demand are in a state of disequilibrium, the best intentions of Government will only pave the way to the proverbial destination, *viz.*, hell. In the short run, a rise in prices may provide incentives to even marginal firms to increase production, but in the long run it will be to the nation's undoing. The purchasing power of the fixed income groups being limited, the industrial products will not have a market at home. Abroad, our prices being high compared to those produced in other countries, we cannot stand their competition. Thus we have the phenomenon of a glut of cloth stocks leading to closure of mills while the average cloth consumption in the country is as low as seven yards per year. Of what good is it to the common man if we tell him that our cloth production has increased so much so long as he cannot get his requirements within the limited means of his purchasing power. I suggest that a free inquiry be held into the comparatively high cost of production in this country, when labour is relatively cheaper as also the raw materials. What is the percentage of profits being made by the business magnates who are no better than speculators? How much of the production capacity of the plants is being utilised? I am told that this is the case even with our State-owned industries. In the report given to us, the production capacity of the plants is not mentioned. I would put it to the hon. Minister of Production that in the next report at least he will supply that information to the House.

Coming to the subject of State-owned industries, it is my misfortune to refer to the scandals galore which it is sickening to recall. Even before a State-owned industry or plant goes

into production, there is a scandal about it, which however does not find a mention in the reports. In the case of the Sindri fertiliser project, the largest in the east, we are told that a police inquiry is going on, several persons have already been arrested in that connection. At this rate, I am afraid that we should have a Ministry of scandals also to go along with the other Ministries.

Take the Vizagapatam shipyard. Though it was an essential defence industry, the Scindias were given monopoly rights for launching the same, in return for the high-flown publicity for some of the Congress party leaders for a long time. The Government of India paid a subvention to the Scindias on the basis of the accounts shown to them; there were open charges in the Press and elsewhere that the accounts have been manipulated so that they could get a higher Government subvention. No inquiry was ordered into this scandal. Then the Scindias said that they could not run the yard any more, and threatened to close it down. Several of the workers were also sent away without any compensation; then the Government agreed to the terms of the Scindias. Is this not blackmail? If the company concerned did not have the capacity to run such a vast National enterprise, it should not have been allowed to take up this national enterprise. Now we are told that a French firm is being approached to develop this yard. I cannot understand how we can be neutral in our foreign affairs, if our army is run by an Englishman, our shipyards by a Frenchman, and our oil refineries by Americans. There cannot be a more disgraceful transaction than the oil deal with certain American Companies. Our Prime Minister has spoken highly of the resurgence of the East and the Middle East, one of whose manifestations was the expulsion of oil imperialists from Iran. But still the Prime Minister's own Government entered into a deal with some oil companies of America, guaranteeing that the assets of the firm would not be touched for 25 years to come. Is it the idea to repeat Iran in India? How can this Government commit future Governments for 25 years to come? Do they think they will remain in undisturbed power for the next two decades, especially with such policies as they have? If they think so, they must be very optimistic indeed.

Before I resume my seat, I wish to point out again that without a clear-cut policy, increased production

will not result from the new Ministry. It must be remembered that the price policy and the labour policy of the Government determine to a large extent the production trends.

An Hon. Member: Will the hon. Member read in such a way that we can follow?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has already finished his speech.

An Hon. Member: There was a ruling some time back by the Deputy-Speaker about reading of notes.

Shri G. R. Damodaran (Pollachi): Just like the previous speaker, I am also new to both the politics and the parliamentary life. I did not think that I would be given opportunity to speak today. I was waiting from about half past ten, and when I had the pleasure of seeing you, you told me that I would not get an opportunity. So I was just now about to pack off and leave the House. I am very glad that you have given me an opportunity to take part in the debate today. The subject which I propose to deal with is production. I stand here to pay credit to Government for the very good work done by them in having started these Government concerns and factories.

Among these most important industries, one of them which is going to be of the greatest service to the progress and the development of our country is the machine tools factory that is going into production very soon. The machine tool industry is one of the most important industries for any progressive nation, either in peace or in war time. It is the machine tool industry, the plank on which the industrialisation of the country depends. Hence, it is a very right step that our Government have taken to start this factory to produce machinery etc. which in turn will help us to build and develop all the industries in our country and help raise the standard of living in our country. While we are starting this factory, there seems to be some doubt as to the need for us to go and get foreign help or foreign aid? Because of the unfortunate past history of ours, we have been left behind in the development of science and technology. Therefore, there is no harm at all when we take help from those advanced and progressive nations of the world in trying to start industries to help the progress of our country. I may also point out here that the very countries—with whom our hon. Members from the Opposition are very anxious that we should have better relations, and whom they are

anxious that we should ask for help—when they had their own five year plan, to put through their huge power development and irrigation schemes, had the help of America and England. Therefore, I do not see that there is any harm at all in these days, when we are having the machine tool industry. Without machine tools, we are hampered very much, we have to depend on foreign countries for the supply of machine tools for almost all our industries, and we have to spend our foreign exchange in importing machine tools. It is a great saving of time and energy if we take help from people who are already advanced in the manufacture and development of machine tools and industry.

Another important factory is the penicillin factory near Poona. Penicillin, sulpha drugs and anti-malarial drugs can take care of nearly three-fourths of the major illnesses prevalent in India. There again, our hon. friend just now mentioned that he was not interested in the aid that we are getting in starting this factory, from the World Health Organisation and the UNECAFE. After all, they are all international organisations. They are giving us help. I do not see why this help should be refused.

Another factory which we propose to have is the telephone cable factory to make cables for telephones etc. This is also one of the most important factories. We can manufacture our own cables instead of spending an enormous amount of foreign exchange for the development of our communications. Also, we could provide employment for our technicians, we could provide employment to our engineers, and at the same time we could also produce exactly the necessary types and kinds of cables that we need in our country and thus save the foreign exchange.

While I am on this point I would like to offer a suggestion to the Ministry concerned, that while there is a factory to manufacture telephone cables, the same factory might as well be expanded to manufacture cables for transmission and distribution of electric power in our country. We are having in our Five Year Plan many schemes for the development of electric power and supply and hence the same factory, I am sure, will be very useful if we consider expanding it also to manufacture cables for transmission and distribution of power.

Shri Velayudhan: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member is speaking from the Treasury Benches. The Prime Minister is also there.

Mr. Chairman: In the interest of audibility I have asked the hon. Member to speak from this place. There is no point of order involved. The hon. Member may continue his speech.

Shri G. R. Damodaran: The most important of the new factories that they are going to have is the pig iron plant. Everybody knows that there is a shortage of pig iron in our country which in turn hampers the expansion and development of engineering industries. Our estimated demand is about 600,000 tons. To bridge a gap of 250,000 tons a year between the supply and demand, the establishment of a new pig iron plant has been considered as a matter of great urgency. For this no indigenous private capital is coming forward; therefore it has been found necessary to invite foreign capital to participate in this undertaking.

While on this point I would like to suggest that Government also take into consideration the starting of a factory to make heavy electrical equipment for our expansion and development programme. Electrical equipments like turbo-generators, alternators etc. will be needed in large quantities. For a factory to manufacture these, we need, of course, help and assistance from some of the progressive countries of the west like America. But a factory of this kind will be helpful in developing the electrical industry in our country, providing employment to technicians and engineers in our country and at the same time supplying the huge quantity of machinery and equipment that is needed for the rehabilitation and reconditioning of our power generating stations which are going to be numerous in our country.

There was a reference made in the hon. the Finance Minister's speech the other day about a national machinery manufacturing concern. I do not know what the reference was about, but I would like to know sometime exactly what this national machinery manufacturing concern is.

Coming down to the south everybody knows that there has been a power cut recently. It is a recurring factor every year. Due to the vagaries of the monsoon, a power cut of 50 per cent. has been enforced in South India and but for the very good answer by God and forces of nature to the prayers of our Chief Minister, Rajaji, it would have been necessary perhaps for us to close down all the factories with a 100 per cent. cut.

I P. M.

In regard to power development schemes in India, I wish to suggest that the lignite mines in South Arcot district of Madras Presidency has to be taken into consideration for extraction and development of lignite as soon as possible. As a result of it, it will be very easy to start thermal power stations there immediately and it might help in tiding over the power shortage that exists in South India. It might also relieve unemployment. I would, therefore, request the Ministry concerned to take into consideration the starting of this thermal station and the development and extraction of lignite mines in South India as soon as possible, and if possible, treat it as an emergency matter, because every year we have this power shortage in South India and unless the monsoon keeps up its prestige there is unemployment, the production goes down and the whole economy of the country is upset.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Thursday, the 19th June, 1952.