

[Shri Warior]

locational distribution suggested by the States Re-organisation Commission has been ignored completely, as far as my State is concerned. The State is giving aid to certain industries whose produce are necessary for the whole of India. In case those industries are closed down, we have to import them and spend so much of foreign exchange. When the State Government comes to the aid of those industries, the Central Government, the Planning Commission, the Registrar of Companies, the Reserve Bank and all of them come in and say, "You should not go for their aid because that particular industry is not within the sphere of the Plan." The industry is one of the most important chemical industries in India.

Then about the rubber industry. Three licences were given of which two are operating outside the State. 90% of the rubber is produced in Kerala. Of course, one licence was given to a man in Kerala knowing fully well that he has no funds to run it.

Then about the lemon grass oil, you know that it is produced in Kerala. The new factory is set up in Poona. How much will transportation of rubber and lemon grass oil and other raw materials from Kerala to other areas cost? I do not mind others getting some industries but in cases where the raw material is there. The question of transport has also to be considered. All these things are transported by the railways which are always crowded and wagons are always difficult to get. These industries are denied to that State.

About the ship-building yard, I would like to say that it is still hanging fire. We do not have any assurance. We do not know where we are. The expansion of Travancore Minerals and their getting the quota of ferrous and non-ferrous metals is another point that I would like to refer to. I know there are certain smithies and

blacksmiths shops in Kerala who alone in the whole of India produce certain parts of machinery which otherwise we have to import. Let the Government take cognisance of these facts and come to some conclusion about the disparity that is there in our State.

16.47 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):
Sir, I beg to present the Thirty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

16.48 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—contd.

Mr. Chairman: Shri Ansar Harvani.
After him I will call Shri Khadilkar.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Fatehpur):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, I join my hon. friends, Shri Kasiwal and Shri Joachim Alva in thanking the President for his Address. But at the very outset I want to draw the attention of this House towards the pathetic food condition in my State of Uttar Pradesh. The recent *Padayatra* that I performed in my constituency, which is just in the neighbourhood of the constituency of our great Prime Minister, has filled me with deepest pathos with disgust and shame. Most of the people in those areas are going with one meal a day. Most of the people in those areas are on the verge of starvation and if immediately some relief is not rushed to Uttar Pradesh, I am afraid that those hands which were raised to vote for us may be paralysed due to malnutrition.

In the year 1952 on the 2nd of October when our great Prime Minister, only a few miles away from this House in the rural areas in the District of Delhi, had inaugurated the

community projects scheme we thought that a new heaven and a new earth will be created in the course of five years. But seven years have passed and I want the hon. Members of this House to visit the various community project areas. What they will find is that production of food has not gone up appreciably. What they will find in those areas is that certain buildings have been built. They will find bungalows for the project executive officers. They will find accommodation for the village level workers. They will find machinery and accommodation for the workers and for the officers of the project areas but when they will visit the fields, when they will go to the khets, they will find that hardly any effort has been made to increase the production of food. In fact, from beginning to end they have mostly been show pieces. India does not want show pieces. India needs results. I am sure that that was the intention of our great Prime Minister when he inaugurated them, but his dream today has not been realised. The time has come when, with the help of Parliament and the people, we should be able to realise the dream of our great Prime Minister.

Recently, much has been talked about co-operatives. The Nagpur Resolution of the Indian National Congress about co-operatives is a revolutionary step, but a revolutionary step needs a revolutionary apparatus. And what apparatus have we created or are we going to create for furthering the co-operatives. On that much depends. If we still depend on the outmoded co-operative laws that exist in this country, if we still depend on the registrars of co-operatives who head the co-operative departments in the various States and the staff of the co-operative departments which is working in the various States, I am afraid that the dream that co-operatives is in the mind of our great Prime Minister will not be realised.

There are some people who have been criticising our resolution on co-

operatives. They have been from the very beginning giving the threat that it will be a failure. Some of them talk about the attachment of the peasantry to the land, but I want to tell them that the peasant is not so much attached to the land as they think. The moment he finds that he can make a few rupees more elsewhere than he can make on his land, then he leaves his land and migrates to big cities to work in the ordnance and other factories, and his attachment to the lands ends. Therefore, that is not much of a consideration. But the co-operatives can be only successful if we appoint a commission which suggests drastic changes in the existing co-operative laws. If the co-operative laws as they are today continue and if the Registrar of Co-operative Societies functions as the Czar of the co-operatives, I am sure the dream about co-operatives will fail.

There is one point about the newspaper industry in this country. There was a time when the newspapers in this country used to have a mission. There was a time when newspapers in this country used to function with a mission and help the national struggle. But today the complex has changed. While the newspapers in eastern Europe as well as in western Europe are glorifying the efforts of our great Prime Minister, and they still consider that his prestige is very high, I am afraid the attitude of the press in this country has changed. Ever since our Prime Minister took drastic steps to implement the Karachi Resolution, the Lahore Resolution, the Avadi Resolution, the Hyderabad Resolution and the Nagpur Resolution, the big business has become jittery, and the press which is a handmaid of these people in this country is coming out with criticism of our Prime Minister. We welcome that criticism. Liberty of the press is dear to us, but the basis of criticism has been shameful.

Then there has been another type of press. That is not the handmaid of

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

big capitalists. That is the handmaid of some individuals who want to live on the lower instincts of the people by calculated sensationalism, giving out sensational news. They do not care for the verification of the news; all that they care is that it should be sensational. And they also find the Prime Minister an interesting subject for their sensationalism. And that should be deplored, and it should be the duty of this House, of Parliament, and of the people to discourage these trends in the press.

There is another thing about the press. We know that the Working Journalists Act was passed and the dispute was referred to the Wage Board. The dispute is still there. But before the dispute is settled, before the Wage Board comes up with its report, the press barons are busy sabotaging all that is to be done. We have got the example of the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* of Calcutta, an institution which was built up by the late Motilal Ghosh for the freedom of this country, an institution which was made not for profit-making, an institution which was built up with the patriotism of the people, which has now fallen into the hands of profiteers. Under the pretext of not making profits, they have closed down the Allahabad edition of the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* as well as the *Amrita Patrika*.

16.54½ hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I hope and trust that our great Prime Minister and his Government will take notice of it and will come to the rescue of the workers of these papers.

The owners of the *Bombay Chronicle* are doing the same. Then there is the great institution in Calcutta, the *Anand Bazar Patrika*. One fine morning it issues a notice of suspension to a Member of this very House of Parliament who was the editor of that paper for 25 years, I mean Shri

C. K. Bhattacharya. He was told he could not continue any more, and after ten days a lie appears in the paper stating that henceforth it would be edited by the proprietor. We should see that in an Indian paper every day a lie is not perpetuated that that paper is edited by the owner. Either there should be no name, or the name should be of the people who really run the press. I have said enough about these things.

I would say just one more thing, and I have done, and that is about Jammu and Kashmir. Our heart bleeds for the people who are on that side of the border. Our heart bleeds for countrymen of occupied Kashmir who are groaning under the iron heel of the military regime, who are groaning under the iron heel of gangsterism. We should send our greetings from here to those countrymen of ours, and I wish our President had sent his greetings to them and assured them that the time was fast approaching when they will be liberated, and they will be all a part and parcel of India.

Shri Khadiikar (Ahmednagar): I would like, at the fag end of this debate, and within the short time at my disposal, to touch a few points which need further discussion. But, before coming to specific points, I would like to make one general observation regarding the President's Address. There is one merit in the speech that is, it really or truly reflects the complacent attitude of the ruling party to the policies as well as their implementation; but it utterly lacks the urgency, the vigour and vitality that would give some sense to the people that Government are determined to go ahead with certain policies. Instead of following the British Crown in this aspect and delivering an Address of a formal nature, I would like that the following suggestion may be considered. Let the Address be a little more analytical and self-critical. After all, those who are occupying high positions are

human beings. They are bound to act, and, therefore, there would be a better Address, and the issues before the country and other things would be better discussed, if we know where Government have gone wrong, what the situation was in which they acted in a particular way, whether they ought to have acted in a different way and so on.

With this preliminary observation, I would like to devote some time to draw the attention of the House to what Shri M. R. Masani has said, because though it is not directly mentioned in the Address, yet it is there at the background; I mean the Nagpur resolution. When Shri M. R. Masani approached the Nagpur resolution, he created a sort of bogey of collectivisation coming through the back-door in this country. I was surprised to find that many Members sitting opposite, and belonging to the ruling party showed admiration; some of them had the courage to show it openly, as Shri Ranga.

An Hon. Member: Quite natural.

Shri Khadlikar: Others showed sneaking admiration saying 'Well done, you have spoken well, our mouths are gagged', while yet others showed halfhearted support.

I am puzzled by this, because if you analyse the Nagpur resolution you will find that it is essentially based, as I understand it, on the Second Plan. What has been stated in the Second Plan has been incorporated as an objective in the Nagpur resolution; it is nothing more and nothing less.

But, unfortunately, Shri M. R. Masani is afflicted with some sort of fear complex. Therefore, he has given quotations from several countries like Poland and Yugoslavia, China and Russia, suggesting, 'Look here, if you go this way, there is doom', and ultimately he threatened that there will be civil war and bloodshed. In his support, he also quoted big names, names like Rajaji, Shri K. M. Munshi,

and last but not least Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan.

17. hrs.

I was surprised. Masani is high intellectual; he has an analytical mind. He ought to have understood what is the problem behind all this. It is not simply introducing a few co-operatives. It is giving a new perspective. Are we going to maintain the economic and political stagnation in the rural areas and think of building an industrial society? It was well observed by Trotsky once that the 'peasant is the pack horse of civilisation.' If it was true about Russia of those days, it is much more true after the seventh year of planning in this country that in this country the peasant is the pack horse of our civilisation and unless we take some bold steps to change the rural atmosphere, there is no chance—not even the ghost of a chance—of not only our plans succeeding—for which he has great solicitude—but of even democracy taking roots at the village level.

Therefore, I would like to say this much. He has quoted the instances of Poland and Yugoslavia. So far as these countries are concerned, I will quote a British authority, not a Russian authority, as to why they had to do de-collectivisation, and why Poland had to take this course. Anne Martin, who has deeply studied this problem, observes in her latest Publication *Economics and Agriculture*:

"One of the great difficulties has been that the industrialisation programmes in these countries have not been as effective as was hoped in drawing surplus labour off the land".

That was one of the reasons so far as Yugoslavia was concerned. She has discussed all this in detail and it is worth study. She says:

"The decision is being taken partly because of the relative inefficiency of these farms and partly because of rising unemployment in the towns which is

[Shri Khadulkar]
causing a migration of labour
back to agriculture"

This shows there was certainly a typical employment imbalance because certain targets set before the plan could not be achieved in one case or the other and they had to do it

Shri Masani also mentioned China and the communes, the latest development I would like to refer him to the latest publication of an Australian professor, Fitzgerald, who had recently gone there. It is entitled *Flood tide in China*. In this, he has summed up the whole position and he says that after six years China has made such tremendous advance in agriculture unrecognisable in every sense, which nobody expected.

But leave aside this professor. Another fellow traveller of Shri Masani, Dr Crossman, a British Labour MP has recently reported in *Statesman*. What has he got to report? He has said that by following this policy definitely, China has added to her food production very immensely. Of course, he has something critical to say about the communes.

Therefore, what has been aimed at must be properly understood. What is the social objective behind the Nagpur Resolution? To my understanding, so far as this Resolution is concerned, instead of creating this bogey of collectivisation and what not, it is a simple proposition. We want a three-tier system in the villages, there will be family holdings with sturdy peasantry, there will be co-operative joint production and there will be community holdings. These things are stated in the Second Five Year Plan. I am not saying something which has not been stated. I do not want to quote because it would absorb my time. Therefore, regarding production, I will mention one point and finish with this aspect of the problem.

As regards production he said something. In his opinion production declines. Of course, one can make

a jugglery with figures. He could not show that though agricultural production has failed to keep pace with industrial production—that is bound to happen in a developing economy—China and Russia are short of food or are importing food from outside. That is one thing.

So far as figures are concerned, I would like to quote another American authority—*Chinese Economy* by Solomon Adler. It is a recent publication. He has given some most authenticated figures about China, prior to the revolution and since the revolution. But, I will confine myself to what happened after 1950. In 1950 production was 130 million metric tons and in 1955 it is 184 million tons. He says it was 71 per cent increase at that level and now it is 1.52. If we take these figures, the case built up with the help of logic and with the help of his analytical mind and all the figures, topples to the ground. I am sorry he is not here, or even Prof Ranga.

Once upon a time in 1934, while we were in the Congress together, we I mean Prof Ranga and myself were the founder members of the Kisan Sabha. I am surprised at his attitude now. He looks at Kisans as Trotsky said earlier. He wants to build up our civilisation as Trotsky had said. The peasant will remain the pack horse of our civilisation. His burdens will not be removed, he will not be liberated.

Therefore, I must make one final observation about this. As Lord Aton has said, the bonds of class are stronger than nationality. It is a very wise observation. In this case, I feel the bonds of Prof Ranga and others with the conservative feudal remnants of this country are much stronger, and a man who has associated himself with highly industrialised circles does not see that unless we change the social pattern in the villages, no economic advancement or industrial advancement in the public sector or even in the private sector can even be visualised.

With these observations regarding this topic, I would like to touch briefly on one or two points. There was a suggestion thrown by my hon friend, the senior leader on this side, Acharya Kripalani regarding National Government. I fail to understand that it was good to talk of co-operation from all parties as it was given expression to by the new Congress President on the floor of the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: On the floor of the House?

Shri Khadilkar: No, I am sorry, she said it outside, but it was echoed by the Prime Minister.

But before approaching this question of National Government we must give thought to the crisis, the crisis of the Congress or political life in this country, that is basically the crisis of organisation. As we know the Congress holds together many groups. Is there one unity of purpose, or unity of thought in the ruling party? There is none. Who can join hands with whom? This is a problem. Therefore, I cannot take that suggestion very seriously.

Shri A. M. Thomas Independents

Shri Khadilkar: Then there is another question, a burning topic. Fortunately, our Prime Minister is here. There is a small dispute regarding some border going on between Mysore and Bombay. Satyagraha is being offered, no tax campaign is being planned. I would ask this House that if there are conflicts between one region and another, is it not the duty of this House to send someone to the border and find out the situation as to who is right and who is wrong? We send emissaries to International Fact Finding Commissions. Why not get hold of the map and after the presentation of a report by somebody, settle this matter here, and appeal to the people who are agitated that justice is not being done or delayed, to stop the agitation? I fail to understand why on such issues this House should not act

338 (AI) L.S.D.—8

Therefore, I would appeal to the Prime Minister to put an end to the agitation. It is the responsibility of the Home Ministry. The Home Minister deputed someone with authority, Shri Jatti is a new man to politics and has been shot up to the Chief Ministership. I have nothing to say about that. But he is unreasonable on all accounts. But let us leave apart who is unreasonable or reasonable. Ascertain judicially what is the position and place a report before the House and settle the matter here.

You say that people should not take things into their hands. On a former occasion, one of our Congress leaders said in this House that they would decide certain issues on the streets of Bombay, or possibly on the streets of Ahmedabad. What is the position? Unfortunately, I hold in high esteem and reverence the new entrant to the Congress-fold in this House—Dr Aney. But on this occasion, it is my misfortune to say something but I have got to say it for the sake of truth. He is learned and a Sanskrit scholar or Pandit.

वृद्धास्तेन विचारणाय यदिति

This is an old Sanskrit saying

If I can apply that, I should ignore him. He did not offer a solution, he did not treat it as a national problem. What are the wishes of the people of Maharashtra? What are the wishes of the people of Gujarat? He did not try to understand that. He is not in a position to do that, physically he is not capable of that. With all that, he takes up the cudgels and says if you want to reconsider this issue, then Vidarbha should be separated or if not then some four States should come in. I fail to understand.

I appeal to this House again. You have taken a decision. This House takes good decisions as well as bad and wrong decisions. You revise them. If you want to get that respect and immediate response from the people that this is a sovereign body, this House has a right to take the initiative. This problem has been hanging

[Shri Khadilkar]

fire for a long time. People's energies are diverted in opposite directions when you should seek their co-operation for development. Why not say you would move in the matter at proper time. Why not give an assurance that this problem will be settled here so that the people will not be forced in desperation to take action and will not have to go to the streets to settle it whether it be Ahmedabad or Bombay. You, as sovereign body in this country, must give this assurance to the people of Bombay and the people of Gujarat. When it was settled, certain vindictive attitude of a section must have influenced the decision. I do not want to go into the past history but the decisions were vitiated and the conscience of the Congress High Command was not clear or clean. About that, I am sure I do not want to attribute motives. It is for this House to take the initiative and reassure the people and say: here we are; why do you take the law into your hands and why do you waste your energy on this matter when there are urgent tasks? Therefore, I would again appeal to this House and our Prime Minister not to keep this problem for very long waiting for a solution.

One final word and I have done. Regarding co-operation, my humble submission is this. If you want to develop this country, you will have to seek the co-operation from all sections. But what do we find? It must be built up from village level to the top. We boast of a planned economy. We have got a Finance Minister and a Food Minister. In any other country which has undertaken such a gigantic Plan of development, taxing people, when there are no violent fluctuations of prices of the necessities of life. The Ministers responsible for this state of affairs would not remain in their position for a day. There is a chronic shortage of things affecting the living standards of the people. There is always a chronic threats of corrosion. There is specula-

tion and hoarding. Unfortunately, from past history, there is a patent allergy to controls in the ruling party that lands us in this deplorable condition. Are we going to tolerate this? You say, "Come on: You join". I would humbly appeal to you to take serious note of it and devise remedies forthwith, taking your appeals for Co-operation in seriousness. Once I had made suggestion in writing to the Chief Minister of Bombay: why not call our M.Ps. though unfortunately many of them belong to this side to consider issues on planning and development. Let them sit together for a discussion and let them chalk out a policy. But there was no reply. No implementation.

You talk of co-operation. I would say that unless you enlist the co-operation of the people, their active participation, in everything, from every section of opinion, whatever plans and whatever total investments and collections you make they are not going to achieve the objective. Therefore, I would humbly appeal, in the end, to the Prime Minister to take initiative in this matter. Enlist the support from the village level, at every stage, and then alone your big decisions, revolutionary decisions, in a sense, in our stagnant society where we want to make rapid advances will be possible of implementation.

With these words, I resume my seat.

श्री मूलचन्द्र कुर्वे (फर्रुखाबाद) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे माननीय मित्र श्री कासलीवाल ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है और जिसका अनुमोदन भी किया गया है, उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ।

इस वाद-विवाद में बहुत सी ऐसी बातें कही गई हैं, जो कि नहीं कही जानी चाहियें थीं। कायदे को अगर हम देखें तो पता चलेगा कि उन बातों का यहाँ बाढ़ा जगह:

ठीक नहीं है। मैं आपकी सभ्यजह् पार्टिकल २७ विम्न २ की तरफ बिलाना चाहता हूँ और साथ ही साथ स्स आफ प्रोसीवर एंड कंजक्ट आफ जिनेस की तरफ बिलाना चाहता हूँ जहां पर यह साफ तौर से लिखा हुआ है कि उन्हीं बातों पर बहस हो सकती है जो बातें कि प्रेजिडेंट साहब के एड्रेस में हैं और उन बातों पर, जिनका जिक्र एड्रेस में नहीं है, जिक्र नहीं माना चाहिये। बहर-हाल आपने कुछ छूट दे दी जिसकी बजह के ये बातें यहां उठायी गईं और इस तरह से बहुत सा समय नष्ट हुआ और यह समय दूसरे कामों में लगाया जा सकता था।

जो जो बातें यहां कही गईं हैं उन पर मैं थोड़ा थोड़ा कहना चाहूंगा। पहली बात जो बार बार आपके सामने आरं- है और लोक-सभा के भाननीय सदस्यों के सामने रखी गई है वह बम्बई, संयुक्त महाराष्ट्र और महाराजरात के बारे में कही गई है। आज की भारत की स्थिति और दुनिया की स्थिति को अगर हम देखें तो हमको पता चलेगा कि सबसे जरूरी बात जो है वह आपस में यूनियटी की और आपस में एके की है। गुजराती और महाराष्ट्री जो हजारों बरस से साथ-साथ रहते चले आ रहे हैं, आज मालूम ऐसा होता है कि एक दूसरे की शकल देखना नहीं चाहते, एक दूसरे को बरदा त नहीं कर सकता है, एक दूसरे के साथ नहीं रह सकता है। अगर इस तरह की भावना चलती रही तो मैं समझता हूँ जो डेमोक्रेटिक इंस्टीट्यूशन है वे चल नहीं सकती है। जब पार्लियामेंट ने एक मसले को तय कर दिया तो उसको बार बार उठाना मुनासिब नहीं है। जब तक पार्लियामेंट ने तय नहीं किया था उस वक्त तक तो इस सवाल को उठाना मुनासिब था लेकिन जब पार्लियामेंट ने एक बात एक दफा तय कर दी तब डेमोक्रेटिक उपूल का यह तकाबा है कि उस बात को माल लिया जाये।

सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि जो भी कदम प्राजकल के जमाने में उठाया जाये, उसको उठाने से पहले यह सोच लिया जाय कि भाया यह कदम उठाना मुनासिब है या नहीं है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे गुजराती हों, चाहे महाराष्ट्री हों, चाहे पंजाबी हों और चाहे मद्रासी हों, सभी को हमेशा यह सोच लेना चाहिये कि उनका जो कदम है वह देश की एकता को कायम रखने में सहायक सिद्ध होगा या नहीं और अगर नहीं होगा तो उस कदम को नहीं उठाना चाहिये। हमको सोच लेना चाहिये कि क्या हम देश की एकता कायम रखना चाहते हैं या देश के टुकड़े टुकड़े करना चाहते हैं, भाया यह कदम एक इंसान को दूसरे इंसान से भलग करेगा या इस इंसान को दूसरे इंसान के नजदीक साने में सहायक होगा। जो कदम एक इंसान को दूसरे से मिलाता हो वह कदम तो उठाया जाना चाहिये लेकिन जो एक को दूसरे से दूर ले जाता हो उसको उठाना मुनासिब नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बात हमेशा हर एक इंसान को, हर एक मेम्बर साहब को और हर एक भारतवासी को अपने सामने रखनी चाहिये। मैं मद्रासियों से, महाराष्ट्रियों से, पंजाबियों से, गुजरातियों से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि जो काम वे करें, उसको करने से पहले सोच लें कि कि भाया उससे इंसान इंसान के नजदीक आता है या इंसान इंसान से भलग होता है। अगर इंसान इंसान से भलग होता है किसी काम से तो वह काम देश के हित में नहीं है और किसी भी तरह से न उस काम को उठाना चाहिये और न करना चाहिये। जहां तक बम्बई, गुजरात और महाराष्ट्र का सवाल है, उसके बारे में मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

दूसरा मसला, जिसके बारे में इस सभा में बहुत ज्यादा बहस हुई वह कुराक का मसला है। उसके बारे में भी बहुत सी बातें कही गईं। गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर इल्जाम

[श्री मूलचन्द्र दुबे]

सगया गया कि गवर्नमेंट ने क्वांटि पदाओं को पूरी तौर पर पहुंचाने का इत्तजाम नहीं किया उनकी कीमतें बराबर बढ़ती जा रही हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके लिये तो अपोजीशन पार्टीज ही जिम्मेदार है। उनकी कीमतों के बढ़ने में गवर्नमेंट का कोई भी कुसूर नहीं है। उसमें सारा कुसूर या तो कुदरत का है या फिर अपोजीशन पार्टीज का है। इस सम्बन्ध में जो भी आंकड़े दिये गये हैं जरा उन पर ध्यान दिया जाये। सन् १९५२-५३ में हमारे सामने जो आंकड़े थे उनसे मालूम होता है कि उस समय ५३ मिलियन टन गल्ला था। कंट्रोल हटने के बाद ५३ मिलियन टन गल्ला हिन्दुस्तान भर के खाने के लिये दिया गया। उस समय कीमतें नहीं बढ़ीं और किसी किलम को दिक्कत पैदा नहीं हुई। उसके अगले साल ६८ मिलियन टन गल्ला पैदा हुआ और उनके भी अगले साल ६३ मिलियन टन गल्ला पैदा हुआ। अगर ५३ मिलियन टन गल्ला देश भर के खाने के लिये काफी हो सकता था तो कोई बजह नहीं है कि ६३ मिलियन टन गल्ला देश के खिलाने के लिये काफी न हो। यह कहना कि अल्ले की कमी थी उस वक़्त, यह मैं समझता हूँ कि गलत बात है। यह बात जरूर हो सकती है कि बाज बाज प्रदेशों में कहीं सूखा पड़ गया, कहीं पानी ज्यादा बरस गया और उसकी वजह से फसल का नुकसान हुआ। लेकिन जहाँ पर नुकसान हुआ वहाँ अपोजीशन पार्टीज ने बैलट बाक्स की तरफ नजर रख कर, चुनाव का खयाल करके, यह कहना शुरू कर दिया कि खाने की कमी है। बावजूद गवर्नमेंट के इस कहने के कि हम सब को भ्रष्टी तरह से खिला सकते हैं, वह एजिटेशन कायम रहा। कहीं पर हड़तालें हुईं, कहीं कुछ हुआ, कहीं कुछ हुआ। अब जो सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि आखिर कीमतें क्यों बढ़ीं, तो उसके बारे में मुझे सिर्फ इतना ही अर्थ करना है कि आप यम रखें कि जब हमने ब्रेकिंग फाइनैन्सिय की,

फाइनैन्सियल से मजूरी ले कर, तो जब बकल किसी ते मी उस पर एक्जराज नहीं किया कि यह क्यों किया जा रहा है। जब ब्रेकिंग फाइनैन्सिय होती है और फसल खराब होती है तो कीमतों का बढ़ना लाजिमी है। अगर यह बात वातावरण में फैला दी जाये, यह जाहिर किया जाय कि खाने की कमी है या किसी दूसरी चीज की कमी है तो इस चीज की कमी कही जायेगी उसी चीज की कीमत बढ़ती जायेगी। यहाँ पर यह भी याद रखने की जरूरत है कि जहाँ पर अल्ले या गेहूँ और चावल की कीमत इतनी बढ़ी है वहाँ दूसरी चीजों की कीमत नहीं बढ़ी है। यह केवल उस वजह से कि उन चीजों की कमी के बारे में कोई आन्दोलन नहीं हुआ, किसी ने यह नहीं कहा कि उन चीजों की कमी है जब कि गेहूँ और चावल के बारे में बहुत ज्यादा शोर मचाया गया। नतीजा यह हुआ कि जिन लोगों के पास गल्ला था चाहे थोड़ा हो या बहुत हो, चाहे किसान के पास हो चाहे रोजगारी के पास हो, सब ने उसे रोक रखा और उसकी वजह से कीमतें बढ़ीं। तो इस तरह से कीमतों के बढ़ने की जिम्मेदारी जैसा मैंने शुरू में ही अर्थ किया अपोजीशन पार्टीज पर है ही दूसरों पर नहीं। गवर्नमेंट के ऊपर इसकी जिम्मेदारी डालना गलत बात है और यह एजिटेशन बेकार पैदा हो रहा है। यह तो रही खुराक की बात।

दूसरी बात जो मैं थोड़े समय में कहना चाहता था वह कोम्पारेटिव फामिग के बारे में है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान की आबादी ५० लाख सालाना के हिसाब से बढ़ रही है और ३०, ४० या ५० सालों में एक जमाना ऐसा आ सकता है कि अगर आबादी इसी तरह से बढ़ती रखी तो हमारे लोगों के लिये खाना काफी नहीं होगा। जो भी लोग उस वक़्त मौजूद होंगे उनको इसकी काफी तकलीफ होगी। इस समय जो पैदावार हमारे देश में हो रही है

वह ऐसा मालूम होता है कि धीरे-धीरे के मुकाबले बहुत कम हो रही है और मैं समझता हूँ कि उसको बढ़ाने की तरफ़ीब की जानी चाहिये। हमारे यहाँ होल्डिंग्स बहुत छोटी छोटी हैं। पाँच पाँच या छः छः एकड़ की होल्डिंग्स बतलाई जाती है। अगर यह सही है तब तो यह मानना पड़ेगा कि जो काश्तकार है, जिसके पास इतनी छोटी होल्डिंग है, वह न तो उसमें ज्यादा लागत ही लगा सकता है और न माडर्न तरीके के एग्रीकल्चर को ही अपना सकता है। नतीजा यह होता है कि जो अच्छी पैदावार करने का तरीका हो सकता है वह उसको नहीं अपना सकता है किसी भी तरह से। धीरे-धीरे जब तक वह माडर्न तरीका नहीं अपना सकता है तब तक पैदावार की एकड़ नहीं बढ़ा सकता है। फ़िरगत्त यह बतलाते हैं कि वहाँ पर आज एक एकड़ में ५५ मन तक गेहूँ पैदा हो सकता है अगर नये तरीके इस्तेमाल किये जायें। अगर इतनी पैदावार हो सकती है तो कोई बजह नहीं है कि ४०, ५० या ६० साल बाद भारतवर्ष में हम लोगों के लिये अन्न की कमी रहे। जरूरत इस बात की है कि जिस तरह से ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैदावार हो सकती है उसको किया जाय। अब सवाल यह आ जाता है कि अगर इंडियन जूटिल करीके का इस्तेमाल करना चाहे जिसके पास पाँच या छः एकड़ जमीन है तो वह इसको नहीं कर सकता है। अब दूसरा तरीका क्या रह जाता है। सिवाय कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग के कोई दूसरा तरीका नहीं है। कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग के बारे में अक्सर एतराज किये जाते हैं और कहा जाता है कि यहाँ पर यह चीज काम नहीं करेगी। मिसालें दी जाती हैं पोलैंड की और यूगोस्लाविया की और आस्ट्रेलिया के पास के कुछ हिस्सों की कि वहाँ पर यह कामयाब नहीं हुई। वह मिसालें जरूर सही हैं, लेकिन इन मिसालों के होते हुये भी हमारे सामने कोई दूसरा तरीका नहीं है जिससे हम लोग पैदावार

बढ़ा सकें। जिस वक्त से काश्तकार को यह मालूम होगा कि जहाँ पर वह आज एक बीघा में एक या दो मन अनाज पैदा करता है वहाँ उसको ५५ मन की एकड़ मिल सकता है, उस वक्त से मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि काश्तकार इतना बेवकूफ़ होगा कि वह कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग पर भ्रमल न करे। वह जरूर इस चीज को करेगा क्योंकि उसको मालूम हो जाय कि उसकी पैदावार बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ जायेगी और उसका फायदा उसको मिलेगा। यहाँ पर बड़े-बड़े भावमियों ने यह बात कही है कि शायद यहाँ पर कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग नहीं चल सकेगी। इतना सब होते हुये भी यह कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है कि इसका थोड़ा बहुत एक्सपेरिमेंट न किया जाय। काश्तकार बेवकूफ़ या पागल नहीं है कि उसको फायदा नजर आये फिर भी वह कोऑपरेटिव फार्मिंग में शरीक न हो।

इसी सिलसिले में यह भी कहा गया कि गवर्नमेंट की गलती है और खाने की कमी है तो फूड मिनिस्टर साहब इस्तीफा दें। वह सब वाहिदात बातें हैं जिनका कोई सिर पैर नहीं है। मैं आखिर में फिर अन्न करता हूँ कि अगर गल्ले की कीमत बढ़ी है तो उसके लिये अग्रजीवन पार्टीज के सिवाय और कोई जिम्मेदार नहीं है।

Shri Gulam Mohideen (Dindigul):
Mr. Speaker, I thank you for having given me an opportunity to take part in the discussion on the President's Address.

It is more than eleven years since we attained independence. We have been talking of many schemes. We have implemented schemes but till now the working mass or the poor man has not improved his position. The rich people are growing richer and there is no check on them. When we approach the masses we say that we have levied many taxes, say, income-tax, wealth-tax and the rest.

[Shri Gulam Mohideen]

But what do the rich class do? Do they really pay their taxes? Certainly not. They avoid taxes. They do not pay taxes. By hoarding money, by cashing property into money, they evade taxes and pass on them to their sons or daughters. Thus, there is no check on moneyed people

I suggest on this occasion that some checks should be put in order to implement the socialist pattern of society. Of course, we have levied many taxes. But there must be some machinery to check these moneyed people so that they really pay their taxes

I know many instances. Most of the landlords and most of the capitalists evade taxes. Unless we do something in this respect a real socialistic pattern of society cannot be attained

Now, everywhere it is said that ceiling on lands is coming. Of course, as a true Congressman and as a man wedded to socialistic pattern of society, I welcome the ceiling on land. But at the same time I want to make it clear that the ceiling on lands alone would not do any good to the society because while the ceiling on land alone is implemented there are a larger number of people who hoard money in other industries and escape this kind of a ceiling. So, I emphasise that ceiling should be on all and not only on land alone

When I advocate that or when I say that ceiling should be on all sides, it may be misunderstood that I am against ceiling or just to avoid ceilings, I am emphasising that. Certainly not. We welcome ceilings. But you know, Sir, in many enterprises people are earning more than what a landlord or an agriculturist earns. For example, if a cinema producer produces one picture he earns more than the value of the ceiling on the land that is contemplated. If 20 acres is fixed as a maximum for a landlord, a cinema producer earns on one picture more than what that 20 acres would cost.

Therefore I submit that to put an end to the growth of the richer classes there should be ceilings on all sides. Our opponents have often been saying that though the Congress principle is that of socialistic pattern of society, we do not implement that system. Certainly not. We are implementing that and let them take it for granted that unless Congress is for socialistic pattern of society it cannot exist. So, the socialistic pattern of society should be based on all aspects

We talk of big schemes but the local masses are not satisfied with big schemes because they cannot go and see them and do not see any benefit in them. Only when local conditions are improved, only when they see what actually is done in their area they will be satisfied. For example in Dindigul area the railway line is a longfelt need, but if the Government does not fulfil that scheme and talk of Bhakra Nangal they will not appreciate that. They will say, "What do you say of our scheme?" There is one Kallar scheme near Madurai District. We have been representing to the Government, both in the State and in the Centre, that the Kallar scheme should be fulfilled. But if the Government does not care to do that the people will not appreciate it for they will see that in their area nothing is being done. So, I emphasise that the Kallar scheme and many other schemes like this should be implemented. There is a feeling and a party is trying to mislead people by saying that the south is neglected. I assure this House that the south is not neglected at all, but I request that something concrete should be executed there

For example, the people of Tuticorin have been insisting that Tuticorin should be made into a big port, but that has not been done yet. There is no mention of that, I wish to emphasise on this occasion the importance of schemes for the development

of Tuticorin and Sethusamudram scheme

Regarding the language question, our Government is not firm. That is my humble opinion. Having once decided that we should give up English with which we are not very familiar, they are not taking proper steps to eliminate English. That is the reason why there is a hue and cry against our determination to have a national language. I will appeal to all the people and our Members in general that we have determined to have one India, and we must have a common language, and that common language should be an Indian language, it cannot be a foreign language if we have committed a wrong, let us revise and come to the conclusion that there must be one language for us. Let us improve that language and have our own national language.

I should also like to point out that money is wasted on many schemes. For example, when we give subsidy to local development schemes, it is utilised without any contribution coming from the local people. In this the officers and the engineers cooperate with them, they prepare estimates in such a way that the people may not contribute any money to the local development schemes. So, there must be a proper check on officials who prepare estimates and waste our money. Something should be done to check all these things so that our money may not be wasted. A public body consisting of Members of Parliament may be constituted to check such wastage.

Regarding prohibition I find that in Delhi, for example taking of liquor is allowed, whereas in Madras it is not allowed. How can it be a right thing in one place and a wrong thing in another place? We praise Mahatma; and we say that we adhere to his principles, but we do not follow what he has said. So, I insist that prohibition should be there throughout. Then only will the poor masses be benefited. So, prohibition should be implemented everywhere.

Then, I would like to point out that the Dindigul area deals more in leather. But from today's papers, I am surprised to see that leather export is prohibited. I urge that some arrangement should be made to export our leather goods to foreign countries, so that we may earn foreign exchange and thereby improve our economy and society.

I would appeal to the Members opposite and also our Members that instead of talking about the public sector and the private sector and all those things, they should try to raise the morale of the people, especially, of the Government servants, because whatever we do, and whatever we plan lies in their hands for execution. After all Government is not the private sector, it is a public sector. But what do we find? While preaching about the public sector, some of our hon friends are asking the workers and the officials to go on strike, that would mean that there will be wastage, and, thereby the public sector will be affected. So, what is wanted is that the morale of the people should be raised, and I appeal to one and all to raise the standards and morale of the government servants.

There is also difference in pay between a State Government employee and a Central Government employee. An officer working in the Madras State, for instance, gets less than what a peon or an ordinary worker in the Central Government gets. This kind of disparity should disappear. For that, the Centre must take the initiative and give subsidy to meet the situation in respect of all the State employees, including those in the panchayats and municipalities etc. Then only we can solve this problem of disparity. Now, when we accuse them of being indifferent in their work, always the same excuse is talked. So the Central Government should see that something is done in this respect.

Mr Speaker: Now, Shri N. B. Ghosh

श्री जगदीश अग्रवती (बिल्हौर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने बड़ी कृपा करके सदन के विभिन्न ग्रुपों के सदस्यों को बुलाया लेकिन यह कृपा उनकी सोशललिस्ट ग्रुप पर नहीं हुई। आपने सदन के बाहर एक स्थान पर यह भी कहा था कि सदन में भी जो माननीय सदस्य हिन्दी भाषा में बोलना चाहेंगे उनको मैं बोलने के लिये अधिक समय और अवसर दूंगा। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि जहाँ आप अन्य ग्रुपों के सदस्यों को बोलने का मौका दे रहे हैं वहाँ आप सोशललिस्ट ग्रुप के भी एक सदस्य बुलायें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सोशललिस्ट प्रोग्राम में क्या पसन्द करता हूँ लेकिन मैंने पहले ही उस ग्रुप के श्री ब्रजराज सिंह को मौका दे दिया है। उस ग्रुप में कुल ८ ही तो मेम्बरान हैं।

श्री जगदीश अग्रवती : दस है श्रीमान्। आपका निर्णय क्या है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं लाचार हूँ टाईम नहीं है, मैं क्या करूँ।

Shri N. R. Ghosh (Cooch-Bihar): I rise to support the motion of thanks on the President's Address

श्री जगदीश अग्रवती : मैं समझता हूँ कि

Shri N. R. Ghosh (Cooch-Bihar). I called one person already from his party. I have called already Shri Braj Raj Singh who is the secretary of that party; I gave him an opportunity. Even if there should be only eight people in a party, they want that they must have the front position; there are 375 Members or so in the Congress Party here; and there are some who, since the inception of this Parliament, have not spoken at all here. It is rather strange that the hon. Member should ask for an opportunity in this manner I am not going to allow it.

Shri Jagdish Awasthi: You have called more than one person from the other parties, but you have discriminated against my party, and therefore we are deprived of the opportunity to speak. I lodge a protest against this and walk out.

(Shri Jagdish Awasthi then left the House)

Mr. Speaker: I must tell the hon. Member that if he protests against my ruling, I would not call him at all. He may go.

Shri L. Achaw Singh rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri L. Achaw Singh (Inner Manipur): I beg to submit that I have also asked for your permission to speak on some of my amendments. From our Party, only Shri Braj Raj Singh has spoken. You have allowed two or three Members from other parties. The Chair should be impartial.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to submit to ordering about by any hon. Member

Shri L. Achaw Singh: The time has also been extended.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order

Shri L. Achaw Singh: I also walk out in protest

(Shri L. Achaw Singh then left the House).

Mr. Speaker: I want to assure all hon. Members who have newly come that I am trying to adjust the time. I have allowed 40 per cent of the time to the Opposition. Among the Opposition, I am trying to give opportunity to every group or representative—big or small. Without exception, I have done that. Some of the bigger groups have had more than one chance. The smaller groups insist upon being called. They will have plenty of opportunities. We are just starting the session They can always protest

against the conduct of Government here. In a parliamentary democracy, the Government and Opposition fight, but neither of them should fight with the Speaker. Evidently, they are new. If next time they repeat this, I will be obliged not to call them at all as a matter of punishment. They cannot protest against the ruling of the Chair. They cannot order; they can make submissions. I have no partiality. I am just watching; I am interested in having a balanced debate in this House, and in giving opportunity to all sections of the House, all groups, front Benches, back Benches, middle Benches and so on.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): This is the strategy of the party in U.P. also. They want to repeat it here (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Enough of what I see here. Why should I draw from the experience of U.P.? I am satisfied with what is happening here.

Shri N. K. Ghosh: Unfortunately for myself, I find myself in the midst of a dispute. What I was going to submit was that in spite of all adverse criticism, it is quite clear that the Address of the President is an unvarnished clear picture showing that actually our Government has laid the foundations of a planned progress of the country in the background of democracy as well as socialistic pattern

I find that there have been much misgiving, much apprehension, on the part of divergent parties with regard to the implication of our socialistic pattern. Some people think that our socialistic pattern really shows a tendency towards Communism; other people think that it is not going far enough, that we are fighting shy of the real thing. I would say that we are not going to copy the pattern of any country. We are going to create a pattern of our own suited to our conditions and fitting in with our best traditions, with our culture—where

the individual will not be dwarfed or smothered but will have legitimate expression, expansion and fulfilment in harmony with the community, but not at the cost of the community. There is no reason for this apprehension that our objective is the Chinese or Russian type. Our Government is committed to a democratic set-up, to a socialistic pattern, based on the consent of the people where force is ruled out. I would submit that such a socialistic pattern is not against our culture. We were really heading towards capitalism imported from the west and that is against our culture and our old traditions. We are going to give due place, due respect, to the individual. The individual will never be liquidated, as in some other countries. To quote one of the previous speakers, the individual will not be allowed in our country to be the pack horse either of any type of civilisation or of any structure of politics.

Some misgivings have been expressed on the floor of the House against joint farming. Some people find in it a bogey of collectivisation. I would submit that it is nothing of the kind. Our Government is not forcing our peasants to take to joint farming. But why is joint farming dreaded? The individual stamp of the cultivator need not be, will not be lost in it any more than it is lost in a joint enterprise, a partnership in commerce or industry. I would submit that if actually there are some uneconomic holdings and there are many, it is apparent that if they are integrated and jointly farmed the results will be much better. Anyhow, it is not being forced upon us. I think that would allay the apprehension of those people who thought that we are really heading towards the pattern of China. We are not doing that.

I shall refer to another matter. I am very grateful to our Government that they have contacted Bhutan and we have secured a special treaty. It was long overdue. Bhutan lies along Jalpaiguri and along some districts of Assam. Bhutan is our next-door

[Shri N. R. Ghosh]

neighbour. The people of Bhutan never considered themselves as foreign to us. They had all along very close contacts. If we increase and develop our communications from Jalpaiguri which is actually the supply centre of Bhutan, then, we will have still closer and fruitful contacts with those people. It is a great achievement. Thanks to our Prime Minister.

As regards our relations with foreign countries, we are very lucky that we have been friendly towards all foreign nations and they reciprocate our friendship. But, the same cannot be said about Pakistan. In spite of our best efforts—our tolerance even to a fault—and our policy of appeasement, the position is worsening every day. They are taking advantage of our goodness; they are mistaking it for our weakness. I would submit that they do not understand our language. This language is unintelligible to them. We are wedded, and very correctly to the policy of peace; but, we can show a little bit of firmness; we cannot appease them at the cost of India. They are not willing to give up an inch of land which is in their illegal possession. Admittedly, Tukergam is ours, but they are strengthening their hold on it. They had absolutely no claim to Berubari and that is not an enclave. They are claiming Berubari on the basis of a wrong map. My house is close to Berubari. Anyone who goes there will find that the map relied on is wrong and now it is being fraudulently used by Pakistan. I submit that the seriousness of the situation is not known to many people. If we were to give up half of Berubari the matter will not end there. If we give half of Berubari on the basis of that map, we lose several tracts which are not really enclaves and it will give rise to unthought and, disastrous complications. They have not given up a single inch of land which is in their illegal possession while we are too willing, too eager to give up our land about which there is only a belated

and malafide dispute. The conditions in East Pakistan are such that it is quite palpable that they are following a policy of squeezing out the Hindus from that place. After the military regime, we are hearing horrible stories.

Are these people who are living in Berubari and who are living in the nearby enclaves going to be thrown to the wolves? I am grateful to the Prime Minister for his assurance that the matter will again be considered by him. I would only submit that the matter is very serious. I pray that these people may not be uprooted again. It can be avoided. I pray their case may be sympathetically considered and the matter may be deeply probed into. We should not be too quick to give up possession of Berubari when they are not giving up the possession of even an inch of land which is in their illegal possession. The whole thing, all the border disputes should be considered together; there should not be any piecemeal decision about Berubari. Perhaps there is some confusion in the minds of several people from the statement of the Prime Minister that actually we have gained something by this exchange. We have not gained an inch; Pakistan has unduly gained a lot. We are practically giving away about 12 square miles.

Another small point and I have finished. That point has been raised by a very revered leader of India, leader of the PSP Party. He has said with regard to the invitation of co-operation by the President and the Congress President that co-operation cannot be forthcoming unless there is an all-party Government. This is against democratic principle, against the mandate of the people. But why stunt co-operation when objective is the same? If the co-operation is whole-hearted the food problem will ease. It will work wonders. I would request that patriotic son of India to reconsider that matter.

There need not be such a condition precedent, such a string behind this proposal. Food is above all parties. It is unfortunate that we are short of food and that the prices are soaring up. In this matter, we should not go half-way. If we control price at the wholesale level, we should also control at the retail level. If the advice of all the parties is sought, if they are at all important stages consulted, there will be no difficulty at the execution stage as is apprehended by Shri Kripalani. Their advice will be fruitful—why they should deny it? Why should they lay down such a condition that unless they have got a hand at the execution stage, they will not co-operate with us? If the whole country co-operates in this matter, we may find ourselves out of the woods

Coming back to the question of joint farming—co-operatives, I would submit such co-operation is not new. Co-operation of services has been long known to India in many of the provinces, especially in Bengal. At the time of cultivation, sowing and reaping, people co-operate and reciprocate and that has been a very great help to the cultivators. It is a fact that a few co-operatives of the modern type which have been experimented upon have not been successful but there should be an investigation into the causes of their failure. If uneconomic holdings are integrated and recourse be had to the co-operative method, the

food situation will improve. We may not go in for big projects. Small irrigation schemes, good seeds and improved methods of cultivation can do a lot. I think the community projects should give more attention to this than they are now doing.

In conclusion, I submit that the country has progressed. But it has not been able to show spectacular progress. In a democracy, such a spectacular progress is impossible and whatever progress is made is permanent and though we are going to introduce socialist pattern, *our friends should remember that it is based on the consent of the people and not force*

Mr. Speaker: There is hardly a minute. I want to assure the other hon. Members who have sent in their names and whom I have not been able to call in spite of the time being extended that I shall prepare a list of such Members if they want to take part in the Railway Budget debate or in the latter debate and I shall try to give them preference.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I am one of them.

Mr. Speaker: They will always be considered.

18 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, February 19, 1959/Magha 30, 1950 (Saka)