

GENERAL BUDGET, 1958-59—GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

Mr. Speaker: I now call upon the hon. Finance Minister.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Finance (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have had a long debate on the Budget that I had the honour to present. In the course of this debate much has been said and a great many subjects have been touched upon—and the hon. Members were of course entitled to do so. But there is a tendency for the wood to be lost sight of perhaps in this way. It is not possible for me to go into every single matter that was referred to through I can assure the House that we shall endeavour to look into any complaint or any suggestion made.

Before I deal with a number of matters referred to, I should like to say that, I believe, I have profited by the discussion that has taken place here—profited not only by some of the bouquets given, but even more so by the criticism offered. Some speeches were not perhaps quite so inspiring as others. Some actually were on the point of being depressing. But, as a whole, a large number of hon. Members spoke, and I would with respect, the matter was dealt with at a fairly high level.

Now, it may perhaps be a fault on my part to try to look at these things in a larger context. I am always a little anxious that I should not lose perspective in looking at any major problem because so many big things are happening in this world today, which inevitably act and react on each other that I want to see this entire picture. There is the international picture, where the Sputniks, the Explorers and the Vanguard's rush through the sky and I presage a new world to come where science and technology have developed tremendously. It is a fact to be remembered because it may well be that in the course of ten years or fifteen years or

thereabout an entirely new and different source of power may be available to mankind and all our calculations in our Second, Third or Fourth Five-Year Plans may be rather out of date unless we keep up to them. All our economic theories in fact may be out of date because economic theories depend on circumstances and facts. They are not something that comes out of the air. Therefore, without going into these matters, I would like just to remind this House of this background of the world today and to look at India in this background.

There is the other thing happening in the world. Here, not far from us, a neighbour and a friendly country, Indonesia, is facing a great deal of trouble. Naturally, our sympathies go out to the people of Indonesia. It is not for us to interfere in their internal affairs and we hope—and indeed are optimistic—that they will settle them. But here is an example of what is happening and what will happen in other countries. It is not right for me to go in for invidious comparisons with other countries, but I think every hon. Member of this House will agree that if any comparisons are made, we have done more than rather well and those, who criticise us so often in this House—sometimes justifiably, maybe—should remember this fact, because we function in a set of circumstances in the world. We do not function in mid-air. We function where conditions are limited by various factors.

In the course of the speeches made, there was that of the Leader of the Opposition, Shri S. A. Dange. If I may say so with all respect to him, he did less than justice to himself. The American Dollar exercises such a powerful fascination on him that he tries to interpret all events in terms of the influence of the American Dollar. The American Dollar is a very powerful thing in the World today. But, there are things in the world

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

which often happen to be outside the influence of the American Dollar still or any money, pound or dollar or rouble, whatever it may be. To interpret anything in that rigid, strained way in which Shri S. A. Dange attempted to do is to give, I think, an entirely false picture of events.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): What is happening in Indonesia—the power of the dollar—does it not perturb us?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not discussing Indonesia. I am discussing India. Shri S. A. Dange referred to the growing fascination in India for American dollars. That is why I referred to it. It is true, as every one knows, that we have received substantial help from the United States and we are grateful for it. But, I think everybody also knows, whether in India or the U.S.A., that we do not barter our soul or our policy for money and that the American Government itself would respect and honour us less if we did so.

Then, there were several speeches by leading Members of the Opposition and many Members sitting on my side of the House which I listened to with interest and sometimes with surprise. The hon. Lady Member sitting on my side of the House gave us a long list of our failings, of our lack of realism, of our complacency, of the faults in the Budget. Having given this long list, she finally said rather illogically, "I generally support the Budget." I would not particularly care to have support of this kind. I should like a little more logic, a little more reason, a little more thinking about these matters. It is easy for me, as for every Member of this House, to criticise the Budget and the economic conditions in India.

I ventured in my Budget statement to place what I said was a pedestrian viewpoint, facts prosaically placed. I did not, so far as I can remember, indulge in any heroic attitude. I did not try to exaggerate or underrate. I

see no reason why I should underrate. I placed certain facts before the House and indicated the broad policy that we were going to pursue, which was broadly speaking, a continuation of the policy laid down last year. Fresh proposals made, like the Gift tax or the amendment of the Estate Duty Act were really in continuation of that. I did not wish this House or the country to deal with anything but facts, realistic facts.

It is true that even when looking at facts, much depends on what one's own mood or outlook is. The same facts may produce a sense of optimism or pessimism. It depends on whether you are habitually a pessimist or an optimist, whether you have vitality in you and the desire and the faith to overcome difficulties or the reverse. Anyhow, we must base ourselves on facts. I ventured, therefore, deliberately and with set intention to give a bald and prosaic narrative which, unfortunately, was too prosaic for the hon. Lady Member, who did not like it at all.

Then, there was Shri Asoka Mehta who chided me for being weak-kneed and not strong enough to face the facts of life as they are today. I admit the soft impeachment. I should like him to be strong enough to face them. I am much older than he and naturally I may not keep up the vitality of youth. He is strong and young. I am very glad indeed that he takes up this attitude of strength, of faith in our people, in our Plan, in our destiny. I should tell him and this House presently if it needs telling what my own faith is in regard to these matters.

Then, there was the hon. Member Shri M. R. Masani. I find some difficulty in dealing with his remarks, because his advice to us and to the Government was to sound retreat and walk back. He gave certain figures about our resources. I think these figures were not at all correct. He gave a certain figure, Rs. 1100 crores

or thereabout, which he calculated as our resources for five years. As a matter of fact, we have nearly approached that in the first years of our Plan, and we are bound to go beyond that. I do know the exact figures.

The real difficulty that I have to face is that Shri M. R. Masani and others perhaps of his way of thinking approach this problem basically in a different way. If our premises differ, possibly if our objectives differ, then there is bound to be difference all along the line. I fear that both our premises and our objectives differ. What do we aim at in India? I fear Shri M. R. Masani aims at something with which I do not agree. I aim at something entirely different. The hon. Member Shri M. R. Masani in the course of one revolving mood has changed his opinions and shifted his approach to economic and other problems of India. From the stormy waters of socialism, he has found a safe haven in private enterprise.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi): Mixed economy.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It is open to him as it is open to anybody else to do so. But, the point is that our approach becomes different obviously and his criticism which may be completely justified if you accept that objective is not justified if you have another objective. So far as I am concerned, I do not pretend to be a great scholar. But, in the course of a large number of years, together with many comrades present here, we have endeavoured to serve India to the best of our ability and to think about the future, not only to be lost in the past. We have always envisaged a future which, broadly speaking, we call a socialistic future, a socialistic pattern of society. We have realised that there are conflicts in the present structure of society, conflicts all over the place. We have also believed in the solution of these conflicts by peaceful methods. That has been the inheritance which we have received in the past generation or two, and we

have tried to pursue that I do believe still in socialism by peaceful methods. I believe in democracy.

I cannot speak—of course, it will be wrong—for any single remedy to be applied to all the countries of the world. They are different. Who am I to tell any other country what it should do, and who is anybody else to tell me, anybody else outside India to tell me what I should do here, or we should do here? We accept advice, we do not thrust advice on others. We try to learn from others, but we do presume that we should decide for ourselves as to what we should do in our country, decide in this Parliament, our people should decide; and we have come to certain decisions about our objectives, about the pattern of society we are working for, about our plans and all that.

I think they are right decisions, broadly speaking. That does not mean that we will not adjust them to changing circumstances, here and there adapt them, but broadly they are right.

We have come to those decisions knowing full well that they involve hardships and carrying heavy burdens. It is not an easy task to pull a country like India, with its low standards, with its enormous population, with poverty always dragging us down, out of that mire and morass. It does not matter what concept of society or economics you may have; it is not an easy task whichever way you march, because the facts of life cannot be changed by calling something socialism or communism or capitalism or Gandhism. All these various methods may be more or less appropriate, that is a different matter.

So, we realised when we draw up the plan more than anything else that we were going to have a hard time. That time became harder because of circumstances. If you like because of our mistakes, if you like

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

because we were caught napping in some matters like foreign exchange. I entirely admit that, but the main thing is that our difficulties arose for us because we tried to fulfil that Plan. Anything less than that Plan if we had undertaken, as Shri Masani suggests even now going back upon it, anything less than that Plan—I should like this House to realise this—would not have lessened our difficulties except perhaps in the immediate present. Tomorrow would have been harder, the day after tomorrow would have been worse still. There is no escape from it. We have to take that Plan or something like it, and by having a softer time today, you invite disaster tomorrow or the day after.

It may be that in a democratic system like ours, this might involve, as it often does, a defeat in an election here and there, because it makes it easy for an opposition to point out; "See the burdens you carry, more taxation, more this and more that, and this Government is bad", as indeed is pointed out here, because the best Budget of all would be: in every Budget less and less taxes, in every Budget more and more expenditure on good works; everybody is pleased, we march ahead smiling; but unfortunately, we have to convert this agricultural community in India with hundreds of years of poverty into a highly industrialised, progressive, dynamic society.

How can that be done? How can that be done without bearing this burden and facing it, facing the consequences, and if the people of India get frightened at it, they themselves will learn how to bear the burden, because whatever other failures I may have, I have never experienced a sense of failing in the Indian people. If we have carried on all these long years in India, in the ultimate analysis it is because of the Indian people and it was because of faith in the Indian people and their soundness and their strength and

their innate vitality even though they had been suppressed by hundreds of years of poverty and degradation. So that, let us realise that there is no escape from it.

Criticism of high taxes, criticism of this and that. What is the alternatives? And especially when we are asked: why don't you spend more on this, and spend more on that, I do not understand where the logic is in this kind of approach. I can understand, of course, that there should be economy, there should not be waste and all that, but there is no progress without heavy burdens being carried. It is no good any hon. Member telling me: "Oh, you must raise the exemption limit of income-tax". I am not agreeable, not all agreeable. I think it is right that exemption limit should be low, and if people do not like it, well, I am sorry, but I cannot sell my conscience. When I do believe in a thing, I should put it forward before the House. It is for this House to accept. It is a right thing if the exemption limit is low; in other countries which are much richer than India, the exemption limit is lower.

I know it hits the middle classes, I know it hits. Many of our indirect taxes hit others, and certainly we should try to equalise the burden so far as we can, but there is no getting away from the fact that we have got to be hit and we must be prepared to be hit, just as when in fighting for independence, we prepared for many things which could be unpleasant and we faced them.

There is one matter to which Acharya Kripalani referred. He referred to defence, and he said this Government does not follow Gandhiji. He was completely correct, that is to say, we do not deny Gandhiji, we endeavour perhaps sometimes to follow him, but it would be completely right to say that we are not following him. I do not know if any Government can follow Gandhiji in this imperfect world of ours. I do

not know if Acharya Kripalani himself can follow Gandhiji in this imperfect world.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): I am afraid I have never used the words "not following Gandhiji". I have never used them in my whole speech. What I meant to say was: we do not follow even our own words which we speak so often.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am sorry if I quoted him wrongly, but this is the remark saw in the notes of his speech, but it does not matter. The words do not matter.

It is a perfectly clear thing, and it is a matter which troubles me very greatly that we cannot do many things that we have talked about and professed in earlier years apart from professing it here in this House

Let me give an example. On the day after independence which we had won by peaceful methods we were suddenly to be dragged into operations in Kashmir. It was a tremendous problem for me, a moral problem, apart from the physical difficulties. I did not know what to do, because the aggression from Pakistan in Kashmir, through Pakistan and by Pakistan, shocked me to the core, and I saw the whole of Kashmir being subjected to rapine and loot any may be generally going to chaos. On the other hand, was I going to ask the Government of India to take steps which might lead to military operations and war? It was something which revolted me, and in that state of mental difficulty and ferment, I went to Gandhiji because he was still with us then. I poured out my tortured mind to him, and he said: "You have to go to the help of the people of Kashmir, even with an army".

Now, I merely mention this not to take refuge in what Gandhiji said, because I do not think it is right for any of us to exploit his name, or take refuge in some phrase of his, because he spoke in a certain context of events. How are we to exploit that

today in a different context, or try to make petty politics out of a great man's saying? I entirely agree with Acharya Kripalani that we have no business to do it, and I wish that Gandhiji's name should be exploited by no man, by the Congress Party or any other.

Having said that, I hope that I will be permitted at least to think and dream of Gandhiji and try to gain some inspiration from that thought and vision from time to time.

I was referring to the international situation. The House knows about the talks that are going on about what is called a high level meeting and so on and so forth. The whole point is that there is a ferment, a tremendous ferment in the world, in the minds of men, a ferment which occurs in the days of great transition from one age to another. And there is no doubt that we are going through this tremendous transition which like many other transitions is being brought about by the tremendous advance in technology and science.

The other day, I ventured to read out here to this House a resolution on science passed by Government. There was nothing very novel or new about it, and yet it required saying and emphasising by Government and by this Parliament. We wanted the country to read it and to think about it, because unless we realise that, unless we understand that, we shall remain in the back-woods; it does not matter how you play about in your budgets, it does not matter what you do about your other things and your speeches and elections. All this is secondary and all this will do no good, if we do not realise these basic changes that are happening in the world. And if I may say so with all humility, one of the big things we have done since Independence in this country is the progress of science and technology in this country, which is a much bigger thing because without that all your second and third and fourth Five Year Plans would never see the light of day except on paper.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I doubt if many hon. Members who are well-versed in economic theory or in other matters give so much thought to how much science and the changes in technology affect economic theory, how the very concept of socialism the result of scientific development and technology. So, we have to keep that in mind.

Now, Shri Asoka Mehta pleaded with us, or rather admonished us in many ways, and told us to be strong. I should like to tell him and this House that I have not the least doubt in my mind that success will come to this country in these Plans, in industrialisation, in higher standards. I have no doubt that the Second Plan will succeed. I have no doubt that industrialisation will come. I have no doubt that food production will go up much more than Shri Asoka Mehta has thought. It would go up, and I am prepared to take a bet with him that it would go up more than he has thought.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Muzaffarpur): What is the bet?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have no doubt about these matters, because I have no doubt in my fundamental faith in the Indian people.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Lack of organisation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The fact that Shri Asoka Mehta tells us not to be weak-kneed shows the doubts that he has in his mind, but I will tell him what I have doubts about and what worries me. It is not the economic position which worries me. India's economy is sound and let everyone know it in India and outside. And if India has taken or borrowed money she will pay it, maybe with an effort, but will pay it. There is no difficulty about all these matters, or perhaps, if I may say so, there are difficulties, but the difficulties will be overcome. So, I am not worried essentially about

economic matters, perhaps because I am not an economist like Shri Asoka Mehta, perhaps because I am rather a passing figure as a Finance Minister, but I shall say what I am worried about and what troubles me.

I see in the newspaper today headlines 'Refugee satyagrahis in Calcutta—Thousands arrested'. What for? One of their major demands is: 'We shall not be rehabilitated outside West Bengal'. I believe this procession was led by the leaders of the party which Acharya Kripalani and Shri Asoka Mehta represent in such a distinguished way here. (Interruption).

Shri Tangaman (Madurai): Are to take it that the refugees have been properly resettled in Bengal?

Mr. Speaker: That is another matter.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Bairhat): Even outside Bengal. What is the reply?

Mr. Speaker: He only refers to the leader.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am referring to my reactions. I said that I have no doubt about the economic future of India. I have no doubt that India is going to pass this poverty barrier, and in fact, she is passing it and will become an industrialised country with high standards and all that. I have doubts about other matters, as to the manner in which it will do it, and as to the result of it, not in regard to economic matters, but in regard to deeper matters of the spirit and soul and what they will be. I am worried about that much more than about economic matters, because we have set something in motion, forces in motion,—not we, I mean, but various things, in India have set various forces in motion—which will not stop

in spite even of Shri M. R. Masani or anybody else or the Forum of Free Enterprise or whatever it may be, because.....

Shri M. R. Masani: I fear your policy will stop the progress nothing else.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): That is immaterial.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In this dynamic motion, it is quite possible that we—not only we, but any government—will make mistakes. It is quite possible that we will stumble occasionally. But the mistakes will be corrected, and if we stumble, we get up and walk again. The stumbling comes, because we want to run; certainly, it is a good thing to want to run and to stumble than to creep along slowly or to sit all the time, so that I have no particular fear in my mind about these economic matters, realising fully their important consequences and all that.

But I was referring to this news item in this morning's paper, and a particular item in their demand which was to give a guarantee that 'we will not be rehabilitated outside West Bengal'.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Do you know what has happened to those who have been sent outside West Bengal? Have you ever looked into that? You have never been to that side. You have never been to Assam, to Orissa to Tripura. You have never been anywhere where these refugees live. And in spite of that, you say this. (*Interruptions*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta-Central): May I draw his attention to one thing to which the Minister of Rehabilitation has never been able to give a reply? And it is this. Have you provision here and now for anything like a sizable proportion of those refugees for whom you say there is no room in West Bengal? You have not got any provision. Now, what

are you going to do about it? It is a human problem, which you cannot wash away or dismiss by your kind of eloquence.

Shri Bishwanath Roy (Salempur): You can send them to U.P. We shall welcome them.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say I am not..... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: We have heard repeatedly what attempts are being made, about Dandakaranya and other things. After all, hon. Members have said what they have had to say, and they had ample opportunities for that. The Prime Minister is trying to explain the various things. But why should they lose patience. If something which is not palatable to them is said? No, hon. Members will keep their soul in patience. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I continue? I am not discussing, naturally, the rehabilitation problem. I was mentioning and I would venture to mention again that a demand is made to give a guarantee to them—I am quoting—'not to be rehabilitated outside West Bengal'. I say it seems to me perfectly fantastic, for any political party, whether it is the Communist Party, whether it is the Praja Socialist Party or whether it is anybody else, to encourage people to make this demand, because making this demand simply means making it impossible to rehabilitate them.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Why is it impossible?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Because in West Bengal, we cannot go on rehabilitating people indefinitely. I really do not understand why the hon. lady Member opposite or any other hon. Member....

Shri Bimal Ghose (Barrackpore): That is not correct (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: That is all right. Hon. Members will keep it to themselves (*Interruptions*.) Order, order.

[Mr. Speaker]

We are not discussing this particular matter. There can be difference of opinion.

Shri Bimal Ghose: It is not a question of difference of opinion....

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing which can be weighed in the scale pan here. Let hon. Members hear what the Prime Minister has to say.

Shri Bimal Ghose rose—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will resume his seat. Hon. Members are not now exchanging views. The hon. Minister feels that they have been taking steps to organise and settle them in various parts of India. Some of them were sent to Andamans (*Interruptions*). Order, order. Some of them are going to be sent to Dandakaranya. Some others were sent to Orissa and they returned to West Bengal. All these years we have been hearing how those people who were sent to various other places have returned to West Bengal. That seems to be the general impression, that those people in West Bengal do not want to leave West Bengal (*Interruptions*). Hon. Members will have an opportunity when this matter comes up (*Interruptions*). Then shall I ask the hon. Minister to agree to whatever the Opposition says (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do submit that I should be allowed to continue. I do not give in to any hon. Member (*Interruptions*).

Shri Tangamani: It is on record that out of the 4 million refugees....

Mr. Speaker: I do not allow these interruptions. Let there be no interruptions. The hon. Minister may be allowed to proceed. Hon. Members will have other opportunities to speak about this in greater detail.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): This is deliberate misrepresentation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is another instance—for the information, education and behoof of hon. Members opposite. At Sealdah Station, unfortunately large number of refugees are there. We sympathise with the refugees that have come. May be they are right in thinking that enough is not being done for them. I am not arguing that point. But repeatedly, Sealdah Station has been cleared; refugees have been taken away. I think the last time it was completely cleared was in November last. Since November, relatively speaking, few refugees are coming from East Bengal. The rate, I believe, is between 400 and 500 a month.

Now, again there are 8000 or 9000 refugees there, at Sealdah Station. People went to inquire about them. They found that 56 per cent. of the people in Sealdah platform were not refugees of any kind at all.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What are they? (*Interruptions*). Migration certificates are there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They had not come from East Pakistan. They were other people, no doubt, deserving people; but they were not refugees. The other people, 44 per cent., may have had a handful of refugees. Since November, very few of them had come. They were all non-refugees or others who had been settled in camps and came away, and they were incited by other people to do that in order to exercise pressure on Government....

An Hon. Member: Shame!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This was made a political question (*Interruptions*).

Acharya Kripalani: May I suggest one thing? I would humbly request the Prime Minister to go and see how the refugees....

Shrimati Benu Chakravartty: No, no.

Acharya Kripalani: I would humbly request him to send some of his officers to find out how refugees are rehabilitated in Germany. Germany has a population of 40 million, and she has rehabilitated 10 million people. I would ask the Prime Minister to see what Germany has done in this respect.

Shri Tyagi: There all parties co-operated.

Acharya Kripalani: Here also we will all co-operate.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member has invited me to go to Germany.

Acharya Kripalani: I did not invite him to go. I have said that somebody should be sent to find out what has been done in Germany (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I accept his word entirely, about the way this has been done in Germany. I have seen it too. Anyhow, I accept it. They have done it, of course. There are many things that can be done in Germany which we may not be competent to do. I am very sorry that I have entered into this debate in this way. I did not intend to. What I was venturing to say was this: it is not our economic situation that troubles me, that is at fault. Difficulties will come and we will overcome them. Fine speeches are delivered here about economic this step and economic that step, and much is done to disrupt the country in various ways....

An Hon. Member: Shame!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ...whether it is on communal grounds, whether it is on caste grounds, whether it is on linguistic grounds or whether it is on provincial grounds. Those are the things that worry me—not economics. We will get over economics.

The hon. Member, Shri Asoka Mehta, said that today people talked

about the phrase—the laws of economic growth are different from the pedestrian law of economics. I entirely agree with him. The laws of economic growth, once they get moving, are different ones from the textbook economics and the rest. But I do not worry about that. But all these efforts to disrupt the unity of India are, I think, much more dangerous.....

An Hon. Member: Imaginary.

Acharya Kripalani: May I again suggest....

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow this interruption.

Acharya Kripalani: I only wanted to make a submission.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He has given way.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is a senior Member of this House. He ought not to interrupt like this.

Acharya Kripalani: I only want to humbly submit....

Mr. Speaker: It disturbs the trend of thought of the whole House. Let us hear the hon. Finance Minister's speech as he progresses with it. Hon. Members will have an opportunity later on to speak with respect to other matters. There cannot be absolute concurrence with respect to any particular matter. There can be differences of opinion. They will kindly keep quiet and not disturb the hon. Finance Minister.

Acharya Kripalani: I want to submit....

Mr. Speaker: No, no. There is no question of personal explanation, except....

An Hon. Member: What is this?

Mr. Speaker: 'What is this?' I am enforcing the rule, and the rule is

[Mr. Speaker]

that unless any personal explanation directly is necessary, I will not give opportunity to any hon. Member here, however big he might be. Let the Prime Minister go on. (*Interruptions*). He must go on. He will go on.

Acharya Kripalani: I have a personal explanation to give.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is a parliamentary right.

Mr. Speaker: No right.

Acharya Kripalani: The Prime Minister has said that certain things are done in this country which are disrupting the country. May I humbly ask....

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister has not said that. There is no question of personal explanation. The Prime Minister did not say that he was responsible for all the disturbances in this country (*Interruptions*).

Shri Asoka Mehta: He has specifically referred to our Party (*Interruptions*).

Acharya Kripalani: I humbly submit that such forces are present in every Party. So far as caste is concerned, so far as provincialism is concerned, so far as the language question is concerned, we are all in the same boat. I submit that only to the Prime Minister.

Shri Tyagi: Agreed, for the sake of argument.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I assure the hon. Member, Acharya Kripalani, that I am in entire agreement with him on this point (*Interruptions*).

Acharya Kripalani: But the Speaker does not want me to speak!

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I just do not understand this. I did not say

that the hon. Member's Party was responsible for all the evils in India. I say, partly the Congress Party is responsible (*Laughter*). I know.

Shri Tyagi: No, no. The Congress Party is not responsible. (*Interruption*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, I am really sorry. Here I am, I hope, objectively, calmly and in a composed way trying to analyse the situation without casting reflection on any hon. Member here or elsewhere....

Acharya Kripalani: That is the right thing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But somehow some people's conscience pricks them and suddenly they get up; especially, Members of the Communist Opposition get very angry the moment I refer to rehabilitation, regardless of any facts or anything. I may be wrong or right. I did not interfere throughout the debate with any speech.

I repeat that what troubles me is this disruptive spirit. And, may I refer to a person whom, I am sure, the whole House respects very greatly, one of our senior most members in India, who has held the highest offices in the State, who has been a crusader for many good causes? Now, he is carrying on a cold war on the language issue in the south.

I am not for a moment discussing the language issue. But, I merely say how soon we forget the major issues before the country and, in our excitement or in our enthusiasm for something that we like, we entirely forget the larger picture of India, the unity of India, the growth of India and a hundred other things and do things which, undoubtedly, weaken India and make it more difficult for us to build up that strong, united India that we seek for.

Shri Goray (Poona): Is he not a Congressman?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member require this information from the hon. Finance Minister?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Will hon. Members opposite, for a moment, imagine that people can talk in terms other than parties? I speak as the Prime Minister of India at the present moment; and I am not speaking for the moment on behalf of this party or that party. I speak as a non-party man in so far as I can—I have my innumerable failings—and in whatever I have said, I have not made distinction of parties. I only mentioned parties because in today's papers they led this so-called satyagraha.

Take this word 'satyagraha'. And, I invite the old colleagues of Gandhiji to see how this word 'satyagraha' has been murdered. Everything good, everything evil, everything bad, is called satyagraha. Every opposition is called satyagraha. It has really pained me, more than the actual murder of an individual, how the murder of this fine word, which was actually a symbol of inspiration, has taken place.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Sir, could I make a personal explanation? (*Interruption*) I only want a clarification. I am not trying to disrupt.

An Hon. Member: No argument.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If any hon. Member feels that he is responsible for what the hon. Minister has said, he may get up and give a personal explanation. Otherwise, he need not get up.

Shri Jaipal Singh: Then, there would be very serious misunderstanding....

Mr. Speaker: Of what the hon. Member has said, is it?

Shri Jaipal Singh: Of what the Prime Minister has said as Prime Minister. He has said something about Bengalis not wanting to go outside. If that be the case, let him de-disrupt Purnea and Manbhum and give them back to Bihar. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do not understand. I do not wish to say anything more.

Mr. Speaker: It is not relevant.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I said as the Prime Minister that the unity of India is important. And, I am not speaking—at least I am trying not to speak—as a Congressman, a partyman in regard to these facts, communalism, casteism, provincialism....

Mr. Speaker: Linguism.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: ...linguism. They are bad. I am saying for everybody—and I hope everybody agrees with me in what I say. Acharya Kripalani said that the Congress people are often guilty. I agree with him. I do not say that one party is guilty about that. (*Interruption*)

There is one thing, however, I should like to say. Acharya Kripalani suggested, as far as I remember, a unilateral action taken by India in regard to Defence. Now, I cannot tell him how much all my urges will pull me in that direction. And yet, I feel I am unable to take it, so also my Government, and I feel sure that if by any chance I recommended this to this House, this House would not take it.

In fact, on the one hand, we are constantly being told to strengthen our Army, Navy and Air Force in this House when Defence estimates come up or in any other matter. The burden of the song here in this House is, be strong, do not be weak. I confess that I am a little frightened at the emphasis laid by this House

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

on being militarily strong. I do not like that. I understand it; but it frightens me, this mentality, military mentality which all of us have, including me, when problems face us; because, I do not think that any problem in the world is going to be solved by war or by arms. And yet, why is it that believing or thinking like that, still we keep up an Army and spend more and more money on it? Why is it so?

I am not going into that question now. But, I should remind Acharya Kripalani that it was about four years ago there was a conference, there was a seminar on—what was it?—Gandhian technique. There was an international seminar on Gandhian technique for the solution of internal and external conflicts. Acharya Kripalani and some others took the position there that there should be no armed resistance even to an aggressor. Now, it is a position which can be taken up. I am not denying that. The point is....

Acharya Kripalani: I do not remember any such resolution, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member can refer to it later on. (*Interruption*)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am told that in the course of argument, however, the Archarya admitted that on practical grounds this position could not be taken up. I entirely agree with him. But, I am merely pointing out the difficulties we have to face. It is a terrific problem. Nothing much has happened in this country.

Few things have really oppressed me so much as the fact that Pakistan which was part of our own country some time ago should harbour so much ill-will against us, should all the time speak of us as their enemy, and arm and generally threaten

us with holy war. We may be stronger than they, it is a different matter. But, what has hurt me is our incapacity, our inability to win the goodwill of Pakistan. I do not want to win or influence Pakistan by the strength of arms or by any threats. I do not wish to gain anything from Pakistan except their goodwill. But, it hurts me that I have failed—our Government has failed, that India has failed—to win the goodwill of Pakistan. Because, that is the only way that I wish to have Pakistan and deal with Pakistan. And, we propose to go on working to that end even though in Pakistan people might talk in a language about us, calling us their enemies and in a language which is not at all agreeable to us.

May I deal with a number of points that were raised in the course of the debate? So far as foreign exchange situation is concerned, I said something in my Budget speech. The present position is that, actually, in the week ending 14th March, there was an addition instead of a decline; there was actually an addition of Rs. 3.68 crores to the sterling balances. Now, lest this might make people imagine that a big turn has taken place, I want to appraise them that the last six months have been good months from the point of view of our exports. I mean the winter months are good and the summer months are bad. Therefore, if we have made so much progress in the last six months, it does not follow that we are going to keep it up during the next six months; and, we should be prepared for a withdrawal, though on a smaller scale, of course, in the course of the next 6 months too and that we shall have to be very careful about this foreign exchange situation and we are not likely to find much foreign exchange for anything new. Fortunately, we have received assistance and this bridges the existing gap and will

enable us to carry on with our various projects.

13 hrs.

Then, there is the question of deficit financing. Some hon. Members referred to this. We are very fully aware of this and certainly we do not wish to go beyond legitimate risks. The Plan provided for Rs. 1200 crores of deficit financing for the whole five-year period. This was an annual average of Rs. 240 crores. On the basis of the estimate for the next year, the total deficit financing in the first three years of the Plan would amount to Rs. 760 crores. This figure has been reached, because in the second year, this went up to Rs. 380 crores. We want to be very careful. My predecessor in the Finance Ministry told Parliament I think last year that we should not go beyond Rs. 900 crores. We cannot fix any rigid limit, but we have to be careful about it and keep in view the prevailing economic conditions all the time.

Then there is the question of the piling up of foreign debts. Most of these, the House knows, are for capital needs of development. The position after 1960-61 will be difficult for two or three years. But we shall be helped by the development schemes reducing the future imports in food, steel and oil. Even so we might have to convert short-term payments falling due into long-term arrangements. Such conversions are usual and though the position will be difficult, no alarmist view need be taken.

It has been pointed out that there has been a drop in small savings and we are asked why we have budgeted for a much larger figure. It is true that current year which is now ending has been exceedingly bad in this respect. But I think we have made a turn towards a better response already. In fact, the last month or two have been much more encouraging. In February, the collection was Rs. 7 crores.

Some hon. Members suggested that there should be a statutory limit for public borrowing. I do not see the need for this. Parliament has full control over borrowing and payment. To lay down any rigid statutory limit in an expanding economy may well prove to be harmful. We have always to remember that we are in an expanding economy in a dynamic situation and while, of course, Parliament must have full control of the situation, if you lay down exact figures, it will come in the way of that expansion.

Some hon. Members criticised the Finance Commission's recommendations that they are not equitable. As Government, we have to accept them even though we may not have agreed with everything they said. We treat it as an award.

There has been talk about the growth in expenditure. There has been undoubtedly growth in defence expenditure which is considered inescapable from the point of view of national security. There has been growth in civil expenditure. Civil expenditure is chiefly development expenditure. Between 1952-53 and 1958-59, i.e. six years, the expenditure on development and social services has risen from Rs. 63 crores to Rs. 188 crores. Payments to States have risen from Rs. 38 crores to Rs. 110 crores. Non-development expenditure has increased only very little. Arrangements are also being made in consultation with the Planning Commission to avoid delays in giving sanctioned amounts to the States and to secure even flow of assistance to the States.

There has been some criticism of public undertakings. I do not presume to say that every public undertaking is being run in the best possible way. But I do say that by and large our public undertakings are doing very well and are run efficiently. Their production is increasing. Of course, as is very well known, Sindhris are doing very well. The Hindustan Machine Tools which for

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the first two years did not do well is doing remarkably well. I could say that about many other undertakings also. Even in the defence industry, I believe they are going to increase the production in the ordnance factories very greatly for civil purposes. In fact, the difficulties have risen in the private sector. Their production has gone down. This is chiefly because of shortages of pig iron, steel and non-ferrous metals. Fortunately, most of the industries in the public sector depend chiefly on indigenous raw materials and this is one reason why it is doing well.

I hope in the course of two or three days to lay on the Table of the House the Planning Commission's examination of the foreign exchange situation during last year. It is a fairly detailed examination and I need not say much about it, because hon. Members can themselves consider it fully. In the main, the main conclusion that emerges is it was an attempt to carry out the Plan that caused this adverse turn. In addition, of course, there was the need for more foodgrains unanticipated and heavier expenditure in defence. Even the imports of the private sector were largely for developmental purposes of the Plan. Then, there were increases in prices and freight rates. It is true that we can be wise after the event and there were lapses in this matter; that is to say, we were not fully seized of what was happening. There was lack of co-ordination in this matter. Otherwise, we might have taken the steps which we took later earlier and I cannot blame anybody in particular. We have to blame ourselves and certainly I am prepared to take the blame.

We used to have a kind of foreign exchange budget some years ago. It is not quite clear to me how it lapsed. It lapsed about four or five years ago; I forget when, partly I suppose because we were actually gaining in foreign exchange and

there was a certain period of boom and a period of optimism—the first Five Year Plan succeeded and there was more production, more agricultural production—and so it lapsed. It was wrong that it lapsed, but there it was. Therefore, different Ministries went on budgeting things and nobody knew the entire picture for some time, neither the Planning Commission nor the Finance Ministry. Since the beginning of 1957, a strict budgeting of foreign exchange is now kept.

There is one matter to which I think some hon. Members referred, the population problem. We are entirely seized of this and I may tell them that during the first Five Year Plan, Rs. 65 lakhs were allocated for family planning—not much—and as a matter of fact less than that was spent, only about Rs. 15·8 lakhs. In the second Plan, Rs. 497 lakhs have been allotted—Rs. 400 lakhs to the Centre and Rs. 97 to the States. During the first Five Year Plan, 147 clinics—21 rural and 126 urban—were there. The target figure for clinics up to March, 1958 was 370 clinics. As a matter of fact, sanction has been issued for 488 clinics and 377 are already functioning.

There is the question of sterilisation in hospitals and private nursing homes. This is permitted, provided, of course, it is voluntary and with the consent of both husband and wife. The Governments of Madras and Uttar Pradesh have issued instructions to this effect. Family planning research centres have been established at regional training centres in different States and research is taking place in Bombay, Calcutta and Lucknow. I am afraid the progress is slow, but anyhow, it is progress and we hope that it will make some effect, though it naturally takes time.

It might interest hon. Members if I gave them the figures of esti-

mates of national income which have recently appeared and which will be published no doubt soon. I would give the figures at current prices and at 1948-49 prices. In 1952-53, at current prices, per capita national income was 266.4. At 1948-49 prices, it was 256.6. Perhaps it is a little confusing. I will only read the current prices which could be compared more easily. Or, if you want both I shall read both of them. In 1953-54, at current prices it was Rs. 280.7 and at 1948-49 prices it came to Rs. 268.7. Similarly the figures for 1954-55 were Rs. 254.2—a big drop—and Rs. 271. For 1955-56, they were Rs. 260.8 and Rs. 273.6 and for 1956-57 the preliminary estimates are Rs. 294.3 at current prices and Rs. 284.0 at 1948-49 prices.

I should like to inform the House of a decision arrived at by Government in regard to an enquiry in the LIC matter into the conduct of officials. In pursuance of the decision arrived at by Parliament, an enquiry is taking place. This is in accordance with the All India Services (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, 1955 which had been framed under the All India Services Act, 1951. The Lok Sabha decided that proceedings should be initiated on the basis of the findings of the Chagla Commission in respect of the three officers: Shri H. M. Patel, Shri G. R. Kamat and Shri L. S. Vaidyanathan. Under these rules, after the charges have been communicated and the officers have put in their written statements and stated, whether they desire to be heard in person and produce any defence, the enquiry is entrusted to an enquiry officer or a board of enquiry. Now, we are appointing a high level Board of Enquiry, the Chairman being Justice Vivian Bose, a Judge of the Supreme Court and the two other members being: Shri Sukumar Sen, Chief Election Commissioner and Shri W. R. S. Sathianathan, Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras. Under the rules, two senior officers have to be appointed, one of

whom should belong to the same service as the officer dealt with. Shri Vaidyanathan is not an officer of the Government and therefore, he does not come under these rules. It is obvious that we could not have separate enquiries. So, we are suggesting to the LIC that that enquiry should also be given to the same Commission. The enquiry against all the three officers is proposed to be held *in camera*. It is not usual for departmental proceedings under the relevant departmental rules to be held in public. The charges to be served on all the three officers are being framed in the Ministry of Finance in consultation with the Ministries of Home and Law.

In this connection, may I mention a matter? It is not normal—and the House knows it—for officers of the Government to be criticised and attacked in the course of speeches in Parliament because they are not supposed—they cannot obviously—to answer. It is really the Minister who is responsible and it is the Minister who must bear the brunt of any criticism and attack even though his officer has done so. I repeat it now because of this reason. Now that actually an enquiry is being held, it would be even more unbecoming for officers who are in a sense being tried for their conduct to be attacked in Parliament or elsewhere.

In the course of the discussion here on the Chagla Commission Report, unfortunately there were quite a number of attacks on these public servants and these officers, some of which, I consider, are rather deplorable. In particular, an hon. Member of this House, Shri Patnaik, referred to one such public servant and mentioned a number, a string, of cases in this connection. Now, I pointed out the impropriety of attacking the public servant in this way when he could not deal with that attack either here or elsewhere. So far as the cases mentioned by him are concerned, each one of them had been carefully consider-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

ed by the Public Accounts Committee and by the Government and after repeated consideration, enquiry, etc., on those cases, it was decided that those matters should be regarded as closed.

Shri U. C. Patnaik (Ganjam). The Public Accounts Committee had recommended that some of these things be enquired into at a high level.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Government did enquire and came to that decision. As a matter of fact, so far as I can remember, even there no charge or no question of personal conduct arose. I regret, therefore, that this very wholesome rule about not criticising public servants in Parliament but criticising the Minister responsible certainly, was not observed. And it is not because a person can be tried for an offence. At this particular moment, it would not be fair for a background of prejudice to be created about past events when a particular matter is being enquired into.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): Sir, may I enquire whether during the pendency of the enquiry, these officers will be in the same position and in charge of the same files?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No, Sir. As a matter of fact, one of them Mr. H. M. Patel has been on leave for some time. I believe Mr. Kamat is going on leave or has gone on leave—I am not sure. Anyhow, he may not be functioning during the pendency of the enquiry. That applies, I understand, to Mr. Vaidyanathan also.

There are certain matters which I should like to refer to among the various criticism on taxation etc. I made it clear to the House that the basic structure of taxation which had been introduced last year was going to continue and I propose no change in it. In fact we have made it a little more integrated by proposing the Gift Tax and certain amendments in the Estate Duty Act. So, that remains. I propose to make no change in the income-Tax or like taxes.

But there are certain changes which I should like to suggest to the House. We realise that the situation in the textile industry is not a good one. Because of this there was a reduction of two annas in excise duty on medium cloth in December, 1957. Two annas per square yard was reduced to 1½ annas. This reduction had some effect of stimulating clearance on medium cloth. But even now, the overall position cannot still be said to be very satisfactory with accumulated stocks. Therefore, we propose to reduce the rates of duty on cloth textiles as follows:

- (1) The Existing duty on coarse dhoties and sarees is being reduced from 3.125 n.P. to 3 n.P. per square yard, and on coarse other sorts from 9.375 n.P. to 6 n.P. per square yard.
- (2) The medium category is being split up into two categories, namely (a) dhoties and sarees, and (b) other sorts. In the case of dhoties and sarees the existing duty of 9.375 n.P. is being reduced to 7 n.P. per square yard, and on medium other sort from 9.375 n.P. to 9 n.P. per square yard.
- (3) In the case of fine variety the existing duty of 18.75 n.P. is being reduced to 17 n.P. per square yard.
- (4) In the case of superfine the existing duty of 25 n.P. is being reduced to 22 n.P. per square yard.

These proposals will cost the Exchequer nearly Rs. 15 crores, but Rs. 9 crores of this sum has actually been taken into account in this budget figures that I proposed. The balance is Rs. 6 crores. I believe that it will not really be Rs. 6 crores; because of greater production and clearance that figure will be reduced. These reduc-

ed rates take effect from the 19th March, 1958, that is tomorrow.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Are there any changes in the powerloom excise?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes. As per notification issued, the compounded rates of duties in respect of power-looms are also being suitably revised in conformity with the reduction in standard rates. The existing rates of additional excise duties are not changed.

Shri T. N. Singh (Chandauli): When duties are changed, usually they take effect immediately. May I know why there is this lapse of 24 hours in this case? There must be a forced holiday so that there is no sale today. Something like that is done. This lapse of time is not usually allowed.

The Minister of Transport and Communications (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): This is a case of reduction.

Shri Tyagi: That is followed only when duties are enhanced.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If it is possible this will be done. I am not quite sure about the mechanics of it.

Mr. Speaker: Whenever a taxation measure is brought here it is passed immediately, but if a notification is to be issued it will take some time. The hon. Prime Minister may consider it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes.

Shri Bimal Ghose: Here the duties are being reduced; so there is no question of any evasion.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Now, Sir, there is another matter. Last year, in December 1956, an amendment was made to the Income Tax Act which required certain deposits to be made by companies with Government of surplus funds. The scheme came into

effect from the financial year 1957-58. So far as the accumulated profits and reserves were concerned no deposits were called for. In regard to current profits, however, a deposit of Rs. 50 per cent. of the amount of available surplus was required to be made for that year. The object of this scheme was to ensure that the surplus money of corporate enterprise arising mainly from the liberal depreciation allowances and development rebate was utilised for purposes conducive to industrial development of the country consistently with the objective of the Plan and was not frittered away in other cases. The experience of Government in the administration of the scheme during the last one year has been that in actual practice the bulk of the financial resources of the companies are, in fact, being utilised in approved directions. Further, in the Finance Bill of 1958—this year—which is at present before this House, a provision has been introduced for the regulation of development rebate allowance for its being utilised for the legitimate maintenance, development and expansion of the business, and to prevent it from being frittered away. As development rebate constitutes a major component of tax-free allowances granted to industry, this new provision will substantially serve the objective underlying the deposit scheme. The Government have, therefore, decided that for the financial year 1958-59 no deposits may be called for from the companies either in respect of accumulated profits and reserves or the current profits.

May I repeat that these deposits were, of course, not tax; they were on enforced loan on which Government paid an interest of, I think, 3½ per cent. As a matter of fact, the result of this has been that we realised Rs. 3.61 crores—a relatively small sum—and this involved an enormous amount of work—claims for exemption being examined, checked and so on. So, the burden of the Commissioner of Income Tax and the Board of Revenue increased, and the actual amount

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru].

realised was small. Of course the amount realised was small—because of very liberal exemptions. That is true, otherwise it would have been large. But, if it had been strictly applied the burden would have been very heavy on industry and, therefore, it was rightly applied in a liberal way. Anyhow, now that the change has been made in this year's Finance Bill the necessity for this does not arise and, as I have said, no deposits will be called for from the companies this year. I might add, however, that for the present we are not taking any steps to remove this law from the statute-book. This is simply because this will require a new amending Bill. When the time comes for us to amend the Income Tax Act we will include this there.

One small matter, which is of interest to me at least and, maybe, to some others here, is that there has been some difficulty in the production of cheap books in India. Cheap books are printed on newsprint and not on normal good paper. All the foreign cheap books that come are printed on newsprint. While books come here duty free, newsprint has to pay duty, and rightly so. And, there is nothing left in the book trade. So our book trade had to print its so-called cheap books on more expensive paper, and it cannot easily compete with foreign cheap books from abroad. The question was that they are getting cheap newsprint. Now, it was suggested that the duty on newsprint should be removed. There is some difficulty about that, but we are examining this matter. We will find some way out of it. If necessary we may get some small special quantity of newsprint and even give some foreign exchange for the purpose, because we do wish to encourage the production of cheap books here.

Sir, I am very grateful to the House for the indulgence. I have spoken for a long time. I wish to repeat, Sir, what I said in the course of my speech

that, while we are fully conscious of the seriousness of the task, of the difficulties and all that, there is absolutely no sense or no feeling of pessimism or defeatism in my mind. If people call that complacency they are wrong; because we are not complacent, nobody can be complacent who has to face the difficulties and burdens of the day. But, it is one thing not to be complacent and yet be full of hope and strength. I have no doubt at all about the soundness of Indian economy, the soundness of the Indian people. These things are more important than any other arguments, and facts and figures we may raise. It is true that we have to function within certain limitations; we cannot escape that; they are inherent. I may quote from Shakespeare, used in a totally different connection:

"The will is infinite, and the execution confined; the desire is boundless, and the act is a slave to limit".

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one question in regard to the Finance Commission's recommendations. The hon. Prime Minister has said today, and it was said more than categorically in the Deputy Finance Minister's speech yesterday, that the Central Government are accepting the recommendations of the Finance Commission as an award. The point that I raised was that they have not done so on one specific item, that is, the consolidation of the loans to the State Governments regarding interest and methods of repayment.

A few days ago, there was a paper placed on the Table of the House to say that those recommendations—clauses 156 and 157—have not been accepted. Therefore, I would like to know how that fits in with the fact that they have accepted them as an award. If it is accepted as an award by the Centre, then, of course, the State Government would also accept them.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I answer that question, Sir? Of course, strictly speaking, it is not an award, but even so, a great part of it, in the nature of a solid recommendation, has been treated by us as an award—nearly the whole of it.

In regard to loans, it is suggestion that they have made; even though they treated it somewhat differently, we had, in fact, accepted even that—a great part of it—as minor variations. I need not go into the reasons; why the minor variations do not fit in, and the difficulty arises.

PUBLIC PREMISES (EVICTION OF
UNAUTHORISED OCCUPANTS)
BILL

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri K. C. Reddy): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Bill, 1958, made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 12th March, 1958 and communicated to this House on the 14th March, 1958 and resolves that the following Members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee:—

Shri N. B. Maiti, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, Shri Naval Prabhakar, Shri T. N. Vishwanatha Reddy, Shri Vutukuri Rami Reddy, Shrimati Maftada Ahmed, Shri Jhulan Sinha, Shri Bholu Raut, Shri Chhaganlal M. Kedaria, Sardar Amar Singh Saigal, Shri N. Sankarapandian, Shri M. K. Shivananjappa, Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi, Shri Shobha Ram, Shri S. Ahmed Mehdi, Shri Kanha'ya Lal Balmiki, Shri Sindhava Singh, Shri Padam Dev, Shri Shivram Rango Rane, Shri Chintamani Panigrahi, Shri P. K. Kodyan, Shri Mohan Swarup, Shri

Braj Raj Singh, Shri Subiman Ghose, Shri Jaipal Singh, Shri Surendra Mahanty, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Shri B. N. Datar, Shri Anil K. Chanda and the Mover."

I do not propose to take much time of the House by way of commending this motion to the approval of the House. I would like, in the first place, to give the House an idea of the magnitude of the problem that we have got to face in this connection. So far as the public premises are concerned, they are defined in the Bill that is before the House. They include all central Government property, lands and buildings as also certain property and lands belonging to the local bodies in Delhi. Since 1947, there have been unauthorised occupations of the Government premises on a very large scale. For example, in New Delhi, the number of buildings in unauthorised occupation since 1947 has been of the order of 6,302. In Bombay, there were 25 unauthorised occupations and there were also 4,000 squatters in a plot of land at Kolaba.

13.35 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

In Calcutta, there have been unauthorised occupants of buildings in 32 cases. In the case of the Hirakud Dam project, there have been 34 unauthorised occupations. In the Ministry of Defence, there have been 1,833 cases of unauthorised occupation of lands. In Kandla, where the port is being constructed, the number of unauthorised encroachments is on a very constant increase. Recently, we have received information to the effect that in Delhi there have been more than 9,000 unauthorised constructions and that in these constructions there are about 50,000 squatters. I am giving these figures with a view to emphasise the magnitude of this problem. Apart from the unauthorised occupation of buildings, the question of rent collection and the assessment of damages also will have to be kept in