

[Shri Nanda]

pensation was payable under section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, to workmen whose services were terminated by an employer on a real and *bonafide* closure of business, or when termination occurred as a result of transfer of ownership from one employer to another. Since then a number of undertakings particularly in Ahmedabad, Kanpur and West Bengal closed down or put up notices of closure for one reason or another rendering unemployed large number of workmen without any compensation. Government considered that emergent steps were necessary to meet the situation that had arisen which was causing serious hardship to workers. Government, therefore, promulgated an Ordinance on the 27th April, 1957, providing that retrenchment compensation will be payable in *bona fide* closure or transfer of an undertaking in certain circumstances. It took effect from the 1st December, 1956.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE
PRESIDENT—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri M. Thirumala Rao and seconded by Shri Mathura Prasad Mishra on the 14th May, 1957, namely:—

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 13th May, 1957."

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you know that there are many Members who want to speak. I would like to know if the time can be extended by another two hours and after that there may be the Private Members Business, which is also there. I say this because this is the first time when so many new

Members would like to speak something.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated Anglo-Indians): There is also another matter. Yesterday the Prime Minister was speaking. I do not know whether it would constitute a point of order or whether it is a matter to be settled with you privately. It is strictly a limited subject whether we should have some convention that whoever speaks in the House should not repeat his speech in different languages because the time of the House is being wasted. I am referring in this connection to the speech of the Prime Minister who spoke in two languages.

Mr. Speaker: The House can ask any hon. Member to go on repeating as it wants to. Yesterday the House wanted that the speech should be delivered in English also. It is open to any hon. Member to speak either in Hindi which is the official language or in English. So also when a question is answered in Hindi, hon. Members want translation of the answer and the answer is allowed to be given. It is a novel point that has been raised just now. At the request of the House the hon. Prime Minister gave his version or synopsis of his earlier speech in English. There is no point of order in this.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): It was a different speech altogether

Mr. Speaker: Both are the same.

In regard to the extension of time wanted by Shri Gopalan the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address is normally followed by two general discussions, one on the Railway Budget and the other on the General Budget. If hon. Members from various groups would kindly pass on to me the names of those hon. Members who would like to participate, I have the least objection to call them.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: You are assuring the House that you would give a chance to Members to speak on the General Budget. I want to know the propriety first of having a general discussion on the General Budget and discussion on Demands and then the Finance Bill in the next session. Is this a healthy convention? I think that this thing has to be decided first before we can have chances to speak on the general discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Very well; we are following the age-long practice. If hon Members want to modify this..

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: Is it age-long?

Mr. Speaker: I am older than he (*Interruption*). Order, order. Hon. Members will kindly refer to the Rules of Procedure. I believe they contain the information. There is a general discussion, then there is a separate discussion on Demands for Grants, and once again there is the discussion on the Finance Bill. Attempts are being made to have one single discussion both on the Budget and on the Finance Bill to avoid repetition. One is quite different from the other. Also it is too late in the day. Then there is the Business Advisory Committee on which the parties are represented. The hon. Member can send in his spokesman and brief him properly.

The Minister of Home Affairs

(Pandit G. B. Pant): Sir, I do not want to inflict any speech on the House. I would have been really glad if I had been spared completely, but I thought that it was due from the Government that before the discussion closed one of its Members should try to deal with at least some of the problems, howsoever imperfectly. I do not expect to win over those who have given expression to different and adverse opinions—and that the Government would be failing in the discharge of its duty if it did not intervene in this discussion, at this almost final and penultimate stage. Before, however,

with the debate and the speeches that have been delivered, as I had no such opportunity I would, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, offer you my hearty congratulations on your unopposed return to this august office. The fact of your being elected without any opposition from any quarter is a conclusive proof of the satisfaction that you have given to every Member of the House during your previous term. So I need not say more in this respect.

I would also, with your permission, welcome all Members who have been elected, and particularly those who are sitting in the opposite benches. I am really gratified to see some of the leaders of public opinion in their respective spheres sitting in those benches; for, the more representative this House is, the better will it be for all concerned. We want to have the benefit of all shades of opinion so that the decisions taken by us may be as correct and as wholesome and salutary as may be feasible in the circumstances. So, I would be looking forward to them for discerning and discriminating support.

So far as the Address of the President is concerned, I venture to state that it was invulnerable and it stands unscathed. The speeches that have been made so far have not in any way impaired the efficacy, the potency or the reasoning that are embodied in this Address. The policies which have been outlined there, the programme that has been chalked out in it and the steps that have been laid down have all been unshaken. So, we can go forward with a stout heart towards the achievement of the objectives and purposes which have been set forth in this Address.

I was glad to hear from Shri Dange, Sir, that he had felt satisfied over the decision that this Plan is not to be halted or to be slowed down. He could not have expressed his approval of this Plan in a more effective way. He wants this Plan to be pushed

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

delayed. Evidently, he is satisfied with the policies on which this Plan is based and also with the programme through which the objectives of this Plan are to be achieved. It is a matter of satisfaction to us. It proves in an unmistakable way that this Plan is really a national Plan. No party here is opposed to this Plan.

I am reminded also of the remark made by Acharya Kripalani. He seemed to complain that the period of the Plan synchronised with that of Parliament and that it was held out on the eve of the elections which again indicated that the Plan was a powerful document and the proposals contained in it were irresistible. If that is so, it is a matter of congratulations, and I expect that in spite of his gentle grumble, he will be good enough to bless this Plan. But factually, his statement was not altogether accurate, because this Plan came into operation on the 1st April, 1956. And the elections were held in early 1957. So, the people had ample time to examine the Plan, to scrutinise its items and to make up their minds about the utility and the propriety and the effectiveness and the fruitfulness of this Plan. They were all satisfied and the sort of objection that this Plan was put before the public just on the eve of the elections indicated that the Plan on its merits was such that it was in conformity with the wishes and aspirations of the people. We would like this plan to be put into operation with the goodwill of all. It is a national Plan.

We are an under-developed country and within this under-developed country, we have classes and communities. We have areas and States which are still more backward and still more under-developed. In spite of all these handicaps, we have made up our minds to work for an egalitarian society in which everyone will be able to develop his personality to the maximum extent and to live a good and happy life in a brotherly way

along with others in a spirit of fellowship and friendliness. That is our purpose and I hope, with the support of all Members of this House, we should be able to march forward not only with zeal, but also with unity enacted in a co-operative endeavour, which will yield us the best and highest dividend, which no undertaking can possibly yield.

12.46 hrs.

[SHRI FRANK ANTHONY in the Chair]

The Prime Minister had spoken on certain aspects of the Plan. You had also listened to the elaborate speech of the Finance Minister, which also has a bearing on this matter. So, I think it not necessary for me to deal with the various aspects of the Plan. Especially when I assume—and I have good reasons for doing so—that everyone stands for the Plan and shall do his duty by it, then it becomes altogether unnecessary for me to take more time of the House in this connection.

The food problem has loomed large during the discussions on the President's Address. It is but proper that it should be so. The Food Minister had the opportunity of making a statement the day before yesterday and we had also the advantage of listening to his speech. I think certain facts stand out prominently and cannot be disputed, namely, that during the last ten years, there has been a substantial increase in the quantity of food produced in our country.

There can be no room for any two opinions on this subject. Some criticism has been made on the ground that our statistics are not absolutely correct. We are, however, not concerned with the absolute accuracy of our statistics. Whatever may be the defects of our system of accounting, the fact remains that so far as comparisons go, they cannot be affected

by any such deficiencies in the method of collection of statistics. It has been proved beyond doubt that there has been considerable increase in food production. The Food Minister has given the increase as it has occurred in different quinquennia. If figures for a year are given and compared with figures for another year there might be some difference of opinion. But when quinquennial averages are taken into account there can no reasonable ground for suspecting their relative accuracy or the inference that can be drawn on the basis of comparison of those figures. Thus, from 1947-48, that is the quinquennium starting in 1946-47 and ending 1951-52 right on to the quinquennium ending in 1956-57, there has been an increase in the production of cereals from 43.5 to 54.8 millions. Every year has recorded some increase. This is not the result of any sudden bounty of nature of Providence. This increase has been going on from year to year and thus we have an increase of 11 million tons which gives an average of about 25 per cent in the course of these five years of this quinquennium.

Similarly the average yield per acre has gone up from 519 to 579 lbs. This particular year the increase in rice came to about 20 per cent, in wheat to 36.8 per cent., in coarse grains to 29.9 per cent. I venture to submit that these figures have to be accepted. Yet, the problem remains and it calls for an explanation as to why paradoxically enough while there has been an increase in production of food grains there should be a rise in the prices. Even in regard to that I would request hon. Members to look at the figures for the last five years carefully. They will find that as compared with 1954 and 1955, there has been a little increase in the level of prices. The prices have gone up only slightly compared to those years. But still there has been some increase and it is also admitted that in certain pockets the production has not been adequate. But we must look at this question from a comprehensive point of view. We are a big country. Here the

people are under-nourished. A rise in prices, if there is any, is a proof of the growing prosperity of the country. It is a proof of the fact that the purchasing power of the under-nourished man, of the starving person is going up. It is a proof of the fact....

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): I hope that proof will continue in future years.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I hope you will help us in that and not retard us in any way. So, I hope that will continue, the increase in production and the increase in prosperity too. So far as possible a balance and an equilibrium will be ensured which will enable all to live in ease and comfort without being afraid of any unexpected developments. But I have to say this that our people are not having enough food today. The average of calories is not adequate. If we could have more food our people could eat more. But we have also to remember this that there is some difference between our pattern of society and the pattern of society in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is essentially an industrial country. It has to import its food from abroad. An increase in the prices of food affects the entire economy of the country and sterling have to be exported in large quantities or equivalent goods. Our country is essentially an agricultural country. More than 80 per cent. of our people live on agriculture when the price of cement goes up, when the price of iron goes up, when the price of everything else including railway ticket goes up and the freights go up, you cannot but expect a slight increase in the prices of foodstuffs too. It is not necessarily an indication of inflation, for manufactured goods have not gone up in price. The price today is not much higher than what it was a year ago. That shows that prices have been kept under control to a large extent. But it is not altogether a tragedy I say if the villager has more of purchasing power than he had in the past. All industries, all progress

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

and everything in our country depends on the prosperity, on the surplus purchasing power that the cultivator possesses. So, if he gets a little more, we should not grudge it to him.

An Hon. Member: He is not getting that.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Then the argument that prices have risen too high is not shared by the speaker. I congratulate him on that.

So what we have to remember is this. Not that I want prices to rise, I must say, but I want the whole economy should be so balanced as to enable every man to live in ease and in comfort. It is true, and it cannot be disputed, that the average income of an urban dweller is much higher than that of a person who lives in the village. So, the former is in a position to make sacrifice to a greater extent than the latter. In the circumstances I must say that while we must make every effort to produce more, so that the income of the cultivator may not go down and the supply may be adequate, we should not grudge a little rise in the price of foodstuffs if the prices of other things go up. That would not be a fair deal.

13 hrs.

Then what has really happened is that the prices that have gone up are not in any way very prohibitive and the Government has been able to supply adequate stocks everywhere. That is what is needed, that people must get food and the Government should be in a position to supply food. But there has also to be some little restraint due from every one of us. There should be no waste. Even today there is considerable waste in the country. If we say what is wasted, I think we could feed 5 per cent. more, or raise the *per capita* consumption by 5 per cent. It would be a great gain. The consumer has to get his food, but the Government is anxious

to see that the burden on him does not increase. It is with that object that the Finance Minister intends to build up a twenty-five crore subsidy pool for helping people who have to purchase foodgrains. The Food Minister intends to set up a high-powered committee so that all these problem may be considered and examined in their proper bearing and opinions may not be formed without taking into account every relevant factor. Our attempt is this, that the cultivator's income should not go down, but his methods of production should improve, and where he is producing five maunds, today he should be able to produce ten or fifteen maunds, so that while the prices may even go down, the total income of the producer may go up. That would be the solution of the problem. On the one hand it would enable everybody to get his food at a reasonable price; on the other it would enable everybody in the villages to get his necessities of life and to raise his standard of living so that he may not be tempted and enticed away by the glamour of life in cities. That is what we have to do. And with that object in view we have to give first place to agriculture in our Plan. For, whatever else may or not come, an increase of the cultivator's income must follow, and we should have adequate quantities of food to maintain everyone in good health and to provide sufficient number of calories for energetic and vigorous work for every workman and everyone in India.

An Hon. Member: Is that being done?

Pandit G. B. Pant: That is our objective, and I hope it will have the sympathy and support of everyone: Sir, I do not think I should pursue this point further.

There was some reference to the subject of the bilingual State of Bombay. I think if I did not say a word about it, it would be regarded as a significant and perhaps deplorable omission. Two of the leading Members of the House and several others

have referred to it. Some have gloated over or expressed their sympathy with the Congress for the defeat of its candidates. Well, I can only say that so far as the Parliament is concerned, so far as this Lok Sabha is concerned, our numbers are larger than they were before; and so far as the Rajya Sabha goes, there too our numbers have increased. So, taking the Parliament as a whole, no tears need be shed by our sympathisers.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): It is not democracy to go by numbers only.

Pandit G. B. Pant: This is exactly my point: do not go by numbers alone when you talk of this bilingual State of Bombay. But you want me to be guided by numbers alone. There lies the difficulty of yours approach.

Sir, what I was saying was this. We had many an ordeal, many hours of trial and travail before we reached that decision. And did we reach it? It was this House, all the Members sitting here who spontaneously decided that Bombay should be a bilingual State.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Some other Hon. Members: Yes.

Pandit G. B. Pant: It was a national problem, and it was settled by the nation's representatives almost with unanimity.

And what did we do? Bombay has been a bilingual State from yore. It had parts of Gujarat and parts of Maharashtra; and they had all lived in peace and amity, in fellowship, in comradeship—not only within the small circle of comradeship of the Communist Party, but all of them belonging to all parties had lived as comrades there. And Bombay was reputed for its efficiency of administration, (*An Hon. Member:* Why not Madras?) for its urbanity of manners, for its hospitality to foreign guests, for the high standard that was maintained there of industrial production and of life in general.

13-5 hrs.

[**MR. SPEAKER** in the Chair.]

Those had been the achievements of a bilingual Bombay States in the past. And the States Reorganisation Commission had recommended that the bilingual State of Bombay should continue. It had, however, recommended that Vidarbha, comprising the eight Marathi speaking districts of the former Madhya Pradesh State should form a separate State, not for a limited period but for an indefinite period or for all time to come. Saurashtra was to be tacked on to the bilingual State of Bombay.

There was enough dissatisfaction, perhaps bordering on resentment in some cases on the exclusion of Vidarbha from Maharashtra. It was argued, and with considerable force, when the whole of Gujarat was being brought within this State of Bombay, why should a part of Marathi-speaking people be kept out of this Bombay State. That was the argument. We therefore tried other devices. We suggested a number of alternative proposals, but they were not accepted.

The Maharashtra Congress Committee, which included many of those who are now entangled in the net of the Samyukta Maharashtra Party—they too were Members of the Maharashtra Congress Party then—(*Interruption*) they resolved and recommended that Akola and Nagpur also should be brought within this Bombay State and that a big bilingual State of the whole of Gujarat, the whole of Maharashtra and Bombay should be formed.

Shri Bharucha (East Khandesh): You are mixing up the Parishad with the Samiti.

Shri Nath Pal: The Maharashtra Parishad never recommended such a bilingual State.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I never said Maharashtra Parishad; I said Maharashtra Congress Committee.

Shri Bharucha: That was one party's recommendation; it was the solution imposed by one party.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am coming to that. Many of those who were in the Maharashtra Congress Committee then supported this proposal, though they have since then joined the Samyukta Maharashtra Party. That was the statement I made.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City—Central): That is an inner party affair. We are not aware of it.

Pandit G. B. Pant: You are not aware of it, but I am aware of it. I hope you will re-appraise the strength of the support behind you when you become cognizant of the fact. This is what happened. We had the support of the Maharashtra Congress Committee. Still, that solution was not adopted. Later on, we were all worried as to what should be done for Bombay. My hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony brought that amendment in this House that a bi-lingual State of Bombay should be set up. It was moved by a citizen of India. (An Hon. Member: A nominated Member) who had no prejudice against Gujarat or Maharashtra and who sits there by the side of a red cap and not by the side of Shri Dange. It was supported, if I remember aright, by Shri Tulsidas Kilachand and Shri Asoka Mehta.

Shri Nath Pai: Shri Asoka Mehta has revised his views since then in the light of the verdict of the people of Bombay.

Pandit G. B. Pant: He may have revised his views. I do not know. But, he is a man who, when he forms an opinion in the first instance, is guided by the right instinct.

Shri Nath Pai: Well; that is what he has done.

Pandit G. B. Pant: It had also the support of Shri C. D. Deshmukh, a man who had very strong feeling over this question and he found it as the best solution. You will please see that it is not a question in which we want to score up arguments. That is hardly the case. I know there is strong feel-

ing over this matter. I know that friends want that this decision should be revised. I am not unaware of the strength of that feeling. But I am just trying to bring it to their notice that the original proposal of the States Reorganisation Commission was in favour of a bi-lingual State, but a somewhat truncated bi-lingual state which was to some extent prejudicial to the interests of Maharashtra. The three unit scheme that was proposed was not acceptable to Maharashtra though it was acceptable to Gujarat and Bombay.

Shri Bharucha: Not to Bombay.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I accept that the gentleman speaking thinks that it is not acceptable to Bombay.

Shri Bharucha: The Corporation has decided that.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I know that the Corporation has a certain strength of 63 returned on one side and 55 on the other.

Shri Nath Pai: Seventy and 54; that is the latest for your information.

Pandit G. B. Pant: May be so. I accept that.

Shri Bharucha: That is the verdict of Bombay.

Mr. Speaker: Let there be no interruptions.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I do not deny that. I welcome enlightenment from every quarter even if it dims the light. But, I would tell him that so far as this is concerned, we put forward a proposal which had the support of most of the Members of this House and that proposal was accepted by us. Now, I put it very humbly to the Members who do not approve of the decision that was taken. Have they no regard for the collective opinion of this House? Would they not even have the generosity to allow a

scheme evolved by this House to work and to see how it works? How will our Parliament function? Should decisions taken almost unanimously on vital problems, after prolonged discussions, be turned down because certain sections of the community do not subscribe to them? On what argument? The argument is that they are people defeated in the election. I do not want to make capital of the argument. But, the fact is there that the majority of the Members returned from Maharashtra subscribed to the bi-lingual State. It is also a fact that the majority of Members returned from Gujarat subscribed to the bi-lingual State. It is also a fact that the majority of Members returned from Bombay subscribed to the bi-lingual State.

Some hon. Members: No.

Shri Nath Pai: What is the majority of votes? I do not want to interrupt. I do not know how to correct wrong statements.

Some Hon. Members: Thirteen—eleven.

Shri Nath Pai: The hon. Minister is referring to this House. If four are elected and 2 represent the Congress, what is the majority?

Pandit G. B. Pant: If four are elected and 2 are returned, the majority would be 2. If 13 are elected on the one side and 11 on the other, the majority would be 2. But, it would not be a minority. It would be a majority still. So, it is a majority. Bombay, as such, has a majority. Gujarat, as such, has a majority and Maharashtra, as such, has a majority in favour of bi-lingual Bombay. But, I leave that alone.

I ask, is there agreement amongst those who are opposed to the bi-lingual State? Shri Dange wants Maharashtra with Bombay and Gujarat as a separate entity. Shri Yajnik, who spoke yesterday, disagreed with Shri Dange and did not support his proposal.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): I did not oppose him. I supported the suggestion for a Round Table Conference of all parties.

Shri Nath Pai: The fact that there was difference between Mr. Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi was no justification for denying freedom to India.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am talking of the argument, and the statements made. He was in fact aggrieved not because there had been the bi-lingual State of Bombay as such, but because the three unit formula which provided for separate units for Bombay, Gujarat and Maharashtra had been turned down and replaced by a bi-lingual Bombay. That is his complaint. Does Shri Dange want the three unit formula to be restored?

Shri Dange: No.

Pandit G. B. Pant: No. He does not. So that, amongst the protagonists themselves, though they are opponents of one thing, they won't agree as to what is to be done. It is....

Shri Nath Pai: That is no justification.....

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will hear and not interrupt.

Pandit G. B. Pant: It is always easy for people to oppose a thing. But, it is much more difficult to hammer out a positive solution. That is the difficulty. We solved in a way which carried the support of every dispassionate and detached patriot in India. There was Acharya Kripalani in its support. There were other friends.....

Shri Jadhav (Malegaon): May I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the speech of the Prime Minister on the 1st of August, 1956 at Poona?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Pandit G. B. Pant: So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to anybody interrupting me. Only he has to take care of himself.

Shri Nath Pai: We are not trying to interrupt. We do not know how to correct wrong statements.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Arguments on either side must be heard patiently. Ultimately any conclusion may be arrived at. There cannot be one way traffic in this House.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Really that has been the misfortune of those days. Arguments were not heard patiently. People holding a different view were not allowed to speak. Stones were hurled. Lurid posters were displayed.

Shri Nath Pai: They were shot down.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am extremely sorry for that. I share your feelings. Our young men are our asset. I would do everything for their safety and for their welfare. If they suffered in any way, it is a matter of extreme distress and agony to me. We cannot heal these wounds by ourselves behaving in a manner which may be called rowdy, ruffian, indecent and vile. That is no remedy for that. Let us find the remedy for this. Let us behave in a proper way ourselves.

So, I was telling you that when we say that people should listen patiently, I am not surprised that on the other side, there are friends who would not listen patiently to me, who have nothing but a desire to serve them, to win their goodwill.

Shri Nath Pai: We do serve and respect them.

Pandit G. B. Pant: The only way that we can serve the country is by converting people who do not share our views to our own. There is no other way. I believe in conversion, not in imposition. That is my attempt. It is a matter of regret that this process was not allowed to work in Gujarat, and sometimes in Bombay. I hope in future we will not see such

unseemly scenes. I do not think I must pursue this matter further. I have already said something about it.

There was something said about Kashmir. Well, I do not want to deal with the Kashmir problem. But there has been one thing which has been streamlined in the papers. The Pakistan Government is reported to have lodged a protest against the representatives of Kashmir attending the Northern Zonal Council. The Northern Zonal Council, as hon. Members of this House know, was formed several months ago, in August last, I think, when the States Reorganisation Bill was passed; and in that, a provision was made that the Northern Zonal Council would consist of Punjab, Delhi, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh, and one more State, namely Kashmir. That was the decision then taken.

There was no question that Pakistan would commit the blunder of going to the Security Council then. Nobody knew that its mind was working so perversely. The decision was taken in an innocent way. Kashmir has been part of India since its accession in 1947, and I hope it will ever continue to be part of India. That was what happened in 1947. And in August, 1956, this House adopted that clause in the Bill under which this Northern Zonal Council was formed.

On the 1st of November, 1956, when the States Reorganisation Act came into operation, this Zonal Council also came into operation. I held a meeting last month of this Council. I do not see how there can be any occasion for any protest whatsoever. It is in a way sought to be made out that this Zonal Council was somehow forged after Pakistan's complaint in the Security Council had been lodged. It is utterly baseless, and it is on such fare that Pakistan feeds the people of that State. It is strange that such an argument should have been put in.

It is a matter of some relief that the basic facts of Pakistan and the way it behaves, so far as Kashmir is con-

cerned, are now being largely and increasingly recognised by the civilised world. A country which committed aggression on an unarmed people and killed hundreds and thousands of them, is pretending to be their protector, and blaming those who have helped Kashmir, Kashmir which is today more prosperous than it ever has been in its history, Kashmir which is attracting thousands of tourists from abroad and from all over the country.

The problem of Kashmir, according to me, has to be viewed from the moral angle. And the moral angle is what will conduce to the welfare of the people of Kashmir. Everything else is secondary. And who is there who cannot but admit today that Kashmir's association with India alone can lead to the salvation of Kashmir? If the relationship between India and Kashmir is disturbed, then Kashmir will be in a bad way, as bad as Jammu and Kashmir happens to be in today. So, I need not pursue this point too further.

There was a remark made by a well-known Member of this House, Shri M. R. Masani, about the promulgation of the two ordinances. I quite agree with him, that as a rule ordinances need not be issued and that ordinances should be promulgated only when it is necessary to do so. But what is to be done when the courts reach decisions which go entirely contrary to the intentions of this Parliament? When the language of the law framed by us is defective, and the intentions are not couched in precise language, and decisions are taken which produce immediate effect, then what should Government do?

Shri Supakar (Sambalpur): They could have waited.

Pandit G. B. Pant: They could have waited; well, some factories had already been closed, and more were going to be closed. Thousands of labourers were being thrown on the wilderness and on the roads. Should Government have waited and seen that they were hung on the streets? Would he have liked that?

So, I say that it had to be done in order to save these thousands of labourers who were being subjected to such maltreatment. It was for their protection that it was necessary to issue the ordinance.

Similar was the case of the other ordinance, concerning the insurance staff. My hon. friend the Finance Minister rushed to Bombay within three days in order to settle all issues and gave them satisfaction, thorough and complete, by his decisions. So, there need not be any grievance on that account.

I know that there are 87 amendments on the Order Paper, and perhaps many scores of speakers have had the privilege of addressing this House. If I were to address myself to all points, I would perhaps be taxing the patience of even the most patient Members of this House too much.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): Has the Minister a word to say about Serai-kella and Kharaswan over which strong feelings have been expressed?

Pandit G. B. Pant: I think the hon. Member would have been well advised not to put this question to me. Serai-kella and Kharaswan form part of Bihar, and I think they will continue to form part of Bihar.

Shri Supakar: Once, they formed part of Orissa.

Pandit G. B. Pant: They do not form part of Orissa. If they do, the hon. Member should have no grievance.

Shri Supakar: They did form part of Orissa, and they were wrested out of Orissa.

Pandit D. N. Tiwari (Kesaria): Once, Orissa formed part of Bihar.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I would appeal to hon. Members for one thing. We spent a considerable period, months and months, over these problems, not only myself but the Government, not only we, the Members of Parliament, but before us, the Commission that was there, a Commission presided over by an eminent ex-judge of the Supreme Court, which had as its mem-

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

bers two of the foremost and knowledgeable persons in our country. That Commission made certain recommendations. We had had long arguments; every little point was very carefully considered; after that, decisions were reached. Let there be no sores left now. Let us all bow to the collective will of this House, so that its strength may grow, and with it the strength of each one of us may grow, and our country may rise to the heights to which it is entitled to rise by virtue of its ancient history, of its vast population and equally vast area.

Shri Thangamani (Madurai): Has the hon. Minister anything to say about amendment No. 7 on the question of renaming the State of Madras as 'Tamil Nad'? In the speeches that were made in this House by Members from that particular State, there was no reference made to this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister, evidently, has said what all he wanted to say. Whatever he has not said, he does not agree with.

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta—East): It may be the other way.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members may please themselves as they want.

Now, so far as the amendments are concerned, if there are any on which the House has to divide, I shall put them off for voting till 14-30 hours, because we do not divide between 13-00 hours and 14-30 hours. May I have the numbers of those amendments so that I can put them off till 14-30 hours and put the other amendments and take a voice vote?

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao: All the amendments may be voted upon later.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Then we will take them up at 15-00 hours. At 15-30 hours, non-official business will be taken up. It is rather inconvenient to make it later because as the evening advances, the House becomes thinner and thinner. It will take some time also for hon. Members to come

back after lunch. Therefore, this will stand over till 15-00 hours.

Pandit G. B. Pant: May I have your permission to go as I do not enjoy the privilege of voting here? Therefore, neither my presence nor my absence is going to make any difference to the voting.

Mr Speaker: Yes.

COAL BEARING AREAS (ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT) BILL

The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Sardar Swaran Singh): I beg to *move—

"That the Bill to establish in the economic interest of India greater public control over the coal mining industry and its development by providing for the acquisition by the State of unworked land containing or likely to contain coal deposits or of rights in or over such land, for the extinguishment or modification of such rights accruing by virtue of any agreement, lease, licence or otherwise, and for matters connected therewith be taken into consideration".

In the Second Five Year Plan, we have a target of additional production of 22 million tons of coal, out of which 10 million tons would be produced in the private sector whereas 12 million tons would be the responsibility of the public sector. With regard to the additional production of 12 million tons which the public sector has to add to the present production, as much as 10 million tons are to be raised from new areas and new mines that are to be developed and opened up. To attain this objective, a private limited company under the name 'The National Coal Development Corporation' has been formed with a capital of Rs. 50 crores.

Nearly all the coal bearing areas are covered by mining leases held by

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.