

1493 Statement re: MAGHA 27, 1960 (SAKA) Motion on Address 1194
Labour Trouble in Raza and Buland Sugar Mills, Rampur by the President

Conciliation Officer to get his grievances redressed through the conciliation machinery, but he has shown an adamant attitude in the matter

71 persons were arrested up to 11th February, 1959 for picketing the residence of the District Magistrate and for wrongful obstruction at the mill gate

A Wage Board has already been appointed by the Central Government for sugar industry in which representatives of workers have also been included. This Board has unanimously recommended on the 9th December, 1958 to grant an interim relief at the rate of 5 per cent subject to a minimum of Rs 3 to all workmen whose emolument is up to Rs 100 per month

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur Sir,

Mr Speaker. I do not allow questions normally on such occasions. We have much more work. If the hon. Members, after hearing the statement, feel that still there is some doubt, let them table a question.

Shri S. M. Banerjee. The object of my adjournment motion was to see that there is an enquiry from the Centre. That was my object and my demand. Now, the Minister says that the lock-out is legal and the strike is illegal. Who is to decide it? Is it there to be an enquiry? I want to know from the hon. Minister whether any officer has been deputed or is being deputed by the Centre to see to it, because

Mr Speaker: No 'because'. He has only put a question. Has any enquiry been ordered by the Centre?

Shri Abid Ali: How can it be possible, Sir? That is within the State sphere. The hon. Member should know the seriousness of the suggestion he is making.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The point is

Mr Speaker: Well, I am not going to allow an argument on that score. I am proceeding to the next item of business.

12.12 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—contd

Mr Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Nemi Chandra Kashiwal and seconded by Shri Joachim Alva on the 13th February, 1959, 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 9th February, 1959."

I believe that Swami Ramananda Tirtha was in possession of the House. He might continue.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha (Aurangabad). The other day, I stated that a sense of urgency had to be imported at all levels in making the second Five Year Plan a success and also to get through the successful implementation of the third Five Year Plan, we are building up a self-reliant and self-generating economic development and that also through democratic methods. I said that this was to be done by the consent of the people, so we have to see that no loophole is left in the framework of the Plan and also the manner in which it is implemented.

While the sense of urgency has to be developed at all levels, the people are in a hurry. As the Congress President has stated, the people in the villages are no longer in a mood to wait. So, the urgency is there and the paramount question, therefore, is, how to meet the urgency. That is the paramount question before us.

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]

Sir, the experience that we have gained during the last few years tells us that we have to improve many of our methods. In this connection, I would like to refer to the manner in which the administrative machinery has moved in the manner of implementing the five year plans. It is a very sad experience. The people come forward with their contributions, with their own manual labour—*Shramdan*—and with their own co-operative associations, and they want them to be registered. The experience is that somehow certain difficulties of procedure are put forth and instead of helping the formation of the co-operatives and such other associations, there is a tendency to impede the process. It very much depends upon the administrative machinery and the efforts made by it in order to make the five year plans a success.

In this connection, I would like to point out the reference made in the Nalagarh Committee Report wherein the Committee has emphasized the need for importing this sense of urgency in the mind of the administrative personnel. The success or the failure of the third Five Year Plan is going to depend upon the sense of urgency of this administrative machinery. The Ministry may have that urgency, the other sections also may have that urgency, but the actual administrative machinery, if it lacks in that sense of urgency, will not be good and the whole third Five Year Plan will collapse, and with the collapse of the third Five Year Plan the entire democratic functioning is going to collapse. Therefore, the urgency which the administrative machinery should feel about its own responsibilities and its own duties is very great. The administration should leave the white-collar attitude and see that this third Five Year Plan is implemented in order to save democracy and all that is meant by democracy.

There is another lacuna in the method of implementation of the five year plans. We want people's co-

operation. Surely, it will come but it can come only when the people feel that something is being done immediately for their betterment. We have got the big projects and they have their own value and they will surely effect betterment of the nation in various aspects. But the villager is far away from those big projects. Just today, a member of the Planning Commission, Shri Shriram Narayan Aggarwal, has said something. He has also put forth this view that if, after the completion of the first Five Year Plan and when we are at the end of the second Five Year Plan and are visualising the third Five Year Plan, we have not been able to meet the barest requirements of the village people, if we are not able to give a good well for drinking water for the villager, the villager naturally feels that all that is going to come in the future is a far-off thing and he remains where he is. I want to put this point of view very sincerely. Can we not so frame our third Five Year Plan or even plan the remaining two years of the second Five Year Plan in such a way as to divert a few crores of rupees from this huge amount and see that every villager in the country has got a good well for drinking water. If that is given, he will be satisfied and he will see that something is being done. So I suggest that when we formulate the third Five Year Plan, let us take into confidence the village panchayat—not every single villager, so to say, but the village panchayat, for there is some organization in each village—and if we ask that village organization to state what their first priorities are, what are their rudimentary requirements, then, the villager will come forward with his co-operation and he will also feel that something is being done for him. Let him not be so cynical about his future. He is growing cynical at present. With all the knowledge of the rural areas, I can say that he feels that there is a huge Plan, etc., but immediately very little is being done for him. There may be a national development, but so far as

the villager is concerned, very little is being done. We may tell him that it is a democratic method; it is going to be slow and it will have its own gradual growth, but if at least something is not done immediately, the villager will lose faith in democratic functioning. That is why I say that urgency has to dawn upon the administrative machinery and the villager has to come forward with his full measure of co-operation. If that is to be so, he has to be taken into confidence and that third Five Year Plan should be so framed that this first requirements will be met here and now.

In this connection, I was rather surprised to go through the speech of my esteemed friend, Acharya Ranga, which he delivered as the President of the Punjab Agriculturists Convention held sometime back in the Punjab. He is enraged at the Nagpur Resolutions of the Indian National Congress regarding agricultural reforms, ceiling, co-operatives and so on. He is a very senior colleague and he is very mature in his experience about the conditions of the *kisans*.

Mr. Speaker: He is not lending an ear, he is engaged, not enraged. Hon. Members must follow at least when remarks are made against them.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: I have gone through his speech with all the carefulness that it deserves, but I have failed to catch up what his suggestion is. He does not want a ceiling on land. If at all, let it come along with other sectors in the society.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): I want ceilings, but let it come upon everybody. Do not say that I do not want ceilings.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: I am only giving my reactions to his speech. If at all a ceiling is to come, he wants it along with the rest.

Shri Ranga: At least let them make firm promise that they would do it

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: He does not want co-operative farming. I put a very straight proposition before him. The population of India is growing at the rate of 5 to 6 millions every year and the land is to remain the same. What is the better pattern of agricultural cultivation that he suggests, not for this year or for the next five years, but for the next 25 to 40 years to come? Does he want this present pattern to continue? If not, what is his suggestion? If he is going to make a speech here, let him satisfy me as to what is the alternative he suggests. I am enquiring this out of curiosity.

Shri Ranga: I will do that.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: Remember we have to remove the disparity and the Prime Minister has made it clear that the ceiling is on the present land holdings, but once that ceiling is fixed, there is no bar to making efforts to raise the productivity of that particular holding. It is not a ceiling on agricultural income, but is a ceiling on the agricultural possession of the land. That has to be clearly understood. India is an agricultural country with an agricultural economy and if a step forward to social justice is to be taken, I do not see any reason why anybody should be against it. Co-operative method is the only way; if there is any other method, let him suggest it to the country. The country is not deaf to practical suggestions. We are not wedded to any particular pattern, but we only want to see that democratic methods are adopted.

Then, I am rather worried about this rise in food prices. We have been given to understand that after two months, the food crisis will be over. I do not know. The rabi crop is coming up; it has come up in certain parts and it is already in the market. But it is very surprising to know that where there is a bumper crop and the markets are flooded, the prices are shooting abnormally. What is this

[Swami Ramananda Tirtha]

phenomenon? I am speaking from personal knowledge. Only two weeks back, I had the chance to travel to the interior parts over three hundred miles and I passed through fields with a bumper crop. But the villagers and the townsmen were telling me that the prices were shooting up. I have no answer to give to the villagers and I find that I am not a solitary person in this respect. An eminent person, a former Finance Minister, Shri C. D. Deshmukh, in one of his interviews at Madurai on the 15th February, has said:

“My perplexity about the present economic situation is how with an estimated crop of about 70 million tons, we still have food scarcity in the country. Last year, we produced 62 million tons. In the two previous years, the production was 65 million tons, which was enough along with the imports for feeding the country. If in the present year, we have 70 million tons, why should price rise at all?”

That is the question which comes from an eminent economist and a former Finance Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Has he given the answer, or has he only posed the problem?

Swami Ramananda Tirtha: He has only posed the question, so far as the newspaper report goes. I just want to know how these prices are going to be controlled or at least stabilised. Life becomes very miserable when every day the price is shooting up. Either we have to minimise what we actually eat or we have to go in for some other methods. This question is a serious one and so I would request the House and those who are in authority to face the situation squarely and properly.

I will refer to one more small matter before I conclude. Because of the re-organisation of States there

is some grievance among the service personnel who have been allotted to the new States. I do not know how deep that feeling is, but there seems to be some substantial cause for their complaint in regard to seniority, in regard to re-allotment and various other matters affecting their service conditions. Though this is a question primarily for the States to consider, since this happens to be an all-India feature, can the Home Ministry here not do something in order to see that the legitimate grievances of those service personnel are removed?

Then, of late there has been a tendency to issue Ordinances and then come forward before this House to legalise them in the normal way. Nobody would be opposed to the issue of Ordinances as such, because in emergencies that is a power which every democratic country must have in its armoury. But if these powers are exercised too often it leaves a very bitter taste in its trial and a feeling is likely to be created that when the Government finds itself in an uncomfortable situation it resorts to Ordinance-making. Well, that feeling ought not to be there in the minds of the people.

I have nothing more to say. Of course, in regard to bi-lingual Bombay State I have always stated my view that this House will be well advised in revising the previous decision. It is for this House to consider. I do not want to say anything more because there will be other occasions in this House for us to consider that.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Mr. Speaker, the President has made only a passing reference to the rise in prices of the primary necessities of the masses. He has said merely that food prices in wheat and gram have increased and added “but the *rabi* crop is going to be good”. Evidently, his advisers think that the people should not purchase wheat at this time but

wait to get their food when the new crop comes! The prices are rising so rapidly that I am afraid that one of these days our Ministers will come to Parliament to ask for dearness allowance. The Members of Parliament are waiting to see when they make this demand, so that the members might make their own demands.

Shri Tyagi: No, no.

Acharya Kripalani: For the rest, the President's Address gives a rosy picture of the accomplishments of the Government. But, I am afraid, that the achievements do not appear to have made any difference in the life of the mass of our people living in the villages. There has been no diminution in their poverty or unemployment. Rather, the hopes that had been formed of the Second Five Year Plan have been falsified. At the end of this Plan there will be more unemployment than before. The outgoing President of the Congress at Nagpur was constrained to say that in India the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. This is natural for there is an all round increase in the prices and the real wages of the people have not increased.

The previous speaker, Swamiji, quoted something from the *ex-Finance Minister's* interview. He (the *ex-Finance Minister*) was surprised, he could not understand that in spite of a bumper crop prices were rising. I think it is a question which is not difficult to answer. It is because there is inflation in the country. Whatever the official economists may say, whenever there is rise in prices and there are no reserves with the Government, it is a clear case of inflation. The result is that the people have to spend more for their primary needs of food, clothing, housing, education of their children, medical aids and so on. There is no proportionate increase in their incomes or in the social amenities provided for them. Rather, taxes are ever increasing. And without completing the tasks that the

Government have already undertaken, they are thinking of a Third Five Year Plan, a more ambitious one than the others.

Somebody connected with the Planning Commission recently gave to the press figures—Rs. 10,000 crores will be spent on the Third Five Year Plan. He has also said wherefrom that money is to come. He said that about Rs. 100 crores would come from the Government's policy to take up State trading in foodgrains. We had thought that the Government itself needed cheaper food for their Plans; we had thought that the people needed relief in this direction; we had thought that this item was being taken up by the Government in pursuance of their policy of socialism. But we did not know, and it is very strange to read, that the motive behind taking up trade in foodgrains is the profit motive.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khadesh): What else do you expect?

Acharya Kripalani: Or course, I expected nothing else; otherwise I would have been on the Treasury Benches.

Shri Tyagi: I am afraid there is no official announcement to that effect.

Acharya Kripalani: Somebody has made the announcement. There is no official announcement. That makes it worse. Any Tom, Dick or Harry might make an announcement and frighten the people. As if the people were not already frightened about the State taking up the trading in food, here is something to frighten them further.

Shri Tyagi: That is an irresponsible announcement.

Acharya Kripalani: It is strange that the first glimpse we have of the new Plan is in terms of money and not in terms of actual projects and the targets we contemplate. This, I submit, is a wrong approach to planning.

[Acharya Kripalani]

Another thing is that the figures have been given to the public even before the All-Party Advisory Committee, to which we were invited, had an occasion to meet. This is how the advisory committees are treated!

As for our capital resources, we are always reminded that however welcome foreign loans might be we must rely upon our resources and for that we are told that not only we must increase our resources, but we should also conserve what we have and economise in our expenditure. The people are told to practise austerity—people, who are not getting two square meals a day are asked to practice austerity! But we see no signs of austerity in high places, whether in administration or in any other field of life.

To give only an example, our Rashtrapati Bhavan and the Governors' palaces maintain the same costly paraphernalia that they did in the old Imperial days. We have done nothing to change the pattern and make it more Indian and less costly. Important visitors from England express their happiness that we are maintaining in these houses the same pomp and the same pageantry that was invented by them to keep up their prestige in a foreign country. Our highest dignitaries, who lived among the people in modest style, are lodged in imperial palaces and are segregated from the people as if they suffered from some contagious disease. The style they live in is so foreign to the country and to them that they do not understand it and they have to rely upon their ADCs to give them instruction about their conduct. And of these ADCs, some of them are not a little afraid!

Expenditure on shows and *tama-shas* has been ever-increasing. This not only drains our slender resources, but it sets a fashion for conspicuous living among the rich and the admini-

strators. While other countries have one national holiday, we have two and the holidays that we enjoy in this sputnik age of hard work and toil would undermine the vitality of stronger and harder people than ourselves.

We talk so much of planning, but planning is a matter not of good intentions. Nor is it a matter of our capacity for careful drafting or even scientific drafting. What is most needed is that the politicians who devise the plans and the administrators who carry them out should be imbued with the spirit and with the basic ideals about the reconstruction of the country. People have doubts whether those who devise the plans, the politicians and the administrators, believe in what they keep before the people. The hon Prime Minister himself, in another context, recently said that "when you make the individual or a group responsible for carrying out a policy which is not his own, difficulties are bound to arise." Further, if our plans are to succeed, the administration must be honest and efficient and must be able to create the requisite organisation for the tasks that it has undertaken. I am afraid that it is a common complaint that bribery, corruption and nepotism are rampant in Government offices.

Shri Tyagi. No

Acharya Kripalani. The hon Ministers say and the administrators also say that corruption exists but at lower levels. But it is at these lower levels that the people come in contact with the administration. It is also at these lower levels that the details of the administration are given effect and it is at these lower levels that co-operation of the people can come about. Then what would you think of the ability of an administrator, who says that he is honest but he cannot keep his subordinates honest? It is strange—such arguments.

Common people, therefore, have no faith in the administration. Man lives by faith and if he has no faith in the administration it is useless to ask him to co-operate with it. He will never do it. The people can co-operate with administration when the administration co-operates with them in their day to day difficulties and redress their grievances. In addition, the complaints of corruption, whenever they are made, are not enquired into.

I am at the head of a national organisation for the production of *khadi* called the Gandhi Ashram. This Ashram has been manufacturing silk cloth in West Bengal. They have to book this costly cloth to different parts of India. I have heard complaints from our workers that when they go to the station they are asked for gratification. If they do not pay their goods are not booked for one reason or the other and they are delayed so that they deteriorate. Complaints have been made but no redress is coming forward. Therefore as the Director of the Ashram I have told my workers to give the customary gratification. Why? Because the losses we have suffered for not paying a few rupees run into thousands and I do not want the poor people's money to be wasted. This Ashram is a national institution and it provides work and wages to the poor people. To such anti-social depths we are reduced, we who are public workers, and they (the leaders) talk of constructive work.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon Member brought it to the notice of the hon Minister?

Acharya Kripalani: Yes, it has been brought to the notice of many people.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): He was Chairman of the Railway Corruption Enquiry Committee. Has he demanded the implementation of that report in every way?

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Yes, he has.

Acharya Kripalani: If Congress people are satisfied with what is happening, I think they are the greatest enemies of the country.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): No, Sir, we are not satisfied.

Shri Nath Pai: Any way, Shri Alva seems to be satisfied.

Shri Ranga: It is the duty of all of us, Sir, to see that the Report of the Railway Corruption Enquiry Committee is implemented, it is not only the duty of Acharya Kripalani.

Acharya Kripalani: I would ask the hon Member who interrupted me, Sir, to hear me out, and when he has occasion to speak he can say what he likes against what I have said. I am not a person to give the order to my workers that they give gratification. All my life I have stood against it. For anybody to think that I must not have taken all the necessary steps to see that these things are corrected, is absurd. But I say, Sir, we public workers are put in such humiliating position, that I wanted to say this in this House in order to excite the feelings of this House and to bring some wisdom to the Treasury Benches.

Further, whenever there are reports in the Press, defamatory reports in the Press, be they against public workers, be they against administrators, be they against capitalists—I have seen books written—nobody wants to vindicate his honour. Nobody, no paper or pamphlet writer is brought to the court of law so that the honour of the administrators or the honour of the capitalists can be vindicated. What does this mean? This means and the people suspect, that if those defamed are going to file a case of defamation more damaging things will come out than have been reported in the Press. This is not a good impression left on the people. Therefore, I am glad that Shri Mathai

[Acharya Kripalani]

has said that he would take proceedings against those who have defamed him.

An Hon. Member: It is only a threat.

Acharya Kripalani: I am sure, whatever you may say; I believe, that he will do something about it. I am also glad that the Government has instituted a probe into this matter even though it may be official, because it is necessary. Many ugly rumours are current not only in the market place but also among the intellectual circles. This probe, I am sure, will vindicate Shri Mathai's integrity and loyalty of which the Prime Minister has no doubts. This probe is necessary also, Sir, because some oblique references have been made to an ex-Minister and to a Governor of a State.

Sir, we have often been told that the reconstruction of the country requires close co-operation between the officials and the people, and the former should be the friends and guides of the latter. But the official relations with the people is that of the old bureaucracy in imperial days. They appear to the people to be the agents of power. Yet the people are asked to give their co-operation.

That the approach of the officials is not as it ought to be is clear from the repeated exhortations made to them by their political bosses. Recently, Sir, our Rashtrapati speaking at the Public School of Administration said, that the administration was not an end in itself but essentially a means for promoting the welfare of the community through the orderly management of the day to day affairs and the smooth and steady disposal of work. It is therefore of the utmost importance that "a human approach" was maintained in tackling problems and in implementing programmes. It was also necessary, he said, to be responsive to public opinion and the administrators should conduct

themselves in a manner which would inspire the confidence of the people. He said that without a human approach and a spirit for service even the best trained administrator will fail to have the right attitude to the public he is called upon to serve."

Sir, the proper organisation of business on which depends the efficiency in the administration also requires to be looked into. I am afraid that many of our failures are due to defective organisation, and in this respect the Audit and the Estimates Committee's Reports are very revealing. In the Audit Report recently published on Defence Services it is pointed out that there were many avoidable irregularities resulting in great losses to the public exchequer. The report says that during the recent years large savings have been made in Defence Services. In the year under review savings amounted to Rs 30½ crores—about 12.5 per cent of the total grant voted. Stores are purchased which can never possibly be used. 240 tons of a certain material were purchased for the manufacture of ammunition in 1952-53, and only 8 tons were used till 1956. After reserving 83.5 tons for possible future use—in how many years I do not know—148.5 tons have now been declared surplus, and valued at Rs. 8 lakhs which will be sold for a song. In 1950-51, 15,250 gallons of varnish were purchased for some manufacturing purposes. In 1956 11,250 gallons were declared as surplus and sold at a loss of Rs. 1,61,634. This shows how faulty are the estimates made. The original estimate was that 25 gallons would be needed for the manufacture of 1,000 units. In actual fact only 6 gallons were needed. 11,260 square feet of a certain material were purchased in 1950. You will be surprised to learn that in 1955, 10,400 square feet were considered as surplus, valued at Rs. 40,000 and sold for Rs. 13,000—thirteen, not thirty. Lack of supervision and unsatisfactory co-ordination in the factories resulted in

huge accumulations of components of the value of Rs. 9 lakhs in two cases alone. The Government had to pay a heavy loss of Rs. 75,000 on a road construction work due to faulty supervision. In spite of that, the road constructed was below specification and defective and inferior material had been used. A vulcanising plant was purchased from American surplus stores in 1949 for Rs. 51,000. In 1956, the same was sold un-used for Rs. 13,000 at a loss of Rs. 38,000 plus Rs. 6,000 spent on freight charges. Another case reported on page 9 makes painful and strange reading. Arrangements were made for establishing of a plant for the manufacture of a certain kind of ammunition. It did not function according to the plan. Target dates have been exceeded by 7 years. Meanwhile the firm of technical consultants have been paid more than the ceiling they were entitled to receive.

13 hrs.

Shri Ranga: One crore more.

Acharya Kripalani: Still the Defence Ministry is unable to fix the persons who were responsible for this. The overall cost of the project is over Rs. 470 lakhs. This is what is happening in our Military department which is meant for the safety of the nation.

What is happening in the public sector? In the public sector, our big plans are executed through autonomous corporations, these days. This will continue to be the pattern in this sector of our economy. In these corporations, under the guise of autonomy and flexibility what is being perpetuated is autonomy and irresponsibility and indifference. The Public Service Commission is not consulted in the matter of appointments. The checks and counter-checks of the Auditor General are avoided. The corporations cannot be brought even under the strict supervision of Parliament. While there is need for a certain amount of flexibility, this should not be allowed to degenerate into irresponsibility. This, I am

afraid, is happening in some of our corporations, especially Insurance, Steel and State Trading corporations. I do not want to go into details at this stage. On some other occasion, I will give you more startling details. I shall give only one or two examples from the steel plants.

There is an overall wastage of Rs. 100 crores in the three steel plants alone. Also every day's delay—even a day's delay—costs us about Rs. 40 lakhs for all the three plants both by way of interest, overheads, working loss, and loss of production. I understand that for the Rourkela plant, the Government was persuaded by its German contractors to hire a certain equipment of theirs which, according to those who know, would cost not more than Rs. 60 lakhs even if it was a new. I am informed that the amount of rent provided in the estimate for this equipment is more than Rs. 75 lakhs. The rent is calculated on the basis of a certain percentage of cost per month. For this purpose, this equipment is taken as new. However, most of the equipment for which we are paying this huge rent is secondhand and almost completely written off. I am amazed at the way these contracts are entered into and are sanctioned by the Law and Finance Ministries. Persons who feel that there should be no criticism about these public corporations are not friends of these corporations. I am afraid they are their enemies. By preventing criticism they are condoning weakness and inefficiency. All these are likely to prejudice the people against the public sector.

Want of faith in our national aims and want of efficiency and defective organisation and co-ordination are not complaints voiced by me because I am in the opposition; they are voiced by Congressmen also. The ginger group or whatever it may be in the Congress recently said, "No matter how good and wonderful the theoretical building of a plan may be, it will not be of much consequence

[Acharya Kripalani]

if it is not backed by an administrative machinery which has as much regard for social ideas as for efficiency and honest work." Unless, therefore, our politicians and administrators are in tune with the socialist ideal that we claim is at the back of our plans of reconstruction and unless the administration is honest and efficient and can properly organise their work and is able to get the co-operation of the people, by co-operating with them in their difficulties and bringing to its tasks the human touch, however well designed our plans may be, they will not succeed in making our economy, in the words of the Rashtrapathi, "self-reliant and self-generating".

There is another point to which I would refer before I conclude. It is rather a delicate point, and in mentioning it, I am afraid there will be some misunderstanding about my motives not only among Congressmen, but among the members of my own party and others. But, after Independence, I have been misunderstood so often that I have become indifferent to my reputation. I am referring to the appeal of the new Congress President. It is sweet of her to invite former comrades in the freedom fight to re-join the parent organisation. I know her from her childhood. She reminds me of her mother who was universally loved and who with all her frailty and gentleness had a will of her own.

Mr. Speaker: Do we refer to statements on party matters here?

Acharya Kripalani: Because they have a reference, I am afraid, to the Government; I am coming to it.

Mr. Speaker: We are addressing ourselves to . . .

Acharya Kripalani: You will please be a little patient. We will be coming to it!

Mr. Speaker: Am I not entitled to know how it is relevant?

Acharya Kripalani: I say when I proceed you will know the relevancy of it, and then you can order an expunction, if necessary.

Mr. Speaker: Normally, the hon. Member would object to such a procedure.

Acharya Kripalani: Normally I would object, but this time I will not object!

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear the relevancy.

Acharya Kripalani: Personally, the appeal of the Congress President has greatly touched me. It would, therefore, be uncharitable to say that the Congress must first put its own house in order before inviting those who have left to come back.

Shri Tyagi: Ours is in order

Acharya Kripalani: After all, most of the wranglings in the Congress today are due to rivalry about positions of power and privilege. Apart from this, the tasks that the ruling party and the Government have kept before themselves and the people are formidable indeed. The difficulties that confront the nation in the fulfilment of these tasks are even more formidable.

To enumerate a few of these tasks, there are the problems of food and the rising prices; then there are the new agricultural policies have to be given effect to; State trading in food; ceiling on land holdings and the very much debated question of the creation of co-operatives and further the creation of service co-operatives; and above all, the Five Year Plans that come upon us so rapidly and have presented in the past financial, administrative and various other difficulties.

These problems touch every aspect of our life,—political, economic, social, moral and even spiritual. The way we tackle these today will make or

near the happiness of generations unborn. It is, therefore, nothing surprising that the President of the Republic should ask for the co-operation of all the parties. It is also nothing surprising that the Prime Minister should remind us from time to time that these tasks are national and not those of the Government or the ruling party alone. A few days back, in the Rajya Sabha, the Prime Minister is reported to have said:

"The broader tasks before us are not party tasks but national tasks, and therefore in this tremendous adventure we seek the co-operation of all. All these great programmes that we see in perspective all round us, cannot be realised without a great deal of co-operative effort. No Government (mark the words), however wise and well-meaning it may be, can succeed without that co-operation. And I do not presume to say that the Government that I have the honour to preside over, is so brilliant as to solve all the problems in India. I do appeal to the House and others outside that while we have every right to hold our opinions and criticise, the broader tasks before us are not party tasks but national tasks. Therefore, in this great adventure we seek the co-operation of all."

Let us see what happens when a country has to face great difficulties or is in a crisis, internal or international. Such a situation requires the utmost unity and concerted effort. These are either imposed through coercion from above, or made available by the people themselves. In the former case, recourse is taken to a temporary or permanent dictatorship, but no dictatorship can be permanent. This dictatorship imposes unity upon the people and drives the people by the whip to work. But this is not the democratic way. In a democracy, unity and co-operative effort are achieved through the arrangement for a national government.

It is no use asking the political parties to co-operate unless co-operation is invited not only at the level of consultation but also at the level of execution. Opposition parties cannot be asked to make themselves responsible for policies in the execution of which they have no part or lot. I am afraid that the logical implication of the oft-repeated appeals of the Prime Minister is neither recognised by him nor by his party nor by the Government.

The formation of a national Government is all the more necessary because the quantum of integrity, intelligence and organising capacity in the nation is strictly limited, and unless we mobilise all our forces and resources in these directions, we are not likely to succeed.

It may, however, be argued that the Congress itself is a national organisation. It represents all the divergent and conflicting interests in the country. I am afraid that while this was its strength before independence, it is its greatest weakness now. But I hope the Prime Minister does not mean this when he calls upon the co-operation of other parties.

If the ruling party is reluctant to recognise the need of the situation in the country, the democratic opposition parties do no better. They often say that we are in the midst of an internal crisis, but they shy at the very idea of a national co-operation which will mean co-operation with the Government and the Congress they have opposed so long. The PSP has a policy statement which precludes it from co-operation with the Congress or the Government in the political field. However, when its members are called upon to work on joint committees on planning etc., they do not and dare not refuse co-operation. If they did, they will be charged with standing out and avoiding responsibility for a national effort designed to advance the interests of the masses.

[Acharya Kripalani]

When, therefore, Food Committees were recently formed in the Centre and some of the States, they had no choice, but to co-operate. They knew that most of the food difficulties arose not so much from defective plans as from faulty execution. For instance, we are told that the present rise in prices is due to black-marketing and hoarding. Measures to check blackmarketing and hoarding, measures to check these evils, can only be devised and executed not by the Food Committees but by the executive. Even when plans are carefully and wisely formulated, unless they are properly and promptly executed nothing much can be done. The democratic Opposition parties are as unwilling to recognise the logic of the situation as the ruling party. The tragedy, however, is that wisdom dawns on both sides when they have to face their common opponents in power, the Communists, as is the case in Kerala. They try to close the stable gates after the horse has been stolen away. What I have said, relevant or irrelevant in this connection, represent my views and not those of my party. However, I feel that I am faithfully voicing the opinions and the wishes of the people as expressed in the market place.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East) I speak in support of two amendments tabled on behalf of the Independent Parliamentary Group, namely amendments Nos 208 and 209, which express the hope that the references to co-operation and agrarian reforms in paragraph 11 of the President's Address do not have specific reference to the proposals for joint co-operative farming and for ceilings which have recently been adopted by the ruling party.

The paragraph in question of the speech is unexceptionable, and one may not quarrel with it. We may then be asked why we seek to raise these issues when they have not explicitly been raised before the House. The

reason is this—that we do not want it to be said later that, even in an implied manner, this House was committed to the principle of those measures. This is the first occasion since the meeting of the ruling party in Nagpur was committed to certain adventures in the field of agrarian legislation, and we want to utilise this opportunity to make it clear that there is at least one group in this Parliament which will give unrelenting opposition to the proposals for joint farming in place of the traditional Indian method of peasant family farming.

Shri Ranga: There are plenty of others also.

Shri M. R. Masani: We believe that these aspects of the Nagpur decisions are greatly injurious to the national cause. We believe that public opinion does not accept these policies, not even within the ranks of the party itself.

Shri Tyagi: Only the crank.

Shri M. R. Masani: And if there is no one else in the House who is prepared to maintain that opposition and to give voice to public opinion, and I say overwhelming public opinion, then the Independent Parliamentary Group will make it its function to do so.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would make a request to you that in view of the importance of this subject, which is one of our national problems today, you would be good enough to give me at least half the time which the preceding speaker occupied,—and we all appreciated his doing so.

Now, I shall deal separately with joint co-operative farming and the proposal for ceilings.

13 32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Let me make it clear that I do so as a supporter of the co-operative principle. I have been a life-long supporter of co-operation. I am one of

the founders of the Industrial Co-operative Association in Bombay, and my own little bank account has never been in a capitalist bank but always in the Bombay State Co-operative Bank. I believe very strongly in the principles of genuine co-operation. But when we use these terms like co-operation, we have to be very clear as to what co-operation really is, and what it is not. I hold in my hand a little booklet called *Co-operatives: True or False*, by Mr. J. A. Hough, Research Officer of the British Co-operative Union, and the views I express will be in line with those of co-operators such as the Indian Co-operative Union in India, the British Co-operative Union and all co-operators throughout the free world.

Now, what is true co-operation and what is false co-operation? True co-operation can take many forms. It can take the form of co-operative credit; it can take the form of multipurpose co-operatives which help the peasant who owns his own land to get good seed, to borrow or loan a tractor, if necessary, to have fertilisers, to get credit for all these services. And he can also use the co-operative for selling his goods in the market, that is, marketing co-operatives. They can be separate or together. But the essence of genuine co-operation is that the peasant must own and cultivate his own land. Co-operation can only be between free men, not between serfs. Co-operation can be between men who say, "This land is mine, I shall cultivate it with the members of my family, but for the sake of greater production and mutual assistance, I shall come together with others of my kind." That, Sir, is genuine co-operation, and I do not think any one in this House can object to it or can dissent from it. We are all for it.

But there is another kind of co-operation, so-called, which is not co-operation at all, and that is collective farming of the Soviet-Chinese model. That collective farming, as Marshal Tito recently said about China, has nothing to do with Marxism or social-

ism. That system has been devised so that the greatest amount of surplus value or surplus gram can be squeezed out of the peasantry for the greater glory of the dictatorship, its military machine and for the process forced industrialisation which is being erected on the backs of the groaning peasantry of Russia and China.

According to an editorial in *The Hindu* of the 11th January, 1950.

"The Nagpur programme appears to be borrowed from China where the fabric of society was destroyed by war and revolutions and where the communist party was in a position to do anything it wanted."

Now, it is in the light of this distinction that I would judge the policies which today go under the name of joint "co-operative" farming. In my view and the view of co-operators, the dividing line is this, if you allow a peasant to keep his land and his boundaries, if he farms it with his own hands and those of his family and hired labour, then he is member of a genuine co-operative, but if you uproot these boundaries, if you pool the land, if you create a big farm and call it a co-operative, it does not change anything, it is still collective farming minus the name. Now in the light of this distinction, let us look at the Nagpur resolution. I shall quote the relevant para, because I do not want to be accused of misquoting or misunderstanding what was decided at that meeting. I am quoting from *Yojana*, the official organ of the Planning Commission.

"The future agrarian pattern", says the resolution "should be that of co-operative joint farming in which the land shall be pooled for joint cultivation, the farmers continuing to retain their property rights and getting a share from the common produce in proportion to their land. Further, those who actually work on the land, whether they own the land or not will get

[Shri M R Masani]

a share in proportion to the work put in by them on joint farms. As a first step, says the resolution, "prior to the institution of Joint farming, service co-operatives should be organised throughout the country. This stage should be completed within a period of three years, even within this period, however, wherever possible and when generally agreed to by the farmers, joint cultivation may be started."

An enthusiastic Member said "exactly" when I read that sentence about retaining property rights. But what will these property rights mean? When the boundaries of that farm have been uprooted, when tractors and machines are running over that land which once was six or eight or ten or twenty farms, what will the right of property mean? It will mean a piece of paper, a scrap of paper given to the peasant to console him saying "You once owned so many acres, your property is still intact." This is the dodge that was tried and practised in China and in other communist countries. But after a while the question is raised: Why should this man who is not working hard or not doing as much as the other fellow draw a larger share because he owned once some land? In other words you start by saying that the people in the farm will be remunerated partly in proportion to the land contributed and partly in proportion to labour contributed. That is fair enough. But this can never last because the functionless owner is no owner. His property actually has been taken away from him without telling him so, and he is being fobbed off with a scrap of paper which a future government will have no hesitation on "equitable" grounds in tearing up because his utility to society ends on the day on which the farm ceases to be his. Therefore, let us be quite clear. Let those who are party to this decision consider whether they really have understood the implications of what has been enacted in their name.

Actually, I have no hesitation in saying that this resolution passed at Nagpur, whether those who passed it are aware or not, is a resolution for collective farming of the Soviet-Chinese pattern and not for genuine co-operative farming. Therefore, I and my Group oppose this insidious attempt to bring in collective farming by the back-door.

Now, some reasons have been given why co-operative or collective farming—and for this purpose, let us use the two interchangeably, because the Congress pattern of co-operative farming if ever carried out, in spite of Acharya Kripalani's doubts will be collective farming—has been advocated.

Acharya Kripalani. He has also doubts.

Shri M R Masani. What are the arguments for this measure? I am aware of three reasons. I shall mention them. The first is that production will increase. I am amazed that in the face of all the facts from every country in the world there should still be members of this Government who repeat the claim parrot-like: Collective farming wherever tried, co-operative farming wherever tried—of that pattern—has failed to increase production. On the contrary, production has invariably gone down whether it has been tried in a Communist country or otherwise.

First of all the assumption is that a bigger farm produces more. It is not true. Statistics of rice and wheat produced throughout the world show that countries which have small farms, like ours, produce more per acre than countries with big farms. Let me give an example of wheat and rice. The two countries with big farms in the world are the USA and USSR, both have relatively very low yields of wheat. The USA produces 122 quintals per hectare and the USSR 93. Now compare against these two

giant farming systems small farms In the UK, with small farms, the figure is 285 quintals per hectare, in Denmark—smaller still,—it is 344 quintals and in Japan—whose average holdings are smaller than ours—the figure is 226 quintals per hectare or twice as much as in the USA and 2½ times that in the USSR In the face of evidence like this, if people go on repeating parrot-like that production will increase under co-operative farming, I cannot understand it

Shri Joachim Alva: It is no use comparing physically tiny countries with physically big countries

Shri M. R. Masani: It has nothing to do with that We are comparing per acre Japan today with smaller holdings than ours produces out of an acre of land more wheat and rice than we do and what Russia and America do The size of Japan is quite irrelevant

Take rice The USA produces 283 quintals per hectare and the USSR produces 25 Japan, again with smaller farms, produces 485 quintals per hectare—twice as much Where in the light of this in any case at all for argument that production will increase under co-operative farming?

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): What about India?

Shri M. R. Masani: I am coming to India Shri Raghunath Singh will have his answer I know he wants it Let me come to a study made by the Indian Agricultural Research Institute of sugarcane production I will read it Ploughing by bullocks yielded 410 maunds of sugarcane, ploughing with tractor farming upto 6 inches 3615 maunds, with tractor farming upto 10 inches 356 maunds In other words, the bullocks gave the best return, a little dose of tractor farming gave less, and full tractor farming gave the least

Now, I turn from these general statements to the efforts to establish collective farming where it has been tried

Shrimati Beneka Ray (Malda): What was the size?

Shri M. R. Masani: I refer the hon Member to the full study I have got very limited time and a great deal of ground to cover for which I have already asked for your indulgence. But I suggest to the hon Member to refer to the study made by the Indian Agricultural Research Institute

Now, countries which have tried collective or co-operative farming have always failed The USSR, it is notorious, lags behind the rest of the world in production per acre and per man Yugoslavia, which tried collective farming from 1948, gave it up in 1957 The Yugoslav Parliament passed a law on April 27, 1957, abandoning collective farming It said that it had shown negative results—loss of interest by the peasants and decrease in production Communist Poland, which also in its Stalinist phase, tried collectivisation, had to give it up In Poland, 80 per cent of the collective farms and co-operatives have been liquidated in the last two or three years Motor tractor stations have been broken up and the tractors have actually been sold to individual peasants The tax advantage given to co-operatives has been taken away by the Gomulka Government on the ground that there should be fair competition between co-operatives and individual peasants

Let me give the figures that Mr Gomulka Prime Minister of Poland, gave on October 1956 He said that peasant production per hectare was 167 per cent higher than in co-operative farms and 372 per cent higher than in State farms This was the reason why even the Communist Government of Poland has given up co-operative and collective farming and given back land to the peasants 80 per cent of the co-operatives and collectives have been liquidated

By going in for this red-herring of joint co-operative farming on doctrinaire grounds, the Government and the

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Congress Party are diverting interest and attention from the real need which is to give the peasant more water, better seed, better know-how and better tools.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha thought that co-operative farming would increase employment. I do ask him to think a little for a few minutes about this. Co-operative or collective farming reduces employment. By pooling land, by bringing in methods of rationalisation or mechanisation, you reduce the need for labour. The one thing that co-operative farming can be expected to do—whatever else it does not—is to increase unemployment in the countryside. Co-operative farming is the last remedy to try when you want to put more men on the job.

There is only one way to create more employment in the countryside, and that is the method that Mahatma Gandhi always urged, the establishment of rural industries, the taking of industry to the countryside with electric power or without

Acharya Kripalani: Is he for decentralised industry?

Shri M. R. Masani: I am and I have always been for that—along with centralised industries. I believe that this country needs all kinds of industry—centralised and decentralised. My own emphasis, like Mahatma Gandhi's, would be on decentralised industry, small people working on electric tools through power taken to the countryside. I believe that that is the pattern of the future and that Mahatma Gandhi was ahead of all us by many generations.

Finally it has been said that co-operative farming is a higher form of society, it is part of the socialist pattern. Let me say—and I would like anyone here to contradict me—that collectivisation is no part of democratic socialism in any part of the free world. Let me quote what Mr. Aneurin Bevan said, warning this

country against following the Chinese path of so-called co-operatives. On his last visit to Delhi, Mr. Aneurin Bevan, Left-wing leader of the British Labour Party, said:

"India cannot afford to make the mistake that Russia has committed, because she does not possess empty spaces which could be called upon to make up for the failures and mistakes in agriculture as in Russia. India has to bring about an economic revolution in harmony with the needs of the countryside. The application of the principles of collectivisation, mechanisation and centralised control has proved a failure in the field of agriculture in the Soviet Union. The whole countryside in Russia seethed with discontent. The number of cattle in Russia today is less than before the revolution. The Russian experience was being repeated in China and the Communist States of Eastern and Central Europe".

And he ended up by warning us against copying these methods though some of us seem to have neglected to listen to him

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) :
अपने शूरकेन की वाहन तो बननाया
लेनिन में जानना चाहता हूँ कि गेहूँ और
चावल की प्रीड क्या है ?

Shri M. R. Masani: I have not got all the figures for everything. I gave figures for wheat and rice throughout the world and I pointed out that countries with small farms like Denmark and Japan produce more per acre of wheat and rice than giant farms in America and the Soviet Union. I do not think there will be any figures to go against that.

On the contrary, I believe that no democratic socialist can possibly want to uproot peasant farming from our country.

Shrimati Remba Bai: Co-operative farming and collective farming are different

Shri M. E. Masani: I have already proved that the "co-operative" farming of the Nagpur pattern is collective farming, it has nothing to do with co-operative farming. It is no good playing with words. I thought I made it very clear that wherever you uproot family farms, wherever you pool land, there you put an end to co-operative farming, you bring in collective farming, by whatever name you call it.

Shri Ranga: By the back-door

Shri M. E. Masani: I do say with all responsibility that the Nagpur Resolution is a Resolution for collective farming, whether the people who passed it know it or not.

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri K. C. Reddy): What about service co-operatives?

Shri M. E. Masani: The hon Minister was not here when I mentioned them.

Shri Ranga: They are to be used as stepping stones to co-operativisation.

Shri M. E. Masani: The Nagpur Resolution says

"As a first step, prior to the institution of joint farming, service co-operatives should be organised throughout the country within three years"

After that, after they have played their part, after they have softened up the countryside for the totalitarian measure that is to follow, we have this type of joint farming.

Shri K. C. Reddy: I wanted the hon Member's opinion on service co-operatives as such without reference to the Resolution.

Shri M. E. Masani: I started my speech by saying that I am for all forms of genuine co-operation. If the

Minister had been here, he would have heard me refer appreciatively to credit co-operatives, multi-purpose societies, service societies and so on. So long as you leave the farm in the possession of the family, so long as you do not disturb the man-land nexus, which is part of our tradition and our civilisation, I am for every measure of co-ordination and co-operation. But, if you uproot the boundaries and take the land away from the peasants, I shall fight you because you are moving towards totalitarian collective farming.

Now, the question is raised: Can voluntary methods bring about this result? I can only quote a man whose knowledge on this subject is unsurpassed in this country, Mr Charan Singh, who has made a life long study of this.

An Hon. Member: Who is Charan Singh?

Shri M. E. Masani: He is a member and leading light of the Congress Party. He knows this subject much better than anybody else, and, in my opinion, he represents Congress opinion. (*Interruptions*) Mr Charan Singh is a staunch and disciplined member of the party and he has not changed his opinion. He has agreed to bow to the decision of the party as a good democrat. There are some people who change their opinions. Mr Charan Singh is not one of them. This is what he says.

"Human nature being what it is, even brothers of the same mother usually separate from one another after the head of the family, the father, has been removed by death or other cause. In the circumstances, it is Utopian to expect that an average householder will, all of a sudden, identify his interest with the interests of these hundreds of persons in the village or neighbourhood who were total strangers to his life before."

[Shri M. R. Masani]

We know that murders are committed between cousins and between relations for land. To say that because you pass a resolution or you pass a law, you are going to change a human being overnight and make people who love their lands with passion to pool their lands in a voluntary manner is thoroughly Utopian.

There is only one way in which this kind of joint farming can be brought about and that is by coercion and violence.

Take another example. We know about the gramdan villages. In Koraput, Acharya Vinoba Bhave and Mr. Jaya Prakash tried to ask the local people to cultivate them as a village and not to ask for distribution of the land. Mr. Jaya Prakash confessed that this experiment has ended in failure because the peasant does not want to farm village land jointly; he wants something of his own. He wants to farm his own land. That is part of human nature. We all want something of our own. We are not prepared to share everything with everyone in an equal measure. You may call it selfish. The human being is largely though not entirely selfish. Are you going to legislate for human beings or are you going to legislate for angels who do not exist?

Now, the Government of India announced last April that there should be 3,000 cooperative farms by the end of the Second Plan and of them 600 should be brought into existence by the end of the financial year 1958-59. What does this mean? What kind of voluntary co-operation is this? Can the Government of India sitting in Delhi decide in advance with fore-knowledge and foresight how many farms the peasants are going to want on a voluntary basis during a certain period? Is it not a farce to talk of voluntary co-operation and targets? (*Interruptions.*)

I would quote from Gomulka. Gomulka pointed out very rightly that targets and voluntary cooperation cannot go together. Gomulka is known to many of my friends here. This is what he said; these are his words in October 1956:

"Quantitative development of producers' cooperation cannot be planned because, on the basis of voluntary entry to cooperatives, this would mean the planning of the growth of human consciousness, and that cannot be planned."

This is what he said when he rescinded the collectivisation law and handed back the farms to the peasants.

An Hon. Member: Was it in an article or a speech?

Shri M. R. Masani: This was in a speech which he made when he rescinded the collectivisation law and handed over the farms to peasants.

Shri Ranga: He has been called to Moscow recently.

Shri M. R. Masani: What kind of administration have we with which to guarantee this gigantic experiment, after three years, of destroying peasant proprietorship, in taking people away from their lands, millions and millions of them and pooling them in joint farms?

I was reading the Report of the Agriculture Administration Committee appointed by our Government. Let me give in two minutes just what their findings are. They say that there is only a handful of competent senior officers in the Department of Agriculture. No replacements are available for this handful of senior competent officers. Directors of Agriculture in the States have said that if such replacements were available, they would like to replace 30 to 40 per cent of their staff who are not up to the mark. The scales of pay in the Agricultural Service are lower than in

other services. It is common for an officer to be promoted to a gazetted post after 20 years of service and then to retire on the magnificent salary of Rs. 400 a month! The service rules have in many States not been revised for 25 years. Is it any wonder that Sir Malcolm Darling, an experienced and enthusiastic cooperator who was asked by Government to come to this country a couple of years ago and have another look at the picture that Indian cooperatives presented summed up his impressions by saying:

"In every State the path of co-operation is strewn with wreckage."

Out of this wreckage, this great mausoleum of joint cooperative farming is to be erected after three years.

What kind of autonomy will these cooperative societies enjoy? Are we really serious when we talk of cooperatives, or are we only intending that we will impose a super zamindari from Delhi on the poor peasants and call it cooperation in order to pacify them?

Let me summarise the recommendations of the Cooperative Law Committee which reported only a few days back. It was a committee of Registrars of Cooperative Societies and other gentlemen who will have to administer this cooperative farming after three years. Let us see what their ideas of cooperation are. I am giving only five or six of their recommendations.

1. The Registrar should have the right to have the accounts of any society audited "under his own direction and control" and then to give directives to the society to put its house in order.

2. The Registrar has the right "to settle disputes of any kind, to appoint another officer to settle the disputes or to appoint an arbitrator." And no appeal shall lie to a court of law in regard to any of three disputes.—At one stroke these Registrars would

abolish the jurisdiction of the rule of law.

3. The Registrar will have the power to supersede any society; and he may run any society so superseded for two years and, at his own discretion, extend the period to four years.

Sir, what kind of cooperative society is it which has to be run by a nominated official over the head of the society for 4 years? Why not admit defeat and dissolve the society?

4. The Registrar may make an order directing the winding up of any society.

5. The State Government may become a member of any cooperative society and when it becomes a member of a cooperative society, "each person nominated by the State Government on the committee shall have one vote."

Sir, it is surprising to have this kind of report from those who are going to administer the agricultural cooperatives in this country. The Indian Cooperative Union, a leading body of cooperative enthusiasts in this country, have said that the effect of such a report, if accepted, would be to "reduce the cooperatives to little colonies of backward, ignorant and helpless people to be 'administered', 'controlled', 'supervised', 'audited', 'inspected', 'superseded', 'adjudged' and 'dissolved' by one single authority, the Registrar of Cooperative Societies."

There is no wonder that Prof. Chandra Sekhar, one of our finest demographers, who recently visited China, described the Chinese communes as a "new form of colonialism", the same phrase that is used here by the Cooperative Union.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must conclude soon.

Shri M. R. Masani: Sir, I hope you will give me a little more time. Acharya Kripalani had one hour. I am not asking for that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He had only 48 minutes and I am giving Mr. Masani 30 minutes in full. He wanted only half the time given to Acharya Kripalani, I am giving him more.

Shri M. E. Masani: How many minutes out of that 30 have been left, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He started at 1.20 (Interruptions)

Shri M. E. Masani: Please give me some 10 minutes more, Sir. This is an important subject, it is a major issue facing the country. I do not normally take much time of the House.

An Hon. Member: A lone voice.

Shri M. E. Masani: It is not a lone voice, I represent the majority of public opinion on this point (Interruptions)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the hon. Member be heard.

Shri M. E. Masani: It seems to me that there are two alternatives with which we are faced. One is that an attempt will seriously be made to implement this programme of destroying peasant proprietorship after three years and to try to bring in collective farming. I do hope that such an attempt will not be made. But if it is made, it can only be by threats, by coercion, and I do not hesitate to say that if a serious attempt is made, it will unfortunately lead to civil war and bloodshed and the death of thousands of people in this country. I think any one who thinks he can persuade the peasants of India to give up their lands and become landless serfs again for a super-zamindari in Delhi or the State capital is living in a fool's paradise (Interruptions) They will never accept such a change. I hope, therefore, no attempt will be made to carry this out.

There are, of course, many cynics who say that there is no intention of doing this. Acharya Kripalani might think so. But I am not a cynic; I

like to take people seriously. When they say something, I like to give them the credit of meaning what they say. One must hope nonetheless that they will not continue on this path. If they do not do so, then again, one could not say that it would be harmless. Untold damage will be done in the attempt to bring it about, even if the effort is given up half-way. Let me give the example of communist Poland. Only 92 per cent of land was actually collectivised but the production in even the private farms fell until the policy of collectivisation was abandoned for every peasant felt that his turn might come in a few months' time. The incentive to production was taken away. Even the psychological damage of talking about the joint "co-operative" farming will be considerable.

The Prime Minister talking at Baoli on the 10th of February, is reported to have said

"Those who tell you that co-operative farming amounts to some sort of confiscation of land are trying to cheat you."

I wish he had not used this uncharitable remark about people as diverse as Shri C. Rajagopalachari, Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan, Shri K. M. Munshi and many others who have said that. For instance, Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan has said in Banaras only four days ago that co-operative farming in today's context means creating "puppets in the hands of officials" thus depriving the peasants of their vocation and land. It is not good to say of these patriotic sons of the soil that they are cheating the people (Interruptions)

Shri Joachim Alva: Why should J.P.'s name be tagged to Munshi's?

Shri M. E. Masani: My friend is trying to show his loyalty as he always does, it is misplaced loyalty (Interruptions) I wish he kept quite (Interruptions.)

Shri Joachim Alva: You are talking of civil war?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. He may be allowed to proceed uninterrupted.

Shri M. R. Masani: I would not, for a moment, say that those who are trying to tell the people that the land would not be taken away from them, as the Prime Minister and others do, are cheating the people. I do not resort to such language and I do not think the Prime Minister should either. But I do say this that, whatever their motives may be, whatever they may be thinking they will be doing, the people who are really misleading the country are those who say that this Nagpur pattern of joint co-operative farming will not take the land away from the peasants. I say it will. It is those who are denying this who are misleading the people and not those who are bringing this matter to the light of the people and doing a patriotic duty that they must perform.

If time had permitted, Sir, I would have gone to the subject of ceilings. In deference to your wishes, I will drop it altogether.

I will only say in conclusion that the ruling party has set its foot on the wrong road, wrong from the point of view of public morality, wrong from the point of view of a free society and also, if I may say so, wrong from the point of view of self-interest.

Shri Joachim Alva: Wrong from the point of view of the Forum of Free Enterprise . . .

Shri M. R. Masani: I say it is wrong from the point of view of self-interest because for the sake of a minority, a majority is sought to be penalised. Let me give the figures of the landed and the landless people in this country. The National Sample Survey of 1954-55 came to the conclusion that there were 68 million households owning land—with five members per household—while there were 15 million households not owning land at all—about 20 per cent of these with land

Indian Agriculture in Brief, published by the Ministry of Agriculture in 1937, gives these figures. Those who are self-employed in agriculture are 53.7 per cent of the population. These who are landless labourers are only 12.6 per cent. In case the hon. Members are under the impression that a small minority is sought to be attacked by the collectivisation of land in favour of a big majority, let them think again. The big majority of people living in the villages do own some land. You may say it is a small plot but they love that land, small as it may be, as they love their baby, even if it is a little infant. They do not think that their land is worthless because it is small. Help them to cultivate it better, provide them with wells. (Interruptions)

Shri Joachim Alva rose—

Shri M. R. Masani: Will the hon. Member keep quiet? A running commentary goes on. None of us said a word when Shri Alva had his say—stuff which may not be considered good sense. (Interruptions)

Shri Joachim Alva: He has said something which no Member has said—he talks of civil war!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We cannot proceed in this way. There ought to be some decorum in this House. Now, he should try to conclude.

Shri M. R. Masani: Sir, I was concluding when I was interrupted. I was urging that the real duty to the peasant today lies in giving water to the cultivator. We have not got enough irrigation facilities. Give them better fertilisers, give them seed and teach them how to cultivate their lands better than they have been used to do through the ages. This is the way in which Japan and other countries have shot forward in the production of wheat and rice. Instead of doing that, we are drawing the red herring of collective farming across the track and diverting attention from our gigantic tasks. Even if it is never carried out,

[Shri M. R. Masani]

it will divert attention from constructive pursuits and will take class war into the villages setting the landless against the landed, small-landed against the big-landed and so on. Therefore, I feel it my duty to draw attention to these matters.

Finally, may I say this? My constituency has a large element—perhaps a majority—of those who are called Adivasis, the original inhabitants of this country, “aboriginals” as we call them. They are passionately devoted to their land. To them the ownership and cultivation of their land is the whole of life, along with their families and their worship. Such people will never give up their land, with whatever slogan you may approach them. If Members feel that I used a harsh term, if I talked of civil war, that is what I fear. If any serious attempt is made to come to the peasants of Ranchi and Chota Nagpur and to tell them: ‘give up your land and get into the big co-operatives as in China’, I may say, whether you like it or not, blood will be shed . . . (Interruptions.) It is to warn the Government against taking such a step, it is to warn against taking steps which may involve this country in such a horrible thing, that I am raising this question. I want that we should carry our peasantry with us. Gandhiji used to say: “We of the cities will do everything to the peasant except get off his back.” This formula of joint co-operative farming is invented by urban doctrinaire people, people who have very little to do with them and is another attempt in a roundabout way to keep on the backs of our peasantry.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Pudukottai): We all listened with great respect and rapt attention to the President’s Address which gave a panorama of all the activities of the Government in the past year . . . (Interruptions.)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Those who want to talk may go to the lobbies; they should allow the House to transact its business.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: The President had referred to the economic development that is taking place in the country in all the spheres and stressed that the people must work hard and not only implement the Second Five Year Plan but also build up necessary resources for the Third Plan which is being formulated. People in the countryside no doubt hear big schemes like Bhakra-Nangal, Hirakud and so on. They only hear them in name but they ask: what have you done for my village? What are your plans? In what way will it benefit my village? What is the use of big irrigation schemes when my village does not get any benefit out of those schemes? What they want is small minor irrigation schemes. If the Planning Commission were to draw up the Plan in such a way and the Central Government were to put forward a scheme by which the local people could be enthused by having a small scheme, may be minor irrigation scheme, through the community development programme and if they say that Rs. 4,000 will be spent in your village, people in the villages are ready to come forward and say that they will subscribe Rs. 8,000 to the small savings scheme. That is the feeling in the villages. I speak with some personal knowledge because recently during the tour undertaken by me in my constituency, on a *pada yatra* programme, this was faced by me and the Congress workers in my area. I wanted to bring this to the notice of the Planning Commission and the Central Government, particularly, the Finance Minister, in order that they should evolve a scheme which would enthuse the people in the villages to take an active part in the great development programme that is formulated under our five year plans.

14 hrs

There is another matter of importance, that is, the language problem, which is very highly controversial. People living in the non-Hindi areas are having a great apprehension that Hindi will be forced on them and that too earlier than is mentioned in the Constitution. Even no less a person than the Chief Minister of Bihar—Bihar is a Hindi-speaking State—has given a warning which has appeared in this morning's papers. He said that we should not force Hindi immediately lest it should arouse the feelings of the people living in non-Hindi areas. I would only like to bring to the attention of the Central Government, particularly the Home Minister, that the people in the non-Hindi areas should be taken into consideration and their feelings must be respected. Even if Hindi were to be introduced, it should be introduced in such a way as to eliminate compulsion or coercion.

The unity of India that was built up by that great architect the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel who was responsible for integrating the 625 princely States, should not be broken up on this question of the imposition of Hindi. That is my humble submission. The unity of India is more paramount than the introduction of Hindi. The introduction of Hindi should wait for some more time when people in all parts of India will take to that language more kindly than they would do now. There are already separatist tendencies. Even though States have been formed on the linguistic principle, still there are other States that are wanting separation. This controversial issue should not be added to that. After all, we are in the year 1959, and we are having development plans. We are towards the end of the third year of the second Five Year Plan, and we are having an ambitious programme for the third Five Year Plan. This country being at an infant stage in the field of industrialization, such issues as language and the like could

wait till the country is developed and till the per capita income of the people is raised to such a level as to give a reasonable rate of income and make them happier than what they are at present.

The President had referred to one or two schemes in the Madras State, such as the Neyveli project. The Madras State, I may humbly submit, is dependent upon the success of this scheme. I would very much urge on the Planning Commission and the Central Government to see that the carbonising and briquetting part of the project is also included in the second Five Year Plan. Otherwise, it will not be an integrated scheme. Without carbonising and briquetting, the scheme will not be complete and it will not be an economical proposition.

Madras, when compared to other States, is very much backward in industrialization. I want the Central Government and the Planning Commission to devote more attention to the needs of this State and give more financial assistance to it. In fact, Madras State has been able to keep up to the target in regard to the collection of taxes and also to the programme in the second Five Year Plan so far, and we hope to exceed the target before the second Five Year Plan concludes. Inasmuch as we have kept up not only to the time-schedule but as we hope to reach beyond the target fixed for our State, I would like the Planning Commission to take into account the ever-growing needs of our State and give us more financial assistance.

We are thankful to the Planning Commission and the Central Government for the assistance they have rendered so far and we look to the Planning Commission more in particular to help us in order to develop a very backward area and see that new industries are started in order to be able to provide more employment.

श्री. डॉ० सु० खरिंद (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं आपका बधाई कहूँ कि आपने कुछ सप्ताह जम्मू तथा हिन्द के खिताब पर अपने ख्यालात के इजाहार करने को मौका बख्शा। जनाब वाला, आजादी को हासिल किये हुए हम को अब तक तकरीबन दस साल हुए। इस दस साल के धरसे मैं हिन्दुस्तान ने जो तरक्की की है यकीनन वह काबिले दाव है।

जिस वक्त हमने आजादी को हासिल किया उस वक्त हमारे सामने एक नक्शा था कल्लो भारत का, लूट और आतिशयदगी का हिन्दुस्तान के मुक्तलिफ कोनों में फसादात का हमारे सामने मसला था फिर से लाखों इंसानों को बसाने का। हमारे सामने मसला था बेकार लोगों को काम मुहय्या करने का। हमारे सामने मसला था अपने आजाद मुल्क की हिफाजत करने का। मैं आज वह बात दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि हमने उन मसलों को एक बहुत बड़ी हद तक हल किया है। और एक हिन्दुस्तानी की हैसियत से मैं उस पर फख्र करता हूँ।

जनाब वाला, नुक्ताचीनी करना कोई बहुत बड़ी बात नहीं है। नुक्ताचीनी में आपका कुछ सर्फ नहीं होता सिवाय लब और जबान हिलाने के। मैंने यह देखा है कि हमारे बहुत से दोस्तों ने अपनी तकरीरों को सिर्फ नुक्ताचीनी पर ही मन्नी रखा। और मुल्क की मौजूदा तरक्की को, जिसका नक्शा हमारे सामने है, बिस्कुल भूल गये। जनाब वाला, दुनिया में आज जो इन दस साल में हिन्दुस्तान

की इज्जत हुई है, चाहे वह हमारी खारिजा पालिसी की वजह से हो या हमारी खन्द-रूनी तरक्की के, काबिले दाव है। जिस वक्त हमने आजादी हासिल की उस वक्त बहुत से मुयालिक यह समझते थे कि शायद हम काम-याबी से इस हकूमत का नखाम नहीं चला सकते, और वह फिर हिन्दुस्तान में कदम रख सकेंगे। बहुत से मुयालिक इस कोशिश में थे कि तकसीमशुदा हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे हिस्सों को हथियारों से मुसल्ला किया जाये, और हमें हमेशा परेशानी और फिक्रमन्दी में रखा जाये। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान के अजीमशुधान वजीर आजम की अमन पसन्द पालिसी ने आज उन तमाम लोगों को मायूस कर दिया है। वह आज हिन्दुस्तान को एक खुशहाल मुल्क की सूरत में, आज हिन्दुस्तान को एक अमन पसन्द मुल्क की सूरत शकल में, वह आज हिन्दुस्तान को तरक्की की तरफ जाते हुए एक अजीम मुल्क की हैसियत में देखते हुए कुछ खुद भी अपनी राय बदलने पर मजबूर हो रहे हैं।

जनाब वाला, आज से चन्द साल पहले अमरीका और बरतानिया की जो राय हिन्दुस्तान की खारिजा पालिसी के मुतालिक थी, आज वह नहीं है। वह हमारे वजीर आजम की खारिजा पालिसी का असर है कि अमरीका के फार्मि सेन्टरी या सेन्टरी आफ स्टेट मिस्टर डलेस यह कहने पर मजबूर हुए कि पाकिस्तान अगर हिन्दुस्तान पर हमला करेगा तो यकीनी सूरत में वह हिन्दुस्तान की हिमायत करेगा। अमरीका आज हमारी तरफ दोस्ताना रविष पर माइल है उस के वजीर आजम यहाँ आये और बहुतेरे मुल्कों

के गुमायन्दे यहां आये। उन्होंने कुशाहाल और तरक्की करते हुए हिन्दुस्तान की तारीफ की।

जनाब बाला, मैं काश्मीर के मसले पर कुछ कहने का इरादा नहीं रखता था लेकिन इस ऐवान के चीफ़्जत मेम्बर मिस्टर गोरे ने और इस ऐवान में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नायब लीडर श्री गोपालन ने आज कही इलाहाबाद में तकरीर करते हुए काश्मीर का जिक्र किया है। जब हम काश्मीर का जिक्र करते हैं तो हमको इस बात का अहसास करना चाहिए कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के एक ऐसे हिस्से की बात कर रहे हैं जिसकी सरहदो पर दुश्मन खड़ा है, जिसकी आजादी को खत्म करने के लिए बहुत से मुमालिक साजिश कर रहे हैं। हमको ऐसा करते वक़्त सिर्फ़ अपने सियासी या जमायती नज़रियात को ही मद्दे-नज़र नहीं रखना चाहिए। हमें यह भी देखना चाहिए कि काश्मीर कौन से हालात से गुजर रहा है। काश्मीर ने किस तरह इन मसाल का मुकाबला किया है और किस तरह तरक्की की है।

इन्सानी फ़ितरत दुनिया में बहुत बड़ी चीज़ है। इन्सान बहुत सी स्वाहिशात पूरी करना चाहता है। और बहुत सी स्वाहिशात में वह दूसरे लोगों का ताआवन चाहता है। जब वे स्वाहिशात पूरी नहीं होती तो हम दूसरे आदमी को बुरा तसब्बुर करते हैं। हम उसकी हर अछाई को भूल जाते हैं। और अगर हमारी यह स्वाहिशा किसी बुरे आदमी के हाथों पूरी हो जाती है तो हम उसकी तमाम बुराई को भूल जाते हैं।

जनाब बाला, मुझे इन्तहाई अफ़सोस है कि गोरे साहब ने अपनी तकरीर में यह फरमाया है कि काश्मीर में सब ठीक नहीं है। हुज़ूर बाला, सब ठीक तो कही भी नहीं है। ख़ुद गोरे साहब में भी सब ठीक नहीं है। इन्सान खामियों, अछाईयों और बुराईयों का मुरककब है। लेकिन देखा वह है कि आया काश्मीर की मौजूदा लीडरशिप ने काश्मीर में तरक्की के लिए, काश्मीर में अम्हूरियत कायम करने के लिये जो कुछ कर रही है, इस में वह कहां तक कामयाब हुई है। उसने जो कुछ किया है उसकी मैं तारीफ़ किये बग़ैर नहीं रह सकता।

गोपालन साहब ने भी यह फरमाया है कि काश्मीर में अम्हूरियत नहीं है। गोपालन साहब यहा मौजूद नहीं है। लेकिन मैं उनकी खिदमत में एक शेर पेश करना चाहता हूँ :

इतनी न बढ़ा पाकिये-दामा की हक़ायत,
दामन को ज़रा देख ज़रा बन्द कबा देख।

उन इन्सानों को जो शीशे के महलों में रहते हो, उन गरीब लोगों पर जो झोंपड़ियों में रहते हैं पत्थर नहीं फेंकने चाहिए।

फंडामेंटल राइट्स का जिक्र किया गया।
इसके बारे में मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ :

"Application of Fundamental Rights: For the first time since State's accession to the Union in 1947, the people of Jammu and Kashmir were enabled to exercise fundamental rights as enjoyed by the citizens in other parts of India."

[श्री अ० मु० तारिक]

जनाब वाला सुप्रीम कोर्ट के बारे में यहां बहुत कुछ चर्चा की जाती है। इस सिलसिले में मैं जनाब की तबज्जह इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ :

“Extension of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of India: The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court has been made applicable to the State in the same manner as in the rest of the Union save in respect of article 136 of the Indian Constitution.”

जनाब वाला, ट्रांसफर आफ सरविसेज ग्रान दी यूनियन लिस्ट के बारे में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ :

“Transfer of services on the Union List: The responsibility to administer departments like National Highways, Telephones, Telegraphs, Income-tax, Broadcasting and Customs, etc., has been transferred to the Central Government after the adoption of the State Constitution.”

जनाब वाला, एक्सटेंशन आफ दी आथॉरिटी आफ दी आडीटर जनरल आफ इंडिया के बारे में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ :

“Extension of the authority of the Auditor General of India: The Accounts and Audit Department of the State is not under the Auditor General of India whose nominee runs the department in the State. . . .”

जनाब वाला, एक बहुत बड़ा मसला था इंटीग्रेशन आफ सरविसेज का। उस के बारे में आप देखें :

Integration of services: State cadre of I.S. and I.P.S. officers has been created and these officers are now being trained through the Union Ministry of Home Affairs.”

जवाब वाला, यह एक प्रासेस है, एक नक्शा है समारी तरक्की का। और ये सब चीजें वजूद में आयी हैं सन् १९५३ के बाद। निहायत ही कलील अरसा में हमने बहुत सी चीजों को किया। और भी बहुत सी ऐसी चीजें हैं जिनको हम तकमील तक पहुंचाना चाहते हैं। हमारे यहां तालीम मुफ्त है। लोगों को जम्हूरियत की तरफ ले जाने के लिए तालीम की बहुत जरूरत है। अगर काश्मीर की मौजूदा लीडरशिप गैर जम्हूरी होती तो यर्कानन काश्मीर में तालीम को यह आला रूतबा न हासिल होता।

जनाब वाला, और बहुत सी चीजों के बारे में महज सयासी नजरियों की बातें हमारे खिलाफ कही गयी हैं। यह कहना कि वहां जम्हूरी रिवाज कायम नहीं है गलत है। वहां अपोजीशन है। वहां डिमाक्रेटिक नेशनल कानफरेंस है, वहां पर प्रजा परिषद है। आप सब इस चीज से वाकिफ हैं कि प्रजा-परिषद एक फिरकावारांना जमाअत है। लेकिन बावजूद इसके प्रजा परिषद को तकरीर करने, अखबार छापने और हुकूमत पर

इल्जाम लगाने का हक है। उन के बहुत से नेता हैं और जब चाहें और जो कुछ चाहें कह सकते हैं। असेम्बली से बाहर भी उन्हें पूरी आजादी हासिल है। लेकिन जनाब वाला, एक बात है जिसकी तरफ मैं इस ऐवान के मेम्बरान की तवज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ। वह यह कि काश्मीर में तखरीबी कार्रवाइयों की इजाजत नहीं दी जायेगी। तखरीबी कार्रवाइयाँ जो पाकिस्तान के एजेंटों के जरिये कयाम में आती हैं। उन तमाम बातों को हम फायदा भी नहीं पहुंचा सकते। हम ने देखना यह है कि इस वक्त हमें काश्मीर के बारे में क्या राय कायम करनी चाहिए। जनाबे वाला, यह कहा जाता है कि काश्मीर तरक्की और जम्हूरियत की तरफ नहीं जा रहा है। मैं इस बारे में चन्द गैर-मुल्की लोगों की रायें और नज़रिये, जो कि निहायत आला हतबे के लोग हैं, आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

जनाबे वाला, सब से पहले मैं आप के सामने मिस्टर ए० एम० रोज़ेन्वेल, जो कि न्यूयार्क टाइम्स के कारेसपॉण्डेंट हैं, की राय रखना चाहता हूँ जो कि उन्होंने अपने एक डेसपैच में जाहिर की।

“The people are getting many of their demands fulfilled and the pace is faster than ever before in Kashmir history.”

इस के बाद मैं “काश्मीर टुडे” में ताया जिन्कन की राय का तज़क़िरा करना चाहता हूँ।

“The relations between Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, Prime Minis-

ter of Kashmir and his people are unique in India. The people's familiarity is such that it can at times be embarrassing, indeed even dangerous.”

वह आदमी एक मर्दे-कलन्दर की तरह लोगों से घुल-मिल जाता है और उन की शिकायत को सुनता है और उनको सुन कर हतुलइ मकान उन को दूर करने की कोशिश करता है। और हमारे दोस्त इस जम्हूरियत को भी पसन्द नहीं करते। वह यकीनन हिन्दुस्तान का नुमाइंदा है। वह इन्टीग्रेशन का हामी है, और लोगों से बहुत ज्यादा।

अब मैं आपके सामने ह्यु के मौजूदा वज़ीर आमज़, मिस्टर ह्यूश्चेव का काश्मीर के बारे में नज़रिया आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

“It shows that the peoples of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, who belong to different nationalities and different faiths, live as friends and want to work for the well-being of their beloved State—the Republic of India.”

“The question of Kashmir as one of the States of the Republic of India has already been decided by the people of Kashmir. This is the people's own affair.”

जनाबे वाला, इसके बाद मैं आप के सामने वरतानिया के साबिक वज़ीर आमज़, मिस्टर एटली, की राय रखना चाहता हूँ। वह काश्मीर में तशरीफ़ लाये थे। उन्होंने

[श्री० म० तारिका]

अपनी आँखों से वहाँ नः सब हालात देखे । जहाँ उन की तबियत चाही, वहाँ गये और बहुत से लोगों से मिले । आखिर में उन्होंने फरमाया कि—

“Altogether my impression is that judging by results, the present regime is successful. It is also thoroughly democratic with local self-Government all way up from village. I think that Kashmir has definitely opted for Union with India.”

जनाबे वाला, ये उन लोगों की रायें हैं, जिन के बारे में दुनिया के लोगों का यकीनन यह कहना है कि वह बहुत बड़े आदमी हैं । मैं हज्जे-मुबालिफ से पूछूँगा कि रुजू-उचेव साहब ने काश्मीर के बारे में जो कुछ फरमाया है, वह उन्होंने नेक-नीयती से कहा है या नहीं । इस का फंमला मैं उस पर छोड़ता हूँ । सारे ऐवान से और खाम तौर पर हज्जे-मुबालिफ से मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं काश्मीर के मामले में किसी किसम की भीख नहीं मागता और न ही किसी खाम रियायत की दरखास्त करता हूँ । मैं यह भी नहीं चाहता कि इस बात के पेशे-नजर कि हमारी सरकारों पर बाहर के हथियारों से लैस दुश्मन खड़ा है, मुल्क के किसी हिस्से में जम्हूरियत को पनपने न दिया जाये । लेकिन मैं सिर्फ एक दरखास्त करता हूँ कि जमायती नजरिये की बिना पर, जमायती इस्तिस्फात की बिना पर, जमायती

इस्तिस्फात की बिना पर काश्मीर को नुक्ता-चीनी न की जाये । मैं नुक्ता-चीनी से नहीं चबराता हूँ । जम्हूरियत ने हमें यह हक बस्था है कि हम अच्छी और बुरी बात पर अपना नजरिया सामने रखें ।

इस के बाद मैं इस ऐवान और मुशजिज मेम्बरान की तवज्जह एक बात की तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ । अगरेजों ने हमारे मुल्क में फसादात की बुनियाद और तस्मोम की बुनियाद इस बात पर रखी थी कि किसी को माइनारिटी करार दिया और किसी को आला जाति करार दिया । मैं चाहता हूँ कि अब इस किसम की तमाम रसूमात को और तमाम नामों को हमारे यहाँ खत्म कर दिया जाये । हर शाख को, हर हिन्दुस्तानी को मुल्क की तरक्की और खुशहाली के लिए दोष-ब-दोष चलने का मौका दिया जाये । किसी वक्त वहाँ फिकापरस्ती के नाम पर मोटे रस्ते जाते थे और उन्हीं बातों ने तस्मोम की बुनियाद डाली । मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन तमाम बातों को खत्म करके इस मुल्क में जम्हूरियत को पनपने का मौका दिया जाये । हमारा यह फर्ज है कि हम इस बात का खयाल रखें कि छोटी छोटी कम्यूनिटीज की लीडरशिप खत्म होती जाती है । इस तरफ थोड़ी सी तवज्जह दी जानी चाहिए । यह निहायत जरूरी है कि तमाम छोटे छोटे फिर्कों का एतमाद हासिल किया जाये । उन को इस काबिल बनाया जाये कि वे फिर्क न रहें, बल्कि वे पूरे हिन्दुस्तानी बनें और इस तरह एक मुतहिद् हिन्दुस्तान को बनने का मौका दिया जाये ।

[شہری ایم۔ اے۔ طاریقی : (جسوں اور کشمیر)۔ جناب ذہنی اسپیکر : صاحب۔ میں آپ کا مشکور ہوں کہ آپ نے مجھے صدر جمہوریہ ہند کے خطاب پر اپنے خیالات کے اظہار کرنے کا موقع بخشا۔ جناب والا۔ آزادی کو حاصل کئے ہوئے ہم کو اب تک تقریباً دس سال ہوئے۔ اس دس سال کے عرصہ میں ہندوستان نے جو ترقی کی ہے یقیناً وہ قابل داد ہے۔

جس وقت ہم نے آزادی کو حاصل کیا۔ اس وقت ہمارے سامنے ایک نقشہ تھا قبل و غارت کا۔ لوٹ اور آتھی زندگی کا ہندوستان کے مختلف کونوں میں۔ فسادات کا۔ ہمارے سامنے مسئلہ تھا پھر سے لاکھوں انسانوں کو بسانے کا۔ ہمارے سامنے مسئلہ تھا بیکار لوگوں کو کام مہیا کرنے کا۔ ہمارے سامنے مسئلہ تھا اپنے آزاد ملک کی حفاظت کرنے کا۔ میں آج یہہ بات دعویٰ کے ساتھ کہہ سکتا ہوں کہ ہم نے ان مسئلوں کو ایک بہت بڑی حد تک حل کیا ہے۔ اور ایک ہندوستانی کی حیثیت سے میں اس پر فخر کرتا ہوں۔

جناب والا۔ نکتہ چینی کرنا کوئی بہت بڑی بات نہیں ہے۔ نکتہ چینی میں آپ کا کچھ صرف نہیں ہوتا۔ سوائے لب اور زبان کے ہلانے کا۔ میں نے یہ دیکھا ہے کہ ہمارے بہت سے دوستوں نے اپنی تقریروں کو صرف

نکتہ چینی پر ہی مبنی رکھا۔ اور ملک کی موجودہ ترقی کو۔ جس کا نقشہ ہمارے سامنے ہے۔ بالکل بھول گئے۔ جناب والا۔ دنیا میں آج جو ان دس سال میں ہندوستان کی موت ہوئی ہے۔ چاہے وہ ہماری خارجہ پالیسی کی وجہ سے ہو یا ہماری اندرونی ترقی سے قابل داد ہے۔ جس وقت ہم نے آزادی حاصل کی اس وقت بہت سے ممالک یہ سمجھتے تھے کہ شاید ہم کامیابی سے اس حکومت کا نظام نہیں چلا سکتے۔ اور وہ پھر ہندوستان میں قدم رکھ سکیں گے۔ بہت سے ممالک اس کوشش میں تھے کہ تقسیم شدہ ہندوستان کے دوسرے حصوں کو ہتھیاروں سے مسلح کیا جائے۔ اور ہمیں ہمیشہ پریشانی اور فکر مندگی میں رکھا جائے۔ لیکن ہندوستان کے عظیم الشان وزیر اعظم کی امن پسند پالیسی نے آج ان تمام لوگوں کو مایوس کر دیا ہے۔ وہ آج ہندوستان کو ایک خوشحال ملک کی صورت میں۔ آج ہندوستان کو ایک امن پسند ملک کی صورت و شکل۔ وہ آج ہندوستان کو ترقی کی طرف جانے ہوئے ایک عظیم ملک کی حیثیت میں دیکھتے ہوئے خود بھی اپنی رائے بدلنے پر مجبور ہیں۔

جناب والا۔ آج سے چند سال پہلے امریکہ اور برطانیہ کی جو رائے

[عربی میں۔ اے۔ طاہری]

ہندوستان کی خارجہ پالیسی کے متعلق تو آج وہ نہیں ہے۔ یہ ہمارے وزیر اعظم کی خارجہ پالیسی کا اثر ہے کہ امریکہ کے فارن سیکریٹری یا سیکریٹری آف اسٹیٹ مسٹر ڈیلس یہ کہنے پر مجبور ہوئے کہ پاکستان اگر ہندوستان پر حملہ کریگا تو یقینی صورت میں وہ ہندوستان کی حمایت کریں گے۔ امریکہ آج ہماری طرف دوستانہ روش پر حائل ہے۔ روس کے وزیر اعظم یہاں آئے۔ اور بہرے ملکوں کے نمائندے یہاں آئے۔ انہوں نے خوشحال اور نرمی کرتے ہوئے ہندوستان کی تعریف کی۔

جنگ والا۔ میں کشمیر کے مسئلے پر کچھ کہنے کا ارادہ نہیں رکھتا تھا۔ لیکن اس ایوان نے فی عزت منجر مسٹر گورے نے اور اس ایوان میں کمونست پارٹی نے نائب لیڈر شری گوپالن نے آج کہیں الگ تہا کہ میں بتا دیتے ہوئے کشمیر کا ذکر کیا ہے۔ جب ہم کشمیر کا ذکر کرتے ہیں۔ تو ہم کو اس بات کا احساس کرنا چاہئے کہ ہم ہندوستان کے ایک ایسے حصہ کی بات کر رہے ہیں جس کی سرحدوں پر دشمن کھڑا ہے۔ جس کی آزادی کو ختم کرنے کے لئے بہت سے ممالک سازش کر رہے ہیں۔ ہم کو ایسا کرتے وقت صرف اپنے سیاسی یا جماعتی نظریات کو ہی

مد نظر نہیں رکھنا چاہئے۔ ہمیں یہ بھی دیکھنا چاہئے کہ کشمیر کو سے حالات سے گذرنا ہے۔ کشمیر کے اس طرح ان مسائل کا مقابلہ کیا ہے اور کس طرح ترقی کر رہا ہے۔

انسانی فطرت دنیا میں بہت بڑی چیز ہے۔ انسان بہت سی خواہشات پوری کرنا چاہتا ہے۔ اور بہت سی خواہشات میں وہ دوسرے لوگوں کا تعاون چاہتا ہے۔ جب یہ خواہشات پوری نہیں ہوتیں۔ تو ہم دوسرے آدمی کو یہ تصور کرتے ہیں۔ ہم اس کی ہر اچھائی کو بھول جاتے ہیں۔ اور اگر ہماری یہ خواہش کسی بڑے آدمی کے ہاتھوں پوری ہو جاتی ہے تو ہم اس کی تمام برائی کو بھول جاتے ہیں۔

جنگ والا۔ مجھے اٹھنی افسوس ہے کہ گورے صاحب نے اپنی تقریر میں یہ فرمایا ہے کہ کشمیر میں سب ٹھیک نہیں ہے۔ حضور والا۔ سب ٹھیک تو کہیں بھی نہیں ہے۔ خود گورے صاحب میں بھی سب ٹھیک نہیں ہے۔ انسان خاموشی، اچھائیوں اور برائیوں کا مرکب ہے۔ لیکن دیکھنا یہ ہے کہ یا کشمیر کی موجودہ لہڈر شپ نے کشمیر میں ترقی کے لئے، کشمیر میں جمہوریت قائم کرنے کے لئے جو کچھ کر رہی ہے۔ اس میں وہ کہاں تک کامیاب ہوئی

ہے - اس نے جو کچھ کہا ہے اس کی
میں تعریف کئے بغیر نہیں رہ سکتا -
گورنر صاحب نے بھی یہ فرمایا ہے
کہ کشمیر میں جمہوریت نہیں ہے -
گورنر صاحب یہاں موجود نہیں
ہوں - لیکن ان کی خدمت میں
ایک شعر پڑھ کرنا ہوں -

اندلی نہ بڑھا پاکنی دا بن کی حکیمت
دامن کو ذرا دیکھو - ذرا بند تھا دیکھو -
ان انسانوں کو جو شہسے کے پہلوں
میں رہتے ہوں - ان قریب لوگوں
پر جو چہرہ نہروں میں دھتے ہوں
نہیں پوچھنا چاہیئے -

لداسمٹل رائیس ؛ ذکر کہا گیا
اس کے بارے میں میں عرض کرتا
ہوں -

"Application of Fundamental Rights For the first time since State's accession to the Union in 1947, the people of Jammu and Kashmir were enabled to exercise fundamental rights as enjoyed by the citizens in other parts of India."

جناب والا سپریم کورٹ کے بارے
میں یہاں بہت کچھ چرچہ کی جاتی
ہے - اس سلسلہ میں میں جناب
کی توجہ اس طرف دلانا چاہتا
ہوں -

"Extension of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of India: The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court has been made applicable to the State in the same manner as in the rest of the Union save in respect of article 136 of the Indian Constitution."

جناب والا - ٹرانسفر آف سروسز
آن دی یونین لسٹ کے بارے میں
کہنا چاہتا ہوں -

"Transfer of services on the Union List. The responsibility to administer departments like National Highways, Telephones, Telegraphs, Income-tax, Broadcasting and Customs, etc. has been transferred to the Central Government after the adoption of the State Constitution"

جناب والا - ایکسٹینشن آف دی
آٹھارٹی آف دی آڈیٹر جنرل آف انڈیا
کے بارے میں میں یہ عرض کرنا
چاہتا ہوں -

"Extension of the authority of the Auditor General of India. The Accounts and Audit Department of the State is now under the Auditor General of India whose nominee runs the department in the State ..."

جناب والا - ایک بہت بڑا مسئلہ
تھا انٹیگریشن آف سروسز کا - اس کے
بارے میں آپ دیکھیں -

"Integration of services: State cadre of IAS and IPS officers has been created and the officers are now being trained through the Union Ministry of Home Affairs"

یہ ایک پرامس ہے - ایک نقشہ
ہے ہماری برنی کا - اور یہ سب
چیزیں وچرد میں آئی ہیں سنہ ۱۹۵۳ء
کے - بہت ہی قلیل عرصہ میں
ہم نے بہت سی چیزوں کو کیا -
اور ابھی بہت سی ایسی چیزیں ہیں
جن کو ہم تکمیل تک پہنچانا چاہتے
ہیں - ہمارے یہاں تعلیم مفت ہے -

[شرعی اہم - اے - طریق]

لوگوں کو جمہوریت کی طرف لے جانے کے لئے تعلیم کی بہت ضرورت ہے - اگر کشمیر کی موجودہ لہذرشپ بھر جمہوری ہوتی تو پہلے کشمیر میں تعلیم کو یہ اعلیٰ رتبہ حاصل نہ ہوتا -

جناب والا - اور بہت سی چیزوں کے بارے میں معضس سیاسی نظریوں کی باتیں ہمارے خلاف کہی گئی ہیں - یہ کہنا کہ وہاں جمہوری روایچ قائم نہیں ہے غلط ہے - وہاں اپوزیشن ہے وہاں ڈیموکریٹک نیشنل کانگریس ہے وہاں پرجا پریشد ہے - آپ سب اس چیز سے واقف ہیں کہ پرجا پریشد ایک فرقہ وارانہ جماعت ہے - لیکن باوجود اس کے پرجا پریشد کو تقریر کرنے - اخبار چھاپنے اور حکومت پر الزام لگانے کا حق ہے - ان کے بہت سے نیٹا ہیں جو ہماری اسمبلی کے ممبر ہیں - اور جب چاہیں اور جو کچھ چاہیں کہہ سکتے ہیں - اسمبلی سے باہر انہوں نے ہری آزادی حاصل ہے - لیکن جناب والا - ایک بات ہے جس کی طرف میں اس ایوان کے ممبران کی توجہ دلانا چاہتا ہوں وہ یہ کہ کشمیر میں تخریبی کاروائیوں کی اجازت نہیں دی جائیگی تخریبی کارروائیاں جو ہانسٹمان کے ایجنٹوں کے ذریعے قیام میں آئی ہیں - ان تمام باتوں کو ہم فریڈ

بھی نہیں پہنچا سکتے - ہم نے دیکھا یہ ہے کہ اس وقت میں کشمیر کے بارے میں کہا جائے گا کہ کشمیر - جناب والا - یہ کہا جاتا ہے کہ کشمیر ترقی اور جمہوریت کی طرف نہیں جا رہا ہے - میں اس بارے میں چند بھر ملکی لوگوں کی رائیں اور نظریے ، جو کہ نہایت اعلیٰ رتبہ کے لوگ ہیں ، آپ کے سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں -

جناب والا - سب سے پہلے میں آپ کے سامنے مسٹر اے - ایم - روزیلٹھل جو کہ نیو یارک ٹائمز کے کارپسہانڈیلٹ ہیں کی رائے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں جو کہ انہوں نے اپنے ایک ٹیسٹاچ میں ظاہر کی -

"The people are getting many of their demands fulfilled and the pace is faster than ever before in Kashmir history."

اس کے بعد میں دہاکشمیر تو دے؟ میں تیزانک کی رائے کا تذکرہ کرنا چاہتا ہوں -

"The relations between Bakhshi Ghulam Mohammad, Prime Minister of Kashmir and his people are unique in India. The People's familiarity is such that it can at times be embarrassing, indeed even dangerous."

وہ آفسی ایک مرد قلندر کی طرح لوگوں سے کھل مل جاتا ہے اور انکی شکایت کو سلتا ہے اور انکو سنکر حقہ الامکن ان کو دور کرنے کی کوشش

گرتا ہے۔ اور ہمارے دوست اس جمہوریت کو بھی پسند نہیں کرتے ! وہ یقیناً ہندوستان کا نمائندہ ہے۔ وہ انٹیگریشن کا حامی ہے۔ اور لوگوں سے بہت زیادہ اب میں آپ کے سامنے روس کے موجودہ وزیراعظم مسٹر خروشچہو کا کشمیر کے بارے میں نظریہ رکھنا چاہتا ہوں۔

"It shows that the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, who belong to different nationalities and different faiths, live as friends and want to work for the well-being of their beloved State—the Republic of India"

"The question of Kashmir as one of the States of the Republic of India has already been decided by the people of Kashmir. This is the people's own affair"

جناب والا۔ اس کے بعد میں آپ کے سامنے سلطانہ کے سابق وزیراعظم مسٹر ایٹلی کی رائے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں۔ وہ کشمیر میں تشریف لائے تھے۔ انہوں نے اپنی آنکھوں سے وہیں کے حالات دیکھے جہاں انکی طہمت چاہی وہاں گئے۔ اور بہت سے لوگوں سے ملے آخر میں انہوں نے فرمایا کہ

"Altogether my impression is that judging by results, the present regime is successful. It is also thoroughly democratic with local self-Government all way up from village. I think that Kashmir has definitely opted for union with India"

جناب والا۔ یہ ان لوگوں کی رائیں ہیں۔ جن کے بارے میں دنیا 332 LSD—7

کے لوگوں کا یقیناً یہ کہنا ہے کہ وہ بہت بڑے آدمی ہیں۔ میں حذب مخالف سے پوچھونگا کہ خروشچہو صاحب نے کشمیر کے بارے میں جو کچھ فرمایا ہے وہ انہوں نے نیک نیتی سے کہا ہے یا نہیں۔ اس کا فیصلہ میں اس پر چھوڑتا ہوں۔ سارے ایوان سے اور خاص طور پر حذب مخالف سے یہ کہنا چاہنا ہوں کہ میں کشمیر کے معاملے میں کسی قسم کی بھیک نہیں مانگتا اور نہ ہی کسی خاص رعایت کی درخواست کرنا ہوں۔ میں یہ بھی نہیں چاہتا کہ اس بات کے پیچھے نظر کہ ہماری سرحدوں پر باہر کے ہتھیاروں سے لیس دشمن کھڑا ہے ملک کے کسی حصے میں جمہوریت کو پھیلنے نہ دیا جائے۔ لیکن میں صرف ایک درخواست کرنا ہوں کہ جماعتی نظریے کی بنا پر۔ جماعتی اختلافات کی بنا پر۔ جماعتی اقتدار کی بنا پر کشمیر کی نکتہ چینی نہ کی جائے۔ میں نکتہ چینی سے نہیں کھبرانا ہوں۔ جمہوریت کے ہمیں یہ حق بخشا ہے کہ ہم اچھی اور بری بات پر اپنا نظریہ سامنے رکھیں۔

اس کے بعد میں اس ایوان اور معزز ممبران کی توجہ ایک بات کی طرف لانا چاہتا ہوں۔ انگریزوں کے ہمارے ملک میں فسادات کی بلحاظ اور تقسیم کی بنیاد اس بات پر رکھی

[عربی اہم-اے-طریق]
 تھی کہ کسی کو مائٹلاریٹی قرار دیا
 اور کسی کو اعلیٰ جاتی قرار دیا -
 میں چاہتا ہوں کہ اب اس قسم کی
 سام رسومات کو اور تمام ناموں کو
 ہمارے یہاں ختم کر دیا جائے - ہر
 شخص کو - ہر ہندوستانی کو ملک
 کی ترقی اور خوشحالی کے لئے دوہی
 مددوں چلنے کا موقع دیا جائے - کسی
 وقت یہاں پر فرقہ پرستی کے نام پر
 سیتھیں رکھی جانی تھیں اور انہیں
 ہاروں کے تقسیم کی بلحاظ قالی - میں
 چاہتا ہوں کہ ان تمام باتوں کو ختم
 کر کے اس ملک میں جمہوریت کو پہلے
 کا موقع دیا جائے - ہمارا یہ فرض ہے
 کہ ہم اس بات کا خیال رکھیں کہ
 چھوٹی چھوٹی کمونٹی کی لہذا شپ
 ختم ہوتی جانی ہے - اس طرف
 توجہ سے توجہ دی جانی چاہئے -
 یہ نہایت ضروری ہے کہ سام چھوٹے
 چھوٹے فرقوں کا اعتماد حاصل کیا جائے -
 ان کو اس قابل بنایا جائے کہ وہ فرقے
 نہ رہیں - بلکہ وہ پورے ہندوستانی
 بنیں اور اس طرح ایک متحدہ
 ہندوستان کو بننے کا موقع دیا جائے -

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura)

I sometimes feel very disgusted that my suggestions and my submissions are not followed and attended to I said that these two things do not go hand in hand—on one side we speak of socialist pattern and, on the other side, we see the President coming right royally I wish that there will not be contradictions in the statements of our great leaders I will speak here of my principle, my prin-

ciple is: all to work for all to make all happy. I do not regard these different parties as different. I only believe that they are all my countrymen and we are all trying to make our country prosperous and happy I have said in my amendment

"but regret that the Government has failed to frame the Budget so as to avoid the necessity of raising loans"

When our Government speaks of Mahatma Gandhi they praise him very much They make memorials for Mahatma Gandhi But they do not act according to the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi Mahatma Gandhi, when he introduced charkha, meant that people will make everything they need in their own country by their own hands That is what he meant But it is not followed Our Government is taking loan after loan and burdening our generations to come with a great burden So, I have said let us follow a system by which we make all that we can with our own resources, even if we cannot make very rapid progress.

Then I have said

"but regret that the Address does not recognize the labours' right to an equitable share in the profit"

I am very glad indeed that the President's Address has accepted my long-heralded plan that labour should be associated with the management Labour should also be given, I say, full half share of all the profit

Then I have said

"but regret that the Address does not suggest the formation of a World Federation to reduce the tension in the international sphere"

I honestly believe that the only way to stop wars between nations is a World Government, World Federation. Now very important people, Ministers, Prime Ministers sometimes, of different

countries speak of the necessity of a World Government. But, unfortunately, our hon. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, though he admits that a World Federation should come, does not work for a World Federation. I have said, and I repeat, that we should take World Federation as our creed, as the Slavs of Russia adopted communism or the Anglo-Saxons adopted democracy. This fact has been repeated by a very important newspaper, *Ashahi* of Japan. *Ashahi* has asked Mr. Kishi, the Prime Minister of Japan, to adopt World Federation as the creed of Japan and to invite all the nations of the world to co-operate on the plan for a World Federation.

I cannot help repeating this too often. I want to repeat it always whenever I get an opportunity that: "speak not please of this danger and that danger; speak not please that there is danger in the Middle East and we have sent the people to Indo-China, we have done this and we have done that". I say that these partial patching methods do not succeed. The only way is world federation. Of course, I have a plan of world federation with the capital at Honolulu and every continent to be a self governing province.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Why Honolulu?

Raja Mahendra Pratap: If such a plan is adopted and if Asia is one of the provinces of the world federated government then in that there will be a district from Iran to Assam and there will be no Pakistan. There will be the principle of local liberty but all unity in federation. In such a case there will be no danger of war between Pakistan and India.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Quilon): Whom do you suggest in the Prime Minister's place in the world government.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Then I say that adequate steps be taken to check the waste of time and energy and on this I can say a lot. I say that the

principle should be that all should be employed. There should be work for all and bread for all. Once when I was speaking in the United States of America I said that for 2,000 years we have prayed: Give us day by day our daily bread. Now let us take spades in our hands and work and so be sure that every one gets his daily bread.

Unfortunately in our country when my hon. friends speak of welfare of all and of very good plans and programmes, what are they doing? They have developed a band of intellectual workers. They tax the people and divide the money among themselves. That is what they are doing. They are not thinking of the common man and the man in the street. How many people are there who are unemployed today, without their daily bread and without their right—spiritual, moral and political? So, I say that we should remodel our whole Plan and programme and re-organise and overhaul the Government. This system of Government made by the British for the British was only to suck the blood of India and take money to England to build great palaces. This system of government is wrong. This system of government bribes our intellectuals or well-educated youngmen to work for this system and not care for the people below.

Now I must say a few words about some of the speeches which I have heard here. One hon. friend spoke a great deal against co-operative system and its methods. I beg of my hon. friends to realise as to what all this is about. You have not understood how the mind works, why it works and for what purpose it works. I will explain it to you.

When some people get hold of the Government, whatever they be—it may be a caste; it may be a tribe or he may be a dictator—when once they are in command of the Government and hold the reins of the State,

[Raja Mahendra Pratap]

then they always try to make their own chairs secure. That is what is always done. Now, what do these hon friends do? There were maharajas in the country. They realised that there were some people called subjects. So they thought of arousing the subjects against the maharajas. They aroused them and the maharajas had to run away. Their States were taken over. They saw that these zamindars also have great power because they have wealth. Now what to do? They thought of arousing the peasants and they aroused the peasants. They did away with the zamindars. Next what do they find? They find that a well-to-do peasant is also a danger to their Government so let him be put down. This is what the co-operative system is. Now they are trying to arouse the landless people against the peasants who are well-off. These are all tricks which should be known. What is behind them? It is always the blood current. There are always some castes. There are always some tribes. There are always some national blood currents which govern the country or the larger areas. Our Communist friends do not know this. I want to tell them that it was the Jews' great brains, that of Karl Marx and Engels and others which found out as to what was the matter in Russia and in Germany and who were ruling. They found out that the Czar was ruling the priests were ruling and the businessmen were ruling. This is natural. Brahmins did the same. That I have told you before. The Brahmins, the Rajputs and the Banias made an alliance and ruled. This is natural. So, when the Jews found that out they said, 'Down with the King down with the priests and down with the businessmen.' They could develop a revolution and turned out the King they turned out the priests and they turned out the businessmen. Then what happened? What happened was that all the great posts and important positions were monopolised by the Jews. I was in Soviet Russia in those days. (Interruption)

An Hon. Member: You were not born then

Raja Mahendra Pratap. Mr Trotsky, Mr Lunachasky, Mr Radek, Mr Kaminef and all these were Jews. They held the most important places in Soviet Russia, of course, there was great hatred against the Jews. I was there in those days and I saw it myself and heard it myself. The Russians called these Jews as Judes. They were saying, "These Judes have taken our country. These Judes have done this and done that." There was a great commotion in the people. They thought as to what to do. Then the Russian minds found out a good leader in Mr Stalin. He was not a Russian and so the non-Russians could be satisfied. Mr Stalin was only a leader of a small community—a blood current—the Georgians, who are called Gurji in Turkish language. He was made the leader.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: The hon Member's time is up.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I am saying something historical. I am sorry that you are not paying attention to that. I will tell you very briefly in a few minutes.

They did a great deal of nationalisation. What is nationalisation? I said before also and I say again that nationalisation is nothing but a system of certain intellectuals to control wealth. This is what is nationalisation. I say: Give people liberty. You may make money as much as you like and by any means. We do not mind that but we shall control as to how you spend the money. If a Czar indulged in naked ballet—it is a kind of dance in Russia—then what is the difference if Mr Stalin also indulged in naked dances? So I say that there should be a moral system for the country. We want you to spend your money in schools, in colleges, in service to the people and in uplifting the common man. But we will not allow these recourses shikars and hunting

parties. We will not allow these dancing parties. It is a shame for the capital of India to see in the newspapers advertisements of dances in the Imperial Hotel. Pictures of seven or eight women are given and the advertisement reads that there will be a performance by those women at midnight in the Imperial Hotel. Is it not a shame? I believe our government officials should do penance for that. They should go on hunger-strike.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Therefore, I am going to put a stop to that. (Rings the Bell).

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Sir, our hon. President has not kindly taken notice of my five points. I want that India should be out of the Commonwealth. There should be Aryan from Iran to Assam and Nepal to Ceylon. The workers should be given half share in the management and in profit. There should be self-government, home rule in every village and town. Still these captains, collectors and *thanedars* are ruling the country. I want that every caste, every profession should be organised in every village and in every town, and the *chaudhuries* or the leaders of these castes and professions should rule the town and the village. The police should be under them. Every school should have with it factories, farms and fields. There should be no fees for students. The students should work and produce their necessities of life.

भीष्मती कृष्णा मेहता (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो अभिभाषण दोनों संसदों के सदस्यों के सम्मुख दिया है, वह वास्तव में बहुत ऊँचे दर्जे का है तथा वर्तमान भारतीय परिस्थितियों का एक वास्तविक चित्र उन्होंने हमारे सामने रखा है। इस अभिभाषण से पता चलता है कि बहुत सी कठिनाइयों का मुकाबला करते हुये भी देश कितने सुन्दर ढंग से अग्रति कर रहा है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति जी के इस अभिभाषण के लिये मैं आभार प्रकट करना चाहती हूँ और उनके अभिभाषण का मैं धन्यवाद के साथ स्वागत करती हूँ।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना का जिक्र किया है जिसका तीसरा वर्ष समाप्त होने जा रहा है। इन तीन वर्षों में बहुत बड़े बड़े काम हुये हैं। बहुत से उद्योगों में हमारा देश स्वावलम्बी होता जा रहा है, इसकी एक झाँकी जनता को १९५८ की प्रदर्शनी में मिली है और सन्तोष की भावना जनता में पाई जाती है।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में खेती के सुधरे हुये तरीकों को अपनाने का जिक्र किया है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि हमारी साख स्थिति बहुत कुछ सुधर सकती है अगर इन सुधरे हुये तरीकों को अपनाया जाये। साथ ही साथ सहकारी तरीकों को अपनाने से भी बहुत तरक्की हो सकती है। सहकारी तरीकों को अपनाने से किसानों को बहुत सी आसानियाँ होंगी। सच्चा समाजवाद लाने के लिये हमें एक और भी कदम उठाना होगा और वह भूमि की सीमा निर्धारित करने का है। यदि ऐसा किया गया तभी सच्चा समाजवाद कायम हो सकता है तथा तभी हम उस लक्ष्य की ओर अग्रसर हो सकते हैं। इससे, मैं समझती हूँ, बेरोजगारी भी काफी हद तक कम हो सकती है। वह एक बहुत ही लाभदायक प्रयोग सिद्ध होगा।

फसलों को भारी हानि पहुँचाने के बावजूद भी तथा अनेक कठिनायों के होते हुये भी, हमारी सरकार ने साख प्रश्न पर दूर का दृष्टि पा लिया है, यह एक बहुत

[श्रीमती कृष्णा बेहता]

बड़ी बात है। मैं यह चाहती हूँ कि छोटी-मोटी सिबाई योजनाओं को हाथ में लिया जाये। अच्छे बीज किसानों में वितरित किये जाये तथा बीर जो सुविधायें किसानों को दी जा सकती हैं, दी जायें, ताकि वे अपनी कड़ी मेहनत का फल पा सकें। भारत एक महान कृषि देश है और इसमें जन-शक्ति है, मेहनत करने की बहुत ताकत है और उसका पूरा लाभ उठाया जाना चाहिये।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में सामुदायिक विकास योजना का भी जिक्र किया है जिसके अन्तर्गत तीन लाख गाँव आ चुके हैं। इसमें कोई शक नहीं है कि सामुदायिक योजना के जरिये से गतिशील हुए हैं और जिन गावों में अच्छी तरह से कार्य हुआ है, वहाँ पर देखने में मालूम होता है कि गाव वालों की जिन्दगी कुछ बदल गई है। इस बीज का पता गावों में जाकर और गाव वालों से मिल कर और उनसे बातचीत करने से ही लग सकता है।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में राउरकेला तथा भिलाई की धमन भट्टियों आदि का भी जिक्र किया है। यह भी हमारी उन्नति का घटक है। हमारे देश में जहाँ पहले कुछ भी नहीं बनता था अब इतने बड़े-बड़े कारखानों की स्थापना हो रही है और कुछ में तो उत्पादन भी शुरू हो चुका है। इन सब से इस बात की झलक मिलती है कि देश कितनी उन्नति कर रहा है। राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में तेल, प्राकृतिक गैस आदि का भी जिक्र किया है। ये दोनों ही बहुत लाभदायक चीजें हैं और अगर बाद में इनका निर्मात भी किया जा सके तो यह एक बहुत अच्छी बात सिद्ध होगी और तरक्की

का यह भी एक रास्ता सिद्ध होगा। जम्मू और काश्मीर राज्य में भी राष्ट्रीय बाजार बगल पर एक गाँव में, सुना पया है, कुछ तेल की खोज हुई है। मैं केन्द्रीय सरकार से प्रार्थना करती हूँ कि वह जल्दी से जल्दी उसकी तरफ ध्यान दे ताकि उन लोगों को भी कुछ फायदा हो सके और साथ ही साथ रियासत में भी कुछ आमदनी का जरिया खुल सके।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपकी भाषा से अब मैं कुछ शब्द जम्मू तथा काश्मीर राज्य के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहती हूँ। भारत के अन्य राज्यों के साथ-साथ हमारा राज्य भी काफी तरक्की कर रहा है, वहाँ भी काफी तरक्की हो रही है और वह हर पहलू से आगे बढ़ रहा है। शिक्षा, चिकित्सा, सिबाई, विद्युत आदि का विस्तार करने की कई योजनायें कार्यान्वित की जा रही हैं। काश्मीर उद्योगों की स्थापना की दिशा में भी काफी आगे बढ़ा है। वहाँ जाने वाले यात्रियों के लिये काफी अच्छे प्रबन्ध किये गये हैं जिससे यात्रियों को काफी फायदा और सन्तोष हुआ है। सहकारिता का काफी तेजी से विस्तार हो रहा है और इस दिशा में काफी सफलता भी मिली है। राजी तथा प्रताप नहर की टेक्नीकल, आर्थिक उपयोगिता की जांच हो चुकी है उससे हजारों एकड़ जमीन जो कि बकाय पड़ी है जब वह योजना पूरी हो जायेगी तब उसमें भनाज की पैदावार होने लग जायेगी। आर्थिक तथा सामाजिक क्षेत्रों में प्रगति भी बड़े सतोषजनक ढंग से हो रही है और वहाँ की जनता का जीवन स्तर बहुत ऊँचा उठा है इस बात का तभी पता चल सकता है जब कि हम गाव वालों से मिले और उनसे बातचीत करे और उनमें इस बारे में पूछें कि कितनी तरक्की हुई है मैं कहना

चाहती है कि भारत के और राज्यों के साथ साथ काश्मीर में भी तरक्की हुई है। मैं जम्मू-काश्मीर राज्य के गांधी में धूमि हूँ उन गांधी वालों से मिली हूँ और मैंने पाया है कि वे खुशी से और सतों के साथ अपने दिन व्यतीत कर रहे हैं। वर्तमान सरकार पर उनका पूरा भरोसा है। विरोधी दलों की तरफ से समय समय पर काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहा जाता है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि ऐसी कौनसी बात है जो किसी से छिपी हुई है या ऐसी कौनसी बात बहा हो रही है जिस पर भरोसा नहीं किया जा सकता है। काश्मीर में आज तक जितने भी लोग यहाँ से या विदेशों से गये हैं और उनमें बड़े बड़े नेता भी गये हैं जैसाकि हमारे भाई तारिक ने भी कहा है और उन्होंने वहाँ पर हुई आर्थिक सामाजिक और राजनीतिक तरक्की की बहुत ताराफ की है। हजारों की तादाद में यात्री वहाँ जाते हैं, काश्मीर की कोई भी बात किसी से छिपी नहीं रह सकती है और सभी ने देखा है कि कितनी अच्छी तरह में लोभा का जीवन स्तर ऊँचा उठ रहा है और काश्मीर दिन-प्रति-दिन तरक्की कर रहा है। मैं तो कहूँगी कि हमारे समस्त सदस्यों को अधिक से अधिक तादाद में वहाँ जाना चाहिये और वहाँ के हालात का समझने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और यदि उन्होंने ऐसा किया तो उन्हें खुद मालूम हो जायेगा कि किस बात में कितनी मचाई है और मचाई क्या है, वहाँ की जनता कितनी उन्नति कर रही है किमी को किसी प्रकार के भी राजनीतिक प्रभाव में आकर मच्चाई को न भूलना चाहिये।

प्रजातंत्र तथा चुनाव आयोग का अधिकार क्षेत्र उन राज्यों तक बढाने की बात भी कही जाती है। इस की ओर मैं सदन का ध्यान आकषित करना चाहूँगी। भारतीय संविधान द्वारा काश्मीर को कुछ अधिकार और कुछ रियायतें दी गई हैं। आन्तरिक शासन के मामले में काश्मीर स्वतन्त्र है

और उस स्वतन्त्रता को बनाये रखने के लिये काश्मीर को उन रियायतों पर गर्व है। केन्द्रीय निर्वाचन आयोग का उस राज्य पर अधिकार लागू होने से सब कठिनाइयाँ दूर नहीं हो जायेंगी। अगर कोई समझता है कि सभी कठिनाइयाँ दूर हो जायेंगी तो मैं समझती हूँ वह बहुत गलती पर है। वहाँ के संविधान को जो हिन्दू सरकार की तथा भारतीय संविधान की स्वीकृति प्राप्त है उसके अनुसार वहाँ जो चुनाव होते हैं, वे निष्पक्षता से होते हैं। विरोधी दलों को वहाँ पर कार्य करने की पूरी स्वतन्त्रता है। संविधान सभा में विरोधी दल भी है। विरोधी दलों को वहाँ पर अपने विचार प्रकट करने की पूरी आजादी है, वहाँ पर प्रेस का पूरी आजादी है और वहाँ पर जो समाचार पत्र निकलते हैं, उनमें से कुछ विरोधी दलों के भी हैं। काश्मीर में प्रजातंत्र अभी बच्चा है। केवल तीन वर्ष हुए हैं जब कि वहाँ पर संविधान को लागू किया गया था। इन सब बातों को देखते हुए काश्मीर के लिये सब कुछ एक दम करना सम्भव नहीं है और इससे कठिनाइयाँ पैदा हो सकती हैं। वहाँ पर चुनावों की पूरी स्वतन्त्रता है। जनता स्वतन्त्रतापूर्वक अपने प्रतिनिधि चुनती है और उन पर उसको पूरा भरोसा है। जनता द्वारा जो प्रतिनिधि चुने जाते हैं वही ससद के लिये प्रतिनिधि चुनते हैं, ऐसी वहाँ प्रणाली है। वहाँ के संविधान के अनुसार, चुनाव होता है नेशनल कांग्रेस के प्रतिनिधि अधिक तादाद में चुने जाते हैं, उसी पार्टी के लोग ससद के लिये भी सदस्य चुनते हैं। नेशनल कांग्रेस पर जनता का पूरा भरोसा है वहाँ की जनता जानती है जो उसकी कुर्बानियाँ जो कि उसने दी हैं और जो कुछ वह अपने मुल्क के लिये कर रही है। इसलिये आज जनता अपनी सरकार के साथ कंधे से कंधा मिला कर चल रही है।

बहुत सी चीजें जिन को समझना और जिनके बारे में सोचना हमारे लिये आवश्यक है

Therefore, my first submission is, it is no use ignoring the social order, because, the solid foundations of a State are laid only on a good social order. If there is no solid foundation of a good social order, the state machinery may not work properly and these are the signs why the Five Year Plan, according to me, is not being successful.

Just as there is complete absence with regard to the social order in the President's Address, similarly there is complete absence with regard to what I may call even a political order. With regard to this, I may give two instances. The first instance is, there is a talk by responsible leaders in the country as to whether the Parliamentary system of Government has failed or whether it is working successfully. There have been responsible leaders like Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan saying that the Parliamentary system of Government has failed in this country. We have got to consider whether there is any truth in it, whether the Government is expected to make any improvement and whether the Government is expected to make any observations with regard to constitutional conventions. Therefore, this is a matter which should also be considered by the Government. Another instance is with regard to minorities. The minorities accepted the Central Government and they advocated that the Centre must be strong enough. This advocacy was made because they thought they would be protected. But, now the Centre has become such a huge instrument that the Centre has become like a big stone on the chest of minorities. The minorities have not been able to have any say at all. They are not able to have any share in the administration, they are not able to have any share in the services, much less in the other social welfare things. Ours is a republican form of government. The essence of the republican form of government is that exploitation, whether of man by man, or of a class by a class, or of a nation

by a nation, must be eliminated. So, it is no use merely saying that we have got a socialistic pattern of society.

15 hrs

I know that something good is being done. The rich people are being taxed, but where exactly does all this money go? To me it appears that a peculiar class is coming into being which is enjoying these benefits, that is to say, the benefits are being enjoyed to the exclusion of the poor, and particularly of the backward classes. It is a paradox that the poor are being deprived and at the same time the rich are also being deprived. The rich people are being taxed, but where does all this money go? Can anybody from the Treasury Benches stand up and say that the common man is really benefited. What is the record, what are the statistics, to show that the common man's lot has been improved?

In regard to this I will cite the example of the Backward Classes Commission. The Commission came into being as a statutory Commission because the Constituent Assembly then thought that there must be such a body in order to investigate into the injustices and the discriminations that were made against the backward classes. Accordingly a report was submitted. Now, what has happened to that report?

There is a provision in the article that certain grants should be made with regard to these backward classes. The Home Minister says in the Memorandum of Action on the Backward Classes Commission's Report that already there are schemes in the Five Year Plan. No separate grants are made. We are told that there has been a provision made to the tune of nearly Rs 200 crores in the Five Year Plan for the backward classes. Where is all this money going?

[Shri B C Kambale]

I will give you an example Everywhere we are requiring money. In the State of Bombay there is an enactment called the Bombay Hereditary Offices Act Under that there are people from the former Scheduled Castes who used to render services to the community and to the Government They have lands measuring at least one or two acres We had carried on a great agitation for the last 20 years with Dr Ambedkar as the leader and we had demanded that this system should be abolished, we should be made the owners of the land and the full assessment should be charged The Government of Bombay have come out with piecemeal legislation, and they have abolished the system, but what are they doing? They are not applying the whole Act to the State of Bombay They said there was no money If we demand a crore of rupees out of these Rs 200 crores supposed to be for the welfare of the backward classes, is Government prepared to give it as a loan or by way of a subsidy or in the form of welfare schemes to the Government of Bombay, so that the whole problem can be solved?

But what we are learning to our astonishment is that the Government of Bombay have issued an order that the lands of these inferior village servants should be either sold or leased by auction Already I have received a letter and a complaint that in my own village these lands are to be auctioned or leased Is it a Welfare State, a socialist pattern or welfare of the backward classes? What is it we are not able to understand Money where required is not given, and large sums are being surrendered This is an instance where all the money is being enjoyed to the exclusion of the benefits of the poorer classes, and that is why I say this is not the proper way of dealing with things

I will give you another instance, the question of waste land There are

nearly 900 crores of acres of cultivable waste land in the country The Government of India is now coming forward with a proposal for co-operative societies. With regard to the co-operative societies I would like to submit this Why is Government not trying first with regard to this cultivable waste land? Distribute this cultivable waste land to the landless persons, have co-operative farming, make an experiment with them first How is it that this land is allowed to be idle? The planners have not thought for the last ten years about the proposal of the waste land

Shri Asoka Mehta was once good enough to say that there is a connection between the food problem and foreign exchange I would like to add a little more to it There is a triangle of this problem, viz, the food problem, foreign exchange and waste land If we can profitably use the waste land and give it to the landless and enthruse them, I am quite sure the food problem to some extent can be solved and even the problem with regard to foreign exchange also, to that extent, can be solved

Now I come to the question of the minorities On 13th May 1958 I read the speech of the hon Prime Minister which he made on 11th May in the open session of the Congress When I read the speech I had so much comfort in my mind, because the Prime Minister made, in brief, the following points

The first point that the Prime Minister was good enough to make was that the Congress would be marked out if fair opportunities were not given to the minorities

His second point was that the question of services or share in the services for the minorities was a question of bread and butter and it affected them psychologically and pathologically

The third point that the Prime Minister made was that justice to the minorities should be done not according to the wishes of the majority, but that there should be some terms of agreement with regard to justice being done. He also made a reference to the statistics that he was collecting.

After reading that statement or speech, I wrote to the hon Prime Minister thanking him for taking up the cause of the minorities, and I requested him to give certain statistics, I requested that a list of the minorities should be given, I suggested that the respective rights of the minorities should be given and also the statistics about which the hon Prime Minister had spoken. The Prime Minister was good enough to reply under his own signature, but what he replied was that he had no information at all in his possession. I wrote to him back saying that I was sorry that as Prime Minister he was not possessing that information.

What I am suggesting is that the approach should be made with mutual respect with respect for the minorities as well as the wishes of the majority, and therefore what I am submitting is that the minorities should get their share.

I would not have opened this topic here because I know what has happened in this Constituent Assembly. I know there were two sets of proceedings. In the one set of proceedings all the shares of the minorities were conceded, and later on, because of the happenings in the Punjab and Bengal, the question was reversed to the extent of the reservation of seats in the legislatures. With regard to the items, it was not reversed. With regard to the other items, whatever was adopted from the Advisory Minority Committee's Report as moved by Sardar Patel was accepted, but then I am making a reference because the matter can probably be dealt with well only if the recom-

mendations of the Backward Classes Commission are accepted with regard to the services and they are carried out faithfully. But what is happening? The Backward Classes Commission has recommended certain reservations. It is a statutory commission, established under an article of the Constitution. The Backward Classes Commission has recommended that in class I 25 per cent in class II 35 per cent, and in classes III and IV 40 per cent of the posts should be reserved for the members of the broad category called backward classes. Since then, we have been coming forward in this House and pleading for the Buddhist converts, but we are told that we cannot get any share in the services. There are instances where simply because a person states that he is a Buddhist, his application is turned down. We had been pressing upon the Home Ministry to see that these instructions are properly implemented. My submission is that let Government formulate a certain definite policy. Are there minorities or are there no minorities? If there are minorities, which are the minorities which are so recognised? What is the broad policy? If there are any rights, what are their rights? If Government want to say that the minorities have no existence, well, Government can say so, and accordingly we shall act, we are bound to submit to what Government have to say. But if Government have to be fair, they have to give all the necessary information. I have been trying to find out from various sources whether any such information is forthcoming or not, but there is none so far.

Therefore, my submission is that with regard to the Buddhists, let Government appoint any committee of their own, and let Government investigate the conditions under which these people live, and whether they deserve any share in the services, whether they deserve any concessions in the educational field and in welfare schemes and so on. Merely excluding a particular section of the population simply

[Shri B C Kamble]
because they have converted themselves to the Buddhist faith is not proper, is not just, and that was why I referred in the beginning to justice being done to people in this social order

Finally, I have to submit one point regarding developmental expenditure. There are so many development schemes, but what we find from the budget estimates is that large amounts are being spent on non-developmental items. Particularly, I would refer to defence. The amount which is being spent on defence must be reduced. And how can it be reduced? If the problems which are thorny, and because of which we feel that the security of the country is in stake, are solved, then alone the expenditure on defence can be reduced. Can it be done? I submit that it can be done and it must be done. Otherwise, for how long are we to go on spending over these matters?

Let the Prime Minister call all parties together, and let each party accommodate its point of view with regard to Kashmir and Goa, and let there be an agreed solution. If there is going to be no agreed solution now, when is there going to be any agreed solution? The Prime Minister's policy is good, and he says that he does not want to solve these problems by force, these problems must be solved by negotiation. But all parties must co-operate and accommodate their point of view. For how long is the present situation to go on? I am speaking this because it tells on my bread, upon the bread of the backward people, upon the bread of those who are suffering, because a large amount is being spent on non-development items, we are suffering. Therefore, my submission is that just as the Prime Minister is now calling for the co-operation of the different parties, maybe for the execution of the Plan, or maybe for joint farming, or maybe for any other purposes, in the same fashion, all these problems must be

settled. Otherwise, files are being piled up one over another, and there is a larger number of papers, and the questions are not solved.

If we can come together in this way, I am sure there will be a greater sentiment of nationality, a greater sentiment with regard to our nation being strong. If, on the other hand, we are merely pulling in different directions, I am afraid that things will go worse. If people come together in this way, then all the minorities also will come together, and they can participate in the government.

If I make a small claim which has been included in the report of the Constituent Assembly, that a kind of convention should be observed that the effective representatives of almost all important minorities—I do not know whether they are religious or linguistic minorities which have been referred to, but I know there is mention about the religious minorities—should be included as members of Government. I do not know whether Government will concede that claim. But indirectly, the Congress Government are following that method.

In the changed circumstances, should Government reconsider its own policy and come out with a statement with regard to the co-operation of the different political parties as well as the minorities, I submit that we shall be too willing and too glad, probably on reasonable terms, which the respective parties and the respective minorities may consider satisfactory and proper, to agree to co-operate for the implementation of the Five Year Plan.

Shri Jhunjhunwala (Bhagalpur)
Whatever achievements have been made by Government are according to the policy enunciated by them. All these are creditable, and Government deserve our congratulations. But there are certain points regarding which I want to say something.

As I have said, the achievements are creditable, but these have been at a very high cost and avoidable waste and a great liability incurred for the future, which will have great adverse repercussions on our future plan and our economy so much so that during the period of the Third Plan or even earlier, we shall have to pay about Rs. 125 to 150 crores annually. If I were to enumerate the leakages which have occurred in different directions, it will take the whole of my time. I shall therefore, content myself merely by referring to the speech of Shri Acharya Kripalani. But the pity of the whole thing is that even our Ministers do not realise what is going on. If any question is put to them they simply evade it. The other day Shri Nath Pai and Shri Morarka raised a discussion on the avoidable waste in our steel plants about which Acharya Kripalani also has spoken. It is necessary, of course, that we should advertise our achievements, and let the people know what our Government are doing but it is regrettable that when a Member of Parliament points out a particular defect the Minister instead of merely repeating the achievements, should have heard from the Member concerned and had guidance from him as to how it could be avoided and thus taken a lesson from it for the future. For the future, I suggest that the Ministers should not take that attitude while replying to questions and discussions. The Chair had suggested that instead of Members putting all sorts of questions it would be better if they wrote to the Minister concerned and get his reply and if they get a satisfactory reply they should content themselves. I wrote to a Minister, twice three, but it is irritating to find that he did not even care to send me a reply. Ultimately, a question had to be tabled. Then the Cabinet Minister of the Ministry said that such and such is the position regarding this question. Of course, the Minister to whom I had written should have taken me into confidence.

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas):
Which Ministry was it?

Shri Jhunjhunwala. I do not want to disclose the name of the Ministry. If the Minister is here, he will understand it. Neither do I want to name him and embarrass him. But it was most irritating that he was evading, in spite of my requesting him orally and writing to him again and again. This was a question whether foreign exchange to the extent of about 50 lacs was involved.

It has been said that ours is a socialistic pattern of society and we want to create such a society. So far as future planning is concerned, the President has also mentioned something about it. If the Government have failed in any direction, in any achievement it is in creating a socialistic pattern of society. Of course, so much money has been spent I do not say that they have not spent for the people but even in what has been spent not more than 20—25 per cent has gone to the pockets of the villagers. The lot of the villagers and of the lower middle class people has become more and more deplorable, not that they have gained anything by these achievements.

It is said that there has been an increase in national income. There has been a 13 per cent to 15 per cent increase in our national income and it is said that our national income will be doubled in a certain number of years. But I would like to ask what has been the increase in cost of living. About three hundred per cent even more. Comparing the cost of living with the increase in national income, I would ask hon. Members to consider what portion of it has been saved. The average per capita national income has been Rs. 280. It is an illusory figure. How much of the increase has gone to the poor people? Have Government collected any statistics to show how much of this has gone to the villages and how much to the big industrialists and capitalists. I was

[Shri Jhunjhunwala]

reading the other day that there has been an expenditure per capita of Rs. 280 by the people. But I would like to know how much the villagers—most of whom have to go on with one meal a day—have spent? This is the fate of the people.

It has been admitted on all sides that there has been a decrease in employment and it is necessary to increase employment. Our President has said

"It is proposed to prepare a preliminary Draft Outline Plan Frame for the Third Plan by the end of this year. The principal objectives which we have accepted are a substantial increase in national income"—

I have already referred to that, as to what it has amounted to the poorer people till now and what it will amount to the richer people. Then

"rapid industrialisation "

This is all right—

"expansion of employment on a sufficient scale "

What sort of employment are Government creating? The other day I was reading a speech of the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh in which he said that about 4000 employment opportunities would be created by appointing teachers for primary schools. I have had often occasion to go to villages and I find that the employment that they get is of such a humiliating condition that it is better that they do not get it. They get about Rs 30 or Rs 40 per month. Though the Government take credit that they have created 4000 or 5000 opportunities for employment, such employment is not even sufficient to feed the employee, what to talk of his family of two or three people.

So instead of saying anything more regarding our achievements in the past, I want to make a suggestion for the future. It is very refreshing that

Government have decided that they will invite the co-operation of all political parties. I have every hope that all political parties will co-operate in making the third national plan in such a way that the poorest may be benefited. I suggest that apart from political parties—which have to do more with their politics. I do not say all, but some of them have to do more with their politics and for getting power—Government should invite the co-operation of non-political parties also. There is one non-political party led by Acharya Vinoba Bhave. They are working only for the villagers and for the downtrodden. They will be the best advisers for the Third Five Year Plan. If at all Government want to do anything for the villagers and the downtrodden, they should invite the members of that organisation to take part in the framing of the Third Five Year Plan.

The Third Five Year Plan should be employment oriented. It should not be in the way I pointed out in the beginning, namely, the way in which some employment opportunities are created. As the president has said, not in his Address to Parliament but at several other places these employments should be self-generating and self-reliant. Priority should be given to those self-reliant and self-generating employments. In framing the Third Plan, the Government should take this point into consideration and give priority to it and see that every citizen of the country has some self-generating employment.

As I said before, the condition of the poor villagers and of the lower middle classes has been very regrettable. They are in great difficulty. The Government should think out in the Third Plan to make their conditions better. If that is not done, it will not be right to say that we want to create a socialist pattern of society. If what we have done in the past is repeated in the Third Plan then socialist pattern of society will remain a dream.

I do not think I have to say anything more I shall simply point out the concluding paragraph of the Address

'We have however, even more than ever before, the duty and the opportunity to endeavour with greater determination, discipline and sense of purpose to make our democracy a reality in terms of the masses of our people'

I request Government to see that the Third Plan is framed in a way, as has been expressed by the President in the last page I lay stress on the word masses

Acharya Kripalani said that corruption is too much Government also said that there is corruption, but it is at lower levels It is most unfair and unjust to say that it is at lower levels Corruption grows at lower levels by taking the examples from above, and that is what is happening in the districts and other places

I do not want to say more Government should search their hearts and find where corruption lies, how the money which is collected from the people is wasted and how these leakages and wastage can be stopped so that we can make better progress

Shri Supakar (Sambalpur) Mr Deputy-Speaker Sir I will first of all refer to paragraph 9 of the speech of the President It is said

Food and food prices are the most important factors in the regulation of our economy On these largely depend other factors vital to our planning and progress, such as availability of foreign resources for development, the balance of payments position, the maintenance of internal price levels and the arrest of inflation if and when it tends to set in"

I wish the Government of India—especially the Department of Food and Agriculture—realised the importance of our food problems Because, unless we are in a position to have some reasonable solution to the food problem, it is difficult for us to think of a Third and future Plans for this country

It is rather regrettable that though Government pays lip service to the contribution made by the agriculturists especially the producers of foodgrains the way our food problems are bungled by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture gives us no hope that we shall be in a position to have a stable food situation in the near future

In this connection I will first of all refer to the statement of Shri Desmukh which was quoted by Swami Ramananda Tirtha, the problem and paradox of today, that is that in spite of our having a bumper harvest this year, the food prices are soaring I will add only this, that in spite of the fact that Government have taken to what is called State trading, in spite of the fact that we have a bumper harvest the food prices should soar and should not be available to the common man of this country

Before we try to diagnose the real problem we must realise what Government is doing by saying that they are taking to State trading If, really, Government were serious in the matter of State trading they should ensure to the producers of foodgrains—especially rice and wheat—a reasonable price for their produce They should also ensure to the consumer reasonable prices at which he can get them with the average income that the country has But, what have they done instead? They have appointed a few middlemen the mill-owners as their purchasing agents, and from high positions in New Delhi they have stated that such and such shall be the price of rice in Orissa, such and such in Madhya

[Shri Supakar]

Pradesh, this shall be the price of wheat in Punjab and so on. And, they have washed their hands clean and sat quietly in their ministerial gaddis and not taken care to see what is happening in the countryside. As a consequence, it has appeared to me like inviting a pack of wolves and preaching to them the sermons of non-violence and putting them in charge of a flock of sheep and hoping that the sermon of non-violence will have its result on the pack of wolves.

It has been found, as a consequence of this policy of the Government of India, in Orissa, though Government say that they have fixed the price of rice at Rs 16- at which the purchasing agents should procure foodgrains, they are not doing so. They are preventing the producers from getting a reasonable price and consequently rice is being purchased at Rs 11- in Orissa. In Orissa on the border of Bengal, on the one side we find that rice is purchased at the rate of Rs 11 to Rs 12½- per md, and, on the other side, in Calcutta, for example, we find that the common man is purchasing rice at the rate of Rs 24 to Rs 25½- per md. Where goes this difference? Who takes this profit? I wish the Government of India or the authority who says that State trading is their own responsibility had any share in this huge profit accruing between the purchase of the foodgrains and the sale to the purchaser. But we find that the State gets nothing. The whole thing, practically goes to the purchasing agents who have been appointed by the Government. If this is the policy of State trading, I do not know what will be the future of our country and what will be the future prospects of our foodgrains, of our producers and our purchasers. This is a fact which discourages the cultivators from investing and from taking an enthusiastic part in the Grow More Food Campaign and in making this country self-sufficient so far as foodgrains are concerned. In those areas when the monsoon is not very

favourable, the producer suffers because he does not get enough. The Government is not there to help either the producer or the purchaser. It says "Look here, the monsoon is very bad and therefore we cannot help either the producer or the purchaser." When the monsoon is favourable and the harvest is good, they leave everything in the hands of the middlemen, the purchasing agent and the producer is in a worse position than in those years when the monsoon was bad. The vagaries of the Government are more unpredictable and more dangerous than the vagaries of the monsoon so far as the producer is concerned. If in spite of this sort of the policy of the Government, we expect that we are going to solve the food problem of our country and attain self-sufficiency in food-grains, I believe we are living in a fool's paradise. If the Government is really going to do anything to solve the food problem they must do something in this connection. They must see that the producer gets a fair price and the purchaser gets the grains at a reasonable price. It is not too late in 1959 to formulate such a policy.

In the matter of solving the food problem of this country many policies are dictated and discussed, both in the academic sphere and also in the political sphere. So far as the problem of agriculture is concerned, I do not think either the political parties or such of the Government give sufficient importance to the re-organisation of our agricultural departments, the pivot of more production. We have recently received the report of the Agricultural Administration Committee which has very thoroughly dealt with the problems that are facing this country and the remarks that are made in this report are very much revealing. I have no time but I will quote only one or two paragraphs from this report, from page 7, where the opinion of one Dr Ensminger has been quoted by this Committee.

"The administration and staff of agricultural departments needs to be thoroughly reoriented, on a vigorous and broad scale, to give first priority to an impact action programme for higher food production. The crux of the problem now is one of gearing up its administration to get the food produced.

As one looks at the administration of agricultural programmes, both in the Centre and the States one observes two disturbing things. First, there seems to be an almost total absence of any sense of urgency about increasing food production, there is even, one might say, what appears to be an actual acceptance of the traditional village farming methods which yield so little. The conviction that these ways must be changed, and that it is the crucial business of the agricultural departments to change them does not seem to have taken hold. The tendency appears strong to keep to the traditional emphasis on regulatory activities rather than active field development, or, to put it bluntly, to concentrate on paper rather than people."

We have spent several crores of rupees on the department of agriculture to produce more food. The whole of community development administration is geared to the production of more food in the countryside. We find from practical experience, as the Committee also found, that most of the activities of the agriculture department as well as the community project administration are towards distribution of seeds and fertilizers rather than impart the know-how of what is known as the extension programme. Unless that is done, these troubles so far as food and other problems are concerned will not be solved.

I will refer to one another paradox of our food and agriculture department. We find that so far as Orissa

is concerned, it has been exporting its rice to its neighbouring States of Bihar and Bengal for the last so many decades. But this year, the Government of India have appointed the mill-owners as their agents. We are told that the hand-pounded rice is not accepted and only milled rice is accepted by them. Hand-pounding of rice encourages more employment. The Khadi and the Village Industries Commission gives Re. -/3/- bonus for each maund of hand-pounded rice but here is a paradox and the State trading agents of the Government of India now say that they are not prepared to take hand-pounded rice. That only shows how confused is the way of thinking of the Government of India. They must look into these matters and there must be some consistency in their policy.

So far as the industrial development is concerned, I must congratulate the Government of India in having opened the Rourkela and the Bhilai blast furnaces on the 3rd and 4th February respectively of this year although the programme was delayed by about five weeks. Acharya Kripalani referred this morning to the waste so far as the steel projects in the public sector were concerned. In the production of steel, we must carry the private sector and the public sector side by side and we must see that our cost is competitive. That is to say, our production cost must be competitive with the production cost of the Tatas and the IISCO. Unless we do so, it will have its repercussions. Though the Government of India is the authority to fix the selling price of iron and steel produced from all these factories, and although it may fix it at a higher level, it will have its repercussions in giving more profit to the private sector. Since we have taken to new methods of production—LD process—and so on, we must see that our prices are competitive. Unless that is done, our public sector activities may not be as good and as competitive as the private sector.

[Shri Supakar]

Lastly, so far as the boundary disputes are concerned, reference has been made to Maharashtra and Maharashtra questions. It is known that so far as the border dispute between Bihar and Orissa is concerned, the people of Orissa have always considered the people of Seraikella and Kharsawan as their own brethren because those two places were previously in the Orissa States and were only merged with Bihar for a temporary period. It is unfortunate that the States Reorganization Commission took absolutely no notice of this problem. I hope that though the Government of India may not be willing at present to re-transfer these two tracts to Orissa, they will see that as the States Reorganisation Commission has mentioned in its recommendations the interests of the so-called minorities, the Oriyas, their culture and education in schools are adequately safeguarded.

Shri Jaganatha Rao (Koraput) Mr Deputy-Speaker I am glad to associate myself with the motion of thanks moved by my hon friend Shri Kashiwal. The President, in his Address, has given a dispassionate review of the achievements of the Government and laid stress on the broad policies of the Government. Objections have however, been raised by some of the hon Members that the Address has not touched many of the broad and burning problems of the day. I may point out that it is not necessary for the President to deal with all the subjects under the sun. He is the Head of the State unlike the President of the United States of America who is not only the Head of the State but also the Head of the Government. As such the American President gives a message to the nation and also gives his own views about the Government's policies. In our country, the President, being the Head of the State only, refers to the achievements of the Government in the past and the policies of the Government in the coming year.

The President was pleased to observe in his Address the objectives of our planning and said that by the end of the Third Five Year Plan, a sound foundation will have been laid for future progress in regard to our basic industries, agricultural production and rural development, thus leading to a self-reliant and self-generating economy. Our objective or goal is the establishment of a socialist pattern of society and, as such, whatever policies the Government adopts are towards the achievement of this goal. Our second Five Year Plan is based on that objective. It is true that the progress is not very great. It cannot be assessed however, in the middle of the Plan. As a matter of fact as the President has observed, it is only by the end of the Third Five Year Plan we will be able to lay the sound foundations for a better society. It is not correct to assess the achievements in the middle of the Plan. These ten years the Second Five Year Plan period and the Third Plan period are what is called the crossing of the threshold at a time when the living standards and the saving potential of the country are at a very low ebb.

True it is that there is some increase in the national income of the country and also in the per capita income of the individual. There is expected to be a ploughing back of about 11 per cent of the national income into our economy by the end of 1960-61. So when we are going ahead with the economic development, it is but correct that we should have assistance from foreign countries. There is nothing wrong in that. We have been receiving assistance from the European countries and also from the capitalist countries. By getting assistance from the capitalist countries it does not mean that our economic policy is going to be shaped or guided by those countries. We are not enamoured by the capitalist economy of America or by the centralized economy of the Soviet Union. We have our own economic basis and our Plan is framed according to the economic needs of the country.

There can be no objection, as I said, in receiving foreign assistance in our developmental economy. Even Russia in the earlier years after the revolution had secured assistance from America, and America also, in the earlier years, had assistance from other European countries. So, it is not correct to say that we should not have assistance from foreign countries either in the shape of loans or grants or aids.

But I may observe that there can be no real development of the country in any direction unless its millions are assured of a necessary minimum food. The common man measures development in terms of food. Several major irrigation schemes have been undertaken in the second Plan, but I am sorry to observe that we have not been able to achieve the targets. There are various reasons for this. Several dam projects have been completed, but one finds that a channel which goes on for more than 100 or 200 miles does not give the same water to the land situated at the tail end of the channel as to the land situated at the source. Secondly, there are no intermediate reservoirs provided. I am referring to the Hirakud project in particular. The commanding area, according to the estimate was 4 lakh acres and odd, whereas we find that only 2 lakh acres of land were irrigated. The reason is, as I said, there are not intermediate reservoirs, and there were no feeder channels either and no supply channels too. The people were not willing to take the water because they were afraid of having to pay water rate because of these plan projects. Because of these big projects, our planners did not lay much stress on minor irrigation schemes in those areas. One reason was that in 1953-54, we had a bumper crop and we were complacent. I am glad to find that, as the President has observed, greater importance and stress is now laid on minor irrigation projects also. We cannot afford to ignore our irrigation tanks and the wells.

The President has been pleased to refer to the rising food prices. The only solution is we should attain self-sufficiency in the matter of food. How is it to be done? In this connection, he has made reference to agrarian reforms which relate to the imposition of a ceiling on land and joint co-operative farming. This morning, my hon. friend Shri Masani spoke very vehemently against co-operative farming. I know his views and his strength of conviction. Last year, while speaking on the demands of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, he quoted Mr. Gomulka saying that co-operative farms were a failure. I may say that what Mr. Gomulka said or the statistics quoted by Shri Masani related mainly to the collective farms. In the collective farms which are called the Kolhoz system of co-operative farming in Russia or in the communes of China there is no freedom of the individual. The man is forced to join a farm, from cradle to the grave he is looked after by the communes. Even in China, people have every reason to lose enthusiasm or interest in it. But in our country, what is being aimed at is joint co-operative farming. In the joint co-operative farming, as I understand it from the Nagpur resolution as published, the individual farmer does not lose his interest in his land. He has to pool the land that is, while retaining his rights in the land he pools along with those of the other peasants in the village. All of them join together and cultivate the land. They have the advantage of improved implements, mechanization and all that, with the result that everyone stands to gain. I cannot understand for a moment the objection raised namely, because the boundaries of a holding are lost, a man who has a title deed to certain acres of land loses his right and so the system is wrong. Supposing 10 villagers in a village join voluntarily to pool their land about 100 acres in extent and cultivate jointly, they divide the produce according to their interest in the land. The man having five acres will get the return in proportion to the extent of the land he

[Shri Jaganatha Rao]

owns. I do not see how it can be argued that the moment pooling of land is there, the incentive is gone and the owner loses the interest.

16 hrs.

Secondly, most of the holdings are uneconomic holdings and no ryot will be able to cultivate it himself. Mr. Masani also referred to the Adivasis of Ranchi district. I know the Adivasis of Koraput district from where I come. It is not correct to say that Shri Jai-prakash Narayan or Acharya Vinoba Bhave tried to distribute the land to the villagers. What they did was, they collected the villages, but till today there has been no distribution of land. I have recently written to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister to take some steps in this regard. It is not correct to say that the Adivasis of Ranchi district or Koraput district will be unwilling to cultivate the land on a joint basis. They will be only too glad to have some assistance from the State or from any other source.

If the villagers all join together, the Adivasis could not go against this principle of co-operative farming. Of course, it is a voluntary affair. Simply because a target has been fixed in the resolution, it does not mean that the Government or the party is going to bring coercion or force the villagers. What are called "service co-operatives" will be introduced first and three years later co-operative farming will be introduced. In these three years, the people will get accustomed to these co-operatives and they will be educated about the advantages of co-operative effort and they will voluntarily join the joint co-operative farming enterprise. Moreover, this joint farming also gives scope for social cohesion. The villagers can live together and they can develop the spirit of co-operation and corporate life.

Along with the co-operatives, there are also the *gram panchayats*, and

they should also share the responsibility of democracy. We have about 6 lakhs villages in the country and if the villagers do not share the democracy that we are enjoying, there is no meaning. It is this basic approach of the Congress resolution passed at Nagpur.

Collective farming can be ushered in the villages which are the subject-matter of *gram dan* or where attempts are being made to reclaim land and where the East Pakistan displaced persons are going to be settled in certain areas where the land is new. They have no right to the land, it belongs to the State. If a hundred persons are located in a particular area and if about 200 or 300 acres are given to them, certainly that is the best opportunity for developing collective farming. In villages where the individual ryots hold the lands, it will not be advisable to have collective farming. But the owners of the land can join together and form co-operatives to their mutual advantage.

The President was pleased to refer to the rapid industrialisation in our country. I am not going to deal with it at length, but I will say it is happy sign that in the field of industry, we are progressing very well. Apart from the basic industries, the ancillary industries also have shown good progress. The progress in industrial production achieved in 1957 has been maintained in 1958. Our export trade also has been maintained at the 1957 level. Considering the fact that there is competition from other countries in our traditional items of export like tea, jute, handlooms, etc., our Government will have to see that our export trade is not only maintained, but also improved, so that our foreign exchange position improves.

Regarding our foreign policy, I may observe that the visit of prominent statesmen from various countries to our country is a great recognition of the stature and the role our country has been playing in world affairs. Our

policy of non-alignment and non-interference has won universal approval and recognition. The recent visits of our President to Japan, Malaya and Indonesia are more in the nature of pilgrimages in the cause of peace and the world has recognised that our foreign policy is one which promotes the cause of world peace.

With these words, I support the motion of thanks

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): The President's Address has failed to touch the very core of the problem which is facing us today. The question that is there in everybody's mind is, why is there so much frustration in the country and why is it that the suffering of the people is mounting? The real reason is that the traders, the hoarders and the big business community whom the Government is unable to control, are holding the community to ransom.

This year we are told that in the matter of food, we are in a very happy position. We are told that Nature has been kinder to us. Our Minister says that we have been blessed with a bumper crop. In this very contradictory situation, on the one hand we are told that we have a bumper crop and on the other hand, we find that rice has disappeared from the market and the price of wheat has soared up which the Government is unable to control. We are often told by the Prime Minister that the crux of the problem is that workers, peasants and everybody must produce more. It is on production that the wealth of the nation depends and the standard of life of the people has ultimately to find its solution. And yet, we find that this year in spite of having a bumper crop, the food situation is completely outside the control of the Government. Why is it then there is this kind of poverty in the midst of plenty? I do not say 'plenty' in the sense that we have enough according to prescribed standards, where each person could have food with a healthy calorific value, but certainly it is a situation where there could be no question of

food shortage. At least things should have proved better than last year.

The real reason is that the policy of the Government has been such that it has helped the hoarders and wholesalers. The bankruptcy of Government policies has to be seen not ideologically, because we have brought about State trading. State trading is something that we have wanted to introduce, but let us look at the way in which it has been brought about. I know in detail the position in my State of West Bengal, where we were told there had been a very good crop. But now, as is usual with official statistics, we are told that we have a worse deficit than we had last year. We are deficit by 2,21,000 tons. Later on, we may be told that it will be more. In Bengal, in spite of the fact that the Centre had told our State to go in for State trading, floor prices were not given. The whole of December went without a floor price, when distress sales had to take place. But on the first of January, a floor price was given, but after that we find that rice has disappeared from the market. Who are our agents, the State trading agents who are buying on behalf of the Government? They are the rice-millers and the wholesale traders. And we are told now by our Food Minister, the notable Shri P. C. Sen, that this state of affairs has been brought about because the peasant is not selling; not because the wholesaler is not selling but because the peasant is not selling. This is the position as far as the State of West Bengal goes, and they have told us that with impunity.

Formerly in the markets of Calcutta 42,000 maunds of rice used to come in every day. Now it has sunk to 5,000 maunds. In this situation what is the Government doing? We are told that there are fair price shops. Our Union Minister for Food says that he is sending all that is required by the States. But in the fair price shops of Calcutta, leaving out the other markets like the village mandis, you cannot get rice. Further, the price of rice has gone up in the State of West

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

Bengal. I can quote the figures or statistics of the agricultural price index. Last year the price of coarse rice in Calcutta in December was Rs. 22·4. This year it is Rs. 22·75; still the Minister says that the price of rice has gone down. Where has it gone down? It has gone down in an area like Orissa where there has been a good crop. This is the contradiction. Wherever there is a good crop the prices fall far below even the cost of production. I have been told by the Orissa friends that the price of rice for primary producers has gone down below the cost of production. And wherever there is shortage, these sharks or vested interests play with the life of the people. This is the contradiction which has been brought about in every sphere of our economy, and it is this very thing that has not been dealt with by the President in his Address, and that is why there is so much of suffering amongst the people.

The funny thing is that today all the blame is put on the peasant. This morning when I was hearing my hon. friend, Acharya Kripalani, I was reminded of this matter. When he spoke of corruption he said that corruption is only at the lowest level. Certainly, there is corruption at the lowest level; nobody can deny that. But what about the people at the top? He said that people at the top are not able to control corruption at the bottom. How can we control corruption when we find at the top are people such as Shri S. P. Jain? Shri S. P. Jain was entertained by the President twice at least and he goes to the President frequently. Very recently at the Calcutta Raj Bhavan he got an audience with the President. What about the Mundhra deal? We see the highest in the land being associated with the Mundhra Deal. We see the Prime Minister calling upon the Minister whose connection with the Mundhra deal was discussed in this very House. We have also seen the Mathai affair. Therefore, we see only the bottom; we do not see the top. But unless the top is properly

controlled, the bottom can never be controlled either. It is from the top that we have to begin.

In the same way, we have to begin with the wholesaler. But we do not begin with the wholesaler or the hoarder. Our Ministers come forward and say: it is the peasant who is not selling. This is a contradiction which our Presidential Address has failed to take note of. Then we put all the blame on State trading. It is not State trading that is to be blamed but the dealers and hoarders who, in the name of State trading, want to make money. We have not taken effective action in that respect and that is why the Government policy has failed.

Why is it that hoarders are not apprehended? We do not find any hoarder being apprehended. When it is a question of the utilisation of the bowers given under the Preventive Detention Act, who are actually apprehended? People who are demanding the stoppage of illegal transfers of land, people who are demanding that their lands should be given back to them. In the State of West Bengal are the largest number of security prisoners held under the Preventive Detention Act. If you analyse the figures you will find, they are peasants and workers who are demanding their wages or fighting against retrenchment or against illegal transfers. But when it comes to a question of hoarders, they are let off.

What has happened to the recommendations of the Food Enquiry Committee? Have we gone in for socialisation of the wholesale trade? Have we set up the price stabilisation board? Government suggests a committee of departmental Secretaries; that is all that we are told. Has the Central Food Advisory Committee been formed? And yet we talk of co-operation. It is true that the Prime Minister has set up an all-party committee at the Parliamentary level. But when it comes to the States, with great difficulty the State Advisory Councils have been formed in a few States. Does it mean that we do not want co-operation

at the State level, we do not want co-operation at the rural or village level, at the level of the units, at the level of the panchayats and the subdivisions? What has the ruling party to say about this? They say no, we utilize this committee for our political power. However much you may talk of social co-operation, that is some thing that is exhibited at the top only. In its actual implementation, in finding out who are the hoarders, in knowing how the Government should implement its State trading in a proper manner, you must have co-operation at the village level, the level of the peasantry. But there seems to be no all party committee at that level. It is a very complex problem and it is the States that have to implement it. Still, the State Governments and the ruling party have refused to do so.

I bring before this House another case an astounding case, to show how cheap we hold Indian lives, and that is the case of the miners who were killed in the Chinakuri colliery accident. It is really amusing. Now we talk of corruption at the various stages. Now the report of the Court of Inquiry set up by this very House has been placed on the Table of the House today and if the Members go through it they will find the astounding conclusions arrived at by this Committee. This Chinakuri Mine is actually a mine which was worked by one of the biggest colliery companies in the whole of India belonging to the British firm Andrew Yule & Company. They mine about 3 million tons of coal a year. In this Chinakuri mine at the time of the accident namely, 19th February 1958 the monthly production shot up to about 14 000 tons from hardly 7 000 tons. Now we claim that they achieved this because they did not care for the labour they recklessly exploited them and they did not care for the safety rules. Now we know that nearly 300 workers were killed. I have before me the conclusions of the Committee which say that 176 is the figure given by the owners and that is accepted by the Court of Inquiry. Yet, I have before me a plan which was submitted

before the Court of Inquiry and this shows that at least 216 bodies were there in the pit itself. Now it is simply a question of arithmetic, adding 216 with the rest that were found after de-watering. The Court of Inquiry, instead of judging the evidence in front of them says that there were near about, but not more than 176 bodies. Is this how we treat human life of the Indian miner, the most exploited of the workers in the whole of India?

Then, we find that in this very Company 7 major accidents have taken place in recent times. And what was the role of the Department of Mines? Here I should say that most terrible is the attitude of the Deputy Minister of Labour. When a few days ago, a month or two ago, in this very House when a question was asked about North Kujama Colliery disaster he said that only eight people were killed and that is why there was no inquiry into that. It was not a major accident, he said. If this is the attitude of the Deputy Minister of Labour, what can you expect from the Department of Mines? This Department of Mines, especially persons like Mr Grewal, who was the Chief Mining Inspector, and others, we find do not even care to go down the mines after the disaster. Can you believe it when I say that not once did they go down after the Chinakuri accident took place? After the Amlabad accident it was stated by the Court of Inquiry that immediately an accident takes place a special investigation team should go down.

Our Department of Mines said, "No, it is not necessary to have a special investigation team. We shall do it ourselves." How did they do it? They stood there on the pithead and waited till these dead bodies were brought up. These dead bodies were thrown 18 miles away from the place of accident on the site of the Grand Trunk Road at Bograchatti. They were all heaped up. The pictures of that are gruesome. One cannot believe that this can happen today.

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

One thinks it medieval barbarism—the type of thing that has happened there. The decomposed bodies were thrown there. And our hon. Deputy Minister said that they were there at a *smasan*. He called Bograchattis a burning *ghat*. Bograchatti is a *smasan*? It was not a *smasan*. If the site of the Grand Trunk road is a *smasan* then I am afraid I do not know as to how much respect we attach to our dead

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Community Development (Shri B. S. Murthy): Where there are dead bodies it is a *smasan*.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I do hope that our hon. Parliamentary Secretary would pay a little more respect to the dead and especially to those who have died in such a major disaster. They were burnt alive.

Shri B. S. Murthy: A *smasan* is a place where dead bodies are buried. This is *smasan* as it is explained.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I do not want a dictionary explanation as to what the word *smasan* means

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A *smasan* is where dead bodies are normally buried and where that place is fixed and specified.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: It is a pertinent question. Why is it that our Mining Department did not take the trouble even to go down the mines? We are told that many of the relatives—sons and relations—of the Chief Inspector of Mines and of other people are directly engaged in the various mining concerns in these areas. Has that anything to do with this? These are pertinent questions and we would demand that there should be a re-trial or a re-enquiry into this whole matter because we believe that it is a stain on the name of a free Government to have allowed such a court of inquiry to falsify the evidence. There have been many statements on the matter. Books have been published. Sifting this evidence, as our hon. friend, Acharya Kripalani, says, if anything,

what has been said is not correct, let Government go to a court of law and bring to book those who had the courage or the audacity to make these charges. Let it be tried out in a court of law. But, I say, they cannot do so because the evidence placed before the court of enquiry itself was such that if they were just to add up the numbers of the dead bodies, they would not have come to the conclusion of 176 dead. That is why we demand that not only there should be a re-enquiry but the entire question of nationalisation of mines ought to be taken up. There should be an overhaul of the entire Mining Directorate and there should be summary punishment to those who were guilty of dereliction of duty in this matter.

I should also like to take up another matter, that is the question of unemployment. In the whole of the President's Address there is a tendency of actually painting such a rosy picture that the real problem which is facing the people—the problem of mounting unemployment—is not there at all. Recently there was a very startling statement by Prof Mahalanobis. In the course of a review of the second session of the All-India Labour Economists' Conference held at Agra this is what he says:

"Less than one-third of India's population was gainfully employed and of this one-third were unemployed"

He says, "The country is producing one million job-seekers every year in urban areas and 2½ million in rural areas. The extent of under-employment is still greater. According to the statistics recently gathered it appears that there are about 30 million people, who have hardly an hour's work per day, 27 million with less than two hours' work and about 45 million with less than four hours' work per day." Even without going into statistics, we know that there is this impossible

situation where, while on the one hand our Plan goes forward, even the question of educated unemployed has become a headache

In the West Bengal statistics given recently we find that unemployment has increased. There has not been a decrease. There has been an increase in unemployment of the educated unemployed. There was recently a review of the National Register of technicians sent abroad. That says that not even ten per cent of those who are sent abroad for technical training or for degrees, when they come back, get employment. This is the situation. The situation is aggravated—and this is very important—by greater restrictions on imports and raw material shortages as a result of which many firms are closing down and the employees are being thrown out of employment.

Then there is the Government's policy with regard to the small scale industries. We are told that we must seek a panacea for unemployment by having small scale industrial co-operatives. I was surprised to learn as to what has happened in Madras. State Rs 50 lakhs handloom rebate has not been paid to the co-operatives. Then how do you expect the co-operatives to work? Rs 50 lakhs have not been paid by the Central Government to the handloom co-operatives!

1626 hrs

[Mr SPEAKER in the Chair]

Then there is the question that even where expansion is taking place people are being thrown out of employment. I am taking up the case of an industry as important as that of steel. Now, in the steel industry there is more and more expansion that is taking place. We have given almost Rs 8 crores to a concern, like the Indian Iron & Steel Co., Burnpur, for its expansion programme. Thus Parliament has also said that rationalisation must be accompanied by alternative employment for the workers. But

what has happened? What has happened is that as soon as coke ovens or blast furnaces of Kulti were closed down, about a thousand workers were retrenched. This is what has happened in a sector which is supposed to be a most important and a strategic sector, in a sector which is expanding. It is here that we see this type of a policy. Not only that. In these very companies equalisation fund of Rs 16 crores is outstanding. It is outstanding there in these private concerns in steel. If you were to calculate the amount of interest at 6 per cent, Rs 27,000 per day would have been accruing to the Government. This is not being taken yet. The Audit has made a remark about it. Our hon. Ministers say that there would be no difficulty in getting it back. When it comes to the question of throwing out workers on the street and adding to the list of unemployed, these employers are given complete freedom. They are allowed to do what they want.

Not only that. There is a concerted move on the part of these companies to bring pressure on the Government when there is any sort of difference of opinion between the Government and themselves as they are carrying out priority projects. Our hon. Railway Minister is here. There is a big quarrel between the Railway Board and the Indian Standard Wagon Company of Burnpur regarding wagons. It is a question of specifications. It is a question of testing those specifications. But what do these private companies do? The first thing they do is not to resolve their quarrels between themselves and the Railway Board and the Government; they retrench the workers. From tomorrow the lay-off notices on 454 ISW workers have been given. They say to the workers, "You get out. I save my money." Pressure is brought upon Government. It is a nice way of dealing with things. Take money from Government. Take up priority projects and put pressure on Government. Throw out workers on the

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

least provocation. This is the type of thing that is going on I shall call it blackmail. It is holding the community to ransom. It is holding the workers to ransom. And this policy is being worked out in a way with the support of the Government. So, I say that they are unable to implement that very code of discipline which has been extolled in the President's Address.

A very interesting letter was addressed to us by this very Indian Iron and Steel Co. On the question of rationalisation there was an agreement that no rationalisation will take place except where prior discussion has taken place. They said, "We are not at all aware of the agreement." As far as employment is concerned, there is no agreement. The agreement is only to be implemented on the part of the workers, which employers can break with impunity. This is how big business functions. That is where the question of Shri M. O. Mathai assumes importance.

Many of the people are saying, "What is Mathai? He is a very small fry." But we think that it is important because it shows how big business tries to burrow into strategic positions from where they can get all the most important decisions and trends of policy making in the State. That is why, in this context, the fantastic figure of assets of Shri Mathai assumes importance. We want a judicial enquiry into that because, firstly, Shri Mathai has hidden his assets. He has not given a full idea of his assets. Even the hon. Prime Minister seems to be misled. Only a few examples will be enough to show how huge are his personal assets. It is amazing. According to his own showing his personal net income after paying income-tax is about Rs. 27,500 per year. If we find the gross income, it would be about Rs. 36,000 per year. This very Shri Mathai is paid a gross salary of Rs. 1,500 a month or Rs. 18,000 per year. This means that the balanc-

ce of the gross income amounting to Rs. 18,000 per annum is derived from return on investments. What are those investments, and those dividends? This itself would require quite an investment of a few lakhs of rupees. Where did it come from? These are the questions. Then, again, it is revealed that he pays an annual premium of Rs. 18,200 on two of his insurance annuity policies. We have learnt that he has a third annuity policy on which he has paid Rs. 48,000, lump sum down in one amount in June 1947. This implies that in one year, in 1957 alone, he has paid the staggering amount of Rs. 66,000 on insurance policies alone. What are the implications of all this? Actually in the Agent's form itself it is written by Shri Mathai himself in his third annuity policy that his monthly income is Rs. 2,000. Normally in these matters it is the gross income that is mentioned. If that is so, it comes to Rs. 24,000 in 1957. How has this moved up to Rs. 36,000 in 1958 and after a payment of Rs. 66,000 as the amount on insurance policies. These are things that have to be enquired into by an impartial Judge. A hurried enquiry departmentally within a week will not bring out the truth. It is the public that has asked for this enquiry. It should be a public judicial enquiry.

Not only that. There is one very important thing. The Prime Minister has said that when he first joined him, this gentleman had assets about Rs. 2 to 3 lakhs. There is difference between two and three—a very big difference. But, that again is a question which has to be looked into by a judicial enquiry. How did he come by this? Anybody who had worked with him earlier knew that he has only drawing a paltry sum of Rs. 400 to Rs. 498 when he was working as a civilian clerk in American Supply and that only for 8 or 9 months or 1 year, he was working on a salary of Rs. 800 for the American Red Cross. Is it possible that such a

man could have built up assets of Rs 2 to 3 lakhs? How is it that he had that amount of assets when he left the American outfit and joined the Prime Minister? These are the things that worry the people. Not because it is Shri Mathai. Shri Mathai is a small fry. He does not matter. But Shri Mathai was very near and dealing with the most secret files of the State. That is the reason why we have to find out what his concomitants are, where his connections are and how it is that even the Prime Minister is misled. He said, in the trust deed we do not know that any big business house has made any donation. In the gift deed of the Tee's January Marg house itself—if you like, Sir, I will put this deed of gift on the Table of the House—it says it is given by the Birla Cotton Spinning and Weaving Mills. And, it is this very Birla outfit which also bought the Kulu orchard which, of course, Shri Mathai says was taken by—he lost on it—Morton & Co. This Morton & Co, anybody who comes from Calcutta knows is a Birla outfit. They bought it. Was all this notified to the Government? If that is so, we would like the hon. Home Minister to place on the Table of the House the permission which he gave and why he gave that permission. It is thus how big business gets into positions of power, strategic positions—I should not say positions of power but certainly positions which are of strategic value. These are the things that have to be enquired into. That is why we wanted a judicial enquiry. Not because it is an individual called Shri Mathai but because it brings into spot light some very nefarious things that are going on as far as big business concerns go.

One last point regarding the transfer of Beru Bari to Pakistan. I just want to say this that we want very good relations with Pakistan. We want that and we want it very sincerely and we would like to go to every length to have that. But on the question of transfer of territory,

we have not objected to any others, but only on the question of the transfer of Beru Bari. Why? Because this is a particular case which was never brought up as a dispute by Pakistan whether before the Bagge Commission or any other. We do not understand why this question was at all recognised as a dispute by our Government. The second point I would like to state is that the map on which the whole thing has been discussed is a wrong map. The particular area under dispute which is known as the Deviganj area is not where it is put down in that map, and if we were to take Pakistan's claims that a straight line should be drawn along to Deviganj, according to the place where Deviganj is a part of Pakistan's territory would also have to be given over to us. Did we know of this, and were we able to bargain on that point? This was not done.

The West Bengal Government was never consulted. This is an amazing state of affairs. The Chief Secretary has gone to the length of issuing a statement to the press, which normally people in such positions never do. He says he was called to Delhi, he did not know anything, he was never consulted, they never asked his opinion and the entire matter was decided. I am sure that this is a very wrong procedure. At least the opinion of the West Bengal Government and its officers should have been sought since, especially, it is not an enclave. And in all cases, the existing *thanas*, the police divisions have not been split up. Therefore, in this case too, why should this normal procedure be given the go by?

Therefore we would again appeal to the Prime Minister to reconsider this whole matter. Because it was done entirely on a wrong map, we would ask that before the Bill is brought before the House, he should take full cognizance of the desire of the people of West Bengal which is based on a legitimate claim—all parties have supported this claim and a unanimous

[Shrimati Renu Chakravarty]
 resolution has been passed by the West Bengal legislature; the constitutional position should also be considered—that Beru Bari cannot go to Pakistan; it is an integral part of India.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Shivananjappa. Absent. Shri Siddananjappa. Absent. Shri Radha Raman

श्री राधा रमण (बादनी चौक) :
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति जी के सम्भाषण के सम्बन्ध में दो रोज से काफी चर्चा हो रही है और माननीय वक्ताओं के जितने भी भाषण हुए हैं उनमें उन्होंने इस सम्भाषण के सम्बन्ध में भ्रमण भ्रमण विचार प्रकट किये हैं। मेरी बहुत ज्यादा देर तक बोलने की इच्छा नहीं है, केवल दो चार बातें ही मेरे मन में आती हैं, जिनको कि मैं इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ।

यह ठीक है कि राष्ट्रपति जी का सम्भाषण बहुत सारी बातों का जिक्र नहीं करता है जो कि हमारे दिलों में या हमारे दिमागों में है और हमारी यह स्वाभाविक इच्छा हो सकती है कि वे तमाम बातें भी सम्भाषण में होतीं। मगर यह बहुत मुद्दिल सवाल है कि साल भर के हमारे तमाम कामों के बारे में चर्चा हो या हम उन तमाम सवालों को सामने ले आये जो कि हमारे मन में हैं। राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने सम्भाषण में उन मोटी-मोटी बातों का जिक्र किया है कि जो आज हमारे दिमागों के अन्दर है या जो कि एक साल के अन्दर देश में घटी है या जिन्हें हमें करना है। अगर हम उनके सम्भाषण को इस क्वालिटी से रखें कि कल का हिन्दुस्तान क्या था और उसके मुताबिक ही उसे देखें तो हम उसे सही तौर पर नहीं देख सकेंगे। साथ ही साथ अगर हम वर्तमान स्थिति के अनुसार भी उसे न पढ़ें या जो परिस्थितियाँ हैं उनको न देखें तो भी हम सही नतीजे मार नहीं पहुँच सकेंगे। हमें देखना यह है कि आज हमारा

देश किस स्थिति में से गुजर रहा है। जो पहली बात जो मुझे इस सम्भाषण के सम्बन्ध में कहनी है वह यह है कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने आज हिन्दुस्तान को एक चुनौती दी है और हमारा ध्यान इस तरफ लींचा है कि हम एक बड़े कठे समय से गुजर रहे हैं और अगर हम बहुत मजबूती से और एक मुसम्मम इरादे से आगे नहीं बढ़ेंगे तो हमारे सामने जो दिक्कतें हैं वे बढ़ेंगी। हमारे बहुत से लायक दोस्तों ने जिन्होंने इस सदन के सम्मुख अपने विचार रखे हैं, काफी इस सम्भाषण की नुक्ताचीनी की है, काफी उसे क्रिटिसाइज किया है। मगर मैं उन वक्ताओं के उन भाषणों में यह देखता ही रहा कि क्या उन्होंने कोई ऐसी कन्क्रीट या कोई ऐसी तामीरी तखवीज रखी है जिसमें कि हमारी जो आज की मुश्किलताएँ हैं और जिनमें से आज हम गुजर रहे हैं, जिन के रहते हम अपने कदम बढ़ा रहे हैं, उनमें उससे ज्यादा तेज और ज्यादा मही कदम हम किम तरह बढ़ा सकते हैं।

सब में पहला सवाल जो है वह खाने की चीजों का है। हम सब यह जानते हैं कि हमारे देश में जमीन सीमित है, असीमित जमीन हमारे पास नहीं है और जितना भी अधिक में अधिक हो सकता है, हम इस बात का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं, जो कि जमीन अभी तक बजर पड़ी हुई है उसे तोड़ कर उस पर खेती की जाये, उसको उपजाऊ बनाया जाए, जो खेतीकर है, उनको हर प्रकार की सुविधा दी जाए ताकि जो अनाज वे अब तक पैदा करने आये हैं, उससे दुगुना और तिगुना अनाज वे पैदा कर सकें। एक तरफ बढ़ती हुई आबादी को जब हम अपने सामने रखते हैं और दूसरी तरफ हम अपनी जमीन की सीमा को देखते हैं तो हमारे लिए इस पर विचार करना जरूरी हो जाता है कि हम उस सीमित जमीन से अधिक से अधिक कितना अनाज पैदा कर सकते हैं ताकि हम अपनी बढ़ती हुई आबादी को पूरा अनाज दे सकें

धीर साथ साथ सस्ती दर पर उसे इन अनाज को मुहैया कर सकें। यह बात भी इस सदन के आननीय सदस्यों को मालूम है कि हिन्दुस्तान की गाड़ी कमाई आज अनाज बाहर से मगवाने में खर्च हो रही है और वह अनाज हमको ज्यादा कीमत पर मिल रहा है और उसे यहां ला कर हम कम कीमत पर बेच रहे हैं। इस सब का मकसद भी यही है कि यहां पर किसी तरह से भुखमरी न हो, किसी तरह से लोगों को अनाज सुलभ हो सके और आम लोगों को उस कीमत पर तो कम से कम मिल सके जो कीमत कि निर्धारित की गई है हमारी सरकार की तरफ से। मैं कहना चाहता हू कि अगर हम यह चाहते हैं कि हमारे देश के अन्दर अनाज की पैदावार बढ़े तो आज जो नागपुर में हमने एक प्रस्ताव पास किया है और जिस की काफी नुक्ताचीनी भी की गई है और यह कहा गया है कि ज्वाइंट कोओपरेटिव या सर्विस कोओपरेटिव नहीं होनी चाहिये क्योंकि इनसे बहुत से नुक्सानात होने का डर है या कहा जाता है कि वह अमल में लाने लायक नहीं है मैं ठीक मानता हू और मैं चाहता हू कि उस पर अमल हो। ऐसे भी आकड़े पेश किये गये हैं जिनके मुताबिक अगर हम अपने दिमाग का लगाये तो यह यकीन हो जाता है कि यह सर्विस कोओपरेटिव और ज्वाइंट कोओपरेटिव दोनों बेकार साबित होंगे। मगर मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हू कि आज हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर जितने भी किसान हैं, दिनों दिन उन के खेत बट रहे हैं, कंसोलिडेशन के बावजूद भी आज उन के खेतों का जो रकबा है वह कम होता जाता है और एक व्यक्तिगत किसान के साथ अगर इस सवाल को जोड़ दिया जाय कि वह अच्छा बीज लगा सके, वह अच्छे बेल रख सके, वह अच्छी खाद डाल सके और अपनी मेहनत से वह खेत के अन्दर ज्यादा उपज पैदा कर सके, तो यह सम्भावना कम नजर आती है कि इतने छोटे से खेत से किसान अपनी व्यक्तिगत मेहनत से उतना अनाज पैदा कर सके, जितना

हम चाहते हैं। अगर ऐसी सूरत में हम ने एक नया तजुर्बा करने का इरादा किया और उस में पहले सर्विस कोओपरेटिव से, बानी जो आदमी जितनी मेहनत करे, वस बीस किसान मिल कर और अपनी मेहनत को इकट्ठा कर के, साथ ही साथ जितना खर्च आये उस को भी इकट्ठा कर के, होने वाली पैदावार को अपने अपने खेत के मुताबिक बांट ले, इस तरकीब से काम लें, तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता यह कौन सी ऐसी बात नजर आती है जो कि काबिले कबूल नहीं है या काबिले अमल नहीं है। हा, वह बात जरूर है कि हम बहुत सी बातों को दूसरे मुल्कों की बिना पर नामजार करना चाहते हैं या उन की नुक्ताचीनी करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन मेरे उन लायक दोस्तों ने जिन्होंने इस का विरोध किया या इस को मजूर नहीं किया, आज कोई ऐसी तजवीज नहीं रखी कि हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर जितनी जमीन है उस को हम जितने आदमी हैं उन में तकसीम कर दे तो जितना अनाज हमारे मुल्क के अन्दर आज पैदा होता है उससे कौंसे तमाम आदमियों का पेट भर जाय और अनाज मस्ता भी हो जाय।' अगर कोई तजवीज इस किस्म की आती तो शायद वह जाची जा सकती और यह सोचा जा सकता कि जो कदम हम उठा रहे हैं हो सकता है कि वह कदम गलत हो और उस से बेहतर सुझाव हमारे सामने है जिन को हमें काबिल कबूल समझना चाहिये।

साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हू कि यहाँ कहा गया कि हमारे मुल्क के लिये मेकेनाइज्ड फार्मिंग ज्यादा फायदेमन्द नहीं है। सरकार की तरफ से या कांग्रेस की तरफ से आज एक आवाज किसानों को दी जाती है कि वह अपनी जमीन में ज्यादा अनाज पैदा करने की कोशिश करें और उस के लिये पूरे इरादे से वह आगे बढ़े। किसी भी किसान से यह नहीं कहा जाता कि चाहे सर्विस कोओपरेटिव हो या ज्वाइंट कोओपरेटिव

[श्री राधा रमण]

में आता है कह देते हैं। मैंने बनारस मुनि-
वरसिटी का किस्सा पढ़ा और बहा जो
अंगरेबाजी चल रही है पढ़ कर दिल को
अक्रतोस हुआ कि हमारे मुल्क में इस तरह
के अंगरे चलते हैं और यह सब इसलिये होता
है कि चन्द एक आदमी जो दीवाने होते हैं
और जिनके मुंह में लगाम नहीं होती वह
अंगरेबा लडा कर देते हैं और उस का नतीजा
बह होता है कि एक बड़ी अच्छी से अच्छी
जमात कमजोर हो जाती है और उसकी
शक्ति घट जाती है और वह बदनाम भी होती
है। आज हम देखते हैं कि हमारे मुल्क में बहुत
से ऐसे सवाल खड़े कर दिये जाते हैं और खड़े
हो रहे हैं और थोड़े से आदमी किसी स्थान को
सामने रख कर होश खो बैठते हैं और वह सही
बात करने नहीं देते और गलत काम को
करवाने के लिये मजबूर करना चाहते हैं। मैं
हुकूमत को इस बात के लिये चेतावनी देना
चाहता हू कि हमारे मुल्क में हुकूमत बगैर
मजबूती के नहीं हो सकती। हमें जो कुछ भी
अपना अमल हो उस पर बहुत मुस्तीदी के
साथ कायम रहना पड़ेगा और जहां इस किस्म
की शोरगुल और शारंगत होनी है उसका
मुकाबला मजबूती मुस्तकिल इरादे और
बहुत दानिशमदी के साथ करना है। इसी
सिलसिले में मैं यह भी अर्ज करूंगा कि बहुत
सी बातों में मैं यह देखता हू कि ऐसी चीजें
जिनको कि हम लोग बहुत आसानी से हल
कर सकते हैं, हमारी बाज सियासी पार्टियों
के नेता उनके हल होने में रुकावट डालते
हैं बजाय इसके कि वे उनके हल करने में
सहयोग करें। बहुत से ऐसे मामले भी हैं
जिनको कि हमारी सियासी पार्टियों को
आम लोगों के ऊपर छोड़ देना चाहिये और
उनके अन्दर अपना हाथ नहीं रखना चाहिये
क्योंकि मेरा अपना यह स्थान है कि अगर
इस तरह से वह मसले छोड़ दिये जायेंगे तो
उसका नतीजा बहुत ज्यादा अच्छा निकलेगा
बनिस्वत इसके कि जो अब तक निकल
रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह चन्द एक बातें जो
मेरे बिनाग में थी उनको मैंने आपके सामने
यहां पर रख दिया। अब राष्ट्रपति के अभि-
भाषण के सबब में जो नुकताचीनी यहाँ पर
हुई है उनकी जवाबदेही तो ट्रेजरी बेंच
के लिये छोड़ता हू लेकिन मुझे यह चन्द
एक बातें अर्ज करनी थी जो कि मैंने आपके
सामने रखी। मैं समझता हू कि हम क्षुणसीब
और क्षुणकिस्मत है कि हमें साल से एक
भौका मिलता है जब हम पिछली तमाम
कार्यवाहियों पर कुछ अपने स्थालात का
इजहार करते हैं और अपने जो इरादे होते हैं
उनको हम और मजबूत करते हैं और आगे
आने वाले जमाने के लिये तैयार करते हैं और
इसमें हमारे राष्ट्रपति जो तमाम हिन्दुस्तान
के हैं वह आकर हमें परामर्श देते हैं और
उस परामर्श की पूरी कद्र होती है। हम यह
चाहते हैं कि इस भौके पर हमें जो कुछ भी वे
कहे उसको हम अपने सामने रखें और उस पर
अमल करें। उस अमल से हम अपने मुल्क को
आगे ले जा सकते हैं।

मैं, राष्ट्रपति ने जो अपना अभिभाषण
दिया है उसको निहायत ही हीसलाकुनु
और हिम्मत दिलाने वाला एड्रेस पाता हू
और मुझे इस बात की उम्मीद है कि बाबजूद
इस बात के कि हमारे मुल्क में बहुत सी
बुराइया हैं जिनसे कि हमें लडना है और
जिनका कि हमें मुकाबला करना है, हमने
अगर हिम्मत से काम लिया और एकता
और सगठन के साथ हम अपनी मजिल की
तरफ बढ़ते रहें तो हम जरूर कामयाब होंगे।

अब यह नुकताचीनी कर देना बहुत
आसान है कि हमारी सर्विसेज के लोग रिश्त
लेते हैं, और हमारे देश और समाज में सब
जगह घूसखोरी, अनुचित मुनाफाखोरी और
व्यभिचार का बोलबाला है तो उसके लिए
मेरा यह कहना है कि हमें उन खराबियों को
अपने यहाँ से निकालना है। किन्तु मैं यह बात

निहायत प्रदब के साथ अर्ष कल्या कि अगर कोई यह समझे कि वह सब जानबूझकर या एक इरादे से होता है, तो वह कसई वैरमुनासिब बात होगी। इन सब खराबियों को खरब करने की इन्तहाई कोशिश है लेकिन प्रभाव्यबश उसमें कामयाबी नहीं हुई है हमें अपने मकसद में कामयाब होने के लिए हर देशवासी का सक्रिय सहयोग प्राप्त होना चाहिए और अगर वह हमें प्राप्त हो सका तो यकीनी तौर अर्ष नतीजे निकलेंगे जो कि हम निकलते देखना चाहते हैं। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में हमारी तमाम सियासी पार्टियों को एक पुकार दी गई है और तमाम देशवासियों को भी कि वह अपने तमाम मतभेद और झगड़े भुलाकर राष्ट्रनिर्माण के इस महान प्रयास में जुट जायें और सहकार और सहयोग की भावना से देश को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए पूरी मजबूती के साथ एक होकर अपना कदम बढ़ायें और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस पुकार के लिए हर देशवासी के दिल में जगह होनी चाहिए और उसके मुताबिक प्रमल करना चाहिए।

श्री अजराराज सिंह (फ़िरोज़ाबाद)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे से पूर्व वक्ता महोदय को राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में जो एक भाषा की किरण दिखाई देती है, मुझे तो वह किरण कहीं दिखाई नहीं दी और मुझ तो उसका कहीं पता नहीं लगता है।

आज जहाँ देश में बेकारी और भुखमरी का बोल बाला है वहाँ दूसरी और गेहूँ और खाद्यान्न वस्तुओं के दाम आसमान को चूम रहे हैं और आज जब देश की एसी दयनीय अवस्था हो रही है उसके बावजूद भी मेरे माननीय मित्र को एक भाषा की किरण दिखाई देती है तो मुझे लगता है कि वह तो किसी जादू की भाषा में ही बात कर रहे हैं। आखिर देश की क्या स्थिति है? क्या उस स्थिति का कोई स्पष्टीकरण या उसकी कोई ब्याख्या राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में की गई

है? उस अभिभाषण से क्या पता लगता है? जिस पंचवर्षीय योजना को चलाने के लिए और राष्ट्रनिर्माण के लिए हमें भाषा की किरण की जरूरत थी और जिस उल्साह की जरूरत थी क्या राष्ट्रपति का वह अभिभाषण देश में और उसके नागरिकों में वह भाषा किरण पैदा कर सकता है?

17 hrs.

आज देश में क्या हो रहा है? अभी हमारी सत्तारूढ़ पार्टी ने पिछले दिनों नागपुर कांग्रेस में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया। कहा जाता है कि वह भूमि सम्बन्धी सीमा निर्धारित करने के हेतु नीति सम्बन्धी प्रस्ताव है। अब भूमि की अधिकतम सीमा निर्धारित करने और सहकारी खेती के लिए जो बार-बार यह कहा जाता है कि हम सहकारी खेती करना चाहते हैं और भूमि की सीमा निर्धारित करना चाहते हैं तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में क्या उसकी कोई अर्ष की गई है? मैं ही यह बात नहीं कह रहा बल्कि श्री विनोबा भावे का भी कहना यह है कि तीन साल तक इंतजार करने के बाद जिस नीति को आप चलाना चाहते हैं तो उस समय आपको वितरण के लिए एक इंच जमीन भी नहीं मिलेगी। जब भूमि की सीमा तीन साल तक निर्धारित होगी तो जो अतिरिक्त जमीन है वह बंट चुकेगी। यदि भूमि की सीमा निर्धारित करने की समस्या आप हल करना चाहते हैं तो आपको यह ध्यान में रखना चाहिये कि यह चीज खेती की समस्या से बहुत ही गम्भीर रूप से जुड़ी हुई है और उसका तो सीधा-सा रास्ता वह है जो कि सरकार अन्य उद्योगों को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए करती है। आपको याद होगा कि अभी पिछले दिनों चीनी उद्योग की साढ़े ६ करोड़ का मूनाफा कराने के लिए सरकार ने एक आर्डिनंस पास किया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों किसानों का फायदा कराने के लिए नागपुर प्रस्ताव पास करने के बाद क्या यह सरकार आर्डिनंस

[श्री राधा रमण]

में घाता है कह देते हैं। मैंने बनारस मुनि-वरसिटी का किस्सा पढ़ा और वहां जो अणुबोम्बा भी चल रही है पढ़ कर दिल को अफ़सोस हुआ कि हमारे मुल्क में इस तरह के अणुबोम्बे चलते हैं और यह सब इसलिये होता है कि चन्द एक प्रादमी जो दीवाने होते हैं और जिनके मुंह में लगाम नहीं होती वह अणुबोम्बा खड़ा कर देते हैं और उस का नतीजा यह होता है कि एक बड़ी अच्छी से अच्छी जमात कमजोर हो जाती है और उसकी शक्ति घट जाती है और वह बदनाम भी होती है। आज हम देखते हैं कि हमारे मुल्क में बहुत से ऐसे सवाल खड़े कर दिये जाते हैं और खड़े हो रहे हैं और थोड़े से प्रादमी किसी स्थान को सामने रख कर होश खो बैठते हैं और वह सही बात करने नहीं देते और गलत काम को करवाने के लिये मजबूर करना चाहते हैं। मैं हुकूमत को इस बात के लिये ज़िम्मेदार देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे मुल्क में हुकूमत बगैर मजबूती के नहीं हो सकती। हमें जो कुछ भी अपना अमल हो उस पर बहुत मुस्तैदी के साथ कायम रहना पड़ेगा और जहां इस किस्म की शोरिश और शरारत होती है उसका मुकाबला मजबूती, मुस्तक़िल इरादे और बहुत दानिशमंदी के साथ करना है। इसी सिलसिले में मैं यह भी अर्ज करूंगा कि बहुत सी बातों में मैं यह देखता हूँ कि ऐसी चीजें जिनको कि हम लोग बहुत आसानी से हल कर सकते हैं, हमारी बाज सियासी पार्टियों के नेता उनके हल होने में रुकावट डालते हैं बजाय इसके कि वे उनके हल करने में सहयोग करें। बहुत से ऐसे मसले भी हैं जिनको कि हमारी सियासी पार्टियों को आम लोगों के ऊपर छोड़ देना चाहिये और उनके अन्दर अपना हाथ नहीं रखना चाहिये क्योंकि मेरा अपना यह स्थान है कि अगर इस तरह से वह मसले छोड़ दिये जायेंगे तो उसका नतीजा बहुत ज्यादा अच्छा निकलेगा अनिश्चित इसके कि जो अब तक निकल रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह चन्द एक बातें जो मेरे विभाग में थीं उनको मैंने आपके सामने यहां पर रख दिया। अब राष्ट्रपति के अति-भाषण के संबंध में जो नुक़ताचीनी यहां पर हुई है उनकी जबाबदेही तो ट्रेजरी बेंचिज के लिये छोड़ता हूँ लेकिन मुझे यह चन्द एक बातें अर्ज करनी थीं जो कि मैंने आपके सामने रखीं। मैं समझता हूँ कि हम सुधानसीब और सुधाकिस्मत है कि हमें साल में एक मौका मिलता है जब हम पिछली तमाम कार्यवाहियों पर कुछ अपने स्थानात का इज़हार करते हैं और अपने जो इरादे होते हैं उनको हम और मजबूत करते हैं और अपने अपने वाले जमाने के लिये तैयार करते हैं और इसमें हमारे राष्ट्रपति जो तमाम हिन्दुस्तान के हैं वह भाकर हमें परामर्श देते हैं और उस परामर्श की पूरी क़द्र होती है। हम यह चाहते हैं कि इस मौके पर हमें जो कुछ भी वे कहें उसको हम अपने सामने रखें और उस पर अमल करें। उस अमल से हम अपने मुल्क को आगे ले जा सकते हैं।

मैं, राष्ट्रपति ने जो अपना अतिभाषण दिया है, उसको निहायत ही हौसलाक़ानु और हिम्मत दिलाने वाला एड्रेस पाता हूँ और मुझे इस बात की उम्मीद है कि बावजूद इस बात के कि हमारे मुल्क में बहुत-सी बुराइयां हैं जिनसे कि हमें लड़ना है और जिनका कि हमें मुकाबला करना है, हमने अगर हिम्मत से काम लिया और एकता और संगठन के साथ हम अपनी मंजिल की तरफ़ बढ़ते रहे तो हम ज़रूर कामयाब होंगे।

अब यह नुक़ताचीनी कर देना बहुत आसान है कि हमारी सविसेज के लोग रिपब्लिक् लेते हैं, और हमारे देश और समाज में सब जगह घूसखोरी, अनुचित मुनाफ़ाखोरी और व्यभिचार का बोलबाला है तो उसके लिए मेरा यह कहना है कि हमें उन खराबियों को अपने यहां से निकालना है। किन्तु मैं यह बात

विद्यमान अवब के साथ धर्म कर्मका कि अगर कोई यह समझे कि यह सब जानबूझकर या एक इरादे से होता है, तो वह कतई वैरमुनासिब बात होगी। इन सब खराबियों को खत्म करने की इन्तहाई कोशिश है लेकिन प्रभाग्यवश उसमें कामयाबी नहीं हुई है हमें अपने मकसद में कामयाब होने के लिए हर देशवासी का सक्रिय सहयोग प्राप्त होना चाहिए और अगर वह हमें प्राप्त हो सका तो यकीनी तौर पर अच्छे नतीजे निकलेंगे जो कि हम निकलते देखना चाहते हैं। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में हमारी तमाम सियासी पार्टियों को एक पुकार दी गई है और तमाम देशवासियों को भी कि वह अपने तमाम मतभेद और झगड़े भुलाकर राष्ट्रनिर्माण के इस महान प्रयास में जुट जायें और सहकार और सहयोग की भावना से देश को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए पूरी मजबूती के साथ एक होकर अपना कदम बढ़ायें और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस पुकार के लिए हर देशवासी के दिल में जगह होनी चाहिए और उसके मुताबिक प्रमल करना चाहिए।

श्री बजराम सिंह (फिरोजाबाद)
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे से पूर्व वक्ता महोदय को राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में जो एक भाषा की किरण दिखाई देती है, मुझे तो वह किरण कहीं दिखाई नहीं दी और मुझ तो उसका कहीं पता नहीं लगता है।

आज जहाँ देश में बेकारी और भूखमरी का बोल बाला है वहाँ दूसरी और गेह और खाद्यान्न वस्तुओं के दाम आसमान को चूम रहे हैं और आज जब देश की ऐसी दयनीय अवस्था हो रही है उसके बावजूद भी मेरे माननीय मित्र को एक भाषा की किरण दिखाई देती है तो मुझे लगता है कि वह तो किसी जादू की भाषा में ही बात कर रहे हैं। आखिर देश की क्या स्थिति है? क्या उस स्थिति का कोई स्पष्टीकरण या उसकी कोई व्याख्या राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में की गई

है? उस अभिभाषण से क्या पता लगता है? जिस पंचवर्षीय योजना को चलाने के लिए और राष्ट्रनिर्माण के लिए हमें भाषा की किरण की जरूरत थी और जिस उत्साह की जरूरत थी क्या राष्ट्रपति का वह अभिभाषण देश में और उसके नागरिकों में वह भाषा किरण पैदा कर सकता है?

17 hrs.

आज देश में क्या हो रहा है? अभी हमारी सत्ताकण्ड पार्टी ने पिछले दिनों नागपुर कांग्रेस में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया। कहा जाता है कि वह भूमि सम्बन्धी सीमा निर्धारित करने के हेतु नीति सम्बन्धी प्रस्ताव है। अब भूमि की अधिकतम सीमा निर्धारित करने और सहकारी खेती के लिए जो बार-बार यह कहा जाता है कि हम सहकारी खेती करना चाहते हैं और भूमि की सीमा निर्धारित करना चाहते हैं तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में क्या उसकी कोई चर्चा की गई है? मैं ही यह बात नहीं कह रहा बल्कि श्री विनोबा भावे का भी कहना यह है कि तीन साल तक इंतजार करने के बाद जिस नीति को आप चलाना चाहते हैं तो उस समय आपको बितरण के लिए एक ढाँच जमीन भी नहीं मिलेगी। जब भूमि की सीमा तीन साल तक निर्धारित होगी तो जो प्रतिरिक्त जमीन है वह बट चुकेगी। यदि भूमि की सीमा निर्धारित करने की समस्या आप हल करना चाहते हैं तो आपको यह ध्यान में रखना चाहिये कि यह चीज खेती की समस्या से बहुत ही गम्भीर रूप से जुड़ी हुई है और उसका तो सीधा सा रास्ता वह है जो कि सरकार अन्य उद्योगों को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए करती है। आपको याद होगा कि अभी पिछले दिनों चीनी उद्योग को साढ़े ६ करोड़ का मुनाफा कराने के लिए सरकार ने एक आर्डिनंस पास किया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों किसानों का फायदा कराने के लिए नागपुर प्रस्ताव पास करने के बाद क्या यह सरकार आर्डिनंस

[जी वनराज सिंह]

धारी नहीं कर सकती थी, जिसके कि धरिये यह बेक लिया जाये कि भूमि की अधिकतम सीमा यह होगी और उसके बाव बितनी भूमि रह जायेगी यह अतिरिक्त लोगों में बांट दी जायेगी? अभी यह सवाल राज्य की चर्चा का विषय भी नहीं है और उसके लिए जमीन पैदा की जा रही है लेकिन खचीन पैदा करते समय ही कांग्रेस पार्टी के अन्दर यह प्रोरम आफ की एंटरप्राइज वाले लोग यह प्रचार करने लगे हैं कि इस तरह से जो भूमि की अधिकतम सीमा निश्चित करने और सहकारी खेती करने की बात है, उसको नवर्नमेंट करने में सफल होने वाली नहीं है। अब मैं ऐसे लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वह सहकारी खेती और भूमि सुधार की चीजें सफल होने वाली नहीं है तो इस देश में क्या यह चीज सफल होने वाली है कि कुछ लोगों के हाथ में सारी पूजा दे दी जाये? मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि नागपुर प्रस्ताव में जितनी दूर जाना चाहिए,

उतनी दूर जाने की बात तो है ही नहीं। आप जमीन कलता की भूमि की तो अधिकतम सीमा निश्चित करने की बात करते हैं लेकिन बाहरों में रहने वाली जनता की धाम्दनी पर कोई सीलिग लगाने की बात सुनकर आपको आश्चर्य होता है और मुझे तो प्रचाल मंत्री महोदय की यह बात सुनकर बड़ा ताज्जुब होता है कि गांवों में सीलिग लगाने से तो कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़ेगा लेकिन अगर नबरो में लोगों की धाम्दनी पर कोई सीलिग लागू की जायगी तो उससे उत्पादन घट जाने की सम्भावना है।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may continue tomorrow.

17 02 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, February 17, 1959 | Magha 28, 1880 (Saka).