

MOTION RE THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT OF BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to move

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 18th February, 1959"

Shri B. Das Gupta (Purulia) I move for the extension of the time for the consideration of the amendments made by Rajya Sabha in the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1958, by one hour more.

Mr. Speaker: Hon Members have got copies of this report. This was presented yesterday. If they want any changes, they must table amendments. They should not get up and say off-hand that the time should be extended in respect of any particular item of business, for other hon Members will be taken by surprise. There are a number of hon Members who in a representative capacity go into the Business Advisory Committee, and take everything into consideration.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basurhat) This came to us this morning

Mr. Speaker: Copies have been sent only this morning?

Some Hon. Members: Yes

Mr. Speaker: Some Members were already in the Business Advisory Committee (Interruptions) Anyway, what is his amendment?

Shri B. Das Gupta: I want to have the time allotted for item No 5 extended by one hour.

Mr. Speaker: We have got two hours already for it.

Shri B. Das Gupta: It is an important Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Under the rules, the Speaker has always got discretion to extend the time allotted by one hour. Therefore, if I find that it is necessary, I shall do so.

The question is

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 18th February 1959".

The motion was adopted.

12 11 hrs.

MOTION ON ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT—contd

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further consideration of the motion moved by Shri Kashiwal and seconded by Shri Joachim Alva on the 13th February 1959, and amendments thereto.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must begin on a note of apology for not having been present here throughout the discussions on this Motion, as I was absent from Delhi for one day and heavily occupied on other days. I was present for some time. I have however, tried to remedy that lapse by reading the official verbatim record of the speeches made by hon. Members, more particularly the leading Members, on the other side of the House. I have read specially the speech of Shri S. A. Dange with its seeming profundity and light cynicism, the speech of Acharya Kripalani with all its earnest appeal, and the war-like saga of Shri M. R. Masani.

The first thing I should like to say is—and I say this almost every year on such an occasion—that there appears to be some misapprehension as to what the President's Address to a joint session of the two Houses should be. I think Shri Dange said that the Address was lifeless and not inspiring. Shri Khadilkar said that the speech utterly lacked urgency,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

vigour and vitality; it should be more analytical and critical, showing where Government had gone wrong and so on. Now, I fear nothing that I can say is likely to inspire the hon. Member, Shri Dange. His inspiration is from sources not available to me. But what Shri Khadilkar said presumes that our President is more or less in the position of the President of the United States with his State of the Union message which he sometimes gives—an analytical survey. It is obvious that our President is not constitutionally or otherwise in that position and it would not be fair to him or fair to this House for the President to function in any other way than is laid down in the Constitution. Therefore, his annual Address is necessarily not an analytical and critical document, except very broadly speaking; it is to be rather a simple narration of what has been done; giving some idea of the major things that Government is going to undertake. If we have to start some other convention in this matter, I do not know how it will fit in with such ideas of our Constitution and the President's position as have thus far been accepted by us.

In the various speeches made in this House, many matters have been referred to. I think there have been several references to the case of Shri Mathai. Many other subjects have come up too, and more particularly there has even been mention of something which had not been previously mentioned in any context in this House, that is, the possibilities of civil war in this country. So the debate has covered a wide field. I should like, if I may, to refer to some of these matters because to refer to every point raised would make what I have to say much too discursive and without much point.

I would rightaway say a few words about Shri Mathai's case which seems to have agitated a number of Members opposite, and to which reference

has been made in the speeches. Now, I welcome any kind of inquiry that can be made about any matter which raises doubts in Members' minds. I have always been willing, if ever I am approached, to give such information as I have, whether outside the House or in answer to questions. When questions were asked in this House and in the other House, I endeavoured to give answers to the particular questions. Naturally, I could not go into the history of it or give a long account of all connected matters. When I found that because of public interests, because of the interest of Members in this House and because of the importance of certain charges and insinuations made it was desirable to have this matter considered in its wider context as a whole comprehensively, I decided not to give information piecemeal which did not seem to satisfy Members, because some of the questions put to me were rather extraordinary, extraordinary in the sense that they were hardly questions; they were something more than questions. And in the speeches made too, it seems to be almost accepted that something very grave has happened—without waiting for all the facts. Therefore, I decided that it was better for this matter to be considered in all its fullness by some one who could prepare a report on it to be considered and at that time it will be for us to decide what, if any, further steps should be taken in this matter. So I asked our Cabinet Secretary to ascertain all the facts that he could in this matter from the various allegations and charges made, whether in any question in this House or in the Press, if it was available, and report to me so that I would be in a better position to submit such a report or my own report on it to you Sir. I have done that. And because these matters involve—these charges involve—financial matters, it is my intention when the Cabinet Secretary sends his

report or note to me on these subjects, to send it to my colleague the Finance Minister and separately to the Comptroller and Auditor-General so that they may judge the financial proprieties and improprieties of any action that had been taken.

When a person has been in fairly intimate contact with another, then, two consequences flow. One is that he is presumed to know him better and more intimately and to be in a better position to judge that man. The other possible consequence is that he might be rather partial to him. One is an advantage; the other is a disadvantage. In any event, I decided that this matter should be considered without my own opinions coming in the way. And, therefore, as I said, I decided that when the Cabinet Secretary submits ~~the~~ report, I shall request my colleague the Finance Minister to look into it and to give me his advice in the matter and separately I shall ask the Auditor-General to consider whether the proprieties were observed or whether any improprieties were committed in this matter. Because I want these to be considered rather fully and because I want it to cover the period since Mr. Mathai joined me—and that was 12 years ago—it will take a little time to get all these facts to be ascertained.

I am not interested in what Mr. Mathai did before he came to me; but, ever since he came to me, naturally my interest begins. I may point out—hon. Members may not perhaps know it—that he came to me very considerably before there was any talk of my being in any Government. I forget exactly, about a year and a half before, I think, and there was no question of his coming to a prospective Prime Minister or any government official. And so, I have asked the Cabinet Secretary to do this, that is from the time he came to me, to have some broad knowledge of the situation and more precisely in regard to the actual allegations made.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Does it mean that the period prior to that will not be enquired into—that the Rs. 2 lakhs or Rs. 3 lakhs which he built up while he was in the establishment of the United States Army will not be enquired into?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, Sir; that is precisely what it means. I am not going to enquire into that; that is a separate matter—whether it is to be gone into by somebody. I cannot go on enquiring into everybody's previous life. But, I am interested and the House has a right to be interested in what has happened since he has been connected with me or in government service.

Now I would like to add again that I welcome the interest that Members of this House take in a matter which creates any doubt in their minds and where they feel proprieties have not been observed. That is right. But, I would with all respect say that I have been a little surprised at the manner in which this question has been pursued, and almost an element of persecution has come in that approach outside and here, because that, I think, is the last thing which hon. Members would desire. They want the truth; they want justice to be done. They want the standards of integrity to be maintained. I am sure no one here wishes that a kind of witch-hunt should take place whenever some such thing comes up to our notice. There has been, in the Press, Sir—and I am not for the moment complaining of anybody but I am stating a fact—a tendency for matters to be sensationalised.

May I mention another simple instance? The other day, in a periodical not famous for its reputation for responsibility or truth, a letter was reproduced which Mr. Mathai had written about 9 years ago. The letter was addressed to Mrs. Rameshwari Nehru. Simply because Mr. Mathai

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

case is before the public, it was published. I do not know where the paper got this letter from; it was hinted that it was got from a sweatmeat seller; the sweatmeat was wrapped up in it. It may be. In this letter which was reproduced, for example, Mr. Mathai had said: The Prime Minister has asked me to send you a cheque for Rs. 5,000 for relief. He regrets he may not be able to send it to you regularly.

Most hon. Members of this House probably know Shrimati Rameshwari Nehru, one of the respected persons in Delhi city who, at that time more especially and since, was devoting herself to the relief of the displaced persons from Pakistan, especially women. She was an honorary Adviser of the Ministry of Rehabilitation. Of course, the Ministry was helping these people. In cases where there was urgency she came to me and said: I can't always wait for governmental slow processes when urgent help is needed. So, I used to give her some money for which he gave me long accounts. And this Rs 5,000 I gave her for relief. This is the kind of thing that is reproduced in this periodical—to suggest that, since she is the wife of a cousin of mine, I was giving her a sort of pension from government funds. (Interruption.)

I think I should like to go on now to Mr. Masani's speech. I regret I was not here, but I have read every word of it in the official report because in the course of a varied experience in this House for the last 11 years that was a novel experience. That was a novel experience and I believe it is the first time that any hon. Member of this House has talked and threatened a civil war if something was done.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East): The Prime Minister will give me a moment. Will he read the verbatim

text? There was no sign of threat; it was a caution. This is what I said:

"If Members feel I used a harsh term, if I mentioned civil war, that is what I feared. If any serious attempt is made to come to the peasants of Ranchi and Chota Nagpur and tell them to give their land, I say, whether we like it or not, blood would be shed. It is to warn the Government against taking such a step, to warn against taking steps which may lead this country to a horrible thing like this that I am raising this question"

Surely, threat has nothing to do with it.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have also got a quotation in inverted commas from his speech with me. He referred to the question more than once. He said that if this thing is done, that is, co-operative farming, it can only be by threat or by coercion.

"I do not hesitate to say that if a serious attempt is made it will lead to civil war and bloodshed and the death of thousands of people in this country. We will never accept such a commitment."

Shri M. R. Masani: One word is missing—'unfortunate'. It is missing in the Prime Minister's text..... (Interruptions.) I wish the Prime Minister discusses co-operative farming and not draw this rod hearing across the trail.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The second one was what the hon. Member has quoted about his constituency where he is so intimately connected with the Adivasis.

He has said:

"Such people will never give up their land with whatever slogan you may approach them. If Members feel that I use a harsh term, if I talk of civil war, I mean this...."

Shri M. E. Masani: It is an uncorrected text; I have got it corrected

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It goes further:

"If any serious attempt is made to come to the peasants of Ranchi and Chota Nagpur and to tell them to give up their land and to get into the big co-operatives as in China, I may say, whether you like it or not, blood will be shed"

I am glad to notice that he is in a more chastened mood and wants to correct his previous speech

Mr. Speaker: No hon Member is entitled to put a new word into his speech (Interruptions)

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch Tribes) May I point out that any hon Member may recite only the corrected text because as you know things are sent to us for correction. Certain words are missing

Mr. Speaker: It was not brought to my notice. The hon Members will kindly look into the rules. No hon Member is entitled to put a new word into his speech or to correct any expression which he has used. Whatever it may be, it is left to the Speaker, if it is objectionable, to expunge it, it is not for him to say after second thought that he ought to have said so. So, he must take the consequence of whatever he has stated here

Shri M. E. Masani: The text is incomplete. The word 'unfortunate' was missing. I put it in because I uttered it.

Shri Joachim Alva: Some of us were present when he talked of civil war. (Interruptions)

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I continue?

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary to pursue this matter.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not interested in a particular word. If

I may submit, if the hon Member thinks that a word has been left out, his word should be taken and the word should be put in because sometimes words are left out. But I have to deal with the more basic position. I was, I should confess, distressed at this light-hearted reference to the possibilities of civil war. Previously, I have heard of this word being used not in this House but outside. Now from different channels it has crept into this House and I think that is a bad development because however strongly we may feel about questions and argue about them in this House and outside, there are certain basic things which we must keep in mind and we must not, I submit, say things which aggravate the situation which lead people's minds into wrong directions. There is enough. We have to face enough difficulties—all of us, I am not talking about the Governments but the country. And while it is right that we should criticise each other's policies, to refer to this kind of thing is, I submit, not to be encouraged.

Now, why did the hon Member, Shri Masani, get rather worked up? Because of certain resolutions passed at the Nagpur Session of the Congress among them being one on land reform and co-operatives. There, in those resolutions, it was said that our aim and objective is joint farming, that we should aim at that but for the present, for the next three years, we should concentrate on service co-operatives. It was further emphasised that this business of co-operation in the very nature of things is a voluntary business and if joint farming comes it will be with the consent of the people concerned. Now, Shri Masani in his speech stated that he had always been in favour of the co-operative principle but the way and what has been said in the Congress resolution has nothing to do with co-operation because the moment the idea of joint farming comes in it means deprivation of the land from

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

the peasant and therefore it is not co-operation. Further, that, if there is joint-farming at any stage, it must necessarily lead to collectivism. That is his argument. Collectivism then leads to that horrible state of affairs which, according to him, exists in Russia and China and elsewhere. Therefore, this is the slippery path which leads down below to the lowest depths. This is the argument, I hope I have put it correctly.

Now that argument of course presumes so many things which do not exist that it is a little difficult to answer it. He starts with this assumption that where there is joint farming, it ceases to be co-operation. I have heard of many criticisms of joint farming but this is the first time I have heard this principle enunciated. Then if there is joint farming, he says that it must lead necessarily to collective farming which also seems to me rather an odd statement to make. Speaking for myself, I do not broadly speaking agree with collective farming. I do not—and I wish to be quite frank—but if some people want to do it, let them do it. I will not come in the way but I shall not encourage them. But I do believe in co-operation and I do, firmly and absolutely believe in the rightness of joint cultivation. Let there be no doubt. I do not wish to hide my own beliefs in this matter. I shall go from field to field and peasant to peasant begging them to agree to it. Knowing that they do not agree, I cannot put it in operation. That is a different matter. It is for them to agree. I am not saying that in this or any other matter any common principle can be applied to every country in the world. I have come to believe firmly that to try to generalise about all countries about one policy, is not right. We may have some general principles, naturally of approach, but each country's facts and conditions have to be judged as they are and something else

from another country should not be imposed which may not fit in. And, if I suggest something for the peasantry of India—whether I am right or wrong, of course, is another matter—it is because I think that in the conditions of India that thing is desirable and profitable. I cannot say in this changing world what I may think or others may think a few years later, because we live in a terrific period of change.

Now, Shri Masani said somewhere that he objects to anything being done to change this traditional way of doing things. He said somewhere that he wants the traditional way of family farming, individual farming, to continue. Now, I am not against tradition as such, but I think that the one thing that we want in India is to get out of tradition as much as possible. We have had enough of traditions here. I do not mean to say about all traditions—that would be absurd for me to say—but we have become in some ways traditionalists, fundamentalists and all that. And, I must say, however much I may differ from Shri Masani, I did not think he was a fundamentalist and a traditionalist in that sense.

So let us consider this question on the merits, realising that whatever we have to do in this sphere of co-operation must come from the willing assent of the people concerned, otherwise, apart from being good or bad—I agree with Shri Masani—it is not co-operation. It is something else. If that is agreed to then most of the arguments that Shri Masani gave us falls to the ground.

He also stated with great vigour that nowhere in the world has this kind of farming yielded better results. Now, again, I think that it is very unsafe to make these general statements. I can give him instances where it has been known to be a success, but leave that out. He gave

examples. He gave us what had happened in Yugoslavia and Poland. The examples were that collective farming was given up. There, again, he will see that, first, he combined two quite different things. He gave the example of one and applied it to the other. That is a curious way of argument. That is, firstly, he says that joint farming of the kind we have suggested is collective farming, and then he says that collective farming failed somewhere else and therefore joint farming will fail here. That indicates a tremendous confusion in his mind, whether it is some kind of an unconscious confusion or conscious confusion, I do not know.

I am not judging Yugoslavia or Poland or Soviet Union or China. I do not like many things that happen in other countries. I like other things. Sometimes in the context of things one expresses one's opinion but I am always reluctant to do so because unless something is a matter of high principle, I honestly do not consider myself competent to judge other countries. I do not know all the facts and circumstances and context, and to judge by some odd facts that appear in newspapers or a report is not enough. I do not want others in other countries also to fall into the trap of judging my country by some odd facts or reports. Therefore I cannot say whether Yugoslavia, Poland, Soviet Union or China for that matter is acting rightly or not, profitably or not. They know best.

But in India we have to deal with a situation where the average holding is very very small. The average for India is—I do not know—one acre, maybe two. Certainly, quite a vast number of people do not even have one acre of land. What are you to do with that? It will be a completely different proposition if the average holding here was let us say, 20 acres or 50 acres. That would make us think differently. I am not enamoured of joint farming or anything because of the name of it. You get some foothold to work there, to im-

prove the land. But what can a person who has a holding of one acre or so, as most people have in India, do with that land? Of course, he can improve it. And, as Shri Masani has told us, we can give him better seeds, give him water, give him fertilisers, give him better tools. Certainly, gradually we can give them to him, and in any event he ought to be given those things. But having given all these, what? Then there are certain improvements in the land which he can profit by if he had larger pieces to plough, to cultivate. A one-acre land will always keep its owner in semi-starvation. If it is a good season he may get a little more to eat but, then again he relaxes. There is no future for him in that. Of course, we have at the present moment too many people on the land and they must be engaged in other occupations, namely, industry, whether it is big industry, middle industry or cottage industry—that is another matter. But they have to be engaged and the burden has to be lessened. That is true, and everything has to be done to help in greater production in the land. But I do submit that—whether it is from the point of view of a theoretical approach or otherwise—in the conditions in India joint farming is the right objective to aim at.

Again, I add definitely that means by consent, not otherwise, and, apart from the theoretical view, if you examine the practical question here you will be led to the same conclusion. I know very well that peasants are conservative, farmers are conservative and they do not easily change their own habits if I want them to change. I will have to put examples of success before them, not a theoretical speech. If I tell them that their neighbour is succeeding in this, that will convince them more than anything else. So, ultimately this question lies in the hands of farmers of India, not in my hands or Shri Masani's hands. I should do my best to convince them of a certain course of action.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

But, in the meanwhile, when we say that for the next three years we should concentrate on service co-operatives, that itself indicates that we are proceeding not hurriedly. Give the full time. They must have their service co-operatives. No Act is going to be passed by Parliament. If they themselves want to change it, who can prevent them? Indeed, I ask you, who can prevent a co-operative society today from deciding that they shall do joint cultivation? Nobody can prevent it. There is no question of coercion. There is no question of a new law. The society itself decides to do it. In fact, many have done so, quite a number of them. So, I do not understand this. The subject of co-operative farming may be discussed, whether there is virtue in it or not. You may even say, well, it is suited to wheat farming and not so much to rice farming. These are matters to be considered—I can understand that. But what has surprised me is this fierce approach of Shri Masani. Shri Masani knows even less about farming than I do. I do not pretend to know much except that it has been my privilege to be connected with the peasants of my State for many, many years. Somehow I felt that that reaction had little to do with joint cultivation. It was a reaction against something, some fear, which lay behind it as it comes out repeatedly. What lies behind or beyond, the future, I do not know, neither Shri Masani. But I do know this, that things are happening in the world and in India which are changing the face of our country and will change it tremendously. We cannot carry on the old traditions, whether they are in land or in industry or in so many other things.

The problem before us is so big; the entire problem of carrying the 400 millions of the Indian people forward is so tremendous that in the course of our journey we shall have to undergo many transformations.

Now, coming back to joint cultivation, I should just like to give a few facts as to the present position of co-operatives. In regard to the small village co-operative societies, not joint farming, I am giving the numbers. At the end of 1950-51, the number of these societies was 118,000. At the end of 1956-57, the number was 159,000. At the end of 1958-59, the number was 179,000. These are the village ones, not the big ones. The membership of village co-operatives was, in 1950-51, 51½ lakhs, in 1956-57, 91 lakhs, in 1957-58, 110 lakhs; in 1958-59, the estimate is 138 lakhs.

To come to the large-sized co-operatives, at the end of 1956-57, there were 1,915, in 1957-58, 4,529 and in 1958-59 6,318.

Then, it may interest the hon. Members to know the amount of rural credit that was given by these co-operatives. I might mention that 80 per cent of this was given by the village co-operatives, I mean the loans. The big ones gave only 20 per cent. In 1950-51, it was Rs. 22·9 crores, in 1955-56, it was Rs. 49·62 crores, in 1956-57, Rs. 63·33 crores; in 1957-58, Rs. 96 crores and in 1958-59 Rs. 130 crores. All this indicates—I do not say it is stupendous advance—a solid advance of co-operative societies, more especially of small co-operatives.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Are these credit societies or service societies?

Mr. Speaker: Multi-purpose.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Many of them are credit societies, but nowadays, we try to make every society that is formed a multi-purpose one. These include all kinds.

Coming to joint co-operative farming, according to the report, there were 2,020 co-operative farming societies in India at the end of 1957-58.

But I would like to add that this term 'co-operative farming' has been used somewhat loosely. Sometimes, the land is held by the society, the ownership is of the society and yet cultivation is carried on individually in some cases. If this type of farming societies is excluded, that is, if those societies where cultivation is carried on separately are excluded, the number of joint and collective farming societies and where cultivation is undertaken jointly, is 1,357, consisting of 966 joint farming societies and 391 collective farming societies. These are the present figure.

It is true, and I would like to make this clear, that some of these societies were formed with the intention of circumventing land reform legislation.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): What is this collective farming? Again, that dangerous word is used.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have got a report where each of these collective societies is separately discussed. They differ. But broadly speaking, I take it that it means—where they use the word 'collective'—that the land is held by the community, that is, each individual has not got a separate share. I take it like that. I suppose it is so.

I do not say that all these 1,300 odd societies are very good societies or very successful ones or models of joint farming. But in every State, there are examples of successful joint farming societies. They have arisen in the last two or three years and they have arisen really not because of any tremendous pressure from anybody but because due to various reasons the farmers have decided to do so. There is a report of the Programme Evaluation Organization of the Planning Commission on *Studies in Co-operative Farming* which was issued two and a half years ago, where all these societies are separately considered and evaluated. Further studies are being organized now by the Planning Commission.

The other question in which some doubt has arisen has been raised by some people. There has been some criticism about the ceilings on land. This question has been under discussion not in this House but outside, and certainly in the Congress organization for a number of years and in the Planning Commission. The hon. Members know that the Planning Commission, in their reports and five years plans, have repeatedly recommended it. In fact, some States have already taken action on it.

The first point I would like to submit is that these decisions, whether on co-operative farming or on ceilings, did not suddenly come out of somebody else's head. These things were discussed, argued for years. We have been criticized, and perhaps rightly criticized, as going too slow in this matter. Anyhow, they have been considered, special committees were appointed not only consisting of members of the Congress but of eminent economists from outside who made these recommendations which were again discussed. So, the decisions arrived at were preceded by a very great deal of discussion and consideration of each aspect of the question.

One thing I would like to say about Shri Masani's speech. He made a statement which seemed to me rather remarkable. He said "Is it not a farce to talk of co-operation and targets?" I hope I understand the English language adequately, but I do not understand what this question means. Why should we not have targets and also have co-operation?

13 hrs.

Shri M. R. Masani: Mr. Gomulka has specifically proved that you cannot have targets when you want it to be voluntary, because you are then planning the rate of growth of human consciousness.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member seeks refuge under Mr.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Gomulka's name, of course a very eminent person, no doubt, but I wish nevertheless that he takes refuge in a common sense approach even more. It is perfectly true—if I am asked how do you expect the Indian peasant to grow in political or economic or other consciousness, how am I to put a target on that? But I can very definitely put a target on a field's production. I may not reach it; that is a different matter, but it is a most ordinary thing to be done.

In fact, that applies to a single individual field. Leave out co-operation; can we or can we not put a target on a farm of 10 acres or whatever the acreage may be? I do not say that it is a precise target and it must be attained. But it is arrived at after some calculation and you put a target—20 per cent or 30 per cent ~~whatever~~ whatever it may be. If we can put it on an individual field, why cannot we put it on 10 or 20 fields joined together and call it a co-operative? I do not understand it. Otherwise, one must say that one can never put a target, regardless of co-operation, on any piece of land, as to what they are going to produce. That is surely an extraordinary statement to make, opposed to all scientific, statistical, and every kind of approach.

Shri M. E. Masani: The target I referred to was the target that 3,000 co-operative farms should be brought into existence by the end of the Second Five Year Plan and 600 must be brought into existence by the end of the financial year 1958-59. It was that target of the rate of co-operativisation that I mentioned, and not any target of production.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Either the hon. Member believes in planning or he does not. I submit that today there is none that, I know of, whether in the capitalist world, the socialist world or the communist world, who does not believe in planning. The approach to planning may be different; it is admit-

ted. But the moment you plan, you must have targets. The targets may be attainable or not.

If I may rather give an example to the hon. Member, nobody can say whether the next child of a certain married couple is going to be a son or a daughter. But statistically, you can say that in India, there are likely to be so many sons and so many daughters. In each individual case, you are completely uncertain. Therefore, targets are put to know what we want to do. It involves some calculation to some extent as to what can be the produce by the use of so much better fertilisers or better seeds, better manure, more labour and all that; this can be calculated, though not with accuracy. But when you spread this out over a large figure, then the inaccuracies become less.

What Acharya Kripalanisays in this House or elsewhere always has to be listened to with respect, because he is not only one of our most respected elder statesmen, but a dear colleague and comrade of ours in the past and I hope in the present too. Acharya Kripalani said that I had made appeals for co-operation, but this kind of appeal had no particular value, because the appeal was for co-operation at the level of consultation and not at the level of execution. He said,

"Opposition parties cannot be asked to make themselves responsible for policies in the execution of which they have no part or lot."

He said on his own behalf—he made it perfectly clear—and not on behalf of his party that there should be, therefore, a national government. I have no doubt that under certain circumstances, a national Government is desirable to a larger measure, because after all, when we consider these tremendous problems that face us, I hope no one can allow himself to be narrow-minded enough to think on

party lines. It has been our privilege to work on mighty tasks and it is our privilege now in this House to face enormous challenges and problems and work out solution. And, we must adopt the method which takes us farthest. That is the only test or yard-stick.

But when I consider Acharya Kripalani's proposal of a national Government, my mind is not quite clear as to what he means and what this thing itself called 'national Government' is supposed to be or is likely to be. He himself in the course of his speech, talking about his own party, the Praja-Socialist Party, said that the PSP has a policy statement which precludes it from co-operation with the Congress or the Government in the political field. Then again, a national government presumably means a government representative of various parties. Which parties? In this House, apart from the majority party, there are three or four major groups and some Independents, who perhaps are not in any group. Those in the opposition may present a solid front, as it sometimes does against the Government, but it is well known that the fissures between the different groups in the opposition are deep and wide and possibly, it may be even more difficult for them to function together than it is for the present Government to function with any one of those groups. So, all these difficulties arise.

One has to try to work, not the routine work of administration but the big work that faces all of us. Whether it is planning or the execution of the Plan, there has to be a certain measure of united approach, not altogether I mean, but if there is a basic difference in the approach itself, then that would simply mean each group coming in the way of the other, no result being visible. Acharya Kripalani, in the goodness of his heart, thinks that people, when faced with serious problems, will naturally took

at it in the right way and come to some kind of broad agreement. But that does not happen. Leaving out people who may not be honest, in politics, even amongst honest people, there are strong differences of opinion. Now, if I may venture to say so, what would happen to me if I have Mr. Masani in my Government? If we can behave peacefully towards each other, we shall at any rate be trying all the time to convert or to prevent the other person from going in a certain direction. There will be a stalemate and nothing will be done. So, there has to be some kind of common approach to problems. That common approach is hammered out, of course, in Parliament, the Planning Commission and elsewhere. As a matter of fact, many of these things are capable of common approaches.

Now, I submit, if the time comes for what is called a national government, well, obviously if the time comes and if the people are in the mood for it, let us have a national government. But again I submit I do not quite understand what the national government would be. Would it mean all the parties in this House functioning together? Patently not. Because, some of them are so far removed from each other that there is no common ground.

Acharya Kripalani: May I submit here that there is more difference among Congressmen about some of the dominant policies that are adopted at the Congress than some of those who are on this side?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Acharya is right in what he has said. In the wide fold of the Congress there are many differences of opinion. But it is no good pointing out to me these differences in the various parts of India. Because, the policy laid down by the Congress comes gradually; because of those differences it takes some time for new policies or variations of old policies to be framed; that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

is true. But once it is laid down, people accept it. If they do not accept it, and if it is a matter of principle, well, then there is a break and the person goes out of the organisation. That has been the history of the Congress, as Acharya Kripalani knows very well.

Acharya Kripalani: He does not go out of the Congress. He is a drag on the Congress.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He is a drag? Yes, that is so. But I was merely referring to the early days of the Congress when people like our respected friends of the Liberal Party left the Congress. Those who do not leave, they become a drag too. That is so. These are but consequences of our history, the Congress history. I do not wish to take much time of the House on this. I just wanted to point out the difficulty one has to face

Now, Acharya Kripalani knows that among the various groups and parties in this House, so far as national policy is concerned, probably his party is nearer to the Congress than other parties here.

Acharya Kripalani: And Communists too.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They are, in fact, people who have been in the Congress. Now, there are others, there is another party, rather faintly represented here—not faintly, I am sorry, but in a very small number—which has laid down, whose leader has laid down the policy of permanent, not revolt of the Trotsky type but permanent civil disobedience or permanent satyagraha, whatever it is.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): Till injustice is going on.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is exactly what I say—permanent interruptions, permanent processions. Now, what are we to do here? Take, for example, the city of Calcutta, which,

I think, now can be called the city of processions. It is always easy to find cause for a procession. But I am told that if there is nothing at all even then there is a procession. Now the recent agitation in U.P. about cane price, this, that and the other, it is a little difficult; I am not going into the merits of it, but I am merely saying these approaches do not fit in. But what I submit to Acharya Kripalani's consideration is this: everything comes when the time is ripe for it. I thought, and I do think still, that there are large number of openings for co-operation, apart from what might be called governmental co-operation. I am not ruling out anything, because we have to prepare the ground for it, because we cannot have an artificial thing.

Today take, first of all, the planning as such, which I submit is the most important stage, vital stage. Insofar as implementation goes, implementation naturally is looked after by the Government, but ultimately the implementation goes to vast numbers of officials and the like. It goes through. Then there are the stages. All these difficulties are there. But one can immediately have co-operation in the planning stage; one can have co-operation in the implementation stage, various levels. Take community development blocks.

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): May I submit that is not done at the district level. That is the monopoly of the Congress people. How can you say there is co-operation by others?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not say about the district level. It may be so. If it is not there, it should be done. I do not know what he means by co-operation at the district level. I can understand the community development block; I can understand the panchayats, the co-operatives. So far as co-operation is concerned, it may surprise Shri Masani to know that we have laid the greatest stress on both

the panchayats and the co-operatives to function, apart from official pressure even official guidance, I would say, except where it is necessary. We want them to be self-reliant entities. Now, if we build up co-operative effort at the top, the planning in its various stages, it grows; it grows and a time may come when we can have it much more, of course.

I have taken much time of the House But I should like to give some information which the hon. Member, Shri Ghose asked for when he was talking about the Berubari Union yesterday. First of all, may I say that we realise fully the depth of feelings in such matters? It is quite natural, especially in Bengal. So far as we are concerned, I can assure him that we shall examine this matter, we shall have it examined again from the constitutional and legal point of view and other points of view also. It is rather difficult for me to deal with this matter while dealing with what he said about consultation—because, honestly I find that I hold a different opinion about what has been expressed elsewhere Now I am not saying that anybody is deliberately saying something that is not true But I can say that there has been a grave misunderstanding about it Of course, in a matter of this kind it is inconceivable to me that one can come to any decision without the consent of the representatives of the Government concerned

But there it is I do not wish to pursue this matter further But he wanted some figures and I shall give them to him—sorry, I cannot find the paper that contains the figures—here is something.

According to the previous agreements arrived at and the Bagge Award certain exchanges took place on the 15th January Many of these things had been agreed to previously—by 'agreed to' I mean that the Bagge Award said so. According to this ...

Shri Bimal Ghose (Barrackpore): It is there.

341 (A) LSD.—3

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Bagge Award is here.

An Hon. Member: Exchange took place this year?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Exchange took place on the 15th January. The area in India's possession and handed over to Pakistan is 26.4 square miles. The area in Pakistan's possession and handed over to India is 12.2 square miles That has been done.

About the others, that is, the Cooch Behar enclaves, the area in India's possession to be handed over to Pakistan is 29 square miles and the area in Pakistan's possession to be handed over to India is 18 square miles.

So far as the Berubari Union is concerned, the area is 4.3 square miles and there is about half a square mile in the 24 Parganas.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: The point we would like to know is whether Pakistan ever raised this question of Berubari as a dispute before the Bagge Tribunal at all and if it did not do so, why this matter was raised as a dispute or accepted by our Government as a dispute to be resolved

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It was not raised before the Bagge Tribunal. That is true But it was raised repeatedly and, in fact, many of the border troubles that have occurred have been on this border in furtherance of that dispute They are trying to come in. But I hope this House will consider this matter in all its aspects fully later

I have dealt with various matters but really what I should like to have dealt with was the major approach of the President's Address, that is, about our planning, about our Third Five-Year Plan, about what we have done and what we intend to do. May I say that in spite of all the errors of which we may have been guilty and in spite of all the disasters—natural

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

and others—that we have had to face, still the general record in regard to production et cetera of the past few years has been, I think, good. The results of that may not be good. That is perfectly true. But I am talking merely in terms of production at the moment—agricultural as well as industrial—because that is a basic thing and on that everything will depend. I do not say that that is the only thing. Other things have to be taken into consideration. But the major fact that we have to face is that if our production goes up by 2 per cent per annum that is just enough to keep us where we are, that is, to prevent us from sliding back. Therefore for any real progress it has to be beyond the 2 per cent increase per annum. I believe our average has been about 6 per cent in the past few years.

Shri Bimal Ghose: Before the last two years.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, before that. During the last two years it has been pulled down, but I think if you take the whole period it may not be less. During the last two years it has been less, specially agriculture. Anyhow, there is a basic fact that we have broadly to go ahead at about 6 per cent. per annum, both in the average of agriculture and industry.

In regard to industry, one can fairly easily calculate it, in the sense as to how much investment you put in and you get back. In regard to agriculture, it is a little more difficult to be precise. But from all indications, apart from the indication of good harvest which we have, the work we have done in the past is bearing fruit now. The community development movement has now been geared up to agricultural production specially and it is producing results, and otherwise also. More important than all, I think, is our efficiency in the States. Our State agricultural departments have—I say so with hesitation—become at last very fully alive to what

they have to do which, perhaps, they were not previously. So, broadly speaking, it is clear that one has to make a certain effort in order to go ahead. About the details thereof we may differ but if we lessen the effort, far from going ahead we will perhaps remain where we are.

Secondly, the resources in India are there and even by the experience of the past few years it is certain that we are likely to do that, but obviously all this requires a tremendous effort. Shri Khadilkar, I think, said about a new perspective. It is not merely a question of doing the same thing with a little more effort, but of a new perspective because that perspective is required not only in industry but in land too. It was more with the idea of giving that new perspective in land that the Resolutions relating to this matter were passed by the Congress.

Now, I want to say a word or two about the so-called public sector. Sometimes I have criticized the private sector—not really the private sector but some persons who said that they spoke on behalf of the private sector. There are some people who, perhaps, in spite of what they do, are not very helpful to the private sector. Perhaps they create prejudice against it by their public utterances. I mean to say some people in the private sector. . . .

Shri P. R. Patel: Should they not give any opinions?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I merely say that by their activities they sometimes create an adverse impression on the public mind. They are welcome to do that as anybody is. There is freedom of speech in this country even though the speech may not be logical or intelligent. But I do believe that on one side everything seems to be judged by this fact, namely, have you nationalised this or are you going to nationalise this. With great respect may I say that these are rather immature approaches to these problems?

12.30 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Nationalising a few more things may be good or bad. We do not know. It depends on the things themselves. But today, as I understand it, we have to increase our production and increase it in a way so that monopoly controls are not added to—to diminish monopoly controls—and a strong socialist basis is gradually built up; that is, the dynamic points in our country are controlled by the State. I believe they are largely controlled by the State; I do not say completely, but they are largely controlled, and they will be more and more controlled. Maybe, of course, all kinds of things happen which sometimes result in pressures,—foreign as well as here—but I think we are in control. To say that any foreign Government can compel us to do something is not right, it is wrong. We may agree to something in the balance, that is a different matter; we decide as to whether it is agreeable or not. To say that the private sector exercises pressures on us is very much less true. The private sector can do much, but it cannot deliberately deflect Government from its policy. I think the private sector people realise that adequately—I do not say every one of them, but broadly; and I will say this, although I have criticised them greatly, some of them, that the great majority of them have tried their best to co-operate with Government.

The point is that some kind of brave gestures by us against the private sector, against the other, do not help at all. Let us examine each point, and as I said, we feel that the private sector has a great domain to work on in India; they can do a great deal. Just to push out the private sector, I think, would be utterly wrong, harmful and injurious to the country at the present moment and for a considerable time to come. But I do not want it to play any kind of a dominating role in our economy. I want more particularly many of its evil features

to be controlled, because there are evil features; and I want especially that this kind of monopolies should not be encouraged and, should, in fact, be discouraged. That is the present approach, and that, I believe, is the broad approach of the Planning Commission.

Therefore, it becomes important how this approach to the Third Five Year Plan has become the most vital of our subjects for consideration today. It governs the next two years of the Second Plan, and it will obviously govern the future, and in that matter particularly, as well as in many others, I want the largest amount of consultation. It is a very big thing—what kind of Third Five Year Plan we build, because on that depends the basic thinking of the country, of the Planning Commission, of this House, of the country, and it is not a matter as you know, as the House knows, of putting together a number of projects. That is not planning; it is something deeper than that that we are endeavouring. Therefore.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): You must be tired, Sir, but do not finish without saying a word for World Federation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The hon. Member has been good enough to remind me that I have spoken enough. Thank you, Sir.

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I seek a clarification from the Prime Minister on his exegesis on co-operation in the field of agricultural production. He has stressed, I am glad to hear, that it has to be on the basis of voluntary co-operation. Now, I find in my own State, the Government of Bihar have what they call the Land Consolidation Act where compulsorily they have sought, without any success whatever so far, certainly not in the south of Bihar, to consolidate, with the result that they have had to withdraw it. Is consolidation a precursor to the future pattern of co-operation?

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

Why is it not being done on a voluntary basis? I am talking of Bihar.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If joint farming was to be in a village, then obviously consolidation was not necessary, but as joint farming is not coming immediately, it is important that there should be consolidation. It is essential that they should go on. It will help, anyhow it will help. Consolidation has to be compulsory because otherwise. . . .

Shri Jaipal Singh: But people are resisting. What do you do then?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is a different matter. When we say "compulsorily", it simply means a law is passed to that effect. In bringing it into effect there should be co-operation, understanding, talking to them and all that, because the hon. Member will understand that consolidation does not mean depriving a person of land, but bringing his piece of land together with others in the same area. Of course, this should be done with a great deal of mutual co-operation and goodwill, but there has to be a law behind it; otherwise, it could not be done at all. j

Shri Jaipal Singh: My contention is that if there is voluntary co-operation, no law is required, but here we have to resort to legislation in order to carry out his ideas.

Shri M. C. Jain (Kaithal): Resistance might be due to the ignorance of the people.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Enough has been said on this.

There are as many as 209 amendments to this. Does any hon. Member want me to put his amendment?

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khairpur): No. 15.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: 84 to 87.

Shri M. R. Masani: 208 and 209.

Shri P. R. Patel: 199 to 203.

Shri Yadav (Barabanki): 32 to 47.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): 48 to 53.

Shri Jagdish Awasthi (Bilhar): 67 to 75.

Shri D. R. Chavan (Karad): 121 to 133.

Shri Jadhav (Malegaon): 18 and 19.

Shri B. Das Gupta (Purulia): 175 to 198.

Mr. Speaker: Some amendments have been moved. Hon. Members are referring to some amendments which have not been moved. 15 is moved, 87 is moved. 84 was not moved, it does not appear here. 199 and 203 have been moved.

Shri P. R. Patel: 199 to 203, inclusive.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Shri M. R. Masani: 208 and 209.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Then, 32 to 47, 49 and 53.

Shri Panigrahi: 48 to 53.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. Then 67 to 75.

Shri Jagdish Awasthi: They are in my name. I have given notice on the 16th.

Mr. Speaker: 67 to 75 have not been moved at all.

Shri Jagdish Awasthi: I have given notice in writing on the 16th, and they have to be taken as moved. I do not know what has happened to them.

Mr. Speaker: I did not allow any amendments to be moved after the discussion started, since hon. Members who had spoken already would not have an opportunity to speak on them. Therefore, I have disallowed these amendments which came in.

Shri Jagdish Awasthi: I have given in writing that my amendments should be moved on the 16th.