

# SWARAJ LEGACY

Chaudhry Ranbir Singh  
*Speeches in the Provisional  
Parliament of India*  
(1950-52)



Chaudhry Ranbir Singh Chair  
Maharshi Dayanand University Rohtak

**Swaraj Legacy**  
**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh**  
Speeches in the  
Provisional Parliament of India  
(1950-52)

# **Swaraj Legacy**

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh**  
Speeches in the  
Provisional Parliament of India  
(1950-52)

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh Chair**  
Maharshi Dayanand University Rohtak

© Publisher

Print : 2012

*Publisher*  
**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh Chair**  
Maharshi Dayanand University Rohtak

*Printed by*  
**Vikash Computer and Printers**  
Naveen Shahdra, Delhi-110032

**He Pleades.....  
for Rural India**

**CONTENTS**

Foreword by Shri Bhupinder Singh Hooda Chief Minister, Haryana	10
Prologue by Prof. R.P. Hooda Vice-Chancellor, M.D. University, Rohtak	12
Acknowledgements	14
Introduction	17

**PART I: SPEECHES IN THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY**

1. Motion on Address by The President	33
2. Army Bill	38
3. Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1949-50	43
4. Annual Budget	49
5. Annual Budget	53
6. Qualifications for Election to Parliaments and legislatures of States	55
7. Motion on Address by the President	58
8. Demand for Supplementary	65
9. Essential Supplies	67
10. Reserve Bank of India (Amendment Bill)*	71
11. Resolution Re. Qualifications for Election to Parliament and Legislatures of States	79
12. Useful Cattle Preservation Bill	81
13. Supply and Prices of Goods Bill	90
14. Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1950-51	95
15. Representation of the People (No. 2) Bill	98
16. Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill	98
17. Appropriation Bill	111
18. Reserve Bank of India (Amendment) Bill	113

19. Requisitioned land (Continuance of Powers) Amendment Bill	119
20. General Budget	122
21. General Budget-list of Demands	124
22. Finance Bill	128
23. Finance Bill	131
24. Minimum Wages (Amendment) Bill	135
25. Representation of the people (Amendment) Bill	140
26. Reserve Bank of India (Amendment) Bill	142
27. State Financial Corporation Bill	144
28. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	149
29. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	153
30. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	155
31. The Constitution (First Amendment) Bill	159
32. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	163
33. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	165
34. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	166
35. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	168
36. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	170
37. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	173
38. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	175
39. Representation of the People (No.2) Bill	182
40. Constitution (First Amendment) Bill	184
41. Resolution re. Raising of Export Duty on Cloth	188
42. Resolution re. President's Proclamation on Failure of Constitutional Machinery in Punjab	193
43. Resolution re. groundnuts oilseeds & vegetable oils	201
44. Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill	205
45. Government of Part C States Bill	210
46. Industries (Development and Control) Bill	216
47. Indian Companies (Amendment) Bill	218
48. Hindu Code	221
49. All India Services Bill	233
50. Motion re Five Year Plan	237
51. Finance Bill	242
<b>Chronology</b>	<b>249</b>
<b>INDEX</b>	<b>255</b>

## FOREWORD

The legacy of freedom movement in India is truly rich and varied that had inspired a generation of stalwarts with values of social obligation and nation building. The long and arduous struggle for freedom had shaped their character and steeled them to face the daunting task of facing the problems that a divided country was to encounter after being a free nation in 1947. One of them was Chaudhry Ranbir Singh, who hailed from a simple peasant family but with rich social and political background.

It gives a deep sense of satisfaction that Chaudhry Ranbir Singh Chair at MD University, Rohtak is publishing a collection of speeches by this eminent freedom fighter in the Provisional Parliament that took over legislative work from the Constituent Assembly (Legislative) from 1950 to the beginning of 1952, before the elections were held under the new Constitution of India to the 1st. Lok Sabha in 1952 with adult franchise. That was his formative period for a parliamentary life. Two and half years in the Constituent Assembly from July 1947 to the end of year 1949 baptised Chaudhry Saheb for his role in political India and an excellent opportunity to hone his skills in parliamentary practice with grit and confidence at his young age. The Provisional Parliament that functioned with effect from 1950 to the beginning of 1952 was to prove a virtual battle ground for him in the interest of a cause dear to him.

Chaudhry Ranbir Singh contributed his best in the Constituent Assembly and later in the Provisional parliament to high light issues that were important for an emerging nation at the time. Whenever I had a chance to go through his speeches in both these houses, I wonder on his grasp, clear and crisp, of the problems the rural population was facing at the time. His passionate espousal of these issues in the Provisional Parliament, no doubt, was marvellous. When he arose to address the Constituent Assembly for the first time on November 6, 1948 and said that '*I am a villager, born and bred in a farmer's house. Naturally, I have imbibed its culture. I love it. All the problems connected with it fill my mind....*', it was a truism of the sorts. The present volume of his speeches is an eloquent testimony of his devotion to the cause he cherished. On every occasion and on every issue he had his rural cause to espouse with forceful arguments, whether it was the question of essential supplies or the electoral law, to name a few.

He closed his eyes for ever on 1<sup>st</sup>. February, 2009 at Rohtak at a ripe age of satisfaction. I had the feeling that with his demise a chapter had closed on that date. I do feel that he was the last of a set where values in politics that gained currency from our freedom struggle led by Mahatma Gandhi were important. That generation has passed into the pages of history, which represented the best of our freedom struggle. Since my childhood I am witness to the fact that he was in the first place a great teacher to his dear ones; a great man and a loving father! I can safely vouch that Chaudhry Saheb was a democrat to the core with rancour to none.

Apart from his accomplishments in political and social fields, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh in fact inherited a value system inculcated by Arya Samaj movement in the first instance and later

was groomed persistently by Gandhiji, that great saint in Indian politics. Chaudhry Saheb was one who practised every dictum of social values and never faulted in his personal life what he asked others to follow. He was as tender hearted as one could be to the young but as strong on convictions as one can imagine a saint in politics to be. He knew how to pursue his furrow like a peasant persistently while not encroaching upon the path of rivals in violence when in power. For gaining or exercising power, I have never seen him crossing the *laxman rekha* of social values he cherished all his life without wavering even in difficult times and adverse situations.

In the raging debates during the life span of Provisional Parliament, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh devoted his every ounce of energy for advancing the cause of peasantry, more so for the welfare of down trodden, including the backward sections of the population. His passionate advocacy for land to the tiller with no eviction of tenants, Minimum Support Price for agriculture produce and working peasantry and strong support for raising wages for the rural labour to save them from hunger and destitution will be remembered for ever. He was for strengthening the rural economy as a foundation for building a strong and prosperous nation.

I hope this presentation of his speeches will help in proper evaluation of this legendry figure from Haryana in proper perspective.

**(Bhupinder Singh Hooda)**



MAHARSHI DAYANAND UNIVERSITY  
ROHTAK-124 001, (HARYANA) INDIA

Off. : 01262-274327, 292431  
Fax : 01262-274712  
Mob : 01262-274133, 274640

#### PROLOGUE

It is a matter of immense pleasure that Ch.Ranbir Singh Chair of this University is publishing a collection of speeches made by the renowned Freedom Fighter and a noted Gandhian, Ch.Ranbir Singh in the Constituent Assembly of India.

The speeches made by the visionary leader reflect the spirit of India that is 'BHARATA' which then stood on the threshold of the beginning of a new era. He spoke about the peasants, poor and downtrodden and fought for the rights of other marginalized sections of the society. His speeches echo his deep concerns about pitiable conditions of rural India in its entirety. Ch. Ranbir Singh was an ardent advocate and champion of the agrarian society of the country. At the same time he was an equally strong votary of modernization and advancement for this entire region.

Undoubtedly, this collection of speeches of Ch. Ranbir Singh is a historical document. It will serve as a light house of wisdom for those interested in the realistic understanding the making of modern India.

We express our sincere gratitude to the dynamic Chief Minister of Haryana, Shri Bhupinder Singh Hooda for writing an erudite foreword of this publication.

We are sure the discerning readers will find this publication to be a realistic analysis of the prevailing socio-economic conditions of our rural populace and a catalog of enlightening facts about the making of modern India.

  
( R.P. HOODA )

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The book owes much to many people. First, as in duty bound, we would like to thank Shri Bhupinder Singh Hooda, Hon'ble Chief Minister of Haryana for his kind help and encouragement, as also for sparing his valuable time to go through the book and write a learned foreword to it.

We are grateful to Prof. R.P. Hooda, Vice-Chancellor, M.D. University Rohtak, for his keen interest in the project as also for its publication in the prestigious series on the life and work of Chaudhry Ranbir Singh being undertaken by Chaudhry Ranbir Singh Chair at the University.

Thanks are also due to Rajesh Kumar 'Kashyap', Dharamvir Hooda, Sneha Kumar and Surender Kumar who rendered valuable assistance in many ways in preparation of this version.

**Chairman**

**In lieu of  
INTRODUCTION**

**THE VOICE OF RURAL INDIA  
In Provisional Parliament**

**I**

Here in the following pages we are presenting the un-polished speeches of Chaudhry Ranbir Singh as these were in the Provisional Parliament that took over legislative functions after the Constituent Assembly finished its work of framing the first Constitution of India of an independent nation. That was his formative period for a parliamentary life. Two and half years in the Constituent Assembly from July 1947 to the end of year 1949 baptised Chaudhry Ranbir Singh for his role in political India and an excellent opportunity to hone his skills in parliamentary practice with grit and confidence at his young age. He made the beginning with his maiden speech in the Constituent Assembly on November 6, 1948. The Provisional Parliament that functioned with effect from 1950 to the beginning of 1952 was to prove a virtual battle ground for him in the interest of a cause dear to his head and heart. He proved his mettle and took the fight to the corridors of power. It took him to be the resounding voice of rural India along with a few of his fellow compatriots before facing his constituency for seeking the next open mandate in February 1952 election to the First Lok Sabha for next five years.

The veteran freedom fighter from Haryana with a rare feel of reality at the ground level, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh is a roaring voice to the aspirations of rural India in its legislatures after independence from a Gandhian perspective with the flavour of a devout. The first such forum in this list is the Constituent Assembly where he baptised for his long innings in parliamentary career, till he bade adieu to this side of politics in 1978 to devote energies in organisational and social activities for the remaining period of life. The eminent freedom fighter and a great nationalist, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh closed his eyes for ever on 1<sup>st</sup>. February, 2009 with a record extra-ordinary of service to the nation and the region he was attached to physically and emotionally. This brilliant head and the compassionate heart ceased to breath that day after a remarkable innings. With his demise, a brilliant chapter of freedom movement for national dignity came to close who had worked tirelessly to give shape to those aspirations so cherished in course of this long-drawn struggle.

His was a life of a saint in politics of values and principles steeped in the legacy of freedom struggle with secular democratic mind, spartan habits of taste and style and zeal of a missionary. He was truly a gem of a man – rooted to his roots but a staunch nationalist in outlook. While paying its deep respects on his death, the MDU had established this Chair in his memory to peep into his life and work for future generations to remember this immortal son of the soil. A simple man with much more simple and frugal habits of life style, he was man extraordinary with values that are rare now in the changed political and social milieu. He worked in an era of struggle for the nation to remain free with pride in its history and was much proud to remain a Gandhian in thought and practice. A man rooted to his grass roots, he never wavered from his moorings of head and heart.

Chaudhry Ranbir Singh was born in a simple family of normal means at village Sanghi of Rohtak district on 14 November, 1914 with no golden spoon in mouth to claim

fame and prosperity. Fame and prosperity came his way later by hard labour in the fields and devotion to social causes. His grandfather and father were bestowed *Zaildari* but because of high esteem and social standing they commanded in the area. Later, when the British Government stripped him off his *Zaildari* for supporting Sardar Ajit Singh and Lal Lajpat Rai in organising peasantry and Arya Samaj affairs during 1905-07, Chaudhry Matu Ram did not flinch a bit and continued his activities as usual - with much more zeal in pursuit of his goals.

At the outset, the Peeth underscores the dictum that a nation which tends to forget the pangs of slavery it suffered in history can not appreciate the value of freedom too for long, may relish slavery instead for a smaller benefit in bargain and the hard won independence is sure to slip by and lose its relevance consequently. Modern Indian history tells a tale: when a cunning trader in East India Company landed on its shores, none here suspected evil in it. Soon arms came to add muscles to the cunningness of a trader for subduing a nation of vast resources duly enriched by simplicity of a peasant way of life and its social values. The British rulers then not only plundered its resources for long but played havoc with its culture, mores and ethos while trying to overturn its social fabric torn asunder, replacing it by a totally alien structure to obliterate its uniqueness; became self-declared masters of this nation and killed its spirit of creativity. That they did ruthlessly. The endeavour to re-invent our past constantly has no other option to rely upon. It also is imperative that the nation remembers its forefathers in gratitude for the price they willingly paid for gaining freedom from such an alien rule. It is due to them that we in a sense breathe free today.

One thing is beyond dispute. The Indian Nation had lost its spirit and sense of purpose as a colonial possession of British capital for long. Its natural course of growth was thwarted under its heels. Ultimately, the whole nation was

up in 'arms' and fought battles in diverse forms for freedom; even those who saw something good in British rule on false notions of historical course of dubious nature saw later some good in independence. Factually speaking, the downfall of British rule in India proved more detrimental than what meets the eye. The claimed positive 'benefits' of this historical mission to civilise the brutes of East turned out to be an arrogance of colonisers par excellence. India survived. Reasons are many and need specific efforts to be underlined in a systematic manner by scholars of intent so that cobwebs of sponsored history are cleansed away.

It is truism to underline that Haryana region had suffered worst at the hands of British rulers for its robust sense of freedom, uncompromising valour and grit it had inherited from its pastoral and agricultural background of a secular living, imbued habitually with a strong sense of justice born out of a democratic conduct in self-rule. The mass uprising in 1857 against an alien rule symbolised this character in abundance and the failure of this struggle ultimately had invited an unprecedented butchery of this spirit. The land was either occupied or turned barren, its people were left to serve as menials or its foot soldiers en masse to fight colonial wars on behalf of these new masters. Turning agriculture more a losing concern by design, all other venues of survival were closed to it, except soldiery. As if by plan, the foreign drill masters of these foot soldiers and policemen felt satisfied over their long labours to ultimately avenge the valour of this region; it introduced instead a servile culture of yesman-ship to the masters and powers that be. This was the period when the mores of a foot-soldier bred an alien idiom with rustic candour that took roots here in the land of courage: don't face the officer and the back of a horse. The region in particular was bled white for its 'crime' to fight for independence in AD 1857. The psyche of the masses stood bruised and brutalised. It is a different story however when this region rose again in anger and determination to challenge the supremacy of



these masters and a good number joined the ranks of freedom fighters. This family of Hooda's was a pioneer in this effort –it started awakening the region first with Arya Samaj activities and grooming the rural areas for joining freedom struggle. The country became an Independent Nation, though with a mauled spirit at the hands of butchers that ruined its resources and Haryana region with the experience of a brute state structure to contend.

With this background, all those who ventured again for freedom, more so in Haryana region truly deserve fulsome kudos for their courage and grit. Evaluation of their role has to take into account the specifics of the situation available then. Here lies the pioneering work that Chaudhry Matu Ram did to till a barren land with the spirit of a peasant seeped in optimism for a good crop. Arya Samaj provided him a timely grounding to work upon, handing over the baton to his son when age demanded it. Rural Haryana did find a foothold in the struggle and played it well thereafter, keeping the immediate past behind.

A peasant family from Rohtak district did attract attention both of its admirers and adversaries alike that had plunged whole heartedly in the freedom struggle at the call of time. Chaudhry Matu Ram embraced the first stirrings and later his sons imbibed the values of social obligation. One of them, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh decided to carry on the task and he did it admirably. The persona of junior Chaudhry had uniqueness for the times that took him to the pages of history. Pursuant to the rule, history of the times shaped his character. His intervention was at local level, as it should be, while his vision was national with a broad rational frame, having a liberal democratic attitude to life. He inherited the baton of struggle in 1942 from the elderly hands of his father, the late Chaudhry Matu Ram who was deeply imbibed by a late runner renaissance appeal of Arya Samaj in Haryana region to start with. He worked up the land in rural Haryana that had paid an

unusually heavy price for its role in the uprising of 1857 against foreign rule. To bring out the peasantry in struggle for freedom movement in the background of a brutal repression, perhaps unparalleled in civilised human history let loose by British rulers after the failed uprising against their regime, made the task daunting. And he did it admirably with much verve.

It may be worth remembering that the elder Chaudhry lived in an age that drew inspiration of a renaissance kind from the reformist movement of Arya Samaj in the religious domain. Renaissance proper was late to arrive in Haryana region, but its need was intensely felt. When Arya Samaj led by Swami Dayanand Saraswati reached the doors of the region, it caught the imagination of usually secular peasantry especially in joint Punjab with Haryana as its part rather than his place of origin in Gujarat and became an unwitting tool of secular norms of behaviour with clean conduct in life style. A deep quest for education spread far and wide due to its efforts. Chaudhry Matu Ram did not lose time and came forward to carry the message with much vigour. This helped in the growth of national consciousness among the people at large and the urge for freedom came in tandem. Fear complex of brutalised state started wearing thin. History placed the onus on him and he did serve it. It was the pioneering job that the duo of father and son performed to bring rural Haryana in the mainstream of freedom struggle again against heavy odds.

One such hurdle was a state sponsored campaign to lure away each and every employable rural youth from the freedom movement by offering government job. Rural Haryana by then was sapped out of its resilience and its economy stood shattered by well orchestrated and deliberate policies of colonisers. In addition, special efforts were made to wean away the peasantry away from the struggle for freedom.

Despite all such difficulties, Chaudhry Matu Ram and later his son, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh was able to sow the seed of hope in time. History cast the duty on them and they performed well. Unlike many, they did not shirk it for personal reasons. Beauty lies here. With their effort rural Haryana awoke to the call and joined hands with the urban population in the struggle for the long awaited delivery.

Out of British jails and free from other restrictions as a 'dangerous' activist, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh entered the highest forum of Constituent Assembly on 14<sup>th</sup>. July, 1947. at just 33 years. His maiden speech in the Assembly on 6<sup>th</sup>. November, 1948 turned out to be a piece introductory to his persona in his raw style and simple terms, devoid of elitist jargons. After 1947, he did his best to make the land prosper with all the limitations of working within the frame of political establishment that had developed in the country.

## II

The Freedom Movement in India is rich in content and form on various counts. There is much to learn about it in the interest of the Nation and its future. In this regard, it has to be studied in its various aspects afresh with Indian perspective. During the last six decades or so the subject has attracted much studies and a lot of literature is available. Still, much has to be said.

India had its concrete conditions ripe and cogent reasons to rise in a movement against demeaning slavery at the hands of British colonial rule that set for its unusually prolonged trajectory in the country. Two experiences apparently worked as a background to shape its strategy and tactics of its own: it had to face the truth of a cruel and crafty state structure new to India as an instrument of terror and expropriation of its labour power as well as its natural wealth led by a crafty foreign trader with its own culture. The other event that apparently influenced its course was the November Revolution of 1917 in Russia, with vast implications to its aspirations

that ultimately gave rise to specific meaning to its struggle for liberation.

To recount: Indian sub-continent tasted slavery for a long period in its history at the hands of a desperate trader with a new set of values and a state structure totally foreign to the ethos of this country. Indian sub-continent had to pass through a long period of slavery that was no less unbearable as the vanquished Red Indians in America had to. Under colonial rule the very Indian ethos was sapped out systematically to make it a different nation with an alien identity, borrowed culture and values of a renegade but charming variety dished out as something modern and liberating! Indians here were not hunted as Red Indians in America had the fate; they were allowed to live as the hard working labour to British advantage!

After the contrived victory in Battle of Plassey on 23<sup>rd</sup>. June, 1757, the East India Company consolidated its grip on the sub-continent for colonial possession and employed means all fair and foul to keep its bastion to the last in its quest for imperial interests. For this, soon they earned a chain of revolts here and there. However, these new masters faced a serious pan-Indian challenge from the people in the revolt of 1857 that ultimately paved way for a direct crown rule by Britain in order to keep afloat its imperial pursuit. This war against colonial rule in 1857, in effect, gave a national perspective to the natives in defeat for a future victory.

Britain did everything possible to keep this sub-continent as a jewel in possession; it terrorised India to the bone and at the same time took extra-ordinary pains to subvert its ethos simultaneously in order to pervert the spirit of right and wrong. It bled this country white so that Britain could attain commanding heights as a supreme power in the world arena and retain it as long as possible with ease. It laboriously chiselled a new tool in education system with a definite colonial objective to fulfil. This prolonged their rule here and mauled the spirit of the vanquished for a while. The victims, however, were not to remain docile for ever. Soon after the defeat in 1857 and despite the terrifying grip of the state that came in

existence thereafter, revolts at one place or the other continued. The Deccan peasant uprisings of 1875 had alarmed the colonialists alike. The events during 1905-07 again alarmed them. The urge for freedom started asserting again and again with varying degree of force.

There were coherent reasons for Indians to fight against this British rule. The crown rule proved no less ruthless in draining out resources from this country; rather the pace doubled up resulting in unprecedented famines where nearly 20 million people died during a span of 50 years till around 1900 alone. The export of food grains rose from starving India. In 1914 the increase was twenty two times over 1901. It was worth 3.8 million sterling pounds in 1858, 7.9 million in 1877, 9.3 million in 1901 and 19.3 million sterling pounds by 1914. To face this increasing onslaught, 'Pagri Sambhal Jatta' movement in Punjab between 1905-07, led by the fiery Sardar Ajit Singh and Lala Lajpat Rai is remarkable for its tone and tenor to rouse the peasantry out of stooping slumber and stand by the resurgent freedom movement. Sardar Ajit Singh found in Chaudhry Matu Ram of Sanghi a ready soldier when he visited his family friend and toured some villages around Rohtak for taking the message to rural belt in Haryana region. It was a job of remarkable dexterity and grit on his part when British rulers were extra apprehensive of Arya Samaj over its activities and those of the Sardar. They felt that something is brewing up the sleeves of Indians by the 50<sup>th</sup>. Anniversary of 1857 uprising.

As is evident, the freedom movement that manifested in 1857 did not stop at its defeat, neither there seems to a break of any substantial character. But, there are sharp differences among historians and social scientists as how to read the revolt in 1857. Problem is, to what extent one remains objective, while reading the facts? There is a catch: differences do crop in evaluation simply due to variation in perceptions or because of preconceived notions one labours with, despite the claim of objectivity. Britishers were happy to term the revolt in 1857 as a mere sepoy mutiny, while some depict it as a revolt of conservative and feudal forces to serve their own agendas. A third stream describes it as '*Jan*

*Kranti*.' Marx said it was the 'First War of Independence', despite the fact that none later talked about any second war of independence!

The freedom movement in its later phases encompassed mainly three streams. Each has its own history of emergence with specific conditions. In response to the state oppression let loose after 1857, terrorists' movement started taking shape operating underground from various centres in the country as well as in various south East Asian countries as well to terrorise the Britishers for their crime against Indians. A bit later, the Indian National Congress came on the scene as a safety valve to channelise the serious mass discontentment that arose due to the economic distress out of colonial policies. Later, a revolutionary stream came up with specific ideological backup, largely supported by the organised labour and peasant struggles. With the arrival of Gandhi on the scene, there was a perceptible change in the strategic struggles and tactical forms of movement. Non-cooperation and individual satyagrah as forms of mass mobilisation were utilised by the Congress, while Quit India movement took the struggle to new heights.

The freedom movement in the areas that constitute the state of Haryana today had two variants; the first is the freedom movement proper fighting directly against the British rule and the *Praja Mandal* movement in those areas that had formed part of princely states during that period. The field proper where Chaudhry Ranbir Singh baptised was under British rule, though adjacent areas of *Praja Mandal* movement were not beyond his spectrum, being culturally a wholesome region.

### III

## The Voice of Rural India

A different perspective altogether emerged after the country attained freedom in 1947. A free nation started taking shape, with lacerating wounds of contrived partition; as if again punished for its urge to be free by the departing trader-cum-ruler. The nation

rejoiced to be free again, but with deep pangs of a new birth. By then the new nation was a deeply divided house of divergent interests, which had been created here by foreign rulers with an alien motive of expropriation permeating all fields around, which had seeped down to its bones. The long period of slavery with its state structure that suited an exploitative regime had worked over time to demolish a nation of just social order with a deep sense of justice and peace. When the newly constituted Constituent Assembly sat down to gather pieces together and chart out course for the future for the nation it was a divided chamber of divergent interests working beneath its mandate. Deliberations in its chamber started reflecting this ground reality of divergent interests working right from the beginning and were there to be seen at the time when it delivered. It was a clash for taking over the free country to a goal of choices. The new Constitution of India that emerged after a labour of 2 years, 11 months and 17 days with 165 (114 sittings for consideration of the draft constitution alone) formal sittings in 11 sessions of the house was a document though of compromises, still it has a preference of its own. The clash thus continued in the later forums for getting due space for these interests. The deliberations in the Provisional Parliament that took over legislative business for an interim period till a new house was elected in 1952 under the new Constitution is testimony of this ground reality where Chaudhry Ranbir Singh took cudgels on behalf of rural India with rare courage of conviction.

### **Pride of rural ancestry and inheritance**

Just at the beginning, on November 6, 1948 when the raging debate was in full furry on the future course this country was to take with a draft Constitution presented two days earlier by the Law Minister on November 4, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh arose to state his side and, while pleading for decentralisation of power whether it is in political or the economic sphere, which engenders a power that is much greater than other kind of power said, among other things, unambiguously:

*'I am a villager, born and bred in a farmer's house. Naturally, I have imbibed its culture. I love it. All the*

*Swaraj Legacy/27*

*problems connected with it fill my mind. I think that in building the country the villagers should have their influence in every sphere.'*

It was not merely a statement of fact or an uncouth rural bragging, an emotional outburst from a Haryana Jat, but a diplomatic style of affirmation regarding a choice he had made in the power game that broke out on the question of a path the country was likely to take. Later, he followed it doggedly with much determination through out the term in the Constituent assembly and the Provisional Parliament thereafter.

In its very first sitting on February 1, 1950, it was Chaudhry Ranbir Singh who had chosen to put forth one fundamental truism about the peasantry as a class. Speaking on the motion of thanks to the President for his address, while pleading for due attention and encouragement to the peasantry, he emphasised one basic truth about social sciences before the provisional central legislative body for the country and said:

*'...the cultivators, who have their own lands ...neither rob others, nor like others to rob them.'*

While stating this, he emphasised the essence, the characteristics of the occupation in its pristine best. Only a person embedded to the cause of peasantry can give voice to it before those who have drifted towards a different path that ignores rural India.

He felt deep agony when peasants were discriminated against. Once, he referred to the discriminatory attitude of public sector Banks in not advancing loans to peasants on flimsy grounds like non-recovery. He lambasted this policy with his irrefutable logic and cadour. On November 21, 1950 he said:

*A man who has such a big security to offer as land and when there is no problem in recovery, he is still considered not fit to take loan. You should lend loan not only to the need of cultivators but also in the interest of the nation. By not lending money to him, you can't*

*28 / Swaraj Legacy*

protect the country from the financial difficulties, nor may protect the national interests.

On a proposal to lay down educational qualification for being a parliamentarian or a legislator Chaudhry Ranbir Singh rightly sensed a danger in the move to debar a majority of the population living in rural India. Intervening in debate on April 4, 1950 he argued that unlettered persons are not necessarily unwise. He asked pointedly as to how they rate the contribution of Kabir to the richness of Indian wisdom in this regard. He argued:

‘I can say that there are many people and I have seen in my own Province that for ten or fifteen years there have been Chief Ministers who were neither Matriculates nor as far as I know they had read in any school or college. I can mention the name of Sir Sikandar Hayyat Khan. I have seen many other Chief Ministers in other Provinces who were neither law Graduates nor Graduates of medicine...I have seen many other friends who had ...administered the country better than those people who were degree-holders, So far as originality of thinking goes, I can cite one example of Kabir who is well known over the whole country. My friend Mr. Hussain Imam wanted to know what the illiterate people have given to the country. I can tell the House what the illiterate people have given to this country.’

Thus, he rightly debunked the arrogance of educated class towards unlettered mass of the people and helped at a crucial stage to keep the sense of democracy preserved lest it slipped into elitism.

Imbued with the legacy of freedom movement, Chaudhry Ranbir Singh firmly stood by its prominent slogan of land to the tiller and land reforms to demolish landlordism as a comprador class that British had patronized to the detriment of emerging land relations in the country. He raised his voice against eviction of tenants by vested interests in collaboration with corrupt officialdom and cautioned against the indiscriminate use of land acquisition power

with the government giving rise to the grave problem of rehabilitation. Speaking on the Reserve Bank of India (Amendment) Bill on November 21, 1950, he gave a body blow to an emerging elite class of economists when he said:

‘I do not claim myself to be an expert on Finance, but I cannot help saying that those in this House who claim themselves to be experts on finance, in my opinion, are not experts for this country. They can be financial experts for those countries where the industries play an important place in the economic life. But in a country where agriculture has greater importance, they cannot be more successful. I think that the greatest reason why the economic order of this country is not stable is because those who consider themselves to be financial expert, in reality, are fit to be financial experts for industrial countries only. They are not experts for agricultural countries.’

How right he was in 1950. There cannot be two opinions on this aspect of his warning about what he said, as above, in the year 1950 when the country was just taking first steps in its zest for quick march to development. Perhaps he sensed the danger too quick on this account and almost proved to be prophetic. By now Indian agriculture is turned into a sector of ruin for lakhs and lakhs of subsistence farmers, all due to the approach of this elitist club of financial experts who have taken over the economic scene to the disadvantage of Indian rural sector - and to the advantage of industrial world.

What Chaudhry Ranbir Singh held about the wage structure and pleaded for 80% of the population is unexceptional to say the least on the question of parity. On April 14, 1951 he said:

I fail to understand the anomaly that if a mill-worker or an agricultural labourer demands his wages, for which of course he is fully entitled, it is not supposed to accentuate inflation in the country, while if the one who gets his income and earns his livelihood by the sweat of his brow and who toils in the field in biting

cold and scorching heat of winter and summer, demands his due for his investment and his labour, the educated class of the country thinks it as a step towards inflation.. Whatever they think right is taken as right, whether it is right or not for the country nobody cares. I think the best policy is that which ensures proper wages to the 80 per cent population of the country. This cannot be in any way inflationary or harmful for the country.

There was a move to put restrictions on hoarding so that essential supplies keep flowing with a penalising clause therein. Chaudhry Saheb was quick to point out the discrimination between the position of a trader and a peasant who has to keep food-grains he has produced for the use of his family till the next crop is available. See what he said in the debate on September 14, 1950:

‘I was saying that the hon. Minister himself told me that an agriculturist or a producer has the right to keep 25 maunds of gram with him. I would like to bring to the notice of the House what the position is in my district: there the people are not interested in keeping unnecessary grain with them but they do deserve to keep with them as much grain as they require...Gram is a thing without which he cannot pull on in our area, where frequently there is a famine. I do not hesitate to say that the hon. Minister has not been able to produce confidence among the agriculturists that he will be able to supply gram after a year, even if the gram crop next year fails, otherwise what will be the result? An agriculturist requires as much as 72 maunds of gram in a year for the consumption of his family and animals....The only quantity that he can keep with him now is 25 maunds...75 per cent of the agriculturists can be sent to prison for seven years. It is a very big problem and on our side as also on yours. Sir, there are many people who look at with mistrust. In my district alone 18,000 cases have been instituted under this Act. I have been trying since yesterday to find out what exactly is the position under this law of agriculturists in my province especially. When I went to my district recently the people

there told me that several producers of gram have been arrested and the surplus gram taken away. There are many people on our side who think that this House is interested only in particular sections of the people and that they are going on in a way as if others do not exist. There is discrimination....under the clause as it stands a man hoarding cloth will be sentenced for three years whereas a man who happens to possess his own grain, harvested from his own field after hard labour and investment will be sentenced for seven years. The man who is dealing in cloth has earned lakhs of rupees: he has a bungalow, cars and many other amenities: whereas the agriculturist has to work hard to enable him to make both ends meet. I would ask the hon. Minister to think of the cumulative effect on the producer, not that I want the producers to be exempted altogether; rather I want to be fair to him.

The text as well as tone and tenor of his speeches during debates on various subjects in the Provisional Parliament, which is the subject matter of this publication, is testimony of his unflinching devotion to the cause of rural India, taking it as a cornerstone of national progress.

The Constituent Assembly finished its task on November 26, 1949 (co-incidentally the birth day of the Chaudhry Ranbir Singh), when members signed the document so adopted with some specific provisions coming into force immediately and converted into the Provisional Parliament as a supreme legislative body for the interim period. The new Constitution of India came into force fully on January 26, 1950 and elections to the 1<sup>st</sup>. Lok Sabha were held in the year 1952. This volume of his speeches covers a period from the year 1950 to early AD 1952 only when this house operated, before the 1<sup>st</sup> Lok Sabha took over after fresh elections under the new Constitution of India took place with universal adult franchise. Chaudhry Ranbir Singh contested for this house and was got elected with a handsome margin to continue his contribution to the cause that was so dear to his head and heart.

**Gian Singh**

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 1st Feb, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of clock on Wednesday, the 1st Feb 1950, The Honourable Dr. Rajendra Prasad in the Chair.

### Motion on Address by The President\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : While wholeheartedly supporting the address delivered by the President, I cannot but express my heartfelt delight for the preference that Mr. President has shown towards Hindi and I feel that this would afford a lot of encouragement to the cause of Hindi in this country. Hon'ble President in his address has made a reference about the shortage of food-grains and the necessity of increasing the production of food-grains in the country. I wish to draw the attention of the Hon. Food Minister of our Government and of this House towards this problem. I do not agree with the views expressed by Shri Sidhva and Shri Kapoor about the shortage of food-grains. They say that there is no food shortage in our country. Had there been no shortage of food-grains in our country then why food-grains

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 1st Feb 1950, Page 76-78*

worth 130 crores of rupees that are being imported every year. Food-grain is not such a commodity that could be hoarded for very -very long periods. I think that food-grains can be hoarded only for one year and certain food-grains are such that they begin to decompose even earlier. I wish to draw the attention of Shri Sidhva to this fact. I do not fall in line with the view expressed by him because he had not taken into consideration the real facts.

**Shri Sidhva** : Have you studied the statistics?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** : I cannot make a study of the statistics like him because I belong to the rural areas and know perfectly well that no one can hoard food-grains for more than a year, may that hoarder be a businessman or a cultivator.

If it be taken for granted that food-grains can be hoarded for two or three years, but it is now seven years that the food-grains have continuously been imported in this country, Then let us know for how long these food-grains could further be hoarded? It ought to have come out in the open market by now. If this hoarded food-grain has not yet appeared in the open market then this fact clearly indicates that there is a shortage of food-grains in our country.

One thing more, some honourable friends have said that as far as agriculture is concerned the general principles of economics do not hold good. I do not contribute to this view. Whenever people want to increase the production of a particular commodity they raise the price of the same, but as far as the production of food-grains is concerned exactly opposite things are being done.

I wish to draw your attention towards one more point. I have put it down in my amendments also that an Agricultural Finance Corporation be set up which may advance loans to the agriculturists on a reasonable rate of interest.

The persons who command some influence in the political circles, every one of them has paid attention towards the problem of increasing production of the food-grains and have made certain suggestions also. But I wish to ask whether any efforts were made to give their suggestions a practical shape? In order to give a practical shape to these suggestions, in the first instance, it was essential to set up an Agricultural Finance Corporation here. If any cultivator desire to bring under plough virgin soil, or wished to make improvements in his farming, or wished to purchase new implements and may also stand in need of money or finance then he cannot obtain finance at rates lower than 12, 13 or 14 percent. If on the one hand, the Government wish to lower the prices of food-grains and on the other, do not provide facilities for obtaining necessary finances, then do the Government think that the production can go up? The production can go up only when the cultivators are given facilities for obtaining the necessary finances and get higher prices for their produce.

The second point, towards which I have drawn attention in my amendment also and which I think is worth mentioning, is about Bhakra Dam. Some time back, few officials and hon. Ministers of the Punjab Government had come here in connection with the construction of Bhakra Dam. They made out a case that if the grant of 14 crores of rupees is not provided then the scheme will not be realized and the construction work on the dam can not be carried on with such speed as they had desired. The reason is given that if this grant is provided it were cause further inflation. I

wish to say that even if further inflation is caused by giving such a grant, still it would help in solving your food grain problem. Faster the Bhakra Dam is constructed, sooner the water would be available for irrigation and the shortage of food-grains would be solved. This will save some 133 or 140 crores of rupees per year to be available to you for the development of other industries.

Another point I wish to draw your attention is the question of giving proper encouragement to the cultivators. As far as the question of bringing virgin soil under plough is concerned, some state governments say that if such lands are not put under cultivation, then these lands would be taken back by the Government and again leased out to those who would promise to take the responsibility of putting them under plough. The efforts have come to a stop at this stage and have not caused a material change. I can say with confidence about U.P. and Punjab that many such lands are still lying fallow which can be developed, provided the cultivators are given necessary help and assistance.

There are many other such points but, for want of time I cannot place them today. Besides this, I do feel that in his address Mr. President made a reference of agricultural labour and other types of labour, but did not make a mention of those who form the major portion of our population, i.e., the cultivators, who have their own lands, who are the owners of lands, and who neither rob others, nor like others to rob them. Do the Government think their condition to be satisfactory? I wish to draw your attention to the fact that in rural areas there are no hospitals nor there are roads even. Here in cities, we have separate roads for motor cars, separate tracks for bicycles and separate foot-paths for the pedestrians. But if you go to rural areas then you would not come across any roads for say up to a distance of 25 miles even. The



address delivered by Mr. President has afforded a lot of satisfaction to me but I cannot help without saying with all emphasis at my command that I do feel there is no assurance for improving the lot of the agriculturists and for giving them proper encouragement.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 7th Feb, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 7th Feb 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Army Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : While giving my support to the Bill for the reorganization of the Army, I have the feeling today that although the time is no more when we, the fighting men of the army, used to think that the country was divided into two parts, one part being represented by the people belonging to the martial races and the other by those of the non-martial races. Yet nobody can deny the fact that even today if you were to take a census of the soldiers in the Army you will find that just those people are serving in the Army as soldiers who used to be designated as martial races during the British rule. Just now my honorable friend, the Lala Achint Ramji, was talking about the caste distinctions, that is, such divisions of the Army as the Jat Regiment or the Dogra

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 7th Feb. 1950, Page 304-306*

Regiment. I am one of those men who have a number of relations serving in the Army, in various capacities from the rank of a soldier to that of a colonel. At the same time I have also had my connection with Lalaji and other friends like him. Moreover, I do not at all subscribe to the idea of caste distinctions. But I have talked with my brethren of the Army and they are of the opinion that if the names such as the Jat Regiment, or the Sikh Regiment or the Dogra Regiment are removed this would tell upon the efficiency of the Army. The main reason for this, advanced by them is that when, in the time of a war, the different regiments, viz., the Jats, the Sikhs and the Dogra go into action they are animated by a spirit of competition. The Mahrattas vie with the Jats for the capture of a certain position. And, Sir, I should like to tell this House through you that even today the men of our Jat regiment advance forth with a fervor when they are reminded of the gallantry shown in France, during the first Great War, by the men of the 6<sup>th</sup> Jat Regiment, who belonged to my parts. This awakens in them the same kind of sentiment as is aroused today in the heart of a national soldier in shouting the slogan. 'Victory to the Father of the Nation'. I cannot raise that issue today and martial categories is no more. India belongs to all of us and everyone has to assume his responsibilities. But I cannot help saying that so far as the soldiers in the Army are concerned they belong to the fighting groups of people. In the case of the commissioned ranks, however, proficiency in writing and speaking of English has unfortunately come to be regarded as the criterion for selection in the same way as in the case of civil employment. I beg to submit, in this connection, that it is not very essential for a military officer that he should be a good writer and should be able to speak English fluently. On the other hand, what is required in the case of a military officer is that he should be possessed of a stout heart and when he

finds death dancing before his eyes he should not run away out of fear at the sight but go forward and elevate the name of his country. And, I could assert that those officers who have risen from the ranks of the soldiers have proved to be possessed of a superior mettle and have fought with valour. I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not take my stand on the caste classifications, but if you want to promote efficiency in the Army you must see that before a man is promoted to the officer rank or granted a commission-even in the case of a direct appointment to a commissioned rank-he must be required to serve as a soldier for a certain period. During the British regime the officer ranks were reserved for the British. They regarded it as their birthright to be taken as officers in the Army. The other group of people was the one designated as the martial races, whose lot it was to be recruited as sepoy on Rs. 17 or Rs. 8. Today this country belongs to us all and every one of us has an equal title to it. Hence I regard it as very important that it should be made a condition precedent to the grant of a commission that the person concerned should have to put in compulsory service for two years as a soldier. In the Transport Bill too there was mention of experience. I think that in the case of Army as well, only experienced persons be appointed to the commissioned ranks. If a person is appointed without that preliminary qualification he does not get an opportunity to form an estimate of the mentality of a common soldier, nor are those people likely to repose confidence in him. When a man is directly appointed as a lieutenant the result is that he is unable to understand the psychology of a soldier. Hence, I regard this as important that while our Government should have the power to grant a commission to whosoever they like, they should frame rules and regulations to the effect that whosoever aspires to a commissioned rank must initially enlist as a soldier. Formerly, the usual practice

used to be that only such a person from among the Indians who happened to be a subedar major or a risaldar major was offered the opportunity of appointment as a lieutenant or a captain. But today it is unfortunate -I can speak with knowledge of the matter - that whereas some of those who had been my fellow-students enlisted as lieutenants other, less fortunate ones, who joined as soldiers and having attained a Viceroy's Commission became Jamadars, could never become lieutenants. Those who had joined as lieutenants became colonels. They got their opportunity because of backing by some higher authority, no matter whether they were efficient or inefficient. Hence, I feel that just as in the case of civil employment, the usual mode of promotion is by seniority and on a graded basis in the same way in the Army too a man who is to become a lieutenant should become a Jamadar before and must initially start as a soldier.

I wish to draw your attention to one other matter which relates to the armies of the (Indian) States. Some people think the State forces are not so efficient. Experience, however, has shown that when the State forces went north to fight shoulder to shoulder with our other forces they might not have been equally efficient but they acquitted themselves fairly well. Hence, I fail to understand why in case of integration, their offices would not be given the same ranks as they enjoyed before. Every man who is not incapable or too old would be retained for purposes of integration and his existing rank considered in the final allotment of ranks. I do not mean to say that this should be done even at the cost of efficiency but consideration should be given to the existing ranks with due regard to the requirements of efficiency.

Now, I wish to make a submission with regard to the court martial. During the British regime some people in the army,

who came to be influenced by the Congress propaganda, happened to say such things while in service as are told by nationalist minded people, for which fault they were discharged from the Army, although they had no other shortcoming and could and did fight gallantly. Only, the British could not stand their nationalistic outlook. The major part of those soldiers is well known to our countrymen. They are known as the I.N.A. The Indian National Army was not inferior to any other Army. I do not say they have been treated very badly but they have not been treated as well as they should have been. There are others too besides the I.N.A.....

**Mr. Chairman :** I hope the hon. Member realizes that his remarks are absolutely irrelevant to the issue before the House.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** I bow to your ruling. I could show you the reference in the Bill; all this falls under court-martial.

Without saying anything more on that subject, I want to say only this much that a considerable number of people in the Army have in the past been treated oppressively and therefore care should be taken to see that they are not so treated in future. I would also urge that some redress should be provided in the case of those who happened to be victimised, either in the form of a pension or in some other form. With this, I support the motion for the reference of this Bill to a select committee.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Monday, 27th March, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 27th March 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1949-50\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : At the very outset, I find myself unable to agree with the plea advanced by hon. Deputy-Speaker that no grant should be sanctioned to the Indian Sugar-cane Committee. His plea is based on the ground that enough funds are already lying with the Committee in question. My able friends, hon. Prof. Ranga and hon. Dr. Deshmukh have made references to the Committee's work in general and to the various obstacles placed in their way. To me it appears that the reasons are somewhat different on which the hon. friends have thrown no light. Looking at the constitution governing the working of the various Commodities Committees, to me the reason for this

\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 27th March, 1950, Page 2219-2221

accumulation of huge funds appears to be that the committee in question has been set up for some business motive rather than to function as a research committee. Whether it happens to be the Sugar-cane Committee or any other Commodity Committee, business interests and representatives of mill-owners seem to dominate everywhere. These people can counteract immediately measures aiming at improvements; they are against any research-work. If you really wish not to let these funds getting accumulated or to use them on some research work, which may result in increasing our production, then it is quite necessary that the agriculturist representation should be increased in these Commodities Committees and over and above that to confine the number of representatives of mill-owners or all other interests to one or two only which should be regarded sufficient for their purpose. Adoption of such a course will remove the basis for the objection or the complaint made by hon. Deputy-Speaker. Once the agriculturists attain majority, they are sure to bring pressure on the hon. Minister of Finance to accept their advice or recommendations and act upto them.

I am unable to subscribe to the view of hon. Prof. Ranga that the Minister of Agriculture should in no way be concerned with these Committees. In my opinion, the assistance of that Ministry should always be available to them in a similar position as that of an ardent advocate. Many of their difficulties can be removed by accepting this suggestion. The Ministry of Agriculture should be willing to render all possible assistance and only their advice should be available in the capacity of an advocate.

Further, I agree with all that the hon. Deputy-Speaker has said in connection with the work of the Underground Water

Research Board. I want to place before the House a few points on this matter. Firstly, I have to draw attention of the House to what Mr. Kashyap, an Assistant Engineer, has written in a book published by him. In that Book he has given even a photo of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, wherein he, is watching a well being sunk. The author has claimed that the well of that type can be got ready within 18 to 24 hours. He also makes an attempt to prove all such excuses as unavailability of rigs in India or the plea that we in India can never construct wells quickly as false. He is even prepared to court imprisonment should anyone prove him to be wrong. Personally, I am unable to say how far his statement is correct. He has, again, thrown the responsibility for suspension of the scheme concerned with sinking of wells on the Under Secretary. He has demanded action against the said officer who has been the cause of so much harm to the interests of the country and he has not exempted even himself from any such penalty on that score.

I don't wish to say any further but for a brief reference to the subsidy of rupees. 1,32,000/- proposed to be given for the import of American cotton, I consider views, should strive to increase production through effecting a reduction in the prices of our own agricultural products. I have no wish to get myself involved in the intricacies of the economics or of any other science. Consistent with even the fundamentals of bourgeois economics, it is necessary to raise the prices of a commodity in respect of which we seek to achieve increased production. But here it is happening quite the reverse of that. We expect the Indian cultivators to produce cotton at prices which even the American or the Egyptian producers have spent towards the improvement of quality of cotton. We expect our peasantry to produce it even at still further

reduced prices and, at the same time we want them to be able to help in increasing the overall production. We should pause to think how far we shall be successful to increase production while holding such notions. You will have to fix the minimum prices in respect of agricultural products if you entertain an earnest desire to avoid all sorts of subsidizing, either on the score of American cotton or on that of imports of food-grains from abroad. Lord Boydorr, a Secretary to the U.N.O. told me in a conversation that the progress with the production of agricultural products in America was possible only when the Government there had come forward to accept the responsibility to purchase such products by fixation of economic prices of cotton in order to avoid heavy subsidies on imported cotton. Some hon. friends consider the peasants to be simple-folk, who are ignorant of the actual value of the rupee. To this, I have to submit that they are no more than the dumb-driven cattle even now. Despite all this the kisan has, at least, developed this much sense as to grow more of these products only which promise a margin of profit. I will cite but one instance in this regard. Take the case of sugar-cane. People cultivated more of it when its prices were high. With the reduction of prices of gur, they have effected a substantial reduction in the production of sugar-cane. Now, they have ample return on sugar this year, so no reduction has been made in the prices of sugar-cane, the peasants are busy this time to sow more and more of sugarcane.

Further, I have to make a submission with regard to the working of the Agricultural Research Institute. I had been there in the company of the hon. Prof. Ranga and some of our kisan brethren. The officer-in-charge there is a doctor. He informed us of the research conducted there so far. Acting on that information, we should think that we have made outstanding progress here in

India. Looking, however, for some substantial achievements, one has only to be dismayed. The reason is that the results of this research have not been put in practice in the actual work on fields. In a country like America where all peasants are literate, Extension Services are in force at present whose job it is to show things in actual experiments on the vast Government fields. They invite the people to see how production can be increased by sowing particular kind of seeds. But in the case of our country, the peasantry is illiterate, if not entirely, at least an overwhelming majority of them. They are unable even to understand the radio broadcasts completely. The fact is that not enough attention is being paid to this aspect and even if an occasional consideration is given to the matter, the people put on this work are such who have no link with the local people. This morning, the people concerned with a scheme being worked out at present in Delhi.....

**Mr. Speaker :** The hon. Member is trying to cover the whole ground. He will restrict himself to the particular Demand that is before us. He need not go into the question of general agricultural research by the I.C.A.R.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** There is a Demand :

“Payment of the Net Proceeds of the Cash on Agricultural produce to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research.”

I was just dwelling on the subject from the research point of view. We stand to benefit from research in no way till the results thereof are applied to the actual work on the fields. I was expressing what I have seen myself and I hope you also agree with me in this matter.....

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** I bow to your ruling. I was referring to this end the necessity to put only such people to work out these schemes who know the subject well and who happen to be in close practical touch with it. There was no provincial or any such idea or intention of the type in my mind. Not saying any further, I have only to make one suggestion namely that a non-official body should be attached to the Agricultural Research Institute whose main concern it should be how best to convey and propagate the results of such research amongst the peasants in every part of the country.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 29 March, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Wednesday, the 29th March 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Annual Budget

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** I agree with that view because the Government today is of the people and by the people. When the Government is that of the people, by the people and for the people, this land revenue cannot be considered a rent. If you just compare that land revenue system with the income-tax system, you will agree with me that there is a disparity between these two systems of taxation. A man whether he produces anything [5 P.M.] or does not produce anything, owns a bigha of land or whether he cultivates on other's land, he is liable to pay the tax. In any case I could not agree that these concessions which you have given to the industrialists or to the middle-class people are justified. May I ask whether you have made some grants to the Provincial Governments in order that they may reduce the land revenue? I

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 29th March, 1950, Page 2300-2301*

may tell the House that Punjab Government has been compelled to increase the canal rates. Somebody may say that these rates are for services. I can say in reply that it is absolutely wrong, because we in Punjab have paid many times the amount invested on the canals. So, you cannot say that these charges are for some particular services or interest on the investment. You may feel inclined to leave the matter aside for the moment but you cannot say the same thing about land revenue. Unless and until you have got as much resources to have the same taxation on the same footing, you should not decrease the level of taxation.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member can speak for one or two minutes more.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** Shall I be allowed to continue tomorrow.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will sit for three or four minutes more. They are very anxious to hear the hon. Member.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** My hon. friend, the Finance Minister, has given many facilities to the industrialists. We have the Industrial Finance Corporation. My hon. friend has not even cared to say anything about the Agricultural Finance Corporation. My hon. friend says that it is a provincial subject. I may just point out to him that the prices for agricultural products is a central subject. My hon. friend has not been able to give assurance to the agriculturists today in this country that he is prepared to buy their agricultural produce on some certain minimum economic price

whatsoever may happen. When Mr. Boyd-Orr the Secretary of the U.N.O. came to this country, I had a talk with him. He told me that even in America they could not raise the agricultural production till the time when the Government came forward and gave an assurance to the agriculturists that they would take the responsibility of buying the agricultural products at a certain minimum economic price.

The other day I pointed out to my hon. friend Shri Jairamdasjee that lakhs of maunds of gram are lying in Punjab and in East Patiala State Union and they are rotting, I requested him to press Punjab Government and the Patiala State Union to come forward to buy that grain. He told me that he could not take the responsibility because he has not got any storage accommodation. I want to tell my hon. friend that if facilities for storing this grain were given today, they may be able to store the grains for some time and afterwards they can sell that at a profit. Some of my friends may say that the money has gone to the agriculturists, but I do not agree with them. May I point out another thing about the price structure? You just go through the price level of wheat. In Jaipur where there is no canal system, the minimum price is fixed at Rs. 10 and in Bombay, where there are some irrigation facilities the price of wheat is Rs. 17. I speak to correction as I am speaking from memory. This disparity in the price level cannot pay you in the long run and this state of affairs will not satisfy the agriculturist. The time has come, my friend, when you and I will have to go before him and it will be he and his class who will be responsible for bringing the members of this House. If you want to stabilize yourself, then you must hear him and you must be wise enough to understand the situation. I can tell you that today the agriculturist

is not very much educated but he knows his interests and if you are not going to serve his interests, he is not going to spare you.

*(The House then adjourned till a quarter to eleven of clock on Thursday, the 30<sup>th</sup> March, 1950.)*



advisable to exempt a person from a tax on the ground that he has got so many children, so many wives or other relatives. I do not agree to this suggestion and I oppose the amendment.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 30th March, 1950

---

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Thursday, the 30th March 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Annual Budget

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : I oppose the amendment moved by my friend Prof. Shah, not because I am an unmarried fellow- I am a married man with five children and member of a Hindu joint-family-but because I feel that it is not the correct thing to do, because in India there is a system of taxation by which about 85 per cent of the population is affected, I mean our land revenue system. By this system not even a single pie is free from tax. Whether one grows anything or not, whether he gets anything or not, he is bound to pay some tax to the State. Of course, that is a provincial tax, but that is also a tax in this country. That being so, where not a single pie is allowed free of tax, I think it will not be

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 30th March, 1950, Page 2312*

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 4 April, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 4th April 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Qualifications for Election to Parliaments and legislatures of States\*

.....

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): I have thought over the Resolution again and again and also on the amendment moved by Shri Kamath, and I have decided to oppose both the amendments and the Resolution itself. The reason for it is not that I do not want any qualifications. I do and I am of the opinion that the qualification for a member should be the service of the country. Before he comes over to this House, he should have served the country in one respect or the other and the people whom he wants to

---

\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 4th. April, 1950, Page 2546-2547

represent. But the whole difficulty arises here how to test it and how to know whether he has served or not. Can we give this authority to a court to judge whether a particular person has served the country or has done anything for the public? I do not think it is right.

Again, as regards the academic qualification, many friends have expressed here that they do not want any 'Graduate' qualification: they want that people who come here should know how to read and write. But so far as reading and writing goes, I can say that a man can easily learn Hindi within five days after he is elected to this House.

**Seth Govind Das** : But you are forgetting it!

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** : No, I am not forgetting it; neither can I forget it. It is my national language.

to reading and writing will do no good. Again, if you go higher than that, suppose you want to limit it to Matriculation Examination, even then I can say that there are many people and I have seen in my own Province for ten or fifteen years there have been Chief Ministers who were neither Matriculates nor as far as I know they had read in any school or college. I can mention the name of Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan. I have seen many other Chief Ministers in other Provinces who were neither law Graduates nor Graduates of medicine. I have also seen many other friends who had not got any kind of Giani or any other qualification, but they have administered the country better than those people who were degree-holders, or were law Graduates or any other kind of Graduates. So, the question arises what qualifications are needed

for a Parliamentarian. For Parliament, you require that a man should have administrative capacity, he should have intelligence, he should be a man of quick grasp, should have common sense and power of expression. I have seen many people who are law Graduates and I have also seen many people who are professors in the colleges, who have remained as professors for long, but they did not prove good Parliamentarians. There have been people who have never been to any school. You may take the example of Herr Hitler and many others throughout the world. As regards his ideology, some people can differ from Hitler, but nobody can deny that he took his country in such a short time to such a pitch, that I do not think any Graduate could have taken that country to that pitch during that short period. So far as originality of thinking goes, I can cite one example of Kabir who is well known over the whole country. My friend Mr. Hussain Imam wanted to know what the illiterate people have given to the country. I am going to tell the House what the illiterate people have given to this country.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 2nd August, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Wednesday, the 2nd August 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Motion on Address by the President\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): I rise to support the original motion of thanks to the President moved by my hon. friend Mr. Tirumala Rao. The President referred in his address to the keenness of the Government and the anxiety of the Government to grow more food. In this connection, I wish to say a few words and offer directly or indirectly have a bearing on the question of grow more food. First of all I will take the system of land tenure prevailing in the country. Even today in our country land tenure system is as faulty as it was before 1947. The jagirdari system in Rajasthan and the Zamindari system in Punjab still continue and even today in Punjab, Rajasthan and Patiala Union the tenants

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 2<sup>nd</sup> August, 1950, Page 151-156*

who have the means to cultivate and who want to do so are being ejected from the land. I do realize the difficulties of the Central Minister the hon. Mr. Munshi. He is not all powerful, he is working under some limitations which have been placed by the Constitution but I know that he has got a vast influence at his command and he can move the Central Government and the Centre can force the Provinces. In this connection, I wish to stress that whatever system it may be, whether it is land tenure or procurement, it should be uniform. As long as it is not uniform, it creates reaction in the other parts of the country. (Interruption). As long as there is no uniformity, the policies of one State has reactions on the Policies of the other.

In this connection I would like to say something about Zamindari abolition. Those are very good but as the same steps were not being taken at the same time in Punjab, Patiala Union and Rajasthan, it has reactions of that system in the areas where no such bills are pending. An atmosphere of distrust has been created although they were charging an exorbitant share from the tenants, and the tenants were exploited to the last limit, but they were able to have land for cultivation. Now, the conditions have changed with the result that the huge tracts of land which were under cultivation till now are now lying fallow. While our Central Minister is spending crores of rupees for importing tractors to bring under cultivation the fresh lands, the lands which were under cultivation previously are going fallow and as agricultural waste lands. I will request my hon. friend to exercise his influence and see that the tenants are not ejected from their holdings in Punjab, Patiala States Union and Rajasthan.

Then, Sir, with regard to procurement, I wish to make some suggestions. My personal opinion in this matter is that there should be decontrol. But, I know that control is an evil that we

cannot avoid at the present juncture. If we cannot [3 P.M.] avoid controls, then we have to go in for procurement. Then, the question arises what is the best type of procurement. Whatever I am going to say, it is not meant for the benefit of the agriculturists in particular; or that more grain should be left with him; there should be more procurement of grain and at a lesser cost. In this connection, as Tirumala Rao Committee has recommended, I would also suggest that the Punjab system should be adopted throughout the country. Under the Punjab system, Government does not go to the farmers; the farmers come of their own accord to the mandis and sell grain. They have created conditions under which the farmers have realized that they cannot realize more price than what is offered by Government. I have submitted an interpellation in that connection. I wish to tell you, Sir, that today the condition in my district is that the agriculturists are taking wheat to the market, but there is nobody to buy and agriculturists are compelled to take back their wheat to their home or sell it to the banyas at a lesser price. My submission in this connection is that the Government, whether it is the Central Government or the Provincial Governments have not been able to control the markets or they have not been able to over-power the banyas or the trading classes. Fortunately or unfortunately, they are exercising their power on the wrong lines. They are trying to see that procurement is the largest; but they are taking steps which lead to the opposite result. I have this much to say that a unified system should be adopted and that system should be the Punjab system.

Regarding gram, the other day, at the party meeting Mr. Munshi referred . . . . .

**Mr. Speaker :** The hon. Member need not refer to the Party meeting.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Regarding gram, I agree with what Mr. Munshi has said in several places that we cannot procure gram with these restrictions. My hon. friend Mr. R.K. Sidhva has often advocated that people are hoarding grain. I wish to point out that it is only gram which can be hoarded, or kept for years together. It is not beneficial to the agriculturists or to any other person to hoard wheat or rice for more than a year or a year and a half, because that hoarding involves loss on the hoarder and no hoarder is interested in incurring a loss. It is only gram which can be hoarded under conditions over which we can be hoarded under conditions over which it cannot have any control. I can cite an example. If gram is mixed with fodder, that is bhoosa, it can be hoarded and it is not possible to procure that gram. Therefore, the gram problem can only be solved if the restrictions on movement and control are altogether removed.

As regards controls in general, I wish to submit that I am not for controls. I want de-control as I have stated earlier. I know there are people, who believe that control on food-grains is absolutely necessary. If you retain the control on food-grains, there is a legacy to that policy. You cannot de-control cement. My hon. friend, Mr. Kapoor has just said that there is sufficient cement or that there is going to be sufficient production of cement. I come from the rural areas, and I know the conditions. Even today, they are not able to get the cement.

**Shri J.R. Kapoor :** Because of controls.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** No; I do not agree that they are not able to get cement because of controls. If control is removed, prices will again go high. The same is the case with coal and iron. If we have to keep the controls on food-grains, as a legacy, we will have to retain controls on all other articles which the agriculturists use.

I have to make a suggestion with regard to another aspect of the Grow More Food campaign regarding the Central Tractor Organisation. I have often passed through the Lal Kuan railway station. Near that railway station, heavy tractors are lying for months together, in a season which is the best suited for work. Now the rainy season has set in and this is not the working season for the tractors. The tractors have reached their destination months earlier, but they have not so far reached the farmers where they are to work. One day, I was travelling in a train. In that train, two officers of the Central Tractor Organisation were also travelling and they were talking to each other. One of them was saying that he has been posted to an appointment which requires experience of a particular type of tractor and that he has not got that experience. I can say this much that a huge amount of Government money has been invested and I do not think that that money will produce the result that it should have produced, if that expenditure had been controlled in an efficient manner. Today in the question hour, several friends wanted to know what is the capacity per hour of a tractor and what is the work which is put in by a tractor per hour. I wish to refer to a personal experience, in this connection. I am developing some agricultural waste lands in U.P. We requested the U.P. Tractor Organisation to help us and we have deposited the necessary amounts. The tractor man came after a year but went away again leaving the tractor on my field, because he

demanded some extra money and that extra money was not given to him.

**Shri Bharati** (Madras) : Extra money for himself?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh**: For the driver.

**Shri syamnandan Sahaya** (Bihar) : You have paid only for the tractor.

**Mr. Speaker** : Order, order. Let him proceed.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh**: There are many other bad examples. Under these conditions, they are not procuring the results which they should.

There is another point, about the price levels of agricultural products. These levels fluctuate very much. In U.P. Khandsari sugar is being sold, I am told, at Rs. 40 per maund, while in Bombay the price is something like Rs. 90 per maund, and in Calcutta it is Rs. 70 per maund. Take the case of gur. While in the producing season, gur was being sold at about Rs. 18 to Rs. 22 per maund, now gur is being sold at Rs. 40 per maund. May I know, when we are not able to control the markets, how we can expect the agriculturist or the farmer, who fortunately or unfortunately has gained some retaining power, not to retain his produce? If you want that the entire produce should come into the market, it is absolutely necessary that you should create conditions favorable for that, that is the prices of agricultural products should remain uniform throughout the year and at all places as far as possible. If these conditions are fulfilled, I am sure a great deal can be done.

I do not want to take up more of the time of the House, especially as I know there are several other Members who may be giving better suggestions than myself.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 9th August, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Wednesday, the 9th August 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Demand for Supplementary\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): I heartily congratulate the hon. Minister for bringing forward a scheme to establish about 4000 post offices in the rural areas. We are glad that there is at least one Minister who has realised the need of the hour.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

Although the need is realised at a late hour, I am glad that he has at least realised that this House has to go to the polls after a few months and everyone of us will have to go to the villager and who will demand from us "What have you been doing for us all this time?" At that time, although the consolation will be very poor, at least we shall be able to say that we have been instrumental for opening four thousand post offices in the villages.

I cannot help saying, however, that in spite of the fact that he has tried to do something for the villagers, he has still love for

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 9th August, 1950, Page 151-156*

the urban people. While there are today so many post offices in the urban areas, he is thinking of opening eight hundred post offices again in the urban areas. I do not know what are the conditions of those areas where he wants to open these post offices. But I would like to know how much money will be spent for these eight hundred urban post offices and how much money will be spent for the four thousand rural post offices in rural areas.

I congratulate him again for bringing this proposal and affording this poor consolation to the villagers and this House.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Monday, 14th August, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Monday, the 14th August 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

---

### Essential Supplies\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I come from a district or an area where the problem is not one of getting wheat but one of surplus of wheat. The agriculturist goes to the mandi and he is not able to dispose of his wheat. And there is another fact to which you also, Sir, referred yesterday. In my district alone 18,000 cases have been instituted under this Act. I have been trying since yesterday to find out what exactly is the position under this law of agriculturists in my province especially. When I went to my district recently the people there told me that several producers of gram have been arrested and the surplus gram taken away. As regards this particular

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 1950, 14th August, 1950, Page 1089-1091*

Bill, I was discussing it the other day with the hon. Mr. Munshi, he told me that in Punjab, the agriculturist could keep 25 maunds of one particular grain and 100 maunds of all the grains. The agriculturist has produced his gram after a lot of hardship and labour. He deserves some consideration especially as he requires the gram for bullock and for his buffalo or she-buffalo.

**Mr. Chairman :** The hon. Mover has made it clear that this will not apply to producers.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** In this connection the hon. Minister himself told me yesterday that in Punjab.....

**Shri K.M. Munshi:** I object to a conversation out-side the House being brought in.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I want to know what cumulative effect this measure will have on my electorate, and so I have every right to know this from the hon. Minister, and refer to any talk whether inside or outside the House.

I was saying that the hon. Minister himself told me that an agriculturist or a producer has the right to keep 25 maunds of gram with him. I would like to bring to the notice of the House what the position is in my district : there people are not interested in keeping unnecessary grain with them but they do deserve to keep with them as much grain as they require. You, Sir, also come from the same area. Gram is a thing without which he cannot pull on in our area, where frequently there is a famine. I do not hesitate to say that the hon. Minister has not been able to produce



confidence among the agriculturists that he will be able to supply gram after a year, even if the gram crop next year fails, otherwise what will be the result? An agriculturist requires as much as 72 maunds of gram in a year for the consumption of his family and animals-whether they are draught cattle or milch cattle. The only quantity that he can keep with him now is 25 manuds, and in my district and also in your district 75 per cent of the agriculturists can be sent to prison for seven years. It is a very big problem and on our side as also on yours. Sir, there are many people who look at with mistrust.

**Mr. Chairman:** I am afraid this reference to your province and my province will not deflect the Chair from holding that the hon. member is irrelevant. It is the sphere of the Provincial Government to fix the amount and not that of the Centre.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** In this connection I wish to say that the powers have been delegated to the Provincial Government by the Central Government and government can amend those delegated powers or request the Punjab Government to amend it.

**Mr. Chairman:** I am sorry this is not the point at issue. We are only concerned with clause 7 and the prescribed quantity which is allowed by the rules.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I am submitting that this very clause will affect our people and convict them to seven years imprisonment and that their number will be 75 per cent of the agriculturists.

**Shri Naziruddin Ahmad:** All your voters!

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I not interested in whose voters they are. But this matter requires very serious consideration. It is not irrelevant. It is very difficult to answer the people outside this House. There are many people on our side who think that this House is interested only in particular sections of the people and that they are going on in a way as if others do not exist in this particular class. There is discriminatin. A man hoarding cloth can be sentenced to only three year whereas a man who has hoarded grain can be sentenced up to seven years. On technical ground you may say that this is also irrelevant. But I am not interested as to whether it is hon. Mr. Munshi or hon Mr. Mahtab but under the clause as it stands a man hoarding cloth will be sentenced for three years whereas a man who happens to possess his own grain, harvested from his own field after hard labour and investment will be sentenced for seven years. The man who is dealing in cloth has earned lakhs of rupees : he has a bungalow, cars and many other amenities : whereas the agriculturist has to work hard to enable him to make both ends meet. I would ask the hon. Minister to think of the cumulative effect on the producer, not that I want the producers to be exempted altogether, rather I want him to be fair to him.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 21th November, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 21th November 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Reserve Bank of India (Amendment Bill)\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : Sir, I am not ashamed to say that I am not an expert on Finance, but I cannot help saying that those in this House who claim themselves to be experts on finance, in my opinion, are not experts in finance for this country. They can be financial experts for those countries where industries play an important role in the economic life. But in a country where agriculture has greater importance, they cannot be more successful. I think that the greatest reason why the economic order of this country is not stable, is because those who consider themselves to be financial expert, in reality, are fit to be financial experts for industrial countries only. They are not experts for agricultural

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 21th November, 1950, Page 400*

countries. I fully agree with you here that it is the right time when the Reserve Bank should be nationalized. I am of the opinion, in view of the conditions prevailing in the country, that there is no way by which the improvement can be brought about in the economic life.

After that, with all humility, I wish to express my views on the distribution of wealth in the rural areas. Today in the money market conditions are such that if an agriculturist goes to a Bank, he cannot obtain money easily for his agricultural work. It is a different matter that as a concession, someone may lend him money without charging any interest on it, but in the money market he cannot borrow money on a lesser interest than 18 to 20 per cent. You know that in the money market, money is easily obtainable against machinery but if some agriculturist possesses a tractor and wants to give it as security even then he cannot borrow money on an interest lesser than 19 per cent.

Apart from this, I think that financially our country has reached such a stage that no development can be possible even by founding Industrial financial Corporation and other Corporations. I have deep sympathy with the mill owners and other friends too, more especially with those who have come from (West) Punjab and (East) Bengal. The government has felt the need for a separate financial corporation for their rehabilitation. But for the cultivators who are the backbone of the country and a new house is to come up next year with their help due to their numerical strength, something essentially has to be done from their view point also. Reserve Bank and other Banks under it should essentially encourage advancing rural loans. For the amendment that has been placed seeking to increase the time from nine months to one year, I would like to say that the method adopted is nothing

but to get cheap popularity. It would not be effective in future. If you want to save this country from economic impediments, you have to bring about a revolution in the economic field. If you talk to the bankers, they would say that money is not safe if it is given to them as loans. I would say that it is like a popular saying in our rural area :

The strong will give you blows  
and will not allow crying too,  
and does not allow to weep;  
Snatch away the grinding mill  
And will not allow grinding too.

It means that a strong man who wields power will brand bad man as a bad one, he could term a good man as bad man too due to his dominant position. All those who go through newspapers today, know it. It is in the news daily that one businessman or the mill-owner has become bankrupt, but you never heard that some cultivator, possessing even a bigha of land has bust bankrupt, Whether one owns a bigha of land he would not say that he has gone bankrupt just to deceive the bank for repayment of a loan. Except Punjab, where some people came to power who knew well problems cultivators face, you go to any other state you may not find a single farmer whether he possess even a small piece of land would not like to declare himself bankrupt, while a mill owner or a businessman having lakhs of rupees can declare himself bankrupt easily and they do it. Why they do say? It is because they are powerful enough. I have no hesitation in saying so because those who have power in this country have no direct contact with the cultivators. That is the only reason that they can say like this. Others can have no chance to declare bankruptcy, while the

cultivators have every possibility of becoming real bankrupts. You can easily collect the arrears as land revenue from the cultivators and do it every day. You do know how the taccavi\* is collected, either properly or improperly. Whether he has a good crop or not, he has to pay taccavi immediately, even by selling his land or his house.

A man who has such a big security to offer as land and when there is no problem in recovery, he is still considered not fit to take loan. You should lend loan not only to the need of cultivators but also in the interest of the nation. By not lending money to him, you can't protect the country from the financial difficulties, nor may protect the national interests. By removing such economic constraints, you would surely ensure that your jute-mills or cloth-mills are run to earn dollars in foreign markets. No progress of the country is possible unless there is large-scale production of cotton, jute and cereals. In such a situation, you have to accept the economic need for rural loans as no other loans are so necessary. I would like to say that there are so many other agencies for loans of all sorts. There are thousands - lakhs of people and journalists who took care of them. But you should take care of cultivators interests. Only few people are there in this country who care for cultivators and no one listens to them; you should shoulder the responsibility of their economic needs.

Now, I intend to present one or two things more before you in a constructive manner in this respect. I have come to know that Reserve Bank has notified to all the cooperative Banks that if they accept this condition, but I am not sure of its percentage whether it is three percent or four or five, only then a peasant or a

---

\* crop-loan under a law of the year 1883

zamindar or cultivator can get loan, otherwise not. But what is the result? You know that everywhere, whether it is cooperative Bank, Scheduled Bank or other Bank, all share holders have fixed their own rate of interest; no parity is there in the interests at national level. You know better than me what the results are. I would like that when you give your speech, you will tell us how much money has reached to the cultivators by such notifications. Also tell whether it is not true that money did not reach them, as no one took the loans or people did not need in such a situation or the country did not need. It is not true. But the reality behind is this that cooperative Banks or other Banks openly argue that none of them will take the risk in the recovery of that money. This is our problem, as one or two per cent given to us is not sufficient. We can not meet out our expenses on the economic basis. In such a situation, keeping your economic position in view, I would request you to operate it either on cooperative basis or compel other Banks that whatever profit they earn through unwanted means, till the disbursement of the money needed for rural loans, they should not earn profit. When you pass such strict instructions, you may term it strict but I would call it quite normal in nature. Until and unless you pass such orders, there would be no proper functioning properly in this regard. You can instruct that if a man purchases a tractor, banks should be ready to give loan at the rate of five percent. I would like to say again that no one is ready to lend money to them. Whether peasant has one acre or two acres of land, you will have to think it over in lending money to him.

There is a taccavi loan which has earned bad reputation throughout the country; I am not talking about any region but when it is given there are cumbersome methods used and ultimately it proves worthless. It is beneficial for the cultivator to take loan

from other persons even at the rate of 25 percent. But this should not be a case of loan on crop. Secondly, when it is being recovered, harsh methods are used. Perhaps, even a lender who receives 25 percent interest from the farmer may be wary of him or the cultivator may prevail upon the lender for giving more time for the repayment. But in case of crop loan from the government he is unable to convince the government, since it is invisible to him and peasant is not aware to whom he should approach. When a policeman approaches him for recovery, he expresses his inability to be lenient as the matter is not in his hands. If he fails to perform, he would loose his service. What to do in such a situation. He often pities on him. If the peasant approaches any other officer the result is the same. I know that crop loan is unpopular. There is no one ready to take crop loan now-a-days. But one can get loan with other methods. If you want that peasants take advantage of crop loans then make it compulsory for the Patwari to certify a person who has fulfilled the conditions. If a patwari does not certify, he should loose his service and the loan be given on his certification. There is no other method to get over the problem. Then the peasants can take advantage of the crop-loan. Secondly, when recovery is made, first the condition of the crop production may be accessed before the process is started in every region or locality.

Now, I would like to make one more point. I wanted to say it in the context of surplus food production but, unfortunately, I could not get time. When the progress in grow more food production is not taking place, the one major reason is of non-availability of agricultural loan. Deputy Speaker Sir, you are perhaps glancing towards me in the hope that I finish my speech early or perhaps that I am going beyond the subject of discussion.

Sir I will take it within the ambit of discussion, if you kindly show a bit of patience.

I was saying that if the agricultural loan for more food production is not available till then the objective will not be achieved. It is good that our Deputy Agriculture Minister is sitting here and he might be aware that not only hundreds but thousands of acres of land have remained uncultivated simply because you do not have the heavy tractors needed. You can not harrow the land with the tractors you have purchased. You need medium tractors for harrowing this land. Central Tractor Organisation does not have those tractors to harrow that land.

**Deputy Speaker:** I fear for allowing the honourable member to finish his speech. He does not make use of it here. I can understand that honourable member is making the point for availability of rural finance necessary to increase food production, but going beyond it and plead for heavy and light tractors; I think it is not quite relevant in this matter.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I am telling all about rural finance. I want to say that you can not make progress in grow more food campaign because you do not have heavy tractors with you and farmers are not getting loans. There is no other provision from where he can lend twenty five or thirty thousand of rupees for purchasing the tractors for harrowing his land. Since, you have a particular opinion on it, hence I will not take your time more on this issue. Still, I would like to say this much that if you want the production to be increased more and improved the economic condition for which Reserve Bank is there, then it is utmost necessary to increase the agricultural loan in such a way that any

tedious mechanism for its safety is not there. The best method is to form multipurpose Cooperative Societies in every village instead of making the notorious moneylenders making your agents in the rural areas.

I do understand that this is not going to make much burden on your shoulders. I went to Mysore where Agriculture Minister told me how the disbursement of agricultural loan in the rural areas is going to be made. He also told that there would be least burden on the state if such a method is adopted. I want to say that if assistance is sought from other ministries then you can increase the agricultural loan without any extra expense. The easiest method for this is to get so many articles, which are under control, distributed through multi-purpose Cooperative Societies in every village like cloth, sugar, oil etc if help is taken from other ministries. These will function like banks in the rural areas. As I told you earlier, only one difficulty is there in the way for this system to succeed. A large number of influential members and officers are either their nephews or relatives. May be they do not harm them, but I just want to sound a word of caution about the danger. This question does not relate to some lakh or a crore of people but it concerns the whole of nation. If you don't improve the economic situation and bring it in order within few years, no government would be stable in this country.

I would not like to take more time of the house as our honourable friend, Satya Narain Singh is glancing at me with more attention, I humbly request you to restrain yourself from adopting cheap populist means you are applying and do take concrete steps for the progress of the country in real terms and raise the living standard of the cultivators to make the country prosperous by this way.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 23th November, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Thursday, the 23th November 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Resolution Re. Qualifications for Election to Parliament and Legislatures of States**

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : Last time when this resolution was being considered, I was submitting that a person possessing high educational degrees or diplomas is not necessarily successful as a Member of Parliament or Assembly. On the other hand, history shows that India has produced persons like Pratap, Ranjit Singh and Akbar, who neither possessed high degrees nor were they educated but who proved to be extremely successful administrators. Again when, Mr. K.T. Shah was moving his resolution, he asserted that budgets are passed in this House. But I submit that on how many occasions and to what extent the House could effect a cut in the same whenever a budget has been presented by the Government in this House, and also to what

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 23th November, 1950, Page 480*

extent the House has been successful in its criticism? Everybody knows that. The other point is that out of all the academic qualifications, I mean degrees, none except the degree of B.Com. and M.Com. helps us in comprehending the subject of finance in an effective way. As a matter of fact, I feel that no qualification is necessary for a Member. But it does not mean that the question whether a certain member has rendered service to the masses or not; this thing cannot be left to any judge or his judgment. If there is any judge, people are the real one who have right to elect (anyone). Besides, some believe in that merit cannot be fixed and permanent. The merit which is deemed precedent does not mean it is relevant even in today's situation. Then, I understand that there is no necessity of any merit. And if the House understands that there should be any merit, you may fix any merit on the basis of economic conditions, it would then benefit the nation. That merit should depend on the possession of land, five, seven or ten acres as cultivable land; if he does not cultivate, he cannot be the member. If you fix any such condition, the country would be benefitted and freed from such economic condition which country is facing today.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 12th December, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 12th December 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Useful Cattle Preservation Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : Sir, I rise to support Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's Bill. Just now we are informed by the hon. Deputy Minister that he is about to bring a Bill which will be much more extensive in scope than the present Bill now before the House. The present Bill will form but a part of it and as such I urge upon Babuji to withdraw his Bill. When Babuji was speaking, I had intervened and pointed out that this Bill could be repealed after the new Bill is introduced.

I do not see any calamity befalling us with the passage of this Bill and so I do not find the argument advanced against the passing of this Bill of much appeal.

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 12th December, 1950, Page 1638-1644*

Again, the Government pleads for further time being given to them. It is almost two years that the pertinent article has been passed and on the 26<sup>th</sup> January a year will be over when our new Constitution was made operative. This is a measure which I do not suppose to affect merely a few lacs of our citizens as is generally the case with so many of our legislations. Only this morning one of our Ministers, whom I do not want to name here, has expressed his concern over the fate that will overtake the residents of Delhi resulting from the prohibition of Vanaspati. The bill now brought forward does not take into consideration the interests of the urban population alone. It has rather been actuated by the consideration of the interests of 90 per cent of our people. Further, it is a measure which entails the Government no expenditure whatsoever. Had any expenditure been necessitated then it would have been a different thing. Our Babuji is a very competent lawyer and has put before us a very commendable proposal in drafting of which he has taken every care. I plead that the Bill should not be shelved for reasons of expenditure involving of four or twelve crores of rupees. The hon. Minister is aware that there are in this country not one but tens of millions of people who have strong feelings against the slaughter of animals of all kinds. But I do not wish that such a step be taken at this stage and Babuji also has not indicated any such desire by including in his Bill any provision to that effect. Apart from having such a desire, I think he has perhaps realized the impossibility of that proposition at this stage and that is perhaps the reason that has led him to take the present decision in regard to cattle preservation only. Dr. Deshmukh had intervened to make certain remarks while Babuji was on his legs. I have visited the province to which Doctor Sahib belongs in his company and I can, therefore, well understand the reason why he was prompted

to pass these remarks. Just the same way, I can realize why Babuji was prompted to bring forward his present Bill. I may explain the reason. A reference in this connectin has been made by Babuji himself. It is true that our individual way of thinking differs and I am totally opposed to the way he suggests solution of this problem so often. It is true again that the present Bill does not cover that aspect of the issue, nevertheless, it shall give a lead to the States and I think if the States too were to follow the Centre in the matter of enacting similar laws, then the issue will be provided an automatic solution. He has, therefore, made an indirect attempt to solve this problem for he knows that this House is not competent to legislate in regard to those subjects that fall within the jurisdiction of the States. That explains why he has made no attempt to extend its scope to the States, knowing well that any such proposal or motion would have been dismissed on the plea that the House was not competent to consider it. The reason responsible for the introduction of the present Bill, which I was going to explain to you just now, is that he has seen with his own eyes thousands of such buffaloes as are capable of producing ten to twenty seers of milk and one to one and a quarter seer of ghee daily, being taken from our State to big cities like Bombay and Calcutta as also to Madras. So far their transport to these places is concerned; Babuji and I hold different views. I hold that they may continue to be transported. But he is also of the view that the animals in question meet their end within a year, or so only at those places. Taking into consideration the present situation and the various laws which are operative in this behalf at present he thinks that the only possible and practicable course left open is that the Punjab Government should impose some restrictions or ban on the transport of these animals to those places this country. Both of us have always been

opposed to each other in this respect. I consider it would be a great mistake if we stop transport of our buffaloes to places like Calcutta, Madras or Bombay simply because those people are unable to enact any such laws or take such steps to provide for the protection of those animals which have been producing ten or fifteen seers of milk daily throughout the year. I have the feeling that if they are unable to protect even such milch animals they cannot be expected to protect themselves even. It is, therefore, for them to make legislations to stop the slaughter of useful cattle and for that reason, I wish to give my strong support to this Bill. I know that its application is restricted inasmuch as it does not extend up to those areas but, as a lead to the rest of the States and thus compel them to enact similar laws within their own territories. In this way, I wish all our countrymen to avail the benefit of these animals of good breeds producing ghee and thus infuse strength in our people. But people of regions like Bombay, Calcutta or Madras can avail of that benefit only when they see to it that the slaughter of such animals does takes place or is allowed to take place within their territories. The objection raised by Dr. Deshmukh can be well understood. I had accompanied him to his State and I have myself seen that the bulls in that part of the country are hardly able to carry more than two or three maunds of weight. On the contrary, bulls in our part of the country can easily drag 35 or 40 maunds. Worthy Doctor Saheb is aware that bulls in Haryana area can easily drag carts having 40 or 45 maunds of load and buffaloes produce ten to fifteen seers of milk daily. I tell you a fact when I say that a goat in our side can easily compete two buffaloes of Dr. Deshmukh's place in the matter of milk production. Cows and buffaloes in his area produce hardly two or three seers of milk per day. On our side, there is a large number of such goats which



produce up to four seers of milk daily. This is a fact. I was, therefore laboring to tell that the hon. Doctor also has not passed those remarks with a different consideration altogether. His reasons are quite different to those of Babuji. Babuji's remarks have lead him to think that way, Babuji has the Haryana cattle in his mind all along whereas with Doctor Saheb thinks about the cattle in C.P. If Babuji were competent to pass a judgment then perhaps he would have also included the C.P. cattle in the category of useless cattle.

The hon. Doctor, therefore, may remember that those habituated to the use of milk will continue to have its supply unhampered. In this connection, I have one thing more to say to our brethren who take meat and who think it to be difficult to make up the deficit in food with our low production of foodgrains on the one hand and with stoppage of cattle slaughter for food purposes on the other. My suggestion to such friends is that they may regard the stoppage of cattle slaughter as a part of our food programme. The country is sure to gain thereby. The government are even in a better position to suggest it more effectively, If they proceed with a food legislation prohibiting the use of meat other than that of the wild animals say even for a period of one year, the food problem of the country will be solved to a greater extent. We have in our land sufficient number of crocodiles and monkeys of large sizes for this purpose. The hon. Minister himself had suggested the other day that the number of monkeys in the country was nearly equal to that of the aged persons and that the choice before the country was to feed either of the two. I, therefore, draw attention of all meat-eaters to this aspect and request them to refrain from having any designs on our cattle for at least one year. This may perhaps afford us an opportunity to improve them

to some extent. You may just pay a visit to Wardha and see how much improvement they have been able to bring about, While at Nasik, I had the occasion to visit a Goshala. There, I saw a cow which formerly produced a seer or a seer and a half of milk only and belonged to the area of the hon. Doctor. They have much improved the same animal, which was described as useless before.

**Dr. Deshmukh :** It is too much a discredit to our cows.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** I have not the least intention to discredit the cows of any particular area and nor can I utilize this forum for purposes of doing propaganda in favour of our own cows. But unfortunately the things stated by me are facts and even for their submission I was forced only because of the particular remark made by the hon. Doctor himself.

Just now, I was submitting that should the meat-eaters in this country took to other sources some good may perhaps be done to the country and just as they at Nasik have improved the cows with very low milk production in the same way it is just possible that the cattle described as useless today may no longer remain as such.

Next, I wish to draw attention of the hon. Minister to the fresh taxes, he proposes to impose on the producers in his draft Bill. I have already come to know of it and he too has referred to a tax of eight annas per head which he contemplates to impose upon the sale of all cattle. What I want to know is who will be the persons ultimately from whom it will be realized? This will be ultimately realized from us and not from those whom the increased production of milk is going to benefit and that too without requiring them to undertake any pains or to do any hard work. The people,

who do not have to look after the cow nor arrange for its fodder but who nevertheless consume the milk, will not be called upon to pay anything whatsoever. This burden of eight annas even will have to be borne by the people who breed cows and toil day and night for them. You may leave aside this question of eight annas and only look to the things which lie in the hands of the Government. By the word Government, I am not referring to the Central Government but that of the U.P. That Government have a farm near the site of the Goshala. Nobody purchases fodder from that farm. That does not imply that there is an excess of fodder in the country. We know that in Delhi fodder is not to be had even at exorbitant prices. The reason lies in the fact that railway facilities for the transport of that fodder are not available. The fodder in question does not belong to any particular individual. It belongs to the Government of U.P. and the benefit accruing on the sale thereof will also go to that Government. You cannot bring that fodder to this place despite the fact that it entails you no expenditure at all. If you could do only some such things then in my opinion you will be able to make sufficient headway in the matter of improvement of the various breeds of cattle. I do not say it about myself but, generally speaking, people of this country have no faith in the large committees that you propose to set up nor in the way you are handling this task of cattle preservation. It is probable that some people may vote against the passing of this Bill. If no one opposes this Bill and this innocent measure brought forward by Babuji is passed, even then in my opinion there is no fear of any immediate harm being done? It will, on the contrary, make people have more faith in the Government. The Government have parried with two important Bills the prohibition of Vanaspati which again indirectly was conducive to the promotion of the bovine breeds.

The Government have deferred that measure under some pretext or the other. The Government have tried to prevent its consideration on the excuse that they want time to introduce another Bill in place of that. I fail to see how the Government can win the confidence of the masses in this way. Some of our people in fact harbour a foregone suspicion that keeping in view the present Constitution and the dignity of this House, no hope can be entertained for any legislation which may be in the interest of the people. They have a feeling that generally speaking the spirit dominating this House is that in the interests of the urban population alone lie the interests of the country as a whole and that they alone have the right to benefit or suffer and no others can claim this right for themselves. This sentiment is already working in people's mind. The Government will only be strengthening it further still if this Bill is rejected. The Government may advance the excuse that they want to bring another Bill in its place. Being myself a Member of the Standing Committee, I also claim to have some knowledge. This draft Bill was placed before us many months back but no announcement in this regard has so far been made. If the Government were in favour of its being postponed then it would have been better to have given notice of that intention beforehand. It was not at all difficult for the Government to do so. A reference has been made of Shri Naziruddin Ahmed. I submit there are several hon. friends like him who think that as they receive a daily sum of forty rupees from the Government, so it is their duty to make up the imperfections left in the various legislations sponsored by the Government. If you are under this impression that this House exists merely for the people to come here and expect that they were not expected to move any amendment to the legislations sponsored by the Government, then I may submit that the

Government are not thinking along the right lines. The Government could have opposed this Bill in another way. They could have given notice of a Bill of their own and the amendments moved there to would have been disposed of afterwards. I fail to understand what prevented the hon. Minister from giving notice of a Bill or what consideration so far kept him from tabling any motion to that effect. I think only one way is left open to the Government to retrieve from the mistakes that have inadvertently been made previously and it is that the Bill sponsored by Babuji be accepted and all of us giving our support to it and pass it.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Monday, 18 December, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Monday, the 18th December 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

---

### Supply and Prices of Goods Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** : Sir, as my learned friend Shri Tyagi has said, that he is against controls, I would also like to make it clear in the very beginning that no doubt, I am opposed to controls but so far as the present Bill is concerned, I think it is a legacy and result of the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act of 1946 which we passed some time ago. If a person does a certain thing he cannot escape its consequences. It seems to me that the view-point from which these articles have been included in this Bill and also in the Essential Supplies Act is not proper. I object to it. The Government seems to think that only a small section of urban

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 18th December, 1950, Page 1900-1903*

consumers should be protected and that no other person needs protection regarding any commodity. I will just point out to the hon. Minister that, as far as I think, in view of the present economic situation he should have included all those articles which should have been included long before. But they have been totally ignored even in this Bill. I do not want to deal with any other point but whatever I will submit in this connection will let the Government understand my viewpoint so that they may agree with me. For this, I will have to say many things and therefore I request, Sir, to take this point into consideration before deciding the relevant or irrelevant portions of my statement. I have submitted all this in view of our present economic situation which requires serious consideration on our part. I can understand the point of view of my friend Shri Upadhyay. He holds that control is necessary only on articles of food and is opposed to controls on all other commodities. I think he is wrong there.

It is entirely against the economic standpoint as it should have been today. The position at present is that we cannot improve the economic position of the country until we increase our agricultural production and agricultural production cannot be increased unless the whole economy is controlled or there is no control at all. Either the Government should resort to decontrol when prices would get fixed of their own accord or, if they consider control is essential, they should not be under the illusion that food control is all right but to go beyond that would be inexpedient. I do not consider this point of view to be a correct approach. It is a principle of mercantile economy that if you want to increase the supply and produce more, the cost price of the marginal producer must also be taken into consideration while fixing the price of the

thing. I am in entire disagreement with what Shri upadhyay has said. As I have already said before. I am in favour of decontrol, but if the Government wants to impose control, the policy of imposing controls on food articles only and decontrolling others cannot be successful. It is not proper for a just Government like the present one. The commodities that are enlisted to show that only the interest of a few persons has been taken into consideration. Just take the case of bicycle. Generally it is used by the middle-class people. The same is true about electric bulbs. Caustic soda ash, tanning material and raw rubber are meant entirely for industrial purposes. This is rather good that the Government have included tanning material in the list for it is an important item for cottage industries also. There are some commodities which are of use to the large scale industry also. But, I believe, that inclusion of item No.7 will not be much effective. I have always held that controls should not be for a section only. If we have been compelled to resort to a controlled economy, we must also be careful towards the results that may follow as a consequence. While the Government in pursuance of the former ct controlled the articles of food, they did not make any provision to stimulate production so that the producers could feel that the law was advantageous to them also. Tractors may be taken for instance. The price of the tractors that used to be imported from the hard currency areas went up by 40 per cent, after devaluation. But the tractors that were got from the soft currency areas are also selling today at about 40 per cent higher rate, while their prices should have remained unchanged. Other commodities that are not controlled are small diesel engines and electric motors for wells. I think they should have been brought on the list. If the Government wants complete decontrol then, it is another thing, but if they want to

retain a controlled economy, they must make it a principle to control those commodities also which are essential to bring about an improvement in the economic position of the country and, secondly, whatever the Government do should be practical. Control should not be imposed on such commodities where it does no good just as it happened recently in the case of control on gur. Let there be control if they want to, but not in the manner in which it was done in case of cloth where there was control first, then decontrol, control again and then decontrol again. This rotation is not good. The policy once formulated must be firmly implemented. As Shri Tyagi told us today, the hon. Minister had said that the Government wanted to pursue the policy of control sweetly and safely. My addition to this is that they must pursue it firmly also. The need to pursue it firmly is more imperative than to pursue it sweetly and safely. The policy once formulated should not be subjected to changes every now and then. I know it is a legacy of democracy that no Government can retain a particular order of things for long. Their view point is affected by the press and other things. Vested interests also raise their voice and influence the Government. This effect, I suppose, is inherent in democracy, but I request the Government to minimise that effect. So, I was submitting that agricultural implements must be added to the list. The hon. Minister may probably declare in this regard that there is already a sort of control over them, for instance, there is control over iron. The man who manufactures implements in the factory does get iron on control rates—the controlled iron reaches the factory all right— but what happens beyond that stage, nobody cares to know. In Punjab too, this issue was raised. My submission is that the virtue or vice of the control must be followed to the conclusive end. They must not be under the illusion that only the city people are consumers.

These commodities are also consumed by people living in villages. I feel that if facilities are needed for anybody these are the very persons. They have neither the press nor any organization to take up their voice. Hence it is they, as a matter of fact who need facilities. By extending facilities to them, the Government would not only be doing good to them but would also be gaining their own objective of greater production, since they can produce more only when you solve their problems with the right perspective. Thus, so far control is concern. I would like that tractors and their spare parts, agricultural implements, pumps, diesel engines and small electric engines used for lifting water from wells may also be added to the list.

I do not wish to take more time of the House. I would like to submit one thing in the end. My able friend Shri Tyagi had referred to the three years period. I also remember well that while the Essential Supplies Act was being amended and the period was being extended to 7 years, Shri Tyagi had opposed it. If his is the same point of view now also, I can well understand him. But I think the discrimination regarding the periods of three years and seven years should be done away with. If they want to keep it seven years keep it for all, But the discrimination of providing only three years for a big cloth merchant and seven years for one, who has more than five maunds or a little more than double the amount, should not be there. Moreover big persons take their cases to High Court or Supreme Court in order to save themselves from the clutches of law, but these cultivators are poor people, who have not got sufficient finances to go to High Court or Supreme Court for redress. Only this House is the place for their protection. So, in the end I have only to submit that either the Government should reduce the period of seven years, or if they do not, at least this discrimination must be done away with.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 20th December, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Wednesday, the 20 December 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1950-51\***

#### **Postal Services :**

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, last time high hopes were raised by the hon. Minister that new post offices will be opened in the villages. Postal Expenses including cost of combined office, I want to know how many post offices were opened in the rural areas and with how many of them Postal Savings Banks were attached? Not only alone I am speaking for the Postal Savings Banks but it is the view of many economists of India and a number of my friends in this House that money has drifted to the villages and opening of Postal Savings Banks there is necessary in order to utilize that money for constructive purposes. This is why I want

---

\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 20th December, 1950, Page 2116-2117

to enquire from him the number of the Postal Savings Banks and of post offices opened in the villages during the course of this year.

My able friend Shri Bhattacharya has just referred to unremunerative post offices in disagreement with his views because the urban post offices are being run on the strength of those who live in the villages and who have little voice. Therefore there should be no question of remuneration for the village post offices. A very little period has elapsed since their introduction and to estimate income from them in such a small period is a wrong approach. The Government must spend a considerable amount of money over them. In fact, the village people are such that they do not probably even know that a post office has been opened in their village. For this reason, these post offices are not earning much. To think that it is to close doever such post offices on this account is and correct. I am opposed to the idea that the time has come to review the position as to how many of them should continue and how many be abolished. I would rather like to know that out of the demand made under conveyance of mails what amount of money is required to send the mail by air? It is said that 30 lakhs of rupees are required for this purpose. One has not to pay extra amount for sending letters by air. The cost of conveyance of an ordinary envelop is the same as it is by the air mail. How far therefore is it reasonable that the hon. Members talk of closing the unremunerative post offices on one hand and want to send the mails by air on the other? How long such discriminative treatment will go on? I am sure the hon. Members will themselves realize that the suggestion made by them is not at all worthy of consideration. The country was entertaining high hopes on account

of the promises of the hon. Minister. But I was very much shocked when afterwards in an answer to a question he informed the House that the scheme would not be implemented in full due to lack of finances. I would submit that the Government may demand more money from the House but the promises once given must be fulfilled. When the people of the villages have once developed a hope after hearing the announcements made on behalf of Government it would not be proper now to turn their hope into frustration.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Friday, 22 December, 1950

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Friday, the 22th December 1950, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Representation of the People (No. 2) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, I will first speak about the multi-member constituencies. I think the safeguards, which have been provided for the scheduled castes or the scheduled tribes, are a kind of punishment to them. Just now, my friend Prof. Ranga has stated that the area of the constituency should be small. But think of the area to be represented in the Parliament and the Members to be elected from the scheduled tribes. It comes to this that he will have to face some 8 or 7.5 lakhs voters which means that he will have to face some 15 or 14 lakhs of population. I think there might be many States in our country with a population of 14 lakhs. In others words, it means that we have provided safeguards for the scheduled castes or the scheduled tribes in our Constitution but I say that they are a kind of punishment to them. If we want to

---

*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I, Pt. II, 22th December, 1950, Page 2311-2316*

provide safeguards to them we will have to make certain changes in the Constitution and if we do not want to make any changes there is one easy way out of this. Suppose, in a state there are 120 or 121 constituencies, then reserve 20 or 21 constituencies for the scheduled castes and the scheduled tribes. There can be only one objection to it. The general voters in the reserved constituencies may object that they have not got any representative to present them. I would like to say that there will be no representatives of the scheduled castes or the scheduled tribes in every constituency.

**Shri J.R. Kapoor** (Uttar Pradesh) : There will be representatives of all.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** In that sense even a person of the non-scheduled tribes can represent the scheduled castes. If it is thought that only a person of the scheduled castes or the scheduled tribes can represent the scheduled castes or scheduled tribes or a person of the non-scheduled castes or non-scheduled tribes can only represent the non-scheduled castes then what I have stated before is correct. Thus, there is no representative of the scheduled castes in every constituency. If a person of the non-scheduled castes can represent the scheduled castes then why a person of the scheduled castes cannot represent the non-scheduled castes? I will have no objection if it is possible to do so. But if it is objected to, I say that we are fortunate in getting some more time to make certain changes in the Constitution. If there are 120 constituencies, reserve 20 out of them for the scheduled castes and the scheduled tribes. Divide a State into 100 constituencies for the scheduled castes or the scheduled tribes where their population is in greater

number, A provision can be made for the election of two representatives from those constituencies, one from the general castes and the other from the scheduled castes. I admit that if we do like that we will have to make certain amendments in the constitution. I think, it is necessary to make certain amendments in the Constitution because the scheduled castes or the scheduled tribes have the most poor finances and education and their names are least known to the outside world. Therefore, I want the suggestion should be accepted or else the second one and if neither of them is acceptable then I would suggest a third one. Take the case of those cities which have a population of 25, 5, 2, 3, or 4 lakhs. Reserve as many seats as possible for the scheduled castes in the urban areas as only three persons will be elected to the State Assembly from that constituency which has a population of 3 lakhs. The expenses of the person who represents a constituency with a population of 3 lakhs will be less as the radius of his constituency will be 3, 4 or 5 miles. But the expenses will increase if we add these the rural constituencies which have a radius of 40 to 80 miles. Therefore, I submit that if these two suggestions are not accepted then at least while making reservation of seats it should be taken into consideration that most of them should be reserved in the cities.

Now, I make a reference to the delimitation as has already been mentioned by the hon. Minister while presenting the Bill. I will raise the objection which I had raised in Punjab against the order which has been issued regarding the delimitation. What should be the population of every constituency in every State i.e. the population basis on which the constituencies should be formed is given in the form of a formula. The formula is like this :



“For the purposes of the election referred to in paragraph 3 and the delimitation of constituencies therefore, the population of any area within a State to be included in a constituency shall unless in the case of any particular area or class of areas the President otherwise directs, be determined by multiplying the number of voters entered in the provisional electoral roll of that area by the total population of that area by the total population of that State as determined under paragraph 4, and then by dividing the product by the total number of voters entered in the provisional electoral rolls for the whole State.”

I want to submit about the objection that has been raised against this formula. There was such a vast difference between the first and the second electoral rolls that one constituency each was dropped from three districts. While there was an increase of one constituency each in other three districts. As far as the position of Government is concerned, I do not want to say much but even the Punjab Government issued a note that entries about the voters cannot be relied upon to some extent.

The formula might have succeeded in other provinces but as far as Punjab is concerned it has created new difficulties. It is not suitable for Punjab as we cannot rely upon the electoral rolls of Punjab. Somebody may have finalised. But about the double entries that have been made Government have issued a note that there is a possibility of double entries being made as 80 to 90 per cent of people have come from the other side. I submit that it is not easy to check them up and if they are really finalised even then they cannot be checked. As far as voting is concerned it has no importance at all but so far as the question regarding quotas of district wise constituencies is concerned, it is likely to be effected. The order reads as follows:

“Unless the President otherwise directs”.

Therefore, necessity has arisen in Punjab that the hon. Minister should represent to the President that the same formula should be applied regarding the formation of constituencies as has been done in the case of the population of other States. That is not very difficult and will be far better than this. Punjab can be divided into two divisions according to that. One will be Ambala division and the other Jullunder division. The result will be that Ambala will get 4 or 5 seats more and if the calculations prove to be inaccurate it may lose the same numbers. I think the increase or decrease of 4 or 5 seats in a division is not a small number. Therefore, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to this fact so that he may take suitable action on it and may make proper recommendations to the President.

Reference has been made about expenses in calculating the costs. I think there are two types of constituencies-one with an area of its polling booth from one to five miles like Delhi, Calcutta, Bombay etc., and on the other there are constituencies with lesser population like Himachal Pradesh etc. The same amount of expenses have been fixed for them as have been done in the case of urban voters. It is true that if the amount of expenses is increased, the chances of success for poor persons in the elections will be lessened. But this is a fact that if thousands of villages with a population of 15 lakhs are put under one constituency, the expenses of the person standing from that constituency is likely to be more than that of the others. The more expenses are increased, the more the rights of the poor people are curtailed. But it is essential that everybody should be treated equally as regards expenses.

I want to give a funny example regarding the reasons which have been mentioned about declaring the elections void. We want free and fair elections. Suppose that free and fair elections were held and the person who was defeated in the elections made a careful-study of the law. With the help of one of his agents he manages to get 100 or 200 false votes cast in favour of his opponent. As they are his own persons he can make them give a statement in the court that such and such candidate or his agent got the votes cast. In the elections as far as the successful candidate is concerned he is honest but due to the dishonesty of his opponent his election may be declared void by any tribunal. Therefore while considering other things, I would like the Government to make some provision for putting an end to this. The defeated candidate, if he is a bit clever, to defeat his victorious opponent may not play tricks before the tribunal.

Regarding secrecy of polling, I would like so say that I am opposed to the views expressed by Panditji that no polling agents or any other persons should have the knowledge of it or the polling agents should not be present there. Either colored ballot boxes should be used or the polling agents be allowed to be there, otherwise the election will depend entirely upon the mercy of the officers. If it is desired to tamper with the fairness, the elections should be held according to the whims of the officers and they should be all in all, then I have nothing to say. If it is desired that polling agents should not remain near the officer then at least the ballot boxes should be colored so that even the illiterate persons may also know whom they are voting for. Like Prof. Ranga. I also want to stress upon the fact that the idea of appointing only one polling Agent for one Polling Station is not right. On certain

occasions circumstances may compel that the Polling Agent should be changed.

Besides this, I also want to submit that we should have as many polling stations as possible. Efforts should be made to open a polling station in every village where there are at least two hundred and fifty voters. It will be a matter of great joy for me if a polling station is opened in every locality, and if this is done, no one will be happier than I. It is possible that two hundred and fifty votes may be considered comparatively a small number, and as such the polling stations should be opened where the number of voters is at least one thousand. But I want that we should fix a limit to the number of voters may it be two hundred and fifty or less than that. We should have a territorial limit wherein every man may have the facility of the polling station.

I have also to make one submission regarding the restrictions imposed on the use of conveyances. The provision, that a voter should he so wish, can make arrangements for his own conveyance, has been allowed to remain; thereby the privilege that was granted to the voter has been taken away. Because if this provision remains, the candidate can easily make the voter say that such and such voters have spent their own money for their conveyance.

**Shri Sonavane :** On a point of Order, Sir. Now that we are going to apply closure at 6 o'clock if one member is given more than ten minutes, that would mean denying other hon. Members who are anxious to participate, of an opportunity to speak.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** No time-limit has been prescribed.

**Mr. Chairman:** It is true that no time-limit has been prescribed, but all the same I would request hon. Members to be brief, so that as many hon. Members as may be anxious to speak, may take part in the debate.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** I shall try to be as brief as possible, Sir, about the election meetings, the hon. Minister has stated that no meetings should be allowed to be held on the night preceding the election. I think this is not a practical approach. There are many such constituencies, where due to long distances we cannot reach before four days from the day of the elections. Generally the meetings are held on the night preceding the election day. Suppose the election is to be held today the meeting can only held preceding night in large constituencies. The constituencies will be sufficiently large, therefore it would be necessary to hold such meetings. Therefore the placing of restriction on the meetings held on that night is not proper. This should be removed.

I do not want to take any more time of the House. In the end I want to submit that the contractors also should be placed in the category of the services. The people who enter in contract with the Government should be treated at par with the services, but care should be taken to see that the issue does not get complicated. Those who broadcast their talks from Radio Stations should not be included in this category as they also have to enter into contract, lest we also may be disqualified for membership.

# 1951

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 15th February, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Thursday, the 15th February 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Preventive Detention (Amendment) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, I have stood up to oppose the amendment. I feel that one of the reasons why it is necessary to extend the period of this Act for one year is that even today it is essential to prevent such activities of those persons at present under detention, who had a mind to take part or who took part in the subversive activities. But, I submit, that a greater danger to our country is from those who indulge in black-marketing and profiteering. That is what I feel. Many of my hon. friends here will probably bear out with me that it is very essential to detain such persons. It is a fact that the greatest danger to our country today is from the back-marketees. Those persons who indulge in subversive activities in our country or who incite people to indulge in them, are lesser criminals than blackmarketees, although that

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 8, Pt. II, 15<sup>th</sup> February 1951, Page 2968-2970*

too is a serious crime because that incitement leads them to black-marketing. Nobody can deny that.

As regards the application of ordinary law against black-marketees, it is not so easy because the law is so complicated and becomes more so when dealt with by the law-yers that they will always try to save a man irrespective of the fact that he has been indulging in all sorts of crimes, and it has often been seen that they succeed in saving him. In this way, criminals and offenders go unpunished. The House very well knows all this.

**Giani G.S. Musafir** (Punjab): Has any black-marketer been arrested during last year under this Act?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh**: The hon. Member was not present here yesterday when the hon. Minister stated that a hundred persons had been arrested under this Act. My personal opinion is that this is a very small number. I also know that the Government might have prosecuted a large number of black-marketees and that there may be comparatively lesser number of persons who might have been prosecuted for indulging in subversive activities. But, today they have created a miserable situation in India—a situation which is incomparable and which is not unknown to this House. Last year some factory owners approached the Government and told that they had surplus stocks of sugar for which they wanted permission to export. But within only two months of that, we found that there was a famine of sugar in the whole of the country and there were disturbances. In Bombay due to this shortage shops were looted and other incidents happened. It is not a question of sugar alone but similar is the case

with all other commodities. There are many hon. Members of this House who want the controls to go. If the House anyhow decides to do away with controls, even then we have no other Act or measure to deal with those who interfere with the maintenance of essential supplies. If this section of the Bill is passed, the Government, even if they set aside all controls, will have the powers under this Act to deal with those persons whose only aim is blackmarketing and profiteering. As one of my learned friends said, licences of black-marketeers can be cancelled. This is right and there is a law also to cancel them. But the laws of issuing or refusing licences have been very tactfully drafted and it is possible that a black-marketeer may indulge in black-marketing and still remain within the bounds of law. Thus his licence can also not be cancelled. Moreover, the profit which they reap by taking undue advantage of this law is not an ordinary one; it runs into thousands and lakhs. So, even if such persons are detained, I think the punishment which they get is insignificant as compared to the profit reaped by them. Therefore, Sir, what I feel is that if there is anyone today who should be detained, he is the black-marketeer. There is famine of food-grains in our country today-not because the cultivators are producing less, but because those, who deal in food-grains hoard them. The cultivators sell the grains at ten rupees or eleven rupees a maund but the same food-grains, the same millet that is purchased at ten rupees a maund from U.P. and Punjab cultivators is sold to the public at twenty two rupees a maund. Sir, it can well be imagined how dangerous this thing is our society and country and how adversely it affects us today when we do not get enough food-grains. The black-marketeers own important newspapers, they have many other influential sources, they propagate that food-grains are lying hoarded with the cultivator.

They always try to make the poor cultivators a victim of law. There is little doubt that the present measure is inadequate to prevent this thing. Therefore I strongly urge that the amendment to this Bill should be rejected forthwith.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Friday, 23th February, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Friday, the 23th February 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Appropriation Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): So far as the administration of the Centrally Administered Areas is concerned, it is too top heavy. Whatever increase in the budget may be asked for by them as compared to other States the hon. Minister should. I submit, pay special attention to it. Now I want to draw your attention to Demand No. 88 which is for Bilaspur. A sum of eighteen thousand rupees has been asked for in that Demand for disbursing the salaries of Girdawars, Quanungos, Patwaris and clerks etc. and that amount is asked for in the name of Bhakra Dam. If the work pertains to Bhakra Dam and its expenditure increases. It should have been included in the Bakra Dam account. I am at a loss to understand as to how the expenditure for Bhakra Dam has come to be included in the account of Bilaspur and how the amount has increased. I think perhaps this sum has been asked for paying compensation

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 8, Pt. II, 23<sup>th</sup> February 1951, Page 3421-3422*

etc. with regards land survey. This work could have been done by the existing staff of Bilaspur. Perhaps this demand has been made on the Bhakra Dam account for the reason that it being a big dam project several people would get jobs, the number of girdawars would increase and there would be promotions. Special attention must be paid to this and the proposed increase in the expenditure should be sanctioned after careful consideration. If you were to compare any field of activity of the Centrally Administered Areas with that of any State you will find that although the strength of their establishment is perhaps equal to that of a Tehsil or at the most of a district of a State their expenditure is equal to that of the State. I do not want to say anything more but wish to submit respectfully that whatever increase is made in the expenditure of the Centrally Administered Areas it should be done after thorough scrutiny.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Friday, 23th February, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Friday, the 23th February 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Reserve Bank of India (Amendment) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): First of all I cannot but express my gratitude towards the hon. Minister, who listened with great attention and care to what his colleagues like me, who were no financial experts, submitted in the Select Committee. He tried to make us understand all the financial difficulties which confront our country; and I cannot but confess that realizing the necessity of the demand for agriculture he tried to go ahead as far as was possible for him. But with all that I cannot check myself from saying that these piecemeal or little amendments and improvements, which we are contemplating, are not going to help our country in some effective manner. We will have to bring revolution in our ideas if we want to bring any revolution in our country.

---

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 8, Pt. II, 23<sup>th</sup> February 1951, Page 3449-3452*

Sir, I tried to express myself before the House at that time also, when the Bill was referred to the Select Committee. I think, as my friend Shri Barman has said, it is not a question of tea-growing alone. It is right that so far as the security of the demand is concerned it is perhaps the best as compared to other products. But situated as we are today and situated as our country is today we cannot pull on without taking some amount of risk. This is my opinion and I hold it that whatever risk is involved in it, this too is because of the other friends who think differently from us, otherwise the amount of risk in agriculture is far less as compared to other professions. The Government has found an easy method of assessing the price of land which a cultivator possesses. Assuming that they are the minimum prices, if loans are advanced on that very basis, agriculture will improve in our country. Our economic condition cannot improve unless and until we increase not only the production of tea but that of the agriculture as a whole. There are many friends in our country who do not consider agriculture to be an industry. But even if we do not consider it to be an industry, I say that it is essential that we should accept any such amendment which contemplates at investing more and more money in our agriculture. Given this point of view, that I have given notice of my amendment.

Firstly, as my friend Shri Barman has said, comes the demand that loans should be granted against standing crops. In his opinion production of tea is an important one. But if we have to develop our country, then the production of other crops in the country is as essential as that of tea. My able friend has just now given us the figures of dollars that are earned by tea. But for what purposes are the dollars required these days? Dollars are required

for food. If food-grains are produced here, perhaps the demand for dollars will not remain as much as it is today. It is true that we require dollars for purchasing machinery etc. But as against this if we can increase the production of such things like oilseeds or jute, we can earn as many dollars as would satisfy our demand for them.

So far as the question of extension of time from twelve months to fifteen thank him; for he has at least fulfilled the demand of keeping it fifteen months instead of twelve months, or fifteen months instead of nine months. This too will not help much because there are many such parts in India where there are no Land Mortgage Banks. The Land Mortgage Banks give more money in the form of loans for agricultural development. Such institutions exist in big provinces only, and it is not easy to establish them in the other provinces. Under the conditions, as are in the country at present, there are no warehouses. We wish that we would have been able to construct warehouses almost in each and every district headquarters, but it is just possible that they may not be an immediate success under the existing economic conditions; though I differ on this point as well; because if warehouses could be built in a short period, for imported grains, why they cannot be built for the food-grains that we produce here? Anyway as the conditions today are, I only suggested eighteen months instead of fifteen in my notice of amendment. This is because, as I submitted just now, agriculture needs three kinds of finance, one long term, the second medium term and the third short term. Only some days back, the Reserve Bank sent a directive to the Co-operative Banks advising them that loans should be given for the construction of wells. In the first instance, I thought that the Co-operative Banks had refused to give loans because they were unable to meet their own expenses.

But after a careful reading one comes to know that the Co-operative Banks feared some deficit in its profits. It seemed to them that the work will cost more and will pay less. This can be one of the reasons and the second one can be that a petty cultivator cannot repay the loan given for the construction of a well within a short period of fifteen months.

With regard to agriculture, many of our brethren who are members of this House used to say before that the burden of land revenue was crushing the cultivation and the cultivators of this country, and that agriculture was not a profession of profit. But there are some brethren who to-day do not agree with me. I have no doubt even today that the productivity of land is very low and unless and until agriculture becomes a lucrative profession or a profession of greater profits, its development will be very difficult. Here we find that our cultivator is not accustomed to keep any sort of cash-book with him, he does not keep any accounts of the labour done. He himself labours day in and day out and has no idea of getting any separate compensation for it. Today, we find that his standard of living too is somewhat low and there has been no change in it. Against this, it may be argued that he too has begun to earn some profits, but even then I presume that if an agriculturist takes a loan for constructing a well, he will not be in a position to repay it within fifteen months even. Although I have demanded that the period should be extended from fifteen to eighteen months, yet eighteen months time cannot solve the problem. I wish that more time limit should have been kept, something more than two years. But I know that in order to have change over from fifteen to eighteen months even would be a hard nut to crack. Indeed it is the hon. Minister's kindness that he has accepted to keep it fifteen months instead of twelve. He accepted



after great persuasion, and therefore it is in no way an easy job to make him to extend this period still further. I tried to make it eighteen months and this too for the reason that there are certain crops which take about a year to ripe. On this very basis I have given him the notice to extend it to eighteen months. Along with this I give him another suggestion and that also for the reason that in our country, we get one crop in every six months, and in this way a cultivator can raise three crops during this eighteen months time. If he takes a loan for constructing a well he cannot construct it within a day. But he has to take loan from the Co-operative Bank and after two or three months the Co-operative Bank asks for the loan from the Reserve Bank and then afterwards he will be getting a time limit of eighteen months. In other words he gets a chance of reaping three harvests during this time. After these three harvests are reaped, he can repay the loan, if he is in a position to do so. So my submission is that if at present our condition is such that we can neither build ware houses nor can we establish Land Mortgage Banks, it is very essential second important thing to which I have referred before is that it is not necessary for cultivators alone to increase production, but it is necessary for the whole country. It has become a necessity for all, whither he is a cultivator or a landlord or a person residing in a city. In fact cultivators constitute seventy to seventy-five per cent. of our population, therefore they should have the maximum share in the finances of India. But even if we do not agree with this idea and do not think on these lines, because people from the cities have more influence on this Government or have a greater hand in it, we should at least bring revolution in the mode of our thinking, if we want to fulfill the demand of the cultivators.

I do not want to take more time of the House. The hon. Minister is an expert in Finance; and considering my views as those of a layman he may brush them aside. This may be true that I am not an expert like him. But I certainly uphold that anybody who calls himself an expert in India may be an expert for an Industrial state, but how far he is an expert with regard to our country, I have doubts about it.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 15th March, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Thursday, the 15th March 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Requisitioned land (Continuance of Powers) Amendment Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): As the hon. Minister himself confessed, the position is not yet such that they may indulge in more constructions or divert some of the land for building purposes even after having done there a good deal of construction. I believe that the scarcity of houses is bound to prevail for a sufficient time to come. Therefore I think that instead of obtaining a sanction every year it would be better to enact some sort of permanent legislation which may be repealed when not required. Another point I want to emphasize is in connection with acquisition of land about which the hon. Minister made a mention in his speech. So far the acquisition of residential land and not of agricultural land, is concerned, I have to say nothing. But I do want to say something in regard to agricultural land. For example, a good deal of

*\*Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 8, Pt. II, 15<sup>th</sup> March 1951, Page 4665-4666*

agricultural land is being acquired in Delhi and Ajmer for various purposes. The former Government was not responsible to the people and thus their attitude regarding acquisition of agricultural land could be understood. But it is a matter of regret that there seems to prevail the same tendency even now. I do not know what amount of compensation for agricultural land is involved in the total compensation amount of Rs. 77 lakh just mentioned by the hon. Minister. But there is no doubt about this fact that it is a question concerning the destinies of millions. It is not easy for a man engaged in agriculture to adopt or enter into another profession. The choice of a profession depends upon the attitude of the individual. An expert agriculturist may be a poor businessman. He may sustain losses if he were to engage his attention in some industry or something else. It is very probable that a very expert and successful agriculturist may fail in these things. While I agree that if it may become necessary for us to acquire agricultural land. I want to stress the point and request that so far as possible agricultural land should be spared, for it produces food. In place of that, agricultural waste land may be taken and Government building may be constructed on such land. But in indispensable cases only when they consider acquisition of agricultural land absolutely essential, they should acquire it otherwise not. But, as is laid down in the Acquisition Act, they should not, try to get rid of the tenant by paying him a nominal compensation. This is not a good policy. Formerly, when the Government was not responsible to the House, such things did not surprise us. But conditions are different now and the Government of today is fully responsible to the House. I see no justification for Government to displace them as a refugee without providing them with alternate profession. There is enough of agricultural waste land in the country and if the

Government thinks it necessary to acquire any land which is or was under cultivation they may, instead of paying cash compensation to the tenant, develop the agricultural waste land or allot waste land to the cultivator and compensate him to that extent so that he may develop that land easily.

So, I only want to submit before the House and the hon. Minister that I have no objection if this legislation be made somewhat permanent and Government should pay proper attention towards the acquisition of agricultural waste land.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Monday, 2nd April, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Monday, the 2nd April 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### General Budget\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Our hon. Minister of Industry is one of the few gems of this country. But he has to face those persons who are called industrialists and who always make a show of their fortunes by drawing in motor cars and putting on white dresses. They want to make the maximum amount of profits but the hon. Minister in his turn has to pay heed to the betterment of our country. As the time is short so instead of delivering a long speech. I would like to ask the hon. Minister a few questions on behalf of the cotton-growing people. What has the hon. Minister to say to those who grow short staple cotton in our country? Here you make the people purchase their cotton at the rate of Rs. 600 per candy while the same cotton is sold at the rate of Rs. 1950 per candy in America. Governments also levy tax at the rate of

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 8, Pt. II, 2<sup>nd</sup> April, 1951, Page 5740-5741

Rs. 800 per candy. Then comes the dealer who makes a profit of Rs. 560 and it is he who does not take any pains to irrigate, plough or cultivate the land. There are other people who grow long staple or medium staple cotton. The hon. Minister makes the people purchase their cotton at the rate of Rs. 850 per candy while in Pakistan they would have been obliged to pay for the same quality of cotton at the rate of Rs. 1700 or Rs. 1800 per candy.

My friend Shri Goenka stated during the debate that the price of a pair of *dhoti* was Rs. 21. A pair of *dhoti* perhaps can be available at this price in Delhi or Madras, but you cannot think about the difficulties of those cotton growers who live in villages and who have to pay the price of Rs. 30 or 35 for purchasing a pair of *dhoties*.

I like to submit to the hon. Minister that all these *dhoties* available at present in the market are manufactured by those who work on power looms. As a sort of concession you give them their quota at the controlled rates. But there is no price control imposed on *dhoties* manufactured by them. Therefore I request that if you wish to impose control you must ask them also to sell their produce at the controlled rates. In addition to this I like to draw your attention to the point that on all Committees that are set up to deal the matters relating to industries representation is given only to the interests of the dealers and manufactures. My submission in this respect is that you should not give representation to the industrialists' interest only but should give representation to those also who grow raw cotton. On all such committees that you set up they should also be given representation.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 7th April, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 7th April 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### General Budget-list of Demands\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, the hon. Members whom you gave opportunity to speak, first of all offered you thanks. But I have to present a complaint, not because you gave me time to speak, for indeed I am thankful to you for that, but I feel complaining against you and the Chief Whip because when the discussion on the Railway Budget or the General in spite of my rising again and again. I was not given time any day to express my view. Sir, I am sorry to say, and I beg to be excused for this impertinence that the work of growing more food in the country has been entrusted to those who do not know even the ABC of the wheat and gram pants. And, Sir, you will excuse me, I have also to complain that you gave chance to such of our friends who

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 8, Pt. II, 7<sup>th</sup> April, 1951, Page 6278-6280

probably do not even know anything about agriculture while those with whom it has been an ancestral occupation and who are still engaged in agriculture and could have rendered some suitable suggestions with regard to agriculture, were not given time. I do not want to complain more than that.

I now only wish to say that I am not one of those hon. Members who believe that there is no-scarcity of food in the country, nor am I one of those who see the solution of the food problem in either control or decontrol. My belief is that the problem of food can only be solved by producing more food and not by imposing control or lifting it. Many friends are of the opinion that crop planning can solve the food problem. But they do not know what amount of water wheat requires and whether other things such as oilseeds require a large or small quantity of water. Nor do they know that wheat or any other thing will not grow on the land on which maize or other food crops have once been grown. But oilseeds can be grown because they enrich the soil and regret that those hon. Members are heard who by themselves have no knowledge of agriculture. The result of that would be that the policy which will be framed will be injurious rather than beneficial to the country. The problem of food can only be solved in the way suggested by my able friend Sardar Ranjit Singhji.

The failure in growing more food is often ascribed to certain calamities. But I want to tell to these of my friends that 17.1 per cent. of country's agriculture depends upon human efforts while the produce of the rest 82 per cent land depends upon the will God or upon nature as we may say. The hon. Minister and the Prime Minister have announced that they want to increase food production on war footing. But may I ask them with what face

they declare that they want to increase food production on war basis by sanctioning only 25 crores of rupees? I think that to put it on war footing they should have sanctioned Rs. 300/- crores. To those friends given for agricultural improvement went waste, I want to say they are wrong. According to the figures relating to the last year, one million wells are constructed in the country, the figures of deficit of the food-grains in the country will be reduced to zero. If one million wells cost Rs. 25 crores, six million would at the most require Rs. 150 crores. Together with that, cement, bricks and money should also be given to the cultivators. There is sufficient land in India where wells can be dug. I am sure we can fulfill our promise of meeting the food shortage if only we open our hearts and give money to the cultivators and ask them to increase the production. A large number of wells can be dug within a few months. I can assure those who have any doubts about this suggestion that no purpose is going to be served by any amount of legislation. That would merely be paper wastage. The real need is to acquire the co-operation of the cultivator. If you have to legislate there be a legislation which may provide that he who does not construct provided what he who does not pay one and a half times of the land revenue. Some punishment could also be provided or an order be issued that the cultivator who does not use the well for production purposes could be sent to jail or any other punishment can be provided.

My submission is that if you want to make good of the food deficit, more money should be given to cultivators. A cut should be effected in the amount that is being spent on imports and that money should be given to cultivators for constructing wells. I have to make another complaint to the hon. Minister. Everybody knows that the hon. Minister is one of the foremost

lawyers of the country. But I want to put a question to him as to what would happen to the client whose lawyer instead of defending him changes sides?

I wish the hon. Minister to give careful hearing to what I submit. He is an expert lawyer but I ask him what would happen to him client if instead of pleading for him he begins to plead for the other party. He has not supported the cause of the cultivator and his talents have been used for the benefit of the industrialists rather than for the cultivators. I request him to let cultivators have the benefit of his abilities. That would add glory to his good name.

I want to say one or two things more. Take cotton for instance. In no other country of the world is cotton as cheap as in India. If we take cotton from Pakistan, Egypt or America, it would be much dearer. Cotton that we purchase for Rs.600/- at home costs Rs.1960/- it would come had from America. This is not a small affair to be put aside. Then there is the question of cloth also. What justification have you to ask for all the food-grains from those who grow without giving them even a pair of *dhoties*?

I had a few more requests to make but I wish my hon. friend Sardar Bhupinder Singh, who is a cultivator like me and whose friends and relations are even today engaged in agriculture may also get time to speak. Hence I close.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 11 April, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Wednesday, the 11 April 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Finance Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, I am much thankful to you for although my name was on the list, I have been called at least for the last five minutes.

After that, I must be thankful to the hon. Minister because of his making endeavours in a direction in which if he gets success, our country would become economically independent. So far our country has achieved independence from the foreign rule only. In my opinion this time he has not imposed these new taxes because of the fact that he feared some deficit in the general expenditure side of the budget, but because he wants that the country should make progress and be free from the economic slavery of other

---

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 8, Pt. II, 11<sup>th</sup> April, 1951, Page 6654-6655

countries. For this, I cannot help without thanking him. But at the same time I have some grievances to put before him and I cannot help without giving an expression to them. I want to draw his attention to those difficulties also which might face him, if he, by the grace of God, were to become the Minister of Finance in the next Parliament also. This discrimination that is being done these days in imposing these taxes cannot last for long. The hon. Minister of Law is not present here; and through you Sir, I want to convey my impressions to him. He took a great deal of pains in getting the Land Alienation Act, 1900 declared illegal and against the spirit of the Constitution. This has proved highly beneficial to the lacs of the tenants of Punjab. But I want to ask whether he would take any pains for getting those discriminations removed which are now being made in imposing taxes. I think he would not act very promptly in this regard, because the small tenants, who come under the purview of Land Revenue Act cannot go to the Supreme Court for redress and cannot force the Court to declare this Act discriminating. Therefore, I particularly want to draw his attention to this fact. You know that according to the Income Tax Act, incomes of less than Rs.5000/- per annum are exempted from the payment of income tax, but a tenant may be running at a loss has to pay the Land Revenue even if he cultivates even one *bigha* of land. I want to ask, is it not discrimination? Perhaps, some of my hon. friends would say that the matter of the Land Revenue comes under the jurisdiction of the State Legislatures and they are not responsible for that. But my submission is that it is not so. There are about ten States in India, which are called Centrally Administered Areas for whom this House is responsible so far as Land Tax is concerned.

Take for instance the case of Delhi Province. The system of Land Revenue in Delhi is not like the income tax system of other places.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 14th April, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 14th April 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Finance Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, when the Parliament was considering this motion on the 11<sup>th</sup> instant I was expressing my humble views with respect to the increasing discrimination observed in the taxation policy. I am glad that the leader of the country who is the hon. leader of the house also is present here at this moment and this I shall be able to submit my views before them. As you know, Sir we had decided to establish a *Panchayat Raj* in India. As such we shall have to think over and see whether the taxation policy we have been pursuing so far is appropriate or needs some change. So far as direct taxes are concerned there are two main taxes: one, the land revenue and the other the income-tax. It is required for the imposition of the income-tax that the tax-payer

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 8, Pt. II, 14<sup>th</sup> April, 1951, Page 6742-6744

should have a minimum income of Rs. 5000/- per annum. But with regard to the land revenue there is no such requisite and no account is taken of profit or loss. The cultivator has to pay revenue even if he sows only a *bigha* of land. Therefore, last time also I had appealed to the hon. Minister to take into consideration the fact that the new House to come will be faced with a number of problems of which taxation policy will also be a big problem and a great deal of wrangling will take place over it. I think no change could be effected now, but during the coming year, I fully hope the Government will frame their taxation policy for the Centrally Administered Areas after taking into consideration the points that I have put forth.

12:00 Noon

Sir, I have also to say something about the policy dealing with inflation and deflation. I fail to understand the anomaly that if a mill-worker or an agricultural labourer demands his wages, for which of course he is fully entitled, it is not supposed to accentuate inflation in the country, while if the one who gets his income and earns his livelihood by the sweat of his brow and who toils in the field in biting cold and scorching heat of winter and summer, demands his due for his investment and his labour, the educated class of the country thinks it as a step towards inflation. I think this policy and such ideas prevail due to the influence wielded by the educated classes in the country, whether it be in regard to the question of the public opinion or in respect of another Government. Whatever they think right is taken as right, whether it is right or not for the country nobody cares. I think the best policy is that which ensures proper wages to the 80 per cent population of the country. This cannot be in any way inflationary or harmful for the country. Moreover, Sir, the price policy followed with respect to



country's production is also understandable. The policy which is formed for an agricultural produce, associated with industrialists, is quite different. I mean sugar. On one side, sugar is decontrolled and the extra quantity of sugar produced is permitted to be sold at any price in the country without taking into account the margin of profit. On the other hand, *gur* which is produced by hundreds of thousands of peasants by their own labour is controlled although that has no effect upon rationing and the Government do not even know whether it would reach the ultimate consumer at the proper price or not. Even under these circumstances, the cultivator is compelled to sell his *gur* at the controlled rate. The same condition as of *gur* obtains with respect to rubber and cotton. It is expected of the country's cultivators to make good the shortage of cotton and at the same time the cotton produced in India is sold at the cheapest rates.

Similarly, when the hon. Minister Shri Tyagi used to sit on this side of the House, he had raised a question in connection with the big canals that are being constructed in the country and had carried on a half an hour discussion on that issue. I do not know whether his views have changed or not with regard to that matter after acquiring Minister-ship, I would say the former Government, which was an autocrat rule and which was not responsible to the people, could not dare to impose such a tax. But when our popular leaders think in these terms, I cannot but express my grief over it.

I want to say a few things about rationing. Some people think that we cannot bear the responsibility of introducing rationing in the villages and it is impossible. My submission to the House is that the lowest income-group of the people in the country consists of the Harijans and the agricultural labourers. Those who have to purchase food grains, there are workers in the cities who got better

wages and earn some extra allowance etc. They get everything. They are given food-grains at controlled rates. Contrary to this, nothing is contemplated for Harijans or labourers, in the villages whose buying capacity is the lowest. I have only to say that if you want to retain controls in the country, the controlled articles must first of all be made available to those whose buying capacity is the lowest and such people are the agricultural labourers and the village *Hrijans*.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member has exceeded his time.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Two minutes more, Sir. I shall finish my submission within two minutes.

**Mr. Speaker:** He has already taken four minutes more. The other day he had spoken for four minutes. Now, he has spoken on the whole for more than 15 minutes.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 17 April, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 17 April 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Minimum Wages (Amendment) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, while supporting the Bill I am compelled to submit that the hon. Minister by not fixing the time-limit has not rendered a good service either to the labourers or to the country. I may say this much also that he has tried to usurp some of the rights of the Parliament because had there been some time-limit of say one or two years and had the Parliament thought it worthwhile to increase the same then it would have found an opportunity to discuss the same. While I think the fixing of the time-limit to be essential, I cannot do any injustice to those State Governments who recognize the importance of this question. Nobody can deny the fact that the most destitute class in this country is that of agricultural labourers and village labourers. But

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. I, Pt. II, 17<sup>th</sup> April, 1951, Page 6947-6950*

nobody can deny this fact also, as my able friend Shri Rathnaswamy has stated, that this problem cannot be solved, even if it be supposed for one minute that the pay level of the higher officers be brought down to Rs. 100 at once even then I think it is not possible to solve this problem. I do not think that this problem can be solved so easily. This is a great problem and cannot be solved until the production in the country is increased. I am not unaware of the fact as to why the State Governments have not been able to solve this problem so far. It hinges upon a very difficult problem and it is that the few rich persons own large industries and have large incomes but so far as the question of land owners is concerned, very few of them are as poor as the agricultural labourer. It is just possible that there may be some rich Zamindars among them but after the abolition of Zamindari they are not going to remain as such. There after remains the question of petty and poor land holders and the agricultural labourers. I submit that it is essential that justice should be done to the agricultural labourer. It is not only right but imperative as well. He must be helped. For this reason the other day when some other question was before the House, I had submitted that if the system of rationing was to be extended it should be enforced on agricultural labourer because his lot is the poorest of all and he has no means to purchase commodities in the open market. One of my hon. friends has stated that their number is 7 crores while another friend gave their number as 15 crores. I submit, that the number of those people whom they have to deal with also are to 15 crores. Therefore, while you have to consider for the welfare of these seven or 15 crores of people you cannot at the same time forget the other 15 crores. This is certainly a complicated problem. If you were to fix at the

same time whether the production in land, which is produced with the help of agricultural labourer, gives to the landholders a suitable income, than you will have to fix the prices of the various commodities accordingly. You cannot think otherwise and in no case cotton cannot be sold at such rates as are lowest in the whole world as you find it being sold in our country today. Then you will not be able to get cheap raw materials for your industries, as for instance, you take sugarcane today at very cheap rates for your sugar factories. The people who are called land holders have neither any voice nor are they in any way opposed to the fixing of their wages. I myself hold a little land. As far as I am concerned, I hold that it would be an wise act on the part of the Government that, what to say of one year, they should fix the minimum wages of the agricultural labourers, even before the coming elections. Whether the Government would be able to fulfill their commitments or not would be seen afterwards. It is likely to cause a lot of difference in the fate of the elections. I can give you the names of so many legislations which, though they have been passed by the Parliament, have not been implemented even till today. Even if, we may not achieve success in implementing this legislation then at least we would certainly succeed in showing a way to the country. It is also just possible that our attempts may bear fruit and we may succeed after a year or two. If the wages of the agricultural labourers are fixed, no Government could refuse to fix the prices of the agricultural products so that the tenants may also get some part of the profits. Where the workers will have a hand in formulating the policy of the country side by side with them the agricultural labourer and those who own hardly two, three or five acres of land will

certainly have a hand in deciding the future policy of the country. I believe that the position of the agricultural labourer is worse than those who own two, three or five acres of the land, and these land holders are comparatively in a better position than the agricultural labourers. As my able friend Shri Rathnaswamy has stated, there is a vast difference between the standards of living of the people of this country. You can yourself have an idea regarding the difference of standard of living of a poor tenant living in the villages and that of an officer working in the Secretariat and drawing a salary of say Rs. 4000 per mensem. For this reason too, I wish that the wages should soon be fixed. While you fix the wages of the agricultural labourers, you at the same time must take into consideration the fact that prices of the agricultural produce should be so fixed as may be beneficial to them.

Now, without taking much time of the House I very humbly submit that the hon. Minister fixes the time-limit till the year 1952 and if possible, as Dr. Ram Subhag Singh has submitted, the time-limit should preferably be fixed before the elections take place.

**Shri Gadgil:** Then the Zamindars would not give votes to us.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Who is there to listen to the poor peasants? But anyhow, the Government should consider the case of those people also who themselves work hard in the fields and take very little help from agricultural labour because at the time of harvest they cannot harvest the crops all by themselves. Hence the Government should see that those who sow the seeds, guard and protect the fields and work day and night also get their full remunerations.

**Mr. Chairman:** Is the hon. Member supporting the Bill or Opposing the Bill?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I am supporting the Bill with some amendments in my mind.

**Shri Meeran** (Madras): To be more appropriate-with mental reservations.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Sir, I would like to tell my hon. friend that there is no reservation in my mind as remarked by him. I like to tell him that I am so keenly desirous of this as he may perhaps be. I wish that instead of two years or one year the time-limit of only four months should be fixed. I also like to state that it is not very difficult to do so. It will hardly take one month's time to have a complete idea about each of the villages in each of the States. There is no worth mentioning difference between the conditions obtaining in different villages. It is not difficult for the Government, if they so desire, to have an idea of the conditions obtaining in villages. However, as my hon. friend suggests, I have no mental reservation. I support this Bill and request the hon. Minister to accept the time-limit of if not 1953 then of 1952 and if he is out to please us he may accept the suggestion and preferably fix some date in 1951.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 19th April, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Thursday, the 19th April 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the people (Amendment) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, I must thank hon. Dr. Ambedkar for providing representation for the backward classes of Delhi and other areas. But I wish to submit all the same that the problem presented by Delhi is a peculiar one. Delhi has four seats out of which hardly one falls to the lot of the rural areas. If the rural seat is also joined on to an urban seat and bracketed with it, the other seat being a reserved one, this would mean giving away the seat of one backward class to another. I think that as against the clever people of Delhi, and the officers and big people living

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 8, Pt. II, 19th April, 1951, Page 7117*

in New Delhi the rural people of Delhi should be included either among the scheduled castes or, if the hon. Minister would not have them as such on the ground that they are not Harijans, they might be included among the scheduled tribes. The hon. Minister should thus have tried to get them a seat. Since I know that this is extremely difficult I would make another suggestion. There is a general principle that as far as possible, the seats for those areas which have a larger percentage of the scheduled castes should be doubled. There are also some other considerations attached. I know that in the case of not one but several States occasions have arisen when the committees have not followed these rules. I do not mean to say that they have not followed them at all. Exceptions are always there and it would be right, to a great extent, to treat this as an exceptional case. The reason for this is that there is a considerable difference between the people living in the rural and the urban areas of Delhi. Besides, if people belonging to the scheduled castes are given representation from the rural areas they will have to experience a lot of difficulty. If any two seats out of the seats for Delhi city are doubled this would help those poor folks, whom we all are interested to secure true and proper representation. If however, their seat is joined on to the rural seat this would not serve as a reward to them but rather as a punishment. Hence, I would appeal to the hon. Minister to give a direction to the Election Commission that in the matter of the doubling of seats they might combine any two out of the three seats for Delhi city and turn them into double seats but that the seat for the rural areas should be left single so that if could be possible to do justice to a backward class of people who are as much entitled to sympathy as the scheduled castes.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Friday, 27th April, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Friday, the 27th April 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Reserve Bank of India (Amendment) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, the hon. Minister replying to my amendment has stated that perhaps I have tried to divert him to some other point i.e., towards Medium Credit, I want to assure him that I had no such intention either at that time or at this time to divert him towards the medium or long term credit. I knew that the present Bill was meant only for short term. He, during his statement, also said that I made a mention of the wells. I would like to know if a man out of the amount of money advanced to him on short term credit gets a well sunk say within a year or six months, then how that credit became a medium term or the long term credit? I cannot follow it. He raised this objection and tried to make us understand

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 11, Pt. II, 27<sup>th</sup> April, 1951, Page 7657-7658*

that the time limit of 15 months mentioned in the Bill became a time limit of 21 months. I want to submit that not to say of the sinking of the wells, if you in accordance with the needs of the country, were to reclaim the barren land, you would find that it becomes necessary to extend the time limit of 15 months to that of 18 months. Because the first two crops grown on that land are generally equal to almost nothing and it takes nearly 24 months for the third crop to reach the market and get sold. Had he accepted my amendment, the credit would have been, as he stated, for a period of 24 months instead of 21 months. I cannot see how it would have become a medium term or long term credit. Therefore, not taking much time of the House, I wanted only this much to submit that if anybody out of the short term credit advances gets a well sunk out of that amount, the credit can in no way become a medium term or a long term credit for this reason only.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 28th April, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 28th April 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **State Financial Corporation Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): I welcome this Bill; I believe there is a great necessity of establishing the Corporation as provided in the Bill. This is so because Hydro-electric Schemes are now being established in various parts of our country and in a few years small-scale industries will assume greater importance than the large scales industries in our country, because in every village of India big or small, we will have electricity and then it will be possible to run small scale industries there. Money will be required to finance them. As the hon. minister has said that the Industrial finance corporation might not serve that purpose, in addition to this. I personally believe that the Corporation being dominated by

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 11, Pt. II, 28<sup>th</sup> April, 1951, Page 7707-7709*

big industrialists, probably they would not like any progress being made by the small-scale industries. So they cannot make much headway unless this corporation is established. It is therefore I welcome this Bill. But at the same time I have to make a complaint to the hon. Minister. It is that just as some people in this country treat Harijans as untouchables, similarly, in the economic sphere of India, agriculturists and all those who cultivate the soil are treated as untouchables. The Parliament passed the Industrial Finance Corporation Bill and now we are passing the State Finance Corporation Bill for the small scale industries. In addition to this they also formed a Rehabilitation Finance Corporation. But I regret to say that no efforts have been made to establish an Agricultural Finance Corporation or some such other institution for the benefit of those who are the very masters of this country and who should have a far more important place in the country. I for one feel and have given vent to this complaint several times in the House that there is an urgent need for such a step. It is said that money is flowing from the hands of the middle classes to those of the agriculturists. Although, I do not agree with those who are of that opinion, but even then I would say that after accepting this thing, if you wish that money should come to you from them, then you should have made a stronger and more touching appeal to them. That appeal could have been nothing but the establishment of an Agricultural Finance Corporation and you should have told them that in order to solve the difficulties that are facing the Government in the construction of large dams and in the implementation of other plans, such as reclaiming and utilizing huge plots of land and other smaller irrigation schemes etc, you are forming a Finance Corporation, I am confident that large amounts of money could be availed from them as loans. For instance, take the case of

Bhakra Dam in Punjab. If you had appealed to the agriculturists in Punjab and told them clearly that if they would subscribe money for that purpose, the whole amount would be utilized in the construction of Bhakra Dam, I am sure, the people of Punjab would never have lagged behind those of any other place in India. On the other hand, I feel that all these crores of rupees that are being spent by the Centre, could have been made available in Punjab alone. But this can be possible only when you make a very touching and sincere appeal to them. Just as you appeal to them by establishing Industrial Finance Corporation for the industries and by forming an Agriculture finance corporation you appeal to the agriculturist, I think all these difficulties will be solved. I hope you will bring a Bill to provide for the establishment of an Agricultural Finance Corporation, before the second House comes into existence.

Now, I also want to make a few suggestions with regard to the provisions of this Bill. Co-operative Bodies have been included in the scope of this Bill. I want that all kinds of Co-operative Societies, big and small, should be able to purchase shares. The hon. Minister should make it clear that the small villages can also join it and obtain finances there from. Not only this, these should be given a fair representation in the Board of Directors and a reasonable quota be fixed for them as has been done in the case of the various other representing bodies. These co-operative societies financing small-scale and cottage industries of our villages should be given all possible assistance. The biggest political party of the country viz., the Congress party which is ruling this country at present has passed a resolution declaring that our aim is a build the country on the basis of a co-operative society and on co-

operative economy. So it is necessary that, if there is not a majority for them, there should at least two mekers . . . , who should be elected by the co-operative societies financing it. They should increase the quota of Directors if there is such a need for the purpose. In this way they will be really able to solve the problem.

I have to submit a few things more. They have laid down the minimum limit as fifty lakhs and the maximum as two crore rupees. Our country, as it is, has all sorts of States-big and small-in it. There are perhaps 27 states in the country ranging from small states like Manipur, Himachal Pradesh and Delhi to as large States as Uttar Pradesh, Madras, Bihar and Bengal.

**Shri A.C.Guha (West Bengal):** Bengal is a small State.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** It is quite big in respect of population.

**A Hon. Member:** And in respect of importance?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** In regard to importance also, it is quite a big State for the Centre. So, I was saying that there are States of all sizes, big and small, in this country. What I fear is that this limit of fifty lakhs may not prove to be only a dream for the small States like Manipur or Delhi or Ajmer. I therefore want this limit to be made flexible. At the same time, for states like Uttar Pradesh-Punjab may also is made to the people, and as I have said earlier, if an appeal is made to establish an Agricultural Finance Corporation, this limit of two crores may prove to be very small. In my opinion if you make a provision that this money would also be utilized in financing agricultural operations, I think Punjab would

also join and a sum of more than two crore rupees can be easily made available from the villages of that State. Therefore, I think the limit of two crores is not proper because this is a very small figure for States like Uttar Pradesh where there are as many as fifty two or fifty three districts, some of them being as large as double and treble the States of Ajmer and Manipur. So I would like them to make higher maximums or make them flexible if they are at all to be laid down in the statutes.

Another point is that the Bill also provides for the formation of Advisory Boards. Regarding the Advisory Boards, I have only to submit that the State Government and the States will have an upper hand in all the State Finance Corporations. Now, according to the bill which we have passed, the representations or members of the States would be elected by the people and accordingly the members of this House through general election. He would be responsible to the people as the members of the States. The members of Parliament of their respective constituencies would be treated like other members. Therefore, when the Advisory Committee is constituted, the members of Parliament of that particular constituency may be kept in mind. And if possible, two or three members of that particular region may be made members of the Advisory Committee/Council.



## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 15th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 15th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, although the hon. Minister has shown no inclination to accept this amendment, yet I think and believe in the heart of my hearts that this amendment should be accepted. I think that the hon. friends who have tried to show difficulties in the way of its acceptance are probably under a misapprehension. All the hon. Members including the hon. Minister himself who spoke before the House agreed with the objects of the amendment. But objections were raised about the method of their achievement. I do not think there should be any objection as such for if we would begin to suspect Government officers i.e. those conducting the work of elections, how could the election be

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12, Pt. II, 15<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 8761-8763

carried on? No election can take place without placing reliance upon them. In a way we are obliged to rely upon them whether they are trustworthy or not. Indeed. I think there is no such big stake involved as to create the question of our placing reliance upon them or not as a message of the President. I do not understand what mischief, and to what extent, can an officer do in this matter to please some particular person. Hence I think there is nothing objectionable in it.

In regard to what has been said about involving the President into elections, I do not find in it anything of the sort. The President does in no way enter into elections and whatever message he is going to issue will be a message that has been embodied in the Constitution. Then, some objection has been raised on the use of the word "proper". I want to ask whether a man going to stand for election will ever say that he is not a proper man. Anybody who is to contest an election would only say that he is the best man, most fit and worthy to contest an election and therefore votes should be given to him in the interest of the country. I also, therefore do not understand where an objection comes for the use of the word "proper".

The hon. Minister as well as some other friends have expressed the opinion that it would probably be impracticable to implement it. I do not think so; for after all we have to create some machinery from somewhere for conducting elections in the country. What objection then could there be to carry the message?

Some friends are of the opinion that the message could also be circulated through the radio and the press. But the difficulty there is that the radio and newspapers do not reach everybody. Besides, there is another great difficulty that the language in which

these message are to be circulated is not the language of all the people. It is the language of an educated few. If it is circulated in English, it could only be carried to probably 15 per cent. people. If it is done in Hindi, then, in the context of the Hindi that is current today, it will probably reach 30 per cent. Although we come from Hindi speaking area, yet large number of villagers there do not understand that type of Hindi. Hence, I think that to carry the message, it is necessary to circulate it in every language of the Secretariat of that area. I submit, therefore that the hon. Minister should again consider this matter. I do not consider the objections voiced by the hon. members to be very substantial. Nor is there anything which might bring a slur on the President.

So far as the question of raising objection against this is concerned. I am reminded of an anecdote. This always happens. The anecdote is that once a man and his son were going somewhere with their horse. The father was on the horseback while the son walked along on foot. As they went ahead they come across some people, who remarked as to how stupid that old man was who he rode the horse while the poor son went on foot. So the father thought it was a blunder and made the son ride on the horse while himself began walking. As they covered some distance some other persons happened to meet them. They chided the young son for riding the horse while the old man marched on foot. So they thought they had made a mistake again and that it was improper for either of them to go on foot. They thought people whom they came

across after covering some distance began to chide them for this even.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members have read this story in their school days.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I would hardly take one minute more. So both of them got down and went on foot when people again remarked as to what sort of men were they to go on foot while they had a horse to ride upon. Therefore, so far the question of goodness or badness of a thing goes, howsoever aloof you may keep the President and the officials, the elements who have to throw mud upon them will invariably do so in every case. Abandoning of our duty for the fear of vilification does not appeal to me.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 15th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 15th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, At the outset, I am not in favour of the amendment moved by Sardar Hukam Singh. Further, when Prof. Ranga was speaking he had expressed the view that the provincial officers should not be appointed returning officers. The spirit underlying the amendment referred to above and Prof. Ranga's view is based on the misgivings that the provincial officers, out of fear or a desire to placate the Ministers, may not conduct this task properly. I can suggest a compromising formula to overcome this difficulty. The government officers may be appointed to act as the returning officers, but all that needs be done is that instead of selecting them from the civil side they should be taken from the

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12, Pt. II, 15<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 8768-8769*

Military. There shall be more chances for a fair conduct of the elections if the military officers are appointed returning officers. It is so because they are taught to observe discipline and keep within rules and regulations strictly. They are thus, much accustomed to observe discipline and are always very hesitant to violate any rules or regulations. You may appoint the presiding officer from either side viz., from Civil or Military, but the returning officers must necessarily belong to the Military.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava :** Sepoys may be appointed as polling officers and the presiding officers?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Not the sepoy, you have a sufficient number of Indian commissioned officers of the rank of a Major, Lt. Colonel and Colonel who may be appointed to act as returning officers.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** They will surely come and intervene when the rival candidates begin fighting.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** For that purpose, other military officers can also be requisitioned. But as far as the duties of a returning Officer are concerned, in a my opinion, the military officers can discharge them in a more honest and more efficient manner. At the same time no political party will suspect their motives. I conclude.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 15th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 15th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the underlying idea of my amendment was that during the elections held in 1937 a candidate from our constituency after conspiring with the officials got such a polling station where polling was held on two days. One day the polling was held for the area in which the polling station for the area in which the polling station was fixed and the next day it was held for another area of which there was no voter in that village. It is beneficial from the point of view of the officials as well as of the candidate to know that he will be opposed from a certain village, he will get the polling station fixed, say at a distance of five or three miles from that village so that

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. I, Pt. II, 15<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 8798-8800*

none of the voters may turn up there to cast votes. Thus, he will not have to face the opposition and at the same time his rivals will be deprived of their expected votes. Therefore, my amendment only means that no polling stations should be fixed for the benefit of any individual candidate but they should be fixed at a place where more facilities are available to the voters. Polling stations should be fixed at places where the voters are in a large number. Suppose, there are 900 votes to be cast in a certain area and there is a village in that area where there are 500 voters, then it will be beneficial both from the point of view of the candidates and the voters as well that the polling station should be fixed in that village. The polling stations should be fixed in those villages where the number of voters be maximum and the voters from the small villages should be asked to come and cast their votes at the polling stations fixed in the big villages. I agree with Shri Menon that the system of casting votes through Post Offices cannot be successful. The postal Department, as it is constituted at present, is already overburdened with too much work and the postmen are not able to cope with the day to day work they have to do. They tear many letters and never deliver. Under such circumstances it will not be possible to deliver letters at the appointed time as there are many persons of the same name and a same parentage. Villagers are not much conscious about their numbers in the lists. It will be difficult to deliver them to the correct addresses. Therefore, the suggestion of Shri Kapoor of sending postcards is not proper.

**Shri J.R. Kapoor:** I had never mentioned postcard. I had simply said that they should sent it. I had not said that it should be sent by

post. I do not know how the hon. friend has come to understand that I had said that it should be sent by post. The most simple method should be adopted. One method can be that they may the *chaukidar*, and in the cities they could be sent in this manner as well or they might be sent by post. I have no such experience that the postmen would tear off the letters in the cities. But it is just possible that such things might be happening in the Punjab Province because big things occur there and specially the district, from which my hon. friend hails, is reputed to be the home of new and strange things.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Sir, perhaps my hon. friend is not aware of the limits of the *patwari* in making mischief's and if we utilize his services for sending them, we will commit a great blunder because it is possible that the postman may not make such a mischief. But as many of the hon. Members are aware that colossal mischief the *patwari* makes in the mutation papers. He can create such conditions that without the knowledge of the other party, he can show a certain person to have died, or living though the evidence may be against him. Therefore, sending them through the *patwari* is also not a good suggestion. I cannot help opposing it too.

As far as this dispatch business is concerned, it should be left entirely to the discretion of the candidates themselves. This could be easily done by every candidate. If a candidate is not capable of doing even so much, he is not fit to stand as a candidate.

Now, as far as the lists are concerned, it is correct that the *Harijans* in our society are economically very poor. But there is also a limit of giving concessions even. I do not understand as to

why they should be given any concessions in the lists as well. Why should they have a concession in regard to surety as well? It is no good to make differentiation in every respect. This discrimination constitutes the violation of our constitution. If you are bent on showing discrimination, at least keep it restricted and provide every candidate with one or two copies of it. Just as my worthy friend Dr. Deshmukh has said that extra copies should be provide to candidates at reasonable prices. This will be a better course.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Friday, 18th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Friday, the 18th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **The Constitution (First Amendment) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** : I am not a lawyer, but from whatever I have heard I can say that the point under discussion in a nutshell is the issue of the exploiters versus the exploited or in other words it is an issue of confidence or no confidence of the people in the persons who will be returned as Members in the coming elections. In yet another way, it is an issue concerning the progressive sections of the society and the backward classes. Some hon. friends have characterized it even as a political question. I disagree with them; I am of the view that it is more of an economic issue than a political one. I will like to explain what I have said just now. Several hon.

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. I, Pt. II, 18<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 9053-9056

friends have suggested that eliciting public opinion on this point. I will like to know what their meaning of the word opinion is. If they mean thereby the opinion of the masses at large, then it was made known at the time they had cast their votes in favour of the Congress. The Congress had contested the elections on two main issues; one was the issue of independence while the other was a clear assurance to put an end to all exploitation of the intermediaries existing between the Government and the tiller of the land. These were the issues which had won for the Congress a popular vote. If despite that they want to know the public opinion, then I simply fail to appreciate the logic of their argument.

The other issue concerns the granting of concessions to the backward classes. In this country the backward classes constitute from 80 to 85 per cent of the total population. The public opinion, should you desire to know it, is very clear on this point. If, however, you mean to elicit the opinion from a very small minority, while the exploited constitute a large majority in this country. So far as an accurate viewpoint is concerned, it has been placed before the House by our respected leader hon. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and as far as the opinion of the exploiting section is concerned, every hon. Member of the House is quite aware of that.

The other issue is that of the liberty of speech and writing. I hold that this sort of liberty is only a 'qualified term' and cannot be an 'absolute term'. Freedom or liberty of the exploiters means bondage and slavery for the exploited. Those who plead for the liberty of speech and writing today, in fact, want full liberty for the exploiters. So on this issue too, the views of exploiters and the exploited are quite manifest.

Another point has been raised. The hon. Dr. Ambedkar is a constitutionalist of renown. He has stated this point in a different

form. To him it is an issue that concerns our relations with foreign countries. Just look at the History of England. They may have had differences on the domestic issues, but as far their relations with other nations are concerned, throughout they have been a compact block, irrespective of the consideration whether they belonged to the Labour Party or owed allegiance to the Conservative Party. Ours is, on the other hand, only country in the world which thought having a panchayati (democratic) set up, yet has differenc of opinion on matters relating to foreign countries, whatever party may be running the Government, they are all combined so far as foreign issues are concerned. I, therefore, feel that our approach to this major issue is to some extent not a correct one.

I have one complaint against Pandit Thakur Das. He is a lawyer of professed ability and renown of our area. As stated by our respected leader hon. Shri Nehru and some other hon. Members, this Constitution has become a paradise for the lawyers. Even now he (Pandit Bhargava) is making efforts to create a paradise for the lawyers by making some small verbal changes here or there. He wants that the words “reasonable” and “apporopriate” should be added before the word ‘restriction’. He is of the view that if these words are not added, the old Sediton Acts will be revived. On both the occasions when he and hon. Dr. Ambedkar were speaking, I had intervned to say that such rules and regulations should not be made a subject for the law courts. I am therefore, afraid that too much, legal tussle will follow if these words ‘reasonable’ and ‘appropriate’ are to be added. What is the justification for such fears? Just consider the reasons which have impelled us to feel the necessity of making certain modifications in the Constitution. It is because of the different interpretations which the judges have given of some articles of the Constitution-interpretations which are contrary to the intentions of the

Constituent Assembly. A similar controversy will follow if the words ‘reasonable’ and ‘appropriate’ are actually added. Apparently, they are very ordinary words and some hon. Members have characterized them even as quite harmless. I, however, do not regard them as ordinary and harmless. Just probe deep into their implications. By including these words, he is seeking to bring the courts in the picture through the judges and the Supreme Court up on the will of the people as expressed through their representatives in this House. I, therefore, request every hon. Member in the House to give a close scrutiny to this issue as has been done by Prof. Ranga. Although, he has expressed his desire to severe connection with the Congress and he may actually do so in the near future and as such, in a way today he may be regarded as a member of the Opposition Party, yet the fact remains that he belongs to the exploited sections of the society and their well-being is his primary concern. That is why, despite cutting connections with the Congress Party, he has agreed with it in this matter.

My hon. friend Shri Sarangdhar Das has stated that he is neither against nor in favour of this amendment. He has suggested a middle course. He has delivered, as described by our respected leader, a speech worthy of the occasion of a debate on Budget proposals. But ,I am sure that if asked to express his honest opinion, he too will not be able to oppose it nor can those who hold the well-being of people above all things-of people who are the target of exploitation at present.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 19th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 19th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): So far as this amendment is concerned I am partly hesitant and partly apprehensive in supporting it, because it is possible that a certain person may bring the School Leaving Certificate and the age recorded in the Certificate and that in the electoral roll may differ. Maybe that in the Certificate the age is 25 years and in the electoral roll it may differ. Maybe, that in the Certificate the age be 25 years and in the electoral roll 36 or 39 years. Under these circumstances, the question may arise as to whether his nomination paper should be rejected. To my mind, the better course would have been that the amendment made in a different way and no provision of 25 years as such may have been placed therein. To me, it appears to be quite retardant. Had

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12, Pt. II, 19th May 1951, Page 9127*

the amendment been brought forward without these words, it would have been better. If these words are inserted, a question is likely to arise as to whether the nomination paper of one, whose age is recorded below 25 years should be rejected. This is correct, but when an individual contests an election, he is more interested to be elected than to prove himself to be a youth or a minor. I therefore, want the hon. Minister to see that whatever amendment he is going to accept, he should clear this difficulty arising out of the differences in age. This will enable the age of a person to be corrected in the case of having been wrongly recorded. These words, therefore, should be deleted.



## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 19th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 19th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, I have a doubt regarding it and I want to get it clarified. There is a provision in it:

“Provided also that where any person having held any office referred to in clause (f) of sub-section (1) of section 7 has been dismissed and the period of five years....”

I think the soldiers and officers of the Azad Hind Fauj are not affected by it, I want to know this thing: Whether this provision debars them as well? And if this provision debars them then there should be some provision so that they may also acquire the right of participating in the election.

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12, Pt. II, 19<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 9130*

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 19th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 19th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, I feel some hesitation in supporting the Amendment. My objection is that discrimination has been made in regard to depositing of security. In the case of Parliament, it is Rs. 500, while for the State Assembly it is Rs. 250 only. Even the amendment introduced by Shri Das in this connection has maintained the discrimination by fixing the amount to Rs. 250 and Rs. 125. I am unable to understand as to why this discrimination has been made in regard to depositing of security. It might have been in the mind of the hon. Minister or whoever has drafted this clause that as huge amount has to be spent in connection with the election to the Parliament, hence the security should also be

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12, Pt. II, 19<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 9140*

more. Or, he might have thought that as there is difference between the all allowances given to the Members of Parliament and those of the State Assemblies, hence there should be discrimination in regard to security as well. But I do not find myself in a position to support it either of the circumstances. The reason is that the expenses will not be simply double. I think, if you take the expenses into consideration, then the difference in security should have been seven or eight times. In addition, to this, there is one thing more as far as expenses are concerned that the scheduled caste candidate will require double the number of ballot-boxes and thus double the expenses will have to be incurred and in comparison to this, he shall have to deposit only half the amount of security. I fail to understand as to whether this discrimination has been made on the basis of expenses alone. Therefore, I would like that the hon. Minister should himself put forward some suggestion for removing this discrimination, because our Constitution does not allow any discrimination and it is rather not to have any discrimination is any matter.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 19th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 19th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): I rise to support the amendment moved by Dr. Deshmukh. Sir, you are aware that we have provided several safeguards or reservations in the constitution for the benefit of backward classes whom, we otherwise call as 'Scheduled Castes' or 'Scheduled Tribes'. We have reserved seats for them both in the Parliament and State Assemblies. We have, however, done nothing for the other unspecified backward classes who are politically; economically or educationally no more advanced than these Scheduled Castes or Tribes. These people are as backward as the scheduled castes or scheduled tribes, except that they are not being recognized as untouchables, though

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12, Pt. II, 19th May 1951, Page 9144*

the political and economic deal they are receiving is no better than the one given to the untouchable. I will, therefore, put it to the hon. Minister that this issue of security or deposit is not a major issue. A small concession on this issue will not count much. It will, on the other hand, give a convincing proof of your mental outlook which will have a friend in this House or there are some who have regard for the progress in the right direction. I, therefore, support the hon. Doctor's amendment.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 19th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 19th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): I beg to move :

In part (a) of the Proviso to sub clause (1) of clause 32, add the words "if he stands for recovered seat only at the end.

Sir, if you will read the sub-section (2) of clause 62, you will appreciate the spirit behind it and realize the need of this amendment. Clause 62(2) says:

"if an elector gives more than one vote to any one candidate in contravention of the provisions of sub-section (1), then, at the time of counting of votes given by him to such candidate shall be taken into account and all the other votes given by him to such candidate shall be rejected as void."

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12, Pt. II, 19<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 9152-9154

In elucidation of it I would submit to you to take the example of a constituency having one general seat and one reserved seat. Now assume that for the reserved seat.....

**The Minister of State for Transport and Railways (Shri Santhanam):** I think this amendment is out of order. Nobody can stand only for a reserved seat. He will be entitled to stand for a seat in a constituency where a seat is reserved for Scheduled Castes.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** That is a matter for the Chair to decide. If my amendment is not accepted, we would be administering another poison into the society through election. If you will only consider carefully as to what shape election would really assume where there are reserved seats, you will find that no non-Harijans, would like to vote for a Harijan candidate because he can be returned from both the seats. Indeed I have no objection in that. If it is intended to send only the Harijans in Parliament of India or in States Assemblies, they may be sent there, I have no objection. But, I object where people enter there by impregnating the society with the poison of rivalry. If my amendment is not accepted, the result will be that a fear will enter into the minds of the general voters that if they would vote for the Harijan candidate there could be the possibility of both the Harijan candidate being elected. So they would like that their non-Harijan candidate may also succeed and therefore they would not like to vote in favour of the Harijan candidate. If that happens, I think it would go against the intent of the framers of the Constitution and their purpose of giving protection to them. But if my amendment is accepted, there would linger no such doubts in their minds and they will also be able to contest the general seats for which they have been empowered by the

Constitution and every voter will exercise his opinion thoughtfully. If any voter wishes that both the candidates of the backward class or scheduled caste should be elected, then he will vote for both of them. But, if this amendment of mine is rejected, it could be possible that even an unpopular and, therefore, I apprehend that no-body would like to vote for the Harijan candidate. Hence I want to request the hon. Minister that no more poison of caste distinction should be allowed to enter in the society. Thus it is in the fitness of things that those Harijan friends who want to stand from the general seats should stand in the ordinary way like other general candidates after furnishing full security. If the voters would like, they would be elected there also; and if they are returned from there, I have no objection at all.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 23th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Wednesday, the 23th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): Sir, I agree with the views expressed by Shri Bhatt and Shri Thakur Das Bhargava. As my able friend Shri Sidhva has stated, I believe that this kind of necessity would arise only in two cases. In the first instance, when the candidate would be so popular as may be elected from more than one seat being outside the country or may be away from there. In that case, it may be possible that the information may not reach him within the ten days' time or he may not be able to send his reply to the Election Commissioner, within the prescribed time limit. The second case may be where one is too eager and trouble monger and may get elected from more than one constituency. In that case, the person concerned must know, as Shri Sidhva has stated, as to from which constituency he has been elected. But

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12-13, Pt. II, 23<sup>rd</sup> May 1951, Page 9257-9258

sometimes it so happens that one who has done over-exertion, loses the equilibrium of his mind due to excessive happiness or grief and in the present day conditions to be elected from more than one constituency is, of course, a very rejoicing news for a candidate and it is quite possible that his mind may not work properly for a few days. If some such thing happens and God does not bless him with His favours, it is just possible that he may not be returned from any constituency.

There can be a third case as well. I think in future elections such things would take place time and again. Because the elections to Parliament would be held in those very days when the elections to the State Assemblies are also take place. At that time, probably some of our friends may simultaneously seek election to Parliament and the State Assemblies as well, and the people may also give votes to him thinking he can serve the electorates and prove more helpful to them both as a Member of the State Assembly as also of Parliament.

So if the time limit of ten days is fixed for such persons, then within this short period they would not be able to decide as to whether they would be able to serve the electorates better as a Member of the State Assembly or as a Member of Parliament. Because, if he is given permission to sit in the State Assembly probably he may get a chance of becoming the Chief Minister or a Minister. In that case he can certainly serve the cause of his electorates better as a chief Minister or a Minister than as a Member of Parliament. On the other hand, he may see that there being no chance for him to become Chief Minister of Minister, then if he has a seat in Parliament, he may perhaps get a chance of becoming Deputy Minister even. Anyhow, it would not be fair for electorates as well.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Monday, 28th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Monday, the 28th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): I have also given notice of an amendment.

**Mr. Speaker:** Was notice given before one hour? I am not having any last minute amendments of hon. Members—that will mean that so long as discussion goes on, amendments will keep on coming.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I have got an old amendment.

**Mr. Chairman:** Amendment moved:

After part (f) sub-clause (1) of clause 7, insert the following new parts:

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12-13, Pt. II, 28<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 9511-9557

“(g) if he is engaged by the Government of India or the Government of any State to appear, on payment of fees, before any court of law or before any other authority;

(h) if he appears before any court of law or any other authority against the Government of India or the Government of any State except to defend any person charged with a criminal offence other than that of black-marketing or profiteering in a court of law.”

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I wish to move my amendment No. 156 in the Revised Consolidated List No. 1. I beg to move:

In part (iii) of the Proviso to sub-clause (1) of clause 7, insert the following new part (a) as part (a) and relater the existing parts accordingly:

“(a) of his having a share or being office holder of the cooperative society registered under ‘The Co-operative Societies Act, 1912’ which hold any contract under any State Government or the Central Government.”

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member has omitted two words from his amendment.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Yes, Sir. I have omitted two words ‘license’ and ‘permit’. This I have done in order to fit it in the present clause 7 as proposed by Dr. Ambedkar. I beg to say that my amendment may be read as under:

In Clause 7A add the words “the co-operative society” after the words “public company and under the company” be added in clause (d) of Clause 7A.

**Mr. Chairman:** May I know where from is he reading? Is it some new amendment?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I have redrafted it.

**Mr. Chairman:** Has he passed on that amendment?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** My previous amendment may be redrafted or read as:

**Mr. Chairman:** Will it not serve the hon. Member's purpose if the words 'license' and 'permit' are taken away from his amendment?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** It will, Sir.

**Mr. Chairman:** Those clauses are yet before the House. The hon. Member may move his amendment with the exception of the words 'license' and 'permit'.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Dr. Ambedkar to the fact that although he thinks that a layman is not to be heard; it is sometimes found in course of discussions that the layman is right. I do not know why he has omitted the words 'co-operative society'. I know that he is a great sympathizer of co-operative societies. As you know, this House is composed mostly of members who come from a party which has adopted a resolution in the Jaipur Session which seeks to establish a co-operative commonwealth in the country. When we are out to

establish a co-operative commonwealth under the resolution. I do not know why the words 'co-operative society' have been omitted. Under the present circumstances, not only a share holder but a director of a public company is allowed to contest, a seat if he does not get anything for being director but in the case of a co-operative society, which holds a contract, even being a shareholder can disqualify a person for standing in any legislature. I do not understand the reason why there should be such discrimination between a co-operative society and a public company. I know that while in the case of a public company the distribution of profit is not limited, under the co-operative Act, it is not distributed as profit among the shareholders. Still we are depriving the shareholders of co-operative societies to stand for the membership of Parliament or the State Assembly if this society holds any contract. Sir, some of my friends may be under the misapprehension that the co-operative society can be covered under the Public Companies Act. I wish to submit, Sir that co-operative societies are registered under a different Act and they are not governed by the Public Companies Act. When we are out to allow the shareholders and directors of Public companies, I do not see any reason why we should not allow the shareholders and office-holders of co-operative societies who, under the Act, cannot hold any office of profit in that society.

**Shri Sidhva:** It is not an office of profit.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** They are debarred from standing.

**Shri syamanadan Sahaya:** How do you say that they re debarred?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** If the co-operative society holds any contract of any Government, the shareholders of that society are debarred from contesting the elections.

**Shri Sidhva:** Contract is a different thing.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Suppose the co-operative society holds a contract for supplying foodgrains to the Government, and then the entire membership of that society is debarred from contesting the elections. My hon. friend says it is a question of contract, I wish to submit that even though the word 'contract' is there with regard to public companies, the shareholders of that company are allowed to contest the seats of the House of the People or the State legislatures. Under these circumstances, I appeal to the hon. Minister of State, who is now acting in the place of the hon. Law Minister who left the House while I started to speak, to consider this. I have great hopes from the hon. Minister of State because he belongs to the Party which is out to establish a co-operative commonwealth.

There is another argument also. Just like the communist party, sometimes, people talk and believe in a classless society and they think that a classless society can be established only by class war; just the opposite way. If my hon. friends think that they can establish a co-operative commonwealth debarring the shareholders of co-shareholders of public companies, then, of course, it will be established through this House which is not

interested in violence. This House is interested in non-violence. In order that society should progress non-violently, I submit that the hon. Minister will accept my amendment.

**Mr. Chairman:** Amendment moved:

“(a) of his having a share or being office holder of the co-operative society registered under ‘The Co-operative Societies Act, under any state Government or the Central Government’”.

**Shri Syamnandan Sahaya:** I think, Sir, that this is a matter which deserves a little clarification. The question must be really gone into, -I am afraid, the hon. Law Minister is not here-whether a co-operative society will be construed as coming within the category of a public company pointed out by my hon. friend Mr. Chaudhry Ranbir Singh will deserve consideration.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member has to find out if a registered co-operative society is a public company or not.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** No.

**Mr. Chairman:** If it is a public company, then, surely the same sections will apply.

**Shri Syamanadan Sahaya:** That is a point on which I would like to have the clarification from the hon. Law Minister. The opinion gathered by my hon. friend is different.

**Chairman:** Mr. Iyyunni.



**Shri Iyyunni** (Travancore-cochin): I am moving an amendment to article 132A. I have nothing to do with clause 7.

**Shri Hussain Imam:** I have a small amendment to move and I wish to say something about the amendments that have been moved by other friends, I beg to move:

In part (a) of sub-clause (1) of clause 7, after the words “illegal practice”, insert the words “under any of the existing Acts, Rules, or regulations or”.

And this is an amendment which can be adopted without modification in the revised clause 7 brought before the House by the Law Minister. What I want to stress is that it is not necessary that the person should have been convicted of an offence under the new Law. If he had been convicted of an offence even under the existing Act, rules and regulations, he should be de-rules and regulations, he should be debarred just as he would be debarred if he had contravened any of the new provisions under sections 138 and 139. It is quite a simple thing and I do not think I need stress this point any further.

Now, I would like to say a few words about the amendments which have been moved. My difficulty is that I always find the Government moving in an unplanned fashion. When we discussed this Bill in the beginning we had more than ample time to discuss unimportant questions; but when we come to important issues, we are hustled and things are sought to be forced down our throats by the shock tactics of sitting up to midnight, if .....

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Monday, 28th May, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Monday, the 28th May 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Representation of the People (No.2) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I beg to move:

In the explanation to part (8) of clause 122. Omit the the words “chaukidar , dafedar, lambardar, zaildar.”

Sir, here is our able friend Shri Thakur Das sitting among us. He is a himself stand, for the membership of any legislative body; but if, perchance, he were to visit and speak anything for me in my constituency then I would be disqualified. Not only this much but also we find that in Punjab today there are several ministers who are sitting members as well as lambardars. So far as the Punjab Assembly is concerned, a large number of its members are lambardars I can challenge that a lambardar can in no way be

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12-13, Pt. II, 28<sup>th</sup> May 1951, Page 9592*

included in the category of Government servants. Whatever he receives, it can only be called his commission. There are several other persons as well who receive payments from the Government in the form of commission but they are not disqualified. Under these conditions my submission is that these words would be omitted.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 2nd June, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 2nd June 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Constitution (First Amendment) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab): I had submitted an amendment for the omission of this clause, which I did not move in this House. My purpose in submitting that amendment was that the Government have repealed an Act in two years' time, which in my opinion should not have been repealed. In this matter I do not agree with Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava when he says that the people will welcome its being repealed. I do not know who are these people about whom he has stated that they would welcome this move. If he means thereby the twenty-five per cent. of the people residing in the cities of Punjab, then it is all right and the masses of Punjab also want it to be so. But, 75 per cent. people in Punjab live in the villages and most of them are peasants. Fifty-five to sixty per cent.

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12-13, Pt. II, 2<sup>nd</sup> June 1951, Page 10005-10007*

of the present population of the Punjab consists of peasantry. Moreover, when this Act was repealed the Harijans and the backward classes of the Punjab were included in the agricultural classes. I am not sure whether the agricultural classes will approve of this measure. Fortunately, the Act was repealed at a time, when considering the economic condition, the times were not so bad, otherwise a great trouble might have arisen. At that time the economic condition of the peasants was fairly good and their lands could not be taken possession of by the non-agriculturists.

I will not discuss it at length. What I mean to say is that the way this done it is not proper. Had there been any such thing in this law which the hon. Minister did not consider proper, that could have been modified. Moreover, I know, there are many laws are there that contain such provisions as this repealed Act had. In Bombay that law is being passed. It has been laid down in the law which has been enacted there that the agriculturists can transfer their to know what was there in the Land Alienation act?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** That Act mentioned only some particular castes of the agriculturists and not as a whole.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I want to tell my hon. friend that considering the social structure of India, no one can deny the fact that the people of a particular caste take to a particular profession. Is it not a fact that the Mahajans in India are generally businessmen and the people of some particular castes are agriculturists? Today we are making provision in this Bill that the legislation can be enacted for the protection of the interests of the backward classes. For this purpose, discrimination will be made and the same could have been allowed under this Bill. But as he accepts this Bill, if he

accepts that too, even I think there was no necessity to repeal it, it should have only been modified. I have taken the time power to modify or repeal is a very vast power. It is not proper to delegate such a vast power to be vested either in any legislature or in the Courts. In the next six months, new State Assemblies and the new Parliament will be elected. This matter should have been left for them and this period should not have been extended. As I have already stated that in a democratic set-up, it is generally believed that howsoever efficient a king may be and however well disposed his intention, yet he is prone to commit mistakes and that explains why Democracy is preferred to any other form of Government, because with the increase of number of persons more and more thought is likely to be given already to avoid mistakes. I have stated that by repealing the Act neither justice has been done to the people nor have we acted in accordance with our Constitution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This does not prevent the Provincial Legislature from adapting or modifying. It only enables the President to do so.

**Dr. Deshmukh:** He refers to the consequences of giving and extending those powers.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It does not stand in the way of the Provincial Legislatures making another law. They can do so.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Sir, either I could not express myself correctly or you could not understand what I was submitting. I stated that in this way people of Punjab were economically well off, otherwise what would have happened there? All the land in

Punjab would have been transferred to those who had nothing to do with agriculture.

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no vacuum in that.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Since enacting law will take five or six months, some provision should be made for the intervening period. I want to submit that those people in Uttar Pradesh who wanted to purchase land during the period when the Zamindari Abolition Act was passed and when it was declared valid, paid very large amounts, because of this vacuum much confusion is likely to prevail and I think that you are not opposed to my view.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 7th June, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Thursday, the 7th June 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Resolution re.Raising of Export Duty on Cloth\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : While supporting this resolution I cannot help referring to the point raised the other day by my learned friend Shri Amolak Chand. He observed that the cloth dealers who used to export cloth previously were feeling bitter as they were not being issued licenses where as the mill-owners were being issued the same. The reason behind the present competition between the cloth dealers and the mill-owners is to be found in the high sale prices of our cloth in the foreign markets.

As the margin of profit is very wide, everybody, whether he is a dealer or a mill-owner, is desirous of participation in this

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12-13, Pt. II, 7th June 1951, Page 10431-10433*

competition. Personally, I have no objection to the grant of license to the mill-owners because that would abolish the agency of intermediaries. Consistency demands that if we want to abolish intermediaries in the sphere of land settlement, we should not allow them to remain elsewhere either. I do not consider it to be proper to let the intermediaries continue. Whatever the system, it is bound to be rendered more and more defective with the increasing number of intermediaries.

I also cannot help referring to what has been stated already by my learned friend, Dr. Punjab Rao Deshmukh. He has said that on one side there is the producer of cotton who endures all sorts of hardships of hot and cold weather and the scorching sun. He puts in the hardest labour and it is with extreme difficulty that he can produce cotton. It is only after enduring all these hardships that he wants money in exchange for the cotton that he has produced. Here is the other side of the picture which has just been placed before the House by my learned friend. He has said that trade in cotton waste is profitable even after paying 50 per cent. export duty. Despite all this, could it be denied that the prices paid to the producer by the Government are made good by the dealer through export of cotton waste alone? Does it mean that the producer of cotton is to be paid at the rate of export prices of cotton waste? Is it the type of justice which can be expected from this Government? It does not end here. The hon. Minister Shri Harekrushna Mahtab has been faced several times with the question of the non-availability of *dhoti*. Several times he has given an assurance that a larger number of *dhotis* would be produced and that the increased production of *dhotis* would actually begin from this or that particular month. Several times he has conveyed us the information that the factories have now been issued orders

to that effect. At the commencement of the present session, the sale price of *dhotis* in the country-side was Rs. 22 but since then it has gone up to Rs. 32. He is giving assurances about the increased production of *dhotis*, but, on the other side, I may tell him that the prices of *dhoti* are daily going up in the market. What is the reason? The situation has to be controlled somehow or the other and to control it is solely your responsibility.

That is not all. So far as the cloth situation is concerned, I would like you to look back and consider the developments that have taken place since you assumed power in 1947, Cloth was under control. People demanded its decontrol on the ground that so much cloth was lying waste in the mills. The Government conceded that demand and the effect was that cloth was decontrolled. The prices were, however, still controlled. The decontrol of supply resulted in a rise of prices, as two fold and even more. The Government was forced to reimpose the control and introduce rationing. This way, the cloth control began to function. But this time the prices were not the same. I think they fixed prices at least 20 percent, in excess of the original prices. Again a stage came when the millowners complained that a large quantity of cloth was lying useless with them and once more the control provisions were somewhat relaxed and rationing was abolished. Thereafter, cloth began to be available in the market as if there was no control. What is the position today? It is the same old story. No cloth, whether coarse or fine, is available in the market at controlled rates. Not only that, the original price of Rs. 12 of a *dhoti* has shot up to Rs. 32.

On the other side, my learned friend is not in favour of increasing the prices of cotton on the ground that would affect the prices of goods-which are sure to rise by any such action and that

the prices, in general, would have an upward tendency as a result thereof. Will the hon. Minister kindly tell us what are the prices of cotton and food-grains in Pakistan at present? If you consider that your argument has any force, why is that force lost when that argument is applied to Pakistan? In Pakistan cotton is selling at almost three times the prices in our country and food-grains too are available at higher prices than they are on this side of the border. Several of my hon. friends are under the impression that the land where cotton is cultivated is also capable of producing wheat or rice. The case is however, the reverse. We cannot grow even long staple cotton on the land where short staple cotton has been grown previously; much less can rice be produced thereon. Further, the land where rice has been grown, cannot be utilized usefully for having even a crop of wheat; maybe even jawar or any other commodities are difficult to be cultivated thereon. For every commodity the extent of irrigation and the kind of soil differ. The land where cotton can be grown with profit, may not be tilled usefully for the cultivation of other types of produce. I, therefore, want to submit one thing with regard to the observation of my able friend that increase in the prices of cotton would not be a good policy to follow. Either you arrange the supply of cloth at the controlled prices at which cotton is purchased or you permit the sale of cotton also at the decontrolled prices so that this kind of disparity and injustice may be removed whereby they are not able to sell cotton at prices at which the dealers can sell even their cotton waste. This is my simple request.

I think that the 25 per cent. levy fixed by you should not be too much. I go a step further to say that even a levy of 100 percent, cannot be called unjust. The reason is they have made a

profit of crores of rupees by exporting cloth to foreign countries. This way they have harmed their own country. The best way is to establish a State Trading Corporation which would put an end to all sorts of complaints heard from time to time, such as excess or otherwise of cloth and the necessity of control or decontrol. There should then be no necessity left for the appointment of investigation Commissions to enquire into the Income-tax evasion by people who have made profits totaling to lacs of rupees. You would not have to face any such troubles then. The establishment of such a Corporation entrusted with the work of trading with foreign countries in jute and all other commodities and articles, would provide a satisfactory solution to all these issues.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 9 August, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Thursday, the 9th August 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Resolution re.President's Proclamation on Failure of Constitutional Machinery in Punjab\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : I had decided to speak in Hindi because most of my hon. friends here want me to do so, although the Minister is probably not very well conversant with Hindi. Anyway, I decide to speak in Hindi.

So far as the Constitution is concerned, I think Article 356, that has been referred to, is only a safety-valve. As for this particular matter, I am in agreement to a large extent with what Dr. Puanjabrao Deshmukh has said. But I must say that the decision taken by the Central Government is quite correct from the legal point of view. If, as he said, he did not want to go through all those reasons and happenings that led to this step having been taken so also we are

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 14, Pt. II, 9<sup>th</sup> August 1951, Page 223-228*

not to go into these details Then, there is not the least doubt that whatever has been done is correct from the constitutional point of view. But I would like to remind the House that I belong to the very State, the affairs of which are now being discussed. The hon. Minister has also said about it in his speech that there were as many as 70 members out of 77 who belonged to the Congress Party. The hon. Minister then made certain observations and expressed certain views on the matter. It would have been better, in my opinion, had he not done so, because I remember that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru gave a statement in this connection at the time of the Bangalore Session of the Congress. What he stated therein was totally different from this.

**Ms. Chairman :** Does the hon. Member wish to continue?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Yes, Madam.

**Mr. Chairman:** Then the House will stand adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

*The House then adjourned for lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.*

*The House re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock.*

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker *in the Chair*]

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I was submitting that from the constitutional point of view there is no doubt that the step taken is wholly justified and the safety valve provided for in the Constitution has been rightly used. But some of my friends and the hon. Minister

have, in an indirect manner, tried to point out that the step taken in Punjab was due to the reason that a stable ministry could not be formed there. I think this argument is not very correct. It is not the misfortune of the State of the Punjab alone that the Ministries have changed more than once and that some ministerial upheaval has taken place. In Madras, your own State, ministries have changed on no less than three occasions. Similarly, the ministry has changed three times in Bengal, and there has been a ministerial crisis four or five times in Travancore-Cochin. So far as the question of personal rivalries and jealousies is concerned, I submit that there too Punjab is not the only State where these things exist. In Mysore, the ministry survived the censure motion only by one vote, or may be by four votes. Anyway, the formation of a stable ministry is not a problem peculiar to Punjab alone and I am not prepared to admit that this was the case only with Punjab and that this was the solitary reason for this action being taken.

Another point that I have to submit is with regard to the amendment of Shri Sidhva of which he gave notice, although he has not moved it. I think it is totally wrong. Party politics and personal rivalries that existed in Punjab can be found in every State and I do not think that could be a reason for suspending the constitution in that State. But on the other hand, I am prepared to admit, as many of my hon. friends said and as Sardar Hukam Singh also pointed out in his speech, that the people of Punjab possess many qualities but at the same time they are more quarrelsome. All this might be correct to a certain extent and that there might be comparatively more quarrels among them, but so far as discipline is concerned, Punjab is the foremost State. Today, in other States, we find that person, one after the others, are quitting the ministry because they doubt the success of the Congress Party

in the forthcoming elections. But it is the province of Punjab alone where, in spite of the removal of the ministry, inspite of the suspension of the Assembly and inspite of the shaky state of affairs, not a single person has resigned from the Congress. What more convincing proof of discipline than this can there be? The people of Punjab are undoubtedly disciplined and it has also been proved that for a good cause, they are good fighters as well. But, as the hon. Minister said, if 70 out of 77 members belonged to the Congress party, why could they not form a ministry and run the Government? There I agree and, as I said earlier, the hon. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru gave a statement during the Bangalore Session, -and I believe it is a correct and true statement -and that is the reason why the Congress Parliamentary Board was forced to advise the leader of the Punjab Assembly Party to submit his resignation. The congress party has long taken the decision that the exploitation of the tiller of the soil must be stopped but despite the declarations of both the leaders of the Punjab Government, Dr. Gopi Chand Bhargava and Lala Bhimsen Sachar, that the tyrannies of the Zamindars would be brought to an end, that the exploitation of the tiller of the soil would be stopped and that necessary legislation would be enacted, no result has so far come out. When Shri Sachar tried to enact laws in this connection, his ministry could not stay long. Dr. Gopi Chand Bhargava also could not do much although there is no doubt that he could issue an Ordinance and also make an Act, which is known as the Tenants Security Act. But this legislation was so inadequate and incomplete that even those who have been tilling the land for more than twenty years are being served with ejection notices. I want to tell those friends of mine, who do not belong to Punjab, that the real difficulty is about the exploitation of the tiller of the soil and that was the



basic principle whereby the Congress Parliamentary Board was obliged to advise like that. Many of my friends and Shri Man also said that some people think, or apprehend, that efforts are being made to close up the ranks and then install a ministry there. I personally believe that these differences were not of the nature of personal differences. Of course, if there could be a compromise on principles, I do not think there would be anything wrong and a ministry might be reinstalled in Punjab. For that, I think, the most important thing is that the exploitation of the tiller of the soil should, as has already been decided, be stopped and if any Government is capable of stopping it, there should not be any difficulty or obstacle in the formation of such a Government. I also think that Sardar Hukam Singh, who is the President of the Akali Party, would also not oppose its formation and I believe the Punjab State Congress party too would have no personal objection to it. Now, some of my friends have just said that the people of Punjab have welcomed Trivedi rule and are very happy. I beg to say that the happiness is not because of Trivedi rule. I am rather surprised when some hon. members of this Parliament call it Governor's rule. It is not the Governor's rule. It is the President's rule of the Parliament. The present rule in Punjab cannot be called an undemocratic rule. But I have a fear that the happiness over the present rule may possibly change into sorrow and regret because those people who are rejoicing today are nourishing a hope that the Government of India would be able to stop exploitation of tiller of the soil. But as we have seen, a long time has passed and as a matter of fact these changes could have been effected by just one ordinance and the ejection of those who have been effected by just one ordinance and the ejection of those who have been tilling the soil for twenty and even fifty years could be stopped-but

no attempts have so far been made to bring about these changes by any such ordinance or Act and I am afraid if such an attempt is not made, the present happiness is certainly not going to last long.

There was a system in Punjab known as the Zaildari system, and under this system only those were appointed Zaildars who generally helped and supported all acts, whether good or bad, of the British Imperialistic regime. In the past, when some patriot came to the villages and addressed the people, it was the Zaildar who used to give evidence against him. The Punjab Government, before going out of office; decided that the Zaildari system in Punjab should be reintroduced. On the one hand, the Ministry and members of Punjab were asked to quit but, on the other, no consideration is being given to that resolution of the Punjab State Congress. While the Punjab State Congress suggested changes in the Tenancy Act of the province, it also passed a resolution that the Zaildari system should not be revived. Today the Governor is trying to appoint Zaildars in the whole of Punjab before the 15<sup>th</sup> August. The former Cabinet had given orders to revive Zaildari but that decision involved a different principle. Talking about my own district, I can say that all persons who have been appointed Zaildars are those about whom it can never be said that they would co-operate with the Government in any constructive manner. On the other hand, those very people who belong to the old system have been appointed Zaildars.

**The Minister of Education (Maulana Azad):** The governor of Punjab has not done it. The proposal had already been made by the last Ministry.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Sir, as I have said earlier the former Punjab Government did accept that proposal but at the same time a definite principle was laid down that only those persons, who would help the Government in their constructive activities, would be appointed Zaildars. Those who are being appointed Zaildars in our district today are anti-Congress people. I would like to draw Maulana Saheb's attention to the fact that an Officer in my district asked a Congressman, who aspired to be appointed as a Zaildar that if he was made a Zaildar...

**Sardar B.S. Man:** Is it such a big crime for a man to be anti-Congress that he cannot be appointed a Zaildar? Can only as Congressman be appointed?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** My hon. Friend has not followed me correctly. I have said that I am myself against the reintroduction of that system. But I wish to submit that just as being anti-Congress is not a crime, similarly being a Congressman is also not a sin.

**Babu Rambarayan Singh (Bihar):** Now it has become a sin.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** it might be your view because you have deserted the Congress, but I do not subscribe to that view. I do not want to take much time of the House. My learned friend Sardar B.S. Man just said that the ministry should not be constituted till elections were over so that the elections might be fair. I do not fear that, nor am I too eager for the early formation of a ministry. It might be after one month or two months but I would certainly like to say one thing. I ask those who talk about impartial elections,

whether it is not a fact that all the employees of the Punjab State are either brought up in an environment of communalism or are persons in whom the mentality of sectarianism and the spirit of discrimination have taken deep roots. Under these conditions, there will be an impartial election is beyond my comprehension.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Monday, 13 August, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Monday, the 13 August 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Resolution re. groundnuts oilseeds & vegetable oils\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : I agreed with my able friend Shri Sarwate when he says that the Government's case in increasing the export duty is not a strong one. Had there been any price fluctuations in oilseeds to the extent that market conditions in that connection had come to be somewhat like those of jute as they prevailed at the time when we had to amend the Tariff Act in order to empower the Government to deal with the jute duty the necessity for bringing a measure of that kind with regard to the oilseeds as if he is unaware of the current oil seed prices in the foreign markets. Thus, the case of oilseeds is not the same as that of jute.

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 14, Pt. II, 13<sup>th</sup> August 1951, Page 534-536*

The second question that arises in this connection is whether or not it is right to enhance the duty on oil seeds in view of the fact that we have no information whatsoever about their current prices in the foreign markets. My able friend, Shri Sidhva has said that it was not bad to enhance the export duty on the oilseeds, if it was in the interests of the industry or the consumer. This principle may hold good to some extent, but I would like to tell him that the consumer's or the industries' out-look cannot be definitely the outlook of the entire country. There is a third party also in this connection and they are the oilseeds producers, those who sweat and toil and put in such hard labour. They too have their point of view and that point of view has its proper place and importance. My learned friend, Shri Sidhva has said that the cultivators will have nothing to lose by it. I failed to understand that argument. My friend is not present here but I would like to tell him that the manner in which the Government have presented their case, lends it no other meaning than that Government intend to levy an indirect tax on the cultivators. Under these conditions, how are you justified in saying that it would not affect the cultivators? I could not understand it. You have no information about the prices prevailing outside India. Under these circumstances, all the super taxes that would be levied would result in the cutting down of the prices of the oilseeds that are to be paid by the businessmen to the cultivators.

**Kaka Bagwant Roy** (P.E.P.S.U.): Prices are very high in foreign markets.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** You may say so, but nothing has been said officially in this connection. Under these circumstances, it will mean nothing but levying an indirect tax on the cultivators. It may

be that the House would favour increasing the incidence of indirect taxation on the cultivators, if circumstances so warrant and it is felt necessary to do so. In the present case it has a soft corner for the mill-owners. The mill-owners have their own newspapers whereby they are in a position to put their case before the Government in an effective manner and are in a position to bring some sort of pressure on them. Take for instance, the case of sugar. On the one hand, there is *gur* which is being produced in the country and which was so far distributed among lakhs and crores of cultivators in the country and which was so far distributed among lakhs and crores of people without rationing. On the other hand, there is crystallized sugar which is being produced by the big mill-owners. The Government have imposed full control on *gur* while, on the other hand, they have partially de-controlled sugar.

In the same way, you may take the case of cotton and its product cloth. The prices of commodities which are exported have been lowered. If the export duty on them had been increased that would have been quite understandable. But it is quite a different matter to increase the export duty on oilseeds. Shri Sarwate has with the help of figures attempted to prove that the cultivation of oilseeds is not being done on a very large scale or that its cultivation has not in any way increased as compared to the previous figures. But perhaps some friends are of the opinion that production of oilseeds should be reduced and in its place production of food-grains should be increased. This is no doubt, a good suggestion because food grains are the most essential thing in the country today; but this suggestion requires a very calm consideration. The first thing that we shall have to consider is that the land which is

being utilized for the production of oilseeds may not have as much of water supply as would be required for the production of oilseeds. The second thing is that the oilseed plant is a leguminous plant which takes nitrogen from Nature and in this way helps to increase the productivity of the soil. Hence, it becomes necessary for the cultivator to raise oilseeds on the land which is once using for raising a food crop or he may do so off and on. Under these circumstances, if the cultivator will try to produce food-grains instead of oilseeds, the result would be that we may not be able to increase our food production but, on the other hand we may lose oilseeds, which we sell to earn foreign exchange which is further used for purchasing food-grains for the hungry people of this country. We can expect no other results from such a move.

So, I would like to request the Government again to think over the move to raise this export duty and before taking any step in this direction see on whom the burden of this tax is likely to fall, and also whether it is going to fall on earned incomes or on unearned incomes.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 14 August, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 14 August 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Punjab State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : Deputy speaker Sir, as Dr. Mukherjee has said, I feel that the first resolution passed by us should be sent to the Governor as we have every right to pass that one. As you are already aware that when the resolution was presented before the House, I fully supported that. But why was this done? The reference given by Dr. Mukherji about the Home Ministry was in the same context. As he has told us that there is a wide difference between article 93 rule 35 and article 356 of the constitution and after fully understanding that I agreed with that there is no major difference in that the members of the Punjab

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 12-13, Pt. II, 14<sup>th</sup> August 1951, Page 651-656*

Legislative Assembly pass laws for Punjab or the Parliament of India pass laws for the Punjab. But when the Bill this before us, I have a feeling of anguish for supporting the move and I understand as my worthy friend Sondhi says, perhaps I have made a mistake (in supporting that). But as Lala Achint Ram has said, I am happy that the whip has not ordered us but to express our views as we wish.

I cannot remain but to express that I oppose this bill, since intervention by Hon'ble Home Minister yesterday many a times that the bill is in response to what has been done earlier. I fully accept that it is in response to what we have empowered the Governor or President to pass the bill for Punjab. I was happy about it whether we give power to it or not. Therefore, I oppose it.

Now, Babu Thakur Dass in his speech has told us another reason to which I don't agree. Besides, the situation which has occurred in the Punjab should be kept in view. I fully understand and how the Governor of the Punjab and his machinery have tried to implement it, I express my view why we have been asked to give them more powers. As I express my views earlier that I can't support that resolution now while I have fully supported when President had decreed; I fully justified its relevance to may notes freely and frankly. And when I was justifying its relevance to my voters I had said at that time that many officers of the Punjab understand that they have absolute powers to rule in the State. But, their such views are erroneous. Today, ordinance of Governor is nothing but dissolution of Punjab Legislative Assembly only and all the powers of the Assembly have been transferred to the members of Parliament. The ordinance issued by machinery of

Governor during the pendency of Parliament has some positive side also but I express my displeasure on many issues. Besides, some efforts have also been made to give freedom of expression and prove that oligarchy is better than the democracy. If there is any defect in the democratic functioning in Punjab, I don't understand it is a bad thing if removed. But I would show my displeasure if any man in India expresses that oligarchy is much better than the democracy. However, lakhs and crores of rupees have been spent on drafting of the constitution and it has been accepted therein that democracy is better than the oligarchy. If any individual or an administration tries to justify that oligarchy is better than democracy, then he dishonors the constitution. I want to cite two and three such examples. I had said to the executive of my district that I understand this that the members of the Punjab Legislative Assembly have been suspended but under the law our right to representation is in built. No one has seized my right to representation. But besides this, I have seen in my district that many top officers of the Punjab came and found only one such officer who attended 400 or 500 persons daily. It is believed that one of his close friends intends to contest election. I came to know when I was present at Rohtak (at that time). I understand that the congress was not in power in the Punjab but it was an administrative arrangement. If the Congress Committee of Rohtak district or the members of the Punjab Legislative Assembly were not called, I did not complain. But when there is President rule or Parliament rule, no officer had the right to be present before him whenever asked; oppose such laws. Before this, they did hesitate to do so. Now, they have been given powers to pass any order/ordinance. I have presented two or three such instances to you in this regard. Besides, I intend to present many more instances to you.

If my worthy friend, Gianiji might have spoken on earlier resolution, I would support him but I have different view point today. Due to this, I intend to tell the Hon'ble Home Minister. The revival of the zaidari system was the responsibility of the Punjab Cabinet but it made a condition that only those persons should be made zaidars who could participate in the constructive programmes. We have experienced that before the removal of this system another zaidar was appointed after one year time of the removal of any zaidar. But now it is the order of the Governor that the posts of zaidars be filled up within a month. It is possible that he has such a doubt in his mind lest the Parliament passes any such legislation against it. He ordered to remove such difficulties. Now, apart from this, it is going against the ministry on whose shoulder it is being done. I know the condition of my district well. Three persons have been appointed zaidars in my district. All these people did not participate in any constructive programme. Despite this, some such persons have been appointed zaidars who did not have any coordination with the government. Now, may I ask the Hon'ble Home Minister why some Governors are engaged in such activities-can we give them such powers?

There is another aspect in which I intend to give some references. Governor Sahib has ordered that those who have been issued armed licenses after 1947, they may be investigated. You can very well imagine that Congress Government ruled Punjab after 1947. There was one such thing in that order how much property they possessed be disclosed. The Congress was the party of the masses. It is possible that their supporters and sympathiers may be poor and ordinary people and they might not possess property. I don't possess even a bigha of land in the

Punjab. There may have been more worthy friends like me who have not any property and now efforts are being made to seize their licenses. When the Congress formed ministry it tried to remove vested interests among the ruling elite, however, it was the government of the people. It thought that it could remove the power of the vested interests. But it should be removed gradually. Therefore, it did not seize their arms which were instrumental in harassing the peasants; but the licences were also issued to those who did not possess any property. But the instructions have been issued today that their licences may be cancelled. Such persons are being kept in A, B and C Categories. And now when the tenure of their yearly renewal comes, it is possible that such process may be suspended.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 28 August, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 28 August 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Government of Part C States Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Sir, I support the amendment moved by Shri Sidhva, but at the same time I cannot help saying that the discrimination which he has suggested is not good. I want that.....

**Shri Sidhva:** I am prepared to accept Coorg also to be included in the amendment. There is already an amendment to that effect.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Perhaps, you already know that I have not got much concern with Coorg. I want that you should include

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 14, Pt. II, 28<sup>th</sup> August 1951, Page 1518-1521*

Delhi in the amendment and I have got sufficient valid reasons for that. When Article 239 was being discussed in the Constituent Assembly, many of our friends, who came from different States, were of the opinion that barring New Delhi the whole of Delhi and its rural areas should be merged with Punjab.

**Shri Deshbandhu Gupta:** May I draw the attention of the Chair to the fact that Delhi is not under discussion at the moment because clauses 2 to 10 do not refer to Delhi. That is why I have kept quiet so far. It would not be fair therefore to refer to that question now. When clause 26 is reached, that question may be taken up.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I think that the objection raised by Shri Deshbandhu is out of order because the name of Delhi occurs in clause 3. This is another thing that in the opinion of Shri Deshbandhu it is not the appropriate moment to speak about Delhi, but I think I have the right to express my views. It is true that Delhi cannot be accorded the status of a State Government because it is the seat of the Central Government. There might arise certain matters where opinions may be different and which may prove troublesome in the future.

I have, therefore, suggested that barring New Delhi, which is the seat of the Government of India, the rest of the State should be merged in the Punjab. There is one other reason for it as well. Leave the things as they are today, but when members would be elected and ministers would be appointed they neither would try that Delhi State should remain as it is because if it is merged in any other State neither could so many members be elected nor could so many members be appointed ministers. If, by chance, ministers

are appointed from Delhi city or the rural areas, the number might not be more than one, but, if this State retains its separate entity, three or four ministers could easily be appointed. There will be 48 members and there can be three or four ministers. Their interest lies in this that the State should remain separate. I believe that if the opinion of the people of Delhi is ascertained, they would like to have their State merged in Punjab, because half of the population of Delhi City consists of Punjabis whose mother tongue is Punjabi and they love Punjab. Similar is the case with the rural population as they seem to be more attached to districts of Rohtak, Hissar and Gurgaon than to any other part of the country. They want to mingle with their brothers for their problems are the same as those of villagers of Rohtak and Hissar.

I supported him because his intention was that small parts should not be allowed to remain separate entities but should be merged in some big State or the other. This is the most opportune time to do it, before general elections are held. It might not be so suitable after the elections are over. There are many reasons for this. One is that there might not be such a majority in the House as at present.

**Shri Dwivedi:** On a point of information. People have migrated from East Bengal to West Bengal and also from the West Punjab to Vindhya Pradesh and other places. I would like to know whether he would like to have all those places merged in Punjab.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I want that there should be only one Assembly for whole of India but, after all, my wish is not the only thing that counts. We have already framed the Constitution of the



country; hence those of our brethren, who have gone and settled in those parts of the country, would make their own way; I need have no worry about them. I was saying that if you want to merge these small parts in big States there would not come a more appropriate time than this period of six months. After all, what is it that stands in your way in effecting the merger, except that in the case of Bhopal you have to obtain the consent of the Nawab. I fail to understand if there is any other difficulty in your way in the case of any other area. There will be no difficulty even if the House wants to merge Vindhya Pradesh.

**Shri Dwivedi:** The Punjab could also be merged.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** As I have told you before I do not want that Punjab should exist as a separate part of India. On the other hand, I should like the whole country to become one unit. But, then my wish alone does not count. Perhaps, my friend Shri Dwivedi might be feeling uneasy and may be desirous of ascertaining the views of the public. I want to ask whether anybody was consulted when such a big State as Baroda was merged in Bombay. There was a State Faridkot in our part of the country. We do not find such good roads and proper arrangements for education in the Punjab or Patiala as existed in that State. But it was merged in Patiala. Was the opinion of those people ascertained?

**Shri Dwivedi:** Ask those people how they are feeling now.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** If you want to ask them, I have no objection. It is merely a question of expressing your views before

the public but as far as reality is concerned it is for their good and for the good of the country. My friend, Shri Dwivedi knows that while we are engaged here in framing laws, others who believe in destruction, are busy in inciting the people. It is possible that they might succeed in putting their wrong ideas before the people. Therefore, the ascertaining of the people's opinion is a mere fancy. It is beneficial to them as well as to the country. It is a question of judging the issue. Some time ago our friend Shri Mukut Behari Lal was very much in favour of Ajmer being merged in Rajasthan. But he does not seem to be so keen about it at present. There are reasons for it. Today, if you were to ask the scheduled castes whether they want to do away with the classification their reply would be in the negative. Why? Because there are political advantages involved, Ajmer has a population of seven lakhs. I think they would elect two members to Parliament similar is the case with the other States as well. Coorg has a population of 1½ or two lakhs. They would also elect at least one member. Who would like to forego these political advantages? All my friends who would come here as members or those who would be elected to the State Legislatures and would be appointed ministers, would be in favour of these States being kept separate.

Shri Rajagopalachari has expressed his noble wish before the House. But who cares for his noble wish? It is bound to remain a mere wish. There will be so many to oppose it that we would not succeed. And I think, we get reasons for this in our Constitution. After all, Coorg had a population of 1½ or two lakhs and we had to provide an article for it in our Constitution while nobody even enquired about the administration etc. of a State like Baroda.

In my opinion you are mistaken if you think that you would be able to merge them after the elections. If you want to merge them in bigger parts of India there would not arise any opportunity more suitable than this period of six months from now on. I would request my friends from Part C States to have patience for a period of another six months. In view of the fact that they have been patient for three and a half years another six months should not matter.

As I have said before, it would be a mistake to keep Delhi as a separate State. That would give rise to a perpetual conflict between the Government of India and the future Government of Delhi State.

**Shri Deshbandhu Gupta:** Does the hon. Member want that from its present position of a Part C State Delhi should be relegated to the position of a Class 'D' State by merger in the Punjab.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** If my hon. friend, Shri Deshbandhu Gupta, thinks that we are in D Class, I may tell him that our D Class is not so bad because our D would take you direct to A while your C would not take you even to B. Do not hesitate to merge in D. I would like to say one thing more, with regard to the remark made by our friend Shri Poonacha that they would all be submerged. In this connection, I would like to say that while Delhi is being ruled by a Chief Commissioner, we are being ruled by a Governor. Both of us have been brought down to the same level for the present. There would not arise any other opportunity more suitable than this, when we could come together and merge in one.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 4 September, 1951

—————  
The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 4th September 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Industries (Development and Control) Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh (Punjab):** Sir, I rise to support this motion. It is because I feel that as compared to a Board, which might consist of three Members or more, development councils would be doing more justice to the industries. The schedule includes practically all the industries of our country and it also indicates our country and it also indicates our industrial policy. The Board that might be formed would be a very important adjunct of the industrial policy of our country. It is possible that Board might not have enough time to attend to category of industries. Hence, I feel that the

—————  
*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 15, Pt. II, 4<sup>th</sup> September 1951, Page 1908*

development councils, which the Government proposes to set up—the Government desires that there should be a development council for each industry or group of industries in place of an Industrial Board—would prove more beneficial to the Industry and would be more in the interests of the country.

I would like to submit one thing more in this connection and it is that the hon. Minister told us that the development councils would be having representatives of labour and industry. But, if you want that this set-up should fit in completely with planned economy, it is essential that consumers should also have their representative on the Board and along with it, those who produce raw materials should also be represented thereon. For instance, take the textile industry. The representation of cotton-growers in the council of this industry is as important and essential as that of the mill-owners and mill-workers. Similar is the case with the sugar industry or other industries where raw material is produced by the cultivators. It is equally necessary to have the representatives of the cultivators on the Board. As Dr. Deshmukh wanted to point out to the House today through an adjournment motion, there is a growing clash between the interests of one section and the other. He did not say anything new in it but it is certainly a fact. I do not know what the Government's intention is, whether they would afford representation to the consumers and producers of raw materials or not? But with a view to do justice to everybody, I want that if the Government has not thought of giving representation to those people as yet, it should do it now. I also request that this point should be fully considered in the Select Committee that is going to be reconstituted.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Friday, 7 September, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Friday, the 7th September 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### **Indian Companies (Aementment) Bill\***

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Sir, I have great pleasure in lending my support to the passage of this Bill, more especially because our Congress Party is committed to establish a Co-operative Commonwealth System in the country and this can be deemed as the first step towards some sort of State interference in this matter. I do not consider it as the final step. Some of our friends are unnerved ahead. We have to bring these public limited bodies in line with the co-operative societies or other co-operative institutions; and as the shareholders of assured of the regular Government supervision in their accounts and think that whenever there is any misappropriation of funds the Government themselves are responsible, they too should feel some sort of security.

---

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 15, Pt. II, 7<sup>th</sup> September 1951, Page 2255-2256

**Dr. Deshmukh:** There is a good deal of misappropriation of funds in the cooperative societies as well.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** No doubt, there too we have misappropriation of funds, because this is in the very nature of man. We can uproot such malpractices only when we shall make our children understand that interests of the country and interests of the society are far above our selfish interests. I know Dr. Deshmukh is a protagonist of the co-operative movement and when a co-operative society was formed in his own place, he became its first President. I know he has already been very fond of forming co-operative societies and in spite of some inherent defects in this system, he would never check us from making progress in this direction. While providing against all the drawbacks that it has we have to go ahead. This is an open secret that although the big industrialists, the company owners or the managing agents may be making profits out of their managing agencies, yet people know that they are not contented with the profits they get. They want to go ahead and want to become not only traders but black marketers too. Hence we require strict legislations and measures to have a check upon this tendency of theirs. Not only that, I am of the opinion that we require honest men to run Government agencies as well because the managing agents always keep a good amount of money at their disposal and are in a position to appease any officer drawing one thousand, five hundred, six hundred, two hundred or amount like that as their salaries. And, in this way, they are able to get a report of their own choice from them by using their wealth, influence and other things. Hence, the Government will have to concentrate their attention on not allowing anybody,

whether he is a Government employee, a managing agent or a company director, who indulges in malpractices, to misappropriate the hard-earned money of the share-holders and to use the funds illegitimately for his personal interests.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Saturday, 22 September, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Saturday, the 22th September 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Hidu Code\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : I have risen to support amendments No. 420 proposed by Pandit Thakur Dass Bhargava and No. 288 of Shri Bhatt. Shri Bhatt by his amendment means that if some customs or usages class with the Hindu Code Bill, then that clash should not be regarded in the light that the custom is abolished, but it should be allowed to continue for ten years and after that period it should be regarded as finished. Amendment no. 420 by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava means that those customs which are in accordance with the Hindu Code Bill should be regarded as abolished; and those customs which are left, their

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-II-Proceedings other than Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 15, Pt. I, 22<sup>th</sup> September, 1951, Page 3142-3150*

power or their legality should be retained. Whatever has been said by my learned friend Shri Pande I agree to that and this thing is right and very much heartening. The real purpose of the Hindu Code Bill was considered to introduce some reforms in the country to remove the prevailing social evils from the society and to bring about some changes in it. How many people would be affected by it has to be taken into consideration and as he said I regard the imposition of this Hindu Code Bill from the backdoor upon those people of this country who were free from it up till now, as an act of abuse of power.

**Shri A.C. Shukla:** Even if they do not want, they must have it.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** Shri Shukla has not understood the meaning of the word imposition used by me, or he has not heard it properly. If he says that the imposition which I have said is wrong then perhaps I would like to any example in which any person from Punjab may be a Hindu or a Sikh or a Muslim, has ever raised his voice that their customary law should be abolished and in place of that they should have the law of Manu, or of Yajnavalkya or of anybody else.

**Shri A.C. Shukla :** When they will become educated they would demand that.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** Perhaps Shri Shukla does not know how dynamic personalities have borne in our Punjab who have challenged the authorities of our country. Although, I do not support them but this is an historical fact that during the recent years nobody

had been able to defeat Congress but in Punjab there was a constituency in Haryana, which is a Hindu majority area, in which Ch. Chottu Ram had defeated a Congress candidate.

**Dr. Ambedkar:** Ch. Chottu Ram was a great friend of Hindus.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** In case, hon. Dr. Ambedkar has got any document or any other proof about it, I am ready to accept that. I am a supporter of monogamy and I want that in some special circumstances arrangement for divorce should also be made so that when some difficulty is felt on both sides, by the man as well as by the woman in living together, a way must be found out to save them from that difficulty. But along with it I cannot help saying that this attempt is nothing but an act of abuse of power, because we should have applied this Hindu Code Bill to those only who wanted to be governed by it.

Since this question of Hindu Code Bill has come before this House, it has taken several months and many a day has been spent upon it, I tried hard to snatch some minutes so that I might express my views about it, but unfortunately I could not get a chance. Unfortunately, when Sardar Man spoke about it, instead of coming to the right point he might have thought that in this way his point would be more force-full or there might have been some other reason. However, I think that this question is not related to Sikhism alone, this is a question pertaining to the customary laws of the whole of Punjab. I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Dr. Ambedkar that even in such a time when such Brahmanic rule and regulations with regard to the living and customs of the country and the society were being enforced rigidly, viz, one could not go

in a particular direction on Mondays or on Tuesdays or on Saturdays, the martial race of the Jats in Punjab, to which I and the hon. Sardar Baldev Singh belong, did not yield to the Brahmanic rules and it has not done so even now. I want to submit that really in our society there is no likelihood of any appreciable opposition to the two provisions relating to monogamy and divorce, and I am not personally against them. But I am opposed to the method and manner which you are resorting to. And the manner or the backdoor method through which it has developed is not a proper one.

This is not because I regard myself a non-Hindu but I do feel that we have never been governed by the Hindu Code and it has never been enforced with regard to us. I doubt your intentions that you can govern by the backdoor policy those whom you could not enslave mentally. I disagree with you to a great extent with regard to the rules and regulations which you are enacting in respect of marriage and divorce without caring for the prevailing customs.

I want to state with respect to this that many reformers of society have done a great many reforms in the Hindu Society with regard to the widow's plight, but I want to point out that a young widow has remained an unknown thing to our society from times immemorial. Our society does not know the name of a young widow. Because, it is a custom in our community that when the husband of a woman dies, then after a year of his death the brothers and parents of the widow and the relations of her late husband meet together and in spite of the shyness, as is common everywhere in our Hindu society, and against her formal wish, that she would herself bear the distress that has befallen her and in spite of her refusal she is told that this is not possible. It may be said that her

ideal is good, but how many people are there who can follow such a high ideal? The people of our society doubt whether such a lofty ideal which you are going to establish in our society would not create any evil in our society. Therefore, I wanted to support the proposition laid down by Shri Bhatt. Now I mention the reasons for that.

On the one hand where your rules and regulations wanted to reduce the troubles of our womenfolk, and they have reduced them to a great extent, on the other hand their troubles have been increased manifold: And that is because you have given them a sort of right to marry wherever they want. In the ordinary way, if no extraordinary trouble arises it would easily become a custom that they could remarry, but why do you lay down this restriction? Generally, people are not bigamous of their own will, but they are forced by circumstances. If a brother dies, his brother has to concede to the custom of bigamy against his wishes.

**Shrimati Dixit :** I want to ask you a question. There is a woman, who has got four or six children, there is her husband's brother wife, and she also has got four or six children. If they are made to live together would not the co-wifely feeling create trouble between principles to force a woman to marry another man against her wishes.

**Sardar Hukam Singh (Punjab):** By the will of God.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** If you mean remarriage by that, I would say no; remarriage is possible only when it is regularly sanctioned by society, but, there are many women who cannot

express their desire. After thirteen or fourteen days of his wife's death a man may express it, but, the women cannot do so due to the peculiar set-up of our society . Such a thing is impossible, and ample time is required to change that. But if she meant this that if there is a brother, who has got two or three children and a wife and he has a brother who is about to die, and he also got two or three children and his wife, that if they are made to live together it would create difficulties and trouble would arise. If she wants to know about that, I am coming to that point also. I confess it and everybody in our society would confess it that nobody resorts to bigamy willingly and that the woman is also helpless, because she loves her children and she cannot leave the two or three orphans, for where could they find shelter. She cannot say that she wants to remarry and the other members of the household also cannot leave the children, then the question arises whether she should take her children with her. But this is a custom in our society and I think, you may enact any law but you cannot change it. This is not a matter of joke. They themselves could change it but you cannot change it today.

There is another custom in our society. It is their belief that even the most foolish man belonging to a particular family would not allow his children to go to another family. And if a man tries to do so, a very severe punishment has been prescribed for him in our community. Even if you say that our community is backward and it is very difficult to improve it, the result of such an action among us is still murder. If you want that the number of murders and assassinations should increase in our society, Punjab is already notorious for murders and assassinations, for many people are hanged there for such murders etc.-if you want to increase their number you are at liberty to impose any rules and

regulations on them immediately. But if you want to decrease the number of murders and assassinations and the sentences of death, I would request you to accept the amendment of Shri Bhatt or of Shri Bhargava.

So, I was saying that either a woman, if she loves her children, will be forced to live as a widow for the rest of her life, as has never been done in her community before, or, if she does not love her children, she might take them stealthily to some other place at night and if she meets some daring person who says that he would see how others could harm him, the result would be that either she would become a widow again or her husband would be hanged. But, in any case, she would not remain a fortunate wife. Though, this is a big and a terrifying thing, but it is a fact.

Then there is the question of sagotra marriage. How many men and women live in the cities? I want to state my own reactions about this Hindu Code Bill. In this house the majority of members come from the urban areas. Those who were born and brought up in the cities confine their thoughts to the rules and regulations and manners and customs of the cities. They think there is a vast difference between town life and village life; they have got no experience about it. I give a simple example. For instance, take the case of a city. If a woman there does not want to marry nobody would object. But if in a village a girl attains about the sixteen of age not only does distress befall her parents but that girl is persecuted too. Everybody comes to the father and says, "Why do you not arrange for the marriage of your girl?" The girl might be bitterly opposed to marriage but she cannot avoid marriage. She is forced to do so: this theory might be good or bad but this is a fact. From this very example you can differentiate between the mode of life in a town and that of a village and see how much

difference is there between them; and still you want to enact a common law for both. My friend Shri Jangde spoke so forcefully. He spoke for others but I suspect Shri Jangde has become a townsman or has gone to their side. He is coming to appreciate the urban way of life. He wants to tell his own tale and not that of the submitting that when there is so much life, there is such a vast difference between their social conditions, and you want to enact a law which will be against their customs and usages, it would be a great injustice to them.

There is another point I would like to touch upon in this connection and that is with regard to sagotra marriage. Unlike the customs obtaining among us in Punjab, here we find that most of the girls are usually married locally. Taking the case of Delhi itself, it will be seen that girls from one part of the city are married in the other part of the city. Even in the small towns having a population of say ten thousand they are married likewise. Under the circumstances, they are not conversant with the customs regarding marriage prevailing among us. In keeping with the custom obtaining among us, I cannot get my son married among my own sub-caste which is spread over as many as 24 villages situated within a radius of no less than ten miles. It is not that he cannot be married in only those 24 villages, even the villages numbering about 30 to 40 where the families of his mother's sub-caste are settled are ruled out for the purpose of such matrimony. Things do not end here. I cannot get my son married to a girl from any of the thirty to forty villages, where people of my mother's sub-caste live. That is to say, I cannot find a bride for my son from amongst a hundred neighbouring villages or so.



**Shri A.C. Shukla:** Is it a healthy practice or otherwise?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** I never laid any claim to this effect. It is none of my intention to annoy him in the way the hon. Doctor did. Unlike him I cannot dare to utter anything unpleasant things. In contrast with the big personality of the hon. Dr. Ambedkar, I am but a humble member.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas** (Madhya Bharat) But you are also Jat.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** Of Course. I am. But not a Sikh Jat like Sardar Bhupinder Singh Man. I do not want to enter into any controversy-and thereby cause offence to anyone-as to whether our custom is better or whether our custom is better or others's of whether or not this measure is of any use. What I want is simply to apprise you of our customs which, for instance, prevent me from getting my son married in about as many as one hundred to one hundred twenty villages. How under such a state of affairs, can those women residing in small towns or even in big cities, be supposed to have any real estimate of the extent of hardships and difficulties which we are subjected to while facing such issues, because for them marriage is no more than a mere routine affair that could be performed from one mohalla to the other?

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** There is no difference between Hindu Law and your law in so far as this matter is concerned.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** There may not be any difference in the laws but the developments do vary. According to our customs

we cannot establish matrimonial connections among some certain gotras. None can dare go against such a custom. Even the most backward person -under the present social structure such a man is bound to be treated as such, although in future he may be called progressive -cannot possibly take such a step. In fact none has got so much courage, so to say so, simply enabling such a man by law, to take such a step.

**Shri A.C. Shukla:** What is it that the hon. member wants?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** I am not going to say what I want. I would, on the other hand, only want to apprise the House of the various customs prevailing. That is why I am pleading for Shri Bhatt's amendment to be accepted. Let developments be closely watched during the next ten years. The truth will express itself in the right manner. If our course of action would be correct you would, I am sure, change over to our side or, otherwise, we would do the same thing.

So, I was referring to the fact that even in the present days sagotra marriages are not being performed. But there is no denying the fact that rules and regulations have great force on their back. Supposing a man with the help of this law seeks to get married in the same village or among the same gotra, what would be the possible consequences? He is likely to meet the same fate as I have described earlier. It is not that I want to exaggerate things in any way, but, all the same, let me point out what I our present day society. Supposing any member of my family gets married in such a manner, nobody, would care to ascertain my views in the matter, if my brother commits any wrong of this type,

it may be that I may also be murdered simply because I happen to be his brother, regardless of the fact whether my views are in his favour or otherwise, none is going to ask me to explain my viewpoint. Such is the sorry state of affairs in our community. Indeed how strange it looks that they judge the doings of one brother from those of the other! Here, in your society, there brothers can hold three different views-one can be a Communist, the second a Socialist more precise, if a man here is a member of the Bharatiya Jan Sangh, it is open to his brother to join any other party. But things at our end are quite the reverse. If any one member of a certain family there joins Congress, the entire family would be automatically deemed to be Congressite regardless of the fact whether it be so or not. Such is the condition of our community. Now it is for you to call it whatever you like-progress or otherwise. I for one, under such circumstances, stand for monogamy in our society. In a country like ours, especially in a community which I belong to, namely Jats, monogamy is particularly essential, for among us the number of boys is more than girls. A man can have two wives only by encroaching upon the share of any one of his fellow beings. Under the practice of monogamy, comparatively larger number of men would be provided with wives who are otherwise not possible there may be such regions in this country where the number of women is more than men.

**Sardar B.S. Man** (Punjab): In Madras they have.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** : But the difficulty is that a Hindu Jat of our side is not so broad-minded as to go as far as Madras; a Sikh Jat may go. I for one consider monogamy to be a step in the right

direction; but the difficulty is that our society has not yet so advanced, or shall I say, degenerated, so as to agree to the practice of sagotra marriage. Let it be postponed for ten years, after that this issue may be taken afresh for consideration. If by that time the society succeeds in reaching that height of advancement, which would clear the field for such steps, we would accept it; otherwise it would keep on pending. We do not, of course, approve of the practice of what we call forced bigamy, but, all the same, the practice continues in our society, though it is not so common. Give us ten years' time during which we may make efforts to do away with such a practice.

In the end, once again I take opportunity to submit to the hon. Dr. Amedkar that although, I am a whole hearted supporter of this measure. I would like him to accept either Shri Bhatt's amendment or amendment No. 420 moved by Shri Bhargava.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Monday, 15th October, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Monday, the 15th October 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### All India Services Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : Sir, I want to submit one thing in this connection. It is that so far as viva voce is concerned, some people being very good at writing, can obtain better marks than others. But if such a person enters the Police Service, he may not prove to be a good officer simply because he is a good writer, because in the Police Service, one has not only to write notes, but also to prove one's mettle in replying to bullets. Similarly, as regards the Administrative Service, there was a time when its members, sitting in comfort, used to pass orders on files after studying them. Now, as we saw in 1947, those officers who had some courage, and who, in my opinion were not very good as writers, proved

---

\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-I-Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. X, Pt. I, 15<sup>th</sup> October, 1951, Page 4959-4961

more successful. Therefore, I do not believe that to be a good writer and obtain good marks in a written examination are the only qualifications. There are many other things besides. Just consider the case of a child who is born in a respectable and prosperous family. From his childhood he is accustomed to the use of telephone and radio in his home. As compared to him, there is another child who does not enjoy these facilities. His bringing up cannot be on the same lines as that of the former child. I do not think you would do justice to such backward children if they do not come up to the required standard in the written examination. If all the children had enjoyed the same facilities, then not granting any concessions to the weaker ones among them would have been understandable. To the former class of children, the society has already given a concession as they are brought up in an atmosphere in which they enjoy the facilities of newspapers, radio and telephone etc. in their childhood. I do not think it to be proper that in the presence of this vital concession given by society, another concession, that those who prove to be good writers shall be deemed successful, should be given by you. We do not, want any such concession. Besides this, as I have just submitted, it is not enough to be a writer in order to prove a successful officer. That requires courage and agility.

**Shri Kamath:** Agility?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Yes, agility. Suppose there is a police officer who is chasing an absconder. Supposing his vehicle has failed, he will have to carry on the chase on foot. So an officer who can run swiftly, fire accurately and face the absconder, will prove to be a more successful officer. An officer who can write

good notes on files cannot succeed here. He is not needed and he will be of no use in such a situation.

I would like to submit one thing more. Just look at the Ministers, at the Centre or in the States. In the States the Ministers get a salary of Rs. 1,500 and at the Centre they get a salary of Rs. 2,500 or Rs. 3,500. But the salaries of their Secretaries are Rs. 5,000 at some places and Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 3,000 at other places, i.e., they get 1½ times or twice as much as the Ministers. We cannot reduce the salaries of the old I.C.S. officers, as we have provided a safeguard for them in the Constitution. But the misfortune is that in spite of the fact that we are reorganizing our Services again, we are not touching their salaries. The viewpoint and the standard of living of persons who put up notes in the files are high. They forget that this is a land of the poor and that to employ persons belonging to such a high cadre and drawing such fat salaries is not in the interests of the country. Therefore, my submission is that the salaries (of officers) now fixed, though they are lesser than those prevailing before, if compared to the salaries of Ministers, will be found to be excessive. Capt. Awadesh Pratap Singh illustrated this point. He said that the Chief Minister of his place drew a salary of Rs. 500 only while the Secretary drew Rs. 2,500 or Rs. 3,000. Then there is another point. Ministers hold office for a period of 4 or 5 years, for which too there is no guarantee. The officers on the other hand, have guarantees of service and pension. Even membership for 5 years is very costly for the Ministers etc. For membership of Parliament, Rs. 25,000 have been fixed as legitimate expenses, so a member who wants to enter this House will first have to spend an amount of Rs. 25,000. For membership of other Houses, candidates will have to spend Rs. 6,000 or Rs. 8,000. If they stand for the next elections after 5

years, they will have to spend a like amount over again. In these circumstances, keeping in view the present state of our society, I do not think it proper that the salary should be Rs. 1,500 and secretaries got Rs. 3000 or Rs. 5000 who enjoy guarantees of service and pension. Therefore care should be taken in the framing of the rules that the scales are not so high as to seem excessive when compared with the standard prevailing in the country.

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 16th October, 1951

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Tuesday, the 16th October 1951, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Motion re: Five Year Plan\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : Sir, while welcoming this Five Year Plan I cannot but say that this scheme when completed would usher in a new era in the Indian villages. It would not be wrong to suggest that it would be a step towards the establishment of Ram Rajya, so to say.

Although I should have liked to take a little more time of the House and make a few more observations, I would now, in view of the short space of time at my disposal, confine myself to congratulating the Members of the Planning Commission and expressing my grievances in this regard. The plan seeks to provide for realisation from the sale or purchase of land one could

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-I-Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. X, Pt. I, 16<sup>th</sup> October, 1951, Page 5206-5208*

understand it, for, in that case, it could amount Government could justifiably claim a share in one's unearned income. But where a tax is continued to be imposed on the use of canal water it is not proper that a separate betterment fee be also realized. There are two or three reasons for this. In the first place, there are two kinds of landed property in the country, viz., there is property in the cities and another is landed property. When some new roads are constructed in cities no tax of the kind of betterment fee is levied. It is, therefore, not justifiable that a betterment fee be charged in villages for constructing new canals. These canals are being constructed not because-as many of us thought the village conditions are required to be improved but because of the fact that India's economic condition cannot be improved unless the country's food production is considerably increased. Under such circumstances, people are of the opinion that the Government should have taken these schemes much earlier and should have spent more money than what is proposed to be spent now. Already they have spent a considerable amount of money in urban development schemes and for providing suitable amenities to inhabitants of cities and towns. But unless villages are placed on equal footing with cities, no betterment fee of this kind can be said to be justifiable.

I have one more thing to state in this connection. It was also referred to by Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. What I mean to say is that the Haryana breed is facing the danger of extinction. It will be recalled that the Haryana breed is one of the finest breeds in the country.

**Sardar Sochet Singh:** Is it a breed of human beings or of cattle?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** It is a breed of cattle—one of the best cattle breeds to be found in India. It is better than the breed of human beings!

**An Hon. Member:** Of that you are a good specimen.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Haryana breed is one of the best cattle breeds in India. May I request hon. Shri Nanda who has also been a Minister in Bombay, to see what is happening in Calcutta. Cows and buffaloes of good breeds are sent from the side and when they go dry, they are slaughtered. While preparing any plans they should also take this fact into consideration so that the best cattle breeds in the country are preserved.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** They have been taking into consideration for the last 28 years but with no results.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I am not prepared to admit that the Government have no means to do so or that it is so difficult a task that they cannot possibly do it. He too seems to be of the same opinion, but since he is a little displeased, he speaks in such ambiguous terms. It is by no means a difficult task. If these cattle are sent back to Punjab, one of the best cattle breeds would be preserved.

Apart from these two things there is one more point which I would like to touch on. It is that there should be a uniform taxation policy throughout the country. Whereas income to the tune of several thousands of rupees is not taken into consideration while

imposing income-tax on all non-agricultural incomes, things are otherwise in case of agricultural incomes. Therefore, since many other things have been taken into consideration while preparing this Plan, this aspect of the question should have also been given due consideration. The system of land revenue should be so formulated that an agriculturist who ekes out his income from the seat of his brow may not have to pay income-tax on the income up to at least two to three thousand rupees.

**Shri Feroz Gandhi (Uttar Pradesh):** Your may see to all these things next time. It is too late now.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** Now, I would not take more time of the House and would only submit to the Government that next time when they bring forward the detailed scheme, they should take particular note of at least two or three things. One is that all the good cattle breeds in the country, especially the Haryana breed, should be preserved. Since it is our desire to see that Bombay and Calcutta get full supply of milk, let there be no slaughter either of buffaloes or of cows. Second thing, as I said before, is that there should be an uniform taxation policy throughout the length and breadth of the country.

# 1952

## PROVISIONAL PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 5th March, 1952

The Provisional Parliament of India met in the Constitution Hall, New Delhi, at Ten of the Clock on Wednesday, the 5th March 1952, Mr. President in the Chair.

### Finance Bill\*

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh** (Punjab) : Sir, while welcoming the finance Bill, I have to draw the attention of hon. Finance Minister to the fact that a new era of agricultural economy is about to begin. As stated by him yesterday, years 1931-39 proved to be a hard era for agricultural economy after which the situation took a turn and a change occurred which brought some relief to the agriculturist. But peculiar circumstances have been prevailing since the beginning of this year. Certain hon. friends have been discussing the sharp rise in food prices and mention that the living index has gone up considerably. I, however, suggest a period of last one

---

*\*The Parliamentary Debates, (Part-I-Questions and Answers) Official Report] Vol. 11, Pt. II, 5<sup>th</sup> March, 1952, Page 2033-2037*

year for this survey. The control price of 'gur' was fixed at Rs. 21/- per maund last year. What is the price today? It is selling at Rs. 6/- or Rs. 7/- per maund. On one hand you are showing concern about the rise of some points in the cost of living index and express fears about an economic revolution overtaking the country, while on the other hand you are ignoring the depression with which 'gur' merchants in the country are faced. They are also your countrymen and their trade also affects the country's economy. It is not a small thing that price of the commodity in which they are trading should so suddenly come down from Rs. 21/- to Rs. 6 per maund. Yet we find-not only in India but also in the whole world-the slogan of planned economy catching the people's imagination. I will like to know whether this is what you mean by planned economy?

You pass legislations and give assurances that cotton of a particular variety can be sown and this cotton the Government will purchase at some specified rates. What are, however, the conditions today? Some days back Pandit Tahkur Das Bargava gave an account of the situation obtaining in his district. A deputation of the agriculturists and farm-owners of that area recently had an interview with the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. In this country long staple cotton is being grown in Hansi and Kamal in addition to my own district. But the situation at present is such that none is prepared at any cost for its cultivation now. You are purchasing the cotton from America where the rate is about Rs. 300 and even more. On the other hand you are reluctant to purchase the very same indigenous cotton even at Rs. 50 per maund. I want to know what sort of planned economy this is. Do you really think the country stands to gain thereby?

I request you to pause and think. If you want to see India to produce a self-superior type of cotton, you should stop importing it from other countries and stop spending your finances in other countries on its purchases. You will, however, have to take all aspects of the matter into consideration. We in this country grow a variety of cotton known as 'narma'. It is as narma (soft) as its name implies. It becomes more softer after some time.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** After March, 16<sup>th</sup> the discolouring would begin.

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh :** After March, 16<sup>th</sup> the agriculturist will not be able to get any price for it. You may just realize the result if it is not purchased before March, 16<sup>th</sup>. You should pass some legislation to meet the situation, otherwise people will let their land remain unsown rather than put in so much toil with no returns. The cultivator toils in order to earn his living. Should that, however, be not possible and on the contrary should he have to incur loss, he will certainly desist from laboring on the plough. If therefore, you want that more cotton of better quality should be produced in the country, you should just ponder over the results of your controls policy during the last ten years. The Government have-by following the policy of controls-taken away all money from the cultivators and have helped other sections of the society in purchasing the commodities at controlled rates. Now that a different trend is in the offing, the Government ought to protect their interests. You should discharge this obligation boldly.

You adopted all devices to bring down the prices of gur last year. You imposed even a license on the kolhus. I will like to



know from the Minister and the Deputy Minister of Food what steps they have taken to stabilise *gur* price?, I would then like to know whether you are the Minister of Food or the Minister of Industries?

As Minister of Food and Agriculture, it is your duty to evolve some scheme, introduce some Bill or adopt any other measures to see that the people who toiled hard to produce sugar or *gur* for the country and endured all rigours of the weather in doing so, get a due return for the same. Should you, however fail, the difficulties regarding the food situation are bound to confront the country in a much more serious form. Till recently our factories had often to close down for want of sufficient cotton. Do you think that such a situation cannot arise again? It is bound to come. If you want your 'Five Year Plan' to achieve results, you will have to concentrate more attention on it. Many friends suggest the granting of food subsidy in the industrial areas without which bound to go up. They, however, forget such a necessity in the case of agricultural labour. An excuse is advanced that they already receive a share in the crops? A person receiving four to five maunds of food-grains as his share under this system, cannot be expected to be able to make both ends meet. It is said again that the income of people living in rural areas has considerably increased.

I want to tell you that if there is any section of society whose economic level can be considered to be the lowest, it is the agricultural labour and it is this section which deserves most the grant of any subsidy. If you are, however, interested in their ruin, you may proceed with it. They will, in that case, gladly suffer along with other sections of society. Many friends here fear some unrest overtaking the country. I will ask them to study the History

of the Asian Countries, if there has ever been a severe unrest, it had its origin in the rural areas. Today you are not faced with any problem concerning the cities of Madras, Bombay or Calcutta. It is Telengana that is engaging your attention most. Our administrators get disturbed sleep because of the developments in Telengana. I wish to know whether that area could be considered as populated by the industrial labour? Any revolution that may overtake the country, will have its origin in the rural areas.

India has attained her freedom because of the struggle of those simple country folk who did not know how to make speeches or get news published in the papers. The history will repeat itself because of these very people and a revolution may come in the country. India's industrial labour is not likely to prove effective for another 20 to 25 years. You should, therefore, keep their difficulties in view in any financial scheme that you may evolve. Even if you cast all fears aside, the part, which our villages play in the country's economy, has to be reckoned with. It is very strange that in a country predominantly agricultural, rural areas should be so by-passed and utterly neglected in all our financial policies.

I wish you just to pay some attention to your taxation policy. You levy and, realize income-tax from the people. Pandit Thaku Das Bhargava is all praise for the joint family system. He wants the taxation limit to be raised to Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 6,000 in the case of joint families. What is, on the other hand, the position regarding taxation in the rural areas? Any person with a holding of only one Bigha, though suffering a loss, has to pay the tax. I want to know if somebody yet dare repeat what was generally said during the British rule that all things may belong to the individuals but land belongs to the Government. Revenue and other taxes is

identical thing. Yet different rules apply to the two categories of tax-payers.

**Shri Syamanandan Sahaya (Bihar):** How much are they required to pay?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** For sugarcane crop they have to pay at the rate of Rs. 15 per acre while for all other purposes it is Rs. 2½ per acre.

**Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava:** These include water charges etc. the revenue is not so much.

**Shri Syamanandan Sahay:** What is the revenue per acre?

**Chaudhry Ranbir Singh:** I want to refer to one point. It may surprise you to know how much the people are charged in Delhi and Chandigarh where roads are being built and all other modern facilities being provided. I want to know the total expenditure incurred on the development of Delhi and the contributions made there to by the local residents. The case with the rural areas is, however, different. People there are charged for the canals dug in their areas and even afterwards they are required to pay regular taxes. Can it be called financial justice? The underlying basis of your justice occurs to be that there should be different sets of laws for rural and urban areas.

A good deal has been said about the difficulties of middle class people. Is it not a fact that during the British rule right up to the year 1939, this class had been living at the cost of other classes?

In addition to their own rights they had usurped other people's rights also. What is wrong if they are getting what is rightly their own for the last ten years. There is no injustice involved therein. A comparison of their financial position with the rest of society even today will show that they are in a more favourable condition.

It is no justice to have justice such a soft corner for the middle class people while denying the same consideration to others. It is not a practical proposition especially in a country where adult franchise has been conceded and where Government's fate hangs on that very basis.

It, therefore, want you to see a stable administration in India and achieve prosperity through a planned economy. You will have to do hard thinking and change the present economic structure if necessary.

# Chaudhry Ranbir Singh

## CHRONOLOGY

### 1914

26 November : Born, at village *Sanghi*, distt. Rohtak.(Mother Smt. Mam Kaur, Father Chaudhry Matu Ram. Brothers .  
: Dr. Balbir Singh, Fateh Singh.)

### 1920

April : Joined Government Primary School, Sanghi.

### 1921

16 April : Mahatma Gandhi visited Jat School Rohtak. Chaudhry Matu Ram presided over a meeting of 25,000 people there which Gandhiji addressed.

### 1924

July : Passed Primary School Examination.  
: Joined Gurukul, Bhainswal, distt. Rohtak for further studies.(Presently Sonapat.)

### 1928

: Left Gurukul, Bhainswal for health rea-

sons.

### 1929

December : Joined Vaish High School, Rohtak.  
: Went to Lahore with his elder brother to witness the historic Lahore session of the Congress.

### 1933

: Passed Matriculation Examination.  
: Joined Government College, Rohtak for higher studies.

### 1935

: Passed F.Sc. Examination.  
: Joined Ramjas College, Delhi for further studies.

### 1937

November : Passed BA Examination.  
: Marriage with Smt. Hardei, d/o Chaudhry Hardwari Singh of village Dumarkha, Jind

### 1941

March : Joined Congress Party.  
5 April : Offered *Satyagraha* during the Individual *Satyagraha* Movement; (arrested from Village Sanghi) awarded one year's rigorous imprisonment (hereafter r.i.)

25 May : Released from jail at the behest of the Punjab High Court, Lahore, along with other prisoners.

June : Again offered *Satyagraha*; awarded 4 months r.i.

24 September : Released from jail.

**1942**

- 14 July : Father died.  
 : Arrested during the wake of the Quit India Movement; tried in the local court; and jailed for 3 years.

**1944**

- 24 July : Released from jail; put under 'house arrest'.  
 September : Again arrested in an old case and sent to jail.

**1945**

- 14 February : Released from jail, but put under 'house arrest'.  
 : Arrested for disobedience of the 'detention' order.

- December : Elections to the Punjab Legislative Assembly announced.

- 12 December : Nominations for the coming elections to the Punjab Legislative Assembly filed (Chaudhary Saheb being still in jail did not contest the election)

- 18 December : Released from jail

**1946**

- : Election to Central Assembly held.

**1947**

- 10 July : Elected to the Constituent Assembly of India by the Punjab Legislative Assembly.

- 14 July : Presented Credentials and signed the Register as a member of the Constituent Assembly.

- 15 August : India became free.  
 : Worked hard to douse communal fire in his own district and Mewat (Gurgaon).  
 : Accompanied Gandhiji during his Mewat peace tour.

**1948**

- 6 November : Maiden Speech in the Constituent Assembly

- 30 January : Gandhiji shot; went to Delhi to have last *darshan* of the great man.

**1949**

- 26 March : Elected to Standing Committee for Ministry of Agriculture.  
 : Elected to Standing Committee for Ministry for Rehabilitation.

**1952**

- April : Elected to 1<sup>st</sup> Lok Sabha from Rohtak constituency.

**1957**

- April : Again elected to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Lok Sabha (Rohtak).

**1962**

- : Elected to Vidhan Sabha from Kalanaur constituency (Rohtak)  
 : Joined Kairon Ministry as Irrigation and Power Minister.  
 : The Bhakra Dam Project completed.

**1963**

22 October : The Bhakra Dam dedicated to the nation by Prime Minister, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru.

**1965-66**

: Worked for formation of Haryana.

**1966**

1 November : Haryana State came into being.  
: Shifted to Haryana Legislative Assembly, and joined as P.W.D. Minister in Haryana Council of Ministers.

**1967**

: Contested election for Haryana Legislative Assembly from Kilo Constituency but lost.

**1968**

: President's Rule in Haryana imposed.  
: Elected to Haryana Vidhan Sabha from Kalanaur.

**1972**

4 April : Elected to the Rajya Sabha from Haryana.  
: Elected Deputy Leader of the Congress Parliamentary Party in the House (Mrs. Indira Gandhi was the Leader).  
: Formed Freedom Fighter's Association and Freedom Fighters Successor's Association along with his friends, Shri Sheelbhadra Yaji and N.G. Ranga; Mrs. Indira Gandhi agreed to give pensions to freedom fighters on their pleadings.

**1977**

: Appointed as President, Haryana Pradesh Congress Committee for about two years.

**1978**

: Renounced electoral politics after the expiry of the Rajya Sabha term; took to social work; worked as President, Harijan Sevak Sangh and became active in Backward Classes Federation, Bharat Krishak Samaj, etc.

**2009**

1 February : Passed away; Nation and the State mourn.

2 February : Cremation at *Smadhi Sthal*, Rohtak.

4 February : Ashes immersed in the Gobind Sagar, Bhakra and the Hathni Kund Barrage, Yamunanagar.

11 February : *Shradhanjali Sabha* held at the Jat College grounds, Rohtak.

## INDEX

Act:44,67,90,94,107,108,109,120,129,137,153,154,161,  
176,178,180,181,184,185,186,187,196,198,201,222,223.  
Administrative :57,207,233.  
Agriculture:34,44,45,71,77,78,113,114,115,120,125,127,146,187,245.  
Agricultural Finance Corporation:35,50,145,146,147.  
Agricultural Products:45,46,50,51,63,137.  
America:45,46,47,51,122,127,243.  
Amount: 50,62,69,94,96,102,111,114,120,122,125,126,  
142,143,145,146,166,167,187,219,235,236,238.  
Animal/Cattle :46,69,81,82,83,84,85,86,87,238,239,240.  
Army:38,39,40,41,42.  
Article:62,78,82,90,91,92,134,161,181,192,193,205,211,214.  
Assembly:79,100,162,166,174,178,182,196,206,207,211,212.  
Backward:140,141,159,160,168,172,185,226,230,234.  
Bank:71,72,73,74,75,77,95,96,113,115,116,117,142.  
Bhakra Dam:35,36,111,112,146.

Bill:38,40,42,59,68,71,81,82,83,84,86,87,88,89,90,91,  
98,100,107,109,110,111,113,114,128,131,135,139,140,142,143,144,145,  
146,148,149,153,155,159,163,165,166,168,170,173,175,181,182,  
184,185,205,206,210,216,218,221,222,223,227,233,242,245.  
Black market:107,108,109,176,219.  
Budget:79,111,122,124,128,162.  
Buffalo:68,83,84,239,240.  
Commission:39,40,41,141,154,173,183,192,215,237.  
Committees:43,44,87,123,141.  
Concession:49,72,123,157,158,160,169,234.  
Conflict:215.  
Congress:42,146,160,162,194,195,196,197,198,199,207,208,  
209,218,223,231.  
Constituency:98,99,100,101,102,148,155,171,173,174,182,223.  
Constitution:43,59,82,88,98,99,100,129,150,158,159,160,161,  
167,168,171,172,184,186,193,194,195,205,207,212,214,235.  
Control:60,61,62,63,78,90,91,92,93,94,109,123,125,134,190,191,  
192,203,216,243,244.  
Co-operative Bank:115,117.  
Cotton:45,46,74,122,123,127,133,137,189,190,191,203,217,  
143,144,145.  
Country:33,34,38,40,42,45,47,48,50,51,55,56,57,58,59,60,71,

72,73,74,75,78,80,82,83,84,85,86,87,88,91,93,  
96,98,107,108,109,113,114,115,116,117,118,  
120,122,124,125,126,127,128,131,132,133,134,  
135,136, 137,138,143,144,145,146,147,150,160,  
161,173,177,190,191,192,202,203,204,212,213,  
214,216,217,218,219,222,223,231,235,236,238,239,  
240,243,244,245,246,248.  
Country-side:137,190.  
Cow:84,86,87,239,240.  
Credit:86,142,143.  
Crop:69,74,76,114,117,125,138,143,191,204,245,247.  
Decontrol: 59,92,93,133,190.  
Discrimination:94,129,131,158,166,167,178,185,200,210.  
Domestic:161.  
Economy:91,92,93,147,217,242,243,246,248.  
Economists:95,96.  
Education:79,100,168,198,213.  
Election:39,55,79,100,101,102,103,105,137,138,141,148,149,150,154,  
155,159,160,164,165,166,171,173,174,179,196,199,200,207,212,215,235.  
Employees:200.  
Expert:71,113,118,120,127.  
Factory:93,108.

Farm:35,87,146,243.  
Farmer:60,62,73,76,77.  
Food-  
grain:33,34,35,36,46,61,62,109,115,126,127,134,191,204,245.  
Franchise:248.  
Gram:51,60,61,67,68,69,124.  
Gur:46,63,93,133,203,243,244,245.  
Harijan:133,141,145,157,171,172,185.  
Haryana:84,85,223,238,239,240.  
Hindi: 33,56,151,193.  
Hindu Law: 229.  
Hindu: 53,221,222,223,224,227,229,231.  
I.N.A.:42.  
Industrial/  
Industry:49,50,71,72,92,118,122,123,127,133,144,145,146,  
216,217,219,245,246,  
Inflation:35,36,132.  
Interest:35,44,45,50,52,72,74,75,76,82,88,92,93,123,150,164,  
185,202,209,212,217,219.  
Iron:62,93.  
Irrigation:36,51,145,191.  
Jat:38,39,224,229,231.  
Justice:135,136,141,186,189,191,216,217,228,234,247,248.  
258 / *Swaraj Legacy*

Jute:74,115,192,201.

Land / Land mortgage:36,49,50,53,58,59,62,73,74,75,77,80,  
85,112,114,115,116,117,119,120,121,123,125,  
126,129,130,131,132,134,137,138,143,145,160,  
185,186,187,189,191, 196,203,204,208,235,237,  
238,240,244,246.

Land Acquisition:119,120,121.

Landlord :117.

Law:56,57,67,74,83,84,92,94,103,108,109,110,129,161,176,179,180,  
181,185,186,187,196,206,207,214,222,223,236,228,229,230,247.

License:176,177,188,189,208,209,244.

Machinery:72,115,150,193,206.

Mandi:60,67.

Marriage:224,225,227,238,229,230,232.

Meat:85,86.

Merchant:94,243.

Milk:83,84,85,86,87,240.

Minimum Price:46,51,114.

Minimum wage:135,137.

Oil:78,201,202.

Oilseeds:115,125,201,202,203,204.

Pension:235,236.

Plan:125,145,181,204,217,237,239,240,243,245,248.

Policy:61,92,93,120,125,131,132,133,137,138,191,216,224,239,240,244.

Politics / Political:35,146,154,159,168,169,195,214.

Polling:102,103,104,154,155,156.

Poor:65,66,94,100,102,110,120,136,138,141,151,157,208,235.

Population:36,53,82,88,98,99,100,101,102,117,132,147,160,185,  
212,214,228.

Post Office:65,66,95,96,156.

Power:40,57,59,60,63,69,73,90,109,119,123,171,186,190,201,206,  
207,208,209,222,223.

Production:33,34,35,44,45,46,47,51,61,74,76,77,84,85,86,91,92,94,114,  
115,117,125,126,133,136,137,189,190,203,204,238.

Profiteering:107,109,176.

Punjab:35,36,50,51,58,59,60,68,69,72,73,83,93,100,101,102,  
109,129,146,147,157,182,184,185,186,187,189,193,195,  
196,197,198,199,200,205,206,207,208,209,211,212,213,215,  
222,223,224,226,228,239.

Qualifications:44,99,100,162,217.

Representative :44,45,46,47,48.

Reservation:81,82,87,100,139,168.

Revenue:49,50,53,74,116,126,129,130,131,132,240,246,247.

Rohtak:207,212.



Rural:34,36,61,65,66,72,73,74,75,77,78,95,100,P140,141,211,  
212,245,246,247.

Savings:95,96.

Schedule Caste/ Schedule Tribe  
:98,99,100,141,167,168,171,172,214,216.

Sectarianism:200.

Sugar:63,78,108,133,137,203,217,245,247.

Sugarcane:43,46,137,247.

Supply:69,85,90,91,179,190,191,204,240.

Tax :49,50,53,54,86,122,128,129,130,131,132,133,192,  
202,203,204,238,239,240,246,247.

Tenant: 58,59,120,121,129,137,138,196.

Village:65,78,94,95,96,97,102,104,123,133,134,135,138,139,  
144,146,148,151,155,156,184,198,212,229,228,229,230,  
237,238,246.

Vote:87,103,104,138,150,156,160,170,171,172,174,195,206.

Voters:69,70,98,99,101,102,104,156,171,172,206.

Wages:132,134,135,137,138.

Wells:45,48,94,115,126,142,143.

Wheat:51,60,61,67,124,125,191.

Yield:224.

Zaildar:182,198,199,208.

