

[श्री यशपाल सिंह]

दिलेरी के साथ इस आसन को सम्भाला है और परमात्मा से उन की कामयाबी के लिये प्रार्थना करता हूँ।

Shri Tyagi rose—

Mr. Speaker: After the reply? Now the debate is closed.

Shri Tyagi: I am sorry. I thought the Minister was going to reply.

Mr. Speaker: The debate is closed. I am putting the motion to the vote of the House. Though they have been discussed together, they are two separate motions. The second motion is not to be put to the vote because it only says "be taken into consideration". The first motion is a positive one. So, it has to be put to the vote.

The question is:

"That this House takes note of the abnormal rise in prices of all foodgrains and other essential commodities in the country."

The motion was adopted.

12.12 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: DISTRIBUTION OF NATIONAL INCOME—Contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the distribution of national income. I think Professor Ranga had concluded his speech that day. Now **Shrimati Yashoda Reddy**.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I earnestly request you, and I am sure my hon. friends will agree with me, that in view of the importance of this resolution and the wide interest it has evoked, the time may be extended by the consent of the House?

Shri Gauri Shanker Kakkar (Fatehpur): I quite agree with what **Shri Kama** has said.

Mr. Speaker: The time allotted for this resolution is two hours, out of which one hour has already been taken. There is yet one hour.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I think at least a total of four hours should be allotted for this.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. Members know, two and a half hours is the maximum that we can give under the rules.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: For the two motions, consideration of which just ended, five hours were allotted.

Mr. Speaker: But that was not under this rule.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: But under rule 292 it can always be done.

Mr. Speaker: All right. I will extend it by one hour.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): **Mr. Speaker**, Parliament has become a place where, more often than not, we somehow or other by-pass the main issues under discussion, and politics and personalities come into the picture. And politicians, people say, are soulless people. Many a time I tried to argue, but they said "No". This time, when **Dr. Lohia** presented his case on the floor of the House, I did feel that we from our side of the House tried to by-pass the main issue which he tried to put forward and tried to argue a case which was very weak, simply because we happen to come from the Congress side. There are many important issues which are above politics. For example, when the question of the defence of India came up here, we forgot all our political and party affiliations and stood as a nation and said "defence comes first and party and personality next". The issue which **Dr. Lohia** has raised now also, in my humble opinion, is not an issue of party politics, relating to Congress or Communists, Swatantra or Praja Socialist, but it is an issue of the poor common man who is suffering so much misery and so it should be discussed from that point of view; not from the

point of view that because Dr. Lohia has raised it or Shri Hiren Mukerjee has supported it, so we from the Congress side should oppose it.

After all, are we the people whose soul is dead, who do not feel for the suffering men? If we have no feeling of sympathy for them even when they are getting only 3 annas or $7\frac{1}{2}$ annas, I say we have no right to belong to the species called human being. Of course, it is true that Dr. Lohia does not always come out with very intelligent or important issues but this time he has certainly proved that he at least has a heart superior. Shri Morarka is a very intelligent person, but the other day he tried to argue a very weak case. But it is not a case which needs intelligence or ingenuity. Only the other day, the hon. Minister came out very stoutly stating "We are not giving them 3 annas; we are giving them $7\frac{1}{2}$ annas". What does it matter? Will it make the slightest difference to the poor people? Instead of coming before the House and stating like that, he could have said "I do apologise because we are not able to give them enough; we will do our best to give them more". That would have been much better. I would say it is rather inhuman, if not indecent to come and say "I am giving them 7 annas". I ask this House, every Member of this House whether he or she can live on 8 annas, one rupee or even two rupees for that matter. Can any Member of Parliament with no house, no food and no clothing just live on 7, 8 or 10 annas a day?

I am not saying that Government is not doing anything. What I am saying is, when so pitiable is the situation, we should not feel ashamed of it. We should be brave enough to come forward and say "this is the position, we are trying our best but, certainly, we have not done our best". It is these words of sympathy and understanding that are far more important to the man in the street than our stoutly defending our position by saying "it is not 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ annas but 7 annas or

8 annas". It reminds me of the famous proverb of two or three distinguished surgeons arguing about a patient in the operation theatre, each insisting that his diagnosis alone is correct, and exclaiming that the *post mortem* will reveal who is correct. The question is not whether he is getting 4 annas or 7 annas a day. The question is whether the man in the street, a person in the village, is getting food, one square meal a day, whether he is getting one set of clothes to change every three days, if not every day. That is the question which has to be faced. Plans, foreign policies and platitudes are no substitute for this. All that he wants is a square meal and two sets of clothes.

Here I would like to mention another thing. The other day, I was listening to the debate on the Report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Somehow or other, it has become a convention in this House, that whenever that report comes up for consideration, only members belonging to the Scheduled Castes and people belonging to backward classes participate in the debate. Of course, I am not saying that they have no right to participate in the debate. But the point is, somehow or other, they are not able to put forward their case before the House and before the country, especially about their socio-economic conditions, as forcefully and cogently as Shri Nath Pai or Shri Hiren Mukerjee or some members from our side of the House would be able to do it.

Shri P. R. Patel: Why should the hon. Member praise Shri Hiren Mukerjee and Shri Nath Pai?

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: They are very good speakers. Whether they have substance or not, they speak very well. That is what I meant. If you are prepared to give me that compliment, I am prepared to accept it.

Mr. Speaker: She might continue her speech.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: Coming to the Adivasis and backward classes, only the other day it was reported in the newspapers that two students of Etawah, who were given admission in the hostel, were ill-treated. And what was their sin? Their only sin was that they were poor people belonging to backward classes. If in India today the university students behave like that, I say that they have no right to be inside any university. It is a shame for every educated man and every university that in India these students were treated like that. Why should a person be treated in that way merely because he happened to belong to a Scheduled Caste or is a harijan, or just because he happens to be poor? Merely because he happens to be poor, neither is his case heard, nor is justice done to him. He is treated with contempt and a sort of indifference. The other day, Shri Hiren Mukerjee and Dr. Lohia presented before the House the picture of glaring poverty which is stalking India. Yet, most of us were indifferent or never had the heart to say it or the strength to own it up on the floor of the House. Maybe, we have seen so much poverty in India that we have developed not only a sort of indifference but also a sort of contempt for poverty.

I am not here to preach anything. My only objection is to the attitude of the Government and the Ministers to this problem. When such a problem comes before the House, I again appeal to the Members of Parliament from our side, they should not look at it from the political point of view or from the point of view of who moved the motion. Let us look at it from the human angle with sympathy.

Of course, I am not in a position now to say what we should do immediately or the direction in which we should act. At the same time, I would like to state one thing. Some hon. Member was saying that this Government is of no use because it has not given any relief to the poor. My submission is, if at all there is

one government and if at all there is one party which can solve this problem, I do firmly believe it is our Government and it is our party. Perhaps, we might not have done enough but, certainly, we are trying to focus our attention better in that sphere. My humble submission to the hon. Minister is this. Whatever may be his plans and platitudes, hereafterwards his main attention or focus should be on the men who are living in the countryside, who are poverty-stricken people and to see that they get a square meal, they get enough food and clothing.

13 hrs.

Before I conclude I would like to say one word about Shri Morarka's speech. He said that in spite of rise in prices the cost of living rural indebtedness have not increased, that people have managed to live for so many years without increasing rural indebtedness. If it is a court of law, you can introduce technicalities. The other day we brought in technicalities but I don't want to quote that. But it is not a court of law where we are trying to argue a case for or against. Here is a fact that a poor man did not or would not go in for extra indebtedness because he just could not. He had no money. The cost of living does not affect him. Whether it is Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 or a few rupees more or less, he does not have any money to spend on house, milk, food, clothing etc. He cannot have them because these are things beyond him. He might not have spent more; he might not have gone in for greater indebtedness. But to say that because he was getting enough he was able to maintain himself is, I think, a very inhuman argument. All that I can tell him is that such arguments would not do.

The hon. Planning Minister who is also in charge of Labour and Home—there he is coming—is a man with a very kind heart and a sympathetic understanding. He should see that the eff-

ect of the Plans, whether in the field of education or health, employment or other things, should go to the villages. They should go to the men in the villages. Let not say the villagers come to the town. Already we see that the urban population is increasing. All the people living in the villages are coming to the urban areas in search of food, clothing and employment. Hereafterwards at least we should see that food and clothing reach them. Today the condition in our villages is that people do not get medical attention, a newborn baby does not get a drop of milk, a man is not able to provide food for his half-a-dozen people who are dependent upon him.

The last thing I would like to say is this. Certainly, the Indian population has been increasing by leaps and bounds. I could not understand Shri Yashpal Singh's Hindi version correctly but I believe he gave a rather absurd picture of the control of population. I am sorry, if I did not understand him.

Shri Yashpal Singh (Kairana): You have not understood it.

श्री नाथ पाई (राजापुर) : आपने ठीक समझा है ।

श्रीमती यशोदा रेड्डी : अच्छी तरह नहीं समझा, लेकिन इतना तो समझा है कि पापुलेशन के बारे में कुछ बोला है ।

But I do say that the control of population is one of the most important things for India. Whatever we may produce otherwise, whatever we may do so far as our Plans are concerned, unless we are able to control our population either voluntarily or otherwise, I think, we will not be able to solve our problem. They may say that it is a sin to control the population, but I think it is a greater sin to have children born year after year to poor people who are not able to feed them and to make them live in Starvation and die of lingering

death. It is better that they are not born at all than to be born and live a life of living death. An American who came to India said about the Indian population that they are born like rats, they live like rats and they die like rats. This is not what I want to be said of the Indian nation. I would like to have a lesser number of people but a better quality of people.

When the hon. Home Minister replies, I hope, he will understand that Dr. Lohia's approach to this is just. In other cases it may not have been so; but in this particular case it is so. I do congratulate him for having brought this to our attention. Let the hon. Minister take it from that point and from the human point of view and not that it is Dr. Lohia who moved this motion. Behind Dr. Lohia's motion is the poor and suffering man who looks upto him and our Government for some protection which he is justified in asking of us.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Guha. Hon. Members will take care that they finish their speeches within ten minutes because there is little time now.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the debate is just to ascertain how poor we are. It is an admitted fact that India is a poor country, but I do not know from where Dr. Lohia has brought these statistics that 60 per cent of the people of India live on three annas a day. It was not just an casual statement made in the heat of the moment on one day but he repeated that statement subsequently and yesterday also he gave certain figures to show that 4 to 5 lakhs of our people die every year of starvation and a few million die of malnutrition. I think, he cannot prove these figures from any statistics. Of course, if he imagines certain things, we cannot help it.

[Shri A. C. Guha]

13.06 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

It is known that India is poor and awfully poor. There is no denying that fact. But the question is from where we started whether we have been progressing in the right direction or whether we have been moving in the wrong direction. We started from a very low bottom and during these few years our national income has gone up by 50 per cent at constant prices. From Rs. 8,600 crores our national income has gone up to Rs. 13,000 and odd crores and it is at constant prices and not at current prices. It is more than 50 per cent increase.

In spite of the rise of population by 20 per cent, our *per capita* income has also gone up and at present it is, I think, Rs. 330. The question is how this *per capita* income is distributed. There has been some attempt on the part of Government to see that there may be some fair and equitable process for making the distribution of income. It is not that the Government is unaware of the fact that the national income was not being properly distributed. In this very House about three years ago the Prime Minister himself raised this question by saying that he did not know where the increased income had gone and who had monopolised the income that had been created through the Plan efforts for 13 to 14 years. So, the Government knows it and the Government has been trying to take certain steps to remedy it. Yet, I cannot say that the Government has been successful in its attempts to secure a somewhat equitable distribution of the national income.

In this regard I should also say that perhaps in no country in the world has there been what can be called an equitable distribution of the national income, not even in the USSR. The main difficulty is at the lowest bottom. The last 10 per cent of the population suffer in every country.

In India they consume only 2.4 per cent of the national income. But before stating these figures I should admit that no figure in this respect can be very, very accurate. But we shall have to proceed on the basis of certain figures available to us. The lowest 10 per cent of the population in India enjoy 2.4 per cent of the total national income. In USA the lowest 10 per cent enjoy only 1 per cent of the total national income; in UK 2 per cent; in West Germany 1 per cent and in Holland 1.3 per cent. Similarly, the second lowest 10 per cent of the population in India enjoy 3.4 per cent of the total national income; in USA 3 per cent; in the UK 3 per cent. Again, the third lowest 10 per cent of the population in India enjoy 4.3 per cent of the total national income; in USA 5 per cent; 2 in the U.K. 5 per cent; in West Germany 4 per cent. In all the lowest 30 per cent of our population in India enjoy 10.1 per cent of the total national income; in USA the lowest 30 per cent of the population enjoy only 9 per cent of the total national income; in the UK 10 per cent and from the available figures only in Sweden the lowest 30 per cent of the population enjoy 10.6 per cent of the total national income whereas 30 per cent of our people enjoy only 10.1 per cent of the national income. So, from the statistics available, we can say that our distribution of the national income from the point of view of the lowest section, the poorest section, of the population is not very unfair compared to other countries. But I should not say that we should be happy or complacent with this, because the level of poverty in our country, whatever may be the percentage figures, is far deeper than the level of poverty in other countries mentioned by me.

As for the minimum *per capita* income, we should proceed on the basis of whatever statistics we have been able to gather. I think it would be admitted that the Adivasis are perhaps the poorest section of our population and

Madhya Pradesh is one of the poorest States in our country. The National Council of Applied Economic Research has made a recent study about the economic conditions in Madhya Pradesh. There, they have divided the whole State into five sectors and the *per capita* income of the Adivasis in these five sectors varied from Rs. 171 to Rs. 104. That is perhaps the lowest income of any section of the people in India. There may be some pockets, some individuals, who may be getting even lower income. But perhaps Adivasis mostly landless labourers—could be taken as the poorest section of the people and Madhya Pradesh is one of the poorest States in the country. There also, the lowest income group is Rs. 104 per year—that is the central sector Madhya Pradesh—which comes to 29 np. per head. That also is higher than what Dr. Lohia suggested. According to his calculation, it is only 19 np.

Besides this, we should also take into consideration that money economy is not so much in vogue in rural areas of India. Money transaction has only now, in the recent past, been introduced in the rural markets. I think, even now, some of the transactions are done on a barter system. It has been mentioned that in the rural areas, particularly the landless labourers and the Adivasis incur debt year after year and that also from money-lenders. They incur debts. But surely they must have been paying the debts. There is no land or any other security to pledge to the money-lender for the debts. They must be repaying the debts. How can they repay their debts? I think they sell their labour. The labour, or rather the value of the labour that they give to the money-lender is adjusted against the debts. That is not taken into their money income. That is only adjusted.

Then, there are some invisible incomes also, some sort of social security, social services, given by the States. In rural areas, I think, primary education is free in all the States and I think about 80 per cent

of the school-going children attend schools. So also there is provision for free medical aids. So, even the poorest section of the community can take the advantage of free primary education. Even about secondary education, I think, in rural areas, upto class VII, certain sections of the people get free education. There are so many stipends and scholarships for the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and Adivasis. That is also a sort of invisible income which goes into the real income of the poorest section of the people. Gratuitous relief and subsidized foodgrains supplied through modified rationing also help to add to the real income of the poorest section.

Now, what is the national income or the *per capita* income? The figure of 3 annas or 5 annas or 7 annas matters very little. The real measure should be: what are the goods and services received or enjoyed by the nation or by the individual. From that point of view, all these services that the poorest section of the people enjoy should be taken into consideration in evaluating, in calculating, the *per capita* income even of the lowest section of the people. Poverty is a chronic problem for India and it cannot be solved by any heated discussion or romantic economics. It has to be solved by a long strenuous and patient labour. The Government have initiated certain measures and it is expected that this will bring some relief to the poorest section of the people and they have been giving some relief to the poorest section of the people.

Another point that I should mention is this. The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Commission proposed to spend Rs. 114 crores in the Third Plan and on the basis of their total population, if it is divided, I think it would come to about Rs. 10 per head. That also should be considered as an income for the lowest section of the people.

We admit that ours is a poor country and our poverty is appalling, we

[Shri A. C. Guha]

should be sorry and even ashamed of the poverty of our country. But it should also be admitted that the *per capita* income of no section of the people can be 3 annas per head. It may be 7 annas, it may be 8 annas, whatever it may—be nobody can get any sure figure. But the Government should see that this state of affairs may be improved at an early date and I hope the Government measures will bring about improvements and all these measures will be properly implemented.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the torrential rains of statistics that are being showered on the unsuspecting and innocent heads of the hon. Members remind me of Disraeli's adage and its veracity has been borne out by the jugglery of statistics which Shri Arun Chandra Guha did just now. Disraeli said that there are three kinds of lies: lies, dirty lies and statistics.

Shri A. C. Guha: And both sides indulge in that.

Shri Nath Pai: And when experts are dragged into this House to sustain this very shaky structure of dubious statistics, I cannot refrain from quoting what Prof. Laski in one of the exchanges with Justice Holmes had to say. He said:

"I came away feeling that expertise is a small item in commonsense. Don't you think I may be forgiven if I feel that experts need a course of training in commonsense?"

Dr. Lohia has said almost the same thing when he said how statistics are confabulated though I would not say they are always fabricated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I feel it is not possible to put into mathematical tabulations at Statistical forms the misery and suffering that pervade this country. It is not possible to compute with an unerring balance, the agony, the anguish, the tears which are the lot of the millions in this country. Statistics generally in such matters are a poor guide and they

are all the more suspected in this country because of the semi-mysterious methods of their collection and the inadequacy of data that is made available to us. But I do not think it is necessary in any way to exaggerate the poverty in India. I think it is nothing short of being sadistic to try to seek to economise the degree of poverty in this country by making resort to statistical sophistication.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, even taking the Government figures, where do we stand? Just now, Shri Arun Chandra Guha has tried to refute all that Dr. Lohia has been trying to substantiate by the data he made available to the House. Very quickly, I want to refer to this. This first and the central factor of life in this country is the unique, unparalleled, universal poverty of people in this country and there is no going away, there is no avoiding, there is no escaping and there is no ignoring this fact by jugglery with figures. Even taking the Government figures, where do we get? The reliable figures show that 60 per cent of the population get less than Rs. 25 per month, 30 per cent get less than Rs. 15 per month and the lowest 20 per cent, the last two deciles, get Rs. 8 per month.

Now, I would like to tell you about the statistical averages? This is very important to bear in mind that these statistical averages are likely to mislead than to throw any light on the true state of affairs. It is no use going and telling a poor mother who, because of the malnutrition of the child and because of her own chronic anaemia, loses her child before it reaches one year of age, "The average of an Indian is 40 years, old mother. Why do you cry?". The same happens with the statistics. May I read out what the National Council of Applied Economic Research have to say about these statistics? They say:

"There are marked differences in the sectoral composition of income between States and also between districts within a State. The same is also true of the *per capita* in-

comes which varied in 1956 from Rs. 140 to Rs. 300 between States and from Rs. 100 to Rs. 350 between districts."

I would like to show only one example here. Taking Andhra Pradesh, there is Warangal, where it is Rs. 147, and the highest is in Guntur where it is Rs. 336. We can take it State-wise and we can take it district-wise, but the conclusion which we have to reach and which we cannot escape is that these statistical averages are not very meaningful. But assuming that we take the Government's figure of Rs. 296 per capita income, per head, as the true figure, can we call it per capita income, per capita wealth, or per capita share of national income? I would in all humility say that what we get is not per capita wealth or per capita income, but it is per capita hunger and it is per capita privation and per capita starvation, and it is the per capita share of shame which every Indian gets when these figures are trotted out.

It was long long ago in his classic that Dadabhai Nauroji computed that an average Indian was getting in 1870 40 shillings on a very liberal basis; that means Rs. 2-4-0 per month. If we translate that sum of Rs 2.4.0 of 1870 for today, where do we get? It means by the most conservative estimate at least Rs. 15. Does it not mean that after all this progress, there are vast segments of our community who have been bypassed by this progress, by this march, by this planned development and all that, that there are millions of Indians who today get less than the average per capita income 99 years ago? And what an accomplishment it will be!

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Compare it with 1947.

Shri Nath Pai: I shall come to that. But how does my hon. friend like it that in 1870 there were Indians who were getting more than what many Indians are getting today? Certainly by this yard-stick you have not made tremendous progress!

Shri Heda: What about 1947?

Shri Nath Pai: I am coming to that, and I shall talk about that also. I do not know how my hon. friend is trying to avoid what I have to submit.

I should like to say here that it has become a fashion to tell us that this is the land of Ram, Krishna, Buddha, Ashoka and Mahatma Gandhi, this is the land which alone can produce this kind of superhumans; it is indeed true, but this is the only land where we can see dogs and humans fighting over a dung-heap to take out a morsel for their afternoon meal. Nowhere else can we come across such a spectacle. Wherein, in which other country, has poverty reduced motherhood, the noblest of human relations to this degrading stage that a mother will break the arms or will twist the limbs of her own issue in order to move the stony hearts of all us to part with one naya paisa? Only in India this can happen. I think that it is no longer true to say that when you are born in India, you are born a heir to the *Upanishads*, to the *Mahabharata* and to all the literary glory of Kalidas. Bhartruhari, Jnaneswar and Tulsidas, To be born in India particularly in the twentieth century, and I am afraid, during the past seventeen years is not just being born a heir to freedom but being condemned to a life of illiteracy, of starvation, of misery and of suffering and trying to live in a hovel in some neglected slum till All-Mighty and All-Merciful Death puts an end to all this agony, and this descendant of Rama and Krishna is consigned to some forgotten limbo and forgotten for ever. That is the normal picture of life.

We need not go into figures, but what shocks the conscience is the contrast between the revolting and nauseating extravagance of the affluent few and the grinding degrading poverty of millions. I think that these figures are irrefutable which have been given by Mr. H. F. Lydall in his study, and which have been subsequently

[Shri Nath Pai]

confirmed by Professor Chaudhuri and Mr. Nigam. We find this kind of a thing in a country where the degree of poverty is what I have just now submitted to you, that the top 1 per cent of our population are getting 10 per cent of the national income, the top 5 per cent get 23 per cent of the national income, and the top 10 per cent get 34 per cent. I am sorry to say that the top 1 per cent get 10 per cent, and the top 5 per cent get 23 per cent and the top 10 per cent get 34 per cent of the national income. There are seven families in this country which control Rs. 776 crores worth of assets, that is, 35 per cent of the total corporate assets in this country. About 119 companies out of a total 8296 public limited companies control 45 per cent of the total paid-up capital of all the public limited companies, or about 0.4 per cent of all the companies control 33 per cent.

In the highest income bracket, this is the picture about concentration of wealth, when this is the poverty of the millions; we cannot get a full picture of poverty in this country unless we see how concentration of wealth is going on side by side in the name of socialism, not to mention a very recent case which appeared in the papers yesterday that the two distinguished sons of a certain Chief Minister who is very much in the news these days have paid an income-tax of Rs. 2 lakhs. What an example of socialist pattern and equal distribution!

Shri Lahri Singh (Rohtak): That is the quarterly instalment.

Shri Nath Pai: I stand corrected. That has appeared in the national press. What a march towards socialism, indeed!

In the highest income bracket of Rs. 2 lakhs and above, between 1948-49 and 1956-57, the pre-tax income rose by 336 per cent and the average post-tax income rose by 37 per cent. This is how the incomes in these groups

have gone up. But has it happened in the case of the lower groups?

Here are some things which I would like Shri A. C. Guha and the hon. Minister to give their attention to. They are refuting Dr. Lohia. Perhaps, it is possible to make some adjustment about the three annas. I would not say that the three annas or the 27 pP may be exactly true, but that is not the essential point; it may be that they are wrong statistically. But here is something which you and I cannot escape. I shall read out the reply given by the Finance Minister of Maharashtra on the 16th of January this year. And this is the reply given by Mr. S. G. Barve in the Maharashtra Assembly. He says that there are people in Maharashtra—and this category is supposed to be among those having the highest per capita national income in the country—and there are pensioners who received this tremendous amount of Rs. 1-12-0 per month! But that is not all. There are pensioners from the former princely States who are doled out 50 pP. per month. But these are the people who are computed and who are assessed. There are millions of our countrymen who are so low, so neglected and so ignored that nobody bothers even to take any note of them, and there are millions of such people.

Here is a recent survey. This has not been incorporated in any published booklet yet, but I would like to read it out for the information of the House. In Kanchipadi village in Tiruttani taluk in Chingleput district of the Madras State, this is what the survey has come across. Only a dozen households in this village took whole-rice meal. The bulk of the villagers had only rice water mixed with millets. But that is not all. 15 per cent of the people, according to this survey, had this luxury only three times a week. But two furlongs from this main village—and there is a big mass of Indians like that—is situated a group of small huts. The people who dwell in these huts have no visible means of

livelihood. And when the young surveyor asked 'What do you live by?' prompt came the reply 'On the field rats'. These are no exaggerations. This is not in order to try to create sympathy, but there are millions of our countrymen who have to live like that. And this has been the measure of our progress and the measure of our achievement! But the alarming thing is this: Is there a way, a hope, that these things are changing, that we are making some progress? I am afraid—though the Minister will hotly dispute ~~it~~ perhaps—the misery is increasing. These are my reasons. First, our population is increasing at an alarmingly fast rate. It was estimated that during the first decade of planned development our population increased by 27 per cent. Today, it is increasing at the rate of 2.4 per cent and by the year 1975, the Indian population will have reached 625 million. There may be shortfalls in steel production, there may be shortfalls in your fertiliser production, but this is the only target in which there will be no shortfall. It will be exceeded—we can rest assured of that.

What is the consequence of this? There will be a working population in that year of 222 million. If all our plans succeed, what will happen? It is estimated that then we may be able to double the *per capita* income of the lowest two groups, of the 20 per cent of our population. It is estimated, therefore, that we shall have to invest during this whole period about Rs. 66,000 crores. How and where are you going to raise it? I would like to ask him this question. There will be a working population addition of 70 million people and it is estimated that you will be able to provide, if all your plans succeed—and it is a very big 'if'—if all your plans succeed, 25 million new jobs. The conclusion is inevitable, that in 1975, there will be between 50-60 million unemployed in this country. Unemployment in this country is increasing today at the rate of 13,000 per day. All this jugglery will not help. In the West Bengal Assembly, it was disclosed that of those

who are registered as unemployed, only 7 per cent have been found jobs during the past 3 years. Thus we will be proving that Marx has been proved right in the land of the Buddha and Gandhi. Marx has been falsified in every country excepting India. His theory of increasing misery has been proved to be correct, proved to be substantiated, only in this unfortunate country.

Before I conclude, I shall have to say how we shall be able to meet this challenge. In 1975, we are supposed to reach the stage of a self-generating economy. I am afraid, if population grows and develops at this rate, if our means of providing at least housing, clothing and the minimum of requirements do not develop, it will not be the self-generating stage that the economy will reach; perhaps what is more certain is that we shall have reached the status and the stage which many a society in history had reached before us, the self-destroying stage. The year 1975 has been marked for us as the year of take-off. But unless we take care—there is no time left for me: otherwise, I would have elaborated some measures—unless we take care and realise that we are not going towards prosperity—let us not deceive ourselves; it is not happening,—and take other steps, there is no hope. It is true that there is a rich class, a New Class, thrown up in every society. It is in Russia, it is in Yugoslavia, it is in India. But you cannot compute the suffering, the lot of the average Indian, by the condition of this rich class, the status of this new class.

This will be the state of affairs. We will be approaching not the take-off stage. I am afraid we are approaching the vortex of a crater, a crater full of the discontent and desperation of those unemployed, of this dispossessed, desperate people. And these people are not going to behave as our forefathers behaved, thinking that we are poor, we are humble, we have to bear the sins of our birth. They will not have room for that kind of resignation. They know whom to hold res-

[Shri Nath Pai]

possible for their suffering. And when this crater begins to belch their discontent, I do not think it will be a happy picture.

May I conclude by quoting somebody who was not a socialist, who did not claim to be a socialist, but who was an ardent supporter of the private capitalist way of life? Today we cannot feed ourselves, we cannot clothe ourselves, we cannot house ourselves, unless we get massive external assistance; we cannot build a mill, a factory, a major road or a bridge, unless foreign exchange, foreign aid and foreign know-how are made available to us. Before 1947, we were dependent on the City of London and on Whitehall. But in 1963, this is the measure of our freedom that we are depending for everything we do not only on the City of London and Whitehall but on Wall Street and—on top of it—on the Kremlin too. This is the measure. But let us remember this warning given not by a fire-eating socialist revolutionary but by Theodore Roosevelt, an ardent Republican, in his famous speech. This is what he said—and it should serve to shake us out of our sense of self-complacency that all is right with this country:

“None of us can really prosper permanently if masses of our fellows are debased and degraded, if they are ground down and forced to live starved and sordid lives, so that their souls are crippled like their bodies and the fine edge of their every feeling blunted”.

I say that this is happening to too many. We cannot afford to continue this spectre for too long, unless we are prepared to see the spectrum of everything that the Government hold dear blowing up to pieces.

Shri Himatsingka (Godda): The discussion that has taken place in the House has, in my opinion, gone on wrong lines. The point raised by Dr. Lohia, who initiated the discussion,

was that 27 crores of people get 3 annas or even less. In support, he put forward certain figures. Of course, no basis was given as to how and wherefrom he got those figures. He said that the per capita income in the rural area in UP is reported to be Rs. 182, but he assumed, I do not know what was the basis of his assumption, that 20 percent people at the top take away and consume 80 per cent of the income and therefore, it comes down to Rs. 91 instead of Rs. 182.

Similarly, another figure mentioned by him was that in 1960-61, the daily per capita income was 45 nP. Then, he added immediately that if 10 per cent at the top be taken the income of the rest is 23 or 25 nP. If the income is reported to be of the rural area, I do not see how 20 per cent can take away 60 per cent of the income leaving the figure at Rs. 91, because this is a report about the rural area and in the rural areas almost all the poorer sections of people live. Then again, to increase the figure of poverty, he mentioned labourers separately, then tribals separately, then widows separately as if tribals and widows do not come within the general class of the poorer section.

This is how figures have been quoted. But instead of quarrelling about these statistics—for which there is no definite basis cited—can we not profitably look at the changes in the consumption pattern and see to what extent the total per capita consumption has increased in the country? If you look at these figures, you will find how things have improved. There is an increase in the availability of these commodities and services which enter into the poor man's budget—in fact, in everyman's budget—and this should be regarded as *prima facie* evidence of higher and improved living standards. If you look to certain figures, they will indicate how things have improved. Certain figures were quoted by Shri Morarka about the increased production of various commodities. Coal

production has doubled, steel and cement production has trebled, consumption of cloth has increased from 8.5 metres to 14.3 metres; as regards food consumption, 1000 calories were available before, now there are 2100 calories; hospital beds have increased, primary education which in 1950 was available to 1,91,50,000 is now being given to 3,43,40,000 students. Taking all the students, the number has increased to 4,35,40,000. In villages also, education has increased. The benefit is going in a very large measure to the poorer sections of the community.

Primary education is free, and the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes get free education even up to matriculation, if not in the colleges. Scholarships are also given.

Life insurance has permeated into the villages. In 1955 the amount of business in force was Rs. 1,220 crores, and it has now increased to Rs. 2,737 crores. New business in 1955 was Rs. 241 crores which has now increased to Rs. 599 crores. Out of this Rs. 599 crores, Rs. 183 crores or 30 per cent is in the rural areas.

Therefore, you will see how these services are being taken to the villages to give benefit to the poorer sections of the population.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: (Alwar): There are moneyed people in the villages also. They may be insured. It does not give that index.

Shri Himatsingka: I do not know how you can distinguish in that fashion. After all, the benefit is going to the villages. If the insured amount in the rural areas is Rs. 183 crores, that certainly shows that the improvement is percolating to the villages. There is no doubt about it.

After all, these figures do indicate something. There are better village roads, schools, better buildings, and a lot of improvement in the villages. This is the test that should be applied

to examine the question whether the country is making any progress or not.

Dr. Lohia mentioned that four to five lakhs or four to five millions. I do not know which, are dying of starvation every year. I wonder where he found these figures. After all, there has been no complaint in the country of starvation deaths or of so many people, and it was really surprising that such a figure should be trotted out in this House. Whether it is four to five lakhs or four to five millions, both figures are wrong. Four to five millions is certainly so absurd that no one should attach any importance to it.

After all, what is happening in the country? Government is introducing a number of schemes and putting forward measures to improve the condition of the villagers. Instead of giving support and explaining these things to the people, our friends create all manner of doubts in them, with the result there is confusion in the villages and they do not take advantage of the schemes. So, may I appeal to my friends here in the words of Lord Krishna:

‘न बुद्धिर्भेदं जनमेदजानां कर्मसंगिनाम् ।

जोषयेत्त्वर्ककर्माणि विद्वान् युक्तः समाचरेत् ॥’

Let us not create confusion among the ignorant people.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: Are they ignorant people here?

Shri Himatsingka: Confusion is being created outside, asking people not to do this, not to do that, to take to satyagraha and shouting slogans. This is what is happening in the villages. In Bengal they say “do not take irrigation water, do not pay taxes”. Similarly, they are not helped to take the advantages that are being made available to them. So, I feel that if the legislators here and in the States, who number about 5,000, honestly take the message to the villages, there is no doubt that the country's position will

[Shri Himatsingka]

improve, and the face of India will change and change for the better.

No one will dispute the proposition that there is poverty in the country, abject poverty in many areas. That is a fact which cannot be disputed, but can it be disputed that steps are being taken to improve the conditions of the people? That, again, I think no honest man should be able to contest. That is the angle from which we should examine the question, and we should apply ourselves to this task of taking the proper ideas to the villages, so that they can take advantage of the various schemes and improve their condition and the conditions in the country.

श्री याज्ञिक (अहमदाबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत के संविधान में हिन्दी को राष्ट्र भाषा का गौरव प्रदान किया गया है, इस वजह से मैं आज हिन्दी में ही कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ।

यह जो सवाल हमारे सामने आमदनी और उस के बटवारे का है उस सवाल को कई वर्षों पहले हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस सदन में उठाया था। चर्चा हुई कि औसत आमदनी तो बढ़ रही है, सारे देश की औसत आमदनी बढ़ती है, मगर गरीब लोग ज्यादा गरीब होते जाते हैं और श्रीमन्त ज्यादा श्रीमन्त होते चले जाते हैं। ऐसी बहस चली तो प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि इस बात को सोचना चाहिये। इस के लिये प्रोफेसर महालोनोविस् की कमेटी बनी। लेकिन आज तक उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने नहीं आई है। अखबारों से कुछ पता चलता है कि अब कमेटी कुछ जागृत हुई है और जल्दी ही अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश करने वाली है। मैं उम्मीद रखता हूँ कि इस सेशन के खत्म होने से पहले पूरी रिपोर्ट इस सदन के सामने रखी जायेगी। अगर पूरी रिपोर्ट यहाँ न रखी जा सके तो मेरी मंत्री जी से प्रार्थना है कि उन को उस रिपोर्ट का सारांश कम से कम इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहिये।

श्री कृ० चं० शर्मा (सरघना) : पूरी ही रखी जायेगी।

श्री याज्ञिक : तभी उस के बारे में चर्चा सफल हो सकती है।

अभी डा० लोहिया ने हमारे सामने कुछ आंकड़े रखे। वह उन्होंने कोई अपने घर में नहीं रखे हैं, सरकारी किताबों से रखे हैं और सरकारी किताबों से ही उन्होंने लिये हैं। उन आंकड़ों के अनुसार उन्होंने बतलाया कि कई कोटि जनता रोजाना १३ न० पै० पर जिन्दगी बसर करती है, कई लोगों को २५ या २७ न० पै० मिलते हैं। यह जो कहा जाता है कि २७ करोड़ लोगों को ३ आ० रोज मिलता है, यह बात शायद सब को पूरी तरह मान्य न हो, फिर भी यह कहने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं कि १०, १५ कोटि से २५, ३० कोटि तक जनता ऐसी हालत में रहती है कि उस को पूरे पोषण के साधन नहीं मिलते हैं। गरीब कितना गरीब है इस का अन्दाजा लगाना और उसे पूरी तरह सिद्ध करना मुश्किल है, यह मैं जानता हूँ। हमारे सामने इतने आंकड़े रखे जाते हैं किसी न किसी किताब में से। उन में से कोई एक परिणाम निकाल सकता है और कोई दूसरा परिणाम निकाल सकता है। मगर इस बात में कोई शुबहा नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान की १० या १२ करोड़ जनता आज ज्यादातर भुखमरी से पीड़ित है। वह अन्न नहीं पाती, भुखमरी पाती है।

अब सवाल यह है कि किस दिशा में जा रहे हैं। भुखमरी की बात तो ऐसी है कि उस की कोई ज्यादा चर्चा नहीं हो सकती है। कोई यह कह सकता है कि ४ आ० रोज मिलता है, ३ आ० रोज मिलता है, ५ आ० रोज मिलता है। मगर यह सच है कि सब को पूरा पोषण नहीं मिलता है। ५० एन० आ० की रिपोर्ट से भी हम को पता लगता है कि सारी दुनिया में भारत

के लोगों को पोषण तत्व कम से कम मिलता है ।

अब मैं आपके सामने खेतिहर मजदूरों की रिपोर्ट का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ जो कि हमारे सामने रखी गयी थी । उस से पता चलता है कि कई दिशाओं में हमारे देश की प्रगति होती रहती है या अधोगति होती रहती है । इस रिपोर्ट में मालूम होता है कि सन् १९५५-५६ में सात कोटि खेत मजदूर सालाना ६६ रुपए पाते थे, जोकि मासिक ८ रुपया और रोजाना २७ नए पैसे हुआ । अगर खाद्य पदार्थों पर उमका खर्चा १०८ रुपए था, तो उस को इस के लिए ६ रुपया कर्जा करना पड़ता था । इसके सिवाय, ज्यादा शर्म की बात तो यह है कि सन् १९५०-५१ के मुकाबले में आज आमदनी उन लोगों की कम हो गयी है । सन् १९५०-५१ में उन को १०४ रुपया सालाना मिलता था और उन को रोजाना २६ नए पैसे पड़ता था । लेकिन पांच साल में उन की यह आमदनी २६ नए पैसे से घट कर २७ नए पैसे हो गयी । कर्जा हर एक आदमी का जो सन् १९५०-५१ में १०८ था वह बढ़ कर १३८ रुपए हो गया । कर्जदार लोगों की संख्या जो सन् १९५०-५१ में ४५ परसेंट थी वह सन् १९५५-५६ में ६४ परसेंट हो गयी । इस से यह मालूम होता है कि खेतिहर मजदूर

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : (बगहा) : एक चीज जरा साफ कर दी जाए । जब कि एक आदमी की आमदनी २७ नए पैसे हो तो यह उस की सारी फॅमिली की आमदनी है या पर कैपिटा आमदनी है ।

श्री याज्ञिक : पर कैपिटा है ।

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : तो जरा यह समझा दिया जाए कि यह २७ पैसे में क्या खाता है । चावल का जो भाव है, गेहूँ का जो भाव है, सब्जी और लकड़ी आदि का जो भाव है उस को देखते हुए तो यह भूखा ही रहता है ।

श्री याज्ञिक : यह सवाल तो आपके जो को पूछना चाहिए कि किस तरह से ये लोग अपनी जिन्दगी बसर करते हैं इस मंहगाई के दिनों में । यह तो मैं सरकारी आंकड़ों के अनुसार बना रहा हूँ ।

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : गलत आंकड़े हैं ।

श्री याज्ञिक : तो आप सरकार से कहें कि आंकड़ों में दुश्मनी करें ।

यह जो २७ और २६ नये पैसे रोजाना पाते हैं उस से देहाती जनता की गरीबी का मूल्यांकन नहीं हो सकता ।

खेतिहर मजदूर के अलावा ज्यादातर आदिवासी लोग जो जंगल में बसते हैं उनके पास छोटी सी, एक एकड़ के करीब, भूमि होती है । तो उस को किसान कहा जाता है, उस को खेत मजदूर नहीं कहा जाता जो आदिवासी लोग देहात में रहते हैं, उनकी हालत क्या है ? मेरे मित्र श्री नायक ने उसके बारे में समझाया था । उन्होंने बताया कि कई लोग तो कन्द मूल खाते हैं जो कि निस्सत्व खुराक फुड होता है, उस से कोई फायदा नहीं होता । कई लोग चावल के छिलके को पीस कर उस की रोटी बना कर खाते हैं । कई लोग आम के बीज को जो पत्थर जैसा कड़ा होता है, तोड़ कर उस के अन्दर से जो कुछ छोटी मी गिरी मिलती है उस को खा कर अपना जीवन बसर करते हैं ।

श्री बड़ै : (खारगोन) : यह तो मुन्शी साहब ने भी कहा था ।

श्री याज्ञिक : कहा होगा, लेकिन उन्होंने उस का स्वाद नहीं लिया होगा कि खाने में कैसा मालूम होता है । उनको उनके स्वाद का तजर्बा नहीं होगा ।

तो मैंने बताया कि सन् १९५०-५१ से सन् १९५५-५६ में खेत मजदूर की आमदनी घट गयी । लेकिन उस से भी

[श्री याज्ञिक]

खतरनाक चीज़ यह है कि सारे देश की आमदनी तो बढ़ रही है पर गरीब लोगों की आमदनी घट रही है। सारे देश की आमदनी सन् १९५०-५१ में पुराने भाव के स्तर पर ८८५० करोड़ थी, वह सन् १९५५-५६ में १०,४८० करोड़ हो गयी और सन् १९६०-६१ में १३,०२० करोड़ हो गयी। देश की आमदनी तो बढ़ती रहती है, लेकिन इन लोगों की आमदनी घटती रहती है। सन् १९५०-५१ में हिन्दुस्तान की औसत आमदनी २१० रुपया थी और खेत मजदूर की औसत आमदनी १०४ थी। यह औसत आमदनी सन् १९५५-५६ में २६८ रुपए हो गयी तो खेत मजदूर की आमदनी ९९ ही रह गयी। हिन्दुस्तान की आमदनी सन् १९६०-६१ में १३,०२० करोड़ हो गयी। तो देश की आमदनी तो बढ़ती है लेकिन उसको ये लोग पाते नहीं हैं। मालूम होता है जहाँ सारे देश की आमदनी बढ़ती है वहाँ गरीब की आमदनी घटती जाती है। सारांश यह है कि भारत में आर्थिक असमानता बढ़ती जा रही है। यह क्यों बढ़ रही है? उस का निवारण कैसे हो इस की चर्चा में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता। इस की चर्चा अप्रस्तुत है।

तो आप पूछ सकते हो कि ऐसा क्यों होता है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि आज देश की समग्र जनता देश को टैक्स देती है। इस प्रकार सरकार के पास ज्यादा से ज्यादा चालत आती है। और उसी प्रकार सरकार का खर्चा भी ज्यादा होता है। हजारों करोड़ रुपया सरकार खर्च कर रही है इन पिछले दस सालों से। तो यह जो खर्चा की ऊपर से बारिश होती है इस को कौन पाते हैं। इसको बड़े लोग पाते हैं, जो पहुँच वाले होते हैं। इस को पूँजीपति पाते हैं, इस को मंत्रिमंडल वाले, सचिवालय वाले, कांग्रेस के नेता, उनके सगे वाले लोग और उन के रिश्तेदार लोग पाते हैं। डा० लाहि्या ने जो कहा वह

ठीक कहा। ४५ लाख से एक कोटि लोग हैं जो ऊपर से होने वाली इस बारिश को पाते हैं, और बाकी की जनता सूखी और भूखी रह जाती है।

आप मुझे माफ करें, मैं इस बात को और स्पष्ट करने के लिए एक उदाहरण और देना चाहता हूँ। ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे चन्दे से एक बड़ा भोजन महोत्सव होता है। इस भोजन महोत्सव में बढ़िया बढ़िया किस्म की चीजें तैयार होती हैं, मिष्ठान्न तैयार होते हैं। मगर जब परोसते हैं, तो उनको कौन पाते हैं। उस को बड़े लोग पाते हैं और वह पात है जिनकी पहुँच है। बाकी जो जनता है उस तक तो खट्टी छाछ तक नहीं आती। यह बात पूरी करते हुए.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You must close now; you asked for two minutes and you have taken it.

श्री याज्ञिक : बस मैं केवल एक मिनट और चाहूँगा। मैं महात्मा जी के बारे में कहना चाहता था.....

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I would also plead that ample time may be given for this. It is a unique debate that we are having.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The time is being extended by one hour.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मैं यह माँग करता हूँ कि इस पर दिन भर बहस चले।

श्री याज्ञिक : इस पर थोड़ा टाइम और बढ़ाया जाना चाहिये।

14 hrs.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: By the leave of the House, the time may be extended. (Interruption). It is a very sad thing that you always say "No, no". Please say "Yes" for a change.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Speaker has decided that the Minister will be called at 2.45.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Speaker has given you the authority when you are in the Chair. When you are in the Chair, you are also of equal authority with him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not wish to go against the wishes of the Speaker.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not against. It is very strange that you take this attitude: everytime you say "No, no." Please say "Yes" for a change.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is the wish of the House. It is not a question of going against the wishes of the Speaker. If the House wishes, you can certainly extend the time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have extended the time. It is a short discussion of two hours. It has been extended to nearly four hours now. I do not think any more extension will be justified. There is other business.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: By leave of the House, it may be extended always.

श्री याज्ञिक : अपने भाषण को समाप्त करते हुए मैं आप के सामने दरिद्र नारायण का गांधी जी ने जो चित्र भारत की जनता के सामने रखा था वह मैं इस सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। गांधी जी उत्कल गये थे। उत्कल से जब वह वापिस गुजरात में आये तो उन्होंने लिखा था कि अंगरेजों कुछ भी कहें मगर मेरी दृष्टि के सामने हड्डी का पंजर नजर आता है। यह हड्डी पंजर जो है वह मरे हुए आदमी का नहीं है बल्कि जिन्दा आदमी का है। यह जो गरीब जनता देश की है उस की कोई आर्थिक तरक्की तो नहीं हुई मगर कई संजोग में परिवर्तन जरूर हुआ है। अखबार बढ़े हैं। रेडियो आप ने गांव गांव में रखे हैं। आंदोलन भी बहुत चलते हैं देहात में। दुनियां भर की उन को खबरें रेडियो और अखबार के द्वारा मिल जाती

हैं। उनको पता चल जाता है कि कहां पर सत्याग्रह हुआ और किस किस जगह हड़तालें कराए गए हुईं? इस तरह से पहले की अपेक्षा लोगों में एक जागृति अवश्य अधिक हो गयी है। गांधी जी ने दरिद्रनारायण के दिल में एक क्रान्ति की प्रतिष्ठा की और आज उस की हालत गिरती रहती है तो वह भी जग जागृत हो गया है। उस के दिल में आग जलती है। आज उस का सिर नीचे गिरा हुआ नट्टी है। सिर उस का ऊंचा रहता है और अधिक ऊंचा होता रहता है। आज जब चारों ओर आंदोलन चलता है, विरोध चलता है, सरकारी नीति जो अमल में आती है उस में उस के दिल में आग जलती है, उस में असन्तोष ज्यादा होता है। यह दरिद्रनारायण सारे भारत में कोई एक नहीं हैं बल्कि लाखों और करोड़ों की तादाद में हैं। गांधी जी ने यह बात साफ कही थी। रचनात्मक कार्यक्रम की किताब में उन्होंने यह बात स्वर्णाक्षरों में लिखी है। यदि दिल्ली में पूंजीपति का महल है और गरीब का झोंपड़ा, उस के बीच में जो भारी अन्तर है वह नहीं मिटाया जायेगा तो मैं पसन्द करूं या न करूं, हिंसक क्रान्ति अनिवार्य होगी। अगर मैं यही बात कहूं तो लोग यह समझेंगे कि मैं कोई एजिटेशन करना चाहता हूँ और जनता को सरकार के विरुद्ध भड़काना चाहता हूँ मगर स्वयं गांधी जी ने यह बात लिखी है कि हिंसक क्रान्ति अनिवार्य होगी। हिंसक क्रान्ति इस देश में हो, मैं यह नहीं चाहता। हम लोग कोई भी यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि हिंसक क्रान्ति हो मगर आज परिस्थिति ऐसी होती है कि गरीबों की संख्या बढ़ती रहती है, गरीबों की गरीबी बढ़ती रहती है और जो उन का पैसा लगातार बढ़ता रहता है। इस तरह से यह आर्थिक असमानता जो कि पहले ही काफी भारी थी और भी अधिक बढ़ती रहती है। ऐसी हालत में सरकार से और मंत्री जी से मेरी बिनती है कि वे जरा इस दारे में गम्भीरता के साथ सोचें। आज करोड़ों लोग इस देश में दरिद्रनारायण

[श्री याज्ञिक]

बने हुए सरकार से हिसाब मांग रहे हैं। अगर सरकार अब भी नहीं जागी और उस ने करवट नहीं बदली तो क्या होगा उस का बुरा सरकार को खयाल कर लेना चाहिए। हिंसक क्रान्ति नहीं चाहिए तो अहिंसक क्रान्ति होगी मगर कोई क्रान्ति तो जरूर होनी चाहिए। मैं उम्मीद रखता हूँ कि मंत्री जी उस का कोई मार्ग निकाल लेंगे।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद (भागलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विवाद का सूत्रपात माननीय सदस्य डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया के उस सनसनीखेज बयान से हुआ जिसमें उन्होंने यह बताया कि इस देश की २७ करोड़ जनता सिर्फ तीन आने पर निर्वाह करती है। इस के बाद जब यह विवाद सदन के सामने उन्होंने प्रस्तुत किया तो उन्होंने शुरू में ही यह बताया कि वह इस बात पर जोर नहीं देने कि तीन आने पर लोग रहते हैं या नहीं बल्कि उन्होंने विवाद को मोड़ इस रूप में दिया है कि इस देश में गरीबी कितनी है या यहां की जनता किस रूप में गरीब है। यह पैसिस महत्वपूर्ण है इसी बात पर जोर देने हुए नाथपाई जी ने भी कहा। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश की गरीबी का जो रूप या चित्र इन महानुभावों ने इस सदन के सामने आंका है उस रूप को हम इस तरफ के लोग भी बहुत दिन से कहते आये हैं और इस बात पर कभी भी न कांग्रेस सरकार ने, न प्रधान मंत्री जी ने, न योजना मंत्री जी ने और न ही किसी और ने यह कहा कि इस देश की औसत आय ५ या १० रुपये है या यहां की जनता को भरपेट भोजन मिल जाया करता है या उसे आवश्यकता के अनुसार कपड़ा मिल जाया करता है। इस के विपरीत हमने तो इस बात पर जोर दिया है कि हमारी जो आर्थिक व्यवस्था प्रथम योजना में, द्वितीय योजना में और तृतीय योजना में चल रही है उस आर्थिक व्यवस्था के अन्तर्गत, हम जो उन्नति कर पाये हैं उस से अधिक उन्नति सम्भवतः हम कर सकते

थे यह हम कहते हैं। लेकिन थोड़ी बहुत जो भी उन्नति की है वह एकदम असन्तोषजनक नहीं कही जा सकती है।

यह कहा गया कि इस चित्र के दो रूप हैं। एक तो आलोचनात्मक दृष्टि वाला रूप है जिस पर यह कहा जाता है कि कोई उन्नति ही नहीं हुई और यह कहते हैं डा० लोहिया और उन के शब्दों में वह विरोधी पार्टियां जिनको कि उन्होंने बहुत अच्छी अच्छी संज्ञाएं दी हैं। चित्र का दूसरा रूप है हमारा व्यवहारिक दृष्टिकोण। जो प्रगति हम ने की है उस प्रगति को मैं संतोषजनक नहीं मानता लेकिन जो यह कहते हैं कि प्रगति हुई ही नहीं या वह एकदम असन्तोषजनक है वह भी गलत बात है। हम ने कोशिश पूरी की। सम्भवतः इस कोशिश में हम अधिक कामयाब हो सकते थे लेकिन जो उसे कहा गया, उसको जिन शब्दों की संज्ञा नाथपाई जी और अन्य विरोधी सदस्यों ने दी है वह भी उचित नहीं है। इतना तो हम जरूर कहेंगे कि इस देश की २७ करोड़ जनता तीन आने पर नहीं रहती है क्योंकि तीन आने का स्तर वह स्तर है जिसे मैं सेमी-स्टारवेशन ही नहीं कहता, जैसा कि कहा गया। अगर उसे केवल ३ आने ही मिलें, तो कहीं से चुरा कर और किसी रूप में अगर वह अपनी आमदनी को तीन आने से अधिक न कर सके तो सम्भवतः इस संसार में तीन आने पर तो वह जिंदा ही नहीं रह पायेगा।

एक माननीय सदस्य : चोरी करेगा।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : मैं ने आप को बताया अगर वह आदमी और किसी तरह से अपनी आमदनी नहीं बढ़ाता है तो इस तीन आने में वह जिंदा ही नहीं रह सकता है। अब चोर की तो यह बात है कि घर को लूटने वाला चोर कहलाता है, गांव को लूटने वाला डाकू कहलाता है और राज और आय की लूट करने वाला बादशाह कहलाता है।

उधर आप की पार्टीज में अभी भी बहुत से ऐसे बादशाह हैं जोकि अभी भी गरीबों को लूट रहे हैं। (इंटरफ़ॉस)

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि श्री रामसेवक यादव चोरी नहीं करते हैं। वह उन लोगों में नहीं हैं जोकि राज की चोरी करके और जनता को लूट कर बादशाह बनते हैं। वह साधारण वर्ग के हैं। वह पूंजीपति नहीं हैं। मैं ने कभी यह नहीं कहा कि वह ऐसे हैं। न ही यह बात मैं प्रोफेसर साहब को कहता हूँ।

मैं उन की इस बात से सहमत नहीं हूँ कि देश में कोई किसी तरह की आर्थिक प्रगति हुई ही नहीं है और यह कि इस देश की २७ करोड़ जनता की आमदनी केवल ३ आने है लेकिन वह मेरी इस बात से सहमत होंगे कि इस देश की ६० फीसदी जनता की आमदनी जोकि इस देश की राष्ट्रीय प्रति व्यक्ति की आमदनी है, औसत आय है उससे कम है। उन्होंने यह बताया कि इस देश में नही के बराबर प्रगति हुई है, मैं इससे किसी कदर सहमत हूँ लेकिन इसके साथ ही उन्हें मुझ से इसमें सहमत होना चाहिए कि जीवन की न्यूनाधिक आवश्यकताओं के लिए अपेक्षित आय को सुनिश्चिन् करने के लिए सफलता हमें नहीं मिल रही है इस बात को हम मानते हैं। डा० साहब ने अपने तीन आने के मिद्धान्त के प्रतिपादन में बहुत सी कहानियाँ मुनाई और अनेकों उदाहरण दिये हैं। मैं उन उदाहरणों को गलत नहीं बतलाता कि आप ने बनारस में गाय को मांस खाने देखा है यह तो वही बनारस है जहाँ पर जीवित इंसानों पर पंडे टूटते थे और सम्भवतः इस बनारस में आज ऐसे नेता या विज्ञाता हों जो पूंजीवादी शासन व्यवस्था के अनुकूल उम प्रणाली को आज भी हाथ में रखते हों और जिसके जरिए वह शोषण करके वहाँ के जीवित इंसानों का मांस आज भी खा रहे हों। मैं इसका खंडन नहीं करता क्योंकि जब तक देश में एसी असमानता और ऐसे लोग हैं तब तक जैसा

कि डा० लोहिया ने हमें बतलाया है, हो सकता है कि वैसी बातें होती हों। उन्होंने कहा था कि जहाँ मछलियाँ नहीं हैं वहाँ उन्होंने लोगों को मछलियाँ मारते देखा। अब हो सकता है कि उन्होंने यह चीज देखी हो या जहाँ पर उन्होंने ऐसा देखा कि कारीगर को बारह आने मिलते हैं। यह भी संभव है। लेकिन मैं सिर्फ एक ही बात पर जोर देता हूँ और वह यह है कि यह सम्भव नहीं है कि यह अवस्था इस देश के २७ करोड़ आदमियों की है। यह कतई सम्भव नहीं है। इस देश में ऐसे कम लोग हो सकते हैं, जिन की इतनी आमदनी हो।

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : अगर २७ करोड़ नहीं हैं, तो माननीय सदस्य ही बतायें कि कितने करोड़ हैं, जिन की आमदनी तीन आने रोज है।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : माननीय सदस्य जरा सन्तोष करें। जिम तरह मैंने उन के तर्कों को सुना, उसी तरह वह भी मुझ अवसर दें कि मैं भी अपने तर्कों को उन के सामने रखूँ।

म कह रहा था कि माननीय सदस्य, डा० लोहिया, ने तीन आने वाला जो सनसनीखेज बयान दिया, वह गलत है। मेरा निवेदन है कि यह दो आने या तीन आने की पालिटिक्स सदन के बाहर चाहे हो, लेकिन वह इस सदन के अन्दर नहीं होनी चाहिये, क्योंकि उस का परिणाम यह होता है कि चित्र का एक अतिरिजित रूप हमारे सामने आ जाता है और हम उस चित्र के सही रूप को नहीं देख सकते हैं। चित्र का एक अतिरिजित रूप यह है कि तीन आने की पालिटिक्स यहाँ पर लाई जाये और कहा जाये कि इस देश के २७ करोड़ लोगों की आमदनी तीन आने रोज है। चित्र का एक दूसरा अतिरिजित रूप यह है कि देश में असमानता बढ़ नहीं रही है, बल्कि कम हो रही है। ये चित्र के दो रूप हैं—एक रूप मेरे दाहिने है और दूसरा रु

[श्री भागवत झा आज़ाद]

लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस चित्र का सही रूप यह है कि न तो इस देश के २७ लोगों की आमदनी केवल तीन आने रोज है और न इस देश में असमानता घट रही है। चित्र का सही रूप वह है, जो कि योजना मंत्री जी ने रखा है, अर्थात् . . .

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
नन्दा जी का कहना है कि उन की आमदनी साढ़े सात आने है।

श्री भागवत झा आज़ाद : मुश्किल यह है कि श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री सिर्फ शब्दों के भ्रम-जाल को जानते हैं। अर्थ-शास्त्र से उन को कोई मतलब नहीं है। उस लिए दिक्कत यह है कि उन का दिमाग साफ नहीं होता है और वह इन आंकड़ों को समझ नहीं पायेंगे। उन ने निवेदन कहेगा कि वह दो चार मिनट टहर जायें और फिर अपने शब्दों के जाल को जितना फैलाना चाहें, अपने व्याख्यान में फैलायें।

योजना मंत्री जी ने जो साढ़े सात आने की ग़ाय बताई है, उस के बारे में वही बतायेंगे कि वह सही रूप है या नहीं और कितने लोगों को इस से अधिक मिलता है या कम मिलता है।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में जो आर्थिक व्यवस्था इस समय चल रही है, उस में हम ने आग बढ़ने की जो कोशिश की, उस में हम उस रफतार से आग नहीं बढ़ पाये, जिस से कि हम बढ़ना चाहते थे। हम समाजवाद और समानता की ओर जिस गति से बढ़ना चाहते थे, उस गति से हम नहीं बढ़ पाये। लेकिन मैं इस दलील को नहीं मानता कि इस देश के २७ करोड़ लोगों की आमदनी तीन आने रोज है, क्योंकि माननीय सदस्य, डा० लोहिया, ने आंकड़े देते हुए खुद कहा कि संख्या-शास्त्रियों से दुश्चिन्तन रहो। माननीय सदस्य, श्री नाथ पाई ने डिज़राइली

का उदाहरण दिया, लेकिन दुश्चिन्तन उन्होंने फिर भी उन्हीं आंकड़ों पर विश्वास किया और माननीय सदस्य, गुहा राहव, की तरह आंकड़ों का जाल ही फैलाया।

इस से पहले इस देश में एक ऐसा राज्य था, जिस में रात-दिन आंकड़े ही तैयार किये जाते थे, लेकिन अब मैं स्टैटिस्टिक्स और लाईज और व्हाइट लाईज में बहुत भेद करने लगा हूँ, क्योंकि अब कुछ मिन्सीयर, और ईमानदारी में, ऐसे भी प्रयत्न किये जा रहे हैं कि हमारे पास सही आंकड़े हों, हालांकि सम्भवतः आज भी आंकड़े नैशर करने के कोई कल-कारखाने ही। उदाहरण के लिए जब मैं कहता हूँ कि इस देश में आज असमानता बढ़ रही है, तो इस के लिए न मैं प्लानिंग कमिशन के आंकड़ों पर निर्भर हूँ और न माननीय सदस्य, डा० लोहिया और श्रीनाथ पाई के आंकड़ों पर। अभी कुछ दिन पूर्व दिल्ली स्कूल आफ इकॉनॉमिक्स के एक विद्वान प्रोफेसर को हम लोगों ने बुलाया, जिन्होंने जांच की है कि इस देश में किस प्रकार नैशनल इनकम बढ़ रही है और जिन्होंने इस सम्बन्ध में एक पुस्तक लिखी है।

उन्होंने बताया कि नैशनल इनकम, राष्ट्रीय आय के चार साज़ीदार हैं : वेजिज, रेंट, इन्ट्रस्ट और प्राफिट्स। १९५० और १९६१ के बीच में जिस स्तर पर चीजों का दाम बढ़ा, जो प्राइम लेवल था, उस के अनुसार वेज और इन्ट्रस्ट को घाटा हुआ, यानी उन की उन्नति कम हुई। हाँ, एक वर्ग की उन्नति जरूर हुई। राष्ट्रीय आमदनी में प्राफिट्स वालों की आमदनी में सात प्रतिशत की उन्नति हुई। इस बात से हम सहमत हैं कि इस देश में राष्ट्रीय आय में वृद्धि सिर्फ उन व्यक्तियों के लिए हुई, जिन के पास सम्पत्ति का बहुत बड़ा भाग है और जिन के बारे में माननीय सदस्य, श्री नाथ पाई, ने कहा है कि इस देश के एक प्रतिशत

आदमी टैक्स देने के बाद दस प्रतिशत राष्ट्रीय आय के हिस्सेदार हैं। उस को और भी विशद रूप में कहिये, तो एक प्रतिशत में भी ०.७६ प्रतिशत के पास ४.०८ प्रतिशत राष्ट्रीय आय है। जैसा कि माननीय सदस्य, श्री नाथ पाई, ने कहा है, टाप के ५ प्रतिशत लोगों की आमदनी राष्ट्रीय आय का २३ प्रतिशत है। अगर इसी रूप में हम और भी आगे आंकड़ों को ले, तो यह स्पष्ट मालूम पड़ता है कि इस समय तो केवल इन्हीं लोगों की आमदनी बढ़ रही है और गरीब लोगों का स्तर ऊंचा नहीं उठ पाया है।

लेकिन इस का यह मतलब नहीं है कि मैं किसी मनमानी खेज बयान पर विश्वास करता हूँ। यह बात भी मालूम है कि हमारे देश में जो इनकम-टैक्स रिटर्न हैं, उन में सब से ऊपर के टैक्स देने वाले में १ प्रतिशत का कर-भार कम हो कर १३ प्रतिशत से १० प्रतिशत रह गया है। इसी तरह टाप के दो प्रतिशत टैक्स वालों का कर-भार १८ प्रतिशत से कम हो कर १४ प्रतिशत रह गया है। स्वयं सरकार के आंकड़ों के अनुसार इस देश का अप्रत्यक्ष-कर बढ़ गया है—वह ४१ से ६१ हो गया है और इस लिए यह स्पष्ट है कि हम जो उन्नति करना चाहते थे, वह हम नहीं कर पाए।

जहां तक जमीन का सम्बन्ध है, हम यह भी जानते हैं कि इस देश में टाप २० प्रतिशत लोगों के पास ६६.६७ प्रतिशत जमीन है, जब कि सब से नीचे के २० प्रतिशत के पास सिर्फ ७.६६ प्रतिशत है। लेकिन मैं यह नहीं कहता कि इस का अर्थ यह है कि २७ करोड़ लोगों की आमदनी तीन आने रोज है। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि आज सम्पत्ति का बंटवारा, टैक्स की प्रणाली और राष्ट्रीय आमदनी को विभिन्न लैबल पर जिस प्रकार बांटा जा रहा है, वह असमानता को बढ़ाने में सहायक हो रहा है। यह बात मैं ने पिछले सत्र में, जब कि माननीय सदस्य, डा० लोहिया, यहां नहीं थे, अपने प्रस्ताव पर

बोलते हुए आंकड़ों के साथ बताया था। अन्य सदस्यों ने भी उस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन किया था और सरकार ने भी कहा था कि हम इस बात को महसूस करते हैं और उसी महसूस करने का रूप है महालनवीस कमेटी, जो कि इस सरकार ने बिठाई, और किसी ने नहीं बिठाई। हम सरकार से सिर्फ यह आशा करते हैं कि उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने जल्द से जल्द आये, ताकि आंकड़ों की इस माया और राष्ट्रीय आय के सम्बन्ध में अन्धकार का अन्त हो, जिस में कुछ सज्जन यह कहते हैं कि हमारी राष्ट्रीय बहुत बढ़ी है और असमानता कम हुई है और दूसरे इस से इन्कार करते हैं।

हम समझते हैं कि असमानता को कम करने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि सरकार कर-प्रणाली को, सम्पत्ति के बंटवारे को, राष्ट्रीयकरण को एक नया रूप दे, जिस के फलस्वरूप हमारे देश में समाजवादी व्यवस्था को, जिस का प्रधान मंत्री जी, योजना मंत्री, हमारी सरकार और हमारी पार्टी-दिन-रात समर्थन करते हैं, मूर्त रूप मिल सके।

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Since the time has been extended, some more Members may be allowed to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am calling the hon. Minister to reply at 2.45.

श्री बृज राज सिंह (बरेली) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं रूज आफ प्रोसीड्यर के रूल २६२ के आधार पर यह निवेदन करूंगा कि आज का सारा दिन इस बहस के लिए दे दिया जाये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has no application to this discussion. This discussion is under Rule 193. I will read Rule 195:

“There shall be no formal motion before the House nor voting. The member who has given notice may make a short

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

statement and the Minister shall reply shortly. Any member who has previously intimated to the Speaker may be permitted to take part in the discussion."

We have taken more than 3 hours. The Speaker has considered all this and given the time. Nearly 12 Members will be speaking by the time I call the Minister.

श्री बृज राज सिंह : एक निवेदन और है। आप ने अभी कहा था कि स्पीकर साहब की ऐसी इच्छा नहीं है। मैं आप से यह व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ कि जब सदन की इच्छा हो, तो क्या स्पीकर की इच्छा का ज्यादा ध्यान रखना होगा या सदन की इच्छा का ज्यादा ध्यान रखना होगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even the rules are framed by the House for the conduct of business of the House.

श्री बृज राज सिंह : आप इस बात की व्यवस्था दें कि किस की इच्छा ऊपर रहेगी।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have to be guided by the rules.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (वाराणसी) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have read the rule. There is no point of order.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : आपने कहा है कि अध्यक्ष महोदय ने केवल एक घंटा बढ़ाया है। आप कोई परिवर्तन नहीं कर सकते हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि आप जब उस कुर्सी में बैठते हैं तो आप अध्यक्ष होते हैं और अध्यक्ष के सारे अधिकार आपको हैं। उन्होंने बढ़ाया है समय को और आप भी अब बढ़ा सकते हैं। आपको पूरा अधिकार है। कोई प्रतिबन्ध आप पर नहीं है। यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण विषय है। इस विषय को आज दिन भर चलने दीजिये और जो माननीय

सदस्य बोलना चाहते हैं उनको बोल लेने दीजिये।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I rise to a point of order. You were good enough to rule that under Rule 195 no extension of time can be granted beyond 2½ hours. But already, according to your own statement, the Speaker has extended the time, not according to that rule but some other rule, and that rule under which he extended the time is available to you also when you are in the Chair. You do not exercise your powers; that is unfortunate.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I agree with the Speaker.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You are as good as the Speaker now when you are in the Chair. It is very strange that you do not exercise your powers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There should be a limit even to extension of time.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Five hours is the time. We do not want extension till eternity, we want only for the whole day.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: (Amravati): Sir, I would like to make one humble submission. When extension of time was requested from the Speaker, he said in a sort of a way "one hour". But I am sure the way he said it showed that he was quite amenable to extension of more time. I think it is the inherent right of the Speaker to extend the time and I do not think any rule is binding on him in that respect.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He told the Minister that he would call him at 2.45. He also told me before I took the seat that I should call the Minister at 2.45.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: When you are in the Chair your decisions and rulings are supreme.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: My decision is that we should abide by the decision of the Speaker.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamth: How can that be a decision? You should not consider yourself mechanically bound by that.

श्री बृज राज सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मैं आप से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप घड़ी की ओर जरा देख लें कि मैं किस समय शुरू कर रहा हूँ। जो समय इस विवाद में चला गया है वह मेरे समय में से न लिया जाए।

आज जो एक बड़ा भारी मतभेद हमारे लोहिया साहब के स्टेटमेंट से गवर्नमेंट और अपोजीशन के बीच में पैदा हो गया है वह समझ में नहीं आता है। हमारी सरकार आंकड़ों के खेल या आंकड़ों का जादू चलाने में बड़ी प्रवीण तो है ही परन्तु जब से अपोजीशन की तरफ से इसका पर्दाफाश कर दिया गया है और लोग इस जादू को समझने लगे हैं तब से सरकार की छटपटाहट और भी बढ़ गई है। ऐसा लगता है कि उनका कुछ थोड़ा सा खेल अपोजीशन ने सीख लिया है और इससे भी उसकी परेशानी और बढ़ गई है। समझ में नहीं आता है कि क्या आज तीन आने और सात आने के बीच में सरकारी आंकड़ों के जादू के अनुसार इंसान जीवित रह सकता है। बड़ी परेशानी है हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी के लिए और उनके चेल्सों के लिए भी कि तीन आने में कैसे आदमी जीता है। हमारे तिवारी जी जो यहां के एक बड़े सीनियर मੈम्बर हैं और जो गांव के रहने वाले हैं और जिन्हें खेती का बड़ा भारी तजुर्बा है, उन्हें भी अपने गुरु के साथ साथ परेशानी है कि आदमी कैसे जीता है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि वे आदमी जिस ने गांव देखे हैं और विशेषतः वे गांव जो कि उत्तर प्रदेश के हैं, मध्य प्रदेश के हैं या बिहार के हैं और आंखें खोल कर देखें हैं उसे मालूम पड़ जायगा कि तीन आने की आमदनी वाले तो

जीते ही हैं और वे लोग भी जीते हैं जिन की आमदनी माइनस में है।

श्री श्यामलाल सराफ : यह नया तजुर्बा है।

श्री बृज राज सिंह : सच है, अभी मैं आप को बताता हूँ। हमारे भागवत झा आजाद जो चोरी को भी आमदनी गिन रहे थे, यदि उस चोरी की आमदनी को आमदनी मान लिया जाए तब तो मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद तीन आने की गिनती में कोई आएगा ही नहीं और सात आने की गिनती में शायद सब लोग आ जायेंगे। परन्तु उस आमदनी को गिनने के बाद भी इंसान आज भूखों मरता है, इसको आपने देख ही लिया है। आप जानते ही हैं कि तीन आने में गुजारा नहीं हो सकता है। शुरू से आखिर तक गिनने के बाद कि दाल के लिए इतने पैसे, सब्जी के लिए इतने, तरकारी के लिए इतने, मित्रों गांवों में जा कर देखो कि क्या ालत है। मैं आपको विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि ालत बहुत ही खराब है। कौम के आधार पर भी मैं कह सकता हूँ कि हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में कंजड़ लोग हैं जो म्यार खाते हैं, जैकाल खाते हैं, सांप खाते हैं, चूहे खाते हैं। आपको मैं क्या बतलाऊं, मछलियां खाते हैं, कंकड़े खाते हैं, कछुए खाते हैं और उनको खा कर अपना गुजारा करते हैं।

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (गुना) : कछुए में विटामिन होते हैं।

श्री बृज राज सिंह : विटामिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपको भी मिल जायें। मैं यह भी चा ता हूँ कि सरकार को भी विटामिन दे दिये जायें और कुछ पैसा उस में से भी हो सके तो बचाया जाए ताकि भारतवर्ष का कल्याण हो।

मैं समझता हूँ कि लम्बे चौड़े दावे करना सरकार को शोभा नहीं देता है। बड़े ही शर्म की यह बात है। रोगी मर रहा है या मर चुका है, और आज इस पर हम झगड़ा करने

[श्री वृज राज सिंह]

बैठे हैं। क्या इस तरह से झगड़ा करना सरकार को शोभा देता है, क्या यह सरकार के लिए शर्म की बात नहीं है। आज वरुण लोगों को रोटी नहीं दे सकती है और इस बात का दावा करनी है कि लोहिया साहब झूठे हैं, लोहिया साहब गलत बयानी करते हैं, तीन आने आमदनी २७ करोड़ लोगों की नहीं हो सकती है। डा० शिनाय ने अपने एक वक्तव्य में पहले कहा था जो मैंने अपने कानों से सुना है कि ४२ करोड़ की जनता में से एक करोड़ आमदनी ऐसे हैं जो अपने खाने के अलावा बचत करते हैं और यदि एक करोड़ की बचत को ४२ करोड़ में बांट दिया जाए तो भी उसका औसत आज हमारी सरकार पंद्रह आने निकालती है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से औसत निकालने से, इस तरह से करोड़ों आमदियों की आमदनी निकालने से जो काश्तकार आज भूखों मर रहा है, जो गरीब आज भूखों मर रहा है, उसके पेट को रोटी मिल जाती है? अगर मिल जाती है तब तो मैं भी बिड़ला के साथ बैठ जाऊँ और मेरा और उसका हिसाब मिलाया जाए तो मैं भी करोड़पति बन जाऊँ और करोड़पतियों में मेरी भी गिनती हो जाए। लेकिन अगर कल को लोहिया साहब जैसे यः बयान दें कि पचास परसेंट आमदनी—वृज राज सिंह सरीखे हैं जिन को रोटी भी नहीं मिलती है, तब क्या आप इससे इन्कार कर सकेंगे? यः जो औसत निकाला जाता है करोड़ों की आमदनी का उससे किसी का पेट नहीं भर सकता है।

कोई बड़ा व्याख्यान देने के लिए मैं तैयार नहीं हूँ और न ही मैं उसके लिए राजी हूँ। कारण यह है कि सदन के दोनों ओर से अपनी विद्वत्ता दिखाने के लिए लोगों ने यः समझ लिया है कि कुछ न कुछ आंकड़े देने हियें चाहे वे उनके दिलों को भातें हों या

न भाते हों। लेकिन उनका खयाल है कि ये रखे जरूर जाने चाहियें, रिकार्ड पर जरूर आ जाने चाहियें, आंकड़े देने वाले लोग उनको समझ लिया जाना चाहिये, उनकी भी उन लोगों में शुमार होनी चाहिये। उनकी गिनती भी उन लोगों में की जा रही है जो सरकार की तरह से आंकड़ों की पैदावार से लोगों को परास्त कर देते हैं, लोगों को दबा देते हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे एक जरा सा, एक छोटा सा चुटकला याद आता है। हमारे गांवों में कहा जाता है कि एक पट्टे लिखे मुंशी जी थे। उनको वड़ा भान था। वह समझते थे कि मैं पट्टा लिखा हूँ। वह अपने परिवार के साथ दरिया पार करने के लिए गए। वहां उन्होंने अपना गज निकाला और पानी को नापा। वह पानी तीन इंच गहरा निकला। पूरे दरिया का नाप तौल करके उन्होंने कहा कि मारे के मारे पानी का एवरेज बारह गिरह से अधिक नहीं है। फिर उन्होंने अपने बच्चों से कहा कि चलो पार हो जाओ। बच्चे जब पार करने चले तो वे उस में डूब गए। इस देख कर मुंशी जी बड़े चक्कर में डूबे और हिमाव लगाने बैठे “कि अरवा सत्ता ज्यों का त्यों कुनवा सारार डूबा क्यों।” उनकी समझ में बात नहीं आई कि बारह गिरह से ज्यादा पानी तो है नहीं तो फिर ये डूब कैसे गए। ऐसे ही आंकड़े हमारी सरकार के हैं। इनके हिमाव से आप भले ही इस बात की घोषणा करते रहें कि हिन्दुस्तान की बड़ी तरक्की हो रही है, हिन्दुस्तान बड़ा खुशहाल बनता जा रहा है लेकिन वास्तव में बात ऐसी नहीं है। हमारे नेतागण कहीं कहीं कहते हैं कि इन ब्लाकों की वजह से कम से कम गांव वालों ने जीप तो देख ली है। बड़े अजीब अजीब आर्गुमेंट दिये जाने हैं। अगर किसी गांव में दो साइकलें होती हैं तो इसे तरक्की का माप बताया जाता है। यः आंकड़ों की खिलवाड़ है। इन से किसी का पेट नहीं भर सकता है।

हमारे याज्ञिक साहब ने कहा कि गांधी जी ने कहा था कि भविष्य में कोई बड़ा विप्लव होने वाला है, अशान्तिमय विप्लव। यदि हालत ऐसी ही रही तो जरूर होगा। मैं तो गांधी जी का बड़ा विश्वासी सदा से रहा हूँ और आज भी बड़े विश्वास के साथ कहता हूँ कि जरा होशियार हो जाइये, ऐसा न हो कि राष्ट्र पिता बापू की भविष्यवाणी सच हो जाय। इसे सम्भालिये, इस को रोकिये, आंकड़ों के खेलों से बाज आइये। अपने को देखिये, कहाँ जा रहे हैं? हमारा भारतवर्ष किस गरीबी में पड़ा हुआ है? बाहर के आंकड़ों से लगाते हैं कि फलाने मुल्क में इतने फी सदी आदमियों की इतनी आमदनी है, फलाने मुल्क में इतने फी सदी आदमियों की इतनी आमदनी है। यहाँ की २ फी सदी आज यहाँ की १०० फी सदी के बराबर नहीं होती। वहाँ का लोअर स्टैंडार्ड २ फी सदी पा कर शानदार जिन्दगी व्यतीत करता है, यहाँ का ७० फी सदी, जिस के १५ आने० आमदनी की बात आप करते हैं, जिस को शत प्रति शत आमदनी कहते हैं, पर कैपिटल इनका १५ आ० की, उस को ले कर हमारे भारतवर्ष के तीन चौथाई आदमियों का पेट नहीं भर सकता। यहाँ मिनिस्टर बैठे हुए हैं, मेम्बर्स बैठे हुए हैं, अपने कलेजे पर हाथ रख कर देखे कि आज देश की आमदनी शत प्रति शत खा कर उन का पेट भर सकता है? नहीं भर सकता। हम दुहाई देते हैं, अमरीका की, दुहाई देते हैं रूस की, और फिर अपने आंकड़ों से सिद्ध करते हैं कि वहाँ २ फी सदी से गुजारा करती हैं अधिकांश जनता जब कि हमारे यहाँ ४ फी सदी है। इस लिये हमारा डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन ज्यादा ईक्विटेबल है और मुल्कों से। शर्म आनी चाहिये। इससे देश नहीं बढ़ सकता, इस से देश कभी उन्नत नहीं हो सकता, इन आंकड़ों को रोकिये। मैं दोनों ओर के लिये कहता हूँ, इस ओर भी और उस ओर को भी। मुझ को लगता है कि आप का जादू इस ओर भी असर कर गया है। इधर के लोगों भी आंकड़ों से खेलने लगे और आंकड़ों से सिद्ध करने लगे हैं। यह

आंकड़ों से सिद्ध होने वाली बात नहीं है, यह आँखों से और बुद्धि से सिद्ध होने वाली बात है।

अभी हमारे मित्र ने दलील दी कि हम मानते हैं कि हम में बुद्धि नहीं है लेकिन हम वेवकूफ नहीं हैं। ऐसी दलील दी मेरे एक कांग्रेसी मित्र ने। मानते हैं कि हम लोगों को अकल नहीं है, मगर हम वेवकूफ हैं, ऐसा हम नहीं मानते हैं। यह बात कैसी है? हम मानते हैं कि भुखमरी है, हमारे देश में, हम मानते हैं कि गरीबी है, मगर इतनी नहीं है। यह क्या है? यह आंकड़ेवाजी मत कीजिये, इस आंकड़ेवाजी से कभी कुछ होने वाला नहीं है।

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, lot of figures have been given on both sides of the House on this motion on distribution of national income. It is said that figures do not lie but one can lie with figures. I do not question the figures that have been given on both sides. The main question is not whether it is three annas or six annas. The problem is much deeper than that.

If we take the figures given by the Prime Minister and the statement given by the Minister for Planning, they do vary with each other. There seems to be a confusion in the figures given by them. When we are discussing the statistics of poverty, there seems to be a poverty of statistics on the part of Government. After fifteen years of Independence, after a decade of planning, we are still in the dark. We are still groping. There is no reliable data and there is lack of knowledge of the extent of poverty, misery and suffering in the country.

There is much talk about the average per capita income and other averages. Averages are to be used only to a certain extent, because the average does not reveal the real position of a group concerned if you take statistics in a serious way. If there is a person

[Shri Sezhayan]

who has got one leg in an ice-box and another in a tub of boiling water, the average temperature may be a comfortable one to look at; but the agony that the person is undergoing may not be revealed by this average. The same state of affairs is existing in this country. The average *per capita* income or the national income may be increasing. Still the disparity also is growing. I can cite another example. If you take the figures of 1 and 9, the average is 50. If you take 49 and 51, still the average is 50. But there is a world of difference between these two groups. Therefore, to talk of the average only may not reveal the real position.

The disparity in the income between the highest and the lowest strata of society and how much they are suffering, that is what we should take into account. During the two Five Year Plans, it has been said even by the Prime Minister and others concerned with Planning that the rich section of the people are growing richer and the poor section poorer. Therefore, there is a maldistribution of the income and the wealth that should have accrued during the course of these two Five Year Plans.

I would like to know what happened to the expert committee appointed by the Planning Commission to study the distribution of income and wealth. This committee was appointed in October 1960. We are yet to receive a report from that committee. Whenever a question is raised in Parliament during question time we get the reply that the report has not yet come. I understand that the three experts in the committee do not agree with one another. One does not agree with the other, and both of them do not agree with the third either in the matter of submitting their report or in coming to a conclusion.

Further, I understand that there was a project to collect data and process the middle class cost of living index. That committee was appointed in 1959.

I think. About four times they have collected the data, and twice they have scrapped the data. And we are yet to receive the processed report. The funniest part of it is that such a project as planned by the I.S.I. the data was collected by the N. S. S. and the processing entrusted to some other committee. Too many committees reported the project.

Also, regarding the statistics given by the Minister for Planning, even taking that for granted, I do not think it gives a rosy picture. Because, according to the statement he gave, 60 per cent of the population still get an income below Rs. 15 per month. As per the report of the Nutrition Advisory Committee, a minimum of Rs. 35 is required for food alone, that is to give a minimum standard of diet for the people, excluding dress and other things. Therefore, even on the statistics given by the Minister for Planning, 60 per cent of the people still do not get a square meal, that is a meal require as per the Nutrition Advisory Committee's recommendation.

And what are the future prospects? Because, they say "we have started from scratch". When Shri Nath Pai quote the figure of 1870 and all that, somebody suggested that we should compare from 1947. All right, I shall leave the past and try to project into the future. What will be the prospect of getting a square meal as advised by the Nutrition Advisory Committee? From the data available now, if you project into the future, it may take thirty to forty years even to get Rs. 25 a month for a major portion of the people. If we project the figures to 1990-91, at that time the *per capita* average income may be Rs. 70, provided all these plans go well, the targets are fulfilled and the distribution is even. On the assumption that the increase in the national income pervades through all strata of society and everybody gets a proportionate increase in the *per capita* income, then by 1990-91 when the *per capita* income

per month will be Rs. 70, even then the lowest ten per cent will be getting only Rs. 16.75, the second ten per cent will get Rs. 22.75 and the third ten per cent will get Rs. 30 or so. That is, by 1990-91, even with all our planning, with all the targets fulfilled, with everything done, with all the pious hopes and the best wishes, more than one-third of the population would be getting still less than Rs. 35 per mensem which has been fixed by the Nutrition Advisory Committee as a minimum for food alone.

Therefore, whatever may be the planning, whatever may be the good or bad intentions of the administration, we are still below the path of a decent living standard being given to the people of this country. We do not say fair wage on fair means of living, but even a minimum living income they are not being provided with. It is high time that the planners came out of the ivory tower and inflated statistics and faced the reality of the growing disparity in incomes, the gnawing poverty, the squalor of the downtrodden. A government and a planning that cannot provide a square meal a day to its citizen does not have a place or right to exist under the sun.

Since the time at my disposal is very limited, I cannot take up the other subject. There is disparity in income not only between different strata in society but even in the economic conditions of different regions in the country. It is a fact which is recognised even by the Planning Commission because they have put it down in the Third Plan. They have mentioned in the Third Plan that regional disparity should also be taken into account while making plans for development. I cannot dwell on it now for want of time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give five minutes to Dr. Deshmukh before I call on the Minister.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was surprised that there was so much quarrel about statistics. I personally feel that even taking Government's own statistics it can be easily proved that a large number of people of this country do not get even five annas or seven annas a day. If we just look at the statistics given by Government, the *per capita* income has gone up from Rs. 267 to Rs. 320 during the period 1950-51 to 1961-62. But, what does it indicate. This itself shows that the *per capita* income has gone down because the value of the rupee has gone down very considerably. If there is a gain of only Rs. 53 over a period of ten or twelve years, in the *per capita* income of an individual, and if we compare the prices that are ruling at present with the price then prevailing, it will be easily probable that the statistics provided by the Government itself proves that the condition of the people has not improved and, if anything, even on the average it has deteriorated.

Now, what does Rs. 320 represent? It represents everything, including the amount spent on clothing, food, housing, transport etc. So, if you deduct from Rs. 320 the cost of these items and compare the food prices, the food on which the average ordinary man lives, it will be easily provable that there is a very large number of people who are at the starvation level, which is a disgrace to all of us.

The reason I felt inclined to take part in this debate was that we have rarely concentrated our attention on such an important and vital issue, and that is why I congratulate Dr. Lohia. I congratulated him yesterday also. The nation, the Government, the leaders, in fact everybody requires some shaking. Otherwise, we become complacent. We know the facts very well. We know that there are all sorts of houses in which people live and we know the extent of their poverty. We know there is a group of people in this country who live on picking up *jowhar* from the cow dung, drying it up and making *rotis*. They live on it.

[Dr. P. S. Deshmukh]

This is known to most people, yet we forget it, and that is the reason why this debate should be given more time so that we really pay concentrated attention on the most vital problem of our country, namely, hunger. That is reason why I referred to the matter yesterday and especially the World Food Congress and the Freed from Hunger campaign.

Here I want to point out one more thing. The brunt of the poverty, or the major portion of the poverty is borne by the rural population, much more than the urban population. If we compare the two, the rural population is progressively getting impoverished. Most of the starving people are concentrated in the villages. Especially in my area, which is fertile area, even though we produce good crops, yet we find that the condition of the people living there is much worse than what it was before. It is really tragic because there is more of misery and less of food for them.

Of course, I do not want to blame anybody. I agree with many of the speakers from my party that we have tried to do everything. Yet, we forget the importance of the problem and give priorities to wrong things. What a colossal waste this Government can be convicted of? Lots of institutions have sprung up overnight, costing Rs. 35 lakhs or 40 lakhs. Some mad of secondary education, an institution has come and Rs. 35 lakhs has been spent only on buildings. There are agricultural colleges and Rs. 56 lakhs are spent on buildings alone. The Prime Minister shouts now and then when he gets disgusted with these things and says that peoples' money should not be spent on brick and mortar. But who listens to him? Such fantastic and fadistic schemes are going on in spite of the Planning Commission. I wonder what the Planning Commission is doing, because all this is done before the very eyes of the Planning Commission. I hope it will have some sense of perspec-

tives and will rectify the position because, on the one hand, here are starving millions and, on the other, here are schemes for grandiose buildings and all sorts of fantastic ideas.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Planning and scheming.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: There is no sense of proportion. I hope some body will awaken it to the urgency of the situation.

Again, coming back to the urban population of taking up the pet subject of the Planning Minister, the industrial labour, because they are well-organised and vocal, what is their income? Their income, according to the average given in the year book by Tatas is Rs. 1,342 per year. When we take into account other people who get thousands of rupees we find that the real income of most people is lesser still. Therefore, we can imagine the extent or magnitude of the poverty of these people. How real and how true is their poverty. And I am told that the Prime Minister, not only here but even in London, in the presence of the ex-Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, is reported to have stated that in India the poor are becoming poorer and the rich richer, and some people say that Shri Morarji Desai left the place when the Prime Minister made that statement.

Shri Nath Pai: During the elections he said it many times.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: For vote-catching.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: By and large, Government realise it; Congress members also realise it; yet, it is necessary to remind ourselves once again how deep the poverty of this country is.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister.

The Minister of Planning and Labour and Employment (Shri Nanda): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir...

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):
 अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या गुलजारी लाल जी
 इन्टु लाल जी का अनुकरण करेंगे ?

Shri Nanda: I shall have a separate talk with the hon. Member in Hindi outside the House. Here there are so many hon. Members who would want me to speak in English.

An hon. Member: We want it in English.

श्री प्रकाश दीर शास्त्री : मुख्य प्रस्तावक
 जिस भाषा में बोले हैं यदि उसी भाषा में
 उत्तर देने वाले उत्तर दें तो ज्यादा अच्छा
 है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Both are correct. I leave it to the Minister to choose the language in which he would like to speak.

Shri Nanda: When the hon. Member, Dr. Lohia, opened his speech, I felt that he was springing on us an agreeable surprise, that he was going to bid good-bye to his figure of three annas and that it would open the way for a sensible discussion of the problem of poverty. But that was not to be, because immediately he relapsed into his hopeless attachment to that figure and proceeded to marshal some kind of statistics. In fact, his speech was strewn with figures and those figures were praised by some people by saying that he had driven home the point and all that. I would, with all humility, due deference and great respect to the hon. Member, Dr. Lohia, tell him that he has failed, and failed completely to substantiate his contentions.

His figure of three annas per day for 27 crores of people of this country is a startling and sensational figure and naturally it hit the headlines. The headlines are waiting for such things.

A kind of vested interest has been created in this figure so far as the hon. Member is concerned. If a somewhat better figure were made available to him, he would not look at it. He is a person with great eloquence and that is a very great asset. At least for the time being it wins for him many admirers, but the eloquence which he expended on this untenable position can not help him. No amount of eloquence can put life into a dead figure.

I may first try to make it clear as to what the issue is before the House. Let our minds be clear about that. What is the issue regarding which this House is going to take a view? That a very large mass of the people of this country are steeped in poverty is not the question. We have never had that in doubt. Also, that a very considerable section of these people live in conditions of abject poverty has never been denied. That was not the question. At some stage the hon. Member seems to have made a discovery and he communicated that to this House some time ago. According to him, 60 per cent of the people, that is, the households subsisted on Rs. 25 a month. From that he derives the figure of three annas for 27 crores.

I came to the House in order to dispel that wrong impression. The estimated *per capita* expenditure according to the statement which I gave for the 60 per cent, counting from the bottom was 7.5 annas a day. It is not something to boast about of and we do not boast about it. This figure is also an index of poverty but the question is one of the degree of poverty. However this figure is a little less gloomy than his figure. He was not pleased with the new figure and came back to the charge and again repeated his claim.

The question before the House is: Does that figure of three annas a day represent a level of living for 27

[Shri Nanda]

crores of the people of this country or is it some higher figure? And it is not really a question of some higher figure, because some people have said that it is immaterial whether it is three annas or seven annas. For example, in the context of three rupees, three annas is not material but against three annas, $7\frac{1}{2}$ annas is material; it is $2\frac{1}{2}$ times. Therefore it is not immaterial whether the figure $7\frac{1}{2}$ annas and not three annas.

Several other things were stated here, such as, about the problem of poverty or the prevalence of poverty and certain cases of distress. We were asked, "Are we aware of it?" We have more reason to be keenly aware of it than the hon. Member and others on the opposite benches because while they may derive some satisfaction from accusing or criticising us, we have to suffer that criticism and our embarrassment, our deep sense of dissatisfaction and pain continue till the conditions changed. For him there is end to it after he has spoken; for us it is not ended. Therefore, there is no question of our not being aware.

There was the question of agony, tears and all that eloquence. The hon. Member will know, I should not talk about my person, that 43 years ago I was in the labour movement.

Shri Nath Pai: I was not even born then.

Shri Nanda: I know in those days what the conditions were. I was brought up in a village. I have maintained contacts with villages and I know the conditions in villages. It is not the monopoly of hon. Members who accuse us, to know the condition of villages.

Shri Nath Pai: I did not claim any monopoly in this knowledge.

Shri Nanda: It is not he.

Shri Nath Pai: He was pointing out at me.

Shri Nanda: I was pointing out with ference, to the earlier observations. Other Members have said certain other things and asked whether we were aware of all that. It was the hon. Member's companion, sitting next to him, who said whether we were aware of it. You have got his speech.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I never took part in the debate.

Shri Nanda: It is a very small matter; let us not take time over it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister refers to Shri Braj Raj Singh.

Shri Nanda: The next thing said was, even if we were aware of all that, what were we doing about it? It will take a considerable time to recount all the efforts that have been made and the measures and programmes that are being adopted. Also, there is going to be a debate on the progress of the Plan. Many hours, may be, several days will be there for discussion and everything can be explained then. But here at this moment I would just like to touch briefly upon one or two essential aspects.

Criticism against us has taken shape in some cases of certain personal observations, of things seen here and there—the dogs and cows and all that. Also, some statistics have been cited. I would just say a little about the approach or the basis of discussion in this matter. I do not deny that direct observation has some value. The evidence of the eye is certainly important. But in a vast country, where there is no uniformity, where there is great diversity and it is a complex economy, something seen somewhere, some piecemeal observation cannot be taken as the truth reflecting the situation in the

whole country. There may be conflicting observations. Therefore in a situation like this we have to adopt scientific techniques or scientific methods of study. We have to find a method whereby we can have a representative picture of the situation through properly conducted national sample surveys. That is what we have been trying to do. Our statistics may not be perfect. They are not, I know it. They may have defects. We are trying to improve them. I was very sorry when some hon. Members poured ridicule on official statistics. I do not mind pouring ridicule on the whole of this field of statistics. That may be fun, lightheartedness.

Shri Nath Pai: But I quoted one of the finest men; I quoted Disraeli.

Shri Nanda: But I will not join issue on that. I have something more to say about it. Some hon. Members—you will know who they are—said something much worse. They not only insinuated but said so very clearly that official statistics are charged with a bias, that they are deliberately being falsified. This is something which should have been avoided for the reason that there are hundreds of our investigators, young people, who are engaged in this activity in the field, all over the country collecting all this data. It is an aspersion on them. That data comes into the computing machines and the computing machines have no bias. But some hon. Members, I think, have made reckless use of these statistics and then they question the very accuracy of statistics and base every argument on the same statistics.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patna): I would like to be enlightened on one thing. The book—I refer to the India Pocket Book of Economic Information—is published by the Government of India. In that you will see that in 1960-61....

Shri Nanda: I may not be detained.

Shri P. R. Patel: Since you are replying, I would be happy if you reply this point also. I should like to be enlightened on this point.

Shri Nanda: Later on.

Now, about the observations made by different Members, about cows mentioned by hon. Member Dr. Lohia and about dogs mentioned by hon. Member Shri Mukerjee, and it was said by several Members that some poor people extract grain out of cowdung—I do not question the veracity of these things; these are horrible things—it is not that things of this kind are not happening. That is not the question that we raise. But the impression created by the manner in which these things are bandied, is as if the practice is very widespread and it really represents the conditions all over the country. It is not so. It is this thing to which I would object. But what is the general scene? Don't they see anything better, any brighter patches anywhere?

15 hrs.

Now, we may forget the figures of increase in consumption that have been cited by several Members again and again. I do not want to take the time of the House in repeating those figures of the increase in production of cotton cloth—62 per cent and food-grains 52 per cent over the decade ending 1960-61. It is a very large increase. I can ask this also. The increase in the production and the availability of cereals, for example, is not going to be appropriated by the people in the higher ranges of income. They have had all that they want, always. This means that more is available for the poor people and that is the most important thing. To the extent cloth is more, to the extent food is more, I think that is a good answer. When we go about in the villages and even in the urban areas, don't we see with our own eyes that people are better fed and better clothed? Nobody can deny that. Why is not that brought into the picture? That is not all.

[Shri Nanda]

15.02 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

The conditions would have been better still had the population not increased so fast. The hon. Member, Shri Nath Pai stressed that fact. This is very important. The rate of increase in population is itself being accelerated. This is a very serious problem for us. But I may inform the hon. Members that this increase in population has occurred not because of increase in the birth-rate but because of the decline in the death-rate practically at all age levels. This is very important.

15.03 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Now, one hon. Member mentioned about infant mortality, that if an infant dies, it is no consolation to her as to what the average expectation of life is. That is all right. But I would like to tell him that even with regard to infant mortality, there has been a very considerable improvement so that mothers will certainly feel more comfortable because fewer infants are dying. So many lives are being saved at all stages and, as a result, the expectation of life has risen from 32 years to 42 years. Is the increase in the expectation of life of no consequence? It is not by an accident. It is the end product of many things which have been done, the health measures taken, the health organisations set up and various facilities provided. Perpetual starvation would not be compatible with this state of affairs. Whatever the statistics may be, here are the facts and the conclusions based on those facts. Whatever the figures may be, it could not be such a bad situation. This is so far as health is concerned. If we take the minimum standard of living for the people—that is an important thing—I feel strongly that, as soon as possible a national minimum standard should be made available to every-

body. That will constitute food, clothing, shelter, education and health—by whatever means we provide them, either through better wages or better income or whether the State provides these things through social services by taking money chiefly from those who have got much more.

Now, take education, the statistics have been quoted. There is 85 per cent increase in the number of students going to schools and in the case of technical education it is a much larger increase.—Why should I cite the figures? Don't we see so many schools coming up in villages, everywhere, almost in every village, and young boys and girls, coming out of schools? There is free education, upto a certain level, and the coverage is progressively being increased. It may be well to know that the expenditure on education has increased from Rs. 114.4 crores in 1950-51 to Rs. 300 crores in 1959-60. That is something. I need not have gone into these details if it had not been stressed that everything is wrong and gloomy, that nothing is being done for the good of the people. More and more people are travelling by railways and buses in the rural areas. There is endless demand for more and more buses everywhere. It is mainly because they have more money to spend. It is because there are better roads. The roads are being built everywhere. I could cite all the figures as to how much money has been spent in the construction of roads and bridges and dams and factories which are coming up all over the country. Don't people see that? This is something which should make the people to have a sense of glow about it. It is not that the problems have been solved. But something is going on. On the other hand, we are told that the situation is deteriorating. It has been said by several Members and the hon. Member. Mr. Ranga, gave certain figures, I am sorry he is not here to prove that the conditions are deteriorating.

He cited certain figures. He said that according to Government's own record, the per capita income had declined from Rs. 250 in 1951-52 to Rs. 193 in 1961-62. This is a remarkable figure. How did the hon. Member get it? It means as if the national income has declined, say, by about 23 per cent. But actually what has happened? This shows that the people do not know the use of statistics. Statistics are a major tool of planning and planned development but they must be handled with care. So he got us into this mess. He based all his arguments on that figure, that it is 23 per cent less. Actually, it was Rs. 293 for 1961-62 and not Rs. 193, that is, 17 per cent more and not 23 per cent less. That was the proof the hon. Member gave in support of the deterioration in the situation. Actually, these are elementary facts known everywhere. Over the two Plans, the national income has increased by 42 per cent. That is again nothing very much to speak of. Per capita income has increased by 16 per cent. Agricultural production has increased by 46 per cent. Industrial production has gone up by 95 per cent. Then, there are certain basic things like electricity etc. where there has been a national increase; there has also been a very large increase in irrigation facilities and some other things which are the sinews of progress.

Now, I shall say a little more about this question of progress or the absence of progress. These ten years have seen this change. Whatever progress has been achieved, I say it is no mean achievement, when we look at it in the background in which we have functioned during these years. There was some talk about the position before Independence. Before Independence, it was well known that over the years and decades there was no material improvement. Dependence upon agriculture had been increasing and that was a proof of the declining fortunes of the rural areas. That was the situation then. Therefore, actually, the whole economy was

1158(Ai) LSD—7.

stuck up. It was a kind of a permanent state of stagnation.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I want to ask one question of the hon. Minister. It is a very important question.

Shri Nanda: I would like to go on. Let not my hon. friend interrupt me now.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. does not yield, then the hon. Member has to sit down.

Shri Nanda: This progress, insufficient or meagre though it may be, has to be viewed in the context of the circumstances during these ten or twelve years, through which we have passed. Anybody can imagine what happens when you take the economy out of the rut. The initial stage is a period of very great effort and correspondingly less result. We have had to overcome the forces of inertia which were the main hurdle to development before. Now the obstacle has been removed and the way has been cleared for faster action and faster development. That is one thing. Then, foundations have been laid and this is more important for more rapid development later on. And there have been structural changes in the whole Indian economy.

It might have been open to us possibly to spend this sum of money on just consumer goods and light industries. It may be that if we had done that, we would have shown a little more income per head because of that. But imagine what would have happened in that case? There would have been continuous dependence on foreign aid. That is one of the features which has to be borne in mind. Great uncertainty is associated with it. Today we are hoping that in the course of the next ten or twelve years, we shall be independent of foreign aid, and we shall achieve economic freedom; I interpret it like that, we would be able to do the things ourselves. For that purpose, what are the kinds of things that

[Shri Nanda]

have to be done? They do not show results immediately. Take the case of big steel works, the heavy chemical industry and the machine-building plants. How many years they take! It takes practically a whole decade to bring such plants into fruition, to bring them to full production. And so we see that all the investments that are going into them are not yet bearing full fruit. But when they do, then it will be a cumulatively onward progress.

What we are engaged in is a very great and mighty endeavour, and it is not to be judged simply in terms of what the immediate result is which again has been considerable.

Further, these things have to be done in a democratic framework in order to preserve democracy, and to great merits and it has also got its great merits and it has also got its disadvantages, so far as action is concerned. But we would not be prepared to secure a little higher rate of progress at the expense of democracy. Ultimately it is through the democratic forces, the release of energy that takes place out of the free development of the individual that will pay us better dividends. I am sure that democracy is not going to be a disadvantage in course of time, but it is going to be a great asset, though for the time being it may be that it is a little handicap.

So, these are the conditions. Therefore, we should not magnify those aspects which do not look to be cheerful. Of course, there are those aspects. But why look only for the dark spots? Why magnify them? Why should we emphasise the seven annas a day, which I said itself represented poverty? But why tell the people that it is only three annas and that we have not improved at all? It demoralises. If the people get the feeling that in spite of all that is happening, no progress is made, then how does it help us to make things better? It does not. Let us have the

facts by all means. Let there be no suppression of facts but let there be no exaggeration either. That is what I am pleading for.

Then, it was said that this debate had been raised to a very high plane. Except that I was hearing every time that things were bad, what was the outcome? What were the concrete suggestions that had emerged? What was it that we were not doing and which we should do? I have made full notes, and I have also seen think all speeches. There is no suggestion at all as to what we should do. No doubt, a suggestion has been made that population should be controlled. That is well and good. I can tell you of all the efforts and the steps that are being taken. No country in the world is doing what we are doing for the purpose of control of population. No State has taken up that responsibility as we have done, and we are doing it more and more. But what else? Hon. Members should place themselves in that position and consider what they would be doing. Even in combination what would they be doing? For instance, if Shri Ranga was at the helm of affairs, what would he do? He would see the public sector abolished, he would see all the big public enterprise abolished, and he would see that there were no steel plants.....

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): The steel plants would be there but with the Tatas.

Shri Nanda: That is what he would do. So what would happen is that the vehicle that must move would be pulled in different directions, and so it would not move at all. But, of course, there is no fear of that kind of combination. In the temper of this country, the party with that outlook or that line of thinking has no chance whatsoever. Therefore, we are safe from them absolutely. And yet, there are some people who think that some-

thing better can come out of these people and certain other groups.

Now, let us see how they are helping. I am thinking of a recent experience, the token strike in Bombay. Has the token strike involving lakhs of people helped anybody? How has it helped? Has it made more things available to the people? Had they any idea of the poverty of the people when they took recourse to that action? I pleaded with them 'Do not do this; you may make all other preparations for any kind of demonstration etc., but please stop short of stoppage of work. This is bad any day in a poor country like ours which is trying to develop.'

डा० राममनोहर लोहिया : जब वजन दे चुके हैं हड़ताल के सम्बन्ध में कि ठीक काम करेंगे तो इस सवाल को यहाँ तो मत उठाइये ।

श्री रामसहाय पाण्डे : सवाल तो उठा हुआ है । उसका सवाल दे लेने दीजिये ।

Shri Nanda: That is the second phase. I shall have to rescue them from that, but that is a different altogether.

That this occurred in our country was wrong, because ours is a country where there are large offers of all possible avenues for settlement of grievances and for justice being done. Nowhere else have the worker and the employer been placed on the same level. The worker can go for conciliation on the same level as the employer or for arbitration or for adjudication etc.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Not for arbitration at all. The employers do not accept arbitration.

Shri Nanda: There is adjudication, of course. I can give the hon Member this assurance. Let her bring forward any case where adjudication is not being given.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: But adjudication takes so long. We want arbitration, but nobody accepts it.

Shri Nanda: My point was very limited. Why should there have been such a strike? What did the workers gain out of it? They gained nothing at all. On the other hand, they lost a great deal. That was the thing that I wanted to say.

Shri R. S. Pandey: That shows that the hon. Minister is hundred per cent correct.

Shri Nath Pai: That should make the hon. Minister re-think after this support.

Shri Nanda: Then, there was the question about disparity of income and wealth. I have never felt comfortable myself so far as the question of disparities is concerned. There was the mention of the committee on levels of living and distribution etc., the Mahalanobis Committee. It will bring out its report....

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: When?

Shri Nanda: Soon, I believe.

Shri Yallamanda Reddy (Markapur): In the Fourth Lok Sabha?

Shri Nanda: Several Members of the committee are engaged in writing the report. They know that the whole House will scrutinise every word, and therefore, they want to be very careful that nothing goes which will be subjected to this kind of treatment. But I do not wait for that report. I know that the disparities are great. I know that for those disparities in many cases there is no proper economic and social justification.

Shri Yajnik (Ahmedabad): Are they increasing or not?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: What about concentration of wealth?

Shri Nanda: I know that there are vast disparities. Whether they have increased by 2 per cent or 5 per cent,

[Shri Nanda]

the statistics in that short period will not be able to tell. I do not know what they will say. But this is enough for me, this problem of disparities. I feel something should be done about them.

What are the things to be done? Here is a basic problem. Take the rural areas. When about 40 per cent of the people who hold land operationally have less than 2½ acres and about 62 per cent have upto 5 acres, what do you expect? This is the problem of population in relation to land. The only solution is increased productivity of land. That we have been trying to achieve. A large amount of expenditure is being incurred. Those people, many of them, have to be taken out of agriculture and put into other occupations. There is no other way. And all the efforts and the large funds that are now being devoted to industrialisation—that is the remedy, that is the answer. What is needed is industrialisation, both small-scale and large-scale.

Recently, we have done two things. One is the rural works programme. It should be understood that conditions all over the country are not the same everywhere. They vary. In some places, the incidence of unemployment is very heavy. We have to approach the problem taking that basic fact into account, not in the statistical way, that there is an average and something has to be done on that basis everywhere. We try to create employment and take steps to raise the agricultural potential so that on that area we need not pour funds from year to year, so that later on the area becomes self-sufficient in this matter of production and employment. That is one approach.

The other is rural industrialisation. It is not possible for us to take away all these people to large cities. That will create big problems. Take housing. Housing has been one thing where I feel we have not made much

progress; in some places, housing conditions might have become worse. It is quite possible. But the only way out is to ensure that these people live in conditions to which they are accustomed. Therefore, industry should be taken to rural areas. That is now the scheme we are working out for rural industrialisation.

These are the two broad approaches. Thirdly, as I said, there is the social expenditure. It is not necessary to have some market price mechanism by which everybody's income rises, and, in the process, disparity is increased. Therefore, our approach is that something is done directly for those vulnerable sections, those weaker sections. Therefore, besides the normal acceleration of programmes of development special steps have to be taken for these areas where the difficulties are more, doing something specially for those areas where poverty is more intense. These are the main things. As I have said, policies have to be evolved for reduction of disparities. I feel more should be done and can be done in this direction.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: About concentration of wealth?

Shri Nanda: It is not that nothing is being done. Take, for example, the expansion of public sector. That is one way we are trying to approach the problem. But we have to see that in the process we do not create conditions where disincentives to production and enterprise may arise. We would like to go forward to the maximum extent to reduce the disparities without coming into conflict created with the very objective of increasing production, employment etc. which the Plans aim at.

Now, it is a question of judgment as to whether a particular step has that effect or not. But I think the objective is clear, for the whole House, it is common ground as to what we should do. I would hope and expect

that Members should treat this as a national question, not a party question—development of production, development of the economy, reduction of disparities and bringing about greater equality. Our mind is very clear about the goal. We do want to do all the things that are required to be done, provided they can be done without creating instability, without actually running counter to the very object of economic progress.

I am very sorry that I have left off the hon. Member, Dr. Lohia, for a while because my mind was directed towards the things that he had said and I wanted to give some answers to them. I shall now deal with some of the figures he has given. I may assure the hon. Member and others that the figure of 7.5 annas arises out of several calculations. There are several rounds of National Sample Survey with which the hon. Member is familiar. When questions are asked, let it be understood that this was a new technique developed in this country, a most advanced technique. It has proved itself. There are several rounds, one after the other, and there is an internal consistency. Therefore, these figures are, by and large, very near the truth. So we can depend upon them for all practical purposes. There may be some limitations here and there. But the figure I have given is based on those rounds. Then, the other data available in the country are also consistent with that. There is nothing else which we have found in a survey in one area or another. It must have an all-India character, a representative character. There is nothing which is not quite compatible with the figure that we have given. I do not want to go into details; it will take too much time. But I can give that information to any hon. Member who wants; the various other studies that have been made may be even less representative and of limited nature, but they all confirm the conclusions of this Survey.

Now I come to the figures cited by the hon. Member in his speech. I have great respect for the hon. Member, but he will excuse me.... *

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब कहाँ है ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : अब भाँ है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : गांधी जी जब जिन्दा थे तब थो, अब नहीं है ।

Shri Nanda: He is a very learned person. His learning extends to many things. But as regards statistics, I may inform him that it is not really for him, because in every minute of his speech, he made one mistake in statistics. He made a great play of the gap between income and expenditure in the rural areas. What would be the income derived from agriculture by the rural population who are making dependent on agriculture. According to Dr. Lohia, rural consumption is about Rs. 8,700 crores and income Rs. 6600 crores. How do we account for the difference?

I would like to tell the hon. Member that as he did on several other things, in this case also he has jumped, losing sight of several other things which deserved notice. In agriculture, he has at least noticed that this sector includes animal husbandry, forestry etc also. He has made an allowance for that. Then does he know that there is some income derived from non-agricultural subsidiary occupations, so far as agriculturists are concerned? This figure is Rs. 670 crores. So Rs. 6074 crores derived from agriculture plus Rs. 826 crores from allied occupations plus Rs. 670 crores from non-agricultural occupations—total Rs. 7,570 crores. Still, the hon. Member will ask; from where have you met Rs. 9,000 crores of consumption expenditure? I will go a step further and tell him that this figure pertains to entire rural population and as such it is the income of non-agricultural population in rural areas, which explains the difference. So when one talks of the rural areas,

[Shri Nanda]

one must take into account income other than derived from agriculture also. If you take them together, it comes to about Rs. 9,900 crores. That is the figure. I hope now it is clear.

Then he had also some other things to say. But because of his innocence about those things, he struck a formula. It was that the top 10 per cent of the population account for 50 per cent of the total national income and the top 20 per cent take away 60 per cent of the total. It is an indiscriminate way of handling these things, and does not lead us anywhere, because actually the percentages are not what he gave. They are much less. Against 50, per cent given by Dr. Lohia, the correct figure is 25 per cent. This represents the share of top 10 per cent in the total personal income in rural areas. The moment you make allowance for that, you come to a very different figure. All the figures he has cited are based on this method of calculation, and so I need not deal with them in detail, because they are *ab initio* wrong.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तेरहवें चक्र में जो आपकी पुस्तक में छपा है

श्री नन्दा : आप चक्कर में न पड़िए ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तेरहवें चक्र में दिया हुआ है कि २० सैकड़ा ६० सैकड़ा खपत करते हैं ।

Shri Nanda: He says the Government has been adding 20 per cent to every figure in order to get more tax revenue etc., but he has assumed that 20 per cent has been added to every figure, and then he has gone to deduct this and deduct that. I wonder how he reached the figure of three annas. By all these processes of deduction and subtraction, the income of 27 crores people should have been zero.

He wanted to give us an idea that he has some alternative sources of in-

formation which lead to the same conclusion. There are so many States and he took only one, namely U.P. For that State he got some information and then applied it to the whole country. With all due deference to the people who come from U.P., the whole country is not U.P. And there again, he applied the same formula of 50 or 60 per cent and got the results.

Then about the districts, this is the book brought out by NCAER in which the figures are clearly stated. He says that in 40 districts the *per capita* income is less than Rs. 120 a year. There is a total of 289 districts given here. He takes 29, out of which he chooses four, and then says that the figure represents the reality for the whole country. There are four districts below Rs. 100 category and another five districts in Rs. 100-124 category.

About agricultural holdings I need not join issue with him, for his figures are wrong. The figure of 34 per cent or so with less than one acre relates to all the population including that section which has nothing to do with land.

There are some other figures. Shri Mukerjee is not here His figures were right, his sentiments were right, but they did not lead up to anything at all. I do not see what it amounts to.

Now I will take up one or two things on which I would rather hesitate to speak, but I have to. First I will dispose of one question which may not have been answered, and that is about the Prime Minister's version of 15 annas. I have given my figures after careful enquiry and scrutiny. The Prime Minister has not calculated, his figure was not based on any precise calculation made by him. What happened? A mistake was made, a discrepancy occurred. The mistake was this. The Prime Minister thought that he must read some

meaning into the figures of Dr. Lohia. When there is no meaning in those figures, naturally a person is misled. The hon. Member says that some Member of the Planning Commission has given him the figure of Rs. 25 per mensem. No light has been thrown on that yet by him as to who was the Member of the Planning Commission and what he said. One cannot really have access to another person's mind, but I tried to work out what might have happened. There is a table worked out on the basis of the same figures. In that table, at the level of 60 per cent of the people, corresponding to that, there is a figure of 24.3 per capita per month consumption which is nearly Rs. 25. So, he must have taken that amount. That figure is for an individual and not for a family. So, there was a mistake. The Prime Minister took that out, but he forgot that the hon. Member had made another mistake. The other mistake was that Rs. 25 is not the cumulative average. It relates to the maximum Value of consumption and therefore the two things got mixed up.

One last thing I have to say. There I feel a certain sense of delicacy, a certain hesitation. The hon. Member certainly is forthright, he is entitled to be so, but then there has to be a certain sense of responsibility, a certain sense of proportion, a certain sense of decency.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आपके साथ आकर बैठ जाएं यही न ?

Shri Nanda: You deserve that, first please make some constructive contribution. I am saying this out of a feeling, and I hope that in course of time, we may be sitting on the same side, some day.

He mentioned about some incitement being given and he mentioned Gandhiji. To bring in Gandhiji all the time, I do not think will serve any useful purpose. But does the hon. Member remember what happened to Gandhiji? That is all that

I have to say. Certain things have to be done. Otherwise, the country will be in a turmoil and the Government and everybody will be arraigned for that. So, to bring up figures which include State expenditure and this and that, which have nothing to do with the personal expenditure of the Prime Minister, does not take us anywhere.

I have taken a long time and I submit that there is really nothing at all to differentiate between friends on the opposite and ourselves regarding the main purpose, that is, trying to grapple with the problem of poverty, resolving it as quickly as possible. If that spirit prevails, I think we will have some better results.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: On a point of information. May I ask how our land policy will emerge ultimately? Today we have landlords, landless cultivators, tenants and so on. So, how soon will that policy emerge and when?

Shri Nanda: This is again a large issue, but he certainly knows that in the fight against exploitation we have already taken certain steps. Feudalism has disappeared, landlordism has been abolished. That was one stage. Now, the second stage is the programme of increasing productivity and trying to make larger, more viable units, so that people can get more out of land. And if it is a co-operative enterprise, they can be freed for other work; they are not tied up to land, and they can be absorbed in other occupations. That is the general approach.

So far as land reforms are concerned, we have conferred security on the tenants. Everywhere land reform legislation has been enacted for that purpose.

Shri Nath Pai: I want to put the question.

Mr. Speaker: I think discussion should be enough. He had his opportunity to speak.

Shri Nath Pai: It is a legitimate question, Sir. I am sorry I have to say this because I do not think it has helped us. We had raised the question of unemployment; it is rising at the rate of 30,000 a day and there will be 55 million. We have not got a reply to that. How is poverty to be stopped? We do not get a reply to that. This is a legitimate question: otherwise the debate becomes useless.

Mr. Speaker: We will see how many more legitimate things crop up.

Shri Nanda: The problem of unemployment is a serious problem. In the Third Plan period, it is true that with all the investments that we have made we have not succeeded in even absorbing all the fresh entrants to the labour force. One reason is this. It costs so much to give employment to one person. I have got the figures of investment-employment ratio with me. Then, if we want to do something and try to get a little more money for the Plan, so many people raise their voices and start an agitation regarding the taxes. How is more investment to be secured with this attitude on their part?

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I will ask a very short question. What was the value of rupee in 1950-51 and what is its value in 1961-62? Are the goods and services available for a rupee the same in quantity? If the quantity is less, by how much?

Shri Nanda: He may have that book in his pocket. In the Second Plan period, about 30 per cent. increase took place in the general price level. In the first Plan, there was a fall; therefore, the overall increase over ten years would be less.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: मेरे हिसाब को बदनीयत, बेहूदा और न जाने किन किन विभूषणों से याद किया गया . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर माननीय सदस्य कोई सवाल करना चाहते हैं तो उसे कर सकते हैं। लेकिन वे और स्पीच नहीं दे सकते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जो बातें कही गयी हैं उन के लिए मुझे . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सारा जवाब नहीं हो सकता है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उन्होंने एक चीज जिसके बारे में बेहूदा वगैरह कहा है .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे अफसोस यह है कि यह जो मौजूदा मोशन १९३ के नीचे होता है इस में न राइट ऑफ रिप्लाइ है और न इस में और कोई चीज है जिससे कि बहस और ज्यादा जारी रक्खी जा सके। यह कोई रंगुलर मोशन हाउस के सामने पेश नहीं है बल्कि यह १९३ के नीचे मोशन रक्खा गया है। इस में रिप्लाइ का राइट नहीं है। इस में और कुछ नहीं है। इसलिए जो हुआ, जो कुछ किसी ने कहा, आपने अपनी पुरानी मुहब्बत की याद में अगर एक दूसरे को कोई अल्फाज कहे तो आपको सुनना पड़ेगा।

अगर माननीय सदस्य कोई एक सवाल करना चाहें जैसे कि अभी अन्य दो, तीन मंत्रियों ने किये तो उसकी इजाजत मैं दे सकता हूँ लेकिन इससे ज्यादा नहीं दे सकता हूँ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: मुझे निजी सफाई देने दी जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जी नहीं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सवाल इतने ज्यादा हो चुके हैं कि मैं और कुछ न कह कर खाली सवाल सुनाये देता हूँ। एक तो यह . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बस एक ही तक अपने को महदूद रखिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: जी सवाल ही हैं लेकिन हैं वे कई एक ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर डा० लोहिया सिर्फ एक सवाल करना चाहें तो मैं उनको उसकी इजाजत देता हूँ लेकिन एक से ज्यादा सवाल करने की मैं इजाजत नहीं दे सकता ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मंत्री महोदय को अपनी किता खुदबं देख लेनी चाहिये जिन में और खास तौर से यह खपत जरीब जिसके कि १७वें चक्र का यह हमेशा जिक्र करते हैं, १३वें चक्र तक छपी हुई है और उस को हम पढ़ सकते हैं । उस में लिखा हुआ है कि देहात की २० सैकड़ा आबादी ऊपर वाली ६० सैकड़ा आमदनी को खा लेती है तो १० सैकड़ा और ५० सैकड़ा तो मैं ने कम बताया था । उस से यह पता चलता है कि जो ६६०० करोड़ रुपये की बात मैं ने बताई थी जिसमें से करीब ११०० करोड़ रुपया पशुधन का होता है, वह छोटों लोगों के लिए ३३०० या २६०० तक बच जाता है और जब उसमें वह जोड़ते जाते हैं . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य फिर तक्रारी करने लग गये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरी बिल्कुल तबियत नहीं है लेकिन क्या करूँ ? उन्होंने मेरे लिए यहां तक कह डाला कि मैं ने यह तीन आने वाली बात महज एक सनसनी फैलाने के लिए उठाई है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो आप सफाई दे रहे हैं जिसकी कि मैं इजाजत नहीं दे सकता ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं सवाल पूछें लेंता हूँ लेकिन मुझ अपनी सफाई . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप को मौका मिला, अबसर मिला और आप ने यह बहस शुरू की

और जो कहना चाहते थे आपने कह दिया । अब यह मिनिस्टर का हक होता है कि आखिर में वह उस बहस पर बोलें । अब यह दूसरी बात है कि उनकी चीजें आपको पसन्द आयें या न आयें, आपको अपील करें या न करें या आप उनमें गलती समझें लेकिन अब उसमें मेरा चारा नहीं है । अलवत्ता अगर माननीय सदस्य संतुष्ट न हों तो किसी और वक्त और किसी और ढंग से इस चीज को ला सकते हैं । लेकिन इस वक्त कोई मौका नहीं है कि आप उस की फिर तरदीद कर सकें । मैं माननीय सदस्य को कोई दूसरी स्पीच का मौका नहीं दे सकता । रूल्स के नीचे यह इजाजत नहीं है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : ठीक है । मैं एक सवाल पूछ लेता हूँ । यहां यह बताया गया कि मैं ने ४०-५० लाख हिन्दुस्तान में अकाल मृत्युएं बताई और यह भी कहा गया कि यह फीगर्स मैं ने बिल्कुल बहुदा ढंग से बता दीं । इसके लिए मैं बतला दू कि यह मैंने खाली यूरोप की मौतों की दर से और हिन्दुस्तान की मौतों की दरों की तुलना करते हुए ५४-५० लाख अकाल मृत्युएं बताई हैं । बिना खाये हुआ की तादाद में ने ५ लाख बताई । अब लोग इसके लिये यह कहते हैं कि तुम इसके सबूत में डाक्टरी सर्टिफिकेट लाकर दो कि फलां आदमी भूख से मरा । अब मैं बतलाऊं कि जो वुडहैड कमिशन बैठा था .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब यह तो आप बतला रहे हैं कि सवाल कर रहे हैं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं मंत्री महोदय से सवाल कर रहा हूँ कि क्या उन्हें उस वुडहैड कमिशन के बारे में पता है जिसके कि अनुसार ५० लाख आदमी बंगाल के अकाल में मर गये हालांकि डाक्टर का एक के बारे में भी कोई ऐसा प्रमाणपत्र नहीं था कि भूख से वह मरे हैं ?

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय : सन् १९४७ के बाद भूख से कोई नहीं मरा है। यह गलत ग़ौर झूठ बात है !

Shri Nanda: I did not enter into that question at all.

Mr. Speaker: This discussion is over. We take up next item.

MOTION RE: REPORT OF U.P.S.C.

Mr. Speaker: We shall take up the report of the UPSC.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarnavis): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Twelfth Report of the Union Public Service Commission for the period 1st April, 1961 to 31st March, 1962, together with the Government's Memorandum thereon, laid on the Table of the House on the 28th August, 1963."

Sir, the Union Public Service Commission is a body appointed under article 315 of our Constitution and is entrusted with certain powers under article 320 and Government are enjoined that before they take action in respect of certain matters enumerated there, they should consult the UPSC which we invariably do. As regards the functioning of the UPSC, the President has caused the report to be laid on the Table of the House. I am glad to say that there is only one case in which Government felt obliged to differ from the advice of the UPSC, details of which are given in para 32 of the report.

15.49 hrs.

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

I shall await eagerly for the suggestions that may fall from the hon. Members of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That this House takes note of the Twelfth Report of the Union Public Service Commission for the period 1st April, 1961 to 31st March, 1962, together with the Government's Memorandum thereon, laid on the Table of the House on the 28th August, 1963."

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Union Public Service Commission is the one authority which should wield the greatest amount of respect throughout the country because it is the Union Public Service Commission that selects administrative services which today have become even more important than they were under the British, the foreign, rule. It is this administration which is given greater authority and greater responsibility for carrying out planning, carrying out controls and for carrying out all those things that we want for the development of a society which is to emerge from backwardness, from feudalism, and go forward towards a more egalitarian society. It is because of the failure of this administration that at many times we are unable to execute the only policies which can bring us forward to that type of society. Year after year, whenever we discussed the Union Service Commission's report in this House, we have been perforce made to utter certain things which we have found, in the course of our practical experience, which do not redound to the credit of the Commission or its work.

I would like to point out that if we look at the amount of work which has been undertaken by the Commission in the course of the last year, it is very surprising that actually there has been, in quantitative terms, a rather surprising falling off in the amount of work that they have gone through. This is all the more surprising because we find every year a big