

15.30 hrs.

**RESOLUTION RE CONCENTRATION
OF ECONOMIC POWER—contd.**

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the following resolution moved by Shri Bhagat Jha Azad on the 7th December, 1962:

"This House is of opinion that while no efforts should be spared to strengthen the defence of the country to fight out the Chinese aggression, constant vigilance should be kept against the possibility of concentration of economic power and wealth, increase in inequality of income and rise in prices which may undermine our resolve of setting up a socialist society."

The time allotted is two hours. We have taken four minutes. One hour and 56 minutes are left.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur): The resolution is very important; it is all embracing and concerns very important problems of the day, and therefore I request that the time should be increased. This is the desire of so many other Members also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is that the desire of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): That is the unanimous request.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us see.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): I do not think that the time should be increased. There are other resolutions also and they must be given a chance.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will continue and see.

Shri Bhakwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Before I commence my speech on the resolution, I am glad that the

House, by an overwhelming majority, has said that this resolution is very important, with the exception of some Members of the Swatantra party who have said that the time for this resolution should not be increased. You know very well that those friends who are the citadel of reaction in this country would certainly oppose such a resolution. But I need not go in to the details now. In due course I will prove what they are doing in this country and how economic power is being concentrated in the hands of a few. This resolution itself is self-explanatory. The first part of the resolution says:

"...no efforts should be spared to strengthen the defence of the country."

On that we are all unanimous. But I would only show to the House how there are two tendencies in this country, and how they are trying to subvert all our efforts not only in the cause of strengthening the defence of the country but also in the matter of economic development, both of which are inter-related. The most vociferous the notable ferocity of the non-combatants who are, from the public platforms, shouting that they want a war-time leadership in this country and by that way they are trying to create a situation by which they want to tell us that in this country, there is no strong Government or there is no strong leadership. That is one of their planks of attack in the present emergency. The most important point of theirs is that the Plan should be scrapped.

The other day, one of the brilliant men of this country, Shri Babubhai Chenoy, said that there should be no super profits tax but there should be salt tax! Secondly, he advised that the Planning Commission should be asked to scrap the entire Plan so that we can strengthen the defence of the country very nicely. The purpose for which I have brought this resolution is this: the resolution says that we are very much concerned with

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

seeing as to how these forces are trying to concentrate, in the name of emergency, their economic power and to increase their own concentration of economic power and wealth.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: Mr. Chenoy is a Congressman.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: But my hon. friend, Shri Mahida, who is not a Congressman, was also a Congressman just before the elections, and he also held the same views.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I never had any economic power.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I would prefer Shri Mahida to reply and rebut these facts which are placed before the House later. Any public speech as in a seminar will not do here. Therefore he should wait and have his chance. I was saying that our difficulty is that on the one hand, they are saying that they want to support and strengthen the defence of the country. They are saying it with one voice: that it is essential that the economic fabric of the country should be strengthened. On the other hand, they are trying to weaken those things. Therefore, I have brought this resolution that in this country, in the name of the emergency, conditions should not be created by which economic power is concentrated in the hands of a few wealthy persons. The inequality between the different income-groups should not be increased. Those people should not have the direction or control of the press, the monopoly of the press, in their hands so that the miseries of the poor can increase and they can have a heyday.

The present budget that has been introduced makes the position very clear. Since the past three or four days we are seeing that the tax burden falls more on those bellias which are empty; the tax burden is less on those who are rich citizens in this country, and yet, shouting is coming from them. As I said yesterday, the Chambers of Commerce and Industry, the millowners, the million-

aires, the monopoly press controlled by the super profits tax-walas, are all shouting in this way and trying to show that in the emergency all plans should be scrapped; that there should be nothing. So much so, that I am sure that tomorrow and the day after, the Chambers of Commerce and Industry in their meeting would want us to say that the 1956 Industrial Policy resolution should be revised to the extent that these things which are should be revised to the extent that these things which are in the public sector, which are very much vital for the country, as the resolution says very clearly, are given up and those friends are allowed to evade the public sector and devour all that is being done in the interests of the public.

The other day, one of those people asked the Minister of Mines and Fuel that their capacity should be allowed to increase to 10 million tons in the matter of oil. At present, it is six million tons. Very rightly, the Minister of Mines and Fuel, Shri K. D. Malviya said that the capacity in the areas in which they lie is not so much that they can produce or distribute more than six million tons. So, on the one hand, they are shouting very loudly that they want to support the war effort; that they want to strengthen the defence of the country. But, on the other hand, they are trying to subvert the entire thing.

The report of the Mahalanobis Committee has not yet been sent to us. But I am sure that the conclusions of that committee are very obvious. What those economists have said is very clear to us already with naked eyes. I would give some figures; I would place them before the House just before our Minister of Planning. Now the Deputy Minister of Finance was quoting some figures. He was telling us that those figures do not clearly show that there has been a concentration of wealth and economic power in fewer hands. He was quoting some figures I would

also like to quote some figures from the Annual Report on the working and administration of the Companies Act, 1956. Then we will be able to judge and see how they are creating the concentration of economic power and wealth and income in fewer hands, how there is this inequality of wealth and income created. Let there be at least some broad principles according to which we can judge these things. For example, one of these criteria may be the decline in the number of firms in an industry, especially if such a decline is accompanied by rising profits and higher dividends, or by a decrease in the number of shareholders; also if complaints of rising barriers to entry of new firms are there. Then there may be adverse movement of per unit costs indicating non-realisation of technological economies inherent in the enlargement of the unit size of production. Lastly, price-rises are higher than 'fair selling prices', and appropriation of profits, particularly at the expense of adequate replacement provision or modernisation. Let us see if in the present circumstances these things are there before these big sharks. Let us see whether it is not a fact that at the cost of the public the price, which is not a fair price, is being raised in this country. Let us see whether it is a fact or not: whether the number of companies is decreasing. On the other hand, we find that fresh capital is increasing. Let us find out whether it is a fact or not: that the managing agency is decreasing. It is being said that their number is decreasing. But is it not a fact that in this country only three managing agency houses are controlling much of the things? Let us find out whether these facts are true or not. And then we will be able to come to the conclusion whether economic power is being concentrated in fewer hands, in spite of all our efforts.

We have promised that we shall give to this country a socialist pattern of society. We have promised that in this country efforts will be made to see that there is no widening of in-

equality. But what do we find? In spite of our policies, that gulf is widening; power is being concentrated in fewer hands. I will give the figures of new registrations during the years 1955-56 to 1961-62 among the private companies. In 1955-56, their number was 1269 and their authorised capital was Rs. 8917 lakhs. In 1961-62, there was a small increase in the number, which rose to 1,415, but the authorised capital went up to Rs. 14,567 lakhs. I will now come to paid-up capital. In 1955-56, the number of private companies was 20,299 with a paid-up capital of Rs. 333 crores. The number of companies goes down to 18,758—by about 2000—but would you like to know how much the paid-up capital increased? The paid-up capital increased to Rs. 945 crores, i.e. more than double. What does this show? Is it not obvious to the House and to the country that, there is concentration in the hands of a very few? I am quoting the figures from the Government bulletin.

I come to now registrations between 1957 and 1962. The number of private companies in 1957-58 was 896 with an authorised capital of Rs. 4,972 lakhs. In 1961-62, the number went up to 1,400 no doubt, but the authorised capital went up to Rs. 14,567 lakhs. I come to the number of companies at work between 1957 and 1962. 19,984 was the number in 1957 and their paid-up capital was Rs. 532 crores. The number again went down to 18,000, but the paid-up capital went up to Rs. 945 crores.

These figures will show even to a blind man how in spite of our policies and in spite of what we are doing under the Companies Act, gradually the smaller ones are being squeezed out and wealth and economic power is gradually being concentrated in the hands of a few. This is in the case of big persons.

10 selected groups of large companies had interest of one kind or another in 876 companies with a total share capital of Rs. 205 crores. That goes up in 1958 to Rs. 277 crores dis-

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

tributed among 929 companies. Shri Bhagat says that can be partly true, but what does he say to the fact that there has been a tendency towards the accumulation and concentration of the means of production? In the cement industry, it is found that one major group accounts for 45 per cent of the total output. Can it be said that this is false? Is it not correct that in chemicals, excluding paints and varnishes, the top group accounts for 23 to 32 per cent of the total output? The greatest concentration, however, has taken place in the engineering industries, particularly in machines and electric fans. Here the top-most group accounts for 88 and 51 per cent of the total output respectively. These figures clearly show that day by day the concentration is increasingly.

Let me come to the common man. Is it not true that in the case of agricultural labour, the average wage declined by 10 per cent by 1959, compared to 1956? Worse still, agricultural wages seem to be lower in 1959-60 than in 1950-51. There are 60 million agricultural labourers in India and their real earnings is going down. Let the Government say it is wrong. It cannot be wrong.

In the case of industrial labour, the real earnings registered will be considerably less. When their earnings are going down, what do you find among the wealthy classes? Let me give figures about the income distribution. These are very revealing. Taking the monthly pre-tax income in 1955-56, 25 per cent of the population in this country got under Rs. 10; Between Rs. 10 and Rs. 19 it was 44 per cent; between Rs. 22 and Rs. 29 it was 17 per cent; Rs. 200 it is only 0.3 per cent. You also find that the top 1 per cent had 10 per cent of the national income after tax. 0.079 per cent of the top population earned 4.08 per cent of the total national income. The corresponding percentage in 1953-

54 was only 3.92. I hope when the Mahalanobis Report comes, I will not be very wide off the mark when I quote these figures. These figures speak for themselves. It is not that we are dogmatic; we are not like our friends to the right saying that this is not correct and this should not be allowed to be said. In all walks of life, they are trying to strangle.

Let me take, for example, the monopoly press. Only one small thing had been done; they had been called upon to make some sacrifice for the country. Let us see how this monopoly press which reports the parliamentary proceedings misleads the people in the country. Last time this House was discussing the Colombo proposals and I had been to my constituency, Bhagalpur. The electorate there is very enlightened. One lawyer friend of mine asked me, "I find from the press that the opinion on the acceptance of the Colombo proposals was very evenly divided in the House" I said, no. But he said, kindly see the *Statesman*. I saw the *Statesman*, a very responsible paper. On the 24th January, it quoted 8 speakers, of whom 4 spoke in support of the proposals and 4 against. But it very conveniently missed to mention 10 speakers who supported the proposals and only 1 who opposed them. That is how they are trying to spread this information. Another paper is the *Times of India*, the greatest sinner. On the 25th, the *Times of India* quoted 13 speakers. This will be a very good privilege motion in the House and I shall bring it up after some time, if they continue to do like this. It quoted 13 speakers, 7 against the Colombo proposals and 6 for them. But it conveniently forgot to mention 12 speakers who supported the Colombo proposals and only one who opposed it. Thus, in every walk of life, this monopoly press tries to give the idea to the country that there is no concentration of economic power and no growing inequality of income..

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

in this country, those who are bearing the heaviest burden to defend the honour, the integrity and dignity of this country, that we will shorten the gulf of disparity. That should be once more re-assured in this House by the Planning Minister and through him the Government, that they would do their maximum to see that concentration of power in the hands of a few is not allowed to grow, that inequality of income is not allowed to increase, that prices are not allowed to be manipulated by these friends in their own interest and thereby create more hardship, more burden and more misery for the poor at the cost of luxury, at the cost of pleasure and at the cost of many other things for a few sections in the society.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that while no efforts should be spared to strengthen the defence of the country to fight out the Chinese aggression, constant vigilance should be kept against the possibility of concentration of economic power and wealth, increase inequality of income and rise in prices which may undermine our resolve of setting up a socialist society."

There are two amendments. Are hon. Members moving them?

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Bara Banki): Sir, I beg to move:

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added:—

"and with that end in view—

- (i) the salaries of Government servants should not be less than Rs. 100 and more than Rs. 1000 per month;
- (ii) all the banks and private industries in the country should be nationalised; and
- (iii) a definite price policy should be adopted."

Shri P. R. Chakraverti (Dhanbad): Sir, I beg to move.

That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added, namely:—

"and a Committee comprising Members of Parliament be appointed to keep in touch with the Planning Commission and have periodical reviews of positive performances in this regard."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The original resolution and the amendments are now before the House. Hon. Members who want to participate in this debate may have five to eight minutes each.

श्री रामेश्वर टाटिया (सीकर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय श्री भगवत झा आजाद ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है उसके बारे में विरोध करने की कोई बात नहीं है। जहाँ तक मेरा खयाल है शायद स्वतन्त्र पार्टी को छोड़ कर और सभी पार्टियों की उससे सहमति होगी।

आज अगर कंसेंट्रेशन आफ पावर हो रहा है तो वह हमारी इस समाजवादी व्यवस्था के लिए उचित नहीं है। परन्तु जहाँ तक मैं समझता हूँ मुझे यह कहना है कि सरकार का इस में कोई भी ऐसा हाथ नहीं है या सरकार की ऐसी कोई इच्छा नहीं है जिस से कंसेंट्रेशन आफ पावर हो।

इनकमेक्स के बारे में जो उन्होंने कहा तो मैं तत्कालपूर्वक निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि कंसेंट्रेशन आफ पावर में रुपये की दरकार होती है तो सरकार ने आमदनी पर काफी टैक्स लगाया हुआ है। अगर किसी की आमदनी १ लाख रुपये है और उस के पास तीन लाख रुपये की सम्पत्ति है, नकदी मकान और जेबरात की शकल में इतनी सम्पत्ति है तो उस पर २ लाख १० हजार रुपये इन्क्यूडिंग वैल्यू टैक्स कर लगता है। इतना अधिक टैक्स के रहते कंसेंट्रेशन आफ पावर तो नहीं हुआ।

इसी तरह से प्रस्तावक महोदय ने सुपर प्राफिट 'क्स का भी जिक्र किया। अब सुपर प्राफिट 'क्स के बारे में मुझे यह कहना है कि उस के कारण कंसनट्रेशन आफ पावर नहीं हो पाती है। आज जो कम्पनियां हैं केवल टाटा बिड़ला या खटाऊ की ही नहीं है। लाखों शेयर होल्डरों की भी वह कम्पनियां हैं जिन में कि रिटायर्ड लोग हूँ विधवाएँ हैं ट्रस्ट्स हैं और बहुत से अन्य गरीब लोग भी उन के शेयरहोल्डर्स हैं और इस के रहते वहाँ पर भी कंसनट्रेशन आफ पावर का सवाल नहीं रहता है। अब सुपर प्राफिट 'क्स आदि को अगर और बढ़ाया जाता है तो खाली मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर्स ने उससे ऐडवर्सली एफैक्ट्स नहीं होंगे। उन को तो जो धक्का पहुँचेगा और नुकसान होगा वह तो उसे सह सकेंगे यह तो ठीक है परन्तु आप को यह नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि खाली मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर्स के इससे एफैक्ट्स होने का सवाल नहीं है बल्कि दूसरे लाखों साधारण आदमी जिन्होंने कि अपनी थोड़ी थोड़ी पूँजी शेयर्स की शकल में इनवेस्ट की हुई है वो ऐडवर्सली एफैक्ट्स में।

में और ज्यादा समय न लेते हुए केवल यही कहूँगा कि उन्होंने जो इनकमटक्स या सुपर प्राफिट टक्स के बारे में कहा है और कंसनट्रेशन आफ पावर को खत्म करने के लिए सरकार को कहा है तो जहाँ यह मेजस उन थोड़े मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर्स को एफैक्ट करेंगे और वह उस धक्के और नुकसान को बर्दाश्त भी कर लेंगे लेकिन इससे जो लाखों साधारण आदमियों पर असर पड़ेगा जो कि उन कम्पनियों में शेयरहोल्डर्स हैं शायद सको सह न सकेंगे।

Shri P. R. Chakraverti: Sir, the resolution which has been moved by my hon. friend Shri Azad has raised three fundamental questions concentration of economic power and wealth, increase in inequality of income and rise in prices. I have pressed through my amendment to associate with the attempt which is envisaged in the

resolution, a committee comprising Members of Parliament to keep in touch with the Planning Commission and have periodical reviews of positive performances in this regard.

When last year the question of disparity of income was raised, the Prime Minister of India immediately accepted the idea of appointment of a committee. The other day, in reply to my question I got the assurance from the Planning Minister that the report of the Mahalanobis Committee is forthcoming and we shall have an assessment, I will not anticipate its recommendations, but from the experience which I have in the constituency which I represent today, namely, Dhanbad, I am only quoting some figures.

As you know, my constituency is the preponderant mining area in India. The workers have expectations of Congressmen specially in the course of elections, we give them some idea as to how we want to shape the society. One of the greatest colliery-owners of India was contesting against me. When I went to the mining area, I stated, "Here is a problem that poses before us. Society is being moulded and in the context of this there will be a change in the social pattern." There I found that the income level of the common worker is very low as compared to very high profits realised by the colliery-owners. I said, "I shall try to see that the inequality is minimised as best as possible."

16 hrs.

The Government immediately appointed a wage board for the coal-mining industry in response to the workers' demand and I, being a member of the Board, had again to face my electorate when I said, "I can recommend a rise in your income on one condition that the increased earnings, that is, the increase in your pay packet, should not be spent on consuming articles which were not desirable in the context of the society in

[Shri P. R. Chakraverti]

which you live, namely, on gambling and wine. On that condition I shall recommend a rise in your wages".

An interim wage increase was accepted. But it is really unfortunate that the moment the interim recommendation giving an increase in wages comes into effect, we find the rise in prices simply neutralises whatever increase was sought to be given by the enhancement of their wages. So, this inequality persists. The way we go on tackling the prices, we seem to be running after something which is moving further and, at the same time, keeping us following in the track. There comes the vital question that this inequality has to be minimised by very rigorous and stern methods.

There is the question of imposition of taxes. A financial wizard, a very important dignitary, was telling me the other day that, during the war period the contribution of the UK and other Western countries needed to be taken into account to find out as to what proportion of their income was taxed leaving none immune from its imposition. But, there is a defect in the arithmetical calculations. When from my income of Rs. 50 a month I allow a reduction to the extent of 10 per cent, that is, Rs. 5, and my young and hon. friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, with an income of Rs. 5,000, allows a reduction of 10 per cent, that is, Rs. 500, it does not necessarily come to the same amount or proportion of sacrifice which I am made to undergo. This is a very faulty way of assessment of the imposition of the taxes in the form of percentages. It is not a question of percentage. In order to pay the tax, I deny my child one bread or a little milk essential in daily lives, while Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad denies himself the luxury of the American car which he wants to drive. Obviously, it is a very faulty system of assessment of taxes on the calculation of percentages and that is what is attempted to be done here.

We must be very careful and vigilant to see how inequality goes on the increasing.

As has remarkably been pointed out by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, it is quite likely that the percentage of increase in income is strictly limited to a particular section of our community, that is, the favoured and the privileged, while the other people, who had been denied the requisites of their life for generations and generations have been left in the lurch expecting some change in the form of life. How far are we carrying out their expectations? That is what we have to look after. Indeed, this Resolution has pointed out these factors which are very basic and which cannot be left to take of themselves on the plea of our attempts to develop. Because it is a developing society, these two questions, namely, concentration of economic power and the increase in the inequality of income, are very vital. Therefore, we have to be very careful in understanding the impact of the imposition of taxes and also other measures which we are trying to introduce to set up a better form of life for the millions of the unprivileged people.

There is also another factor, the question of the rise in prices and, I am sure, the Planning Minister is very much interested in keenly observing the trends in prices. You know, when this House was discussing the question, on other occasions, as to how far the prices were going up, there was an assurance—forthcoming from the Deputy Finance Minister—that there was a remarkable achievement in the last ten years, that the prices of cereals have not gone up by more than 2 per cent. It is a very remarkable achievement. But we must be careful because the other day, in reply to my short notice question, the Government came forward with a statement that there has been a very steep rise in the prices of rice even

in West Bengal which is having a shortfall in the production of Aman this year. This price also has got its direct impact on our family budget. I am sure the Planning Minister will endorse my suggestion that there must be an acceptance of the policy that at a certain level we must be ready to introduce some form of rationing, that is, some form of control on distribution. That is on one side. On the other side, there should be some form of price support so far as the producers are concerned. These are the two factors, that are essential. We must have a supporting system to help the producer to carry on his production and at the same time we must ensure that the consumers are assured of the supply of their essential requisites at a fair price.

These are the factors which have been mooted in the resolution and I would press my amendment so that the idea of setting up a committee comprising Members of Parliament to keep in touch with the Planning Commission and have periodical reviews of positive performances in this regard may be found effective and purposeful.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय जो प्रस्ताव मेरे मित्र श्री भागवत झा आजाद ने रखा है मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ। लेकिन इस के साथसाथ मैं उन से एक तो यह निवेदन करूँगा कि मैं ने इस में जो संशोधन जोड़ा है उसे भी वह स्वीकार करे और दूसरा निवेदन यह है कि वह अपने मूल प्रस्ताव को कायम रख उस को वापस न लें।

मेरे संशोधन का आशय यह है कि सरकारी नौकरों की तन्खवाहों में एक और दस का अनुपात रखा जाए और किसी की तन्खवाह सौ रुपये से कम न हो और एक हजार रुपये से ज्यादा न हो। मेरे संशोधन का दूसरा भाग यह है कि जितने बैंक्स और

निजी उद्योग इस देश में हैं उन सब का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाय। मेरे संशोधन का तीसरा भाग यह है कि एक निश्चित दाम-नौति अपनाई जाये जिस में यह खयाल रहे कि जो कम से कम आमदनी के लोग हैं उन की आमदनी के हिसाब से जिन्दगी की जरूरी चीजों के दाम निश्चित किये जायें ताकि वह अपनी जिन्दगी चला सकें। समाजवादी योजना में मेरा निवेदन है कि वह मेरे संशोधन के साथ स प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करें और अपने समाजवादी विचारों का परिचय दें।

कांग्रेस ने समाजवादी समाज की रचना की घोषणा की और कांग्रेस के अन्दर श्री भागवत झा आजाद जैसे मित्र हैं जो शायद इस समाजवाद के लिए लड़ते रहते हैं और कुछ मंत्री भी हैं समाजवादी लेकिन उन समाजवादी मंत्रियों से मेरी यह शिकायत है कि जब वे अपने आप को समाजवादी कहते हैं तो फिर वे किस तरह इस सरकार की भोग की मशीन के पुर्ज बने ए है खुद उसका लाभ उठाते हैं।

मैं ने इस प्रस्ताव को अच्छी तरह से पढ़ा है मैं ने पाया है कि उस में कोई कन्क्रीट सुझाव नहीं दिया गया है। मैं ने प्रस्तावक महोदय के अच्छे भाषण और उन के द्वारा दिये गए आंकड़ों को भी सुना है। फिर जो दूसरे संशोधक महोदय ने मेरे उन के भाषण को भी सुना है। उन्होंने भी इस प्रस्ताव की तार्किकता की लेकिन उन्होंने स दिशा में कोई सुझाव नहीं दिया कि यह र-बराबरी कैसे दूर होगी।

एक माननीय सदस्य : श्री टाटिया भी ले है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मैंने श्री टाटिया का भाषण भी सुना। स देश में बिड़ला जैसे पूँजीपति भी हैं जो कि बड़ी धार्मिक भावना के हैं, लेकिन वह किस तरह का गोल-माल रूबो और एशियाटिक नवो स कम्पनीज में करते हैं, यह सामने आ गया है

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

उनका भाषण भी सुना । लेकिन जब तक कोई आपके ठोस कदम समाजवाद की ओर नहीं उठते हैं, तब तक आपका यह नारा केवल नारामात्र बन कर ही रह जायेगा, गम काटने वाली चीज ही रह जायेगी और समाजवाद की स्थापना की ओर आप अग्रसर हैं, इसके लक्षण नज़र नहीं आयेंगे । इस वास्ते में चाहता हूँ कि ठोस कदम समाजवाद की ओर उठाये जायें । मैंने सुझाव दिया है कि जो तनख्वाहें हैं उन में एक और दस से अधिक का अन्तर नहीं होना चाहिये । मैं सरकारी नौकरों की तनख्वाह की बात ही करता हूँ । तनख्वाहों को आप अगर छोड़ दें और सुविधाओं को लें तो वह वैसा ही बात होगी जैसे "भेंडा मोट भवानी दूभर" । हमारा देश बहुत विचित्र है । तनख्वाहें तो जितनी हैं उतनी ही लेकिन भत्तों के रूप में तनख्वाहों से भी ज्यादा रुपया लोगों को मिल जाता है । अगर किसी की २२५० रुपये तनख्वाह है तो इससे ज्यादा या इतना ही उसका भत्ता बन जाता है । जितने का ढोल नहीं होता है उससे ज्यादा कीमत का मजोरा, यह कहावत यहां पर चरितार्थ होती है । मैं तनख्वाहों के बारे में कुछ मिसालें आपके सामने रखता हूँ । १९५७-५९ में जो पे कमिशन बैठा था उसने जो रिपोर्ट दी थी, उसके पेज ८०, पैरा ११ में दिया हुआ है कि यहां पर कितना अन्तर है और विदेशों में तनख्वाहों में कितना अन्तर है । यू० के० जिस की हम बहुत दुहाई देते हैं और जहां का पार्लिमेंटरी पद्धति को हम नकल भी करते हैं और जिस का शिकार मैं होने भा जा रहा हूँ, उसका ही बात मैं करता हूँ । इन तनख्वाहों के मामले में यू० के० की भी हम नकल नहीं करते हैं । वहां पर जो अन्तर है वह एक और पंद्रह का है । यू० एस० ए०, जोकि घोरतम पूंजीवादी देश है वहां पर छोटे से छोटे और बड़े से बड़े नौकर की तनख्वाह में जो अन्तर है, वह एक और पांच का है । कनाडा जोकि पूंजीवादी देश है, वहां पर एक और छः का अन्तर है । आस्ट्रेलिया में १ और १३.६ का

अन्तर है । जापान जोकि पूंजीवाद के शिकंजे में है वहां पर १.४ और ७ का अन्तर है । हमारे यहां जो अन्तर है वह १ और २४ का है । कैसा यह समाजवाद है, इसको आप देखें । समाजवाद को अगर मूर्तवान करना है तो कम से कम यहां के छोटे से छोटे और बड़े से बड़े सरकारी कर्मचारी की तनख्वाह में कोई तालमेल तो आप बिठायें, कोई रिश्ता तो कायम करें ।

आपका ही यह नारा था कि सौ से कम और हजार से ज्यादा किसी को नहीं मिलना चाहिये । उसको भी आप चरितार्थ नहीं करते हैं । इसका मतलब यह है कि आपकी कयनी और करनी समान नहीं है । समाजवाद अगर आप को देख लेगा और उसको पता चल जायेगा कि इतना बड़ा भारी अन्तर है, तो वह आपकी तस्वीर को देख कर ही भाग खड़ा हो जायेगा । हिन्दुस्तान संसार का सब से ज्यादा असमानतम देश है । छोटे और बड़े आदमी की तनख्वाह में यहां पर जमीन असमान का अन्तर है । इतना भारी अन्तर और किसी देश में शायद ही होगा । इस फर्क को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी और मंत्रीगण अधिक बढ़ाते जाते हैं ।

यहां पर मजदूर को क्या मिलता है ? आठ आने या बारह आने ही तो मिलते हैं । उसके मुकाबले में दूसरे लोगों को इतनी बड़ी बड़ी तनख्वाहें दी जायें, भत्ते दिये जायें, आराम दिया जाये, यह कौन सी सभ्यता कहती है । मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे ज्यादा कोई दूसरा असभ्य काम नहीं हो सकता है । लेकिन यहां तो उलटा चोर कोतवाल को डांटे की कहावत ही चरितार्थ होती है । हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि समाजवाद बड़े असभ्य हैं । एक तरफ तो लोग भूखे मरते हैं, बीमारी का शिकार होते हैं, मलेरिया का शिकार होते हैं हैजा की बीमारी से मरते हैं और दूसरी तरफ इतने भारी खर्च और प्रधान मंत्री जी समाजवादियों को असभ्य बतायें और स्वयं सभ्यता

के सब से बड़े केदार बनें, यह कहाँ तक न्यायसंगत है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ ।

मैं माननीय भागवत झा आज़ाद से तथा सरकार से निवेदन करूँगा कि सरकार को सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के जो कारखाने हैं, जरा उन कारखानों की तरफ भी नज़र दौड़ाना चाहिये । अगर हम पूँजीपतियों को कोसते हैं और उनको कोसना भी चाहिये, तो हमारे जो सार्वजनिक कारखाने हैं, उनकी तरफ भी हमारी दृष्टि जानी चाहिये । मिसाल के तौर पर मैं रूरकेला के कारखाने को लेता हूँ । सौभाग्य से प्रधान मंत्री जी इस वक्त यहाँ मौजूद हैं । वहाँ पर स्थिति यह है कि तीन हजार मजदूरों पर लगभग तीस लाख रुपया खर्च होता है और एक हजार अधिकारियों पर बीस लाख रुपया खर्च होता है । पूँजीपति शायद कम ठाठ से रहता हो, उन से जो अधिकारी इस कारखाने में काम करते हैं । यहाँ पर अधिकारीगण ठंडे और गर्म मकानों में रहते हैं । अगर समाजवादी कारखानों में चीज़ों के दाम कम न हों, उनकी लागत कम हो, उसका लाभ उपभोक्ता और पैदावार करने वाले को न पहुँचे तो आखिर उस समाजवाद में और पूँजीवाद में क्या अन्तर रह जायेगा । तब सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के कारखाने में और निजी क्षेत्र के कारखाने में कोई अन्तर नहीं रह जायेगा । रूरकेला में जो उत्पादन होता है, वह घट रहा है, यह माननीय मुब्रह्मण्यम साहब ने बताया था और इस पर चिन्ता प्रकट की थी । अब उसकी जांच भी होने वाली है ।

इसी तरह से मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो माल वहाँ पर सरकारी कारखानों में पार होता है उसके दामों पर भी कोई नियंत्रण नहीं है । पिम्परी में तपेदिक की मुद्रियाँ बनती हैं । वह सरकारी कारखाना है । प्रधान मंत्री जी उसके मालिक हैं । एक मुद्रि तीन आने में पड़ती है लेकिन बाज़ार में वह बारह आने में मिलती है । यह है सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र का नमूना ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य खत्म करें ।

श्री योगेश्वर झा (मधुबनी) : ऐसे महत्वपूर्ण विषय के लिए तो ज्यादा समय मिलना चाहिये ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : यह नहीं हो सकता है ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : हमारे योजना मंत्री जी समाजवादी हैं । समाजवादी होने के साथ साथ धन पर चलने वाले भी हैं । सब समाज में उनका बड़ा विश्वास है । भारत सेवक समाज जो कि भ्रष्टाचार का अड्डा बना हुआ है फिज़लखर्ची का अड्डा बना हुआ है उस में भी वह है । ये जो शाही यतीमखाने बने हुए हैं इनमें भी हैं । उन से मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वे निश्चित दाम नीति अपनाये और ज़िन्दगी की ज़रूरी चीज़ों के दाम निश्चित करें जिस में लोगों की आमदनी का ध्यान रखे । कोरे भाषणों से दाम रुकने वाले नहीं हैं । मेरे और भागवत झा आज़ाद जी के दृष्टिकोण में इतना ही अन्तर है कि उन्होंने जो बातें कही हैं उनके निवारण के लिए कोई मुझाव नहीं दिये हैं और मैंने निश्चित मुझाव दिये हैं । उन्होंने कहा है कि गरीबी और अमीरी बढ़ रही है । मैं इससे सहमत हूँ । धन शक्ति और सरकारी शक्ति जो दोनों ही एक ही हाथों में एकत्र हो रही हैं उधर उनका ध्यान नहीं गया है । इसका कारण यह हो सकता है कि उस तरह के लोग आपके बीच में हैं जो धन शक्ति और सरकारी शक्ति पूँजीपतियों के हाथ में एकत्र कर रहे हैं । मैं समझता हूँ कि जो तीन ठोस मुझाव मैंने दिये हैं उन पर अगर सरकार अमल करे तो देश का भला हो सकता है । आज जबकि चीनी संकट हमारे सामने है और ४४ करोड़ जनता का हमें सहयोग लेना है गरीबों का सहयोग लेना है तो हम को इन तीन ठोस मुझावों को कार्यान्वित करना होगा और अगर ऐसा किया गया तो सही मानों में समाजवादी ंग के समाज की रचना की बात जनता की भी समझ में आयेगी और उस धोर हमारा कदम भी बढ़ेगा ।

[श्री राम सेवक यादव]

मेरा प्रस्तावक महोदय से निवेदन है कि वह मेरे इस संशोधन को स्वीकार कर लें और साथ ही साथ अपने प्रस्ताव पर कायम रहें क्योंकि उन बैचिज की तरफ से कोई ऐसा बढ़िया प्रस्ताव आता है तो हमेशा भय रहता है कि कहीं वापिस न ले लिया जाये।

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): I support the resolution. There is a process in history which is called mimesis. If this process of mimesis goes to the past then the society is static and stagnant and it goes to decay and becomes insignificant in the historical process of the world. On the other hand, if it goes to the future, the society becomes dynamic, progressive and makes rapid strides towards greatness. India stands at the dividing line and has to decide whether to go to the past or to look to the future.

16.18 hrs.

[SHRI THIRUMALA RAO in the Chair]

It is a sad commentary that we find in our country today. About a year ago, before the elections, I looked into the speeches, programmes and the propaganda and the most salient things significantly broadcast from every corner of the country was that India was great, united and undivided. Very little was said about what India is going to be tomorrow.

The time has come now when we should look in the context of the present emergency, and the change that the social structure requires and the thinking requires. Taking the present emergency into consideration, I beg to submit that the time is past when the brave Rajput would fight for his country, with this thought in his mind that his mother has told him 'Make your mother's milk resplendent; it is the country where your forefathers' bones are buried very deep. Fight for it. Come with the shield, or be on the shield. Those brave days have gone. The modern

soldier looks not to the lump of earth, not to the holy waters of the Ganges, nor to the broken stones of the Himalayas, but he considers his own status, his own dignity, and the place of his people in the country for which he is going to fight. Do we expect him to fight as a slave of the people who only yesterday could ask his father 'If instead of a son, you had three daughters, you would have paid my interest and the loan?' Such a thing is impossible now.

So I beg to submit that the time has come when we should do away with the rapacity of the rich, the tyranny of feudalism of the feudals lords and the tryranny and oppression which the young soldier was suffering. Everyone should now be made to feel that there is a change for the better, scope for the fullest growth which means universal education, full employment and the opportunity for realisation of the possibilities of life.

How to do this is a difficult proposition. We have what is called a mixed economy. This is a set of economic principles which have been accepted by economic scientists as the right ones. We allow the private sector to work and develop and to make money. We also take in certain important sectors of development and production in the public sector. My respectful submission is, whether it is the private sector or the public sector, no one should under the law, much more so in public morality, be authorised to have profits through the labour of a slave. If a big industrialist making millions of profit does not provide for good housing, does not provide for the education of the children of labourers and does not provide ordinary sanitary facilities, he is a criminal. You do not allow a thief to build castles on the profits of his crime. I submit with all the force at my command that anybody who does not provide the minimum facilities for

the necessities of education, sanitation, housing etc. for his labour is no better than a thief. He is a criminal against society. It is no logic to say that in the Constitution we have provided for the freedom to trade and commerce, to have industries and so on. That freedom is there under certain human conditions alone and on no other.

Therefore, the time has come when a very strong and dynamic view of the thing has to be taken and the old, stagnant sector has to be done away with; With these words, I support the Resolution.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: Chairman, Sir, sometimes I have also to speak in English because as my friends from the Hindi-speaking area say when they speak in English so that they want to give importance to Members from the South, I also want to share my thoughts with them. To my mind, the present taxation policy cannot bring in the desired effects. If at all we want to speed up matters, merely having a limit on incomes will not do; there should be a limit on assets as well.

A little while ago, my hon. friend Shri Tania was saying that a man having Rs. 30 lakhs assets and an income of Rs. 2 lakhs will have to pay a tax of Rs. 2,12,000. If we allow even Rs. 38,000 for his expenses, it means he will be diminishing his assets only at the rate of Rs. 50,000 a year and it will take 60 years to bring the assets to the lowest level.

The whole position is that we are neither following the pattern of economy prevailing in America, nor that prevailing in Russia. Nor are we having a phased programme of some years. That is the main difficulty.

There are four sectors—the private sector in the form of the corporate sector, the private sector in the form of individuals and registered firms, the private sector in the form of co-operatives and the public sector. Besides, there is the Government machinery itself.

So far as Government machinery is concerned, my hon. friend Shri Yadav has already said that the ratio between the minimum and the maximum should be 1:10, and the minimum should be Rs. 100. I fail to understand why this ratio cannot be maintained without loss of efficiency. Actually speaking, the present method of living has a great influence on all these things. We have been accustomed to living in bungalows, having refrigerators, air-conditioning and all these things, and so we feel it difficult to bring down the ratio and expenses. So, unless and until the Ministers themselves set an example by leaving these houses and have such flats where they can live in a very simple way, and unless and until the same thing is done by the big officers, we cannot have the fulfilment of our dreams. Once they take to it, others also will follow, even the business magnates will follow. So, unless and until there is a proper co-ordinated programme to have first a limit on assets and then a limit on incomes in a phased way, our objective cannot be achieved.

The most essential thing is that the lowest income group must be raised first. Unless we raise them, there will be no use bringing down the income of the higher groups. Our success depends on how speedily we do it.

The community projects, for example, have failed because they have not been able to do anything for the lowest income group. This is the plain fact accepted even in the Evaluation Committee Reports on Community Projects, and the problem of not increasing the yield of agricultural produce is the main cause behind all these things. We are not able to increase because all our reforms are transitional and people have lost all faith in security over their land. If we go into details, we will find that so much loss in the villages is due to all these things, and due to politics coming into the zila parishads and panchayat samitis.

[Shri Kashi Ram Gupta]

We have formed the zila parishads and panchayat samitis mainly for development, for increased production, but it has resulted in fighting with each other in the name of politics. Sometimes they say the Congress is in power, sometimes they say the Communists are in power. What has the Congress or Communists to do with this? So, actually speaking we who proclaim that we believe in democracy are not believing in it. We believe in power politics. So, unless and until we remove this, we cannot remove the disparities. We can only talk of a socialist pattern of society, but cannot evolve it. So, we should leave the slogan totally and either go with the Swatantrites saying we should have plain thinking Or we must be very clear in our concept and working that it cannot be done unless and until we have a co-ordinated programme for all the sectors along with the Government machinery. That cannot be done unless and until the party in power corrects itself, its organisation and its working. This party says one thing and does quite the opposite. This has been clear by the speeches of the people here on the Budget. These very people who say that there should be socialist pattern of society criticise the Budget in a way in which they ought not to.

श्री विश्वाम प्रसाद (लालगंज) : सभापति महोदय मैं श्री भागवत झा आज़ाद द्वारा लाये गये प्रस्ताव का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ, मगर साथ ही साथ डर रहा हूँ कि हाउस के अन्दर एक कांसपिरेसी चल रही है और शायद उनको अपना प्रस्ताव वापस लेने को विवश किया जा रहा हो।

इस से पहिले कि मैं इस प्रस्ताव पर कुछ कहूँ मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान आज़ादी मिलने से पहले के समय की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ। उस वक्त कांग्रेसी कहा करते थे और उस सिलसिले में महात्मा गांधी जी का

नाम भी लिया जाता था कि हम देश में राम राज्य कायम करेंगे और हर आदमी के लिए खाने की रहने की, कपड़े की व्यवस्था की जायेगी। महात्मा गांधी ने शायद स्वयं कहा था कि मैं तो तब खुश होऊंगा जब कि इस देश का राष्ट्रपति झोपड़ी के अन्दर रहेगा। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि वे स्वप्न जो लोग उस समय देखा करते थे और वे वायदे जो उस समय किया करते थे उनको आज पावर में आ जाने के बाद भूल गये हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जिस वक्त इस देश को आज़ादी नहीं मिली थी उस वक्त इस देश में गरीब और अमीर में १ और ११० का अन्तर था और आज यह बढ़ कर १ और ३२० हो गया है।

योजना तथा श्रम और रोजगार मंत्री (श्री नन्दा) : पहले कितना था और अब कितना हो गया है ?

श्री विश्वाम प्रसाद : पहले १ और ११० था जो कि अब बढ़ कर १ और ३२० हो गया है। आप कहिये कि ऐसा नहीं है।

आप कहते हैं कि हम देश में समाजवादी समाज की स्थापन करना चाहते हैं। लेकिन आज एक तरफ लोग खाने बिना मर रहे हैं, महुआ और गुवरहा अन्न खा रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ लोग महलों में रह रहे हैं। क्या यही आपकी समाजवादी समाज व्यवस्था है ? एक तरफ लोग नंगे रह रहे हैं उनके पास कपड़ा नहीं रहने को जगह नहीं दूसरी तरफ लोग मोटरों में और हवाई जहाज़ों में चल रहे हैं। क्या यही आपकी समाजवादी समाज व्यवस्था है ? एक तरफ लोगों को मिट्टी का तेल जलाने के लिए नहीं मिलता और दूसरी तरफ मिनिस्टर्स के बंगलों में नौ नौ सौ और पांच पांच सौ की बिजली जलती है। क्या यही समाजवादी समाज व्यवस्था है ? एक तरफ अफसों को तीन तीन हजार वेतन मिलता है और दूसरी तरफ उनके चपरासी को ३० रुपये

यानी एक और सी का अन्तर है जब कि चपरासी के पांच बच्चे हों और अफसर के दो ही बच्चे होंगे। चपरासी अपने बच्चों के लिए सोने का कपड़े का पढ़ाई का प्रबन्ध नहीं कर सकता। क्या यही आपकी समाजवादी समाज व्यवस्था है ?

आप कहते हैं कि नेशनल इनकम बढ़ी है, लेकिन वह गई कहां ? वह उनके पास गई जिनके हाथ में पैसा है जो कि पैसे का जाल फँसा कर गरीबों और कंज्यूमर्स को लूट रहे हैं। जब किसान के गल्ले के दाम बढ़ने की बात कही जाती है तो सारी दुनिया चिल्लाने लगती है कि खाने की प्राइस बढ़ने लगी, लेकिन किसान को तो अपना गल्ला सस्ता बेचना पड़ता है मगर उसको अपने लिए मिट्टी का तेल, कपड़ा, दवा, कागज, पेंसिल महंगी खरीदनी पड़ती है। जितने भी आपने टैक्स लगाये हैं वे अधिकतर किसानों और कंज्यूमर्स से वसूल होंगे। किसानों के पास इतना धन नहीं है कि वे बड़े बड़े पैमपलेंट मिनिस्टर्स और मेम्बर्स के कमरों में जाकर डालें ताकि वह जाकर हाउस में बोल सकें कि किसानों पर बड़ा टैक्स लगा है। किसानों के पास इस तरह की कोई अपनी संस्था नहीं है जो उनकी आवाज को इस हाउस में पहुँचा सके। क्या यह सही नहीं है कि इस देश में ऐसे लोग हैं जिनकी आमदनी ७ और १० रुपये से कम है। क्या यह सही नहीं है कि इस देश में ६० प्रतिशत से अधिक ऐसे लोग हैं जिनकी आमदनी नेशनल इनकम की आधी के बराबर है। जब इस तरह की विषमता है और आप समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि विषमता कम हो जाये और लोग खुशहाल रहें और हर आदमी के लिए रोटी, कपड़ा, खाना, रहने का स्थान, शिक्षा और चिकित्सा का इन्तिजाम हो, तो आप को सोचना होगा कि इसका क्या कारण है कि देश में इक्वालिटी लायी जा सके। लेकिन आप इस तरफ ध्यान न देकर बड़े मिल ओनर्स

को मदद दे रहे हैं, आपने टाटा को बिना सूद के दस करोड़ रुपया दे दिया और उसने आप को १५ लाख इलेक्शन के लिए दे दिया। अगर आप की ऐसी मनोवृत्ति रहेगी तो चाहे आप समाजवादी समाज व्यवस्था का स्लोगन भले ही लगाते रहें और कहते रहें कि देश में बराबरी हो जाये, लेकिन ऐसा सो वर्ष में भी नहीं हो सकेगा। जब तक आपका इंटरेस्ट पूंजीपतियों के साथ रहेगा और ये लोग आपकी मदद से फायदा उठाते रहेंगे, तब तक आप कितना भी चाहें कि देश में बराबरी हो जाये, वह नहीं हो सकती। मुट्ठी भर लोग, चाहे वे पांच हों, १५ हों या १५०० हों, जब तक आप से अपने पैसे के बल पर चाहे जैसा कानून बनवाते रहेंगे, और जब तक आप उनका साथ देते रहेंगे और उनका प्रभाव बढ़ता रहेगा, तब तक देश में बराबरी नहीं आ सकती।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं कहता हूँ कि श्री भागवत झा आज़ाद जो प्रस्ताव लाए हैं यह बहुत अच्छा है और इसको पास होना चाहिए।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : सभापति जी, मैं श्री भागवत झा आज़ाद के संकल्प का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ जो उन्होंने सदन के सम्मुख प्रस्तुत किया है।

श्री भागवत झा आज़ाद ने मांग की है कि जहां पर प्रतिरक्षा के काम में किसी प्रकार की कमी न की जाये और मोर्चे पर शत्रु का सामना करने के लिए हर प्रकार के उपाय किये जायें, वहां उन्होंने सरकार से यह मांग की है कि इस बात से चौकन्ना रहा जाये कि आर्थिक शक्ति कुछ जगहों पर केन्द्रित न हो बल्कि जनता में वितरित हो। धन का एक जगह एक्कीकरण न हो। आमदनी में जो विषमताएं हैं उनको समाप्त किया जाये और बढ़ती हुई कीमतों को रोका जाये। साथ ही उनका कहना यह है

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

कि जो सोशलिस्ट या समाजवादी ढांचा कायम करने का हम ने इस सदन में संकल्प लिया है उसे मनसा, वाचा कर्मणा पूरा किया जाये।

सभापति जी, मैं जहां इस बात को अच्छी तरह से समझता हूं कि हमारी सरकार के प्रयत्न इस दिशा में पूरे तौर से चालू हैं कि जो हमारी कल्पना है वह समाज में साकार हो और बड़े और एक समाजवादी संसार हम बना सकें, लेकिन मैं देखता हूं कि हमारी बोधित नीतियों में और हमारे व्यवहार में कुछ अन्तर अवश्य है। और यह अन्तर कैसा है इसका मैं उदाहरण देना चाहता हूं। प्रथम मैं यह कहता हूं कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के पश्चात गरीब और अमीर की जो खाई है वह पट नहीं पायी है बल्कि बढ़ती जा रही है। हम ने यह संकल्प लिया था अपने संविधान में कि हम सब को देश में समान अवसर उन्नति के लिए देंगे और समान काम के लिए समान वेतन और समान पारिश्रमिक देंगे, वहां आज यह हो रहा है कि गरीब की गरीबी नहीं मिट रही है, लेकिन अमीर की अमीरी बढ़ रही है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अमीर तो गरीबों को नोकर रखते हैं।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : यही तो मैं कह रहा हूं कि अमीरों की अमीरी बढ़ रही है और विषमता बढ़ रही है। आप उदाहरण के लिए तनख्वाहों को ले लीजिये। हमारे देश में शिक्षक को, जो कि आज समाज की ५० प्रति शत जनता का गुरु है, तीस और चालीस रुपये मासिक वेतन मिलता है, लेकिन जो लोग क्लर्की के आधार पर काम करने का दावा करते हैं और उनकी लिखा पढ़ी के ऊपर अफसरी चलाते हैं, उनकी तनख्वाह तीन तीन हजार रुपये से भी ऊपर है। तो समाजवाद का ढांचा कहाँ दृढ़ हुआ ? हम ने कई बार प्रार्थना की नन्दा जी से और सरकार से भी निवेदन किया कि न्यूनतम और अधिकतम वेतन क्रमों को निर्धारित किया जाये,

लेकिन इस मामले में हमारी सरकार कोई चेतना प्रकट नहीं कर रही। जब तक हम न्यूनतम और अधिकतम वेतन निर्धारित नहीं करेंगे, ये विषमतायें बढ़ती ही जायेंगी, घटेंगी नहीं कारण कि इनके कारण देश में बैस्टेड इंटेरेस्ट बढ़ रहे हैं जो कि केवल अपना ही हित देखते हैं और देश में जो दान, निधन, गरीब और विषमता ग्रस्त लोग हैं उनकी अच्छाई देखना पसन्द नहीं करते। अब आप देखिये कि शहरों में आमदनी बढ़ाई जा रही है। शहरों के हर प्रकार के वर्ग की आमदनी बढ़ाई जा रही है लेकिन ग्रामीण जनता की आमदनी किसी प्रकार से भी नहीं बढ़ती है। मिनिमम वेजेज के जो भी कानून बने हैं वे केवल शहरों में काम करने वाले और मिलों में काम करने वाले लोगों के लिए ही होते हैं। उन के वेतनों के लिए एक सीमा निर्धारित की हुई है कि इससे कम उन्हें नहीं दिया जायेगा लेकिन इसके विपरीत जो खेतिहर मजदूर हैं, कृषि कार्य में लगे हुए हैं उनकी मजदूरी का सीमा निर्धारित नहीं की है। मिनिमम वेजेज ऐक्ट में एग्रीकल्चरल लेबरर्स के लिए निम्नतम मजदूरी की कोई सीमा नियत नहीं की गई है। ग्रामीण संसार में जो लोग रहते हैं उन के बारे में कोई चिन्ता नहीं की जाती है लेकिन चूंकि शहरों के लोग ज्यादा वोकल होते हैं, शोर कर सकते हैं इसलिए उधर सरकार का ध्यान चला जाता है। शहरों के प्रतिनिधि भी जो संसद् में आते हैं वे शहरों के वास्ते शोर करते हैं। दुर्भाग्य इस बात का है कि १५ प्रतिशत शहरों की आबादी के मंत्री भी अधिक होते हैं इसलिए वे शहरों की बात ज्यादा करते हैं और देहातों की बात वे भूल जाते हैं और इस तरह से वे उपेक्षित रह जाते हैं। इस देश की ८०-८५ फीसद जनता जो कि देहातों में बसती है, जिनके कि आधार पर यह सरकार बनती है, जिन पर कि सारा दारोमदार निर्भर है और जो कि आधार स्तम्भ होते हैं और जिनके कि बलबूते पर हम ने स्वतन्त्रता हासिल की थी, वे उसी तरह उपेक्षित रह जाते हैं।

आप देखिये कि आज क्या कारण है कि गांवों से लोग शहरों की तरफ भाग रहे हैं। गांव में खेती बाड़ी के काम से जितना उनको मिल पाता है उससे कहीं ज्यादा वे शहरों में कारखानों आदि में काम करके कमा सकते हैं। अगर कृषि कार्य से गांव में किसी व्यक्ति को २० रुपया मासिक की आय होती है तो वही व्यक्ति शहर में नौकरी आदि करके आसानी से ६० या ८०-८५ रुपये महीना कमा सकता है। यह विषमताएं आज तेजी से बढ़ रही हैं जिनकी कि ओर अभी तक हम नहीं देख पा रहे हैं। मेरा कहना यह है कि सरकार शहरों के लोगों की आय को बढ़ाने के प्रयत्न में लगी हुई है। शहरों में सारे विकास कार्य कर रही है और देहातों को ऊंचा उठाने और उनको आर्थिक अवस्था बेहतर बनाने की ओर ध्यान नहीं दे रही है। इस प्रस्ताव का मुख्य उद्देश्य यह है कि इन विषमताओं को हम दूर करें।

इसके अनिश्चित आप को यह भी नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि आज इमरजेंसी चल रही है। देश की बाह्य आक्रमणों से रक्षा करने का सवाल दरपेश है। भारत की स्वतंत्रता को रक्षा करने के लिए यदि पृष्ठ होना है तो शहरों के लोग कम लड़ने जायेंगे देहातों के लोग कहीं ज्यादा तादाद में लड़ने जायेंगे। सारा दारोमदार देहाती जनता के ऊपर है। सुरक्षा कोष में भी जो रकमें आ रही हैं उस में भी देहातों के लोग शहर वालों की अपेक्षा कहीं अधिक खुले दिल से अपना योग दे रहे हैं।

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अब समाप्त करें।

श्री म० ला० बिबेदी : मैं एक मिनट के अन्दर ही समाप्त किये देता हूं।

जहां तक बाद्यान्तों के मूल्यों का सवाल है मैं कह सकता हूं कि गेहूं आदि अनाज का जहां पहले १० रुपया प्रति मन भाव होता था अब भी उसका भाव १४ या १५ रुपये प्रति मन से 2991 (A) LSD—7.

अधिक नहीं है। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि अनाजों के मूल्यों में केवल ५० प्रतिशत का ही वृद्धि हुई है। लेकिन किसानों और ग्रामीण जनता के रोजमर्रा में आने वाली आवश्यक चीजों का जहां तक सवाल है उन में पहले के मुकाबले ४०० प्रतिशत से लेकर १००० प्रतिशत से भी ज्यादा उनके मूल्यों में वृद्धि हुई है। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि ग्रामीण जनता के काम में आने वाली आवश्यक वस्तुओं के दामों में कृषि पदार्थों के मुकाबले कहीं ज्यादा वृद्धि हुई है। अगर कृषि पदार्थों के दामों को गिराये जाने की ओर ध्यान नहीं है तो यह भी भूलना नहीं चाहिये कि वे अधिक बढ़े भी नहीं हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में ग्रामीण जीवन अस्तव्यस्त हो रहा है। उसका स्तर ऊंचा नहीं उठ रहा है। सुरक्षा के कामों में आपको ३०-३५ करोड़ ग्रामीण जनता का सहयोग जिस तरह से मिलना चाहिए था वह उनकी आर्थिक अवस्था आदि के कारण मिल नहीं पा रहा है। जैसा मैं ने पहले कहा देश की सुरक्षा का दारोमदार इस ८०-८५ फीसदी जनता पर ही है और उनके साथ आज जो उपेक्षा बर्नी जा रही है और केवल ८ या ९ करोड़ लोगों की ओर ध्यान दिया जा रहा है यह ठीक चीज नहीं हो रही है। अगर आप उस ३०-३५ करोड़ जनता का आर्थिक स्तर ऊंचा करेंगे तो आपको सुरक्षा कोष में उनका और अधिक योग हो सकेगा। उसी दशा में हमारे देश का कल्याण होगा और वह बलवान व समृद्ध हो सकेगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं श्री भागवत झा आजाद के प्रस्ताव का पूरी तरह समर्थन करता हूं।

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: Sir, it is rather strange that I am accused of possessing enormous wealth and concentrated with all sorts of capitalism. I want to correct the impression of my hon. friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. I was at the London School of Economics, trained under the famous labour leader Harold Laski. Therefore, I do not need any teachings in socialism. I have preached and prac-

[Shri Narendra Singh Mahida]

tised socialism in the real sense. But I am opposed to the adulterated socialism that the Congress talks about. I have left the Congress because of this reason that the Congress follows the policy of adulterated socialism. I have followed Gandhiji and I still believe the Gandhian method is the correct method. Myself and my party are not opposed to the Gandhian method. (*Interruption*).

If we are capitalists, then they in the Congress are equally capitalists. I may inform hon. Member, Sir, that I do not possess any gold, I do not possess any bank balance, nor have I an income more than Rs. 500 a month including the salary allowance that I get from this House. Even then we are blamed and it is said that we are capitalists, we are supporters of big industrialists and all that. It is very wrong. I wish to correct my hon. friend, and show to him this hypocrisy which prevails in the Congress. An hon. Member from Calcutta, who just now spoke, said that the Swatantra Party will oppose the resolution. I can only laugh at these things, that hon. Members who themselves have economic power, who have wealth and who are themselves capitalists accuse us, small fellows who have become peasants now. They accuse that we are capitalists in spite of the crores that they possess. This is the sort of hypocrisy that is seen in the Congress and they shed crocodile tears for the poor.

Mr. Chairman: I would advise the hon. Member to confine his remarks to the resolution that is before the House.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I am saying of the regimentation that is going on. There is no freedom of speech. Why should we be accused in this House or otherwise.

On the principle of the resolution, Sir, I fully agree with the mover. As I said, an hon. Member from Calcutta said that the Swatantra Party

will oppose it. I do not oppose it, I only request that the term "socialist society" should be changed to "Gandhian society".

An Hon. Member: He looks like a Maharaja.

Shri Narendrasingh Mahida: I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the principle contained in the resolution. I only request Shri Azad to change the term "socialist society" to "Gandhian Society", and I will then support his resolution. It is a fallacy to talk these days that the ruling party is only fighting the Chinese aggression. They have the monopoly of concentration of economic power. We have no concentration of economic power. I have not got any power, but as far as my party is concerned I certainly want to defend and remove the wrong ideas or wrong opinions that others have about us. There may have been some blacksheeps with us as others have.

Sir, as I said, I fully support my hon. friend, Shri Azad's resolution with this correction that instead of the term "socialist society" it should be "Gandhian society". I am fully in agreement with the principle. Why does he not adopt the term "Gandhian society" Shri Nanda also knows me. I have moved with him and others also. It is very necessary that we have some sort of a compromise between the upper class and the lower class. We do not want to kill the hen that lays the golden egg. It do not have the hen but the ruling party has it. If this hypocrisy is gone from the other party, I am fully in agreement with them.

Sir, I want that freedom should be there in this country and that there should be no regimentation. The Gandhian way is the correct way. If they follow the Gandhian way, we are all with them and we have no axe to grind.

Mr. Chairman: There are two or three speakers more. Does the hon. Minister want to reply now? How much time does he want for his reply?

Shri Nanda: I will take about half-an hour.

Mr. Chairman: What I feel is this. We are scheduled to sit up to six o'clock. The list of speakers is growing and it is difficult to accommodate all of them. Some hon. Members have thought of speaking at a late stage in the debate. There are already many names with me. I see from the benches here that the hon. Member who is to move the next resolution is not present.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): I am here.

Mr. Chairman: Then, we are pressed for time and I think I will have to ask the hon. Minister to reply.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: He can just move his resolution and it can be discussed on the next day. The other day I only just moved my resolution and it has been discussed today. Similarly, my hon. friend can move it today and it can be discussed on the next day.

Mr. Chairman: I am in the hands of the House, and we have also to look to the convenience of the Minister.

An Hon. Member: The time may be extended.

Shri Sheo Narain (Bansi): We had requested the Deputy-Speaker to extend the time.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha): You can find out how many are there and give only five minutes each.

Mr. Chairman: Even if we extend the time by half-an-hour, I do not think all the speakers can be accommodated.

Shri Nanda: I need only half an hour. They can have another ten minutes if they want.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have been listening to the speeches that have been made on the Resolution moved by my hon. friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. Socialism will not be effected by distributing poverty. Where there is concentration of wealth it is bad. But when we deprecate and say that the higher-income groups should be brought down without making any effort for alleviating or bettering the economic position of the vast mass of our country, it is also bad. So, we must strive for a *via media* to see that wealth, either economic wealth or political wealth, is not concentrated in the hands of a few people only. Concentration of wealth in the hands of a few persons in the country is also as bad as concentration of development in one part of the country. I am glad that there is another resolution that is coming up before the House which my hon. friend, the Maharaja of Kalahandi, is moving regarding regional imbalances that are there in the country.

I have been surprised to hear the speeches of some of the hon. Members from the Opposition. They said that all these economic ills and all this concentration of power in a few individuals' hands are due to Congress rule and the policies of the Congress Government in this country. I am surprised to hear such speeches made by some eminent hon. Members of this House. I can only say this much that after independence when we decided to introduce a socialist pattern of society in our country, we could not give a perfect plan to effect an all round socialism in the country. What I want to impress upon you is that when we thought of effecting land reforms in our country, we did not, at the same time, think of putting a ceiling on urban incomes. We started with the abolition of zamindari and the abolition of princely States in this country, but at the same time we did not think in terms of putting a ceiling on urban incomes. We went on raising the slogan of these land reforms in this country.

[Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah]

So far as land reforms are concerned, the principle is very good but so long as there are hundreds and thousands of landless poor in this country and the entire landed property is concentrated in the hands of very few people, neither agricultural production will go up in the country nor will the lot of the common man be improved. We had started land reforms in this country with that idea in mind. The progress or the pace of land reforms that are being carried on shows that we were not quick or very sincere about our policy of land reforms. Even in introducing land reforms in several States I could see that the hand of the big or the wealthy people is there. We had exempted the sugarcane growers and the rich zamindars and maharajas who are having thousands and thousands of acres under sugarcane and all that. We have exempted them. We have exempted them under the plea of mechanised cultivation and all that. We allowed them to go scot-free in the country. Also, in the name of exempting gardens in the country, we have allowed such things to grow. So, when land reforms are to be introduced, it must be in a very systematic way and on a socialistic basis. If we do not put an urban ceiling, we will not be able to do away with this concentration of wealth in a few hands. We allowed the people to have their own say in the economic matters of the country. So, I would say this much that the Government may be responsible to some extent for the passing of the legislation, but we also to a great extent as public men, as legislators, as Members of Parliament are responsible. We were not able to educate the public opinion in the way in which we ought to have done. A new society has come up after Independence—a society of bootleggers. A new class of bootleggers has come up in this country who are simply dominating our very social life. Anti-social elements have come down in our social life. What are the steps which we have taken as public men and as legislators? I am also putting

that question to myself. So, this problem has to be looked from every angle, not only from the Government point of view but also from the social angle. From the social angle, we have to see all these things, as our friend Shri Kashi Ram Gupta was saying though I do not agree with many of his views that he expressed. I know that a new class of society has come into force which is corroding our very social fabric. Until we take steps at every level—not only at this level, but at every level—we must proceed in a very cautious way. We should not cry hoarse or we should not proclaim as to who is a capitalist and who is a socialist. We are not able to make out here. People who speak about socialism, about depriving the people of their wealth, whether they are socialist by conviction or by convenience, we do not know. So, we should set an example by our very behaviour, by our very morals that we preach and we must live up to them. There is no use of criticising Ministers for living in palatial bungalows or drawing a salary of Rs. 2500 or so. Many of our eminent people who have worked for the national cause, who have done yeoman's service happen to be at the helm of affairs today. Have they come here to take a few thousands of rupees or to live in a big bungalow? As a matter of fact, you do not have such courtesy or decorum or dignity of not speaking ill of those people who are here to serve the country, to serve the nation. If we do not even have the sense of toleration, I do not know in what way we are going and in which way we are leading.

Sir, I thank you for the time that you have given me to speak on this resolution. I only say that this is a very good resolution that my hon. friend has brought forward. I would congratulate my hon. friend for having brought this resolution before the House and I also request him and other friends that this resolution must be viewed from all its aspects and we

must make a good approach. We would find in the Planning Minister a good socialist, a good Gandhian, who is more socialistic than anyone of us and, I am sure, our interests are safe in his hands.

Shri Nanda: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I too congratulate the hon. Member, the mover of this resolution, for having brought up this subject in the House. I am glad that he has done so. It is a subject worthwhile being considered from time to time particularly under the present circumstances. There are several reasons for what I am saying. In the first place, this approach reflected in the resolution, the aim which it endeavours to realise through the discussion here is nothing new. The Constitution of India has embodied these purposes and they also reflect the declared intentions of the Government. Still, it is vital to see how far we have gone in this direction, how much progress we have made and in what respect, particularly at this juncture when the risks become manifold by taking the country in an opposite direction.

17 hrs.

In any country, when a situation of emergency arises, when a war takes place, then, in a very short space of time, public expenditure rises in magnitude in an extraordinary manner. There are very urgent needs to be satisfied, for public purposes, of course, and certain essential activities have to be undertaken for the safety and integrity of the nation. Therefore, there can be no grudging of expenditure on such occasions. But, it also happens that simultaneously, there are opportunities opened up on large scale for profiteering and for exploitation. Actually, it is such abnormal times, that the new rich arise and concentration becomes intensified. Therefore, we have to take a warning; we have to be alert. That part of the Resolution, "no efforts should be spared to strengthen the defence of the country to fight out the Chinese aggression" is common ground. The need for "constant vigilance" is undeniable,

as he said because of the risks involved. There is the past experience. Public expenditure in 1945-46 was 16 times more than the level reached in 1939-40. The Second World War created those conditions of scarcity everywhere. Prices rose mainly because of recourse to deficit financing. That was an easy way of doing it, not the hard way of various burdens that are imposed upon the community, which are ultimately the easier way, the lighter way for any community. During this period of war, the index of wholesale prices rose three times. Who was hit hard? They were the low income people, fixed income groups; and of course the middle class who suffer always.

Now, when we are again in the midst of a bad situation, whatever happens, actually, we are facing a situation when we have to increase our preparedness for any eventuality. Large expenditures have to be incurred to make our country impregnable. That again is a situation when, as time goes on, those risks will develop. Therefore, there is need for a warning like this, a reminder to ourselves.

There is another factor also which is not peculiar to this emergency, but which applies to a period of rapid development. Whenever a country wants to develop, particularly a country like ours, from an under-developed stage seeking to reach up to the status of full development, that process, again, is attendant with great risks. Particularly, when there is a free market, those who have resources, get great opportunities and therefore, they can lay by large profits and thus enrich themselves. Inequalities, in these circumstances are bound to be accentuated and there is no escape if things are left to themselves. But, things are left.....

Shri P. K. Deo: I do not like to interrupt the hon. Minister. But I would like to get a clarification from him: whether this concentration of economic power is not due to the prevalent permit, licence quota, which is a corollary to control and scarcity of

[Shri P. K. Deo]

which the beneficiaries of the so-called socialism are making hay?

Shri Nanda: Subject to the limitation of time, I shall be very glad to take up that subject also, including Gandhian socialism. Even the word 'socialism' may possibly be forgotten, but when the word 'Gandhian' comes in, they and we are in for something more revolutionary than what is being attempted in the mere word 'socialism'. So, I shall deal with that also if there is time.

I have got some information about what happened during the second war period. In 1938-39, 67 per cent of the assesseees accounted for 39 per cent of total reported income, while at the highest point, top 0.6 per cent accounted for only 6 per cent. In 1943-44, 64 per cent of the assesseees reported only 17 per cent of the total income while at the highest point 0.6 per cent accounted for 37 per cent of the total income. Here is a demonstration of what may happen. Therefore, there is every reason for taking stock of the situation and establishing all the precautions that are possible. And we are very conscious of the fact that as development proceeds, apart from the emergency, same economic concentration will occur. And, therefore, the policy as presented through the Constitution to the nation, and later on, through our Plan programmes and policies, aimed at avoidance of concentration and of the growth of inequalities. A variety of instruments was developed for this purpose, instruments for regulation of production and of distribution, monetary devices, institutional agencies such as, co-operative institutions, and a number of other things. I would not like to take up the time of the House in going over the whole of that ground.

17.08 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

But one thing is very clear that while this is one of the objectives, the other objective for any economy, for a socialist economy, and much more so for a Gandhian economy, is that

there should be enough to go round, there should be enough production and there should be enough availability of things.

After all, it may be that barring a very small fraction of people on the top, the others have smaller incomes. There is no comparison at all, and no possible ratio can be established between their incomes and the incomes of the large masses of the people who are in the lowest or lower rungs. The people with large incomes form a small proportion only. I have got with me here an analysis of the distribution both on the basis of consumption and on the basis of income. Even if we go up to the last tenth, or, just below the top, that is 90 per cent of the population, their income will be nothing very much to speak of in the sense of making room for any kind of luxury or any kind of conspicuous consumption. What does it mean? Up to the 60 per cent, that is, the sixth decile of population, per capita consumption standard is below Rs. 25. per month. So, that is the problem.

So, while we are trying to attain that very desirable aim of not only preventing increase of inequalities but of reducing inequalities and disparities in income, and this has to be pursued, side by side with that, there is also the other aim which is no less important, namely that the increase in the national income and production should not be hampered. For, after all, what will the large number of people, who are not well off, who are in a state of distress or privation, think of us if we have pursued policies which will not give them the prospect of coming up to a position when their minimum needs can be satisfied? They would not excuse us at all in that case. Therefore, our policies have to be realistic in the sense that while they enable increase in income and production, at the same time, they should also prevent increase of concentration of income and wealth and of inequalities in the direction of economic power particularly. It is not

that the Congress Government says one thing and does another. I can give a catalogue of measures which have been adopted for the purpose of achieving this very objective—reducing concentration of wealth, income and economic power in a few hands. One of the major instruments is the public sector. There may be varying opinions as to whether it is functioning well or not. It may be that there are certain defects in its working, but not the defects which the hon. Member pointed out. One Member said that prices in the public sector should be lower, and at present they are making profit. Public sector undertakings should certainly make a profit, they should show a surplus. How else is the economy to grow and further investments to be financed? The public sector implies that the national social purpose will also be kept in mind, the objective is not to raise resources only. But how can the tax-payer be expected all the time to be paying for increasing investment? How can the economy grow on that? This applies to the private sector also. It must have resources to ensure that development does not suffer.

This is the answer in general terms. Specifically, there can be various questions, the *pros* and *cons* of one measure or another. Therefore, it is not a question of party slogans. There are many other steps taken, although it is true that some of them have not proved effective. For instance, if land reform has not proved fully effective, it is because that in spite of all our great enthusiasm and our readiness to go ahead with legislation, we are **face** to face with forces, social and economic, which have grown in the course of long. You cannot change or abolish all that. It is not that these problems can simply be solved by legislation, something much more radical has to be done in society itself. Social change is not a matter of legislation only. Particularly when we are aiming at revolutionary change, it cannot be accomplished through legislation only. The legislative measures

may even outrun the capacity of society to absorb them unless corresponding adjustments have taken place. It happened in the case of land reforms. In spite of all that we have tried to do, there has been slow implementation in several areas.

Side by side, if our performance is to be judged, I can show a fairly good record even in land reforms. All the tenants practically have been given security of tenure which is something important both from the point of view of their well-being and of agricultural production. Fifteen years back, 40 per cent of the area was under the zamindari system. Now that has gone. Though the ceilings law may not have operated fully everywhere, it is there. It is being felt. It is making a change. It may take some years.

Shri Bade (Khargone): The impression is that ceilings are to be there only in the case of land in rural areas, whereas the industrialist can have any amount of accumulation.

Shri Nanda: That is one of the aspects. There is the question of the rural area *versus* urban area. You cannot push down the throats of the rural people all your socialism and leave the urban people free to pursue their profiteering and all those gains. I entirely agree there.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I may give an instance, if you want details. In Ahmedabad, there are industrialists possessing more than 8,000 acres. What have you to say about that? They are in your party.

Shri Nanda: If they are in our party, their land is going to be much safer in our hands and there will be no very great difficulty. They will not be able to cry and agitate. We will have it out of them. On the other hand, those in the Opposition agitate and oppose it.

[Shri Nanda]

Again, the question turns on the structure of the economy. We have two purposes to be secured at the same time, one conflicting with the other. The prospect of having improvement of the large millions of the people should not turn out to be something illusory. We do not want simply slogans and things illusory. We want reality. If the hon. Member has any proposal which, on analysis, can be shown will achieve the purpose and yet not hurt production, we should accept that. The Gandhian idea goes much farther. If the Swatantra Party is prepared to accept the implications of the Gandhian ideology, I trust they will not have very much to object to whatever we are trying to do. We are prepared to go much farther than this; only the economic and political stability of the country should not suffer.

Shri P. K. Deo: All the trouble is due to licence, permit and quota.

Shri Nanda: I have in my mind the question of these controls. Control is possibly not a very good thing. I personally am not very much for regimenting the people. No; I would like to have the people function in a normal way. Therefore, I prefer the co-operative institutions. But how do we get at the results of a Gandhian society? It may be that if you dispossess everybody completely, you need not have controls. Controls means that you allow the economy and the productive apparatus to function in a certain way, you want to prevent excesses, and therefore the regulation. The whole approach is that the regulation should be such that it does not become oppressive. Some regulation is such that I think no one should have any kind of objection.

What are the controls to which the hon. Member objects? Licensing of industry? That has been the big cry.

Shri P. K. Deo: All controls.

Shri Nanda: That means that it is not anything near even a small resemblance to Gandhian economy. With democracy and general elections, with the people being made conscious of their rights, if poverty continues to stalk the land, if there is unemployment, it will not be a question of control or no control, it will involve a choice between liberty or no liberty for the people. The question will be whether peaceful and smooth progress is possible or not. It is a question of a peaceful revolution or another kind of revolution. If anybody thinks that there is a better way of reaching the goal, I think we should examine and consider it, because we would not simply like to have controls which are not needed. If the controls are not there, the amount of profiteering and concentration that can arise and develop is something unimaginable, and therefore it will be a complete anti-thesis of the approach of this resolution.

The resolution is very broad. We agree, and so many speakers have supported it. Even the Member who has said something against it has only opposed the word "socialism". He wants to replace it by Gandhism which is more far-reaching, more radical than the socialist concept we have introduced.

Has the situation become worse during this period? That is the question. I shall not attempt any answer straightaway in any statistical terms. I have not got that information with me. I am not quite sure whether the Mahalanobis Committee will be able to bring it out in very clear terms. I am afraid that comparing the change that has occurred during these last few years and focussing our attention on that is not a very reasonable way of looking at the situation. It means working on a base which was highly unequal, where economic concentration at the time of start of the process of planned development was very heavy, and therefore, any change

which will occur, one way or the other will not be seen. You will not be able to notice then in any prominent manner. It is quite possible that the Mahalanobis Report may reveal that there has been some worsening of the situation which could not be avoided because of our aim of allowing the process of development proceed unhampered. It might have been so in spite of all our precautions. Without these precautions the situation might have been very much worse. There was a figure given here about the proportion between the highest and lowest incomes in the country. It was said that after Independence the ratio had changed to a certain extent. I do not accept these figures. They do not exist in so far as anything that I have seen. But in so many directions we have been successful to a large extent in relieving the hardships of the people. It will take too much time of the House. The combined revenue expenditure of the Centre and States on education in 1950-51 was about Rs. 61 crores and rose to about Rs. 263 crores in 1961-62. On Health Services, it has increased from about Rs. 28 crores to Rs. 101 crores. Much more is being done in other directions through the instrument of public expenditure. We are utilising taxation, borrowings, etc. for making available increased facilities of social services to a very large number of people. If the consumption of food or cloth has increased, where has it all gone? The rich man cannot consume beyond a certain limit.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta: The evaluation committee on projects have clearly stated that the lowest group of people has not been benefited.

Shri Nanda: I agree that there are so many things which happen and which we do not like. The structure of our society is such that still people with money and social influence have a strong position and they can thwart the purpose of advance towards social and economic goals. We are trying at the same time to counteract those tendencies. For instance, the hon. Mem-

ber spoke of the people in the rural areas that they have not benefited much from the loan facilities. It is so. We have come out with a remedy. Now the question of credit-worthiness will be viewed in a different way. People who are not credit-worthy in the normal sense will be allowed to have loans and if there are bad debts on that account, we are providing even against that risk. We have been taking measures which are feasible and we are prepared to go further.

In the course of these years, maybe, we have not succeeded fully in the direction in which we wanted to move, but the main problem is this. We started with very heavy concentration. What is the comparison of 60 or 70 per cent. or even 90 per cent. of our people with a few persons at the top? The question which the hon. mover of the Resolution attempted to bring out through the figures about the concentration of share-holdings in the companies floated has not got the same significance. Naturally, if production increases shareholding will increase, including paid-up capital, etc. What he pointed out was that the number of companies had declined. If it were a few concerns, that was one question, but if there are in hundreds, it only means that in the course of these years, the average size of a concern is being enlarged which is a good thing, whether in the private sector or the public sector, as long as there is large enough number of units to permit a proper competition and monopoly interests do not develop. Mere one aspect is monopoly in the production apparatus and another is the financial hold. You cannot get an idea of the monopoly from the company figures; you should look into the matter very much deeper. It may be that there are a number of companies about which you can say that there is no concentration but ultimately they may be in the same hands, one way or the other. It is there that the concentration has to be seen, the concentration of economic power—and not that of the productive apparatus

[Shri Nanda]

directly. In that way, they might have grown. It appears that the overall picture has not perhaps changed materially during the last five years.

I would like to say one thing which may not be very relevant but which was brought up by an hon. Member, and that is regarding some institutions with which I am connected. I would like to have an opportunity of saying something about that matter sometime, to disabuse the minds of hon. Members as to what the role of certain institutions is. If there is anything wrong with them, I think that should be set right and not broadcast. But if they serve a social purpose, that is, if they help the community, let us not simply do something which injures ourselves by focussing too much attention on what is being done. I will be able to show that the benefit conferred on the whole community through voluntary organisations is incomparably more than anything that could be done otherwise. For that, I shall take some other opportunity. But I agree with the hon. Member there who said that there must be some suitable or reasonable proportion between the top and the bottom. We have put that idea in the Plan itself. To say that the disparity, so far as the administration is concerned, has increased in the public sector, that the public sector people are getting so much more is wrong. We are losing people in the public sector who go to the private sector because the salaries in the public sector are not high enough. These are the implications of a mixed economy which you cannot escape. The mixed economy may have to be there for several reasons some of which I explained.

The purchasing power of the money in the hands of the people in the upper rungs of the administrative ladder is not now the same as it was before, however, relatively to those who are at the lower rung; the incomes have increased. Even now I would acknowledge that the disparities are still very large and steps should be taken more

and more to bring them down, consistently with the other objectives which I have mentioned. I hope it will be possible to show more and more results which will be in conformity with the object enunciated under this resolution.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say to the hon. Member that we accept the resolution because it need not be accepted. I have explained that there is a common ground and concrete suggestions are being taken up. Therefore, it is not necessary for me to accept either this resolution or the amendment for the reasons which I have given.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I would say a few words in a minute. The main aim of my resolution was to focus the attention of the House and of the country that in the name of emergency there should be no wrong attempts made by some persons. The hon. Minister has very clearly said that he and his Government would always try to see that such things do not happen. In the course of his reply, he said that he realises that there is a wide disparity between the income-groups and that it will be the endeavour of theirs to lessen it. Therefore, in the light of his reply, and also in view of the fact that all those Members who have participated in this debate have supported this resolution, including Shri Mahida who wants to go one step further than the Gandhian ideology—it is much further than socialism—and also because we have been able to focus the attention of the Government on this matter, which is the purpose of the resolution, I wish that I should be given the permission of the House to withdraw my resolution.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member, Shri Yadav, want his amendment to be put to the vote of the House?

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That at the end of the Resolution, the following be added:—

"and with that end in view—

- (i) the salaries of Government servants should not be less than Rs. 100 and more than Rs. 1000 per month;
- (ii) all the banks and private industries in the country should be nationalised; and
- (iii) a definite price policy should be adopted."

The motion was negated.

Shri P. R. Chakraverti: I would like to withdraw my amendment by the leave of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member have the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, have the leave of the House to withdraw his Resolution?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

17.32 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. REGIONAL DISPARITY

Shri P. K. Deo: (Kalahandi): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House calls upon the Government to appoint a Committee consisting of Members of both Houses of Parliament to go into the question of disparity in the development of various re-

gions in the country and to suggest ways and means to lessen such growing disparity."

This is such a simple resolution that no persuasion will be necessary on my part for the Government to accept it, because it is one of their precepts that all the regional disparities should go.

Shri Nanda: Sir, I have to attend to an important meeting. May I just go?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes, he may go. The hon. Deputy Minister is here.

Shri P. K. Deo: The entire basis of this motion is on the very concept of building up a society to dispel all forms of disparity including regional disparity. If you will study the history of development in this country, you will be convinced that these are accidents of history. The British developed India as a colony and when they first came here, they had their foothold at Fort Williams, Fort St. George and Fort St. David. They started their industrial and imperialist expansion at these three points. Naturally, those three areas formed the focus of industrial gravity and they fully utilised the hinterland. That is how Calcutta, Bombay and Madras developed at the cost of the other areas.

Now, even though the entire concept has changed, we are still following the legacy of the British Government and we are following the same pattern, though we have been saying time and again that there should be uniform development of the entire country. The first and second Plans have been formulated on the basis of the capacity of the various States to bear the stresses and strains of planned economy and those resourceful States which had the resources could carry on with the development programmes. Those States like Orissa, Assam and Rajasthan, which had limited resources and which could barely meet their day to day administration naturally lagged behind. Our entire purpose of nar-