

Now, there is another privilege motion given by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri which I will take up tomorrow. If this is to be taken up tomorrow, then that will be taken up on Tuesday.

श्री मधु लिमये : बिहार को कल लिया जाये ।

Shri Daji : This may be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker : All right. I will take Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri's privilege motion tomorrow. Now, Papers to be laid on the Table.

13:39 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

CAPITAL ISSUES (APPLICATION FOR CONSENT) RULES, 1966

The Minister of Finance (Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri) : I lay on the Table:

(1) A copy of the Capital Issues (Application for Consent) Rules, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 600 in Gazette of India dated the 23rd April, 1966 under sub-section (2) of section 12 of the Capital Issues (Control) Act, 1947.

(2) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the above Notification [Placed in Library, See No. LT-6745/66].

PATTAZHI DEVASWOM LANDS (VESTING AND ENFRANCHISEMENT) AMENDMENT ACT, 1966

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Irrigation and Power (Dr. K.L. Rao) :

On behalf of Shri L. N. Mishra, I lay on the Table a copy of the Pattazhi Devaswom Lands (Vesting and Enfranchisement) Amendment Act, 1966 (President's Act No. 5 of 1966) under sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Kerala State Legislature (Delegation of Powers) Act, 1965.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT-6746/66].

INDIAN AIRCRAFT (PUBLIC HEALTH) AMENDMENT RULES, 1965

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Health and Family Planning (Shri B. S. Murthy) :

I lay on the Table
(1) A copy of the Indian Aircraft (Public Health) Amendment Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 2735 in Gazette of India dated the 4th September, 1955, under section 14A of the Indian Aircraft Act, 1934.
(2) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the above Notification.

[Placed in Library. See 6747/66].

13:40 hrs.

VERBATIM PROCEEDINGS OF THE 28TH SITTING OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Shri Morarka : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the verbatim proceeding of the 28th Sitting of the Public Accounts Committee held at 17:30 hours on 1st August, 1966 (relating to 55th Report—Third Lok Sabha), containing the evidence given by the Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation, as directed by Mr. Speaker.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT-6755/66].

13:41 hrs.

MOTION RE: ECONOMIC SITUATION—contd.

Mr. Speaker : The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri on the 26th July, 1966, namely:—

“That the present economic situation in the country be taken into consideration.”

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza may continue his speech.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza : (Warrangal) : I was referring yesterday to the effect of the war on the economic situation of the country.

The Minister of State in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Jagannatha Rao) : What is the time left, Sir?

Mr. Speaker : Four hours and five minutes.

Shri Jagannatha Rao : The Minister may reply tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker : All right; that could be done.

The Minister will reply tomorrow.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad) : The discussion on railway accidents is already fixed for tomorrow; two hours for that have already been fixed, unless the House agrees to postpone discussion on that motion.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri) : I would not take very long; I would not take more than 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker : All right. This would be taken up first tomorrow and then the discussion on railway accidents may be taken up.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza : We had aimed high to bring about a rapid development in the country. We had taxed our people to the maximum capacity; we had borrowed at home and abroad to the utmost limit we could do; we resorted to deficit financing keeping in leash inflation, so that it does not run away. We had also assumed a period of peace. When the Chinese invasion took place, not only political but also our economic situation got affected and that was because we did not provide for aggression in our Plan. The result was that we had to raise our expenditure on Defence and we had to resort to deficit financing. By the time we could recover from that, there was another aggression from Pakistan and this again was outside our field of calculations. On the top of all these, there were natural calamities like drought. Our Plan was such that no reserve or margin of safety was provided in that and for that reason, we had all these troubles. No matter who

the Finance Minister is, if you have a Plan there are certain things which you assume and if certain things outside the field occur, it is bound to upset the Plan. Therefore, I submit to this House that, if you want to make the Plan a success or the economic condition of the country to recover, you have

13.43 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

to decide whether you are going to have a war economy or a peace economy. When war stops, there is demobilisation; the industry shifts from war production to peace production; all the unproductive expenditure resorted to during war is stopped. But, here, we are placed in a very difficult situation in this country. We have no war; there is a problematic peace with Pakistan and an uneasy cease-fire with China; so, while at peace, we are really in a condition of war. Therefore we cannot succeed in having an economy, based on peace, because we are in a condition which is really a war condition. Therefore, this House, and the Government in particular, have to take a vital decision whether they will buy peace and time even on unfavourable terms, as Lenin did at Brest-Litovsk; whether, as in the case of Russia, you will buy peace and time and have your plan that way—cut off all expenditure on Defence and all unproductive expenditure—and wait for the day when you are strong enough.

The condition that exists today is a condition of continuous war. The Defence Minister announced the other day that Pakistan has decided to double the strength of her armed forces—from 5 to 11 divisions or something like that. And that very moment your Plan gets upset; you have to meet again that particular situation; therefore, you must be all the time on a war basis and if you are to be on a war basis, then there are certain disciplines involved in that condition and you have to accept those disciplines. There will be controls all round—on food, cloth, petrol, etc.—and all sorts of unnecessary expenditure have to be cut; also there

should be equality of treatment from the President to the peasant; there should be equal austerity and that should be the condition in which the economy should function and then the economy will succeed.

I am not creating a war hysteria. I think this is the condition all over Asia and Africa. We are all involved in petty wars and are all the time spending on arms and armaments competing with one another. During the debate on foreign affairs I suggested that we should all, in the Afro-Asian countries' conference, decide on freezing the frontiers for ten or fifteen years, whichever may be advantageous to one party or the other. We have tried to have conditions of peace; we have given concessions to Pakistan; we have given concessions to China also over Tibet we have tried to have conditions of peace but we have not succeeded in that. Therefore, let us accept this condition and accept that while we plough, we have to carry also a rifle on our shoulders.

Now I come to the question of foreign aid. Foreign aid has recently taken a colour which is not very attractive. I accept what our Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, says, namely, that the decision about devaluation was a decision on economic factors and there were no pressures. But, nonetheless, there is no denying the fact that pressures were sought to be exercised, pressures were exercised and pressures continue to be exercised. I am not saying anything new. In the Budget debate I said that we are being pressurized and that is the Johnsonian technique; that is how he holds the Senate in his hands; that is the way he tries to function in Vietnam; pressures are being exercised on Mr. Wilson: if you read Mr. Wilson's speeches over the last three or four years, you will find the difference in the attitude; he, at one time, disapproved of the bombing in Haiphong, but now he approves of the bombing in the Demilitarized Zone; there is an apparent contradiction. So

the pressures are exercised and will continue to be exercised because after all, the persons who deals with money has a certain advantage. I am afraid the U.S.A. is becoming like a money lender in our villages. They are dependent on that money-lender to our peasants and so they have to yield to the whims of the money-lender. That is a position which no self-respecting nation should allow itself to be in. After having been devastated by the Second World War, Russia did not accept the Marshall Plan; she struggled and stood on her own feet. No doubt, she got something from the East European countries. After all, the East European countries also had suffered in the war. Yet she also helped in the restoration of economic conditions in China.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Not like us.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza: China today is not getting aid either from Russia or from the U.S.A. She is trying to brow-beat and bully the biggest Power in the world. When China can do without foreign aid, why can we not also do so? People say that there is regimentation there but ours is a democracy. I submit that there is nothing wrong if we have regimentation in our physical life, as long as there is no regimentation of our minds. What we object to is the regimentation of our minds in the communist way and not orderly and disciplined behaviour.

I was glad to learn only yesterday that two Plans were being contemplated by the Planning Commission, one on the basis of aid and the other on the basis of no aid. I think that such a step should be welcomed.

Everyone says that there should be more production. But production of what? Does it mean production of consumer goods or production of armaments or production of what else?

An hon. Member : Foodgrains.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza : The interruption reminds me of foreign aid in regard to food. If there had been no foreign aid, we would have been more self-reliant today than we are in the matter of food. Look at the amount of foodgrains that we have imported, not during the drought year only but even during the earlier years. We have imported nearly Rs. 1000 crores worth of food. Supposing there is a shortage by 5 per cent, then if we just fast on the Ekadasi days we can meet this shortage. Anyway, I was talking about production. For greater production, improved techniques are necessary. For instance, automation can lead to higher production. But we do not go in for automation in industries which are export-oriented, but we go in for automation in the LIC which does not save any foreign exchange but which in fact spends foreign exchange. In the agricultural field, we go in for fertilisers. That is very good. Fertilisers are very important. But at the same time, we have neglected land reform on which we do not have to spend even a single dollar or a single pound sterling. The other day, somebody gave the figures and pointed out that 40 per cent of our cultivators were holding less than one hectare. Any one who knows anything about agriculture knows that on one hectare, or half an acre or a quarter of an acre it is not possible to produce any marketable surplus, no matter how much of fertilisers you use. It is a question not merely of increasing production but of increasing the marketable surplus, of increasing the quantity that goes to the market. That 40 per cent is not a small figure. Should we allow that kind of thing to continue? We have been trying land reforms for so long. After nineteen years of Independence Shri Asoka Mehta has told us, this morning that we are having committees to examine the defects in the legislation and to find out how far the laws are being implemented; of course, there is also this

excuse given that it is a State subject. The prosperity of the whole country is at stake. Here is a government whose writ runs in every State, here is a party which is united, which has got a prestige and which has got a past to be proud of. If a party like that, and if a Government formed by that party comes forward with some technical objection to bringing about land reforms on which the existence of the whole country depends, I think that that cannot be understood. Even MacArthur did in Japan more than what we have done in our country, as far as land reform is concerned. I know that zamindaris have been abolished, and I know the jagirdaris have been abolished, and I know that the princely States are no more. But they were decaying institutions, and we only have buried them. But as far as the basic land reforms are concerned, the position is that the condition in the village is no better than what it was before. Everyone wants to run away from the village, and the village has no attraction even to the peasant. Here, I would like to make a reference to the study report by the technical experts, that is, the American experts, about the package programme. The reports says that in Tanjore, which is the district of our Food Minister....

Shri Sezhiyan (Perambalur) : That is not his district.

Shri Bakar Ali Mirza : What I meant was that it was in his State.

The report further says:

“The landlords still continue to change tenants from plot to plot to defeat the tenancy laws. A large number of cultivators hold no title to the leased lands, pay high rents, and are never certain of their status. They are left with little to subsist on and much less to invest....”

It further says :

“In Madras and Andhra Pradesh, the lands reform law is of a temporary stop-gap nature. Comprehensive

legislative measure have yet to be enacted. In Bihar, the law in force is still the Tenancy Act of 1885 with some modifications which are wholly inadequate. Legislation in the Punjab is extremely defective and needs complete overhauling. Only in UP...."

... I hope my hon. friend Shri Tyagi will be glad to hear this—

"... a well-thought out and comprehensive legislation has been enacted and effectively implemented."

That is the condition in regard to the land reform laws. I suggest that the Government of India take this problem of production on agricultural lands more seriously.

Whatever the policy may be, we must have an implementation machinery which is good and perfect. It does not matter what we say on paper; if it is not put into practice on the fields, then it will lead to no results. Our administration today is not in the condition in which it should be in a developing country like ours. I am glad that Government have set up the Administrative Reforms Commission under Shri Monarji Desai and I hope that he would submit at least an interim report before the next elections so that we can get going. This matter cannot be delayed for long till the whole comprehensive report is received and laid on the Table of the House; I do not know how many volumes it would consist of.

Our objective is to have a socialist society and that has to be realised within a very short period of time. Socialism does not mean only the public sector. The public sector is only one of the ways to achieve socialism. Take, for instance, the case of the Imperial Bank of India. It was in the private sector before, and it has become the State Bank of India now.

If we examine the functioning of that bank today, do we find any difference in its functioning at all? Compare the State Bank of India with the Central Bank of India or Birla's United Commercial Bank and you will find the same story everywhere; the same type of credit facilities are given, and the same industrialists have the advantage. Though there is a direction that the money should be spent on co-operatives and for agricultural purpose nothing is done. So, it is not only the creation of more public sector undertakings that will help, but they should also function more efficiently and with socialist purpose. I suggest that some committee or some body should be formed to find out how far we have really gone on the way to socialism, because a poet has said, "Travellers, weave the fabrics of the road we go." So, we must know where we are going and whether socialism is just a mere distant ideal or it is going to be realised in our life-time.

14 hrs.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the entire explanation for the state in which we find our economy today is to be found in the problems of defence, diplomacy and development. It is in these three fields that a concatenation of events has brought about a situation of despair and pessimism in our country. I include in this trilogy diplomacy not because the hon. Minister of External Affairs happens to be sitting here opposite me, but also because the fundamental fact of our economic situation today is that we have not developed that negotiating skill, particularly in the economic field, which might have averted the disaster of devaluation.

Before I embark on a fuller analysis of devaluation, I should like to remind the House of an observation which I made on the day on which the Press of the country announced the decision of the Government to devalue our rupee. At that time, I had said :

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

"The devaluation of our rupee represents a tragic denouement of prolonged economic malfunctioning. It bespeaks a flabby and flagging economy. Debased and debouched, the Indian currency was brought to precipice by the inexorable momentum of persistent folly. Not only does devaluation run counter to the categorical assurances of the Government to Parliament; it does not hold out the hope that even this drastic remedy would enable the Government to salvage our rupee from foreign exchange wreckage. The remedy obviously is worse than the disease itself. One wonders whom it is intended to benefit, for the advantages claimed remain unconvincing. The suspicion is inescapable that we have finally yielded to the pressure of the World Bank and the IMF by accepting devaluation. My fear is that devaluation might unleash fresh inflationary pressure by enhancing the cost of imports and may not actually secure a realistic parity of exchange, with the result "that black market will continue to flourish."

"Devaluation brings home to us the compelling necessity of intensely vigilant foreign exchange budgeting, unsparing import substitution and a purposeful and pragmatic industrial policy, for after all, our foreign exchange crisis was not an act of God: it is a man-made disaster. The object lesson of devaluation is that fiscal management is not a mere matter of manipulation, it is a function of resilient foresight and efficient implementation of policies, and on both these scores, our economic administration has been found wanting".

I do not want to enter into a controversy whether devaluation was inevitable or

inescapable, but it seems quite clear and the Government has on its own admission conceded that devaluation was resorted to because of the mounting pressure of the International Monetary Fund, and in spite of the softening intercession by the World Bank, it seems that the recommendations of the Bell Mission backed by the pressure of the IMF and the US Government proved too much for our Government. The question is whether devaluation will increase exports, whether it will reduce imports, whether it will stimulate production, whether devaluation means a break with the past. The Finance Minister perhaps is more sinned against than sinning. I am prepared to concede that devaluation arose not merely by an act of volition on his part, but by a concatenation of events over which he had no control. This was perhaps implicit in the legacy that he had inherited from his predecessor. But in all the eloquent confusion that has been created in the wake of devaluation, for the Governments' eloquence is matched only by its propensity to confuse public opinion, one does not find a single basic, sound, solid ground in defence of devaluation today. Indeed, after so many weeks of devaluation, it has become all the more clear that devaluation was resorted to merely as a short-sighted measure yielding to the pressures that were building on this Government. It is true that our economy was coming to a grinding halt; it is true that the embargo on aid by donor countries as an undisguised instrument of political pressure during the Indo-Pakistan conflict brought to a sharp focus the hopelessness of our desperate dependence on foreign aid. But was devaluation the way out? Was it the answer? That is a question which the whole country asks of this Government in despair and in indignation.

Devaluation was described, as a matter of fact, by Government and the spokesmen of Government as a major surgery. It seems that after this so-called major surgery was performed by the not so skilful hands of our fiscal policy measures, the

wound was allowed to run sore; it was not bandaged, it was not bound and it is a running sore today in our economy. Nothing that was said at the time to justify devaluation, nothing by way of follow-up measures has yet been brought before this country. After all, can the inertia of the Government, can the promises of the Government, be permitted to hoodwink this Parliament? I would not like to use such a strong expression but for the fact that my heart aches with sorrow at the complete inactivity of the Government following devaluation, as if devaluation by itself was a panacea, as if devaluation opened the floodgates of progress and prosperity for us, as if devaluation was the *finale* to our economic planning and to our hopes for economic progress today.

Let it be understood clearly and once for all that devaluation is not a substitute for economic policy; it is not a substitute for efficient implementation of policy; it is not a substitute for farsightedness. Even if devaluation had to be resorted to under the pressure that I have just described at least it behoved the Government of the country to come up with certain measures which would heal the wounds that are running sores in our economy today. I ask the Government to explain to this House as to what they have done following devaluation which deserves the approval of this House, as to what they have done to deserve the approbation of this House. It is in despair and in sorrow that I speak because I find that the economy of this country is allowed to go down the drain by this inertia, by this inactivity, by this desperate dependence on foreign aid.

I do not wish to criticise the United States of America for what has happened. The entire fault is our own and it serves no purpose for us to blame the US Government. After all, out of the Rs. 3,600 crores of foreign assistance that we have received, Rs. 3,000 crores of assistance was given by the USA alone. This is twice as much as they gave to any other country. What use did we put it to? Did we put it to good

use? Did we take that assistance for a specified period of time to end all dependence in future? This is what we should have done; this is what we should have attempted if we wanted to serve the cause of the country and the cause of our economy.

I think that the Government has to do something to rehabilitate the concept of foreign loan assistance which is what we are receiving and not free gifts. We have to do something to rehabilitate the concept of this loan assistance as a moral obligation of the developed countries and not as mere doles to the downtrodden.

The other day when I questioned the hon. Finance Minister about his visit to West Germany, he came forward by saying that it is as a matter of fact regarded by these developed countries that the assistance that they give us is really in the nature of a fulfilment of a long-standing moral obligation of developed countries to developing countries. But is this borne out by the facts of the situation? Is this borne out by the economic realities that we have to be confronted with, that are inescapably part of our life today? Is this borne out by the fact that our Ministers have to rush and run in somewhat indecent haste after devaluation to explain, to seek excuse, to persuade, to cajole, foreign governments to give us more assistance.

On the one hand we say that devaluation will reduce imports, but on the other hand we keep promising businessmen in this country that this will open the floodgates of larger imports into the country. Is it to increase the imports into this country that we devalued the rupee? It seems that these contradictions remain completely unresolved.

I would like to mention here that the social cost of receiving aid is a very high one. We have always thought, our Government particularly, as if the assistance is coming to us for free. It is not. We and the future generations of this country will have to pay

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

through our noses for this assistance that we receive.

Unfortunately, the United States which claims itself to be a great bastion of democracy, unfortunately the United States which claims itself as the greatest fortress and reservoir of strength for the democracies of the world, has chosen not to look beyond its nose, has chosen to adopt a short sighted policy which compels us to insist on arming ourselves and increasing our defence expenditure. Unfortunately the United States has been unable to output sufficient pressures on countries like Pakistan which have been playing a double game of receiving assistance from the United States as well as from China. Unfortunately the United States has not been able to make good its promises that the equipment supplied by it to Pakistan would not be utilised in the eventuality of a conflict between India and Pakistan.

It is in this background that we must view the entire question of foreign assistance and review it. We must set, I think, a definite time-table for aid-receiving, we should set a definite deadline for putting an end to aid. We must accept, if it is feasible, a larger dose of aid at least in lieu of the compliance that we have served the United States with in response to their pressures, but over a limited period of time, and with the definite and declared purpose of putting an end to all aid.

I think in this contest it would not be improper or impertinent to emphasize the need for divesting our plan of man of its frills. I am a believer in planning, I believe that planning is the only way for an under-developed or developing country, but I also believe that you cannot endlessly live beyond your means on loan assistance received from elsewhere. The terms of servicing the debts and the terms of servicing these loans become liable to change from time to time so that our liability becomes an unredeemable and unendurable liability. This loan assistance has brought us to pass where

an equivalent of about 17 million dollars in Indian currency is owned by a foreign country. I do not wish to cast any aspersion on the possible motivation of the United States of America which has been a friendly country, which came to our succour and rescue at a time of great need when China invaded us. All the same it is for us to reflect on this desperate situation, it is for us to think that howsoever good their motivation may be such loan-receiving cannot contribute to our influence, to our prestige, nor can it promote an equal sort of relationship with that country.

In the first plan we received aid to the tune of about Rs. 380.3 crores. In the second plan the assistance was to the extent of Rs. 2,731.3 crores. In the third plan loan assistance was of the order of Rs. Rs. 3,937.8 crores. Larger project gestation gaps than were originally planned by the Planning Commission and the policy makers in this country have led to a sizeable divergence in the aid available and the aid actually utilised, so that a very anomalous situation has arisen.

The aid actually used in the first plan was Rs. 201.7 crores; in the second plan it was Rs. 1,435.3 crores in the third plan it was Rs. 2,519.5 crores. That is to say, in the first plan only 53 per cent of the aid was actually utilised, in the second plan only 52.6 per cent, and in the third plan not more than 64 per cent of the assistance was utilised. It seems that although aid has been available in sizeable measure in this country, its utilisation has been poor, and our warped sense of priorities has contributed to growing distortions in our economy which it would take a long time for us to rectify.

Only last year there was deficit financing to the extent of Rs. 435 crores, and this was after many repentant assurances given by the Finance Ministers of this country that no longer any deficit financing would be

resorted to. Who foots the bill as a consequence of this deficit financing? The common man. And the common man's situation, believe me, has grown from desecration to desperation.

Prof. Colin Clarke, a great economist, has made a very pertinent observation. He says that the economist or politician who offers to trade away price stability for an expected higher rate of economic growth may end up by finding that he has lost both. This is what our predicament seems to be today.

As I said, I am a believer in planning. I said that I believe that a developing society cannot except through the methodology of planning made a breakthrough from the stagnation that surrounds its economic situation; but by trading away price stability completely, by throwing all caution to the winds, the situation that we have brought about is that we have neither been able to keep price stability in this country, nor have we been able to achieve a greater rate of growth.

It was shocking and it was painful to find that the rate of growth in our country is the lowest in the whole of Asia, with the exception of Indonesia which was suffering from many kinds of internal conflicts, and which should be no cause for consolation to this country.

My hon. friend Shri K. D. Malaviya spoke the other day rather eloquently in defence of the public sector. Perhaps a word has to be said in defence of the public sector in this country where the public sector has functioned rather inefficiently.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri L. N. Mishra): Question.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It is not to attack or assail the concept of the public sector that some people criticise the functioning of the public sector. As a matter of fact, those who are interested in the proper economic growth of the public sector must

concern themselves with the fact that the public sector economy in our country has been functioning on a most uneconomic basis. We are concerned in this Parliament with efficiency both in the public and private sectors. It is true that if there is inefficiency, if there is inertia, if there is stagnation in the private sector, we have a right to be concerned, but we have even a greater concern in the matter of the public sector functioning where nearly Rs. 2,000 crores of public money happens to be invested.

The present, average return in the 60 corporations in the public sector is, I am sorry to say, 0.60 per cent, and even in the more profitable concerns in the public sector, the average return is only 3.6 per cent. In spite of the defences and excuses of the gestation period being long, I do not think that any Member of this House, — whether he is for the public sector or not, will be able to say that this is a fair rate of return after many, many years of these investments having been made. It is necessary, if our economy is to be made muscular and if it is not to continue to be flabby and flagging as I said, that the public sector must be made to function more and more efficiently. Otherwise, we would be consoling ourselves with a mere delusion of a kind of post-office socialism which does not lead us anywhere.

I should like to mention here briefly that the tax structure in this country should also be revised. It is true that once our economy reaches a self-generating level, once our economy comes to a stage of take-off as it is called in the parlance of economics, you could mop up the surplus resources in the community but at this time the tax structure which hits all sections of the community is bringing about greater inflation and reduced investments as a matter of fact. It is bringing about a situation where there is no climate of investment and a situation where production has come to a grinding halt. The other day the hon. Prime minister spoke very eloquently but unconvincingly about the size of the Plan

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

and said that a small plan meant a freeze on poverty. If we do not want to put a freeze on poverty, the priorities would have to be revised. They have not been revised in spite of solemn assurances and the firm and earnest resolve of the late prime Minister Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri who initiated a turn in our economic thinking. If we do not want a freeze on poverty, we must enforce a freeze on prices and a freeze on wages, which we can do only if we could enforce a freeze on prices. It is unconscionable for the Government and Parliament to legislate for a freeze on wages without a freeze on prices.

The economic situation in our country needs to be gone into intimately and in detail. The Planning Commission has brought forward plans one after another but it has not brought about that deeper reflection and that far-reaching analysis of the economic problems which afflict us. I would like to suggest that there is need for an economic reforms commission. I do not suggest this because commissions are the order of the day but because that is the only way of securing a national appraisal of the far-reaching problems that afflict us today.

The administration in this country is also largely responsible for the fact that our economic progress has not kept pace with our expectations and our targets. I came across a rather interesting passage the other day reading from an article by a visiting economist and publicist. What he writes about our administration is rather interesting. He says:

"I have had occasion to read files in India which go back to Lord Curzon, British Viceroy in India (1899-1905) and in the same connection I have read current files on governmental subjects. The language, style, format, the absence of any sense of urgency, the Olympian detachment of the bureaucratic writers—separated by six decades—all are char-

mingly identical. Charming—if the Indian case were not so desperate."

If this is our bureaucrat's idea of being charming if this is the kind of charm which he enjoys, then we might better bid farewell to him. But I say that the basic timber with which our bureaucracy is made is a sound one. Our administrative services could be refashioned and recast to serve the purpose of the social-welfare state. Has this been done? The answer is very much in the negative unfortunately. Nothing at all has been done in the matter of improving our administration whether it is in the field of redress of public grievances or in the matter of improving our administration whether it is in the field of redress of public grievances or in the field of speedier pace of progress in this country and efficient economic administration. Our administration at the lower levels and at the higher levels, from the centres to the states and the districts is busy in a game of hide and seek. With whom?—with the poor people of this country. This game of hide and seek with the poor people of this country must cease if we are to bring about a social welfare state in this country.

I would like, before I conclude, to refer to the situation that has been engendered by devaluation. The cost of devaluation is not quite known to this country I mean the tremendous proportions into which it runs will take away all likely benefits that would accrue from the augmented and increased quantum of assistance from abroad. I am told that economists have estimated that 300 crores will have to be put in only for subsidising certain basic commodities in this country. Otherwise, the prices will go high. An economist Dr. Rangnekar, says:—

"As a result of devaluation, the cost of all subsidies, including food, kerosene, petroleum products, fertilizer etc. will probably add up to a formidable bill of the order

of Rs. 250 to Rs. 300 crores. These figures are rough but they illustrate the magnitude of the new burdens which the Government has imposed on the budget and on the people. Any suggestion that this burden will be offset by increased revenue from export duties or anywhere else can be lightly dismissed. I think the net burdens will increase further, not decrease, because in addition to the subsidies on food, fertiliser etc., there is also a lowering of import levies in certain cases and there will now be a tendency to relieve the much maligned export incentive schemes by the back door in order to counteract the adverse effects on certain export products."

He says further :

"There will be more to pay by way of freight and other service charges on food imports. P.L. 480 supplies already cost the country roughly Rs. 110 crores every year by way of freight and other charges. The freight bill on the proposed 14 million tonnes of PL 480 imports will go up roughly by Rs. 50 crores to Rs. 84 crores. If, as the Government says, the imported food grains will be subsidised to the public, the subsidy will cost the exchequer anything between Rs. 150-160 crores. Who is going to pay for all this? The tax payer, of course".

There are other types of costs, social, economic and of course in terms of our self-respect that we are paying as a result of devaluation. Why is it that the Government has not been able to initiate immediately and promptly after devaluation certain necessary follow up measures? Devaluation is said to be an opportunity and a challenge. If so, the least that they should have done was to come out with definite schemes and proposals to give a turn to our

economy. It has not been done. The big question that remains before the Government and before the people in this country is whether this Government has the political courage, has the will and dedication to bring about those measures which alone could show results after devaluation. Devaluation is not a magic cure, as the Prime Minister said. It is not a panacea. It is only an instrument at the very best. Even if it is taken at its best, as an instrument, just as an unskilled workman, the Government have not shown any intention to use devaluation as an instrument for turning the course of our economic history. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, when the hon. Finance Minister rises to reply to this debate, I should like him to tell us as to what has been done in respect of follow-up measures after devaluation? That is being done to control prices? Why has the scheme of price stabilisation board been abandoned? Why have the Government not come out with specific proposals in respect of price increases, in respect of taxes, in respect of exports? Are the exports really going to increase? Are we going to reduce imports? There are no answers to any of these questions. It is in this context that there is despair and pessimism and hopelessness in the country. I would like, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that the Finance Minister at least clarifies these issues and brings to bear upon his thinking in this matter the national concern for the very future of our country.

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : इस मसले पर काफी बातचीत हो चुकी है। मुझे डर है कि मैं कोई नई बात नहीं कर सकूंगा। एक बात साफ हो जानी चाहिये। यह बात मेरे मन में तो बिल्कुल साफ है। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि डिवल्यूएशन करते समय गवर्नमेंट की जो नीयत थी, वह बिल्कुल साफ थी, अच्छी इंटेंशन से उसने इसको किया। लेकिन यह बड़ा गम्भीर फैसला हुआ और इसकी वजह से हमारे राष्ट्र के स्वाभिमान को धक्का लगा, इसमें भी कोई सन्देह नहीं है।

[श्री त्यागी]

लेकिन मजबूरन हमको इमको करना पड़ा। यह कहना कि किसी व्यक्ति या किसी देश का प्रेशर नहीं था, ठीक बात है। परन्तु यहां का जो वातावरण था, यहां के जो सरकारमिस्टासिस थे, यहां का जो प्रेशर था, उनसे मजबूर होकर हमको वर्ल्ड बैंक की शर्तें मंजूर करनी पड़ी। यहां के जो हालात थे उनसे मजबूर होकर हमको झुकना पड़ा। इससे माली नुकसान भी पहुंचा इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है, हमारे स्वाभिमान को भी धक्का लगा इसमें भी कोई सन्देह नहीं है। आप खयाल करें और देखें कि तीसरे प्लान में हर साल हमको कितना गल्ला बाहर से मंगाना पड़ा। सन् 1963 में हमको 4.56 मिलियन टन फूडग्रज बाहर से मंगाने पड़े जिसके दाम 133 करोड़ 60 लाख रुपये होते हैं। यानी एक अरब 33 करोड़ 60 लाख का गल्ला 1963 में हमको बाहर से मंगाना पड़ा। 1964 में आप देखें तो आपको पता चलेगा कि 6.27 मिलियन टन आया 4.56 की जगह, जिसकी कीमत 266.25 करोड़ रुपये अर्दा करनी पड़ी। 1965 में छः मिलियन टन की जगह 7.46 मिलियन टन अनाज लाना पड़ा, जिसकी कीमत 290.32 करोड़ रुपये थी। जब हमको इतनी कमत का अन्न बाहर से लाना पड़ता है, तो अगर हम इन शर्तों को न मानते, तो हमारे सामने सिर्फ यह रास्ता था कि हम बाहर से कोई चीज नहीं लायेंगे, जितना अन्न हमारे देश में है, हम उसी पर गुजारा करेंगे, बला से कोई हमको अन्न दे या न दे, हम त्याग और तपस्या की भावना से रहेंगे और कोई मदद नहीं लेंगे। यह काम हम शान से कर सकते थे, लेकिन इसमें खतरे भी थे। इसलिए इन हालात से मजबूर होकर गवर्नमेंट को डीवैल्युएशन करना पड़ा। यह कोई आसान काम नहीं था। कैबिनेट ने यह फ़ैसला सब बातों को सोच-विचार करके किया।

यह बात साफ़ है कि अब तक हमारे ऊपर जितना भी विदेशी ऋण था, जितना

भी इन्टरनैशनल कर्जा था, रुपये की कीमत घटते ही उस कर्ज की रकम बढ़ गई। डीवैल्युएशन के फलस्वरूप हमको पुराने कर्ज से 1899 करोड़ रुपया ज्यादा देना पड़ेगा। चूंकि हमारे रुपये के दाम घट गए हैं, इसलिए पुराने कर्ज को पूरा करने के लिए हमको 1899 करोड़ रुपया ज्यादा देना पड़ेगा। इस तरह हमारे ऊपर टोटल कर्जा 5187 करोड़ रुपये हो गया है। यह कर्ज का इतना बड़ा बोझ जान-बूझ कर अपने उपर लिया गया है, जो कि एक बहुत तकलीफ़ देने वाली बात है। इसलिए मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह फ़ैसला कोई बहुत खुशी से नहीं किया गया है, बल्कि बड़े दुख के साथ किया गया है। इस देश पर जो कर्जा चढ़ गया है, अगर उसको बांट दिया जाये, तो हमारे देश के एक-एक परिवार पर 576 रुपये का कर्जा हो गया है। इतने कर्ज के बाद हम और कर्जा ले रहे हैं।

हमारे देश के लिए यह एक आपत्ति का काल है, इस में कोई सन्देह नहीं है। विशेषरूप से हमारे मित्र-राष्ट्रों ने हम को एक बड़े धोखे में डाल कर ताशकन्द का फ़ैसला करा दिया, जो कि साफ़ तौर से एक कैम्प्लेज था इस काम के लिए कि हिन्दुस्तान कहीं पूरे काश्मीर को खाली न करा ले। पाकिस्तान की हालत इतनी खराब हो गई थी कि अगर पन्द्रह बीस दिन और लड़ाई चलती, तो हम पाकिस्तान आक्रुपाइड काश्मीर को सचमुच "आजाद काश्मीर" बना सकते थे।

1947 की पहली लड़ाई में भी जब एक ऐसा मौका आया कि हम पूरे काश्मीर को अपने हाथ में लेने वाले थे, तो हमारे मित्र, अंग्रेज, और दूसरे राष्ट्र मिल कर फौरन आए और कहने लगे कि सीज फायर करो और पाकिस्तान की इज्जत बचाए रखो। हम ने सीज फायर कर दिया। मैं समझता हूँ कि वह उस जमाने का सब से बड़ा राष्ट्रीय

व्लंडर हुआ है, जिस के लिए इतिहास हम को माफ नहीं करेगा ।

डिफेंस का चार्ज लेने के बाद मैं वहां पर मुआयना करने के लिए गया । मैं ने जेनरल से पूछा कि उन्होंने सीज-फायर क्यों किया, क्योंकि जहां पर उस के कई हजार आदमी मर सकते हैं, उस का फर्ज है कि वह वहां पर सीज-फायर करने से मना करे । मुझे पहली लड़ाई का तर्जुंबा था । मैं पहली वर्ल्डवार मे अंग्रेजी फौज में ईरान वगैरह में सर्विस कर चुका था । उस नाते से मैं ने यह सवाल पूछा । उस ने कहा कि गवर्नमेन्ट के आर्डर्ज आ गए, इसलिए वह सीज-फायर करने पर मजबूर हो गया । उस वक्त जो सीज-फायर हुआ, उस को हमारी सरकार ने कायम रखा । यही महीं पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में हमारे काश्मीर का जो हिस्सा है उसको वापस मांगने का तकाजा करना भी हम ने बन्द कर दिया है । मैं समझता हूं कि यह एक डिप्लोमेटिक भूल है । आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता दुनिया यह भूल जायेगी कि वह हिन्दुस्तान का इलाका है और वह पाकिस्तान का ही हिस्सा कहलायेगा । पार्लियामेंट में यह कहने का क्या मतलब है कि काश्मीर हमारा इ टैथ्रल पार्ट है ? हमारे तकाजा करने पर सिक्क्युरिटी कौंसिल ने यह फ़ैसला किया कि वह हिन्दुस्तान का हिस्सा है और पाकिस्तान उस को खाली कर दे । सिक्क्युरिटी कौंसिल और हमारे मित्र-राष्ट्रों ने इस लड़ाई में फिर सीज-फायर करा दिया, लेकिन वे पाकिस्तान को इस बात के लिए मजबूर नहीं करते हैं कि वह पहले फ़ैसले पर अमल करे ।

यह साफ बात है कि हमारी बाहर की दोस्तियां मुलम्मे की दोस्तियां हैं—वे असली नहीं हैं । यही वजह है कि हम को धोखे में डाल कर ताशकंद का समझौता करा दिया गया । रशा वाले भी हमारे दोस्त हैं । बहुत से लोगों को रशा की दोस्ती पर गर्व है । लेकिन

ताशकंद करार इस लिए कराया गया कि लड़ाई जारी रहने पर पाकिस्तान खत्म हो जाता । पाकिस्तान की इज्जत बचाने के लिए ताशकंद समझौता कराया गया । यह एक बिल्कुल खुला हुआ कंमुफ्लेज था । हम तो उस समझौते पर ईमानदारी से कायम हैं, लेकिन पाकिस्तान ने फौजी तैयारियां कर ली हैं । पाकिस्तान की तैयारियां इतनी ज्यादा हो चुकी हैं कि हमारे लिए उस में घुसना नामुमकिन हो गया है । यह हम क्या देख रहे हैं ? बना-बनाया खेल खत्म हो गया है । “क्या इस लिए चुनवाए थे तकदीर ने तिनके, कि बन जाए नशेमन, तो कोई आग लगा दे ?” यह क्या हो गया ?

हम ने आख मीच कर उस समझौते पर दस्तखत कर दिये और उस के बाद यह फ़ैसला भी कर लिया कि हम काश्मीर में अपनी फौजों को 1947 के लेवल तक घटा देंगे । हम ताशकंद के फ़ैसले पर चल रहे हैं, क्योंकि हम ने ईमानदारी से यह फ़ैसला किया है, लेकिन उधर पाकिस्तान अपनी फौजी ताकत को बढ़ा रहा है । इस का नतीजा यह है कि आज हम खतरे में हैं और दूसरी लड़ाई छिड़ने वाली है । अखबार पढ़ने वाला हर एक आदमी यह महसूस करता है कि पाकिस्तान और चाइना बहुत जल्दी हम पर हमला करने वाले हैं । ऐसी नाजुक हालत में हम को फौजी मदद लेनी पड़ेगी ।

हम ने इस मजबूरी में डीवैल्युएशन कर लिया, यह मैं समझ सकता हूं, लेकिन स्थिति की गम्भीरता को देखते हुए हम को सोचना चाहिए कि हम ने आईन्दा क्या करना है । अगर आज भी हमारी आंखें नहीं खुलती हैं, तो हम खत्म हो जायेंगे । मैं समझता हूं कि इस डीवेट का सबसे बड़ा फायदा यह होना चाहिये था कि ट्रेजरी वैचिज के लोग यह समझने की कोशिश करते कि हमारा क्या रीएक्शन है । आखिरकार हम जितने मेम्बर यहां हैं, वे नुमायन्दे हैं देश के । चाहे वे विरोधी दल के हों और चाहे इधर के, सरकार को उन सब

[श्री त्यागी]

की राय की कद्र करनी चाहिए और यह समझना चाहिए कि उन की राय देश की आवाज है ।

मुझे अफसोस है,—क्या कहा जाये, मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता—मिनिस्टर साहबान यहां पर मौजूद नहीं हैं । मुमकिन है कि वे कुछ परिशानियों में मशगूल होंगे, इसलिए वे यहां पर हाज़िर नहीं रहते । लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि यह उन का फ़र्ज़ था कि वे खास तौर पर इस डीबेट में रहते और समझने की कोशिश करते कि लोग क्या सलाह देते हैं ।

हम लोगों ने डीवैल्यूएशन किया । इंग्लैंड ने भी इस सिलसिले में कुछ करने का इरादा किया है, लेकिन उस ने पहले ही अपनी इकानोमी को बचाने के लिए जरूरी कदम उठा लिये हैं । इस में शक नहीं है कि हमारे रुपये की कीमत गिरी हुई थी, बहुत कम थी । इन्टरनेशनल मार्केट में रुपया मस्ता था, जितना हम ने कहा, उस से भी मस्ता था, जितनी कीमत हम ने घटाई, उस से भी कम उसकी कीमत थी । इस हालत में रुपये की कीमत को बढ़ाने का तरीका क्या है? वह तरीका यह है कि आज एक रुपया जितना सामान खरीद सकता है, वह उस से ज्यादा सामान खरीदने लगे, तो रुपये की कीमत बढ़ जाये । अगर आज दो रुपये में एक सेर चावल मिलता है, और अगर एक रुपये में चार सेर चावल मिलने लगे, तो रुपये की कीमत आठ गुनी हो गई । रुपये की कीमत तब बढ़ सकती है, अगर उस की परचेजिंग पावर बढ़ जाये ।

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar) :

When the hon. Member is speaking, there is no quorum in the House. Also, there is no Cabinet Minister present here.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : The bell is being rung.

Now there is quorum. He may continue.

श्री त्यागी : तो मैं कह रहा था कि असल में जब हम ने यह अवमूल्यन कर दिया तो रुपये की डीवैल्यूएशन करने के पहले कोई तरीका भी तो सोचनी चाहिए थी क्योंकि रुपया तो घंटी बजा रहा था कई वर्षों से कि कीमत गिर रही है । लेकिन उसकी आवाज कानों में कम पड़ी । यह पहले ही सोचना चाहिए था कि कीमत को रोकने के लिए क्या तरीका किया जाय । पर जब मजबूरन कीमत गिरा दी, उस की वैल्यू घट गई तो अब तो कोई तरीका सोचो । मैं अपने साथियों से कहना चाहता हूं कि जरा इस मामले में बहादुरी से काम लो क्योंकि आज देश की मांग इस बात की है कि गवर्नमेंट मजबूती से काम ले और देश आपका साथ देगा क्योंकि कोई मुखालिफ पार्टी हो या कोई हो, इतनी देश भक्ति, इतनी पैट्रि-आटिज्म सब में है कि वह राष्ट्र के साथ हैं और राष्ट्र की इज्जत, राष्ट्र की बेहतरी में आपका साथ सारे लोग देंगे बशर्ते की आप कोई ऐक्टिव स्टेप लें कि किस तरह से इस को कम किया जाय, यह खर्चा कैसे कम हो, इन्फ्लेशन कैसे कम हो, क्योंकि जब इन्फ्लेशन बढ़ता है, तो रुपये के दाम घटते हैं । जब जर्मनी में उन के सिक्के की कीमत घटी तो पांच-पांच सौ और एक-एक हजार सिक्के में एक प्याला चाय वहां मिलने लगी थी । तो इन्फ्लेशन तो बढ़ रहा है, बढ़ता ही चला जायगा क्योंकि जब इन्फ्लेशन बढ़ता है तो बढ़ता ही चला जाता है, घटता नहीं । जब तक कि कोई बड़े किसम का आपरेशन न हो । आज हम क्या कर रहे हैं? 188 करोड़ का डेफिसिट तो मैंने सुना है कि स्टेटस का है, आज हमारे किसी इन्तजाम की वजह से स्टेटस के और हमारे ताल्लुकात अजीब हो गए हैं क्योंकि एक ही पार्टी वहां पर पावर में है और वही यहां पर पावर में है । शायद इस रिश्ते से हम लोग लापरवाही करते हों । उन के सबजेक्टस अलग हैं, हमारे अलग हैं । कांस्टीट्यूशन के अनुसार ।

परन्तु स्टेट जो खर्चा करते हैं उसमें हमारा खर्चा माना जाता है लेकिन न मालूम किस तरह से रिजर्व बैंक उन को ड्राफ्ट देता जाता है। हमने सुना था रिजर्व बैंक को हिदायत दी गई थी, और उस वक्त शायद मैं गवर्नमेंट में था कि जब कहा गया था कि वह ड्राफ्ट की इजाजत न दे स्टेट्स को हमारी तरफ से, लेकिन खुने तौर से स्टेट्स ड्राफ्ट ले रहे हैं। आज हलत यह है कि 65-66 में शायद कहा जाता है कि 188 करोड़ का डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग उन्होंने किया है। अब वह ड्राफ्ट कितना है, मैं नहीं कह सकता। लेकिन 188 करोड़ का डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग स्टेट्स का है। तो आप अकेले क्या करेंगे? अगर स्टेट्स को फ्रीडम है डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग करने की तो आप इन्फ्लेशन को रोक सकेंगे जब तक कि स्टेट्स के ऊपर कोई डिस्प्लिन नहीं होगा? और मालूम नहीं कहां तक ठीक है, हमारे साथी भगत बड़े हुए हैं, बतायेंगे, कहा जाता है कि 180 करोड़ के करीब का डेफिसिट इस साल आपके बजट में होने जा रहा है। तो क्या यह 180 करोड़ आसान बात है? क्या यह डीवैल्यूएशन के लिए किया जा रहा है?

वित्त मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री ब० रा० भगत) : इतना अभी है।

श्री त्यागी : इतना इसी वक्त है तो इस को काउंटर ऐक्ट करने का कोई तरीका करना चाहिए। 368 करोड़ का दोनों का मिल कर डेफिसिट होता है तो इस को काउंटर ऐक्ट कैसे करेंगे आखिर यह इंडस्ट्रीज वगैरह की प्लानिंग चलती चली गई। रुपया बाहर से कर्जा मिलता गया। अब कर्ज के रुपये को कोई बेपड़ालिखा आदमी भी, आपके यहां तो बड़े-बड़े एकोनामिस्ट्स हैं, लेकिन एक बेपड़े लिखे जाहिल आदमी से भी पूछें तो वह कर्ज के रुपये को.....

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : जाहिल शब्द कैसे कहा उसे ?

श्री त्यागी : मैंने कहा जो बिल्कुल बेपड़ा है वह.....

श्री काशी राम गुप्त : वह जाहिल तो नहीं होते।

श्री त्यागी : मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि मैं जाहिलों का नुमाइन्दा हूं। आप पढ़े लिखों के नुमाइन्दा हैं, आप कानून के नुमाइन्दा हैं, बड़े बड़े लोगों के नुमाइन्दा हैं। लेकिन आप को मालूम होना चाहिए कि 80 प्रतिशत आदमी ऐसे हैं, वह पर्स नहीं दे सकते हैं पोलिटिकल पार्टियों को लेकिन कर्स करते हैं उन की तरफ से मैं बोलता हूं। आखिरकार इतनी बड़ी तादाद उन लोगों की है। उन्हें भी देखें तो कर्ज का रुपया शोकीनी में नहीं खर्च करते। वह किसी न किसी ऐसे काम में लगाते हैं, ट्यूबवेल में लगा देंगे, किसी और काम में लगा देंगे, ताकि पैदावार हो सके और वह सूद दे सकें। हमारा कर्जा ही तो बढ़ता गया है इतना जो मैंने बताया। लेकिन उस से पैदावार कितनी बढ़ी उस को भी गौर कर लीजिए। बड़े-बड़े काबिल आदमी प्लानिंग कमीशन में हैं। उन की तुक्ता चीनी करना मुश्किल है। लेकिन नतीजा जब खराब निकलेगा, मैच में जब हार जायेंगे तो हर एक विजिटर कहेगा कि हम हार गए। मेरा कहना है कि प्लानिंग में भी देखें मिस्टर भगत प्लानिंग के इन्चार्ज हैं, इसलिए इन्हीं से बात कर रहा हूं कि इस बीच में 1957 से आज तक करीब-करीब दस वर्ष हो चुके हैं, इंडिया की तरक्की 41.7 परसेंट हुई है इंडस्ट्री में और पाकिस्तान की 58 परसेंट हुई है। 41 परसेंट इंडिया की और 58 परसेंट पाकिस्तान की। उन को पिछड़ा हुआ कंट्री हम बड़ी शान से कहते हैं लेकिन उन की एकोनामिक्स, हमारी एकोनामिक्स से शायद अच्छी है और डब्लो मेसी भी शायद कुछ खराब नहीं है। तो 41.7 परसेंट इंडस्ट्री में तरक्की इस बीच

[श्री त्यागी]

में इंडिया ने की है और 58 परसेंट पाकिस्तान ने की है। 77.7 परसेंट ईरान ने की है और 87.6 परसेंट इजराइल ने की है। तो ऐसा नहीं है कि बड़ी भारी प्लानिंग से तरक्की हो रही है। मेरे ख्याल से प्लानिंग को फिर से गौर करना पड़ेगा। फर्स्ट चीज, पहली चीज पहले करना पड़ेगी। उस के बिना काम नहीं चल सकता।

आखिरकार सबसे पहली चीज जो आपको करनी चाहिए थी वह तो यह थी कि यह जो 2 अरब 90 करोड़ का अन्न आप ने पारसाल मंगाया है बाहर से 290.32 करोड़ रुपये का, यह एक सौ करोड़ से शुरू हुआ, 266 करोड़ हुआ, 290 करोड़ हुआ, होते-होते सौ करोड़, सवा सौ करोड़, डेढ़ सौ करोड़, ढाई सौ करोड़ से अब करीब-करीब तीन सौ करोड़ तक वह चलता चला आया। तो आप की प्लानिंग कहां ले जायगी? पहला काम यह था कि अब शहर वाले जो हैं 25-30 प्रतिशत आबादी हैं, वह हमारे सगे हैं, नजदीक हैं, यह मैंने माना और बाकायदा मिलना-जुलना भी उन से रहता है लेकिन कुछ आबादी ऐसी भी है जो गांवों में बहुत दूर रहती है, अगर आप उन को जरा सहारा दे देते तो आज आप की यह खराब हालत न होती। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि बोकारो का जो बुखार है उस को उतार दो। जितने यह सब स्टील प्लान्ट वगैरह हैं, बड़ी बड़ी इन्डस्ट्रीज हैं, अच्छी हैं? पब्लिसिटी के वास्ते लेकिन इन को रोक कर एक माल का भी रुपया, जो आप 3 अरब रुपया खर्च कर रहे हैं गल्ला बाहर से मंगाने में उस तीन अरब की जगह 2 अरब भी अगर खेती की तरफ डाल देते? और जहां-जहां पानी नहीं है, वहां पानी पहुंचाते, क्यों नहीं किया गया यह काम आज तक? मेरे दिल को तकलीफ है और मैं आप को बताता हूँ, पार्टी की रायल्टी मेरी है, आखिर तक रहेगी लेकिन यह समझ लीजिए कि अभी 40-45 वर्ष की खिदमत के बाद, मुझे याद आता

वड़े-वड़े बजुर्ग हमारे बैठे हैं, चाहे किसी भी पार्टी में हों, आखिर मुल्क को आजाद करने में कुछ खून पसीना बहाया है, अब अपनी आंखों से मुल्क की तबाही देखी नहीं जाती। इसलिये मैं यह कहूंगा कि आपको सही बात को मानना चाहिये। वरना जब पार्लियामेंट के सब लोग मिल कर फैसला करेंगे तब तो आपको मानना ही पड़ेगा। यह लाजमी चीज है और पार्लियामेंट की तरफ से यह मांग है कि आप पहले गांवों के अन्दर आबाशी और सिचाई का इन्तजाम कीजिये। क्योंकि 38 करोड़ एकड़ जमीन है खेती के अन्दर, और उस में मुश्किल से 6 करोड़ एकड़ ऐसी है जो इरिगेटेड है, बाकी अन-इरिगेटेड है। अगर आप इरिगेशन के काम को अब तक करते होते तो कम से कम यह 300 करोड़ रुपये का जो अन्न मंगते हैं, यह रुक गया होता। यह कहां की आपकी फूड मिनिस्ट्री है, यहां कहां की गवर्नमेंट है, मैं जवाब तलब करता हूँ नेशन की तरफ से? आप सफाई दें, इस बात की कि क्या किया आपने, क्यों आपने तबज्जह नहीं दी? आपका फर्ज है कि आपकी जितनी ताकत है, पहले उसको इस तरफ लगाइये।

मद्रास के अन्दर बहुत अच्छा बिजली का इन्तजाम हुआ, पानी-सिचाई का इन्तजाम हुआ, मद्रास की स्टेटिस्टिक्स के मुताबिक अगर कोई खुशक जमीन है, उसकी फी एकड़ आउट-पुट 95 रु० है और जहां उसको इरिगेशन की सुविधा दे दी गई है, उसकी आउट-पुट 640 रु० फी एकड़ हो जाती है। 95 रु० से 640 रु० हो जाती है 6 महीने के अन्दर क्योंकि एक ट्यूब-वेल 6 महीने में बन कर तैयार हो जाता है और अगर एक आदमी 95 रुपये के बजाय 640 रु० की आउट-पुट उसकी सहायता से कर देता है, तो आपने अगर यह काम पहले कर दिया होता, तो आज रुपये की कीमत घटाने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ती, क्योंकि फिर एक रुपये का 10-12 सेर चावल

बिकने लगता। आप कहते क्या हैं, किसान को जब कुछ सहायता नहीं मिलती है, तो वह कुछ खोद कर बैलों के जरिए से काम लेता है और इसमें उसके 500 रु० फी एकड़ बैलों से सिचाई करने में लगते हैं। 83 रु० फी एकड़ डीजल इंजन से खर्च लगता है और बिजली से 42 रु० फी एकड़ खर्च लगता है। यहां बिजली आपकी इतनी बन गई और गांव वालों को बिजली नहीं मिल रही है। मेरी अपनी कांस्टीट्यूएंसो से मैं आया हूँ, कम से कम 1000 कुम्रां के करीब यानी ट्यूब-वेल तकावी लेकर लोगों ने वहां पर बनाये हैं, लेकिन उनको बिजली नहीं मिलती। अगर आप उनको बिजली देते तो एक दम कहां से कहां पैदावार बढ़ सकती थी।

मीडियम और मेजर प्राजेक्ट जो थे, जिनके लिये आपकी इरिगेशन मिनिस्ट्री ने तजवीज किया था, अगर वे कम्प्लिट हो जाते तो 250 लाख एकड़ जमीन उस में आ जाती। यह आप मिनिस्ट्री से पूछिये, उनकी रिपोर्ट में मैंने पढ़ा है, 250 लाख एकड़ जमीन को वह आबपाश करते, इतनी सिचाई उस से होती और उनका कहना यह है कि 15 से 20 मिलियन टन तक पैदावार बढ़ती। आप 5 या 7 मिलियन टन बाहर से लाने हैं। अगर ये प्रोजेक्ट्स पूरे कर दिये होते तो बजाय 5 मिलियन टन के आपको 15-20 मिलियन टन मिलता। क्या वजह है कि अपने घर का 20 मिलियन टन नहीं कमाते और बाहर से 5 मिलियन टन भीख मांगने जाते हैं। आखिर कहां तक यह लाजिक चलेगा। यह साफ़ चीज है कि अगर उनकी स्कीम को पूरा किया होता जो इरिगेशन मिनिस्ट्री ने मांगी थी, तो देश में गल्ले की पैदावार बढ़ सकती थी।

ट्यूब-वेल-कम-पम्पिंग सेट के लिये आपने पिछली मर्तबा मेजर प्रोजेक्ट में 130 करोड़ रुपया सैक्शन किया था—प्लानिंग कमीशन ने लेकिन खर्च में क्या आया—90 करोड़। उस तरफ़ तवज्जह ही नहीं है, सिचाई कोई

मायने नहीं रखता, किसान कोई मायने नहीं रखता। अगर किसानों की तरफ़ कोई लापरवाही होगी तो मैं आपको चेलेज करना हूँ कि किसानों की तादाद बहुत काफी है, वह अपनी नेगलेक्ट को ज्यादा दिन बरदाश्त नहीं करेंगे। वह अपनी ताकत से आपसे चीज को करा लेंगे। अगर आप वहीलों के कहने से नहीं करते, तो किसान अपने कहने से करा लेगा और आपको उसके कहने के मुताबिक चलना पड़ेगा।

आपको भगत साहब, यह ध्यान देने के लिये कि मेरे इस ख्याल से यह पार्लियामेंट सहमत है, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि मैं अकेला बोल रहा हूँ, लेकिन मैं देश के सेन्टीमेन्ट को जानता हूँ, मैं अपने दोस्तों से यह कहूंगा कि वह गवर्नमेन्ट को जाहिर करेंगे कि वे मेरे विचारों से सहमत हैं—मेहरबानी कर के अपने हाथ उठा दीजिये।

देख लीजिये—एक एक सहमत है कि आबपाशी के काम को पहले किया जाय। मैं इसे दृष्टान्त नहीं मानता, लेकिन इन्फार्मली पार्लियामेंट युनैमिस है कि आबपाशी को, सिचाई को पहला प्रिफ़रेंस दिया जाय, यह युनैमिस वडिक्ट है।

श्री कमलनयन बजाज (वर्धा) : आपका दूसरा हाथ नहीं उठा हुआ था, आपका एक ही उठा था।

श्री त्यागी : आपने दोनों उठाये थे।

Shri Sezhiyan : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in spite of numerous broadcasts and statements, brochures and brave speeches from the Central Ministers, a very large section of informed public opinion in the country remains sceptical about the proposed benefits from devaluation. Central Ministers are excelling one another in extolling the benefits of devaluation. They are paying glowing tributes to the art of devaluation. From the way they talk it looks as though with them bankruptcy has

[Shri Sezhiyan]

become a virtue and devaluation a sure sign of progress. But the people are yet to be convinced and they are yet to recover from the shock and shudder they received from this fateful decision. They are aware that the country has nothing to gain but everything to lose in this debased and dishonest deal of devaluation. When I say "dishonest" some persons may object. The other day, Shri Patil, the Railway Minister, also ably argued—some other Members also said that—that Government when it does devaluation cannot afford to give previous intimation to others. I concede that point, that the Government cannot give advance notice of devaluation. But my accusation is that that the Government has been dishonest not before devaluation but after devaluation. Once the decision had been taken, the Government should have taken the country into confidence. They should have given out the real reasons for devaluation. They should have told the country why they had to decide upon devaluation now, why there was this urgency and immediacy about the problem. Here, I agree with one of the premier economic journals in the country—the *Eastern Economist*—which remarked in its Editorial dated 17th June, 1966 :

"To return, then, to the question which forms the title of this article, "Why Devaluation?" , we suggest that the true answer is that it had become a condition of continuing aid from Consortium sources. This is the answer which the Government should have had the integrity and the Finance Minister the courage to give to our people on the night of June 5. It was because the people were not told this truth on the earliest occasion on which they had the right to know it, the Government must accept the blame for political dishonesty in failing to take the community into its confidence."

That is to say, they have not only devalued our currency, but they have acted in a debased and dishonest way.

But in the fateful 11th hour broadcast on 5th June, this was not given out, that it had become a condition for getting aid from abroad, that until we devalued our currency we would not be able to get aid from abroad. Even now the Ministers are protesting against the pressures and conditions. Probably they are protesting too much because the cat is out of the bag. But the whole world knows why the Indian Government devalued its currency. Devaluation took place here on 5th June. The next day, on 6th June, the *New York Times* wrote :

"The United States and the International Bank have been pressing for devaluation as one of the measures to get the Indian economy moving. Increased western aid for India's Fourth Plan has been held up pending Indian action on their recommendation."

This has come spontaneously in the *New York Times* dated 6th June.

Also, coming nearer home, when the Congress Working Committee was meeting, a note seems to have been circulated by one of the members, Shri Biju Patnaik from Orissa, which has been reported in the *Hindustan Times*. I am quoting from the *Hindustan Times* report :

"Much of the unpleasantness could have been avoided, had the Government plainly told the nation of the overriding consideration that tipped their decision in favour of devaluation, instead of indulging in attempts at attributing a set of virtues and benefits that would flow out of this decision."

He also had this to add :

"Devaluation shorn of idle speculation about its illusory benefits is just a step to secure the required quantum of foreign aid."

15 hrs.

Therefore, foreign aid has become a major point in their taking the decision which they are fighting shy even now to accept. They may come out with so many statements. The Prime Minister and other Ministers, day in and day out, are saying that they have not been pressurised by any foreign country and that external aid has not been a condition for devaluation. But in their own brochure, which they published immediately after devaluation, they have admitted it. On the last page of the brochure "Devaluation of the Rupee—Some Questions Answered" they have admitted it. A question was put why they acted now and whether they could not have postponed this action by a few months. In answer to this question posed by themselves, it is answered in the brochure:

"Lastly, action could not be postponed as all further aid negotiations hinged on it."

That is to say, if you devalue, aid will flow in; if you do not devalue, aid will not come. Why do the Government not have the honesty to accept and courage to declare that they devalued the rupee because without devaluation they could not get aid? They should have had the honesty to do so. On the 5th of June when the Finance Minister made the broadcast, he did not say anything about it. That is why I say that devaluation even from the beginning has been done in a stealthy, dishonest and debased way. They have devalued not only the rupee but they have devalued themselves and India's honour.

Here I want to ask one pertinent question of the Finance Minister. What is the rationale for fixing the rate at 36.5 per cent? Why could it not be 26 or 46? If, as they say, devaluation is the best way to recover and progress and to make the economy strong, why not have it still higher? What is the sanctity for 36.5 per cent? Why should a dollar be equiva-

lent to Rs. 7.50? Could the rate not be different?

Then, again, Government have imposed so many export taxes after devaluation. They say that they wanted to keep down the margin of profit. That shows that the rate of devaluation has been much higher than what is actually required by the circumstances. If the international prices are much below the Indian prices, we need not have devalued to that extent as to invite further export duties.

Many contradictory statements are coming forth from the Government sources themselves about the need, necessity or urgency of devaluation. The Commerce Ministry Annual Report was presented to us in the middle of March. On page 37 of that Report they have argued against devaluation. The Government are at full liberty to hold one opinion at one time and then change it. I am not questioning it. What I am questioning is the argument based on certain facts which they have given in the Commerce Ministry Annual. There the Commerce Ministry argued that about 80 to 82 per cent of our exports are moving at international prices without any special assistance and, therefore, there is no need for devaluation. This position given by the Commerce Ministry in the Commerce Ministry Annual Report has not changed yet because, in answer to my Question No. 1537 dated 5-8-66, in this very session they have stated that the situation continues to be so. For the whole year 1965 those items that have been moving at international prices without any special assistance have been of the order of 79.6 per cent. From January to March 1966 the order has come to only 77 per cent; there has not been a drastic fall so as to invite any devaluation. But, only the other day, when the Planning Minister was speaking, he was saying that about 70 per cent of our export articles have to be subsidized, they require some assistance of the other. I want to know which one is the correct statement—the statement given be

[Shri Sezhiyan]

the Commerce Ministry in their annual report that 80 to 82 per cent of our export articles are moving without any special assistance of the present statement of the Planning Minister? They can change a decision but they cannot afford to change facts. They should give us the facts. What is the position? Is it true that 80 to 82 per cent of the export articles are moving at international price level or 70 per cent of the articles have to be subsidised? Which is correct? I am sure that within three months the situation has not so deteriorated as to change the position. Therefore, the Government should have been honest and intelligent enough to come before the House with correct facts. They may take different decisions, bring in their own logic and adduce different arguments but the basic facts should not be changed.

The Central Minister and other leaders are harping on the theme that the price rise on account of devaluation will not be high. One reason which they have given in support of their argument is that articles like food, kerosene and other things will be subsidised. Therefore, they argue, the prices will not be allowed to rise. I do not know how this is going to help the country. As Mr. Tyagi was saying just now, we are importing huge quantities of food. In 1965 we have imported food to the tune of Rs. 290 crores. Taking for granted that the same situation prevails in 1966, if we are to import the same quantity of foodgrains, we have to pay Rs. 456 crores. In other words, the extra amount which we may have to pay on account of devaluation will come to Rs. 167 crores.

Then, when Shri Subramaniam or Shri Sachin Chaudhuri says that Government are going to subsidise such and such articles, they are not going to pay it from their pockets or from their family funds.

The money will have to come from the exchequer. If it has to come from the exchequer, it can be only by taxes. So, from that point of view, when a man goes to the bazar he may pay a subsidised amount for the grain he purchases but he will have to pay more for his matches or some other items; an indirect tax will be collected from him to make up for the loss from subsidy. Therefore, even the subsidy is a burden on the public, in one form or another, and subsidy is no way to avoid price rise. If you are going to hold the price line by subsidy on kerosene, you are going to make it up by additional taxes on probably textiles or matches or tea. Therefore, in one way or the other the Government is going to pass on the burden to the people. In other words, they have to pay through their nose for this devaluation. The price rise is inevitable. It is a cruel joke to say that devaluation will not result in rise in prices. Now the question is how are you going to compensate the people for the rise in prices? How are you going to meet the situation?

Our planning and other estimates are going away day by day. Government are not making any firm estimates which can be relied upon. Just now I narrated how the Government changed the figures three months later to suit their convenience. I will give one more instance. Last November our Food Minister was saying that our food production in 1965-66 will be one million tonnes less than the bumper crop of the previous year. At the turn of the year, two months later, he revised the figures to 12 million tons and the final figure was 17 million tons. It will mention another interesting point. A question was asked as to what will be the requirements of foodgrains for the year 1966. It is a very pertinent question. It is Unstarred Question No. 158 dated 26th July, 1966. It reads:

“Will the Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development

and Co-operation be pleased to state:

(a) the estimated requirement of food-grains for the year 1966”

it is a very simple question. There is a very big Planning Commission and a Ministry of Food and Agriculture. They are all engaged in it. What is the reply the Minister has given? It is for the specific year 1956, of which six months have already passed and we wanted to know the requirements of the country. The reply was:

“The requirement of foodgrains depend on a number of factors. and it is not possible to estimate the foodgrains requirements of the country for any specific period.”

The Government is in the dark as to what will be the requirements. They have the statisticians, they have the Census Report they know how many persons are dying and how many births are taking place. They can ascertain the number of deaths from the Registers of Births and Deaths, the Railway Ministry, Health Ministry and other Ministries. Then is it not possible to calculate what will the requirements? After all, it is not a question of production which will depend on factors like Veruna, Indira and monsoon. Here it is a question of taking the figures of human beings in the whole country and calculating their requirements of foodgrains. Do they not have the census reports? Do they not have the statisticians and actuaries who can easily calculate it?

But the Government has the temerity to come before the House and say that it is not possible to estimate the foodgrains requirements. When it is not possible to estimate the foodgrains requirements of the country, how are they going to meet the requirements' to pre-arrange things, to avoid a crisis before it comes and to avoid a catastrophe before it happens in the country? That is the state of affairs.

It is not only so in the Food Ministry but even in other ministries. Take the Commission, the grand super Cabinet that we are nourishing in our country. For the Fourth Plan so many figures are being given. In the year 1963-64 we were told that the Fourth Plan would be of the order of Rs. 22, 500 crores—it was at 1962-63 price levels—and the Planning Commission had estimated the aid requirements at Rs. 3,200 crores. One year later they revised the figures; they brought down the figure of the estimates for the whole Fourth Plan to Rs. 21,500 crores—the earlier assessment was Rs. 22, 500 crores; Rs. 1,000 crores were taken away and it was brought down to Rs. 21,500 crores—but our aid requirements went up to Rs. 4,000 crores. When it was Rs. 22,500 crores, the aid requirements were calculated at Rs. 3,200 crores but when the whole estimate came down to Rs. 21,500 crores, the external aid estimates went up to Rs. 4,000 crores. Now it has gone to Rs. 4,800 crores, I think.

We do not have any firm planning, any idea of the requirement but we have got very big machinery here working on the plans. But the results have been very poor. That is one thing that led us to bankruptcy and devaluation. They do not know what they are doing. A Big Planning Commission is there; a Food Ministry is there but they do not know the requirements or planning. But when the failure is there, they come and say boldly “We take a very bold and patriotic decision” But were they patriotic enough to avoid this decision? Is it not a wise man's job to have anticipated this crisis? This crisis was not new. Price rise is not new. External aid condition is not new.

Just now I was saying about external aid. That is the whole crux of the matter. As per the brochure given by the Government, that is the kingpin on which the entire thing devolved. They had to devalue because of the aid conditions. Plan by plan we are increasing our external aid proportions. Instead of relying on internal sources, more and more per centage of ex-

[Shri Sezhiyan]

ternal aid is being brought in. It is not self-sufficiency; we are becoming more and more dependent on foreign aid.

During the First Five-Year Plan, internal borrowings were Rs. 388 crores and external aid was Rs. 97 crores. Compared to internal borrowings, external aid was only 25 per cent of that. For the Second Five-Year Plan internal borrowings were Rs. 931 crores and external aid was Rs. 692 crores; that is, external aid for the Second Plan formed about 74 per cent of internal borrowings. For the Third Five Year Plan internal borrowings were Rs. 1,426 crores but external aid had gone up to Rs. 2,225 crores; that is, compared to internal borrowings, external aid had gone up to 156 per cent. For the Fourth Five-Year Plan I do not know what firm figures are coming because every day when we see the papers we find that different figures are given, but as per the figures that I have got, I find that internal borrowings will be of the order of Rs. 2,300 crores and external aid will be of the order of Rs. 40,800 crores; that is, compared to internal borrowings external aid is going to be more than 200 per cent. In the First Plan it was 25 per cent; in the Second plan it was 74 per cent; in the Third Plan it went to 156 per cent and in the Fourth Plan it is going exceed 200 per cent. As the Plan progresses we are not becoming self-sufficient but more and more borrowings or beggings had to be had from Washington.

Shri M. R. Krishna (Peddapalli) : No begging, only aid.

Shri Sezhiyan: It was said that we had to devalue due to rise in prices. The rise in prices had not been the making of the people. It has been the outcome of the bungling and the bankrupt policies adopted by this Government or by the previous Government which they cannot absolve. They say that only six months' period is there. What about the 18 years that they have been ruling? It is the same Government or the same party but they may deny them.

They should have the courtesy or the honesty to inform the people as to how much deficit financing has been made by them just now Mr. Tyagi was also referring to it. In the First Five-Year Plan the total deficit was Rs. 644 crores; in the Second Plan it was of the order of Rs. 1,156 crores; in the Third Plan Rs. 1,730 crores in the Fourth Plan it is estimated to be of the order of Rs. 2,000 crores. It may become more as the plan progresses.

Therefore we are not only taking more and more aid from foreign countries, begging or borrowing whatever it may be, but we are also asking our Nasik press to produce more. One production that has gone up enormously in India is the note production at Nasik. Suppose, a private body were to print a note, it is counterfeit but when the Government prints notes more than desirable, it becomes the prosperity of the country.

When the no-confidence motion was being discussed Shri K. R. Patil, the Railway Minister, put forth the best plea from the Congress side, but in the *Economic Times* dated the 10th June 1966, when the weekly review of Delhi was published, it has been stated as follows :—

“Mr. S. K. Patil took a political line and expressed strong misgivings. He is reported to have said that the Congress Party might lose 5 million votes at one stroke.”

That was his first reaction as reported in this paper. When the country is going to suffer, whether imports are going to rise or whether exports will dwindle, whatever happens to the economy of the country and to the poor people, he does not seem to have been worried. His first reaction as given by the paper is about Congress votes. I am quoting the paper. He may deny it if he wants. But he seems to have been more concerned about 5 million votes that the Congress may lose. That may be his first reaction but when he came to the House he seemed to have gained more confidence. He said, “Yes, we have devalued; we will go to the polls, to the country

we are confident of getting the vote of confidence from the people”.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj : That is, even after losing 5 million votes we are confident of getting more. That could be the explanation.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli) : Let us wait till the elections are over.

Shri Rajaram (Krishnagiri) : They could accept so many injections from you, Bajaj injections.

Shri Sezhiyan : But one thing I can say. Even now the Congress is ruling not by majority votes but only by minority votes 46 per cent or so.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj : We take decisions in the national interest not in the party interest.

Shri Sezhiyan : It is coming down and I am not bothered about that. But before getting the vote of confidence from the House. America has voted confidence for you. You devalued the rupee on 5th June and on 8th June the *Washington Post* had this to say. This is a report given out by Reuter :—

“Washington June 8. The “Washington Post” said today that the United States should give India vote of confidence for its devaluation of the rupee by re-summing American aid on an orderly annual basis.”

So, before getting the vote of confidence here the Government have already got the vote of confidence from America. What was that vote of confidence? It was Continue the aid that was being held up.

I can understand why the Railway Minister has been so confident.

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

Shri Sezhiyan : I have got about 10 minutes more.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Your time is over.

Shri Sezhiyan : I will finish. The time for them also is over after devaluation.

The Railway Minister seems to have been more confident not of getting the confidence of the people, but of getting the polls filled by votes for Congress. How can he do that? He is a pastmaster in that art. Probably they might have got crores of rupees in their funds.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj : We have to face only people like you. That is our confidence.

Shri Sezhiyan : I am glad, a front-bencher is saying that. If they are the people, I will be very glad.

There was one statement made by Shri Patil in 1960, as per the *Hindu* report dated 18th August, 1960.

I am quoting it. It says :

“Bombay, August 16, 1960—Mr. S. K. Patil, Union Minister for Food and Agriculture said here that it was becoming more and more difficult to collect funds for fighting elections. During the last General Elections, Mr. Patil pointed out that Congress spent about five crores of rupees. He wondered from where such a big amount would come for the next General Elections”.

At the time, Mr. Patil was the Treasurer of the Congress Party. Therefore, he should know the full position. In 1957 General Elections, they had to spend Rs. 5 crores to fight the elections. After devaluation, now I do not know how much it will be—it may be Rs. 10 crores or Rs. 15 crores. They seem to have the amount and that is why he says, he is very confident of going to the polls.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He must conclude now.

Shri Sezhiyan : Just one or two minutes more. Generally, I do not ask for more time. This is very important and I want to say one or two things more.

The other day, Mr. Karuthiruman is reported to have made some comment about the working of the Corporation of Madras.— I thought it was not a fit subject to come here. Recently the Mayor of Leningrad visited Madras and paid a glowing tribute that it is the best administered Corporation here. Apart from this, Mr. Karuthiraman should know that the Congress has got the unique distinction of being the corporation unlimited for corruption in this country.

Lastly, I want to quote from *Tnirukkural* a couplet in Tamil by Tiruvalluvar, which is given under chapter of "Politics— Acting with full knowledge".

Seythakka Alla Seyakkedum, Seythakka Seyyamai yanum kedum

The English translation of it is :

"It is harmful to do what you should not do, and it is equally harmful not to do what you should do."

The Government has been doing what it should not do and it has not been doing what it should do. That is the saying given by Tiruvalluvar a thousand years ago. They should go out. That is one thing they should do that they are not doing. The thing they are doing which they should not do is that they are still keeping the power.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the hon. Planning Minister, when he intervened in the debate, asked for the sympathy and the understanding of the House. But I trust, if he really wants the sympathy and the understanding of the House and the country. He should be here to understand the feelings of the Members who participate in this debate. I do not see why between the Finance Minister and the Planning Minister they cannot arrange that one of

them is here. It may not be a real question of privilege in that literal sense but, certainly, it involves a privilege if the House is taken lightly and if one of them is not here all time. We resent it. I want to record my resentment.

Sir, I will not enter into the warfare of ideologies on this particular subject because I want to go to the hard core of the thing. Well, so far as ideologies are concerned, we are quite clear in our mind that we want democratic socialism. Now, the only question is of the content we give to socialism. I will certainly not want democracy to be impinged, in any way, by such methods of socialism which will not leave a real democracy intact. It is absolutely essential that we now give a real content to socialism and take a step forward in that direction which will be such that there is no confusion in any quarter regarding the policies of the Government. At present, there has been some confusion and I want that, not by explaining here on the floor of the House but by having a real plan or a programme and the implementation of it, we should be able to assure every section of this country what we mean by socialism and how far we are prepared to go.

We have talked about pragmatism. This word 'pragmatism' fascinated me for quite a considerable time because by 'pragmatism' I thought we meant dynamism, dynamic assessment of our programmes towards social needs. But if pragmatism means to be pushed from position to position under certain pressures because of weaknesses and failures, I think, it is just a prostitution of the word 'pragmatism'. We must adopt a dynamic policy. I do not propose to deal with devaluation. I do not think there is any purpose served in flogging a dead horse. Much has been said on the floor of the House. But I would certainly urge strongly that it is a baseless slander to say that the Government has taken this decision or that decision under the pressure of the U.S.A. Government or the U.S.S.R. Government. It may be that a lurid picture had been pla-

ced or wrong assumptions were there. But, I say, the decision that has been taken is of the Indian Government and an independent decision. It is almost a humbug and an utter nonsense to say that for the last 15 years there has been economic mal-adjustment. I refute that charge. As I said, while I was speaking on the motion of No-Confidence, our difficulties started since 1962. The increase in price, as I submitted, at that time, was only 2 to 2½ per cent per annum and in 1961 the price index had travelled only upto 120 points, taking it from 1952-53. That was not an inflation in that sense of the term. It was after 1962 that from 120 or 125 points, it has come to 180 or 182 points. This is absolutely an abnormal situation which has got to be taken care of. It is no use blaming, as my friend Mr. Masani said, about Menon and Malaviya policies. They were not in the Government after 1962. What is the use of blaming them? I stoutly resist and contradict both these allegations put forward.

Sir, I also refute what is quoted most of the time that this Government has brought this country to bankruptcy, that we had about a thousand crores of rupees worth of foreign exchange when we started our career in 1947 and that today we have got a debt, a loan, to the tune of Rs. 2,500 crores and all that. Our friends conveniently forget that the balance of payment, about Rs. 1000 crores, was in the context of a war which had been waged and certain balances had been put on our side. We also forget that it was the British army which was responsible for defending the country and not an Indian army raised to the needs of this country. We have to spend much more. Instead of spending Rs. 300 crores, we are spending Rs. 1000 crores for keeping and maintaining the defence of our country. Let us not forget that. When the people say that we had this much bank balance at that time, they forget that at that time we had no steel plants we had no oil and natural gas plants, we had no refineries, we had no heavy engineer-

ring plants, we had no heavy electrical equipment, we had no machine tools, we had no anti-biotics and so on and so forth. We have now hundred and one things.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha) : The return out of the public sector is only .06 per cent.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur : Again, it is unfortunate, when people talk about the public sector, as my friend just now said that we receive out of the public sector only .06 per cent, it is just distorting the whole picture and it is slandering the public sector. I venture to submit that the public sector will be a gold mine after a few years if it is properly looked after. What is happening today? I want my esteemed friend, Acharya Kripalani, to understand that today Rs. 30 crores to Rs. 40 crores are being put in the depreciation fund. These plants and projects have cost us Rs. 200 crores to Rs. 250 crores and we have got to put Rs. 30 crores to Rs. 40 crores every year in the depreciation fund before we declare any dividend or any profit. What have the Tatas done? They have now completely written off what they had invested 50 years back and they can have big dividends and big profits. After 10 years, when we have put aside Rs. 300 crores or more, these plants will be giving you a profit of about Rs. 30 crores or Rs. 40 crores or even Rs. 50 crores and then the resources which will accrue to the Government would be to that extent.

Having said this on the assets side of the Government which we should not, in any case, overlook if we want to have a balanced picture, let us take the question which is very much before the House at present about the Plan and the size of the Plan.

Shri Warior (Trichur) : Depreciation fund will not come to a close after 10 years. There will be new investment also.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur : The steel plant is not going to last you only for 10 or 15 years. It is going to last you for hundred years. After 10 or 15 years

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

you would have put in the depreciation fund more than Rs. 300 crores which is the total capital outlay. Therefore, after that, your profits are going to be much more. Let us understand that.

Let us understand the difficulty. If I give you a picture of how Tatas' expansion on steel has gone on, you will find that they had gone on in a far worse manner than any of our three steel plants; they had exceeded their estimates by more than 100 per cent and they are not earning profits on what they have put up. Let us understand that.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj : I think it would be a very interesting inquiry if the Tatas' working and the other steel plants' working are examined thoroughly from the beginning.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur : My hon. friend may rest assured that I do not speak without facts. We had been to the Tatas and the Public Undertakings' Committee we had collected certain facts. So let me state that very squarely.

Let us now come to the size of the Plan. The question as to what should be the size of the Plan, whether we want a big Plan or a small Plan, intrigues me very much. Left to myself, if I were to say what should be the size of the Plan which we should have I would say that we must have a Rs. 50,000 crore Plan, if all the requirements put up by the Members of Parliament are to be fulfilled, if all the items are to be taken, if the aspirations of the people are to be fulfilled. If wishes were to be horses, beggars would ride over them. We cannot have a Plan according to our wishes and that should be clearly understood. It is meaningless to say that we are going to have a Rs. 25,000 crore Plan. Let us put it to the Planning Commission as to what is it that we want and what is it that we can do. If we can have a Rs. 50,000 crore plan, then we are most happy and would say, 'please go ahead with it'. But tell us how you are going to have it, whether we have the necessary resources for it, whether we

have the necessary foreign aid. When we are talking on this subject, let us understand that there is no foreign aid without strings. We have all the time been talking about foreign aid without strings. I am glad there was an article which appeared the other day; it has clearly pointed out that there is no foreign aid without strings. You say that you are not going to beg for aid and what you want is loan. But are you not going to use all sorts of influences to get even loans? Is it your creditworthiness which is getting you the loan? If you are creditworthy, if you can get loans, which you can repay in a dignified manner, please go ahead; I do not say anything; you can have a Plan of Rs. 50,000 crores if you can raise the necessary resources; I have no objection.

But the first thing which I want to put before the Planning Commission is, what is the target, what is the first requirement, that I demand of the Planning Commission. As I said before, the prices had risen only to an index of 125 till 1962. It could go up by another 20 and in 1966 it could be 145, but at present it is 185. The Plan should be designed to bring down the prices from the index of 185 to 145. This is the first requisition which I make on the Planning Commission. How are they going to do it? They will have to do it by increased production; production has to be increased. How are they going to do it? That is the task which I am going to place before the Planning Commission.

The second thing is about the essential commodities which the common man wants. Let us plan to see that all essential commodities which the common man wants are amply made available during the course of the Fourth Plan; the common man must get all the essential commodities, all the things of daily use, at reasonable prices. The index should not go beyond 150 and the things should be made available at that level. That is the second thing which we must ask the Planning Commission to include in their programme.

If they can do these two things, then they can employ whatever resources they want to.

Let us understand what has happened to the resources which we have raised. My most poignant complaint and the matter on which I feel extremely hurt is that the resources which we have raised have brought about agony to many people and relief to none. How has it happened? I had enquired of the Planning Minister and the Finance Minister as to what were the total resources that were raised during the Third Plan, and what have we done with them. I have not so far got the information. But I have got information from one State, i.e., from Madras State. During the Third Plan, the Planning Commission asked them to raise Rs. 42 crores; they said that they would be able to raise only Rs. 35 crores, but eventually they raised about Rs. 52 crores. Out of these Rs. 52 crores, Rs. 25 crores had to go to pay increased dearness allowance without any relief to the common man to whom the dearness allowance has come. What would be the projection of it during the Fourth Plan? I have an authentic report, from official quarters, to say that the projection in the Fourth Plan is that Rs. 92 crores would go only to pay the additional dearness allowance which had been allowed in the Third Plan and prices have gone up to 185, they have to give even more—I am not going into that now. The whole thing is liquidated. The total revenue which they will get during the Fourth Plan—the projection—is Rs. 122 crores. The additional staff that they will employ is different and that is also taken, it will be much more. We are raising the resources by taxing the entire population. What are we doing with that? We are not raising resources to increase production; we are doing it only to pay these by way of dearness allowance. If you are going to have this sort of Plan, the country rejects it and refuses to accept it. We must see that the basic things are understood very clearly.

There is a great need for economies in the administration, for which a voice has been raised from all quarters. When we say 'economies in the administration' it does not mean—and I do not, for a moment, suggest that—retrenchment; no, it certainly does not mean that. But you have to make a plan as to how economies can be effected. I do not agree with Mr. Dandekar that economies should be to the tune of Rs. 500 crores per annum; it is a fantastic thing to say that something like Rs. 500 crores per annum must be saved by the Centre and the States; it cannot be done. But if you have a systematic approach to this problem, you can certainly cut down Rs. 200 crores per annum between both the States and the Centre and this can be done during the course of three years. We should have a plan for it. We should have a plan for absorbing the surplus staff. Let us first have the surplus staff located; let us have a co-ordinated programme as to what we are going to do with the surplus staff. In the Fourth Plan, you say that you are going to have jobs created for 2 million people. These should be the people who should first be absorbed against those; if they are not fit for those jobs, they should be trained. This should be done. We must take into consideration all these factors.

When we think of effecting economies in the Government, we always start with chaprasis. That is why when I sent a note to the Prime Minister, I started with Governors, Central Ministers and Secretaries. I know that there are at least half a dozen Secretaries who do not have more than half an hour's job every day; there are a number of Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries who have nothing to do with decision making and yet, they are there. The draft which is submitted is just pushed forward; that is all. So, there is an urgent need for effecting economies there. I do not propose any commission for this purpose; let me make that absolutely clear;

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

this is not the work of a commission ; the Prime Minister, assisted by two persons who have the whole time to be devoted to this work could do it in four months' time. I do not want that there should be a Commission which should go about this job for five or ten years.

Coming next to the question as to how we can gear up our machinery, here again it is a sad spectacle. Today the government servants are seething with discontent because of rising prices, but I do believe that they are as patriotic as any of us here or outside and if they are explained the position that instead of giving them Rs. 20 crores this year, you are going to give them a price decrease by 10 per cent by utilising these Rs. 10 or 20 crores, they will be happier. They can be taken into confidence and let us gear up our Plan in such a manner that you give them all that they need at a price 10 or 15 or 20 per cent less and let us employ all that we have to gear up production.

15'40 hours.

[SHRI SHAM LAL SARAF *in the Chair*]

I have pointed out how the hiatus has been created. The unfortunate thing is that there is no discipline. That is what is being said. But the fact is that there is no discipline at the top and that is where the difficulty lies. If there is no discipline at the top, how can you expect discipline in the lower rungs ? I shall not speak about the Ministers, but I shall refer only to the officers. Government decided to transfer two secretaries from here to their respective State Governments. With a great fanfare there was a lot of noise about it. We read things about it in the papers that Government were streamlining the administration and they were wanting efficient people in various places and only merit would count and nothing else. If Government cannot transfer even two secretaries and the secretaries refuse to take orders, if somebody who was ap-

pointed as the Chief Commissioner of Delhi does not want to go to that post, if the seniormost civil servant behaves in this manner, and if Government are not able to enforce their orders even in such cases, how can you expect that there will be discipline in the lower rungs ? What has happened unfortunately is that there is not that confidence and respect for the leadership, which should be there whether at the Ministerial level or at the administrative level, and which is the first thing if you want to go ahead in any manner. Previously, the Ministers commanded respect, and the IAS and ICS officers who were there at the top commanded respect. I have never before seen such a hiatus as exists today between the lower rungs of officials and their IAS and ICS bosses, between the departmental heads and the secretaries, between the scientists and the secretaries. This is a malady which has not to be looked into, and something must be done about it if you want real discipline.

Shri Warrior : The same is the case between civil administrators and technocrats.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur : I am talking generally about the administration. We want discipline in the economy, but unless and until our administrative machinery functions effectively nothing is going to happen.

Now, I come to the programme which we must have on the developmental side. Everyone says that agriculture is the key today. In this country, agriculture and industry have got to go hand in hand, and we shall have to strike a balance between them. But I have not the least doubt that the present requirement is a greater emphasis on agriculture.

When we talk of agriculture, let us understand the requirements of the day. The requirement of today is increased production and production at a lesser cost. If we want to maintain prices, then

we must give remunerative prices to the agriculturists. How are we going to do it? Two things have got to be done for this purpose. If we have more agricultural production, that will take care of our industry, that will take care of our international trade and that will take care of our exports also because it is on those items that we are having exports to the extent of 80 per cent in some cases. How are we going to achieve greater production? There must be increase in production and that must be at a lesser cost. Why has our agricultural policy or our agricultural department failed? What is the position in our country? What is the position in other countries? I would not like to quote the figures from Japan, America etc. But I would like to quote some figures from our own country :—

Commodity	k.g. per hectare	
	Average yield	Peak yield
Rice	922	9,736
Wheat	888	6,618
Cotton	118	612
Sugarcane	39,000	2,50,000

So, the per-acre-yield has to be increased. That is the first step.

As my hon. friend Shri Tyagi has pointed out very rightly, the next most important actor is the small industries, or the small projects. I have got here a statement before me to show that in Rajasthan alone there are about 60,000 wells which need repairs before they can be utilised for lift irrigation. The total amount required for this purpose is Rs. 6 crores. And after all, this Rs. 6 crores is only a loan and it will come back to Government, and, therefore, by giving this, they are not spending much. But that will bring 2 lakh acres of land under irrigation. Then, there are some tanks which need

Rs. 2 crores, and if they are repaired they would bring 12 lakhs acres under irrigation. That means that about 4 lakhs acres can be brought under irrigation if we spend about Rs. 8 crores. Have we come to such a bankruptcy in our plans and in our internal resources that we cannot find even this much money? Then, they want certain wells in Rajasthan to be energised. This is the pattern obtaining everywhere. If these wells could be energised, then the cost of production could go down to almost half, as compared to what it would be if we adopted the conventional method, namely lift irrigation. There are about 10,000 wells to be energised. Power has gone to the village, but there are no funds to take that power near the wells, because there are no funds for the transmission lines. Another Rs. 2 crores is needed for this purpose. Have we really come to that pass that we cannot find even this much money?

So, I would suggest that the most important thing is that a blue print should be prepared for all States regarding the small irrigation projects and the rural electrification programmes, and these should get the topmost priority. If that is done, then I am sure that we can get rid of most of our difficulties. A blanket sanction must be given in respect of all these small irrigation projects in each and every State, and whatever funds we have at our disposal should be earmarked for those projects and then for rural electrification schemes. On the social side, I would say that the topmost priority should be given to potable water supply. At least let the people have drinking water. It is very strange if even after nineteen years of Independence, we cannot provide even that. I was really amazed when I read Prime Minister Nehru's remarks on this subject.

Shri M. R. Krishna : These are small things.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur : We do only big things, and so, the small things

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

are ignored. This was what Prime Minister Nehru had said :

It is astonishing that there are still areas in India where water supply is not available, good water supply ; I mean good water is not available, and men and women shall have to go long distances to fetch a little water. We must do something for the nation so that every village should have more water.

Then, I would point out that we must also take care of education. We should not produce people who are unemployable; we must produce people who can be employed. The Education Commission says that the number should be increased fourfold, but before we increase the number fourfold, we must create jobs four fold.

I would conclude by saying that if Government really want the understanding and sympathy of the people, then they must be in touch and in communion with the hearts of the people, their requirements and their demands ; if they do so, then not only this House but the whole country will give their entire support to them. Did they not give that support when the Pakistani aggression was there? It was a spontaneous all-round support. Even in the economic field if a challenge is taken, and if we appeal to the people, and if we touch their hearts and we look to their needs and requirements, I have not the least doubt that we shall get all their support. I have not the least doubt that the country's heart is sound and sound to the core.

Shri Abdul Ghani Goni (Jammu and Kashmir) : Devaluation has been under discussion in the House for the last three or four days I am neither an economist for one who has specialised in finance. But as a commoner, when I heard about this devaluation when I was in my village, it gave me a rude shock, and I thought as a commoner that this would not en-

hance our prestige or the prestige of the country but on the contrary it might have some adverse effects.

As I have already submitted, I am not an economist, but when I heard the speeches from various sections of the House I was extremely sorry that the main economic aspects of the situation had not been properly appreciated by the various sections. Most of the speakers have played politics while discussing the economic situation. As a commoner, I find that the country is advancing in all spheres, though it is true that it may not be advancing with that speed which people expect. Whether it be the industrial sector or the agricultural sector or even education and social services or medical services, everywhere I find that there is a gradual increase and there is a gradual progress throughout the country. When the problems of the country as a whole are being discussed, hon. Members from various sides mostly bring politics in. For instance, a Member brought in Kashmir also. Someone talked of the approaching elections. We are now thinking about the common man and his problems; we are not thinking about the elections or about politics. Of course, the next elections are near. But whether this party or that will come into power, is not the question before us now. As MPs we are now discussing the country's economic problems for the betterment of the country, for the betterment the common man whose representatives we claim to be. We here represent the down trodden masses of India, but we are fighting politics here.

Let us take a pledge to fight out corruption, to fight out backwardness, to fight out illiteracy and to remove agricultural backwardness so that we go ahead. Let us suggest to Government the ways in which we should proceed to achieve these objectives. But here we see mud-slinging from one side to the other. This

will not help the common man. The common man is not going to give us credit for this.

Of course, as I said, the elections are near. The Congress may come to power or even some Opposition parties may come to power or may increase their strength. But that is a different thing. What will happen to the common man? We should first think of him whom we claim to represent here. On the one side, we say that we will have a socialist state, a democratic set-up based on socialism. Let us think in those terms and give the maximum benefit to the common man.

When we look at the last twenty years of our history, what do we see? On independence, unfortunately this country was divided. That was the first mistake we committed. That was a compromise with evil. So we had two parts of one body. Here this part is aching on account of economic ill-health and requires attention. But again, we are playing politics; those powers which had seen this country divided, those western people seem to be happy that we have devalued our rupee. Some Members have quoted the *Washington Post* and said that America has given us a vote of confidence. This is not a great thing. We should not quote such things here. This seems to be a humiliation for us, quoting that the American or western opinion has confidence in us or that the communist countries have approved our action. We must get the vote of confidence of our own people. We must depend on our own people whose leaders we have here, whether on this side or on the other side. They have gone through bitter struggles and made sacrifices and seen the country through independence. So we should not think that only one side is patriotic. There are patriots on the other side, but those who are in the ruling party, those who are heading the Government are not unpatriotic. After all,

1274 (A) LS—9.

they are also patriotic, they have gone through struggles and sacrifices for the sake of the country. They also know the interest of the people. They also want their welfare. They have openly declared that their basic policy is to usher in socialism in the country. When we talk of socialism, the basic thing is that we should think of the common man who has sent us here. We should think of him and see how his lot can be bettered and not indulge in mud-slinging.

As I said, somebody brought in the question of Kashmir also in this discussion. He said there is a programme of Naya Kashmir which advocates that Kashmir is a part of Pakistan. I am sometimes disgusted and disappointed that our hon. Members have not even studied the history of their own country. They claim to be expert on communism, Americanism, capitalism and so on, but they forget their own country.

Mr. Chairman: Say 'some' or 'a few'.

Shri Abdul Ghani Gooli : 'Some' I am sorry. The National conference, from its very inception, had a socialist programme and was affiliated to the Indian National Congress. When it came into existence, it never supported Jinnah or the Muslim League or Pakistan. How can we say that 'Naya Kashmir', the economic programme of the National Conference which was affiliated to the Indian National Congress and was part of it could advocate for Pakistan? This is a sorry state of affairs that we devote so little attention to our own affairs and our own history. I strongly repudiate that statement and say that the Member concerned has misled the House. I would say that the National Conference has always stood, and will always stand, by the Congress and by India; we cannot afford even according to the Naya Kashmir programme to go to the western side.

But one feels uncertain when hon. Members who claim to be the represen-

[Shri Abdul Ghani Goni]

tatives of the people of a big country are not well aware of their own history. These days talks are going on with Sheikh Abdullah. He has been our leader. He was the man who affiliated the National Conference with the Indian National Congress and who brought in the Naya Kashmir programme; he was dead against Pakistan. He has said that he is not for Pakistan and even today that is his stand. I feel happy that there are some talks going on; I wish good success to those talks. I wish Sheikh Abdullah would come back to the Congress fold so that things would be much more easier in Kashmir also.

But as I was saying, twisting of facts and distortion of history will not help us. Let us be straightforward. Let us be factual in history as in politics.

Shri Daji (Indore) : Are we discussing economics or history ?

Shri Abdul Ghani Goni : A member said that the Naya Kashmir programme advocated that Kashmir is part of Pakistan; he had not read our own history. That was what I said.

We in Kashmir are proud of the fact that we constitute a secular force and that by virtue of the fact that we are a part of India, India which is already secular has been strengthened, the secular forces of India have been strengthened. Kashmir has given a good example to India in this respect. In the rest of India, you see communal troubles, but not in Kashmir. Even when Pakistan invaded Kashmir in 1947 or even last year, the people of Kashmir, irrespective of caste, community, creed or colour, stood as one man against the enemy. It is also a matter of pride for us that now for the first time India is a country where every man, whoever lives in India, whether he belongs to the Congress or any other party or no party, whether he believes in God or not, everyone has stood for Kashmir. Everyone is for Kashmir being in India.

There may be some miscreants everywhere. They are there not only in Kashmir but in other parts. Take Nagaland, for example. Or take the happenings in Shillong. There may be some miscreants, but the majority of the Jammu and Kashmir people are for India. Do not try to misunderstand them.

There are some Members who want some more states like Punjabi Suba and Hariyana; they want a divided Kashmir. My personal opinion in this—I know this is also a representative opinion—that we are not in a position to divide Kashmir and attach a part of it to some other State or tag on a part of another State to Kashmir, because Jammu and Kashmir, as it is, is a unit of India to be maintained as a unit.

Mr. Chairman : Viable unit.

Shri Abdul Ghani Goni : Yes. It is a most beautiful part of the country. So we have to preserve that beauty as we preserve the face of the body,

16 hrs.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur : Why is it we cannot have one of the Ministers? Have they explained to you? We do not speak here for nothing. Why cannot you get the Minister of Planning or the Minister of Finance here? Could we know what is the cause of their absence? We will not permit the Ministers to take Parliament lightly. We must know why they are not here. Either there must be a good explanation or they must be here.

Mr. Chairman : After all, hon. Members from different areas do speak out things of importance. Just now Shri Tyagi and Shri Mathur spoke, now Shri Daji is going to speak. I think the demand is very reasonable.

Shri B. R. Bhagat : I am here sitting. I have sent a message to them.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur :

We are glad you are here, there is nothing unconstitutional, but I submit : why is it that the Minister of Planning or the Minister of Finance is not here ? They must take Parliament seriously. Their first duty is to attend to Parliament when their subject is being discussed.

Shri Daji : Mr. Bhagat says he has sent a message. If they cannot come, for half an hour we may adjourn and resume later.

Shri B. R. Bhagat : Presumably the other House is discussing devaluation.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur : Therefore, please explain.

Shri B. R. Bhagat : I have sent them a message. More than that I cannot do. I am sitting here, I am tied down.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur : We have no complaint against you, we are grateful to you.

Shri Daji : We are discussing the economic situation, and I was wondering whether the motion has been happily worded at all, because before we can discuss the economic situation, we must have some economy. Today our economy is in utter shambles, it has almost broken down, there is no economy worth the name. Therefore, in a way it is ridiculous for us to discuss the economic situation and for the Minister to come forward with a motion suggesting that there is anything like an economic situation left.

I need not dwell at length on the condition obtaining today, because the Economic Survey and the Supplement and all the speakers in this House from both the sides are agreed on the total collapse of anything like an economy. Today we find, after spending Rs. 10,000 crores in the third plan, that our national income has fallen to 4.7 per cent, and our *per capita* income has fallen by about 7 per

cent. whereas the average income of an Indian was Rs. 293 in 1960-61, it is only Rs. 294 in 1964-65. An expense of Rs. 10,000 crores has led to a growth of a bare rupee per year in the *per capita* income of this country. This is a dismal thing, but yet it is not the total picture.

We find also that whereas prices in the decade 1951-61 rose by 23 points, prices in the last two years have risen much steeply, and prices in the third plan alone have risen by 39 points. We also find that whereas the plan provided for deficit financing to the tune of Rs. 400 crores, the actual deficit financing is of the order of Rs. 1,450 crores, more than three times that provided for in the plan. What is the purpose of having a plan if we go on exceeding the deficit financing by three times ? The result is bound to be what it has been—increase of prices, collapse of the economy and runaway inflation.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand) : There is no quorum in the house when we are having such a fine speech of Mr. Daji.

Mr. Chairman : The bell is being rung . . . Now there is quorum.

Shri Daji : Whereas the national income has not risen, whereas the *per capita* income has fallen by 7 per cent when it was supposed to increase by 17 per cent, whereas the price rise has been unprecedented, the profits of a handful of monopolists have been skyrocketing. After all, one must find an explanation as to where these Rs. 10,000 crores have gone. Whereas the total profits of the corporate sector in 1950-51 was a bare Rs. 39 crores per year, it has risen to Rs. 139 crores in 1963-64 the last year reported, *i.e.*, an increase of 350 per cent. The *per capita* income has decreased, the national income has decreased, but profits have grown by 350 per cent in absolute terms. In relative terms, whereas the profit

[Shri Daji]

ratio to net worth was 7 per cent in 1950-1951 it was 9.3 per cent in 1963-64. Both absolutely and relatively profits have increased resulting in price increase. On the one hand we have this picture; at the other end we have the picture of a decreasing *per capita* income, decreasing national income and increasing misery of the people. This is the picture of the economy.

This is the background, Sir. There is another side to the picture, the mounting foreign debt. At the end of the Second Plan it was of the order of Rs. 750 and odd crores but at the end of the Third Plan our foreign debt stood at almost Rs. 2600 crores. During the period of one plan, we have relied on foreign debt to the tune of Rs. 1900 crores. It is in this background that devaluation comes.

I do not want to repeat what has been said in this House but I would ask certain pertinent questions not replied to by hon. ministers who had broadcast or by the pen pushers who had been asked to write articles on devaluation. It is supposed to increase exports. What exports are likely to increase? 80 per cent of our traditional exports are already there. Of the remaining 20 per cent, what items of exports are going to be increased? There is no reply. We are told that we are having a system of import liberalisation. What are the items of import that you are going to liberalise? What is the idle capacity to be used? What are the industries concerned and what is the employment potential to be benefited? What will be the products as a result of this? If for instance you are going to make more refrigerators, more cars and things like that by this import liberalisation, are we not violating the priorities of national development that we laid for ourselves? Is our import liberalisation going to help plan priorities

or is it to run counter to them? What has happened to the much boasted export trade? Even our well established item of export such as jute has to be given import subsidy for raw jute before jute goods could be exported at a profit. In the first flush of devaluation, export duties were changed and there was a hue and cry in the country that if they were changed, exports would not be possible and therefore, we had to revise the whole thing. Having first reached a decision to devalue, export promotion was used as an argument. Subsequently, the Government found itself in a deep morass created by devaluation and post-devaluation crisis about which even after weeks it is unable to find its way and is groping its way. Devaluation by itself is bad enough. It is almost suicidal to launch our country on the path to economic ruin traversed by so many countries of Latin America who have had to devalue again and again under American pressure till the very economy was reduced to smithereens. Apart from that the strategy of devaluation is worse than devaluation itself. Devaluation is a package deal forced on our country of which devaluation of the currency was the first step. Second is unrestricted dependence on foreign aid; third is import liberalisation and the fourth, decontrol. Devaluation by itself is bad enough but the whole gamut of economic policies that has been launched in the wake of devaluation is worse than it. To say that there was no alternative before the country but to devalue is dishonest. There was an alternative but this government had neither the conviction nor the courage to pursue. This government had only the courage to knuckle down before the American imperialism. Foreign aid and foreign loan had been much publicised. I have got the figures from the Reserve Bank of India, figures available upto the 6th. Despite all foreign investment, we had a net out-flow of Rs. 7.5 crores per year; reinvestments from earnings from this

country are of the order of Rs. 15.2 crores per year; investment in kind, in machinery, etc. was of the order of Rs. 20.7 crores. This is the picture. After devaluation, investments in kind will be inflated automatically and reinvestments from earnings will also be to our benefit. What then will be the net picture after devaluation on foreign investments? The whole economy will be weighted in favour of foreign investors against our own. I had occasion to cross swords with our erstwhile Finance Minister, Mr. TTK and he dubbed me as an apologist of capitalists though I am a communist. I raised my voice of protest when the tax structure was changed in favour of foreign investor against the Indian capitalist. As a citizen of free India I cannot visualise a foreign investor being given more tax concession than an Indian investor.

Mr. Chairman : The hon. Member's time is up; he has only 16 minutes.

Shri Daji : I thought I had 25 minutes. That logic, the logic of those policies has been further strengthened by devaluation and the floodgates of India have been thrown open to foreign investors. That is the basic strategy which we want to check.

The very innocent Finance Minister gave explanation; he has given the figures about PL 480 funds. The strategy of PL 480 now is to enter the industrial field. Till now we have been depending upon PL 480 for our agriculture; after devaluation, the new strategy is PL 480 for industries also. Agriculture could not progress because it depended upon PL 480; our industry will not progress if it is made to depend more and more on total foreign investments. The strategy is to use foreign investment, not as a walking stick to help us walk faster but as crutches to our economy so that our economy in the future will not be able to stand on its own legs. There are dangers inherent in it, political dangers. Mr. TTK has said that the US embassy in India has not given account of the PL

480 funds. The present Minister contradicted that and has given the figures saying that the account had been given by the US embassy to the Government of India. They are : Rs. 7.14 crores on education programmes; Rs. 4.13 crores on agricultural programmes; Rs. 24.50 crores on administration and programme expenditure, Rs. 7 crores miscellaneous and Rs. 15 crores on U.S. information services. I want to ask the Finance Minister bluntly : is he satisfied with this accounting? Miscellaneous Rs. 7 crores. Is this accounting? Rs. 15 crores for USIS— is this accounting? Let me tell the House that this is more than the entire budget of the I & B Ministry of the Government of India. This is a dangerous signal when a foreign embassy spends on its own information agency more than what the Government of India spends on the Information and Broadcasting Ministry.

Shri M. R. Krishna : They are spending their own money.

Shri Daji : But they do not spend their own money in their own country. No sovereign country will permit that. With great humility, I submit that the Finance Minister may be satisfied with this accounting but even his wife would not be satisfied with such fake accounting, from his cook if she is a good housewife; she will demand more close accounting than given by the American Embassy for expenditure of crores of rupees. This is being shown to the country as adequate accounting. That is the danger of American penetration.

Shrimati Renuka Ray (Malda) : That is why Government wants specific schemes.

Shri Daji : The Finance Minister has given these figures as final complete and satisfactory accounting.

Shri M. R. Krishna : They cannot get anything more than that.

Shri Daji : Therefore, one must understand that the price of foreign aid is endless dependence on others. What is more, this policy is going against the very basic principle of socialism. Because, socialism is an attack on privilege and money power. This means increase of money power. What was the alternative ? There was under-invoicing and over-invoicing. One alternative was to liberalise imports. The other was to nationalise foreign trade. The Government chose the former. So do not say there was no alternative to devaluation.

What about the Monopolies Enquiry Commission's report ? A report in the *Statesman* dated 14th June says that the high echelons of Government are now thinking that in the present state of our economy, no action need be taken on the report of the Monopolies Enquiry Commission, a Commission which was headed by a Supreme Court judge, and which found that 75 business-houses own 46.9 per cent of the total assets of our corporate banking.

Mr. Chairman : The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Daji : I shall finish soon. This is the alternative. You have not nationalised banking. You have not nationalised foreign trade. Here are the 75 looters of the people's wealth; they have amassed wealth at the cost of the *per capita* income, and the national income of the country. They have reaped the benefit of Rs. 10 crores of investment in the Plan. Instead of laying your hands on this, raising resources internally, what are you doing? This is going to be a very important question for the Fourth Plan ; where are you going to get the resources from? The normal resources are blocked. Taxation any further is almost impermissible. The taxes on commodities have reached the saturation point. Corporate tax cannot continue. Deficit financing has led to this spiralling and runaway prices. Therefore, either you depend upon foreign aid, a total dependence on foreign aid, or mobilise the internal resources.

Mobilisation of internal resources in today's context means placing your hands on wealth which has accumulated, in the 75 business-houses. 16 other houses have been listed as trading companies who have amassed wealth. This is the growth of this monopoly which is endangering political democracy. We find new upstarts rising. Mundhra was not alone. New Mundhras have come up. The Aminchand Pyarelal group of companies have shot to fame and power and wealth, who can influence Secretaries and Ministers, who can get contracts, who can get black-listing orders cancelled, and who can even throw dust into the eyes, as has been reported by the Committee on Public Undertakings.

The INGC, which is a public sector undertaking, gives a tender for steel pipes. Steel pipes are manufactured only by one company in India, and that is the Rourkela Steel Plant, a Government undertaking. Rourkela Steel Plant submits a tender and Aminchand Pyarelal group of companies submits a tender at Rs. 15 per ton less than the Rourkela company, and Aminchand Pyarelal gets the orders from the Oil and Natural Gas Commission, a Government undertaking. No one pauses to think as to how a middleman could supply a tender at Rs. 15 a ton less than the manufacturers, and lakhs of rupees go by the drain this way. These things by upstarts are possible because the policy is a policy of allowing unlimited plunder and profit by a few, and causing thereby untold misery and price increase.

Mr. Chairman : He must conclude now. He has taken four minutes extra.

Shri Daji : I shall conclude now. Therefore, the alternative before the nation is, which path do we want to travel. Do we want to continue on the path of national development, of self-reliance, which was mapped out earlier, or, do we want only to talk of self-reliance and in practice follow the policy of unlimited reliance with foreign aid. These are the two alternatives before the nation.

The present economic policies of the Government spell danger and ruin; they are the policy of cowardice and political disbauchery. They are not the policy of self-reliance and courage. They are not the policies to be pursued by a proud, free, independent, strong and confident nation, but by tottering leadership who are prepared even to declare their own bankruptcy rather than face the challenge constituted by foreign and Indian monopolists. That is the economic situation.

Unless the Government changes basically the policy, and sets its face against the present drift in policy, I say that the country is going to face difficult times and the people are not going to tolerate it. We are having bundhs. Someone said yesterday that bundhs are anti-national. Bundh is not anti-national, but by devaluation, you have presented Rs. 900 crores per year to America, and that is anti-national. If this anti-national policy of the Government continues, I submit that you will be having bundhs and more bundhs and frantic bundhs, because the rise of the people will not be contained; the hunger and starvation of the people cannot continue, and their urge for a better life cannot be denied or delayed a day further.

सभापति महोदय : अगर कांग्रेस के मंत्री साहिबान दस-दस मिनट लें तो तीन चार और मंत्रियों को वक्त मिल सकता है। श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी (हमीरपुर) : मुझे तो कुछ अधिक दीजिये। पंद्रह-पंद्रह मिनट आपने सबको दिये हैं। मेरी बारी आई है तो आपने दस मिनट कर दिये हैं। उनको आपने अभी पांच मिनट ज्यादा दे दिये हैं। मुझे आप कह रहे हैं कि....

सभापति महोदय : आप दस मिनट में खत्म करने की कोशिश कीजिये।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं कोशिश करूंगा लेकिन मेरा आप ध्यान रख लीजियेगा।

अभी मेरे मित्र ने कहा है कि यदि सरकार की यही अर्थ नीति रहे, सरकार ने अपनी इसी नीति को जारी रखा तो और बन्द आयेंगे, और घरे डले जायेंगे और-और बड़ी-बड़ी इतारों का आयोजन किया जाएगा। मैं अपने विरोधी मित्रों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उनके पास कोई रचनात्मक काम देश को देने के लिए नहीं है? क्या वे राष्ट्र को कोई ऐसी योजना नहीं दे सकते हैं जिससे देश की समृद्धि बढ़े, देश की तरक्की हो? आज ये सरकार की नीतियों की आलोचना मात्र ही करना जानते हैं।

श्री दाजी : सरकार बदली जानी चाहिए।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : जनता में जा कर उनको कहना चाहिए कि यह राष्ट्रीय कार्यक्रम है और जनता में जा कर उनको काम करना चाहिए, बन्दों को रोकना चाहिए, घरों को हटाना चाहिए और कोई रचनात्मक काम साधने रखना चाहिए। यदि उन्होंने ऐसा किया तो मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि उनकी नीतियों पर जनता विश्वास करेगी।

मैं उन आदमियों में से नहीं हूँ जो सांप निकल जाने के बाद सांप को लकौर को लाठी से पीटते रहते हैं। अबमूल्यन का सांप निकल चुका है। उसने भारतीय अर्थ-व्यवस्था को डंस लिया है और डंस कर वह निकल गया है। आज हम उस सांप की लकौर को पीट रहे हैं। मेरे विरोधी मित्रों को चाहिए कि वे बताते कि अबमूल्यन के बाद क्या किया जाना चाहिए। मैं बता देना चाहता हूँ कि मैं अबमूल्यन का समर्थक नहीं हूँ। लेकिन यह चीज तो अब हो चुकी है। अब इसको मिटाया नहीं जा सकता है। अब हमारी कोशिश यह होनी चाहिए कि जिस तरह से भी हो राष्ट्र की अर्थ-व्यवस्था

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

सुधरे । हमारे मित्रों को इस तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिए था जो उन्होंने नहीं दिया है । उनका ध्यान बन्दों की ओर है, विनास की ओर है, हड़तालों की ओर है, राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति की बरबादी की ओर है ।

मे उनको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि देश संकटों से घिरा हुआ है । पाकिस्तानी और चीनी दुश्मन हमारा सीमाओं पर आंच लगाये बैठे हैं । आज वह समय है जब कि विरोधी दल और कांग्रेस दोनों को देश के सभी लोगों को मिल जुल कर देश की अर्थ व्यवस्था को सुधारना है, देश की सैनिक शक्ति को मजबूत करना है, एक हो कर देश के लिए काम करना है । लेकिन आज होता क्या है ? आज अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव लाये जाते हैं । अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव भी किस पर लाये जाते हैं ? हमारे एक सदस्य महोदय ने कहा था कि हमारे देश में हरिजन कन्या प्रधान मंत्री हो उसको हमें मान लेना चाहिए । वह तो नहीं हुआ लेकिन आज एक कन्या ही और हमारे एक साथी को कन्या ही जिसके आप चाचा हैं, जिसके आप भाई हैं, देश की प्रधान मंत्री हैं । उसे अगर काम करना नहीं आता है तो काम करना उसको हम सिखायें और वह सीखने के लिए तैयार है वह देश का भला करने के लिए तैयार है । आज उस कन्या पर आप उस तरह से आक्रमण कर रहे हैं जिस तरह से महाभारत में वीर अभिमन्यु पर बड़े बड़े योधाओं ने बड़े बड़े महाशक्तियों ने बाण संधान किया था . . .

सभापति महोदय : देवी हैं कन्या नहीं ।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : इस देवी पर आप अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव लाते हैं, उसकी आप तरह तरह से आलोचना करते हैं । आलोचना ही आपको करनी है तो हमारे वित्त मंत्री की करें योजना मंत्री की करें, उनके ऊपर आप संधान करें । लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जिन्होंने अभी कुछ ही समय पहले से काम करना आरम्भ किया है और

जो कि हो सकता है कि आगे चल कर स्थिति को समझ कर काम करना शुरू कर दें . . .

श्री अल्वारेस (पंजिब) : ट्रायल नहीं है ।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : ट्रायल पर तो सारा संसार है । आप भी ट्रायल पर हैं । यदि इन पांच सालों में आपने अपनी योग्यता साबित नहीं की तो आप भी चले जायेंगे, आप भी नहीं आयेंगे ।

हमारे देश ने अत्रमूल्यन अपनी मुद्रा का किया । जब हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने और हमारे नॉनिमंडल ने इसके बारे में निर्णय लिया तो कुछ तो सोच समझ कर लिया होगा । क्या वहाँ पर मूड लोभ बैठे हुए हैं ? क्या आप उन सब को मुझ समझते हैं ? वे आप से बुद्धिमान हैं । आप अगर बाजार से सब्जी लेने जाते हैं और आप कभी खराब सब्जी ले कर घर आते हैं तो बीबी आप पर नाराज हो जाती है लेकिन बीबी को क्या मानूँ कि आप सब से अच्छी सब्जी जो उपलब्ध थी उसको ले कर आए हैं । इसी तरह मे मैं कड़ना चाहता हूँ कि जो काम करता है वह जानता है कि कैसे काम होता है । मेज़ कुर्सी पर बैठ कर खाली आलोचना मात्र कर देने से काम नहीं चलता है । कांग्रेस ने रचनात्मक कार्य किये हैं स्वतंत्रता से पहले और स्वतंत्रता के बाद भी और जो रचनात्मक कार्य हुए हैं उनसे कोई आँखें नहीं मीच सकता है । राउडकेला प्लॉट बना, इस्पात के कारखाने बने, बड़े बड़े उद्योग अंधे हमारे देश में चालू हुए । 23000 करोड़ रुपये की चौथी योजना तैयार करके हमने आपके सामने और जनता के सामने प्रस्तुत की है । देश में समृद्धि हुई है यह मैंने देखा है । किसान पहले गंगा और झूबा रहता था, उसके बच्चे नंगे रहते थे । वह काठ का बना हुई कठौती में खाता था, तुमझी में पानी पीता था । अब घर घर में बरतन हैं उनकी औरतों के पास जेवर हैं । देश की आर्थिक स्थिति सुधरी है । इस सब की ओर से मैं आँख

नहीं मॉच सकता हूँ जो सत्य है उस पर पर्दा नहीं डाला जा सकता! है जो सत्य है उसको कहना ही पड़ेगा। सरकार ने जो काम किए हैं वे स्तुत्य हैं, अच्छे हैं। जो बुरे काम हैं उनकी हम नुबताचीनी करेंगे उनको सुधारने की बात कहेंगे। मैं खाली समयन करने वाला नहीं हूँ मैं आलोचना भी करता हूँ लेकिन ऐसी आलोचना जो रचनात्मक आलोचना होती है जिससे सुधार हो। सांप निकल चुका है उसकी लकीर को पकड़ कर हम पीटते नहीं रह सकते हैं। अब-मूल्यन वाला सांप निकल गया उसे आप पकड़ नहीं सके हैं और अब कह रहे हैं, यह लकीर है इसको पीटो। यह विरोधी दल वालों का काम नहीं है। उनका काम देश के सामने रचनात्मक सुझाव रखना है।

मैं योजना मंत्री से यह प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह कल्पनालोक में विचरण न करें, बल्कि वह जनता की आवश्यकताओं को समझने का प्रयत्न करें। वह देहातो में घूमें और देखें कि हमारी जनता की क्या स्थिति है? जनता की स्थिति को सुधारने के लिए, उस की कठिनाइयों को दूर करने के लिये जिन योजनाओं की आवश्यकता है, वह उन योजनाओं को को हाथ में लें। मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वह 23,000 करोड़ रुपये की कोई लम्बी चौड़ी योजना बनायेंगे, तो उस से देश को कोई लाभ नहीं होगा। प्रधान मंत्री ने उत्तर प्रदेश के सदस्यों के बीच में कहा था कि अब योजना के अन्तर्गत वही काम लिये जायेंगे, जो इस समय चालू हैं या जो पूरे नहीं हुए हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि 23,000 करोड़ रुपये की योजना देश को अधःपतन की ओर ले जा सकती है इस लिए हमें एक बड़ी योजना बनाने का लोभ संवरण करना चाहिए और देश की आवश्यकताओं को दृष्टि में रखते हुए एक छोटी सी योजना बनानी चाहिए। इस वक्त जो काम चल रहे हैं या

जो अधूरे काम हैं, उन को पूरा किया जाना चाहिए और अधिक कुछ नहीं।

आज इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि फ़िज़ूलखर्चों के कामों को रोका जाये। सरकार इस बात की जांच करे कि जो रुपया वह देती है, क्या उस का सही इस्तेमाल होता है, और क्या उस की बर्बादी तो नहीं होती है। आज रुपये के व्यय की जांच करने के संबंध में कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। सरकार रुपया बांटे जा रही है, लेकिन उस को इस बात की कोई चिन्ता नहीं है कि वह रुपया गटर्ज में जा रहा है। कांग्रेस का एक सदस्य होने की हैसियत से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा रुपया जनता की गाढ़ी कमाई का रुपया है, जो कि उस से करों के रूप में वसूल किया जाता है और इस लिए उस रुपये का सदुपयोग किया जाना चाहिए, उस को सच्चे कामों में लगाया जाना चाहिए और उस को बर्बाद नहीं होने देना चाहिए।

वित्त मंत्री से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि वह जनता को सोने के अंडे देने वाली मुर्गी न समझें, जिस के सारे सोने के अंडे वह एक-साथ ले लेना चाहते हैं। हमारी जनता अबश्य ही सोने के अंडे देने वाली मुर्गी है, लेकिन उस का पालन-पोषण करना चाहिए, उस में इस बात की क्षमता पैदा करनी चाहिए कि वह रोज सोने के अंडे दे सके। लेकिन यदि वित्त मंत्री सारे अंडे एक-साथ प्राप्त करने के लिए छुरी से उस की अंतर्धियां निकाल देंगे, तो मुर्गी भी मर जायेगी और उन को सोने के अंडे भी नहीं मिलेंगे। इसलिए वित्त मंत्री से मेरी प्रार्थना है, कि वह वास्तविकताओं को देखें—वह देखें कि आज भारत में स्थिति क्या है, आज जन-जीवन की क्या दशा है। आज स्थिति यह है, कि घर-घर में लोग एक एक चीज के लिए तरस रहे हैं। उन के पास खाने पीने के लिए नहीं है। कपड़ा उन को नह मिलता है। आज सब चीजें इतनी महंगी हो गई हैं कि जीवन-यापन दुर्लभ हो गया है।

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

यह हालत आज एक जगह ही नहीं है, बल्कि देश के कोने कोने में है। अगर वित्त मंत्री वास्तविकताओं को नहीं देखेंगे, तो केवल कोरी योजनाओं से कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता है।

मैं जानता हूँ कि वित्त मंत्री के अच्छे विचार हैं और वह अच्छे काम करना चाहते हैं। मेरा विचार है कि अच्छा काम किये बग़ैर नाम कमा कर मर जाना अच्छा नहीं है, लेकिन अच्छा काम कर के गुमनामी में मर जाना ज्यादा अच्छा है वित्त मंत्री बने बग़ैर, गुमनामी में रहते हुए अगर वह अच्छा काम करते, तो वह प्रशंसा के पात्र होते। अब जब कि वह वित्त मंत्री बने हैं, तो उन को ऐसी नीति पर चलना चाहिए कि लोग उनके बारे में यह न कह सकें कि वित्त मंत्री ने अलोकप्रिय काम किये, उन्होंने लोकप्रिय काम नहीं किये और वह देश को बुरे रास्ते पर ले गए।

क्या वित्त मंत्री ने यह सोचा है कि जिस दिन उन्होंने अवमूल्यन का निर्णय किया था, उस से एक दिन पहले उन को इस आशय का एक अध्यादेश जारी करना चाहिए था कि जिस से चीजों के मूल्य न बढ़ते, जिन लोगों के पास काला धन है, वे चोर बाजारी और काला बाजार न कर सकते और जिस से भ्रष्टाचार रुक सकता? उन्होंने यह वादा किया था कि वह एक ऐसा अध्यादेश जारी करेंगे, लेकिन आज तक वह अध्यादेश नहीं आया है, जिसका परिणाम यह है कि देश में चारों तरफ़ चोर बाजारी और काला-बाजारी हो रही है और मूल्यों में लगातार वृद्धि होती जा रही है। क्या वित्त मंत्री यह समझते हैं कि दिल्ली में एक सुपर बाजार खोल देने से सारे देश की जनता खुशहाल हो गई है? वह देहातों में जाकर देखें कि वहाँ पर चीजें दिल्ली से तीन गुना ज्यादा भाव पर

मिल रही हैं। लोगों को एक एक चीज के मिलने में कठिनाई हो रही है। आज मिट्टी का तेल भी नहीं मिल रहा है।

मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि बिड़ला दालमिया और टाटा ने एक महीना पहले ही यह कैसे जान लिया था कि सरकार अवमूल्यन करने वाली है। पहले वनस्पति धी की कीमत लगभग चौदह रुपये थी, लेकिन अब वह बढ़ कर लगभग चौबीस रुपये हो गई है और उस दाम पर भी वह लोगों को नहीं मिलता है। आखिर उन लोगों को कैसे मालूम हो गया कि सरकार अवमूल्यन करने वाली है और उन्होंने इनने दाम बढ़ा लिये? अगर प्रशासन में कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं, जो इस प्रकार के गुप्त समाचार दूसरों तक पहुँचाते हैं, तो उनको पर्ज कर दिया जाये, उन को निकाल दिया जाये, वरना वे हमारे देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था और अर्थ-नीति को खोखला और बदनाम कर देंगे।

विरोधी सदस्यों से मैं कहूँगा कि आज वे केवल आलोचना का काम कर रहे हैं—वे देश की रचना का काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। अगर वे देश के हित को दृष्टि में रखकर कोई रचनात्मक काम करेंगे, तो हम उन से सहमत होंगे।

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: They want to create chaos.

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी: मैं उस का विरोधी हूँ। अगर वे देश में कपास पैदा करना चाहते हैं, तो मैं उस का विरोधी हूँ। उस के लिए हमारी सरकार भी मजबूत है और वह उसको रोकने के लिए हर एक प्रयत्न करेगी। लेकिन मैं उन की अच्छी सेन्स और उन की बुद्धिमत्ता को अपील करूँगा कि वे देश में एक अच्छे वातावरण का सृजन करें। सितम्बर, अक्टूबर में न मालूम हमारे देश पर कौन सी विपत्ति आने वाली है। इसलिए स्थिति की गम्भीरता को पहचान कर उन को गम्भीरता से काम करना चाहिए—आवेश में आकर कोई काम नहीं करना चाहिए। अगर वे सरकार की आलोचना के बल पर अपने

आप को लोकप्रिय बनाने की कोशिश करेंगे, तो यह लोकप्रियता उन को महंगी पड़ेगी। देश की जनता जानती है कि किस को वोट देना है और किस को वोट नहीं देना है। अगर विरोधी सदस्य यह सोचते हैं कि केवल आलोचना और क्रिटिसिज्म की बातें करने से यह सरकार बदल सकती है, तो यह उन का स्वप्न मात्र है, जो कि पूरा नहीं हो सकता है। मैं उन से निवेदन करूंगा कि वे इस संकट को देखते हुए रचनात्मक काम में लगे और देश में फिर से एकता लाने के काम में योगदान दें। उनका कर्तव्य है कि वे देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था और अर्थ-नीति के सम्बन्ध में अच्छे, उपयोगी और रचनात्मक सुझाव दें। अगर वे ऐसा करेंगे, तो देश की अर्थव्यवस्था सुधरेगी और देश प्रगति करेगा।

सभापति महोदय, मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

Shri Ramapathi Rao (Karimnagar) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Five Year Plans have been adopted firstly to grow more food to feed the Indian population without depending on foreign countries and, secondly, to export cash crops to earn foreign exchange so that with the export earnings plants to manufacture other goods, for which we are not self sufficient, can be got. These are the principal reasons for chalking out the Five Year Plans.

In 15 years of our plan period, Rs. 4,939 crores have been spent on agriculture. To achieve the objectives carefully set out in the Plans, the Government thought it wise to get foreign loans to import capital goods. The country has permitted the Government to get food under PL. 480, because the argument advanced in favour of PL. 480 was that it was necessary to have buffer stocks. Shri S.K. Patil, the then Food Minister and author of Public Law 480 for India, in his reply to the debate on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture in 1952, made a

very bold declaration. What Shri Patil said to the House and to the country is very encouraging. Even those who are in the agricultural profession, who rightly felt and feared that creation of a buffer stock would take away the incentive of the agriculturists, accepted Shri Patil's assurance.

What did he say in 1962? He said : "Next year the food production will be 85 million tons. Every year's production must be more than the previous year." What has happened to this assurance? Because the monsoons did not favour in one season, the country should not have been reduced to the present position. The Indian farmer is not completely ignorant about agriculture. He may not have religiously followed Japanese or Chinese methods, but he is conversant with crops, seasons and soil.

The Plans were just to supplement his knowledge, supply better implements, protect his crops from pests and rats, provide him fertiliser and so on. More than anything else, the farmer expected the Plans to provide him with irrigation facilities. The planners have to see and examine whether the small assistance needed were given in time or not. Comparing the shortfall with other countries does not appear to be sound. From the time our Plans started, emphasis was laid on agriculture. Small and medium size projects should be taken up without our asking. We may venture to pay Rs. 120 crores to Rs. 130 crores for imported food, but the planners will not care to provide Rs. 30 crores to Pochampad which can give the country several lakh tons of rice. I will not hesitate to say, give irrigation and nothing more the Indian farmer will provide you enough food.

A word about fertilisers. Some of our friends are opposed to fertiliser deals with US firms. I cannot understand the opposition to this. To my mind, if we import food it means the country is depending for food on other countries. If we import fertiliser it means the agriculture

[Shri Ramathi Rao]
of our country is depending on imported fertilisers. If we import foreign collaboration to improve our fertilizer production with Indian participation, what is wrong? If the fertiliser produced is sold in India at the price fixed by the Government, whoever may do the distribution it should matter less or little. In each food producing State two or three factories should be started.

Coming to devaluation, the principal reason advanced by those who are responsible for the step towards devaluation was failure of agriculture and depletion in foreign exchange reserves. They have assured the House and the country that the follow-up programmes would be effective and they will help the nation to surmount all possible evils as a result of devaluation.

Countries like France, Yugoslavia and the Asian neighbour Indonesia have in the past resorted to devaluation. France and Yugoslavia, with strong measures, have converted devaluation to their full advantage, while Indonesia was caught up in the web of soaring prices. Devaluation instead of benefiting has caused economic unrest and, finally, political disorder there.

It boils down to this that the Government machinery should become effective to hold the price line. Whether it is the Andhra hoarder or Assam hoarder, whether one has Congress support or Communist support he should be punished if he indulges in malpractices.

Where the Government have items of engineering and other goods which have been manufactured before devaluation, whose prices should not go up, they should all be exported if they are exportable items. Export-incentive schemes have to be thoroughly examined. The impression is that a few big export houses have stooped to unfair dealings and concealed foreign exchange. Many shipping companies earn and hide the precious foreign exchange.

Government should not appeal to their good or patriotic sense. The loopholes should be plugged. If any suspicion is created, inquiry and quick award of punishment is necessary.

Produce and export should be the slogan and facilities should be provided without asking and delays should be eliminated vigilantly. To create confidence in the public that we mean business, the top-heavy administrative expenses should be sliced down before it could swallow up all earnings. If the price line is held, it is only then that we will save the country from economic slavery, before which many other unpleasant things like demonetisation etc. will crush the Indian community.

Devaluation was resorted to earn more foreign exchange to meet our requirements. At the same time, devaluation will cause large rupee shortage in the country. Even to continue the existing collaborations the rupee requirements will increase by 25 to 30 per cent. The cost of imports has gone up by 57.5 per cent. It is estimated that to meet the private imports alone the cost will be higher by Rs. 3.5 crores. What would the new projects cost? Therefore, the country can come out of the woods only if it can produce. 'Produce or perish' was the slogan given by our revered Panditji. Therefore, every unproductive expenditure should be avoided. The administration should be efficient and less costly. Expenditure on State Government and the Central Government should be curtailed. The new projects should be of such a nature that the production should be in sight just in a year's time. They should also be really export-oriented.

By incentives, strict quality control and other methods India expected to export Rs. 920 crores worth of goods before devaluation. Now it would have to be increased further. How could it be done depends upon the Government machinery and the

good gesture of foreign and national collaborators in the industry and trade.

In conclusion, I would request the Government to adopt quick measures to keep the labour happy to enable the industry and agriculture to produce plenty without labour trouble.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur)
Mr. Chairman, I have given notice of a substitute motion which reads :

“This House, having considered the present economic situation in the country, holds the Government responsible for leading millions of people to impoverishment, unemployment and starvation.”

The position is quite clear from the various speeches delivered from this side of the House as well as some speeches delivered from that side of the House.

While discussing devaluation it has been said not only by the Finance Minister or the Planning Minister, but even by the Prime Minister, that they did not succumb to any pressure from either the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund. I want to know whether it is a fact that an ultimatum was given by the World Bank that unless the Government of India take a firm decision about devaluation latest by 9th June 1966 they will stop all aid to India. I want a reply from the Finance Minister or Planning Minister or even the Prime Minister, whosoever is prepared to listen to this. I say that this is not only my impression but the impression of many people high up that there was a sort of ultimatum that nothing is going to come to our country from the World Bank if this devaluation was not agreed upon. If that is true, I do not know how we are going to face this problem.

We counteracted the Chinese aggression, we fought back the Pakistan aggression but this dollar aggression which has come

into the veins of this country we are finding it difficult to fight.

This is going to be a new East India Company which will go into the veins of the economy of this country and ultimately our dependence will depend purely on the charity of the USA. The new slogan is: Sell your independence to save independence; have more loans to pay back loans. If these are the slogans, I do not know what is going to be the economic condition of this country.

When we discuss this motion today, what picture is there before our eyes? At the end of the Third Plan unemployment had risen from 8 million to 12 million. 20 lakhs of goldsmiths are on the streets today because of the most hated and anti-people gold control. Their Joint Secretary, Shri Anil Basu, is today fasting unto death near Parliament House demanding the scrapping of the Gold Control Order.

Not only this but middle-class employees in almost all the establishments, whether in the public sector or in the private sector, are facing a threat of retrenchment every now and then. Nearly 24,000 employees working under the LIC are likely to lose their jobs, despite all the assurances of the Life Insurance Corporation, after the introduction of the new automation that is, the electronic computer.

Then, there is a talk going on in the country that there should be a price freeze and a wage freeze. I do not know whether this Government is capable or efficient enough to freeze prices because the Government has miserably failed during the last 19 years—failures after failures—to hold the price-line. Whether they will be able to freeze the prices or not, surely they are trying their best to see that wages are frozen.

The other day I put a question to the hon. Minister of Planning, Shri Asoka Mehta. My question was that if Government has taken a decision to freeze the wages in the Fourth Plan, why appoint a commission: why trouble the ex-Chief

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

Justice of the Supreme Court, a man of unquestioned integrity, Shri Gajendra-gadkar. Why appoint him as Chairman of a commission, known as the DA Commission? What will he do if the policy of the Government is not to pay anything to the Central Government or State Government employees or to their employees in the public sector projects?

If you see the terms of reference of that commission, you will find that it clearly says that this commission will also look to the interests to the State Government employees and the local bodies employees. A wage freeze cannot be and should not be tolerated by any employee, whether working in the public sector or in the private sector. I say this because from 1947 wages have not been protected. Any commission, whether it is the Pay Commission or any other award, or any report of an eminent economist clearly says that they are getting their wages either at the starvation level or just about that. I, therefore, request the hon. Finance Minister and the Planning Minister to see that the talk of wage freeze should not be there. If there is going to be a wage freeze, there is going to be an all-India strike, throughout the country, both in the public sector and in the private sector because persons, who are not getting even two hot meals a day, who cannot possibly dress their children, who are almost facing starvation day and night, will not tolerate further erosion in their wages.

Then, we talk of corruption. My hon. friend, the hon. Member, Shri Homi Daji, said something about the new Mundhras who are growing in the horizon. Lots of things have been said about Aminchand Pyarelal. In 1961 this particular firm, Aminchand Pyarelal, did the same thing. As per existing import regulations an importer has to obtain an import licence before import of any material. Messrs. Aminchand Pyarelal Group of industries imported a huge quantity of mild steel sheets worth about Rs. 12 lakhs and Rs. 7 lakhs from UK at Calcutta and Bombay Ports respectively without obtaining any

prior import licence from the Iron and Steel Controller. As per rules, that is, Sea Customs Act, this import was totally unauthorised and ought to have come under the Sea Customs Act resulting in forfeiture of the goods or imposition of heavy penalty. Instead, the Iron and Steel Controller regularised the import by issuing only the Customs copy of the licence without any original licence and thereby saved the firm from paying the penalty to customs authorities and other punitive measures.

To save himself from the anomalous position, the Iron and Steel Controller imposed a condition on the firm that the materials should be re-exported but at the same time allowed the firm to lift the materials to their godown and without setting up proper machinery to check up whether the particular materials had been re-exported or not. The firm took advantage of this position and evaded the stipulation for re-export by re-exporting a part of the total quantity which was also under dispute in respect of the quality.

Thus the Steel Controller gave the firm an opportunity to earn lakhs of rupees in an illegal way and a huge sum of money was lost in foreign exchange.

What happened to the Iron and Steel Controller? Shri A. N. Banerjee was the then Iron and Steel Controller who was responsible for this deal and he is now the General Manager of the Rourkela Steel Plant.

You can imagine what is happening. Apart from M/s Aminchand Pyarelal, if you investigate the affairs of all the big houses, whether it is Birlas or anybody else, you will find serious irregularities, not only irregularities but serious violations of various Acts. Therefore, I demand that if we want to strengthen the economy of the country

if we want to better the conditions of our people, we have to see whether this Plan is for the planner or for the poor people

I demand once again that there should be proper consideration of the Monopolies Commission's Report. There should be a high-power inquiry commission to go into the affairs of M/s Aminchand Pyarelal. Not only Mr. Subramaniam and Mr. Bhoorthalingam, apart from them, there are also indications that one more Cabinet Minister is involved in this. There are indications that this gentleman wants to slander even the hon. Speaker of the House—he wants to drag his name. That is why I demand a high-power inquiry commission into the affairs of M/s. Aminchand Pyarelal. Once it is done, that will allay the fears in the minds of many that this Government's judgement is always coloured by the considerations of the big bosses.

With these words, I repeat that the Plans of the Planning Commission are going to be of no use to the common people unless we can convince the people that whatever they pay though their nose by way of taxes will be utilised for their betterment. Sir, I hang down my head in shame when I see a cartoon of a starving man going before our Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and saying, "मां, मुझे गेहूं दो, तुझे जानसन देगा" Previously, we used to say, तुझे भगवान देगा। Now, we say, तुझे जानसन देगा।

Let us not depend on those countries which bleed our country white and which want to subjugate our country and subordinate our economy. We should be free from the clutches of those countries. That is why I say this Government has miserably failed and led the entire country to impoverishment and starvation.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) : सभापति महोदय, आने मुझे जो टाइम दिया है, उस के लिये मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

सबसे पहले 1949 में अवमूल्यन हुआ। उसके बाद 1954 में रुपया बन्द कर के इस सरकार ने जनता से चांदी छीन ली, मन् 1956 में पैसा बन्द कर के ताम्बा छीन लिया, 1962-63 में गोल्ड कन्ट्रॉल लाकर सोना छीन लिया, अब शायद 100 रु० का नोट भी खत्म होने वाला है। यह सारा अमरीका का प्रभाव है। क्योंकि एक ही साल के अन्दर अमरीका से यानी 1 जुलाई, 1965 से 30 जून, 1966 तक 1 अरब 70 करोड़ 90 लाख डालर, इतना कर्ज इस सरकार ने ले लिया। जो 15 साल तक इन्होंने नहीं लिया था, वह एक साल में ले लिया। क्या वजह थी? यह अमरीका के दबाव का प्रमाण नहीं है? लेकिन सरकार छिपाती है और कहती है कि वह अमरीका के दबाव में नहीं हैं।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, जिस दिन अवमूल्यन हुआ, क्या योजना मंत्री अमरीका में नहीं बैठे थे, क्या बराती बन कर फौज बनाकर अमरीका नहीं गये थे। जापान ने शिकायत की है, जापान ने कहा कि बरात की बरात अमरीका तो पहुँच गई, लेकिन मेरे पास एक चूहा भी नहीं भेजा। जब कि मैं 10 करोड़ रुपये की विदेशी सहायता देता हूँ, क्या वजह है कि ऐसी नौबत आ रही है।

मैं इन से पूछना चाहता हूँ जिन्होंने रुपये का अवमूल्यन कर के इस देश की जनता को बिल्कुल दिवालिया बना दिया है। जनता ने हर तरह से सरकार की इज्जत रखने में कमी नहीं की, लड़ाई के जमाने में कपड़ा दिया, पहनने के लिये जूता दिया, खाने के लिये एक टाइम खाना न खा कर अनाज दिया, गम कपड़े दिये, धन दिया, पैसा दिया, लेकिन मरीज आखिर मर ही गया। सरकार की आज इज्जत 35.5 परसेंट कम हो गई है, क्यों हुआ यह सब? यह आपकी फजूलखर्ची का नमूना है अवमूल्यन के बाद भी 50 लाख की विदेशी मुद्रा बरात की बरात बनाकर अमरीका ले जाने में खर्च कर दी।

[श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा]

जिस वक्त अवमूल्यन किया तो प्रधान मंत्री ने बड़े जोर शोर से कहा कि मैं अब बड़ी मोटर में नहीं बैठूंगी, छोटी मोटर में बैठूंगी, यानी एम्बेसेडर में बैठूंगी, लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ इस वक्त प्रधान मंत्री यहाँ नहीं हैं मैं प्रशोक मेहता साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या एक ही फॉटो प्रधान मंत्री ने 25 हजार रुपये देकर कलकत्ते से नहीं मंगवाया प्रखवार में छपाने के लिये, क्या यह अवमूल्यन का प्रमाण नहीं है।

लेकिन दूसरी तरफ कौन कौन से जरूरी काम इन्होंने रोके हैं मैं उसके प्रमाण देना चाहता हूँ मैं एक मरीज का प्रमाण देता हूँ—पूना का एक वक्ता जरूरी इलाज के लिये अमरीका नहीं जा सका। पश्चिमी राष्ट्र में प्रायः इंजीनियरिंग में विशिष्ट प्रशिक्षण के लिये दिया गया आवेदन पत्र इन्होंने अस्वीकृत कर दिया। क्रिकेट प्रेमी दिल ममोश कर रह गये, जब इन्होंने उनके वेस्ट इण्डिज के कार्यक्रम को खत्म कर दिया। उधर उड़ीसा में वक्त पर अकाल को टाला न जा सका, क्योंकि चावल का आयात खर्चीला था। हमाराष्ट्र के कारखानों में मंदी आ गई क्योंकि उनको कच्चा माल नहीं मिला और हजारों लोग, मजदूर बेकार हो गये, ये इस के ज्वलन प्रमाण हैं। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ क्या होता है—वह भी मैं आप को बता देना चाहता हूँ। एराउण्ड दी वर्ल्ड चित्र की शूटिंग के सिलसिले में 16 लोग तीन बार दुनिया का लम्बा दौरा कर आये। बम्बई में बन रही और हिन्दुस्तान में दिखाई जाने वाली फिल्म “लव इन टोकियो” का पूरा यूनिट जापान के अन्दर कई महीने तक रहा। “इर्वानिग इन पैरिस” के कलाकार और निर्माता ने महीनों यूरोप में गुजार दिये। “अमन” फिल्म के लिये लन्दन के कई चक्कर लगाये गये और अब तक यह चित्र बन रहा है। क्या इन पर विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च नहीं होती।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ, वित्त मंत्री जी से, इन्दिरा जी रोजाना रेडियो से भाषण देती हैं, सन्देश देती हैं राष्ट्र के नाम, कि अवमूल्यन से जितना पैसा बढ़ेगा उसको सरकार बरदाश्त करेगी, लेकिन मैंने अभी दो दिन पहले एक प्रश्न पूछा था कि 14,000 रु० का ट्रैक्टर, जो किसानों के काम आता है, उसका मूल्य 21,000 रु० हो गया है, क्या आठ-सात हजार रुपये जो बढ़े हैं, वह सरकार बरदाश्त करेगी? तो उन्होंने जवाब में कह दिया कि नहीं, वह तो वही देंगे। यह झूठी अफवाह नहीं तो क्या है, क्यों आसमान में कागज के गोले छोड़ते हो? सरकार अवमूल्यन करने से पहले भावों पर नियन्त्रण करती। भावों पर नियन्त्रण न करने से क्या हुआ—सरकार जनता को दबाती जा रही है।

राजस्थान सरकार ने कह दिया है कि 22 महीने से पहले के जितने मजदूर हैं, सब निकाल दिये जायेंगे, क्या यह अवमूल्यन का प्रमाण है। मैं राजस्थान सरकार के चीफ मिनिस्टर और इस सरकार को बता देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस तरह से मजदूरों के ऊपर अवमूल्यन का असर पड़ेगा तो शायद यह सरकार टिक नहीं सकेगी। यह 80 लाख मजदूरों का सवाल है और मुझे तो ऐसा दिखता है कि शायद सितम्बर में दूसरा सेशन सरकार को बुलाना पड़ेगा। आज मुझे यह भय है और जिसे मैं यहाँ पर रखना चाहता हूँ कि जो 70-80 लाख मजदूर हैं, दूसरे लोग हैं, उनके मंहगाई भते में बढ़ोतरी होनी है, उसको वे रोक देंगे, अध्यादेश जारी कर देंगे और जो मना करेगा, उसका विरोध करेगा, उसको नौकरी से निकाल दिया जायेगा। तीसरे यह कि 200 करोड़ रुपये के टैक्स लगाने के लिये यह सरकार बाध्य हो रही है। अगर इस नंगी भूखी जनता पर जो पहले ही टैक्स से दबी हुई है, जो गरीब लोग हैं, गरीब कर्मचारी है, जो दो टाइम का खाना नहीं खा सकते, अगर उनके ऊपर अवमूल्यन का बोझा

इस तरह से डाला गया तो इसके परिणाम अच्छे नहीं होंगे। आपने अवमूल्यन करना था, कर दिया, लेकिन इसका असर उन 80 लाख कर्मचारियों से पृष्ठो, जिनको एक टाइम का खाना भी नहीं मिलता है। मैं विल्ड्ज में प्रकाशित एक फोटो की तरफ आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक मजदूर जो भूख से मर रहा है और अशोक प्रेहता साहब तो उत्र टांगें फैलाकर सो रहे हैं, उनको क्या मालूम।

सरकार को मालूम होना चाहिये कि अमरीका की आय 1325 रू० है जब कि हमारी आय 325 रू० है, हम अमरीका से मुकाबला करने चले हैं। जब तक यह अमरीका का गेहूँ आना बन्द नहीं होगा, य जो दास्ता की जंजीरें हैं ये नहीं टूटेंगी, जब तक यह सरकार रूस या अमरीका या किसी भी दूसरे देश की गुलामी करना नहीं छोड़ेगी तब तक इस देश की जनता इसी तरह से कुचनी जाती रहेगी। मैं सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार गरीब मजदूरों का, गरीब कर्मचारियों का ध्यान रखे और चूँकि अवमूल्यन हो चुका है, इस वास्ते यह कह कर उनको न टालदे कि उनके महंगाई भत्ते नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं। अगर आपने इस तरह का निर्णय लिया और उनको राहत प्रदान नहीं की तब तो यह सरकार बच नहीं सकेगी। ये तपेदिक के मरीज की तरह एक दिन मर कर रहेगी।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister will reply tomorrow.

17 hrs.

*DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES IN RAJASTHAN

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur) : I raised this half-an-hour discussion because

I think that the answer giving to the question in the House were wholly unsatisfactory, unconvincing and devoid Both of reason and of reassurance. I raise this half-an-hour discussion also because I think it is a basic and fundamental question of priorities in the plan and in the allocations for development. It is a question of rectifying some of the inherent imbalances that have crept into our economy. It is a question which is agitating the minds of some of the most backward States in the country; it is a question whether the plan allocations are meant to make them more backward or to lift them from the morass of stagnation into which they have fallen.

The hon. Minister of Planning who replied to my questions on the 28th July 1966 was very eloquent but very confusing, If I may say so with great respect. He adopted the technique of the broad sweep, the technique of window-dressing, and if I may say so, in some of his answers, he has indeed by taking shelter under reasoning which is specious added insult to injury.

I would like particularly to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the memorandum submitted to the Prime Minister by Members of Parliament from Rajasthan was a memorandum to which Members of Parliament from Rajasthan belonging to all the parties, were signatories. So, it is not a partisan issue at all, but it is an issue concerning the very existence and future of that State.

As is known, the Rajasthan State is one of the most backward States, but

*Half-An-Hour Discussion.