

Mr. Speaker: Is the amendment withdrawn?

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: I press it, Sir

Mr. Speaker: Then, I shall now put his amendment to the vote of the House. The question is:

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

"and feels that the enquiry was vitiated by the presence of the Vice-Chancellor of Aligarh University in the sitting of the Committee against the assurance to the contrary given by the Minister of Education on the floor of the House and by the atmosphere of terror created by certain interested parties as a result of which many intending witnesses did not appear before the Enquiry Committee."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The main motion is a formal motion. It has been discussed. The question is:

"That this House takes note of the Report of the Aligarh Muslim University Enquiry Committee, laid on the Table of the House on the 21st April, 1961."

The motion was adopted.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTY-FIFTH REPORT

Sardar A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th August, 1961."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-fifth Report of the

Committee on Private Members Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 9th August, 1961."

The motion was adopted.

15:43 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: INDIVIDUAL INCOME—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Kalika Singh on the 28th April, 1961:

"This House is of opinion that in order to achieve the goal of socialistic pattern of society the individual incomes should be so regulated that the gap between the maximum and minimum income is reduced to the ratio of 10 to 1."

Out of 1½ hours allotted for discussion of this Resolution, 25 minutes have already been taken up. Shri D. C. Sharma.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have read the Resolution put forward by the hon. Member Shri Kalika Singh. I listened to his speech last time with rapt attention. I have again read through his speech as it has been reported in the proceedings of the Lok Sabha. On going through all these things, I have come to one conclusion that this Resolution is motivated by some very fine sentiments. This Resolution is steeped in a very idealistic spirit and it takes us to those goals which we all cherish and which we all have in view. This Resolution refers to those objectives which are the most cherished objectives of our Constitution and the Directive Principles of our Indian Constitution.

Now, Sir, first of all I want to put one question. Has anything like that been done in any country of the world which has socialism as its goal

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

or which is a socialist country? Looking at the map of the world we find that there are some countries which are described as capitalist countries. Of course, even those countries say that they now practise people's capitalism and that they are not capitalist in the old sense of the word. There are some countries which are not fully developed or fully industrialised, where the standard of living is not very high and which are trying to improve themselves economically and industrially. When I look at those countries of the world where socialism is practised, so to say, even they do not have this kind of a ceiling either on the minimum income or on the maximum income of an individual.

Now, I want to refer to a country which is a socialist country but I do not give the name of that country because if I give the name of that country there may be so many allegations and counter allegations and so much controversy and counter-controversy. In that country, by and large, the minimum income of a person is about Rs. 150 a month. But the maximum salary which some of the persons draw there is about Rs. 15,000 a month. Therefore, even in those countries which swear by the name of socialism, there is no such thing as this: if the minimum income is one, the maximum income should be 10. But one thing is there. In every country of the world today, be it socialist, capitalist or democratic or of other kinds, the effort is to level up the salaries and incomes of persons who are, if I can describe them as such, in the low income group. That is, in every country of the world an effort is being made to level up the starting salary of every worker.

In my country, fortunately or unfortunately, we have divided our workers or our officials into four classes. There are the class IV employees; then there are class III employees, then class II employees and then class I employees. I am not very happy to see this kind of division of

workers in Government or elsewhere into these classes. This is a kind of administrative stratification. If I am against social stratification, I have every reason to believe that this kind of administrative stratification is very, very pernicious so far as this country is concerned. Not only this. There are strata of society between one group and another group. Class IV does not mean only Class IV. There are so many strata in Class IV and Class III. All this is very deplorable. To all these people, we have been trying to give a better deal or rather we have been making an attempt to give a better deal to Class III and Class IV employees. We have also been making an attempt to cut down some of the allowances and additional perquisites of office, which some of these officers and others have been getting in the higher income group.

If I understand aright, the gap between the lowest and the highest, before India became free, was in the proportion of 1:80. Now, the gap between the highest and the lowest in free India has been narrowed and I would say that it is now in the proportion of 1:30. Of course, I look forward to the day when this gap will be further narrowed down, but I believe that to give this kind of numerical description to this gap is not conclusive either to the efficiency, well-being or prosperity of the workers or to the prosperity of our country as a whole.

One thing to which I may draw your attention and which I am keen about is that the Minimum Wages Act should become the norm of employment in our country. It should be so not only in the public sector but also in the private sector. There are so many sectors in our society—agricultural and other sectors—where the minimum wages have not been prescribed and where even if they had been prescribed they have not been implemented. There are so many sectors of our society where this thing has happened. There are some other sectors also,

as for example, the white-collar workers, where the minimum wages have not been properly dealt with. There are some persons who have tried to whittle down the wages of these persons. In order to realise the socialist pattern of society, we cannot be rigid in this approach. Who knows that it might come about, that a day might come, when the difference between the lowest and the highest may be just 1:2 or 1:3 or 1:4 or even 1:5? Therefore, this kind of rigid approach which my hon. friend Shri Kalika Singh applies to this problem is not in consonance with the socialist pattern of society. This approach should be kept as flexible as possible, for we cannot legislate for all time to come. We should go on legislating from year to year or from Plan to Plan, from one Plan to the next Plan. Our Prime Minister has said—and I think that is the view held by some other statesmen of the world also—that we should not talk in terms of a five year Plan or a seven year Plan or a ten year Plan but that we should talk in terms of a Plan which is being shaped every year. Similarly, I say that this narrowing of the gap between the high income group and the low income group should be kept under constant supervision and scrutiny. We should go on adjusting it to our economic conditions as time passes. Therefore, to legislate for all time to come, namely, that there should be a proportion of 1:10 and all that, is not, I think, good economics and it is also also not good socialism.

Another point is that our country has been thinking for sometime past in terms of wage boards. We have got wage boards for so many industries. There are some industries in which we do not have wage boards. We are trying to have these boards for them also. My feeling is that the principle of wage board should not only be applied only to industrial workers, but to other kinds of workers also. Why should not there be a wage board for teachers and for journalists? Of course for journalists it is there but it is not being fully

implemented. Why not there be a wage board for all these different kinds of intellectual workers? All of us are workers, whether we are white-collar workers or non-white collar workers. So, this policy of wage boards should be extended as much as possible and there should be wage boards for all kinds of workers. I think that these wage boards should keep under supervision all the different problems connected with the salaries and allowances and other things.

15:55 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANATHA RAO *in the Chair*]

Another problem that deserves attention at our hands is this. The public sector can be kept under check. If we give a high salary to some Secretary or Additional Secretary here or there, there will be a question about it in Parliament. The Minister will be answerable to the House as to why it has been done. All these things are under supervision all the time and we are very conscious of what is being done so far as the public sector is concerned. But I feel that in the private sector, it is the law of the jungle that prevails. There are no rules that govern the salaries in the private sector. We are trying to bring this private sector under control. There is no doubt about it. I feel that it will take a long time before this private sector can be made to obey the law of a socialist society. Look at the fabulous salaries which some of the people in the private sector draw, and look at the allowances that they get. Look at the perquisites of office, which they get. If you bring these things to the notice of the public, they say, "They are not doing anything; they are getting salaries in proportion to their capacity for work." I know what their capacity for work is. Therefore, this point requires to be considered and I think that the Deputy Minister of Finance who is sitting here will take it into consideration. The salaries which some of these persons get should not be out of proportion to the salaries

{Shri D. C. Sharma}

which some of our men in the public sector are getting.

We have certain companies in India which are not our own. They are managed by other countries in the world. They have their head offices in England or in some other countries. Those companies give to their national employees very high salaries and they give to Indians, who are doing the same kind of work in their companies, very low salaries. This is another aspect which ought to be looked into. The intention of the mover of this resolution is that the socialist pattern of society should grow from strength to strength. What he wants is this. Anyone who works and lives in this country should know that he is living and working in the country where there is equality, social justice, and no difference between one man and the other man. Everyone should have that feeling. You cannot give that feeling to these persons unless you do something about it.

16 hrs.

Take the case of Class IV employees. The other day I received an invitation from the Class IV employees' union in Uttar Pradesh to attend their conference. I do not know why they send that to me, but anyhow I get it every year.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): They send it to you because you are a good man.

Shri D. C. Sharma: These Class IV employees have to be looked after much more than before. Why? People are not going to Judge India by the multi-storeyed buildings that we put up. The other day a young lady from some other country came here and said, "We come to India to see four things: The Prime Minister, Taj Mahal, snake charmers and the poverty of India". That is what she told us. People from other countries come to India to look at the poverty of India.

Of course, during the last ten years, we have tried to overcome the poverty of India to a great extent and I pay my compliments to those persons who work out our Plans. I am glad when our Third Five Year Plan is implemented, the poverty of India will be more diminished than before.

People do not judge us only by the Taj Mahal that they see. They also judge us by the slums that we have in our country. They do not judge us by the bungalows in which our Class I officers and Members of Parliament live. They see other things also. Therefore, the intention of the mover of the resolution will be fulfilled and his desire will be satisfied if we do something to level up at least the incomes of those who are at the bottom of the scale.

Look at the Central Secretariat Service. Look at the lower division clerks. People continue to be lower division clerks till the end as if lower division clerkship is something by birth. Just as I am a Brahmin by birth and I continue to be a Brahmin till the end of my life. Lower division clerks come and say, "Look at our condition". Something has got to be done to step up the resources of these persons. If we do that, I am sure we are giving reality to the socialist pattern of society. So, we should do something for these Class IV employees, lower division clerks, etc. so that they can realise that we are trying to have a socialist pattern of society.

In spirit, I agree with the mover of the resolution; in theory, I am at one with him. But when it comes to actual practice, we should not adopt a rigid attitude, but a flexible attitude and we should see to it that the incomes of the people in the lower group go on increasing and the incomes of the people in the upper group go on decreasing as much as possible, so that the gap between the one and other becomes narrower and narrower as time passes.

श्री सरजू पंडेय (रसड़ा): सभापति जी, मैं प्रस्तावक महोदय को यह प्रस्ताव लाने के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ। इस सदन के मीनियर मेम्बर धर्मा जी ने एक अजीब मवाल उठाया है कि समाजवादी समाज की स्थापना के लिए हमको बहुत रिजिड तरीके से पेश नहीं आना चाहिए और उनकी समझ में यह आ रहा है कि यह प्रस्ताव बहुत रिजिड है। मैं समझता हूँ कि मूल स्थापना समाजवाद या समाजवादी समाज की यह है कि देश की अधिक से अधिक जनता को भौतिक सुविधाओं से लाभाविन्न किया जाये। यह तो उसके लिए पहली जरूरी चीज है। हमने समाजवाद का नारा तो दिया लेकिन काम हम उसका उलटा कर रहे हैं। इस नारे को लगाकर कहा जाता है कि हम धीरे धीरे समाजवाद की ओर जा रहे हैं, मगर असलियत यह है कि हम धीरे धीरे पूंजीवाद की ओर जा रहे हैं। यह प्रस्ताव हमको समाजवादी समाज की ओर ले जाने के लिए एक आवश्यक कदम है। इस प्रस्ताव की मुख्य धारा यह है कि सरविसेज में जो लोग हैं उनके बीच एक ओर दस से अधिक अन्तर तनख्वाह में नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि समाजवादी नारे को पूरा करने के लिए लोक सभा को ही सब से पहले यह कदम उठाना चाहिए।

अगर हम चाहते हैं कि देश को अधिक से अधिक लोग अधिक से अधिक चीजों का उपभोग कर सकें तो लाजिमी तौर पर हमको ऊपर के लोगों की आमदनी पर रोक लगानी चाहिए और नीचे के लोगों की आमदनी को बढ़ाना चाहिए। मेरे पास आंकड़े मौजूद नहीं हैं, लेकिन अगर पिछले १४ वर्षों की स्थिति को देखा जाए तो पता चलेगा कि इस समय में पूंजीपतियों का मुनाफा बढ़ा है, बड़े बड़े अफसरों की तनख्वाहें बढ़ी हैं। छोटे छोटे अफसरों की तनख्वाहें बढ़ायी गयीं मगर उसी अनुपात में महंगाई बढ़ जाने से उस बढ़ोतरी का उनको कोई लाभ नहीं मिला। ये जो छोटे कर्मचारी हैं यही मुल्क की रीढ़ हैं, उनकी सुविधा की ओर खास ध्यान देना चाहिए था। उनकी ओर हम ध्यान नहीं

देते और ऐसा प्रयत्न नहीं करते कि वे भी पूरी तरह भौतिक सामग्री का इस्तेमाल करें। बल्कि हम बड़े अफसरों के लिए हर प्रकार की सुविधाओं का प्रबन्ध करते हैं ताकि उनकी एफीशेंसी बढ़े और वे ज्यादा अच्छी तरह काम कर सकें। उनके लिए यह जरूरी समझा जाता है कि उनको एअरकंडीशन्ड महलों में रहना चाहिए, उनके पास बड़ी बड़ी मोटर्स होनी चाहिए, उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा आराम मिलना चाहिए। अगर यह देखा जाए कि राष्ट्र इन अफसरों के ऊपर कितना खर्च करता है और ये राष्ट्र की उसके बदले में कितनी सेवा करते हैं, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इनको सजा का भागीदार समझा जाएगा। और जो यह काम करते हैं उसका तो आपको पता ही होगा। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हम को वास्तव में समाजवाद की ओर चलना है तो हम को इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करना चाहिये। आज आप इस देश में समाजवाद की बात करते हैं, लेकिन एक लड़का जो स्कूल में पढ़ने जाता है वह देखता है कि उसको भी उतना ही पैसा देना होगा जितना उसको जिसका बाप तीन और चार हजार रुपए मासिक वेतन पाना है। ऐसे हालात में यह कैसे मुमकिन है कि गरीब आदमी का लड़का भी वैसे ही तालीम पा सके जैसी कि धनी आदमी का लड़का पा सकता है। आज देश में अवस्था यह है कि गरीब आदमी अपने लड़कों को ऊंची तालीम नहीं दे सकता। जिनके पास पैसा है केवल वे ही अपने लड़कों को अच्छी तालीम दे सकते हैं, अच्छे टीचर रख सकते हैं, अपने बच्चों को अच्छे स्कूलों में दाखिल करवा सकते हैं। हमारी सरकार की नीति क्या है उसका मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। एक आदमी आठ दिन का भूखा है और दूसरा आदमी ६ दिन का भूखा है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि ऐसी हालत में पहले खाना किस को दिया जाना चाहिए। स्पष्ट है कि उसको दिया जाना चाहिए जो आठ दिन का भूखा है। लेकिन हमारी सरकार की नीति यह है कि जो ६ दिन का भूखा है उसको खाना दिया जाता है और इतना दिया जाता है कि चाहे उसको हज्म

[श्री सरजू पांडेय]

भी न हो, और जो आठ दिन का भूखा है उससे कहा जाता है कि तुम सब करो। यह आपका समाजवाद है। होना तो यह चाहिए कि जो आठ दिन का भूखा है पहले उसको खाना दिया जाए और जो ६ दिन का भूखा है उससे कहा जाए कि तुम कुछ सब करो। लेकिन हमारी सरकार उससे उलटी चल रही है। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि गरीब आदमी की मुसीबतें बढ़ती चली जा रही हैं और दूसरी तरफ अमीर लोगों की ऐश और आराम में वृद्धि होती चली जा रही है। मैंने देखा है कि हमारे छोटे-छोटे जो नौकर हैं जो इस मुल्क की जान हैं और जो इस मुल्क को चलाने वाले हैं उन से हम बहुत ज्यादा उम्मीद रखते हैं। हम पुलिस के सिपाही से यह उम्मीद करते हैं कि वह ईमानदार रहे मगर पुलिस के आई० जी० से हम यह उम्मीद नहीं कर सकते कि वह दरअसल देखें कि उनका स्टाफ ठीक से काम करता है या नहीं। आई० जी० घरों से नकलते भी नहीं हैं और न ही यह देखते हैं कि हमारा स्टाफ ईमानदारी से ड्यूटी दे रहा है अथवा नहीं। हमारे मन्त्री लोग भी नहीं जाकर देखते कि दरअसल हमारे नीचे काम करने वाले लोगों में क्या विचार बन रहा है। अगर देश में यही अवस्था कायम रही तो एक तरफ तो ऊंची ऊंची अट्टालिकाएँ, बड़े बड़े महल, ऐशो आराम, मोटरकारों और दूसरी फिजूल-खर्चियाँ देखने को मिलेंगी और दूसरी तरफ आम इंसान नंगे और भूखे फिरते नजर आयेंगे।

हमारे शर्मा जी ने कहा कि प्राइवेट सैक्टर में चूँकि लोगों को तनख्वाहें ज्यादा मिलती हैं इसलिए पब्लिक सैक्टर में हमें योग्य और अनुभवी व्यक्ति प्राप्त न हो सकेंगे। मैं शर्मा जी से इस में सहमत नहीं हो सकता। लेकिन मैं उनसे पूछना चाहूँगा कि प्राइवेट सैक्टर को कौन प्रोत्साहन देता है और उसके वास्ते कौन जिम्मेदार है? आखिर यह सरकार ही तो उसके वास्ते जिम्मेदार है।

यह दलील देना कि अगर हम अपने यहां तनख्वाहें घटा देंगे तो हमको अच्छे और योग्य व्यक्ति नहीं मिल सकेंगे, मैं इसको नहीं मानता। लेकिन प्राइवेट सैक्टर में भी जो इतनी लम्बी लम्बी तनख्वाहें मिलती हैं उसके लिए यह सरकार ही तो जिम्मेदार है। उनको इतना मौका देती है कि वह इतना लम्बा मुनाफा कमायें और लम्बी लम्बी तनख्वाहें देकर बड़े बड़े लोगों को अपनी तरफ खींच लें। समय आ गया है जब हमें प्राइवेट सैक्टर के भारी मुनाफे पर कोई रोक लगानी चाहिए ताकि इस तरह से वे लोगों को लम्बी तनख्वाहों पर इनगेज न कर सकें। इसलिए मैं चाहूँगा कि अगर दरअसल हम समाजवाद की ओर जाते हैं तो हमें आज यह जो भारी आर्थिक असमानता विद्यमान है उसको दूर करना होगा। कुछ मुल्कों में समाजवाद है लेकिन मैं नहीं जानता कि हिन्दुस्तान का समाजवाद क्या है। अब यह तो एक सीधी सी बात है कि एक कुर्ता मैंने पहन रक्खा है और मैं दर्जी से कह सकता हूँ कि मेरा एक ऐसा ही कुर्ता और बना दो लेकिन जिस कुर्ते का हमें कोई आइडिया न हो तो उसको कैसे बनवाया जा सकता है? ठीक यही बात हमारे समाजवादी सिद्धान्त के बारे में लागू होती है। हमारी सरकार के पास हिन्दुस्तान के समाजवाद का कोई आइडिया नहीं है कि उसमें क्या होगा और वह किस तरीके से मुल्क में लाया जायगा। विभिन्न मुल्कों से इधर उधर की कुछ चीजों को लेकर एक अजीब तरीके का समाजवाद गढ़ लिया गया है जो कि एक चूँ चूँ का मुरब्बा बन कर रह गया है। कोई साफ रास्ता आपके सामने नहीं है कि दरअसल आप समाजवाद लोकसभा में किस प्रकार से और कैसे लायेंगे?

अब अपनी लोकसभा को ही आप ले लीजिए। जैसे आसार हैं उसके मुताबिक यह मालूम पड़ता है कि लोकसभा में कोई भी गरीब आदमी नहीं आ सकेगा। लोकसभा के चुनावों में उम्मीदवारों को काफी खर्च करना पड़ता है और उसकी वजह से लोकसभा

में गरीब आदमियों का आना मुश्किल हो जायगा क्योंकि वह चुनावों में इतना पैसा खर्च नहीं कर सकते। दो, चार साल में यहां सब बड़े बड़े लोग और पैसे वाले आकर बैठ जायेंगे और वह सरकार की रीति नीतियों पर प्रभाव डालेंगे। होना तो यह चाहिए कि ऐसे लोग जो पैसे के प्रभाव से सारी चीजें खरीद लेते हैं उन पर रोक लगाई जाय और ऐसे लोगों को ज्यादा से ज्यादा लिया जाय जो कि साधनहीन हैं। लेकिन हमारे यहां इसका बिल्कुल उलटा है। एक तरफ चुनाव में ऐसा आदमी खड़ा हो जो कि इंसान को खरीद सकता हो, तालीम को खरीद सकता हो और बड़ी बड़ी फाइलों को खरीद सकता हो और दूसरी तरफ उसके मुकाबले में यदि कोई छोटा मोटा गरीब आदमी उम्मीदवार हो तो वह कैसे जीत सकता है? साधनहीन लोग कैसे उन बड़े बड़े लोगों का मुकाबला कर सकते हैं?

उन साधनहीन और गरीब लोगों से यह अपेक्षा की जाती है कि वह सब करें और मुल्क के लिए सैक्रीफाइस करें। अगर मजदूर लोग अपनी तनख्वाह बढ़ाने की मांग करते हैं तो फौरन उन पर गोलियां चलने लगती हैं। छोटा मोटा कर्मचारी तो अपनी मांगों के लिए हड़ताल कर ही नहीं सकता। अभी पिछले दिनों उन्होंने एक हड़ताल की थी। उन्होंने मांग की थी कि उन्हें जीने लायक तनख्वाह दी जाय। लेकिन उन बेचारों को हड़ताल करने का मजा अच्छा खासा मिल गया और काफी तादाद में अभी भी उनका भविष्य अधर में लटका हुआ है अर्थात् उन्हें सरकारी नौकरी में वापिस लिया भी जाता है कि नहीं। उन्हें सोशलिज्म का मजा मिल गया। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वह कोई बगावत कर रहे थे? वह तो केवल जीने लायक तनख्वाह की ही मांग कर रहे थे। लेकिन सरकार ने उसके लिए यह बहाना किया कि दूसरे मुल्कों ने उनको व्हंकाया है और भड़काया है और उनकी जो वाजिब मांग थी उसको उन्होंने सुनने से इंकार कर दिया। यह क्या समाजवाद हुआ कि एक तरफ तो

अफसरों के कुत्ते पुलाव खायें और दूसरी तरफ हमारे कर्मचारियों के बच्चे दाने पानी के बगैर मरें?

मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रस्तावक महोदय के इस प्रस्ताव को सरकार को स्वीकार कर लेना चाहिए। तमाम लम्बे लम्बे मुनाफों पर कुछ रोक लगनी चाहिए और अधिक से अधिक पैसा उन लाखों कोड़ों लोगों के पास जाना चाहिए जो कि आज उसकी बहुत तंगी महसूस कर रहे हैं। समाजवाद का सीधा अर्थ यह है कि आज देश में जो भारी असमानता फैली हुई है उसे दूर किया जाय। अभी पिछले दिनों स्विटजरलैण्ड का आदमी मेरे साथ जा रहा था। उसने लाल किले के पास की गन्दी बस्तियों को देख कर कहा था कि मैं नहीं समझता कि दुनिया के किसी कोने में इस तरीके से खराब हालत में इंसान अपना जीवन व्यतीत करते हैं। जिन चीजों के वास्ते आज हम अपने मुल्क में लड़ रहे हैं हजारों वर्ष पहले वह चीजें उन मुल्कों में हो चुकी हैं। अगर १ और १० का अनुपात तनख्वाहों में रक्खा गया तो यह एक समाजवाद की ओर बढ़ा हुआ कदम होगा और उस को सरकार को मानना चाहिए। इससे ज्यादा तनख्वाहों में फर्क नहीं होना चाहिए। अब लम्बी लम्बी तनख्वाहों में कटौती न करने के लिए यह दलील दी जाती है कि अगर हमने तनख्वाहें कम कीं तो हमें अच्छे और योग्य आदमी मुलभ न हो सकेंगे। लेकिन मेरे पास इसकी मिसालें मौजूद हैं कि ५००० तनख्वाह पाने वाले अफसर भी ठीक काम नहीं करते हैं। इसलिए यह कोई बात नहीं है कि अगर हमने लम्बी तनख्वाहें नहीं दीं तो लोग काम नहीं करेंगे। मेरा तो कहना है कि अगर हमें इस मुल्क को समाजवाद की ओर ले चलना है तो हमें कुछ जरूरी और बुनियादी कदम उठाने पड़ेंगे और यह बुनियादी कदम यहीं से शुरू होगा कि हम तनख्वाहों के भेद को कम करें। प्राइवेट सैक्टर में जो लोग भारी मुनाफा कमा रहे हैं उन पर रोक लगायें। हम इस तरह के कायदे व कानून बनायें

[श्री सरजू पांडेय]

जिससे हम अधिक से अधिक नीचे के लोगों को, जो शोषित और पीड़ित हैं उनको हम अधिक से अधिक लाभ पहुंचाये तभी हम सही मायनों में सोशलिज्म कायम करने की बात कह सकते हैं वरना होगा यह कि बात तो हम सोशलिज्म की करते हैं और चलते हैं पंजीवाद के रास्ते पर और जिस में कि पूजापतियों का मुनाफा दिन पर दिन बढ़ता ही जाता है और वह अधिक से अधिक चीजों को एवैल करते हैं और गरीबों की गरीबी दिन प्रतिदिन बढ़ती जाती है। मैं सदन से यह अपील करूंगा कि इस प्रस्तुत प्रस्ताव को पास करें क्योंकि यह हमारे देश को समाजवाद की ओर ले जाने का एक रास्ता है।

Dr. Melkote (Raichur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, a poor country that we are, when motions of this type are made before this House and when he says that it is a socialistic pattern of society that we are trying to form here and therefore the difference between the earning capacity of one and another should not exceed the difference between 1 and 10, it causes enthusiasm in the general population. It is hard not to accept such a resolution, but I would like to place before this House the various aspects of this question, because simply placing before us that the difference should not exceed between 1 and 10 is not sufficient to my mind.

Sir, if I remember correctly—I am quoting figures of 1953, possibly there is a lot of difference between then and now—in the European countries—I happened to tour most of the European countries in 1953-55 and in 1959 I happened to visit Bangkok, Rangoon, Australia and some other places—the minimum wage in England was about Rs. 450 per month, in France it was Rs. 600, in Germany it was Rs. 700 and in Sweden and Switzerland it was somewhere about Rs. 750—I am speaking of 1955. In 1959, in Australia the minimum wage payable to any worker was Rs. 650,

and when I made enquiries I was told that hardly any worker got less than Rs. 1000 per month. The general standard of living in those places is so high that an ordinary worker in England possibly lives in a better house, dresses well and eats well than most of the Members of Parliament here. Wherever I went, whether it was a boy or girl, wherever they were working, whether they were cleaning the pavements or white-washing the walls of a house or cleaning a motor-car or working as a porter in a railway station, nobody was educated less than the minimum of matriculation. Whomsoever I met and asked, they said that they had passed their matric. Before entry into any profession they have to be at least 16 years and by the time they pass their matric they get a minimum of Rs. 450—this was in England, whereas in Sweden and Switzerland it was Rs. 750 and in Australia a worker earned not less than Rs. 1000.

The highest amount earned there was not more than Rs. 10000. In many of these places the difference was somewhere about 1 to 10 or 1 to 12. I am given to understand that many of the scientists and others in Russia get as much as 30,000 roubles and the minimum wage structure is between 600 to 800 roubles. There it makes a difference of nearly 1 to 35 or 1 to 40. Even so, the conditions of living are entirely different between the European countries, the democratic countries and the totalitarian countries, because when we consider these aspects of the question we have got to consider what are the things that we have to do if we are to apply this criteria of 1 to 10. This is a problem which we have got to understand very clearly. In Russia the difference is that sales tax is imposed mostly on the commodities that the common man purchases from the market; because, it is the common man that purchases the maximum of commodities, and, therefore, the Government can get the maximum of revenue by imposing

imposing sales tax on the common commodities. Here in India if we impose sales tax on the common commodities, people resent. I am placing the various aspects of the question before the House for consideration.

In England and most of the European countries people enjoy good health, various amenities in the shape of housing, health and general sanitation etc. Then, education is almost free in most of the countries. In England among the students even in the universities more than 70 to 75 per cent get scholarships either from the countries, or from the university itself, or from big donors, or from the factories where their parents happen to be working.

So, it is not merely a question of a ratio of 1:10. We have to see how it impinges on our general existence. What are the amenities that Government is going to give us? What are the taxes that it is going to impose and in what manner do we want them to be made up? If I remember the conditions that existed in India in 1948, the maximum that any of the Secretaries in Government could earn was somewhere about Rs. 2,200 and the minimum was Rs. 30 for a *chaprassi*. Today, even after the revision of salaries by the Second Pay Commission, no official in the Government services gets, generally speaking, more than Rs. 2,200; possibly it is Rs. 1,650, whereas the minimum that a worker used to earn in India has suddenly gone up. An industrial worker in Bombay, Ahmedabad, Calcutta or Madras does not earn less than Rs. 120 a month today.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about the prices?

Dr. Melkote: I am coming to that. I am referring to the various aspects of the question.

The minimum level has gone up like this. We are trying to improve the minimum wage structure, though it has not gone up as much as we desire.

Though the level has not gone up very much, still, sufficient rise in the pay scales has taken place in India. Education is becoming free. More amenities are given in the shape of medical care and housing. At the same time, there is a hue and cry from vested interests, because they do not want this rise to take place in the wages. They complain that the cost of commodities has gone up because we are paying higher wages to the workers in the industrial sector. They do not like the wage structure being revised even for the white-collared workers, as it is bound to have its impact on the workers in the industrial sector. So, they are trying to propagate among the rural population that this kind of rise in wage structure and expenditure by Government on huge salaries to their servants is going to adversely affect the rural sector and that their condition is not being improved. This is a fallacy which has been exploded by Communists long ago. It has been found in all economies where the minimum scales of wages have been raised sufficiently high, to Rs. 600 or 650 or more than that, that the purchasing capacity is increased and, therefore, *pari passu* the village sector is benefited thereby on the condition of the villagers is improved because the price structure of the commodities has gone up. So, this cry of the vested interests that the wage structure in the industrial sector or to the Government servants should not be raised has not much substance.

Merely bringing the ratio down to 1:10 is not sufficient. Of course, it has got to be reduced. But even 1:10 is too big a ratio. I would say that it should be 1:5 or 1:3. Why should this difference exist in a country like India where we want to have the socialist pattern of society, where we want to give free education, public health measures, housing schemes and all that? Why should there be any difference at all? But, even so, in a democratic country like ours as things stand, even if we accept this motion, what would be the difference that would accrue to the poor people?

[Dr. Melkote]

Our national income today has gone up to about Rs. 12,000 crores. If it is distributed among 44 crores of people, the average will work out to only Rs. 300 per person. So, by bringing about this ratio of 1 : 10 the poorer worker is not going to be benefited very much more. But he will feel psychologically that the difference between himself and the top man is not very much different from what exists in other countries which have socialist pattern of society; he will have a feeling that he is getting a fair deal. That is why I said that even this ratio of 1 : 10 is very big and it should be reduced to 1 : 5.

But here I will say that it is not merely a question of bringing about or reducing the ratio to 1 : 10. We must try to give more amenities to the rural sector where the cost of living has gone up nearly four to four and a half times, with the result that the rise in wage structure has not been equal to the rise in price structure. Therefore, bringing about this ratio of 1 : 10 alone is not going to solve the problem. So, I would plead before the House that conditions should be brought about in such a manner that there is not merely a ratio of 1 : 10 but other amenities are also given so that those disparities that exist between the rich and the poor are done away with. If that concept is accepted, I am sure that this House would welcome this proposition. But merely saying the ratio should be 1 : 10 and then imposing more and more sales tax on the poor people and produce the conditions obtaining in Russia is not a very welcome feature for a country like ours. I would, therefore, plead before this House that it should accept my proposition that the difference should be reduced to 1 : 10 or even 1 : 5 and, along with that, better amenities should be given to the poor so that the disparities that are there are levelled down to the minimum.

The Deputy Minister of Finance
(Shri R R Bhagat): Mr. Chairman, I

was very closely following the speech delivered by the hon. Member who spoke last. In a very elucidatory manner he referred to the concept of a more egalitarian society that can be achieved in this country and he appealed to the House that his proposal should be accepted. I was not able to follow fully what he meant. Anyhow, I will bring to his notice, and also to the notice of the other hon. Members, an earlier resolution which this House had accepted on this subject, on 5th May 1956, which reads as follows:—

“This House recommends to the Government to take appropriate measures to reduce the disparity in income prevailing between the different sections of society in the country.”

So far as the principle underlining the present resolution is concerned, that is to say, the reduction of the inequality to the maximum extent, that principle has been accepted by the House and the Government, and in our successive Plans we have emphasized this point. If I understood the hon. Member correctly, he wanted the level or ratio to be brought down to 1:10, or 1:5 or even 1:3. Though it should not be applied rigidly, according to him the objective should be that over a period of time, through following certain measures, either integrated measures of economic development or taxation policy or fiscal policy, the disparity should be brought down to the minimum extent. I would be happy if the disparity is brought down completely to nil, quite apart from bringing it down to 1:5 or 1:3. Hon. Members quoted the salaries or wages in more advanced countries of Europe and stated that it is roughly 1:10 or 1:12 and that the maximum salary was not more than Rs. 10,000.

But the Resolution speaks of income. I can understand that the minimum wage in England or in Sweden or

Switzerland may be in the range of Rs. 600 to Rs. 750. In the U.K. the salary may be Rs. 10,000, but the incomes are larger. So, it is not in the ratio of 1:10 or 1:12.

My point is that the Resolution speaks of a rigid ratio of 1:10 which has not been achieved so far in any country of the world, even in the advanced countries. Rapid economic development has a general tendency of reducing inequalities. Whatever may be the economic or ideological set-up, the very pace of economic development has tended to reduce the inequality in the countries well known as the capitalist countries. In the socialist countries also, particularly in the Soviet Union, this very concept of reducing inequality by way of reducing the salaries has been given up. It is more or less a phenomenon of economic growth in which we have to follow a certain rational or scientific process which arises as a result of the impact of development. We have to bear in mind various considerations. It is not that we follow a certain pattern. It is not that if you reduce the inequality between incomes or in salaries, it is necessarily a step towards socialism. Socialism has become a part and parcel of the way we achieve economic development bringing about the maximum good and the largest opportunity to the people. It is more as a way of economic development of the country than as a way of related incomes or salaries although the latter is true that in any socialist economy whatever inequalities there may be, whether of salaries or of incomes, have to be reduced. But basically they have to go more in conformity with the rapid economic development as also with the ownership and control of all the economic apparatuses of production by the community. But where the introduction of levelling down of incomes or salaries comes in the way of rapid economic development or of various incentives for going towards a very speedy development, it has been given up both in the capitalist coun-

tries and in countries like the Soviet Union.

The hon. Member quoted some figures. I can only emphasise that it is well known that the Soviet Union has followed a policy of incentives so as to lead to greater productivity. For example, the salary differences are quite considerable. It is 1:35 as it has been said. Also, they have found it necessary to make large payments by way of bonuses and other benefits to workers and managers who make a special contribution to production. The idea is that reducing inequalities is not an end in itself. But in the overall march of socialist economy, as they call it, if it is necessary to give certain incentives or if it is necessary to give higher wages or higher salaries to the top classes, they have given them and have given them for good reasons and in the good interest of the march of socialist economy.

In the Soviet Union, as it is well known, these incentive payments must be judged in the light of the fact that progressive direct taxation is particularly unknown there. So, the point is that it is correct to follow the policy which the House has accepted in 1956, namely, that we accept the policy in general terms and the Government must make efforts towards reducing inequalities.

Shri Kalika Singh (Azamgarh): To what extent?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: To any extent. To whatever extent that is possible. We should not commit ourselves to it. If it is possible in the interests of the overall economic development and the bringing in of the socialist transformation of society, as I call it, we will reduce the inequality to zero and not only to 1:5 or 1:10 or whatever it may be. It is a purely pragmatic and practical approach. But if it is not possible, we will maintain that because we cannot do it.

[Dr. B. R. Bhagat]

[SHRI HEDA in the Chair].

That is the practical approach so far as the principle underlying this Resolution is concerned. Any rigid proportion or level will not work. For example, I may try to analyse what it would lead to. If we follow the ratio mentioned in this Resolution, that is, of 1:10 what does it mean in the present context of the economic situation? According to the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee's Report, the annual family income of an agricultural labourer varied between Rs. 319 per year in Orissa to Rs. 755 per year in Assam. If we take the average over the country it may come to about Rs. 500. That is a rough figure and I am using it for calculation. Rs. 500 per year is the minimum income of an agricultural worker, according to the figures that we have today. This Resolution says that there should not be a gap between the maximum and the minimum income of more than ten times. If we have this ratio of 1:10, there should not be any income in the country of more than Rs. 5,000 per year.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (द्वाराबंकी) :

आप इसको बढ़ा दें ।

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I am interpreting the Resolution as it is and am saying how impracticable it is. The Resolution says that there should not be more than ten times difference between the minimum and the maximum. The fixation of the ceiling at Rs. 5,000 per year would mean that the income-tax at the level of Rs. 5,000 would have to be 100 per cent, although it is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent today and in the case of married persons with two or more children it is 0.7 per cent. So, instead of that we will have 100 per cent. I do not know if the House will accept this.

So far as the principle involved in this Resolution is concerned, the

House has already accepted it. The Government is committed to that. We have been following that on the general lines. But the Resolution as it is is impracticable. It cannot be worked and has to be given up in the shape as it is.

Then hon. Member opposite said that the Government has no concept of the socialism that it is following. He said that he has a shirt and can order another shirt meaning thereby that he wants to follow some dogmatic socialism which he has in mind.

Shri Sarju Pandey (Rasra): What is your socialism? Please explain.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I am saying that you would like to follow some socialism the picture of which you have before you, namely, that because you have a shirt you can order a similar shirt. I think by it you meant that you will follow some socialism which is being applied in some other country. I think in the conditions of today in the country that cannot be applied. Even the votaries of socialism who have established socialist economy in other countries have given up the idea that socialism in each country will be of a different form and size.

Shri Sarju Pandey: What is your socialism?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I am coming to our socialism. If he reads through the Third Five-Year Plan which has been circulated to hon. Members of the House, he will have a clear picture of what socialism is and of the picture of socialism that we are going to have. I think the hon. Member has not cared to read it. If he has not read it, he will in any case get an opportunity to discuss it. There he will find a very, very clear picture of socialism. It is in Chapter I, section III—Progress towards Socialism. I will commend him to that.

The real question is this. The correct approach to this problem is what

is outlined in the Third Five-Year Plan. It is on page 16-17 "Disparities in Income", Chapter I, section VI, If hon. Members glance through this short chapter they will find the correct line that we should follow in this respect. I am saying this because every session we have been having this resolution. Although the House has accepted the principle of this, every session we are having this resolution; and sometimes I see the embarrassing picture of Members who have voted against the resolution again coming forward and moving the resolution itself. I think it is better that it should end, because the line indicated in the Third Plan, which I am sure the House will discuss and adopt, gives a very clear perspective as regards the range of disparities or the measure taken towards reducing the same. It says:

"In this connection"—that is, in connection with the question of reducing the disparities in income—it will be recalled that the Taxation Enquiry Commission considered a reasonable range of incomes after tax to be about thirty times the average family income. This broad objective should be progressively realised over the next two or three Plan periods. Although, in view of the low incomes of the bulk of the population, this range represents a considerable disparity, it could be further reduced as lower incomes rise."

So the main question is that disparities arise because our economic growth has been stunted over a period of time. The more advanced the economy the lesser is the disparity, as is evidenced in the advanced economies of Europe and America as also the Soviet Union. Here in our country this has been due to our traditional society, feudalism, marginal farm incomes, the inefficient way of land tenures, inefficiency in our farming or lower agricultural wages, lack of industrialisation, pressure on population—all these aspects of our

797 (A) LSD—10.

traditional society led to high incomes on one side and a vast impoverished population on the other. It was because of our arrested economic growth. This is the basic cause of the inequality. Let us analyse the causes.

Now, when we bring out the society from the traditional stage into a more dynamic or self-sustained growth we have to approach it in a number of ways. And it also creates various problems.

For example, the hon. Member who moved the resolution said that the very fact that the development process has gone on in the last ten years has in some ways increased the disparities in income. That is true. In a transitional period, at some stage there has been a certain increase. For example, like salaries. It has been said that the private sector is paying very high salaries, that Indians in foreign companies are getting less and the foreigners are getting more, and so on. That may be so. But the fact is that most of the foreign personnel in the private sector are imported from outside. In our own public enterprises we are getting foreign experts, paying them very high salaries. The reason is that there is such a shortage of technical personnel that we have to pay them at the level at which they get pay in a particular concern. For instance, in Bhakra Nangal we were paying the Chief Engineer a very high salary. He did the design and execution and the fact was that there was saving in time and in the overall economy it was not very expensive. But the fact that the salary paid was very high cannot be denied. In some cases we have to do it.

Similarly, in our own country today, situated as we are, whether it is the private sector or the public sector, there is such a shortage of technical personnel, scientists, engineers, etc. That is the reason why in the Third Plan we are trying to expand the technical facilities so as to provide 20,000 trained men every year. But till our

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

institutions produce the requisite number of technical personnel there will be greater and greater demand for them. And when there is a great demand for a thing, it acquires scarcity value. That is the reason why for technical and other personnel we have to pay a higher salary; because the private sector pays them and we do not get them. This is a transitional period.

Then there is the impact of development in the rural areas. The income of those who have lands goes up quickly, because we give them fertilizers, irrigation facilities, credit facilities and other things. So their income grows over a short period, and there is a tendency for the incomes disparity to increase. But we have been following all these years, and we are trying to follow in the Third Plan with more speed and with greater care, the method of creating counter-balancing forces so as to decrease the disparity, as for example by co-operative farming or by reducing the size of the land holding. We are criticised, "Why are you attacking land when you are not reducing incomes in urban areas?" That is not the point. The point is that the entire land management is so obsolete and out-moded that unless we take it out of its traditional form we cannot have a progressive farming economy. And that is why land ceiling is a measure in the right direction, the object being to increase the per-acre production. As it is, either it is a capitalist system or it is the management of big firms or it is absentee management by the land-holding people. But if we divide the land through co-operative management or through small holdings we encourage them to take to modern farming so that the per acre production increases. If a man having a small holding has double the production per acre, the income will not go down. So by land ceiling it is not as if we want to reduce the income in the rural areas, but we want them to take to modern

farming. And the future of agriculture lies there.

In the urban sector we have the fast growing public sector which grows every day. We have the co-operative sector. And by speedy economic development, and also by counteracting the reactionary forces which during the transitional period of economic development tend to increase the disparity, by progressive measures of taxation, by reducing the income at higher brackets, by various other processes such as our direct tax, capital gains tax, expenditure tax, wealth tax, by all these processes we are trying to gear the machinery so as to pull down the higher income; not so much as to break all incentive, but our aim during the past ten years has been, and during the Third and Fourth Plans will be, to increase the lowest income, whether it is the income of the farmers, the small farmers, or agricultural labour or industrial labour, or the middle classes. Wherever it may be, it has to be raised.

That is the only way by which we can reduce the disparity in income, and that is the only way by which we can bring about socialism. Because, socialism, as I said, is not merely a question of reducing income; we may reduce income. But that would be, as is well known, distribution of poverty. Unless we develop fast and create all the sinews of rapid development and distribution, it is of no use. Social ownership is such that there is maximum opportunity for the people, either in the way of universal education, training of a large number of technical personnel, percolating down the lower and lower classes; and we have a modern agriculture and a strong and growing public sector.

Through all these integrated measures of economic development we will be able to reduce income; that is by increasing the lower incomes to such an extent that the disparity will

be less and less. And I hope it may be not one to ten, but one to five or one to three, as the hon. Member has said. With these words I oppose this Resolution in the form as it is.

Shri Kalika Singh: Sir, the purpose of my Resolution has been largely achieved, because the discussion that has taken place in the House has given an opportunity to the Government to reiterate its policy regarding disparities in income.

Some Hon. Members: Don't withdraw.

Shri Kalika Singh: In my Resolution, I had put in as the objective that the disparity should not be beyond 1:10. The Minister, in his speech, has said that he would be very glad if the disparity is reduced to 5, or 3 and even to zero. After that assurance on behalf of the Government that the aim of the Government ultimately is to have a socialist pattern of society in India in which the disparity would be reduced even to the minimum, to zero, I think it would be wrong on my part to insist that the disparity should not be below 1:10. On the 28th of April, 1961, when I moved the Resolution, I moved it with a view to impress upon the Planning Commission which was then formulating its policy regarding this disparity in incomes to come to some definite view about this. In the First Five Year Plan, this subject of disparity or reduction of inequality in incomes had not been touched at all. In the Second Five Year Plan, this was put in as one of the four objectives. But, in the Third Five Year Plan, which is before us, there is a full chapter about it. I am glad that the Third Five Year Plan says that the essential problem here is to reduce the spread between the higher and the lower incomes and to raise the level of the minimum. I also said that my aim is not so much to put a ceiling on incomes, because there are only 1847 persons in the whole of India who have an income

of over Rs. 50,000, but my aim is to impress on the Government that they should look to the foundational structure of the socialist society, the great labour force. I think the labour force in India must be about 20 crores; it is about 45 per cent or 50 per cent or nearabout that. When we have got such a large labour force, we have to look to the foundational structure, that is we should look to the floor rather than to the ceiling. We should fix a proper floor and try to raise the income of the masses, and that should be the aim of the Government also. There are opposition parties here in India. They just try to propagate that we should aim at the ceiling only and bring somebody down. But, they would not look to the foundational structure of the masses as a whole. Now, the Minister has said that he is also more emphatic about the foundational structure, about raising the level of the income from below. With that assurance, I think it would not be quite proper to insist upon passing this Resolution that the gap should be 1:10, because the spirit of the Resolution has been understood by the Government and the Government has also laid down a policy about it. Therefore, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my Resolution.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

RESOLUTION RE: BAN ON EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED GOVERNMENT SERVANTS

श्री अर्जुन सिंह भदौरिया (इटावा) :
सभापति महोदय, मैं जिस संकल्प या प्रस्ताव को सदन में उपस्थित कर रहा हूँ वह बिल्कुल ही निर्दोष और पवित्र है। संकल्प की भाषा इस प्रकार है :—

“इस सभा की राय है कि सरकार को सेवा से मुक्त या निवृत्त सरकारी कर्मचारियों के किसी भी सरकारी या गैर सरकारी नौकरी या सेवा में