

श्री जगजीवन राम : वह तो आपको परिश्रम करना पड़े, इसलिए बताना उचित नहीं है। श्री दिल किशोर सिंह उस बात को समझ गये हैं इसलिए वह भीतर ही मुस्करा रहे हैं। लेकिन मैं कहूंगा कि जो कोई भी आपके इस भाषण को पढ़ेगा वह समझ जायगा कि तथ्य को आपने कहां तक नहीं प्रकाशित करने का जतन किया है। अब फिर रेडियो और टेलीविजन के संबंध में इतना ही कहूंगा कि माननीय मित्र ने जो कुछ कहा है, उसको बहुत अधिक अतिरंजित करके कहने का प्रयत्न किया है और विरोधी पक्ष इस तरह से अतिरंजित करके कहें तो उसका बहुत बुरा मानने की जरूरत नहीं होती है, उनका काम ही होता है सरकार को जहां तक इम्बारास किया जा सके, किया जाये। लेकिन इम्बारास करने की एक सीमा होती है इतना मैं उनसे कहना चाहूंगा।

यहां सभी विषयों पर कहना आवश्यक नहीं है लेकिन मैं पुस्तकों के विषय में कहना उचित समझता हूं। सरकार बिल्कुल सदन के हाथ में है, सदन का जो निर्णय होगा वही हम करेंगे।

श्री उपसभापति : श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर।

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर (बिहार) : अब लंच के बाद ही करेंगे।

श्री उपसभापति : थोड़ा सा समय बाकी है अभी, आप समाप्त कर दीजिए। अगर आप नहीं बोलना चाहते हैं तो श्री रंगा ...

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, here is a Resolution —

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर : श्रीमन, मैं एक मिनट लूंगा।

श्री उपसभापति : यही मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूं। आप जल्दी कीजिए और एक वजे से पहले समाप्त कर दीजिए।

RESOLUTION RE. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL AREAS AND REMOVAL OF POVERTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE COUNTRY—contd.

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर (बिहार) : श्री रेड्डी साहब के प्रस्ताव पर, (Interruptions) मैं कहना चाहता था कि पिछड़े क्षेत्रों के संबंध में, अब पुराने विषयों को आप जाने या न जाने कोई आने जाने वाला नहीं है, यह जो सरकार आयी है अगर यह कुछ नये कार्यक्रम लेकर आयी हो तो आज जो गांव में या देश में जहां कहीं पिछड़ापन है और उन पिछड़े क्षेत्रों का सर्वेक्षण भी पिछली सरकार ने किया था, योजना कमीशन के पास डाटा भी मौजूद हैं, उन क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिए इस सरकार को काम करना चाहिए। रेड्डी साहब ने भी जैसा कि अभी इस संबंध में कहा था। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि जैसे अपने उत्तरी बिहार को लें वहां कई समस्याएं हैं जैसे रेलवे लाइन के रेस्टोरेशन का सवाल है फिर चाहे वह पगहा, छितौनी की लाइन हो, निर्मली भटिया की हो या हाडगेज के बनाने की हो अथवा वह नटरल रोड जो बरेली से अभीन गांव तक आती है। यह सड़क 12 आने काम होने के बाद भी दरभंगा के बीच में पड़ी हुई है। इसी प्रकार से कारखाने हैं अर्थात् गांवों में विकास का काम जिस अनुपात में होना चाहिए वह नहीं हो पाया है और साधन वहां तक नहीं पहुंच सके हैं—अतः मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि योजना कमीशन—प्रधान मंत्री तो यहां हैं नहीं—और सरकार इन समस्याओं पर विशेष रूप से ध्यान दे इनकी प्रगति के लिए।

इसके अलावा उपसभापति जी, आज सबसे बड़ी समस्या आती है महिलाओं के लिए। आप गांव में जाये, एक से एक बढ़कर गांव हैं। पानी की समस्या जो है सो है पर पाखाना फिरते के लिए तो किसी भी सरकार का शायद ध्यान अभी तक पता नहीं गया या

[श्री गुगानन्द ठाकुर]

नहीं कि औरतों को कितना कष्ट होता है। वे समय पर बायरूम नहीं जा सकतीं। कहीं पर भी बायरूम एवं यूरिनल की व्यवस्था नहीं है। पिछड़े क्षेत्रों में, देहाती क्षेत्रों में बीमारी फैलने का एक प्रमुख कारण यह भी है। अगर इस ओर सरकार ध्यान दे, योजना कमीशन ध्यान दे तो बहुत बड़ा कल्याण होगा। बेकारी और गरीबी इस देश की एक कहानी हो गयी है। एक फैशन बन गया है जो आये उस पर भाषण कर दे, लेकिन उस को मिटाने के लिये, उस को जड़ से दूर करने के लिए, खत्म करने के लिये क्या करना चाहिए इस संबंध में हम इस सरकार से क्या उम्मीद करें। इस सरकार की क्या नीति है? यह सरकार किवर जाना चाहती है। प्रस्तावक महोदय को कड़वा अनुभव है। वे अभी हाल ही में उस जमात के साथ जा कर मिले हैं। कहां तक गाड़ी बढ़ सकेगी इस को वह अच्छी तरह से समझ सकते हैं। लेकिन अगर रेड्डी साहब जो पुराने समाजवादी रहे हैं अगर इस सरकार से थोड़ा काम भी करवा सके, इस प्रतिक्रियावादी सरोर सरकार से कुछ करवा सके तो देश का और गरीबों का उस से बड़ा कल्याण होगा और खास कर इसलिये कि यह देश गांवों में बसता है और लोगों की जिन्दगी खेती पर ही निर्भर है। उस के लिये तो बाबूजी को भी कहना पड़ा कि हरिजनों पर अत्याचार पहले से अधिक बढ़ गये हैं। आज उन की जमीनें छीनी जा रही है, उन पर जुल्म हो रहे हैं। अगर वह इन को ही थोड़ा बहुत रकवा सके इस सरकार के द्वारा तो मैं समझता हूं कि रेड्डी साहब के इस प्रस्ताव में कुछ जान आ सकेगी। मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता, रंगा साहब बोलने वाले हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि उन का जो प्रस्ताव आया है उस में राजनीतिक बातों को छोड़ कर जो मूल बातें हैं, जो प्रगति की बातें हैं जो देश के विकास के संबंध में बातें हैं और जो गरीब और कुचले हुए लोगों को उठाने के बारे में बातें हैं उन पर ध्यान

दिया जाये और योजना कमीशन अगर रेड्डी साहब के प्रस्ताव के हिसाब से काम को आगे बढ़ा सके तो देश का और समाज का थोड़ा कल्याण होगा। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं प्रस्तावक महोदय से कहूंगा कि आप इस प्रस्ताव में राजनीतिक बातों को छोड़ें। आर्थिक विकास और देश की प्रगति के संबंध में जो सुझाव आप ने दिये हैं, गरीबी और बेकारी को मिटाने के लिये जो सुझाव दिये हैं उन पर सरकार से अमल करावें। मैं इस में प्रस्तावक महोदय के साथ हूं और उन को मेरा पूरा समर्थन है इन प्रश्नों के बारे में और मैं आशा करता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जो और खासकर योजना कमीशन इस संबंध में गंभीरता से विचार करेंगे और पिछड़े और दबे और कुचले लोगों के और पिछड़े प्रदेशों और क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिये यह सरकार अगर कुछ काम कर सकेगी तो कम से कम इस मुल्क के गरीबों और दबे पिछड़े और कुचले लोगों में जो एक भावना आ गयी है कि यह बड़े लोगों की सरकार है वह भावना दूर हो सकेगी। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्री उपसभापति : सदन की कार्यवाही ढाई बजे तक स्थगित की जाती है।

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-eight minutes past twelve of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI N. G. RANGA: (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. I would like the House to look at this Resolution and the amendment suggested thereto from an all-party point of view or in a non-partisan manner because we should consider how much

of it is agreeable to everybody. Only one or two aspects of it in the preamble may be taken objection to by some because it may sound in some way as criticism of what has happened till now. I am sure my hon. friend, Shri R. Narasimha Reddy, would have no objection to drop that portion and even the contents by simply saying:

"Having regard to the fact that planning so far has resulted in. . . (the various items mentioned in the Resolution."

Nobody can take objection to the statement:

"rich becoming richer and the poor, poorer."

And also the statement:

"abnormal growth of cities at the expense of rural areas forcing people to migrate to cities in search of work"

it is also not objectionable. As regards the statement:

"increase at alarming rate in unemployment and destitution at the end of each Five Year Plan".

it has also been admitted at every stage by the planners. Then he says:

"...this House is of opinion that for the economic development of rural areas and removal, of poverty and unemployment in the country, Government should take the following steps namely...."

And he details eight items. My hon. friend, Mr. Patil, has suggested a ninth item, namely:

"... ensure remunerative price for each major agricultural produce having regard *inter alia* to the cost of production including minimum wages to be paid to the agricultural labour under any law and such other relevant factors relating thereto."

Sir, so far as all these nine items are concerned, I say that all in this

House would agree to accept them. Therefore, I congratulate my friend, Mr. Narasimha Reddy, one of the brilliant alumni of the Indian Peasant Institute and also of the Madras University, for having had the good luck to get this Resolution admitted in the ballot and move it as a non-official resolution. It is quite possible that if it had been moved from the official benches, the usual party way of considering it would have prevailed and some damage would have been done to the main objective behind this Resolution. Fortunately it has been moved as a non-official resolution and I am glad that it has been framed in such a way—except for those small alterations that I have suggested—that it is agreeable to all sections. But at the same time, I would like to make one more small suggestion to my friend. I hope he would not be unwilling to accept it. When he details all these things, he says, "Government should take the following steps". It should not be an all inclusive list. It should be an open one. Therefore, if he is agreeable to changing it as "----- the following steps, among others, namely -----", then I am sure there would be no difficulty.

Sir, the Resolution reads well, as I said. Twenty-five years ago when the First Five-Year Plan was being drafted, it also read very well. The principles underlying it were agreed to by all people like me. I thought that what I felt should be done for the rural people and agriculturists was being incorporated in it and I congratulated myself and went and told all our ruralities that we could thereafter expect a fair deal from the Swaraj Government. But we know what has happened. Planning means priorities, and priorities would have to change from time to time. It so happened that by the time we had reached the Second Five-Year Plan, higher priorities came to be given to large-scale industries. This resulted, as we have said here, in the rich becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer. This we wanted to

[Shri N. G. Ranga.] change but we could not succeed. Now, at long last, here is a Government, the Janata Government which comes forward and says that it is prepared to turn the wheel in the direction of the rural area, rural India, rural people, kisans and mazdoors. We welcome it. It can be said, and it has been said, by those friends who have been implementing these Plans that they have also been thinking about it, that they have also been doing it. Nobody objects to that. They have done quite a lot. My hon. friend, Mr. C. Subramaniam, former Minister of Finance, said that the Congress Government had also reached almost the figure of 40 per cent of the total Plan expenditure in regard to the rural areas. It is true. But is that enough? In actual practice, it has not been enough. Therefore, I would like the Janata Party now not simply to be content with saying "We are going to devote 40 per cent". I would like them to give an assurance to the House, now if possible, otherwise later, that their minimum would be 40 per cent so far as rural people and rural areas are concerned. I hope they would be able to do it. But would that be enough? It would not be enough.

In the light of the past experience, it is not enough to have merely liberal professions, radical professions. The most important thing is that the Government of the day, whatever it may be, whatever may be its political colour, should be keen on implementing those professions. In the past I was not satisfied with the way in which, so far as our rural people are concerned, whatever we accepted at the beginning of the Plan regime was implemented. I was not satisfied with it. I hope the same would not be the fate of these professions also from the side of this Janata Government. Therefore, I am glad that today we have as a guarantor for these professions not only the Janata Government but also the Congress Party. Both parties would be standing by it and I hope that those in power—the Congress is in power in some of the States and the Con-

gress is here in Opposition—and the Opposition, both of them would see to it go on controlling each other, supervising each other scrutinising each other, in order to see that the rural people would not continue to have the kind of raw deal which they had hitherto. I trust they would certainly have a chance for progress, real progress and quick progress to. I only wish my honourable friend had had an opportunity to consult us about the manner in which the problem should be approached—it should be the manner in which I am approaching it, a non-party manner, an all-party manner—and I would certainly have suggested to him the inclusion of the need for protecting and promoting the interests of the self-employed sector which is the most important sector in this country. Most people are obsessed with the idea that there is a capitalist sector, that there is a State sector or a nationalised sector. More important than either of these two is the self-employed sector. From out of these self-employed people as well as artisans and other people also, from out of these industrial workers and rural workers, we should be able to develop cooperative sector. And that is the reason why some 10, 15 years ago the Congress thought of establishing in this country a cooperative commonwealth. But they gave it a go-by. But the cooperative sector has come into existence thanks to the spirit of enterprise of our peasants. You go anywhere you like. In Maharashtra there is that glorious growing cooperative sugar factory sector. So is the case with Andhra and Punjab. Unfortunately UP and Bihar are lagging far behind. I would like them to be developed soon. This also will have to be taken into consideration by the Government as well as the Congress Party when they develop their new attitude towards planning.

Then, in addition to that priority has to be given to rural housing. So many crores of rupees have been spent on developing urban housing.

subsidising it from the municipalities, from the various corporations like the LIC, and even the banks. But what about the rural areas? Some thought was given to it when Mr. Dikshit was the Minister. Afterwards we thought that they would develop it. But so far very little has been done. I want rural housing to be given the highest possible priority. Not just a hundred crores of rupees but several hundred crores of rupees should be placed at its disposal. I am sure agricultural workers would be willing to cooperate with the Government in making their own contribution by way of labour or what you call part-time labour or partly paid labour. Let the Government come forward with building materials, with concrete, with bricks and bams and various other things, and in that way help the rural people to have decent enough houses; small houses but nevertheless they should be decent. In Madras the DMR and the ADMK are doing good work by developing multistoreyed buildings, houses for industrial labour. I hope that they would turn their attention to the rural labour also. In Malabar they have built more than one lakh of houses for rural labour. Let the present Government and the Congress also pay special attention to this particular aspect of it so that rural labour would not have to continue to suffer as they have hitherto been suffering in an inhuman manner. Then there are rural sanitation, rural education, rural health and rural water supply. All these have been neglected. They have got to be developed too. There are the Harijans and other backward classes. Some friend has asked me: Should we not insist upon, the Janata Government implementing the ceiling? We need not because the law has already been passed and it is being implemented. It is a matter of time—may be one or two years. If the Janata Government is sensible enough and wise enough to accept the Andhra Pradesh Government's suggestion that the State Government should be allowed to pay more economic compensation.

1523 RS—5.

then the implementation can be speeded up in no time. I do not think this should be a hurdle at all because the ceiling is there and it is being implemented and has got to be implemented. We shall see as a responsible opposition that the Janata Government will be kept on its toes in regard to this matter.

In regard to rural housing, I want to ask: Should We continue to have this Pakistani thing—separate housing for Harijans and backward classes? Should we not have a cosmopolitan housing scheme where the poor, the homeless belonging to Harijans and non-Harijans can have their small houses? Let us not have this social leprosy or social distress any more. We have had enough of sufferings on that score. Some friend asked: Why should we have an infra-structure for education specially for rural areas? Mahatma Gandhi also thought about it. He said that there should be a rural bias given to our education. Similarly, he thought about a special infra-structure for rural industries and under his guidance Shri Kumarappa started the All India Village Industries Organisation. A lot of research work has got to be done in this field. Take our cobblers. Take our weavers or take, for instance, **our** brassware workers. They all need better and modern implements. In order to manufacture these implements, we need medium-scale industries. Therefore, that infra-structure is necessary. Then machines for the medium-scale industries are needed for which you need large-scale industries. Therefore, there need not be any quarrel between the 'Nehruiites' and the 'Gandhinities' or between the 'urbanities' and 'ruralites'. Let the 'urbanites' concentrate on their large-scale industries. We need them. Let the 'Nehruiites' go on developing more and more of these huge, large-scale industries. We need them. But who is to manage them, govern them and control them? That is another problem into which I need not go just now. We need medium-scale industries from which we can get our fertilizers,

[Shri N. G. Ranga.]

manures, pesticides and tractors and spares. All these are needed by our kisans and villagers. The quarrel comes only when the question of priority comes. These large-scale industry wallas had their day. The 'karorpathis' had their day. They have made or earned enough. Should we not see that in the next ten years our attention should be turned to the rural India, to the neglected people there so that they are enabled to keep pace with others or are brought up to a certain level? How can we do it? Unless you have crop insurance, unless you have unemployment insurance and unless you have cattle insurance, how can you do it? We had sent our delegate to the social security conference held by I.L.O. in Norway. He has submitted his report a copy of which has been circulated to us today. That conference also has laid stress on crop insurance. It is as necessary as health insurance, unemployment insurance or the so-called social security insurance which is being provided to the industrial labour. Now, in all these directions we have to plough back our money. Therefore, I would appeal to the Government and also to others and to my own party to see that we all combine in doing our very best and, if necessary, in asking the other sectors to wait for some time and to be content with whatever they have had already and be ready to plough back all their savings into those sectors and go on developing them, but not to depend upon the Government for their future progress. I would also appeal to them to encourage the Government, incite the Government and force the Government to spare the maximum of their resources for the development, for the protection and for the well-being of the rural people of this country.

With these words, Sir, I support this Resolution with this amendment. Thank you.

SHRI GOVINDRAO RAMCHANDRA MHAISEKAR (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support

this Resolution that is being debated today in the House.

Sir, this is a Resolution which is concerned with the basic approach to the planning process in this country and this Resolution, in all its aspects, is a very healthy one and it is a healthy approach in that it is guiding and directing and reorienting the planning process in this country in a balanced manner in order to see that the rural economy of this country which has suffered although the national economy has developed itself, takes its due share in the new planning policy of the Government.

Sir, the national income in this country has increased and there is no doubt about that. But the emphasis of this Resolution is on having a new orientation towards rural development, integrated rural development, because we all know that seventy per cent of our population lives on agriculture and other secondary occupations. Not only this. The nation's economy draws 50 per cent of its income from agriculture

and the other secondary occupations. Sir, there are 7.05 crores of operational holdings in this country and naturally, Sir, this means that there are 7.05 crores of families the mainstay of whom is nothing but agriculture?. Though there has been a stockpiling of 21 million tonnes of foodgrains in this country, there is no guarantee of a surplus production in the future with a steady growth of agricultural production. But this does not mean that there is no potentiality and that the future is very dark or bleak because it is a fact that the optimum potential has not been tapped in the last four or five Plans of this country. Sir, the different allocations made in the different Plans for agriculture and the allied sector can be seen from the figures which I would like to quote.

Agriculture got

in the First Plan	.	.	14.8	per cent
in the Second Plan	.	.	11.7	„
in the Third Plan	.	.	13.7	„
in the Fourth Plan	.	.	15.00	„

Then, Sir, irrigation, because it contributes to agriculture, got—

in the First Plan	.	.	22.2	per cent
in the Second Plan	..		9.2	„
in the Third Plan	..		7.8	„
in the Fourth Plan	..		8.1	„

village and small industries got—

in the First Plan			2.1	Per cent
in the Second Plan	..		4.1	„
in the Third Plan	..		2.8	
in the Fourth Plan	..		1.6	„

Thus, Sir, we see that the sum total of this in the First Plan, is 39 per cent and, unfortunately, thereafter, this percentage has been decreasing. It was 25 per cent in the Second Plan, 23.3 per cent in the Third Plan and 24.7 per cent in the Fourth. Now, in this year, that is, 1977-73, we have decided to spend 30.7 per cent on agriculture. What is the result of all this? Today, we have got hardly 45 million hectares of irrigated land out of a total of 152 million hectares which are cultivable. Thus it comes to 21 per cent of irrigated land and there is a big responsibility, I would say that there is a herculean task ahead, in the matter of providing assured irrigation to a large part of the arable land in this country. Sir, even in the sector of power, the picture of rural electrification has been very slow. The percentage of villages electrified till today is 41 per cent if the Fifth Plan target is achieved. The number of pumping sets will cross 3.7 million if the target set is achieved.

What is the position of power pumps? The per unit land consumption of power in India is relatively very low. It is 0.4 HP as against 5.0 HP of Japan and as against 2 to 4 HP of many

European countries, which are also agriculturally advanced. There have been damaging shut-downs at the very peak hours of crops when water was badly needed by the farmers for the crops that are standing in the fields. Our energy requirement in 1979 is estimated at 130,000 MKWH, which means a generation of 30 million KW. With the seasonal variations in hydel projects, this is an unattainable target. We will have to find out alternative sources of energy which will have to be tapped to the maximum in order to relieve the burden on our electrical power.

Sir, even in the sector of roads, the share of the rural areas has been below the mark. The fact that we are now thinking of a Rural Road Construction Corporation and Rural Road Commission is a proof that we have not paid sufficient attention to the construction of rural roads which are nothing but a part and parcel of the infrastructures for the development of the rural areas.

Sir, social service facilities have been at the lowest. Pre-primary education is out of question. It is from here that

[Shri Govindrao Ramchandra
Mhaisekar.]

a rural area boy and girl continue to be deficient in their knowledge, and yet they do not get this facility, because of which deficiency becomes chronic in their education throughout their life. Compulsory primary education is still to be achieved. Secondary education is of a neglected order. The same can be said about primary needs of health and the primary needs in other sectors. Recently, I have had occasion to put an unstarred question in this House when I was told that the Maharashtra Housing Board, out of a provision of Rs. 10.6 crores, would only spend Rs. 26 lakhs for rural housing. This shows how social services have been completely out of question for the rural areas in this country.

Sir, there was a great debate on 'banking' yesterday in this House. There is no dispute about nationalisation of banks. I totally support it. But the fact is that mere nationalisation from 1969 has not helped solve the problem of rural credit. There has been an apparent sixfold increase in the lendings of the 14 banks, after 1969. But the share of the rural sector has gone up from 15 to 25 per cent from 1969 to 1976—only 10 per cent rise in their lendings in spite of all the attempts. This is the picture. A survey has been carried out in Maharashtra by the Reserve Bank of India and it has been found that lead banks have not been able to give leadership in their respective districts, so far as rural credit facilities to farmers and to new entrepreneurs who come out of rural areas, are concerned. 3 P.M.

Sir, why has this happened? What is the result of all this? There is an imbalance in our national economy. Our national economy is today divided clearly by an imbalance. On the one side is the under-developed rural economy and on the other side our different sectors of national economy which have developed in galloping-manner. Hence we find this imbalance

there. Industries got concentrated in the cities. Even processing agriculture industries were located in the peripheral areas of the cities. What is the result? The result is unemployment and under-employment in the rural areas, attraction of these people for the cities and urbanisation. Now, urbanisation at what cost? One industrial worker costs Rs. 12000/- for the facilities to be created for him in the urban area. Besides this, we require investment to provide him job in the urban areas. This is something which one is unable to understand and this is something which should make us see that urbanisation should not be encouraged in this country.

Sir, this policy of orienting trade, commerce and industries towards the cities was the policy of the foreigners. They did their export and import through the cities without having any system of communication for the distribution of the fruits of these in the rural areas. This system continued. Naturally, in consequence of this, all railway line, national highways and State highways got connected with the cities and the problem of urbanisation became much more acute. This policy got extended *for* the last 30 years to mofussil areas and mofussil towns. They have not reached the villages. Therefore, the invert pyramid of planning will have to be understood correctly. It has been there knowingly and unknowingly, knowingly for the bureaucrats and the elite who are interested in the development of the urban areas and unknowingly for the poorer sections of the society which live in villages. I can cite a few examples of this invert pyramid. 36 per cent of the education budget for 1952 was earmarked for primary education. It came down to 26 per cent in 1972. The budget meant for higher education went up to 26 per cent from 19 per cent in 1972. What is this? This is a clear example of an invert pyramid of planning. The gap between the under-developed areas and developed areas is ever increasing. This has been accepted even in the fiscal policy

statement of our hon. Finance Minister. This is happening because there has been no serious thought given to 'balanced planning in order to see that all the sectors in the development of an economy maintain a real position among themselves. (*Time bell rings*). I will conclude in a minute. The policy of exporting at the cost of the consumers is because the purchasing capacity of the rural areas has not gone up and indigenous demand has not increased. Today, we are exporting resources and importing inflation. It is because of this that we require a revision of planning based on integrated rural development policy which will be based on factors and functions advancing and promoting the growth of agriculture in all its aspects and also envisaging the participation of the poorest and weakest sections in it to share the consequential benefits. It is from this point of view that I propose that a few tenets should be added to the resolution. This new policy should be based on more harvesting of water, high-yielding seeds and seedling in sufficient quantities, promotion of inputs, marketing facilities, promotion of infra-structural facilities, diffusion of all kinds of industries in rural areas, progress and development of allied sectors, strengthening and enlarging the scope of Small Farmers Development Agencies and Marginal Farmers Development Agencies and other agro-industries corporations, providing more social services to the rural areas in an intensified and extensive manner, etc. With these words, I commend the resolution to the House.

श्री देवराव पाटील (महाराष्ट्र) :

माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, मेरे मित्र श्री आर० नरसिंह रेड्डी ने जो संकल्प उपस्थित किया है उस में उन्होंने कारण और उद्देश्य दिये हैं। कारणों में उन्होंने कहा है कि चूंकि देश के ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के आर्थिक विकास को यथोचित महत्व नहीं दिया गया है इस के परिणामस्वरूप अमीर और अमीर हो गये हैं और गरीब और गरीब हो गये हैं, नगरों का विस्तार हुआ है और बेरोजगारी बढ़ी है।

और भी कई परिणाम दिये हैं। जायद कारणों में किसी को मतभेद हो सकता है क्योंकि 30 वर्ष जो लिखा हुआ है उस पर मतभेद हो सकता है, लेकिन जो आब्जेक्ट है रेजोल्यूशन का, जो इस का उद्देश्य है उस में किसी को मतभेद नहीं हो सकता क्योंकि रेजोल्यूशन का उद्देश्य है ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के आर्थिक विकास को यथोचित महत्व देना और देश से गरीबी और बेरोजगारी को दूर करना और उस के लिये उन्होंने अपने कुछ सुझाव दिये हैं। इस के बारे में किसी को मतभेद नहीं हो सकता और इस लिये मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

उपसभापति जी, ग्रामीण अर्थ व्यवस्था को सुधारने के लिये संकल्प में कुछ सुझाव उन्होंने दिये और उन में आखिर में कुछ कृषि विकास के बारे में हैं। कृषि उत्पादन में सहायता कार्य के लिये कुछ कदम उन्होंने सुझाये हैं। उन में मेरा सुझाव है कि अगर कृषि का विकास करना है और उस का उत्पादन बढ़ाना है तो जो कुछ इनपुट्स उन्होंने सुझाये हैं उन में एक महत्व का इनपुट प्राइस का रहता है और इस लिये मैंने कहा कि किसानों को अपने उत्पादन का उचित मूल्य मिलना चाहिए। मूल्य नीति के बारे में कृषि के लिये लाभकारी कीमत होनी चाहिए इस के बारे में कोई दो रायें नहीं हैं। सरकार ने पहले ही रिम्यूनरेटिव प्राइस की पालिसी मान ली है और अभी भी इस के बारे में हमारा जो पहला अधिवेशन हुआ है दोनों सदनों का, राज्य सभा और लोक सभा का, उस में 28 मार्च 1977 को हमारे उपराष्ट्रपति जी ने, राष्ट्रपति के नाते जो प्रथम भाषण दिया उस के पेज 3 पर उन्होंने कहा है 'कृषि के लिये लाभकारी मूल्य नीति किसानों को अपने उत्पादन का उचित मूल्य नहीं मिला' स्पष्ट कहा है उन्होंने और यह भाषण सरकार ने तैयार किया है। उस में उन्होंने माना है कि किसानों को अपने उत्पादन का उचित मूल्य नहीं मिला। इस निष्कर्ष पर सरकार पहुंच गयी है और हमारे सब से बड़े नेता राष्ट्रपति जी ने इस बात को अपने भाषण

[श्री देवराव पाटल]

मैं कहा हूँ। उपसभापति जी, मैंने जो रेजोल्यूशन दिया उस में मैंने खेतिहर मजदूरों का भी जिक्र किया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि खेती के विकास के लिये केवल कृषकों का ही विकास काफी नहीं होता, क्योंकि गांवों में कृषक भी रहते हैं, खेत मजदूर भी रहते हैं और ग्रामीण आर्टिजन्स भी रहते हैं। इन सभी का विकास कृषि का विकास है। खेतिहर मजदूर जो हैं उन को भी लाभकारी बेज मिलना चाहिए। जो संकल्प है वह सर्वश्रेष्ठ आदि रुरल पुअर के संबंध में हैं और इस लिये देश के महान नेता इस बारे में क्या कहते हैं यह भी मैं बताना चाहता हूँ जिस से प्रश्न की गंभीरता योजना आयोग और सरकार दोनों के सामने स्पष्ट हो जाये। देश के राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी ने यह कहा है :

"Our salvation can only come through the farmers. Farmers and workers make India. Their party is Indians and their prosperity alone can make India a country fit to live in."

यह महात्मा जी ने कहा है। हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में जब वह राष्ट्रपति का कार्यभार संभालने के अवसर पर 25 जुलाई, 1977 को अपने अभिभाषण के पेज 2 पर कहते हैं—

‘भारत सचमुच गांवों में रहता है। हमारी प्रगति का लाभ ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में रहने वाले जरूरतमन्द लोगों तक पहुंचना चाहिए।’ जो पहला भाषण राष्ट्रपति का हुआ उसमें उन्होंने यह कहा था कि कृषि तथा संबंधित विकास के लिए विनियोजन बहुत ही आवश्यक है। मैं इसलिए कहता हूँ कि इससे इस प्रश्न की गंभीरता का, इस प्रश्न के महत्व का और इसकी तरफ आयोजन का ध्यान देने की कितनी जरूरत है, इसलिए मैंने इसका उल्लेख किया। यह सब इसलिए कि हमारे किसान और ग्रामीण जीवन से ये जो नेता परिचित थे इसलिए ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की समस्याओं का अधिक से अधिक ध्यान देने के बारे में उन्होंने कहा।

यही इरादा हमारे माननीय सदस्य का है जिसने यह संकल्प प्रस्तुत किया है।

आज के गांवों की स्थिति क्या है, इसके बारे में मैं नहीं जानता। मैंने काफी इंफार्मेशन इसके बारे में इकट्ठी की है। गरीबी की लाइन के नीचे आने वाले लोगों की संख्या, पर-कैपिटा इनकम, पर-कैपिटा कंजम्पशन और रुरल इंप्लायमेंट तथा ग्रैंडर-इंप्लायमेंट के बारे में जो इंफार्मेशन है उससे इस प्रश्न की गंभीरता का पता चलता है जिस पर पहले ध्यान देना चाहिए। जो देश का सर्वोत्तम है, आर्थिक सर्वोत्तम है, उसके अनुसार पेज 6 पर उन्होंने कहा है :

“योजना-बद्ध विकास के बावजूद 72 प्रतिशत जनता के जो किसान हैं, औसत प्रतिशत प्रति व्यक्ति आय इस अवधि में 197.70 रुपये से घटकर 197.50 रुपये हो गई है और गरीबी से फंसी जनता का प्रतिशत 39 से बढ़कर 47.5 हो गया है।”

मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि 5 साल की प्लानिंग करने के बाद यह क्या हुआ। जैसे प्रस्तावक महोदय ने कहा है, गलत कार्यान्वयन हुआ है। देश की 30 प्रतिशत जनता का ध्यान रखते हुए, उसका संरक्षण करने के लिए उसको सुविधा देने के लिए हमारा प्लानिंग बना और 70 प्रतिशत के लिए, उसकी तरफ पूरा ध्यान नहीं दिया है और ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के आर्थिक विकास को सर्वोत्तम महत्व नहीं दिया गया है।

दूसरी बात यह हुई कि ग्रामीण और शहरी लोगों में भेदभाव की नीति अपनाई गई। जो मूल सेवा देने का सवाल है, कोई भी रोड-कंस्ट्रक्शन का काम हो, डिस्पेंसरी देनी हो, कोई स्कूल बिल्डिंग देनी हो, वहां पब्लिक कंस्ट्रक्शन किया जाता है।

पीने के पानी की सुविधा देनी हो तो पब्लिक कंटीव्यूशन किया जाता है, लोगों से पैसा मांगा जाता है ग्रामीण लोगों से मांगा जाता है, शहरी लोगों से नहीं। ये लोग इतने वंचित हैं उनके लिए कोई डियरनेस अलाउंस नहीं, मंहगाई भत्ता नहीं, वेजेज नहीं। किसी ने इनकी वेजेज की तरफ नहीं देखा। इतनी मंहगाई बढ़ते हुए उसको डियरनेस अलाउंस नहीं मिलता है और न मिलने के कारण हैं। हम जो कृषि के लिए अलाभकारी जोतों के लिए मदद मांगते हैं उसका कारण भी सदन को समझना चाहिए। उपसभापति जी, किसान साल भर में जो उत्पादन करता है और जो उसको उत्पादन का मूल्य मिलता है उसी पर उसका जीवन निर्भर होता है। ऐसी हालत में यह बहुत जरूरी हो जाता है कि किसानों को उनके उत्पादन का लाभकारी मूल्य दिया जाय। आज हमारे देश में हालत यह है कि किसानों के उत्पादन का जो मूल्य निर्धारित किया जाता है वह कंज्यूमर की जरूरत को ध्यान में रख कर तय किया जाता है। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि जिस प्रकार से कच्चे माल और पक्के माल को ध्यान में रखकर उद्योग की दूसरी चीजों के मूल्य निर्धारित किये जाते हैं उसी प्रकार से किसानों के उत्पादन का मूल्य भी निर्धारित होना चाहिए। कपास के मूल्य के बारे में हम कई बार निवेदन कर चुके हैं कि जिस तरह से कपड़े का मूल्य निर्धारित किया जाता है उसी प्रकार से कपड़े के मूल्य के अनुसार कपास का मूल्य भी निर्धारित किया जाना चाहिए। जिस तरह से ग्राउण्ड नट आयल की कीमत कच्चे माल और पक्के माल को ध्यान में रखकर तय की जाती है और उनमें आपस में लिफाफा होता है उसी प्रकार से किसानों के उत्पादन का मूल्य भी निर्धारित किया जाना चाहिए। इसलिए हमारे मित्र ने इस संकल्प में आर्थिक

नीति में बुनियादी परिवर्तन की जो मांग की है वह उचित है।

कृषि के बारे में हमारे देश में बहुत चर्चा होती रहती है। कृषि क्या है, इसके बारे में बहुत कम लोग जानकारी रखते हैं। हमारे सदन में भी बहुत से सदस्य ऐसे हैं जो स्वयं खेती का काम करते हैं। जहां तक हमारे देश के बड़े-बड़े कृषि संबंधी आयोजकों का सवाल है, मैं समझता हूं कि उनका वाइट पेपर उनके लिए खेद है, उनका पैर उनके लिए हल है और इसी जरिए से वे खेती के बारे में जानकारी रखते हैं और इसीलिए वे लोग खेती से उत्पन्न वस्तुओं का मूल्य कंज्यूमर की दृष्टि से ही तय करते हैं। यह तो कहा जाता है कि उत्पादन बढ़ाओ लेकिन कृषि नीति केवल मात्र उपभोक्ताओं को ध्यान में रख कर तय की जाती है। किसान को अपना जीवनयापन करने के लिए क्या मिलना चाहिए, इसकी कोई फिक्र नहीं करता है। इसलिए हमारी यह मांग है कि कृषि नीति का आधार कृषकों को संरक्षण देना होना चाहिए। इस प्रकार से मैंने जो दो तीन बातें कहीं हैं उन पर ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। सबसे पहले हमें प्रत्येक व्यक्ति के लिए तीन चीजों का इन्तजाम करना चाहिए और वे तीन चीजें हैं—रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान। गांवों के अन्दर जो बेकार लोग हैं उनके लिए रोटी-रोजी, कपड़ा और मकान का इन्तजाम करने की आवश्यकता है। गांवों के अन्दर दिन-ब-दिन बेकारी बढ़ती जा रही है। उन लोगों के लिए रोजगार की व्यवस्था करनी बहुत आवश्यक है। आज हमारे देश में फण्डामेंटल राइट्स की बात कही जाती है। मेरी यह मांग है कि प्रत्येक व्यक्ति को रोजगार मिलने का भी अधिकार होना चाहिए। सरकार को गांव के प्रत्येक किसान मजदूर के लिए रोटी, रोजी, कपड़ा और मकान की व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए। गांवों

(श्री देवराव पाटिल)

के लोग कोई बहुत बढ़िया भोजन की मांग नहीं करते हैं। उनको साधारण भोजन चाहिए। रूरल हाउसिंग की हमारे सामने एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या है। अगर आप सोवियत रूस के संविधान को देखें तो उसमें आपको पता चलेगा कि प्रत्येक आदमी के लिए मकान की व्यवस्था करने की बात कही गई है। मैं सरकार से यह रिक्वेस्ट करूंगा कि आप संविधान में संशोधन करने जा रहे हैं, इसलिए हमारे देश में भी इस प्रकार की कोई व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए जिससे प्रत्येक परिवार के लिए मकान की व्यवस्था की जा सके। कुछ काम ऐसा पहले हो गया है परन्तु उससे सवाल हल नहीं हुआ है। इसलिये इन तीन-चार बातों पर ज्यादा ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। मैंने जो संशोधन रखा है, वह संशोधन, जो मूल प्रस्ताव है, उसके अनुसार है। मैं आपके मार्फत प्रस्ताव के संस्थापक, प्रस्ताव को प्रस्तुत करने वाले माननीय सदस्य और सदन से प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि वे मेरे प्रस्ताव को मान लें।

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I thank the mover of the Resolution. This has given me an opportunity to express my criticism in regard to this Resolution. Sir, the mover has correctly stated that during the last thirty years, no serious planning has been made in regard to rural development. This is correct. Similarly, he has also diagnosed some symptoms. The three symptoms which he has mentioned in his Resolution are: rich becoming richer, abnormal growth of cities at the expense of rural areas and increase at alarming rate in unemployment. All these are correct. They are no doubt true. These symptoms are correct. It is also correct that there has been failure in regard to planning. He has prescribed some medicines. He has prescribed some eight medicines without diagnosing the real ailment. Here, I would like to make my critical observations. Sir, while prescribing

the country

his medicine, he urges upon the Government to revise clearly and decisively the basic attitude and approach to our planning so that further plans are formulated properly. Is there any basic attitude or is there any approach towards planning itself? I would like to criticise the mover of the Resolution also in regard to this basic thing. It is admitted that during the last thirty years of our planning at the national level, we have achieved some progress and development. But as regards rural development, these thirty years of planning, under the capitalist system, which is called mixed economy, has abjectly failed to transform our society towards the goal of democratic socialism. It has abjectly failed to eradicate poverty and to curb the monopoly houses whose number has increased from 75 to 104 and whose assets have increased by four to ten times. The rich have become richer. It has failed to check the alarming increase in unemployment. It has failed to develop the rural areas. It has failed to change the production relations, the production patterns and the property relations. It has failed to check corruption which is all-pervasive now. All these things have been there despite planning for the last 27 years. Why? I think there is no use having a prescription given by a quack without diagnosing the real ailment, where it lies. Under the capitalist system, which is still called mixed economy, under monopoly domination, there were land reform programmes. There were programmes for the rural areas and so on. There was the twenty-point programme. There were development programmes for the tribals as well as for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled

Tribes. There were also agricultural programmes and industrial programmes. It is not true that all these things were not thought of. It is not true that all these things were not conceived. But the real ailment, where it lies, should be discovered and ac-

cordingly prescriptions should be given for real rural development. Somebody may say that we are under the influence of some doctrine. No. What is the objective to be achieved? You have seen that in the last 30 years with the experimentations with the mixed economy under the capitalist system planning you have abjectly failed to achieve the desired objective. Whatever money you put through, whatever plan you take up, without changing the socio-economic structure, without changing the basic structure, will be of no use and it will produce no results. You will repeat the same history.

Sir, regarding land reforms our estimate in the country of surplus land would have been about 268 lakh acres. Till today you have taken possession of only 83.5 lakhs acres of surplus land and of this only 25 to 30 per cent has been distributed.

Again, after 30 years of planning there has been a development of economic growth at the rate of only 3.5 per cent while it should have been at least 8 per cent. We have to invest a large sum of money for developmental works to achieve the desired rate of economic growth. And it is not possible to mobilise such huge resources through this capitalist system. Secondly, there should be a savings mobilisation and it should be to the tune of 28 per cent, if we want to reach the level of 8 per cent, of the economic growth. At present, it is merely 17 per cent. Sir, despite plans for democratic transformation in the society, the rich have become richer and the beneficiaries of the development are the rich population, whether in the rural areas or in the urban areas. Though there are block level organisations, there are Agriculture Extension Officers, Industrial Extension Officers, there are some plans and formulations, but to what advantage? The mover has said that there should be some zones and every zone should be divided in some population. There

should be some such structure so that they can look after the rural development. Instead of all that, there are BDOs, there are Agricultural Extension officers, there are Industrial Extension Officers. What is their contribution to the rural development? The rural poor population is not deriving any advantage out of this structure. Out of the 72 per cent, population in the rural areas 68 per cent, are above poverty line. Now what is the benefit of the infrastructure? We have some of the infrastructure. We have some infrastructure in the public sector also. But whatever infrastructure is there, the beneficiaries are in the main the rich people. Monopolists are enjoying at the expense of the poor people. Monopolists are the beneficiaries of the public sector. Similarly, exploitation is going on, corruption is rampant. Therefore, I say that all this should be analysed. This should be diagnosed. Where the disease lies it should be correctly diagnosed. Otherwise, no solutions would be found.

Now it is said that the capitalists should go to develop the rural areas. Why should they go? I am absolutely realistic. Why should they go? Shri Morarji Desai has said that 43 villages will be given to some tycoon families who will develop the rural areas. Correct, if they get benefits of income-tax rebate, if they get benefits of income-tax evasion, they will go there. But these areas will be developed under the tycoon administration only for the benefit of the monopoly families, at the expense of the Public Exchequer, at the expense of the poor people. Is it not true, who can deny, that any developmental work under the capitalist system will not be more in favour of the rich than in favour of the poor people?

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri H. M. Trivedi) in the Chair]

Why should the capitalists go to the rural areas in such cases? Because the profit motive is there. Profit is

[Shri Sanat Kumar Raha.] the only criterion which gives incentive to the capitalists to go to the rural areas or the urban areas. Their incentive is that the easiest possible profit and the quickest possible profit should be returned at the highest level. The State Governments should intervene and create such infrastructure in the public sector so that the production of essential commodities and other wage articles of daily consumption is taken up. These things should not be missed; otherwise it would mean that we have not learnt any lessons from our experience of last thirty years.

Prof. Raj Krishana, a Planning Commission Member, has also stated that all Governmental help will be routed through the private sector for the development of rural areas. Only the Janata Government can depend on the private sector at the cost of the public sector. This Government believes in the concept of Gandhian trusteeship. Trusteeship means that monopoly houses will be the trustees. Who will do voluntary work as trustees? Is it practicable, is it a fact of history? I want a reply from the mover. Does he believe in this theory of trusteeship, theory of voluntary austerity and voluntary sacrifice? Can all these things be there in the world economy? No. Prime Minister Morarji Desai has also said the tycoons are more effective in implementing rural development. Always there is this emphasis on the private sector, tycoons, the monopolists and the capitalists. They have eliminated State control in the matter of food zones. This was controlling the black-marketeers, hoarders etc. In the absence of such restrictions, there is a free market economy in the food zones, in wheat as well as in rice. This is the way in which the Janata Government is going. I am a student of Marxism. Charan Singh and the Janata Government say that their line of economic development will be mixed economy. It will not be along the capitalist path; it will not be along the Communist path. As a Marxist

student I believe that the Communist stage is the highest stage of socialist economy. Therefore, I ask the mover of this Resolution if it is neither the Communist path, nor the capitalist path, what path is left. The only path that is left is the monopoly path. Path of the mixed economy is in the interest of the monopolists. This way the Janata Government cannot have another independent line in the name of social democracy, in the name of Gandhism, trusteeship and all those things. The property relations, the production relations will be kept in tact so that the capitalist section is not annoyed, so that they and their class still remain there at the Centre.

We have got training centres and agro-industrial service centres in the rural areas. What are they doing? If you go to the villages, some *kulaks* will say that they are giving good service. But if you go to the poor peasants, who possess two, three, or five acres of land, they will say that these BDOs, Extension Officers, service centres are doing nothing for them. It has been said that the country's economy should recover. But if you go to the rural areas, its 72 per cent, population will say that it is not meant for them. The planning is meant for those *kulaks* who own 50 bighas of land or more. This is the real situation. I am not against big *kulaks*. I want that both the rich peasants and the other peasants should be then. But the basic approach should be to find out where the ailment lies who then we are planning for the development of these down-trodden 72 per cent of the rural population or for the urbanised rich population. The conception of industrialisation of rural areas *versus* urban areas is misleading. The problem is that the development should be as a whole. The question is which class of population will benefit from our planning and what are we doing for our rural people so that their economy would grow, their purchasing capacity would grow.

and thereby the industries would further grow. There should be some sort of integrated planning.

So long as a free market economy under monopoly control is there, incentive price for the agriculturists will not come. If monopolists are allowed to grow they will not allow a peasants' free market to grow. The poor peasants will have to sell his commodity at distress price. So these are the anomalies. So I think the mover should think over this Resolution again and again because here the prescription is like that of a poor doctor who ~prescribes^ without knowing the real ailment.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करते हुए यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के दोस्तों को सारी चीजें अंधकारमय ही दिखायी देती हैं, उनको हर समय हर चीज कुछ उल्टी दिखायी देती है। आज ही अपने प्रस्ताव में माननीय सदस्य भूपेश गुप्त जी ने पं० जवाहरलाल जी की और गांधी जी की तारीफ की...

श्री देवराव पाटील : अब उससे क्या ताल्लुक है ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : सुनिए ; सुनने की कोशिश कीजिए । तो उन्होंने तारीफ की, उनके ऊपर जो किताबें लिखी गई हैं उसके संबंध में यहाँ चर्चा करने के लिए उन्होंने प्रस्ताव पेश किया । हमारे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के दोस्त गांधी जी की तो उपासना करते हैं मगर गांधीवाद से नफरत करते हैं । जवाहरलाल जी के लिए तो कहते हैं उनका स्टेट्यू खड़ा कर दिया जाए मगर मिक्स्ड इकानामी को पसंद नहीं करते हैं, उसकी घोर नन्दा करते हैं । जवाहरलाल जी की जो नीति थी, जो सिद्धान्त था, उसको ये पसन्द नहीं करते । गांधी जी की जो नीति थी उसे ये पसन्द नहीं करते हैं, उसकी निन्दा

करते हैं । पर गांधी जी की मूर्ति को ये लोग बिठाना चाहते हैं । यह तरीका हमारे इन कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के साथियों का है कि नीचे से जड़ खोद दो, व्यक्ति की बात कहो और उसकी बात कह कर उसके पीछे अपने स्वार्थ की सिद्धि करो, मगर उस व्यक्ति का जो सिद्धान्त है, उसका जो असूल है, उसका जो रास्ता है, उसका विरोध करो । हमारे लायक दोस्त ने गांधी जी की ट्रस्टीशिप का विरोध किया और यह कहा कि यह गांधियन थियोरी जो ट्रस्टीशिप की है यह तो बहुत ही बुरी थियोरी है, इससे तो टाई-कुन्स और पूंजीपति, ये सभी बड़ जाएंगे । मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ, राय साहब, कि गांधी जी मार्क्स के बाद पैदा हुए अन्यथा इस दुनिया में मार्क्सवाद नाम की कोई चीज नहीं होती, गांधीवाद ही होता और मार्क्स स्वयं गांधीवादी होता । गांधी जी से बड़ा समाजवादी दुनिया में कोई पैदा नहीं हुआ है । मगर आपका मक्का जहाँ है उस मक्के से जो आपको इशारा मिलेगा उसके अलावा दुनिया में कोई दूसरी अच्छी चीज आपको दिखायी नहीं देती । अच्छी से अच्छी चीज आपको दिखायी नहीं देगी, लेकिन मक्के से जो फतवा आयेगा वह आपके लिये अच्छा होगा ।

श्री खुरशीद आलम खान (दिल्ली) : मक्के से इशारा क्या मिलेगा, हमारे यहाँ तो मक्के से हृदय बदल जाते हैं । आप यह सोचिये ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : उनका मक्का तो मास्को में है ।

श्री सनत कुमार राहा : जनता का मक्का कहाँ है ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं बता रहा हूँ । पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं में शुरू से कहा गया श्रीमन् कि यह योजनायें गरीबी हटाने

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

के लिये बनायी गयी हैं और बन रही हैं। योजनायें देश को समृद्ध करने के लिये और नीचे के तबके को उठाने के लिये बनायी जा रही हैं। लेकिन आज नहीं, आज से 15 साल पहले यह निष्कर्ष निकल चुका कि इन योजनाओं का लाभ केवल धनी वर्ग को हो रहा है और देश की संरक्ति कुछ धनी परिवारों में सिमटती जा रही है। इसी कारण पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने आचार्य कृपलानी की अध्यक्षता में एक कमेटी बनायी थी इस पर विचार करने के लिये और उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बाद मोनोपोली रिस्ट्रिक्शन ऐक्ट बना। मगर मोनोपोली रिस्ट्रिक्शन ऐक्ट के लागू होने के बाद उसका डिफायंस ज्यादा हुआ और उस पर इम्प्लीमेंटेशन कम हुआ। अभी दो, तीन साल पहले चूंकि मोनोपोली ऐक्ट के अनुसार बड़े घरानों को स्टील प्लांट का लाइसेंस नहीं दिया जा सकता था इसलिये मिनी स्टील प्लांट का नाम निकाला गया और मिनी स्टील प्लांट की आड़ में बिरला को स्टील प्लांट लगाने के लिये लाइसेंस दिया गया। इसी तरह श्रीमन्, कहा कुछ और गया और किया कुछ और गया। जैसा कि प्रो० रंगा ने कहा हमारा प्रोफेशन दूसरा रहा, हमारी प्रेक्टिस दूसरी रही। हमने ईमानदारी के साथ कभी कोशिश नहीं की कि गरीबों को राहत मिले। अगर गरीबों को राहत मिलने की बात होती तो बिरला की फैक्टरी का इश्योरेंस हो सकता है, शहर के कारखानों का इश्योरेंस हो सकता है, शहर की हर एक चीज का इश्योरेंस हो सकता है, लेकिन लगातार मांग के बावजूद आज भी खेती की फसल का इश्योरेंस करने के लिये तीस साल तक कांग्रेस सरकार तैयार नहीं हुई और शायद आज की सरकार भी तैयार न हो। किसान की फसल का इश्योरेंस नहीं हो सकता। वह 6 महीने तक खेत में गड़ेगा, खेत में बीज डालेगा, खेत की सिंचाई करेगा और जब फसल खड़ी

होगी और एकाएक उसके ऊपर पत्थर की वर्षा होगी तो सारी फसल समाप्त। वह ताकता रह जायेगा। अगर बाढ़ आ गई तो सारी फसल समाप्त। किसान देखता रह जाएगा। मगर उसको एक भी पैसे की राहत कहीं से मिलने की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। 5 रुपये बीघा लगान लगता है। उसके लिए भी यह तरीका है कि पहले लेखपाल उसको देखेगा, फिर कानूनगो, फिर डिप्टी कलेक्टर, ये सारे रिपोर्ट करेंगे कि कितने परसेंट नुकसान हुआ। उसके बाद तब गवर्नमेंट विचार करेगी कि 5 रुपये की छूट छोड़ दी जाए या नहीं। गांवों में रहने वाले के साथ यह व्यवहार है। दूसरी तरफ शहरों में रहने वालों के साथ, पूंजीपतियों की व्यवस्था ब्या है यह देखिये। उनकी फैक्टरी में आग लग गई तो 1 लाख रुपये का नुकसान हो गया तो क्लेम 5 लाख का करते हैं। इश्योरेंस कंपनी वाले से 5 लाख रुपये लेते हैं। इश्योरेंस के इंस्पेक्टर जांच करते हैं और अनुमान देते हैं कि 5 लाख रुपये का नुकसान हुआ। यह नजरिया है। आज भी नजरिया यह है कि गांवों में रहने वाले के लिए कोई राहत नहीं। गांवों के लोगों के लिए कोई सुविधा नहीं। पिछले 30 साल से कहा जा रहा है कि गांवों में सड़कें बनाई जायेंगी उनको सड़कों से जोड़ा जाएगा। हर प्लान में व्यवस्था है कि सड़कों से जोड़ा जाएगा, लेकिन जुड़ते दीखते नहीं। मैं श्रीमन् आपको बतलाऊं कि हमारा गांव गोरखपुर में है जो वहां से 30 मील दूरी पर है। गोरखपुर से दिल्ली आने में 2 घंटे लगते हैं, लेकिन गोरखपुर से हमारे गांव जाने में पूरा एक दिन लगता है। मैं अपना भेतला लेकर चलता हूं सुबह चलने के बाद शाम को पहुंचता हूं। आज भी 30 साल के बाद ऐसी व्यवस्था है जब कि हमारे गांव में अस्पताल भी है, हमारे गांव में हाई स्कूल भी है, हमारे गांव में ब्लाक का आफिस भी है।

श्री देवराव पाटील : बहुत सारे इंतजाम कर रखे हैं आपने ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : ये सारी चीजें हमने कोशिश करके बना रखी हैं । मगर सड़क कैसे बनायेंगे । इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ कि गांवों के लोगों के साथ जो अन्याय प्लानिंग के नाम पर हो रहा है, उसकी कल्पना नहीं की जा सकती । 300 करोड़ के बिड़ला को 1100 करोड़ का बिड़ला बनाने का प्लानिंग हुआ है । 400 करोड़ के टाटा को 900 करोड़ का बनाने का प्लानिंग हुआ है । किसी गरीब को रोजी देने का प्लानिंग नहीं है । सरकारी आंकड़े बताते हैं कि बेरोजगारों की तादाद बढ़ती जा रही है, गरीब और गरीब होता जा रहा है । ये 5 पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं का रिजल्ट है कि 30 साल के बाद हम यहां पहुंचे हैं कि गरीब और गरीब होता जा रहा है । इसलिए श्रीमन्, मैं कहता हूँ कि जो नजरिया है वह कभी ऐसा नहीं रहा कि उनका भी कुछ सुधार किया जाए । हरिजन के लिए बड़ी चीख-पुकार होती है । गांधी जी ने तो नाम ले दिया हरिजन का और तब से बराबर हरिजन का नाम लिया जाता है । और पिछले 6 महीने से तो संसद में रोज ही बड़े जुलूम हो रहे हैं हरिजनों पर, यह सबाल पेश हो रहा है । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इन 30 सालों में हुआ क्या है ?

श्री कल्पनाय राय : कुछ नहीं हुआ ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं कहता हूँ श्रीमन् सरकारी आंकड़े अगर जोड़े जायें तो हरिजनों को इतनी जमीन दी गई, इतने मकान दिये गये, तो अब तक जितनी उनको दी गई है उतनी भूमि इस देश में नहीं है । . . .

(Time bell rings)

श्रीमन्, घन्टी जरा रोकिये । तो मैं कह रहा था कि हरिजनों के लिए केवल मौखिक कल्याण की बातें लगातार 30 सालों से की जा रही हैं और आज भी ऐसी ही हालत है । मैं नहीं कहता कि बहुत कुछ किया गया उनके

लिए । मेरा यह कहना है कि 6 महीने से जुलूम बढ़ गये हरिजनों पर, यह इतना बड़ा झूठ है जिस पर ध्यान देने की जरूरत नहीं । हरिजन भी उन्हीं गरीबों में से हैं पूरे गरीब तबके में वह भी आते हैं । तो गरीबों की बात करनी चाहिए, हरिजनों की बात अलग से नहीं करनी चाहिए । सारे गरीबों के साथ अन्याय हो रहा है, उनकी राहत के लिए कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है ।

श्रीमन्, कानपुर में एक मिल में एक घटना हुई ।

वहां पर 8-9 मजदूरों को गोली लगी और वे मर गये और दो अधिकारियों को मजदूरों ने मार डाला । इस मिल के मालिक श्री राजाराम जयपुरिया ने इस मिल में एक एक करोड़ रुपये के शेयर लगाये हुए हैं । उसने इस रुपये को इधर उधर करके अपनी चार पांच अन्य मिलों पर लगा दिया और इस प्रकार से इस मिल के पास कोई रुपया नहीं रह गया । मजदूरों के लिए तनख्वाह देने के लिए भी रुपया नहीं रहा । उस मिल का एक करोड़ रुपये का हिस्सा दूसरी मिल में लगा हुआ है । कानून के अनुसार उस हिस्से को खरीदने का अख्तियार आई० डी० बी० आई० को है, गवर्नमेन्ट को है । गवर्नमेन्ट और आई० डी० बी० आई० उस शेयर का पुराना दाम देने के लिए तैयार हैं । मगर श्री राजाराम जयपुरिया चाहते हैं कि उस शेयर को चार या साढ़े चार करोड़ रुपये में थापर को बेच दें । यह बात कानून के खिलाफ है, मोनोपोली रेस्ट्रिक्शन एक्ट के खिलाफ है । मगर वह पूंजीपति अपने को सरकार से ऊपर समझता है । सरकार की बात को मानना नहीं चाहता है । वह स्वदेशी काटन मिल के शेयर को आई० डी० बी० आई० को बेचने के लिए तैयार नहीं है । वहां पर मजदूरों को कई महीनों से तनख्वाह नहीं दी गई है । उस मिल का मालिक यह इल्जाम लगाता है कि सरकार

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

उसको अपना शेयर नहीं बेचने दे रही है। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि इस प्रकार की जो व्यवस्था है उसको समाप्त किया जाय।

श्रीमन्, एक दो और मुद्दे हैं जिनके संबंध में कुछ बातें कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त कर दूंगा। आज कहा जाता है कि लोगों को गांवों की तरफ जाना चाहिए क्योंकि शहरों में भीड़ बढ़ती जा रही है। जैसा कि मेरे दोस्त ने कहा, शहर में एक मजदूर के रख-रखाव पर 12 हजार से लेकर 13 हजार रुपये तक खर्च होते हैं। मगर मेरा कहना है कि अगर उद्योगों को गांवों में लगाया जाएगा तो यह खर्च नहीं होगा। गांवों के अन्दर मजदूरों के रख-रखाव पर कुछ भी खर्च नहीं होता है। हमारे उद्योग मंत्री श्री जार्ज फर्नेन्डीज ने कहा है कि किसी भी सूरत में पांच लाख से अधिक की आबादी वाले शहरों के नजदीक कोई भी उद्योग लगाने की इजाजत नहीं दी जाएगी। आज तक क्या हुआ है, इस पर थोड़ा ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। इन पिछले 30 सालों में दिल्ली के नजदीक गाजियाबाद और फरीदाबाद में सारी इंडस्ट्रीज लगाई गई। इसका कारण यह है कि हमारे देश में जितने भी पूंजीपति हैं वे दिल्ली में रहना चाहते हैं और दिल्ली से ही गाजियाबाद या फरीदाबाद की अपनी इंडस्ट्रीज को कंट्रोल करना चाहते हैं। वे दिल्ली में रहते हैं और कार में बैठ कर इन स्थानों पर पहुंच जाते हैं। गांवों में कोई नहीं जाना चाहता है। यही कारण है कि आज सारी प्रोब्लम्स शहरों के अन्दर पैदा हो रही हैं। गांवों के अन्दर इंडस्ट्रीज लगाने की बात हो भी नहीं सकती है क्योंकि छोटे छोटे गांवों की बात तो दूर बड़े-बड़े गांवों तक में सड़कों का कोई इंतजाम नहीं है। देश के अन्दर अधिकांश गांव ऐसे हैं जिनको सड़कों से नहीं जोड़ा जा सका है। इसीलिए हमारी जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने यह निश्चय किया है कि पहले गांव का विकास किया जाना चाहिए।

हमारी सारी व्यवस्था, हमारी सारी प्लानिंग गांव की ओर मुखरित होगी, गांव सुखी होंगे, और तभी गांव का विकास करके इस देश का कल्याण हो सकता है।

(Time bell rings)

एक बात और श्रीमन्, मैं कह दूँ जो कि इस प्रस्ताव में भी है। किसान को अगर एक बोरा खाद भी लेना होता है तो वह अपने गांव से चलेगा 10-5 मील और उसके बाद बस मिलेगी। बस में बैठकर वह आयेगा शहर में, जिला हेडक्वार्टर में आयेगा और वहां उसको गोदाम से खाद मिलेगी। अगर उसके हल का एक फाल भी टूट गया तो फाल की भी गांव में मिलने की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। गांव से वह चल कर के 30 मील दूर तक बनारस शहर में आयेगा और वहां जाकर उसे हल का फाल मिलेगा।

श्री कल्याण राय : काबू तो उसे नजदीक ही मिल जायेगा।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : आपके यहां मिलता होगा। श्री चन्द्रजीत यादव ने वहां अपना कारखाना खोल दिया है। सब के यहां नहीं मिलता है। तो श्रीमन्, मैं यह कह रहा था कि जब तक गांवों में ऐसी दुकानें नहीं होंगी जहां से किसान को अपनी खेती की आवश्यकता की सारी सामग्री उपलब्ध हो सके, तब तक उनका विकास नहीं हो सकेगा। कोई भी सामान हो, उसको शहर में जाना पड़ता है, हर चीज के लिये शहर जाना पड़ता है। इसके लिये आवश्यक है कि 5 हजार आबादी के लिये एक इस तरह का केन्द्र, सहकारी केन्द्र हो, जहां पर किसानों को उनकी आवश्यकता की वस्तुएं मिल सकें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): Please conclude.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं एक मिनट में समाप्त करता हूँ श्रीमन् ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): Please conclude.

एक ऐसा केन्द्र होना चाहिए जहाँ पर कि किसान को अपनी आवश्यकता की समस्त वस्तुएं उपलब्ध हो सकें । इसके लिये लाजिमी है मशीन स्टेशन । चाहे इनको मशीन स्टेशन नाम दें चाहे कुछ भी कहें । अपने लायक दोस्त ने शिकायत की कि साहब छोटे छोटे ट्रैक्टर बन रहे हैं । हमारे सी० पी० आई० के दोस्त ने शिकायत की है । इन लोगों की जबान पर एक शब्द है कुलक । जब यह सीमा बांध दी गई कि 15 एकड़ से ज्यादा जमीन किसी के पास नहीं रहेगी . . .

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : 18 एकड़ है ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : कहीं 18 एकड़ है, कहीं 15 एकड़ है और कहीं 10 एकड़ भी है । यदि इससे ज्यादा जमीन किसी के पास नहीं होगी तो आप कहां से कुलक शब्द उठा ला आते हैं । जब आप छोटे ट्रैक्टरों का विरोध करते हैं तो आप चाहते हैं कि आप . .

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA: Thirty-five per cent small peasants.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : सी० पी० आई० के लोग कलकत्ता और बम्बई के होटलों में बैठ करके अपनी सारी प्लानिंग बनाते हैं । गांवों से उनका कोई संबंध नहीं । गांव में ये रहते तो जानते कि वहां गरीब लोगों के पास इतने भी साधन नहीं हैं कि वे अपने दो बीघे में खेती कर सकें, उसके लिये साधन जुटा सकें । गरीब वहां विवश है । आप हमारे गांव में जायें तो मैं आपको दिखाऊंगा कि उसके पास इतने साधन नहीं हैं कि वह खेती कर सकें । वह सम्पन्न किसानों को अपनी खेती कटाई पर देता है । मेरे गांव में हरिजन रहते हैं और व भजवूरी से अपने खेतों को यादव लोगों, दूसरे लोगों को, जो सम्पन्न हैं, कटाई पर देते हैं । उनके पास बैल नहीं, उनके पास हल नहीं, उनके पास कोई साधन नहीं ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : इसलिये अगर आप चाहते हैं कि हरिजन खेती करें तो उन्हें खेती करने के लिये बैल देना होगा, खेती करने के लिये हल देना होगा । आज एक बैल की एक छोटे बैल की कीमत 15 सौ और 2 हजार रुपये है । जिसको दिन में दो वक्त भोजन नहीं मिलता है वह 15 सौ और 2 हजार रुपये के बैल कैसे खरीद सकता है । आप कल्पना की दुनिया में रहते हैं । आप क्या कभी गरीबों के पास रहें हैं । आप बड़े बड़े होटलों में बैठकर विचार करते हैं, बम्बई में बैठकर मैनीफेस्टों बनाते हैं और कलकत्ता में बैठकर गांवों के कल्याण की बात करते हैं । आप गरीबों के पास जाइये, उनका हालत देखिये । कैसी उनकी हालत है ? वे कैसी अवस्था में रहते हैं ? आप गांवों में जाकर यह देखिये । श्रीमन्, मैं अब आखिरी बात कह रहा हूँ ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): Mr. Shahi, please conclude.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, मैं आखिरी बात कह कर समाप्त कर रहा हूँ ।

मैंने अपने यहां हरिजन टोले में एक स्कूल खोला जो बच्चे नहीं पढ़ने थे उनको पढ़ाने के लिये । जब बच्चों को पढ़ने के लिये कहा गया तो उनके भां बाप ने कहा कि यदि हमारे लड़के बकरी नहीं चरायेंगे तो वह खायेंगे क्या ?

4 P.M.

चार साल के, आठ साल के बच्चे को काम करने के लिए विवश होना पड़ता है । अगर बकरी न चराएँ, अगर भजवूरी न करें तो क्या खाएंगे । इसलिए पहले उनके लिए काम की व्यवस्था की जानी चाहिए ताकि उनको रोटी मिल सके । रोटी सब से पहले होगी ।

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

डा० लोहिया ने कहा था कि सब से पहले रोटी, कपड़ा, मकान और शिक्षा की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए । अतः आप रोटी की व्यवस्था कीजिए । आप तो यूरोपियन वर्ल्ड में रहते हैं, आगरीबों से दूर रहते हैं । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस का समर्थन करता हूँ और समाप्त करता हूँ ।

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM); Mr. Vice-Chairman, this Resolution is a very important one. It wants to direct the attention towards the condition of rural India and also what steps should be taken in order to improve the conditions in rural India. It is no exaggeration to say that India lives in villages, and it is no exaggeration to say that agriculture is the most important source of income and employment in this country. For many years to come in spite of industrial development, agriculture will continue to remain the base of India's economy. The year in which agricultural production is satisfactory, it is admitted on all hands that Indian economy is satisfactory. The year in which agricultural production is adversely affected, it is not only admitted but it is a fact that Indian economy gets adversely affected. Therefore, it is necessary that much attention is paid to the reconstruction of rural India. The planning in the initial stages gave much attention to the development of some of the basic industries. Opinions may differ, but at one stage it was very necessary. I will briefly explain.

It is generally agreed that in spite of 25 years of planned development hardly any progress has been made towards removal of poverty and reduction of inequalities in incomes and wealth. Between 40 and 60 per cent of the population is still below the poverty level depending on how that line is defined. Unemployment especially in the form of rural unemployment is high. Urban unem-

ployment and congestion which are but a spill-over of rural unemployment have also been increasing. Then there is a regular migration of people from rural areas to urban areas in the expectation that when they go to urban areas there may be some chance of finding some employment. And when they go to urban areas, it adds to the difficulties of the urban areas. Development of sanitary and other facilities does not keep pace with the increase in the population, with the result that further addition to slum areas in cities and towns takes place. The estimates of poverty vary depending upon the assumptions made. It would appear on the basis of the available estimates that the percentage of people below the poverty line increased steadily during the decade of sixties. Towards the end of the decade and the beginning of the seventies, there was probably no deterioration in the situation and perhaps some improvement. The situation seems to have worsened since. On the whole, the percentage of people below the poverty line remains as high, if not higher, as some 15 years ago. The employment situation has been a matter of concern to planners and policy-makers. According to the estimates made by the National Sample Survey (27th Round) in 1972-73, the total extent of unemployment including under-employment was equivalent to 19.4 million people being wholly unemployed. There are, however, considerable regional variations in unemployment. It is observed that the rate of unemployment by current activity status is high in rural areas of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jammu and Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Orissa, Tamil Nadu, West Bengal, Goa and Pondicherry. In urban areas it is high in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Haryana, Kerala, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Tripura, West Bengal, Goa and Pondicherry. The employment trend in the last decade and half indicates concern. Employment in the factory manufacturing sector grew at a compound rate of 4.73 per cent per annum in the period of the Third Five Year Plan. In the periods of the Annual

Plans employment in the organised sector grew at the rate of 0.8 per cent in 1966-67; 0.1 per cent in 1967-68 and 1.8 per cent in 1968-69. The growth rate during the Fourth Plan period was 2.9 per cent. Thus there has been a marked declaration in the growth of organised sector employment in recent periods. The number of applicants on the live registers of employment exchanges has gone up over six-fold since 1960. From 1.60 million in December 1960, it increased to 2.6 million in 1965 and 4.1 million in 1970. There has been a steep increase in the number in the recent years as it exceeded 9.3 million in 1975 and touched 9.8 million a year later. On the basis of the available scanty information, employment in the unregistered manufacturing sector may have declined by 2.15 per cent compound per annum during the decade 1958-59 to 1968-69. This compares with the rate of growth of employment in the factory sector at 3.35 per cent during the same period. Thus the share of the household sector in aggregate employment is estimated to have been declining in decade of the sixties. According to the estimates of employment in Khadi and Village Industries prepared by the Khadi and Village Industry Commission, the employment in these industries declined by 1.9 per cent compound per year during the period 1967-72 to 1973-74. It is likely that the organised sector, under conditions of relative scarcity of raw materials, manages to mop up a higher share of the supplies. Secondly, the organised sector, through superior marketing and technical abilities, has been able to sustain for itself a higher share of the market.

As regards the steps proposed in the "Resolution, the following comments may be mentioned:

In view of the unsatisfactory experience of planned development in the past, the Planning Commission has proposed to terminate the Five Year Plan a year in advance and to prepare a new development plan based on the 1523 RS—6.

re-formulated objectives and restructured investment priorities with the least possible delay. The primary objectives of the next phase of development would be the removal of unemployment and substantial under-employment within approximately ten years, provision for the production and delivery of the basic needs of goods and wealth, achievement of the maximum population in the lowest income group over the same period, a significant reduction in the disparities of income and wealth, achievement of the maximum feasible rate of growth of per capita income and continued progress towards self-reliance. These would continue to be important goals. The employment objective which is also linked with the alleviation of poverty, can only be reached in the prevailing conditions in India by a significant increase in labour absorption in agriculture and related activities. Since the possibilities of expansion of the area under cultivation are very limited, the increase in employment in agriculture has to be linked with increased productivity of the available land through irrigation, multiple cropping and improved technology. The broad thrust of the planning process would, therefore, be to extend the coverage of irrigation as rapidly as possible. In implementing the agriculture-oriented development strategy of this kind, the implementation of land distribution programmes and schemes for consolidation of holdings will have to be pushed forward and farm mechanisation will have to be carefully regulated to provide for maximum labour absorption consistent with increased productivity. A significant increase in agricultural employment should lead to growth in secondary employment in distribution and transport and tertiary employment in supporting services in the rural areas.

Sir, I mention these facts only briefly and one can expand them and take more time of the House. After agriculture, the greatest potential for labour-absorption would be in household and small-scale industries producing consumer goods for mass consumption. The Technology Analysis

[Shri Jagjivan Kam.]

unit of the Planning Commission had initiated a study in eight sectors of industry, namely, textiles, sugar, rice and oil milling, leather, food products, building materials and light metal fabrications, where the future growth can be allocated between the existing large-scale units, small-scale units and the household industries and this will open a vast vista for employing a very large section of the population in the rural areas. Work is also directed towards an examination of the market structure, the present status of the Industries and the comparative economics of the various processes by the different sectors. The implications of employment generation and income generation are being given particular emphasis in arriving at an optimal allocation of capacities among the sectors. The possible locations for future capacity expansion are sought to be identified, giving due consideration to region-wise unemployment rates and raw material availability. Existing credit and other policies are also being reviewed in order to formulate recommendations for using the various policy instruments to promote appropriate techniques. The need for an integrated approach to rural development is already accepted. The programme for increased agricultural productivity and stimulation of household and small scale industrial production will have to be incorporated into a total area approach which will cover the provision of minimum rural services such as water supply and sanitation, elementary education, some non-formal adult education and a degree of health care.

The need and desirability of area planning have been appreciated. The distribution of unemployment and poverty and the potential for development of agriculture and related activities varies widely from region to region and also within regions. The overall sectoral and regional allocation of resources and the elaboration of sector-wise development programme and projects will therefore be In-

adequate for the attainment of the basic objectives in the next phase of planning, namely, eradication of unemployment and reduction of poverty and Inequality. Unless development programmes can be made area-specific to a such greater extent than in the past, regional imbalances and infra-regional variations may even be accentuated in the process of development. Area planning implies the identification of activities suitable to the particular area and capable of absorbing local labour surplus for which supplementary funds over and above the funds available for investment under sectoral programme can be directed. Area planning also clearly implies a much closer involvement of the people whom it is hoped to benefit in both the formulation and the implementation of investment plans. It clearly means involvement of the people of the area.

In view of the emphasis on decentralisation it would not be correct to prescribe a uniform method or approach in regard to the division of the rural areas into economic units. The approach should be flexible and the size of the unit should depend on the specific conditions and requirements of the area concerned. It has been tentatively decided to initiate programme for the preparation and implementation of employment intensive area plans in over 2000 blocks in the next five years. The processing in the rural areas will absorb a large number of people, without requiring them to move from their place of residence.

While the concept of area planning based on an inventory of resources of the area with a view to exploitation of full potential of the area is accepted, the concept of local self-sufficiency is neither possible nor desirable, because the idea is not to create a condition in which the standard of living will at a certain stage become stagnant. In the present day world, we will have to

create an affluent society and, therefore, the idea of self-sufficiency will not be commensurate with the idea of developing the standard. Only by recognising such interdependence, opportunities can be provided for sustained development for both. Area self-sufficiency may seriously foreclose the options for rapid modernisation and fuller integration of the economy and the society.

It is very important to take advantage of the technological advancement in the world. And, therefore, in the new strategy of development there will be even greater accent on the development and application of intermediate technology than in the past. I have already mentioned that a study was undertaken in respect of 8 industrial sectors which offer a scope for adoption of different levels of technology and the selective adoption of labour intensive technologies and the possibilities of decentralised production are being examined by the various working groups set up for the next Five Year Plan. The issue of the relationship of technology and employment in the modern manufacturing sector is somewhat complex. In the core industrial sectors, the use of capital intensive techniques is essential and has to be continued. On the other hand, the possibility always exists that capital intensive techniques can be used wastefully at different levels of scale in the industrial sector. The policy of provision of cheap capital in a non-discriminate fashion to the entire industrial sector may create the possibility of substitution of labour by capital in areas where this is not strictly necessary from the angle of the requirements of the economy. It is always possible, for example, to substitute capital for labour in activities like transporting, conveyer line systems, etc. provided that the substitution is cheap from the angle of the individual entrepreneur.

The concept of area planning and the strategy of integrated rural development will encourage local processing and local production of consumer goods. The State Governments have also been following the general policy of not encouraging setting up of new industrial units in the metropolitan cities. Sir, the education is very important. I have already mentioned about the provision of minimum needs including the provision of facilities for primary education and adult education in the rural areas as well as culture and industrial activities. Fortunately, after the achievement of independence, the spread of education in the rural areas has been phenomenal and the number of schools—primary and secondary—and of colleges established in the rural areas has increased by a large number. What is required is to so orient the education that it will meet the requirements of the rural areas and of integrated rural development. Agricultural bias has to be provided. Similarly institutions giving vocational and technical training will have to be introduced. It has been the experience as has been narrated just now that if something goes wrong with some of the implements of the farmer, he has to rush to the urban centre. If we can establish institutions where preliminary repair work can be provided there itself and the farmer may have to go to the cities only for special repair work, then it will save much of his time and labour. As a matter of fact, when I was the Agriculture Minister, I had decided upon two things. One was to train a large number of Inter Science young men in the method of soil analysis and provide them, without any charge, a kit containing all the necessary accessories for soil analysis, to pay them a subsidy of Rs. 150 per month for two years and after two years, to leave them as private practitioners of soil health in the rural areas. Similarly, the idea was to train a large number of mechanics who will know only the repair of tractors, pumps and tube-wells and to leave them. They will have their clients among the farmers.

[Shri Jagjivan Ram]

whom they will be visiting periodically to set right anything that has gone wrong with the tractor or with the pump. All these facilities will have to be created in the rural areas. Another thing, Sir. It will be an integral part of the new strategy of agricultural development that the necessary inputs and services will be ensured for ensuring the success of the objective of employment through expansion of irrigation and power in the agricultural sector. As a matter of fact, when it was thought of providing the service facilities to the farmers, the idea was to create such facilities at convenient points, that from one place the farmer will be in a position to receive his credit, seeds, fertilizers, insecticides and all these things that he requires for his agriculture. I am still of the opinion that these facilities will have to be created at convenient points in the rural areas. Further, I am of the view that these facilities should not be left in private hands. They should be managed either by governmental agencies or by service co-operatives. But I will say that the precise form of organising these services can be left to the State Governments as well as the local organisations of farmers so that they can work in an effective way. As a matter of fact, already the State Governments have their machinery for extension services of this nature. The most suitable organisation can be considered in the context of the formulation of the next Plan. And, as a matter of fact, we will welcome the suggestions of the hon. Members as to what will be the most effective method of organising these services.

I may add a few things regarding the points raised by the hon. Members. As I have said earlier, agriculture will continue to be the main base. It will provide a sizeable component of our national income as well as employ the largest number of people in this industry. The farmer will have

to be ensured that necessary credit and other facilities that are required for agriculture are provided to him. He will have to be further ensured that a remunerative price will be made available for his produce. A further assurance is necessary that even in a free economy, if the farmer feels that he is not getting the price determined by the Government, the Government will be prepared to purchase any stock that the farmer will offer and thereby the farmer will not be thrown at the mercy of the traders. Sir, one hon. Member was complaining about the removal of restrictions on the movement of foodgrains. As a matter of fact, the foodgrain policy of the Government is not decided on the basis of some slogans or pre-determined ideas. It is decided in the context of the situation that prevails in the country and, therefore, I may say that our policy is a pragmatic policy. Last year, I say the agricultural year, the rabi production was very satisfactory. This year fortunately the kharif production also has been satisfactory. The buffer stock of all foodgrains with the Centre and the States and the cooperative sector is a record quantity. The availability of foodgrains in the country is so easy that the offtake from the fair price shops has not gone up. The Government are facing the difficulty of storing the foodgrains with them. On the other hand, the farmers were complaining that an undue restriction has been placed on the movement of their foodgrains and so they were not getting the price that they could get in market operations. Then again there was a complaint from the deficit States that if the movement of foodgrains is free, the situation in their States may ease and the prices may fall. And, therefore, it was decided to remove all restrictions on the movement of foodgrains. But, what are the facts? The facts are that the trader has not entered the market in any big way. I will say that he has not entered even in a small way. The position in Punjab and Haryana is such that the farmers are handing over their stock only to the Govern-

ment purchasing centres, and as compared to the years in which we had zones for each State only and movement outside the zone was not permitted, the stock that was offered to the Government was not in any manner larger than what is being done this year. In the face of this situation to say that the farmers have been thrown at the mercy of traders betrays colossal ignorance of the situation in the country.

Sir, we have to determine the price and that is done. As a matter of fact, previously we were determining two prices, the procurement price and the support price. As a matter of fact, we are continuing to use the phrase procurement but in fact there is no procurement at present and the price that is fixed is only one price and that becomes the support price. If the farmer is not in a position to sell his stock anywhere else at a price higher than that, the Government is prepared to purchase all the stock offered by him itself. So, the farmer has received the assurance. As a matter of fact, it is in contrast with the experience that the Indian farmer had some ten or fifteen years ago. The year in which he produced less, he received more for his stock and the year he produced more, he received less price for his stock. But now he has been assured that whatever stock he produces, the price will not be permitted to fall. The Government will pay him the price fixed by the Government. This is the price policy of the Government so far as agricultural commodities, especially cereals, are concerned.

Sir, I think I have briefly covered the Important points raised in the Resolution. I may assure the House, Sir, that we attach great importance to the development of rural areas. It is unfortunate that the community which works hard, and works hard to sustain the entire nation is, perhaps, the poorest in the country. It is a strange phenomenon that those who produce Wealth are the poorest and those who

manipulate wealth are the richest people. This dispensation will have to be changed. The producer will have to be ensured not only a reasonable return for his produce, but he will also have to be ensured a place of honour in the society. Today he neither gets the reward, nor he gets the honour. One who works hardest is perhaps the lowest in the society and those who work less are respectable and those who do not work at all are, perhaps, the most respected. This is the essence of our society. I think It will be possible to change it if you want to create an affluent society free from exploitation and inequalities. Sir, I welcome the Resolution.

SHRI N. H. KUMBHARE (Maharashtra):
Sir, may I seek a small clarification?

Sir, the hon. Minister has just now said that India is surplus in foodgrains. At the same time, he has stated that in our country there are millions of people who are under-employed and unemployed. Naturally, these people, who are in millions, do not get even a square meal a day. Is it not a very peculiar phenomenon that on the one hand we claim that we are surplus in foodgrains and, on the other hand, we find that rural poor do not get even a square meal a day? I think the greatest ill in this country is—and as rightly pointed out—that a person who puts in his labour, does not get a fair return. It is because of the poor purchasing capacity of the rural poor that he remains semi-starved. So, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether any arrangement would be made so that these rural poor can get a reasonable return and get a square meal a day and let there be no superfluous surplus.

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: perhaps, the hon. Member has not cared to listen to the entire burden of my speech. Sir, the whole nurnosp is to create em-ployment oportunties so that the poorest will have the purchasing capacity. That was the whole burden

[Shri Jagjivan Ram]

of my speech. I do not know what clarification the hon. Member wants.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): Now that the Minister has already replied to the Resolution before the House, do we wish to continue the discussion or pass on to the next item?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: We can pass on to the other item.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA):

अभी तो केवल एक दो
बोलने वाले हैं। उनको तो केवल इंट्रोड्यूस
करना है

After five, we have the Half-an-Hour Discussion. There is enough time.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I also want to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI H. M. TRIVEDI): Do you insist? I thought we had a fairly detailed discussion on it and, perhaps, it is time to call the mover to reply to the debate.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I am very glad that my Resolution has provoked a very interesting and instructive discussion. Before going to the main points in the Resolution, I would like to refer to certain points raised by the hon. Members. Sir, in the Resolution I have said:

"Having regard to the fact that the planning during the last 30 years has not given due importance to the economic development of rural areas...."

Some Members felt that I was criticising the previous Government by saying that nothing was done in the past 30 years. Probably, the Members did

not listen to me when I moved the Resolution. I very clearly said, and it is very clear in the Resolution also, that this refers only to one aspect of planning, and that is the main approach, the direction, the basic approach to planning. In this basic approach, what I said was, during this period, planning has not given due importance to the economic development of the rural areas. I have not said that development of the rural areas was not taken into consideration at all. I said that due importance was not given during this period. Therefore, I would request the hon. Members to appreciate that this is not a criticism. When I moved the Resolution, I said that it is not a party issue. As Prof. Ranga—also put it, this Resolution is not a party Resolution. This Resolution—is a general Resolution which all of us should consider without bringing party politics into it. I would request the Members to consider this Resolution in that light. Now, generally, Members from both sides have welcomed this Resolution. I am very happy. But hon. Members, Shri N. P. Nanda and Shri Raha, have raised certain fundamental questions. Mr. Raha complimented me for the diagnosis of the disease. But he said that I had diagnosed the disease but could not prescribe the proper treatment. Therefore, he criticised the suggestions which I had made and said that I had given a wrong prescription. His prescription was the usual prescription given by the Communist Party, namely, that the mixed economy should be abolished and that the entire private sector should be taken over by the State, the public sector.

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA: Not exactly in those terms.

SHRI KHURSHED ALAM KHAN: It is a matter of understanding.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: I am saying what I have understood from the speech which I have listened carefully. He has clearly said, Mr. Nanda has also clearly said that....

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA: I have said about monopoly houses.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Mixed economy. These words were used. You said that this was responsible and that the monopoly...

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA: Mixed economy under the capitalist system.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Do you mean to say that there is mixed economy under the capitalist system and mixed economy under the socialist system? Anyway, mixed economy under the capitalist system...

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA: A system which will curb monopoly.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: I will use your own words 'a system which will curb monopoly'. As far as I understand, it was clearly stated by Mr. Raha -----

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: He is revising his opinion.

SHRI KHURSHED ALAM KHAN: He is trying to understand Mr. Raha.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Mr. Raha went the whole hog against the capitalist system and all that. He said he is a Marxist. According to him, the panacea for all these things and the prescription for all these things was the nationalisation of the entire industry.

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA: Not the entire. There should be total land in the interest of the poor peasants. We have also given sufficient thought to the matter.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: I am only referring to industry. I am

not referring to land. I am referring to industry,

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA: This is not a debate on communist versus socialist democracy. You go on as per your understanding.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: That was the prescription Mr. Raha gave. sir, in this connection, I would like to point out one thing. When I moved my Resolution, I had stated that whether it was the capitalist system or the communist system, there was one thing common between the two. The so-called industrial and technological revolution has resulted in the abnormal growth of the cities at the expense of the villages. This is evident both in the communist and in the socialist countries. This is a common factor. Whatever may be the system, if they follow a particular line of industrial and technological revolution, the result is bound to be this.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri V. K. Lakshniana Gowda) In the Chair] In this connection, I would like to invite the attention of my friend to the? position in China. It is a very strange thing that in China, in the People's Republic of China, Mao Tse-Tung had, in his own way, introduced, what I called when I moved my Resolution, the Gandhian idea of self-sufficient rural republics. He, in his own way, because he came from a rural area, saw this divergence between the developed cities and the undeveloped villages and, therefore, he developed the infrastructure in the villages and made the people, most of the people, from the cities go back

[Shri Sanat Kumar Raha]

to the villages. This fact: everybody who has studied China and Mao's theory, knows. So, this is not a question of a particular system. My main point was that in the underdeveloped countries, whether it is a communist country or a capitalist country, we had an idea of following the advanced countries industrially. By following their footsteps in industrial and technological development, we thought that poverty and destitution will be wiped out from this country. Of course, it was not a mistake to think like that. I did not condemn that. I said that all the countries had taken to that line and we had also taken to that line. But now it is time to see what results it has produced. I am glad, my friends have agreed that the rich have become richer, that the cities have become richer at the expense of the villages and all these results have come in. Now when this is the position, should we not look back and see why this has been so? This is because we gave all the importance only to goods and not to 'man'. The other day Mr. Fernandes, when he was asked about the industrial policy, said that the man is the centre of the industrial policy. And this is what I repeated when I moved this Resolution, explaining the Gandhian philosophy. What is the difference between the economic philosophy of the industrial development and the Gandhian philosophy of the industrial development? In the economic philosophy of the industrial development, whether it is communist-oriented or socialist-oriented, the main

emphasis is on production of goods. The main thing at the centre is production of goods, more and more production of goods and for that only the science, technology and all other organisation is necessary. But in the economic philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi the centre is the human being. What is it that the human being wants? One Mr. Schumacher has written a fine thing: Small is beautiful. In his book he has clearly said that Mahatma Gandhi's contribution to the entire world today is that he has shown that man is the centre at the entire economic process, which in the 19th century the modern world had carried away. In the 19th century, materialisation has whipped off the 'man'. The result is that we have been after more and more technological development, after super technology, which has replaced man. Actually, technology should help man to increase productivity, but not to drain away man from his productive capacity. So, the result has been that man has been thrown away from all these industries. (*Time bell rings*). I want to have the time for my reply. What is the time I get for the reply?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKHSMANA GOWDA): Because it is going to be 5 o'clock and the discussion has to close and there is another lady who has requested that she wants to move her Resolution..

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: No, no, I cannot help. I must get time for the reply.

SHRIMATI HAMIDA HABIBULLAH (Uttar Pradesh): Why can't you help?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Yes. continue Mr. Reddy.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): In the light of the illumination and the reply of the Minister, his reply is superfluous.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: It is not for you to say that it is superfluous.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Please continue.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: The essential feature of this Resolution, the basic thing which I have pointed out is that in our entire economic thinking, we will have to think of the human being. When 80 per cent of the people in this country live in the rural areas, when we start thinking of the human being, we will have to think of this 30 per cent of the people in the rural areas. When we do not think of them, the result is that there is an economic imbalance. My hon. friend, Shri Mhaisekar, gave such an interesting analysis of the disparities and the imbalance between the city and the village. He gave so many facts and figures, how it has happened and why it has happened.

SHRI N. H. KUMBHARE: What about the imbalance in the villages?

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: I will come to that. That point I have noted. This is the central theme.

Now coming to the imbalance in the villages, another friend raised the question of land ceilings. I have never said that I am not for land ceilings. This is beyond the purview of this Resolution. Land ceilings have been there; land laws have been introduced and they will have to be implemented. There is no question of going back on land ceilings and without the elimination of the landlords totally from the villages, the village agriculture will not be revived. There is no doubt

about that. So the ceiling laws will have to be implemented. And once they are implemented.

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): No interruptions please.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Land ceiling laws have been passed. If they are not being properly implemented, it is now for the present Government to see that they are properly implemented and the disparities in the villages are eliminated and the surplus land is given to the Harijans and the poorer sections of the people. These programmes are there. That is accepted. But the entire approach of our Plan has to be revised. The whole spirit of the Resolution is this. I have said in my Resolution that "this House is of opinion that for the economic development of rural areas.... Government should take the following steps, namely: revise clearly and decisively, the basic attitude and approach to our planning so that future plans are formulated giving primary importance to the economic development of rural areas". Now this is the essential thing that the entire approach should be revised. That is why I said at another place that you will have to set up about 3000 economic units in this country, from which the Plan has to be built up. Today the planning is built from the top; the planning comes from Delhi; and from there it goes down lower below to the villages. Even in the States, there are no proper planning bodies. In the districts, there are no planning bodies. In the rural villages, there are no planning bodies. So what happens? We just prepare the Plan on paper. We have got all statistics. And that is the Plan we have. But a Plan which takes into consideration the 80 per cent of the people must be built from below. That is why the economic units have to formulate their plans. They have to see what resources there are, what raw materials they are producing and how best they can develop and what processing and other indus-

[Shri R. Narasimha Reddy.] tries can be started in the area. All these plans will have to be mobilised by the State and they will have to formulate the State Plan. And these State Plans will have to be taken up by the Centre. This is the approach that I have given.

In the beginning I said that the tillages are the colonies of cities. I repeat that they are colonies of the cities. We were producers of raw materials under the British rule. We are still producers of raw materials. These raw materials are taken away, sucked away by this industrial economy into the cities and we are just given a little share. The lion's share is taken away by the trader and the urban manufacturer. Why should this be done? I can give you any number of instances. Even in a thing like groundnut, the oil is not manufactured in the area concerned. It is taken away to centres where oil is manufactured and is sold back to the growers of groundnut at a very high price. This is the position. This has to be reversed. How will you do that? This can be done only when you develop the infrastructure in the rural area itself. The whole Plan must take its birth in the rural area. Till that approach is adopted no amount of pious words, no amount of good resolutions is going to change the picture, and the same old thing will go on. Top bureaucrats sit in the cities and formulate the Plan. Most of our planners and economists are urban-born, urban-bred, urban-educated and urban-oriented. Therefore, the same thing will go on and our resolutions will remain pious resolutions. It is not a problem for this country alone. This is the problem all over the world. Unless we learn the Gandhian way, which some affluent countries have already learnt, our planning will have no meaning.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Reddy, you do not want the Resolution to be voted. You just want it to be talked out. It will close at 5 o'clock.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY: Sir, this is the central point which I am making. So unless this is done all the other points will go waste.

Coming to the question of cities, it is absolutely necessary for us to review the situation. Unless the growth of cities is stalled at the places where they are there is no hope for the village economy to recover. It should be assured that no processing and consumer industry is installed in and around the cities. This is a must. Unless this is done you cannot develop the villages.

Our friend said about monopoly, capital. Where is this monopoly capital? It is in the cities. The answer to this monopoly is the establishment of a rural republic in the Gandhian way. Therefore, this has to be developed.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam). Half a minute is left.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): It will be talked out.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Others shout as well as given an opportunity to speak.

5.00 P.M.

SHRI R. NARASIMHA REDDY Finally, Sir, I am really glad that all most all the Members who spoke supported this Resolution and Babuji also on behalf of the Government, welcomed this Resolution. Now, as my purpose is served, I may be permitted to withdraw my Resolution.

SHRI DEORAO PATIL: Sir, I may be permitted to withdraw my amendment.

The * amendment was, by leave withdrawn.

The Resolution was, by leave withdrawn.

•For text of the amendment, *vide* Debates dated the 13th November, 1977.