

[Shri Om Mehta]  
(Regulation) Amendment Ordinance, 1970 and consideration and passing of the Foreign Exchange (Regulation) Amendment Bill, 1970, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(2) Consideration and passing of:

The Agricultural Refinance Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1970.

The Coal Mines (Conservation and Safety) Amendment Bill, 1970, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(3) Consideration of a motion for reference of the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1970, to a Joint Committee.

(4) Discussion on the Resolutions tabled by Shri Bhupesh Gupta and others seeking repeal of the West Bengal (Prevention of Violent Activities) Act, 1970, and the West Bengal Maintenance of Public Order Act, 1970.

(5) Discussion under Rule 176 on the steps taken by Government to check rising trend in prices of essential commodities and industrial raw materials.

#### **RESOLUTION REGARDING AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION FOR INCLUSION OF THE RIGHT OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS—contd.**

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS: Sir, I was saying, whenever we talk of industrialisation, we think only of the western model, and that was a fundamental and basic mistake committed by our planners right from the beginning. Because in the western countries they had the unique advantage of exploiting their colonies for mobilising resources for capital formation; they also had the unique advantage of a very low density of population. We have neither of the advantages, and therefore we cannot just imitate the west in order to build up an industrial structure on the western model; neither do we have resources, and also we have a very huge population to feed and to be gainfully employed. If you take the case of Communist countries like Russia and China, that example will not hold good in the case of India because of the differences in the two political systems. The advantages of a totalitarian system are not available in a democratic system, and therefore we have to think absolutely on new lines, and this should have been done right from the beginning.

In the development of our economy we must take care of one thing in a democratic country, and that is to minimise the social tensions as far as possible. Because without minimising the social tensions a democratic system can not work. Therefore, in our effort to develop the economy we should have taken note of that, and

unemployment is one of the factors which causes serious social tension in the country. From this angle I would simply say that if we had taken into account our position regarding resources on the one hand and the huge population on the other hand and the democratic structure under which we have to function and develop our economy, we should have decided on emphasizing on small and medium-scale technology rather than large-scale technology. Large-scale technology ultimately will not solve our problem. We should have emphasized on the medium-scale and small-scale technology. By this I do not mean that large-scale industries should be done away with altogether. No, Sir. There are certain sectors, there are certain fields, where large-scale technology is inevitable, is essential; but generally speaking the emphasis should have been overwhelmingly on the side of small-scale and medium-scale industries.

I may draw your attention to the fact that today Japan is industrially the third richest country in the world. What is happening in Japan? How have they achieved this? Ninety-nine per cent of the industrial units in Japan belong to what they call medium and small-scale industries; 70 per cent of the industrial working population belong to these industries; 50 per cent of the total GNP has been produced by the same industries. More than 44 per cent of the exports are managed by these very industries. This is how Japan has today become the third richest country in the world. Therefore, if somebody says that if we simply insist on small-scale and medium-scale industries we shall never grow, our economy cannot grow, we cannot grow at the desired pace, Sir, that has been proved to be entirely wrong and baseless by the example of Japan. Therefore taking the facts of the situation into account, we should have built up a different kind of strategy, drawn up a different kind of strategy for our industrial development. And that we did not do, and that was the fundamental, basic mistake that we committed when we started our planning. In the Fourth Five Year Plan, the Planning Commission has talked about labour-intensive programmes instead of capital-intensive programmes. But what kind of programmes? Construction of roads, small irrigation and such kinds of things. These kinds of programmes give employment only for a part of the year, only casual employment. They cannot provide sustained employment. Therefore, whereas on the one hand I would certainly welcome these measures whereby a large-population can be employed, on the other hand the entire economic structure, the entire industrial structure should be so reorganised that employment becomes sustained in this country, not casual or three-month-a-year employment.

From this point of view, I would also submit that so far as agriculture is concerned, there is a talk of mechanisation of agriculture in order to raise the output in agriculture. Sir, I warn—large-scale mechanisation of agriculture will take this country to doom. We can make use of scientific knowledge, the technological knowledge also, in the case of agriculture but must not introduce large-scale mechanisation, which will definitely put a huge population out of employment. We can use, for example, power tillers, electric pumpsets, like that. We can make use of chemical science for increasing the output. But what I am emphasising is that in the agricultural field, as in the industrial field, we have to depend more on the small-scale and medium-scale mechanisation than on the large-scale mechanisation. That is the fundamental thing that we have to do and if on these lines the Plans are revised or the Fifth Five Year Plan is drafted, then, as I said at the beginning, then problem can ultimately be solved. Unemployment cannot be solved tomorrow, in one year or in five years. But the process will have to be started by which the problem of unemployment may be solved ultimately. And this line must be accepted. Otherwise, I do not see how this problem can be solved even after 15 years or 50 years.

Finally, I come to the question of education. The present education system in our country is what the British gave us. We have hardly made any change in it. This education system produces an army of parasites, people who live on others, who do not work—that means, those who are not engaged in productive work. That system has to be changed from the bottom. Whereas in this age science and technology must find their own place in our education system right from the bottom, I would submit that technical and vocational education should be provided in three stages. The first stage or the junior-most stage comes after what I may call, in the language of the Education Commission's Report, the higher primary stage. Immediately after the higher primary stage, the students should be allowed to bifurcate, diversify into different courses. Everybody should not go along on the main road up to matriculation, up to higher secondary, then to university. This process has led to so many problems of which we are already aware. Therefore if at the base—after the higher primary stage—we allow the students to bifurcate to other vocational training, to other kinds of training, to other lines, then we will create a new band of students who will be equipped with sufficient knowledge so that they can get employment and also employ themselves. Second stage is after matriculation, that is, after the lower secondary stage and thirdly it is after the higher secondary stage.

Now, Sir, the Planning Commission has said that economic growth alone may ultimately solve the unemployment problem. I do not believe in it. It may help in providing additional employment no doubt. But this alone will not solve the unemployment problem in this country because the population is increasing. The problem of unemployment is so big. In the case of education, therefore, we have to remodel the whole thing so that more and more students go towards technical training and that can be done right after the higher primary stage, and thereby alone we may create a band of new citizens who can find employment elsewhere or can self-employ themselves.

Sir, I would emphasise on self-employment more than on employment. Mr. Raju referred to some medical graduates being unemployed. I am surprised why even medical graduates cannot find employment. They can employ themselves by taking to practice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I am concluding. I would like to emphasise that our educational system should be such, our curricula should be so revised that we produce students who can not only find employment wherever employment can be found but who can also find self-employment. That means they should be able to do something productive and thereby earn their living, not that they should only become consumers and parasites.

SHRI B. K. KAUL (Rajasthan): Who will do that?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I do not know. Whoever does it, I am asking the Government of India, I am asking the Planning Commission...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Conclude, please.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I am only making an appeal to the Planning Commission, to the Government. Who is in the Government is not my concern just now. But whoever is the Government should do it. That is the basic approach that I am making before the House so that we can draw up our Plan accordingly and revise our educational system accordingly.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I am concluding. I would like to point out that just as in the case of industries we think of large-scale industries, so also in the case of education and technology we always think of producing Engineers. Some years ago a

[Shri Bipinpal Das.]

Russian expert came here and he made a remark to somebody in Delhi as to why we produce so many Engineers. Why do we not produce technicians, mechanics and artisans who can do something by themselves if they cannot find employment elsewhere and thereby add to our production? He asked, We aim at producing big engineers. I have seen the big engineers. They just go to the office and sign the bills. We want men who can be present on the construction site, who can take personal interest in the matter of actual construction and development work.

Therefore, the whole problem has to be attacked from three angles. Revise the educational system. Put more emphasis on agriculture. And the whole industrial structure should be patterned on a new basis in which much more emphasis will be given to small and medium industries rather than large-scale industries. Science should be introduced into agriculture without going for large-scale mechanisation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is enough. Please sit down now. Mr. Dharia.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, even though I do not agree with the contents in the Resolution moved by my friend, Mr. Man Singh Varma, he has provided a good opportunity to this House to think over this serious problem in our country. We cannot forget that this problem of unemployment and the problem of under-employment not only put great strain on our economy but on our Parliamentary institution or the Parliamentary democracy too.

Sir, I do feel that right to work must be a fundamental right in our Constitution. But to say that the Government has completely failed in solving the problem will not be proper. It may perhaps amount to the ignorance of history or exhibition of political motives.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (राजस्थान):

इतना सा अमंडमेंट आया म्ब कर दीजिये।

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, my friend should not get annoyed that way because I feel that we should not treat this issue as a party issue. It is a national issue and I have no doubt whatsoever that it is perhaps one of the first dangers being faced by this country, by the people of this country and this problem shall have to be solved on a war-footing. Only by declaring a war against unemployment we can solve this problem, not otherwise. I am participating in this debate not because I belong to a particular party, but because I feel that it is a national issue, a very serious issue and

serious consideration and more serious actions are called for.

Now, whenever a question is asked as to how many persons are unemployed, the Government just gives the number of people who have registered their names with the Employment Exchanges and says, "According to these lists, there are about 35 million people who are yet to be employed, there are about one million educated people who are unemployed, and so on." Sir, these Employment Exchanges only give the number of people who go to those Exchanges. But it is not necessarily the number of people who are unemployed, and certainly not the number of people who are under-employed. Let us not forget that out of the 55 crores of people in this country more than 35 crores of people are such whose income is less than one rupee per day. And that is the real problem. It is in this context that an amendment has been moved by one of my colleagues on the basis of a resolution passed by my party that in the coming five years, our plans should be so formulated and implemented that every house has at least one member earning not less than Rs. 100. Therefore, I welcome that amendment. But it is not enough. The basic question is how to solve this problem. Under our present economic system, can we solve this problem? Is it possible for this country to provide employment to crores of people in the present economic system, with the present hold of these monopolists over the economy? We have accepted mixed economy in the country. But let us not forget that the laissez-faire economy has certainly overpowered this mixed economy, and it is these big monopolists who are not allowing this country to function in a proper way. Sir, I feel that this country shall have to accept the socialist economy if we want to solve this problem and from that point of view, we shall have to formulate all our plans and schemes.

The Planning Commission has unfortunately failed in properly assessing this problem, and it has further failed in providing a proper solution to this problem. With these figures that are enumerated in this Fourth Plan, is it ever possible for us to solve this problem? When we have been adding to our population by about 120 lakhs every year and when this rate is growing every day, how is it possible that we can provide employment to so many after so many years? It is practically impossible because the backlog itself is so great. With this backlog, it will never be possible for us to provide a proper solution to this problem unless a radical change is made in our Plan. To say that there are no resources reflects on the ability and the intelligence of the Planning

Commission and of those who advise the Government. There are resources. This country has unlimited resources. The only question is: Are we prepared to find out where the resources are? I can quote instances after instances. Take, for instance, gold. In this country there is gold worth Rs. 7,000 to Rs 8,000 crores. I do understand the feelings of the ladies about their security. Let them have 20 to 25 tolas of gold. If every family gives the country 20 to 25 tolas of gold, within no time we can clear off our debts to foreign countries and this country can become self-reliant and it can have more foreign exchange for bringing in modern technology and science and modern methods for industrial advancement of the country. Are we prepared to do that? For that a drastic decision is required to be taken. What is a fundamental right? The right to work should be a fundamental right, not the right to property. If this country is interested in protecting the human right, the human dignity the right to property as a fundamental right has no meaning whatsoever. And it is high time that this country took a drastic decision and said "No, in this country we shall allow the right to property only to a certain extent. There will be a ceiling on property in rural and urban areas. Above that ceiling no property should be treated as a fundamental right in this country, and that property above the ceiling necessarily belongs to the State for the welfare of the State, for the welfare of the people, for solving problems like unemployment". Are we prepared to take such a drastic decision? Without taking such a drastic decision we cannot solve this problem. Let me warn this Government today, with all our best possible efforts to maintain parliamentary democracy and parliamentary institutions in this country if proper employment and proper employment opportunities are not provided to the youngster of this country, parliamentary democracy in this country cannot survive. It has no chances whatsoever of surviving. It is all right to say that the Naxalite problem is a law and order problem. But we cannot forget that the basic instinct in the young men for accepting violence is there because the young man feels that his life is insecure in this country. So we should first provide security for him in this country. Let him feel that in this country, in this land of his, he has got all possible opportunities for a normal life, to be self-reliant, to get self-employed, to bring dignity to human life, to bring dignity to his country. In that case I have no doubt that he will not accept that violent power. Let us not forget that this is a socio-economic problem. How are you going to solve this socio-economic problem? Simply condemning the acts of the youth is not going to solve the problem or provide a

solution to the problem. The youngsters are agitated and they are more so because they feel to be educated is an anathema a crime, and to be uneducated is also a crime. They do not see any prospects in their life and so they are losing faith in parliamentary democracy. So it is from this angle that we shall have to solve the problem. Therefore, I say that what is required is the correct basic approach to all these problems. In this country have we not witnessed during the last twenty years or so that progress has been made industrially or otherwise, in agriculture, in science and technology and in various other fields? There is no doubt about it. We have made progress during these twenty or twentythree years, and we have certainly provided employment to lakhs of people in this country. There is no doubt about it. But it is not enough. Have we also not witnessed alongside that the big monopolists, the big industrial and business houses are growing richer and richer every year? There are many who have become new princes, new rulers, in this country. They have become a class in themselves. Then, how can any young man have faith in this system of Government? How can we have faith in this democratic system? There are opportunities in this country today only for big people. There are no opportunities for the poor. There are all sorts of barriers simply because one is born in a poor family or because one is born in a particular caste or community. If this is the situation, how can the young have faith in the functioning of this parliamentary system? Therefore, I say this challenge of young men, this challenge of unemployed young men, is not only a challenge to the economic system of the country, but it is a challenge to our parliamentary democracy which we have accepted and to which we are all so sincerely dedicated. From this point of view I feel that we have been committing great injustice to the younger generation that is fast coming up in this country.

Sir, take our population. Are we prepared to take some drastic decisions about our population? With this growth rate at the rate of 55,000 citizens taking birth in this country every day, how can we solve that problem? I have spoken for ten minutes. Within this span of ten minutes, nearly 900 babies have taken birth somewhere in this country...

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): Not in this Parliament.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA Some Members of Parliament are also responsible for that.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): I am not responsible.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: My friend will agree with me that to be a bachelor is not

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

enough to say that he is not responsible. Anyway, my submission is that during this span of ten minutes, nearly 900 babies have been born somewhere in this country. Let us not forget that they are crying for food. As trustees of this country, we should take note of the whole situation. I am not here to put forward all the schemes. But I have no doubt whatsoever that we have to make a basic approach to this problem. We believe in socialist economy; yes, we believe in equality; yes, we believe in equal status and opportunity. We want to function on those lines as indicated in the preamble to our Constitution. Nobody can stop this government from providing solutions after solutions in meeting this problem. But unfortunately it has again happened and our engineers have been loitering on the streets for employment for the last two-three years...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI KRISHNAN KANT (Haryana): It is a very valuable speech. Let him continue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is private members' business.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Therefore, I should not speak for more than 15 minutes. I will conclude in a minute or two.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Let more babies be born.

SHRI KRISHNAN KANT: Without the help of Shri Mani.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: He said: Let more babies be born. I am of the clear opinion that it is high time that we do something about it. Let anybody belong to any religion; but no couple in this country should have more than three children. This must be made a legal provision. There is no other alternative. That is my submission. Are we prepared to think on those terms? Shri Reddy will feel that I am curbing his personal rights...

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): Will what you say be made applicable to all castes or creeds or only to some set of people?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: It should be applicable to Muslims, Hindus, Jains and other communities.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Shri Reddy is at the moment unemployed because there is no Supreme Court case going on...

(Interruption)

SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA: Why three children? Why not two?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I am ready even for two. But it should be acceptable to the country and palatable to all. Otherwise, I am ready for two.

श्रम, सेवा नियोजन और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय  
में राज्य मंत्री (श्री भगवत झा आजाद): हम  
दो, हमारे दो ।

श्री ओम् महता : दो या तीन, बरा

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Coming to the last point, what I want to say is that we have to create the right atmosphere for it in the country. What is our educational system today? Is it production oriented? Have we taken care of our industrialisation programme? There should be more and more productive industries and more and more land-reforms and we should give priority to these in our plans. We have not bothered to see that our education becomes production oriented. It should create a feeling of self-reliance in the minds of people. It should create creative creatures and not people who would be seeking employment with a slavish mentality as in the days of British rule. Whether this resolution is voted by the House or not, I would appeal to the House to look at this problem of unemployment and under-employment as a national problem. As leaders of this country, let us all sit together and find out solution to this problem by working hard setting aside our ideological differences. There is no other alternative. If we are prepared for a radical change, then alone a radical solution could be provided and this problem could be solved and not other wise. Thank you very much.

3 P.M.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am glad that we are discussing one of the most explosive problems of our time in this country after independence, namely, the problem of unemployment and under-employment. I am in agreement with the Resolution and I think nobody can take exception to it. I was a little surprised when I heard my friend, Shri Dharia, taking exception to the expression in the Resolution, "that the Government of India has completely failed in solving the problem of unemployment". Evidently, Mr. Dharia does not like the word 'completely', but he would agree that the Government has failed. Now, I should like to know when this particular word could be properly used and where.

At the time of the First Five Year Plan, there was a backlog of 3.3 million unemployed people in the country; at the start of the Second Five Year Plan, the figure rose to 5.5 million; and, at the end of the Third Five Year Plan, it was 7.5 to 8 million and now it is in the neighbourhood of 20 million. After these, would Mr. Dharia object to this word 'completely' being introduced in his Resolution? If this is not a case of complete failure, I do not know where we can find an instance of complete failure. So, I think that my friend, Shri Dharia, because of his loyalty to the ruling party and the Government, for once has gone wrong in this matter. Being an intelligent man that he is, he will certainly understand where the word 'completely' should be used and should not be used.

Now, unemployment is a problem which is not an easy one to be solved and, in fact, impossible to be solved on a permanent and durable basis or, if I may say so, completely, under capitalism. Today, even in the affluent societies, the so-called affluent societies of the USA, France, England, West Germany, etc., unemployment has risen.

**SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON** (Kerala): Even Japan.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Yes, even Japan. But I am not talking about Japan. But these are the very old capitalist societies and they are developed societies, affluent societies and there unemployment is on the rise today despite very great technological revolution having taken place. Sometimes, under capitalism, this technological and scientific revolution leads to unemployment because the capitalist society does not know how to reconcile the problems of labour and employment on the one hand and the impact of the scientific and technological revolution on the other, which is taking place in the world today.

In under-developed countries also unemployment is rising, all the more so because backwardness is there and remains on account of the fact that the vested interests continue to wield their power in the economic and the political life of the country. And, India is a case in point. We have got today so many people unemployed and we should not be guided by the figures of unemployment but we must take into account what is called the disguised unemployment, that is to say, the figure of under-employed people. Now, if you take into account the rural and the urban economy, the rural and industrial economy, together, according to the various estimates that have been made officially, by 1980, there will be in this country, at this rate, one hundred million people unemployed or under-employed. This is the estimate made by the Government agencies, not by any other agency and such is the problem that we are facing.

And not only that where the backlog goes on increasing, we find that the gap between the number of people entering the labour market on the one hand, and the employment opportunities created, whether in the public sector or in the private sector, whether in agriculture or in industry, is widening again. Therefore, we are faced with the situation in this capitalist economy that as time passes, the backlog goes on increasing, and this gap between people seeking jobs and those who are supposed to offer jobs will go on increasing. Such is the situation today.

The remedy is, therefore, to be a basic one. There cannot be any tinkering with the problem. The present approach has proved utterly inadequate, and even laughable, in our society today. The Planning Commission has completely failed. It has criminally failed. I should not say 'completely'; I should say that the Government and the Planning Commission have not only completely failed in tackling the problem of unemployment, but have failed criminally, and deserve indictment at the bar of the nation. That is not the way we should approach the problem. We must look at the capitalist economy as a whole, instead of trying to find out piecemeal solutions here and there. It is possible to find out some makeshift arrangement in this or that sector of the economy. That is not going to solve the problem of this staggering dimension, namely, the problem of unemployment. We must go to the root cause of this problem and the growth of unemployment in our country.

In our agrarian economy, which accounts for nearly 70 per cent of our total population; and from where comes 45 per cent of the total national income, we are almost in a stage of semi-development, despite bickerings and talks about green revolution. The green revolution affects a very small area of land. But what is most important to consider in this context is whether you are developing the agrarian economy with a definite bias in favour of employment, with a view to eliminating unemployment and under-employment in the agrarian sector of the economy, with a view to harnessing the vast resources in the form of manpower and labour power and harnessing this production. That should be your approach. That has not been done. Why? Because your methods are out-moded and antiquated. Certainly they are backward, whatever you may say. That is why it was not possible to do any thing in regard to this matter.

Even today, on some computation it has been found that 21 crore acres of land could be easily found for distribution among the agricultural workers and among the poor

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

peasants, Harijans and Adivasis, provided we re-organize our agriculture on a radical basis, carry out land reforms radically and remove manifold exemptions that stand in the way of even the implementation of the existing ceiling laws. If we bring under plough the fallow land, that has not been brought under plough, and also distribute the fallow land—it is easy to get 21 crore acres of land—among the peasantry, then you can well understand that we will have vast resources for tackling also unemployment and booming in the direction of solving this problem. After all, each village today in our economy, to solve the problem of unemployment, demands, before anything else, the distribution of land, to the tillers of the soil, to the agricultural labourers and poor peasants who remain for most of the year idle. And that means production in their hand. By this, we can really make a better break-through in our struggle against this menace of unemployment. But we are not doing it. We are not doing it . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): You said forest land. But forest is as essential . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The difficulty is that you come from Hyderabad. Forest is essential as far as afforestation is concerned. But there are many forests which are not necessary. Land is lying there, and for afforestation that land is not necessary. When you take this land, the total comes to 21 crore acres. I am not talking about general forests or afforestation.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Including the rocks and boulders and hills and dales?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know. That is the Syndicate way of talking. . .

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: You are speaking from imagination.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am speaking from the statistics prepared by the Government when you were sitting on these Benches. These documents were prepared then. Mr. Desai leads a party which is full of people who are illiterates. There is no doubt about it because they do not read anything.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Your party has political scoundrels.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My party is supposed to contain political scoundrels? Fancy it from the quarter of scoundrels—the phrase is being used.

What you are doing for your agriculture is the test of your sincerity and unless you

hit the landlord concentration and undertake land distribution, let us not talk about the solution of the problem of unemployment because it leads you nowhere. I would like to point out the importance of setting up agro-industries in the rural areas. We should seriously launch a project of such agro-industries where we can create employment potential and create opportunities for supplementing the employment in the rural areas and semi-rural areas in our country. We should concentrate on also minor irrigation projects and building construction especially rural housing which would find employment for many people. The tendency to-day is to concentrate on very heavy irrigation and other projects and medium irrigation projects. Of course these are necessary but in a country like our where manpower is idle, where your resources are the human labour, these should be utilised to whatever possible extent in order on the one hand to reduce the cost of these projects and the foreign exchange element in it and on the other to provide employment.

I was in China twice and found that instead of going in for big irrigation projects, the whole of China had been studded with small irrigation projects with a view to solving problem of irrigation in such a manner that at the same time it gives employment to the poor peasants and the agricultural labour and those who come up in the labour market. We have no such approach here today. On the contrary we have an approach of starting big capital projects. That will neither solve the problem of food nor unemployment. The crux of the problem in our rural economy from the point of view of the production of food or from the point of view of employment is the distribution of land to the tillers of the soil and creation of employment opportunities by starting small irrigation projects, housing projects, agro-industries and so on. That will make for an integrated approach to our struggle for solving unemployment in the vast sector of our rural economy.

I now come to the question of industrial sector. The industrial sector is monopolistic and capitalistic. Unemployment is the progeny of a capitalist economy. The capitalists do want unemployment to maintain an army of unemployed so that they are in a better bargaining position with the labour and with the trade union movement. An army of unemployed people is a necessary capitalist thing for them with a view to browbeating the labour population and browbeating them in their trade union and other activities. Now therefore, as long as the basic motive in production is profit-making the basic line of their activity would be how to carry on an intensive and ex-

tensive exploitation of labour. And that also brings unemployment and that is happening in our country. Therefore, you cannot run away with the hare and hunt with the hound. You cannot say we have a mixed economy with the capitalist class and the monopolist class occupying a dominant position, a key position and directing the economy openly and covertly on the one hand and at the same time you cannot claim that you are solving the problem of unemployment. The entire economy is vitiated by the influence of the monopolists, by sabotage and other activities of the monopolists. And here, for example we know very well how callous and cruel and cynical these monopolists are to the problem of unemployment. Even today you find that many capitalists in West Bengal have closed their factories, and they say it is due to labour trouble. May be some labour trouble is there but they are closing it all, and on the contrary the big monopolists are seeing to it that the smaller factories also do not run. Because there is competition between the big and the small the big always sees to it and that is how the big continues to be big and the small is weeded out, is squeezed out from the field of production so that they continue to occupy the monopoly position. Therefore, as in the United States of America and in other advanced capitalist countries, the process is here, and because of the monopolists' operations the small scale ones are going out of existence under the wheels of the fierce competition by the monopolist tycoons in the industry. That has to be stopped, and you cannot stop it by merely issuing sermons and other things. For this we need on the one hand very strong effective anti-monopoly measures but above all expansion of the public sector. For this we need a very clear-cut democratic employment-oriented labour policy which would make illegal closures punishable, retrenchment, lay-off, etc. punishable so that the capitalist and the monopolist classes are not in a position to take to such action as creating more unemployed people.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, here is Mr. Bhagat sitting. We have Mr. Asoke Sen, a member of the ruling party and a former Union Minister, who has closed down the 'Basumati' concern throwing 550 people out in the streets. And can he deny—I would ask him—that the closure is illegal, that the closure of the 'Basumati' concern is illegal? No action is being taken. Mr. Asoke Sen belongs to the ruling party who is going to take Mr. Dharia's professions seriously, because Mr. Asoke Sen is a friend and a member of the ruling party and has been a former Union Minister and still owes allegiance to the Government of the day? And today he is creating unemploy-

ment right under our nose in the streets of Calcutta by illegally closing the 'Basumati' concern. This is the example of a case . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: We have condemned it. Government should take over this paper because I am worried over the outcome of its closure, worried because the employees there have been thrown out of job.

SHRI A. D. MANI: But no Government will take over a paper.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: So you say Government has not completely failed to take it on.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): If Government takes it over, one day your paper may also be involved.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not try to defend him. (*Interruptions*) I am not functioning as Mr. Asoke Sen's spokesman. I am not talking of Mr. Asoke Sen, a Congress Member. I am talking of Mr. Asoke Sen as an employer, as one who creates unemployment, who resorts to illegal closure . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: What about Shri Rajagopalachari?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: An unnecessarily irrelevant interruption. Whoever they are, go against them. If it is Bhupesh Gupta, shoot him, shoot him.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: No, no, we shall not shoot Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is shot at, then who will shoot in Rajya Sabha?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, what is needed today? This concept of mixed economy is a bogus concept. It is a colossal bluff. You cannot be chaste and a street-walker at the same time. You cannot be both. You cannot be a street-walker and a virtuous lady at the same time. It is impossible. Today the concept of mixed economy is a mischievous concept, and I find that Mr. Dinesh Singh, our Industries Minister, is trying to popularise the theory of mixed economy in a manner where the mixture is more and more in favour of the employer, of the monopolist, and the worker is left without anything. Therefore, let us not talk about it. Today there must be a structural change in our economy where the foreign concerns, like oil, should be nationalised and other monopoly concerns should be nationalised for the public sector to gain a preponderance in our economy, and certainly in our industrial economy. But this is not being done. The second point I should like to say is that you must give encouragement to small scale in-



[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

dustries and medium scale industries. Do not think that we can tackle the problem of unemployment by starting big industries only. We are limited in our resources but surely small scale industries and medium scale industries you can start. The country can be studded with such industries especially in the backward regions. Industrially speaking the country can be studded with such industries with the backing of the State Governments and the Central Government and the credit institutions of the Government of India and that is how we can create employment opportunities and spread out employment all over the country but that is not being done. In this context not only there is need for expansion of the public sector; the public sector must enter the consumer industries, must start such small industries and thus create employment potential. We should do that not only for selling goods at cheap prices to the consumer but also for attracting labour and finding employment opportunities. At the same time small men in industry should be given assistance. Our small scale industry people, as you know, do not get assistance in credit, do not get assistance in raw material, do not get assistance when they require a little foreign exchange, do not get assistance for marketing facilities and so on and even after the nationalisation of the banks the position has not changed. Therefore the Government should really link up the development and expansion of the small and medium scale industries with the creation of employment opportunities. That should be made a condition for all industries.

Finally, closure, retrenchment, lay-off, all these things should be dealt with very firmly by the Government and the capitalist class should not be allowed, the monopolists should not be allowed to hold our economy to ransom in this manner creating such a social problem.

*(Time bell rings.)*

Sir, before I sit down, I would say I have made some suggestions, concrete suggestions but I know they will not accept them. All that happens is, I have spoken, you have rung the bell and you have listened to it but nothing will come out of it. This Government is utterly incompetent, it has no labour policy at all. Its planning is not only defective but it is no planning at all. To call it Planning Commission and Udyog Bhavan is a colossal misuse of expression. It is no Planning Commission at all. I do not know what this planning is. As I said before, instead of Mr. Gadgil planning the Planning Commission he has allowed the Planning Commission to plan Mr.

Gadgil. That is the tragedy of one of our outstanding economists today.

Before I sit down I have a word for my friend, Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad. Here is a labour problem. I understand that the workers of Calcutta jute industry are supposed to go on strike from the 8th of this month, that is, from Monday. All of them are here for negotiations but I understand that negotiations cannot take place because Mr. Sanjivayya is unfortunately bedridden and ill and Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad has an appointment in his own State. I would appeal to Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad by telephone to cancel that appointment and attend to this problem which has been brought to Delhi. The employers' representatives, the labour representatives belonging to all the trade unions, have arrived in Delhi and it would be most unfortunate if they were to go back and without any effort they were forced to go on strike. I would therefore appeal to him that he should make the necessary arrangements so that the negotiations which were to have started today do start and an amicable settlement acceptable to the working people is found so that the strike does not become necessary. Otherwise the strike is going to take place and justifiably so. That is the appeal I have made and I would like Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad to give an assurance about unemployment in Bengal. Whenever Bengal is mentioned you always talk of Naxalites. I cannot tolerate this talk of Naxalites. Unemployment is at the root of the problem. I should like to know from Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad as to what steps he has taken in order to put his partymen in order and also see that at least these 550 workers do not become unemployed, the workers of the Basumati concern. It is all that I have got to say. Again I tell you, frankly speaking it will make no sense at all to them and the Planning Commission has no commonsense at all in such matters.

SHRI K. P. MALLIKARJUNUDU (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the outset I congratulate my friend, Mr. Man Singh Varma, on having brought forward a very important Resolution before this House. The unemployment problem is the most burning question of the day. Any Government worth its name should direct its attention towards a solution of this problem.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

I am glad that Mr. Varma has brought this problem into bold focus. He has rightly, in my opinion, emphasised the importance of the unemployment problem and wants that the right to employment should be embodied in our Constitution. I wholly endorse the view set out in the Resolution. Our Government which sweats by socialism

has not tackled this problem in any satisfactory manner. To say that they have brought forward certain measures like the abolition of the privy purses does not really solve this problem. In my opinion, it is only a smokescreen to cover up their own failures. This huge problem of great dimensions, this problem of unemployment stares us in our face. Any Government worth the name should tackle this problem with the utmost urgency. This must be given the topmost priority. Once the Government fails to do this, I should say that the Government has failed in its most important duty. It has been shown by the previous speakers that this problem is assuming huge dimensions. I might again, for the sake of emphasising the importance of this problem, repeat that the number of unemployed is growing day by day. As you know, Sir, the Planning Commission appointed the Dantwala Committee to go into this question. They went into it and made an elaborate report. From that report we find that at the end of the Fourth Plan the number of unemployed would be more than 33 million. While the figure stood at ten million at the beginning of the Fourth Plan, the net addition to the labour force would be 23 million, thus making a total of 33 million. In the words of the Dantwala Committee Report. That only shows that the problem has assumed great proportions. As you know, these figures are only a guess-work. There is no scientific foundation for arriving at these figures. Even the Planning Commission, in the Report of the Committee of Experts on Unemployment Estimates, has said:—

"In previous Plans, estimates used to be presented of the backlog of unemployment at the beginning of the Plan period, of the estimated increase in the work-force during the period, and of additional employment likely to be secured through implementation of the Plan as formulated. Excepting the estimate of increase in the work-force, which was related to demographic data, the others were admittedly rough estimates. There were inherent difficulties in estimating the employment potential of the vast range of projects and programmes planned during the period."

Even the figures supplied in this report are only rough estimates and they do not represent the accurate state of things. As I said in the beginning, any Government worth the name should tackle this problem with the topmost priority. In this connection I would like to draw your attention to article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The right to employment, the right to work has been accepted as one of the fundamental basic

human rights. This article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights reads as follows:

"Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control."

It has been clearly laid down by this Declaration of Human Rights that right to employment is a basic fundamental human right. When such is the case, there is no reason why the Government should adopt a step-motherly attitude towards this most important problem.

Sir, in this connection I may also be allowed to quote article 39 of the Indian Constitution which is contained in the Chapter relating to Directive Principles. It reads as follows:—

"The State shall, in particular, direct its policy towards securing that the citizens, men and women equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood."

So this principle that it is a very basic right has been accepted in the language of the Directive Principles. When such is the case, the Government ought to have taken steps to meet the situation. I must confess that the Government has woefully failed in this respect. Sir, when I say that this right to work, this right to employment, should be included in the fundamental rights, adumbrated in the Constitution, I am not unaware of the difficulties that are inherent in the situation. You know, Sir, that the unemployment problem is a huge problem and it cannot be solved overnight. I agree. But what I want to say is that the Government should take immediate steps in such a manner that the urgency of the problem requires. Has the Government done anything so far? Even taking the Fourth Plan document into consideration a small chapter has been devoted to this question. Some rural works, some kind of small works in the rural areas are mentioned as giving some kind of employment to the unemployed. That is the position. So, I would like to say that unless it is made a fundamental right and enumerated in the Constitution in the chapter on Fundamental Rights, this question cannot be solved, because it gives the necessary urgency to the problem, it goads the Government, it places the responsibility and duty on the Government to see that this problem is tackled with the utmost urgency. Unless it is done so, it cannot be solved. Why I say this is, when once it is included in the fundamental

[Shri K. P. Mallikarjunudu]

rights, there is a statutory obligation, constitutional obligation on the part of the Government to tackle the problem. Suppose the Government fails to provide work or employment for a certain person, if it is included in the fundamental rights, he can go to the court of law and get redress. At the same time I may tell you that it is not possible to create employment for all people overnight. I agree. So, let there be a provision in the Constitution that within a period of 15 or 20 years this problem should be solved in its entirety. By so saying we will be giving the right to go to the court of law after that period. After the expiry of the stipulated period of 15 or 20 years if the Government fails to provide employment to any particular individual, that particular individual will be entitled to go to a court of law and get redressed. I am aware of the difficulties of the problem. Hence I would say that a phased programme may be chalked out to meet the situation without any practical or administrative difficulties. In this connection I may submit that our Congress Party has recognised the importance of this problem, and in a Resolution passed by them at the AICC on the 27th and 28th June, 1970 in Delhi they categorically put this problem in its broad perspective. It is to the following effect. Let me be permitted to read the Resolution and quote:—

"There should be a massive works programme. Every municipality and every cluster of village panchayats must have works on hand. The resources for this should be given top priority as in defence. A Department of Economic Opportunities should be added to the Government of India. It will have a budget of its own of Rs. 1,000 crores over a five-year period. The amount will be used through State Governments for developing employment opportunities in rural and urban areas, agriculture, industry, principally small-scale and cottage industries, giving special attention to chronically backward areas."

This is the clear cut Resolution passed by our party at their AICC meeting at Delhi. I want to bring this to the notice of the Government and say that it should be implemented without any delay.

I once again thank my friend, Mr. Man Singh Varma for having brought forward this very good and excellent Resolution.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Sir, I rise to support the Resolution moved by our esteemed friend Shri Man Singh Varma.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the amendment?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I am coming to that amendment also. The Resolution seeks to highlight three major and principal points. The first is the failure of the Government to tackle the menacing unemployment problem of the country; secondly, he wants that the Constitution should be amended so as to include the right to work as a Fundamental Right and thirdly he says that if the Government fails to provide job to an able-bodied man, he should be provided with payment of unemployment allowance. These are the three principal points that he has sought to highlight through this Resolution.

Sir, with regard to the failure of the Government, I was amazed to listen to some of our very esteemed friends who belong to 'Young Turks'. I do not know how they can afford to say that the Government has made very significant progress, particularly in this field. Well, we have got certain staggering figures at our disposal to place before the House. Even the voluminous document of the Fourth Five Year Plan, to the greater surprise of the people of this country and the world also has not even sought to mention something about the number of unemployed persons in our country; there has been no specific programme with regard to the solution of the unemployment problem. Is it a success? Is it a success which they claim? Is it not a glaring failure on the part of the Planning Commission and also the Government as a whole? Sir, according to very widely accepted estimates, there are at least 20 million people without jobs. I think you will agree. But they claim it as a success and not a failure. Sir, according to the survey of the Reserve Bank of India, they say that 13 million of the people are unemployed. I think that is a success for them, not a failure. The Fourth Five Year Plan expects to generate 14 million new jobs whereas during the Fourth Plan period 28 million people will be entering the labour market. I think it is their success. If they call it their success I have got nothing to say. Yet with all these glaring failures they have got no courage to admit it and say, "Yes. We have failed. But we have to muster courage and attack the problem with concerted endeavour".

Sir, much has been said about employment exchanges. Sir, I have very elaborate figures. To bring to your notice only one figure, the figure of West Bengal. Sir, according to the live register of employment as on 17-4-70 the total number of unemployed people was 34,60,177 of which West Bengal tops the list; it stands first. Its

share is 5,17,872 to the greatest agony of the nation as a whole, not to the agony of West Bengal alone.

Sir, I have got other figures also. I do not like to take the time of the House. But one significant factor which is to be discussed is that West Bengal, Kerala, Maharashtra with 21 per cent. of the total population, have got a share of unemployment of 33 per cent. Of the total unemployed, 33 per cent. is the share of these three States, West Bengal, Kerala and Maharashtra, when the total population of three States constitutes 21 per cent. of the total population of the nation. I do not mean to under-estimate the unemployment problem of Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi and other States. But the significant fact is to be taken note of.

Sir, much has been said about the Dantwala Committee. It is very significant when he reveals that the problem of unemployment and under-employment is more serious in the age-group of 15—25. This is the breeding-ground of Naxalism and here lies the major and basic problem. These young men between the age group of 15—25 have got no future or meaningful life. Therefore, they do not think much about your democracy. They do not think much about what you say and what you plead and what you practice. Therefore, this thing is also to be borne in mind.

Now, Principal Bipinpal Das was referring to the educational system. I am completely in agreement with him. But the problem is that a scare is being created in this country that we have too many educated people and, therefore, there should be no further spread of education.

I know, Sir, there is a very great problem of unemployment for the uneducated. Today there are about 17,60,000 educated unemployed in our country of whom about 10 lakhs are matriculates, about 4,69,000 are under-graduates and 2,68,000, perhaps, graduates. This is the problem. At the same time you should also bear in mind that ours is a vast country with a population of 550 million. What is to be borne in mind is that the entire working force of our country consists of only three per cent of educated persons. I want the Principal to note this. Of the entire working force in this country, only three per cent are educated. *(Interruption)* Twenty-six per cent are literate and 74 per cent are illiterate. Our Education Minister comes and says that there has been pread of education and proliferation of educated men. But we are living in a Republic where 74 per cent of the working population is illiterate and only three per cent of the working force

constitute the educated. And now they propose to limit the scope of education. I entirely agree that there is need for diversification of education. But that does not mean that we should limit the scope of education. It does not mean that we have outstripped the scope of education and, therefore, there is no necessity for further education.

**SHRI BIPINPAL DAS:** Nobody said that.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU:** This is the attempt which is being made, that since there are a large number of educated unemployed, admission should be restricted and the scope of education should be restricted. The Education Ministry came out with a programme that there should not be further admissions in engineering colleges.

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:** No.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU:** I have got it with me. Therefore, that is not a solution. The solution is not to restrict education.

**SHRI BIPINPAL DAS:** I think Mr. Chitta Basu is wrong. The emphasis is that there should be lesser admission in general education and more admission in the technical field, in mechanics, in vocational training and so on. This emphasis is there.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU:** That is there.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** The emphasis is on diversification.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU:** I agree with him, but that does not mean that education is not to be spread. Education is to be spread and we should not think that we have been able to fulfil our programme for education. That is what I want to stress. It should be diversified, I agree.

Now, if we want really to tackle this problem, there should be a radical reorientation of the entire economic programme. There should be a structural change in the economic system. By that I mean, the Government should immediately break the stranglehold of the monopolists over our economy; they should nationalise the basic and key industries, they should nationalise foreign banks, they should also ban repatriation of profits to foreign countries. In this way, there should be a radical programme for the economic rejuvenation of the country. I do not want to dilate on that subject, but I want to bring to the notice of the hon. mover of the Resolution that when he wants the right to work as a fundamental right, he is silent on removing the right to property from the chapter of fundamental rights. If he wants the right to work as a fundamental right,

[Shri Chitta Basu]

then the right to property should be removed from the chapter of fundamental rights. You cannot guarantee the right to work unless you snatch away this right to property from the chapter of fundamental rights. Therefore, if you really want to radicalise the economy, if you really want that socialist economy should be developed in this country, then your attack should also be directed against those persons who are there to protect the vested interests in the form of retaining the right to property as a fundamental right.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY** (Tamil Nadu): Then what would one work for?

**SHRI CHITTA BASU**: Property is only for one's own living, not for creating surplus property at the expense of the hunger and suffering of others.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA**: My friend says the right to property should not be a fundamental right just as consumer right is not a fundamental right.

**SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY**: It is a natural right.

**SHRI CHITTA BASU**: Therefore, I want that the honourable Mover should also consider this aspect of the problem which I have referred to. Now I want to refer to the amendment moved by my friend, Mr. Krishan Kant. He wants to solve this problem within the framework of the present policy of the Government of which unfortunately he is a follower. He cannot go beyond those limits. Therefore, the amendment, also sponsored by the Congress, is nothing but another hoax, is nothing but another deception, on the younger generation of our country. If we are really interested in liquidating unemployment, we must pick up courage to bring about a radical change in the economic policies of our country.

Sir, with these few words I conclude.

**DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR** (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am glad that Shri Man Singh Varma has brought this Resolution before this august House, but I cannot see my way to support the Resolution because three things have been said before that the Government has entirely failed in its task of reducing unemployment, that we must amend the Constitution and that we must give a dole to all those that are unemployed. Well, I would not dilate upon the first two points. But I must say that there is no Government of any type in the world—although the communist countries do give employment to all, now even in those countries unemployment is growing—there is no Government whether with parliamentary system or other democratic set-up, which can give

a pension or an allowance to every worker who has not got a job. I agree that unemployment is a sort of a giant and it is eating at the very root of our democratic set-up. It is the cause of unrest among the people, it is because of many evils that are there in our country. But the problem has to be tackled in another way. Much has been said about facts and figures of unemployment. My previous speakers put forth so much data and spoke much. But I would confine my remarks to a few points.

Regarding education it is unfortunate that in India our education is service-oriented it is job-oriented. When Lord Macaulay advocated English education to the Indian people, his main point was that there would be Indians who would speak English, who would write English and who would serve in the offices at that time because the Britishers could not come in the required numbers. He said so many other things. But all of them are not relevant here. Unfortunately that has persisted in our system of education, that type of service-oriented education. Every Indian who goes to a college, who goes to a technical institution, who goes to a university, gets job-oriented education. Of course, jobs they must get. But we must have education not only for finding jobs. In other countries many people are amazed and they put this question: Why do all Indians want to have Government service? It is true. Therefore, education should be much as to give a feeling of self-reliance to students. Their attitude should be such that if they get jobs, it is good; if they do not get jobs, they should be self-reliant and they should have initiative in other directions. Only then, this problem can be solved to a great extent.

The other thing is that education is meant to cultivate the mind and to prepare an individual for future life, for methodical thinking and working. Education is not always meant to enable people to do office jobs. Therefore this mentality of the parents—no matter what they are doing—to educate their children just to enable them to take up government jobs, has got to be changed. This mentality has created unemployment among the educated to a great extent. I would suggest that the children of those who are engaged in cottage industries should acquire skill in their respective industries and government should encourage and help people in this direction. I am glad that in the field of agriculture the government is taking the right step in training young people in agricultural operations and a farmer's son wants to remain a farmer. This should be done in the case

of cottage industries also. Take the example of Kashmir. Those beautiful Kashmiri shawls made of pashmina had gone out of market because young people do not like to work with their hands. I am glad that the Kashmir government is taking steps to encourage the young people to do this work with their hands and those beautiful things are again coming back to the market. Similarly, the unemployed engineers who are in huge numbers should be encouraged more and more to start small-scale and medium-scale industries. But for that there is an acute shortage of steel in our country and government have to see to it that steel is made available to them. Otherwise engineering industries cannot function without steel, and other raw-materials. There is scope in other fields also such as drugs. Government should see to it that they get the raw-materials. I am glad that the nationalised banks and other credit institutions are giving credit to these people on easy terms. This should be implemented to a greater extent and whatever obstructions there are, should be removed.

Then, improvement in public sector should take place. The management and labour relations have to improve and for that I appeal to all the political parties to see to it that no disputes on political grounds are raised. I must say a word about women. There are many women who are employed in all walks of life such as industries, services, etc. I wish them well and I would appeal that there should be less and less resistance to women being employed. But I must say a word about married women. There are a bulk of married women, some educated and others not educated, who are staying at home looking after their families.

4 P.M.

Sir, I feel that looking after children is a sacred duty of a mother and no one else can give mother's love and mother's care to a growing child. There the mother has a responsibility towards the child and towards the nation. But, at the same time, Sir, when they have finished with the job of bringing up their children, those women who are in large numbers, should be given part-time employment wherever it is suitable and there should be a committee, Sir, to go into this question, because in other countries they have got facilities for the married women to have re-orientation courses and then to get employment, it may be a part-time employment or full-time employment. In middle-class families and other families it is absolutely essential these days because women have to supplement the income of their husbands to meet the rising prices and increasing expenses of the family and therefore, the interests of the mar-

ried women, who have done their duty towards their children, their families and to the nation, should be safeguarded and I suggest, Sir, that there should be a committee to go into these problems of the women force which is a big force in our country and who are discontented, because nowadays doing some work outside or in the family has also become a status symbol for women. Other women, wives of very highly placed officers, would not go out and do small jobs in schools and other places. But they do, not because they need the money, but because they feel they should also do some work, some active work, outside their families. So, Sir, this urge has to be satisfied and their real need has to be met and at the same time, the nation owes a duty to them because they have also done their duty towards the nation. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Prof. Ruthnaswamy.

PROF. M. RUTHNASWAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, while I sympathise with the intention of the mover of this Resolution, as an attempt to draw the attention of the Government to the overwhelming problem of unemployment, I am afraid I cannot congratulate him on the wording of the Resolution in which he calls for an amendment of the Constitution with a view to incorporating the right to work as one of the rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

Apart from the parliamentary difficulties, in the present position of parties in this Parliament, of bringing about a constitutional amendment, there are very serious objections to incorporating the right to work among the fundamental rights of the citizens of India, because if a man or if a woman claims the right to work, it will imply that the State is under a paramount obligation, under an inextricable obligation, to find work and it may be obliged to find that work itself, to undertake a number of industries, State industries, in other words, to be more socialistic, and in order to achieve this end in perfection, it should be communistic as far as possible. This right to work to individual citizens implies that the State will have to establish a large number of industries itself. This is not the first time, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that the right to work has been claimed. Nearly a hundred and twenty-five years ago, at the time of the revolution of 1848, in France, this right to work was to be incorporated in the Constitution which founded the Second Republic of France. And the great political philosopher and statesman, D. Tocquaville, who wrote one of the classic books on Democracy, "Democracy in America" argued that if this right to work is incorporated in the Constitution, it would take France back to the days of the

[Prof. M. Rushnaswamy]

Ancient Regime, days of the absolute monarchy, when the monarch, the Government, was the 'mai-baap' of the people, trying to find work, trying to establish industries, which will be encouraged to invade all spheres of employment, all spheres of work. Therefore, there is great danger of incorporating this right to work in the Constitution.

But this Resolution which has been brought forward focuses the attention of the public as well as the Government on this great need for solving the problem of unemployment. Many figures have been quoted. Most of them are based on guess-work. But one thing is certain about the number of under-employed people. The labour force in our rural parts accounts for about 100 million people, and all these 100 million men and women are under-employed for half the year. And there are large number of unemployed, graduates in Arts and Science, and still a large number of unemployed un-skilled workers. So it is the duty of the Government, not so much the right of the citizen to work it is the duty of the Government—to find employment, directly or indirectly, by encouraging private industry to expand as much as possible.

There are two ways, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in which the Government can solve the problem of unemployment. The first is directly by multiplying the public works that are so necessary for India, for India to build up an effective economic structure. The *infra structure* has to be built up. Roads have to be built, specially rural roads, connecting villages with the nearest market. We are woefully deficient in roads. India is one of the most backward countries of the world in regard to roads. We have 750,000 miles of roads to build. If the Government undertakes a crash programme of rural road making, as recommended by the Sinha Committee which wanted the Government to spend Rs. 75 crores a year for rural roads, then we would find work for at least 5 million people to make the roads, and these 5 million would be required to maintain the roads once they are built.

Then there is a large number of drinking-water wells, one of the prime necessities of people. There are 400,000 villages which are not provided with pure drinking-water. There are thus these wells to be dug up and maintained. That will give employment to 2 millions to 3 millions of people.

Then there is rural housing which has been referred to already. Sixty million houses have to be constructed or re-constructed. There is need to convert the huts or hovels

into which our rural population lives at the present time into decent human habitation. One million such houses would find employment for about 10 million per year if this rural house building work is undertaken.

And then there are small-scale industries, cottage industries and other village industries that could be modernised so as to serve the modern needs in modern conditions. Another 10 to 15 million people will get employment if these village industries, cottage industries, etc., were mechanised and situated at some economically viable place—not one in each village, but at least at the site of a Panchayat, Union or Samiti.

In these ways, directly by organising crash programmes of public works, millions of people could be employed. The Government would find work for millions of people. And all these works are labour-intensive. Villagers are willing to offer their labour free for the making of the village roads, digging of wells and reconstruction of their houses. The raw material is to be found all about the place—the sand, the clay, and the chunam that are required. They are not capital intensive, they are labour intensive employment. Then there is the preparatory work which the Government could undertake.

About adult education, our country has the doubtful distinction of being probably the most illiterate country among the civilised countries of the world. 25 per cent of the people only are literates and there are the other 75 per cent to be made literate. At least we might undertake the rapid promotion of literacy among the adult population. We cannot wait for our boys and girls to grow up to be literates. These 100 million people could be educated in less than 6 months according to the Russian method of making people literate. Thousands of the unemployed graduates could be employed in these adult literacy classes. As for the unemployed engineers, I do not understand why the Government has not adopted the device adopted in France by which all the industrial factories and firms are employing on the managerial side. If the engineers are employed in the management of such factories instead of the IAS and the ICS people now employed in the management of our industries and in public undertakings in place of the relatives of the proprietors of the private enterprise, and the caste-man of the proprietors of private enterprise. These engineering graduates with a year's training in management, could be put into the managerial sections of our industries, whether in the private or the public sector.

Again technical schools must have millions of our unskilled workers into skilled workers. You do not want engineer colleges,

you do not want polytechnics for this purpose. Create junior technical schools, one in each taluk and senior schools one in each district. They could convert millions of unskilled into skilled workers and they would find employment in all the small-scale and large-scale industries. In these practical ways the Government, by following the programme such as I have suggested, should be able to solve the problem of unemployment. If the Government is not able to do it, it is because it is carried away by the socialist and communist idea of capturing the commanding heights of our economy. But before capturing the commanding heights, you must make good your structure at the ground level. It reminds me of an episode in the last NEFA war with China when General Kaul went to a Brigadier and asked him to capture a commanding height occupied by the Chinese. The Brigadier said: "We have not got the men and the equipment, how can we go and capture the commanding height". The General said: "No, that is the order of the Government of India that not an inch of Indian soil shall be in Chinese hands". So the Brigadier in spite of his judgment and commonsense and the facts of the military situation, undertook that job and he was hurled down with his troops by the Chinese. So before capturing the commanding heights of the economy, you must make good the ground level structure so that the commanding heights of the economy may be built up in the future.

Now, if this Government will not undertake this crash programme, such as I have suggested, it is open to other parties to take up such a programme to take up such a practical programme to solve the problem of unemployment. If other parties, whether singly, or in alliance such as is now being organised, were to put in their election manifesto this election cry that they will find employment for the millions of the unemployed, I am sure it will go a long way towards the party or parties winning the elections. Whether by this Government or by future Governments, such a programme for finding employment for the millions will solve one of the most anxious and one of the most pressing problems with which the public and the Government are faced today. So the Resolution of Shri Man Singh Varma will, I hope, serve a useful purpose, the useful purpose of concentrating the attention of the public and of the Government on this question of solving the problem of unemployment as quickly, as rapidly and as effectively as possible.

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** माननीय वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, श्री वर्मा जी ने जो बेकारी की

समस्या के समाधान के लिये प्रस्ताव रखा है मैं समझता हूँ कि वह उन्होंने आधे दिल से रखा है।

**श्री मान सिंह वर्मा :** आप भी आधे दिल से बोल रहे हैं।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** मैं आपको समझा दूंगा कि क्यों आधे दिल से रखा है। समस्या का समाधान नहीं किया, सिर्फ सरकार को दो, चार शब्द कहे हैं, सरकार का टोटल फेल्योर हुआ है सरकार फेल हो गई। तो इनका इरादा कुछ दूसरा ही था, प्राबलम और समस्या का समाधान करने का इनका इरादा नहीं था तो जैसे हिम्मत करके कहते हैं राइट टु वर्क 53 करोड़ हमारी आबादी हो गई है, 54 करोड़ होने जा रही है, इतने आदमी बेकार हैं और यदि इनके प्रस्ताव को सरकार मान भी ले, सदन भी मान ले तो यह डोल, भिक्षावृत्ति देने के लिये पैसा कहां से आएगा, सब जगह घाटा पर घाटा हो रहा है, पैसा नहीं है—वैसे ही यह भी उसके साथ लगा देते कि फण्डामेंटल राइट टु प्रापर्टी को उड़ा दिया जाय और हिन्दुस्तान में 100 परिवारों, पूँजीपतियों के पास जो सारा धन और सम्पत्ति रखी हुई है वह ले ली जाय तो इतनी पूँजी हो जाती कि उस समस्या का समाधान हो जाता। इसलिए मैं कह रहा था आधे दिल से क्योंकि इस तरह सरकार को गाली देने का इनको मौका मिल गया, लेकिन समस्या का समाधान करने का इनका इरादा नहीं है। अभी भी मौका है, इस प्रस्ताव में हिम्मत के साथ संशोधन लाएं, सारा सदन मानने के लिये तैयार है, हिम्मत के साथ ये अपने प्रस्ताव में खुद अमेंडमेंट लाएं या हम लोग अमेंडमेंट दें उसको ये मान लें, फण्डामेंटल राइट टु प्रापर्टी चला जाना चाहिये। उसके बाद हिन्दुस्तान के जितने कल-कारखाने, इंडस्ट्री, चाय-बागान हैं उन सबका बिना कम्पैनसेशन दिये राष्ट्रीकरण कर लेना चाहिये। कम्पैनसेशन के क्लाइम को उड़ाने की संविधान में तरमीम आए तो हम लोग सहर्ष उनके रिजोल्यूशन को मानेंगे और समझेंगे कि जनसंघ के लोग, जिन को हम



[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

दकियानूसी कहते थे और प्रतिक्रियावादी कहते थे, अब सही रास्ते पर चले हैं। इसलिये मैं वर्मा जी को सलाह दूंगा कि वर्मा जी अपने प्रस्ताव में तरमीम लावें। ठीक है राइट टु वर्क होना चाहिये लेकिन पूंजी कहां से आएगी। इसलिये वह नुस्खा भी रखें, सहर्ष इस प्रस्ताव को हम मानेंगे। ये खाली सरकार की भर्त्सना करना चाहते हैं, समस्या का समाधान नहीं करना चाहते, इसलिये हम इस प्रस्ताव को समर्थन नहीं दे सकते। हमारे कृष्णकान्त जी का जो अमेंडमेंट है वह भी गोलमोल है, समस्या का समाधान उससे भी नहीं होता...

**श्री मान सिंह वर्मा :** समाजवादी है...

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** समाजवाद मैं आपको समझाता हूं। हमारे समाजवाद-समाजवाद कहते-कहते ही तो आप राइट टु वर्क पर आ गए। आप मजदूरों के साथ रहते हैं, टेंगड़ी जी बुरी जगह बैठे हैं लेकिन आप आएं सही रास्ते पर। इसलिये इनके प्रस्ताव को मैं मानता नहीं। मैं अपनी सरकार की भी मजबूत करना चाहता हूं। इससे पहले मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो हमारे प्रोफेसर रत्नस्वामी हैं इनको समाजवाद ही आ बन कर दिखाई देता है, यह कहते हैं समाजवाद इससे नहीं होगा। मैं कहता हूं वाइस चैयरमैन महोदय, कि जब तक इस देश में समाजवाद नहीं होगा तब तक बेकारी की समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा। आप कहीं चले जाइए, किसी सोशलिस्ट कंट्री में कोई अनएम्प्लायमेंट नहीं है, लेकिन लोग कहते हैं कि अमरीका और ब्रिटेन जो बहुत बड़े धनी देश हैं वहां भी बेकार हैं। सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज में बेकारी नहीं है और वहां बेकारी नहीं हो सकती।

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I would like to point out that I have seen it myself that unemployment exists in communist countries. I have seen it myself.

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** वाइसचैयरमैन साहब, मैं उन को कहता नहीं हूं, लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि वह दूसरे चश्मे से देखे होंगे। सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज में बेकारी नहीं है।

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: I am telling the truth. I am a lover of socialist countries but I have seen myself.

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** हम भी गये हैं और हम ने भी कम्युनिस्ट और सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज को देखा है। कम्युनिस्ट कंट्रीज तो अभी संसार में कोई भी नहीं है क्योंकि कम्युनिज्म में आगे जा कर 'स्टेट शैल विदर अबे' हो जाता है इस लिये वहां कोई सवाल नहीं उठता, लेकिन सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज में जहां जहां भी मैं देख कर आया हूं वहां मैं ने भी अपनी आंखों से देखा है और हमारे दास जी ने भी देखा होगा, लेकिन उन्होंने दूसरे चश्मे से देखा होगा और हम ने अपने चश्मे से देखा है और इस लिये हम को वहां हरियाली दिखायी पड़ी और उन को कुछ नजर नहीं आया। यह तो अपनी अपनी नुस्ते निगाह है। मैं उन को वेशी नहीं कह सकता हूं; लेकिन इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि समाजवादी देश में कोई बेकारी नहीं है।

**श्री मान सिंह वर्मा :** आप ने भी तो चश्मा लगाया हुआ था।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** हां, और हम ने उस से आप को भी देखा है और दूसरे देशों को भी देखा है। मान सिंह वर्मा जी ने हम को एक मौका दे दिया कहने के लिए। तो मैं अपनी सरकार से कहता हूं कि वर्मा जी कहें या न कहें, लेकिन हमारी सरकार को सचेत होने का समय अब आ गया है और मैं समझता हू कि जितनी प्रगतिशील जमातें हैं और जो वर्मा जी जैसे लोग हैं वह सब इस मामले में हमारी तरफ आ जायेंगे, कभी कभी वे राजे महाराजों के साथ चले जाते हैं, चले गये, लेकिन चूंकि वे बेकारी की समस्या को हल करने का कोई रास्ता निकालना चाहते हैं इसलिए मैं अपनी सरकार को राय देना चाहता हू और यह प्रस्ताव देना चाहता हूं कि यदि सरकार सचमुच में चाहती है कि बेकारी की समस्या का समाधान हो तो जो मौजूदा निजाम है, जो मौजूदा व्यवस्था है मिक्सड इकानामी की, यह एक दोगली नीति है। यह एक वास्टर्ड पालिसी है। इस को हम दोगली नीति कहते हैं। यह न तो समाजवादी है और न

पूँजीवादी। यह तो बीच के रास्ते से चल रही है। यह एक बीच की नीति है। हमारे नेता लोग कहते हैं कि यह एक अच्छी नीति है, लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि जो दोगली नीति होगी वह अच्छी नीति कैसे हो सकती है? और क्या इस से बेकारी की समस्या का समाधान हो सकता है? कभी नहीं हो सकता। कहीं भी दुनिया में मिक्सड इकानामी से बेकारी की समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो रहा है। इसलिए अब मौका आ गया है कि अगर आप को समाजवादी व्यवस्था लानी है तो यह मिक्सड इकानामी ज़रूरी चाहिए और उस को छोड़ कर वर्मा जी की राय मानते हुए जितने कल-कारखाने हैं, जितने बाग-बगीचे हैं चाय और काफी के देश में उन सब का बिना मुआवजा दिये हुए राष्ट्रीयकरण, समाजिकरण कर दिया जाना चाहिए। उस के लिए किसी को मुआवजा देने की जरूरत नहीं। श्री शान्ति प्रसाद जैन और बिड़ला जी को ही दस हजार और बारह हजार रुपया महीना दे कर उन का मनेजर बनाओ, जैसा कि लेनिन ने किया था। और यह आप के आई० सी० एस० और आई० ए० एस० अफसर लोग जो हैं वे कारखाना चलाना नहीं जानते। यह तो सिर्फ एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन कर सकते हैं; ये लोग कारखाना क्या चलायेंगे? (*INTERRUPTION*) उनसे कारखाने नहीं चलेगे.....

**श्री मान सिंह वर्मा :** इसलिए सारे कारखाने घाटे पर चलाते रहिए।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** इसी लिए मैं कहता हूँ कि उन्हीं शान्ति प्रसाद जैन और श्री बिड़ला जी और उन के और ठेकेदारों को उन का मनेजर बना दो तब इस समस्या का समाधान हो सकता है। वाइस चेरमैन साहब आप एक पंचवर्षीय योजना में ढाई करोड़ लोगों को नौकरी देगे लेकिन उस बीच में हम 5 करोड़ लोगों को पैदा कर के रख देगे और इस लिए इस मिक्सड इकानामी में आप कितना भी कीजिए इस बेकारी की समस्या का समाधान नहीं हो सकता। रेजीमेंटेशन तथा क्रेश प्रोग्राम की बात हमारे भूपेश जी ने कही। उन की सलाह नेक है। हमारे क्रेश प्रोग्राम के

वारे में जो सलाह है वह ठीक है, रेजीमेंटेशन आप कीजिए लेकिन असली जो रामबाण औपधि है वह यह नहीं। जैसा मान सिंह वर्मा जी ने और प्रोफेसर रत्नास्वामी ने कहा, कि यहां सोशलिज्म नहीं होगा, और इस से समस्या का समाधान भी नहीं होगा। जिस रूप में यह प्रस्ताव आया है उस को मान लेने से तो इस बेकारी की समस्या का समाधान होने वाला नहीं है। कुछ बेकारों को पैसे देने से काम नहीं चलेगा और सब को पैसा दिया नहीं जा सकता इसलिए कि सरकार के पास पैसे नहीं हैं और पैसा लेने के लिए जो एक सौ परिवारों के पास धन है जो सारे देश की संपत्ति है उस को आप लेना नहीं चाहते। अगर राजे महाराजों का सवाल आयेगा तो उस समय कांग्रेस और जनसंघ सब मिल जायेंगे और प्रापर्टी फंडामेंटल राइट है का नारा लगाने हुए निज-लिगप्पा जी और दूसरे लोगों के बयान निकलने लगेंगे। तो इस तरह शरमाने से काम चलने वाला नहीं है। यहां तो घड़ियाल के आंसू बहाने से काम चलने वाला नहीं है, इसलिए सही मानो में, सचमुच में, बेकारी की समस्या को हल करना है तो सरकार आगे बढ़े। श्री मानसिंह वर्मा प्रस्ताव लाते रहे, सुन लेना चाहिये, लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ अपनी सरकार से कि जो हमारी मौजूदा नीति है इस नीति का हम परित्याग नहीं करेंगे तो, वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, जनता बदलती नहीं करेगी। उसने 1952 ई० में विश्वास किया, 1957 में विश्वास किया, 1962 तक विश्वास किया, थम्पिंग मेजोरिटी देती रही, लेकिन अब जनता क्षुब्ध हो रही है, जनता ने लाठी चलाना शुरू कर दिया है, जब से इन्दिरा गांधी ने कहा कि यहां समाजवाद करेंगे, ऐसा प्रगतिशील काम करेंगे, तब से कुछ जनता इस की बात सोचने लगी है लेकिन यह कछुये की गति, कच्छप गति, टारट्याज स्पीड से काम चलने वाला नहीं है। इससे हर एक घर में एक नक्सलपन्थी निकलेगा, आप रोक नहीं सकते हैं। इसलिये यदि सचमुच में इस समस्या का, बेकारी की समस्या का, अन-इम्प्लायमेंट के क्वेश्चन का, समाधान करना है तो

[ श्री शीलभद्र याजी ] :

जरा सोशलिज्म की जो गाड़ी है वह तीव्र गति से चले तब तो काम होगा नहीं तो कोई रास्ता नहीं है, हम लोगों को अन्धकार मालूम पड़ता है और सरकार भी शायद अन्धकार में गिर जायगी। इन शब्दों के साथ वाइसचेयरमैन महोदय, जयहिन्द।

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SANYAL (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I agree with my friend, Shri Yajee, that this is not a matter of sermon, but a matter for practical consideration. We are talking of distribution of property, but we are not completing that distribution by the distribution of poverty also. We are talking of unemployment, and under-employment without taking into consideration that a large percentage of our people are over-employed. If you have to nationalise property, you have to nationalise poverty. You have also to nationalise the vocations and the opportunities for employment. At this old age I think that no person should have more than one occupation. You go anywhere and make an assorted assessment and you will find that a man like me is a lawyer in a court and, having inherited some property from his ancestors, is enjoying that also. Members of Parliament get a subsistence salary at least, but they are also carrying on their profession. So long as we are here as Members of Parliament, we ought to create a climate of confidence in the people that we mean business. Anyone who is a Member of Parliament, getting a subsistence salary at least, ought to forego his other normal vocation, so that others of his line may get the advantage of that. If you are a lawyer, you must not be a farmer. If you are a farmer, confine yourself to 75 bighas of land. Why not a businessman confine himself only to one business getting a subsistence living? You go and look into this. Monopolism has been talked about by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and by Mr. Mohan Dharia. How does this monopoly come into existence? A particular businessman starts his career with one business. Then, he picks up a fat income and takes up another business. He becomes a contractor, a cinema director, an industrialist, an enterpriser, a commercial distributor and all that. In this way, the entire surplus money of the country has been bogged and locked into a few hands. Therefore, the proposition is this. Under-employment and unemployment can be solved, to some extent, simultaneously by being attacked on this front, namely, one man not more than one job. Whether that job is remunerative or not is a secondary matter for consideration, but you start with this one man one job. Then, the second job, the third job and the fourth job in his

hands will be released and will be available to the other fellow-citizens. After all, what is the point in socialism? We are taking votes from persons who are aged 21.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Will you forego, if you have more than 75 bighas of land?

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SANYAL: I have got only 14 bighas of land.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No interruptions please.

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SANYAL: Well, I am prepared to forego my 14 bighas of land. If you want my 14 bighas to go, I will gladly forego, and if I am guilty, well, penalise me. I shall make him disgorge whatever he has got.

Therefore, my humble appeal to all sections of this House is, so far as the objective is concerned, we are nearly one. Only our method of approach is different. We must look into the matter.

As I was saying, you go to a man aged 21 asking for his vote. Why do you not also guarantee him an ounce of food? This is a national problem. This is a national proposition. So, what have I to ask the voter for, whom you have not been able to guarantee a morsel of bread? Therefore, unless this Resolution pinpoints the centre of the democratic concept of things why make meaningless differences in the name of socialism, the nation and so on?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: You should also provide funds.

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SANYAL: I am glad that my friend . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Please continue. There are others also to speak.

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SANYAL: Sir, my friend has asked for funds.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Ignore him.

SHRI SASANKASEKHAR SANYAL: If you want to make an honest start, freeze the wealth of the community and then make a start, make an assessment. But do not take away everything. Give something for subsistence. Take away his business. You demonetise the currency. As I said on previous occasions, demonetise the currency. Bring all the people on the same level. That should be begun seriously and unless the Government is prepared to do that it is no good responding to Varmaji's Resolution by mere slogans and eulogising propositions.

Therefore, I submit that over-employed people must be brought down to a level of minimum employment. "One man, one job" must be the theory. All wealth should be taken away and the surplus should be assessed by rational determination and beyond

that determination everything must go to the State. So, make all the people poor first so that you can make them competent afterwards. It will not do to nationalise property from the top now. You have to nationalise poverty. You should give the rich man a taste of poverty; he must go and sit on the same pavement with the rickshaw-walas and the pheriwalas. Every man should be occupied and every man should be given a new opening according to his talents, according to his equipment, according to his education that he might profit. Thank you.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI (Haryana): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, that the right to gainful employment is a basic human right, is a proposition which is beyond all controversy. I do not think anyone would suggest that there is any scope for difference of opinion in this limited proposition that the right to gainful employment is a basic human right. I say 'gainful employment' because it has to be gainful to the individual as well as to society. Any employment in unsocial activities is not what we have in view, neither in the Resolution nor in the view of any one of us. So to introduce this amongst the Fundamental Rights to my mind, does not do justice to its basic nature. I think it is more fundamental than the fundamental rights that we have in the Constitution today.

Take the instance of a young man who is properly educated in good health, competent and capable of performing an excellent job for himself and for the society, unable to find a job for himself. What is the meaning of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom to move freely in the country and all the other freedoms that we have enumerated in article 19 of the Constitution? I say the unemployed person who is capable of being usefully employed, to him the fundamental right are meaningless. They do not mean anything to him I believe that talent becomes destructive when it is not gainfully employed, when it is not employed for the benefit of society, for the benefit of the nation. It is neither an economic problem nor is it a problem of law and order. It is a basic human problem that we are confronted with when we are talking about unemployment.

We agree with the resolution not as it has been framed but in so far as it recognises the problem. It is a gigantic problem. It is a colossal problem. It is a problem which has to be handled, which has to be dealt with on a war footing and we should have a crash programme for it. As for recognising the nature of the problem, the size of the problem, the dimensions of the problem, we are at one with the mover of the resolution. But what are the remedies that the resolution suggests for it? First of all they say that it should be made a fundamental right. Well, the right to work is there in the Directive Principle of State policy. Article

16 provides for equality of opportunity for all citizens in the matter of employment. Article 19(1)(g) guarantees the unfettered right to practise any profession and carry on any occupation of trade or business. Article 41 lays down the right to work as a Directive Principle of State Policy. What is sought to be introduced is right to work and right to employment as an actionable matter so that if a person is unable to find work, he could sue the Government, he could go to the Supreme Court or the High Court and obtain a decree that he should be provided work or he shall be provided compensation. That proposition has colossal implications. It would be a highly desirable thing to do it we could do it. Then an hon. Member from Congress (O) thought that as soon as such a provision was made in the Fundamental rights, all the problems connected with unemployment in this country would be solved. He thought it was a mere matter of Rs. 1,000 crores a year. He read out that some kind of resolution had been passed to this effect, that it was a paltry sum of Rs. 1,000 crores a year, and if this was provided, the problem of unemployment would be solved. It is really not recognising the colossal nature of the problem, the human nature of the problem and the basic nature of the problem. We cannot oversimplify matters and find solutions. It is a matter of national resources and the relative priorities that we have in the matter of utilisation of those resources. When we talk of defence, we think that that is the most important thing, that it should have the first charge on our resources. When we talk about education, we deplore the fact that 75 per cent of the population of this country is illiterate and that, therefore, education should have the first priority. When we talk about something else, we say that it is a colossal problem. It is a question of assessment of our resources and of the relative priorities in regard to the utilisation of those resources.

Some of us have very convenient solutions. Some of us honestly believe by conviction that if we were to copy everything that is being done in the USSR or if we were to copy everything that is being done in the USA, all our problems would be solved, whether it is unemployment or it is food production or its distribution; problems will cease to exist as soon as we carry out what I call a cultural transplant. Why should we uproot this culture which is our own way of life, which is a synthesis of various cultures that have contributed to it? We have our own problems. Here we are confronted with a state of affairs where we generate electric power with the most modern methods like atomic energy. Here also today more energy is generated by burning cowdung than any other fuel. Here we have the most modern forms of locomotion. We are using building and even supersonic aircraft. Yet the staple means of communication in

[Shri Dev Datt Puri]

this country is the bullock-cart. More tonne miles or kilometres are carried by the bullockcart than by any other means. It is a problem which is not capable of solution by copying some other country. Very briefly speaking, there are two set patterns before the world today. We have the Communist pattern and the American pattern by which these countries have solved their problem of unemployment and of industrialisation, in which term I include industry and agriculture. Sir, the American pattern is based on a political system of democracy as we understand it. The pace is slow; everything is in the private sector, and industrialisation is carried out by the slow method of trial and error. Sir, the Communist method is of dictatorship. It is certainly not democracy as we understand it, not parliamentary democracy as we understand it. At a very rapid pace, in about 20 or 25 years, the USSR has been able to achieve a degree of industrialisation which the western countries took 200 years. We here are attempting to acquire the pace of the Communist countries, while maintaining the freedoms, as we understand them, that are in a democracy.

SHRI BALKRISHANA GUPTA (Bihar): Japan has done that.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI: Both systems have their good points; both have their bad points. To suggest that there is no unemployment at all in the Communist countries or to suggest that every country which is not Communist is not beset with this problem of unemployment, is oversimplifying it. In Britain, for all practical purposes, there is full employment; they call it over-employment. In the USA, they talk so much about unemployment. It has become an issue there in the last elections. The unemployment figure is between 4.5 and 5.8 per cent.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON: It is 11 per cent.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI: I was in the USA when this thing was debated on the TV day in and day out, and the highest figure that was mentioned was 6 per cent, which was disputed. Therefore, I do not say that one system or the other system is the answer; it is not that if you transplant one or the other system here all your problems will be solved. Therefore, what I suggest is that we have to face our problems in our own manner. Various things have been suggested. No transplantation is suitable to us, according to my way of thinking.

Sir, various suggestions have been made. Take engineering education. I have something to do with some IITs and with engineering colleges. They only prepare engineers to take jobs in large-scale industries. They do not prepare engineers to be self-employed at all. We should train our engineers and technologists and everyone in the

most modern technology because we have to face those problems today. But we should also balance that education so as to prepare them to be self-employed. The engineer should generate his own employment and should contribute to the production of the country. That is one aspect of the matter which will need to be gone into very carefully.

Equalisation of wealth certainly will have to be done. We cannot possibly visualise that a great concentration of wealth will continue undisturbed, unhindered, unhampered. Unless we do that, we will not be able to solve the unemployment problem or any other problem. That will have to be equalised. Therefore, our socialism and our method have to be our own. We cannot; well, get a carbon copy of what is happening in the USA or the USSR and say, "Follow this or that, and your problems will be solved."

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Who has suggested it?

SHRI DEV DATT PURI: Certain suggestions have been made from various parts of the House, on that side.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Nobody has made it.

SHRI DEV DATT PURI: Anyhow, I will wind up by saying that we recognise the problem, we know that it is there, and I maintain that it is more fundamental than the Fundamental Rights, and it needs to be solved through a crash programme of our own. Therefore, we should not try to find the answer firstly by condemning the Government and secondly by suggesting that you amend the Constitution and the problem will be solved. It is only tinkering with the problem. None of these is going to be of the slightest assistance in so far as the solution of this problem is concerned. I do suggest that the Planning Commission and the Government pay very serious attention to this.

I am very grateful to the Mover of the Resolution that attention has been drawn to this problem. It must be treated as a human problem which is more basic, which is more fundamental than the Fundamental Rights or anything else.

I do suggest and I believe that like God's free air the provision of gainful employment is the responsibility of every civilised Government and the sooner this is realised by our Government the better it would be.

श्री बाल कृष्ण गुप्त : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो बेकारी का सवाल है यह विचित्र रूप में यहां पेज किया गया है। कुछ आदमियों ने तो कहा है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण करते ही सारी बेकारी गायब

हो जायेगी। लंका में बेकारी है। वहाँ राष्ट्रीयकरण किया हुआ है। मैं पिछले साल मिश्र में गया था, वहाँ सब कुछ राष्ट्रीयकरण किया हुआ है और उस के बाद भी बड़ी भारी बेकारी है? योगोस्लाविया के 1 लाख आदमी वेस्ट जर्मनी में काम कर रहे हैं और आस्ट्रेलिया की डम्बेसी योगोस्लाविया में सब से बड़ी है इसलिए कि योगोस्लाविया के ग़रे लोगों को वह अपने यहाँ ले जा रहे हैं और अभी तक एक लाख आदमियों को ले जा चुके हैं और वहाँ के टीटो साहब ने और वाइस प्रेसीडेंट साहब ने मुझे कहा कि अभी तक हमारे यहाँ 1 लाख आदमी अनइम्प्लायड हैं। दो करोड़ की कुल आबादी है योगोस्लाविया की और वहाँ सब चीजों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया हुआ है। पूरा कम्युनिज्म है लेकिन उस के बाद भी वहाँ यह हालत है। मैं फ्रैफर्ट के एक होटल में उतरा। तो वहाँ का विस्तर साफ करने के लिए एक लड़की आयी। मैंने उस से पूछा कि तुम किस राष्ट्र की हो तो वह बोली कि मैं हंगेरियन हूँ। बियना में मैं गया। जहाँ मुझे ठहराया गया वहाँ एक लड़की नाश्ता ले कर आयी। मैंने उस से पूछा कि तुम कौन हो तो उस ने बताया कि मैं चेकोस्लोवाक हूँ। तो यह जो कहते हैं कि कम्युनिस्ट होते ही वहाँ बेकारी गायब हो जाती है यह एक भयंकर झूठ है। सब जगह बेकारी है। जापान के अंदर लेबर शॉर्ज है। वेस्ट जर्मनी के अंदर 40 लाख आदमी स्पेन, पुर्तगाल और इटली के काम कर रहे हैं। बेकारी मिटाने की, अगर इच्छा हो तो राष्ट्रीयकरण करने की जरूरत नहीं। यह समस्या बिना राष्ट्रीयकरण किये हुए ही हल की जा सकती है और ऐसा दूसरे देशों ने कर के दिखा दिया है। आप देखें कि वर्क चैपट हो गया है राष्ट्रीयकरण कर के और वहाँ पर इतनी बड़ी बेकारी और गरीबी फैल गयी है, जो कि चावल पहले वहाँ सरप्लस था वह भी अब गायब हो गया है। यह जो बार बार दाव दिलाया जाता है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण से सब समस्या हल हो जायेगी यह गलत है। हिन्दुस्तान में 55 करोड़ की आबादी है और हर साल 1 करोड़ आदमी नये बढ़ रहे हैं और यह

जो हमारा तरीका है यह जो फाइव इयर प्लान्स हैं यह बहुत छोटे हैं और बहुत खर्चीले हैं और साथ ही अनइम्प्लेजमेंट है। कल्पना से बाहर की चीजें आज हो रही हैं। इस सरकार ने थोड़े दिन पहले पटना में ए० आई० सी० सी० की बैठक की थी और वहाँ कहा गया था कि हम 5 लाख आदमियों को काम देंगे, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान के 55 करोड़ में तो 10 करोड़ लोग बेकार हैं और अगर यूरोपियन स्टैंडर्ड से देखा जाय तो 20 करोड़ लोग बेकार हैं इसलिए कि वहाँ 1/3 औरतें भी काम करती हैं। वेस्ट जर्मनी में ईस्ट जर्मनी ने दीवार खड़ी कर दी और खाइया खोद दी और साथ ही बिजली के तार लगा दिये इसलिए कि ईस्ट जर्मनी की आबादी भाग कर वेस्ट जर्मनी जा रही थी। यह जो कम्युनिस्ट पेराडाइम की बात करते हैं उस का हाल मैं बता रहा हूँ। रूस के अंदर अकेले मास्को में इतने डोमेस्टिक सर्वेंट हैं जितने कि न्यूयार्क में नहीं हैं। न्यूयार्क में किसी करोड़पति को छोड़ कर और किसी घर में भी आप को नौकर नहीं मिलेगा, वहाँ किसी के पास मोटर ड्राइवर नहीं है और कोई और नहीं है। बीबी उन के घर का काम करती है और बच्चों को खिलाती पिलाती है और इसी तरह से सब कुछ चलता है। तो यह कहना कि राष्ट्रीयकरण होने ही सब कुछ ठीक हो जायगा सही नहीं है। बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ, आप ने कितने नये आदमियों को काम दिया? कहाँ क्या नई बात हुई। तो यह सब इसी तरह की बातें हैं (*Interruptions*) मैं तो अपनी तरह से ही बोलूंगा, आप के कहने के मुताबिक मैं नहीं बोलूंगा। मैं भी समाजवादी हूँ और मैं 1932 में रूस गया था और मैंने उस समय भी वहाँ पर बेकारी देखी। मैं 1932 में रूस में गया था जब कि रूस जाने पर आप के पासपोर्ट ब्रिटिश सरकार छीन लेती थी। अब तो रूस दुनिया की दूसरी ताकत हो गया है लेकिन आज भी आप वहाँ जा कर देखिये कि वहाँ के मजदूर बैठे रो रहे हैं। आप ने एक बड़े राष्ट्र का समर्थन प्राप्त करने के लिए कम्युनिज्म के बारे में बहुत सी बातें खड़ी कर रखी हैं। इस देश की प्राबलम

अगर साल्व करनी है तो हम सब को मिल कर काम करना है, चाहे प्राइवेट सेक्टर हो चाहे पबलिक सेक्टर हो सब को खुली छूट देनी होगी कि इंडस्ट्री को बढ़ाओ और लोगों को काम दो। तब ना कुछ हो सकता है, सिर्फ नेशनलाइजेशन करने से काम नहीं चलने वाला है। हिन्दुस्तान में बहुत ही कंसर्नस नेशनलाइज्ड है, दुर्गापुर है, भिलाई है, रूरकेला है, जगह जगह इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड्स हैं, आधे से ज्यादा सब तो नेशनलाइज्ड है लेकिन कहीं पर आपने लोगों को काम दिया, कहीं बेकारी मिटी। शहरों के अन्दर डेढ़ लाख की तादाद में इजीनियर्स घूम रहे हैं और हर तरह का काम करने को तैयार हैं। आपकी योजनायें बिल्कुल फेल हो गई हैं और आप लोगों से बात करते हैं कि बेकारी मिटायेंगे। इस गति से यह देश अगर चलता रहा तो बेकारों की संख्या ना मालूम कितनी हो जायेगी, इस देश में बेकारों की तादाद हर पंचवर्षीय योजना के बाद बढ़ती ही गई है और आज लोग नक्सलाइट हो कर के बंगाल में घूम रहे हैं। आप यह सब सोचिये। यह सिर्फ पोलिटिकल और एकानामिक प्राबलम ही नहीं है। आप देखें कि अगर इंडस्ट्रियाइजेशन करना है तो एक आदमी को काम देने में पांच से दस हजार रुपया तक लगेगा, तो इस रुपए को इक्कठ्ठा कर के इधर उधर की जो बर्बादी है उसको रोकें, जो लोगों का कांस्पीकुअस कंजम्पशन है उसको रोकें और जो इनवेस्टमेंट करें, जो काम करें, जो रुपया बचा कर रखे उसको टैक्स से माफ करें तब जा कर के इस देश में कोई गति अयेगी। जापान और जर्मनी को किसी विदेशी ने सहायता नहीं दी है और न चीन को किसी विदेशी ने सहायता दी है, उल्टे साम्यवादी रूस ने एक साहूकार की तरह अपना कर्जा मय व्याज के मांग लिया और चीन ने वह कर्जा चुकाया है। तो हम लोग सब कुछ कर सकते हैं अगर हमारे यहां ये 55 करोड़ आदमी काम करने लगे। मिट्टी से ही सीमेंट बनता है मिट्टी से ही कोयला निकलता है...

**श्री श्रोम मेहता :** मिट्टी से इंसान बनता है।

**श्री बालकृष्ण गुप्त :** ... मिट्टी से लोहा निकलता है। हमारा जो कच्चा लोहा है वह जापान को, पोलैंड को, फ्रांस को, सब को भेजा जा रहा है और यहां कारखाना नहीं बनने देते और आपके जो स्टील के कारखाने पबलिक सैक्टर में हैं वह इस बुरी तरह से चल रहे हैं कि किसी भी मुल्क में प्राइवेट या पबलिक सेक्टर ऐसा बुरा नहीं चल रहा है। मैं अल्जीरिया भी गया हूं, वहां भी गवर्नमेंट है और उन्होंने सब कुछ नेशनलाइज कर रखा है, फ्रांस के लोगों ने भी कर रखा है लेकिन अल्जीरिया में भी तीन या चार लाख आदमी बेकार हैं और अल्जीरिया की आबादी डेढ़ करोड़ की है, ज्यादा बड़ी नहीं है। वहां तीन चार लाख औरतें पदों में पड़ी हैं। अभी भी बहुत से मुस्लिम देशों में औरतों को काम जल्दी नहीं मिलता है, हा, एकाध देश अवश्य हैं इजिप्ट और लेबेनान वगैरह जहां कि थोड़ी सी औरतों को जैसे कि हिन्दुस्तान में है काम मिलता है। यूरोप के अन्दर गोरी सभ्यता में औरतें लेबर फोर्स में काम करती हैं, फैक्ट्री में काम करती हैं, दूकानों में काम करती हैं, रेस्ट्रॉ में काम करती हैं लेकिन हमारे यहां आधी आबादी के बहुत बड़े हिस्से को बेकार बना रखा है, सिर्फ किसानों की औरतें काम करती हैं या गरीबों की औरतें काम करती हैं, बड़े आदमियों की औरतें सजावट करने में ही व्यस्त रहती हैं। यह सब क्या हो रहा है क्या नहीं हो रहा है। मैं तो आंखों से देख रहा हूं। समाजवाद की बड़ी बड़ी चर्चा होती है। चार चार पंचवर्षीय योजनायें बीत गईं और बेकारों की तादाद दिन दूनी रात चौगुनी बढ़ती चली जा रही है। अगर आपको बेकारी मिटानी है तो फौरन ही जो कोई भी कहीं इंडस्ट्री बनाये उसको इजाजत दें, हां उसको कंट्रोल करें, उसके दामों पर प्रतिबन्ध लगावें। तो इससे बेकारी को दूर करने में सहायता होगी लेकिन अगर यह सोचते हैं कि सिर्फ राष्ट्रीयकरण करने से यह अनइम्प्लायमेंट का प्राबलन गायब हो जायगा तो कम्युनिस्ट कंट्रीज में भी अनइम्प्लायमेंट बड़ा भारी है, चीन में भी है। हां,

चीन ने एक करोड़ आदमी आर्मी में ले रखा है, उनको खाना बण्डा देता है, वहाँ लोग सड़क बनाते हैं, यह करते हैं, वह करते हैं, ता हम लोगों को या तो चीन के रास्ते जाना होगा या जापान के रास्ते जाना होगा। यह जो छिटपुट इधर-उधर करते हैं, और यह जो पंचवर्षीय योजनाये बनाते हैं, यह न समाजवाद है और न कैपिटलिज्म है, उनसे कुछ होन वाला नहीं है। चाहे मुझको आप समाजवादी कहें चाहे प्रतिक्रियावादी कहें लेकिन आपको सच्चाई का सामना करना होगा और हिन्दुस्तान में करोड़ों की बढ़ती हुई आबादी को आपका काम देना होगा नहीं तो आपकी सरकार को, आपकी इस डेमोक्रेसी को, आपके संसद को, तीनों को, लोग नष्ट कर डालेंगे।

**SHRI UMASHANKER JOSHI** (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it seems there is always a consensus of opinion that this should be treated as a national problem as the other day the problem of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was treated as a national problem. If all citizens of our country are very serious about this great deficiency from which our social life suffers, then, all of us should put our heads together and treat this as a national problem. The problem of unemployment will have to be tackled keeping in mind the employment potential that obtains at the moment in our country. For the foreseeable future agriculture will remain our main industry. We find that in some parts of India, say, Bengal, the people are more or less unemployed for eight months in a year. That is not a desirable situation. So the problem of land hunger will have to be tackled. And then we will have to provide some decentralised industries in mofussil areas.

Belonging as I do to the educational field I should like to concentrate on tackling the problem of the new entrants to the labour market. Our educational system should be used as an instrument of change as far as this great problem is concerned. I am sorry to say that as a Vice-Chancellor I suffer from a sense of guilt as I told this House the other day in so many words. As one heading a university, I have a feeling that I am presiding over an organisation which throws the men and women of our country

to the wolves. The educational system seems to have fallen between two stools, the State Governments and the Central Government. The politicians in the various States are rightly trying to see that there are more schools, more colleges and more universities, but there is no coordination between secondary education and university education. If we do not provide for professional courses at least at the higher secondary level, I do not know what will be the fate of the young people whom we turn out from the schools and colleges. The degrees have been described as passports without visas. The students have degrees but those are of little avail. We should wake up to this eventuality. Let us have more vocational courses at the secondary level and at the university level which give some means of livelihood to our young men and women. I do not agree that we should not allow students to go to the universities. That would be bad in a democracy. I should even go to the extent of saying that it is better to have educated unemployed than uneducated unemployed. I know, there is a proverb in Sans-

krit: असंतुष्टाः द्विजाः नष्टाः Discontented scholars are lost of souls. Vinobaji has turned this phrase into “ असंतुष्टा : द्विजाः

कम्पनिष्टा : Discontented scholars go communist. I do not know how far this obtains in our country. Even in the case of Naxalites in Calcutta, in Bengal, the discontentment is not merely about their getting some gainful occupation. It is the state of affairs which unnerves the mind of sensitive young men. The young men feel that there should be a system which delivers the goods, there should be social justice meted out to the vast millions of this country. It is high time that we impressed upon our younger men that the system to which we are all committed is a democratic system which wants to bring in socialism and that it is politically and socially a viable system. For this we should leave nothing undone. All that I would say is that this problem should be treated as a national problem and in all seriousness we should find out some early solution to this problem.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)**: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 7th December, 1970.