

कहा था कि जो लोग इसमें होंगे जाहिर है कि उनके अपने अपने विचार होंगे, यह कोई जरूरी नहीं है कि उनके विचार और सरकार के विचार एक हों ...

श्री राजनारायण : यह ठीक है ।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : ... लेकिन जहां तक कि माननीय सदस्य ने कमिटेन्ट की बात उठाई है तो इस कमिटेन्ट में कोई सरकार की नीतियों का सवाल नहीं है वह तो देश के हित के लिये कमिटेन्ट की बात है और इसमें तो जाहिर है कि जो होंगे वह देश के हित में कमिटेड होंगे ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर । प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My fear is that there may be an Expert Committee to sabotage the foreign policy in so far as good things are concerned.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मैं आपसे यह जानना चाहता हूं कि संसदीय प्रथा में मंत्री का उत्तर डेफिनिट, क्लियर होना चाहिये, वेग नहीं होना चाहिये । राष्ट्र का हित भूपेश गुप्त अपनी दृष्टि से देखेंगे, राष्ट्र का हित मैं अपनी दृष्टि से देखूंगा, राष्ट्र का हित प्राइम मिनिस्टर अपनी दृष्टि से देखेंगे ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

श्री राजनारायण : जो मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि राष्ट्र का हित जो है उसके लिये कमिटेन्ट शब्द का प्रयोग किया, हमने राष्ट्र के हित के लिये इसका प्रयोग किया, तो एक कांस्टीट्यूशन बना हुआ है और उस कांस्टीट्यूशन को मद्देनजर रखते हुए राष्ट्र के हित को उस दृष्टि से समझना है...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

श्री राजनारायण : यह प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर नहीं है तो दुनिया में कोई प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर हो ही नहीं सकता, जो सदन में प्वाइन्ट आफ डिसआर्डर होगा उसी को प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर माना जायगा ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sit down, Mr. Rajnarain. This is not a point of order.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: I wish to make only a submission. I am not arguing. The hon. Foreign Minister has given a reply just now about the meaning of the word 'commitment', but yesterday the Home Minister gave a different reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have heard you and I know.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Now the two cannot be reconciled. I would like an explanation how they are to be reconciled.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MOKHERJEE: It appears from the reply of the Minister that non-official advisers won't have any access to official documents. In that case may I ask him how the non-official advisers could help the Ministry in formulating the policy if they are not posted with facts and information?

SHRI DINESH SINGH: Just as the hon. Member helps us here, Sir, by giving his views.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next Question.

†REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

***127. SHRI CHITTA BASU:** Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Committee on unemployment set up by Government has since submitted any report;

(b) if so, the essential features of the report; and

(c) the action taken by Government thereon?

†Transferred from the 27th February, 1970

THE MINISTER OF SUPPLY AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR): (a) The Committee has not yet submitted its final report.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Now the hon. Minister says the Committee has not given any final report. Has the Committee submitted any interim report, and if any interim report has been submitted, the recommendations thereof?

SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR: The Committee has given a purely interim and tentative report with a summary, and the Committee has dealt with mainly a problem as to how to identify unemployment at different levels, for instance, rural unemployment, middle level unemployment. They have suggested a new methodology to be evolved to exactly enumerate how many are unemployed because, in the rural areas, there are some household employees, and in the sense that they are not wage-earners they are half-employed and they seek employment. At the present juncture, while calculating figures for unemployment, all of them are lumped together. Their final report is expected to come by the end of the month. They have done this exercise with a view to finding out what is the total unemployment in this country.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I think the endeavour of both the Committee and the Minister has been only to let the House know as to the number of unemployed. Sir, we have had enough of the unemployed. Now the question is what are the specific suggestions which have been made, or the Government proposes to make for the solution of the unemployment problem, which has already assumed a menacing character and dimension. And in this case may I specifically know from the Prime Minister, in view of the delay of the deliberations or the finalisation of the report of the Committee, whether the Government proposes to announce payment of some financial allowance to the unemployed so that their hardship can

be mitigated to a certain extent pending the formulation of a final policy for fighting unemployment in the country?

SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR: While replying to the first question I said that the only purpose of that Committee appointed by the Planning Commission was very limited in scope, and I gave the substance of the summary. So far as the second problem is concerned, how the Government proposes to deal with this issue, I would like to point out to the hon. Member that every effort is being made to stimulate employment, and he must have seen particularly in the latest Budget and the Plan that we have provided Rs. 400 crores more than in the current year. We have chosen certain special schemes for stimulating employment. For instance, I may point out here that for small farmers there is a scheme to provide certain employment there. There is yet another dairy farming scheme. There is also the area development scheme and rural works programmes. I may point out that a special scheme has also been taken in hand for imparting training to engineer entrepreneurs with a view to helping them in starting suitable small-scale industries. The curriculum of such training includes management policies and practices, etc. From these schemes the hon. Member would realise that, instead of providing unemployment doles or benefits, a positive stimulus is given at various levels to find new avenues of employment. That is the objective of the policy.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: That there are certain programmes I don't doubt, but the question is whether the Government proposes to announce the payment of certain financial allowances to the unemployed pending the implementation of any grandiose programmes for creating employment potential. Does the Government propose to make such an announcement?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Sir, I am sure the hon. Member will appreciate that it is better to provide

jobs rather than doles. Now my colleague went into such details about the report. Why? We know that this particular Committee had limited terms of reference; nevertheless they are relevant to this question and the present situation because the numbers or statistics of unemployed have been given rather recklessly, without any real basis as to whether they are true or not. That is why this Committee was formed, and they have found that many of these numbers are incorrect and that is the relevance of what my colleague had just said. The situation will be clearer when that report is in hand, but in the meantime—I think I did state it in this House the other day—there has been about 2 per cent. improvement in the number of employed in organised industry. I know it is small, but it does show that while we were stuck in a particular position, now we have got moving, and the information from the employment market centres tells that during the current year there will be further improvement. My colleague has enumerated some of the steps which are being taken in the present Five-Year Plan which will very much help. As the hon. Member knows, the whole economy was in recession, but education continued to expand. That is why we had this rather difficult unemployment situation but the manner of looking at the numbers was from a point of view that was not very relevant to conditions in India. In Japan also they have stated with regard to calculating the numbers of unemployed, the Western system is nonsense in reference to their conditions. It is the same here; the conditions are so different in India that we have to have our own methods of finding out the correct numbers. As I said, we consider it much better to increase the employment potential rather than to give doles, which will inhibit our capacity to invest money where it is most needed. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. D. MISRA: Sir, the Government—including the Planning Commission—has been giving us figures about unemployment of the educated and uneducated. Still the

Government had set up a committee regarding unemployment. Now the Prime Minister has just used the word 'reckless' and said that these figures are reckless. I do not know if the figures of the Planning Commission and the Government about unemployment statistics are reckless. We do not know, and if that is reckless, then the 2.3 per cent. increase in employment also, I think, will be reckless, because it is the same body, the Government of India or the Planning Commission which has arrived at that figure. Now, Sir, this Committee—just now the Finance Minister replied—has given an interim report about the norms of unemployment. Now was this Committee to go to determine the norms of unemployment? Is it the idea that this Committee has given the interim report so that the Government can appoint another committee on the basis of this? Or is this Committee to give the final figures. If that is so, then where was the occasion for giving norms, and for what purpose? What was the occasion for that?

SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR: As I earlier mentioned, the hon. Member should realise that the terms of reference or the scope of this Committee was limited. I do not know exactly what the report will be at the final stage. As I have said, it is coming by the end of the month, but at this stage their objective was circumscribed in the sense that while collecting statistics regarding unemployment we must observe certain methods. They are evolving that method so that our statistics would be more correct. As the Prime Minister pointed out, in collecting statistics in India in Indian conditions, as in Japan also, we cannot wholesale copy the Western methods. That thing must be borne in mind. Let me conclude. He mentioned about the figures. I may mention that the figures that the Prime Minister mentioned relate to the figures of employment in the organised sector.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Sir, I am on a point of order. I am finding that in answer to this question Mr.

Khadilkar has been quoting the Prime Minister too often. Now, the point is this. Previously of course in earlier days as Michael Stewart said we used to quote classics but now the Ministers are quoting each other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हमारा एक प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है ।

श्री सभापति : क्वेश्चन चलने दीजिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हमारा प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर यह है कि क्या सदन में प्रधान मंत्री या वित्त मंत्री का यह कहना उचित है कि प्लानिंग कमिशन ने जो फिगर्स दिये हैं वे रैकलैस हैं ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not a point of order.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, इस सवाल पर आगे बहस खत्म हो जाती है अगर सारा प्लानिंग कमिशन रैकलैस है ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order means any point relating to the procedure.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस सम्बन्ध में कोई बहस हो सकती है ।

श्री सभापति : यह बहस नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : बहस क्या है । प्राइम मिनिस्टर यह बतलाना चाहती है कि अनइम्प्लायमेंट की स्थिति में कुछ सुधार हुआ है जबकि फैक्ट यह है कि अनइम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ा है ।

श्री सभापति : ख्वाहमख्वाह बहस न कीजिये और अब बैठ जाइये ।

श्री राजनारायण : यहां पर प्राइम मिनिस्टर लैक्चर न दिया करें । 'हां' और 'ना' में जवाब दिया करें । जब प्लानिंग कमिशन की फिगर्स को रैकलैस कहा जाता है तो...

श्री सभापति : आप बैठ जाइए ।

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD: May I know in which State unemployment problems are more and in which State unemployment problems less? Is there any statistics collected by the Government so far?

SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR: So far as the present question is concerned, this is not relevant but if he gives notice I will give Statewise figures. These would be figures on the register, these would not be the final figures.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : कहां से देगे यह तो सब रैकलैस है ।

श्री सभापति : आपसे नहीं कहा । आप बैठ जाइए ।

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: What is happening to you today? I don't catch your eye. Already forty-five minutes have passed in the Question Hour I have not caught your eye even once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I call anybody I like, I want to give opportunity to every section of the House.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Have we been given any opportunity so far?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have not yet finished the question; you have no right to complain.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Not on this question only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not understand your objection, Mr. Banka Behary Das.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: This is really astonishing.

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : इस पर हमको भी एक सवाल पूछना है ।

श्री सभापति : हम सबको मौका देंगे ।

श्री मान सिंह वर्मा : क्या मंत्री जी निश्चित रूप से यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि इस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट कब तक आ जायेगी ? दूसरी बात यह है कि जिस उद्देश्य से यह कमेटी मुकर्रर की गई थी, क्या उसके सम्बन्ध में आप यह महसूस करते हैं कि उसके उद्देश्य की पूर्ति में विलम्ब हुआ है । जैसा अभी आपने कहा कि इसके टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस का स्कोप बड़ा लिमिटेड है, तो है यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इतना लिमिटेड मोते हुए भी इसमें इतनी देरी क्यों लग रही है और इसका क्या कारण है ।

SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR: I have already stated that by the end of the month the Committee is expected to submit their final Report and regarding the objective or the terms of reference I said the scope was limited. I need not repeat that thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Banka Behary Das.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: No; I would not ask.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Sir, I have to seek one clarification. There seems to be some confusion. Two Committees were appointed. At least one of the Committees was appointed by the Planning Commission. It was of a technical nature and it was to go into the definitional aspects of the problem and lay down norms and so on to which the Prime Minister referred. The other Committee was promised to be appointed by the Labour Minister. Now, we do not know about which Committee we are discussing just now. Are we discussing about certain findings, tentative findings of the Committee set up by the Planning Commission or are we discussing the tentative findings of the Committee which was promised by the Labour Minister on this very subject?

SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR: The hon. Member is right. The question pertains to the Committee appointed by the Planning Commission and it is with that we are concerned directly and I am confining myself to that. For the information of the hon. Member I may point out that it is true

that the Labour Ministry had promised to appoint a Committee and I understand, though it does not directly concern me or our Ministry, that preliminary work is being completed and that Committee will be set up soon.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN: There is a large-scale tendency amongst educated persons not to go to rural areas. Therefore will this Committee go into this question and find out how many jobs are there for which even though personnel with the requisite qualifications are available the jobs are vacant and the personnel remain unemployed in the urban areas?

SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR: The hon. Member must be aware that the Committee is suggesting certain methods to be adopted for the enumeration of the unemployed and preparing the statistics, as I said, for identifying different area. Once that is done, the National Sample Survey or the next Census Report will take advantage of the method that would be suggested by the Committee.

NATIONALISATION OF KEY INDUSTRIES

*239. **DR. BHAI MAHAVIR:** Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in her recent interview with Pravda, she spoke about nationalisation of all key industries in the country; and

(b) if so, which industries are covered by the description and when they are intended to be nationalised?

THE MINISTER OF SUPPLY AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR): (a) and (b) The Prime Minister, while reaffirming Government's faith in the concept of a mixed economy, emphasised that the key positions in the economy should be occupied by the State. She did not refer to the nationalisation of any industry as such.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, may I know if this means that the Government is not committed to the nationalisation of key industries?