

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa)** : I would like to know whether the Government of India on their own did not invite the constitutional representatives of the Nagaland Government or was it objected to by the representatives of the underground Nagas ? If it is an objection from them and that is why the constitutional Government has not been invited, would they reconsider it ?

**SHRI DINESH SINGH** : At this particular time the Chief Minister of the Nagaland Government could not come because, as the House is aware, they have had some important business in their own Assembly but earlier also when all these talks were going on, on a number of occasions, the Chief Minister was in Delhi and we were able to consult with them.

**SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh)** : If I may be permitted, I will be voicing the feelings of most of the Members of the House if I congratulate the Prime Minister on the patient manner in which she has been carrying on the Naga talks. We are sure that by her patient and persistent efforts, it would be possible to find a solution for the Nagaland problem in a peaceful manner within the Indian Union.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** . We go on to the legislative business. Mr. Gupta.

श्री राजनारायण . (उत्तर प्रदेश) जरा मैं भी कुछ कहने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ ।

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** . Mr. Gupta, your motion.

श्री राजनारायण जरा एक सवाल का जबाब चाहता हूँ ।

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** I have passed on to the next item.

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे खड़े होते ही आप पास कर जाती है, जरा स्थाल कीजिएगा ।

#### MOTION RE DEVALUATION OF THE RUPEE

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal)** Madam, you have asked me to move my motion. I am glad that the

Prime Minister is here but none of the three gentlemen is here—Mr. Asoka Mehta . . .

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** : The Prime Minister is here.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** : . . . Mr. Sachin Chaudhuri and also Mr. Subramaniam but I leave him for the present but this is a matter connected with devaluation. The head of the Government is here, it is good.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa)** : She will not sit through.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** : But as far as we are concerned, we would like to have one of those two gentlemen. Now I am told that the hon. Deputy Minister is there. I know that thing I am very glad that he is all right there. But the trouble is : where is the Finance Minister ? (*Interruptions*) But this I may tell you, Madam. I am not enamoured very much of Ministers, as you know very well, but it is a question of propriety that when the matter of devaluation is discussed in this House for the first time, the Minister in-charge, or those who have been advocating and guiding this policy should be present, and it is not good to treat us with only a Deputy Minister, a Deputy Minister formerly in the Home Ministry and now in the Finance Ministry. Now therefore can we adjourn ?

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** No, you will move the Motion because the Prime Minister is present in the House and the other Ministers will come in.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** That is partly a consolation.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar)** . I also like to express myself on this point. I am also supposed to speak on this subject, Madam, and I will not have the heart to speak if the Finance Minister and the Planning Minister are not there. I am very happy that the Prime Minister is here and we are obliged to her that she is here. I would like to submit also that I have got great respect for the Deputy Finance Minister and I am glad he is here, but I hope you will direct that the Finance Minister, and the Planning Minister, Shri Asoka Mehta—the latter is a Member of this House also—should be present here

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** I do not want to hear anything further. Mr Bhupesh Gupta will move his Motion. I do feel that the Minister should have been here on the Treasury Bench, but since the Prime Minister is here, you can move your motion and the other Minister is coming in as stated by the Minister in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** But for the fact that the Prime Minister is present—although she would not listen to us—I would not have liked to move my Motion. Now this is a concession I am making to her, and I have got it. I move

“That this House records its disapproval of the devaluation of the rupee by the Government as it is totally against national interests and is contrary to the Government's pronouncements in Parliament”

I had to be very modest in wording the Motion because hon. Members—there are veterans here—would not like very strong expressions used. But I would call it now in my speech the blackest act of national betrayal since independence and I hope our Prime Minister will be good enough to note that under her presidency of the Council of Ministers this has been committed, under the evil advice, the blackest ever act since independence had been done.

This act has very far-reaching political, economic and social consequences in the country, and devaluation has been carried out in the style of a coup, planned in the United States of America, in New York and Washington, and executed in Delhi. For the first time we have a major policy question settled not in Delhi, but in Washington and New York, not in consultation with the leaders of the Congress ruling party, but in consultation, in the first instance, with foreigners in the United States of America. It is no wonder therefore that up to this day not a single political party, I will repeat, not a single political party in the country has supported devaluation, not even the Congress Party at the party level.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI JAGHNNATH RAO)** Not correct.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** The last meeting of the Congress Working Committee, discussed and dispersed without adopting a resolution on devaluation. For the first time since independence, again, a major decision of the Union Government of the dimension of devaluation was not approved even *ex post facto* by the Working Committee of the ruling party, namely, the Congress. That in itself is a condemnation of the act and also it points to the isolation of the Government in regard to the measure which has been taken. I know that the Congress Parliamentary Party has supported it, or, in voting, has supported it. But that is again my point of complaint.

The Congress Parliamentary Party, unfortunately, had been presented with a *fait accompli*. So they would have no other alternative but to signify their support to the measure, otherwise it would not have been supported at all. But with all my criticisms of the Congress Party, the Congress rulers, men in authority, and so on, I have some faith in the common sense of our non-official Congress Members of Parliament.

Now devaluation has been carried out on American orders, and that is sought to be denied by the Government, and presently I shall invite your attention to what appeared on the 6th of June in 1966 in the 'New York Times' in a matter of hours after devaluation had been announced, or almost at the same time.

“The United States and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development have been pressing for Devaluation as one of the measures to get the Indian economy moving. Increased western aid for India's fourth five year plan had been held up until India acted on these recommendations”

I read from the 'New York Times' May 1 now invite your attention to the London 'Daily Telegraph' which reads as follows:

“The decision in fact is believed not to have been his (Finance Minister's) but that of Mr Subramaniam, the Food

Minister, and Mr. Asoka Mehta, the Planning Minister, both of whom have recently visited the United States and have been firmly given their working orders by the 'International Monetary Fund'

I read from the 'Daily Telegraph'.

Then I would invite your attention to another matter, that recently in a Congressional Committee Mr. Thomas Mann gave evidence in which he said that devaluation had been carried out—well, on the orders of or according to Americans' advice—and so on.

Then here is a report in the 'Indian Express' of 9th August, 1966, under the head "Washington":

"An almost identical statement was made with regard to devaluation by another key official, Mr. Thomas Mann, before a different committee."

Earlier, the report refers to the Passman sub-committee in which Mr. Bell gave evidence under oath. Therefore the American position is quite clear. The trouble with our Government is that it does not know when it is kicked and when it is kissed. It does not know when it is bamboozled and bluffed and when it is counselled and advised. That is the trouble with our Government. It has lost all sense of, shall we say, feeling; it is lost to it. Therefore they do not understand. I sympathise with them, because they are in a state of mental, political and moral decline, and in such a state one does not expect that the Government would be in a position to differentiate what makes pressure and what does not make pressure. Now here, therefore, it is quite clear. It is no use Mr. Asoka Mehta telling us that it was only a case of advice. We know that it is not an advice. When advice is accompanied by threats of withholding economic assistance, or non-project assistance, or committed aid, advice assumes the complexion of pressure. When advice is given in the background of threats to slow down our industrial development, to bring our industries to a halt, to withhold food supplies, advice does not remain advice. It becomes political pressure and political blackmail, to which this Government, unfortunately and to the misfortune of this country, has surrendered. Now here, in

the Congress Working Committee it was discussed last month, and I hope the Prime Minister will throw some light on this subject. One former Minister, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, who, I understand, was consulted about devaluation, but not the two other former Ministers, Mr. Deshmukh or Mr. Morarji Desai—not that I have got any particular fascination for others, but one was consulted—and the advice of the former Finance Minister was—it was about seven days before devaluation was announced—that devaluation would be a wrong step, and it appears that he told the Congress Working Committee that it would open the flood gates of economic slavery. At that Working Committee meeting, Madam Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister and Mr. Asoka Mehta were all present, but none of them spoke except Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri who neither understands valuation nor understands devaluation. Well, he understands neither. He understands Company Law and Income-tax, how to evade it.

There in that meeting one other Minister spoke and that was Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, according to press reports. These gentlemen of the Congress Working Committee have got the practice that after their meeting they brief their pressmen. They have got lobbies around them. So we get to know things. There Dr. Ram Subhag Singh spoke against it. The Prime Minister, that is to say, the Head of the Government on the one hand, and Mr. Kamraj who is the head of the Party on the other, either by mutual agreement or due to coincidence kept mum. That was an interesting sight. As is well known again, naughty people have said it outside in the country, that they violently differ on this particular issue. Of course, there should be differences in such matters. What is the quarrel between the two we are not interested now, except we would like to know who fares better in this quarrel. Anyway, if Mr. Kamaraj opposes devaluation I have no hesitation in signifying my support to him because I am not for blind opposition. When Congressmen do good things I support them. When Congressmen do bad things I oppose them. In the case of my esteemed friend Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, well, I am sorry I have to oppose her.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Now, there I see Shri Asoka Mehta coming to the House. After devaluation a number of Indian businessmen publicly spoke and made statements and if you scan through their statements you will find that a large number of industrialists in the first instance, opposed this devaluation. Now after devaluation has come, they are trying to make the best of the bargain and in the name of follow-up measures they are trying to get all kinds of concessions. To that aspect of the matter I will come later. Now if you read the newspaper editorials in the country, you will find practically all the newspapers opposed the devaluation. That is how devaluation was denounced by the entire nation, either by remaining silent as in the case of the Congress leadership at the top, or by open condemnation or criticism as was done in the case of the newspapers and a number of businessmen and industrialists in the country, let alone the Opposition.

Now, Mr. S. K. Patil said at one of the meetings—he is a very brave man—that he would make devaluation an election issue next year. Well, if that is so, let him make this an issue right now. Let the Government resign now and let us have one single issue, this devaluation only and let us have the election. Only then can it be decided whether the people support devaluation, not otherwise. But Mr. S. K. Patil being an electioneer knew that this was only a stunt. In other countries over such matters governments do resign and test public opinion. May I ask the Prime Minister . . .

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI** (Maharashtra): In which Communist country has the government resigned on such an issue?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA**: I am not for the present concerned with multi-millionaires. I am concerned with a government that represents the multi-millionaires. I would ask the Prime Minister, why not resign immediately and have an election only for the Lok Sabha, only for one House? I am sure the Government will be denounced and most votes will go against them. But we need not go into that now because neither will they resign, nor can we force them to resign. All that

we can do is to put before them the moral case for it and this we are doing.

I do not wish to raise this as a party issue and I would like the House also to discuss this matter from the standpoint of the larger national interests. Naturally in this context, I would like to deal with it more from the economic than from the political point of view. I think these are matters which we can discuss and debate and also I hope the hon. Minister will take it in the right spirit and consider my case on merits and from the economic point of view, keeping in view the larger interests of the country.

The first argument advanced in favour of devaluation is that it is the recognition of a reality, that the value of the rupee had gone down and therefore devaluation was in the nature of acknowledging an established fact. First of all, I would like to point out that the price of the rupee in the international market had been going down for many years. It is not as if today the price had suddenly gone down. It had been going down for some time and it was also being mentioned earlier and when the matter had come to the House it was pointed out that in Beirut, Hong Kong and other places, the rupee was selling in terms of foreign exchange at a discount. But nobody thought of devaluation then. If you think that the rise in the prices internally is another factor justifying devaluation in relation to the external currency, may I point out that in the recent period in many western countries also the prices had risen by ten to twenty per cent. In the United Kingdom there has been recently a rise of 3.5 per cent annually. Prices have also risen in Ceylon, Pakistan and other countries. But none of these countries has thought it fit to devalue its currency. On the contrary, the U.K. Government is trying to defend the sterling pound with all its might and the matter is being discussed publicly and hon. Members would certainly know from the newspapers that there is no hush hush about it. Though we may not like the approach or the way they try to defend the pound sterling, in England, the Wilson Government has initiated discussions among bankers, politicians and economists and so on as to how they can defend the pound sterling. But here this Government which is incompetent and

capitulatory waved the white flag even without the pretence of a fight. I could have understood if they had gone down fighting. But unlike England they did not even approach the issue with the object of defending the rupee though the rupee deserved to be defended by the Government in cooperation with all of us. Therefore, this argument of acknowledging an established fact does not hold water at all.

Here comes the question of pressure. Now, Mr Asoka Mehta and Mr Sachindra Chaudhuri and others will certainly deny that they had been subjected to pressure. After all, how can such great people be subjected to pressure, except the pressure of the Almighty perhaps? Then comes Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. I must say that Ministers usually tell the truth when they are out of office. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari revealed that he had been subjected to pressure, to quote his own words, "to stupendous pressure" for two years. Am I to understand that he left no trace of that pressure in his office for his successor to take note of? Certainly Mr Sachindra Chaudhuri knew that this Ministry, this Government and the country had been subjected to blackmail and pressure. Therefore it is not at all sudden. Devaluation is the culmination of the capitulatory policies of this Government in relation to the United States of America and the American monopolists and Indian monopolists. I find that our Prime Minister does not seem to be familiar with that phraseology, monopolists and so on. In Moscow or somewhere she said something. But if she will kindly look at *The Glances of World History*, containing a series of letters written to her by her illustrious father, she would find these phrases. Nobody should be unfamiliar and she at least should not be unfamiliar with them. Shri Sachin Chaudhuri or somebody else may be, but certainly not she. And we also learned many of these phrases from the Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru when we were young and from the letters written to her—I hope she would not mind if I read them—and also from his other books.

3 P.M.

As far as the foreign exchange reserves are concerned, the reserves came down by

March to Rs. 185 crores, Indian assets and so on. This is not the first time that it has come down very low. Earlier also at times the situation had been simply precarious. Even then not a suggestion was made even remotely by any member of the Government or by any member from any side of the House that the way to meet the situation was to devalue the rupee. Therefore the argument about the foreign exchange reserves is an afterthought, shall we say, and an argument which is not acceptable to us. Now, here I should like to point out that many other countries have their foreign exchange reserves at a very low level. Even England is in a very bad position and sometimes America complains that its position is not so very good but from their point of view. But generally devaluation is not done, on the contrary efforts are made to defend the national currency.

Now let me come to the official arguments. Their first argument is that devaluation will stimulate exports, the second argument is that it would restrict imports and encourage import substitution. Their third argument is that it would improve the trade balance. These arguments demand consideration and I shall endeavour to do so. Besides these it is also said that devaluation was necessary for getting assistance from the U.S.A. and this is an admission of the fact that the Government has been subjected to pressure and blackmailing tactics. This was said on the 7th of June in reply to a question, if I remember right, by the Finance Minister himself or by his Ministry. Let us examine these arguments but before going into them I should like to point out, Madam, the impact of devaluation on the national economy. Right at the beginning I wish to say that our economic development had certain independent aspects. It is a capitalist economy but development was taking place in some ways on an independent line but now the devaluation has hit the independent aspect of economic development right on the head. That must be remembered, the independent aspect has been the casualty of this blow.

Now, let us take the position of foreign debts. Foreign debts, we know, have gone up as a result of devaluation by a stroke of the pen from Rs. 2,733 crores to Rs.

[ Shri Bhupesh Gupta ]

4,102 crores, an increase of Rs 1,369 crores, almost equal to a full year's imports of this country, or slightly—shall we put it in another way less than ten or between eight to nine per cent of the total national income. Therefore hon Members will take note of the fact that by a single stroke of the pen the nation's liability has been increased to this extent and it will have to be borne by the generations living and the generations yet unborn. The national economy has been to this extent so seriously mortgaged to Americans and others.

Let me go to another aspect of the matter but before I pass on I would like to point out here that in 1966-67 we have to pay an additional sum of Rs 88 crores simply on account of devaluation as principal and interest charges in regard to debts already incurred by this Government. This will go on increasing of course. Now let us look back a little. On August 14, 1947—we are now in August 1966—nineteen years ago India's Sterling credits stood at around Rs. 1,200 crores, not taking into account Pakistan's share. If Pakistan's share was also there, undivided India's Sterling credit stood at about Rs 1,500 crores. So we launched our independence as a creditor country with huge Sterling balances about which the Congress Working Committee in 1945 or 1946 passed a series of Resolutions that with this money India's economic development will be promoted. Now today after nineteen years of independence—we have entered the twentieth year—this Congress regime has brought the country to the verge of bankruptcy. We might as well declare that we are insolvent. I am sure if this had happened in the private life of Mr Asoka Mehta personally, had he been a creditor and now come to such a state of affairs, he would have approached the court for declaration of insolvency in the same way as Mr Fazlul Haq in his time used to do, but today he will never do so. Perhaps, he will be wanting promotion for the great act of bravery that he has done.

Going back, at the start of the First Five Year Plan in 1950-51 our foreign debt stood at Rs 32 crores and today after devaluation it is Rs 4,102 crores. Of course, part of it has been utilised for the development of our economy, I can understand

that but the gap between the two has to be borne in mind in the background of the devalued currency. And foreign loans of Indian companies will now go up by 57.5 per cent and interest will go up from, say, seven per cent to at least nine per cent in terms of the rupee on those outstanding foreign loans of private companies. It is no wonder therefore that some of the private concerns in this country are demanding a revaluation of their assets in the light of devaluation of the rupee. It is also significant that Mr J R D Tata, speaking the other day, said that such assets of the Tata Iron and Steel Company as are linked with foreign debts and foreign loans should be revalued, that is, their value has to be raised. Now, services will also go up and I need not go into that.

And the result will be that planning will be whittled down. Our planning has been brought to such a position that without American endorsement we cannot even produce a Plan. I say that the Planning Minister should have resigned even on the score that even after four months of the planning period he has not been able to present to the country even a draft outline of the Fourth Plan. But whatever happens—Gods may come down to earth—our Ministers never contemplate resignation unless they land themselves in corruption cases, but it is very difficult to find out such cases always in time. That is the position. Therefore our industrial projects, Madam, will be delayed, industrial projects which depend on foreign loans and there are clear indications that such projects will be whittled down, curtailed, discouraged and so on. And it is quite understandable again that the prices of these projects, as far as their foreign components are concerned, will go up. One estimate is that the steel projects would now cost Rs 200 crores more, compared to the pre-devaluation period. Then we are faced also with the question of heavy costs of maintenance imports and that will begin to tell not only on prices when these maintenance imports go into operation after devaluation but they will also affect the small and medium industries because many industries which are small and medium, especially the smaller ones, will not be in a position to maintain themselves in fierce competition with the bigger elements when the foreign components will cost so much

in rupee terms. Therefore cut-throat monopoly competition will be directed against these medium and small industries, especially the smaller ones, with the result that concentration of wealth will take place more and more and in a country like ours where the small and medium industries have still some part to play, especially having regard to the regional disparities, it will lead to great retardation of the industrial development of the country.

Then what about the agricultural programme? Mr Subramaniam used to tell us about the package deal in agriculture. Madam Deputy Chairman, here again after devaluation the prices of everything that we import in this connection will go up by 57.5 per cent. Before, Mr Asoka Mehta, I have got his speeches, pointed out in one of his speeches that two million tonnes of fertilisers would cost about Rs. 12 crores. That was before devaluation. Now, naturally that would cost Rs. 20 crores. We were told that in order to carry out the big schemes and so on we would be requiring about Rs. 450 crores or so in the next five years, that is to say, the Fourth Five Year Plan, for fertiliser factories and so on. That would now go up to Rs. 600 crores, if not more. Therefore, as far as this particular scheme is concerned, the so-called package deal will be beyond the reach of the nation. If we had the capacity to meet the requirements, I think that has been scuttled already. There will be some effort on the part of the Government to get things going, but they would not be in a position to do it, because the bill will be too heavy. Even at that time Mr. Asoka Mehta and others in their speeches expressed doubt whether it would be easy to meet the requirements, in pre-devaluation terms, of the package deal, but assuming that what they said at that time was a sound calculation, well now it will be one and a half times more. Therefore, that is doomed already and as against that we do not have any alternative suggestion of agrarian reforms by giving land to the tiller of the soil in order to bring about an upsurge in our agriculture. Therefore, a vacuum is being created not only in theory, but also in practice and it will have a very negative impact on the entire economic development in the coming days. Devaluation has been, if I may say so, a

devastating blow to our agrarian economy, if we keep in mind the present Government policies. The national exchequer has been heavily burdened for years and years and, well, the destiny of the nation has been mortgaged.

Now let us come to the argument that it will promote exports. We are told that our exports are priced out in the international market, but in our view this is not true. The Report of the Ministry of Commerce for 1965-66 points out that 80 to 82 per cent of our exports move out at almost international prices. Therefore, the argument that our exports were getting priced out would not stand, because the Report itself has pointed out that it was not so. Only 18 to 20 per cent of our exports requires Government subsidies. Therefore, the whole argument is wrong. After devaluation, the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry expressed doubt as to whether we would be in a position, after devaluation, to maintain our export targets, even at the pre-devaluation estimate of Rs. 5,100 crores. Now, a doubt was cast by the FICCI. We are told by this Government that their export target, after devaluation, would be Rs. 8,000 crores. This is the same as Rs. 5,100 crores in terms of the devalued rupee. The value of the rupee has fallen. Therefore, the Government actually does not envisage a larger quantum of export or a larger real earning in terms of the pre-devaluation rupee. The position remains more or less static. The difference in the amount is explained by the devaluation of the rupee.

Seventy-five per cent of our export items are inelastic and this is admitted in all official reports, i.e., jute, cotton, tea, textiles and so on. Here again the scope for the expansion of the export trade is very limited. As a matter of fact, the export of tea fell from 529 million pounds in 1956 to 440 million pounds in 1965. It is a falling proposition. I do not think that we are going to make it up. Do I understand that just because Mr Asoka Mehta and the Government have devalued the rupee, the demand for tea would go very high in England? Why should the people in England oblige us by taking, say, six cups of Indian tea instead of three? It does not go up like that. Therefore, this is

[ Shri Bhupesh Gupta ]

not true. The demand cannot go up to that extent. Now, suppose the demand goes up. Are we in a position to produce? Is it easy for us to bring about a rise in production in the plantations? Tea is grown not in Yojana Bhavan, nor in the Finance Ministry nor in the Prime Ministers Secretariat. It is grown in the plantations of our country and there increase cannot take place easily. Any trade union worker or any worker even in an industry will tell you and yet the calculations are made on that basis. As far as jute is concerned, again, do I understand that the demand will go up so rapidly? There is no point in thinking along these lines. Again, we find that within the country there is shortage of raw jute. Recently some block closures were taking place. At that time discussions had been in progress between the JMA on the one hand and the Government on the other hand, how to avoid the block closure of jute mills. Here is a time when we cannot keep the jute industry going and it is no use the Government telling us that as a result of devaluation there will be more jute production and so on. Therefore, the question of export surplus is a myth. We are not going to have very much export surplus as a result of devaluation. Now, what will happen, I will just show. In order to earn the same money prior to devaluation we will have to send 36.5 per cent more goods abroad, to our export markets. This, again, will come in the way . . .

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : How?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now, our export earnings are estimated at Rs. 8,000 crores, during the entire Fourth Plan period, after devaluation. We have our doubts whether this target will ever be reached. Here again I say that a small section of the monopolists will, of course, be enriched by this kind of thing, because they will be earning more rupees, there is no doubt about it, for one dollar. You can have more money, but how does it help the economy? The economy will suffer, because we will have to send more goods. The advantage will go to the exporter here, to the private exporter, because he will earn more money and can spend a lot more. But the nation will have to work harder in order to earn the same amount

of dollar for the simple reason that we will have to export one and a half times or more goods and those goods will have to be produced by our workers. Therefore the working people have to work more, as a result of devaluation, for the benefit of Americans and others for the sake of foreign consumers and not of our own people. No wonder that Mr. Manubhai Shah and others have already come forward with the suggestions for a cut in consumption.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : Just go to an elementary school in order to understand these things. What he is saying is rot. You must go to an elementary school to understand these things. What you are talking is all absurd.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Because you cannot understand it. He will not understand things. He has lost so many things and he has lost something else. When you were here you understood things, but now you will not understand it. I hope that some day you will be a Minister for misunderstanding it. Do you not understand that we will have to send more goods than what we export now in order to earn a hundred dollars?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You will have to send more goods.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : You will have to pay more for your imports.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am saying it from the official statement. (Interruptions) Please do not disturb me. You will have your chance. Here because the value of the rupee has fallen, the dollar is much higher now in relation to the rupee. If you say that the international prices will be there, it will not work that way. Anyhow, you will have to send more goods.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Of course, by selling more goods you can earn more, but the scope, as I said, is very little. Now, prices will go up by 57.5 per cent. The question is how it will affect our economy. For the last two years food im-



ports were 21 per cent, industrial raw materials were 56 per cent. Even according to Mr. Mehta's statements you will find that under the Fourth Plan it was envisaged that we would have to spend Rs. 900 crores for imported components for our machineries and plants and also another Rs. 600 crores for spares, altogether Rs. 1,500 crores. Madam Deputy Chairman, this again will be Rs. 2,200 crores which you will have to pay for the same thing.

The prices will go up of many articles. They will go up a little later, but they have started going up. Food, for example. Last year you imported food costing Rs. 300 crores. It will be after devaluation, I am taking into account the rise, Rs. 455 crores. The freight bills of 14 million tonnes of foodgrains will be up by Rs. 50 crores to Rs. 80 crores. It is said that food, fertilisers, pesticides, etc., will be subsidised. That will cost in the period of the next four or five years or so Rs. 250 crores to Rs. 300 crores.

With regard to imports and exports let us see the trade balance, how it fares. In 1965 we imported Rs. 1,400 crores worth of goods. By our exports we earned Rs. 800 crores in round figures. We had a deficit of Rs. 600 crores. Today if we send exactly the same amount of export in quantum and import the same thing, what it comes to after devaluation? The same imports will cost us Rs. 2,200 crores instead of Rs. 1,400 crores, and by export of those things we shall be earning Rs. 525 crores instead of Rs. 800 crores.

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI** . How do you come to this figure of Rs. 525 crores? Madam, he has all the while been saying that our exports will be costly and the imports will be costly. Is there any sense in saying that?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** I know I am hitting on the right point. So the deficit will go up by Rs. 1,075 crores compared to Rs. 600 crores before devaluation, other things remaining equal, the quantum of export. Reduction of imports will also be very difficult. You are already liberalising imports and giving import licences and so on of the order of Rs. 140 crores. Collaboration agreements will be encouraged and helped, collaboration with private

concerns at the monopolist level. Import substitution or Swadeshi that way will suffer because there will be more collaboration with the foreign monopolists and inflow of foreign private capital.

In export drive also you have little success because of the very nature of our economy and because of the international trade relations into which we are placed today. This will take place at a time when our per capital income rise has stagnated at 0.4 per cent when the national income has only increased in the Third Plan by 12.7 per cent compared to 30 per cent target. Just at that time there will be the so-called tightening of the belt, cut on consumption, a greater waste of our labour power to earn foreign exchange and so on, leading to a general onslaught on the living standards of the masses and thereby giving up steadily the social objectives of our planning. This is what I would like to point out.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** You must wind up now.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** Our liabilities are going up. How shall we find the additional money that we will require? This will be raised by taxation. Already there are proposals for taxation and more taxes will come. After all the money will not come from the Congress election fund, and Mr. Chinnai will not make a voluntary surrender of crores of rupees in order to meet the liabilities. This money will be found by taxing the people, by raising the prices so that the capitalists will benefit more and more. Therefore, we are faced with such a situation of an all-round attack on the living standards of the people. The broad line of independent economic development is lost.

What has brought about this devaluation in our view—I shall just point out. It is the general line of capitalist development aggravated by concessions to Indian and foreign monopolists and also by the compromises with the semi-feudal elements in the countryside which come in the way of land reform. I can only say that for the last several years since independence we have imported Rs. 2,200 crores worth of foodgrains. That is a very serious lapse on our part. Dependence on foreign assistance has gone up. In the Third Plan it was 25 per cent of the entire plan. It will

[ Shri Bhupesh Gupta ]

be now more. Then again it is a situation when about 90 per cent of our external trade has been tied to the western market and as a result we will suffer. Deficit financing also will go up, and in the last year of the Third Plan there was deficit financing of the order of Rs. 400 crores compared to the total plan target of Rs. 500 crores. Therefore, non-project aid and other things will get in in encouraging the exporters in the private sector and so on. There will not be any economic discipline so to say.

This is my last suggestion. In order to bar the road to ruin our suggestion will be nationalisation of external trade here and now; moratorium on payments of principal and interest on foreign debt; drastic curb on remittances for foreign investments amongst the foreign monopolists such as commissions, dividends, royalties, etc.; more trade with the socialist countries and Afro-Asian countries which do not form part of the Western bloc and are not subjected to the depredations of the imperialist world market. We should pass on vigorously from aid to trade. Dependence on aid for our economic development has been ruinous and today orientation should take place in the direction of trade so that trade pays for our development. Nationalisation of banks, the oil industry and certain other industries in the monopoly sector should be carried out, and we must here and now take effective measures to break up the 75 monopoly houses marked in the Monopolies Commission Report which are responsible for many evil things. If they remain and they control the banks, the aftermath of devaluation will only be greater ruin for our national economy and sufferings for our people. The price line should be held. Therefore, monopoly procurement has become a life and death question for the nation today. Mr. C. V. Raman has stressed on the need of self-reliance. We should certainly give our thoughts to this problem and do away with imported technical know-how, where we can avoid it, and collaboration agreements with the foreign private sector; the instrument of exploitation and pressure should be avoided. Radical land reforms should be carried out. Lands should be given to the tillers of the soil and that is how an upsurge in our agriculture should be brought about, by

using the labour power and our own internal resources instead of relying on foreign fertiliser, foreign pesticide, foreign fertiliser plants, and so on. In the first place it is a reliance which has nothing to do with Swadeshi, and secondly we are not in a position to meet the increased cost of such things. Therefore the danger to the agricultural sector is very very great indeed.

These are some of my suggestions, practical I know, but they will not be accepted by this Government because by devaluation the Americans and the Indian monopolists have laid a siege on our economy and therefore we have to see how we can save the situation. Therefore, I say these are some of the constructive proposals that I make and these should not be treated as something very extraordinary, revolutionary but certainly they are progressive to meet the situation.

Finally, before I sit down, I think after devaluation Mr. Asoka Mehta, Mr. Subramaniam and Mr. Sachindra Chauhuri have no right to continue as Ministers. In fact they should be impeached and we have demanded the resignation of the Government. We know that the Congress Party has a majority, but the mass protests of the people are being organised and we have to present the people on the 1st of September before the gates of Parliament. But before that I say that, this Government has let down the country. This Government has shifted the decision-making centre of our country from Delhi to Washington, and Mr. Asoka Mehta, Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri—he is the second fiddle in that—Mr. Mehta and Mr. Subramaniam, notably Mr. Mehta, have been instruments in this sell-out deal. Therefore, for the sake of the nation, for the well-being of the nation, in order to redeem our prestige which has suffered as a result of devaluation and in order to remove the taint that has been put on our sovereignty, they should resign. Besides, they bluffed in Parliament deliberately in February/March this year and therefore, on that score also, whether they have committed privilege or not, I say that the bluffers, those who deceived the country and Parliament, those who told lies before the nation and Parliament have no right to occupy the Treasury Benches. Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Government, if she has

got any self-respect, should offer resignation. Moreover, I demand the impeachment of these three evil men. I call them evil geniuses of the present Government, two of them especially.

*The question was proposed*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Shri S. N. Mishra. I may inform the House that 10 hours have been allotted for this debate and there are very nearly 50 hon. Members who want to participate

SHRI S. N. MISHRA (Bihar) Madam Deputy Chairman, I find myself in a difficult predicament, after the Bhupesh Gupta economics which has been elaborated before us for about fifty minutes. We seem to have forgotten all the economics that we have learnt in our life. I have always been a great admirer of Shri Bhupesh Gupta as one of the most charming persons on the Opposition Benches, and I have admired him for his adroitness and resourcefulness in debate. But today I must say that I have to confess to a feeling of disappointment because of this kindergarten stuff. I did not want to use that word, but it seems that he has not been very well briefed by his party secretariat on this very important and vital subject of devaluation and what we have been treated to is only a collection of congeries or a mass of irrelevant and half-digested things on this important subject. I had imagined earlier that to Shri Bhupesh Gupta, devaluation was equal to the hon. Shri Asoka Mehta, the hon. Shri Sachindra Chaudhury and the hon. Shri C. Subramaniam. And if after having spoken about them he had thought that his task on the subject was over, if he had done that, Madam, I think he would have been on surer grounds and would have achieved much better eloquent results. But apparently he chose to tread on the toes of economics and he did it very badly, if I may say so. It has been one of the greatest banes of the Communist Party of India that throughout its career it has viewed national affairs and national personalities through an inverted mirror. And since we have not been brought up in that tradition of using very strong language, we do not want to say anything in reply to what he has said about some of the personalities who adorn the Treasury Benches. We do not want to pay him back in the same coin. But what I thought was that

after all that had happened this morning he would use soothing words, words which do not injure but heal. But apparently he has not chosen to do that. What he has done is that he has picked out only three honourable gentlemen out of the Ministerial inflation of sixty, and out of a large party of 500—dangerously large I should say. I do believe in a strong opposition for then alone would there be any real meaning and vitality in our democratic structure. But he has chosen to pick up only three persons out of those 500. I mention this figure only to the House in the most clear and emphatic terms that the entire party of 500 is solidly behind the Government on this important subject. Whatever initial doubts and hesitations were there, those doubts and hesitations and cogitations are ended, which is very natural to a democratic party like ours. Now the mind of the party is clear and firm and the party thinks that it is not only beneficial in the present, but it is also beneficial from the long-term, point of view. And I shall just try, during the time that is available to me, to establish that there is a strong economic case for devaluation in spite of what Shri Bhupesh Gupta has said a few minutes ago. He talked of discussions and differences in the Congress Party and he tried to bring in the Congress President and the Working Committee, the Congress Party in Parliament and what not. These are all wishful thinking. And so far as the Congress President is concerned, I would like to say that Shri Kamaraj is too deep a person for Shri Bhupesh Gupta and he should not try to interpret him whenever he says anything or whenever he does not choose to say anything. In fact, he has not chosen to say anything. So far as I have been able to see, there has been absolutely no statement from the Congress President on the subject.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): When he was leaving the country, he said that every party and every Congressman should support the Government move in this direction. He said that.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I repeat, let him not try to interpret a person like Shri Kamaraj. He is too deep for him and if the Communist Party of India wants to meet the Congress in the field, I would suggest to that Party to appoint a

[ Shri S N Mishra ]

Committee to study Shri Kamaraj in all his depth and present a thesis for a full-fledged discussion. Anyone

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA** If I could only have access to the Working Committee meeting

**SHRI S N MISHRA** The main burden of the theme of Shri Bhupesh Gupta was that this measure was undertaken under political pressure. This point has been met squarely from our side. I must tell him that I am so much convinced of the strong economic case for devaluation that I think that all his charges are patently absurd. Yet, if one is not in a position to establish an economic case, of course, his charges would hold water, would hold good. The fact is that the advice to devalue was given by some financial institutions. Even during the most crucial period when we were engaged in a conflict with Pakistan, we got advice from various governments—we got advice from the East. We got advice from the West. But where was the question of compromising of our economic sovereignty? Yes, we did get advice from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Let there be no denying the fact. In fact we are entitled to get advice from these financial institutions. We are members of these institutions. We are making substantial contributions to them. We are represented on the Executive Boards of these bodies and we expect that they would give us advice on matters in which their advice is required. And I may remark in this connection that the advice by the International Monetary Fund was given two years ago. And the fact that the Government of India did not think it fit to agree to this during these two years means that the economic sovereignty was fully exercised, and never compromised. Can you think of any better example than this? This was tendered two years ago but not agreed to. But apparently, my hon friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, has chosen to be ignorant of it. Now, when I say

**SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY**  
The then Finance Minister resisted it, but the present Finance Minister yielded

**SHRI S N MISHRA** I am coming to that. Now, not only against us

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN** It is the policy of the Government, not that of the Finance Minister alone

**SHRI S N MISHRA** It is not only against us that the charge is being levelled that it has been undertaken under political pressure. If you refresh your memory, in 1949 this was the charge also levelled against the United Kingdom Government, when important persons and important economists like Prof Harrod said that this was the handiwork of the back-room American boys.

*This was the charge laid so far as the 1949 devaluation in the United Kingdom was concerned*

Now Mr Bhupesh Gupta used the strongest language possible when he said that it was the greatest act of national betrayal after independence. Thereby he meant—he said in so many words later—that our prestige has been affected as a result of this act of devaluation. I do not really understand why cold reason and hard logic should not be brought to bear upon an important subject like this. It should be in the national interest not to import sentiments. Both socialist and capitalist countries—he did not mention this fact—have had to devalue their currency and they came out rather very well from the business of devaluation, and that is what we propose to do.

Now, our prestige, Madam—this is my humble submission—can be preserved if we are able to achieve a high rate of economic growth. Our prestige can be preserved if we are able to meet our repayment obligations in time and without difficulty. Our prestige can be preserved if we are able to show to the world that we are engaged in a real battle of self-reliance. Then alone can our prestige be preserved. Our prestige cannot be preserved by using pyrotechnics, by using words which Mr Bhupesh Gupta has used. After all, this defending the rupee is no less difficult and no less important than defending a piece of territory. It equally requires total mobilisation of the community behind it. Now that cannot be done by empty words and by verbal techniques. So I was saying that this devaluation now opens up before us a

new battle of economic self-reliance and economic defence, and the Government after having accepted to do this has, in fact, invited the entire country to join in this battle. That is the real meaning and significance, to my mind, of devaluation. Devaluation is not—although it has been said by many a spokesmen of the Treasury Benches—merely an exchange adjustment or monetary reform. It is much more than that. It is, what I have already said, the battle of self-reliance which we all have to join.

Now, unfortunately, Madam, a psychology of depression and crisis is sought to be created by many. Even important and responsible persons say that there would be a second devaluation and that a galloping inflation was round the corner. When Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was talking of national bankruptcy, I think he was talking in a light-hearted manner. He did not consider that this nation has now built up an economy of which we can be really proud. This is an economy, Madam, which has thrown up not less than Rs. 200 crores of additional resources during a space of nine months through the Supplementary Budget of 1965 and the Annual Budget of 1966. In spite of the lengthening shadow of an unprecedented famine and in spite of the Indo-Pak conflict and a decline in the national income to the extent of 4 per cent. this economy was able to throw up this substantial amount. This speaks of the vitality, resilience and strength that we have been able to build into the economy.

Again Madam, this is an economy which has been regularly throwing up marginal savings to the extent of 25 per cent. This is an economy which stood the test of self-reliance in the Indo-Pak conflict when the supplies were cut off. Pakistan was put to a great embarrassment, we were not. So we won it without much difficulty.

Madam, here I must refer to what has been said rather irresponsibly by many people mostly outside the House, namely this has been the result of thorough economic mismanagement during the course of the last 15 years. Now is it the result of economic mismanagement that we have got an economy so internally sound and bubbling with pent-up dynamism? Of

course, there are certain things lacking. But even so the economy is throbbing with pent-up dynamism.

I would like to refer here to that part of the resolution of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta which says that it is against all past pronouncements of the Government.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Pronouncements in Parliament

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** Yes, against past pronouncements in Parliament. Now if Mr. Gupta had said that devaluation should have been disclosed to Parliament earlier, then I have only to quote what Mr. Attlee—and this is very interesting—had to say about Sir Stafford Cripps on whose Christian conscience this was hanging heavy for a pretty long time.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I never said that it should never be done. The resolution says that it has been contrary to all past pronouncements. That means the pronouncement should have been made earlier about what we are going to undertake. Devaluation had no particular, auspicious date.

**SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN :** If they had not kept quiet, it would have given room for suspicion.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** I can, therefore, do no better than quote Mr. Attlee on this point. He says :

“But I am afraid Stafford did take it rather hard. He had a feeling that people were accusing him of something not quite honourable, particularly as he'd had to deny it right up to the last. He was rather a silly ass that way. There were an increasing number of rumours. They were affecting exchange rates and they had to be denied. You can't let that sort of decision be known until it comes into effect. Having to deny what was the truth was no doubt hard on a Christian like Stafford, but he wouldn't have let it worry him if he'd any sense.”

What I am saying is that this is one of the weakest arguments that the Opposition has been trying to make against this issue of devaluation.

SHRI P N SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh) Even Yudhisthir had to go to hell because he spoke some lie

SHRI S N MISHRA As I said earlier, I am completely convinced that there was a strong economic case for devaluation. I want to dwell on this point at some length

There was a constellation of economic circumstances, to my mind, which dictated it—and I am quite sure that if the Communist Party had been in power they would not have acted differently. And that is what Communist governments have been actually doing in such circumstances

I would like the hon'ble Members to refresh their memory about a series of serious elements in the economic situation that confronted us. Now many of these things could not be ignored. It is said that bad management is one thing responsible for all this. Can you attribute unprecedented famine to bad economic management? Can you attribute the Indo-Pak conflict resulting in heavy economic costs and dislocation of the economy to bad management? Madam, had these two exceptionally adverse factors not supervened on the economic situation, probably there would not have been the compulsion to devalue. These two factors have been largely responsible for decision of this kind. But let me refresh the memory of the House about the situation that we are facing and I would ask whether there was any alternative in the given circumstances

Firstly, Madam, we had a balance of payments deficit which was sizable, persistent and chronic and our debt to the International Monetary Fund was mounting. In fact, it has already mounted to \$ 475 million by now. Secondly, the price level and the cost of living index were out of alignment with the prices ruling in the countries with which we largely deal. Thus we were not able to make good in the struggle to reduce the costs and the prices and our goods were outpriced. Thirdly, the free market rates of the rupee exchange that were current in the foreign markets were out of tune with the official rates and the rupee was over-valued. Mr Gupta was saying that the rupee had been over-valued for quite some time, the prices were high in some other countries too

The question is, if the rupee was over-valued, what was the period over which he thinks the rupee had been over-valued? The rupee had been over-valued only for a period of two years or so. It had not been over-valued for a long time and during this period, we tried to do with halliatives, with some of the remedies which we had adopted and later on found to our grief that they were not working well. So let me come to another difficulty which we were facing and that is the most important point to be borne in mind by hon. Members. We are basically faced with a situation in which the essential developmental imports are inelastic and our exports stagnant. How does Mr. Gupta suggest that this gap between the two should be bridged? This is the most basic point to which the House must address itself. All these trends, persisting over a period, were enough to warrant devaluation but they were further aggravated by some of the factors which I have already mentioned, that is by the Indo-Pak conflict and by the unprecedented famine. You know that last year we had an appreciable decline in national income and a rise in the prices to the extent of 15 per cent. All in all, the economic situation, to my mind, called for a break-through and a revolutionary trend. Otherwise we were heading towards a catastrophe.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA It has been a slip-through from independence to slavery

SHRI S N MISHRA No, making good in the economic sphere is not paying the way for slavery, and trying to step up the rate of economic growth is not making room for any kind of economic enslavement. To my mind there was no better alternative than devaluation in the given circumstances

There were certain alternatives and in fact they have been mentioned by some experts. What were they? One mention was that there should have been a floating rate of exchange. This apparently could not have appealed to this House. This cannot appeal to any self-respecting economy. It had been done in a few cases as in Canada in the past but there were special circumstances in which they had to do it. But in our case it would have made for uncertainty in the minds of exporters and this would have made the matter worse

There was another alternative—a severe deflation. This is what has been proposed for the United Kingdom to preserve the value of the pound, to defend the pound. In our case it would have meant cutting down drastically the balance of payment deficit by cutting down the development programmes and this would have meant nominal existence of planning. This would have meant accentuation of poverty and unemployment and this would have meant lowering of wage rates all-round, the wage rates of the labourers by whom Mr. Gupta stands undoubtedly. He has always been espousing the cause of labour as many of us on this side also do.

The third alternative was, leaving things as they were. That seems to be the main burden of Mr. Gupta's speech—'leave things as they were'. He says: "You should not have done anything in these circumstances although you were faced with these difficulties that are mentioned by the Government spokesmen." Now let us examine what it would have meant, this leaving things as they were. If we had left things as they were, it would have meant this. Unconsciously Mr. Gupta probably seems to subscribe to the view that there would always be some countries very anxious and keen to bale us out of these difficulties. And so he says: 'let us remain where we were'. That seems to be the unconscious suggestion of Mr. Gupta. I know that would be farthest from his mind because he is a real believer in the process of independent economic development. About that I have no doubt absolutely, but this is what his argument has led up to.

Secondly it would have also meant the continuance and even increase of the whole system of export incentives with import restrictions of a severe kind, constricting development and almost paralysing production, and import entitlements and purchase of foreign currency at a premium through the Remittance Scheme—all bidding fair to add up to a fantastic subsidy of—probably the House is not quite conscious of this—about Rs. 250 crores per annum. How could this situation be viewed with equanimity by the country and by the House? Should not the Government have turned to another solution? And all this for what? For merely keeping devaluation

veiled or concealed. There was really no other purpose in continuing to do this but only to keep devaluation veiled and concealed.

Thirdly some aid-givers remaining unconvinced of our efforts to achieve self-reliance, would have been reluctant—and this is not a thing which must be laughed at. I am only saying that if we have to modernise our economic and social structure, there is no doubt that we have to get aid from foreign countries but this aid must be sought and received in such a way that we do not compromise our basic principles and programmes. That is what the House ought to demand from the Government. So in the given circumstances, the aid-givers would have been reluctant to extend assistance. This is an unfortunate fact that our industrial structure has come to depend too much upon economic aid from outside, but this is not the moment when we should give way to bewilderment or to self-pity or to horror. We have to act, and we have to act in such a way that the economic machine works and it does not falter. We have to create some such confidence in the world that we are able to bring about this inflow of assistance. The realisation of the dangers about too much dependence on foreign economic aid is indeed a psychological asset of the highest importance and that should be a guarantee for the future. That should ensure that we are not going to use the aid in such a way as might tend to threaten our independence or economic structure, as it has been our experience in the last few months.

I have to say a few words by way of suggestions as to what should be done. In fact here I have a grouse against the Government. I think the Government should have come to the House with a full package of reforms to deal with the new situation. That the Government does not seem to be contemplating to do during the current Session. This would in fact be one of the gravest failures on the part of the Government. You know that in the U.K. the British Government came with a Mini Budget with the most swingeing reforms and austerity measures. Here we have not got any such full package of reforms or changes that the Government wants to

[Shri S. N. Mishra.]

bring about. Therefore I would say that here is a thing about which I could have joined hands with Mr. Gupta in demanding from the Government a full package of reforms that ought to be undertaken.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI SACHINDRA CHAUDHURI): He never demanded them.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I think that any negative response to the present situation is not in the national interest. In fact, nothing would be more fatal to the national interest than to make a negative response to this new situation. We all have to come forward with our mite to deal with this situation.

4 P. M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken half-an-hour and by going on further you will be keeping out someone from your party.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: A few minutes more, Madam. Now the first thing I have to suggest is that the Government has to take drastic measures—not only this drastic measure of devaluation but much more drastic measures—to deal with the present situation. And the first imperative drastic measure that is suggested in the given circumstances is the one to deal with the inflationary pressures. If the inflationary pressures are not kept under control, all the advantages of devaluation are going to be completely neutralised. This is not the occasion, nor does the time permit, to deal with all the measures that are required to deal with the inflationary pressures in our economy. I shall do so when an occasion arises, but at the moment I would like to say that there should be a board appointed by the Government to go into incomes and the prices, and to formulate a policy on incomes and prices, as it has been done in the United Kingdom—on the model of the Jones Board on incomes and prices. Because the whole question of prices is related to the national income and expenditure policy; it is necessary to do so. And the second thing that I would like to suggest is the distribution of essential commodities at cheap prices. That must be considered to be a thing of the highest priority and there should be a Minister to look after the consumer stores

which must be spread throughout the country. This is only to deal with . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Are your services available for that particular Ministry?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: My services are available for any work that I am capable of, and about my capability, probably he has not got a very low opinion.

Now in the matter of reduction in administrative-cum-non-development expenditure, it has been probably suggested by many that there should be a reduction of 10 per cent or so. I do not think it is going to be a very practical proposition.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: It was 3 per cent and 5 per cent respectively, I think.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: What you can do, after slashing it down to the extent possible, is to limit the rise in future to the rate of growth in national income. That would be the most practicable. . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Is it not possible to cut down some items altogether?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: You would be facing the human problem, Dr. Pande, which would be overwhelming.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: And it would be a mistake to cut down expenditure on Health and on Education.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Now I will say a word about exports.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you beginning a new point? You may wind up here.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Just a few points more. One or two Members on this side would like to make time in my favour. I am just trying to make a few points and I shall do so within three or four minutes.

Now I come to exports, because this is the most important thing; this is the most important thing connected with devaluation. Here also, I should say, more time would be required to give details of the measures that would be necessary in this connection. But what I want to submit to the House



is that the programme of economic self-reliance is synonymous with a vigorous export drive. And what does this export drive require if you want to achieve economic self-reliance during the course of the next ten years? That is the programme now placed before the country by the Prime Minister, and that has been mentioned in the Indo-Soviet communique. If the country wants to achieve economic self-reliance during the next ten years, it means in concrete economic terms that exports will have to increase from the present level of Rs 800 crores (pre-devaluation) to Rs 1,300 crores by the end of the Fourth Five-Year Plan and to Rs 1,700 crores by the end of the Fifth Five-Year Plan. If that is so, it means that exports will have to be doubled during the course of the next ten years. Now this is the most concrete national task to which we have to address ourselves. This cannot be achieved—and here I would join hands with Mr Bhupesh Gupta and I completely agree—this kind of export drive or export promotion cannot be brought about through normal channels or through routine methods. There you will have to undertake Madam, the nationalisation of exports of the bulk goods, and the goods produced by small units which cannot organise salesmanship abroad. These two are, it seems to me, not on doctrinaire grounds but on practical and pragmatic grounds, dictated by the circumstances.

**SHRI P. N. SAPRU :** What about nationalisation of banks?

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** This is not the issue just now. It may also be laid down, Madam, for bringing about this export drive, that every unit capable of exporting must have the obligation to export 10 to 15 per cent of its products. If it does not do that, then it will have to part with that quantity to the State Trading Corporation, or any other agency set up by the Government, and that agency, after deducting costs, would pay back the remaining amount to the unit concerned. Again it must be laid down clearly that there would be an obligation on every unit that gets set up to pay back its foreign debt obligations. At the moment there is no such obligation on any unit to pay back its foreign debts and they have to be discharged by the

financial institutions with the assistance of the Government. This state of affairs must end as soon as possible.

Now, Madam, only one word about economic management of foreign exchange, and I will have done. Here again I have got a complaint. Much of the troubles that we are facing today is because of the fact that some of the agencies, which are meant to watch, warn and anticipate in this regard well, they did not function effectively. We were given those signals many times before many of these problems arose. The Finance Ministry is one such agency and it should have warned that some such situation was developing, and maybe some difficulties could have been averted. Then the Planning Commission is another agency and they should have acted with speed in this matter. Any way there must be some agency which can be caught hold of by Parliament, which must be responsible to Parliament for submitting periodically regular reports on the foreign exchange situation. So this is my suggestion that in future there must be regular reports to Parliament on the foreign exchange situation.

Lastly I would say this, Madam—and this is also sad to me to some extent—that, so far as the Government is concerned, for them to suggest even remotely that there can be abolition of the Gold Control Order, I think, is not a very responsible thing. If the circumstances leading to devaluation have confirmed anything, it is this that the Gold Control Order does not require to be abolished, it requires to be strengthened. But what am I to say of a country in which the Communist Party thinks that communism cannot be sustained except on the basis of 24-carat gold? I wish Mr Gupta very well with this bejewelled bride of communism. It is a new contribution to the communist philosophy, which I am not able to understand, but his party seems to be subscribing to the view that the Gold Control Order must be abolished. I am all for all that is required to be done for effective and adequate rehabilitation of the goldsmiths, and I would like that much more should be done. They have probably done quite a lot, but I would like more to be done for them. I am quite sure however that many boys and girls belonging to those families are not going to take to this business again in future.

[ Shri S. N. Mishra. ]

I plead to the Finance Minister to do all he can in this matter, but let him not even remotely suggest that what is under contemplation in the Government is the abolition of the Gold Control Order.

With these words, Madam, I thank you very much.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL** (Gujarat) : Madam, we have had two speeches on the economic policies of the Government mainly in relation to devaluation. We can understand Shri Bhupesh Gupta and his economic theories. They have a clear line. The Communist method is no respecter of orthodox economic theories, right or wrong. In their country what they say is right. Even if economically the price of a certain article is Rs. 100 they can fix it in their country at Re. 1 or Rs. 1,000. But the question is whether the Congress Party is also subscribing to such theories. The speech of the previous speaker leaves one in doubt as to where the Congress is going. For the last fifteen years there has been confusion in the Congress Party. It is but natural. From the Gandhian path to the Communist path is a contradiction in terms and during the last fifteen years of Nehru, we have had the indoctrination from the Gandhian Congress to what is emerging before us as the completely communist State. I have been telling my friends here since I have come here, since the last eight years, that you are being driven by Shri Bhupesh Gupta into his Communist economic theory and what he says today you submit to and do tomorrow. Well, here it is. What you are facing today is the result of what you have been following. Devaluation is the heavy price that the people of this country are forced to pay because of the fiscal indiscipline of the Congress Government.

One may, of course, ask whether devaluation should have been so drastic. I do not know whether it could have been possible for the Government to have taken the people into confidence. Perhaps it is not exactly possible. But it was not necessary to mislead the people by reaffirming again and again that they were not going to devalue the rupee. How will the people

of this country, for the matter of any country, have faith in their Government when they go on repeating *ad nauseum* that they are not going to do something and then they do it the next minute ?

What is going to be the effect of this devaluation ? On the day devaluation took place the prices had risen considerably by as much as 16 per cent over those of the previous year. What will be its effect as time goes on ? We are, as I said in the beginning, a democratic country and I hope we will remain a democratic country where prices cannot be controlled by the fiat of the Government. There can be laws for preventing profiteering. But the normal laws of economics must apply and no laws of economics can be subjected to the fiat of the Finance Minister or the Prime Minister or any dictator. May I remind the House of that simple story of King Canute and the waves ? There is nobody who can ask the waves to stop or to go back. Similarly no Finance Minister and no Congress Government or Communist Government can put life into our economy if you go on behaving like a bankrupt.

You have sunk crores and crores of the well-earned money of the country, of the people of this country whom you have squeezed dry. All this money you have sunk into what you call your public sector projects, your show-pieces. They were supposed to earn for you interest. If they had done it, then you would have deserved and you would have earned the gratitude of the people. But instead, we are not earning from them even one per cent as interest. We are not earning even one per cent interest from the Rs. 3,500 crores—that is my rough estimate—that you have spent on these projects. On the contrary, we are paying interest at rates varying from 4 per cent and 5 per cent and 6 per cent on that amount.

**SHRI A. D. MANI** (Madhya Pradesh) : Even eight per cent sometimes.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL** : So we are losing at the rate of 3 per cent and 4 per cent annually on that amount that has been invested in these public sector projects. That is rank financial indiscipline for which the Government has taken

no action. They just listen. They smile. There are people in this country who do not believe in free trade, who do not believe in private enterprise, who believe only in public enterprise.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : And in nationalisation.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Yes, as my hon. friend there says, 'in nationalisation also. These may suit certain conditions. But is this doing any good to the country? Have we got in this country people who will take to Government service and take Government employment and run those public sector projects? Have we got a management cadre in this country? We have none. And, therefore, all these difficulties come before us. Our Government will not listen even to people of experience who have told us, who have warned us where we are going. But those in our Government they just go on in their own way and tell the people that they are doing everything to control prices. We have been listening to this talk about controlling the prices all these years. Of course, the driving force behind all this is the Communist theory and the Communist nations. To please them we have entered into the fraud of the rupee-payment agreements. I would suggest to those friends who do not believe me, to go and have a look at these rupee-payment agreements. In every one of those agreements you will find a clause to say that the value of the rupee should have so much gold content. This makes it higher even than the dollar and much more difficult for us than in the case of the dollar, Madam. But to please these Communist countries, if I may say so, to buy the friendship of the Communist countries we have been giving them our experts. They buy them at a cheaper price and they sell their stuff to us at a higher price. And when sometimes they cannot make enough in their own country, they purchase from the free world and then sell the same thing to us at a high price and the foreign exchange which they get from us they utilise for their own economic benefit. It is this policy of this Government of helping the satellite Communist countries that has resulted in the tremendous loss to this country and in great financial benefits to those satellite countries. What else will happen here to

your economy if you follow such a policy? After all, the laws of economics are no respecter of persons or nations. But this fact the Government refuses to recognise.

This normal *de facto* position of the falling rupee was before us. Anyone who has gone abroad knows what the fate of the rupee was, how it was dwindling for the last few years. There was a time immediately after we attained our independence, when the rupee was welcome currency abroad, while the pound was not so welcome.

SHRI K. K. SHAH (Maharashtra) : Up to 1952.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : But because of the very efficient management of the Congress Government the position is reversed today. So whom else can we blame except the Congress Government for its misguided political and economic policies? Yet it is no use just saying this is wrong, wrong, wrong. We have come up to a situation where we have to face devaluation. Now what do we do? There are countries which have made good even after devaluation; France, Yugoslavia and there may be other examples.

SHRI A. D. MANI : Mexico.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : My friend says Mexico. They have made good after devaluation and this country can very well do so provided the Congress Government corrects the wrong notions that still persist in the brains of their leaders.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI L. N. MISHRA) : What are they?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Looking to Russia; taking all the dictation from Russia and allowing the satellite countries to build up their export trade at your cost. If you do not understand these simple things, I do not know what you will. We can even now, Madam, improve the situation if proper discipline is introduced in the affairs of the Government. Wasteful expenditure should be cut down straightaway. In spite of all talks of economy there is so much of wasteful expenditure even now going on.

SHRI A. D. MANI : For example ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Look at the costs of the tours and of the equipments for the Ministers and their convenience. Air-conditioning equipment is put up for a few hours' halt of Ministers. Even a boat to transport the Prime Minister had to be air-conditioned at a cost of Rs. 25,000, I think

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Where ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : This was very recently. I think the Ministers had better look into these things. I will give details if you want.

SHRI RAJENDRA RATAP SINHA : Baseless allegation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That was in Bezwada if you like.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : There you are. He is well-informed. You take everything else from him ; why don't you take these things also from him ? You take all the wrong theory, all the wrong notions from him ; why don't you take the other things also from him ?

SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI : (Uttar Pradesh) : Has he supplied the material to you ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Unfortunately he did not ; otherwise I would have given you everything.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : That was wrong. So much money was not spent at Bezwada.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : The way in which you are going today, I am very sorry to say, is the way that Indonesia is going. Unless proper brakes are put and financial stability is introduced, instead of a free Government, a free country, we will have a closed economy, a dictatorship and devaluation will be very necessary because we would be soon insolvent again. Madam, this was one of my first reactions when devaluation was announced and I find that people more experienced in financial matters have also expressed similar views on the subject. The avoidance of deficit financing which has become a habit with the Congress Government is one of the first few things which the Finance Minister should look into and also the overdrafts

of the State Governments to which there seems to be no end. Every State Government wants to spend more but how they spend it is not subject to scrutiny but if you look at the reports of their Public Accounts Committees it is very easy to find it out. No one who can't spend money judiciously should be allowed to spend money so freely but unfortunately it cannot be said of many Congress Governments in the States that they know how to spend money judiciously and they are not disciplined either. Unless they are disciplined in this matter we will still have the same trouble, deficit financing at the Centre and deficit financing at the States with the result further devaluation will become necessary.

Then there is the large gap of unplanned expenditure and this unplanned expenditure continues in spite of criticism, Madam, because a good bit of it is ultimately propaganda machinery for the Congress. I charge the Social Welfare Boards and the family planning programmes. I am saying from personal experience how all this expenditure is incurred and how the people who are paid salaries work there. Here is the new Lady Member who has come from Saurashtra, Shrimati Pushpaben Mehta. In the last elections I saw how her army of young ladies worked. In one election booth they took charge of the whole office. They took charge of the voting paper from every person who came, marked it themselves and put it in the box.

SHRIMATI PUSHPABEN JANARDANRAI MEHTA (Gujarat) : Madam, may I say . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : I am prepared to prove it, to prove every word. I have got the names and . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : She wants to say something, would you yield ?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : In a minute let me tell everything and then I will yield.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : When you make a charge against a Member, think you should give her an opportunity (Interruptions) Order, order.

**SHRIMATI PUSHPABEN JANAR-DANRAI MEHTA:** On a point of order, what I want to say is this. The ladies who were working in the election campaign were not members of the Board; nor were they paid by the Board. They were only the ladies living in the same town. I do not think there was any paid worker of the Board and we have not got so many paid workers either in the Central Board or in the State Board. Only five centres are being run near Wadhwan city and there are only five Sevikas. These five Sevikas cannot run the whole election campaign. As a point of information I may also tell you that at the time of election all the jeeps which belong to the Central Board and the State Board are kept in the garage so no one can use them for election campaign. We do not allow anybody to use any jeep during the time of election.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** Madam, I wish the hon. Lady Member, in her own interest, had listened to me. She has made my charge stronger. I myself saw the ladies in charge of the booth. I went to one of the booths there; my wife was one of the candidates there. And the gentleman looking at my cap says: "Everything is going on very fine. See our Sevikas are there. They are taking the voting papers from these ignorant ladies, marking them and putting them in the box." I said, "Gentleman, what is your name?" As soon as I asked his name these girls bolted. I insisted and asked him to give me his name. In the meantime somebody told him who I was and he went and fell at the feet of my wife and said: "I have got seven children and they will all starve. Do you want that to happen?" My wife is a very kind-hearted person and she said, "Let us go away."

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** What about you?

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** I am not. She is much more kind. I have got a little harder heart. I said: "No, I want to make a complaint" and I wrote out a complaint. I still got it on the file and I have got the name of the gentleman, the name of the place and all the particulars. This is what is happening and this is how the Congress wins the elections. In regard to these family planning pro-

grammes, Madam, you go and ask the doctors privately, who are working on the advisory boards, to put their hands on their hearts and tell you what really goes on and they will tell you how at least half the money allotted for the family planning Programme goes to the Congress funds. That is how money is wasted. This is unplanned money; this is not money spent for the Plan but this money is spent for boosting the Congress Party. That is why we are facing financial ruination now and in this financial ruination where do we stand? We have become the proverbial beggar who takes money from everyone. Our Finance Minister goes about asking for aid from everywhere. Unfortunately this Finance Minister has come into a bad legacy; I do not blame him. I have no quarrel with him. I have great regard for him. He has come into a very bad legacy of his two predecessors who ran amuck completely and put our country into this financial mess. I wonder why they did it. Did they not have a conscience? Did they not understand? Did they not realise that they were taking this country to utter ruination? We have now to pay for the sins of these policies and that is why devaluation has come. I appeal to the present Finance Minister to examine whether this devaluation is going to work and whether he means to apply the financial discipline necessary to make this devaluation a success; otherwise we will have to have another devaluation in a few years.

Thank you

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Madam, I have listened to . . .

श्री राजनारायण : जरा हमारी बातों का भी जवाब दे दें तो अच्छा हो ।

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** I have listened to the two learned speakers from the Opposition and I find they have made quite contradictory points. One has suggested one remedy and the other has suggested exactly the opposite remedy. Now, my hon. friend is walking away, because he is not prepared to listen to what we have to say on his speech.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** Our Party is here.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** That is all right but courtesy demands that

[ Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha. ]

the speaker must listen to the other Member.

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

Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have listened to the two prophets of doom. They have said that this country under the Congress rule is going to ruins. I would just tell them that it is exactly the opposite. The country has grown stronger and stronger and I shall show you that during the last sixteen years this country has progressed and the country can be proud of its progress.

श्री राजनारायण : सही है सही, कोई नहीं है तो आप तो हैं ही ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We know it.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : Please listen. I can give you facts and figures to show what economic progress has been made during this period.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What progress we know. You have travelled from this side to that side.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : Agricultural production has gone up. Industrial production has gone up.

DR. B. N. ANTANI (Gujarat) : The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : My hon. friend in his speech just now said that the best seed of self-sufficiency was sowed at the time of the Pakistani attack. We could stand that onslaught on our own. We are not only self-sufficient in the economic field, but we are also self-sufficient in the matter of military equipment.

श्री राजनारायण : सही है खूब किया । सोशलिस्ट पार्टी से बड़ी पार्टी कांग्रेस पार्टी में चले गये ।

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : Please listen to me first. Now, as Mr. Mishra pointed out, we would not have come to this mess but for two important factors, which he mentioned. One was the serious drought of last year which pushed back our agricultural production by 15 per cent and foodgrains production by 18 per cent. The other point he referred to

was the aggression by Pakistan. I would like to add one more. The Chinese aggression is also largely responsible for the mess in which we are. So, these three factors are largely responsible for the deterioration in the economic situation during the Third Five Year Plan. If we look at the Third Five Year Plan, during the first two years of the Plan rapid progress was made in the economy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No, no.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : Yes. I will give you the figures.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Look into the Appraisal of the Third Five Year Plan.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : I am saying that during the first two years progress was made both in the agricultural and industrial fields.

(Interruption)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Food-grain production was higher only in the first year of the Third Plan. That was only for one year.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : I am merely saying this that during the first two years of the Third Plan the progress was satisfactory. It was only when we had the Chinese aggression that conditions changed the other way. We had to resort to heavy deficit financing and as a result of that inflation came about in the economy. The price rise also, during the first two years of the Third Five Year Plan, was not so big as it had been during the last three years of the Plan. Now, the hon. Member was saying that there has been a price rise in other countries as well. Price rise in this country has been of the order of 76 per cent in the last decade, whereas the price rise in other countries was far below this.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : That is not a compliment.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA : I am stating what the facts are. The hon. Member just said that there has been a price rise in other countries also. The fact of the matter is that the price rise during the last three years was because we had resorted, on an average, to deficit financing of the order of Rs. 400 crores, because of this war. We had to meet the threat

and challenge from Pakistan and China. Therefore, deficit financing had to be increased and during this period the price rise was very high. My hon. friend has explained to you that we were priced out in the international market. The price rise in other countries is far below the price rise in India. Therefore, I would like to say this. During the last two years the economy has been undergoing great stress and strain.

Now, the hon. Member said that we have received advice from time to time from friendly countries that our economy was not going on well. This is a fact. Now, the very fact that we withstood all this advice from the IMF for two years to devalue the rupee is proof that we were not under any pressure. But I would like to tell you that there were other courses which the previous Finance Minister had adopted. We could have devalued the rupee one or two years earlier, but instead of devaluation the other course was adopted. He imposed heavy import duties in order to restrict the import of foreign goods. He resorted to subsidisation of exports on a very large scale. The hon. Member was saying that our export was moving on its own. It is not a fact.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I have quoted from the Report of the Ministry of Commerce.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :** I would like to quote from this—"A supplement to the Economic Survey" . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** No, no.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :** . . . which has been circulated. It says :—

"Over the last few years, even our traditional exports had to be given assistance. Tea and jute, for instance, were given assistance in the form of tax credit certificates. If allowance is made for this, well over 70 per cent of India's exports moved only with the help of assistance of one form or another and in the case of newer manufactured goods, the assistance had to be substantial."

So, I would like you to understand that what was happening is this. Instead of devaluing the rupee, the Government adopted other courses, which the Govern-

ment is doing even today. In order to ease the balance of payments position, the Government started restricting imports by making imports very dear, by imposing heavy import duties. On the other hand, because our goods were priced out we started subsidising exports on a very large scale. As has been correctly pointed out, 70 per cent of our goods could move only on subsidy. Now, the Government was considering all these matters all this time. There was a further rise in prices. Because of the stoppage of imports our industries came to a grinding halt. Even today for many of our industries we are dependent on foreign raw materials. Our industrial production came to a grinding halt practically with the result there was a further spurt in prices. More and more export subsidisation was found necessary. Then the question of aid is there. There is some difficulty from which our friends suffer. They do not understand exactly what aid means. Aid is not something which we are getting as gratis from them. You can more appropriately call it credit. We are having credit, and we shall pay all that we are getting to the pie, and that is the reputation of this country. We have paid all that we have borrowed, and we will pay tomorrow also what we will borrow today. Therefore, the important point is that we are not going out with a beggar's bowl in hand. We are negotiating for credit, and the industrial development and the agricultural development of this country cannot take place . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** But even the bowl is now American.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :** No, no. Please do not talk like that. Please listen to what I say. We are only arranging credit because we can only enlarge our productivity in this country if we have all this foreign credit in order that we may import sophisticated machinery, sophisticated plant and technology and also some of the raw materials and spare parts for which we have not yet become self-sufficient.

The idea is this that by devaluation you will help the industries, the export-oriented industries will be helped. What will happen is this that the export will become more profitable, and therefore there will be greater inflow of enterprise and capital

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]  
in the export-oriented industries. Then there will be greater incentive for import substitution because the imports will become dear. Today what is happening? The imported goods were cheaper than the Indian goods. Therefore, people were tempted to import more goods from abroad.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY :  
By imposing duties you would have increased the import price.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :  
That is what I say. We went on increasing but even then it was not enough. We have had to impose more import duties. So what will happen is this. The real situation has to be recognised. As Mr. Mishra has pointed out, we have a multiple rate of foreign exchange. We have the foreign exchange remittance scheme. Nothing will move without import entitlements which gave a very heavy subsidy of even 50 or 60 per cent on the exports. Our nation could not export to the extent desired and therefore devaluation was thought to be a better method of doing it. The hon. Member was just saying that we would have to export more. It is not at all necessary to export more in quantum because we have on many items raised the export duty not to the full extent of 57 per cent but have left a small margin so that there is room for enlarging the price account on the quantum of export. But today what happens is goods worth Rs. 100 will also cost the same in the foreign market because the foreign currency does not change. In foreign price there will be more money income. That I can understand.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You want to say that the World Bank has advised devaluation so that the Americans can buy the same quantity of tea or jute by paying the same amount of foreign exchange as before.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :  
My hon. friend has got an obsession of the World Bank. We do not always look at it from the point of view of the World Bank and what they say about it. We see what is to our benefit.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Sinha, you go on. They want to take away your time. You have only five minutes more.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY :  
We want to get enlightenment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We can get that from Mr. Mehta.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :  
I would like to say one or two things on what the hon. Member has said. He has chosen to attack two or three Ministers for this policy of devaluation. The whole purpose of the Communist Party is to have a character assassination of members of the Congress Party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Not at all. Mr. Vice-Chairman, there must be a character to assassinate. I do not think they have any character.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :  
That is your whole strategy. I am not yielding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : He is not yielding.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : There is no political character altogether.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :  
This decision has been taken by the Cabinet as a whole and not by a few individual members.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is right. I agree. Therefore, we have demanded the resignation of the Government.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :  
No. You can ask whatever you like. But nobody is going to resign.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I want the Indira Gandhi Government to resign, and in that Government they are the villains of the piece.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :  
Quite right. What you say may be correct.

(Interruption)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh)  
He is not correct.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA :  
But I want to tell you that this is a collective responsibility of the Government and the Government has taken the decision as a whole. You should not attack one or two individual members, which is



your policy. The hon. Member was saying, both of them were saying, that the Government members were all the time saying that "we will not devalue". I do not know what they mean by this. Yes, Mr. Mishra has very aptly quoted from the House of Commons report to show that you ought not to have put such awkward questions; and if you put those questions, we have no other alternative but to say that we are not going to devalue. The Government members have no other option but to say this. How could they give a clue and fall into a trap and say "we are going to devalue"? Do you expect them to say that? You are saying of bluffing. You are responsible for that.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** Mr. Sinha, you address me.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** Please address the Chair.

**SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:** Government have denied it in the last session and said that there was no proposal for devaluation of the rupee.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** We did not dilate on it. The question was whether there was any proposal. The Government could have easily said that there was a proposal. Even that was denied.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** They could say that only after they have made up their mind.

*(Interruption)*

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I want to say . . .

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** I am not yielding.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN):** Let him go on. He is not yielding. You have got two minutes more.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Let him speak till five o'clock. If he does not yield, I cannot get up.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** About the price rise what I would like to say is this. After devaluation there is bound to be a price rise. What the Govern-

ment have committed themselves to is this that they will hold the price line as far as the essential commodities are concerned. If there is no price rise in the direction in which we want the price rise to take place, the whole purpose of devaluation will be defeated. What we want is whatever commodities go for export, their price should rise so that their consumption goes down in this country and it is more profitable for the exporters to export them and therefore there is more production of these items, whether industrial or agricultural. Then exactly we want that the commodities manufactured out of imported items or machineries which are imported, their price should rise because we do not want to use imported raw materials or imported machinery for ourselves. This will be a help for greater production of these raw materials and greater production of machinery in this country and people will go in for indigenous machinery instead of foreign machinery. So the Government is only committed to see that there should not be a general price rise of all commodities, particularly the commodities which are used by the common man in this country.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** We exported you from this side.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Then I would like to say that the Government should see, as has been pointed out, that inflationary pressures are reduced, and for that purpose I would agree with the suggestion that has come forward that all wasteful expenditure should be absolutely cut down drastically. We should not resort to deficit financing any further and we must manage our economy within the resources that we can generate for the Fourth Five Year Plan.

**श्री राजनारायण:** श्रीमन्, मैं श्री भूपेश गुप्त जी ने जो प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया है उसके पक्ष में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि प्रस्ताव और साफ शब्दों में होना चाहिए था जिसमें इस सरकार की भर्त्सना और निन्दा भी होती।

**श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा:** कुछ लफ्ज आप इस्तेमाल करिए।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से निवेदन करूंगा कि जब हम अवमूल्यन पर वाद-विवाद करें तो जरा संयम के साथ उस विषय की गम्भीरता को देखते हुए अनावश्यक टोकाटाकी न करें। हम चाहते हैं कि हमको भी अपनी बात को ठीक से रखने का मौका मिले और सरकारी पक्ष का कोई प्रवीण पंडित अगर डिवेल्युएशन के सम्बन्ध में समझा सके तो उसको भी पूरा समय दिया जाय। इसलिए जब हमारे बिहार के साथी मिश्रा जी और सनिहा जी बोल रहे थे तो मैं चेयर से बारबार यही आरजू कर रहा था कि उनको बोलने का पूरा मौका दिया जाय। मैं चाहता था कि वे ठोस, साकार शक्ल में आते, लेकिन हमे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि न मिश्रा जी ठोस हुए और न सनिहा जी ठोस हुए।

**श्री ललित नारायण मिश्र :** निराकार तो नहीं है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं कुछ तथ्यों को पहले सामने रखूंगा क्योंकि यह जो डिवेल्युएशन का मामला है यह पूरी आर्थिक नीति का मामला है, अर्थ व्यवस्था का यानी सम्पूर्ण बजट का। अगर देखा जाय तो हम लोग इस सरकार के सारे बजट पर विचार कर रहे हैं। इतनी बात मैं सरकारी पक्ष वालों की मान लूंगा कि यह डिवेल्युएशन एकाएक कहीं आममान से टपक नहीं गया बल्कि पिछले 20 साल से जो सरकार की जनहित-विरोधी और राष्ट्रहित-विरोधी नीतियां रही हैं, जो इस सरकार के कुकर्म रहे हैं उन सबका समुच्चय, जोड़ इस डिवेल्युएशन में हुआ। इसके पहले भी मैंने कहा था कि प्रधान मंत्री के बाप ने जो जहर का पेड़ लगाया था प्रधान मंत्री बेटी उस जहर के फल को आज इस मुल्क की जनता को चखाना चाहती है और चखा रही है। मिश्रा जी इस समय वित्त मंत्री जी से बात कर रहे हैं और उनके ध्यान को अपनी ओर खींचे हुए हैं। वित्त मंत्री जी को जरा इन पाइन्ट्स को समझना चाहिए

और उनका ठीक से जबाब देने के लिए तैयारी करनी चाहिए। 1950-51 में केवल 32 करोड़ का विदेशी ऋण हमारे मुल्क पर था। 1955-56 में यह ऋण हुआ है 114 करोड़ का, 1960-61 में यह ऋण हुआ है 761 करोड़, 65-66 में यह ऋण हुआ 2,629 करोड़ और 1966-67 के बजट में यह ऋण है 3,293 करोड़। यह प्रगति की ओर ले जा रहा है या अवनति की ओर ले जा रहा है? जो विदेश का कर्जा था वह लगातार साल-ब-साल बढ़ता जा रहा है या घटता जा रहा है? मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हमारे मित्र सिन्हा जी बहुत दिनों तक हम लोगों के साथ थे, मगर इस समय जब सरकारी पक्ष . . .

**श्री राजेन्द्र प्रताप सिंह :** इधर से कर्जा लिया जाता है और उधर प्रोजेक्ट खड़े करते हैं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** सब ले लूंगा। डेढ़ सौ साल का अंग्रेजी राज का इतिहास और बीस साल का कांग्रेसी राज का इतिहास पूरा रख दूंगा। केवल समय चाहिए।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :** लेकिन टाइम आपका 20 मिनट है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, कहिए तो फिर मैं न बोलू क्योंकि यह विषय बड़ा गम्भीर है और इस पर समय की कोई लिमिट नहीं होनी चाहिए।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :** यहां कई आदमियों की फेहरिस्त मेरे पास है। मैं चाहता हूं कि मैं आपको टाइम दूं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** हम दोहरायेगे नहीं, लेकिन हमारी करबद्ध प्रार्थना है कि इसमें समय की लिमिटेशन न रखें।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :** कैसे मैं काम चलाऊंगा?

**श्री राजनारायण :** अब मैं अपना पाइन्ट ले रहा हूं।

पहले कृषि लेना है। कृषि के बारे में ठीक से देखा जाय। श्रीमन् जो योजना बनाई उसको मैं कुयोजना कहता हूँ, अनप्लान्ड प्लान। कुयोजना माने बुरी योजना। तृतीय योजना में श्रीमन्, लिखा है 30 प्रतिशत खाद्यान्न बढ़ाने का लक्ष्य, मगर इसमें कमी हुई है। 30 प्रतिशत खाद्यान्न नहीं बढ़ा है। कैसे कम हुआ है? 61-62 में वृद्धि नहीं हुई, 62-63 में 5 फीसदी की कमी हुई, 63-64 में 3.7 फीसदी वृद्धि हुई, 64-65 में 10.5 फीसदी बढ़ोतरी हुई और 65-66 में 5 फीसदी की कमी हुई। इस टोटल को जोड़ा जाय तो 6 फीसदी की कमी हो जाती है सम्पूर्ण तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में। अब आप देखें कि सरकार की ओर से जो प्रवक्ता बोले हैं उन्होंने कहा है कि गल्ले की कमी रही है और जब-जब दोष मढ़ना होता है तो दोष मढ़ा जाता है मौसम पर मौसम की रपट भी हमारे पास है। मौसम पर दोष देना बिल्कुल फिजूल है। अभी जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के खाद्य विभाग का सबसे लेटेस्ट आंकड़ा प्रकाशित हुआ है उसमें, श्रीमन्, कहा है कि कुल 7 करोड़ 23 लाख टन गल्ला इस साल पैदा हुआ है और 9 फरवरी को यही सूब्रह्मण्यम् साहब जवाहर नगर में कह रहे थे कि 7 करोड़ 59 लाख टन गल्ला पैदा होगा। आगे हम देख रहे हैं सारे आकड़े को जिसके मुताबिक 1966 में 9 करोड़ 68 लाख टन गल्ला खाने को चाहिए। यानी जो मौजूदा हालत है उनमें एक करोड़ 40 लाख टन गल्ले की कमी पड़ रही है 48 करोड़ जनता को खिलाने में। 5 करोड़ लोग भूखों मरने पर विवश होंगे। यह सरकार की खाद्य नीति है। यह सरकार का आंकड़ा है और यह सरकार की किताब का आंकड़ा है। इसको कोई डिनार्ड नहीं कर सकता।

मैं 50-51 से चल रहा हूँ और इस सरकार को दोषी बनाता रहा हूँ। 50-51 में हमने सरकार को सुझाव दिया, सोशललिस्ट

पार्टी में सुझाव दिया कि अन्न सेना बनाओ, नई जमीन को तोड़ो, जो ऊसर है, परती है, बंजर है, तराई भावर का इलाका है, पानी से ढका हुआ इलाका है उसमें से नई जमीन निकालो। इससे दो काम होगा, बेकारों

5 P.M. को काम होगा और अन्न के उत्पादन में बढ़ोतरी होगी, वहापर वह बस जायेंगे तो अन्न पैदा होने लगेगा। मैं आपके द्वारा अदब के साथ इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उस समय के प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था, हमें जरूरत नहीं है अगर हमको जरूरत पड़ेगी तो हम गमले में खेती करेंगे, मकान की छतों पर मिट्टी डाल कर खेती करेंगे। गमले में खेती करने का नारा उठाने वाली इस सरकार ने और मकान की छतों पर मिट्टी डाल कर खेती करने वाली सरकार ने आज देश की जनता को भूखमरी में जाने पर विवश कर दिया है, इसके लिये कोई भी विदेशी दोष नहीं, न चाइना के हमले का दोष है और न पाकिस्तानी हमले का दोष है।

अब इस सरकार की जो तृतीय प्लानिंग है, योजना है उसके बारे में देखा जाय। नाइट्रोजन खाद का 690 हजार टन उत्पादन का लक्ष्य था।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): If you like we will sit till 5.30

SOME HON MEMBERS: No. On Monday.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I can continue on Monday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You can continue today. We will finish one more speech till 5-30. There is a list of about 50 people. I am sure, as my learned friend desired to speak, he will also appreciate that others should also have a chance. In view of that, if the House agrees with me, we will sit for half-an-hour more.

SHRI HAYATULLAH ANSARI: Let us sit half an hour more; otherwise Mr. Rajnarain will consume a full day on Monday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): When I request him he listens to my request. Mr. Raj-narain, fifteen minutes more.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): You will have to give us also half an hour.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): That will be deducted from your party time

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आपको हमेशा सुनता हूँ आप मेरी मजबूरी को सुनिये। मेरा तो पैगामे मुहब्बत है जहाँ तक पहुँच जाय . . .

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : बहुत शुक्रिया।

श्री राजनारायण : जनाब का फर्ज अहले सियासत है वह आप जाने। मैं एक ही बात अर्ज कर रहा था कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि हर पार्टी के एक एक प्रवक्ता को अपनी पालिसी रखने का पूरा मौका, पूरा समय, दिया जाय

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : आधा घंटा दे रहे हैं और आपको भी आधा घंटा दे रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : हम दुहरायेगे नहीं। बीच में जो टीका-टिप्पणी है यह समय निकल जाना चाहिये, उसको नहीं जोड़ा जाना चाहिये।

तो कुछ प्वाइंट्स दे रहा हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि मिश्रा जी और सिन्हा जी या इनकी तरफ से कोई और बोलने के लिये खड़े हों तो वह कृपा कर के इन प्वाइंट्स को नोट कर ले।

तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में नाइट्रोजन खाद बनाने का लक्ष्य रखा गया 690 हजार टन और कुल 190 हजार टन बना। लक्ष्य पूरा नहीं हुआ, करीब एक बटे चार ही लक्ष्य पूरा हुआ। 128 लाख एकड़ भूमि पर सिंचाई का लक्ष्य रखा गया और मुश्किल से 75 लाख एकड़ हो पाई। यह किसका दोष है, न चीन के हमले का दोष है न पाकिस्तान

के हमले का दोष है। उन्नत बीज का प्रयोग 1480 लाख एकड़ भूमि पर होने का इस सरकार ने लक्ष्य बनाया था तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में और 470 लाख एकड़ भूमि पर यह हो पाया। हमारे मुल्क में गल्ले का जो उत्पादन हो रहा है उसमें सब से बड़ी कमी और खराबी जो आज आ रही है उसका एक बड़ा कारण है भूमि का क्षरण होना, भूमि की शक्ति का घटना, जिसको स्वायल कंजर-वेशन के जगिये यह सरकार ठीक करना चाहती है। प्रथम और द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजनाये बीत गई और मुश्किल से 27 लाख एकड़ भूमि में भूमि-संरक्षण का काम हुआ और तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में 110 लाख एकड़ का लक्ष्य था और चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना में 200 लाख एकड़ भूमि का लक्ष्य रखा गया है। अगर यह पूरा हो जाय और जहाँ तक भूमि का क्षरण हुआ है वही तक रुक जाय, आगे भूमि का क्षरण न हो तो पांच पंचवर्षीय योजनाये बीत जाए और सरकार अपने वायदे और लक्ष्य के मुताबिक काम करती रहे तो भी पूरी भूमि का संरक्षण नहीं हो पायेगा। अब इसमें कहा चीन आया और इसमें कहा पाकिस्तान आया। अनावश्यक ढंग पर हम मसले पर चीन और पाकिस्तान को लाने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं।

अब मैं बताना चाहता हूँ। औसत हमने निकाला है। प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में 24 लाख टन गल्ला बाहर से आया है फी साल, द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में 31 लाख टन गल्ला औसतन फी साल बाहर से आया है और तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में 50 लाख टन गल्ला औसतन फी साल बाहर से आया है। जिस साल इस सरकार ने कहा कि बम्पर क्राप हुई है उस साल यानी 1964-65 में 60 लाख टन गल्ला बाहर से आया और हमने पांच साल का जोड़ कर औसत निकाल दिया है तो 50 लाख टन होता है। अब देखा जाय कि कहाँ है खेती जिसके बारे में कहा जाय कि खेती है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सरकार हमारे साथ बहुत अन्याय, बहुत गुनाह

कर रही है और इस सरकार को ऐसा करना नहीं चाहिये। जिन हमारे माननीय मित्रों ने कहा है उन माननीय मित्रों से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अनावश्यक ढंग पर इस सरकार के कुकर्मों और इस सरकार की जन-विरोधी नीतियों को छिपाने के लिये यहां पर प्रयत्न नहीं होना चाहिये। हमारे आदरणीय मिश्रा जी सोंचें, हमारे माननीय मिन्हा जी सोंचें जिन्होंने कि इस सदन का समय लिया कि कहां से इसमें चीन के हमले की बात आ गई, कहां से इसमें पाकिस्तान के हमले की बात आ गई। इस सरकार की कृपि-नीति दोषपूर्ण है, हम बमते हैं लखनऊ में, बनारस में, पटना में और यह सरकार हमारे लिये खेती करवा रही है वार्षिकगटन में, इस सरकार ने अमरीकी दुम में हमारी आजादी को गिरवी रख दिया है, केवल डिबेल्युएशन करने में ही नहीं रखा है बल्कि अपनी योजनाओं को विदेश के, साम्राज्यवादियों के, अमेरिका के दुम में बांधने की लगातार साजिश की।

अब मैं कुछ दूसरे आंकड़ों को कहना चाहता हूँ ये खेती के बारे में हैं। इस सदन में कहा गया है कि अब हम किसानों को खेती को बढ़ाने के लिये ऋण देंगे। देख लिया जाय, 1962 ई० के आंकड़े मैं प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूँ, इसके बाद के आंकड़े इस सरकार के पास नहीं हैं। 1962 में किसानों पर केवल खेती का कर्जा 2,380 करोड़ रुपया था और इस 2,380 करोड़ में केवल 15.4 प्रतिशत सरकार और सहकार का है, यानी गवर्नमेंट और कोऑपरेटिव सोमाइटीज दोनों ने किसानों को जितना ऋण, जितना कर्जा, दिया है उसको जोड़ लेते हैं तो वह इसका कुल 15.4 फीसदी होता है और व्यापारी तथा महाजन का 70 फीसदी है। तो 70 फीसदी व्यापारियों और महाजनों का उस पर कर्जा है। तो किसान गया कहां। किसान महाजन और गपारियों के कर्जों के बोझ से दबा है और ये किसानों की सारी गाढ़ी कमाई को अपने सूद में छीन ले रहे हैं।

तो क्या इस सरकार की कोई पालिसी है, इस सरकार की कोई नीति है और इस नीति के रहते हुये क्या कभी भी मुल्क में अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ सकता है। अगर अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ाना है तो भूपेश गुप्त की उस बात को मानो कि यह सरकार इस्तीफा दे दे, इसमें इतना विवेक आये कि स्वतः इस्तीफा दे दे और इस्तीफा दे कर जनता से कहे कि इस देश को तरक्की के रास्ते पर ले जाने में हम असमर्थ हैं इसलिये दूसरी कोई सरकार बनाओ। अगर सद्बुद्धि हो, ठीक अकल हो तो सरकार को यह रास्ता अख्तियार करना चाहिये।

मुझे अफसोस है कि इस मौके पर माननीय अशोक मेहता यहां नहीं हैं, मगर मैं उनको कहना चाहता हूँ कि कहां है उनका कैपिटल फार्मेशन। खैर, कैपिटल फार्मेशन का विषय दूसरा है। लेकिन 3,590 लाख एकड़ जमीन पर खेती होती है, जो आखिरी आंकड़ा है इस सरकार का उसके मुताबिक, और 1,120 लाख एकड़ जमीन में कुल सिंचाई हो रही है, तो सिंचाई कहां पर है। मैं आज इस मौके पर बोलते हुये डा० लोहिया को मुबारक बाद करना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने 1948, 1949 और 1950 में एक घंटा देश को दो यह नारा लगाया उन्होंने कहा कि बांध बांधो और मुल्क के उत्पादन को बढ़ाओ, हम लोगों ने स्वयंसेवकों की भर्ती की, कुछ बांध बांधना शुरू किया, छोटे छोटे साइज के बांध बनाना शुरू किया, और उसकी नकल की गई हमारे भारत के भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री के जग्गिये, प्रथम प्रधान मंत्री के जरिये, चांदी का फावड़ा बनाया गया, प्रदर्शन किया गया बुलन्दशहर में और उन्होंने कहा कि चांदी के फावड़े से हम भी बांध बना रहे हैं। सारी की सारी बातें इसकी आत्मा को मार कर केवल ऊपर का आवरण रखा है सरकार ने। इसलिये मैं अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सरकार के पास कोई अन्न के उत्पादन की योजना है ही नहीं।

[श्री राजनारायण]

दूसरी बात, हम कहते हैं, और मैं जहाँ तक जानता हूँ कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी भी कहती है और दूसरी प्रगतिशील पार्टी भी कहती है कि लिमिटेशन आफ होल्डिंग्स हो—सीमा बांधी जाय कि इतनी जमीन से ज्यादा जमीन किसी खेती करने वाले परिवार के पास न रहने दो, हदबंदी करो और उसमें हमने मुझाव यह दिया था सरकार को कि एक हल बैल से जितनी जमीन में खेती हो सकती है उसकी तीन गुनी से ज्यादा जमीन खेती के लिये एक परिवार के पास नहीं रहनी चाहिये वरना उसकी प्रोडक्टिविटी घटती चली जाती है। हमने उनको जापान का उदाहरण दिया है। देखा जाय, कहीं भी हदबंदी की सरकार ने, कहीं हदबंदी लागू हुई? चाहे बिहार में लिया जाय, चाहे उत्तर प्रदेश में लिया जाय, कहीं भी हदबंदी लागू नहीं हुई। हदबंदी की जगह कुछ राज्यों में इस सरकार ने चकबंदी चला दी। उस चकबंदी से अन्न के उत्पादन में गिरावट आ गई क्योंकि जो गरीब किसान, जो टिलर आफ दी साइल है, जिसकी जमीन रहनी चाहिये, जो अपने हाथ से खेती पैदा करता है, अन्न पैदा करता है उसकी अच्छी जमीन छीन ली गई और वह जमीन उन बड़े-बड़े काश्तकारों को दे दी गई है जो अपने हाथ से खेती नहीं कर रहे हैं। नेशनल प्रोडक्शन, राष्ट्रीय अन्न का उत्पादन, इस कुयोजना से लगातार गिरता जा रहा है। आपको अनेक आंकड़े देकर हम साबित कर सकते हैं। यह तो कृषि के बारे में हुआ।

तो मैं सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से कहूंगा कि हरगिज हरगिज खुदा के लिये इस सरकार की किसी नीति का समर्थन करने के लिये यहां खड़े मत हों, हां डिवेल्युएशन क्यों हुआ यह कह सकते हैं। जो हालत ऐसी पैदा कर दी गई खोखली, अनुयोजित, कुनियोजित, अनप्लान्ड प्लान से, इल प्लान्ड प्लान से, उसका नतीजा है कि सरकार को डिवेल्युएशन करना पड़ा—इसे जानने से हमें कोई ऐतराज

नहीं है। मगर जिस ढंग में डिवेल्युएशन हुआ, जिस तरह से गुमराह करके डिवेल्युएशन हुआ, वह भी अपनी जगह कुछ महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है। एक बार नहीं अनेक बार इस सदन में और दूसरे सदन में डिवेल्युएशन के बारे में सवाल पूछे गये। सरकार बराबर कहती रही है कि डिवेल्युएशन नहीं होगा, जबकि लोग समझते रहे हैं कि डिवेल्युएशन होने जा रहा है, डिवेल्युएशन होने जा रहा है। जब-जब सरकार का ध्यान खींच गया है सरकार ने जानबूझ कर के इस सदन को गुमराह किया है, बराबर आश्वासन दिया है, यकीन दिलाया है, कि डिवेल्युएशन नहीं होगा। वावजूद इस यकीन दिलाने के डिवेल्युएशन कर दिया गया। तो निश्चित रूप में यह तो संसद् है, इस संसद् के प्रति इस सरकार ने असम्मान प्रकट किया है, संसद् से सरकार ने दुराव किया है, छिपाव किया है और अतंतोगत्वा, यकायक, उसने 6 जून को डिवेल्युएशन कर दिया। माननीय महोदय, मैं निवेदन करूंगा, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ मिश्र जी से, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ मिन्हा साहब से कि क्या डिवेल्युएशन के बाद महंगाई नहीं बढ़ी है? महंगाई बढ़ी है। जो जो आवश्यक सामग्रियां हैं उन आवश्यक सामग्रियों की महंगाई बढ़ी है।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भार्गव)  
पीठासीन हुए]

क्या सरकार यह नहीं बता सकती है कि 40 रु० तोला तक सोना बढ़ा, 25 रु० भरी तक चांदी बढ़ी, दो रु० सेर तक लौकी बिकी, साबुन नदारद, मिट्टी तेल नदारद, वनस्पति घी—नदारद ये सारी की सारी चीजें हो गई हैं, इस सरकार के इस डिवेल्युएशन को लेकर। फिर अनावश्यक हमसे बार-बार यह कहना कि डिवेल्युएशन से यह फायदा, यह फायदा, तो यह डिवेल्युएशन से बड़ा नुकसान है। कोई भी मुल्क डिवेल्युएशन को पसन्द नहीं करता। मैं तो यहां तक कहना चाहता हूँ, अपने मित्र भूपेश गुप्त से भी कहना चाहता हूँ, कि अगर भूपेश गुप्त के प्रस्ताव के समर्थन

मे कोई भी विदेशी मुल्क न हों, कोई भी पार्टी न हो, केवल यही अकेले रहे तो, भी डिवेल्युएशन की निंदा होनी चाहिये, जिस ढंग से डिवेल्युएशन किया गया है उसकी भर्त्सना होनी चाहिये। यह हमारे राष्ट्र को पीछे ले जा रहा है।

अब हम दूसरे आर्थिक पहलू पर आ रहे हैं। यह सवाल है उद्योग धंधे का। हमने इस सरकार को एक बार नहीं अनेक बार सुझाव दिया कि बड़े उद्योग धंधे के चक्कर में मत पड़ो, विदेशी मुल्कों के आश्रित मत रहो। हेव्बी इंडस्ट्री कब होगी इसका भी रास्ता बताया और एक उदाहरण मैंने दिया था। हमारे यहां, श्रीमन्, शायद आप नाम सुने हो कि महाराजा बलवंत सिंह थे जो वर्तमान बनारस स्टेट के फाउंडर रहे हैं, उनकी तलवार अभी हमारे पास थी, उस तलवार से अगर हम पेड़ पर यू मार डाले तो पेड़ की बड़ी-बड़ी डाले कट जाये—वह धातु कहां बना, वह फौलाद कहां बना? वह फौलाद छोटी-छोटी भट्टियों में बना। इस सरकार को हमने कहा, अगर स्टील का प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाना चाहते हो तो न मालूम कितना लोहा जगह-जगह पर बिखरा हुआ है, उस लोहे को एकत्रित करो, उस लोहे को ढुंढवाओ और पुराने जमाने में जैसे छोटी-छोटी भट्टियां बनाकर स्टील (फौलाद) बनाया जाता था उसी ढंग से फौलाद बनाओ।

**श्री ह्यातुल्ला अन्सारी :** आन् ए प्वाइन्ट आफ इन्फार्मेशन, सर। चीन ने इसी तरीके से भट्टियां बना-बना कर फौलाद बनाना चाहा लेकिन वे अपनी पालिसी में नाकाम रहे।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं अन्सारी साहब का श्रुक्रिया अदा करता हूं कि उन्होंने हमारे तर्क को मजबूत किया। कहा क्या, कि चीन ने छोटी-छोटी भट्टियों को बनाकर फौलाद पैदा किया। तो उसी का नतीजा है श्रीमन्, अन्सारी साहब समझ लें, कि चीन इन के मुल्क के ऊपर हमलावर है, उसी का नतीजा

है कि चीन भारतवर्ष से करीब 13,000 वर्गमीटर जमीन को दवाये रखे हैं। हम दुख से छटपटाते हैं लेकिन हमारी सरकार शर्म की कालिख पोत रही है, भारत के मस्तक को गिराती है, नीचा करती है। मैं अन्सारी साहब से कहता हूं : अन्सारी साहब, चीन जो इस मुल्क पर हमलावर है उसने स्टील का, फौलाद का, उत्पादन बढ़ाया है और ठीक बढ़ाया है, छोटी-छोटी भट्टियां चलाई ह। अगर चीन कोई बढ़िया काम करता है अपने मुल्क का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये तो उसकी हम नकल कर लें तो कोई हमारी हेठी नहीं होगी, कोई हमारा असम्मान नहीं होगा। मैं इसके बाद यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस सरकार की पूरी की पूरी उद्योग की नीति गलत है, पूरी की पूरी औद्योगिक नीति जनहित विरोधी, राष्ट्रहित विरोधी है। लगातार हमारी पार्टी ने सरकार को सुझाव दिया कि कपड़ा है, चीनी है, सीमेंट है, रसायनिक पदार्थ है, इन सबो का राष्ट्रीयकरण करो। सरकार ने राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं किया। आज उसका नतीजा क्या हो रहा है? मजदूरों में असन्तोष है, किसानों में असन्तोष है, उपभोक्ताओं में असन्तोष है, देश के राष्ट्र के रेशे रेशे में, कण कण में असन्तोष है। फिर क्या यह गारन्टी है कि आगे डिवेल्युएशन नहीं होगा? क्या यह गारन्टी है कि इन्फ्लेशन नहीं होगा? इन्फ्लेशन होगा और यह सरकार मजबूर होगी कि इसको आगे भी ज्यादा नोट छापने पड़ेंगे। मैं आपके द्वारा अपने उन माननीय सदस्यों से कहना चाहता हूं जो सरकार के डिवेल्युएशन के पक्षपाती हैं कि अगर हमारी बातों को न माना गया और इसके मुताबिक योजना में सुधार नहीं किया, नीति को बदला नहीं गया, तो निश्चित रूप में यह सरकार मजबूर होगी 'नियर फ्यूचर' में ज्यादा नोट छपने के लिये। मैं अपने मित्र सप्रू साहब के बारे में. . . .

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाबीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** आपको आधा घंटा हो गया।

**श्री राजनारायण :** नहीं श्रीमन्, आधा घंटा तो साढ़े-पाच बजे होगा। खैर, देखा जायगा। मैं अपने आदरणीय बुजुर्ग सप्रू साहब की मुसीबत को भी आपके सामने कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं आपके जरिये सप्रू साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या वे जो विदेशी मँगजीन मगाते थे क्या उसकी कीमत उन्हें ज्यादा नहीं देनी पड़ रही है? क्या जो विदेशी किताबें आती थी उनकी कीमत ज्यादा नहीं देनी पड़ रही है? कल हमारे यहां बिहार से मेडिकल कालेज के कुछ विद्यार्थी आये थे, वे कह रहे थे कि साहब, जो किताब 85 रु० में पहले हम लोगों को मिलती थी अब वह किताब 175 से 170 रु० में मिल पा रही है। इस सरकार को ज्यादातर बार मैटीरियल, युद्ध सामग्री, बाहर से मँगानी पड़ेगी, क्या उसकी कीमत ज्यादा नहीं देनी पड़ेगी? 4 रु० 76 पैसे की जगह साढ़े 7 रु० एक डालर का नहीं देना पड़ेगा? देना पड़ेगा। फिर यह सरकार अनावश्यक ढंग से अपने चेहरे को छिपाना चाहती है। कहती है कि हम निर्यात बढ़ायेगे। निर्यात किस चीज का बढ़ेगा? क्या चाय की कीमत नहीं बढ़ी? हम तो हर जगह बराबर घूमते रहते हैं। श्रीमन्, आप भी जानते होंगे कि जो 10 पैसे की और 12 पैसे की चाय थी वह कम से कम 15 पैसे और 18 पैसे की तो हो गई। चाय की कीमत बढ़ेगी। उस दिन जवाब देते हुये मनुभाई जी ने कहा कि अब मान लो कि एक किलो चाय एक पौड में बिकती थी, एक किलो चाय पर एक पौड जो पहले 13 रु० पाता था, अब विदेश में भेज कर के उसके लिये 21 रु० हमारे देश का चाय उद्योग करने वाला पायेगा। जब 21 रु० चाय के उद्योगपति विदेशों में चाय भेज कर के पायेगे, तो क्या उनके मन में लालच नहीं बढ़ेगा कि वे अपने मुल्क के लोगों से चाय की कीमत बढ़ा कर के लें। वे क्यों अपने मुल्क के लोगों को सस्ता बेचेंगे? उनके ऊपर क्या चूक है, क्या पेशबन्दी है। एक पेशबन्दी यह लगाई गई है कि हम

एकसाइज ड्यूटी बढ़ा रहे हैं। एकसाइज ड्यूटी बढ़ाने से यह मसला हल होने वाला नहीं है। और जिन विदेशी सामग्रियों के जरिये किसान अपनी खेती को बढ़ाता है, दूसरे लोग अपने देश में उपज करते हैं, जब उनको विदेशी सामग्री की ज्यादा कीमत देनी पड़ेगी तो क्या वे अपने जरिये उत्पन्न की हुई चीजों की कीमत नहीं बढ़ायेगे। उसके रिलेशन में चलेगा, हर चीज अनुपात में चलती है और रिलेशन में चलती है। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आज तक इस सरकार ने फुजूल-खर्ची को रोकने के लिये क्या व्यवस्था की, सिविल प्रशासन पर जो लगातार खर्चा बढ़ता जा रहा है उसके लिये क्या व्यवस्था की, अनोत्पादक मदों पर जो ज्यादा खर्चा पड़ता है, अनप्रोडक्टिव मदों पर जो ज्यादा खर्चा पड़ता है उसके लिये क्या व्यवस्था की और फुजूलखर्चा जो होती है उसके लिये क्या व्यवस्था की। श्रीमन्, आप जानकर हैं और देख रहे हैं कि इधर भी डिवल्युएशन है। सारे राष्ट्र में हाहाकार मचा हुआ है और यहां लखनऊ में बैठ कर के सौदेबाजी हो रही है कि चन्द्रभानु और कमला का पैकट हो, कमलापति और सुचेता कृपलानी का पैकट हो, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी और मोरारजी देसाई का पैकट हो या श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी और कामराज का पैकट हो। रोज़, नित्य तमाम दिल्ली की गलियों में, बाज़ारों में जा कर के आप सुनें। बराबर यही चर्चा है कि कामराज से इन्दिरा गांधी जी का मतभेद हो गया है, अब कामराज और मोरारजी देसाई के रिलेशन नियरर हो रहे हैं। यह सब क्या है? यह सरकार जो निरंतर सत्ता की साझेदारी में पूरी की पूरी ताकत और शक्ति लगाती चली जा रही है, क्या वह कभी इस डिवल्युएशन का मुकाबिला कर पायेगी?

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ माननीय मिश्रा जी से और माननीय सिन्हा जी से कि सही मानों में अगर उनको मुल्क की जनता के लिये दर्द है, उनके दिल में मुहब्बत है, तो उस मुहब्बत



को ज़ाहिर करने की जगह वह नहीं है जहाँ पर वे बैठे हुये हैं। मुहब्बत का इजहार और उसको अमली जामा तब पहनाया जा सकता है जब वे हमारे पास आ कर के हमारी ताकत को मजबूत करे। केवल यहाँ पर यह कह देने से कि विरोधी पक्ष मजबूत होगा तब डेमोक्रेसी चलेगी, इस मौखिक प्रवचन से काम नहीं चलेगा। उसको अमली जामा पहनाना पड़ेगा।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :**  
गजनारायण जी, एक मिनट और।

**श्री राजनारायण :** बस एक मिनट और ? तब तो किमी पर जैसे बज्र गिरता है, वैसे आपने गिरा दिया।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :**  
पार्टी का जितना समय है उसके हिमात्र से मिलेगा आपको।

**श्री राजनारायण :** ज़रा सुन लिया जाय। बड़ा दीजियेगा समय, श्रीमन्। यह सोमवार और मंगल तक चलेगा।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :**  
50 आदमियों की लिमिट भी है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो दिमाग का जाला है उस जाले को मैं खत्मकर देना चाहता हूँ। इस लिये हम को थोड़ा और समय दे दिया जाय। हरगिज, हरगिज चीन को दोष नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये इस मुल्क पर हमला करने के लिये। अगर दोष है तो इस सरकार का है, इस सरकार की लचर नीति का है, इसकी राष्ट्र विरोधी नीति का है। चीन ने जितना हमला किया नहीं, उससे ज्यादा इस सरकार ने चीन को इस मुल्क पर हमला करने के लिये ललचाया, हमला करने के लिये उकसाया। उसके डिटेल में जाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। यह सब आप भी जानते हैं, हम भी जानते हैं। उसका सारे का सारा आकड़ा

है जिस तरह में तिब्बत पर चीन के हमले के समय इस सरकार ने गलत नीति अख्तियार की थी, जिम तरह में श्री नेहरू ने गुड विल दिखाने के लिये अपने 12 डाकबगले, अपनी फौजी चौकिया, तारघर, चिट्ठीघर चीन को बिना एक पैसा मुआविजा लिये दे दिया था। इस सरकार को पता नहीं है कि सगापो नदी कहा है, इस सरकार को पता नहीं है कि पूर्ववाहिनी ब्रह्मपुत्र नदी कहा है, इस सरकार को पता नहीं है कि मसर गांव कहा है। मसर गांव पर कब्जा हो जाय और यह सरकार लोक सभा में बयान करे कि चूँकि वहाँ से लगान वसूल करने में जितना खर्चा हो जाता था उतना पैसा लगान से आता नहीं था, इस लिये मसर गांव चीन को दे दिया गया और यह सरकार कहती है कि चीन ने हमला किया। इस सरकार की कायग और राष्ट्र विरोधी नीति ने चीन को उकसाया कि वह इस राष्ट्र पर हमला करे।

श्रीमन्, हमने कहा कब कि मुल्क का बटवारा कबूल करो। लगातार मुल्क के बटवारे के हम विरोधी रहे हैं। 15 अगस्त, 1947 को जब ए० आर्डी० सी० सी० ने, कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी ने, कांग्रेस के नेताओं ने इस मुल्क के बटवारे का कबूल कर के उसको अमली जामा पहना दिया, वह एक हिस्टोरिकल फैक्ट हो गया, तो बहुत से लोगो ने चुप्पी साधी। मगर मुझे याद है कि 15 अगस्त को लगातार हमने ट्रक पर झंडा बांध कर के यह नाग लगाया है मंडको पर कि यह आजादी झूठी है, देश की जनता भूखी है। हमने उसी समय कह दिया था कि यह सतवासा बच्चा हुआ है। इस आजादी से मुल्क का काम बनने वाला नहीं है। हमको दूसरे ढंग से आजादी लेनी चाहिये थी और हम को समझौता नहीं करना चाहिये था। हमने उमी समय कहा था कि ब्रिटिश कामनवैल्व्थ से नाता तोड़ो। लेकिन आज तक यह सरकार कामनवैल्व्थ में बंधी हुई है और इसने उससे नाता नहीं तोड़ा है। जब 15 अगस्त, 1947 को एक मयुक्त आजाद हिन्दुस्तान को दो

[ श्री राजनारायण ]

टुकड़ों में बाट दिया गया भारत और पाकिस्तान में, तब भी हमने चेतावनी दी थी सरकार को कि समस्या का समाधान इससे नहीं होगा। साढ़े सात लाख जाने गई हैं, राष्ट्रपति की हत्या हुई है, डेढ करोड़ लोग बेघरबार हुये हैं। इतना बड़ा काफिला मुल्क के एक हिस्से से उठ कर दूसरे हिस्से तक गया। यह अद्वितीय घटना है दुनिया के इतिहास में। दुनिया में एक जगह से दूसरी जगह जाने का कोई ऐसा सबूत नहीं मिलेगा। जब मुल्क की जनता एक जगह से दूसरी जगह भाग रही थी तो आधा घंटा एक हिस्से में दूसरे हिस्से तक लग जाता था जाने में हवाईजहाज में। फिर यह सरकार यहां मुह रखती है इस बात को कहने के लिये कि चीन का हमला हो गया, यह मुसीबत आ गई। यह मुसीबत इस सरकार ने पैदा किया, यह जुल्म इस सरकार ने पैदा किया।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** श्रीमान्, आप बहुत अधिक समय ले रहे हैं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** अब आप देखिये कि सन् 1950 में नेहरू लियाकत पैक्ट हुआ, 1958 में नेहरू नून पैक्ट हुआ, 1960 में कैनल वाटर डिस्पूट ऐग्रीमेंट हुआ, 1965 में 30 जून को समझौता हुआ कच्छ में जा कर और फिर समझौता हो गया ताशकन्द में। यह किसने किया ? क्या यह हम विरोधी पार्टियों ने किया। क्या संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी ने किया ? क्या देश की जनता ने किया ? देश की जनता ने नहीं किया। इस सरकार ने किया। जो सरकार देश की जनता के हित की चिंता से दूर है, उस सरकार ने किया। फिर भी इस सदन में सरकार का पक्ष करने के लिये समझदार आदमी, बढ़िया शक्ल सूरत पाये हुये मिश्रा जी के सरीखे खड़े हो जाते हैं। मैं उनके मुह की ओर टकटकी लगा कर ताकने लगता हूं कि

यह क्या बोल रहे हैं। सिन्हा साहब खड़े हो जाते हैं तो मैं टकटकी लगा कर ताकने लगता हूं कि वे क्या बोल रहे हैं। चाहे विदेशी नीति हो . . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Watch Sinha ?

**SHRI RAJNARAIN :** Shri R P Sinha.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Don't blame him, Mr. Mishra. He says privately one thing, and in committees and other forums a different thing.

**SHRI S N MISHRA :** Who says ?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** You should be fair.

**श्री राजनारायण :** तो मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि चाहे विदेशी नीति हो, चाहे कृषि नीति हो, चाहे औद्योगिक नीति हो, चाहे शिक्षा नीति हो, इस सरकार की सारी की सारी नीतियां बालू की भीत पर हैं, गलत हैं, जनहित विरोधी हैं। कहते हैं कि तरक्की हुई। मैं आप से समय ले कर के यही कहना चाहता हूं। डेढ सौ साल, सवा सौ साल इस अंग्रेजी राज्य का इतिहास देख लीजिये। हमने औसत लगाया है कि हर साल अंग्रेजी राज्य में औसत एक चीनी कारखाना खुला है, हर तीसरी महीने औसत अंग्रेजी राज्य में एक कपड़े का कारखाना खुला है, हर रोज औसत अंग्रेजी राज्य में एक मील रेल की पटरी बनी है। अंग्रेजी राज्य में 35 हजार मील रेल की पटरी सात अरब रुपये में बनी और कांग्रेसी राज्य में सात सौ मील रेल की पटरी सात अरब रुपये में बनी। कहां सात अरब में 35 हजार मील और कहां सात अरब में सात सौ मील रेल की पटरी मुकम्मल हुई। फिर भी हमारे ट्रेजरी बेंचेंज के लोग कहें कि यह सरकार की नीति है तरक्की की ओर ? हम को आंकड़ों की जानकारी है। सन् 1950 में हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में एक देहाती की औसत आमदनी 211 रु०

वार्षिक थी और अब 188 रु० रह गई है। देहात की औसत आमदनी गिरती जा रही है। फिर भी इस सरकार का मुह हो और यह कहे कि उसने तरक्की की है। हां, तरक्की की है भ्रष्टाचार में, तरक्की की है, चोरी में, तरक्की की है डाके में, तरक्की की है कत्ल में, तरक्की की है मुल्क को कर्ज में लादने में, तरक्की की है अन्न को चौपट करने में, देश को चौपट करने में, तबाह करने में। इसलिये मैं निहायत अदब के साथ . . .

(Time bell rings)

अभी हमारी घड़ी में जिससे हम बोलने खड़े हुये थे तीन मिनट बाकी है। तो मैं निहायत अदब के साथ आप से कहना चाहता हूं कि इस सरकार की अवमूल्यन की योजना बिल्कुल गलत, राष्ट्रहित विरोधी और जनहित विरोधी रही है। पिछले सालों में इस सरकार ने जो गलतियां की है उनको छोड़े, भविष्य के लिए सुधार करे, अपने कदमों को सुधारे, लोक-कल्याण कार्य क्रम बनाए, जनहित कार्य करे। तब भसला बन सकता है, अन्यथा बनने वाला नहीं है।

विदेशी दूतावासों पर निरन्तर खर्चा बढ़ता जा रहा है। क्यों? फैशन पर निरन्तर खर्चा बढ़ता जा रहा है। क्यों? उत्पादन बढ़े नहीं, हम लक्ष्य बढ़ाते जायें, फैशन पर खर्च करते जायें, उपभोग बढ़ाते जायें—यह कहीं भी मुल्क की आर्थिक स्थिति को दृढ़ नींव पर ले चलने की योजना नहीं है। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि अगर यह सरकार सुधार चाहती है तो मेरे कुछ सुझाव हैं जो मैं आपके द्वारा रखना चाहता हूं।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** अब समय नहीं है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** केवल एक मिनट का समय। मेरा सुझाव है कि अविलम्ब यह सरकार ऐसा कानून बना दे कि एक हजार

रुपये महीने में ज्यादा न कोई आमदनी कर पाए और न कोई खर्चा कर पाए। 20 अरब के करीब सालाना इस योजना में बच जायगा। मैं चाहता हू कि सरकार ऐसा कानून बनाए। मैं चाहता हू कि जितने सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं उनके लिए अगर सरकार के पास पैसा नहीं है तृतीय और चतुर्थ श्रेणी के कर्मचारियों को ज्यादा महंगाई भत्ता देने के लिए तो बड़े कर्मचारी और छोटे कर्मचारियों की आमदनी में रेशो स्थापित करना चाहिए जैसा दुनिया के दूसरे मुल्कों में हुआ, स्वीडन में हुआ, डेनमार्क में हुआ, यूगोस्लाविया में हुआ, स्विटजरलैंड में हुआ। उसी तरह से हम सरकार को कहना चाहते हैं कि छोटी-बड़ी आमदनी का रिस्ता 1-10 के अनुपात से करें। छोटी आमदनी अगर एक है तो बड़ी आमदनी दस से ज्यादा नहीं होनी चाहिए। इसी तरह से पक हल-बैल से जितनी जमीन जोती जा सकती है उसकी तीन गुने से ज्यादा जमीन किसी बड़े-से-बड़े परिवार के पास न हो। इन योजनाओं को करके, शिक्षा को ठीक से सुनियोजित करें, जो हरिजन हैं, पिछड़े हुए लोग हैं, मेहनतकश लोग हैं, उनके उत्थान की योजना बनाएं, जाति-पांति की दीवार को ढहाएं जब जाकर यह मुल्क समुन्नत होगा, तब जाकर बाहरी हमलों का मुकबाला कर पाएगा, विदेशी हमलों के सामने घुटने नहीं टेकेगा। सरकार इन बातों पर ध्यान दे और भविष्य के लिए ऐसे कदम उठाए जिससे फिर इनफ्लेशन न हो, नए नोट छापने की जरूरत न हो, दूसरी शक्ल में अवमूल्यन न हो, वरना यह सरकार इस मुल्क को जहन्नम ले जायेगी और फिर वहां से उठना हमारे लिए मुश्किल हो जाएगा। आपके और सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों के बाल-बच्चे इस मुल्क के अन्दर रोयेंगे और हमसे ज्यादा आपको कोसेंगे कि जब मौका था इस कांग्रेसी निकाम्मी सरकार को गिराने का और बढ़िया सरकार बनाने का तब हमारे पिताजी ने, हमारे भाईजी ने, हमारी मां ने, बहिन ने कांग्रेस का साथ देकर

मुल्क का जहन्नुम मे धकेल दिया। मे चाहता हूं कि आप इस दोष मे बरी हो, कांग्रेस सदस्यगण इस दोष से धरी रहे। इसलिए मैं आपके जरिए सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों मे निवेदन करना चाहता हू कि यह प्रश्न केवल पार्टी के संकुचित दायरे मे न रहने दे। यह राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है, जनता से सम्बन्धित प्रश्न है। इस नुक्तेनजर से देखेंगे तब समस्या

का समाधान होगा, वरना मुल्क तो जहन्नुम मे जा रहा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirtyfive minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 19th August 1966.