

up with the Railway Ministry and the other Ministries and that the Government are already discussing the matter. We are at a happy stage when we shall break this vicious circle and definitely take a right turn towards the right thing.

Then about training of personnel. As yet in India these advertising agencies which do such big business have not undertaken any training for the staff. I think a suggestion was thrown out by somebody that the Government also should take interest in seeing that proper personnel is trained for the advertising business. I think it is very necessary.

With these few points I accept the amendment that Mr. Dhage has moved.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will put the amended Resolution to the House. The question is:

"That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted; namely:—

'Having regard to the stronghold of foreign-owned and foreign-controlled advertising agencies on the business of advertising in the country, this House is of opinion that with a view to encourage Indian-controlled and Indian-owned advertising agencies, Government should show preference to Indian-controlled and Indian-owned advertising agencies in the matter of advertising done by Railways, Government companies, Statutory corporations, Public Service Commissions and such other concerns including advertising done by Government in general.'

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Resolution is adopted, as amended.

RESOLUTION RE: FIXATION OF CEILING FOR INDIVIDUAL INCOMES

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move the following Resolution:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take necessary steps, by legislation or otherwise, to fix a ceiling for individual incomes at Rs. 25,000 per year, and as a first step towards the fixation of such ceiling, determine the maximum emolument to be drawn by any Civil Servant under the Central Government at a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,800 per month."

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the intention of this Resolution is very clear and I do not know if there will be even the slightest opposition to it. However, as there may be certain Members in some corner of this House belonging to the privileged class who may plead ignorance of the aspirations and demands of the people of this country, with a view to direct them to the right path, I will now like to offer a few points for their consideration so that they may leave the path that they have been treading so long which, in my opinion, is anti-social. I hope the privileged people of this country will mend their ways hereafter and try to fall in line with the people and support the aspirations and demands of the people of this country.

Sir, the country is just starting on the second Five Year Plan. The first Five Year Plan is just over and the Planning Commission has stated in the Introduction to the second Plan:

"The first five year plan ends in March, 1956. Its approach and outlook are part of our common thinking. It has prepared the way for achieving the socialist pattern of society."

The Introduction further says that the National Development Council directed the Planning Commis-

[Shri B. K. Mukerjee.]

sion that the second Five Year Plan should be drawn up so as to give concrete expression to policy decisions relating to the socialist pattern of society. The Planning Commission therefore formulated the Plan with reference to certain principal objectives and one of the objectives of the Plan is—

“(d) reduction of inequalities in income and wealth and a more even distribution of economic power.”

This is one of the principal objectives with which the second Five Year Plan for the country has been formulated. The Plan no doubt is very bold and ambitious and the Finance Minister in his Budget speech this year stated that it is indeed a bold and ambitious Plan that we shall be undertaking requiring great and sustained efforts and it will be therefore a matter of pride and gratification if we can successfully implement such a Plan within the five year period. This is no doubt an ambitious Plan and to implement this Plan the country needs the co-operation from everybody in the country and that co-operation will naturally come and will voluntarily come if we can create the enthusiasm required for extending co-operation by the people of this country for reconstruction and development of the country. That enthusiasm and that co-operation will be forthcoming if the present disparity in income is tried to be reduced.

Our present disparity in the distribution of wealth is a sort of a colonial system and tends to press down the growth and development of the desired socialist pattern of society. It is, therefore, the aspiration and demand of the people to eliminate chances of exploitation and it has been accepted. That is, the establishment of a socialist pattern of society has been accepted by our popular Government headed by the world leader of today, Pandit Nehru, and a great exponent of the democratic socialism and the

socialist pattern of society in this country. A country, where the *per capita* national income at present is Rs. 280, cannot afford to allow unlimited income to any individual. The present system of allowing any individual to acquire unlimited income—whatever the source may be—is not only encouraging disparity, but the system will not allow the country to achieve the desired objective for which this ambitious Plan has been framed. And people are anxious to offer their co-operation to implement the Plan for the growth and prosperity of the country. As the Planning Commission has tried to give concrete expression to the aims of the people of this country—that is the establishment of a socialist pattern of society—it has under consideration a ceiling on individual income from commerce, trade and industry and professions as well as to impose a ceiling on agricultural land holdings, because these two will enable the country to achieve the socialist pattern of society. But it is not certain when the Planning Commission will come out with the conclusions of their deliberations regarding the ceiling on individual income and I am not sure whether they are contemplating to have legislation to implement the ceiling they want to impose or they are thinking of adopting any other method for the implementation of this objective, that is, imposing a ceiling on individual income. Whatever method may be adopted by the Government the Government will take steps to give effect to this proposal to impose a ceiling on individual income. This Resolution will help the Planning Commission to arrive at a decision at a very early date. But as they are contemplating if this House adopts this Resolution—which I am sure it will—it will relieve the Planning Commission from all their labours to arrive at an early decision regarding this matter.

My intention in putting this Rs. 25,000 per year as the ceiling is according to the *per capita* national income. We cannot afford, with this

meagre sum of Rs. 280 being the *per capita* national income, to allow anybody to have more than Rs. 25,000 a year. Though a stage may come when the *per capita* income will rise, the necessity will be again there to reduce this Rs. 25,000 to bridge this gap and bring the lowest and the highest nearer. That is the first step I have suggested—Rs. 25,000 for the time being to be the ceiling limit.

3 P. M. In the second part of this Resolution, I have dealt with the emoluments to be paid to the Civil Servants in this country. We all know the proverb that charity begins at home. If we want to impose a limitation on individual incomes, that will include not only the people in Government, but people outside also. Those people who are still in service today are entirely in the hands of the Government. Their emoluments can be reduced or increased by the Government at any time if they wish to do so. Therefore, the Government must try to implement its own decision regarding the establishment of a socialist pattern of society.

It will be apparent that there is a little difference between the ceiling on income that I have suggested and the maximum emoluments to be paid to a Civil Servant, because I feel that people engaged in commerce and industry and other professions run some risk to earn their income whereas those in Civil Service need not fear any risk. Whether they work or not, they will get their salaries. Secondly, they enjoy in Civil Service various other facilities also which people in other professions in commerce or industry do not normally enjoy. Therefore, there must be a little difference between the income of the two sections of people. One section of people are those whose income—whether they work or not—is assured and the others are those whose income is not assured if they do not work and consequently there is a risk that, instead of earning, they may also lose something. Therefore I have suggested this difference between these two sections of our population.

Why has this limit of Rs. 1,800 been suggested for Government servants? Civil Servants at present cannot get more than Rs. 1,800. The Central Pay Commission submitted its report to the Government of India on the 30th April 1947. This Commission was appointed long before there was any talk of independence coming to this country. The Commission sent a recommendation long before the 15th August 1947, the day when India became independent. The Commission suggested, "We nevertheless think that the time has arrived when the problem of high salaries calls for a new approach quite as much as the problem of low salaries. It would not, however, be right to lower salaries suddenly. As Dr. Gadgil himself recognises, it will take some time to change the ways and break the prejudices engendered by a long period of high salaries. As a first step, we think that it will be fair, from all points of view, to fix Rs. 2,000 per mensem as the maximum salary of public servants in India."

The Commission suggested "a scale of Rs. 1,800—Rs. 2,000 is intended for the heads of the biggest departments and would normally be the highest point which a permanent civil servant could reach in service." Therefore, they recommended a scale from Rs. 1,800—Rs. 2,000. But they were afraid at that time—that was in the year 1947—to reduce the emoluments of our Civil Servants to a figure which they thought might result in disastrous consequences. Therefore, they did not reduce as they wanted to do at that time. But our Civil Servants have had sufficient warning and their emoluments may be reduced because this recommendation came to the Government of India in April 1947. Now we are passing through 1956. That means nine years have passed and they have had sufficient warning so that the Government may reduce their emoluments from such a high place to one where the common people can reach.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Mr. Mukerjee.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: There are five minutes more, I think.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. Two minutes more. You began at 2.42 P.M.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: The ratio between the highest income and the lowest income in our country should not at this stage be more than one to twenty, as against one to eighty or hundred as it has been so far.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Taxable or tax-free.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: I am not concerned with taxes here. I am just suggesting how we can find money to fill the gap in our resources in order to finance our second Five Year Plan.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: What does he mean by his Resolution? Are they taxable or tax-free?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): That will be discussed later on.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: If a man gets Rs. 2,000 a month, surely he will be taxed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As it is taxed now.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: The present level of taxation will remain there, and whenever we talk of any reduction in the emoluments of these fortunate ones, they always raise the question of taxation. Our common people do not understand anything about income-tax, because they are not required to pay it. The national per capita income is only Rs. 280. I want to reduce the ceiling, and I hope the Members of this House will also agree with me that the present disparity between the highest income and the lowest income of the Civil Servants should be reduced, and the ratio should not be more than one to fifteen.

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): Civil Servants of all classes, or only the I. C. S. people?

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: They include *chaprasis* also.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Do you want the salaries of the *chaprasis* to be reduced?

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: It is often said that, if we reduce the high salaries of the Civil Servants, real talent will not be forthcoming for the Civil Services. It is not so. Before we attained independence, our enemies used to say that we won't be able to manage our affairs, that we won't be able to run the Government. But what do we see today? We have been managing our affairs, not only managing but managing in a way that India has gained a very high place in the comity of nations. So, if we today decide to reduce the salaries of these people, certainly talents will remain in the country. They won't go out of this country. Therefore, they will be harnessed and will be available and utilised for the prosperity of the country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take necessary steps, by legislation or otherwise, to fix a ceiling for individual incomes at Rs. 25,000 per year, and as a first step towards the fixation of such ceiling determine the maximum emolument to be drawn by any Civil Servant under the Central Government at a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,800 per month."

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I fully support the underlying principle of this Resolution, the idea behind it. Of course, I do not agree with all the figures given here. The main idea is that the disparity between the lowest-paid and the highest-paid should be reduced progressively so that we may see the day when the

difference between the highest-paid and the lowest-paid is very small. To attain this object, we must really improve the condition of the lowest-paid income groups. Their income is exceedingly low. As the hon. the mover of this Resolution has already pointed out, the *per capita* income of our country is only Rs. 280, and even if we presume that a family consists of five members, five multiplied by Rs. 280 comes to only Rs. 1,400 per family, but this is only the average. In actual practice, the family of the common man does not get more than Rs. 1,200 per annum. If we presume that both the husband and the wife work, even then probably their total monthly income will not exceed Rs. 100, and that comes to Rs. 1,200 a year. You know that in big industrial towns the housing condition is so atrocious that out of this Rs. 1,200, they have to pay a substantial amount by way of house-rent. If they cannot afford to pay the house-rent, a visit to the city of Bombay will convince any hon. Member how the workers spend most of their lives on the streets and sleep on the pavements. If they get some *chawl* probably 12 feet by 10 feet, some ten to twelve workers will be living in it. Besides increasing their salaries, it is more a question of providing them with amenities, it is more a question of providing them with social security, it is more a question of providing them with medical relief when they are unwell, it is more a question of providing their children with education, it is more a question of affording them something to fall back upon in their old age. So, I would suggest to the hon. the mover of this Resolution that instead of fixing figures in rupees, it is better to provide these various amenities which are most essential for living. It does not matter even if they get a little lower salary, if they are guaranteed decent housing, education for their children, medical and other facilities for their family, and some sort of security for their old age. So, our ideal should be to so organise our society that the poor man, the common man, gets some of the decencies of life. Why it is suggested in this

Resolution that a ceiling be fixed, the reason is that apart from the provision of these amenities of life, if the disparity is great, the psychological effect on the common man is bad. If every man lives poorly, then it will not matter very much, but when a poor man sees riches flaunted in his face, then certainly he feels hurt. So, some sort of ratio has to be fixed between the highest income and the lowest income. An hon. Member just now questioned whether the income of Rs. 25,000 will be the net income or taxable income. We can decide on gross income or net income basis. What we really have to do is to fix the ratio between the highest and the lowest paid. Various people have suggested a ratio of 1:100 or 1:50 or 1:30 or 1:25 or even as low as 1:5. Whatever we fix now, our object should be to slowly and gradually reduce the ratio so that eventually the ratio will not exceed 1:10. It may not be possible today to start with a ratio of 1:10, but after careful examination if we reach some sort of ratio, say 1:30, or 1:25, then as the mover has suggested it will come to about Rs. 25,000 or a little more. I am sure the hon. mover is not very particular that it should be only Rs. 25,000 and not Rs. 24,000 or Rs. 26,000.

His whole idea is that the ratio between the highest and the lowest has to be brought down. If we compare with other countries, we find that both in U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. the condition of the common man is very good. The question will arise as to how we are going to raise the income of the common man. Will it be by simply giving him a higher salary? If we give him a higher salary and it does not lead to greater production, the result will be that the prices of articles will go up. Of course, as long as the excess profits of the industrialist can be reduced, it will be all right but after reducing the profits of the industrialist, if the wages are increased without increasing production, the result will be that the price of articles will go up and there will be a sort of continuous race between increase in salary and increase in the prices and

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

he will not benefit by it. So, actually, what we want is to increase his salary without increasing the prices of consumable articles. How is it possible to increase his income without increasing the price of articles? This is only possible if productivity per man is increased and that can be increased by mechanisation. I will give the case of a country like U.S.A. In U.S.A. they make a beautiful car like Chevrolet for 1,600 dollars, the equivalent of which is Rs. 8,000 and now every worker in that factory gets 2 dollars per hour and even if he works 40 hours a week, he gets 80 dollars per week which means Rs. 400 per week. His income is Rs. 400 per week—of the unskilled worker, and yet the cost of the car is only 1,600 dollars. If on the other hand in America they had raised the wages of the workers and they had increased the price of the product made by their labour, he would not have benefited.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the case in Russia?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I am coming to that. Similarly in Russia, they have by mechanisation, by the same method and process, increased the productivity per man. They have increased the wages and yet kept down the prices of articles. The difference between U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. is about the ownership of the means of production, not about the methods of production. The methods of production are the same in the two countries. It is only a question of whether the ownership is held by the capitalist or it is held by the State or by Co-operatives. That is a separate matter. I am only interested in trying to illustrate here that it is all a question of increasing productivity per man and that is only possible if we really go in for mechanisation. So I was saying that we should try to adopt it and our second Five Year Plan is aiming at that. We are gradually and slowly aiming at greater mechanisation in the industrialisation of our country so that we may be able to give higher wages to our workers and yet not increase the prices. In the case of other coun-

tries like U.S.S.R., the worker gets so many benefits. For example, he goes to a health resort once a year for about 15 days at the cost of the State. His children are well provided for. His health needs are looked after. In this way, besides giving a higher wage, if all these amenities are provided we can really improve the standard and the lot of the common man. Our object in this Resolution as far as I can see, is to raise the standard of living of the common man and also to curb the unnecessary expenditure of the rich people by which they are trying to squander money and really wasting the resources of the country. I do not agree with the mover of the Resolution where he wants to bring down the salary of the civil servants or administrative services only and does not put a ceiling to the income of the industrialists or capitalists. The result will be that good talents will not come to the civil services or administrative services and they will all go to industries. Therefore there should be some sort of balance. I would suggest first to put a ceiling on the industrialists and then on the administrative services. We want to attract the best talent from industry to the administrative services. All administrative officers have opportunities of temptation. If you lower his salary too much, he may be tempted and it may really affect the honesty and integrity and the fair-mindedness of the administrative services. Therefore, always to only point our fingers to the administrative services and say that their salaries are too high and they should be reduced is not right. We must bring down the general level. If an administrative officer finds that by a stroke of his pen he can change the fortune of a big industrialist, from riches to poverty,—and if he sees that his own income is so low that he cannot maintain his wife and children in comfort—the result will be that he may be tempted. Therefore I would never suggest the lowering of the salary of the administrative services till we have lowered the income in other groups also. It should be a simultaneous process. Otherwise we will be

really doing a great injustice. With these words, I support the Bill.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, on the face of it, this Resolution appears to be acceptable and also reasonable but if one were to look at it more carefully from the view-point of those sectors of society in regard to which our Government has already made up its mind, to fix ceilings, one is inclined to feel that these proposed ceilings that are to be found in this Resolution are too high, far too high and if the Government were to accept this Resolution and implement it, then it would mean the establishment in this country of a new aristocracy, a new class of exploiters, a new class or group of people admission into whose ranks would become so attractive that from every other rank of people or from every other social structure of people, there would be such a great rush indeed in order that they might also be able to qualify for these high salaries and wages. Is it not a fact that the Planning Commission has recommended and the Government of India have almost agreed to fix a ceiling on agricultural incomes? Is it not a fact that they have calculated that the average income for, what is known as, a basic holding or gross income would be 1,600 rupees, the net income would be Rs. 1,200 and that the ceilings for agricultural income should be fixed at three times this basic income of Rs. 1,200 and therefore Rs. 3,600 per annum per family which means again Rs. 300 per month? Kindly consider what would be the effect of fixing your incomes here at the rate of Rs. 25,000 per annum for an individual, for all and sundry and Rs. 1,800 per month or more than Rs. 2,600 for a Civil Servant. The effect would be this, that all the 70 per cent of our population in this country who are condemned to be agriculturists, whether they are agricultural workers or land owning peasants, will begin to feel that here is a class of people who has come to be established which is now being enthroned as a kind of new nobility in this land of socialism, in this land

20 R.S.D.—3.

of social justice, in this land of co-operative commonwealth and who cannot be touched at all, whose income will always continue to be so very high whereas so far as they are concerned, however enterprising a peasant may be, whatever great initiative he may be capable of, however efficient he may be, he would always be condemned to a maximum monthly income of Rs. 300. No wonder that even today, whenever in a peasant's family there is a marriage, it is stated in the "Subha Lekha" that the bride is studying in the second year in college or that the bridegroom is studying in the final year and so on. Why do they say that? They do so, because it is no longer a matter of pride for one to be a peasant. He wants to be something else. These people are not content to be ordinary peasants of this country. Actually what people take pride in is in getting this kind of educational qualifications, qualifications from the universities, because that opens the door to these very high salaries, these very high incomes.

My hon. friend Mr. Kishen Chand is not satisfied even about this income that is suggested for the Civil Servant. What does it mean? It means Rs. 1,800 per month for each of them, and it is quite possible to have two Civil Servants from one and the same family. We are throwing open the doors of the Civil Services for our women also to enter. Men and women can now enter them and so there may be two members of the same family in the Civil Service. So multiply the amount by two and you get an amount more than even what my hon. friend Mr. Kishen Chand is dreaming of as the reasonable salary for his Civil Servants.

My hon. friend was saying: Do not make any distinction between the Civil Servants and people in other professions. If you want to fix any kind of ceiling at all, fix it simultaneously. I am in favour of it. I am sure all will agree that there should not be a ceiling fixed for agriculture separately, apart from other people, the people who are being allowed all

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

these sumptuous salaries. I am in favour of a ceiling being put in the case of agricultural income; but at the same time I would also plead that there should be a ceiling fixed on incomes from the other professions also. When you fix it, do it reasonably, and do consider what might be the possible social consequences of the kind of policy that you are pursuing

Sir, according to our Constitution, our citizens are to be assured equality of opportunities. One is born in an agricultural family and another is born the son of a Civil Servant. Is there equality of opportunities between these two? Even if we take it that both the boys are fortunate enough to be sent to a university, that both of them are fortunate to be brilliant, to be industrious and to be capable of hard work and initiative, even then what happens? The one born in the peasant's family continues to be a peasant and he can never rise beyond Rs. 300 per month, whereas the other who is no better in attainments than the peasant's son, because he is born in a professional family, is able to get into the Civil Service, whether at the lowest rung or somewhere higher up and he will be capable of earning a sum of not only Rs. 25,000 per annum, but even more, for with the help of his wife as well as his son or somebody else, he may get another Rs. 25,000 or at least another Rs. 5,000 which makes Rs. 30,000 per annum. Is that reasonable? Do we want that? We have got rid of the Maharajas with their crores and lakhs of rupees: We have also got rid of the zamindars getting crores and lakhs of income per year. Now we are trying to introduce the excess profits tax in order to bring under control the merchant princes. But here I find on the other hand we are going to create another sort of princes, those of the professional classes, these Civil Servants, these people as a kind of new rulers in this country, in our economic sphere and in our social sphere also. Is that going to be useful to the country? Is it going to help us to reach the socialist society? Is it going to

help us to establish social justice? It is on these lines that I am anxious that this House should begin to think when it considers this Resolution.

Let us look at the highest and the lowest incomes that are being suggested. Sir, the *per capita* income is Rs. 280. Therefore, a family is supposed to be having about Rs. 1,400 per annum. What happens to a farmer? He would be getting hardly three times as much. What about the industrial worker? We are trying our best, somehow, to see that every industrial worker will be able to have an income of Rs. 100 per month. That is the aim of the Communist Party. That is also the aim of the Socialist Party and also of the Congress Party. So, therefore, the industrial worker will be able to get Rs. 1,200 per annum, and that is what one man earns. It is quite possible that his wife will also be earning.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): It is the least.

PROF. G. RANGA: Yes, it is the lowest. And it is quite possible that his wife too may be earning at least Rs. 50 a month or 50 per cent. of what he does. So in all they would get Rs. 1,800 per annum. And that is half as much as the maximum income you allow to the peasant. I do not grudge that. But there should be a reasonable proportion between the earning of the industrial worker and the maximum income of the farmer. In Russia too there is a kind of proportion between the highest and the lowest. But here in this country it is entirely disproportionate because even if we were to look at it from the socialist standpoint, my hon. friend Mr Kishen Chand is prepared to contemplate it as 25 times difference. In course of time he wants to aim at ten times difference. Even at present he is not prepared for this ten times difference. Then why is he prepared to accept this three times difference between the lowest and the highest income with regard to farm income? I do not know. I feel it is because of the kind of prejudice in this country as it used to be in this

country in the past against agriculture. You want to keep the agricultural peasants down, to turn them into a new kind of depressed classes in this country. If you go to the countryside and begin to talk to them about the socialist system and co-operative commonwealth and all that, they will simply fling this back in your face if you talk in these exalted terms, because it does not stand to reason. It does not appeal to their conception of justice. Why do you want equality and justice? You want it in order to help the ordinary mass of people to put in their biggest possible productive effort, to maximise national income, for they should have the feeling all the time that as a result of their endeavour, no one particular person would be getting much more than others, that all would be getting more or less the same salary or rather the same benefit from out of the national endeavour. As a result of this, when everybody puts in his own biggest possible effort the national progress will be maximised. My hon. friend is an eminent mathematician and therefore he was taking us through a labyrinthine maze of calculations. But this is the simplest piece of calculation you can have. If all the three hundred and forty millions of our country were to put in their best possible effort, their productive national effort, their enterprising effort, then certainly the national income can be maximised in the shortest possible time. The easiest key and the surest key and the most useful key to this is to give the people the assurance that no other class of people, no other group of people, no individual for the matter of that, is going to be allowed to enjoy an inordinately high unjustifiably high salary, income or wealth.

On the other hand, this Resolution is not going to help us in that direction. It is some sort of an indication that we would like the Government to go in that direction. At the present time, neither the Planning Commission nor the Government of India seem to be making any kind of an effort in this direction, if we are to judge from

what the hon. the Finance Minister said in the other House the other day. I can easily understand that there may be administrative difficulties in the way of achieving a desired objective like this. But that is no reason why the Government should come forward and say that they are not going to do anything, because they are not able to get the money for paying compensation to these persons and all the rest of it. Why? You need not pay compensation. Start with your own servants. You tell those whom you are going to recruit, that they will be getting only such and such a salary as the maximum. And in the case of your present servants, as my hon. friend Mr. Mukerjee said, you have given them notice some eight years back when the Report of the Central Pay Commission was published. Tell them that they are entitled to get only that much. Take the necessary legislative action and tell them that you are fixing their maximum salary at that particular level at which the Taxation Commission itself had suggested the other day. It is also too high, but nevertheless, be prepared, at least be bold enough to fix them at that level, high as it is and wrongly high as it is.

It is high time that the Government of India comes forward to make its policy quite clear to the people. Otherwise its objectives and its policies are likely to be suspected however much it may be possible for many of us here in this House as well as outside to go to the people and tell them that we are achieving all these things in our country, that we are increasing the *per capita* income as well as the total national income, and that they should be satisfied, they would turn round and say, "Yes, you are achieving all these things but what is our share and what is the share of the other people? Why is it that we are condemned to this degradation?" Why is it that there is so much of corruption in the official circles and in other services also? Is it not a fact that even for the sake of admission into the colleges and high schools, there is so much of corruption today? Why,

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

because in order to get into these institution people have got to pay. Why do they pay? Because it pays to get into these institutions, because you have not fixed any kind of a ceiling for professional incomes. The main object of the professional people in this country seems to be to try to rise above the level of the other people, place themselves on an exalted plane and enjoy the pleasure of looking down upon the rest of the masses of this country. Is it the policy of the Government, is it the policy of the national leaders of this country to condemn 70 per cent. of the poor people permanently to degradation? I would like to know. You are trying your best to salvage and save our own depressed classes from depression, you are trying your best to help the backward class people to regenerate themselves but, on the other hand, even now, in the name of your own national planning and its principles, you are creating a new depressed class. All your propaganda is turned in that direction. You say that you do it in the name of social justice, in the name of national planning and are condemning 70 per cent. of your population to this. I find it necessary to give this warning from this platform to the Government of India that unless the Government of India takes note, and unless it gives definite instructions to the national Planning Commission to come forward with its own proposals simultaneously to fix the ceiling not only of the civil servants but of the incomes that may be derived from all the other professions and activities in this country as they are trying to do in regard to land, Government is likely to be criticised at the bar of history.

Thank you.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I congratulate first of all my trade-unionist friend, Mr. Mukerjee, for having come out with a Resolution of this type. We agree in principle with the underlying idea of this Resolution that there should be a ceiling put on the income,

to begin with, of the civil servants. This class of civil servants has been created by the erstwhile rulers of India, the British Imperialists. They have created this class as slave drivers, as jobbers and mistries of this great industrial concern that they were running, the Government of India. After freedom, more particularly today, when we are thinking in terms of planning, when we are thinking in terms of closing the gap between the high and low incomes in this country, when we are thinking in terms of raising the living standards of the common people, we have got to think in terms of even slashing the highest salaries that have been awarded to this class of people, to this class of civil servants, by the earlier rulers of this country. As trade-unionists, we have very bitter feelings. When I say 'trade-unionists', I mean all, red, pink or tricolour—whatever they are—and we have very bitter feelings against this. My friend, Prof. Kishen Chand, has just now said that there should be ceilings even on industrial incomes, even on payment of salaries to the managers and the managing staff of private concerns and commercial and industrial concerns. I entirely agree with that proposition. As trade-unionists when we present a case for wage increases, we have been shouting in every place, in every industry—I have to repeat, the trade-unionists of all types to emphasise the point—that every concern wants to give higher salaries to the managerial staff in order that they may get the incentive to curb the workers, in order that they may work upon the workers as slave drivers, as mistries, etc. I entirely agree with Prof. Kishen Chand that even the salaries of such people must be slashed; even they must be asked to receive a lower income. Just as a private industrialist in the interests of the exploitation, in the interests of curbing down ordinary labour wants to pay higher salaries to the supervisory staff, to the managerial staff, similarly the Government of India, the earlier Government of India, the British Government, was paying higher salary to this type of manage-

rial staff of this slave concern. To-day, Sir, we are thinking in terms of covering up this gap, of shortening this gap, and in such circumstances it is absolutely necessary that, on the one side we raise the incomes of the lower income groups and, on the other, slash down the incomes of the higher salaried people. I entirely agree with the proposition that the higher salaried people also may be given social amenities like housing, health services and so on—and these should be charged on the State not that it should be left to their own private sources; that is quite agreeable—but these should be included in their total emoluments which must not be so high. When the posts and telegraphs employees, when the railway employees, when the Government of India employees, ask for a new pay commission to be appointed as the earlier Commission was appointed at a period when the salary structure of the country was not certain, when the Government itself was not in our hands but that now the production has increased, that the economy of the country is going up in a particular direction, the leadership of the country wants to take the country in a particular direction, you do not agree. When the posts and telegraphs employees, the railway employees, the non-gazetted employees ask for an increase in their salaries, you come out saying that their salaries will not be increased unless they increase further the output and production. In this case, you want to link up production with salary when we are telling you that there is no incentive to the railway employees, to the posts and telegraphs employees, to the non-gazetted employees—there is no incentive in the form of higher salaries to them—you do not say anything but you say that there should be incentive to the I.C.S. officers, the Police Commissioners and to all these people in the shape of high salaries. This is your policy but, Sir, this policy does not hold good—does not fit in—with the declaration of a socialistic pattern. In the international organisations, in the I.L.O. and in other places—even

including in your Industrial Policy Statement—you say that there should be equal pay for equal work but certain categories get a very high salary while certain others who may not be counted as civil servants, who may not be counted as the Collectors but who, put in exactly the same amount or even more of work, are not paid the same amount. For example, the Collector is paid a certain amount but what about the Civil Surgeon? Is not the Civil Surgeon equally responsible? Is he not the district medical authority? Even then, look at the disparity between the salaries of the Civil Surgeon and the Collector. This sort of disproportion is there even in the higher services. There is disproportion—a big gap—not only between the higher services and the lower services but there is disproportion even between the higher services of different categories among the Forest Services, Judicial Services, Medical Services, Engineering Services. In all these cases, there is this type of disparity. The nature of work, the amount of work, the total energy expended may be the same or even more, but the salary given is less. Therefore, Sir, there is absolute justification that the whole thing should be investigated, the whole thing should be gone into and a new salary structure must come, which will definitely bring down this gap. The political parties in the country have definitely expressed themselves on this point. The Praja Socialist Party, the Communist Party, the new Socialist Party and the Congress Party, those Congressmen who were in the thick of the struggle of the workers, peasants and people in the past,—I am not certainly talking of those persons who might have joined the Congress now for certain purposes or with certain ideas but those old Congressmen, who have been with the people, who have fought with the people, who know them and who told the people then that “we” are winning power for the people, to see that the people’s lot improves—to those Congressmen I appeal and I am sure that some of them are definitely in the Ministry also, in the Government also,

[Prof. G. Ranga.]
and they should certainly come forward with courage and support the proposal underlying this Resolution which Mr. Mukerjee has brought before this House.

With these I conclude. Thank you very much.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am really very happy that my friend, Mr. Mukerjee has placed this Resolution before the House. Just at present I am not considering the feasibility of implementing it. But it gives us an opportunity to examine the approach that is adopted by the Planning Commission as well as by the Government. My line of argument would be more or less similar to that of Professor Ranga. If one reads the Planning Commission's Report, it makes a very very disappointing reading. When coming to the income of the professionals as well as the commercial classes the objective before the Planning Commission is thirty times the minimum income, but so far as the agriculturists are concerned, so far as an agriculturist family is concerned, they say that it is sufficient if their net income is Rs. 1200 a year. Now you will realise for yourself that, computing at the present rate, so far as the professional or a member belonging to the commercial classes is concerned, it may run to about Rs. 3,000 per month, but so far as an agriculturist is concerned, it is Rs. 100 per month for the entire family. Added to this, it was rather shocking to hear the Finance Minister make a statement in the other House that he can very well visualize putting up a ceiling so far as the agriculturists are concerned, but he shuddered to think of putting a ceiling so far as the other persons are concerned. Somebody asked me what socialism is. I said it is socialising other persons. So the Planning Commission is now attempting to socialise the agriculturists not realising the fact that the backbone of this Government is the 70 per cent. of the agriculturists that are in this country. It is true to some extent the agriculturists have been dumb and

to some extent they are deaf also. But this will not go on for a very long time. Everybody realises his own interests, but this art of socialising others would not pay very much dividend at all. Possibly this Government is not yet aware that there is a deep discontent among the agriculturists.

PROF. G. RANGA: Hear, hear.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: The moment there is a slight rise in the price of the agricultural produce, there is an uproar—the agriculturists cannot benefit at all—but the moment there is an increase in the income of others there is nothing wrong and they say it is a normal feature; they must earn. So far as a mill-owner is concerned even if he gets a dividend of 40 per cent. well, it must be there; he earns it. So far as the Government servant is concerned, if he gets Rs. 4,000 a month it is said that we must know that we must place them above want and above temptation. So far as the toiling agriculturist is concerned he is an underdog; he must toil for it. Is this approach correct? Now, if you are having a yardstick, have a common yardstick. Please consider what is good for the goose is good for the gander also. In the ultimate analysis it is an increase in the standard of living that you are offering to the people, be he an agriculturist or a professional. Now it is inherent in the situation that the professional class has certain advantages. They live in the cities where there are facilities and they could send their children for education. Their expenses will certainly not be as much as the expenses of the agriculturists. If an agriculturist sends his boy or girl to the town, he will have to put up the boy in a hostel. He will have to pay for it extra, whereas a Government servant, normally I may say, when he sends his child to the school will not have to incur this expenditure. He has a number of other amenities that are available to him, which are not available to the village people. The Planning Commission has been totally ignorant of the real situation in the country. So.....

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Andhra): Nobody knows the difficulties of the Planning Member.

PROF. G. RANGA: Yes, there is not one agriculturist Planning Member.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I would only request you to see whether there is a single agriculturist in the Planning Commission. There is none who can speak for the agriculturists and know about their difficulties.

THE MINISTER FOR REVENUE AND CIVIL EXPENDITURE (SHRI M. C. SHAH): In Parliament also there is no agriculturist.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Undoubtedly; we do see that in the Parliament as well as in the Government there are either no agriculturists or there are persons who do not realise the difficulties of the agriculturists. Looking that way they are.....

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA: They are only consumers.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Now look at the way of their approach. So far as fair rent is concerned, it is 25 per cent. Absolutely satisfactory, they say. So far as the compensation that is to be given to a petty landlord is concerned, it has to be first reduced to fair rent which is 25 per cent. Then ten years' rental is sufficient for the purpose of valuation. Even suggestions have been made in many quarters that three years' fair rent is sufficient compensation. But when you take a share of, let us say, the Imperial Bank, the highest possible compensation must be paid. Otherwise there may be furore. The foreign share-holders might withdraw the money, and the person who has paid the share capital will suffer. Why don't you apply the same principle when you are taking the land of the agriculturists? In what way is his money different from the money that is advanced by a capitalist.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): The quantity of land is fixed.

PROF. G. RANGA: Your jobs also are fixed in number. That is why we are putting the proposal.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I am really glad the hon. Member, Mr. Sapru, says that the quantity of the land is fixed. So it will be all the easier to pay compensation, because it is a fixed item. We know also what is the capital invested in the concerns. We know what it is, in what way his interests are different from the interests of the capitalists. Now take for example this, you have got the Insurance Bill which is coming up before this House. How is the compensation being given so far as the shares are concerned? Everybody's rights are protected, even that of a servant of a branch manager or the agency management; everybody is protected. It seems in this country everybody's interest will be protected but not that of the agriculturists, who constitute 70 per cent. of the population.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Lawyers' interest also.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: I am not here for either protecting the interests of the Ministers or the lawyers. I am really sorry that in the list of civil servants our Minister is not there. But one thing is certain and everybody knows that in reply to this Resolution the hon. Minister will say. "It is all right, but it is very difficult to implement it; it is unfortunate that I am not able to do it because, if I do it, our plans will not work." They do think the moment you reduce the salary of the Government servants, the Plan will not work because, after all, the Plan will have to be worked by them. But so far as the agriculturist is concerned, it is merely his back. He is carrying the load; I am driving him; it is slave-driving. That is the approach that the Government has made. That is why we ask whether this approach is correct. It gives us the basic idea that, when you have the idea of a ceiling, you can't have it for everybody. When you have an income ceiling per month tax free or with tax, whatever it is, have it for every section of the society. Whatever the maximum for the professional man, let it be also the maximum for the

[Shri K. S. Hegde.]

industrial class and the agriculturist class. Do not treat different people differently. That is all that I am saying and I am prepared to accept any maximum, but I am merely here to voice that that maximum must be available to every section of the people.

4 P.M.

Now, coming to the question of the maximum earning, a sum of Rs. 25,000 has been put down as the maximum yearly earning. To the extent I have been able to study the history in other countries, I do not know whether it is ever possible to implement a rigid maximum. We can merely have an objective, and not a specific figure which could be taken as a maximum. The mechanism through which you operate to limit the maximum earning is the mechanism of taxation and the more a man can avoid tax or dodge the tax, probably he is much better off. As it is, we know how much tax evasion there is. But even in a country like Soviet Russia I am told—my friends from the other side probably will be able to give it more authoritatively—that a man can earn even to the tune of about a lakh of rupees a year.....

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Or more.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): He is a better authority.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: On the maximum side he is the authority and on the minimum side probably you will be the authority. Now, if you fix a maximum of Rs. 25,000 how that will affect the industry, it is a matter for Government's consideration. I have absolutely no quarrel about fixing this amount as the ceiling because the section of the people whose interest is dear to me or whom I purport to represent will not be affected by this ceiling at all because none of them gets more than Rs. 25,000. There is absolutely no difficulty except perhaps when I speak as a lawyer but

there again most of us probably may not get more than Rs. 25,000 and this maximum is ample for us.

Coming to the question of Rs. 1,800 as the pay of a Civil Servant, I think a distinction might have to be made between the Civil Servant who is already there and the Civil Servant who will be entering the Service hereafter. I do say that a certain amount of reduction is called for even among the existing servants but the reduction might be more steep and probably more pronounced in the case of new entrants rather than in the case of persons who are already in the Service. Because once you get habituated to a certain standard of life it becomes extremely difficult to adapt oneself to a lower standard. But more than that what was passing in my mind is that we will be having the same ceiling for everybody, for a man whose family is very large or who has a large number of dependants and for another who has a comparatively small number of dependants. Take the agricultural classes and theirs are all what are called undivided families and some of them are prolific in the number of their children. In cities and towns we know the art of birth control and most of the people there know how to limit themselves to one, two or three children. But in many cases in agricultural families there are dozens. It is not a very big thing and none of you need be surprised. Speaking for myself I have half a dozen.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): And more to come.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Now if you have the same ceiling for everybody without any other arrangement for meeting the expenses of his children, will it be possible to educate the children which all of us now want to do with the same level of income which you give to a single person like my hon. friend Mr. Reddy and to a person like me who is having a num-

ber of dependents? That is where I agree with Mr. Kishen Chand when he said that it is not very much a question of putting a ceiling but that it is a question of creating the necessary amenities whereunder every person may have an equal opportunity and a more or less common standard of life. That will be the most important thing and it is from that point of view I am approaching the subject. Sir, I commend the objective behind the Resolution though I am not able to subscribe to it as it is worded.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am very grateful to the hon. the mover of this Resolution. Shri B. K. Mukerjee because this Resolution gives us an opportunity to discuss one of the most important questions of our social life. Just at the moment I would not be concerned with figures and calculations. I would leave that to be decided upon after we accept the principles involved in this. We have heard a number of speeches on the subject but we have not yet heard the speech that would be made, I am sure, by Mr. Parikh. I suppose he has a different story to tell.

Sir, the underlying principle of this Resolution commands the support of every right-thinking person and I can tell you that in moving this Resolution Mr. Mukerjee is not alone in the Congress Party. There are many others in the Congress Party—Congressmen and their supporters who today, guided by an urge for national reconstruction, seek certain remedies through changes in this direction. We naturally share this sentiment and it would be our common endeavour to join together in order to realise such noble aims but that would take time because the Government seems to be still against the idea of accepting such principles. Sir, it would not be denied by anybody in this House or anywhere else in the country that very great income disparities exist in our country. Yawning disparities exist among the

various sections of the people. On the one hand you have got a handful of people who roll in wealth and who live in unbounded extravagance and wastefulness, while on the other, you have got millions of people whose incomes are much too meagre even to ensure them a minimum decent life, who live in starvation, in perpetual unending want. Such is the condition in our country. In the second category fall the workers, the peasants and the middle class people who live by their hands or by their brain. Their incomes are very very low and multitudes of them live on starvation level. Naturally in such a society it becomes very important to go into the question of the distribution of national income. After all, national income is the result of the national productive activity of the people as a whole. And you will agree that in the last five years or so it has been found from our own experience that while the national income had registered an advance, the distribution of income has followed in a very unhealthy direction. That is to say, the incomes of those in the higher brackets have gone up while those who are lower down in the ladder have suffered certain losses and their incomes have not risen. Why it is so is a story which I need not go into at this stage. But it has been admitted on all hands and by all eminent economists that there has been an unjust and inequitable distribution of the national income especially of the additional income that had been created in the first Five Year Plan. If you look at the memorandum on the Second Five Year Plan which was circulated to Members of Parliament by the Planning Commission you will find that it is stated clearly that there is the fear that in the coming period too these income disparities will continue to grow when it is necessary to narrow them down. Such is the perspective we have before us and I think that should cause concern to every man and woman in the country who desires the progress of our country and well-being of our people. It has

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

been stated that the *per capita* national income is Rs. 280 but as we know the overwhelming majority of our people, millions of people in our country, do not have even that much income. If you take into account the families of the working classes you will find that the family income computed in terms of the national *per capita* would be much below that national average. If you look into the Report of the Rural Credit Survey you will find that the majority of peasants, especially the agricultural labourers, do not have that *per capita* income either individually or as a family. They live far below that level. If you take the middle class employees the story is equally disappointing. For instance, in the Central Government service there are about 9 lakhs of employees in all the civil departments excluding the railways. There again the income is very low. There are very few people who get income above Rs. 100 per month. That is the position. That means that 80 per cent. of the people do not have a decent income at all. On the contrary the majority of the people live with very small incomes, incomes which do not give them even two square meals a day. That is the position. Now, here again I find, as I have pointed out, there are a few people. I looked into the figures of income-tax. We find that there are about eight lakh assesseees who pay income-tax. I am not talking about those gentlemen who have succeeded in evading income-tax. I am talking about those whose income-tax has been assessed. There are about eight lakh assesseees or so.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Six lakhs.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It has gone down. If that is so, it would be much less than one per cent. of the population who have attained the level or got incomes up to the minimum taxable limit. That is the position. Now, naturally we are interested in reducing the income of

the people at the top layer of the society, not because we have got any particular grudge against them, but we dislike the way they spend the money, we dislike the way the sons of the rich squander wealth, we dislike the manner in which they live. These are well-known facts. We want to reduce the income of these people by putting a ceiling in order to find more money for national reconstruction. We want to stop all parasitism which corrupts our social life; we want to stop corruption and debauchery that is indulged in by the propertied class at the top layer of society. After all we are elevating our country. We want to elevate the society to a higher level, not only materially but also culturally. We want to do away with the system which keeps so much money in the hands of so few that they can do whatever they like in our society in the face of social justice and carry on their malpractices. These are the reasons for which we want reduction of their incomes by introducing a ceiling.

Prof. Ranga told us he seems to think that he has got rid of the Princes, Rajas and Maharajas, but have they gone. I would ask. As far as he is concerned, he may have got rid of them, but they are very much in our society. They have got their money, their wealth, landed estates and real property out of which they draw fabulous incomes. And some of the princes are given privy purses. The Nizam of Hyderabad is given one crore of rupees a year. Therefore, they are very much upon us, drawing upon the fat of the land, living an unjust life, which we want to put an end to, not in the physical sense but the social sense in which it is used. Now, they are very much there. As far as the landlords are concerned, it is true that lands have been taken away from them in some cases, but they have managed, by all kinds of malpractices, to keep vast quantities or areas of land in their hands. Besides, some of them have got landed properties in the States:

and they draw heavy incomes from this source.

Then, again, you have got the great capitalist class, the class of the capitalist system. As far as the capitalist system is concerned, I would like to know something from Mr. Parikh as to their incomes. It is very difficult to assess their income, because part of it is concealed, part of it is known. Therefore, I would not be in a position to state exactly what are their incomes. But it appears when a gentleman gets arrested his son-in-law comes forward and immediately forks out two and a half crores of rupees at a moment's notice. I take it that they are all earned income, whether they are one lakh or ten lakhs or crores. It is for the gentlemen of the capitalist class to tell us and in this matter we seek enlightenment from them. But the manner in which they live in the society and the way they conduct themselves in our social life leaves no room for doubt that they are earning enormous incomes, the like of which should not be permitted in our society today. We want to deny them this unhindered, unrestricted draft on our national output, national wealth. Therefore, we stand for the ceiling here. They will say that in that case there may not be incentive and all that. But we know that the industries can very well be run without the so called captains of industry. These captains of industry, as we know very often, lead us to shipwrecks in our social life. Therefore, we are not particularly keen on these captains. We know what sort of captains they are when we see speculation, blackmarketing and corruption being rampant in our economic life.

Then, he said that about the officials there is a provision, a suggestion in the Resolution that their income should be brought down. I wonder why the Congress Government is not taking any steps in regard to this matter? It was not merely the Pay Commission which

had recommended—even before the Congress assumed power—that the incomes of these people should be reduced. It is the Congress Party that from its own platform preached that the incomes of these people should be reduced. I am not particularly keen on the Karachi resolution, but the spirit which actuated this resolution should be kept in view all the time. It is a matter of great regret that these preachings have not been sought to be translated into life. I cannot for the life of me see as to why in our country the Secretaries should be given Rs. 4,000 per month when the Prime Minister of the country gets about Rs. 2,500....

SHRI M. C. SHAH: Not Rs. 2,500. It is Rs. 2,250.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All the more reason why you should not let off your Secretaries. But it is an amazing thing in our public administration that when the Prime Minister of the country—who is undoubtedly the biggest figure in the administration—is satisfied with Rs. 2,200, the gentlemen of the Secretariat.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Rs. 2,250.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Rs. 2,250.the gentlemen of the Secretariat, the favoured children of the British imperialism, should not be satisfied with anything less than Rs. 4,000. Where is social justice? Where is fairplay? Where is public morality? Where is an elementary sense of decency? That is something which I would ask the Government to explain to us. Now, has any proposal been made to them? If so, what are their reactions to such a proposal? If no proposal had been made to them to forego a part of their salary, why has not such a proposal been made to them? When day in and day out Government spokesmen ask the people to make sacrifices for the rebuilding of their country, for the reconstruction of their economy, may I ask

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

in that case why these people are not being made compulsorily to forego a part of their salary? It is possible. I know if the Prime Minister were to make an utterance in the public, the gentlemen of the Secretariat would be obliged to forego a part of their salary. I am not thinking in terms of legislation—which they can pass immediately; but even a strong word from the Prime Minister, a word uttered before the gaze of the public would do the trick. But I am extremely sorry that the Prime Minister does not consider it necessary to make such a demand on the good sense of the gentlemen who adorn the high offices in the Secretariat in Delhi and other places. Sir, this is something very important. (*Time bell rings.*) I am finishing—and this question should be gone into. Now, some hon. Members said charity begins at home. Yes, He said, "Charity should begin at home." But, unfortunately, at home there are not very right people. Some wrong people had entered the home before the present rulers entered it. They remained with all their vices and the home has to be cleared of such people so that this home becomes an ideal home. That is what we aspire for; that is what we want to have. Therefore, the spirit of this Resolution is acceptable. The principle involved in it commends itself to the acceptance of every right thinking man in our country, whether he belongs to the Congress Party or the Communist Party or for the matter that, no party at all, because we want to create a climate in this country—a situation in our country—which we will have social justice, getting away with the gross injustice bequeathed to us by the Britishers. I hope that the Government will take counsel in this matter, take into confidence and discuss this matter so that within the period of the Second Five Year Plan we can get to grips with this injustice and something tangible which would be acceptable to all sections of our people, to the entire community.

We all want to see India prosperous and happy, and we must move in that direction. It is an important step in bringing about social justice which has been denied to the masses of our people and to our country.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Resolution that has been moved in this House has been moved on the basis that the disparity in the incomes of different classes should be reduced. If that be the idea, no one will object that the disparity that exists at present should be reduced. But I feel, Sir, that this method which has been suggested is not the correct one. I would have very much liked the mover to suggest that the Government do take steps by legislation or otherwise to fix a floor that is to say, the income should not be lower than a particular sum for every person employed in Government service. I can understand that the income of a very large number of people is so low that it is not sufficient to make their two ends meet. Therefore, the proper suggestion would be that an attempt should be made to increase the *per capita* income of everyone who is not getting a sufficient sum. It will not do to reduce the income of persons who are getting sufficiently on account of their merits, on account of their ability and on account of the service that they render. But if you do away with the disparity by raising the income of the low paid people.....

SHRI T. D. PUSTAKE (Madhya Bharat): Where is the money to come from?

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: Money has to be produced.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot produce money by forgery; you have to get the money from the capitalist class.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: If you produce more articles, more money will be there. As you know, Sir, these rivers were devastating the

country so long. Now, they are being harnessed and they will help in more and more production of wealth. It is a truism to say that India is a rich country inhabited by poor people. Why should it be so? Because the resources that are available in the country have not been properly utilised so far. The mineral wealth is lying hidden under the soil. So, India is a country where 95 percent. of the people are cultivators. But look at the production from the land; compare it with that of countries like Japan. I think that if you will follow the same method and the same ideas are accepted here, the income of the peasant will increase a number of times and the cry—and the right cry—that their income is very low will not be heard at all. But instead of taking steps for increasing the income of peasants whose income is very low, we want to do away with the disparity by reducing the income of those who are getting more. You know the condition after independence, of certain countries like Indonesia and Burma where the Civil Service did not exist properly. It is fortunate that in India we have a Civil Service which is efficient. They were carrying out the orders of the British Government when they were serving under them. Now they are carrying out the orders of the present Government. Certainly a very large number of them—I cannot say all—are competent. They were carrying out the orders of their then masters. They were acting against the interests of India at that time because they had to carry out their masters' orders. If you are serving under a person, you cannot refuse to carry out his order. Therefore, I feel that it would be a wrong step to suggest that the disparity should be done away in this fashion. It should be done away by raising the income of the lower group. There are enough resources and enough facilities in our country which, if properly utilised, will certainly help in increasing the income of the country. As a matter of fact, wealth is lying in the country, but it is not being taken advantage of.

My hon. friend, Shri Kishen Chand, said, "If you produce more, then it will be possible for you to pay more to the labourers." I entirely agree with him. You cannot pay more unless you produce more; otherwise, the result will be, if you pay more, the price of everything will go up and those who are consumers—and most of us are consumers—will have to pay more for what we purchase. Therefore, if we produce more in our country, the share of every one will increase and that would be the proper method for us to adopt.

Look at the position that we are in. At present I am talking of our own Members of Parliament. How much do we get? About Rs. 800 to Rs. 900. Does it not make much difference from what the common people get? And still we are not satisfied. Most of us are asking for free telephones, free air passage, free rail pass and everything and still we say that the Civil Servants should be paid less.

SHRI B. K. MUKERJEE: Those concessions do not go to the bank. That is for the duty they are doing. They want to do their public duty.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: I know the public duty that we are doing. Anyway.....

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: You do not know because you have never rendered it perhaps.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: What. I suggest is that the proper approach will be to raise the income of the lower group and do away with disparities as far as possible and as quickly as possible.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL (Bihar): Do I understand that he wants that the agriculturists should be taxed more and more in order to make more income, to keep the present level of salaries?

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: I am sorry, Sir, if I have been misunderstood as saying that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He did not say that.

SHRI KAILASH BIHARI LALL: Most producers are agriculturists in the country, and you are laying stress on production. That means far more income to be paid to higher service.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: They will keep their own income.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Sir, I am in agreement with the objects of this Resolution. But I think that this is not the proper way to reduce the inequality, as mentioned in the Resolution, because, as the previous speaker pointed out, the lower level of income should be increased and that will reduce the disparity. That is one of the methods.

Mr. Mukerjee has suggested fixing a maximum limit of emolument for the Civil Servants under the Central Government. Then naturally the State Governments also will have to fall in line with them. And even if my hon. friend Mr. Ranga becomes a Minister, he will not be able to implement this figure of Rs. 1,800, because we have to see to the realities that we have to face. We have to see to the realities of the problems before us. We have to see to the man-power which is existing in this country and the man-power that we require. All these factors are forgotten. First of all, we want resources. That is one thing. We want man-power. That is the second thing. Let us understand what we have got. In the discussion on the Finance Bill, I made a number of suggestions in regard to the levy of direct taxation and I think if you implement 10 per cent. of these suggestions, Mr. Ranga ought to be satisfied. If my suggestions in regard to direct taxation are adopted, we will go a long way in the matter of reducing inequalities. But I am not touching on those points here again.

But I want to say that we are faced with a problem as regards man-power. There are doctors and lawyers. Shall we fix their incomes

at Rs. 25,000 per year, above that should they not get anything and the rest should go to the State? I know doctors and lawyers earning rupees one lakh and two lakhs. They are receiving money in cash for their visits and for all their work.

Now as regards capital, do not forget that the Government are borrowing at the rate of four per cent. A sum of Rs. 6 lakhs has an income of Rs. 24,000. Government borrow in the open market and 4 per cent. is the rate. In private sector the rate is 7% and so a man who has a capital of Rs. 3,50,000 will have a ceiling. All persons who have a capital between Rs. 3½ lakhs and Rs. 6 lakhs will not have any initiative, any enthusiasm or enterprise for work.

AN HON. MEMBER: What will they do?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I will point out what they will do. First of all, we want to have development programmes, and we want capital for these programmes, and so long as we want capital, we will have to pay interest on it. Government is already borrowing from other countries at 5½ per cent. How can we get more money? We are not having any capital levy which I have advocated. We are not having higher sales tax. We are not having deterrent taxes on consumption. Then, how are we going to get money for development? We are not going to expropriate capital.

What I want to point out is that, when we fix a ceiling of Rs. 1,800 for salaried persons, we have to compare Government service with private service. You cannot reduce the salaries of Government servants only. Nobody will continue in Government service if he can get 50 per cent or 75 per cent. more in private industry. Therefore, this Resolution is lacking in that respect. As it is at present worded, this Resolution cannot be accepted. So long as you do not cover private

service, this cannot be successful. Moreover, we want highly technical personnel to be trained in the country. We want engineering skill in many departments, in mining, chemical engineering, the oil industry and all the rest. Are you going to pay these skilled and qualified men only Rs. 1,800? I think we are not facing realities. We are simply talking in an idealistic manner, but to achieve our object, we must be practical. I am one with the objective, but we cannot do this, so long as we have these development projects on our hands. Some Junior Secretary is getting Rs. 1,800, and a Senior Secretary will also be getting Rs. 1,800. Do you think it will be workable? Already so many Government servants have resigned their Government posts and joined the private sector, and they have been given 50 per cent. and 75 per cent. more remuneration. How will you prevent it? Have you been able to prevent it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is seduction on the part of the private sector.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Whatever it is, it is there, and we must word the Resolution differently if we mean business. It is no use indulging in unrealities in the matter. I agree with Prof. Ranga that the minimum income in our country is very low and should be raised. I think that fifty per cent. of our families in India do not get even Rs. 1,200 per annum. That is the finding of the National Sample Survey Committee. How are we going to increase this? This can only be increased by increasing our production. That is the only way. But the production from land is limited. Our lands will be in future irrigated to the extent of 30 per cent. and 40 per cent. How can we expect rain-fed areas to increase their production, even if the cultivators toil for eight months of the year? If the rains don't come, the production dwindles. It will also take more than fifteen years for these areas to be irrigated to the extent of 30 per cent. or 40 per cent. and we shall have also to invest capital for it.

Another point is that this figure is useless because it is unrelated to the cost of living index. The cost of living, taking 1939 as the base, stands at 400. There is no point in taking a figure which has no relation to the cost of living index.

Another point is that you can limit the ceiling of the income of a person even in the private sector. I can understand that, but what about industries? The return in industry is sometimes, as I have explained on many occasions, to the extent of 30 per cent. and 40 per cent. on capital employed. Has the Finance Minister done anything to prevent that? If he accepts some of the suggestions I have made in this connection, it will bring more money for development and reduce inequalities and we will be more successful. You can also say that you will put a ceiling of 10 per cent. or 15 per cent. on industrial profits. But I say that it will be no use putting an absolute ceiling as regards industries. If a man cannot get 10 per cent. or 15 per cent. out of his profit of 100 per cent., I think you will be killing all his initiative and enthusiasm. You know that all people are not working for patriotism. We must understand that. As long as our education is what it is, as long as our public morality is what it is, and so long as the profit motive is there, you cannot do this. For all excess income over Rs. 25,000, if you allow a man to retain 10 per cent., then it is something—out of 100 per cent. just ten per cent. You have seen the return in certain industries. In certain industries you get a return of 40 per cent. In certain industries you get a return of 30 per cent. In certain other industries, you get 20 per cent. In certain industries you get 10 per cent., and the man who has money to invest will naturally try to invest in industries where he can get the maximum return for himself. Have you done anything to prevent that? Can you prevent that? And how can you do it?

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMA-NAND (Madhya Pradesh): By putting

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]
a ceiling on income, naturally those returns will be controlled.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I think I can excuse her for her ignorance, because she does not know this subject. First of all, capital gains levy is not there.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: Let him tell us, if he knows more.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: A capital gains tax is not there. A man who had invested Rs. 1000 in 1930 gets his capital increased to Rs. 1 lakh after getting a 6 per cent. return on it for all these twenty-five years and more. What have you done to prevent this? Have we taken any steps in that direction? Instead of doing such things, there is no use suggesting measures which are impracticable. I agree with the objective, but the whole thing is that we must go in for methods, right methods, for realising that objective, and not talk loosely like this, because the matter is very important. The Finance Minister, after all the suggestions I had made, said, "I am not in agreement with many of those suggestions." What has he done about my suggestions, I wish to know.

SHRI M. C. SHAH: He will know in time.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: He says that they will be examined. I know they will be under examination not for one year but for five years. The whole thing is that, for deciding on the methods of reducing inequalities, we must know the real factors by which inequalities are created, and not go about it in this manner. The Resolution, as it is worded, has no bearing on the situation in the country. With these suggestions, I oppose the Resolution.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Deputy Chairman. Sir, I rise to support the Resolution brought forward by my hon. friend Mr. Mukerjee though it

may be that it is not as happily worded as one would wish it to be and though it may not cover all the ideas that the hon. Members have placed before the House, those who lent their support to the Resolution. As I see, the object is two-fold. One is to altogether obliterate the idea that arises in the minds of vast masses of people that the few only are the chosen and the rest are only hewers of wood and drawers of water. I ask my friends here whether that is not the feeling today among the vast millions in the land? Is it not a fact that they have resigned themselves more or less to their fate and, feel over-burdened by the immediate necessity of merely making both ends meet? May I ask, after all what are the wants of an average Indian? Are they many, are they much? Even though the wants are so few, of an Indian, how few of them can ever meet their own requirements? Is it not possible for us to see this? So the first objective emphasised by hon. speakers who spoke in favour of the Resolution is that we try to minimise these vast disparities between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' which is I think, a very desirable thing. I don't think either Mr. Parikh or the hon. speaker who preceded him or the Minister for Revenue and Expenditure will dispute the point. Possibly there is some truth in the statement of my hon. friend, Mr. Parikh who always contributes very much to the discussions, that this by itself is not going to usher in an era of prosperity in the land. After all by the mere acceptance of this Resolution, we will not have materially raised the standard of living of the masses. I suppose that is what he was trying to make out. It may be so but I ask, is there not a much more and more fundamentally important thing such as psychology, in the land? Does this not create a proper psychology in the nation, among the whole people, on the one side among the masses, the poorer masses and on the other side, with the richer few which is so necessary for the great task that lies ahead? I think that it will be

one of the finest results that will flow from the acceptance of this Resolution. It blesses him that foregoes these high salaries and it blesses those who might benefit from the savings. The savings will be turned to good use and will be helpful in resorting to all those developmental schemes meant for the welfare of the people. I consider that these high salaries, relatively speaking,—I don't say they are high as compared to American scales—these high salaries have a demoralising effect among those people who enjoy those salaries. I am viewing it from that psychological point of view. It may be that there can be some truth in what Mr. Parikh said but I want Mr. Parikh and those friends who think like him to appreciate this aspect, namely, that this continued enjoyment of more or less the special privileges of high salaries demoralised those very people who draw them and keep them apart from the rest of the humanity in the land. That is a thing which has far more deleterious effect in the country than anything which the monetary loss arising from the high salaries could cause.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: What about high dividends?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I will come to that. As I said, this Resolution, if you read properly you will see, is not the end by any means but it is only the beginning in the sense that it is acceptance of a principle. It does say that:

"As a first step towards the fixation of such ceiling, determine the maximum emolument to be drawn by any Civil Servant under the Central Government at a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,800 per month."

So what Mr. Mukerjee makes out is that it is better to have mentally a picture before us, namely, that ultimately we do not want any person to have an income of more than Rs. 25,000 per year. I ask my friend Mr. Parikh whether the Planning Commission itself has not suggested

it. It has suggested in the Second Five Year Plan that so far as the urban personal incomes are concerned, they need be only.....

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Rs. 30,000 tax free.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I have read it. Therefore they have already contemplated a ceiling on an income of Rs. 30,000 tax free. I have no objection to it. Let at least Mr. Parikh bless that suggestion of the Planning Commission. We will request Mr. Mukerjee to raise the ceiling from Rs. 25,000 to Rs. 30,000 if it meets with the unanimous acceptance of the other friends here. Therefore you will see that after all Mr. Mukerjee's Resolution is not so extravagant or so outlandish or unreasonable or unfair. There is a certain fairness in the suggestion put forward by my friend, Mr. Mukerjee. So I think whether you view it from the point of view of removing these disparities or from the other, the moral standpoint that I indicated, namely, that it corrupts the man who draws these heavy salaries and such a thing does not go to the benefit and to the progress of the country, viewed from these points of view, I think the Resolution merits the sympathetic consideration of the Government.

Then I would like to deal with the other question which has cropped up incidentally namely, this idea of differentiating between the ceilings of income of the rural areas and of the urban areas. I do not want to comment on the composition of the Planning Commission as some other friends have chosen to do. But I have discussed this matter with the friends in the Planning Commission and at various other places where we have considered the whole matter and I have not been able to see why there is an attempt to discriminate in this manner with regard to the incomes of people. One of the grounds that was just now whispered across the floor is that land is limited after all and therefore it is not possible for everyone to have a large extent of

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

land and we have to share what we have whereas with regard to other forms of property, it is possible to expand it to any extent. Could that be advanced as a reason for doing something which is discriminatory in character? That is what I want to understand. Will it not go fundamentally against the Constitution itself to have two different sets of principles so far as these people are concerned—the rural and the urban people? How can we imagine that with an ideology such as ours—the Congress ideology, we try to tilt the balance against the rural areas and in favour of the urban areas? Then a very specious plea is put forward in justification of this discrimination and that is that it only sets a ceiling on agricultural income and it does not prevent the agriculturists from having recourse to other forms of production and income. That is one of the pleas. It sounds extremely plausible but I think there is an element of—I don't say dishonesty—but what do you call, fallacy in this argument. I ask what other profession the people in the remote villages can take up which will add to their agricultural income. Can they set up a fine textile mill as in Ahmedabad? Can they have an iron and steel factory as in Tatanagar in their own village? It means that the Government or whoever is their spokesman, knows full well that these poor agriculturists cannot have any other form of income than what they can obtain from their own agriculture.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): What about the Ambar Charkha? The Ambar Charkha is there.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Yes, the Ambar Charkha has been much discussed, but you know you are going to give the villager 12 annas for eight hours of work. That is going to earn him how much? Rs. 30,000?

There is another and very important point and I would beg of the hon. Members of this House to direct

their attention to that point. After all, who are going to form the leadership in the rural areas? Is it not true that the person who has got the welfare of the rural people at heart would be the best possible man to represent the rural people in the Houses of Parliament and also in the different legislatures? Is it possible for the man with limited means with Rs. 3,600 in the rural areas.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: That is for the joint family.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: No, the ceiling is three times the average holding which means Rs. 3,600. So do you expect that person with Rs. 3,600, after meeting all his family requirements, and incidentals and after paying the interest on his loans and debts, after paying his taxes and meeting the expenses of education and marriage and a hundred and one other things, out of that sum, do you expect him tomorrow to stand for election?

SHRI ABID ALI: Yes, with the support of the party.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It looks to me—I do not say anybody intends it to be a ruse to prevent him from coming into these legislatures—but that in effect will be the result. I am not simply airing my own views. I have had discussions with farmers and others and they have told me that the net result of this fixing of ceiling on land is going to be effective prevention of rural people representing themselves through their own people in the legislatures. It means that the city people, the urban persons, they are going to represent the rural people. How effectively, how nobly, how justly and fairly city man can do that is a thing amply in evidence in the kind of plans that we get here. Therefore I feel that this is a matter which cannot be lightly brushed aside by the Government and my hon. friend the Minister for Revenue and Civil Expenditure who, no doubt has a fund of knowledge and has got piles of papers before him—I already see some of them before him—I hope he will

take these remarks seriously into consideration. Not only will he bestow on them the consideration that they deserve, but he will also communicate this matter to his colleagues that the preponderance of opinion is this, if not unanimous opinion here, is that there should be no such discrimination between the incomes of the rural and the incomes of the urban populations.

I have therefore, very great pleasure in supporting this principle underlying this Resolution and I hope that the hon. Minister would accept the principle, whatever quarrel he may have with the wording of the Resolution.

श्री बेषकीनन्दन (मुम्बई) : उपसभापति जी, जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने है उसका मैं हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ और अपने मित्र श्रीयुत मुकर्जी को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उनको इस प्रस्ताव को पेश करने का मौका मिला और बैलट बाक्स को भी धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उनका नाम इस बलट में पहले आया। कुछ देर पहले अपने दो उद्योगपतियों के भाषण को मैं बड़े गौर से सुन रहा था, हालांकि वे विरोध कर रहे थे, तब भी मैं यह जानना चाहता था कि मेरे ये उद्योगपति आखिर इस हिन्दुस्तान में क्या चाहते हैं। मैंने देखा कि वे यह चाहते हैं कि उनकी पैदावार के ऊपर कोई मर्यादा नहीं रखी जाय और उन्हें ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैसा पैदा करने का मौका दिया जाय। ठीक है, जब तक वे अपने बगल में अपना जसा ही कोई पड़ोसी देखते हैं तब तक उन्हें यह ख्याल पैदा ही होगा लेकिन जब वे हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की ओर देखेंगे तब उन्हें मालूम होगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के मन में, हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के दिल में उन्हें देखकर आज क्या भावनाएँ पैदा होती हैं। जिस वक्त वे उद्योगपतियों को देखते हैं, उद्योगपतियों के महलों को देखते हैं, उद्योगपतियों के खानपान को देखते हैं, उद्योगपतियों की मोटरों को देखते हैं, तो उनके दिल में, गरीबों के दिल में आम जनता के दिल में कौनसे भाव पैदा होते

हैं उसको जरा आप सोचियेगा और तब इस प्रश्न पर विचार करियेगा। मैं तो यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आप जिस निगाह से इस प्रश्न पर विचार कर रहे हैं उस निगाह से न करें बल्कि मानवता की दृष्टि से इस प्रश्न को देखें कि हिन्दुस्तान की मानवता आज क्या पुकार कर रही है और क्या अपेक्षा कर रही है। हिन्दुस्तान से बढ़कर कोई और गरीब देश आज दुनियाँ में नहीं है। सब से गरीब, गरीब से गरीब हिन्दुस्तान है। मैं यह मानता हूँ, जैसा कि हमारे भाई पारिख साहब ने कहा कि इंकम की सीलिंग से गरीबों की गरीबी कुछ दूर होने वाली नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि इससे उनकी गरीबी दूर नहीं होगी क्योंकि इनकी कमाई में कुछ कमी होने से गरीबों की गरीबी बहुत कुछ कम नहीं हो सकती मगर सवाल यह नहीं है कि गरीबी कम होगी या नहीं होगी, बात यह है कि इससे गरीबों के दिलों में समता का कुछ भाव पैदा होगा, उनके दिल में भाग्यवानों के लिये, व्यापारियों के लिये, उद्योगपतियों के लिये कुछ न कुछ प्रेम पैदा होगा जब कि आज दिन ब दिन उनके दिलों में इनके प्रति द्वेष और मत्सर की भावना पैदा हो रही है। आप हमारे साथ देहातों में चलिए। जब से आपने इस लैंड सीलिंग की बात उठाई है तब से शहरों में और गावों में, उनके बीच में, एक तरह की उद्वेग की भावना पैदा हो रही है। खेती करने वाले किसान हम से पूछते हैं कि हमने क्या पाप किया है जो कि आप हमारी जमीन के ऊपर, हमारी पैदावार के ऊपर, सीलिंग लगाना चाहते हैं और इन व्यापारियों ने, कारखानेदारों ने, वकीलों ने और डाक्टरों ने पूर्व जन्म में कौनसा पुण्य किया है कि उनकी कमाई पर किसी तरह की कोई मर्यादा नहीं लगाई जा रही है। तो यह सवाल उनका होता है और उसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि मैं अपने पक्ष की निगाह से भी यह कह सकता हूँ, हम दिन ब दिन किसानों की सहायु-भूति खोते जा रहे हैं। क्यों खोते जा रहे

[श्री देवकीनन्दन]

ह? क्योंकि किसान देखता है कि उसकी जमीन पर सीलिंग है, उसकी पैदावार पर मर्यादा है और जो कुछ चीज वह पैदा करता है उन चीजों के भाव पर, उनके रेट्स पर, प्रतिबन्ध है। आज मेरे जिले के, मेरे प्रान्त के कुछ किसान यहां आये हैं, वे मुझसे दोपहर में बातें कर रहे थे। वे यहां किस लिए आये हैं? वे इसलिये आये हैं कि उनके खेतों में जो प्याज पैदा होती है, जो ओनियंस पैदा होती है, उसको बाहर भेजने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान सरकार से इजाजत मिल जाय क्योंकि आज महाराष्ट्र में एक रुपये मन कांदा बिक रहा है, प्याज बिक रहा है और अगर इसको बाहर भेजने की इजाजत उनको मिल जाती है तो फिर उनको पांच रुपये या छः रुपये मन का भाव उसके लिये मिल सकता है।

श्री अकबर अली खान (हैदराबाद) : प्रान्त के बाहर भेजने के लिये या देश के बाहर भेजने के लिये?

श्री देवकीनन्दन : देश के बाहर एक्सपोर्ट के लिये। व इस आफिस से उस आफिस को दोड़ रहे हैं लेकिन उन्हें कोई पता नहीं चलता है कि कब उन्हें एक्सपोर्ट की इजाजत मिल सकेगी और कब उनका कांदा या प्याज बाहर जा सकेगा। हमारे उद्योगपति मित्र अपने भाल के एक्सपोर्ट के लिये कितनी जल्दी काम करा लते हैं यह तो आप सब जानते हैं। वह तो मैं कहना नहीं चाहता। मेरे कहने का मतलब

यह है कि आप किसानों की दिक्कतों को अपनी आंखों के सामने लायें और देखें कि आज वे किस तरह की तकलीफ में हैं और कौन सी सहूलियत उनको आप दे रहे हैं। आप उनको न खेती के बारे में कोई खास सहूलियतें दे रहे हैं, न खेती की पैदावार के बारे में सहूलियतें दे रहे हैं, न उनके आरोग्य के बारे में कोई सहूलियत दे रहे हैं और न उनकी शिक्षा के बारे में कोई यथायोग्य प्रबन्ध कर रहे हैं। आप उनके घर को देखिये, उनके रहन सहन को देखिये और उनके दिलों में आपके प्रति जो भाव पैदा होते हैं उनको सोचिये। क्या आपके लिये कोई प्रेम पदा हो रहा है? मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं, माफ कीजिये, कि आजादी मिलने के बाद भी आम जनता के दिलों में सरकार के लिये कोई खास प्रेम बढ़ रहा है ऐसा दिखाई नहीं देता।

श्री सी० पी० पारिख : सरकार के लिये?

श्री देवकीनन्दन : हा। आप लोगों के लिये पैदा हो रहा है या नहीं वह तो आप समझिये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will continue on the next non-official day. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 7th May 1956.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 7th May 1956.