

years or from 10 to 12 years, no fundamental change in the educational system has come.

We are saying today that our basic approach is secularism, democracy, socialism and so on. Do our text books give the real picture or true meaning of democracy or socialism or secularism? I had the opportunity to talk to many student gatherings and when they are asked: what is democracy, they say: it is the rule of the majority. If democracy was the rule of the majority obviously in this world Hitler was the greatest democrat. It is not the rule of majority. It is the development of human values where even the views of minority are to be given due weight.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can continue on the next occasion.

14.59-1½ hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT

SHRI S. D. SOMASUNDARAM (Thanjavur): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st November, 1973."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st November, 1973."

The Motion was adopted

15 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: ESTABLISHMENT OF CONVENTION WHEN GOVERNMENT SHOULD RESIGN—*contd.*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We take up further consideration of the Resolution moved by Shri Shyamnandan

Mishra. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra may continue his speech.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, although it might sound paradoxical when I say that conditions in the country both dictate and deter such resolution, I consider it my duty to place such a resolution before the House for its acceptance. Why do I consider that the conditions in the country dictate paradoxical considerations? On the one hand there are conditions of widening and deepening poverty, mounting unemployment and increasing economic and social disparities which are making the national situation almost explosive and on the other hand we find that the political conditions in the country do not favour any optimistic assumptions that underlie my resolution. My resolution calls for a 7 per cent growth in national income and correspondingly it calls for increase in industrial and agricultural production. It also expects that there would be increase in employment of a particular order and those who are below the poverty line would be getting a fairer deal. These are the basic points of my resolution. But I am also emphasising that the political conditions in the country do not seem to give us much hope and encouragement in the direction of my resolution. The political condition does not seem to be geared to growth and development or even to social justice and the atmosphere is now definitely hostile to planning. Therefore, we find that we are in a plan holiday, and this plan holiday has been continuing for quite some time—since 1966-67. When we are in the midst of a plan holiday, would it not appear somewhat fool hardy to suggest that our targets should be higher than they have been in the past? That is a question which is bound to be asked of me.

The real aspect of the present situation is that if these things that I have mentioned in my resolution are fulfilled we shall end up in a way that

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

will not be conducive to the ideals that we cherish both in respect of democracy and socialism. The plans are losing credibility and yet we are talking much larger Fifth Five-year Plan. It indeed does not behove this Government, which has not been able to implement the fourth plan successfully, to talk of the higher targets in the Fifth Plan. Therefore, all our talk about planning is sounding less credible. There are wide gaps between performance and the targets. Who do such gaps appear or occur? Is it because of faulty planning or is it because of slackening of effort or lack of efficiency in the implementation machinery?

Planning makes certain assumptions about the efforts to be made both by the Government and the people. Nobody can say that the assumptions that underlie our Five Year Plans are unrealistic or unreasonable. If you want that the same assumptions should hold good, as have been prevailing in the past, so that no additional effort is required, then there would be no justification for planning at all. Planning does mean an additional effort, both on the part of the Government and the people. Planning does not mean that spontaneous development that has been occurring in the past should continue. If we want the situation to change, there is no doubt that additional efforts will have to be put in, both by the Government and the people. So, my submission is that the assumptions behind our Five Year Plans have not been unrealistic or unreasonable.

The main thing is that the Government has not been measuring up to these tasks. The Government must own their own failures in respect of the tasks that are embodied in our Five Year Plans. All the programmes of the Five Year Plans concretise the reasonable assumptions with regard to the efforts to be made by the Government and the people.

Even if you take the targets as the basis, the targets that we have accepted for our Five Year Plans are rather modest ones in comparison with the targets achieved even in the smaller countries of the world. So, one could not say that the failure has been because of unrealistic assumptions of the Five Year Plans.

My contention is that the failure has been at the political level. And by the political level I mean the political leadership that has been provided by the Government. In fact, there may be some defect in the political constellation as a whole also. But to put the political constellation in a proper form and make it geared to the national targets that is embodied in the Five Year Plan is also the task of the Government. It depends largely upon the Government to make the political constellation aligned to the national task. If the Government is failing to do that, it is failing in its most important duty. In fact, Government in a democracy is not a government by majority; it is a government by consensus.

If you are not able to evolve a consensus on the basis of the national targets embodied in the national plan, then you should hold yourself responsible for the failure that affects the lives of millions. In another sense also the moral obligation devolves on the Government to fulfil the task. When the Government accepts the national plan, it accepts the targets in the national plan. If the Government is ultimately found to be failing in fulfilling those targets then the Government loses the moral justification to continue in power. I have, therefore, suggested in this Resolution, even though it may sound a little out of the way, even though it may sound a little extraordinary—in fact, this is the first Resolution of this kind which suggests it—that if the Government is not able to fulfil the targets embodied in the national plan then it must quit.

Some hon. Members might argue that some of the targets that I have mentioned here are a little too high. For instance, I have mentioned an increase in national income of the order of seven per cent. It may be asked that when we have not been able to achieve even four per cent increase in national income during these years of planning how do you expect that we would be able to achieve an increase of seven per cent in the national income.

My submission is that if you go into the record of our planning, you would find that out of these 18 or 19 years, in more than 8 to 9 years we had achieved an increase in national income of the order of nearly 7 per cent.

I would not like to enumerate the details in all those years. But those who are the students of planning would be able to find out that in about 8 or 9 years out of 18 to 19 years of planning, there has been an achievement of increase in national income of the order of about 6.9 or 7 per cent. What we were able to achieve during 8 to 9 years should be possible to be achieved in future if we are able to duplicate the same conditions. If we have failed to create these conditions, then the responsibility is that of the Government. So, this should not be unrealistic even in Indian conditions or in the light of the achievement of some of the past years of our planning.

Then, there is another basis for my postulating an increase of this order. It has been mentioned many times in this House. Without 7 per cent increase per annum in national income, we will not be able to fulfilled. The aspirations of the masses within the time horizon in which one can reasonably expect them to be fulfilled. The assumption behind 7 per cent increase in national income per annum is that the national income will be doubled in 10 years. To repeat, if you are able to increase at the rate of 7 per cent per annum, you will be able to double

your national income in about 20 years' time.

Apart from the domestic economic and social conditions, there is the international dimension also. While I say that the conditions are becoming explosive because of increasing unemployment, increasing poverty and all that, I would also like to submit that the international position of India is becoming less respectable because of its failure on the economic front. If India is not able to achieve 7 per cent increase in national income per annum, India cannot figure on the international map with pride and respect. That is my humble submission.

That is what has been happening in many countries of the world. Those countries which are not able to have a significant rate of increase in the GNP, they are now sliding back and they have to be dependent upon the super powers and their independence is becoming nominal. If we do not take this aspect into account that is, the international aspect of Indian situation, and also the position of India on the international political power map, we will not be doing our duty as the proud citizens of this country. This is another aspect of it.

So, I would also submit that 7 per cent increase per annum in national income is a must if we have to catch up with the standard of living of the people in the affluent countries of the world. There are psychological demonstration efforts on the minds of the people here. You cannot contain them with the present level of standard of living. The conditions are dismal. And yet to seek to adopt a particular rate of growth which might enable us to catch up with the standard of living of the people in the affluent countries may sound a little Utopian. But the people of this country do want to know within what time horizon they will be able to catch up with the standard of living of the people in the most affluent countries of the world. There have been certain calculations

[Shri Sayamnandan Mishra]

the details of which I do not want to enter into at the present moment. These have disclosed that if we are able to progress at the rate of 7 per cent per annum, then we will be able to catch up with the affluent countries of the world within a time span of 50 years or so. Otherwise, to catch up with those standards even in hundred years will be difficult. If we lag behind during the next 40 to 50 years, we will be lagging behind in the race for all times to come. This is third aspect which underlies my postulation of the growth in national income of the order of 7 per cent per annum.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, another target that I have mentioned is that the per capita income of these below the poverty-line should increase at the rate of seven per cent per annum. The increase in national income is, after all, a national average, and if the increase in national income is appropriated by a small class, there can be no social justice. Therefore, I have tried to suggest that we have to see to it that there is an equitable distribution of the increased national income. How can that be brought about? The only way to bring about this is to ensure that the income of these who are below poverty-line is seen to increase at the rate of seven per cent per annum, that is, the rate at which the national income increases. What we find at the present moment is that the per capita income of those below poverty line has been sinking instead of increasing. It must therefore be made an imperative condition that the per capita income of those below the poverty-line must be enabled to increase at the rate of seven per cent. Then alone you can remove poverty in this country.

We have heard a lot of talk about *garibi hatao*, but nobody seems to have gone into the implications of this pledge that has been made.

What exactly is required in economic and social terms to bring about fulfilment of this target? This is the only way—the way I have indicated. You may say that it may be extremely difficult to achieve this because income may be generated in the big industries, situated as we are; the productive agents, the more dynamic productive agents at the present moment are those who are affluent, those who are better off, and it may not be easy for the income generated by the more affluent sections to percolate to the bottom.

Now what is the way to bring it about? The only way to bring this about is through increased employment opportunities—to the largest number of people. It is through increase in the employment opportunities that we can bring about distribution of income. I do not see any effective way of bringing about distribution of national income except through increased employment opportunities. Increased employment opportunities at increased levels of skill can bring about increased income to the vast millions who happen to be below the poverty-line. Therefore, necessary condition for increasing the per capita income of those who are below poverty-line is to increase the employment opportunities. Therefore, my Resolution has laid down that we must strive to generate employment opportunities at least to take care of the addition to the labour force each year.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, while I am on the subject of employment, I would like, first, to delineate before the House the dimension of the problem of unemployment that stares us in the face. At the present moment, the number of those unemployed or severely under-employed happens to be 29 millions. They constitute about 12 per cent of the working force. Now, even a smaller percentage of unemployment in any country of the world would have created

an explosion, but since we have a manipulative democracy, there seems to be calm on the surface at the moment. But this calm cannot prevail much longer; that is my submission; and that is what happened in Sri Lanka. In Sri Lanka when they had only 18,000 or so educated unemployed, as I said yesterday, almost a seismic upheaval was caused. There were only 18,000 educated unemployed on the register there, but in our country the number of educated unemployed is about 3.5 million—35 lakhs. Of course, the size of the country makes a difference. But even so it should not make that difference because if you take into account this vast army of the educated unemployed, it is indeed a big army, not less than the army that you command the military personnel that you have. Therefore, the conditions may be extremely difficult to handle if we are not able to take care of them in time. My submission, therefore, is that we have to take care of the additional labour force that comes to the labour market every year.

What is the order of the problem so far as the addition to the labour force per year is concerned? I find that the male labour force at the present moment amounts to about 150 million. Of this, two-thirds are employed in agriculture; that is two-thirds amounting to 100 million are employed in agriculture and the remaining 50 million in non-agricultural sector. In the organized sector we have got 20 million and in un-organised non-agricultural sector we have 30 million. Each year according to the population increase we would require an addition of quite a considerable size. We should expect the population to grow by another 25 per cent in the decade 1971—1981. That is we are increasing at the rate of 2.5 per cent per year. Hence, in 1981 if we take the decade 1971-1981, we will have an additional working force of 37.5

million to take care of. That is, in each year you will require about 3.5 million jobs to be created. Now, if these are to be absorbed in non-agricultural sector which presently employs 50 million workers, the employment in this sector must increase by 35 per cent in five years, that is at the annual rate of 6.8 per cent per year. But, what has been the trend so far? The trend so far has been that the organized sector has been able to absorb a much less percentage than 6.8 per cent that I have mentioned just now. The percentage of absorption has been of the order of 3.6 per cent. How are you going to achieve this? And, in addition to that, the problem is that we will have to find jobs also for those who are getting unemployed in the un-organized non-agricultural sector. Many people are getting displaced in the cottage industry and the small scale industries sector. All in all, not only those who are displaced in the agricultural sector but also the unemployment created in the unorganized industrial sector will have to be taken care of and that would make the size of the problem in a decade of the order of 40 million. This 40 million will have to be absorbed by 20 million who happen to be employed in the non-agricultural sector. That is, we would require an increase of the order of 200 per cent in the non-agricultural organized sector. You cannot expect, generally speaking, that they would be absorbed in the non-organized industrial sector because they are already getting displaced there. It may sound a tall order that all these have to be settled in the organized industrial sector, because the organized industrial sector has an employment base of only 20 million or so. My submission is that this will have to be done to a large extent. And yet, much more employment opportunities will have to be found both in the cottage industries and the small-scale industries. That is not happening at the present moment. We will have to find out the reasons why it is not

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

happening. Increased opportunity will have to be found also through the intensification of agriculture. It has been the experience of China that job opportunities were found through the intensification of the agricultural processes and also in the small scale and cottage industries sectors.

If you want that this should be absorbed only in the organised industrial sector, then, the problem is indeed very large and you will have to increase considerably the rate of growth there. That is to say, the employment opportunities will have to be increased at the rate of 11.6 per cent and not only at 6.8 per cent that I have mentioned. But, if you want to distribute it over the agricultural sector and the small-scale and cottage industries sectors then probably it would be easier to do so. That would require, I think, a change in the product-mix and also the technology-mix of our industrialisation. It is not possible for me to go into all that at the present moment but I am simply placing the problem in its broad contours. It would require a great deal of technical studies to complete the picture that I am seeking to present before the House.

For increase national income of the required order we will have to increase the per capita income of the poor people and for that employment opportunities will have to be increased considerably.

Due to increase in the production of the agricultural sector the income of the masses of the people can be enabled to increase. Therefore, have suggested that there should be increase in agricultural production of the order of five per cent per year. Till now we are able to achieve probably less than three per cent increase in agricultural production. Through the years between 1949-50 to 1971-72, we had been able to achieve an increase of the order of 2.9 per cent or say, 3

per cent, per year, the agricultural field.

But now my suggestion is that this rate of increase will have to be stepped up to five per cent per annum.

How is this going to be brought about, that is to say, from three per cent to five per cent? It is not a very steep climb. With the new technology that seems to be very widely accepted by the people, and a great deal of encouragement from the Government, this might have the way for an increase in agricultural production of five per cent per year. At the moment agricultural production is lagging because the rate of increase in the cash crop sector has been rather disappointing. In regard to food production we are not lagging so much behind but in the cash crop sector we are lagging very much behind. Additional efforts will have to be made in that direction and if we are able to do that it would be possible for us, I am sure, to increase agricultural production at the rate of five per cent per year. And, since about eighty per cent of our population is engaged in agriculture, if we want to increase the income of the vast masses of the people, that is the only way to do it.

And, therefore, Sir, this also becomes a vital target in our national planning.

The growth in industrial production that has been suggested in my Resolution is of the order of ten per cent per annum. Again this is not a very high target, which may be difficult to achieve. We had been able to achieve, during the years 1958 to 1965, an increase in industrial production at the rate of ten per cent compound per year. But since 1965 we have been falling behind and we will have to go into the reasons why there has been a serious shortfall.

Our Five-year Plans have been laying down eight to ten per cent increase in industrial production as the target. So, when I suggest that industrial production should increase at the rate of ten per cent I am not suggesting something which may be extremely difficult to achieve. If we are able to bring all this about, that is to say, if we are able to bring about an increase at the rate of say, five per cent in agriculture and ten per cent in industry, then, it should not be difficult to achieve an increase in the national income of the order of seven per cent per annum.

As I have submitted to the House earlier, it was possible for this country to achieve this increase in national income during the nine years out of 18 to 19 years of planning. If the required conditions are created in the country, it should be possible for us to achieve all those targets.

Finally, after having dealt with some of the suggestions that I have made in this Resolution, I would like to refer to the operative part.

In any country in the world where planned economies prevail, any person or any minister has to go away if there has been a failure on his part to achieve the target which has been entrusted to his care. In the Soviet Union where they have planned economy, if the Ministers are enable to fulfil the targets, they have to go away. But, in our country, what happens? Anybody who comes to occupy the ministerial responsibility go on merrily for a five-year term even if he is not able to achieve the targets that have been entrusted to his care. There is no accountability on his part for fulfilling the targets. How are you going to ensure the accountability of the ministers to fulfil the targets of the national planning? I am not after the blood of the Ministers in the present Government.

The Resolution relates even to ministries which might be formed in the country in future. Any Government, if it fails to fulfil the targets which affect the lives of millions as also the dignity and status of this country on the international map must not be allowed to continue. This is what happens in many countries of the world where they have got the planned economy and where it is being seriously implemented.

There is another aspect—constitutional aspect—also. To-day, our Government has gone before the Supreme Court to say that the Directive Principles of the Constitution are as good for them as the fundamental rights. In fact, they have suggested to the Supreme Court that the Directive Principles of the Constitution may override the fundamental rights. If that is so, then the Directive Principles dictate to us that these targets must be fulfilled. For the poor people of India, we have not been able to fulfil their basic needs. We have not even been able to achieve the rate of growth in national income of the order that had been stipulated.

I was suggesting that the Directive Principles dictate to us that food, shelter and jobs must be provided to the people; the Government must accept responsibility for the provision of these needs to the people. It is the primary responsibility of the Government to do that. If it fails then it fails in its primary obligation to the people.

Law and order situation might become extremely difficult to maintain if the conditions of the country are allowed to go on worsening because of the lack of fulfilment of the national targets.

With these words, I commend this Resolution to the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Resolution moved:

"This House resolves that a convention be established that the Government should resign if it fails to fulfil the following basic programme:—

- (i) growth in national income at 7 per cent per annum;
- (ii) growth in per capita income of those below poverty line at 7 per cent per annum;
- (iii) growth in agricultural production at 5 per cent per annum;
- (iv) growth in industrial production at 10 per cent per annum;
- (v) to contain price rise within a limit of 5 per cent per annum;
- (vi) to generate employment opportunities at least to take care of the addition to the labour force each year."

There are two amendments to the motion given notice of by Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya and Shri R. V. Bade. Are you moving?

SHRI R. V. BADE: I move:

"That in the resolution,—

for "agricultural production at 5 per cent"

substitute—

"agricultural production at 10 per cent." (1).

"That in the resolution,—

for "take care of the addition to the labour force each year."

substitute—

"reduce the annual percentage of unemployment by 20 per cent." (2).

श्री नवल किशोर शर्मा (दीसा) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं श्री श्याम बाबू के द्वारा प्रस्तावित इस प्रस्ताव के विरोध में खड़ा हुआ हूँ। वह प्रस्ताव जिस भाषा में श्रीर जिन भावनाओं तथा कार्यक्रमों को लेकर पेश किया गया है साधारण तथा किसी भी व्यक्ति को यह हिम्मत नहीं हो सकती कि वह इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करें क्योंकि इस प्रस्ताव के जरिये श्याम नन्दन बाबू ने देश की तरक्की के लिये कुछ उपयोगी मुझाव रखे हैं। उन्होंने अपने भाषण में यह बात भी कही है और उन हालात का दिग्दर्शन भी कराया है कि जिन हालात को दूर किये बिना देश की तरक्की और विकास नहीं हो सकता, जिन के बिना हमारे संविधान में निहित डाइरेक्टिव प्रिन्सिपल की पूर्ति करना सम्भव नहीं हो सकेगा।

इन सब बातों के बावजूद भी यह प्रस्ताव इतना सीधा-सादा नहीं है और शायद उन की मंशा भी हालांकि मैं उन की मंशा के बारे में सन्देह करूँ तो अच्छा नहीं होगा—लेकिन सन्देह करने पर मजबूर होना पड़ता है—शायद उनकी मंशा खाली देश की तरक्की करना नहीं है, उस के पीछे राजनीतिक भावनाएँ हैं और गालिबन ये राजनीतिक भावनाएँ ही हैं, जो आज विरोधी दलों में एक फ्रस्ट्रेशन, एक निराशा का वातावरण पैदा हो रहा है, यह उम का प्रतिबिम्ब मात्र है।

हमारे देश में हम ने प्रजातन्त्रीय पद्धति को, लोकतन्त्र को स्वीकार किया है और हम लोकतन्त्र की मूलभूत बात यह है कि सत्ता का जो श्रोत होता है, केन्द्र बिन्दू होता है—वह जनता होती है। जनता जिस विस्म के लोभों को चुन कर भेजती है, जिस पार्टी को शासन का भार सौंपती है उस पार्टी का दायित्व हो जाता है कि वह जनता की मांगों को, जनता

की दिक्कतों को, जनता की परेशानियों को, जनता और देश की तरक्की के बारे में सोचे, विचार करे और कार्यक्रम बनायें। जनतन्त्र में हर पांच साल बाद, हर तीन साल बाद, जैसी भी व्यवस्था हो, चुनाव आते हैं और वे चुनाव इस बात की कसौटी होते हैं कि जनता उस समय तक जिस पार्टी का शासन रहा है, उस पार्टी को पसन्द करती है या नहीं करती है। यदि जनता उस पार्टी को पसन्द करती है तो उसे चुन कर भेजती है, उस को पसन्द का भ्राम-भ्राधार यही होता है और यही होना चाहिये, भले ही आप उस के विरोध में कितनी दबीलें दें। जनता चुनाव के द्वारा उस पार्टी की राजनैतिक नीतियों में, आर्थिक कार्यक्रमों में, सामाजिक दृष्टिकोणों में अपना विश्वास प्रकट करती है और उस विश्वास को परिपुष्टि के तौर पर ही वह व्यक्तियों या दलों को चुन कर भेजती है।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा, समापति जी, इस प्रक्रिया के अन्तर्गत हमारे देश में पांच चुनाव हो चुके हैं और इन चुनावों के दौरान दुनिया के इस सब से बड़े प्रजातन्त्र ने जिस शान्ति के साथ, जिस संघम के साथ, जिस दिलचस्पी के साथ, भारी तादाद में अपने मत का उपयोग किया, वह उस को समझदारी और परिष्कृति का सुबूत है और दुनिया के सभी मुँकों को जो प्रजातन्त्र में विश्वास रखते हैं, जो प्रजातन्त्र में आस्था रखते हैं, यह कहने पर मजबूर कर दिया कि भारतवर्ष में जनतन्त्र को नींव बहुत गहरी है।

15.35 hrs.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

समापति जी, इस सब के बावजूद यह पस्ताव यहां पर पेश करना इस बात का खेतक है, इस बात का सुबूत है, जो हमारे मन में शक पैदा करता है कि उस जनतन्त्र से जो जनता का केन्द्रबिन्दु है, उस की शक्ति पर हमारा विश्वास नहीं है। यदि हमारी जनता की शक्ति पर, उस की योग्यता पर, उस की

समझदारी पर हमारा विश्वास हो तो इस तरह के प्रस्ताव लाने का कोई मन्तव्य नहीं है, कोई जरूरत नहीं है। इस में कोई दो राय नहीं है, इस में मतभेद की गुंजाइश भी नहीं है और गुंजाइश हो भी नहीं सकती—हमारे देश में, इतने बड़े देश में जो हालात हैं, उन में ज्यादा तेजी से बदलाव की जरूरत है, तरक्की की जरूरत है। इस बात से कोई भी इन्कार नहीं करेगा कि खेतीहर मजदूरों की हासत सुधरनी चाहिये, कोई इस बात से इन्कार नहीं करेगा कि इस देश में जो बेरोजगारी है—चाहे पड़े लिखों में हो या बगैर पड़े लिखों में हो, उस का समाधान होना चाहिये। कौन इन्कार करेगा कि गृह उद्योगों का विकास होना चाहिये, कौन इन्कार करेगा इस बात से कि देश के कृषि उत्पादन में 5 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि होनी चाहिये इन बातों से कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता और इस बात से भी इन्कार नहीं किया जा सकता कि देश का औद्योगीकरण तेजी से होना चाहिये। उस की रफ्तार जो काफी धीमी है वह बढ़ कर 10 प्रतिशत हो सकती है, इस से बढ़िया परिकल्पना नहीं हो सकती, हमारे देश के लिए इस में बढ़िया बात नहीं हो सकती, लेकिन इन बातों को कैसे किया जायगा, इस के बारे में विचार करें तो ज्यादा अच्छा है और इस पर विचार करने का अवसर आता है जब प्लानिंग कमीशन पर डिबेट होती है, प्लान पर चर्चा होती है। जिस समय हम प्लान पर विचार करते हैं, उस बक्त अगर हम यह विचार करें कि हमारे देश में हम जो आंकड़े रखना चाहते हैं तरक्की के, अगली पंच वर्षीय योजना में उस की गति में हमारे यहां औद्योगिक उत्पादन में 10 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि होनी चाहिये, प्रतिशत खेती का उत्पादन बढ़ना चाहिये, उस के लिये आवश्यक साधनों को संजोया जाना चाहिये, उस के लिये सारी पृष्ठभूमि तैयार की जानी चाहिये, उस के लिये आवश्यक धन का बटवारा किया जाना चाहिये, धन का इन्तजाम किया जाना चाहिये। उस चर्चा के दौरान अगर हम और श्याम बाबू इन सबालों को उठावें

[श्री नवल किशोर शर्मा]

तो निश्चित तौर पर मेरा विश्वास है कि शायद देश की लाभ हो सकता है। हम पंच वर्षीय योजना के लक्ष्यों पर इन बातों को रख सकते हैं और जोर दे सकते हैं अगर यह जरूरी समझा जाय कि इन का रखना जरूरी है तो मजबूर भी किया जा सकता है, फंसला भी किया जा सकता है : लेकिन इस संकल्प के जरिये तो केवल मात्र राजनीतिक तरीके से एक हथियार को हाथ में लेने की कोशिश की जा रही है, सरकार को हटाने की।

आप भी जानते हैं और हमारे देश के सभी लोग जानते हैं कि सारे प्रयत्नों के बावजूद भी जो राजनीतिक ढांचा इस देश में बना हुआ है, एक पार्टी की सरकार जो मेरी पार्टी है और जो किसी वक्त श्याम बाबू की पार्टी भी थी, उस पार्टी की सरकार के लिए यह भी नहीं कहा जा सकता कि देश के लिए उस ने कुछ नहीं किया बहुत कुछ किया है। उस की सबसे बड़ी देन या यह देन उस व्यक्ति की है जो देश में आजादी लाने के बाद देश का पहला प्रधान मंत्री बना, इस देश में प्रजातंत्र की नींव को गहरा बँठाना था। दुनिया के बहुत से देश जो भारत के साथ ही आजाद हुए थे, उन का प्रजातंत्र लड़खड़ा गया, लेकिन भारतवर्ष में आज भी सारी दिक्कतों और परेशानियों के बावजूद बाहरी और अन्दरूनी हमलों के बावजूद, प्रजातंत्र अडिग खड़ा है, मजबूती के साथ खड़ा है। इस देश में आजादी के 25 सालों में विकास के रास्ते पर बहुत कुछ किया गया है और आज भी यह देश उम रास्ते पर चल रहा है। यह ठीक है कि प्रजातंत्र में विकास की रफ्तार थोड़ी तेज नहीं होती धीमी होती है। इसी लिए कई दफा लोग कहते हैं कि चीन ने बहुत तरक्की की है। हमारे साथ ही वह मुल्क आजाद हुआ था, उस में बहुत रिवॉल्यूशन आ गया, लेकिन हम बहुत पीछे रह गए, इस लिए इस व्यवस्था को बदल दो। लेकिन हम ने उस हवा का भी मुकाबला किया, भले

ही हमारी गति धीमी रही, लेकिन देश में न टूटने की शक्ति पैदा हुई, खड़े रहने की शक्ति पैदा हुई है। हमारे विरोधी मिल, हमारे साथी श्यामनन्दन जी जैसे समझदार बुजुर्ग सिर्फ इसलिए कि सरकार को अप्रसन्न नहीं कर पाये, विरोध में गए, चीगुटा बनाया, अब 6 गुटा या 8 गुटा बनालें-लेकिन सरकार अडिग रही और सरकार उनके हाथ में नहीं आ सकी इसीलिए अब उन्होंने यह तरीका अख्तियार किया है कि इस तरह से नहीं तो उल्टे रास्ते से ही इसको किया जाये। अभी आप यह कह रहे थे कि मिनिस्ट्रों पर मैं कोई आक्षेप नहीं लगा रहा हूँ यह तो हमेशा के लिए है पर बहुत सी दफा आदमी अपनी नाक इसलिए काट लेता है कि दूसरों का अपशुन हो जाये। वही स्थिति इस प्रस्ताव के जरिए से भी मालूम होती है। आपकी विश्वास नहीं हो रहा है जल्दन्त में आपकी आस्था नहीं रही है इसीलिए आप यह कह रहे हैं। वास्तव में यह बात आपके चुनाव घोषणापत्र के जरिये से होनी चाहिए। श्यामनन्दन जी को चाहिए कि चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में यह कार्यक्रम रखें और यह कहें कि अगर हम इन कार्यक्रमों की पूर्ति एक, दो या तीन साल में नहीं करेंगे तो हम इस्तीफा देकर सरकार से हट जायेंगे तब में समझता हूँ वे एक स्वच्छ परम्परा कायम करेंगे। लेकिन एक प्रस्ताव के जरिए से आने वाली किसी भी सरकार को बाध्य करना कि आप इस्तीफा दे दीजिएगा अगर आप इन लक्ष्यों की पूर्ति नहीं करते हैं, यह उचित नहीं है। फिर यह संकल्प भी कैसा है कि भले ही लड़ाई हो जाये, मुल्क में युद्ध का खतरा हो जाये, कोई महामारी फैल जाये-ऐसा कोई भी एमर्जेंशन इस प्रस्ताव में नहीं है। सरकार को यह लक्ष्य तब पूरे ही करने होंगे। एक अजीब हालत है और मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस प्रकार का अव्यवहारिक प्रस्ताव श्री श्यामनन्दन जीसा विद्वान आदमी कैसे पेश कर सकता है? उनकी आस्था जनतन्त्र में रही है। इसलिए मैं उनसे दरखास्त करूँगा कि

मेहरबानी करके गम्भीरता से इस पर विचार करें क्या यह प्रस्ताव हमारे देश की परम्पराओं के अनुरूप है? क्या यह प्रस्ताव हमारे देश जिसकी गहरी आस्था प्रजातन्त्र में है उसके अनुरूप है? या यह प्रस्ताव प्रजातन्त्र का मखौल है, उस भारतीय जनता का मखौल है जिसने इस देश में अपनी गहरी आस्था प्रजातन्त्र में प्रकट की है? इन शर्तों के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was listening very attentively to the speech of Mr. Sharma. The ruling party finds politics in everything that is done and in every move that is made. When the no-confidence motion was brought, it was supposed to be politically motivated. When the people were not getting food and are asking for it, it is supposed to be politically motivated. When the people are groaning under the miseries which are being faced by the common people, and under the mounting burdens of living when they ask for food and also demonstrate and call for a bandh or a hartal, it is all politically motivated.

The point is this. My friends opposite should be aware that there is such a great hiatus, not only a hiatus between their programmes and performances, but they have no other answers on merits when a resolution like this or proposals like this are brought forward.

I wish Shri Shyamnandan Mishra had asked for a Constitution (Amendment) Bill instead of resolution asking for the setting up of a convention, because, this Government has no faith in conventions. They can twist the convention to suit their own party purpose and not for national interests. We know how the convention relating to the institution of Governors has been abused for the purpose of meeting the political ends of the ruling party.

Therefore, I have no faith in conventions in so far as their observance by the ruling party is concerned.

The point I should like to emphasise on this resolution is not only the performance of the party after forming this Government. There is also another point. One very important aspect in our national and political life is that there are promises which are made by the party for the purpose of coming into power, but they fail miserably to keep up those promises. This Government has come into power. We are reminded *ad nauseam* of the supposed massive mandate on a single slogan of *garibi hatao*. I should like to know from the hon. Member or from the Ministers of the Ruling Party: In what single respect has garibi been removed from the country, in the price of food, employment opportunities, cloth, education, industry... (Interruptions)? In what single respect aspect of national life has garibi been removed?

What is to be done by the people. Five years afterwards we will have to face them and, therefore, it does not matter if in the mean time we do not carry out our promises. If people continue to suffer, it does not matter; nor does it matter if we mislead the common and simple rural people of this country who have not got much education and exploit their naivete and come back to power. We do not have to bother what promises we have made before the election; we can go on merrily for five years and start making fresh promises after 4½ years just before the next elections. This is what they seem to think.

The hon. Prime Minister yesterday could not answer the point about U.P. Her only answer to the question posed by Mr. Samar Guha with regard to the spurt in the supply of commodities to U.P. was that Mr. Guha seemed to have been himself soaked in kerosene. Because there was no answer on merits, she chose

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

to make an answer like this. The spurt in the activity of the ruling party just before the election takes place, is a sickening part of the democratic process in this country. Now we find this spurt in the activity. Fertilisers was rushed to U.P., cement was rushed to U.P. as if there is no other State where construction activities are going on. No. But they must now choose U.P. for this purpose. I do not want that any part of this country of ours should suffer either for lack of fertilisers or cement or kerosene.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to make one observation. My difficulty is about time. The time fixed is two hours for this. The Members should be brief.

DR. KAILAS (Bombay South): The time should be extended by two hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As it is, this would go upto five. We can extend it by 30 or 40 minutes. There is a Half an Hour discussion at 5.30..... (Interruptions). There is the demand from both sides that the time should be extended. I want to know what the Government has to say to this request.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : सभापति जी, मेरी बात भी सुन लीजियेगा। अगर पहले फैसला दे दीजियेगा तो सब गड़बड़ हो जायेगा।

जो अगले प्रस्ताव है उसको भी पेश करने की अनुमति आप दे दीजियेगा।

सभापति महोदय : हमारी दिक्कत यह है कि रूल्स के मुताबिक जब तक यह प्रस्ताव चलता रहेगा हम उसको मूव करने की इजाजत नहीं दे सकते।

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : ऐसा आपने पहले किया है।

सभापति महोदय : नहीं, ऐसा नहीं हुआ है।

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : नहीं, आप देखिए कि आपने पहले इजाजत दी है।

सभापति महोदय : नहीं नहीं। इसका हम पांच बजे तक एक्सटेंड कर सकते हैं और इनमें हम आपकी मदद चाहते हैं। आपके 12 आदमी हैं जिसमें एक आदमी बोल चुका है। कांग्रेस साइड के 14 हैं। और 7 आदमी अपोजीशन के बोलने वाले हैं। इंग्लिश समय अगर 5, 7 मिनट भी कम के दिया जाय लॉग को तो जा कर के दूसरे का मूव करने का मौका मिल सकता है। क्योंकि प्रभो श्याम बाबू को जवाब देना पड़ेगा, मंत्री को भी बोलना पड़ेगा, उसमें एक संशोधन है उसको मूव करना पड़ेगा। ठा सारी चीजों में समय लगेगा। अब बोलने वाले कुछ अपना हक छोड़ दें दोनों तरफ के तो यह काम सा पांच बजे तक हो सकता है। एक मिनट का टाइम रहेगा उसमें वह मूव कर देंगे। इसमें आप की मदद चाहिए।

कल अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर बहस हो चुकी है और बहुत सी बातें जो आज कही जा रही हैं, वह कल कही जा चुकी हैं। कोई नई बात नहीं है। इसलिए 5, 7 मिनट के लिए आप राजी हो जायें और घंटी देने के बाद बैठ जायें तो यह काम हो सकता है।

माननीय चटर्जी, आप बोलिए।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE:

I was saying, this spurt in the activity in areas where elections are due to be held is a misuse of the democratic process. What Mishraji has said in his resolution is not something beyond the possibility of reach of any Government, because this Government has in its several plans since independence set down larger targets. But the question is, targets are being set but they are not being reached. What is the explanation? What is the right of the people in regard to the failure of the Government in achieving its targets? The Chief Minister of West Bengal, who is now claiming to be one of the stalwarts of the ruling party, propounded a wonderful theory. He said, if food prices have risen, if people are not getting enough to eat, "You have to wait for five years. If you do not like us, change us. Why should you in the meantime agitate?" This is his wonderful logic! Therefore, what is the good of saying to the people, here is the Constitution under which you have to wait for five years. In the meantime, even if you perish, you should not raise your voice. So, it is not merely a question of the people's right that the Government should go. It is a question of the obligation of this Government which is unable to fulfil its minimum duty to feed the people. What should be done in such cases? There is nothing in the Resolution which is ridiculing the Government, saying something which the Government cannot achieve. So, the opposition to the Resolution itself shows the utter bankruptcy of the ruling party, both in formulation and implementation of policies.

16 hrs.

What does this Resolution seek to do? For instance, it talks of a minimum rate of growth of seven per cent. The plans have provided for a larger growth. Why do you not achieve it? Why do you always give the same stereotyped reply that

you have got a massive majority and so whatever promises you have made you need not fulfil because the people are supposed to have faith in you? Another argument is that since the opposition parties cannot provide an alternative Government, therefore, this question need not be gone into. The Government can be let loose on the people in the sense they can do whatever they like and the people have no remedy irrespective of what they feel.

I should have thought that the Government would welcome the spirit behind this Resolution and offer themselves to go out of office, if they cannot carry out the minimum requirements for the survival of the people, as provided in this Resolution. But they have not done it.

To give another instance, take the question of employment. During the election campaign for the 1972 elections the Chief Minister of my State promised the people that his Government will provide one lakh jobs. But though the elections are over, not even one job has been provided by the Government. Much is made about the much-advertised jobs in the Electricity Department. Even though 40,000 posts have been created not one person has been given a job. Applications were invited for 17,000 jobs and 15 lakhs young people sent their applications; you collected from each of them Rs. 1.50. That is to say, you collected in all Rs. 22½ lakhs as application fees and yet not even one application has been opened yet. Can you not say that this is a Government which is not fit to remain in office, because it has given a particular promise and has not carried it out?

There is no provision in our Constitution for either recall or referendum. If the people have the power of recall, they can recall their representatives when they are not satisfied

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

with their performance. In the absence of that power with the people, if you do not try to reach the targets which you yourself have fixed, it would be playing a hoax on the people because you do not care or bother to carry out your own promises.

Therefore, I support the spirit of this Resolution and I hope the party on the other side would have the grace to accept this position.

श्री चन्द्रलाल चन्द्राकर (दुर्ग) : सभापति जी, अभी इस प्रस्ताव पर श्याम बाबू के विचार सुने, और सुने के पश्चात् ऐसा लगा कि अभी जो कल, परसों विचार विनिमय हुआ अविश्राम प्रस्ताव पर, तथा और भी जो पिछले एक योजना मंत्रालय पर विचार विनिमय हुआ था उस का शायद वह भूल गये हैं।

पहली बात तो यह है कि जो इस्तीफा देने की बात है उस पर कल ही विचार विनिमय हुआ और मैं समझता था कि इस प्रस्ताव को वह स्वयं वापस ले लेंगे, कल के बाद। आप ने उत्पादन के जिस तरह से आंकड़े रखे हैं 5, 7, 10 परसेंट के, इस में कोई शक नहीं है कि आप पहले योजना मंत्री रह चुके हैं, लेकिन उपयुक्त समय पर उपयुक्त स्थान पर नहीं रखे।

मेरा कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि इस तरह की चीजों को आपको चाहिये था कि आप योजना में जुड़वाने का प्रयत्न करते। हर साल योजना का इवैल्युएशन प्रस्तुत किया जाता है और जब उस पर बहस होती

है तो आप कहते हैं कि पांच प्रतिशत या तीन प्रतिशत की वृद्धि जो प्रस्तावित की गई थी या सात प्रतिशत की की गई थी वह पूरी नहीं हुई है आप हटिये। इस तरह का प्रस्ताव लाने की आप को आवश्यकता नहीं थी। जैसा अभी शर्मा जी ने कहा चाहे लड़ाई हो, चाहे अकाल पड़े, वर्षा महो उसका इस में कोई ध्यान नहीं रखा गया है केवल यह रख दिया गया है कि ये ये चीजें नहीं होती हैं तो त्याग पत्र दे देना चाहिये। आपको हमारे देश के ग्रामीणों की अधिक जानकारी होगी और है मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ। अच्छा होता कि जब योजना पर बहस का समय आता तो आप कहते कि हमारे देश में पांच लाख 67 हजार जंग गांव हैं इन में से इतने गांवों में पांच साल के अन्दर सिंचाई की व्यवस्था हो जानी चाहिये इतनों में बिजली की व्यवस्था हो जानी चाहिये, इतनों में पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था हो जानी चाहिये, इतनों में मड़कों की व्यवस्था हो जानी चाहिये। लेकिन आप तो पांच प्रतिशत और तीन प्रतिशत आदि की बात कह रहे हैं। अगर आप ने ऐसा किया होता तो गांव वालों को कुछ मालूम होता कि उनके लिए कुछ किया जाने वाला है। आप तो योजना मंत्रालय में रह चुके हैं। आपको तो मालूम ही है कि प्रोडक्शन किस तरह से होता है, किस इलाके के कितने ग्रामों को उससे लाभ पहुंचता है, आप तो जानते ही हैं कि किसी में उत्पादन ज्यादा होता है और किसी क्षेत्र में उत्पादन कम होता है और आप यह भी जानते हैं कि बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश, मध्य प्रदेश आदि विकास न होने के कारण अधिकांश गरीब हैं। योजना पर बहस के समय आप

कहते हैं कि उन की तरफ विशेष ध्यान दिया जाए और उन को आगे लाने का प्रयत्न किया जाये। प्रान्त के आधार पर आप गांवों को लेते और कहते कि इन्हीं गांवों में सिबाई की व्यवस्था हो जानी चाहिए और इन्हीं गांवों में ये ये चीजें हो जानी चाहियें और योजना पर बहस के समय आप इस चीज को उस में जुड़ाने की कोशिश करते तो अधिक अच्छा होगा।

एक घोषणा पत्र की तरह से आप ने इस प्रस्ताव को यहाँ रख दिया है। आपने कह दिया है कि इन्हीं प्रनिश्चित विकास इस क्षेत्र में हो जाना चाहिये और इन्हीं प्रनिश्चित इस में। साथ ही साथ आपने कह दिया है कि ये जो लक्ष्य आप ने बताया है अगर ये पूरे नहीं होते हैं तो सरकार इस्तीफा दे दे। मुझे कहना तो अच्छा तो नहीं लगता है लेकिन मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि किसी न किसी तरह आप का मंशा यही है कि सरकार इस्तीफा दे दे। इस तरह के प्रस्ताव लाने का अगर देश में अच्छा नहीं पड़ सकता है। आप तो सोचते हैं कि अच्छा पड़ेगा लेकिन नहीं पड़ेगा। पांच प्रनिश्चित उत्पादन में वृद्धि नहीं हुई तो सरकार इस्तीफा दे दें, तीन प्रनिश्चित नहीं हुई तो इस्तीफा दे दिया यह जो आप कह रहे हैं इसको लेकर आगे चलकर जनता यह भी कह सकती है कि फलों फलों संसद सदस्य ने फलों फलों विधायक ने इतने कुछ हमारे क्षेत्र में नहीं खुदवाये इस वास्ते वह इस्तीफा दे दें। अब इस तरह की चीज को कैसे व्यावहारिक समझा जा सकता है। 522 के करोड़ लाभ सभा के सदस्य हैं।

चाहें कोई राज्य सरकार का विषय हो या केन्द्र का विषय हो जनता की विधायकों से यही आशा होती है कि वे उसके लिए कुछ करें, गांवों में सिबाई की व्यवस्था करें, गांवों में बिजली पहुंचाना चाहिए राज्य सरकार का विषय है लेकिन फिर भी वे आशा करेंगे कि एम पी उनके गांवों में बिजली नहीं पहुंची, इस वास्ते दोषी हैं, इन्हीं कुछ उनके क्षेत्र में पांच साल के अन्दर नहीं खुद सके इसलिए वे दोषी हैं और इस प्रस्ताव का दूरगामी परिणाम यही होगा कि वह मांग करेगा कि ये लोग इस्तीफा दे दें। इन्हीं लोगों को ये नोकरी नहीं दिला सके हैं, इस वास्ते इस्तीफा दे दें। इस तरह की जो व्यवस्था है यह व्यावहारिक नहीं है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि इस प्रस्ताव को बनाने समय और इसको यहां पेश करते समय उन्होंने व्यावहारिक दृष्टिकोण अपने सामने नहीं रखा है।

उनको चाहिये था कि जब पंचवर्षीय योजना पर विचार हो तब कहे कि विकास दर इस इस क्षेत्र में यह होनी चाहिये और पांचवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना पर पांच रोज, छः रोज का आठ रोज का समय मिलना चाहिये। यह अधिक व्यावहारिक प्रतीत होता है। मैं चाहता हूं कि वह इस पर विचार करें और योजना में इन चीजों को जोड़ें और तब इस चीज को यहां लायें।

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : यह सर्व विदित है कि पिछले पच्चीस साल में हमारे देश की समस्याएं मुनजाने के बजाय दिन प्रति दिन उभरती जा रही हैं। बेकारी बढ़ रही है, महंगाई आसमान को छू रहा है

[श्री रामा शास्त्री]

और दूसरी तरह तरह की बुराइयां हमारे समाज में हैं। इसका मुख्य कारण यह है कि हमारे देश में आज भी पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था काम कर रही है। जब तक पूँजीवादी घरींदे से हम देश को निकाल करके सही मानों में समाजवादी रास्ते पर ले जाने की कोशिश नहीं करेंगे तब तक इस प्रस्ताव में जिन बातों का जिक्र किया गया है वे पूरी नहीं हो सकेंगी। तब तक हमारा देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकेगा आत्मनिर्भर नहीं हो सकेगा, लोगों को काम नहीं मिल सकेगा, और देश के अन्दर गरीबी भी बढ़ती जायेगी और दूसरी तरफ़ अमीरी भी बढ़ती जायेगी और हिन्दुस्तान में इजारेदारी की व्यवस्था और भी ज्यादा मजबूत होती जाएगी। इस नुक़्ते से मैं इस बात की आशा कर रहा था कि जो वक्ता हम से पहले बोल चुके हैं वे बतायेंगे कि राष्ट्रीय आय बढ़ कैसे सकती है, बेकारी को हम कैसे दूर कर सकते हैं जो महंगाई है इसे कैसे मिटाया जा सकता है और मैं इस आशा में जरूर था कि कहाँ जाएगा कि इन सब कामों को करने के लिये यह जरूरी है कि इजारेदारों पर चोट की जाये। इसके विपरीत मैं देख रहा हूँ कि सरकार रुक रुक कर, हाल्टिंग वे में कदम बढ़ाने की कोशिश कर रही है। सरकार जब कारखानों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात कहती है या अन्न के व्यापार के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात कहती है तो उसका श्याम बाबू और उनके सहयोगी विरोध करते हैं, उसका भी समर्थन करने को वे तैयार नहीं हैं।

आप किसानों की समस्या को देखें। आज देश में 31 से 41 प्रतिशत खेत मजदूर हैं

जिन के पास या तो बिल्कुल जमीन नहीं है या बहुत नाम मात्र की जमीन है। हम देश में गल्ले की पैदावार बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, हरित क्रांति की बात करते हैं, आत्मनिर्भरता की बात कर रहे हैं : यह सब तभी सम्भव है जब हम जोतने वाले को जमीन दें। जब इस तरह की बात होती है तो हमारे श्याम बाबू के दल के लोग तथा उनके दूसरे सहयोगी भूमिसुधारों के सवाल, जो आज बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है, का विरोध करते हैं। मैं चाहता था कि वह कहते कि भूमि का वितरण करो, भूमि सुधारों को जो कागज़ पर हैं उन्हें क्रियान्वित करो। लेकिन उल्टे मैं देख रहा हूँ कि बिहार में गरीब किसान, जमीन जोतने वाले किसान आज जब जमीन की लड़ाई लड़ रहे हैं तथा मधुबनी में, दरभंगा में, पूर्निया में, चम्पारन में, मंगेर में, पटना में, तमाम जिलों में तोड़ हो रहा है तब कृषक संघ बन रहे हैं जिस में कांग्रेस और के लोग भी हैं, कांग्रेस (ओ) के लोग भी हैं, जन संघ के लोग भी हैं, स्वतंत्र पार्टी के भी हैं, संबोपा के भी हैं और सोपा के भी हैं। इस तरह से एक प्रकार का ग्रांड एलायंस वहाँ खड़ा हो गया है। कांग्रेस वाले कहते हैं कि हम जन संघ और उन लोगों के साथ नहीं जाते हैं। लेकिन यह क्या हो रहा है कृषक संघ के नाम पर हरे झंडे के नाम पर? इसी तरह से संबोपा और सोपा के भाई कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस (आर) से हमारा कोई ताल्लुक नहीं होगा। लेकिन वहाँ क्या हो रहा है? तमाम जो जमीन के बटवारे का विरोध करना चाहते हैं एक मंच पर इकट्ठे हो रहे हैं, पार्टियों की सीमायें टूट रही हैं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी क्या कहती है?

अगर आप चाहते हैं कि गरीबी मिटे, महंगा घटे, देश की आमदनी बढ़े, बेकारी की समस्या का समाधान हो तो आप तमाम उन लोगों को इकट्ठा करिये जो प्रगतिशीलता की तरफ जाना चाहते हैं, सही मानों में समाजवाद की तरफ जाना चाहते हैं, वे चाहे कांग्रेस पार्टी में हो या उससे बाहर हों तमाम एक हों करके इजारेदारी पर, जमींदारी पर चोट करें जो यथास्थिति का समाज बनाए रखना चाहते हैं श्याम बाबू और इनके सहयोगी, इस यथास्थिति वाली बात से काम नहीं चलेगा, इसको तोड़ने की आवश्यकता है।

कई हमारे साथी बोले हैं। लेकिन इस और किसी ने ध्यान नहीं दिया है। जब तक इन मूल समस्याओं की तरफ आप ध्यान नहीं देते हैं, इस पर चोट नहीं करते हैं, तब तक न बेकारी मिटेगी न आमदनी बढ़ेगी, न महंगाई मिटेगी और न देश सचमुच में समाजवाद की तरफ आगे जाएगा। इसलिए जरूरी है कि देश को पूंजीवादी समाज के घेरे से हम निकालें। सरकार भी आज क्या करती है? कुछ प्रगतिशील नारे लगा देती है और भीतर घात करती है, जैसा कि गेहूं के राजकीय व्यापार के सम्बन्ध में किया गया है। इसी तरह उत्तरे चावल को राजकीय व्यापार के अन्तर्गत लेने से इन्कार कर दिया है और इस प्रकार प्रगतिगामी शक्तियों, पूंजी-पतियों, मुनाफाखोरों और गल्लाचोरों के सामने घुटने टेक दिये हैं।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्री मिश्र इन बातों पर भी कुछ रोशनी डालें। ये कदम उठाने से ही

समाज आगे बढ़ेगा और देश का फायदा होगा।

SHRI D. K. PANDA (Bhanjanagar): Sir, the next resolution stands in my name. Just a small request that the time may be so regulated that by 5 p.m. the Minister may reply and still I may find time to move my resolution; otherwise, I may lose the priority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not only for me to regulate the time. You may make that request to your friends.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): May I submit, Sir, that alternatively the time may be extended in such a way that he may not lose the priority?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not in favour that daily we should sit late without any information to the persons who are working from morning till evening. I am not in favour of extending the time, not to-day.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: You may extend the time in such a way that he does not lose the priority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us see at the end.

श्री शिवनाथ सिंह (मुंशुन) : सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य; श्री मिश्र, ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, ऊपर से देखने में तो वह काफी सुन्दर लगता है, लेकिन इसकी काम्प्लीकेशन श्री मिश्र ने नहीं देखी है। उन्होंने पांच छः ऐसी कन्डीशन लगा दी हैं कि अगर सरकार उन में से किसी में भी फ़ेल हो जाये, तो वह अपने आप त्याग पत्र दे दे। मेरे ब्याल से दुनिया के किसी भी देश में ऐसी सरकार नहीं हो सकती है, जो इन कन्डीशन के रहते हुए बारह महीने से अधिक टिक जाये।

[श्री शिवनाथ सिंह]

मुझे आश्चर्य है कि माननीय सदस्य ने जे. कास्टेरिया किस आधार पर रखे हैं। आखिरी कास्टेरिया में कहा गया है कि एक साल में लेबर फ़ोर्स में जितनी वृद्धि हो, सरकार उसको एम्प्लायमेंट दे। हमारी सरकार का लक्ष्य यह नहीं है। उस का लक्ष्य तो यह है कि देश में जितने भी अनएम्प्लायड हैं, उन को काम दिया जाये। लेकिन माननीय सदस्य यह चाहते हैं कि एक साल में लेबर फ़ोर्स में जो वृद्धि हो, उसी को एम्प्लायमेंट दी जाये। अगर कभी माननीय सदस्य के हाथ में शासन की बागडोर आ जाये, तो क्या वह इसी तरह इनकार करेंगे ?

माननीय सदस्य ने एक कन्डीशन यह लगाई है कि एग्रोकल्चरल प्राइक्शन में 5 परसेंट प्रति-वर्ष की वृद्धि होनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्हें एग्रोकल्चरल सेक्टर के बारे में जानकारी नहीं है। हमें यह देखना है कि हमारी पापुलेशन किप रेट से बढ़ रही है और हमारी एग्रोकल्चरल प्राइक्शन उसी के अनुसार बढ़ना चाहिए, ताकि वह हमारी आवश्यकताओं को पूरा कर सके। इन प्रकार के संकीर्ण मापदंड निर्धारित कर के क्या माननीय सदस्य चाहते हैं कि देश में सरकारें बदनती रहें ? मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्रस्ताव को कार्यन्वित करने से कोई रिजल्ट नहीं निकल सकता है।

माननीय सदस्य ने एंड रेंडम टारगेट्स फिक्स्ड कर दिये हैं, कहीं 5 परसेंट, कहीं 7 परसेंट और कहीं 10 परसेंट। मैं समझता हूँ कि देश का एग्रोकल्चरल और इंडस्ट्रियल प्राइक्शन बढ़ना चाहिए, लेकिन उस के लिए अलग अलग कार्यक्रम हैं। आज जो हमारे पास सोमित साधन हैं, हम उन को प्राइक्शन बढ़ाने के लिए लगा रहे हैं। माननीय सदस्य इस बात को नज़र-अंदाज़ कर रहे हैं कि एग्रोकल्चरल प्राइक्शन को बढ़ाने के लिए

सिचाई के साधनों और बिजली का विस्तार हो रहा।

हम भी चाहते हैं कि देश का एग्रोकल्चरल और इंडस्ट्रियल प्राइक्शन बढ़े लेकिन इस तरह के कास्टेरिया निश्चित करने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है कि अगर अमुक अमुक लक्ष्यों को न पूरा किया गया, तो सरकार को त्याग-द्व देना पड़ेगा। क्या माननीय सदस्य दुनिया के किसी भी देश की सरकार का उदाहरण दे सकते हैं, जो इस तरह के टाइम-बाउंड प्रोग्राम में बंध कर काम करसके, या जिस ने ऐसा किया हो ?

जैसा कि अभी सी० पी० आई० के माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है, श्री मिश्र ने प्राइक्शन को बढ़ाने के लिये कोई डॉन मुझाव नहीं दिये हैं। उन्होंने यह नहीं बताया है कि एग्रोकल्चरल प्राइक्शन को बढ़ाने के लिये क्या सुधार करने चाहिये और क्या कदम उठाने चाहिये। वह लैंड सीलिंग, भूमि-सुधारों और फूडप्रेन टेक-ओवर का विरोध करते हैं। किसान के लिये फूडप्रेन के टेक-ओवर का सिद्धान्त बड़ा महत्त्वपूर्ण है। किसान चाहता है कि उस को प्रोड्यूस के लिये तब शरा माबिट मिल जाये और उन को वाजिब प्राइम मिले। लेकिन माननीय सनपटेक ओवर का विरोध करते हैं। फिर भी वह कहते हैं कि एग्रोकल्चरल प्राइक्शन बढ़ाना चाहिये। ऐसा नहीं होने वाला है।

इस प्रकार के प्रस्ताव से कुछ नहीं होने वाला है। हमारी सरकार और हमारी पार्टी ए० प्रोग्राम को लेकर चल रही है। माननीय सदस्य उस को सहयोग दें। तभी हमारी प्राइक्शन बढ़ सकती है।

श्री आर० बी० बड़े (बख्शी) :
सभापति महोदय, श्री मिश्र ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, मैं उस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

अभी एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि देश के पांच लाख गांवों में सड़कें नहीं हैं, वहां सड़कें बनानी चाहिये और गांवों का विकास होना चाहिये। पंच-वर्षीय योजनाओं में ये सब बातें सम्मिलित हैं। वास्तव में इस प्रस्ताव में जो टारगेट निश्चित किये गये हैं पंच-वर्षीय योजनाओं में उन में ऊंचे टारगेट रखे गये हैं। लेकिन क्या उन में से कोई टारगेट प्राप्त किया गया है? प्रश्न यह है कि अगर उन टारगेट्स को पूरा नहीं किया गया है, तो सरकार को क्या सजा मिलनी चाहिये। इस प्रस्ताव में यही कहा गया है कि अगर कोई सरकार अपने द्वारा निर्धारित टारगेट्स को पूरा नहीं कर सकती है, तो उस को त्यागपत्र दे देना चाहिये।

देश में छिछरे पच्चीस साल से कांग्रेस का शासन चल रहा है। उस में जो भ्रष्टाचार और इनएफिमेंसी व्याप्त है, उस के कारण कोई भी विकास का कार्यक्रम पूरा नहीं हो पाया है। उस का जो विकास विभाग है, उस का विनाश विभाग कहना चाहिये। मध्य प्रदेश में 65 लाख आदिवासियों की जो स्थिति है, उस का देखकर ऐसा मालूम होता है कि वहां कोई शासन है ही नहीं। वस्त्र में आदि-वासियों स्त्री और पुरुष नंगे रहते हैं और धन नहीं पहनते हैं। उन का कोई विकास नहीं हुआ है। इस प्रस्ताव में यही कहा गया है कि अगर शासन अपने कार्यक्रमों का पूरा नहीं करता है, तो उस को त्यागपत्र दे देना चाहिये।

माननीय सदस्य ने अपने प्रस्ताव में एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइव्क्शन को 5 परसेंट बढ़ाने की बात कही है। चूंकि पंच-वर्षीय योजना में कहा गया है और कांग्रेस का भी कहना है कि उस में 10 परसेंट वृद्धि होनी चाहिये, इस लिये मैं ने इस में यह संशोधन दिया है कि एग्रीकल्चरल प्राइव्क्शन में 10 परसेंट वृद्धि होनी चाहिये।

इस प्रस्ताव में कहा गया है कि हर वर्ष देश को लेबर फॉर्स में जो वृद्धि होती है, उस के लिये एम्प्लायमेंट के अवसर उपलब्ध किये जाने चाहिये। इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि देश में काश्तकारों और एजुकेटेड लोगों आदि विभिन्न श्रेणियों में जो अनएम्प्लायमेंट है, उस को कम किया जाये। माननीय सदस्य ने अपने प्रस्ताव में यह नहीं कहा है कि अनएम्प्लायमेंट कितने परसेंट कम करनी चाहिये। इस लिये मैं ने यह संशोधन दिया है कि सरकार को एम्प्लायमेंट के इन्ने अवसर पैदा करने चाहिये, जिससे अनएम्प्लायमेंट 20 परसेंट कम हो सके।

इस प्रस्ताव का अभिप्राय सरकार के प्रति अविश्वास प्रकट करना नहीं है, जैसा कि सदन में कहा गया है। श्री मिश्र ने इस प्रस्ताव के द्वारा यह कहा है कि अगर सरकार काम करने में समर्थ नहीं है, तो वह किचट करे। इसलिये मैं इस का समर्थन करता हूँ।

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Ernakulam):
M, Chairman, Sir, I have tried to listen carefully to the speech made by the hon. Mover of this Resolution.

[Dr. Henry Austin]

Of course, I have never suspected his motive in bringing forward this Resolution. However, I think he has taken a simplistic view of a very serious political proposition. And throughout his speech he was trying to emphasise the developmental problems of our economy ignoring, perhaps, the political overtones of the Resolution which he has brought forward. In yesterday's censure debate, he tried to indict the Government by more or less same argument. But, our Defence Minister, Shri Jagjiwan Ram and Shri Chavan, our Finance Minister had already replied to all the points that he had raised. I was wondering what the *locus standi* of the hon. Member in bringing this Resolution emphasising allegations of economic failures of Government after his speech yesterday.

Coming to the substantive aspects of the problem, I wonder whether a leader of Shri Mishra's stature has thought about the political implications of it. Has he thought seriously, how with such legislative and constitutional rigidities and limitations of this type he suggests in his resolution, we shall be able to fulfil the programmes laid down by Government and Parliament. Shri Mishra himself was once connected with the Planning Commission. Planning, as he must have realised then, is not that simple as he seems now to imagine. Plans are drawn out after taking into account all aspects of problems for a certain period, say in our case, five years. It is the integrated view that is taken into account. There that in a particular year such and such a target may not have been fulfilled. It may not always be possible from a pragmatic point, to achieve whatever has been laid down as targets.

Take for example petrol crisis that has come up now. It is not right to say that this has come about due

to the failure of present political leadership. I do not know what will be the consequence that would flow if the whole cabinet resigns due to an unforeseen situation like this, or if our own country's oil potential is exhausted over a period of time, does the hon. Member suggest that the person in charge of petroleum ministry should resign? In our country if this sort of situation arises, then there will be complete political bankruptcy in that experienced leaders and administrators will themselves disqualify to become Ministers.

The hon. Member himself knows that within our party there was a split on the issue of more ridiculous and for accelerated pace of development of our country. We wanted a social revolution; we wanted economic radicalism. But then Shyam Babu preferred to join the forces of *status quo*, who wanted to retard the progress of the country—it is not we who have retarded the progress. We have created the necessary ethos in our ruling party; we are also creating the necessary elan. We are saying that in such and such a period we shall achieve such and such things provided other things being equal. We should be pragmatic in our approach. But, this Resolution does not reflect a pragmatic approach taking into account their difficult situation that we are facing in this country. We will be living in a fool's paradise if we merely think of accelerated pace of development without offering constructive suggestions. In yesterday's debate not a single constructive suggestion had been offered to meet the present economic situation. This resolution wants that conventions should be established by which, if the Government fails to fulfil certain stipulated targets that conventions should be established it should resign.

Sir, conventions are not created by Resolutions but conventions are

developed. For that we should wait for the evolution rather than imposing by resolutions this kind of conventions. Sir, I oppose the resolution.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): If my esteemed friend Shri Shyamnandan Mishra's intention in bringing forward this resolution before this House is to have some further discussion on important matters relating to the economic progress of the nation, I am all for such public opinion being ventilated on the floor of this House. But if he is really serious in implementing this, I am afraid I cannot agree with him on that matter, because, for one thing I agree fully with what my hon. friend Dr. Henry Austin has just said that you cannot establish conventions by a resolution or by an Act of Parliament. Conventions have to grow out of certain public opinion which is expressed.

Of course, I agree to the statement of Shri Mishra that this resolution is not directed against the present Government as such. I think that he wants this to be a practice for all parties and for all democratic governments. But then inevitably in the present situation. I would not find fault with my friends on the Government benches seeing in this resolution an attempt to have a dig at them by my hon. friend Shri Mishra. For, after all, for some years to come at least, at least in the foreseeable future, there is no party which can dislodge the present party from power. Therefore, they have a right to believe that way. At the same time, I do not want to be uncharitable to my hon. friend Shri Shyamnandan Mishra. I agree with him when he says that he wants it to be observed by all. But the question is whether this totality of five or six laudable objectives can be considered as a 'must' for any Government to remain a government. If they fall short by even half a per cent of the expected and desired result, according to Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, the Government

must go. If that were to happen, there will be no government anywhere, because Governments have to be judged by certain successes and certain failures. It is only at the end of their legitimate period of office, four years or five years or even years as in the case of France, it is only at the end of some stipulated time that you can test the performance of a Government. You cannot test a Government merely on this or that performance. You must test them on their whole performance throughout their period of office, whatever that period may be whether it be four years or five years or seven years.

I have another difficulty also. If my hon. friend Shri Shyamnandan Mishra really believes—I wonder if he is really seriously believing in it, but in case he really believes—that these are the only issues on which Governments fall and Governments are made, I cannot agree with him. There are certain international issues and there are certain foreign policy issues also. For instance, my hon. friends opposite who belonged to the ruling party went to the polls in 1971 largely on the basis of the Bangla Desh victory. It had nothing to do with affairs in the domestic field. Therefore, it is not true always to say that Governments are created or Governments are falling on grounds of domestic policy only; sometimes, they may do so on foreign policy questions also. Therefore, it would be wrong to ask any Government to get out simply because on a particular point they have not succeeded up to the expectation as is outlined by the hon. Mover in his resolution.

If he would have said that he wants that any Government worth their name and calling themselves a socialist Government and a progressive Government must promote the following objectives, I could have understood that. It is quite a laudable objective

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

to say that if a Government fails to do it, it must get out. But this can only be a directive principle or a guideline or a kind of guidance, but it cannot be made an imperative. You cannot compel a Government to resign on the issues mentioned here.

Therefore, I do wish to suggest that this is a very amazing piece of draftsmanship by my hon. friend Shri Shyamnandan Mishra. No doubt, this resolution contains very laudable objectives, and as far as those laudable objectives go, we dare not object to them, and we do not want to object to them, because we all share those objectives. But the trouble is that the machinery that he is envisaging is neither workable nor desirable nor acceptable in any kind of democratic set-up.

In conclusion, if Shri Mishra rightly wants' to suggest that these are the things which any government must achieve, failing which the people must throw it out, his appeal should be not through a Resolution on the floor of the House but through various media of public opinion outside the House and to large electorate of the country. This is true of any country because only through an appeal to the electorate can you reject a government, not on the basis of this or that set of ideal or objective resolutions.

SHRI P. R. SHENOY (Udipi): I fully appreciate the spirit behind the Resolution moved by Shri Mishra but I am unable to support it for the simple reason that it is not practicable to implement it for at least the next ten years, considering our financial resources and the problems we have to face. It is also not logical to link the continuance of a government with a percentage bound programme. If production is reduced in a particular year and is raised to the previous

level in the next year, there will be increase in production in percentage terms, but in fact there will not be any increase at all.

In the Fifth Plan we have a growth target rate of 5.5 per cent. Considering the programme of social justice and self-reliance we have placed before ourselves, this is ambitious enough. We have to solve the problem of unemployment, both rural and educated. We have placed before ourselves a minimum needs programme and a wage policy. We have decided to remove regional imbalances; we have decided to improve the lot of the backward classes and bring up the backward regions. We have also a programme of fair distribution of what we produce. Considering all these programmes, the target of growth of 5.5 per cent is ambitious enough. Therefore, we cannot have a growth rate of 7 per cent per annum as suggested in the Resolution.

The Mover wants to have a growth rate in agricultural production of 5 per cent per annum. It is a moderate target but he has not thought of abnormal years we have to face in the country. Until our dreams of utilising the water resources for irrigation and power projects to the fullest possible extent are realised, our economy has to depend on favourable weather conditions.

For instance, in 1971-72, the agricultural output went down by 1.7 per cent. Again in 1972-73, it dropped by 4 per cent due to unfavourable weather conditions. The production of foodgrains in 1971-72 was 104.7 million tonnes and in 1972-73 about 100 million tonnes. In 1973-74, it is expected to be 115 million tonnes, that means an increase over 1972-73 of 15 per cent and not 5 per cent. So the target fixed by the Mover is not at all logical in terms of percentage.

With these remarks I conclude.

*SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Salem): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to say a few words on the Resolution of Shri Shyamnandan Mishra on behalf of Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam.

The Resolution postulates that the Government should resign if it fails to fulfil the following basic programme:

- (i) growth in national income at 7 per cent per annum;
- (ii) growth in *per capita* income of those below poverty line at 7 per cent per annum;
- (iii) growth in agricultural production at 5 per cent per annum;
- (iv) growth in industrial production at 10 per cent per annum;
- (v) to contain price rise within a limit of 5 per cent per annum.

If the Government decides to resign on the above ground, it will really mean that the Government is determined in ensuring the country's progress. Here I will bring to your kind notice one important point by giving the illustration of the Congress Party.

It will be undemocratic to demand the ouster of the Congress Party from power especially when the Party has got absolute majority to form the Government. The healthy convention will be that the Government, which fails to fulfil the laudable objectives narrated above, should be replaced by another Government of the Congress Party. What I want to emphasise is that the Congress Party should not allow the Council of Ministers to run the Government even when the basic programme has not been implemented properly and successfully. By demanding the resignation of such a Council of Ministers and by installing a new Council of Ministers, the majority party having the mandate of the

people should work for the successful implementation of the basic programme. According to me that would be the healthiest convention which a majority party in a democracy can try to establish in the larger interests of the country. Then democracy will also take deep roots in the country.

I would now request the hon. Member, Shri Mishra, to incorporate two or three more points on which the Government should resign.

The next day after the Prime Minister's statement about the economy of the country taking a turn for the good the price of petrol and kerosene was raised. In a recent Press Conference, the Prime Minister stated categorically that the tax evasion and the black money have not contributed as much to the price rise as the agitational approach like 'Bandhs' etc. of the Opposition Parties. Along with this, if she had elaborated the steps taken by her to rectify the wrong policies of her Government, it would have been tolerable. During the two and half decades of Congress rule, only one thing has grown beyond expectations and that is, the habit of magnifying the faults of those holding contrary views to the Government and brushing aside the deficiencies of the Government. While participating in the debate on the No-Confidence Motion yesterday the Ministers stated that the price rise was an international phenomenon and not just a peculiar feature of this country. You will find from today's newspapers that the price of bread has gone up and again the price of petrol has increased. The hon. Finance Minister, Mr. Chavan, stated in this House that the prices have shown a downward trend and when he was questioned further, he said the price of oilseeds has come down, as if the prices of all essential commodities have shown a downward trend. The Minister of Petrole-

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil.

[Shri E. R. Krishnan]

um and Chemicals, Shri Barua, stated in this House that kerosene is available in plenty after the price has been increased. I can say that without knowing the real situation obtaining in the country the Ministers make statements in this House. Recently there was a cartoon in an English daily in Delhi. The cartoon depicted that in the dictionary of Napoleon there was no word like 'impossible'. If only Napoleon were asked to control the price rise in our country, he would find the word 'impossible' in his dictionary. When such is the situation the Ministers make loose statements contrary to the actual situation.

I would like Shri Mishra to incorporate in his Resolution that the Ministers who make statements contrary to the actual situation should resign from the Council of Ministers. Shri Mishra knows that our Agriculture Minister, Shri Shinde, says in this House that 5 lakh tonnes of wheat has been procured and immediately after on a public platform he says that more than 6 lakh tonnes of wheat has been procured.

It will be a healthy convention if the Ministers making such contrary statements are to resign from the Council of Ministers.

Before I conclude, I would like to refer to another point which should also be incorporated by Shri Mishra in his Resolution. I have to take the example of Congress Party here also.

The Members of the Congress Party while speaking in the House, point out that the Government have taken stringent measures against the growth of monopoly, against price rise, against the menace of growing unemployment etc. But in the Congress Parliamentary Party meeting, they took strong exception to the way in which these important problems had been handled

by the Government, which provoked the Prime Minister to admonish them for their bravado talks. I would request my hon. friend Shri Mishra to incorporate in his Resolution that the Party which has Members saying one thing in the House after taking oath and entirely different thing outside the House should not be allowed to form the Government at all.

With these words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI B. R. SHUKLA (Bahraich): The mind of Shri Mishra, the mover of the resolution, is very fertile in conception and smooth in delivery. I dare say that this resolution is due to complete muddled thinking on his part. Watching for two days the long debate over the motion of No-confidence should have been sufficient to persuade him to withdraw this resolution. But he has simply utilised this resolution to further his party ends. The utter irrationality of this resolution would be brought home to him if we consider the consequences of accepting this resolution.

Agriculture is a subject in the concurrent list and the State Governments and the Central Government are both concerned with agriculture. Suppose the States in some parts of the country fail in their agricultural programmes will those State Governments along with the Central Government *Ipsa Facto* resign. I think there would be annual elections to the State Legislatures and to the Central Government. If this resolution were adopted for guiding the mode of working of the Government; we should ponder over the matter as to when the accountability of a particular Government is to be adjudged, whether it is to be adjudged yearly or it should be adjudged periodically or at the close of the five years as laid down in the Constitution. (Interruptions). There is no lacuna in that. Every year we formulate the budget proposals and for three months we sit here for the budget to be

passed and then it takes another three or four months more for formulating particular proposals for particular regions and then they are put into effect. If a road construction is taken up, it takes three or four years for construction and completion of the road. It is practically impossible and physically unthinkable to implement any of the items or programmes which are covered in this resolution.

So far as we are concerned we have already laid down a very healthy convention. In 1970 when the Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi suspected that the country was not with her on her policies, when the resolution on privy purses was voted down in Rajya Sabha, she did not hesitate even for a minute to resign from the Government. She asked for a fresh mandate and, therefore, we are conscious of our responsibilities. We have made a deep and sincere commitment to achieve the laudable objectives which find mention in the resolution of my hon. friend.

My friends had pointed out that conventions are not to be made by statutory resolutions or by codifications. They evolve out of day to day working of parliamentary processes and procedures. I appeal to the distinguished Member to ponder over the irrational consequences which would follow if this resolution were adopted. Therefore, he should withdraw his resolution.

श्री राम कंवर (टोंक): सभापति

महोदय, श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र जी ने जो संकल्प इस सदन में रखा है उसका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। आज हमारे देश में जो बढ़ती हुई मंहगाई है उस को बखते हुए जनसाधारण जो सत्य की कमाई करता है, जिनके पास चोरदरवाजे की आमदनी नहीं है, जो गरीब हैं, छोटे किसान हैं

जो दिन भर 8 घंटे अपने सिर पर वजन ढोकर दिहाड़ा कमाकर अपनी उदर-पूर्ति करत हैं उनके सामने बड़ा भारी संकट उपस्थित है क्योंकि वे अपने पेट की भूख को मिटाने में असमर्थ हैं। हमारे भारतवर्ष में जो बेरोजगारी की समस्या है वह केवल पढ़े-लिखे तक के लिये ही नहीं है। मैं इस बात का मानता हूँ कि दूसरे देशों में मंहगाई बढ़ी है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि दूसरे देशों ने मंहगाई बढ़ते हुए भी वहां के लोग विशेष बेरोजगार नहीं हैं, उनके पास पैसा उपलब्ध है जिससे खरीदारी करने में समर्थ हैं इस लिये उन्हें कठिनाई नहीं है परन्तु हमारे भारतवर्ष में वह बात नहीं है। मैं मिश्राजी को बहुत धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि शासक कांग्रेस पार्टी जो 25 वर्षों से गद्दी पर बैठी है उसके संकल्पों, उसके द्वारा जनता को दिये गये वक्तों को मिश्राजी ने आटे में नमक के बराबर सरकार के सामने एक प्रस्ताव के द्वारा रखा है लेकिन वह प्रस्ताव की सरकार को बहुत बुरा और अजीब ठंग का लग रहा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यहां पर जो अभी अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव आया था उसी से मिलता जुलता यह मिश्राजी का प्रस्ताव भी है। कल बाबूजी का जो भाषण हुआ उसको मैं ने सुना था। उसमें उन्होंने कहा कि विरोधी दलों ने एक रथ में चार घोड़े जोत दिये हैं लेकिन विरोधी दलों ने ऐसा नहीं किया बल्कि आज कांग्रेस के राज्य में यह जरूर हो रहा है कि एक ही जमीन को चार आदमियों के नाम एलाटमेंट कर दिया जाता है और उस खीचा-तानी तथा लड़ाई झगड़े में

[छो राम कंबर]

गरीब किसान न उस जमीन को बो सकते हैं और न उसमें कोई उपज पैदा कर सकते हैं और न ही उनकी कोई समस्या सुलझ सकती है। इस लिये मेरा कहना है कि मिश्राजी ने जो संकल्प रखा है उसे सरकार को ज्यादा से ज्यादा कार्यान्वित करना चाहिये वरना हम इस बात को भी जानते हैं कि विरोधी पक्ष वाले किसान भी सत्यता को सामने रखें सरकार उसको कभी स्वीकार नहीं करती है पिछले चुनावों में जनता भी बहुत कुछ देख चुकी है। पहले हमारे पूजनीय स्वर्गीय जवाहरलाल नेहरू प्रधान मंत्री थे और अब उनकी सुपुत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी प्रधान मंत्री हैं। पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी के जो संकल्प थे वह उनकी लड़की से भी पूरे नहीं हुए हैं तो फिर उनको कौन पूरा करेगा? इस लिये मैं इस संकल्प का समर्थन करता हूँ कि अगर बेरोजगारी की समस्या दूर न हो, खेती और उद्योगों में उन्नति न हो तो सरकार को जरूर अपने आप इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिये।

श्री नाथूराम अहिरवार (टीकमगढ़): सभापति महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव मिश्राजी ने पेश किया है उसकी भावना की मैं कद्र करता हूँ लेकिन जिस तरीके से वे उसको अमल में लाना चाहते हैं उनकी उस मंशा में हमको मालूम पड़ता है क्योंकि जो कुछ उन्होंने इस प्रस्ताव के अन्दर लिखा है कि अगर ऐसा न हो तो सरकार को इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिये, वे यह बताएँ कि हमारे देश में जितनी पंचवर्षीय योजनाएँ बनी सभी योजनाओं में हमने

कहा है और कांग्रेस पार्टी के घोषणा पत्र में कहा है कि हम देश में खेतिहर मजदूरों किमानों की उन्नति करेंगे, उद्योग-धंधे बनें, बेरोजगारी दूर करेंगे, और इन सारी बातों के लिये हमें इस देश में संगठित होकर काम करना है और हमें आपका, जनता का सहयोग लेकर राष्ट्र का विकास करना है। राष्ट्र के जीवन में 5 साल, 25 साल कोई बड़ी अवधि नहीं होती है। बहुत समय लगता है। लेकिन मिश्रा जी ने प्रस्ताव रखा है कि एक साल के अन्दर खेती में 5 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि करना मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इतना बड़ा देश है गिछने वर्ष जैसे कि 9 प्रान्तों में सूखा पड़ गया, गल्ले का हाहाकार मच गया, पानी नहीं बरसा, अब अगर उस साल लक्ष्य बना लें तो कि मिश्रा जी रखना चाहते हैं तो सरकार अपने लक्ष्य में फेल हो गई होती और हम सब लोगों को इस्तीफा देना पड़ता। तब ऐसा प्रस्ताव लाइये जो व्यवहारित हो। सरकार चाहती है कि जो देश के विकास का कार्यक्रम है वह सबको साथ लेकर बनाये। कांग्रेस पार्टी यह नहीं कहती है कि हम ही देश का आगे लेजाना चाहते हैं सभी विरोधी लों। सहयोग चाहते हैं। लेकिन जो आप ने शर्तें रखी हैं वह आप भी पूरी नहीं कर सकते। घर में ही नहीं पूरी कर सकते हैं, देश की बात तो छोड़िये। घर में हर एक लड़के को एक किलो दध दीजिये, नहीं दे सकते तो आप इस्तीफा दे देंगे?

आप को केवल यह बुरा लग रहा है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी सत्ता में बैठी है उस को हटा नहीं सकते। अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर भय कुछ कहा गया। इस लिये कुछ ऐसा कहिये जिसमें देश की तरक्की हो। हम ने गल्ले का व्यापार हाथ में लिया आपने लोगों को भड़काया कि गल्ले न रां। इस लिये अच्छे विचार लाइये, विकास में सहयोग दोजिये तब तो ठीक है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं मिश्रा जी से अनुरोध करता हूँ कि वह अपना प्रस्ताव वापस ले लें।

श्री मधु लिमये (वांका): महाशय महोदय, गन्तावारी दल के कुछ सदस्यों के भाषण सुन कर मुझे वाज्जुव हुआ कि वह इस प्रस्ताव को अव्यावहारिक क्यों समझते हैं? और इस प्रस्ताव को रखने के पीछे हमारे मित्र श्याम बाबू का अन्दरूनी उद्देश्य क्या है उस की वह चर्चा क्यों करते हैं, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है। आप को मतलब प्रस्ताव में है। अगर प्रस्ताव में उन्होंने ने कोई गलत बात रखी है तो वह कह सकते हैं कि वह बात गलत है। लेकिन उनकी बातें यदि सही हैं और उनको पूरा करने में यदि किसी भी सरकार को असफलता हासिल होती है तो उस सरकार को जरूर इस्तीफा देना चाहिये। इसीलिए हम में कहा गया है। क्या आप की इस्तीफे चिड़ से है? क्या आप यह कहना चाहते हैं कि हम चुनाव के समय मतदाने ढंग में वचन देंगे और चुनाव के बाद उस को तोड़ेंगे फिर भी हम से न इस्तीफा मांगा जाय, न हम को चुनाव में हराया जाय? अगर यहाँ मंशा है तो

मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है। इस लिये मैं नीयत वाला बात में नहीं पड़ता। इनके प्रस्ताव के दो, तीन पहलुओं की ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

कुछ लोगों ने यह कहा कि हमने जिस लोकतांत्रिक प्रणाली को अपनाया है, इसको यदि हम बचा कर रखना चाहते हैं तो इस प्रस्ताव में जो उद्देश्य और लक्ष्य रखे गये हैं उन को हम लोग प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते। तो इन लोगों की जानकारी के लिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि 7 प्रतिशत की बात तो छाड़िये दुनिया में ऐसे बहुत से देश हैं जिनमें 10 से लेकर 15 प्रतिशत तक राष्ट्रीय आमदनी में गल्लाना बढ़ोतरी की है। इन में कम्बु-निस्ट देश भी हैं, जैसे रूस, रूमानिया, चीन भी है। लेकिन यह जरूरी नहीं है कि कम्बु-निस्ट प्रणाली को अपनाने के बाद ही तेजी में आप तरक्की कर सकते हैं। जापान कोई कम्बुनिस्ट देश नहीं है, और जापान में जो अर्थ व्यवस्था है उस के बारे में हमारे मतभेद हो सकते हैं, लेकिन इस बात में इन्कार नहीं कर सकते कि वह तेजी से तरक्की कर रहा है। आप ऐसा की बात कर रहे हैं। एड आप सब से ज्यादा ले रहे हैं। आप इतने बंगु हैं कि बिना बैशाखी के आप चल नहीं सकते। आप को अमरीकी, रूसी, ई. ई. ० की बातें चाहिये। जब आप जापान के बारे में कहते हैं उन की एड के ऊपर इंग्लैंड की आर्थिक प्रणाली है, यह ठीक नहीं है। जापान ने हर साल 12 प्रतिशत के हिस्से में अपनी तेजी से आर्थिक प्रगति की है। जापान का उदाहरण हम

[श्री मधु लिमये]

सामने रखे । लेकिन हमारे देश में दिक्कत यह है कि कम्युनिस्ट प्रणाली की सारी खराबियों को हम ने अपना लिया और पूंजीवादी प्रथा में जितने दोष हैं उन को भी हम लोगों ने अपना लिया है और दोनों का मिलाजुबा विकृत रूप हम लोग मिश्रित अर्थ व्यवस्था के नाम पर इस देश में पेश कर रहे हैं ।

कल मैं ने सभी लोगों के भाषण सुने, तीन तीन मंत्री भी बोले हैं, लेकिन किसी भी मंत्री ने सार की बात नहीं कही । माननीय जगजीवन राम ने कहा कि श्याम बाबू पश्चिम में देखने हैं, माननीय ज्योतिर्मय बसु पूरव की ओर देखने हैं, माननीय समर गुह दक्षिण की ओर देखते हैं और डी०एम०के० वाले उत्तर की ओर देखते हैं । सवाल यह नहीं था । सवाल यह था कि आप ने जो वचन दिये और घोषणायें की जो योजनायें बनायीं क्या उन योजनाओं को वचनों को, घोषणाओं को आप ने कार्यान्वित किया ? और अगर नहीं किया है तो फिर आप को हटना चाहिये । यह विषय था । लेकिन दुनिया भर की बातें हम ने इन्दिरा जी के मुंह से सुनीं, माननीय जगजीवन राम और माननीय चव्हाण साहब के मुंह से सुनीं । लेकिन किसी ने यह नहीं कि हम लोगों को इस में असफलता क्यों मिली है ।

17 hrs.

आज गणेश जी इस का जवाब देंगे, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या उन्होंने 1971 की मधेमशुमारी के जो आंकड़े हैं उन

का अध्ययन किया है ? क्या 1961 और 1971 के बीच में निरक्षर लोगों की संख्या में 5 करोड़ की वृद्धि कराने का महान काम आप ने नहीं किया ? जहां अध्यक्ष महोदय, 1961 में जिन के पास कुछ मात्रा में खेती है ऐसे लोगों का अनुपात 52 प्रतिशत था । इन लोगों की नीतियों के चलते वह अनुपात घट कर 42 प्रतिशत हो गया है । और खेतिहर मजदूरों का जहां अनुपात 15 प्रतिशत था वह 24 प्रतिशत हो गया । तो सारी बातों को छोड़ दीजिये ।

आप गरीबी हटाओ की बात करते हैं । लेकिन यहां मुल्क में तेजी से कंगालीकरण होता चला जा रहा है कुछ वर्गों का । और केवल जो कुछ थोड़ी बहुत तरक्की हुई है, औद्योगीकरण हुआ है, उस का सारा लाभ एक, डेढ़ प्रतिशत देश की जो आबादी है उसी को मिला है । इसलिये जब तक आप संकल्प नहीं करेंगे, कुछ नहीं होगा इस प्रस्ताव में उन्होंने क्या कहा है कि 7 प्रतिशत राष्ट्रीय आमदनी में वृद्धि । इस के बिना हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता । इतना न्यूनतम होना चाहिये ।

दूसरे इन्होंने कहा है कि जो बहुत ज्यादा गरीब लोग हैं उन की व्यक्तिगत आमदनी 7 प्रतिशत बढ़े । यह ठीक ही कहा क्योंकि इसका क्या मतलब है ? दो, सवा दो प्रतिशत लोक संख्या में वृद्धि होती है । इसलिये जब 7 प्रतिशत गरीबों की आमदनी बढ़ायेंगे तो नतीजा यह होगा कि आज जो गैर बराबरी है वह उससे पट जायगी ।

यह आज सभी लोग मानते हैं कि यह देश समाजवाद की बकवास करता है, गांधीवाद की बकवास करता है, योजना की बकवास करता है। इस देश में गरीब और अमीर के बीच में जितना अन्तर है दुनिया के किसी भी देश में नहीं है चाहे वह पूँजीवादी देश हो या सामान्तवादी देश हो या कम्युनिस्ट देश हो। इसलिए इनका यह दूषण अंश जो प्रस्ताव का है यह भी ठीक है ये कहते हैं पाँच प्रतिशत खेती के उत्पादन में वृद्धि होनी चाहिये। औद्योगिक उत्पादन में दस प्रतिशत की होनी चाहिये। तभी जो मात प्रतिशत राष्ट्रीय आय का लक्ष्य रखा है, उसको प्राप्त किया जा सकता है। इतना अगर नहीं होगा तो मात प्रतिशत आमदनी नहीं होगी और सात प्रतिशत गरीबों की आमदनी नहीं बढ़ाएंगे हर साल तो समाजवाद की बात करना बिल्कुल बेकार है।

मैं एक अंतिम अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ। पाँचवी योजना में आप सब मे पहला यह काम करें कि अमीरों के उपयोग की जिननी चीजें हम वक्त बन रही हैं चाहे आटो-मोबाइल हों, रेफ्रिजरेटर हों, कम एयर कंडिशनर हों, टेलीविजन हों इन सब चीजों की पैदावार आप बन्द कर दें, अव्यवस्था में परिवर्तन लाएं, खेती का विकास करें और जो साधारण जनता के उपयोग की वस्तुएं हैं उन्हें के लिए समस्त साधनों का इस्तेमाल करें। इतना आप करेंगे तो जो लक्ष्य है वे हासिल करना आपके लिए मुश्किल नहीं होगा और आपको इस्तीफा भी नहीं देना पड़ेगा। ये काम करिये और इस्तीफा न

दीजिये। नहीं करेंगे तो इस्तीफा मांगा जाएगा और लोग आपको एक दिन निकाल देंगे।

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobbili): Most of the present arguments have already been answered yesterday more effectively by the leaders of our party. All the speeches made by the Opposition members are apparently shallow. This particular Resolution is totally ill-conceived because a convention of this sort has never been followed in any of the Constitutional countries. May I ask Shri Shyamandan Mishra whether he has come across any democratic country where the fate of a Government has been linked up with economic targets? Economic targets are meant to be goals and are not to serve as guillotine on any government. Therefore as a concept itself, it is totally wrong and irresponsible, if I may say so.

Hon. Member Shri Madhu Limaye has compared our country with countries like Russia, China and Japan. He should realised that in these countries the economy is totally regulated. Their structure is different from ours; not only economic life but even social, political, in fact every aspect of life, is totally regulated. Therefore they can order any economic target and can achieve it. But in a country like India where the economic structure is still retaining its capitalist cross-ends, how can we stick to any particular target? Even though we may plan to achieve certain limits, we may not be able to achieve the target because we have to depend on certain elements which are outside the purview and control of Government. Therefore, sticking to a particular target may not be possible. It is, therefore, mischievous to make such a proposition. Though the Mover of the Resolution has not mentioned any particular party or government; it is obvious, that every argument is addressed to the present Government. Therefore the motivation is very clear

[Shri K. Narayana Rao]

There is also another difficulty. Assuming that the present Government falls on the ground that it has not fulfilled the target, what will follow? Are they in a position to form an alternative government? They cannot form an alternative government. Therefore, we have to go to the people again. That means, every year we have to go to the people and annual elections will become the order of the day.

For all these reasons, I strongly oppose this particular Resolution.

श्री अनार्द चरण दास (जाजपुर)

अपने प्रस्ताव में प्रियम बाबू ने कहा है कि जो लक्ष्य उन्होंने इन प्रस्ताव में रखें हैं यदि उनको प्राप्त नहीं किया जाता है तो सरकार इस्तीफा दे दे। उसके बाद क्या होगा? उसके बाद इन्वेकशन ही तो होगा। लेकिन कितने दिन में, कितनी अवधि में वह इन लक्ष्यों को प्राप्त नहीं करती है तो इस्तीफा दे, इसके बारे में इन्होंने कुछ नहीं कहा है। जांच पड़ताल की कोई एक अवधि तो पहली बात यह है कि उनको रखनी चाहिये थी। अब अगर इन काम में सरकार असफल होती है तो इसका नतीजा यह होगा कि इन्वेकशन होगा। अगर इन्वेकशन होगा तो मैं उन से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि नेशनल इनकम क्या उनसे बढ़ जायेगी? क्या वह घट नहीं जायेगी? उन्होंने इन में यह रखा है :

growth in per capita income of those below poverty line at 7 per cent per annum.

पावर्टी लाइन में जो हैं उनके हाथ में क्या है? उनके हाथ में कोई साधन या सामर्थ्य नहीं है। वे काश्तकार हैं। काश्तकारों के लिए जब हम रेडीकल लैंड रिफार्म लाते

हैं तो उसका ये ही लोग हैं जो विरोध करते हैं। जब ज्यादा जमीन बड़े बड़े साहूकारों के हाथ में, बड़े बड़े जमींदारों के हाथ में, कैपिटलिस्टों के हाथ में रहेगी तो कैसे आप कहते हैं कि पर कैपिटल इनकम बढ़ जायेगी। यह जरा नालायकी की बातें हैं।

उन्होंने यह भी कहा है कि कांग्रेस की कोई परम्परा नहीं है। यह ठीक नहीं है। परम्परा की वजह से ही आज कांग्रेस जिन्दा है। अगर ऐसा न होता तो वह आज बही न होती और कभी का उसको हटा दिया गया होता।

उन्होंने यह भी कहा है अपने प्रस्ताव में :

to generate employment opportunities at least to take care of the addition to the labour force each year.

एम्प्लायमेंट अपरचुनिटीज कहां ढूँढ़ेंगे आप? गांवों में ही ढूँढ़ेंगे। आप भी प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर रह चुके हैं। तब आपने इस दशा में कुछ आउटलाइन पेश की थी और उसको आपने अमल में लाया था? तब उन्होंने ऐसा कुछ नहीं किया।

मैं समझता हूँ कि केवल मात्र सरकार को बदनाम करने के लिए वह इस प्रस्ताव को लाए हैं। मैं उन से अनुरोध करता हूँ कि इसको वह वापिस ले लें।

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH): The resolution moved by the hon. Member, Shri Shyam-nandan Mishra, has two parts. One part is: he seeks to set up certain targets of production, industrial and agricultural, and growth rate and the growth of national income. In the other part, he seeks with the help of

this House to set up a convention for the Government resigning if it does not achieve these targets.

As far as the targets are concerned, we may differ in the figures, whether a particular percentage is realisable in the present day conditions of economy or not. But, as far as the objective of fixing a target for having a quicker rate of development and growth is concerned, since our country has lost many years and we cannot afford to lose, I do not think there may be any difference of opinion with the hon. Member. I may also admit that if the Government cannot achieve certain objectives, it has a moral responsibility to own before the people that we have not been able to achieve these objectives and that these are the reasons on account of which we have not been able to achieve these objectives. There is no escape from accepting any moral responsibility. But, when the hon. Member goes further and indicates that if these objectives cannot be achieved, the Government must resign, I do not think that such a precedent exists anywhere else in any country where democratic constitution of the parliamentary type or any type exists. He is a very wise and learned person. The only difficulty about him is, he has a dual personality. When he sits on this side he has a correct attitude to every single problem. I know, Sir, and we have discussed many times many problems. But when he goes there he has a particular personality, that is to say, that dual personality always comes in conflict in giving a very integrated personality. If a very wise person like him, with a knowledge of economics, with his knowledge of various things, has this integrated personality, it would contribute very much for the growth of our nation because we need a person who would be able really to help us in solving the various complex problems which this nation is facing.

May I submit that democracy as we have now, as we have worked in this country, and as it has worked in seve-

ral other countries, has its own correctives. We have elections every five years and we have elections of various other forms and there is the corrective of Parliament. There is the corrective of people's own attitude to Government, people's movements, people's agitations, and newspapers and various other forms of media which are available to the people to keep the Government under constant check to see that the Government pursues those policies which are given out to the people. These correctives and these countervailing forces have worked in this country. After all, we are a very particular democracy. Our democracy is not confined to Chamber of Parliament Houses or Chambers of Legislatures. It is a democracy which has gone to the very deep roots of the people. And, people show their anger at the Government, at the wrong policies of the Government. And that check is available. I am trying to make a distinction. This check is also there, apart from the formal check which is already there of elections every five years. So, there are other checks like these which are available to the country.

But the difficulty is this. Some of the Hon. Members on that side do not always properly assess those checks. Those checks are available and in addition there is the party check. That is to say, every party has given pledges to the people and that party has got to assess its own position. They assess what they are doing, whether there are any defects or any slidebacks and from that point of view, every political party in a democracy has got its own mechanism of bringing about certain checks and keeping their party in a state of alertness.

I will not go into the various economic arguments because I have not much time. These matters have been discussed many times. The Government spokesmen have tried their best to explain it in the best manner possible. We have discussed the economic

[Shri K. N. Ganesh]

situation in the Adjournment Motion, in the No-Confidence Motion and in the earlier discussions also. We have discussed points regarding the growth of the economy, with regard to Bangladesh, drought, the rate of growth, profiteering, black money and various other matters which go into the making of an economic situation. It is a difficult economic situation today and we have discussed that many times. I will not go into that in detail just at present.

I will just deal with two or three points which he has raised. He said that the situation is very explosive. I would like to point out that the national situation is very difficult, I agree, but to think that the situation is very explosive or that this explosion will lead to the destruction of what we hold dear, etc. is not the correct approach. We have faith in the innate goodness of the people. We have laid sound foundations of democratic conditions. We have passed through the very difficult national situation earlier. It will be wrong to say that because of this present difficulty, the national situation would become explosive. Having said that, I have one other point to make

My hon. friend spoke about the low rate of growth in the national income of the country. I admit it and there is no difference between us. I would only submit to him through you that he has not given any alternative policy. What is the alternative policy which he wants that we have to follow so that it may lead to the increase in the growth rate of national income from the present 7 per cent to 10 per cent? When it comes to alternative policy we have got to see whether it is possible for us to implement it. Take for example land reforms or procurement of foodgrains and distribution of the same through the distribution machinery. I entirely agree with the hon. Member Shri Limaye that our production pattern has got to be

changed and we cannot go on producing only luxury goods for a particular class of people. There are many items which the people need but which are not available in plenty. If the private section is not interested in producing those things more, the public sector has got to come in. He has not given a alternative policy by which these things would be fully met. He has said that because of our internal situation our image in the outside world is lowered. I think this is very far from reality because at any given point of time in this critical economic situation, we would not have been able to play our role as effectively as we ought to. At the same time, in the international affairs whether it is in Bangladesh, Lusaka, West Asia or United Nations Forum we have played a very significant role. I would submit to him that in this country in spite of difficulties that we have been facing we have been able to play a very significant role in the international fields.

I agree with the hon. Member when he made the remarks that we have to have a target for each and everything that we do. There has to be some accountability of the person who has been entrusted with a certain responsibility which he has failed to fulfil. I say there are enough mechanisms and correctives available in the democratic system as we have today. If I may submit that India has got a fighting democracy. We have enough correctives and so this recourse of frustration need not be resorted to because any Government needs time to do a certain thing.

With these words, Sir, I would request the hon. Mover to withdraw his Resolution.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Chairman, Sir, although we had got out of the no-confidence atmosphere yesterday, I find that the incubus of no-confidence is still here. I am not in the no-confidence mood at the present moment. I want to settle down to do some constructive task. And I think that the

Resolution has provided me an opportunity for the same. I do not believe in the clandestine method of doing a thing; I believe in a direct confrontation. Towards the end of the discussion, the hon. Member Shri Chatterjee said that the Government should have been warned, and I agree with this.

I find that a number of arguments have been advanced for circumventing the spirit of my Resolution and in this process they have evaded the task which any Government must face squarely.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with some of the points which are of constitutional nature which have been raised in this context. My hon. friend, Shri Mavalankar said that the Government should go only if they fail to fulfil their promise on special issues. He further said that it should not be made obligatory that it is only on the non-fulfilment of those issues that Government must go.

Several other issues also come up. For example, my hon. friend would not agree with me when I say that even if the Government succeeds on the international front or in the war but it is not able to feed its population, it must go. That is what happened in the U.K. after the second world war. Although Mr. Churchill's party had won the war it had to go on the economic issues.

This Resolution does not rule out at all other issues being taken up by the people or by any party to oust the Government.

I must express my regret that I had not been able to stress earlier one very important item in my resolution. That related to the prices. Unless the prices behave properly, there would be no sense in all these targets. I thought that since this subject had been taken up only recently and discussed very thoroughly, it did not require my going into details now. But my hon. friend from DMK did lay stress on that, and he was quite right in doing so.

Dr. Pande had also raised a point of constitutional nature. He said 'If agriculture fails in a particular State—agriculture happens to be a State subject—would Mr. Mishra ask the Government at the Centre to resign?' My answer to that is that the Plan is accepted by the entire country; the Plan is accepted by the National Development Council which consists of all the Chief Ministers. And if the Chief Ministers accept the agricultural targets or the targets with regard to the subjects that lie within their purview, it is obligatory on them also to see that these targets are fulfilled. Indeed, they have to pull together with the Central Government in this matter.

Then, it was said that no Government could be expected to achieve the target in a democratic system. My hon. friend Shri Madhu Limaye has very adequately replied to that point. May I again emphasise that even smaller countries like Taiwan and South Korea, let alone Japan, are fulfilling much higher targets than these and so, it should not be difficult for a country like India to fulfil those mentioned in the resolution?

It was also said that no Government could survive if such conditions or conventions were laid down. My answer to that is this. Please consider how many Governments in the world are achieving these targets from year to year? I do not for a moment suggest that even if there are abnormal years, Government must be obliged to fulfil these targets. The country can take a view, the Parliament can take a view, that there have been conditions which warranted exoneration of the Government in the given circumstances.

My hon. friend Shri Chatterjee suggested that such a resolution should be incorporated into the Constitution. It is in fact a part of the Constitution, if you properly read the Directive Principles. What my resolution seeks to do is to lay down conventions, and the conventions are as

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra]

good as the Constitution itself—that is the practice which prevails all over the world. So, this should satisfy my hon. friend Shri Chatterjee. But it is also a fact that in some countries of the world where there are planned economies, the Five Year Plans are the statutes of the Government. I am not expressing any opinion on that aspect of the matter; I mention it only to stress the fact that the targets have to be achieved and it is to that end that the plans are translated into statutes.

The hon. Member Shri Ramavatar Shastri said that these targets could not be achieved within the framework of a capitalist society. My answer to that is that he is quite right. But my difference with him lies in this that I believe in a democratic socialist order whereas he believes in a communist totalitarian order. I also believe in the transformation of the present society, but I do not believe in the communist totalitarian order. I believe in a mixed economy which I consider to be the most dynamic model which can maximise growth. You cannot have the maximisation of growth except through a mixed economy.

My hon. friend Shri K. Narayana Rao had asked the question whether any democratic country had adopted any conventions about the fulfilment of economic targets. My answer to that is that that should not come in the way of our laying down these conventions particularly after looking at the results or consequences that many countries are facing after their targets had not been fulfilled. In the democratic world, where the Plans are not being fulfilled, indeed very difficult conditions are prevailing, and even the democratic system is itself in peril.

Then I come to the hon. Minister who seemed to agree with me so far as the objectives of the Resolution are concerned, but disagreed with the

idea of laying down conventions. He told the House that I lacked some integration in personality. If integration mean slackness, if it means lack of efficiency, I do plead guilty to the charge that I lack integration. I want more efficiency, more alertness to be infused into the system.

Then he said that there are already checks and balances of other kinds available to the people and to Parliament which could be exercised. My question is: why did not these checks and balances work in the past to enable us to achieve targets? My Resolution comes in the light of the experiences that we have had in this country where we have not been able to achieve a higher target than 4 per cent increase in the national income? So that argument of the hon. Minister does not avail. Hence I wanted these to be laid down clearly.

Finally, I would ask some questions, simple and direct of the hon. members opposite, who have tried to read motives into the resolution. With all seriousness and solemnity, I ask can our democracy survive the present low rate of growth and development? Have they not come to realise that the present low rate of growth and development would not simply do in the circumstances? Do they believe that our country can remain a significant force in international affairs if we are trailing behind in a slow coach so far as economic development is concerned?

My friend, Shri Sharma, spoke of China's development. He said that that kind of rate of growth could not be achieved within our democratic system. There used to be a time when the countries of the world thought there was a real competition between India and China. Perhaps they looked forward with a certain amount of hope and expectation that India would be able to forge ahead with a higher rate of growth than China. But where do we find ourselves today?

We are left completely behind. If you take into account steel production, both countries began their career with the same quantity but now China has leapt forward with a four times lead over us. So is the story in petroleum production. Even in defence matters, their atomic arsenal is now becoming bigger day by day; in the field of missiles, they are forging ahead.

So we are facing an extremely difficult situation indeed.

The ruling party goes to the polls after having accepted the targets of the Plan. They form a part of their manifesto also. So the party has also got a mandate from the people for fulfilment of the plan targets. If they do not fulfil them, they have lost all justification for remaining in power.

My thesis has been that the ruling party, having accepted the Plan, must convert itself into a Plan army and the Cabinet must convert itself into a Plan Command. If that does not happen no planning can succeed in this country. That has been the catastrophe in our country, which I want should be avoided in future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is Shri Bade pressing his amendments?

SHRI R. V. BADE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put Shri Bade's amendments to the Resolution to vote.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 were put and negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about the main Resolution?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I am not withdrawing it. This is a very important Resolution which they must accept.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"This House resolves that a convention be established that the Government should resign if it fails to fulfil the following basic programme:

(i) growth in national income at 7 per cent per annum;

(ii) growth in per capita income of those below poverty line at 7 per cent per annum;

(iii) growth in agricultural production at 5 per cent per annum;

(iv) growth in industrial production at 10 per cent per annum;

(v) to contain price rise within a limit of 5 per cent per annum; and

(vi) to generate employment opportunities at least to take care of the addition to the labour force each year".

The motion was negatived.

17.35 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE. COLLECTIVE SECURITY IN ASIA

SHRI D. K. PANDA (Bhanjanagar): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:

"Having noted the welcome change in the international situation and the growing urge among the Asian peoples, this House is of the opinion that India, along with other friendly nations, should take necessary initiative for creating a system of collective security in Asia on the basis of the principles of the U.N. Charter, peaceful co-existence and the Bandung Declaration, in order to—

(i) consolidate their independence and attain economic independence;

(ii) safeguard the peace and security in the Asian region;

(iii) develop their struggles against the forces of imperialism and neo-colonialism; and