

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of the provisions contained in Sections 31(2)(k) and 32(4) and (5) of the Institutes of Technology Act, 1961, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, one member from among themselves to serve as a member of the Council, established under Section 31(1) of the said Act, for the unexpired portion of the triennium ending on the 15th May, 1965, vice Dr. K. L. Rao resigned."

The motion was adopted.

13:22 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: DISTRIBUTION
OF NATIONAL INCOME

Mr. Speaker: We shall take up the discussion under Rule 193.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I ask your permission to say one thing. It is not about the calling attention. There is a news item appearing in the Press for the last three days. Is Government taking some steps?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I cannot allow anything to be raised in this manner unless hon. Members write to me. It is not the proper time. Let him write to me.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Since the Prime Minister is here....

Mr. Speaker: Even if the Prime Minister is here, I cannot take up the matter like this. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): I want to make one submission.

Mr. Speaker: Business is not to be interrupted in this manner. There are exceptions which the hon. Members know. Business in the Order will be taken up. If they want anything

extra, they have to inform me and I will request them to abide by what I say.

Shri Priya Gupta: It is on this issue, Sir. There is going to be a discussion on the distribution of national income. I want a clarification from the hon. Minister. I asked for some information; I wrote to the Speaker and you have replied, Sir, that Planning Commission has informed you like this. I would like to quote the Planning Commission's communication sent to me through the Lok Sabha Secretariat on the subject of "short duration discussion under rule 193 regarding distribution of national income." It reads as follows:

"Ref: Lok Sabha Secretariat U.O. No. 17/1/63/L dated 2-9-1963 forwarding letter of Shri Priya Gupta M.P., dated 2-9-1963 to the Speaker of Lok Sabha seeking some information in respect of actual minimum slabwise per capita income upto 50, 100, 1000, upto 5000, upto 100000, upto a crore (above one crore) percentage wise. No authentic data on distribution of income by ranges with all India coverage are available."

Mr. Speaker: What does he want me to do?

Shri Priya Gupta: I am raising a point of order. When this Government has got nothing to show as national income, how do they arrive at a national income. My point is when the Government says there is no authentic information, what are we going to discuss?

Mr. Speaker: Then discussion should be closed.

Shri Priya Gupta: They must be ready.

Mr. Speaker: If that is the demand, I will close the discussion. (*Interruptions.*) I will request the Leaders of Groups also to control their Members

when they are going beyond bounds. If the Leaders cannot control them, I shall consider those individuals as separate Members and not as Members of the groups.

Shri Priya Gupta: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. I have heard him.

Shri Priya Gupta: At least hear me.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard him. I will give him time to speak during the discussion where he can say all these things.

Shri Priya Gupta: Without any data, what can we discuss?

Mr. Speaker: He may sit silent then. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri Priya Gupta: Then you will give me time afterwards?

Mr. Speaker: I will again ask Leaders of groups to look into this matter. There ought to be some manner in saying things.

Shri Priya Gupta: You are not allowing a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: It is happening again and again. Dr. Lohia.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी तक इस बहस का नतीजा इतना निकला है कि मैं ने २७ करोड़ हिन्दुस्तानियों के लिए तीन आने रोज की आमदनी कही, प्रधान मंत्री ने १५ आने रोज की और योजना मंत्री ने साढ़े सात आने रोज की। अब प्रधान मंत्री और योजना मंत्री आपस में निबट लेंगे कि दोनों में कौन सही है।

मेरी बहस यह नहीं है कि हिन्दुस्तानियों की और खास तौर से २७ करोड़ की आमदनी तीन आने या साढ़े तीन आने या

दाई आने है। बल्कि यह देश इतना गरीब है जिस का अन्दाजा हम सरकार को नहीं है, और इस गरीबी को दूर करने के लिए जब तक इस सरकार में भावना नहीं आएगी, तब तक कोई अच्छा नुस्खा तैयार नहीं हो सकता।

पहली बात तो मुझे कहनी है, जो आंकड़े योजना मंत्री ने यहां रखे उन के बारे में, कि वह कर जांच कमेटी के लिए तैयार किए गए थे। वित्त मंत्रालय ने पूछा था कि किस तरह से हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों की आमदनी है और खपत है ताकि वह कर अच्छा और ज्यादा लगा सकें। इसलिए इस जांच समिति के आंकड़े पहले से ही सन्देहात्मक थे क्योंकि उन का तात्पर्य ही कुछ और था

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : वह खर्च के आंकड़े थे, आमदनी के नहीं थे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : ठीक है, लेकिन वह दिखाना चाहते थे कि हिन्दुस्तानी ज्यादा खर्च करते हैं, इसलिए उन के ऊपर ज्यादा टैक्स लगाओ। विन्कुल साफ बात है, छपा हुआ है किताब में। जो सेंट्रल सर्वे छापता है। उस में लिखा है कि वह टैक्सेशन एन्क्वायरी कमेटी की तरफ से कहा गया है ताकि फाइनेन्स मिनिस्ट्री उस से अपना काम काज चला सके। यह सब लिखा हुआ है। इस पर आप बहस न करिए नहीं तो प्रधान मंत्री की तरह आप भी फंस जायेंगे।

तो पहली बात तो मुझे यह कहनी है।

और दूसरी बात यह है कि सन् १९४८-४९ की जो आधार कीमतें हैं उन को छोड़ कर अक्सर चालू कीमतें ले ली जाया करती हैं, और इस तरह की एक रकाबट भेरे सामने और आ जाती है कि ये अंक शास्त्री लोग कौन हैं। जिस वक्त बंगाल में पचास लाख

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

आदमी भूख से मरे थे, उस वक्त इन अंक शास्त्रियों ने साबित किया था कि खाली पांच लाख मरे हैं। तो इसलिए मंत्रियों को बड़ा सावधान रहना चाहिए, और उन्हें कोई दिशा देनी चाहिए। मैं कोशिश करूंगा कि इन अंकों को, जहां तक हो सके, अपने दिमाग को लगा कर के भी इस्तेमाल करूं। तो पहली बात मुझे यह कहना है। और दूसरे योजना मंत्री ने जो आंकड़े दिये उस के अनुसार देहाती खपत ८७ अरब रुपये की हो जाती है। ८७ अरब। और जो हमारी राष्ट्रीय आमदनी खेती से है जिस में कि मैं पशुधन को शामिल किये लेता हूं वह कुल ६६ अरब या ६६०० करोड़ रुपये की है। तो ६६०० करोड़ रुपये की देहाती आमदनी और ८७०० करोड़ रुपये का खर्चा यह योजना मंत्री के आंकड़ों से बिलकुल साफ साबित होता है। वैसे मुझे चाहिए कि खेती की आमदनी में से पशुधन की रकम अलग कर लूं लेकिन उस को बिना अलग किये हुए ही २००० करोड़ रुपये का फर्क पड़ता है। एक माने में ३०००-३५०० करोड़ रुपये का फर्क पड़ जाता है, जो दो हिसाब दिये हैं उन में। हो सकता है कि सरकार की तरफ से यह कहा जाय कि आमदनी में और खर्चों में फर्क है क्योंकि खर्चों में दान भी जोड़ लिये जाते हैं, कर्जा भी जोड़ लिया जाता है। अब इस के बारे में मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि लगातार कर्जा नहीं चल सकता है। कर्जा तो २, ४, ५ या १० वर्ष की चीज होती है। आखिर कर्जा और खर्चा यह किसी न किसी तरीके से एक होना ही चाहिए, थोड़ा बहुत फर्क चाहे रहे।

एक बहुत बड़ी गलती इन उपभोक्ता आंकड़ों में होती है और वह यह कि इन में मूल्य फर्क जोड़ जुलाया जाता है? मिसाल के लिये मैं आप को बतलाऊं कि ईंधन और रोशनी पर १३वें चक्र के आंकड़े हैं जो छप

चुके हैं और योजना मंत्री ने १७वें चक्र के बताये, उन के लिये हमारे पास कोई आधार नहीं है। १३वें चक्र में मैं बतला रहा हूँ कि ईंधन और रोशनी पर नकद खर्चा सब से नीचे के लोगों पर २० पैसे रकबा गया है और खर्चा रकबा गया है ६१ पैसे। २० पैसे और ६१ पैसे। इसी तरीके से के एक और समूह का रकबा है नकद खर्चा २८ पैसे और दूसरा कुल खर्चा एक रुपये २ पैसे। चीनी के लिए १५ पैसे नकद खर्चा है और दूसरा खर्चा १६ पैसे रख दिया गया है। इस तरीके से कुल खर्चों को बढ़ा दिया जाता है लेकिन कितना भी बढ़ायें ६६०० से ८७०० तक बढ़ा देंगे, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहुत ही अनुचित काम है।

मैं एक दूसरा तरीका बतलाऊंगा उस हिसाब को लगाने के लिए और वह यह है कि सन् १९६०-६१ में हिन्दुस्तान के ३२ करोड़ खेतिहरों को जो देहात में रहते हैं, ४५ पैसे रोज की आमदनी पड़ती थी। आज ६१-६२ में ३५ करोड़ खेतिहरों को ४३ नये पैसे रोज के हिसाब से हो गयी। अब यह हिसाब मैं ने कैसे लगाया है, वह तो एक लम्बा क्रिस्ता होगा, खाली इतना ही बतला दूँ कि यह सरकार के आंकड़ों से ही हिसाब लगाया गया है, ४५ पैसे रोज और ४३ नये पैसे का। यह साधारण तौर से मान लिया जाता है कि जो ऊपर के १० सैकड़ा लोग हैं वह की पूरी आमदनी का ५० सैकड़ा ले लिया करते हैं जिसका कि नतीजा यह होता है कि ६०-६१ में खेतिहरों को २५ पैसे रोज की आमदनी थी और ६१-६२ में २३ पैसे रोज की आमदनी थी, यह सरकार के आंकड़ों से सिद्ध होता है। अगर मान लीजिये इन में पशुधन की आमदनी जोड़ भी ली जाय तो २७ पैसे रोज की आमदनी यानी साढ़ ४ घाने की आमदनी पड़ती है। लेकिन पशुधन जोड़ना नहीं चाहिए क्योंकि जिन लोगों के बारे

में मैं चर्चा कर रहा हूँ वह इस हैसियत में नहीं है कि पशु वगैरह रह रख कर अपनी आमदनी को बढ़ा लिया करें। इसलिए जो सरकार के अपने आंकड़े हैं उन से यह सिद्ध होता है २७ करोड़ से ज्यादा आमदनी ४ आने राज के ऊपर ज़िन्दा रहते हैं। यह जो राष्ट्रीय आमदनी के आंकड़े सरकार की तरफ से छपे हैं, उन के बारे में मैं कह रहा हूँ।

इस सिलसिले में मैं एक थोड़ी सी जानकारी जो मैं ने हासिल की वह बतलाना चाहूँगा। अब वह कहां तक सही है या गलत है यह मैं नहीं कह सकता। वहर हाल मैं आप को बतलाता हूँ कि जब से यह राष्ट्रीय आमदनी का सिलसिला सरकार ने चलाया है तब से शुरू से ही २० सैकड़ों की बढ़ती कर दी गई है चाहे जिस इरादे से की गई हो। बढ़ती इसलिए भी की जा सकती है कि हिन्दुस्तान को ज्यादा अमीर दिखाना है जितना कि वह है। दूसरे इसलिए भी हो सकती है कि सरकार को यह टैक्स कर लगाने की मुविधा हासिल करनी है और यह सब को मालूम है कि जो भी आंकड़े हमारे असली हैं उन में २० सैकड़ों की बढ़ती कर के यह सारे आंकड़े छापे जाते हैं।

अब मैं आप से एक और बात बतलाता हूँ और वह है गरीब प्रदेशों की दर, जिन आंकड़ों को कि योजना मंत्री ने रक्खा था और वह दूसरे संशंस जनगणना वाले आंकड़ थे। उस में उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार, राजस्थान, मध्य प्रदेश, उड़ीसा और आंध्र प्रदेश यह ६ हिन्दुस्तान के सब से गरीब इलाके हैं। उन की कुल देहाती जनसंख्या २० करोड़ होती है वैसे तो कुल २३ करोड़ है। मुझे उत्तर प्रदेश का एक आंकड़ा मालूम है। सरकार ने वह आंकड़े हर साल छापे हैं। एक बार तो १८२ रुपया फ्री आदमी हर साल देहात की आमदनी थी और वही अगर तर्क लगाया जाय कि ऊपर का दस सैकड़ा ५० सैकड़ा आमदनी हज़म कर लेता है या एक दूसरा तर्क जो कि मैं लगाता

हूँ कि उपभोक्ता जरीप से ले कर ऊपर का २० सैकड़ा खा लेता है ६० सैकड़ा और नीचे के ८० सैकड़ के लिए केवल ४० सैकड़ा बच जाता है। यह आंकड़े मैं ने खुद सरकार की किताब से लिये हैं। यह बात दूसरी है कि आंकड़े दूसरे के हैं, अलवत्ता जो कुछ हिसाब मैं ने लगाया है वह मेरा अपना है। मैं सरकार को सलाह दूंगा कि विशेषज्ञों के आंकड़ों को वह इस तरीके से इस्तेमाल न करें बल्कि किसी दिशा के साथ करें। बिना दिशा के इस्तेमाल करने का नतीजा खराब हो सकता है। इसलिए यह जो १८२ रुपया फ्री आदमी की हर साल उत्तर प्रदेश के देहात की आमदनी है वह अगर ५० सैकड़ों वाला घटा दिया जाता है तो १०१ रुपये हो जाती है और अगर ६० सैकड़ा ले लिया जाता है तो ९१ रुपये हो जाती है। इस के मानी यह हुए कि वह चार आने के नीचे रहता है। ४ आने के नीचे खुद सरकार के आंकड़ों से २७ करोड़ से ज्यादा लोगों की आमदनी रह जाती है यह तो बिल्कुल सिद्ध हो जाता है फिर उस के बाद १९३ रुपये की भी रकम दी गई है फ्री आदमी पीछे और वह थोड़ी सी बढ़ सके तो वह चार आने रहेगी या साढ़े तीन आने या सवा चार आने होगी। इस से ज्यादा फर्क नहीं पड़ेगा। यह मैं ने उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में कहा है हालांकि यह उत्तर प्रदेश का दुर्भाग्य है कि मुझे जैसा निकम्मा आदमी और प्रधान मंत्री जैसा अज्ञानी आदमी इस सूबे का प्रतिनिधित्व इस जगह पर करते हैं जो कि इतना गरीब सूबा है। उस के साथ साथ उड़ीसा, मध्यप्रदेश, बिहार और राजस्थान यह सब भी उसी हालत में पड़े हुए हैं और करोड़ों लोग मैं ने आप से बतलाया, २० करोड़ देहाती, उन में से या तो आप घटा दीजिये दस सैकड़ों के हिसाब से २ करोड़ और २० सैकड़ों के हिसाब से ४ करोड़ हुए, तो यह १८ करोड़ या १६ करोड़ लोग सरकार के अपने आंकड़ों के मुताबिक चार आने या साढ़े तीन आने रोज पर अपनी जिन्दगी चला रहे हैं।

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब मैं आप को याद दिलाऊँ कि प्रधान मंत्री ने २० अगस्त, सन् १९६० को कहा था कि राष्ट्रीय आय में ४० प्रतिशत: और प्रति व्यक्ति आय में २० प्रतिशत: की वृद्धि हुई। फिर उन्हें बड़ा अचरज हुआ कि यह बढ़ती चली कहाँ गई? तो सच पूछो एक माने में वह पहले ही इसे मान चुके हैं कि उन्हें पता नहीं कि कहाँ चली गई यह बढ़ती। तब उन्होंने ने यह १४ अक्तूबर सन् १९६० को आय वितरण समिति बनाई थी। अब मेरा सवाल है कि वह समिति कहाँ चली गई? इस सवाल पर कुछ धोड़ी सी तफसील की वान मैं आगे बतलाऊँगा लेकिन पहले एक और चीज के ऊपर मैं आप का ध्यान खींच दूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में एक एकड़ से कम खेती करने वाले ३४ सैकड़ा कुटुम्ब हैं और १४ सैकड़ा जमीन एक सैकड़ा कुटुम्ब के पास चली जाती है। इस आंकड़े से कुछ खतरनाक नतीजा निकलता है। मैं ने तो २७ करोड़ के लिए ३ आने वाली बात कही थी। अब मैं यहाँ कहना चाहता हूँ कि १० से १५ करोड़ हिन्दुस्तानी सिर्फ २ आने की आय पर रहते हैं। मेरे पास खत आये हैं, बहुतेरे खत आये हैं कि यह तुम ने तीन आने कह कर कैसा अन्याय कर दिया? अगर इस तरह के आंकड़े को दूसरे ढंग से भी साबित करना चाहें तो खेतिहर मजदूरों की संख्या करीब ७ करोड़ है। इन में से १ या आधा करोड़ घटा दीजिये जो शायद ऊँची अवस्था में हों।

फिर छोटे किसान की संख्यां मालूम है, डाई एकड़ तक के किसानों की संख्या कम से कम १५-१६ करोड़ होगी। फिर कारीगरों की संख्या मालूम है। वः भी २, ३ करोड़ होगी। फिर शहर के अन्दर २० से २५ सैकड़ा लोग ऐसे हैं जोकि बड़ी मुश्किल से जिदगी बसर करते हैं। मुश्किल से क्या, वः कैसे जिदा र ते हैं, मुझे नहीं मालूम। वे बेचारे पगथ पर और झुगी शोपड़ियों

में र ते हैं और शहर के कूड़ेदानों पर जा कर उम में से दाने बीन बीन कर किमी तरः में अपनी जिदगी बसर करते हैं। और जो लोग देहात से आ कर यहाँ आमदनी करते भी हैं, वे खुद बहुत कम खर्च करते हैं, क्योंकि अपने देहाती आदमियों को उन्हें पालना होता है। फिर आदिवासी हैं, विधवायें हैं, और अगर मैं कहूँ, तो फकड़ साधू हैं—सरकारी साधू नहीं। इन सब को मिला कर कोई २७-३० करोड़ आदमी आ जाते हैं।

13:40 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]

अगर इन आंकड़ों के अनावा में आंखों देखी हालत बताऊँ, जोकि प्रधान मंत्री, योजना मंत्री और सरकार को अपने सामने रखनी चाहिए, तो वह यह है। मैं ने बनारस में गाये को मुर्दे का मांस खाते देखा है इस सरकार में। मैं ने उड़ीसा में, जहाँ मछलियां विन्दुल नहीं र गई थीं, बहुत मामूली थीं, सैकड़ों लोगों को जाल फँक कर मछली पकड़ते देखा है। मैं ने तामिलनाड में मेलम में लाखों कारीगरों को दस आने, बारः आने, चौद आने रोज कमाते देखा है और मुना है और अगर व हिसाब भी लगाया जाये, तो तीन आने से कम पड़ता जाता है। इसी तरः से और जो भी हमारी जन-संख्या के छोटे वर्ग हैं, अगर हम उन की तरफ ध्यान देंगे, तो आमदनी उतनी ही आ जायगी।

श्री मोर्य (अलीगढ़) : गोबर में से दाने बीन कर खाते हुए मैं ने राजस्थान में देखा है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं ने भी देखा है कूड़े में से चीजें निकालते हुए, गोबर में से अनाज निकालते हुए। मैं ने तो बहुत कम बताया था। मैं ने सोचा था कि कहीं कोई नाजुक दिल टूट न जाये, इसलिए मैं ने दो आने वाली बात नहीं कही थी।

ये खुद सरकार के ही आंकड़े हैं। इन सरकारी अंक-शास्त्रियों में कुछ होड़ भी चला करती है। एक संस्था या दिल्ली में ही काम करती है, जिस को कते है आर्थिक जांच की राष्ट्रीय कांसिल। उस ने २६ जिलों के नाम दिये है, जिन में कुछ जिले है—बहुत सम्भल कर बोलना पड़ता है—जो १०० रुपये के नीचे जाते हैं। दरभंगा : ६६ रुपये फ्री आदमी, सारन, छपरा : ६८ रुपये फ्री आदमी, देवरिया : ६८ रुपये फ्री आदमी, टेहरी गढ़वाल : ८४ रुपये फ्री आदमी। अगर वही तरीका यों भी लागू किया जाय, जो मैं ने पहले दिया था कि ऊपर के १० सैकड़ा के लिए ५० सैकड़ा निकाल दो और अगर इस खपत जरीब के जरिये २० सैकड़ा के लिए ६० सैकड़ा निकाल दो, तो फिर इन जिलों की आमदनी तीन अ ने फ्री आदमी रोज से भी कम पड़ती है। मैं ने चार के ही नाम गिनाये हैं। और इस तरः के चालीम के करीब हैं, जोकि ११०, १२० और १२५ रुपये की आमदनी वाले हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब माननीय सदस्य अपना भाषण समाप्त करने का प्रयत्न करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत बड़ा सवाल है और मैं यह भी निवेदन करूंगा . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आप का ध्यान रूल १६५ की तरफ खीचना चाहता हूँ, जिस में लिखा है :

"There shall be no formal motion before the House nor voting. The member who has given notice may make a short statement and the Minister shall reply shortly. Any member who has previously intimated to the Speaker may be permitted to take part in the discussion."

I have got 14 names of Members who have given such intimation.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्या आप कुछ समय बढ़ा सकते हैं ? क्योंकि सभी माननीय सदस्य चाहेंगे कि इस ब स में भाग लें।

श्री बागड़ी (फ़ार) : यह देश की किस्मत का सवाल है। इस का समय बढ़ा दिया जाये। (Interruptions.)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य ने बीस मिनट ले लिये हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं समझता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के माननीय सदस्य भी चाहेंगे कि समय बढ़ाया जाये। (Interruptions.)

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : समय बढ़ाया जाये। (Interruptions.)

श्री रामसेवक यादव : चर्चा का समय बढ़ा दिया जाये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : वह नहीं होता है।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, खाद्य स्थिति के बारे में ढाई घंटे का समय दिया गया था और उस में ढाई घंटे और बढ़ा दिया गया। इस मत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न के लिए भी समय और बढ़ा दिया जाय।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He may take five minutes more and finish.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह तो इस सदन और आप का अधिकार है कि समय बढ़ा सकते हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : He may take 5 minutes more. For a discussion under Rule 193 the time prescribed is only two hours.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जीवन-स्तर कितना नीचे गिरता जा रहा है, यह इस तरह्वे

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

चक्र से साबित होता है कि करीब ३० सैकड़ा आबादी का खर्चा १९५२ में पड़ता था १० रुपये २८ नये पैसे—यह मैं सरकार वाले आंकड़े दे रहा हूँ—और १९५७-५८ में वह घट कर १० रुपये, १४ नये पैसे हो गया। प्रधान मंत्री जी अपनी किताबों को खुद पढ़ लिया करें, तो उन को पता चल जाये कि चीजें घटती रहती हैं। १५ रुपये, ७० नये पैसे था और तीस सैकड़ा घरों के लिए, जो घट कर १४ रुपये, ५० नये पैसे हो गया। सिर्फ २ सैकड़ा घरों का खर्चा ४५ रुपये से बढ़ कर के ४८ रुपये हुआ है। यह जीवन-स्तर घटता चला जा रहा है।

जहां तक राष्ट्रीय आमदनी का सवाल है, वह पहले ७ रुपये फ्री आमदनी हर साल बढ़ा करती थी। वह अब बन्द हो गई है, ऐसा मेरा हिसाब बताता है, जो दो नये पैसे प्रति व्यक्ति होता है—दो नये पैसे फ्री आमदनी फ्री साल, अगर इस रफ्तार से हम लोग चलते गये, तो न जाने हम को किस किस का शिकार होना पड़ेगा, सिर्फ चीन का ही नहीं। दूसरे देशों में घाना और चीन की बात मैं खास तौर से कहूंगा, रूस और अमरीका की नहीं। घाना में करीब ३०-४० रुपये फ्री साल फ्री आमदनी के हिसाब से बढ़ रहा है और चीन ५०-६० रुपये फ्री आमदनी फ्री साल। हम क्यों बंध गये? इस का कारण यह है कि खपत का आधुनिकीकरण हमारे यहां हुआ और पैदावार के आधुनिकीकरण को किये बगैर हम ने यूरोप और अमरीका की नकल करना शुरू कर दिया। नेताओं, नगर सेठों और नौकर-शाहों का जीवन स्तर तो उठता चला गया, ताकि वे यूरोप और अमरीका के बराबर आ जायें, लेकिन साधारण जनता का जीवन स्तर नहीं उठ पाया।

दो तीन लाख हर साल साहब बनते हैं, यह इस योजना का परिणाम जरूर होता है और वहां बहुत काफ़ी हिस्सा बढ़ती हुई

आमदनी का चला जाता है। मेरे हिसाब से इस वक्त पचास लाख बड़े लोग हैं और हर साल तीन लाख साहब या बड़े लोग बनते हैं। छह बारह पंद्रह बरस से तीन लाख साहब बड़े साहब हो गये हैं। एक मानी में कहा जाये, तो अंग्रेजों की सरकार तो तीन लाख लोगों की सरकार थी और यह सरकार पचास लाख लोगों की सरकार है।

अगर आमदनी के आंकड़ें, आय-कर, को भी आप देखें, तो पता चलता है कि ९,५२,००० आमदनी कर देते हैं, जिन के ऊपर दो अरब का कर है और बारह अरब आमदनी है। लेकिन हर एक जानता है कि कम से कम उतनी ही रकम और है मुनाफ़ का या दूसरी तरह से सुविधा बगैरह की, जोकि मात्रियों बगैरह को मिलती है। तो सब मिला कर बरोब २५ अरब रुपया है। यह २५ अरब रुपया के ल एक सैकड़ा आमदनी ले लेते हैं, यह सरकारी आंकड़ों से सिद्ध होता है। मेरे आंकड़े तो ख़र और ज्यादा आगे जाते हैं।

मैं समझता हूँ कि आसानी से १०-१२ अरब रुपया एक हिसाब से और १५-२० अरब रुपया दूसरे हिसाब से बचाया जा सकता है इस खपत के आधुनिकीकरण से, जिस से सरकार का भी काम ठीक चल सकता है, लोगों के ऊपर करों का बोझा कम हो सकता है और खेती, कारखानों का पंजीकरण भी ज्यादा अच्छा हो सकता है। लेकिन यह वही कर सकता है, जो इस दर्द को जाने।

यह विशयज्ञों की सरकार हो गई है और दिशाहीन विशयज्ञों की। कोई भी पुर्वा मंत्री को बड़ा देता है और मंत्री बगैर सोचे समझे उस को पढ़ देता है, क्योंकि मंत्री बचारों को कुछ पता ही नहीं होता है कि क्या खेती है, क्या कारखाने हैं, क्या राष्ट्रीय आमदनी है। मंत्रियों को खुद अपना दिमाग

लगाना चाहिए। इन बातों के ऊपर सोच विचार कर उन्हें दिशा बतानी चाहिए, क्योंकि ग्रंथ शास्त्री और ग्रंथ शास्त्री तो विषय की तरह हैं और वीन जिस तरह की बजाओगे, उसी तरह से वह नाचने लग जायगा और अगर वीन बजाना ही नहीं जानते हो, तो फिर नतीजा क्या निकल सकता है ?

मैं दावे के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान की आमदनी के बंटवारे को ठीक किया गया, तो बीस रुपया हर साल की वृद्धि की जा सकती है और कोई मामूली ग्रंथ के आमदनी भी इस काम को कर सकते हैं, लेकिन तब जब बढ़ती के सब हिस्सेदार हों।

मैं आप से अर्ज करूँगा कि मेरे खिलाफ यहाँ पर काफी ज़हर उगला गया पच्चीस हज़ार रुपये रोज़ के खर्च के मामले में। लोगों ने कहा कि मैं उकसाता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री को कत्ल कर दिया जाये। लोगों ने नहीं सोचा कि वे उकसा रहे हैं कि मुझ को कत्ल कर दिया जाये। इस तरह का ज़हर मेरे खिलाफ उगला जाता है। मैंने तो खाली एक सिद्धान्त की बात उठाई थी, वरना मुझे क्या मतलब पड़ा हुआ है। अगर एक आमदनी पच्चीस हज़ार रुपया रोज़ खर्च कर देता है, तो मैं उसको माफ़ भी कर देता, लेकिन मेरे लिए सवाल है कि उसकी नकल करके ये एक सैकड़ बड़े लोग २५ अरब रुपये सरकारी आंकड़ों के हिसाब से—और ५० अरब रुपये मेरे आंकड़ों के हिसाब से—ले जाया करते हैं। यहाँ कई माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि पच्चीस हज़ार क्या चीज़ है, करोड़ों खर्च करेंगे। मैं उनको खाली याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ वह किस्सा जो १९१७ में गांधी जी ने बड़े लाट वाइसराय के बारे में कहा था। वाइसराय बहुत ज्यादा खर्च करता था अपने ऊपर, लेकिन इतना नहीं जितना ये हज़रत करते हैं। वह इसका छठा भाग ही था। तब महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था यह बड़ा भूखा देश है, गरीब देश है, खाने को नहीं मिलता अगर बड़े लाट इतना रुपया खर्च करने से ही

अपनी जिन्दगी बचाते हैं तो इससे ज्यादा अच्छा है कि वह मर जायें। ये गांधी जी के शब्द हैं, मेरे शब्द नहीं हैं।

आखिर में मैं इतना ही कहूँगा कि बहुत ज़बदस्त धधकती आग है भूख की और गरीबी की। तबीयत तो मेरी यही करती है कहने को कि धधकती आग में यह सरकार जल करके खाक हो जाय और मेरे जैसे निक्ममे आमदनी जो इस सरकार को न हटा पायें, शायद उनके लिए भी खत्म होना अच्छा ही होगा ✓

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am very happy that Dr. Lohia has given notice of this subject for discussion in this House, because the problem of poverty is of such massive dimensions that unless the Government really and truly resolves to remove it there is no future for our country. I have no time to go into a lot of statistics. Besides, I remember the saying that there are three kinds of lies: lies, damn lies and statistics. And probably statistics can be cooked up, as they obviously are, in certain government departments. So, we cannot very much rely upon them.

Sir, it is a sorry state of things that we do not yet have a complete set of national accounts of the sort which was recommended by the United Nations, and the Bombay cost of living index dispute has shown how much of our data are unreliable. In any case, the other day, the Prime Minister referred to an economic expert who had given him a note, which he read out, in which it was said that Dr. Lohia had confused the per capita income of Rs. 25 per month with the family income and based all his deductions on the simple fallacy, drawing naturally absurd conclusions. I do not know who this economic expert is, I do not care, but the figure as given by the Planning Minister later on is very much nearer to the figure given by Dr. Lohia than the Prime Minister's, and it is a pity that the Prime Minister himself was led away so pathetically by the advice of his economic experts. The least

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

we see or hear of them, the better for this country, and the kind of economic expert whom he quoted should not be seen anywhere near in the precincts of the Yojana Bhavan or in any of the other government departments.

There are certain indisputable facts, however, namely, that 60 per cent of our people earn much less than the overall average *per capita* income of Rs. 25 per month, less even than the minimum standard of Rs. 20 per month per person and two-thirds of our people are below starvation level. Only recently there was a national sample survey effort and they found that 60 million of our people live on as low as five annas or less a day, 40 million live on four annas or less a day and 20 million live on two annas or less a day and these conclusions were substantiated by the Working Group set up by the seminar on some aspects of planning which was held in New Delhi in 1961. I give some of these figures, because it is rather important that we remind ourselves that very important Congress representatives have stressed this point. Our good friend, Shri Dhebar, whom we miss in this House very much, wrote an article in the *Khadi Gramodyog* of April 1963, exactly what I have just quoted:

"Over 60 per cent of the heads of the families cannot fulfil these necessities."

They cannot get for their children food, shelter, education, medicine and other reliefs. Then, he added:

"According to a recent survey, it is estimated that a man needs a minimum income of Rs. 35 per month to be able to consume nutritive food. On the other hand, in India the monthly *per capita* income of the six per cent of families in the lowest income bracket is Rs. 6.60, whereas that of the next ten per cent of population is Rs. 9.60, those in the third decile Rs. 11.70, the fourth decile Rs. 13.26."

I would go on quoting, Sir, but I am pressed for time and I cannot do so.

Now, it remains a fact, therefore, that the condition of our people is nothing to brag about, nothing even to try to cover up with some kind of excuse which the Government tries to do from time to time. Only a few years ago, the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations put it in their report that India had the lowest caloric intake and that it has the poorest diet of all countries listed in their year book. This kind of thing goes on all the time. And when our economists try to go into more details about it, to get the kind of break up which is necessary to understand the condition of the lowest rung of the social ladder, then we find such findings as I notice in the *Economic Weekly* of the 15th of June, 1963, an article on the origin and distribution of rural income in India 1956-57 where all the latest techniques of statistical computations are employed, and there it is found that agricultural employment brings to landless labourers and people with very little land in their possession an average income per earner of Rs. 113:27. It is income per earner, which has to be divided into several units because several mouths have to be fed in every family. I have so many other things to quote. Professor Gadgil himself has remarked in his note to the second volume of the Report of the Study Group on the Welfare of the Weaker Sections of the Village Community how, particularly because of the manipulations of statistics, this fact has not become very clear from time to time that the condition of our people in the villages is not only stagnant but also, in many cases, even deteriorating in the present day conditions. We also notice how the Government's own efforts through such organisations as the Second Agricultural Labour Inquiry Committee have brought about the finding that the landless agricultural labour households in 1956-57 accounted for 57 per cent of all agricultural labour households as against 50 per cent in 1950-51. Then,

a study group appointed by the Government of India has estimated that about 45·50 per cent of the rural households have an income of less than Rs. 500 per annum, about 80 per cent less than Rs. 1,000 per annum, and this is far lower than the miserable low average *per capita*, which stood at Rs. 232 for 1960-61. I would go on adding to these statistics, but I suppose it will not be necessary.

I would like to draw the attention of this House and of the Government to certain matters which are perhaps sometimes overlooked. I know the conditions in the countryside are worst of all that we should have such a sense of shame about it that we cannot go about the world with our heads in the air. We have to have a sense of humility which must be translated into positive terms of action. But even in those areas of our country which are supposed to be comparatively well off—take, for instance, West Bengal—recently there was a report made by the National Council of Applied Economic Research that in West Bengal, the *per capita* income was the highest in the whole of the country, but the very same organisation has remarked in its report that the higher state income and also average *per capita* income are “a handsome though illusive facade behind which lurks extreme misery” because of such tremendous disparities which hardly bear talking about. And that is why from West Bengal, supposed to be the State which has the highest *per capita* income in the country there comes news reported in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of the 28th of August, that a family of four had a suicide pact, three of them died but the fourth man, the head of the family, lost his nerve at the last moment and he has been arrested on a charge of attempted suicide, a suicide pact because they did not have anything to live on.

14 hrs.

Dr. Lohia referred to what he has seen in certain parts of the country. I can say this and I put it down on re-

cord in a copy of the journal, *Kurukshetra*, of the month of July 1963—in the same journal the hon. Prime Minister also has written an article. I had an experience in Calcutta in late May or June. I went to a place where I was invited to have dinner—there was some kind of a ceremonial—and when I was coming out of the place I saw with my own eyes the leavings of rich food served inside being dumped on the streets and a number of destitutes fighting with dogs in order to get some part of the food. I had seen this kind of thing before but in my wishful ignorance I thought that perhaps that kind of thing did not happen in this country now. But they do happen still. I do not know how the hon. Prime Minister or any of his colleagues can have a clear conscience about it. How can they come and say that more or less conditions are improving? They have to have a very vivid and persistent and permanent sense of humility about what has not been achieved in this country as far as the condition of living of our country is concerned.

I say so because Dr. Lohia has quoted Gandhiji. If one single piece of a literary or emotional pronouncement had an impact on me, which pushed me into the arid regions of politics where I do not belong, it was the statement made by Gandhiji before the court which tried him on the 18th March 1922. Shri Tyagi perhaps will remember it. I read about it and it thrilled my whole frame and has stuck in my memory. He said on that occasion in his statement before that court in Ahmedabad where he was tried by Mr. Bloomfield, the English Judge:—

“No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in our Indian villages present to the naked eye.”

He said further:—

“I have no doubt whatsoever that the government established by law in British India is carried

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

on for the exploitation of the masses and the miserable little comforts of the town-dwellers represent the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter and the profits and the brokerage are sucked from the masses. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town-dwellers in India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unparalleled in history."

This was the statement which, at least, in my humble case has changed the tenor of my life. I am sorry to have to say that. But it did. This is the kind of thing or emotion with which our people came forward. When Gandhiji talked about Harijans as people of God or Daridranarayan, as God coming in the garb of the poor did he mean that the people who are under-privileged are to be kept in a special enclosure so that the comfortable votaries of God can look upon them and exercise their philanthropy and earn some virtue? He did not mean that. He said, on the contrary, that God comes to the poor in the garb of food. That is why the kind of ugly, barbaric disparity which continues in our country today cannot be tolerated. I do not know what the hon. Planning Minister has in view—he is the Home Minister also today—and I do wish he tries to do something about it.

The day before yesterday in the Rajya Sabha in answer to a question, the hon. Finance Minister said that there are eight individuals in this country from whom income-tax arrears to the extent of Rs. 1 crore and more are still to be collected. There are here eight individuals so rich that they can keep a crore of rupees or more as arrears of income-tax. We have read in the papers how CD cars, Pontiac or some other luxury cars, are sold for Rs. 80,000/-. To whom? To what kind of people? Who are they? We know what kind of people they are.

We read in the papers about a film star in Bombay who had her house

burgled. How much did the thief take? Rs. 2,20,000/- burgled out of a house! Obviously, it was black money, kept there. But monies of that dimensions seem to be kept at certain places by certain people. On the other side of the picture we find people trying to get food by picking crumbs out of whatever is dumped on the streets.

I remember, in the old days, having read about the Sabarmati Ashram where every morning the people who lived there would go round. What did they say? They chanted the sloka from Markandeya Purana which said:

न त्वहं कानर्यं राज्यं न स्वर्गं न पुनर्भवं
कामये दुःखतप्तानां प्राणिनामतिनाशनं ।

"I do not want a kingdom or to go to heaven; I do not want to be born again. What I want is that there should be elimination of the misery and the pain of our people."

That was the ideal on which is based everything that we are fighting for. When we are asking for socialism, do we do so only because we want to live a life of luxury and ostentation? Do we want socialism because we want affluence? Oh! no;—we do not want a merely affluent society. We want a non-acquisitive society. We want a society where mere possession is looked down upon, where the good things of life are properly and truly respected. That is why I feel that too often we come here and go back and make speeches—footling little things, jobs which need not be done, occupy all of our time. I do not know.

I am reminded of the Biblical story about the King coming out and asking the watchman of the tower, "Watchman, what of the night?" and he replies, "The night is very dark." When will the people of India be able to tell themselves that the dawn is breaking? When will the dawn break? When will the Government awake to its responsibilities? It is not doing so. That is why there are footling little efforts,

pettyfogging efforts to deny the fact of the situation which is that our people have no food, that the people live in the depths of degradation which misery has brought. If this misery is not eliminated, there is a very thin line between hunger and anger. If in the countries, like India, this misery is not stopped, if the world continues half-privileged and half-starved then there would be upsurges not only in other countries of Afro-Asia but in India also beside which the Russian Revolution might look like a mere tea-party. That is the perspective in which planning has to be done in this country. If you really and truly want to change qualitatively the character of the life of our people do behave more sensibly—it is my appeal to the Government—do not fly in the face of facts which show that our people are in their utterest sloughs of despond and degradation and do adopt some measures in order to change the present position.

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this discussion arises from the argument advanced by Dr. Lohia that a large portion of our population, about 27 crores, live on an income of less than three annas per day. The argument is very simple but the implications are very grave. The House is entitled to know whether the argument of Dr. Lohia is correct and, if it is correct, what are its implications and, if it is not correct, to what extent a mistake has crept in, Dr. Lohia's argument.

The discussion suffers from a great handicap in as much as Dr. Lohia did not disclose how he arrived at his figure of three annas per day for 27 crores of our people.

डा० राम मनोहर लोडिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य भाषण तैयार करके नाएँ थे, मेरे भाषण को सुनने से पहले ? सब बतलाया मैंने ।

Shri Morarka: Even today when Dr. Lohia tried to explain how he

arrived at the figure, I must confess my inability to have followed him. While he accepts the total national income of this country which is arrived at by a certain agency, he does not accept the figures of distribution of that income in the different sectors of population. If he had accepted all the figures collected by the National Income Unit Committee or by the National Sample Survey, or for the matter of that other independent agencies, such agencies as we have in this country, I am sure, a man of Dr. Lohia's eminence and intelligence would not have taken time to appreciate the fallacy of his own argument. I will give statistics collected only by three different agencies which are independent. When I say this I must preface it by saying that I am not trying to argue that there is no poverty in this country. There is. A very big majority of our population has a very low per capita income. There is also inequality to large extent. I am also prepared to concede that the progress that we have made is not according to our expectations. If you like, I would also say that the standard of living of the people has not substantially improved. But all these things are quite different from the argument that 27 crores of people in this country have an income of less than 3 annas per day.

First of all, I would give you the evidence of the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry conducted in 1956-57. They have examined the income of the lowest strata of our society, the landless agricultural labourers, and that enquiry was in respect of 7 crore people. What was the evidence? What was the finding of this Committee? The finding of this Committee was that the average income of each agricultural labour household was Rs. 437 per year and the average household unit was 4.4 persons. So, on that basis, the per capita income comes to Rs. 100 per year or Rs. 8.33 per month as against Rs. 5.62 per month indicated by Dr. Lohia.

[Shri Morarka:]

Now, the point is this. This relates to 7 crore people and these 7 crore people belong to the lowest strata in society, whereas Dr. Lohia's argument was that this income of 3 annas per day is not the income of 7 crore people only, but it is the income of 27 crores of people, that is, as much as 60 per cent of our population.

The Minister of Shipping in the Ministry of Transport (Shri Raj Bahadur): The difference is only 20 crores.

Shri Morarka: Then, take another authority on statistics, Mr. Lydall. His finding was that the average income of 65 per cent of our population is more than Rs. 11.6 per month. According to Dr. Lohia, 60 per cent of our population get Rs. 5.62 per month. According to this independent foreign visitor, who spent some time and collected the facts and figures, his finding is that 60 per cent of our population, on an average, get Rs. 11.6 per month.

The third authority is our Planning Commission, the Perspective Planning Division. What is their finding? It is that 60 per cent of our population have the per capita income of more than Rs. 13 per month.

The other day, the hon. Minister for Planning disclosed in the House the figures of consumption and according to those figures the consumption of the rural people, in the rural area, comes to 70 nP per day per head and that is not only for 27 crores of people but that is an average for the entire 36 crores of people living in the rural area. The objection taken was that the figures given by Nandaji were the figures of consumption and that they were not the figures of income. In the first place, Dr. Lohia's own figures were also the figures of consumption. He said that they are living on 3 annas per day. But leave that aside also. I do not want to argue on a small point.

The main point is that in a population, or in a sector of the population, where the income is very low, there cannot be much difference between the income and the expenditure because the income is so low that the people cannot save anything. The argument given by another hon. Member was that it may be they are living by borrowing money. I can understand borrowing money in one year when the crop fails. I can understand borrowing money by a few people. But I cannot understand 27 crores of people borrowing money from the remaining 9 crores of people in the rural area. And borrowing money on what security? And borrowing year after year? The Rural Credit Survey does not disclose any evidence of our population's indebtedness having been increased or increasing year by year.

Having said this, I confess that the statistics that we have got in this country, the statistics that we collect in this country, are not very very comprehensive, nor are they very accurate. Even in the advanced countries, the statistics about national income are never found to be very reliable and much more so in this country. Before independence, no attempt was ever made to organise the collection of statistics in this country. It is only thereafter that we have established different agencies, the most important of which is our National Sample Survey. I have got here a quotation about the statistics. I am quoting this because Dr. Lohia compared the growth of national income of this country with those of other countries. So far as the national income is concerned, it is very difficult to compare the national income of one country with another because there are so many different factors and those factors are not only peculiar to each country but the interpretation of those factors and the extent to which the weightage is given to them are all arbitrary. Here is the opinion of some famous Cam-

bridge Economist which I would like to quote here for the benefit of the House. This is what he says:

"In every calculation or estimate of the national income decisions must be made on each of several points on which there are differences of opinion stemming from conceptual and practical difficulties. There is no simple and unambiguously correct course to follow; decisions are necessarily a matter of preference or convenience, and hence are arbitrary. This gives rise to the possibility that national income computations for different countries may not be based on identical definitions or on identical treatment of economically similar items."

Now, Sir, leaving aside the statistics, I will apply one or two practical tests, give practical evidence, to see whether the argument of Dr. Lohia could be correct or not. The first practical evidence is of the *per capita* consumption. Has the consumption of different commodities in this country during the last one decade increased or not?

If you take that evidence, what do you find?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This country is consuming the consumer.

श्री भागवत मा आजाद (भागलपुर) :
अच्छी कविता है ।

Shri Morarka: *Per capita* consumption of textiles has increased from 11.3 to 15.7 metres; of kerosene it has increased from 3.3 to 6.7 litres; of tea it has increased from 215 to 280 gms; of coffee, from 52 to 105 gms; of sugar, from 3:2 to 5:8 kgs.; of Vanaspati, from 472 to 802 gms. and of footwear and bicycles etc. it has similarly increased. The richer class or the well-to-do class was already using all those commodities according to their own requirements. If the consumption of these goods has increased—and I submit it has increased

substantially—then the increase has gone only to the people who were previously deprived of these goods. The main question, therefore, is that if you apply the test of consumption, you find that the standard of living of the people has increased to some extent. But leave all this aside.

I come to the final point. If 27 crores of people can exist on an income of less than 3 annas per day, does it not follow that this country is a paradise of cheapness where everything is available so cheap, that there is no price rise, that there is no burden on the people because 27 crores of people can live on less than 3 annas a day.... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, order; reserve your comments.

Shri Morarka: 27 crores of people cannot live at starvation level. 27 crores of people cannot live by borrowing money. They are therefore living only with the income they have got. I submit, Sir, that the figures given by the National Sample Survey that at least the *per capita* income of 27 crores is more than 7 annas or 7.5 annas per day are more correct and the figures given by Dr. Lohia are misconceived.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप ने—मोर करेक्ट—शब्द इस्तमाल किए है । जरा बतला दीजिए कि मही क्या है ।

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I am glad that my hon. friend Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia has given the occasion for this House as well as for Government to have a heart-searching in regard to the stark poverty that is prevalent in the country. If he had not made bold to pitch upon this particular figure of three annas, perhaps, we might not have done that heart-searching. The dispute is not between three annas and seven annas, but the dispute is, and ought to be, over the question whether as a result of these fifteen years of this Congress administration and these two and a

[Shri Ranga]

half spans of their planning, the actual living conditions of the general masses of this country have improved or not.

The other day, the Prime Minister made bold to say or rather expressed the hope that somehow the ordinary people must be eating a little more than in the past. That is a very poor consolation, and I contest that statement also.

In actual fact, the *per capita* income has been going down even according to the Government's own records. From 250 which it used to be in 1951-52, it has come down to 193 in 1961-62. Then, if you take again their own hopes of increasing the *per capita* income in this country, they were hoping that they would be able to raise it by 4 per cent per annum in the First Five Year Plan, by another 5 per cent, I suppose, in the Second Five Year Plan, and by another 5 per cent in the Third Plan. All these hopes have come to be frustrated, and they have reached only 8.2 in the First Five Year Plan, and 9.7 in the Second Plan. Therefore, it does not show progress. On the other hand, it is only a regression. Then, on top of it, what do we find in regard to the consumption levels of our people?

It was said by experts that the calorific quantity of food that an ordinary worker would need would be 1½ lbs, i.e. 24 ounces for manual workers. I am sure that most of these 27 crores of people whom my hon. friend Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia had in his mind when he was speaking, belonged to the class of manual workers and those other people who were just liberating themselves from eight to ten hours of manual work every day. These people would certainly need a minimum of 24 ounces of cereal food. But what are they getting? As a result of this planning and the 16 years of this administration and all these ever-rising burdens of taxation and public loans, whereas, in 1951, they were getting 11.5 ounces

of cereals and 2.02 ounces of pulses, by the time we reached 1962, they were getting only 13.6 ounces of cereals; that is, instead of getting 24 ounces which they need, they are getting only 13.6 ounces. If this is not half-starvation, if this is not starvation, I would like to know what sort of starvation anyone can possibly imagine.

In this way, the standard of living of our people is coming down, and it has come down also even according to the admissions made by the Mahalanobis Committee and also by the professor himself, as well as by so many Congress leaders including the Prime Minister himself, that the poor people are becoming poorer and the rich people are becoming richer. That was why they appointed that Mahalanobis Committee. And what have they done? Till now, they have not published their report at all. I do not know why. They are keeping it a great secret. But we know one thing that Professor Mahalanobis himself has said that the *per capita* income per day is not more than five annas. He has said only five annas as the *per capita* income. Even supposing we take five annas as the starting point, what do we find? If you would look into the commemoration volume which was published in honour of Shri D. R. Gadgil, you will find that there is a very interesting calculation made there in regard to the incidence of excise duties on ordinary people, on agricultural workers, and also industrial workers, and you will find from that that one anna every day is the *per capita* incidence of excise duties on those people. If you take into account the incidence of all other taxes and other burdens that are indirectly being placed on them by Government as well as by various exploiting agencies in this country, you will only get about 4½ annas or 3½ annas; even according to Professor Mahalanobis himself, if you take the figure as five annas, then the incidence of excise duties and other bur-

dens would come to one anna or one anna and six pies. Therefore, the figure cannot be more than five annas. So, how on earth could it be seven annas at all?

What satisfaction did the Prime Minister and the Minister in charge of Planning wish to derive by coming here and beginning to contradict Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia saying that it is not three annas at all, and that all his calculations are wrong? Can they deny that our people, our ordinary masses, the agricultural workers, and even the industrial workers for whom my hon. friend Shri Nanda has got such a tremendous amount of love, are poor? Can they also deny what my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee had said just now that there are lakhs of people who would only be too glad to pick things out of leavings? When such is the poverty in this country, what is it that they can say in favour of their own administration? It would have been all right if they had said that when the British were here, there was this poverty. But after the British had gone, what have they done? After having taken these tax burdens to these sky-high levels, and after having also increased the land revenue burdens by 200 per cent or 300 per cent in many places and more than 150 per cent in so many other places, what is the achievement of this Government? They want our people to derive satisfaction, I suppose, by looking at all these great manufacturing edifices that they are raising and the sky-scrapers which are coming up in Delhi and in other cities. But that is not going to bring any more food.

I have no objection if they give their figures only in regard to consumption. Even in regard to consumption, what is it that the ordinary people are getting? I would like to invite my hon. friend the Minister in charge of Planning and the other Ministers also to come to the weekly markets and see how the ordinary working class women and the peasant women are making their purchases.

1100 (Ai) LSD—6.

They come there with only four annas sometimes, or sometimes eight annas or in very few cases, with one rupee, and with that one rupee or eight annas or four annas, they make their purchases. And how many things can they purchase with this sum? So, they go on heckling and haggling and bargaining, and they also quarrel with each other, and in the end, they get small quantities of oil, salt, ginger, and then condiments and various other small things, and mind you, no *dal* at all; as for tobacco, they cannot even hope to get a stump of tobacco, and so, they purchase only the *churnam*. This is the position of the masses of this country, even after fifteen years of planning. In the face of this, I cannot understand how my hon. friend the Minister in charge of Labour, who was the Labour Minister till the other day, had the heart and also the temerity to come here to this House and make such a statement. And my hon. friend is a man of honour, and a man of sentiments also. I wonder how he could have stifled his own sentiments and come forward here to contradict Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia's statement in a grandiloquent and solemn manner and say that it is not three annas but seven annas.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Does my hon. friend also stand by the figure of three annas?

Shri Ranga: My only advantage is that I do not have so many of those experts and who go on misleading my hon. friend here. My hon. friend had to fall back upon some sample surveys conducted here and there in different parts of the country by a few people who were trained or untrained or ill-trained. Does my hon. friend again want to commit that blunder? I pity him, because he has put his foot into that, and so did the Prime Minister also. And I am glad in a way that they have done it, because they will realise that even after these sixteen years of their planning, the consumption of cereals and pulses, and even of cloth to which my hon. friend Shri Morarka made a reference, has come down; even

