

RESOLUTION RE FIVE YEAR PLAN

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I beg to move:

"This House records its general approval of the principles, objectives and programme of development contained in the Five Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission."

In moving this resolution, I have a feeling, first of all, of the stage of a journey being completed, of a duty done, and if I may say so, well done, and at the same time I have another and more powerful sensation of a harder duty and more difficult work ahead, of another journey immediately to be undertaken, because ultimately there are no resting places in the journey we have undertaken.

So far as this present Plan is concerned, it may be said to have had its beginning in preparation when the Planning Commission first came into existence. Of course, much thought had been given to this question of Planning in India even previously and discussions had taken place in this very House or the Parliament before. But this particular attempt was begun when this Planning Commission came into existence two and a half years ago. Now, perhaps, I may speak in this matter without any offence against modesty, because my own connection with the Planning Commission, though intimate, nevertheless, was one in which the burden of work fell lightly upon me. Others carried the burden, and therefore if I may praise that work, I do not praise myself or what I have done in regard to it. Therefore I said I can speak a little more freely about that matter than if I had myself been possibly a recipient of that praise.

The Planning Commission, and as such the staff of the Planning Commission—when I say the staff, I include all the members of it, whatever their degree or status might be—have worked very hard, very conscientiously, very earnestly and with something of the crusading spirit, in preparing this Plan.

I should like, therefore, to pay my tribute to them, not merely an empty tribute without knowledge but with due knowledge of what they have done. And that, if I may say so, need not necessarily have any relation to what we may agree or disagree with any particular chapter or particular part of the Report. This work was, in a sense, the first of its kind, certainly the first of its kind so far as we were

concerned, and I think we might justifiably say that in this particular context it was the first of its kind anywhere. We know very well, of course, that planning became well known and rather fashionable ever since over 20 years ago when the first Five Year Plan of the Soviet Union came into the field and was much talked about. Gradually planning became a popular subject for people to talk about, though very often those who talked about it, talked perhaps without really understanding what they were talking about.

What I mean is this. People talk about planning sometimes in limited spheres. Of course, there can be planning for a nation, it is something infinitely more than that planning in bits and spurts here and there. It becomes an integrated way of approaching this question of a nation's manifold activity. But the difference in the way of our approach and the way of the old Soviet approach—I am not comparing the two, I am merely mentioning it—has been a certain difference in our objectives, somewhat, though not perhaps so great ultimately as might be thought, but much more so in the methods adopted. And in view of the fact that we function under a democratic set up which we have deliberately adopted and enshrined in our Constitution and in this Parliament, naturally any planning that takes place must be within that set up and no Planning Commission has any right to go about producing something which has no relation to our Constitution or the set up under which we are functioning.

Now, that puts certain self-imposed limitations on a plan, but I would like to say that those limitations are not final limitations. And I do not think it would be right to say that that democratic functioning necessarily puts any limitations at all. It may make the way a little more difficult; the procedure adopted may be a little more complicated. But a democratic set up, properly worked, should permit of anything that we desire to be done. And, possibly, that, I suppose, is the justification of that democratic set up, apart from other justifications, that what it does, even though it might take a little more time, it does perhaps build on more firm foundation and in particular, it builds on a foundation of an individual, and not entirely forgetting the individual. However, that is not a point I wish to labour. What I wish to say is that accepting the democratic set up and accepting the functioning of this Parliament etc., we must consider this Plan, on that basis. We have made a Constitution and we should abide by that Constitution.

Nevertheless let it not be said that that Constitution, every part of it, every chapter and corner of it, is something that is so sacrosanct that it cannot be changed to the needs of the country or the nation so desired. Undoubtedly it can be changed wherever necessary, not lightly but after full thought, if it is thought that that part of the Constitution comes in the way of the nation's progress. But, generally speaking, we have to plan in accordance with that Constitution.

Now this Plan was produced, or rather the parent of it—the Draft Outline—was placed before the country a little over a year ago and placed before this Parliament also, and it was approved generally by Parliament then and it has been the subject of approval and criticism and, to a slight extent, condemnation in certain parts but much more so of approval generally all over the country during this year. And the Planning Commission has profited greatly by that criticism and even by the partial condemnation of parts of the Plan that has been placed before it. I doubt if there has been greater consultation of various, not only organisations, parties, States, but opinions, viewpoints etc. I doubt if there has been a greater consultation of the various elements that go to make up the nation's life anywhere in this matter than we have had in this particular Plan during the last year and a quarter. In that sense, therefore, it might be said to be not the production of five or six members of the Planning Commission, but rather a joint effort in which a large part of the nation has taken part and, therefore, it represents something much more than the opinions of the members of the Planning Commission. They had to deal with a very difficult problem. Of course, the country is big, but apart from the bigness of the country, we had to deal with a federal structure—the Centre and the great States, and the various States also divided in various degrees. We have to deal with an economy which is in many ways a very backward economy. We have to suffer the consequences of past acts and many things that have happened in the past. We have to deal with a new social consciousness which is very desirable. We have to deal with great ambitions, which we all share, to progress rapidly and we have to deal with limited resources to further those great ambitions. We have had to, and have to, deal with, looking at the world in a period of storm and trial and crisis and change, and generally speaking, disaster round the corner. We have to deal in India often enough with thinking in old ruts, with some-

times superstitions and outlooks which come in the way of progress. We have to deal even, if I may say so with all respect, with the reformer of yesterday who is a conservative today, the revolutionary of yesterday forgetting that today is different from yesterday. In other words, we had to deal with a dynamic and live situation, ever changing, which could not be resolved by any dogma, whether of religion or, of economic or, of anything else.

Apart from that fact, when you deal with a great country like India, you have to deal with India only and not with any other country or the conditions that exist in any other country and try to repeat them here. Of course, there are certain principles, certain ideals, certain objectives which hold for various countries, which hold for various ages too; they do not change. India herself has represented various principles of that type and I hope she will hold to them, while, at the same time, I hope and say that with emphasis, that she will give up a large number of superstitions and evil ways of old which have impeded her growth and which are taken advantage of even today to divert people from the principal subjects that we should consider here. So, for all this amalgam and variety that we have in India, we have to form a plan for future progress. And, when I think of this for a moment, I forget these two heavy and fat volumes of the Report of the Planning Commission and something much vaster comes before me, the mighty theme of a nation building itself, re-making itself, all of us working together to make a new India—that is a big job—all of us working together, not abstractly for a nation but for the 360 million people as individuals or as groups going ahead.

In fact, we are trying to catch up as far as we can with the Industrial Revolution which came long years ago in western countries and made great changes in the course of a century or more, which ultimately has branched off in two directions from the same tree, if I may say so, the two directions at present being represented by the very high degree of technological development represented by the United States of America and other represented by the Soviet Union, branches of the same tree even though they might quarrel with each other. Now, this Industrial Revolution has a long history in the past and we are apt to think in terms of European history when we look at India. Why we should repeat the errors of the past is not clear to me. Obviously we have to learn from the past and avoid these errors.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Now, we talk in terms of industrialisation and it is obvious to me that we have to industrialise India as rapidly as possible. And, when I use the word 'industrialise' I include, of course, in it all kinds of industry, major, middling, small, village and cottage. The biggest step that we can take in the industrialisation of the country can absorb only—by any computation you like—a small part of the population of this country in the next ten, twenty or even thirty years, put it whatever you like. Yet hundreds of millions remain over who will be employed chiefly in agriculture but who, also have to be employed in smaller industries, in cottage industries and the like. And, therefore, the importance of village and cottage industries. I think, the argument that often takes place, the argument of big industry versus cottage industry and village industry is rather mis-conceived. I have no doubt at all that without the development of major industry in this country, we cannot raise our levels of existence. In fact, I will go further: We cannot remain a free country because certain things are essential to freedom: Defence—leave out other things—which if we do have, we cannot remain a free country. Therefore, we have to develop industry in that major way, but always remembering that all the development of industry in that major way does not by itself solve the problem of the hundreds of millions of this country and we have to increase the smaller village industry and cottage industry in a big way also remembering that in trying to develop industry, big or small, we do not forget the human factor. We are not out merely to get more money and more production. We want not merely more production but ultimately we want better human beings in this country with greater opportunities not only economic and the rest but at other levels also. We have seen in other countries that economic growth by itself does not necessarily mean human growth, does not necessarily mean national growth. So, we have to keep this particular picture and not think that the growth of the nation comes merely from the shouting that takes place in the market places and the stock exchanges of the country. So, to balance all these, to produce some kind of integrated plan for the economic growth of the country, for the growth of the individual, for greater opportunities to every individual, for the greater freedom of the country, you have to do all this within the framework of political democracy. Political democracy, ultimately of

course, will only justify itself or be justified if it succeeds in producing these results. If it does not, political democracy will yield place to some other form of economic or social structure, does not matter how much any of us like it or not. Ultimately, it is results that will decide the fate of what structure we may adopt in this country or in any country of the world. When we talk of political democracy we must remember that it is ceasing to have that particular significance which it had, say, in the 19th century. Political democracy, if it is to have any meaning must gradually, or, if you like, rapidly lead to economic democracy. Without that, if there is great inequality in the country, all the political democracy and all the adult suffrage in the world does not bring about the real essence of democracy. Therefore, your objective has to be—call it economic democracy, call it the putting an end to all these great differences between class and class—the bringing about of more equality, and a more unitary society. In other words, it has gradually to put an end to the various classes that subsist and ultimately develop into a classless society. That may be a little far off, I do not know. But you must keep that in view.

Now, it is clear that you cannot approach that by way of conflict and violence, so far as this country is concerned. We have achieved many things by way of peace and there is no particular reason why we should give that up and go into violent methods. There is a very particular reason why we should not do so because I am quite convinced that, however high our ideals might be, and our objectives, if we try to solve them by methods of violence, it will delay matters very greatly. It will help the growth of the very evils that we are fighting against. India is not only a big country, but a varied country, and if anyone takes to the sword, he will inevitably be met by the sword of someone else. Therefore, it becomes a clash between swords, or violence, and all the limited energies of the nation are destroyed in that process, or greatly lessened.

I P.M.

Now, the method of peaceful progress is a method ultimately of democratic progress. But keeping in mind the ultimate aim of democratic thought. It is not enough for us to say that we have given votes to all, and let the rest remain. The ultimate aim is economic democracy. The ultimate aim is putting an end to these great differences between the rich and the poor; the people who have opportunities and those who have none

or very little. That must be kept in mind. In the ultimate analysis, everything that comes in the way of that aim must be removed—removed in a friendly way; removed in a co-operative way; removed by State pressure; removed by law—because nothing should be allowed ultimately to come in the way of your achieving that social objective.

So, a plan of this type is not merely the putting up of a number of factories here and there; not merely showing greater production here and there—which is necessary, of course—but something more with a deeper significance; something aiming at a certain kind of structure of society that you want gradually to develop. Of course, you and I cannot lay down what will happen or what the next generation might do. You and I cannot even say what the next generation will be like. In these days of very rapid technological advance, no man knows what the world would be like some time hence. We are technologically backward. Therefore, sometimes when we discuss big problems, we discuss them—if I may say so with all respect—in a rather static way, forgetting that the very ground underneath our feet is changing or slipping away. Unless we move with it, we may tumble over or be left behind. The enormous pace of technological advance ever since the Industrial Revolution is generally known and appreciated, but nevertheless we are not emotionally aware of what is happening from day to day, and it may well be that in the course of the next ten years, or twenty years, or more, this technological advance might change the whole aspect of the things in the world, and that affects the life of human beings tremendously. It affects their thinking. It affects their economic structure. It affects their social structure. Ultimately, it affects their political structure also. Anything may come. We cannot hind the future. For the present, we have to deal with facts as they are.

But I mention these broader factors, so that our mind must have that dynamic quality, that quality of vision, that revolutionary quality which not only the average laymen, but even our experts—whether they are economists, or even planners—lack. They have become very static in their approach. I do not see this mighty change. We talk of revolutions and think perhaps that a revolution is a process where you can break each other's head. That is not a revolution. It may be or may not be—that is a side show. Good or bad, a revolution is something which changes fundamentally the structure—political

and economic—of the society, so that with this background we have to take into consideration this first attempt of ours to make a plan.

Naturally, it is not perfect. I do not claim perfection. Perfection is a big word. I think that it is quite easy to pick holes in it. It is quite easy to demonstrate that it is wrong somewhere or not right elsewhere, or that much could have been done, or something which could have been said has not been said, or that something which need not have been said has been said, and so on. All this can be done, and no doubt will be done. I have no doubt that after it has been done, the Planning Commission itself may like to profit by what has been said. But look at it in this broader context and not from the point of view of more criticism. This is the first attempt in India to bring this whole picture of India—agricultural, industrial, social, economic etc. etc.—into one framework of thinking. That is a very important thing, and I say that even if that thinking is wrong partly here and there—even then, it is a tremendous thing attempted and done. It has made not only those who have participated in it, not only Members of this House who have to deal with these big matters, but to some extent the whole country “planning-conscious”. It has made them think of this country as a whole, because I do think that one of the biggest things in this country at present is for us to make the country which is politically united and which is in many other ways united but which is not yet mentally and emotionally united to that extent to be united in that respect also. We often go off at tangents, whether they are provincial tangents, whether they are communal or religious tangents, whether they are caste tangents, or whether they are all kinds of other things. We do not have that emotional awareness of the unity of the country which we should have. It is planning and viewing these problems as a whole that will help greatly in producing that emotional awareness of our problems as a whole apart from our separate problems in our villages or districts or even provinces. Therefore, the mere act of this planning, the mere act of having approached this question in this way and produced a report of this type is something for which we might, I think, congratulate ourselves.

Remember this. When we talked about planning two or three years ago, powerful voices were raised against it. The idea of planning, to some people, was just helping industry, by let us say, tariffs or giving them money etc. and leaving it to

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

them to do what they like. They did not like being controlled in any way. While the essence of planning is this broad picture of some kind of control of the whole economy of the country, this Plan talks about a public sector and a private sector. But the House must remember and everybody should remember, that the private sector is going to be a controlled sector also, not of course to the same extent, but it will have to be a controlled sector in many ways and an increasingly controlled sector as time goes on. It may be controlled, of course, in regard to the dividends and the profits that it makes, but it will have to be something more than that, because we have to control the strategic points of the economy of the country, and this report—rightly I think—is cautious about many matters. But if you read it carefully, you will find that it has stated what can be done and what should be done without definitely saying "Do it, because it has left the door open". Take important subjects like banking and insurance. They are highly important in the economy of a country. Strategically, they must be controlled in any economy. Well, how to do it, and what to do etc. have not been dealt with, because the Planning Commission did not think itself justified in laying down the details. But if you read the earlier chapters of this report, the Planning Commission has said that these are important and these have to be kept in view and steps will have to be taken to bring them in some form or other under control so as to fit in them more and more within the purview and sphere of a controlled economy.

So, this Plan suggests something definite to be done and also suggests many other things which can be done and should be done, but it does not go into details as to how it should be done or when it should be done. That, of course, can be done during the period of the Plan, and not afterwards, because after all the method of planning or the method of working out a plan is ultimately the method of trial and error. The best of us can only see dimly into the future, if at all. We can proceed by analogy. We can proceed by past experience. But, ultimately, you have to deal not with steel and cement and things that you can measure, but you have to deal with 360 million individual human beings in this country, each different from the other. All the statisticians in the world and all the economists in the world cannot say what a multitude of individuals may or may not feel, or may or may not do. You

have to proceed by the method of trial and error. I have no doubt that when the time comes for a second Five Year Plan, we would be in a far better position, and on far firmer ground, because we would have gone through this process of thinking and what will follow from it. Again, the process of working and trying to build according to this Plan would have been there, and we would have learnt much by it. The second Plan therefore will be a much more effective and far-reaching Plan, based on greater knowledge, and derived not from theory but from practice.

Now, remember this also, that we call this a Five Year Plan, but two years out of the five are over. Therefore, it really is a plan for the next three years or so. We started with this Plan under certain limitations, because we had to accept what was done. We did not start from scratch. We had to accept them. Our resources were tied up with things that were done; we had to accept that naturally, and with the balance of resources left we had to deal with the next period.

So that this Five Year Plan is partly in action and it would be over in the next three years or so. Also remember that this Plan is essentially if I may say so—preparatory plan for greater and more rapid progress in future. As I said, the second Five Year Plan, if we build our foundations well, could proceed at a much faster pace, or rate of progress than we have indicated here. We have indicated the various paces. People calculate them in their own way. Some people say it is too slow a rate. Others ask: "Can you do it—it is too fast." It is based on intelligent anticipations and calculations. If we can better it, certainly we will try to better it.

We talk about industrialisation. You will see in the earlier Chapters certain figures are given as to how much will go to industry, how much to agriculture, how much to social service, transport and the rest. Industry does not seem to come very well off in that picture. Agriculture takes a great deal. As far as I remember irrigation takes a very big sum. We attach the greatest importance to industry, but we attach, if I may say so, greater importance in the present context to agriculture and food, and other matters pertaining to agriculture, because if we do not have our agricultural foundation strong then the industry we seek to build will not be on a strong basis. Apart from that fact, in the country as it is situated today, if our food front cracks up everything cracks. So, we have to keep a strong food front; we

dare not weaken it. If our agriculture, as we hope, becomes strongly entrenched and is in a good way then it becomes relatively easy for us to go faster on the industrial front, while if we try to go faster in regard to our industry now and leave agriculture in a weak condition, we make industry weaken still. Therefore, first attention has been given to agriculture and food and I think it is quite essential in a country like India at the present moment.

But even so, certain basic industries, key industries, have been thought of and brought in. The basic thing even for the development of industry is power—electric power. You cannot develop industry, or anything, unless you have adequate power. You can judge the progress made by any country by how much electric power it has. That is a good test of the growth of any country. Now, we will get electric power by these various hydro-electric schemes, river valley schemes, multi-purpose schemes and the like.

I do not propose to go through these two big volumes in my preliminary remarks. I have no doubt that hon. Members would be studying them with great care, and make their suggestions in the course of the debate. If I may suggest with all respect, the Chapters that might be studied more than the others and might be dealt with in debate more than the others are the earlier chapters which lay down the general approach, the principles, the objectives and the structure of the Plan—the first four Chapters and if you like a few others. The rest, though very important, is after all working out the details of that and no Parliament can sit down to work out details or priorities. Parliament must lay down the objectives, the general structure, that we should follow.

So, I submit, Sir, that in approaching this question we should bear these general principles and objectives in mind. We should determine the methods. If I may say so, or if you like, we have already determined the methods and we are working along these methods—that is the general democratic approach to this problem. Although this is so, I wish to make it perfectly clear what our conception of democracy is. It is not limited to political democracy. We do not think that democracy means, as is sometimes said in some other countries, what is called *laissez faire* doctrine in economics. That doctrine may remain in some people's mind still. But as a matter of fact it is almost as dead as the nineteenth

century which produced it—dead even in the countries where people talk about it most. It is totally unsuited to the conditions in the world today. In any event, so far as we in India are concerned, we reject it completely. We are not going to have anything to do with it.

That does not mean, of course, that the State is taking charge of everything. The State is not, because we have a public sector and a private sector. But, as I said, the private sector itself which we wish to encourage must fit in with controlled economy. In that sense its freedom of enterprise will be somewhat limited. Now, in this context, I would ask this House to consider this plan.

This Plan—I am not going into figures—provides for two thousand and odd crores of rupees—about several hundreds crores more than provided for in the Draft Plan. There is a big gap between the estimate of our resources and the Rs. 2,000 crores. It is hoped that we may be able perhaps to find more resources. We may get some help from outside. We have got some already. Some hon. Members have occasionally expressed their fear that this help from outside may interfere with our freedom as to what we should do and should not do in this country. Well it is perfectly true that when in any matter one depends upon an outside authority, to that extent there is a risk. If we depend on outside authorities, let us say, to supply us with weapons of war for our army, well, to some extent, there is risk—whatever it may be. If we depend for our economic advancement on other countries, well, we are depending on them. And I am quite clear in my own mind that I would rather wish that our advance was slower than we become dependent on the aid of other countries.

Having said that, I really do not see why we should be afraid, provided we are strong enough ourselves, of taking this type of aid from other countries which obviously helps us to go more rapidly ahead. There are so many things which we could do with that aid which we have to postpone without that aid. On the one hand there is a slight risk, not a risk of being tied down, but if you like to put it, a slight moral risk, or whatever risk you like to call it. On the other hand, it is for us, for this Parliament, for this country to be quite clear of what it wants to do and not allow ourselves to be pushed this way and that way. After all almost every country has

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

gone ahead with help in various ways from other countries in the past and I do not see any reason why we should prefer not to take aid, even though that aid does not influence our policy or our activities in the slightest.

Sir, it is late now and this subject is a very big one. But I intended my remarks to be more of a preamble to the consideration by this House of this voluminous report and not to go into the details. I have no doubt that in the course of this debate many points will arise which will require dealing with, and my colleagues or other Members of this House or myself may deal with them at a later stage.

But I would like to impress upon the House somewhat the feeling I have on this occasion, the feeling of dealing with this great theme of re-making this country of ours, that we are engaged in a tremendous task which requires not only all our united effort, but united effort with enthusiasm and a crusader's spirit attached to it. I have no doubt that if this House accepts this report in that spirit, and when all of us go to our respective constituencies and other parts of the country we go with this message from this House and from this Parliament, this Five Year Plan, and try to work it out, I have no doubt that this Plan from being something on paper, you will see it gradually rising and taking effect in the country. And as you do this I think it may well be possible for us to over-reach this Plan and go further ahead than even the Plan Commissioners have laid down.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker : Resolution moved:

"This House records its general approval of the principles, objectives and programme of development contained in the Five Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission."

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): Sir, before we proceed with a discussion of this motion I would like to make a suggestion to you for your consideration. We have tried to go through the volumes of the report supplied to us as carefully as we could, but we feel we have had rather very short notice. We have had a full legislative programme throughout the week and this has made it rather difficult for us to study what we wish to study in the short compass of time which is allowed to us. That is why I suggest that we may have at least four

days for discussion of this report, that means Tuesday to Friday, and also that, if necessary, you might be pleased to adjourn the discussion of this till tomorrow morning so that we may be better prepared not only to consider what we have already read but also the remarks made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as the number of days is concerned, even at the outset, anticipating that a number of hon. Members would be interested in taking part in the debate, I agreed to the House sitting from 10 A.M. to 6 P.M. with the usual interval for lunch. At present it is scheduled to go on for the 15th, 16th and 17th. As we proceed let us see what the progress is. I am sure we will be able...

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): 18th also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Originally it was fixed for the 15th, 16th and 17th. That was the time that was prescribed. We have given to ourselves one more day at the rate of nearly two hours a day, about one extra hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon.

Shri A. C. Guba (Santipur): On the previous day the Prime Minister was agreeable to four days.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The extended periods put together give us another day. Therefore this programme will stand till the 17th. Let us see the progress.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: So far as we are concerned we should like--I understand that the latest date up to which this Parliament session is to go on is the 20th; it will be difficult to go beyond that—we should like two clear days, 19th and 20th, to finish up some important legislation pending. Apart from that I am in your hands and the hands of the House. You have already been good enough to extend the hours of sitting. If necessary, and if the House agrees, we may drop the Question Hour to discuss this problem for a day or two.

Hon. Member: It is a very good proposal.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: The Prime Minister says he would like to have two days for the other legislation. Then this debate can continue till the 18th evening. That he can easily agree to.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, as a matter of fact what you, Sir, said was, I believe, that after a couple of days you will decide. So far as we are concerned we are prepared to go on till the 18th, provided it does not go beyond the 18th.

Shri H. N. Mukherjee: The legislative programme still outstanding is not of a particularly considerable character and in one day or one and a half days at the most we can dispose of it.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: We can consider. It will be not beyond the 18th in any case.

The House now stands adjourned till 3 P.M.

The House then adjourned for Lunch till Three of the Clock.

The House re-assembled after Lunch at Three of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are some amendments tabled to this resolution. I find some of the amendments are not in order. Others will have to be moved. The first two amendments standing in the name of Mr. Vallatharas are as follows:

(i) That the consideration of the resolution be postponed to the next session; and

(ii) That for the original resolution the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that the Report of the Planning Commission be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 31st January, 1953."

Why does he want this resolution to be put off?

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai): It concerns the entire nation. An expenditure of 2000 and odd crores has to be met by the people themselves. The scheme is brought for the first time. Two years and more have been taken for drafting the original Draft Plan. Subsequently 18 months have been taken. There has not been a single attempt on the part of the Government or any political bodies just to go about the nation itself directly and explain what the Plan is. The people do not know what the Plan is.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have heard the hon. Member. This is dilatory in character and I will not allow these amendments. The Draft Plan was issued long ago and there was a

discussion on this earlier on the floor of the House. This is a five Year Plan. The object of submitting a Draft Plan to the House is only to enable not only the Parliament but others also to discuss. As a matter of fact, this was discussed by groups also elsewhere. If this is to be discussed there must be another Five Year Plan and it is endless. The Draft Plan was discussed long ago. This is dilatory. I rule both these amendments out of order.

Hon. Members who want to move their amendments may move them now. Those who are not here, I will treat their amendments as not having been moved. If any particular portion of any amendment is not in order, I will reserve my right to rule that portion out of order.

Shri Vallatharas: I beg to move:

That for the original resolution the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that the policy and the plan are permeated by a sense of over expectation and unwarranted optimism and the economic calculations on which they are based will inevitably lead to a disorganisation of the entire economic system."

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House records its general approval of the principles and objectives of installing a planned economy in India in terms of the Resolution of the Government of India in March, 1950 but is of opinion that the final draft of the First Five Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission fails to reflect in any adequate measure the national aspirations of the people of India and to formulate a programme for the most effective utilisation of the country's resources so as to secure all citizens the right to an adequate means of livelihood, the distribution of the ownership and control of the material resources of the community as best to subserve the common good and to ensure that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment in the real meaning of the Directive Principles of State Policy as enunciated by the Constitution of India."