

ता० 15 से ता० 30 की बीच की जो बात माननीय सदस्य ने उठाई है, जो जलूस निकला, जो सत्याग्रह हुये—मांग इतनी थी कि जिन लोगों को गिरफ्तार किया गया—ता० 30 को 35 लोग गिरफ्तार किये गये . . .

श्री केशर लाल गुप्त : क्या वे गुण्डा एलीमेंट्स थे ?

श्री धनिक लाल मंडल : मांग इतनी थी कि उनको अनकण्डीषनली रिलीज किया गया . . . (इयबधान) . . . उनको बेल पर ही छोड़ा जा सकता था . . . (इयबधान) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, kindly don't repeat the same thing. Please answer the question.

श्री श्यामसुन्दर लाल : होम निनिस्टर साहब कह रहे हैं कि एक टाइम पर आठ जगह आग लगी और गवर्नमेंट उसको सम्भाल नहीं सकी। इसका मतलब है कि देश में बहुत बड़ी साजिश चल रही है और गवर्नमेंट को बिचकुल पता नहीं चलता है। आज आगरा में आग लगी है, कल क्या होगा, इनको पता नहीं है . . .

MR. SPEAKER: He has raised three or four questions. You have to answer the questions, or if you do not have the information, you have to say that you do not have the information, and that you will collect it, but you are not again and again to repeat the same thing. That does not serve the purpose. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Don't record.
(Interruptions)**

SHRI NIRMAL CHANDRA JAIN
(Seoni): rose—

MR. SPEAKER: How do you come into the picture? This is a calling attention.

SHRI NIRMAL CHANDRA JAIN:
On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

SHRI NIRMAL CHANDRA JAIN:
The answer has not been given to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: My question was: how many goondas were taken into custody as a precautionary measure?

SHRI DHANIK LAL MANDAL: It does not arise.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no, it does arise. If you do not have information, you can say so.

SHRI DHANIK LAL MANDAL: I require notice.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Will he advise the Chief Minister of the State to call a meeting of all the parties?

MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of suggestion. Shri Keshavrao Dhondge— not present.

We go to the next item.

12.50 hrs.

MOTION RE. DRAFT FIVE-YEAR
PLAN 1978-83

MR. SPEAKER: We now take up the Motion to be moved by the Prime Minister:

[Mr. Speaker]

"That this House do consider the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83' laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978."

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do consider the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83' laid on the Table of the House on 26th April, 1978."

This Draft Plan which is before the House was discussed in the National Development Council and the Plan for the first year was agreed to the rest of it has to be considered further because there was no time to discuss the plans with the States earlier and secure their agreement before bringing it to the National Development Council. It was, therefore, decided that after the Finance Commission gave its report, we would be in a better position to consider it finally and fully and come to useful conclusions. Therefore, it was decided that the National Development Council would meet again sometime in November when a final decision would be taken on this Plan. But, in the meanwhile, the basic objectives and investment priorities were approved by the National Development Council. Now, the States will be consulted about their plans and it will be ready by the time the National Development Council meets next.

There are certain features regarding this Plan which, I think, ought to be mentioned by me so that hon. Members can give their useful suggestions which we shall, certainly discuss and give due consideration to them.

In the first place, the Fifth Five Year Plan was to end after this year. This year was the last year of the Fifth Five Year Plan. But we saw that we were fixing new priorities and giving new direction in the matter of rural development and it was, therefore, necessary to see that a year was not wasted in the Plan and, therefore,

we ended the Fifth Five Year Plan last year. So, this year becomes the beginning of this Five Year Plan.

It will be seen that this Draft Plan provides for development in various sectors of the economy with far greater emphasis than before. Planning started in this country from 1951-52. We have had Five-Year Plans and about three Annual Plans in the interval. And now this is the Plan which succeeds the Fifth Five Year Plan. Many things have been achieved as a result of the five year plans. It cannot be said that earlier plans have not led to the development of this country. But experience has shown that we have not been able to reduce growing unemployment and that the fruits of planning and the fruits of development have not reached more than 60 per cent of the people. It has not benefited the rural areas as much as they should have done. This is more important because in this country 80 per cent of our people live in villages and on their prosperity will depend the prosperity of the whole country.

Some things have been done in agriculture, in irrigation, in electricity. Some developments have taken place, but, as I said, they have not reached the rural areas effectively as much as they should have done. It is, therefore, that we decided upon different plan priorities, as it is known to the hon. House from the policy announced by this Government when it took charge. Accordingly we have provided in this Draft Plan development of the areas to which we have given priority. It will be seen that the total plan this time is Rs. 116,000 crores, out of which Rs. 69,000 crores will be Government and public investment.

In this Plan we have introduced the concept of the Rolling Plan. That was done purposefully in order to see that the evaluation of planning goes on simultaneously with its implementation. There have been complaints that whereas the plans were good,

their implementation was not effective. Large amounts of money have been spent but the poorest sections of the people have not benefited. Therefore we found it necessary to assess the implementation of the plan on a year to year basis in order that shortfalls in implementation could be corrected and remedial action taken.

"So, at the end of every year, we can have an assessment of the performance of that year and see that the performance in the next four years becomes more effective. This is why the Rolling Plan concept has been adopted. I know that there has been criticism about it, but for anything new or what is considered a new concept there is bound to be criticism; the criticism is welcome. But I hope that those who criticise it will also look at it from the point of view which I have placed before you. We have, in this Plan, now given priority to rural development, to see that the rural people living there get proper attention so that full unemployment and partial unemployment, which is far more prevalent in the rural areas—is tackled effectively. And that is why we have now allotted far more funds.

MR. SPEAKER: How much time will you take?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: We can take it up again after Lunch.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned till 2 O'clock.

12.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the clock

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

MOTION RE. DRAFT FIVE-YEAR PLAN, 1978—83—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister.
§1 LS—10.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Sir, we have put a greater emphasis on the removal of unemployment and partial unemployment particularly because we want to see that we remove some of the worst forms of poverty through the minimum-needs programme. We are, therefore, determined to do more in the next five years for supply of drinking water to the villages, where there is no such supply or where there is unsatisfactory supply, reduce illiteracy, improve conditions in the slums, provide house sites to the landless, labourers and workers and provide rural health services in a greater measure than what has been done in the past. This I may illustrate by showing what allotments made are in the next Five-Year Plan. We have allotted 43 per cent, Rs. 33,000 crores of the total Plan to agriculture and rural development which is more than all the previous Plans. We plan to spend Rs. 4200 crores for the minimum-needs programme as compared to Rs. 800 crores during 1974—78. This is more than what has been spent in the last 30 years. We plan to make available safe drinking water to all the problem villages in the next five years. At present only 64,000 villages covering 10 per cent of the rural areas have been provided with safe drinking water. The allocation of Rs. 675 crores for rural drinking water supply is more than the entire amount spent on rural water supply schemes in the previous five year plans.

In all the last 30 years, only 5 million slum dwellers have benefited. In the next Plan the allocation for improvement of urban slums is Rs. 190 crores which will benefit 13 million slum dwellers.

In the field of rural housing 8 million landless workers will benefit from a scheme that will provide developed plots, drinking water facilities and sanitation.

90 per cent of the children of the age group 6—14 will be covered by our

[Shri Morarji Desai]
plans for expansion of primary school education.

In the matter of irrigation it is proposed that an additional 17 million hectares will be brought under irrigation. That is double of what was done in the Fifth Plan.

In power it is proposed to add 18,500 megawatts, roughly equal to what was added during the last 25 years.

Then it was said that industry would be neglected and the public sector scuttled. It is completely wrong. The public sector is being strengthened and made more effective and it is expected to contribute more towards the development programme. There is no question of industries, whether heavy or medium or light, but we have to pay more attention to the rural industries and cottage industries, especially for the transformation of the life in the rural areas and that is what has received a priority.

But after all that is said and done, our problems of poverty, unemployment and economic development are so deep-rooted and wide-spread that it is only over a period of time that we can tackle it fully and it is with that view that we are making this programme. It is, therefore, that we are trying to have it time-bound. Though it is not a very easy thing to do but we have got to do that so that we implement the programme properly, thoroughly and people also can see the results and realise what is being done for their welfare. But we have to recognize that much will depend upon how it is implemented and it is that to which we are paying greater attention. Yet, may I say that we do not propose to emulate the west or its affluence. We do not want to do that because that kind of affluence does not in any way bring in happiness. We must have enough for every person living in this country so that he has a "satisfactory life and there is prosperity" for the country so that it can acquire a capacity to help human society to be hap-

py all over the world. This is the goal for which we are working and this is how this Plan has been drafted.

I cannot claim any perfection for it. The Planning Commission cannot do so, but we have tried to apply our minds as much as we can to the accomplishment of these goals in view. I shall be thankful to the hon. members to consider all this and give whatever suggestions they want to give.

As I said earlier, we will pay respectful consideration to whatever suggestions are made.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That this House do consider the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83' laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978."

Hon. Members whose substitute motions to the Government motions have been circulated, may if they desire to move the substitute motions send slips to the Table with 15 minutes indicating the serial numbers of their substitute motions they would like to move. In so far as Dr. Ramji Singh's substitute motion is concerned and Shri A. K. Roy's substitute motion is concerned, they are delayed and, therefore, not admitted.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki):
The House has before it one of the most important documents, the acceptance and implementation of which will depend to a large extent on the course of the nation.

National planning has always been a matter of total national endeavour and concern. We entered on the concept of planning even as part of our national movement, even before we became independent. Subsequently, the Planning was accepted as a measure of our economic development and whenever a Five Year Plan was adopted by the nation, there was almost invariably

the preliminary exercise of a detailed discussion throughout the country, far from partisan angle, in an effort to bring about a national consensus on the plan to be adopted. I must at the preliminary stage say that as far as this Plan document is concerned, it has got the distinction that this preliminary exercise was not gone through. The Prime Minister told the House that this Plan—Sixth Five Year Plan—would mark a deviation in the matter of priorities, in the matter of direction and in the matter of the thrust. Whether there is going to be a deviation and, if so, in what direction I will come to but if there is to be a deviation as the Prime Minister told that was all the more reason why this document should have been subjected to a thorough, deep scrutiny before it was presented to the N.D.C. This House will, I am sure, remember when the Five Year Plan was adopted, there was an approach document. There was a Draft Plan. It was discussed in the House on so many days. The House divided itself into so many Committee-Parliamentary Committees dealing with different subjects, conveners of which were from both sides of the House. Reports were submitted and then ultimately the matter came to the N.D.C. and it was accepted. I do not know why this exercise was not gone through and this is a matter for regret that this was avoided, particularly so, as I said that the Plan is intended to have a different thrust from what it was so far. The result was that the N.D.C. did not approve the plan as such.

If the Report of the NDC is gone through, it would be found that there is no indication that the priorities were accepted by the N.D.C. There is no indication that the manpower and the employment potential calculations were accepted by the N.D.C. No. They said, there will have to be further discussion. Even the allocations were not completely accepted by the N.D.C. In other words, the N. D. C. gave the Plan back for further discussion on a national plane and for sub-

mission to the N.D.C. on a subsequent date. This should not have happened. This is what I have got to say by way of my preliminary remarks.

I said at the beginning itself that the history of Planning of this country is a saga of national endeavour which is a continuing process, on the success of which every Indian, to whichever party he may belong, must feel proud, with respect to the failure of which everyone must bring in an attitude of introspection and subjective analysis rather than of recrimination and fault-finding.

We started in the First Five Year Plan with a very modest amount. Stage by stage we moved up.

In the First Plan we had Rs. 1234 crores.

In the Second Plan we had Rs. 2531 crores.

In the Third Plan it was doubled up—to Rs. 4136 crores.

In the Fourth Five Year Plan this came to Rs. 8871 crores.

In the Fifth Five Year Plan this came to Rs. 15,778 crores.

These are all in the public sector—not the totality of the investments.

Keeping up with this pace, of doubling what it was, now, we are almost doubling what it was in the Fifth Five Year Plan, that is, Rs. 37,000 crores. Now, almost doubling it, we have Rs. 69,000 crores. This is nothing extraordinary. This has been going on.

Now, starting with a humble beginning, as a result of our planning, the country has benefited and the country has progressed considerably.

We owe it to the Planning Commission that they were truthful in the matter of presenting a review of what had happened.

And when we say that we have jumped on let us not forget the

[Shri C. M. Stephen]
fact that we started as a colonial country under subjugation, completely exploited. Brick by brick we had to build ourselves up. And in a colossal nation like ours, to come on to the stage of take-off, it naturally takes a much longer period.

And, by the beginning of the Fifth Five Year Plan we have come almost to the stage of take-off. By the end of the Fifth Five Year Plan we are at the stage of take-off.

Now, this is what the Planning Commission has said about in their document:

"It is a cause of legitimate national pride that over this period a stagnant and dependent economy has been modernised and made more self-reliant.

Agricultural output has risen throughout this period, though slowly. The production of foodgrains has increased to levels which make us virtually self-sufficient.

The area under irrigation has doubled in the period of planning.

A major achievement has been the diversification and expansion of India's industrial capability with the public sector playing a leading role.

The country is self-sufficient in all consumer goods and in basic commodities like steel and cement, while the capacity of other industries like fertilizers is rapidly expanding.

The growth of capital goods production has been particularly impressive and India can now sustain the likely growth of most of her industries.

The output of India's primary fuel source—coal—has been expanded more than three-fold. The intensive search for oil and gas has achieved notable success.

A large infra-structure has been built to sustain this sub-continental economy."

All these have been stated. And then it says:—

"India's foreign trade has expanded rapidly in recent years.

Of late, the inflow of remittances has also been very high.

"Our foreign exchanges situation has improved to a stage where it is not a major constraint on development".

And then it says:

"Significant results have been achieved in agricultural research and Indian scientists and technologists are working in many areas. On the frontiers of today's knowledge."

In respect of scientific knowledge, in respect of our scientific personnel, we are now the third country in the entire world, next only to the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

In further industrial and scientific advance, the position is like this. In technology:

"The expansion of output of scientists, engineers and technicians has been rapid since the late fifties."

"The average life expectancy of the Indian people rose from thirty two years in the fifties to around forty-six years in the sixties".

It has gone up further now.

Elementary education has expanded considerably. All these have bettered. I say this because I feel constrained to say so. The Prime Minister was good enough to say that this is not as if in the last thirty years nothing has been done although some of my friends in time and out of time said about the mismanagement of thirty years. The result of the mismanagement is this impressive picture which is present.

Nevertheless the Planning Commission has this verdict finally to say about this. Certain failures they

have pointed out which I will come to.

"It is on account of these that the need has arisen for a reappraisal of the development strategy. We must face the fact that the most important objectives of planning has not been achieved. The most cherished goals seem to be almost as distant today as when we set out on the road of planned development".

Well, Sir, If these facts which I stated were correct, is this verdict borne out by the facts of the situation? We are still at the stage as far as this thing is concerned, when we started on the planning. This is what they have stated, If this verdict is not borne out by the facts of the situation, what is the new developed strategy that they have set out? The new development strategy is this. This is what they say. That is 'towards achievement of full employment, eradication of poverty and the creation of a more equal society'. There will be no quarrel with their ideals postulated. But, there is a difference between the plan aims stipulated in the previous Plan and the plan aims postulated here. In the Fifth Five Year Plan the aim of the plan was very specifically spelt out like this:

'Removal of poverty and the attainment of economic self-reliance are the two strategic goals that the country has set for itself'.

Removal of poverty is retained. The other which is only an attendant to it, is the removal of unemployment and eradication of poverty and creation of an equal society. As you have stated, unemployment poverty and inequality are related phenomena so that any success in solving one of these problems would imply a success in solving the other. Therefore, the

differences do not matter at all. Here this is what they have stated:

"If removal of poverty is to be attained, inequalities have got to be removed, unemployment has got to be wiped out. People must get employment".

If it happens, naturally, the poverty also is removed. But, what about the other aspect of it which was emphasised, namely, self-reliance. This aspect is dropped out from these postulations. According to me, this is not by an accident. If you will analyse the Plan, you will come to understand that this is not by an accident that the N.D.C., in their resolution, has laid emphasis on self-reliance. They laid emphasis on self-reliance and removal of poverty and all that. In this Resolution they have taken care as to lay emphasis on this also.

Well, Sir, what are the defects that the Planning Commission has pointed out? They have pointed out very few defects—in agriculture, we are deficient in oil seeds and cotton. So, we have got to import. The per capita agricultural production has remained stagnant. But, they do agree that even they can be kept at that. In spite of the explosion of the population the per capita income itself has moved up and it is not merely stagnant. This is the second aspect they have pointed out. They say that there is inequality in rural areas pointing out that consumption has differed. That is to say, that lowest 20 per cent of the people are consuming 9.5 per cent and the highest twenty per cent is consuming 38 per cent. This is the consumption pattern. This is what they have emphasised. This is the inequality. This comes to about 1:4. That is the difference with respect to consumption pattern.

As far as industry is concerned, this is what they have pointed out. There they have to find a correction. There the distortion is going to take place.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

"(1) Industrialisation has caused loss of income to rural poor engaged in cottage industries;

(2) It has resulted in concentration of economic power in certain industrial houses;

(3) Effective demand being from the affluent group further expansion is limited by the narrowness of the market. Further import substitution of consumer goods and capital goods cannot afford impetus to the continued industrial growths".

These are the defects they have pointed out.

With respect to industry, science and technology they have acknowledged that a considerable mark has been made but they say our research expenditure does not have social relevance to justify continued application of our limited resources. They have also come to the conclusion that supply of scientists, engineers and technicians has out-stripped the demand. It is these defects they are now seeking to correct. In the attempt to making those corrections—I am making the accusation which I will come to later on—a considerable distortion is going to take place as far as planning pattern is concerned.

Now, Sir, how are they going to make these corrections! The sole purpose—or the major purpose—as far as this Plan is concerned is 'employment' and for the purpose of solving unemployment problem the emphasis is being laid on agricultural front. They are seeking to put emphasis on two areas, namely, shift the emphasis to agriculture; shift the emphasis to cottage and small scale industries and traditional type of industries. Shift the emphasis to that and that will solve the unemployment problem. When that is solved, economic equality will come and everything will be alright. This is the type of approach that they are bringing in.

Now, let us take agriculture. May I ask is it something tremendous now being sought to be done? The Prime Minister pointed to, drinking water. Of course, in certain sectors more is being given. But don't forget we are today at the take-off stage and today we have certain instruments which we do not have earlier. Today there is no constraint of foreign exchange difficulty. We do have the scientific know-how. We have a self-reliant industrial base and self-sufficient in food. We have reached this stage today. You have today sufficient elbow space. You are not under any constraint at all. You are not at all at the mercy of anybody. How the question arises how you are going to use this tremendous instruments? Are you going to use it for further strengthening the self-reliance and the self-sufficiency of the country or are you going to make it dependent on other nations and other countries? Are you going to use this tremendous instrument to usher in more prosperity in this country? What is your concept of employment? Are you satisfied if somebody just gets employment as a khadi spinner and collects Rs. 1.50 paise per day? Are you satisfied with that? Is that our concept of employment which will bring something? What is the concept we have been following? Cottage and heavy industries will be there. That will give money and economic power. Feeding to them smaller industries will develop. Certain areas which can be developed by small industries will be reserved for them. This has been going on. Is this emphasis going to continue or not?

Take the position of agriculture. The complaint against us is that we have been neglecting agriculture. What is the real fact of the situation? During the Fifth Five Year Plan as against a total allocation of Rs. 37,000 crores, Rs. 4,302 crores were allocated for agriculture. In the Sixth Five Year as against the total allocation of Rs. 69,000 crores the allocation for

agriculture is Rs. 8,600 crores. Percent wise it is almost the same. It is 11 per cent versus 12 per cent. There is increase by one per cent. In this the emphasis which must be taken note of as a considerable change in emphasis? In fact, in the Five Year Plans the emphasis on agriculture started with a vengeance. First and the Second Five Year Plans were for agriculture. Then we realised with agriculture alone we cannot be self-sufficient unless industrial base is built. Unless you have got the fertiliser, unless you have got the machine tools, unless you have got the tractors, unless you have got the agricultural implements, unless you have got the power, unless you have got energy, unless you have got these things, agriculture cannot be self-sufficient and supporting shift was therefore made on to the other sectors. Now that is complete. With the availability of 5th Plan benefits, emphasis started back again on the agriculture and on the small scale industries. The emphasis is shifted back. But when shifting the emphasis back to that, the demands of heavy industry was not by-passed. The demands of the key industry was not by-passed. Those industries were retained as a base on which the self-sufficiency of the country had to be maintained. This is the emphasis on which we are fighting. They say that the main accent is on the agriculture where employment has got to come in a big way. The employment objective depends crucially on increased labour being absorbed in agriculture and allied activities. And secondly, after agriculture, household and small industries produce consumer goods for mass consumption which hold out the greatest potential for employment. These are the two analyses they have given. May I ask by shifting the emphasis to agriculture, would the problem of unemployment be solved? Whatever holdings you have, whatever a person may be holding, by shifting the emphasis on agriculture he can make

more money and he can earn more money and it is his aim to earn more money. But the question is the shifting of the emphasis is to result in the distribution of the money in the rural areas and the backward people and the landless labour must also have the due share of that; then the emphasis is not on the shifting of the money—which of course there must be—but on the structuring of the entire land tenure and land relationship. Redistribution has got to take place and there the question of land reforms and all that come in. But without that is this emphasis going to benefit those whom you are thinking of. The problem of unemployment cannot be solved. The N.D.C. took note of it and emphasised that land reform is a matter of high priority. May I ask every Member sitting on the ruling benches as also those sitting on this side to consider whether the political will for this is available? I am not saying that the political will was available in the past. I do not claim that. But wherever there was a political will, this transformation took place. Wherever there was no political will, the transformation did not take place. It was not that there was no policy stipulation. Policy stipulation there has been. Even from 1950 onwards land reforms has been one of the major tasks the nation has undertaken. We have gone to the extent of amending the Constitution; we have gone to the extent of incorporating the 9th Schedule in order to give Constitutional protection to land reform laws. The nation wanted it but the political will was not forthcoming. Wherever it was forthcoming in my State it was forthcoming, the land reform had been complete. In Karnataka it was forthcoming and there, to a large extent, it has been complete. In certain other areas, it has been forthcoming and it has been completed. May I ask whether the political will is available today? The Harijans have been hounded everywhere. The land has been

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

taken away by the people from these people. If the political will comes from these people, whether a great transformation can take place? If it does not take place, then this huge money will result only in the concentration of wealth on certain sections from whom you will not be able to take that back. It will not help to implement the schemes at all. This is the point I just wanted to emphasise.

Then we come to the small scale industry. It is stated that something new is taking place here. In the Fourth Plan the allotment was Rs. 276 crores; actual expenditure was Rs. 250 crores. In the Fifth Plan as against an allotment of Rs. 611 crores the expenditure was Rs. 510 crores. Today the allotment is Rs. 1410 crores. Certainly something higher has been allotted. But in the small scale sector it is not the allotment that really matters. It is not as if the previous plans did not take care of this. The Planning Commission has got this to say on this matter:

"There was substantial increase in the overall availability of institutional credit to the small scale industries. The total advances by the commercial banks to these industries went up from Rs. 280 crores at the end of June 1969 to 1147 crores at the end of December 1975 and further to 1421 crores at the end of December 1976. During this period the number of small units assisted increased from about 56,000 to 2,69,000 and further rose to 3,89,000". I am pointing out that only to emphasise scale sector everything was neglected and nobody took care of it. No sizeable allotments were made; institutional finance was made available and a large number of industrial units came

up, as stated in the report of the Planning Commission itself. In the totality of goods produced in the factory sector, the small scale industry accounts for 28 per cent, that is in the goods produced in the factories, of that 28 per cent was accounted for by the small scale industry.

Now, what is the new innovation? Merely giving more money will not ensure the starting of small scale industry.

You can have capital structure and you can begin a big industry. So far as small scale industries are concerned, there are many factors. In the sphere of implementing machinery it is not with the central government; it is the state government. Not even the state government, but authorities further down. So that has to be streamlined. What is the institutional arrangement you are going to make? You are saying that the district industries centres will be developed. This is nothing new. A total package of consultancy service was started in the Fifth Plan; it is just that this institution is seeking to achieve, the district industries centre. The question is: whether the man power men who are manning these centres have got the capability to be of assistance to an industrial entrepreneur who is coming forward, where money would come from, what the technology is and where the market is and how it could be viable. Will these centres have the capacity? Who are manning these centres? The wonderful thing they say is that they are going to implement it in districts where rural industry projects are already functioning. The units of the Khadi and village Industries Commission will also join together. If it is those people who are going to decide give direction how small scale industries should develop, all I can say is that I wish them well, the small scale entrepreneurs who are coming in to receive great advice from the particular centre.

The real problem in this area is not availability of know-how, or of credit. There is inbuilt structure in every bank where credit can be made available. But the real problem is the marketing problem for the cottage industries as well as small scale industries. The plan also makes mention of the marketing problem but no bold initiative is forthcoming. They say that there may be some reservation and some priority in purchase by the government. If in the marketing field the responsibility is taken over by the government agency so that whatever is produced will be taken over by them, if this proposition is accepted, to a large extent the small scale industries will be assisted. But that is not forthcoming. That is a bold initiative. The remedies mentioned do not point to the direction of a bold decision which will solve the problem; that is not what we find here. Nobody is against small scale industries, nobody is against irrigation, irrigation is a necessity undoubtedly. But the major question is, *vis-a-vis* that what is your attitude to the bigger industries? The Prime Minister pointed out that as far as the public sector is concerned, the Government has got a very warm corner for that and that as far as the big industries are concerned, it is not going to be discriminated against. But the Plan Document gives us an entirely different story. The Plan Document proceeds on this basis that the entire malady in this country is because of the emphasis on capital intensive industry which means for employment of one person so many lakhs of rupees whereas in the small scale industries, it needs only two thousand rupees. Therefore, capital intensive industry must now stop, enough and no further and the entire emphasis has been shifted. One by one, industry by industry as far as the core sector is concerned they have mentioned in this document. What they have said is, the on-going schemes will be continued, nothing new.

There was Fifth Five Year Plan and a Perspective Plan, extending upto

1982-83 and in our Perspective Plan, we felt that the steel we are producing today is not sufficient at all, it must be tripld or increased four times to meet our future requirements. If the agrarian expansion is going to take place in the way you think it will, steel will be in short supply, implemments will be necessary, tractors will be necessary and the whole thing will have to be there and the installed capacity will not be sufficient to meet the requirements? Are you thinking of developing the core sector? You say that as far as this Five Year Plan is concerned, the on-going schemes will be kept, nothing more. For want of time, I do not want to go into the details of this. They take industry by industry and say that the on-going schemes will be kept and nothing more. This is the total approach, they are just tolerating, they cannot just scrap the on-going schemes but no further expansion, no new ones. This is the attitude of this Government. From the place of pride that this country had attained as a result of the endeavours which we passed through the joint efforts of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Morarji Desai and the whole lot of them, I am afraid, we are now retracing our steps. I feel rather emotional when I think of it. We have gone to a particular point, we are now in the take-off stage and you say: "let us go back to cottage and small scale industry, hand-spinning industry and as far as the core sector is concerned, whatever is there, let us be satisfied with that." Is it in the interest of the nation? Not only that, certain mischievous suggestions are made here. What are they?

On page 187 of this document, it has been stated:

"In order to introduce a degree of competition which may help in improving quality and reducing cost, it is proposed to liberalise imports in certain well-defined areas where the need for such competition is felt."

There are three basic steps. One is exposing other industrial units to

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

inter-national competition, liberalising imports for the purpose of price stability and all that. You become self-sufficient, you become more efficient and you can do it only in competition with the inter-nationals monsters. Therefore, liberalisation of imports will start even in areas where we are producing more because our prices are slightly high. There are Tariff Boards—why? We create Tariff Boards to protect our industries against the multi-nationals. We have got a solicitude for them; there need be no apology about it. Now they are sought to be exposed to international competition. Another idea is import of capital intensive goods. They have discussed the question of how to deal with the foreign exchange. I have already submitted to the House their idea of being satisfied with on-going schemes and nothing further. What about the requirements? For the requirements, they are looking to the foreign exchange. The Planning Commission clearly says:

"A conscious strategy will be adopted for drawing down our foreign exchange reserves by planning imports in a number of capital-intensive industrial goods such as steel non-ferrous metal and fertilisers."

Therefore, goods in which this country is self-sufficient and is competent to export after stopping further expansion of the production capacity in those areas, they are attempting to import them and use the foreign exchange for that purpose. Then they say that industries which cannot stand up to the limited international competition in certain specified product areas which the liberalised import policy will create will be allowed to close down. This is what is contemplated: Expansion not allowed, on-going schemes permitted, imports being liberalised and if an industrial unit cannot stand up to that competition, that shall be allowed to be closed down. To meet the shortage of capital intensive goods, foreign exchange will

be used rather than expanding our own industrial base. This is the picture that is emerging. That is to say, the international economic powers will have the doors of India open to them to come in and have a free play in these areas. This is the picture that is coming up.

About multi-nationals they say, 40 per cent equity capital. Everybody knows that with 60 per cent dispersed capital versus 40 per cent equity with them concentrated, they will control the whole thing. Diffusion of shares is not the answer to the multi-nationals' control. It is common knowledge in the corporate sector that if you have concentrated capital in your hand, you can face the majority of shares that are dispersed and that are not concentrated. And they cannot stand up to you.

The most monstrous part of it is about education. Originally they said, supply has outstripped demand. The research area is not sustaining what the new priorities have now stipulated. Therefore, emphasis is now going to be on removal of illiteracy. This has happened in the course of so many years. Efforts has to be made and illiteracy has to be removed. What about secondary schools? What about colleges? They are very clear in their mind. They have stipulated that whatever secondary schools are there they will be fully utilised. New institutions, as far as possible, will not be allowed. No new universities will be allowed. No new colleges will be allowed. No new technological institutions will be allowed. No new engineering colleges will be allowed, because according to them production has outstripped demand. Therefore, stop all that. Merely concentrate on primary education and elementary education. As far as research area is concerned, where they themselves concede that we have come to a place of pride and we have got engineering graduates and technological skill which can compete with any in the international field—we are able to supply it to other countries also—the present position is, we are at a

saturation point; nothing more can be allowed. This is the position they have taken. Therefore, on an analysis, we find that industry is now being clipped. Development is being stopped. Our industries will be exposed to international competition. We are getting back to the small scale and cottage industry stage that will completely satisfy everybody. As far as education is concerned, we have had enough; nothing more. Just have elementary schools. That will be enough for you. About other things, you can wait for some time. This is the attitude they are a taking up.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Please give me a few more minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no objection. Your Party is allotted one hour and 40 minutes. Out of that, you have already taken 40 minutes.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: And all these, for what purpose? Employment, emphasis on employment. And what is the picture which is emerging? Their own document gives us the picture. The picture is as far as village areas are concerned. This is all for employment. At the end of this Five-Year Plan, as far as the engineering graduates, diploma holders and all of them are concerned, as against the present backlog of 6,95,000, at the end of this Five-Year Plan the backlog will be 14,26,533. The unemployment problem is going to be wiped out. But in the course of this five-year period, this is what is going to emerge. In the other areas also, in the totality of the areas, we will find that the unemployment position will have worsened. Not only this. Even if all these calculations are coming true, even then the unemployment problem will have become much more serious. But the question is whether the agrarian employment can be completed. Unless there is re-structuring of the village

economy and of the land tenure, the problem of unemployment and inequality cannot be solved at all.

Now, there is a question of resources. There is no time at my disposal and I do not want to go into the question of resources. The only thing I want to say is, we had proceeded on the basis of self-sufficiency, not depending on foreign countries. But here they have now Rs. 69,000 crores. For that they are relying on the balance out of the current account, Rs. 12,766 crores. The country is passing on to deficit financing. This has become the order of the day. But they say that from out of the tax and non-tax revenue, after meeting all this, there will be a left over of Rs. 12,766 crores. By what calculation they are able to get, God alone knows. I leave it to them. Then, they are going to raise additional resources to the extent of Rs. 13,000 crores. What will happen? Additional resources include additional excise on the items which are specified as otherwise unspecified items which we had a dose this time. We had 5 per cent of the excise duty on the otherwise unspecified items. They are not satisfied with that. Again, further doses are coming for those unspecified items, additional excise duties are coming in. Then, subsidies will go in respect of fertilizer, food, controlled cloth etc. All these fellows are enjoying subsidies. When their subsidy is scrapped, the excise duty on unspecified items will be added on and that will make up this Rs. 13,000 crores.

Then they say that railway commuter fares are rather too cheap and therefore, fares and freights will have to be increased. This is the other one that they have given notice of—fares and freights will have to be increased. Then electricity rates will have to be increased, irrigation rates will have to be increased. The whole thing has been spelt out under the 'other resources'—Rs. 13,000 crores.

Then, about agricultural income-tax. I will salute the Government if they

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

can collect this money from certain of those areas. There are certain States which are managing agricultural income-tax. There are certain areas in which with all your power you will not be able to get this and you are calculating on the basis of the agricultural income-tax. This is what you are doing. After doing all that, there will be a deficit of Rs. 2,226 crores. Then, after drawing Rs. 1,180 crores from our foreign exchange—Rs. 1,180 crores will be drawn from foreign exchange—they will be still left with a deficit of Rs. 2,226 crores even after getting foreign assistance of Rs. 5,954 crores. The 5th five-year plan's contemplation was that in 1978-79, our need for foreign assistance will be only Rs. 790 crores. Thereafter, there will be no need for foreign assistance. This was our calculation. In its place, the new idea is given: Rs. 5954 crores of foreign assistance, to carry the Plan forward. Here it is that I say that you dropped the word 'self-reliance' deliberately. Self-reliance is being diluted completely. We are being made a colonial country completely. Our frontiers are being opened for multinationals. Our exchequer is being thrown open, to be assisted by foreign countries. You are going to be dependent upon them. Thereafter, the problem of paying back the interest will arise. This is the situation that is going to arise.

One minute more, and I will conclude. They have mentioned "plan strategy". In the plan strategy, they say, there must be continuity. This is what they have stated in this document "pursue a strategy for a specific period". "The selected strategy must be pursued consistently over a period of time, sufficient to establish its success or failure." A new strategy has been spelt out. If the strategy is to be successful, there are certain conditions-precident and certain conditions-postulate. About conditions-precident, I have said that they are

impossible. The condition-postulate is that it must be continued for a long time. They are proceeding on the basis that the persons who have framed this scheme are going to be here till eternity. Let them presume it; but the conditions in the country are so clear: there is no national consensus on this scheme. In my view, this is the most retrograde and reactionary scheme, aimed at hitting the country and putting it back to the colonial age from which it had emerged, and at throwing away self-sufficiency. Inherent in the scheme is a basic approach—I don't attribute it to any force; but the basic approach will be resisted by every political party which has got the good of the country in its mind and by the people. The resistance has started. Resistance will develop. Stop this betrayal, keep the country in self-sufficiency and self-strength. Don't dilute its self-sufficiency. That will be a crime done to this country and it will undo whatever we have done.

With these words, I take my seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the parties know their position in regard to distribution of time. The time distributed to Congress (I) is 1—14 hrs; Congress 1-08 hrs.; CPI(M) 22 minutes; AIADMK: 20 minutes; Janata 5—12 hrs.; CPI 7 minutes; P&WP 6 minutes and Unattached 15 minutes.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I have to make a request, in the light of this. This is a very important document. Rather than struggling for time tomorrow evening, kindly agree to give at least one more day, for the discussion of this item. It will be absolutely necessary. This is not a matter for cursory consideration.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): You remember that in the Business Advisory Committee, we talked of having 3 days.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: This is the most basic document that the nation

can think of. We must go into it in detail. There must be no constraint on Members who want to speak. Therefore, we must have more time. We must have sufficient time.

SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur): Why not Saturday?

MR. SPEAKER: I will place the suggestion before the Business Advisory Committee.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, is distressed to find that in the Draft Plan there is no mention of the Upper Indravati Multipurpose Project of Orissa whose foundation stone was laid by the Hon'ble Prime Minister on 9th April, 1978 and of its early completion according to the time schedule on which the Prime Minister laid emphasis in his speech at the function and suggests that at page 172 of the Draft the Upper Indravati Project be categorised as '85(A)' among the new schemes." (1)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978 regrets that no mention has been made to give constitutional protection (like article 371 in case of Maharashtra and Gujarat) to the most backward southern region of Orissa by providing a separate development board and equitable allocation of funds for development expenditure over the said area and equitable arrangement for providing adequate facilities for technical education, vocational training and adequate

opportunities for employment in services." (2)

SHRI B. C. KAMBLE (Bombay-South Central): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83' laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, and also having noted in the said Draft Plan, observations about some fundamental failures in the last quarter century of Planning, as also about increase in original disparities in the backward areas and many segments of population like the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, not having shared fully the benefits of growth recommends that steps be taken to indicate specific schemes and specific amounts provided and the extent to which benefits of plan development accrued to the said segments of population in the annual Economic Survey and Budget documents and also for full implementation of the said schemes." (4)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83' laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, and also having noted in the said Draft Plan observations about some fundamental failures in the last quarter century of Planning, as also about increase in original disparities in the backward areas and many segments of population like the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, not having shared fully the benefits of growth, regrets that the Government, the Planning Commission and the National Development Council have not drawn the said Draft Plan in accordance with the principles laid down in the Directive Principles of State Policy, as also the principles laid down in the Articles 46 and 338 of the Constitution of India, and

[Shri B. C. Kamble]

further this House directs the Government to recast or modify the said Draft in consonance with the said Principles to avoid fundamental failures of the past planning." (9)

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): I beg to move:—

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, recommends that more radical socio-economic changes and more effective measures should be adopted taking into consideration the prevailing poverty, unemployment, economic disparities, caste and class conflicts endangering the basic living standards of the people of this country and further strongly recommends steps for accelerating the growth rate and eradicating economic stagnation and combating the prevailing situation explained above." (5).

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, regrets that there is no mention in the Draft of any time-bound programme regarding economic growth, eradication of unemployment and poverty, and regarding rural development." (6).

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, regrets that the Government has failed to make any provision in the Plan outlay for Ganga-Kaveri link to accelerate the growth of economic activities in Southern States as envisaged in the Expert Committee Report on the subject." (7)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan, 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978 regrets that the Government has failed to provide adequate economic assistance to the Southern States, especially Karnataka State, in implementation of Vijayanagar Steel Plant, hydel and thermal projects and adequate financial assistance for implementation of medium and major irrigation projects, resulting in stagnation and sluggish growth of financial health of the State." (8)

SHRI VINAYAK PRASAD YADAV (Saharsa): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978 directs the Planning Commission to make the Plan work-oriented instead of money-oriented, frame year-wise master plan to remove acute unemployment and under-employment immediately and allocate at least 65 per cent. of the Plan money to lay a network of irrigation, power and small industries in the next five years to end chronic poverty and backwardness of the villages." (10)

SHRI D. D. DESAI (Kaira): I beg to move:—

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, recommends that the draft be suitably changed to include in it (i) an allocation for agricultural research a sum equal to 1 per cent of the total money value of agricultural produce annually, (ii) constitution of an agricultural commodities prices stabilisation

board to fix prices of agricultural commodities in advance of sowing and to run a disaster relief fund to help farmers and (iii) the speedy construction of Navagaon Dam on the Narmada and allied works." (11)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, recommends that the draft be suitably amended to include a shift in the use of groundnuts from a source of oil to that of protein food." (12)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, recommends that the draft be suitably amended to include an agricultural policy that aims at substituting coarse grains by more nutritive ones." (13)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, recommends that the draft must include all necessary steps to catch and properly utilise every drop of water available in this country without any waste." (14)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, recommends that the draft must include steps to help tobacco and short staple cotton growers." (15)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, recommends that the draft be suitably amended to provide for a ban on the use of trade unions by political parties and on political elements entering trade union field." (16)

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI (Kolhapur):
I beg to move:—

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, is distressed to find that the discrimination between Agriculture and Industry is continued in regard to (i) price policy (ii) tariff rates for electricity and prices of agri-production and industrial production." (17)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, recommends that remunerative prices for agricultural commodities based on cost of production and cost of living be guaranteed and necessary machinery to undertake purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities be established." (18)

SHRI GIRIDHAR GOMANGO (Koraput): I beg to move:—

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, is distressed to find that as per the policy decision the Central Ministries were required to identify the programmes relating to tribal development concerning their sectors, but so far no Ministry

[Shri Giridhar Gomango] has earmarked allocation for tribal sub-plan areas though the Fifth Five Year Plan is already over, and annual plan of Five Year Plan is in progress and there is no mention in the Draft of the names of the Ministries which earmarked allocation for these areas." (19)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, is distressed to find that in the Draft there is no mention of the names of the Central Ministries which have already introduced or are introducing in next financial year, separate budget heads under each major functional head to ensure non-divertibility of funds at the Central level and also there is no mention in this document regarding the guidelines issued in this regard by the Planning Commission to different Ministries." (20)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, regrets to note that there is no mention in the Draft regarding the socio-economic uplift of the most primitive tribes such as Bonda, Paraja, Sauras, Lanjia Sauras, Dongoria Kondh, Kutia Kondh, Juang and Paudi Bhuiya of Orissa and other States where such primitive groups are there and also the tribals of the outside tribal sub-plan areas." (21)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, regrets to find that in the Draft there is no mention about the allocation earmarked by the States having tribal sub-plan areas in Annual Plan of 1978-79 nor

the Five Year Plan, 1978-83 and the State-wise allocation from State Sector outlays and the assistance from the Centre to the States for tribal sub-plan State-wise." (22)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, regrets to find that in Draft there is no mention of increase in allocation or assurance that there will be no cuts in tribal sub-plan allocation or lapsing of funds in the following available resources for tribal sub-plan:—

- (a) State sector outlays,
- (b) Central Ministries,
- (c) Centrally sponsored schemes,
- (d) Institutional finance,
- (e) Special Central assistance in the Annual Plans and Five Year Plan by the States and Government of India." (23).

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, regrets to find that in the Draft there is no mention regarding the administrative set up adopted by the States for the implementation of sub-plan schemes for the instructions issued by the Government of India to those States to adopt the administrative set up with immediate effect for effective implementation and to increase in efficiency in the administration to achieve the aims and objectives of the tribal sub-plan areas." (24)

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83', laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, regrets to find

that in the Draft there is no specific mention of policies adopted for the tribal sub-plan areas by the Centre and the States regarding the (a) Excise Policy (b) Forest Policy (c) Personnel Policy (d) Economic Policy (e) Educational Policy (f) Communication Policy (g) Irrigation Policy (h) Industrial Policy (i) Allocation Policy (j) Cultural Policy and the other policies to share the fruit of developmental policies of the State and Centre." (25)

SHRI YUVRAJ (Katihar): I beg to move:—

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 'Draft Five Year Plan 1978-83' laid on the Table of the House on the 26th April, 1978, regrets that the Government has failed to provide adequate economic assistance to the Northern States especially Bihar State in completion of Katihar thermal power plant and adequate financial assistance for implementation of medium and major irrigation projects resulting in stagnation and sluggish growth of financial health of the State." (26).

श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सिकरथ फाइनल ड्राइंग प्लान पर यह सदन विचार कर रहा है।

14.59 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

श्री स्ट्रीफन स हब ने

श्री युवराज (कटिहर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा प्व इन्ट आफ आर्डर है। जो आर्डर-मेपर है, उस में यह है

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री युवराज, आर्डर पेपर के बारे में अब कोई वाइस्ट-ऑफ-आर्डर नहीं उठ सकता है।

श्री युवराज : माननीय अध्यक्ष जी ने यह कहा था कि जिन लोगों ने अपनी अमेन्डमेंट सूच करनी है, वे लिख कर देंगे। हम लोगों ने लिख कर दे दिया है कि हमें सूच

करना है। इस लिय हमें हल अपनी अमेन्डमेंट सूच करने दीजिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : जिन लोगों ने लिख कर दे दिया है, उन की अमेन्डमेंट सूच मानी जायेगी। लेकिन नई अमेन्डमेंट अब नहीं आ सकती है, जो पहले दी हुई है, वही सूच मनी जायेगी।

श्री युवराज : हमारी नई अमेन्डमेंट नहीं है, हमने पहले लिख कर दिया हुआ है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने लिख कर दिया है तो वे सूच हो गई।

15.00 hrs.

श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : मैं नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि स्टीफन साहब का भाषण सुन कर न केवल मुझे बहुत निराशा हुई बल्कि मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इतना शक्तिशाली मुझे उनका भाषण लगा कि मैं कल्पना भी नहीं कर सकता था कि कोई व्यक्ति आज इस सदन के अन्दर और देश के सामने इस प्रकार का विचार रख सकता है। बिना बिजनेस, बड़ी इंडस्ट्री और बड़े बड़े स.प.वेदार घरानों का इतने ज्यादा डिपेंडेंस, इससे ज्यादा उनके हितों की रक्षा, जो भाषण उन्होंने दिया, नहीं हो सकती थी। इन्होंने अपने सारे भाषण में दो चीजों पर जोर दिया। एक तो बड़ी इंडस्ट्री को किस तरह से बचाया जाए और दूसरे इस बात पर कि बड़ी यूनिवर्सिटीज या हायर एजुकेशन को शायद हम स्कूल करने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने यह बात समझने की कोशिश नहीं की कि हमारी प्रायरीटीज क्या हैं और मैं फिर नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने हाथ बढ़ाया था कि वे इस देश के सब लोगों के साथ मिल कर इस छठी प्लान के बारे में एक राष्ट्रीय कन्फरेंस पैदा करें। अगर अपोजीशन का रवैया यही है और अगर वे वेस्टेड इन्टेंट्स के इस तरह से हितचिन्तक बने हुए हैं तो शायद कोई चीज कामन नहीं है उनमें और जनता

[श्री विजय कुमार सहोबा]

पार्टी के अन्दर। बड़ी इंडस्ट्री के मुकाबले में गरीब लोगों की नुमायन्दगी करना यह हमारा उद्देश्य है। ये बड़ी बड़ी यूनिवर्सिटीज जैसे नेहरू यूनिवर्सिटी की बात करते हैं जिस के अन्दर 30 हजार रुपये एक स्टूडेंट पर खर्च होते हैं और वह भी ग्रार्टेंस का स्टूडेंट है और दूसरी तरफ करोड़ों करोड़ ऐसे बच्चे हैं जिनको एजुकेशन नहीं मिलती है और बिना एजुकेशन के वे छोटे छोटे कारखानों में काम करते हुए तपेदिक के मरीज हो जाते हैं और कभी पढ़ाई नहीं कर पाते हैं। इन दोनों चीजों को सामने रख कर चुनाव चाहिए और वे प्रायरीटीज को समझने की कोशिश नहीं कर रहे हैं।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अपने सारे भाषण में उन्होंने पांचवी योजना का हवाला दिया और पांचवी योजना जो श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के शासन काल में बनी थी, उसमें सब से पहले शुरू में यह लिखा हुआ है :

"Removal of poverty and attainment of economic self-reliance are the two major tasks which the country has set itself to accomplish and, at the same time, firmly move forward towards consolidation of the democratic political order, prevention of concentration of economic power, reduction of disparities in income and wealth, attainment of balanced regional development and the spread of institutions, values and attitudes of a free and just society."

श्री और जस्ट मोसाइटी या डेमोक्रेटिक पॉलिटिकल आर्डर की क्या हत्या पिछले दो, तीन सालों में हुई थी, मैं उसका इस समय जिक्र नहीं करना चाहता क्योंकि उसमें समय बहुत लग जाएगा परन्तु इसके अन्दर जो जिक्र किया गया कि डिस्पैरिटी इन्कम को खत्म की जाए, जो इसमें जिक्र किया गया कि अमीर और गरीब के बीच के भेद को खत्म किया जाए और इसमें जो

जिक्र किया गया कि जो कन्सेन्ट्रेशन आफ इकोनामिक पावर है, उसको खत्म किया जाए, उसके लिए क्या कदम वे सजेस्ट करते हैं। उसके लिए आप देखेंगे कि पिछले कुछ सालों के अन्दर 1969 में जो 20 बड़े घरानों के 2500 करोड़ रुपये के एसेट्स थे, वे आज बढ़ कर 5100 करोड़ रुपये हो गये हैं। यह उन की डिस्पैरिटी खत्म करने का तरीका है, यह उनका डिस्पैरिटी को खत्म करने का तरीका है कि वे यह कह रहे हैं कि बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज को न सिर्फ टालरेट करो बल्कि कन्स्यूमर प्राइटेम्स के अन्दर भी अंधाधुंध एसेट्स बढ़ाने की इजाजत दो, नहीं तो युराने कोलोनि-यलइज्म में चले जाएंगे। इसके अन्दर आप देखेंगे कि पिछले पंचसाला प्लान के अन्दर ग्रोथ रेट साढ़े पांच परसेंट रखा गया था और उसे साढ़े पांच परसेंट ग्रोथ रेट के मुकाबले में इन्होंने एचीव किया है साढ़े साढ़े तीन परसेंट और पापुलेशन इन्क्रीज हो गई 3 परसेंट और 50 परसेंट इन्फ्लेशन हुआ 1972-73 में जब कि इनका यह प्लान पेश किया गया था और 1978 तक 50 परसेंट के बाद पावर्टी रिमूव करने का सवाल कहां पैदा होता है। कितनी गरीबी बढ़ गई, कितनी जगहों पर पीने का पानी नहीं है, स्वम इम्प्रूवमेंट की क्या हालत है और करोड़ों करोड़ लोग पावर्टी लाइन के नीचे और चले गये, उसके बाद यह कह रहे हैं कि इन की पंचसाला प्लान में बड़ा अच्छा काम हुआ। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर ये प्रायरीटीज नहीं बदली गई और पिछले 30 सालों में जो प्रायरीटीज रखी गई थीं उनको पूरी तरह से न सिर्फ टालरेट ही न किया जाए बल्कि उनको अगर स्कैप नहीं

नहीं किया गया, तो हिन्दुस्तान के आने वाले दिनों के अन्दर हमारा भविष्य कोई नहीं रहेगा। इसलिए सबसे पहले मैं यह बात रखना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ पर इस प्लान के संबंध में एक बात निश्चित करनी चाहिए कि हमारी प्रायर्टीज क्या हों।

1972-73 में पांचवीं योजना का मसौदा पार्लियामेंट में पेश किया गया था, 1974 में प्लान पर काम चालू हो गया और 24 सितम्बर, 1976 को यह फाइनेलाइज हुआ। 1974 में शुरू होकर 24 सितम्बर, 1976 को यह एन०डी०सी० के अन्दर फाइनेलाइज हुआ।

1972-73 में प्लान का मसौदा आया, 74 में प्लान शुरू हो गया, 76 के अन्त में जाकर फाइनेलाइज हुआ और 78 में उसकी यह हालत हुई तो यह कैसा प्लान है। इसलिए मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी से नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बात को देखने की जरूरत है कि कहीं इस प्लान की भी यही हालत न हो जाए। मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि 1978 से प्लान शुरू हो गया है। प्लान हैज आलरेडी स्टार्टेड। अभी इसको इस साल के आखिर में नेशनल डेवलपमेंट काउंसिल के सामने जाना है, वहाँ पर फिर से इस पर विचार किया जाएगा, इसके बारे में हर स्टेट्स से भी विचार विमर्श किया जाएगा, फिर ब्लाक डेवलपमेंट्स पर और किया जाएगा और पूरी स्कीम्स बनेंगी। जब तक यह प्लान डिटेल्स में फाइनेलाइज होगा तब तक दो साल निकल जाएंगे। कहीं इस तरह से इस प्लान का भी बही हाल न हो, इसलिए क्या इस बात पर विचार किया जा सकता है कि यह जो 78 साल का प्लान चल रहा है, उसको इयरली प्लान मान लिया जाए और 79 से एक पूरे पांच साल का डिटेल्ड प्लान बनाया जाए जिस पर कि सारे देश के अन्दर पूरी तरह से विचार हो ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने रोलिंग प्लान के बारे में कहा। रोलिंग प्लान का कंसेप्ट अच्छा है लेकिन जिस रूप में उन्होंने इसे रखा है उस रूप में दिखता तो अच्छा है परन्तु कहीं नौकरशाही इत रोलिंग प्लान का मतलब यह न निकाले कि हमारी पर-फोरमेंस के मुताबिक हमारे सारे टारगेट्स बदल जाएं। अगर ऐसा होता है तो ये जो टारगेट्स हम अचीव करना चाहते हैं उन्हें हम अचीव नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसलिए टारगेट्स को नीचे लाने के बजाय हमें अपने परफोरमेंस को ऊपर लाने की कोशिश करनी होगी। नौकरशाही के सामने यह बात बहुत स्पष्ट होनी चाहिए ताकि वह गलती से इसका मतलब यह न निकाले।

अध्यक्ष महोदय हमने 4.7 परसेंट प्रोथ के टारगेट्स रखे हैं। लेकिन हमारे सामने इस समय जो स्थिति है और जो यह अन्दाजा लगाया जा रहा है कि अगले पांच साल के अन्दर हमारा बर्थ रेट बहुत कम हो जाएगा और इसके कारण से हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर उतना पापुलेशन इंक्रीज नहीं होगा जितना कि होता रहा है, मेरे विचार में यह सही नहीं है। पिछली बार भी यह गलती हुई थी। अब भी यही अन्दाजा लगाया गया है कि हमारी पापुलेशन 30 पर हजार में कम हो कर 25 पर हजार पर आ जाएगी। परन्तु अभी हेल्थ मिनिस्टर्स को एक दो महीने पहले जो मीटिंग हुई थी उसमें इन टारगेट्स को अन्व्यावहारिक बताया गया था और कहा गया था कि हम 1983 तक भी 25 पर हजार का टारगेट अचीव नहीं कर सकते हैं और 30 पर हजार का जो टारगेट है, इसी को मान लिया जाता चाहिए। अगर हम 30 पर हजार का टारगेट ले कर चलें, डेथ रेट हमारा नीचे आ रहा है, तीन परसेंट के करीब हर साल पापुलेशन बढ़ रही है और हम अपने इन्फ्लेशन का परसेन्टेज दो या तीन परसेंट भी रखें तो भी बहुत माइनेट तौर पर

[श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा]

4.7 परसेंट का ग्रोथ रेट अर्चीव कर क्या हम पावर्टी रिमूव कर सकेंगे, क्या हम पूरा एम्प्लायमेंट दे सकेंगे, इस पर हमें विचार करना चाहिए? जनता पार्टी ने अपने इकोनॉमिक प्लान में यह लिखा है कि हमें मिनिमम 7 परसेंट ग्रोथ रेट रखने पर विचार करना चाहिए। अगर मात परसेंट का नहीं होता है तो क्या हमने जो टारगेट्स रखे हैं, उनको हम पूरा कर पायेंगे?

अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी हमारे सामने जो टारगेट्स रखे गये हैं, उनके अनुसार 49 मीलियन मेनपावर क्रियेट होनी है, तीन करोड़ के करीब नयी ज़ेवर फॉर्म आयोजी, करीबन दो करोड़ पुराने बेकार लोग हैं, उनको भी डम प्लान पीरियड में काम देने की बात कही गयी है, यह सब करने के लिए अपने ग्रोथ रेट के बारे में सोचने की ज़रूरत है। हमने 4.7 परसेंट का ग्रोथ रेट रखा है, उससे क्या हम यह सब अर्चीव कर सकेंगे? क्या हम पांच परसेंट या साढ़े पांच परसेंट का ग्रोथ रेट नहीं रख सकते थे? इन सब कामों को पूरा करने का और कोई तरीका नहीं है। हमें डिस्पेंसिटीज का खत्म करना है, देश के अन्दर रिडिस्ट्रिब्यूशन आफ इंकम करना है, रिडिस्ट्रिब्यूशन आफ असेट्स का करना है। प्लान में उसको एनबीसज किया गया है परन्तु कैसे यह हो सकता है, कोई इसका तरीका है यह मैं माननीय स्टीफन साहब से पूछता हूँ। क्या कोई ऐसा तरीका है? बड़ी इंडस्ट्री भी है क्या उसकी कंज्यूमर आइटम्स जो हैं उनका उत्पादन बढ़ाते चले जाने की और हिन्दुस्तान का शापण करते जाने की छूट दे दी जाय? मैं समझता हूँ कि जो इंडस्ट्रियल पॉलिसी हाउस में रखी गई है वह इंग प्लान में रिफ्लैक्ट नहीं हो रही है इसको ज़रूर रिफ्लैक्ट इस प्लान में होना चाहिए। बड़ी इंडस्ट्री की कंज्यूमर आइटम्स में टालरेट किया जाये इसको भी मैं गलत समझता हूँ। ऐसी बात भी नहीं है कि इसको

टालरेट किया जा रहा है। मैं कहूँगा कि कुछ आइटम्स हैं जिनमें बड़ी इंडस्ट्री का और मल्टी-नैशनल्स को ज़रूर स्कैप किया जाना चाहिए और वे वे आइटम्स हैं जो स्पॉल स्केल और फाटेज इंडस्ट्री को बचने नहीं दे रही हैं। इनको बढ़ावा दिये वगैरह हमारा गुज़ारा नहीं चल सकता है। कोई दूसरा तरीका विनाय इन्वेस्टिगेशन में ढाँही सकता है। उनका यह भी कहना था कि क्या एक प्राइसी को हैडलूम में काम देकर आप यह समझते हैं कि एम्प्लायमेंट उठाओ मिल जाएगा? आप देखें कि आज हालत यह है कि 40 से 60 परसेंट लोग पावर्टी लाइन के नीचे हैं। ऊपर के पांच परसेंट लोगों ने ही भारत की सारी रोजन को इकट्ठा कर लिया है। ये जो पावर्टी लाइन के नीचे हैं उनके ऊपर हमें ध्यान देना होगा। उनको अगर हम दो कर्ब या तीन रुपये भी रोज दे सके तो भी मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक बहुत बड़ी अर्चीवमेंट होगी, यह कोई छोटी बात नहीं होगी। ऊपर के जो पांच, दस या बीस परसेंट लोग हैं उनका ही हम ध्यान करते चले जायें, उनके बारे में ही सोचने चले जायें तो हिन्दुस्तान की प्रोडक्शन का सवाल हल नहीं होगा। डम वास्ते मैं समझता हूँ कि इंडस्ट्री के बारे में जो कुछ चीज़ें रखी गई हैं उनके बारे में हम को पुनर्विचार करना चाहिए।

यह भी कहा गया है इंडस्ट्री के बारे में कि बड़ी इंडस्ट्री अगर हैडलूम और फाटेज इंडस्ट्री के रास्ते में बाधक होगी तो उसके ऊपर आगे चल कर ऊर्ध्व लगाने की बात सोची जायगी। इसका मतलब यह है कि इंडस्ट्रियल पॉलिसी में जो यह कहा गया था कि बड़ी इंडस्ट्री पर हम पूरी तरह से कर्ब लगा देंगे, उसको बिस्कुल एक्स्पैशन करने नहीं दिया जाएगा, इसमें उनको बहुत बड़ा लैटीट्यूड दिया जा रहा है। जहाँ तक कंज्यूमर आइटम्स का ताल्लुक है फाटेज और स्पॉल स्केल

इंडस्ट्री को बढ़ावा देने के लिए इसके अन्दर बहुत ज्यादा चीजें करने की मैं समझता हूँ जरूरत है।

ग्रोथ रेट को बढ़ाने के लिए कुछ चीजें और करने की जरूरत है। उनका इसमें उल्लेख नहीं है। अगर यहाँ इनवेस्टमेंट को बढ़ाना है, सेक्टर को बढ़ाना है तो एकम-पेंडीचर के ऊपर किसी तरह का कर्ब लगाना भी बहुत जरूरी है। उसका इसमें उल्लेख नहीं है। जो हमारी एकमपेंडेबल इनकम है उसकी रेशो को ऊपर तक क्या बदला नहीं जाएगा? यह चीज उसके अन्दर निश्चित रूप में आनी चाहिए थी। एकमपेंडेबल इनकम का जो रेशो है वह एक से बीस किलोने माल में आ जाएगा इसका भी आपका देखना चाहिए। जनता पार्टी के मैनिफेस्टो में कहा गया था कि एक से बीस का रेशो लायेंगे और दस साल में उसको कम करके एक में दस कर दिया जाएगा। इस चीज को भी प्लान में आपका रखना चाहिये और बताना चाहिये कि किंग तरह से आप उसके अन्दर फर्क डालने जा रहे हैं।

इसमें एक बहुत बड़ी बात सोशल नीड्स के बारे में कही गई है। उसके ऊपर खर्च को घाट सी करोड़ से बढ़ा कर 4100 करोड़ किया गया है। यह सब से बड़ी अचीवमेंट है। पांच सी परसेंट की इनक्रीज इसमें की गई है। परन्तु पिछले पांच साला प्लान में भी इनक वास्ते 3300 करोड़ रखा गया था लेकिन उसके बाद इसको कम कर दिया गया और घाट सी करोड़ कर दिया गया। जब भी खर्च में कमी करनी होती है तो सोशल नीड्स की सबसे पहले कॅम्प्राइसिटी बननी है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सोशल नीड्स के वास्ते जो प्रावधान किया गया है इसको 4100 करोड़ रहने दिया जाय और इसको किसी भी कोमत पर कम न किया जाय। यह पूरे का पूरा खर्च होना चाहिये। इसमें कोई कमी नहीं होनी चाहिये।

एजुकेशन तथा दूसरी मदों में जो वृद्धि की गई है वह भी प्लान में एक बहुत बड़ी बात की गई है।

एजुकेशन का परसेंटेज पहले से कुछ कम हुआ है यह ठीक है। लेकिन हमने प्रायोरिटी बदल दी है। बड़ी-बड़ी यूनिवर्सिटियां खोलने के बजाये हम प्रोपन यूनिवर्सिटियों पर ज्यादा जोर दे रहे हैं। हमको एजुकेशन को डिग्री से डी निक करने का काम करना चाहिये। परन्तु इसके साथ-साथ प्राइमरी एजुकेशन और दूसरी चीजों में बहुत ज्यादा खर्च करने की भी जरूरत है। शुरू में हमारा कॅम्पेणन था कि पब्लिक स्कूलों के बजाय नेबरहुड या कामन स्कूल होने चाहिये उसका हमें आगे बढ़ाना चाहिये। उसके विपरीत रूप के प्रावधान करने की जरूरत थी और जो एक बहुत बड़ी बात थी उसका हम प्लान में जिक्र नहीं किया गया है। प्लान में इस बात का जिक्र जिक्र होना चाहिये जब बच्चे पैदा होने के बाद पहले जायेंगे उनको एक तरह की एजुकेशन मिलेगी न कि दो तरह की। बड़े बड़े गहरों को छोड़ कर छोटे बच्चों में भी आज पब्लिक स्कूल चल रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ गरीब बच्चों के स्कूल चलते हैं। इसके निये एक नेबरहुड स्कूल या कामन स्कूल का कॅम्पेणन और उसके ऊपर जो खर्चा होना है इस देश के अन्दर उसका भी इस प्लान में जिक्र होना चाहिये और उसको भी प्लान में रखा जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि आगे चल कर सोशल इक्विजिटी को हम पूरा कर सकेंगे। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बात का वह जिक्र विचार करें कि इस प्लानिंग को हम किस लेवल पर करना चाहते हैं? केवल यही नहीं होना चाहिये कि प्लान पर सिर्फ पार्लियामेंट में डिस्कशन हो गया और कुछ सुझाव आ गये। इसके बजाये इसको ब्लाक डेवलपमेंट और पंचायत लेवल तक जरूर ले जाना चाहिये। ब्लाक का प्लान बने तो पंचायत लेवल पर डिस्कशन होना चाहिये। आखिर डीसेन्ट्र-

[श्री विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा]

लाइसेंस का मतलब यही है कि इसमें सब मिला कर शामिल हों।

प्लानिंग के लिए प्राज देश में एक बड़ी दुखद स्थिति पैदा हुई है। पहले प्लान के समय लोगों में बड़ा उत्साह था क्योंकि लोगों को विश्वास था कि उन्हें कुछ मिलेगा। परन्तु पहली, दूसरी, तीसरी, चौथी और पांचवीं प्लान पूरी होने के बाद भी बेकारों की संख्या बढ़ती ही गई। एक करोड़ दस लाख लोग एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज में बढ़ गये। पहले से काफी ज्यादा लोग हैं जिनको पीने का पानी नहीं मिलता है, बेसिक प्राइमरी हेल्थ सेंटर्स नहीं हैं, पहले से बहुत ज्यादा बच्चे पढ़ने नहीं जा रहे हैं। इससे लोगों को लगता है कि गरीब आधमी को इस प्लान से क्या मिल रहा है? उसकी हालत पहले से भी ज्यादा खराब होती जा रही है। इसलिये उस लेविल तक जा कर इसका जरूर विचार करना चाहिये और उनको इस प्लान के अन्दर हमें जरूर इनबाल्व करना चाहिये और यह तभी सम्भव है जब हम इसको डिसिन्ट्रेलाइज करेंगे, जो कि हमें करना भी चाहिये।

हम इस बात का निश्चय कर लें कि आखिर पावर्टी लाइन जिसको समझते हैं। पहले प्लान में 1961 के प्राइस लेविल पर 20 ६० के नीचे पावर्टी लाइन मानी जाती थी, और 1971 के प्राइस लेविल पर 40 ६० के नीचे पावर्टी लाइन मानी जाती थी, और प्राज के हिसाब से यह 70 ६० बैठेगी। 70 ६० के नीचे परकैपिटा इन्कम के 60 परसेंट से ज्यादा लोग हमारे देश में हैं। उनको ऊपर लाने के लिये, और उनको किस लेविल तक ले जायेंगे, पांच साल में रीडिस्ट्रीब्यूशन कैसे किया जायगा, इकोनामिक डिसपैरिटीज कैसे दूर की जायेंगी, इन बातों का भी इस डीक्यूमेंट में जिक्र होना चाहिये। और नेशनल कन्सेन्स बनाते हुए मैं जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि जो एप्रोच अपोजीशन ने दी है उस एप्रोच को विल्कुल डिसकार्ड करना चाहिये और जो

गरीब और निर्धन वर्ग करोड़ों की तादाद में पावर्टी लाइन के नीचे हैं वह इस प्लान के द्वारा इस बात की आशा कर रहे हैं कि उनका भविष्य सुखद होगा और जो अपने 30 साल में नहीं किया, इस नई सरकार के आने से उनकी आशाये जलवती हुई हैं, उनके साथ कोई समझौता न किया जायें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

SHRI N. TOMBI SINGH (Inner Manipur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to begin by saying that planning being a continuous process should not be a casual affairs which can be changed, done and undone with the coming of new leaderships, new parties. The Document before the House is very interesting and crude mingling of academic and political twisting.

My hon. friend, Mr. Stephen, of the Congress I, speaking on behalf of his Party, read out the first few lines of every paragraph in the Introduction Chapter I and in these paragraphs the first few lines have been invariably praising the performance of the earlier plans. If I read the last lines it comes to a haphazard negative attitude of the Planning Commission or the present Government whatever it is. This only indicates that the approach by the Planning Commission, as it is today and also by the present Government towards planning is like a step-mother who accompanies her beautiful step-daughter to a dance performance. Everybody praises the daughter but the step-mother cannot help praising her and joining them. But, somehow, after saying that this girl is very beautiful, the step-mother will rush to say: yes, but the face is slightly defective which is contradictory.

I would like to illustrate this by reading one or two paragraphs. In the first para it is said:

"It is a cause of legitimate national pride that over this period a stagnant and dependent economy has been modernised and made more self-reliant. A modest rate of growth of per capita income has been maintained despite the growth of population. On the other hand, the numbers of unemployed and under-employed are still very high and more than 40 per cent of the population lives below the poverty line".

I do not say that the statement contained in the second line is not a fact but there is a way of doing things. This is very inartistic and very un-academic and the Planning Commission, whenever they present a report—particularly when the Planning Ministry is headed by our Hon. Prime Minister whose goodness, honesty and sincerity cannot be doubted—should be free from these things.

If you read the following paragraphs of the whole introductory chapter, we find that there is a hurry a negative approach, which of course cannot undo whatever has been done within the various Plan periods. Since planning is not a casual thing but is a continuing process, it should be free from any element of political twisting. We should state facts as they are.

In the concluding part of the introductory chapter it has been stated:

"This assessment of India's economic development over a quarter of a century of planning has indicated some fundamental failures".

Also, soon after this the new development strategy has been indicated, in which a few points have been mentioned. These perhaps are points over which there cannot be a dispute because we are all interested in the

development of the country. We started from scrap during the British colonial rule. Then there has been a sincere attempt on the part of the previous regime. I would maintain that we cannot segregate ourselves from that. If we look to the Janata benches today we find that the majority of the leaders who now say that 'things have been done erroneously in the past and we are out to play magic and correct them overnight', had belonged to the erstwhile ruling camp and they have also contributed to whatever has been achieved or otherwise. If now they would like to disown their contributions it is up to them, but then, this has nothing to do with academicians and common people.

With these introductory remarks I would like to pose a few questions. Can we have long planning unless we can be sure of political stability to at least a workable extent over a visualised period? In the country today, psychological instability is increasing one who is my enemy today because my friend tomorrow and vice versa. So it is very difficult for any Party or any Government to talk of a long plan or a series of plans, particularly when the political friendships cannot be relied upon. So, this indicates that we should have a planning forum, a planning mechanism which should be free from political twists and this forum should be one which is not influenced by the quickly changing political wings. The working of the Defence Department for instance, can be taken as an example. The report given by the Planning Commission for the year 1977-78 makes a mention of the rolling plan and there are some contradictory statements in that connection. The example of the Defence Department has been indicated to show that it has proved a success in the case of this Department. This has tremendous implication.

What I want to suggest is that the planning forum, the Planning Com-

[Shri N. Tejbi Singh]
mission and the experts manning the Commission as also those at the State levels, should be free from the quick changing political winds of the country.

I would like to confine myself to certain aspects of the Plan. By and large, I do not have much to differ from the points made by the leader of the Congress (I), Shri Stephen. However, the attitude taken by the spokesman of the Janata Party, Shri Malhotra has been purely political; there is nothing economic and academic about it.

I have said in the beginning that the planning forum should be free from all these quick changes in the political scene. I am giving a few suggestions and when I do so I am visualising that the country is facing instability, mainly political and I maintain that in spite of the political instability, changes in Government, changes in the Ministers etc. the planning process should be maintained; at least workable sanctity undisturbed. Keeping this in view I am making a few suggestions.

Sir, ours is a big country. We talk of backward classes, backward regions, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and all that. There are a few pockets in the country which can be just called wholly backward areas. Unless we take up the upliftment of these areas it is very difficult to put the country in proper shape economically, whatever number of Five-Year Plans we may have. Unless we identify the real difficulties of the small pockets and outlying areas of the country and try to solve them, the country will not be developing quickly.

Let us first be concerned about viability of small units. We have a number of small States, particularly the region which I represent the North-Eastern areas. It has got so many small States and union territories. When these small States came into being, at that time, there was no national consensus about this. Some

leaders had opposed it. I vividly remember that when we were struggling for the establishment of small States like Manipur, Nagaland, Tripura, Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh etc., our present Prime Minister Shri Morarji Desai was opposing the idea. Now, we are told that he does not want to undo what has been done. He also says: "Had I been in power at that time, I would not have done that". One feels very unhappy about such observations by our Prime Minister particularly when it comes to planning and allotment of funds for the development of these areas. What priorities are the small States going to get? Just saying that the small States are not economically viable is nothing else, but calling a spade a spade. How long are we going to say that these are not viable States and the Centre is maintaining them? Some destructive psychology is being created in those States. The officers going from outside would say to the common people there: See, yours is a unviable State, a poor State, we bring money from outside for you. This is as if the small States are the small colonies of the country. That psychology is being built up. It is not the leaders who go and contradict these things. So the confrontation starts between the people and the people who work there from outside. So also even among the politicians there is a feeling that some small States are spending what should have been spent for other areas in the big States. Now, I would suggest that our future planning should address itself to the making of the small units viable. And there are ways and means. For instance the States of Meghalaya, Nagaland, Manipur are rich States geologically and full of minerals and forests and hydel power which can be exploited and made use of for the development of those States. So far the steps taken towards the development of these areas within the resources of the States have not been satisfactory

and real emphasis should be given to the development of these small States to make them viable so that after some time one may not have to say, 'You are not a viable State, you are a poor State we are maintaining you and you are at our mercy.' This should not have been there and steps should be taken in that direction.

I would like to mention in this connection that some of the small States and Union Territories including Andaman and Nicobar, Laccadives and Goa and invariably all the States and Union Territories in the North Eastern areas could be tourist havens. But tourism as an industry has yet to take shape in this country. The hotel accommodation in the city of Bangkok alone is more than what we can provide in the whole country. This indicates that we have yet to go a long way in tourism industry. Here some of the small States and Union Territories like Goa and Andaman and Nicobar and invariably all the small units in the North Eastern areas can be developed as tourist havens by investing and not merely spending money but by investing for future benefit. We find tourism comes just in the passing in this Plan. If it had not been done in the past, perhaps that should not be an excuse for this government not to do it now. Our suggestion is that in order to make the small States viable, in order to make certain areas which are not good for certain heavy industries self-sufficient and earning, we utilise their resources and invest to that end. So, I would like to make this emphatic suggestion to our hon Prime Minister to see that these units which have already proved as tourist places should be developed properly and on modern lines.

I come to development of forests. Forestry is an important field for the economic development of these areas. Jhumming cultivation should be stopped and trees filled should be replaced by quick-growing trees. Some suggestions have been made. These sug-

gestions find a place in different Plans and in all the documents and the Planning Commission reports. Now, what I would suggest is that forestry should be taken seriously for all these forest areas all along the Himalayas beginning from UP and then going upto the Burmese border. Then we shall be able to exploit the resources of the hill areas to the benefit of the nation.

Then I come to the aspect of agriculture. We say agriculture is the mainstay of the country. 80 per cent of our population are agriculturists but in agriculture unless and until we have complete land reforms all our efforts will not mean anything. You spend more but the benefits go to the big landholders, to the people who can do larger trade in the agricultural crops. The primary thing about the development of agriculture should be the completion of land reforms in every State. Here, land reforms according to this document gives a very disappointing picture. Whatever have been the mistakes, whether the previous regime was responsible for it or the officers did not implement that properly, political mudslinging is not of any relevance today. We should see that the land reforms are completed without delay. Whatever we invest in the agriculture should go to the agriculturists and this mass unemployment problem will be solved. Until and unless we do this, even if we spend more, we will create a gap between the rich and the poor. Therefore, I would like to emphatically say to the hon. Prime Minister that in the field of agriculture—to the extent land reforms are concerned—these should be seriously taken up before this planning is implemented.

The Sixth Plan as presented to-day has been based on the assumption that the prices will be stable. Unless the prices are stable, what is going to happen? Assumptions should have at least a workable factual support. Now-a-days the prices are so unstable just as human minds are unstable, or

[Shri N. Tombi Singh]

more particularly politicians are unstable. People are coming and going. Aya Rams and Gaya Rams are ruling in the States and in the Centre. Like that prices are unstable. The planning made on the assumption that the prices will be stable will, perhaps be a most risky thing.

I come to the idea of the Rolling Plan. This is a new idea it has surprised us all. It has been said—it is a new thing and is subject to criticism. All new things are subject to criticism. This is the way the Prime Minister would defend it.

In the Rolling Plan there are self-contradictory things—whether instability of the prices has been assumed or I should say apprehended, or stability is assumed and instability has been apprehended. In the annual Report in one place it is said that there is no need for Annual appraisals, annual reviews and in some other part it has been said that annual review of targets should be necessary. Somewhere again it is said that the targets and achievements will be reviewed after every five years and such of the portions and such of the subjects which will necessitate extension will be extended by one year. This is the position. Now the very idea of the Rolling Plan is indicative of the lack of self-confidence of the present Government. Whatever may be its merit, it is a new thing. If we just see, if we examine this in the context of different forms of instabilities—instabilities of the mind, instabilities of the attitudes, instabilities of the prices, so many forms of instabilities, then it will be seen that the Planning Commission and for that matter the Planning Minister is having shelter under this Rolling Plan so that they could be able to adjust themselves according to different whims and different situations. Ultimately, where are we to go? The country needs a solid Plan, a well visualised scientific Plan which will give impetus to appropriate priorities. Just with uncertain poli-

tical will and this kind of wrong assumption the Rolling Plan will not succeed. There should not be annual adjustments here and there. There should be a well visualised plan which should be stuck to. Then only the country will be able to go out of the present crisis. Otherwise this will be only waiting for the bus which will never arrive and getting nothing after the expiry of the years.

Before I conclude, I would like to again reemphasise my demand that the small units, Union Territories, and Small States which have come to exist in the map of the country by their legitimate rights should be made self-sufficient by utilising the resources in those places and establishing industries, big or small, and the infrastructures thereof according to the situations. In order to remove the disparities between the rich and the poor particularly in the agricultural sector, we should complete the land reforms to which all of us have been committed whether we belong to this party or that party. Irrespective of parties, this is a national commitment which we should fulfil. Then only this Plan will have some meaning.

With these words I conclude my speech.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY
(Bombay North-East): Sir, we in the Parliament naturally welcome this opportunity to discuss the draft Sixth Five Plan particularly because it is in the new context. We have the experience of the last 30 years. Besides this experience of the last 30 years, we are also in a new position because the usual bottlenecks that one encountered of food and foreign exchange, are not there as serious constraints. However, Sir, a sentence in the beginning part of the draft Five Year Plan which said:

'It is a cause of legitimate national pride that over this period a stagnant and dependent economy has been

modernised and made more self-reliant..'

has encouraged Mr. Stephen to think that whatever they did when they were in power was extremely good and the Janata Government should be obliged to them for it;

There is no doubt that a certain progress has been made. But the issue is not that. The issue is: At what cost? That also has got to be considered.

Therefore I would probably think that reading the chapter as a whole one would get the impression that perhaps this sentence could have been avoided, because, sentences of this kind have put Mr. Stephen very much in a sort of a dream-world.

So, in order to restore some reality I think, it ought to be emphasised that the progress that has been attained in the last 30 years, has also entailed severe costs for us. And this is one of the difficulties that the present Government I am sure, faces in planning for the future.

Sir, the constraints are many and I think Mr. Stephen should have really placed them here.

The first is, the economy has been subject to a straight-jacket of a three-and-a-half per cent growth rate since 1951 and if you look at the trend you will find that there has been actually a drop in the growth rate. And a three-and-a-half per cent. rate of growth is nothing to boast about. I would tell Mr. Stephen that it is very small if you compare it with other countries. If you make this international comparison, you will find this.

There have been many, many countries which have achieved over ten per cent. of growth rate. I would say, this three-and-a-half per cent growth rate, and that too, declining over the 30 year period, is nothing

that one can say, is a great contribution, that it is something to which we ought to be obliged for.

The second thing to be considered along with this is the growing inequalities. And Mr. Stephen failed to mention any statistics on that. And over this 30 year period, what has happened is this.

The top five per cent of the population today own 38 per cent of the assets and 30 per cent of the income. I would point out that this is one of the highest and most unequal distribution in the whole world. The assets of Monopoly Houses are growing at the rate of 15 per cent per year despite all the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act and other legislations which they had passed.

The people whom we can call 'grossly poor' had swelled their numbers to 290 million. Similarly, now, there are 200 million illiterates compared to 100 million illiterates when their planning started. So, these are some of the serious constraints that we are faced with.

Along with this was the mounting huge unemployment, as the statistics show, of thirty million unemployed in standard equivalent terms and the foreign debt of Rs. 10,000 crores we owed to thirty countries. The foreign aid or debt to-day comes to Rs. 10,000 crores for which we have to pay about Rs. 800/- crores in terms of amortisation and in the repayment of interest and principal.

Mr. Stephens forgets to mention when he talks about self-reliance as to how self-reliance is being given up. He said that in the Fifth Five Year Plan zero net aid was at the end of the Plan. We have not postulated the zero net aid as an objective. This means a sell-out to western countries etc. from where we just got carried

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

away. While discussing about the rolling plan, he went rolling along with all the fantasies. What is the factual matter?

When we started off with the Plan, the objective was somewhere half-way. Mr. Stephen and his leader, who was then the Prime Minister, reappraised the Plan; had the reappraisal of the plan and, in the reappraisal of the plan, what did they do? Originally they thought that they shall take in the Fifth Plan only a net aid of Rs. 2,400 crores. But, after the reappraisal of the Fifth Five Year Plan, mid-term appraisal, they stepped it up to Rs. 5,834 crores. That is they gave up the objectives themselves. And to-day we are in a difficult position largely because the trend which may have been started earlier, is increasing, progressively increasing, towards self-reliance. This trend was reversed during the emergency when they had no one here to ask anything. This is something which he must remember. He has not brought the facts before us. Similarly he talked about taxation. In previous Plan he said that the taxation was mild. While it is true that when they drew up the additional financial resources mobilisation it was Rs. 6,850 crores. But, in the mid-term appraisal, this was stepped up to Rs. 14,693 crores, the highest. Even at this stage, when we are formulating our Sixth Plan, this kind of mobilisation has not taken place.

So, I would say that facts must be brought in their perspective. I am sorry Mr. Stephen is not here. This seems to be the standard practice to say something and then to disappear so that he is not in a position to listen to some facts. This Sixth Plan, in my opinion, does have very key elements which ought to be highlighted here. Praiseworthy are, particularly, the facts that, for the first time, in our Planning, we have had a blending of growth and employment objectives. During the previous Plans, the rate of

growth of national income was 3½ per cent per year but the rate of employment growth was only 2.1 per cent per year. The proposed rate of growth would be 4.7 per cent but the rate of growth in employment will be 5.3 per cent. This will mean, according to us, in five years, the unemployment which is today 20 per cent of the labour force, will be reduced to 6.7 per cent which will be comparable to the lowest in many of the countries in the world. This is the first time that in our Planning, we have blended the growth objectives along with the employment objectives. In none of the previous Plans such a blending has taken place. The second factor is the decentralisation, particularly, financial centralisation. If you look at the Central Plan, it is smaller than the States and Union Territories' plans put together. At least as far as the first year of the Plan was concerned, it was cleared by the N.D.C. This is for the first time, in thirty years that the Central Plan is being smaller than the States and Union Territories Plans. Next is the conscious planning for the poor.

It has been written into figures that the total number of poor people will decline in percentage terms from 46.3 in 1977-78 to 37.9 and the minimum needs programme in this particular case needs to be pointed out which, in the Fifth Plan, had only 800 crores. The sum total of allocation for the minimum needs programme, despite your Twenty-Point Programme, with all the fanfares on *garabi hatao*, it is only 800 crores. In the present Plan, the minimum needs programme allocation has been stepped up from Rs. 800 crores in the previous Plan to Rs. 4,180 crores. This means 5.23 times mark up which in my opinion has never happened earlier. Along with this there is the increased allocation for village and small industries, namely, from Rs. 388 crores it is now Rs. 1,410 crores. It comes to 263.4 per cent increase over the previous

plan. These are some of the most praiseworthy things which Mr. Stephen should have borne in mind before he began to criticise the Plan.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, there has been lot of confusion on the rolling plan concept. Rolling plan is not an alternative to present planning. Actually the word 'Plan' should not be attached. It is rolling evaluation. It is a method of strengthening planning so that we do not make mistakes as we did in the past.

After having made these observations, I still feel that the Plan needs certain clarifications and the basic strategy needs further elaboration so that people like Mr. Stephen may not try to shed crocodile tears. The first and the foremost is that over 55 per cent of the total unemployment in the country is concentrated in Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra. These five States account for 55 per cent of the unemployment and certainly they do not account for 55 per cent of the population. Therefore, there is need for further spelling out the strategy for regional development.

Secondly, while I appreciate that there has been a vast increase in the allocation for agriculture and rural development, there is the question about how these resources would be spent. We may have the best of intentions but how these resources are going to be spent. If they are earmarked for small farmers and landless labour, will they be spent for them! What is the experience of the past? Here I would like to quote from the Reserve Bank report on Small Farmers Development Agencies published in 1966. According to the Reserve Bank, despite the fact that the programme was specifically earmarked for small farmers:

"The Agencies do not appear to have persuaded the revenue officials to bring the land records up-to-date and record tenancy rights

therein. As a result a substantial section of small tenant-farmers could not be enrolled as participants. One reason for not identifying tenant-farmers was the fear that had the Agency attempted to record tenancy rights in a village, there would be strong opposition from land owners, which would have an adverse impact on the tenants themselves. Secondly, the majority of tenants were oral lessees where tenancy arrangements were concealed. By passing such sensitive issues, the Agencies had adopted a practical approach. In the process, however, they left out large numbers of small farmers who were tenants."

What does this show? Even if you allocate a lot of money for agriculture, whether will it be spent for the people for whom you have allocated it? In my opinion, a fundamental overhauling of agricultural administration is necessary before any further step-up of the investment in agriculture is contemplated.

Further, I would like to bring out as a suggestion that a nexus between the growth strategy and the allocations must be clearly brought out. The share of education is reduced from 3.3 per cent to 2.8 per cent. What is surprising is for university and technical education the decline is absolute. There is absolute decline of 9.2 per cent for university education and an absolute decline in allocation for technical education of 3.8 per cent! There must be a strategy behind it. No doubt, although there has been reduction of the share of university and technical education, yet for elementary and adult education the increase has been phenomenal. The step-up in the case of adult education is of the order of 1,000 per cent. Nevertheless, the allocation for elementary and adult education will be really a primary aim at reducing illiteracy. But on the question of demand of small industries, village industries and rural development, we

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

need a little more thinking. Therefore, the relationship or the direct nexus between educational allocation and the industrial and agricultural strategy has to be spelt out further. Now, the small industries, village industries and rural development and consumer goods industries require good transportation. Here again, I find that the share for 'transportation' has gone down; for railways it has gone down from 5.6 per cent to 4.8 per cent, for roads from 3.4 per cent to 3.1 per cent, for road transport from 1.2 per cent to 1.1 per cent. Actually, there has been a total decline of 20.3 per cent. Therefore, I would say here again that it is necessary to spell out exactly the allocation for the village and small industries. The main problem with the small industries is the question of marketing of all its products and if you increase the allocation for small industries, there is going to be an increasing pressure on marketing their products and, therefore, increasing pressure on transportation will be the consequent result. Here again the surplus allocations should have a proper nexus. I would say that the resource mobilisation techniques in the plan also need to be more clearly spelt out because there seems to be even an assumption that there will be step up in the Governmental savings. The additional resource mobilisation would be by and large from the public sector. About 51.3 per cent of the total resource mobilisation would come from the public sector savings and the question is that this has never happened in the past. Therefore, steps have to be outlined by which this can be done.

I would therefore, say in conclusion that this Five Year Plan is a very new plan. It has so many new things; it has something which has never been considered before. But nevertheless there are four or five points in which particular attention is to be paid. The first and the foremost is agriculture. The administrative aspect has to be brought out. I

would say that in agriculture, actually it is not so much necessary to have investment but proper price policy has not been spelt out here and also for a really effective machinery for distributing their products and giving credit to them, I think the small farmers by themselves can do everything without governmental help, provided they have got a proper price for their products and marketing of their products and at the same time credit should be given whenever they wanted. In fact, I would not be so much worried about the resource situation for agriculture as it is in private sector. Of course land reform policy is to be implemented.

Then, I would also say about the kind of industrialisation that we saw in Japan in regard to all small industries which Mr. Stephen means is taking the country backward. I think Mr. Stephen has not looked at the Japanese case or the Taiwanese case or the South Korea case. In electronics they have defeated the most advanced industrialised nation because they have surplus of manpower and they have used their land more effectively. It is something which we should do in our country like the Japanese style of industrialisation. In my opinion, it has offered a clear picture and I would say that the bulk of the resources should, in fact, go for that. Along with this, there should be a nexus developed between education, credit and the restructuring of taxes. Ultimately, I do not think the present taxes can deliver much more resources and I would particularly say that the resources mobilisation should be aimed at providing incentives to households. Unfortunately, in this Plan, the contribution of households is expected to remain unchanged. Households are not expected to contribute more resources. In my opinion, households have enormous potential for providing resource provided proper incentives are given to them.

I think in India incentives have much more effectiveness than taxes or controls.

16.00 hrs.

.. .

Finally, I would urge a word, as I did before, on the question of self-reliance. I would say that certainly India today is in a position to have self-reliance. We have Rs. 5000 crores worth of foreign exchange. The amount of foreign aid is not so much. We certainly have to pay back about Rs. 800 crores as interest and amortisation charges on past loans. This can be arranged by asking the countries which gave us aid to purchase goods and services from our country rather than making the payment. I think it can be done. The argument in the Plan Document that the foreign aid taken is only five per cent in my opinion is a further argument why should have self-reliance immediately. After all five per cent is a number which means we can do without foreign aid. I think it will electrify the nation. Five per cent is a number which I can quote in another context. Dr. Sushila Nayar talks about prohibition. How many people in India drink? I think only five per cent of the people in India drink. Still we are for prohibition. In the same way, in the total resources, if the foreign aid is five per cent, that is all the more argument why we should achieve it instantaneously. The scope is there and we should do it. (Interruptions) I know Mr. Sathe is hurt by prohibition. But I think...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is alright.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): This is the Draft Sixth Five Year Plan. There is a background of Five Year Plans and on the basis of experience of these Five Year Plans this draft has been presented.

Here it has been stated:

"Thirty years after independence, twenty-seven since we set out with the First Five Year Plan

"to translate...the goals of social and economic policy prescribed in the Directive Principles of the Constitution...into a national programme based upon the assessment of needs and resources."

What were the Directive Principles? The Directive Principles were to reduce disparity. But what is the result after thirty years? Disparity has increased. What were the Directive Principles? To remove unemployment, to provide jobs to all, work to all. What is the result? More and more unemployment. Why is it stated that in the last thirty years, attempt has been made through Five Year Plans to implement the Directive Principles, when the fact is just the contrary? This must go. Mr. Stephen must admit that they have not been pursuing the policy to implement the Directive Principles. The Directive Principles is a bluff and a hoax to keep the people under the illusion that we have the desire to remove poverty, unemployment from the country, but in practice more and more bigger houses became far more richer. This is the experience of thirty years and this draft has admitted that there has been more concentration of wealth. Is this the effort to implement the Directive Principles? No. Big monopoly houses have become far more powerful and bigger? Due to what? Due to planning. If this is the result after five Five Year Plans, then it is nothing but a capitalist Plan which is being pursued in the last thirty years and the entire advantage has been gained by the capitalists, big business houses at the cost of the common people. If this basic thing is not understood... (Interruptions) Dr. Subramaniam Swamy has also admitted. He has given only figures as to how many big houses have earned profit during Mr. Stephen's regime. The same basis remains the basis of this Plan. There is no change, no basic change. Then, why are you eulogising the Congress Plans when the result is just the contrary? It has been an admitted fact that the result is just contrary?

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

Capitalism has its own logic, for its own interest they develop roads, they develop technology, they set up Engineering Colleges, which is the need of capitalism. That is why there is improvement in infra-structures. This reality must be understood. Otherwise, Janata Party is bound to fail completely and they cannot solve any basic problem of the people. What are the objectives declared in this five year plan? Mr. Stephen has read them out. The same objectives were mentioned in the fifth plan. The same things are mentioned here. The same objectives are in the directive principles. So, by declaration of objectives, results cannot be judged because we have judged for the last 30 years and the performance and profession are just contradictory. Why? Because it is the capitalistic system, a system based on exploitation. The entire economy is under the control of the big houses and capitalists. In the villages, the entire agricultural economy is in the grip of land monopolists, landlords, kulaks, moneylenders and others. The administration has given protection to them.

There has been growth in agricultural production, but the prices for the growers have completely crashed. This issue has been raised several times here. The price of raw cotton has crashed. Cane-growers, tobacco growers and jute growers are crying. They are not getting proper price for their produce, because the entire village economy is under the grip of the black-marketeers. They know how to manipulate price. Whenever there is harvesting, the price is brought down. The peasants are forced to sell their crops at a cheaper price. When the crops go out of their hands, the prices start rising. These operations are going on for so many years. Unless you try to stop that thing, simply pumping money into the villages will further help economic polarisation. More money will be concentrated in the hands of the few who are the vested interests

and the life of the peasantry will be completely ruined.

In page 2, the draft has admitted, "this assessment of India's economic development over a quarter century of planning has indicated some fundamental failures"—fundamental failures mentioned here are not understood. What are those fundamental failures? Then it says, "it is on account of this that the need has arisen for a reappraisal of the development strategy". Our point is, the reappraisal has not been done. Only due to some objective compulsions from the side of the Janata Party, they have brought this plan here. Our Prime Minister has told us that we have agreed only for the first year. Then again, the National Development Council will meet; the Chief Ministers will meet; the Seventh Finance Commission will have to submit its report. If you have to await all that, how can you call this a plan? If further discussion is awaited, without coming to some understanding even with the Chief Ministers of the States, whose plan is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Only your Chief Minister is creating trouble!

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: It is not my Chief Minister alone. All the Chief Ministers are creating trouble because it is a fight between the States and Centre about allocation of finance. That has to be resolved. The Centre-State relation has arisen a new because of the strained economic situation.

A peculiar formulation has been made here: "Slow growth of production and distributive justice". How can you remove poverty and unemployment by slow growth of production? How is it that if there is high growth of production, there may be distributive injustice? No. Why is this argument coming? It is coming because further increase in production requires an attack on the vested interests. There comes the resistance. That is why the old slow process. Our friend has shown that the Congress Government fixed a target of 5 per cent but actual performance was 3

per cent. What satisfaction do you get out of it? Your target is 4.7 per cent. How can you be sure that you will not go below 3 per cent? This means you are treading the same path, no difference. Simply one is accusing the other. But if you pursue the same path, then the same results are bound to occur and this means further concentration of money in the hands of a few and more economic polarisation. Poverty is bound to increase further. So, it is a question of attacking the vested interests. If you are serious to remove poverty, learn from other countries—there are countries where poverty has been removed, unemployment problem has been solved. The glaring example is China. The Congress was in power for 30 years. In 30 years, unemployment has further increased in our country. But after 28 years of rule of the new Chinese Government, unemployment has been completely removed from China, the population of which is much more than that of India. (*Interruptions*). You are talking about solving unemployment within ten years. But one year has already passed. Is it that one-tenth of unemployment has been solved and nine-tenths has remained? No.

16.10 hrs.

[DR. SUSHILA NAYAR in the Chair]

So, the matter should be very seriously thought over. Some friends have rightly told that unless you remove landlordism, feudalism, from the villages, and unless you change the relations of production in the villages—the poor peasants and the landless labourers to become the owners of land and restructuring of the entire administration—the money spent for improvement or development of the poor people will not go to them, it will go to the rich peasants, the landlords and the money-lenders, and it will create a heaven for them by this new plan.

The Reserve Bank Report says—that has been mentioned by the Planning
831 LS—12.

Commission itself—how the polarisation in the villages has taken place. It says that 10 per cent of the lowest rung of the people have assets of only 0.1 per cent, and the upper 10 per cent have assets more than 50 per cent. In this situation, if you invest money for further power generation, how these lowest sections of the people can get advantage of the power? They have no resources to purchase power. You will not give them power free. So also irrigation facilities. They cannot avail of the irrigation facilities. They cannot get advantage of the banking loans and other things. So, the way the whole social system is now operating here, unless the relations of production are basically changed, unless the landlordism is completely eliminated, this poverty can not be removed by the further induction of money in the rural economy. This is a very fundamental thing, but unfortunately not a single word has been mentioned in the Draft Sixth Five-Year Plan regarding abolition of landlordism. Only they have told that only the surplus land above the ceiling prescribed by legislation should be distributed. And according to their calculation, the surplus land available is 5.7 million acres and up till now the land distributed after one year is only 1.2 million acres, and about the rest of the land, nobody knows whether it is fallow land or uncultivable land that has been declared as surplus. I saw one Resolution passed by the National Executive of the Janata Party 4 or 5 days ago. In that Resolution, it has been admitted that there are loopholes in the land legislations. And in the past also it has been admitted that this is due to lack of will—as Mr. Stephen said just now. My question to him is: why this lack of will? Why is will not forthcoming? It is because those who are at the helm of the Administration are directly linked with the landed interests. That is why the will will never come, so long as they are at the helm of Administration. That is the reality. You must understand this.

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

Then, a big figure has been given as the Plan target, viz. Rs. 116,000 crores. But the prices are bound to rise further. So, the actual value of this huge amount, when it is computed, distributed or used, will get much reduced. And the way the resource mobilization has been suggested, also shows that ultimately the burden will fall on the common people. One way is through new taxation to the extent of Rs. 13,000 crores. And the Centre will impose a taxation of Rs. 9,000 crores, and the States Rs. 4,000 crores in five years. It means that per year, there will be Rs. 800 crores of extra taxation by the State Government. I don't think State governments will agree. Here, the Chief Ministers will oppose. So, there will be further Central taxation, and then State taxation. What else? There are the public sector undertakings. You are expecting that they will give much more surplus. But these five five-year plans have proved that the public sector undertakings have become the real instruments for earning huge profits for the big monopolists. Their pull on the Government is so big and on the management of public sector undertakings so much strong that they will never allow prices of the commodities coming out of these undertakings to be raised to earn huge surplus—as long as the interests of private capitalists are linked up with the production of the public undertakings.

We have told categorically that landlordism must be completely eliminated and peasantry given land. We have always advocated, not to-day alone, that all the monopoly houses—both foreign and Indian—must be nationalized. Government will decide whether it should be done with, or without compensation. The Constitution has now been amended. Compensation can be nominal; but leaving those monopolists to have control over our economy, you cannot remove unemployment from the country. And you cannot remove poverty from the country without complete abolition of landlordism. The way this Plan suggests

foreign aid, Mr. Stephen has correctly put it. It is said that Rs. 6,000 crores of foreign aid will now be necessary. The Planning Commission has shown it to be 5 per cent. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy said that 5 per cent. was nothing. It is not 5 per cent, but 12 per cent of the total amount to be invested, namely, Rs. 69,000 crores in the Public Sector. This shows more dependence on foreign aid. I fully agree with Mr. Stephen who spoke about this. The door is being opened for multi-national corporations. We are starting the import of foreign goods, where we are competent to produce, manufacture our own indigenous goods. We are importing such goods. This is their line. And the emphasis on the rural sector is not an isolated thing. This is the formula advocated by the World Bank long ago.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): quite right.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: It applies to you also, not only this Janata Government. In 1974 McNamara came. This is the continuation of the same policy pursued by the Congress Government. This is our main accusation.

So, the World Bank wants that India should not advance in industrialisation because there is competition in that. They want Indian markets as far as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are 22 minutes for your party. You have taken 20 minutes already. Please try to wind up.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: The World Bank wants that India should remain a market for their goods, and that our Government should be involved more in agriculture.

Then, regarding improvement of slum dwellings, this is a proposal of World Bank. They are interested in giving money for this, but they do not want that we should set up new industries further. Money has been

allotted for the public sector undertakings, but that is only for some extension work, to achieve better utilisation of capacity.

So, this means that our Indian market is being opened to foreign goods. We have started importing. Because of the low purchasing power of the people and because the purchasing power is going down the internal market is shrinking, our big houses, whose production is increasing, are very much interested in having outside markets, and that is why they are hobnobbing with all the foreign monopolists to have foreign markets, and there is more and more collaboration with these imperialist countries. Even the liberalisation of the MRTP Act and other concessions show that private big capitalists can have agreements with multinational corporations in matters of technology and other things. This means they are very much interested in reorienting the home policy and the foreign policy of the Government of India, in seeing that our policies are run in such a way that their interests are defended in this country.

This means danger to our independence, danger to our self-reliance, and these are very basic things on which we cannot keep silent, and that is why it is essential that this draft Plan submitted here should not create illusions in the people that it is a very big Plan and that now poverty will be removed, unemployment will be removed. No, the result will be just the opposite, as it happened in the case of the other Five Year Plans. So, a basic change is absolutely essential, a basic change in the relations of production, in the property relations. That is the only solution to which the Janata Party Government must give serious thought.

श्री सुर्वा चन्द (कांगड़ा) : सभापति महोदय, प्रश्नी छटी ड्राफ्ट प्लान पर कुछ बाध्यों ने अपने विचार रखे हैं और प्रपोजीशन

के लीडर श्री स्टीफन ने भी अपने विचार रखे हैं। पहले उनके वक्त में जो प्लानिंग चलता था तो उसको नेशनल प्लानिंग माना गया और सब पार्टियां उसको लेकर चलती थीं और विश्वास के साथ हम कह सकते थे कि यह नेशनल प्लानिंग है लेकिन उन्होंने जिस तरीके से क्रिटीसाइज किया है, उससे साफ़ जाहिर होता है एक पीलिये के मरीज को पीलिया ही पीलिया दिखायी देता है। उसे अच्छी कोई बात दिखायी नहीं देती है। उन्होंने कहा है कि हमने तीस साल में जो प्रोडक्शन केपेसिटी देश में क्रियेट की है सिर्फ उसी को जारी रखने का इस प्लान में टारगेट रखा गया है और सिक्कस फाइव इयर प्लान में कोई नये कारखाने लगाने की बात नहीं रखी गयी है। उनका ख्याल है कि देश में सीमेंट के, फटिलाइजर के और कारखाने नहीं लगने वाले हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस ड्राफ्ट प्लान को गौर से नहीं देखा है। अगर वे इसे गौर से देखते तो उन्हें मालूम हो जाता कि हमारा 1977-78 में सीमेंट का, फटिलाइजर का कितना प्रोडक्शन था और वह 1978-79 में कितना होगा। स्टील की प्रोडक्शन 1977-78 में 7.73 मिलियन टन होने की आशा है जबकि वह छठे प्लान पीरियड में 11.80 मिलियन टन हो जायेगी। इसी से प्राप अन्दाजा लगा लें कि हमारे यहाँ इसके कितने कारखाने बढ़ेंगे। हमारे पास इस समय जितने स्टील के कारखाने हैं उनकी इतनी केपेसिटी नहीं है कि वे इतनी प्रोडक्शन कर सकें। इसका मतलब साफ़ है कि इसके नये कारखाने लगेंगे। इसी तरह से फटिलाइजर के नये कारखाने लगेंगे तभी जा कर फटिलाइजर की पैदावार डबल हो सकेगी। सीमेंट की प्रोडक्शन के बारे में भी देख लीजिये। 1977-78 में सीमेंट की पैदावार 19.20 मिलियन टन होने की आशा है जो कि छठे प्लान पीरियड

[श्री दुर्गा चन्द]

में 29 से 30 मीलियन टन हो जायेगी। सीमेंट की पैदावार छठे प्लान पीरियड के आखिर में कितनी बढ़ जायेगी इसके यह बात साफ़ है कि इसके नये प्लांट लगेंगे तभी जाकर पैदावार बढ़ेगी।

इन सब बातों से यह मालूम हो रहा है कि छठे प्लान में बहुत अधिक इन्वेस्टमेंट हो रहा है। यह सारी प्रोडक्शन बिना इन्वेस्टमेंट के तो नहीं हो जायेगी। सिक्स्थ प्लान में 1 लाख, 16 हजार, 240 करोड़ रुपये का आउटले निर्धारित किया गया है। इसी आउटले से आप अन्दाजा लगा लीजिये कि कितना बड़ा इन्वेस्टमेंट हो रहा है। इस प्लान में हमारा हर साल 4.7 परसेंट का ग्रीथ रेट होगा। इस प्लान के टोटल आउटले में से हमने 69,380 करोड़ रुपये का आउटले पब्लिक सेक्टर के लिए रखा है। पावर जनरेशन के लिए हमने 15,750 करोड़ रुपये रखे हैं और एप्लीकल्चर और एलाइड एक्टिविटीज के लिए 8,600 करोड़ रुपये रखे हैं। इसके अलावा हमने 9,650 करोड़ रुपये इर्रिगेशन और फलड कंट्रोल के लिए रखे हैं।

इतना सारा इन्वेस्टमेंट करने के बाद क्या नये कारखाने नहीं लगेंगे? नये कारखाने लगने से क्या एम्प्लायमेंट जनरेट नहीं होगी? मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्लान में कोई ऐसी बात नहीं है जिसकी नुक़साबीनी हो। हाँ आपकी इसके बारे में सुझाव अवश्य देने चाहिए और यह बताना चाहिए कि कहाँ-कहाँ इसमें डिफेक्ट है। तभी हम आपकी बातों से फायदा उठा सकेंगे। अगर आप इसकी नुक़साबीनी करते रहे तो इसकी इम्प्लीमेंटेशन में रुकावट आयेगी। अगर इसके इम्प्लीमेंटेशन में रुकावट आती है तो उससे स्टेड्स को नुक़सान होगा। हमें ऐसी कोई बात नहीं करनी चाहिए जिससे देश को नुक़सान हो। हम सब मिल कर इस प्लान के टारगेट्स को पूरा करें।

मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि तीस साल के बाद यह पहला समय है जब लोगों ने देखा है, गांव के लोगों ने देखा है कि कोई सरकार बनी है। मैं अपने हिमाचल प्रदेश के मुतालिक तो मैं आपको बता देना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस सरकार की तीस साल की कार्रवारियों के अन्धर वहाँ पर पांच परसेंट लोगों को पीने का पानी नहीं मिला था। अपनी कंस्ट्रिक्टयुंसी के मुतालिक मैं कह सकता हूँ कि वहाँ एक भी जगह पाइप के जरिये पानी नहीं पहुँचा था लेकिन जनता पार्टी की जब से गवर्नमेंट बनी है देखने में आ रहा है कि हर जगह पानी का काम हो रहा है और अगर यही रखसार रही तो मैं समझता हूँ कि पांच साल में हम अस्सी परसेंट लोगों को कवर कर जायेंगे और तीस साल में जहाँ पीने का पानी तक लोगों को नसीब नहीं हुआ था यह सरकार उनके वास्ते पानी का प्रबन्ध कर देगी।

यह छठा प्लान अप्रैल में शुरू हुआ और 1982-83 तक चलेगा। इसमें प्रायोरिटीज को बदल दिया गया है। सारा डाइवर्शन इनवेस्टमेंट का गांवों की तरफ, सरल एडिशाज की तरफ जाने वाला है। यह बहुत बड़ा काम आपने अपने जिन्मे लिया है। यह काम पिछले तीस साल तक नहीं किया गया जो आप करने आ रहे हैं। आज तक गांव सूखे थे, उनकी हालत ख़ूबक थी। सारा कंसेंट्रेशन शहरों में होता चला गया, शहर बढ़ते चले गये और गांव उजड़ते चले गये। इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन शहरों में होता चला गया। लोगों में गांवों से शहर की तरफ आने की एक होड़ सी लग गई। यह कैसे रक सकता है यही इस प्लान का मक़सद है। मक़सद यह है कि गांवों को एट्रिक्टिव बनाने की कोशिश की जाए, वहाँ इंडस्ट्री जाए, एप्लिकल्चर को वहाँ बढ़ावा दिया जाये, स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज को वहाँ इंस्टिटुट दिया जाये ताकि लोगों को रोज़गार मिले और उनका स्थान शहरों की तरफ से हटे और गांव जो उजड़ रहे थे वे फिर से बचने

बुक हो जायें। मैं सिर्फ इतना कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन्फ्लेमेटेशन जो है उसकी तरफ आपको खास ध्यान देना होगा। वहाँ पर काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज को ले जाना चाहते हैं, इरिगेशन की फीसिलिटीज देना चाहते हैं, बिजली की देना चाहते हैं तो जिस तरह से आपने शहरों का प्लानिंग किया है उसी तरह से आपको गांवों का भी करना चाहिये। आज तक शहरों का ही प्लानिंग होता गया है गांवों का नहीं। जब किसी शहर को डिवेलप करना होता है तो उसका प्लान बन जाता है, सड़कें कौसी और कहां कहां होंगी, बिजली कितनी दी जायेगी, सीवेज सिस्टम कौसा होगा, कहां-कहां इंडस्ट्रीज होंगी सब तय हो जाता है। एक थार्गनाइज्ड तरीके से, प्लांड तरीके से शहरों का डिवेलपमेंट आपने किया। अब जब आप रिसोर्सिस का डाइवर्शन गांवों की तरफ करने जा रहे हैं तो आपको यह भी देखना होगा कि काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज गांव में कैसे लगेगी क्योंकि हर गांव में तो लग नहीं सकेंगी इस वास्ते कहां कहां लगेगी। काटेज इंडस्ट्री का मकसद यह तो नहीं है कि लोग घर घर में चर्खा ले कर बैठ जायेंगे। मकसद यह होगा कि छोटे-छोटे यूनिट लगे जिनमें बिजली इस्तेमाल हो और वे बड़े पैमाने पर नहीं होंगे। इसलिए हमें चाहिए कि गांवों का प्लानिंग करना हम शुरू करें ताकि ग्राहिस्ता भ्रष्टता वस साल में कम आज कम पचास परसेंट गांव जो हैं वे माडल गांव बन सकें और उनका विकास प्लांड तरीके से हो। वहां सब सलूजियतें प्लांड तरीके से उपलब्ध की जायें। यह सारी जिम्मेवारी ब्लाक पर या पंचायत पर दी जायेगी। अब ब्लाक का तजुर्बा हमारा भू है कि तीस साल से सी०डी० के मातहत घरबों वपया खर्च किया गया है चाहे इरिगेशन के लिए, ऊरल रोडज के लिए, बिजली के लिए, पानी के लिए लेकिन वहां न सड़कें बनी हैं और न ही इंडस्ट्री उबरी हैं। ब्लाक डिवेलपमेंट के जरिये सारा पैसा सी०डी० के मातहत

की या वह जाया हो गया है। इस वास्ते ब्लाक को री-स्ट्रक्चर करने की जरूरत है, उनके वास्ते टारगेट्स फिक्स करने की जरूरत है। साल में कम भ्रज कम चार पांच माडल गांव एक एक ब्लाक में हो जाने चाहियें। यह काम प्लांड तरीके से हो, जहां काटेज इंडस्ट्री भी लगे, तमाम दूसरी सलूजियतें भी उपलब्ध की जायें, पानी, बिजली, हाउसिंग फीसिलिटीज सब प्लांड तरीके से वहां पहुंचाई जायें।

अब मैं पावर जनरीशन के भूतालिक कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। यह टारगेट फिक्स किया गया है कि सिक्स्थ फाइव-थीथर प्लान में कितनी बिजली तैयार होगी और किस किस सोर्स से कितनी तैयार होगी। 1951 में हमारे पास 2300 मेगावाट बिजली थी, 1976-77 में हमारी केपेसिटी 24,000 मेगावाट तक पहुंच गई, जिस में से हाइडल 9,115 मेगावाट, थर्मल 11919 मेगावाट और न्युक्लियर 640 मेगावाट थी। 1977-78 में हम 2,000 मेगावाट एडीशनल बिजली की जनरीशन एन्टीसिपेट करते हैं। इस तरह हमारी टोटल केपेसिटी 26,000 मेगावाट हो जायेगी। हम चाहते हैं कि सिक्स्थ प्लान में 18,5000 मेगावाट बिजली और तैयार की जाये। इस को मिला कर हमारी टोटल केपेसिटी 44,500 मेगावाट हो जायेगी। इस के लिए प्लान प्राउटले 15,000 करोड़ रुपये रखा गया है।

पेज 164 पर लिखा है कि बिजली की बल्क प्राफ प्रोडक्शन थर्मल से की जायेगी, और हाइडल जनरीशन के भूतालिक कहा गया है कि वह ज्यादा टाइम-कनज्यूनिंग होती है, उस पर ज्यादा पैसा लगता है, और इस लिए सिक्स्थ फाइव-थीथर प्लान में हमें पावर जनरीशन का ज्यादातर प्राधार थर्मल पर रखना पड़ेगा।

यह ठीक है कि थर्मल प्लांट लगाये जाने चाहियें, उन की जरूरत है, वे जल्दी लग

[जी बुर्गा बन्द]

जाते हैं और उन से फायदा भी जल्दी होता है। लेकिन इस बारे में हमें अपने रसोसिज और दूसरी बातों को भी अपने सामने रखना चाहिए। हम ने पावर जनरीशन के लिए न्युकिलियर स्टेशन लगाये हैं। उन के लिए हमें हैवी वाटर भी इम्पोर्ट करना पड़ रहा है और यूरेनियम भी बाहर से लाना पड़ेगा। हमारे कोयले के रसोसिज भी लिमिटेड हैं। आखिर एक दिन वे खत्म होंगे और तब पावर का प्रश्न पैदा होगा।

दूसरी तरफ हमारे देश में हाइड्रल जनरीशन की काफी कैपेसिटी और पोटेंशल है। इस लिए हमें उस की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहिए। जहाँ तक उस के टाइम-कनज्यूमिंग होने का सवाल है, उस में मैनेजमेंट की गलती है। अगर हमारा मैनेजमेंट ठीक हो, तो हमें अपने हाइड्रल जनरीशन के पोटेंशल को हारनेस करने में कोई कठिनाई नहीं होनी चाहिए।

हमारे देश के नार्थ-वेस्टर्न एरिया में, जिसमें हिमाचल प्रदेश, टिहरी और गढ़वाल आ जाते हैं, गंगा, व्यास, सतलुज, चनाव और रावी के बेसिन हैं। हम वहाँ पर 15,000 मेगावाट बिजली तैयार कर सकते हैं। ट्रांसमिशन लाइन की कोई तकलीफ नहीं है। मैं आप को यू० एस० ए० की मिसाल देना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ पर एक रिबर के बेसिन को कंट्रोल किया जाता है। ये नहीं कि एक पावर स्टेशन रिबर व्यास पर, एक सतलुज पर और एक गंगा पर लगाया जाये और उन के लिए अलग अलग ट्रांसमिशन लाइन्स हों। इस से खर्चा बचता है। इस लिए हमें वहाँ भी एक रिबर के बेसिन को कंट्रोल करना चाहिए। जैसे, सतलुज पर स्लेपर के मुकाम पर बिजली बर बनाया गया है। उससे सात किलोमीटर दूर कोल डेम की प्रोजेक्ट रिपोर्टें बन गई हैं। इस के अलावा नाबपा-आयर्षी की स्कीम है।

पम्बीस, तीस किलोमीटर के एरिया में पांच ठाँव पावर स्टेशन लग सकते हैं और एक ट्रांसमिशन लाइन से वह बिजली मेगनल थ्रिड में आ सकती है।

अगर हमारे देश में बिजली, सीमेंट और स्टील की काफी प्रोडक्शन होगी, तभी देश में बुगहाली आ सकती है, हमारी प्राबलम्ब हल हो सकती है और प्लानिंग भी कामयाब हो सकता है। हाइड्रल जनरीशन के मुताबिक मैं इतना ही कहूँगा प्रधान मंत्री जीसे कि इस तरह तबज्जह दें। यह सब आसान और परमानेंट रिसोर्स है जो अनएग्जास्टिबल है कभी खत्म नहीं होने वाला है। उस में एम्प्लायमेंट का भी पोटेंशियल है, लोकल मॅटीरियल भी उस में लगता है और उस का इन्फ्रा स्ट्रक्चर भी इन इलाकों में मौजूद है। तो वहाँ इन को संकशन कीजिए ताकि बिजली ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैदा हो। मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI (Kôlhapur): I would like to place my observations on the draft Five Year Plan 1978-83 before the House. The draft Plan is not complete: as the Prime Minister has said, some of the aspects of the Plan are to be discussed with the States and some information has to be collected. Therefore, I would have to restrict myself to certain topics which were discussed by the National Development Council—and these are the major objectives of planning, resources, etc. I don't want to go into the resources problem because, ultimately, it will have to be resolved by the Government.

The Plan says that a new concept of rolling Plan has been introduced in the planning in India. That means the Government will have an opportunity to modify it every year, after reviewing the position. So, under this sort of new thinking, annual Plans will be introduced. There won't be any Five Year Plans or a perspective of ten years' planning or something

like that. The second point is about a review of the previous year's planning.

The Planning Commission has, in this draft, given some conclusions. One is that the per capita production in agriculture has been stagnant. The second is that the concentration of economic power has increased in the sense that, within the corporate sector, the assets of bigger corporations have increased more rapidly, and the expansion of large-scale industries has failed to absorb a significant proportion of the increment to the labour force and led, in some cases, to a loss of income for the rural poor engaged in cottage industries like textiles, leather, pottery etc. The third conclusion is that the major beneficiaries, especially of the banking system, have been the wealthier part of the population, both in urban and rural areas, and the vast majority have barely been touched. The fourth conclusion is that an unduly large share of resources is thus absorbed in production which relates directly or indirectly to maintaining or improving the living standards of the higher income groups. So, the last 30 years' investment in this country has been absorbed just to develop the living conditions or for the amelioration of the upper 20 per cent of the population.

Therefore, I wanted to know, after reading the Plan, whether these conclusions have led the Government to re-consider the entire planning process. The Government or the Planning Commission has put up the objective of removing unemployment, poverty and inequality. So, after thirty years' experience of planning and large investments, we have come to the conclusion that still we have to fight poverty, remove unemployment, remove inequality. On the contrary, these evils have increased in the socio-political conditions of India. The Plan as it is presented does not give an indication of any change in the concept of investment or in the concept of allocations. The Prime Minister

said, and the Plan itself says, that the rural development has been given priority and more allocation has been made for agriculture, rural development, cottage industries, small scale industries etc. There is another thing that the agriculturists will be supplemented or the cultivating community will be given secondary employment in the cottage industries, milk dairies etc. and by that way, the employment conditions for them would improve.

During the last thirty years, with so many Five-Year Plans and investment of thousands of crores of rupees, we have failed to create employment opportunities in the rural areas. The same pattern is being accepted again. The National Commission on Agriculture has indicated that India will have to have an agricultural pattern of small farmers. But what has happened in actual practice during the last ten years is that the number of cultivators in India has decreased and the number of agricultural labourers has increased. That indicates that the small farmers are being driven out of the land. I want the Government to go into this problem and draw its own conclusions. My conclusion or my experience is that the small farmer is being driven out from the land he is joining the force of agricultural labourers. There is no employment opportunity, there is no improvement in the cultivator's life during the last thirty years. What is the reason? Is it that the agriculturist or the cultivator is not prepared to work? He is prepared to work. He toils day and night throughout the rainy season in cold and hot climate. If he is given the proper opportunities, proper incentives, he can produce more and in a number of seasons, we have seen that the agricultural production increased tremendously. The basic problem of rural India is how to take care of the small cultivators. The statistics show that 80 per cent of the cultivators are having below ten acres of land. That means that they require our best attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now.

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI: I want some more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to keep to the time allotted to individual Members. Please wind up now.

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI: The major problem of the Indian agriculturist is not to have a secondary industry or secondary employment, but to increase employment in agriculture. That will be done only if we assure a remunerative price to the cultivator. Remunerative price will give him additional support in financial matters; he will invest his savings in agriculture. Interjecting credits or interjecting something like subsidy will not help. This is the only way by which the production will increase and the earnings of the cultivator will increase. That will give us savings, that will give us market. Even if you have rural industries, cottage industries, where is the market for the products? The market can be developed only if you give remunerative prices to the agriculturists.

Secondly, the Government should not discriminate between agriculture and industry.

I will just quote one or two paragraphs from this draft.

"Stabilisation policies for agricultural commodities will involve appropriate support prices, buffer stock operations and imports when necessary. The commodities to be covered under this policy would include not only rice and wheat but also cotton and jute. Subject to our financial and administrative capabilities it is desirable to add pulses and oil seeds to this group. The approach of the Agricultural Prices Commission to the determination of support prices of various commodities has been sound, and it is important in the interests of price stability that no price increase

be given unless it is justified by substantial rise in input prices."

This is about agricultural prices. What about industrial commodities?

"In the case of manufacures price fixation should be limited to a few commodities where this is clearly required for maintaining overall price stability and orderly marketing for all such commodities, whether produced in the private or the public sector. A fair return on investment should be assured in determining administered prices..."

A fair return is assured to the industry but the same principle is not applied to agriculture. A fair return to agriculture means that he must have the cost of production, he must maintain his family and he should get a remunerative price. But here is this discrimination.

Another thing which some members have also pointed out is about electricity. Electricity in the whole of India is charged at two rates: one for the agricultural community and another rate which is a lower rate for the industrial community. Like this there are a number of discriminatory things in the economic development of the country. So, unless you wipe out this discrimination, you cannot do justice to both the sections and unless agriculture improves, industry cannot be sustained. So, this is the major thing. As I have no more time at my disposal, I thank you, with these words.

SHRI YASHWANT BOROLE (Jalgaon): We have on the floor of the House distinctive thoughts which have been expressed. One thought which as discerned from this draft Plan has been enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition. The planning that he has envisaged is altogether a different one than what is indicated in the draft Plan. Mr. Stephen thinks that it is no use going in for small-scale and cottage indus-

tries because, according to him, it is a retrograde step and the economics of production will not benefit the country. The expansion of big industries, more of factory goods shall alone sustain the economy. It will provide a capital formation and it may also at the same time give a boost to the economy so as to fulfil all the consumer requirements of the masses. This thought which has been put forth before the House is disproved by the very process of planning which we have followed for the last 25 years. All the Five Year Plans which required crores of rupees of investment have definitely not benefited at least 75-80 per cent of the people of this country. The statistics which have been produced in the same draft also show that the benefits have not percolated to the lowest in the ladder, the marginal farmers and particularly, the landless labour and unemployed persons.

I would like to point out as to the planning of more capital goods investment, as to what happened in this country, about its growth and about the rate per capita, on the basis of 1960-61 prices. In 1950-51, the per capita income was Rs. 252.9, in 1960-61 it is 305.6, in 1970-71 it is only 353, in 1974-75 it is 343.2, in 1975-76 it is 365.9.

The annual growth rate in 1960-61 is 4.54, in 1970-71 it is 4.40, in 1974-75 it is 1.14 only and in 1975-76 it is 8.76.

This growth rate of 8.76 in the year 1975-76, is an exceptional one. Let us analyse, why it is so, why such a tremendous growth rate has been recorded in this particular year? What is the reason? Is it because we have invested more in the industry? Is it the effect—that we have expanded industry to a very very great extent? The reason is, obviously not. It is merely the effect of favourable agricultural production which has come in 1975-76. But for this, this rate of growth could never have been doubled. This average has been

doubled in the year. So, there are potentialities of agriculture for an increase in production and ineconomic growth process. What has happened, with all these capital investment goods? I will give the output capital ratio.

In the first Plan, from 1951-56 the output capital ratio was 47—that means an additional increase generated during the period over the investment. In the Second Plan i.e. 1956-61 it is only 39. In the Third Plan 1961-66 it is 21. Thereafter there was Annual Plan. In the mean while in 1967-69 it was 20 and in the Fourth Plan 1969 it is 19 only. So, we find right from the First Plan what was 47 has dwindled down to 19. That is the output capital ratio. This points out that the industrial investment does not pay more. It has a longer gestation period. Not only that, but we find that from planning to its implementation and the actual production, there is a great time lag. Consequently, the capital investment also enormously increases and the ultimate output which we are getting does not bear the desired production ratio and, therefore, Mr. Stephen would be required to think again, rethink on the process, as to whether this planning which has been there for the last 25 years, whether it has really paid.

17 hrs.

We started planning. We had Colombo Plan which we adopted. Just it was meant for development of common wealth countries. We adopted it and then comes Nehru and Mahalonobis age, which has a definite plan. This has a thrust on industrial investment. That was the principal thing which was done, that we put more investment in the industries there will be steel available; there will be cement available; there will be electricity available there will be all types of infra-structure available and in the second phase it was expected that the consumer goods could be

[Shri Yashwant Borole]

produced to a very very large extent to meet requirements of the Indian people and the masses. But, unfortunately, this has not come to be true. The position in which we are placed here is that the Indian people have suffered the rising trend in prices continuously. There has been a rising trend of unemployment and under-employment. There has been a rising trend in inequalities also. There has been rise in the poverty. Sixty per cent of the masses are below the poverty line. These facts cannot be brushed aside. We have to bear in mind all the consequences produced by the implementation of the Plans and, therefore, the perspective will have to be totally changed. At the same time, I would like to say that we are not decrying any improvements made in the past. My Opposition friends should never think on those lines. The Prime Minister has said more than once on the floor of the House that we do not say that nothing has been done during the last thirty years but do not get satisfaction thereof that everything that has been done is correct and right and on the proper lines and fit for Indian conditions.

Our conditions are very peculiar. Eighty per cent of our population is dependent on agriculture spread over a large number of villages. So, the question to be considered is as to what type of economy we are going to give them. We cannot go like Mr. Samar Mukherjee that everything can be disbanded in this democratic setup. We know the forces behind Russia and China. We know what is the freedom that has been there. We also do not want merely to create a materialistic world around us. We want to develop a system where we can develop both the spirit and the mind as well as the material gains simultaneously. No doubt, thirty years is a long period to wait. Hence there is all the more necessity to hasten and really move on. If need be we shall even import consumer goods which are not available in the coun-

try for distribution to the poor who are not getting the same at a fair price. Till our cottage and small scale industries develop we have to meet this shortcoming. Mr. Stephen said that liberalisation of imports means killing of our own industries. This is not the correct position. Our industries will neither get killed nor get abolished as has been pointed out by Mr. Stephen. It would not be done like that. We are determined that advantages must percolate to the lowest man. In what way they can percolate this. Agriculture will have to be strengthened first and by and large small industries and cottage industries will have to be supplemented. There is a tremendous potentiality for increasing the production in agriculture but we have not realised this. The increase in the growth rate in 1975-76 is mainly due to increase in the agricultural output. Hence there is the necessity for increasing the irrigation facilities and we are determined to do that. More irrigation facilities will not only increase the production in agriculture in the country, but it will give employment to a large section of people. If the double cropping system adopted with the aid of irrigation, certainly there is going to be a need for double labour force in this field. So much so, better economics of agriculture is going to give us better and cheaper food. These factors are very well interlinked and therefore consequently if agriculture is given proper attention, definitely there will be more employment potential generated in this field.

So far as small scale industries and cottage industries are concerned, I take it that they are supplementary and complementary to agriculture. When agriculturists do not find work, sometimes when there is an off-season, they can very well be engaged in cottage industries and consequently more employment can be created. There are certain points which I would like to make. It has been said on the floor of the House that it is

not a fact that the N.D.C. has approved this draft Plan. The objectives of the Draft Plan have certainly been approved of by the N.D.C. There is no dispute about the objectives which have been now incorporated in this particular Draft Plan. The dispute is only regarding the proportion of the Central assistance that is to flow. Whether it should flow from the Centre or whether the States should have resources at their own command to implement the schemes and projects by themselves is the question to be considered. It is merely a question of proper and better understanding and adjustment among the members of the federal polity.

Now, another point is: which part in India should be developed? Whether the port should be developed in Madras or Maharashtra or West Bengal is to be decided by the Centre. If this question is left to the States, are they going to solve the problem of the State on a national basis? The States like Bihar, Rajasthan, Orissa and Madhya Pradesh have been deprived of their plans because of non-availability of funds with them. The N.D.C. and the Chief Ministers agreed to have 10 per cent allocation. But both are not satisfied with this agreement. They are also not satisfied with even 70 per cent loans and 30 per cent of grants to be given by the Centre. I do not think there is any other difference in regard to the objectives of the planning. The Planning is accepted. How to float more schemes in consultation will be a different matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI YASHWANT BOROLE: That will be a different matter. Another thing I want to suggest is regarding the framework of administration, which is very necessary. The Plans are not implemented, many aspects of Plans are not implemented. For a while, I will tell you a story, of a farmer. He said: "I lost my well". He has

given in a newspaper that his well in a farm was stolen away. What he wanted to say was, when he went for getting grants, what happened in the revenue department, the loan is being granted in stages. After getting the first instalment which is for digging the well, he actually did not dig it and got a certificate by bribing some officials to the effect that the digging is over and got the second instalment for construction of well. In a similar way he got the third instalment also, but the well is not there. That is what is going on. Therefore the question of administration becomes very important. How can the Farmers' Cooperative be developed? These are the more important questions which will have to be dealt with Farmers' Cooperatives cannot be established in a day because people do not like to surrender their parcel of land and resources because the cooperatives themselves are not functioning well.

The real question before this party, the ruling party and the country is, what machinery we are going to provide, is it only the administrative machinery of State, Collector, BDO and so on working and functioning? The people's cooperation and People's participation could be invoked by certain process, by floating some institutions which will inspire confidence among the farmers, landless labourers, and which will have direct dealings with the farmers; let there be a mass distributive system, percolating downwards to the lowest level so that every kind of help will reach the villagers. The real question which we have to tackle is, rooting out the corruption, creating confidence in the illiterate masses and villagers that here is a real organisation for them which should be developed and which will benefit them.

SHRI B. C. KAMBLE (Bombay South-Central): Madam Chairman, So far as this document is concerned, I welcome that feature which relates to a sort of confession of failures of

[Shri B. C. Kamble]

the previous Government. That is a right assessment and it appears like a religious confession and I think that the Prime Minister who is very sincere will see that the confession of failures which are mentioned in the Plan are not committed and there will not be a further occasion to mention the failures so far as the implementation of the present Draft Five Year Plan is concerned.

What happened to the previous Five Year Plans? The schemes under the previous Plans appear to be *ad hoc* and there was no specific scheme as far as the removal of unemployment is concerned. The result has been very disastrous. The result is mentioned at page 3 that 20 per cent of the population own only 1 per cent of assets and 4 per cent of the population own 30 per cent of the assets. This shows that this country is like a divided house so far as the economic situation is concerned. The percentages at page 3 are so far as the rural situation is concerned. If we take into consideration the urban situation, it will be a worse picture. Therefore, whatever mistakes have been committed in the previous plan, they should be rectified.

Taking the plans as a whole, what is the position? We are grouping in a growth rate between 1 to 2 per cent. From 3.2 per cent, under this draft the growth rate is supposed to be 4.7 per cent. For the last 30 years, we are grouping within 2 per cent of growth. Is it commendable? So far as life expectancy is concerned, from 30 years it has reached 48 years. That means, every two years, we can increase the life of an average Indian only by one year. If we compare these figures, what is it really that we are planning? I feel that we are very very backward compared with the rest of the world.

If we take the position of backward classes in the previous plan, per head annually there was a provision of 4 annas, i.e. 25 paise. How can there

be economic development if this is the provision? In the present draft, it comes to at the most one rupee. The population of backward classes is 25 per cent as per this draft. The provision made is 1 per cent. The Prime Minister will understand that if the previous plans have failed and the benefits have not accrued to the very backward classes, again in this draft plan injustice is being done to them. As I said, if he is sincere about it, he will see that the allocation for the welfare of the backward classes is increased.

It appears that so far as the present draft is concerned there appears to be a shift to rural development. I have not been able to understand exactly what is going to be the rural development and what are going to be the jobs that will be created. I want to be frank. If the jobs to be created under rural development are going to be merely hereditary as they came down for centuries, then we will oppose it tooth and nail. Therefore, if the jobs are to be considered, the jobs must be created in such a manner that the hereditary quality must be abolished. Only modern methods should be employed and jobs should be created. That is my first suggestion.

Secondly, if we compare the allocation given at page 17 in the draft, we find that social services are sacrificed. There is comparison on pages 17 and 18. So far as industry and minerals are concerned, there is an increase of 40 per cent. In irrigation and flood control, the increase is 128 per cent. And energy etc. 102 per cent and social services hardly 30 per cent. Therefore, Sir, what has been sacrificed is the social services.

Now, I would like to make a few suggestions to the Prime Minister, namely, unless the economic relationship which has come right from the Mughal Emperors down to the present day, is re-arranged, nothing can be done. And therefore, the Directive Principles which are embodied in

Article 39 should be taken into consideration while making these proposals and I am really sorry that no attention has been paid to the Directive Principles, particularly Article 39, which speak about the control of ownership of the material resources of the nation.

As the time is very short, I would like to make two more suggestions. With all the representatives of various sections of the backward classes, have a full-fledged discussion with regard to the schemes of welfare which they would like to have and then adopt those schemes. Otherwise if the principle embodied in the Draft is selecting a few families or selecting a few individuals, that is going to worsen and the have-nots would be still sinking down.

The second suggestion I would like to make is, whatever the lands they may have from the hereditary days or even today, they should be taken over by the State and the State farms should be established and the modern methods of agriculture should be employed. They should be divested of the ownership of whatever little land they have. Creation of ownership amongst the backward classes or the Scheduled Castes of one acre or two acres, which is uneconomic, is of no use. Take over the entire land, set up State farms with modern methods. That would be one of the ways of improving their conditions.

Finally, I would like to request the Prime Minister that the view that is taken about the individuals or families, is not going to help anything. Therefore, the proposal should be considered at a representative meeting of the backward classes and the implementation also should be considered in such a Conference.

With these words, I conclude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call the next name, I would like to tell

the hon. Members that here is a long list of hon. Members who want to speak. So, the time limit should be strictly adhered to.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): The time is being extended.

बौधरी बलबीर सिंह (होशियारपुर): सभापति महोदय बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि हमारी प्लानिंग के इनचार्ज गांधीवादी मोरारजी भाई हैं। प्रधान मंत्री तो वे हैं ही लेकिन प्लानिंग के भी इनचार्ज हैं। गांधी जी ने जो कहा था उसकी तरफ अगर आप देश को ले जाना चाहते हैं तो आप बोल्ड स्टैप लें जैसे कि प्रोहिबिशन के बारे में आपने बोल्ड स्टैप लेने की कोशिश की है। चाहे पीने वाले या कुछ धोर लोग कुछ भी कहते जायें लेकिन आप अपने तौर पर उस तरफ चलेंगे तो हिन्दुस्तान साजमी तौर पर आगे बढ़ेगा। महात्मा गांधी ने बैसिक बात यह कही थी कि हम सैल्फ-सफिशिएंट हों, हमारे ग्राम आत्मनिर्भर हों। अगर ग्रामों को आप लें तो फिर प्लानिंग के सारे ढांचे को बदलना पड़ेगा। इस बात जो ढांचा बनता है, उस में यही होता है कि इतने करोड़ रुपये या इतने अरब रुपये इस फण्ड में आ जायेंगे, उस से हम यह करेंगे, वह करेंगे, लेकिन इस के उलटे अगर हम यह मान लें कि ग्राम हमारा बैसिक यूनिट है—अगर किसी गांव की आबादी 2 हजार है, तो उस में कितना कपड़ा चाहिये, कितनी दूसरी चीजें चाहिये, इन सब का उत्पादन उसी गांव में हों, गांव की जरूरियात गांव में ही पूरी हों, तो फिर प्लानिंग के बारे में हमारे सोचने का ढंग बदल सकता है।

अगर हम पुराने इतिहास को देखें—ग्रंथों के जमाने से पहले, सारी चीजें गांव के अन्दर ही पैदा होती थीं। लेकिन बाद में हालात बदलते गये। एक शायर ने कहा है—

मजें-इरक पर रहमत खुदा की,
मजें बढ़ता गया ज्यों-ज्यों दवा की।

[बीधरी बलश्रीर सिंह]

हमारे प्लानिंग का असर उलटा होता गया। हम कहते रहे कि बराबरी का समाज लाना है, लेकिन कैसा समाज लाये—हमने बड़ी-बड़ी इमारतें बनानी शुरू कर दी, शहर बनते गये। पुराने शहरों को हम गालियाँ निकालते गये, लेकिन जो नये शहर बने—वे कैसे बने—मान नगर, शान नगर, सेवा नगर। सेवा नगर में कौन रहते हैं—क्लास 4 एम्पलाइज, क्योंकि वे सेवा करते हैं। जहाँ पहले किसी बड़े धावमी के मकान के साथ गरीब का मकान होता था, गरीब धीरे धीरे के बच्चे साथ-साथ खेलते थे, उसी मिट्टी में पलते थे, लेकिन आज गरीब का बच्चा धीरे के बच्चे के साथ नहीं खेल सकता, उन को मिलने का मौका भी नहीं मिल सकता—इस तरह का समाजवादी हिन्दुस्तान में प्राये। जहाँ पहले सब बराबर थे, सब मिल कर काम करते थे, सब में भाई-बारा था, आज वह खत्म हो गया। जहाँ पहले किसी गांव में किसान अपना पंदा करता था, तो लोहार उस के हल की मरम्मत करता था, तिरखान उसका लकड़ी का काम करता था, कपड़ा बुनने वाला उस की कपड़े की जरूरत को पूरा करता था, जब फसल पक कर आती थी तो वह बैठ जाते थे और अपनी जरूरत के मुताबिक उस को बांट लेते थे उस में दो-धरी तिरखान की है, 2 धरी लोहार की है, 2 धरी कपड़ा बुनने वाले की है, 2 धरी जिस ने लेबर की है, उसकी है, इस तरह से वे लोग अपनी जरूरत को पूरा कर लेते थे। लेकिन आज हालात बिलकुल बदल गये हैं—अब इंसान गुलाम बन गया है। बिजली का गुलाम है, मशीनरी का गुलाम है। आज बिजली, मशीनरी और दूसरे साधन हम पर राज करते हैं। हम ने समाज को बेहतर बनाने के लिये इन का इस्तेमाल किया, लेकिन नतीजा क्या हुआ—मशीनरी ने इंसान को बेकार बना कर रख दिया।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी गांधी वादी हैं और गांधी जी ने यह कहा था कि ग्रामों को

आत्म-निर्भर बनाओ, ग्रामों को बेस बनाओ जो खुद यह फैसला करें कि उन्हें क्या चाहिये ग्राम को डाक्टर चाहिये तो वे खुद डाक्टर बनाये, ग्राम में निरक्षरता है, उसे दूर करना है, तो वे टीचर बनाये। इसी तरह से एडल्ट एजुकेशन के लिये जो टीचर रिटायर होते हैं वे एडल्ट्स को पढ़ाना शुरू कर दें तो निरक्षरता दूर हो सकती है। लेकिन ये सब काम गांव में बैठ कर गांव वाले खुद करें, यहाँ दिल्ली में बैठ कर या चण्डीगढ़ में बैठ कर हम उन के लिये प्रोग्राम बनाये कि हम को इतने करोड़ प्रायमियों को पढ़ाना है, इतने करोड़ बच्चों को पढ़ाना है—तो यह काम नहीं हो सकेगा। जब तक हम देहात में नहीं जाते गांव वालों के साथ बैठ कर इस काम को नहीं करते तो काम नहीं चलेगा। वहाँ जा कर हम को देखना चाहिये कि उन की क्या जरूरियात हैं उनको कितना कपड़ा चाहिये, कितनी खाण्ड चाहिये, कितनी दूसरी सहायियों चाहिये और जो चीजें देहातों में न बन सकें, वह बाहर से मंगाई जाये—तब गांवों का सही मायनों में विकास होगा। वहाँ पर चर्चा चलाने के बजाय धागा बड़ी-बड़ी इण्डस्ट्रीज से प्राये, खड़ी लगी हो तो वह बिजली से चले—दूसरों पर निर्भर रहने से हम आत्म-निर्भर नहीं हो सकते। हम को इस की बुनियाद में जाना चाहिये—हमारी बेसिक रिक्वायरमेंट क्या है और उस को गांवों के जरिये कैसे पूरा किया जा सकता है, हम को अपनी मौजूदा इकानामिक्स में रुपये के रोल को खत्म कर के चीजों का जो रोल है उस तरफ जाना चाहिये। हमारे यहाँ जो चीजें बनती हैं हम उनको दोलत समझें, लेकिन हम ने नोट को ज्यादा महत्व दिया, उस के तकसीम में ही गड़बड़ हो जाती है। अगर एक धावमी कपड़ा बनाता है, दूसरा जूता बनाता है और तीसरा धावमी अपना पंदा करता है तो वे आपस में बांट लें और आपस में एक दूसरे को चीजें दें। गांधी जी का यह नजरिया था। इस

के बारे में उन्होंने कहा था और अगर इस ढंग से हम शुरू कर दें तो बहुत सी दिक्कतें दूर हो जाएगी और यह जो हम कहते हैं कि बिरला के पास जो 37 करोड़ रुपये में वे भ्राज बढ़ कर 1100 करोड़ के ऊपर हो गये और टाटा के पास जो 37 करोड़ रुपये थे वे भ्राज बढ़ कर 1200 करोड़ के ऊपर हो गये। इस तरह की बातें बन्द हो जाएगी। अगर नीचे से चलना शुरू करेंगे तो हमारा जो प्लानिंग है, वह प्लानिंग सही ढंग से चलना शुरू हो जाएगा और हम हर प्रादमी की जरूरियात को पूरा कर सकेंगे। भ्राज झगड़ा होता है कि हरिजनों को रिजर्वेशन चाहिए और अगर गांवों को यूनिट मान कर चलेंगे तो एक भी प्रादमी बेकार नहीं होगा। अगर मकान चाहिए तो मकान बनाने वाले मकान बनाएंगे और जो जो चीजें चाहिए उन को बनाने वाले उन चीजों को देंगे और भ्रम : देहात में वे नहीं मिल सकती हैं तो बाहर से वे भ्राएगी और देहात का फालतू माल बाहर भेजा जाएगा और उस के बदले में बाहर से चीजें ली जाएगी। भ्राज होता क्या है कि हमारी चीजों की अगर कीमत तय करनी है, तो उस को तय करने वाले बिल्ली में बैठ कर उस को तय कर देते हैं, अहमदाबाद में जो बटे हैं वे उस की कीमत तय कर देते हैं। यह जो नया जमाना आने वाला है, इस में सब से बड़ी जरूरत इस बात की है कि हम डिसेन्ट्राइज करें और इंडस्ट्री घर घर और गांव गांव में पहुंचे। अगर ऐसा नहीं होता है और अगर अहमदाबाद में बम या एटम बम पड़ जाए, तो सारे देश से कपडे का अकाल हो जाएगा या बम किसी और जगह, पड़ जाए, तो उस जगह जो चीज पदा होती है, वह पैदा होनी बन्द हो जाएगी और सारा काम रुक जाएगा क्योंकि भ्राज सेन्ट्रलाइज सारा मामला है। अगर डिसेन्ट्रलाइज करेंगे तो इस का नतीजा यह होगा कि जब मुल्क में किसी चीज की कमी आ जाए तो दूसरी जगहों से उस को पूरा किया जा सकता है और वहां से उस का निकास कर के हर

जगह पहुंचाया जा सकता है। अगर देहात को यूनिट मान लिया जाए, तो लीडर-शिप वहां पर पैदा करने की जरूरत होगी। भ्राज जो लीडरशिप दिल्ली में है या बंबई में है, तो वहां लड़ाई हो जाती है और लीडर-शिप के लिए हर जगह फसाद होते हैं। अगर हम देहात को यूनिट मान लेते हैं तो हमें लाखों प्रादमियों की लीडरशिप के लिए जरूरत पड़ेगी जिन को वहां के इन्तजाम को सभालना होगा। वहां पर वे प्लान्ट प्रोटेक्शन का काम करवा सकें, फसल का काम करवा सके सड़कों का इन्तजाम करवा सकें, देहातों में जो पानी की जरूरत है उस का इन्तजाम करवा सकें और अगर कोई ट्यूबवेल लगाना है, तो देहात वाले अपने तौर पर लगवा सकें, इन सब बातों के लिए देहातों में हमें लीडर्स की जरूरत पड़ेगी। अब तो क्या होता है कि यहां पर बैठ कर फसला करते हैं। अगर होशियारपुर का मसला है, वहां का माऊन्टे-नियस एरिया है और बाढ़ का जो पानी आता है, वह वहां पर लोगों को तबाह कर देता है और उस इलाके को तबाह कर देता है, अगर वहां के लोग उस के लिए प्लानिंग करेंगे तो सब से पहले हम सोचेंगे कि होशियारपुर के जिले को कितनी चीजों की जरूरत है, होशियार-पुर के देहातों की क्या अहुरायत है और वहां कौन सी चीज पैदा हो सकती है और उन को हम कैसे यूटीलाइज कर सकते हैं, इन सब बातों की प्लानिंग ठीक से हो सकती है।

यह मैंने चन्द बातें कही हैं और मैं यह कहूंगा कि अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी इस के बारे में बोलडली स्टेप लें तो इस बात को आगे ले जाने के लिए सारा देश आप के साथ होगा। सरमायदारों के लिए ही काम करने से देश में कुछ नहीं होने वाला है।

इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, the document placed before the House by the hon.

[Shri K. Lakkappa]

Prime Minister for discussion has not indicated the direction in which the country's economy should be developed and should be implemented. I would like to quote one thing that the Draft Plan which was placed before the National Development Council was, for the first time in history, rejected by the various State Chief Ministers when it was discussed. I will never minimise the importance and also be keen interest of the Prime Minister because he takes certain concepts of Gandhian ideology which is very dear to him and at the same time, he sincerely adopts a certain planning envisaged by Jawaharlal Nehru. This shows the far sightedness of the Prime Minister. But, unfortunately, it has been coming into conflict with the Janata Party constituents of various characters and shades of opinion. Now they are trying to dilute and dismantle the very spirit of the Prime Minister's concept of planning by various factors through various people.

There has been—it is needless to state—a lack of unity on economic and social purpose within the Janata conglomeration itself and this is the main bottleneck. The differences are revolving around conflicting approaches on plan priorities and strategy. It is clear that the basic economic policies of the country can be evolved only on the basis of a national consensus. But, unfortunately, the national consensus was not there at the meeting of the NDC and at the same time divergent views were expressed regarding this plan concept, the Rolling Plan and its concept. This is nothing but dismantling the planning system that had been envisaged by the previous Government.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY
(Bombay North-East): Sanjay Gandhi.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Do not quote Sanjay Gandhi. You may be having phobia for people. I do not have. I am always for the people. I have been serving the people for the last so many years long before Dr.

Subramaniam Swamy came here. You may be having phobia for people, but I do not have a phobia of that kind. In spite of Prime Minister's tribute to Jawaharlal Nehru for his great foresight in introducing planning and its incorporation in the NDC resolution, it has been confronted by people who are holding the concept of private sector—this of course the Prime Minister genuinely may not believe—but the constituents are opposing the concept of prospective planning and also the development of the nation, of the country and its economy envisaged by the Planning Commission and how this Planning Commission would envisage the development of this country, we have to see. The performance of the Janata Party in one year is a clear reflection how and in which direction that is going on.

I would like to quote something which is very relevant here. To give remunerative prices to the jute growers has been opposed by no less a person than Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. I am putting it to you because this is an occasion to tell you how they are diluting the system and are doing dismantling systemically as far as the entire planning and developmental activities of this country are concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nothing.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Nothing is wrong, if you hold that opinion, then I cannot say anything about it. But, unfortunately, people of this country were given different, time and again, warnings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You address the Chair.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I will take some time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Strictly 10 minutes.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I would like to quote another performance of

the Janata Party As far as our economy is concerned,—you see the direction in which they are going—not only there is economic stagnation but the growth has been withheld. There was money supply and it was up by 15 per cent. In 1977-78 financial year, the money supply expanded by 15.4 per cent. Between March 1977 and March 1978, it rose in absolute terms by Rs. 2402 crores—from Rs. 15,609 crores it rose to Rs. 18,011 crores. This increase of money will create inflation. In that direction, the performance of the Government is going on. I want to say that whatever may be the figures you have quoted, no new direction has been envisaged—other than quoting figures and explaining graphically how 40 per cent is below the poverty line etc.—which figure is also not correct. So, quoting figures and increasing money for certain items of the Plan outlay is not an indication of any plan for the development of the nation. Firstly, in regard to utilisation of man-power, how it should be utilised has not been planned or envisaged. That requires will on the part of the Government, the will that controls the entire nervous system of the Government. That will, that codification and that consolidation of directions towards growth is not there in the Government. So how can we expect any growth? This is only an ornamental document that has been placed today. There is no difference between previous plans and these documents, except that there is increased money for certain items like road work or employment or for some industrial purposes. But how are you going to utilise man-power?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only two minutes more. You are encroaching on the time of other Members.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: My whip told me that I can take a little more time.

The basic concept is about the large-scale sector, the industrial sector. The large-scale sector, the in-

dustrial sector, the heavy industries which are already functioning and are giving or bearing fruit are to be dismantled by this changed concept and we are going back again to the bullock-cart age. You want to generate employment in the rural areas, but what are the industrial resources available in this country, which can be exploited for human development? If growth is envisaged, in the plan which has been created, the work under progress, and then water, forest wealth, mineral wealth and man-power has to be coordinated. Unless you create a coordinated effort and there is will on the part of the Government, how can you implement the schemes? Today we are having different types of Governments in different States, with different ideologies. Your partner in West Bengal is asking for a dialogue between the State and the Centre—which envisages a certain system of ideology and political philosophy. You are a partner here, but you are denying that dialogue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now; cooperate with the Chair.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: So, there is no question of any implementation of the draft Five Year Plan which is under consideration as it does not envisage in which direction our country can develop and what is the economic strategy that we have to adopt and what are the resources that you are going to exploit to meet the situation. There is nothing about tackling the burning problem of unemployment, under-employment, rural economy, industrial growth, utilisation of man-power, science and technology, the manner in which you are going to deal with science and technology and treat scientists, the manner in which you are going to advocate the private sector. You are rendering help directly or indirectly—by soft-peddalling and indirect nursing—to the multi-nationals. How can our economy come out of the clutches and stranglehold of certain groups in this country? The document does not

[Shri K. Lakkappa]

envisage anything in that respect. No infrastructure has been created either ideologically or economically. The entire thing requires a fresh look.

Ours is a developing country. The country's self-reliance in various sectors depends upon the will of the people and the will of the Government. The will of the Government is not there and, therefore, the implementation of the various policies is impossible. Political freedom without economic benefits to the people has no meaning. We should not discriminate between people. Today, we find everywhere class conflicts, discrimination, favouritism and nepotism. For example, the banking institutions are catering to the needs of the vested interests only and their own kith and kins. The whole approach of in this document is indicative of the capitalist outlook. I do not think that the discussion on this document would bring any results here: I would, therefore, warn the Government that they should change the concept and bring about a revolutionary change in the entire system and bring this country to prosperity and plenty. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was really astonished to hear Shri Subramaniam Swamy's speech today. As a matter of fact, by saying that for these thirty years, nothing has been achieved, it is not only insulting the Members, but he is insulting his own Prime Minister. You should not forget that though the Prime Minister is with you now, he has been out of the Congress Party only for eight or nine years. For twenty or twenty-one years' he was in the Congress Party, and he was very much involved in the preparation of the First, Second, Third or the Fourth Five-Year Plans, as Finance Minister Deputy Prime Minister etc. So, to say that we have not achieved any-

thing during the last thirty years is an insult to him as also to other people.

This document makes it very clear that we are self-sufficient so far as foodgrains are concerned and in certain other respects also. The only thing that they are emphasising is that there is disparity among and people and what we have to do to reduce this disparity.

In this connection, I appreciate this document which lays much emphasis on agriculture and rural development.

Agriculture depends upon so many factors. To develop agriculture, we require irrigation, we require electricity, we require fertilizers, we require pesticides and so many other things. What have we done so far in this direction? Take the case of irrigation. In this sector, unfortunately, we have neglected minor irrigation. There is lot of scope in this sector. All the major projects, which we have undertaken and have not yet been completed because of scarcity of money and other things, when completed are not going to irrigate the whole cultivable land in this country. That is why, we should lay proper emphasis on minor irrigation. The Prime Minister is not here now; I would like to request him to look into the scheme of Dr. K. L. Rao about linking of Ganga and Kaveri—I had mentioned this last time also. This is very very important. I know a lot of amount is involved in this project but it is worth taking up. That I would like to say. If this is undertaken, not only the whole cultivable land is irrigated by this but also there will be an emotional integration in the country. We always speak about national integration. If the Ganga is linked with the Kaveri, naturally Ganga water will flow throughout the country from the north to the south and people would like very much that they are having the Ganga water and naturally, it will help

national integration. In this connection, I request the Prime Minister and the Planning Commission. After all they have to provide the amount for this purpose. This is very very important and emphasis should be laid on this.

The second point I want to mention is about the development of backward regions. I am really sorry for the development of backward regions you have not provided any allocation for new railway lines. You speak about the development of backward regions but, for the development of backward regions, railway lines are very very important and they play a major role. But in this document you have made it very clear that you are not going to undertake any new line at all. You are only taking up modernisation of the existing lines, electrification and conversion of metre gauge into broadgauge. This is very unfortunate and particularly those who come from the backward regions are sore about it. I also come from Telengana, a backward region and there are other members also who come from backward regions and it is a great disappointment for us. Without railway lines we cannot develop these regions. I think this document has not been fully discussed by the Chief Ministers and when they discuss, I am sure they will lay emphasis on this. So, through you, I request the Prime Minister to kindly see that some new lines are laid. Since independence there is not a single line laid. This is a great injustice and I am sure you will please see that new lines are laid in these areas.

The other thing is that we speak about rural development. All right, you are going to provide some amount for the construction of roads, and rural water supply and all these things you are having. The only thing I would like to say is that whatever you achieve will be useless unless you control the population. I know you came to power on this

point of *Nasbandi*. I do not say anything about it but the only thing I would say is: however much you achieve and however much you develop, unless you control the population, you are not going to be self-sufficient in this country. That will be a very very dangerous thing. You please consider, Mr. Subramaniam Swamy. I know you always speak about Sanjay Gandhi and *Nasbandi*. But this *Nasbandi* is very much required—I will tell you. You may not apply it by force but when I read this document, nothing is mentioned about it. They have not given any importance to this population control and unless you control the population, it will not be possible for our country to achieve the economic development we want to achieve.

About industries, my leader, Mr. Stephen has already mentioned. You are emphasizing rightly on the small scale and cottage industries. It is not a fact that we have neglected these but we were emphasizing on big industries. Recently Mr. Fernandes, while addressing a Press conference in Calcutta, has himself admitted that unless there are big industries, there is no question of development of small scale industries. These small scale industries depend much upon these big industries. So there is no question of neglecting big industries. If anybody thinks that we have wasted our money on big industries and we should have now only small scale and cottage industries he will be very very wrong. That thinking is very dangerous to this country—I am telling you.

You are saying about this unemployment problem. The Prime Minister said that he is going to solve this unemployment problem within 10 years. Last time also I put a question to him. Within ten years you are going to remove unemployment. I would like to know in this one year how much of the problem of

[Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao] unemployment have you solved? Shri Samar Mukherjee was also mentioning about it. You have not solved this. Problem of unemployment is linked with big industries. If industries are there unemployment will be solved. We should not neglect these big industries also.

My last point is about rural development. Without land reforms there is not going to be any rural development. You are allocating crores of rupees. So many crores of rupees are going to the rural areas, but they will go to big landlords only. That is not going to solve unemployment problem, of which you are very very particular. That is why I say land reforms are very very important. I would like to emphasise this point. In your own interest and in the interest of the country unless this land reform scheme is implemented, unless the landless persons are given lands, there will be chaos in the country. 70 per cent of the people are dependent on agriculture. 79 per cent of the landless poor people are there. That is why this problem is very very severe and urgent. Please try to solve it.

Again I will request the Government and also the Planning Commission to see that they should revise this new dangerous policy about the railway lines. New lines are very much required for the backward regions.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Government for having produced this bold document—Draft Five Year Plan of 1978-83 which has envisaged an outlay of Rs. 1,16,000 crores.

In this regard I would like to point out, while making an inaugural speech the Prime Minister has frankly stated that as there has been no consensus in the National Development Council, probably they will have to wait till November, till the Finance

Commission submits its Report and the National Development Council meets again. So, I would like to know from the Government that from to-day till November of this year, are we to take that this will be a Plan holiday? Are they not going to implement any portion of the Plan as envisaged in the Draft Five Year Plan of 1978-83?

Now coming to the other point—the Prime Minister has been to my constituency on the 9th April, 1978. On behalf of the people of my constituency, I deem it a privilege to congratulate him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will resume discussion to-morrow.

Shri Ravindra Varma, Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Labour has to present the Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

17.58 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE SEVENTEENTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR
(SHRI RAVINDRA VERMA): I beg
to present the Seventeenth Report of
the Business Advisory Committee.

HALF-AN DISCUSSION

ARTICLES SEIZED DURING SEARCH OF
MOTI DOONGARI PALACE.

श्री राम नरेश कुमराहा (सलेमपुर) :
माननीय सभापति महोदय, मेरे लिखित
प्रश्न सं० 3292 दिनांक 9-12-1977
श्रीर मौखिक प्रश्न सं० 641 दिनांक
7-4-1978 के जो उत्तर मंत्री महोदय
ने दिये हैं, दोनों उत्तरों में परस्पर विरोध
है, साथ ही 5 और 10 जून, 1975 के
छापे में मिले माल का ही 7 अप्रैल,
1978 के उत्तर में जिक्र है।
11-2-1975 के छापे में मिले माल का कोई