

that the process was laborious and therefore it took a little time. I hope the hon. Minister will try to clear these letters of intent and licences pending with the Government. They refer to the setting up of plants for sponge iron, shoddy yarn, paper and pulp, soap, refractories etc. The licenses should be given.

The demand for a second steel plant in Orissa is pending with the Government. We got a very favourable answer when the Prime Minister went to Orissa and in this House also. Orissa has rich deposits of iron ore. So this should be considered in the Fifth Plan. I thought that the hon. Minister would throw some light on the progress that has been made because a Committee had been appointed to go into the location of the future steel plants. I wanted to know what the Government had done for undertaking locational survey etc. for future steel plants. The work should start even in the Fifth Plan.

Lastly I want to mention this. Respected Ministers like Dharia and Dhar—the names sound similar—have mentioned a particular sum for the development of the backward regions, but the approach paper to the Fifth Plan does not clearly mention the figure. Mr. Chairman, you also belong to the backward region and there was a conference of Members of Parliament and we had approached the Prime Minister, the Planning Minister and other Ministers also and they have gone on record that Rs. 3,300 crores had been allotted separately for the development of the backward regions, but that has not been mentioned in the approach paper. I think this should be mentioned. Secondly Rs. 3,300 crores is insufficient and this sum should be raised to Rs. 8,000 crores. The outlay on the Fifth Plan is estimated to be Rs. 51,000 crores. The value of the rupee is only thirty five paise and so it would increase to Rs. 61,000 crores if you actually want to achieve what you have planned and it may even go up to Rs. 71,000 crores, the way the prices are rising.

I would have been glad if the government had accepted this resolution. My friend has requested me to withdraw this resolution. I request your permission to do so. I thank the hon. Members who had given overwhelming support to this resolution. Though I am withdrawing the resolution, I hope the eastern region of India will develop very soon with the assistance of the Central Government and the Planning Commission so that at the end of the Fifth Plan no-body would complain that the benefits of planned deve-

lopment were not as widespread as they were expected to be and that the benefits had not gone to all sections of the people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. Member leave of the House to withdraw the resolution?

*The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn*

17.35 hrs.

#### RESOLUTION RE: PEASANT DOCTORS

DR. G. S. MELKOTE (Hyderabad): Sir I beg to move the following resolution:

"This House welcomes the scheme of Peasant Doctors to serve the rural population and urges upon the Government to take steps to implement the same expeditiously."

I have pleasure in mentioning that during the last two or three years certain significant developments have taken place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can continue next time.

17.36 hrs.

#### HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

##### PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATING IN PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF FIFTH PLAN

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall take up half-an-hour discussion by Shri Samar Guha. There are four Members who want to ask questions and they must be given five minutes. So, Samar Guha may take ten minutes.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Fifteen minutes should be given to me.

Sir, Lenin will be remembered by the whole humanity—not only as one of the greatest revolutionaries of our century but also as the integral father of planned economy for evolving the concept of planning. Had he lived his full life, perhaps, his idea of 'All Power to Soviets' would have given a different orientation to the concept as also the structure of planning in Soviet Russia. After him, the planning got a completely different orientation—a totalitarian orientation in Russia—at the cost of millions of lives and at the cost of the sufferings of millions more in the concentration camps and slave camps in Siberia.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a second. Are we dealing with Planning in Soviet Russia

or India? Otherwise you will be losing much time.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** I am coming to that. I want to bring out that this totalitarian concept of planning of—Russia was also followed by the Fascist Germany—the pattern was same but for different objective. The method, the concept and structure of planning in our democratic country should be different. Gandhiji was the Father of the philosophy of planning in a democratic country like ours. Netaji Subhas Chandra was the father of Indian planning in the sense that he was first to introduce the idea of planning in our country. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru gave shape to our planning. The Father of the Nation was the person who indicated how socialism was to be integrated with democracy. We only talk of Gandhiji but many of us failed to understand his concept of 'Charkha Economy' i.e. the—economic and political philosophy behind that. By his 'Charkha Economy' he only meant evolution of political and economic power. Unless the present generation accepts the concept of decentralised economic planning, planning in a democratic country like ours, may have a dangerous consequence leading ultimately to growth of totalitarian type of planning.

Sir, I was looking to all the speeches made by Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose regarding Socialism. I found in one of his speeches which he made in Hindupur Congress. Interestingly, he never used the word 'nationalisation'. He always used the word 'socialisation'. The words 'nationalisation' or 'socialism' have different conceptual and structural meanings. Socialisation means devolution of power; it means involvement of people with planning. Not only that. It also means initiative from the people. But, unfortunately, for the last twenty years, in a democratic country like ours, we have almost forgotten this and we have developed a different concept; a different pattern and different structure of planning. This indicates a dangerous trend for the future of our political system. Our democratic system may get eroded by this system of Soviet type of planning. During the last twenty years or so the concept or the structure of planning that was followed by us is followed only in a totalitarian country. In fact, the trinity—the politicians, the bureaucrats and the economic entrepreneurs are all combined in it, who want to have this kind of State planning. That is the reason why—the Government themselves agreed that—40% of our people are still living below poverty line. Since Government themselves agree on this there is no need for me to make any comments on the result of our planning.

Look at the last four Five Year Plans. I thought that at least after our experience of the last four Five Year Plans, the Government would make an appraisal of the achievements made in the last four Five Years Plans and would have made a conceptual as also structural re-orientation in the Fifth Five Year Plan so as to fit it with our democratic ideals. But, Sir, they have not done that. Let me quote the political jargon which the Government have used in the Approach Paper of the Fifth Five Year Plan, I quote from the 'Approach to the Fifth Plan, Document. This is what they say:—

“..... 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 spread of the institutions, values and attitudes of a free and just society.”

All this ultimately means involvement of the people by their participation not only in the preparation of the Plan but also in its execution or its implementation. But, I am sorry to state that in this approach to the Plan they have only made a political jargon which I quoted just now. The words that have been used are:—

“..... consolidation of the democratic political order.”

In the name of democratic planning, a dangerous tendency is being created in our country. You are creating a political and economic milieu, a matrix, a structure which is the same as that followed by the other totalitarian countries. Whether you want it or not, by making the State an over-bearing authority, in the name of planning, you are creating a condition of Statisation and bureaucratisation; you may create a political compulsion of totalitarian planning out of which it may be impossible for you to come out. May be some new aspirant will require to give a new twist and orientation of a totalitarian concept to our democratic policy.

17.35 hrs.

[SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL, in the Chair]

You have talked about people's involvement. How casually you have mentioned about participation of labour in the 'Approach Paper'. It reads:

“It is doubtful if the management in the public undertakings possesses the right type of orientation. The role of the working class in the managerial function is

insignificant. The existing system of higher technical education and training almost completely excludes the working class. There are hardly any rank and file workers in our technical and management institutes and colleges. Even the most brilliant and honest among the rank and file of the workers have little chance to move into leading positions."

What an admission! And, yet you talk of involvement and participation of the people both in formulation and implementation. What role have you assigned to the working class either in the formulation or implementation of this plan?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Is he opposing the nationalisation of key sectors?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: There is a radical distinction between the concept of nationalisation and the concept of socialisation. Nationalisation means Statistisation, which means bureaucratisation, which means complete concentration of political and economic power in the hands of Government. On the other hand, socialisation means involvement of the people, of the working class, of the agriculturists, of the producers, not only in the formulation of the plan but also in its execution. That is absolutely lacking in our planning.

I was not a Gandhite during the freedom struggle days. But what was Gandhiji's real philosophy? He had shown the way how to integrate freedom with democracy, how to integrate democracy with socialism and how to develop a really people's democracy and people's socialism by propounding the theory of devolution of political and economic powers, by giving a greater role to the people. In the end of this *Approach to the Fifth Plan*, you say:

"In order to ensure that these are forthcoming in the required measure, there is need for active involvement of the people in the formulation and implementation of the Plan. The involvement of youth on a massive scale can bring about a qualitative improvement in implementation. A necessary condition for such involvement is understanding and appreciation of Plan objectives, strategy and programmes. In this task, Plan information and education can play an important role. High priority would be accorded towards working and putting into practice the various modalities of 'peoples' involvement.'"

What a solution! They say people's involvement is important. What is it there? Only a few cheap editions of the *Approach to the Fifth Plan* documents are to be

printed to educate them. What is the objective? What is the strategy? What are the modalities by which you want to involve youngmen, agriculturists, the working class? There is no mention of that.

In reply to the question, out of which this discussion arises, the Government pathetically admit:

"The peoples' participation in the preparation as well as implementation of the Fifth Plan has not been available to the extent necessary....."

Why was it not available? Who is responsible for it? Who makes the programmes for the plan? Who thinks about the programme and working structure for the implementation of Plan? The reply given by Government says:

"It has not been available to the extent necessary mainly because the progress with regard to decentralisation of decision-making has generally been slow. Moreover, institutional arrangement has also not been established to associate the non-official experts and the representatives of the people with the formulation and review of the Plan."

What a pathetic admission by the Government!

In conclusion, I want to say, although it will be a cry in the wilderness, after 25 years of independence you have propounded a philosophy, you have got your own concept and you have laid down the structure, but that structure is nothing but a totalitarian concept of planning, not a democratic concept of planning. Although it is a cry in the wilderness, I want to say that if you want the Plan to succeed, then the Plan must come from the bottom upwards and not *vice versa* and the result must benefit the last man first. I want to repeat the concept of Gandhiji, when he said, "My socialism does not start from zero but from one" thereby meaning that his socialism does not start from the State but from the people.

Secondly, it must lead to encouragement of the building up of the initiative of the common man, by giving more and more areas to be managed and run by him through his primary community; it means the production must be controlled and utilized by the actual workers and producers.

Lastly, the aim of the Plan, the first priority, should be for providing full employment, opportunities for work to every able-bodied person in the country even at the cost of rate of growth or rise

[Shri Samar Guha]  
per capita income. Then alone the poverty in the country can be removed..

Otherwise, I conclude by giving a warning, you will be creating a political compulsion when by concentrating the political and economic powers in the hands of the State alone you will be creating a condition for the growth of a totalitarian polity, for scuttling the whole foundation of our democracy and the future of peoples' socialism in our country.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Madam Chairman, I am very glad that this topic has been brought for a discussion even though only for half an hour.

My hon. friend, Shri Samar Guha, has talked about Gandhiji. I agree with him. Gandhiji insisted on common man's involvement in the processes of our freedom. I am reminded of a very important dictum of the late Mr. Aneurin Bevan, a fiery leader of the Labour Party in the United Kingdom:

"The language of priorities is the religion of socialism."

Is it not true that because the priorities are not set right that people do not feel involved in the processes of planning? Unless the millions of people of this country feel that they have a stake in what the Government is doing, that they have something to gain by having this planning, the people's interest will not be roused. Unless you set your priorities right, how are you going to have people's participation in your planning?

What is the fundamental question? Are we having democratic planning? Are not we having instead, more of centralised planning and regimented institutions and is not democratic planning still distant? Are the people in the centre of all we say and do? Is the welfare of the people the main concern or is it the correctness of certain institutions, the correctness of certain bureaucratic patterns and the correctness of Government machinery? Which is more important? If people are more important, only then people's involvement can be expected. Are people enabled to involve themselves in the plan processes? How much of initiative have they got in their hands? If they have no initiative, how can they participate in terms of decision-making and implementation?

Then, in regard to planning, in terms of thinking and action, how much of it is emanating from grass-root level? Are not most of things thrust on the people from above? Is that not the reason why because it is thrust from above, the people are

not feeling enthusiastic about it in terms of their response to it?

I ask the Minister: Have we or have we not failed in getting people's involvement? If the answer is, by and large, we have failed in that, have the Government gone into this question and found out the whys and hows of people's apathy, indifference and lethargy?

Why is it that everything is done by Government and semi-Government agencies? Has any effort been made to obtain both the consent as well as the will of the people? Is independent, free, critical thinking about public issues and vital priorities really and sincerely encouraged?

What is the role of voluntary agencies, academic bodies and universities and colleges? Talking about planning forums in colleges, it is a sad record. Throughout these Four Five-Year Plans, most of the Planning forums in colleges have been, more or less, defunct or ineffective mainly because even a slight suggestion is not respected and is not looked into by various authorities. If this is a sad record, by and large—there may be a few good institutions and forums by way of exception in some colleges and universities—then, now that the Fifth Plan is about to be launched, shall we rectify the mistakes and see to it that in order to achieve the principles and practices of democratic planning, we rectify the mistakes and set the country and the people on the right path by inviting experts, independents, non-partisan people, and consult them and take them into confidence and respect their wishes even if they are not in conformity with the views of the establishment and of the Government? If we accept this, can we not then expect that results will be better and there will be more people's participation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Kachwai—absent. Shri S. M. Banerjee. As the time is short, I would request the hon. Members to put their questions in brief.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Madam Chairman, I was surprised to hear the speech of my hon. friend, Shri Samar Guha, who started with Lenin and then mentioned Netaji and, further on, he spoke against nationalisation and in favour of socialisation a slogan that was given by Mr. Morarji Desai also . . . (Interruption) Whenever we talked of nationalisation, Mr. Morarji Desai used to reply that socialisation was the real slogan. I did not know it was so important at that time. (Interruption).

Another thing is that Government has been accused of following a pattern based

on socialistic system as in USSR. He says that they are totalitarian countries; by totalitarian countries he means those countries which are socialist countries.

It is a tragedy that we are not going towards socialism, because we want the mixed economy to continue. I do not know where the mixed economy will lead us to. In a socialist country. . .

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** I have not said anything about mixed economy. He has his own indoctrination of one particular political philosophy. Therefore, he will not understand my idea of socialism. I did not stand for 'mixed economy'.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** He only used the word 'socialisation'. I am saying that, if this Government really wants to bring socialism, they will have to move towards socialism. There is nothing wrong in following the system which has eliminated employment. In America, the value of Dollar is going down and there is a crisis there. There, every year unemployment is rising. In the Soviet Union, however, even the worst enemies of communism will admit, there is no unemployment. You have seen that communist hunting ultimately results in suicide.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the growth of State capital instead of growth of monopoly or concentration of wealth in a few hands, is better or not, whether he is going to associate the representatives of the people and the people with the plan in order to give them the feeling that the Plan is meant for the people and not that people are meant for the plan, so that they will have confidence. I fully support what has been demanded by my hon. friend, Mr. Mavalankar, very honestly and earnestly, that all sections of the people—professors, students, intellectuals, those who are working with their hands and those who are working with their brains or pen should be associated, so that the plan is taken as their own Plan and they work for its implementation. But the Plan should not result in unemployment. In this country, what has planning proved? Here more planning means more unemployment. That is why people have lost faith in the Plan.

My question is whether this mixed economy theory will be blasted once and for all. We do not want a forum of free enterprise. We want definite economy, an economy which moves toward socialism. Socialist countries are those countries which are on the map of the entire universe, and USSR is one of them. We do not know the unknown socialist countries. Let us not follow the American pattern where they are having so many pro-

blems, where unemployment is mounting up and they are going to face another crisis.

**SHRI ARJUN SETHI (Bhadrak):** People's participation in the preparation and implementation of the Plans, I consider, is the most important factor for the successful implementation of our Plans. But this has not been so in the past and the hon. Minister, while replying to questions, has conceded this. In the Approach paper they have said:

"The Approach Paper envisages a reduction in the consumption level at the top decibels of the population, a higher rate of savings and better performance by all sections of the population."

In this context, may I ask the hon. Minister what is the reduction in the consumption level envisaged and whether it is compulsory or voluntary? Similarly I ask the hon. Minister whether the 'higher rate of savings' will be compulsory or voluntary. Also, the Approach Paper speaks of better performance by all sections of the population. I want to know from the hon. Minister what is meant by this 'performance'.

I consider this should be clearly mentioned to the people so that they can realise. . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I would request the hon. Member to put straight questions please and not to make any speech.

**SHRI ARJUN SETHI:** . . . so that people can realise their duties.

Lastly, I want to know from the hon. Minister one thing. There was a proposal under consideration of the Government to create District Planning Cells and State Planning Boards to involve the people at the lowest strata of the planning process. I want to know what sort of assistance the Central Government is going to give to these planning cell and boards.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI MOHAN DHARIA):** Several important points have been raised here and the time is too short. Therefore, I shall try to be brief.

Regarding the involvement of the people in the process of planning, as I have already said in reply to an earlier question, that we have fairly conceded that people's involvement to the extent necessary in the earlier Plans was not possible and this time we have decided to have as much involvement as possible while formulating the Fifth Plan as also in implementing it. It is not enough that we have given an assurance, we have started the process. In the Consultative Committee meetings for Planning we have discussed this matter on

[Shri Mohan Dharia]

several occasions. We have started dialogues with the various Parties in the Opposition and we have already had discussions with the Communist Party (Marxist). Jana Sangh as also with the DMK. We shall be having this dialogue further with the remaining Parties and also with the trade union leaders and organisations of entrepreneurs and also with the economists. There were two meetings with the economists in the country and that dialogue will not only be continued but we would like to have all their advice while formulating the Fifth Plan.

I do share the feelings of Prof Mavalankar when he said that at the University level, at the College level, the forums that were functioning are not functioning and that they have gone dead. We would like to give life to these forums and even if some expenditure is to be incurred, we shall not mind. We want that these discussions and dialogues should continue.

Prof. Samar Guha has raised various points including nationalisation and socialisation. I have not been able to understand the difference when he said that Subhash Chandra Bose was the father of Indian planning and Gandhiji was the real father. It is very difficult for me to understand the distinction. I think that we should not do any injustice to Subhash Chandra Bose. I feel.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I have said that Gandhiji was the philosopher of the integrated concept of freedom and democracy.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: You can go through the record tomorrow and then you will find what you have said. I personally feel that it was Subhash Chandra Bose when he was the President of the Congress that a planning committee was formed and it was Gandhiji and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who were the pioneers, and who gave that new sight to the country.

By this planned economy in the country what have you done—that was the question asked by Prof. Samar Guha. I know there are difficulties. But, at the same time, We cannot forget that it is because of the planned economy in the country that we have raised the infra-structure for the industrial and economic progress of the country. Is it not a fact that during the last 25 years, foodgrains production has gone up from 5 crore to 10 crores of tonnes? Is it not a fact that a country which was not even able to manufacture bicycles, that country today manufactures motor cars, bicycles, diesel oil engines and even aeroplanes? And there are only eight countries in the world which are producing atomic energy and should we not be proud that India is one of the countries which produce atomic energy for peaceful purposes. So, to say

that nothing is achieved in the country, I think, is too much an underestimation on ourselves.

We cannot forget the problems of our country. Take for instance, education. In 1950 the number of children who were going to schools, colleges and technical institutions was hardly 2.50 crores. Today there are over 8 crores of students in various schools and colleges of the country. I know that standards shall have to be improved. But how can we forget that our number of students is more than countries like Germany, England and France? When we take the whole planning process into consideration, we should not forget that this country is facing several problems almost upto the height of the Himalayas. Is it not really something that this country has proceeded on this planning process, has been able to create the conditions whereby we have been able to face all these calamities that this country has been confronted with till today? Is it not something to be taken into consideration? So, how can anybody say that there is any dictatorial hierarchy and all that? It is certainly not correct. We are wedded to the democratic process. The Planning Commission is there at the National level. We want to have such bodies at State level. It is an old idea and it has been pursued further and now I am happy that in 13 States in the country there are also Planning Boards at the State level. These Planning Boards have already been constituted. Mr. Sethi referred to this. We have requested them to treat districts as the units and this plan process should start right from the bottom, as suggested by Mr. Banerjee. We want that type of grass-root planning.

We have suggested certain guidelines to the State Governments and we have stated that while submitting the Draft Fifth Plan they should have an appendix where they should also attach plans for every district in that State. It has never happened before in the past. We have given such guidelines. Why have we done all these things? It is only because we want the planning process to start from the lowest possible level. How can this be ensured? This is done by involving people, by involving non-officials at the State level and the district level. Some questions were asked to the effect, why the people's representatives are not being taken into confidence by State Governments and all that. I personally wrote to Chief Ministers saying that this is the feeling of Members of Parliament. I am happy to say that I got back replies from many of the Chief Ministers to the effect that they are involving Members of Parliament and also Members of the Legislative Assemblies at various levels while formulating the plan. I am going to insist that this participation should not only be

at the formulation stage but also at the stage of implementation. There should be proper machinery for collecting the necessary data. On the basis of that data plan formulation can take place. After the formulation, we have to take care of the implementation part and then we shall go to the assessment as to what happened to them, not so much in terms of monetary results, but as Mr. Sethi said, in terms of physical targets. We want physical targets to be achieved. Therefore, all these plans have to be realistic. If they are to be realistic, we cannot forget the people's representatives. We have to carry out their aspirations and therefore we would like to involve them at various levels.

There are various dialogues with the various political parties and this dialogue is not only to be done at the initial stage while formulating the plan, but this is to be done at the implementation stage also. We intend to have such dialogue with the political parties in the country, with various non official agencies in the country, with various experts in the country.

Now, Madam, some other problems regarding employment were mentioned and very rightly so by my friend, Shri Banerjee. We plan for what? We do not want to plan for scarcity. We want to plan for plenty. The whole approach has to be changed and while achieving new heights of economy we cannot forget that justice has to be rendered to the weakest sections in the society. Therefore, the main objective of the Fifth Plan is eradication of poverty and attainment of self-reliance. We have taken a balanced approach. We would like to have agricultural and industrial production but while doing that we want this country to become a self-reliant country and, therefore, we cannot afford to neglect core sectors whether it be steel, power, fertiliser, chemicals, mines and other basic industries.

One more question has been raised by Mr. Banerjee as to how it is going to be the investment trend whether we like to have more capital invested from monopoly section or from State section? There cannot be any dispute and, therefore, in this envisaged plan of Rs. 51,000 crores more than Rs. 36,000 crores will be in public sector. I can assure Mr. Banerjee the government is very clear that these monopoly houses cannot exploit the society in future. It is true in this country private sector will have its field of operation but commanding heights of economy shall always be under the control of public sector. (Interruption).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir today's discussion is regarding people's participation in preparation and implementation of Fifth

Plan. I want to know how public sector will be more autonomous; to what extent there will be participation of workers and producers of wealth. I did not touch the other points. These are the points on which you should enlighten us.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: Madam Chairman, I was under the impression that while other Members were putting me the questions the hon. Mr. Guha was listening to their questions. I am not referring to any question which was not mentioned on the floor of the House. I know how to be consistent in the House and I also want the Hon. Member not to disturb the other Members while they are speaking. He may kindly allow me to speak. Madam, I can enlighten those who are in a mood to understand.

My hon. friend was very much interested in knowing the modalities of how we wanted to do it. What I had stated was the form of the modalities. We have started our dialogue with the various political parties. We have started a dialogue in the Parliamentary Consultative Committee. We have requested the State Governments to have multilevel planning. We have requested them to have planning boards at the State level and to involve non-officials. We have requested them to involve the representatives of the people. We have requested them to involve the workers and their representatives and also to see that they get their share in management and they participate in management. I am happy to say that it was—the Hindustan Antibiotics, which was the first public sector undertaking in the country where a representative of the workers has been nominated on the board of management. This is how all these efforts are being made.

But may I again appeal to the House that when we have a planned economy, it is the people who will have to come forward and it is the duty of the representatives of the people to see that they are properly mobilised?

We have taken up the minimum needs programme. This is perhaps one of the best possible programmes that we are having. In the minimum needs programme, we have said that there shall not be a village not having water to drink, there shall not be a village not having a school within a radius of 1.5 k.m., there shall not be a village having a population of 1500 or a cluster of villages having a population of 1500 not having a road which is a permanent road, which is an all-weather-proof road, there shall not be a village where we have not given health amenities and for every area with a population between 8000 and 10000 there would be a sub-health-centre, and for a population of between 80,000 and 1 lakh, there shall be one pub-

[Shri Mohan Dharia]

lic health centre. Again, we have said that 60 per cent of the rural population will be necessarily brought under rural electrification through this Fifth Five Year Plan.

In regard to those who are landless and who are homeless, and whose number is large, the Central Government has said that there is no question of money or funds and we shall make all the funds available to every man from the rural areas or backward areas to have a homestead of his own, and for that the land will be given at the cost of Government. We have taken up this programme. But it is not merely a question of taking up the programme, but all these villages shall have to be identified, and the people will have to be identified, and care shall have to be taken to see that justice is rendered to them. Because of this programme, it will be possible for us to take care particularly of the backward areas and backward villages, and the people will get that feeling which was expressed by Shri P. G. Mavalankar when he said 'If you tell them that this is being given to you, then they will get involved'. I would like to tell them 'This is given to you, friends', and in this way, we can involve them more and more.

This is the new approach that we have accepted. I do not have unfortunately much time at my disposal, otherwise I could go into all the details. But I can say that while we think of the Five Year Plan, it is a plan meant for the people. After all, for whom is the Plan? Is the plan for the people or are the people for the plan? It

is the plan which is for the people, and Government are well aware of it, and we would like to have more and more involvement of the people. I would like to appeal to my hon. friends that as the representatives of the people, we would like to have their utmost cooperation. There is no question of any party in this. Those who believe in planned economy, those who believe in democratic socialism should all come forward. In this country, we have accepted socialism, but we do not want dictatorship, and, therefore, we say that it is democratic socialism which we want. We cherish all values of democracy, at the same time, we want to render social justice, and without a socialist economy it shall not be possible. Therefore, while Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, Mahatma Gandhi and Nehruji are our philosophers and guides, at the same time, we shall have to take all these realities into consideration. My hon. friend can rest assured that we shall not allow any dictatorial system to come into this country in this form or that form. That shall be our aim. It is in this democratic set-up that we shall establish socialist Society. But if these socialist ideas are not implemented, then democracy itself will be in danger. For us democracy and Socialism are the two sides of the same coin. In order to avoid any danger to this philosophy, care shall have to be taken, and we are very much aware of it. I am thankful to the House for giving me this opportunity.

18.15 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, May 14, 1973/Vaisakha 24, 1895 (Saka).*