

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That this House agrees with the Twenty-eight Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 17th April, 1968".

The motion was adopted

formulated or that are to be formulated in the Fourth Plan.

Hitherto, the Planning Commission has been working on some basis, and has given many plans, especially the three Five Year Plans. Now, Government have set up the Administrative Reforms Commission to go into the administrative set-up of all the spheres of Government so that the efficiency and economy of the entire administrative set-up can be assessed by the commission and economy and efficiency could be brought about or maintained on the lines indicated by the commission. So, the importance of the Administrative Reforms Commission cannot be underrated. If certain reforms have to be effected, then the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission have to be adhered to, and have to be respected. If the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission are thrown out or are rejected, then it means that we have no respect for the Administrative Reforms Commission and its recommendations.

If that be the mentality or the attitude of Government, then there is no necessity to have set up the Administrative Reforms Commission at all. I was surprised to see in yesterday's papers that a full meeting of the Planning Commission held in Delhi under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister rejected the Administrative Reforms Commission's suggestion for change in the original terms of reference of the planning body to give it the expert character. If that be their attitude to the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission in respect of the Planning Commission and that too under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister, then where is the necessity for this Administrative Reforms Commission at all? Why should the Administrative Reforms Commission continue to work at all? So, I would say straightway that the Administrative Reforms Commission has been slighted under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister herself.

I would submit that this sort of attitude towards the Administrative Reforms Commission must cease. Otherwise, we could as well scrap the Administrative Reforms Commission itself by now.

Now, I would come to the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission in brief.

16. 28½ hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : REORGANISATION OF PLANNING COMMISSION—Contd

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now we take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri S. Xavier on the 5th April, 1968 :—

"This House is of opinion that the Planning Commission be reorganised on the basis of the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission".

One hour and thirty minutes have been allotted for this. The hon. Member has taken one minute. He should finish in 15 minutes.

SHRI SHRI CHAND GOEL (Chandigarh) : The time is not sufficient. It should be extended.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : It had got to be extended.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is a serious question which is being debated. We shall see. Another Resolution is also there. He must get his time.

Mr. Xavier, to continue his speech.

SHRI S. XAVIER (Tirunelveli) . Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the text of my resolution reads as follows :

"This House is of the opinion that the Planning Commission be reorganised on the basis of the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission".

At the outset, I would submit that this is a very serious subject, and the fate and the lot of the people of the country are dependent upon the plans that have been

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : That report is not correct.

SHRI S. XAVIER : The Administrative Reforms Commission has called for the abolition of the matching pattern in determining the grant of Central assistance for State plan schemes, association of the private sector with planning and a drastic reduction in the unreasonably excessive staff strength of the Planning Commission.

The Administrative Reforms Commission has recommended the association of the private sector with the planning because of the practical knowledge which the managers of the private sector have. Secondly, the commission has recommended in favour of the limited advisory role of the Planning Commission which according to them, must necessarily result in considerable reduction in their expenditure and personnel. The Planning Commission, according to Shri Hanumanthaiya, the Chairman of the Administrative Reforms Commission, can work with about half its present staff strength. This House will be dumbfounded to know the figures in regard to the Planning Commission staff of various categories. I shall quote the figures for the benefit of the House ; the figures are : 446 gazetted officers, 990 non-gazetted officers and 308 other staff. The budget for the current year is nearly Rs. 1.59 crores on the staff itself.

On plan formulation, the ARC has recommended that the Commission should seek guidelines from the NDC, give a tentative framework of the Plan considered feasible by it and also indicate other alternative approaches calling for different degrees of effort. The basic features involved would be the rate of growth, resources required, sacrifices involved.

While laying down the Plan, the Commission must have before it a perspective of development over a longer period. The Commission should be responsible only for formulating the objectives, laying down priorities indicating broadly the central outlay, fixing the basic targets and approving main programmes. It should not undertake field research work. Since the entire public exchequer is now at the mercy of the Planning Commission and the

planners, the Commission has found it necessary to recommend that Parliament should devote more attention not merely to watching the performance of the Plans but to the problem of the reform of the Plan itself. In the absence of such an effort, reform is likely to end up in a renewed effort at self-deception.

Regarding financial assistance by the Centre for State Plans, the ARC has suggested that the amount of the total central aid to be given to a State should be determined first. If there is a shortfall in implementation of the State Plans taken as a whole and as a result the Central assistance utilised by the State is more than what would be proportionate to the expenditure met by the State out of its own resources etc. what should be done.

These are briefly the recommendations of the ARC about the Planning Commission reorganisation. I am afraid in the light of the news that has appeared on the 17th rejecting the ARC's recommendations by the Chairman of the Planning Commission and the Commission itself, my Resolution may not have any effect at all on Government. But I submit at the outset that the Resolution is not against Government. It is in the interest of the entire country. It should be viewed in fairness and justice. If I am not able to convince the Prime Minister and the Cabinet that the Planning Commission is not at all necessary according to our Party, at least on the lines indicated by the ARC it can be reorganised.

In the first place, I would call the Planning Commission a Super Cabinet. The Planning Commission as constituted is not answerable either to the Cabinet or to Parliament or the people at large. It actually controls the Council of Ministers. In the allotment to grants, Ministers have no powers of their own independently to act. They have to rely on the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

I will cite an instance. In the informal consultative committee meeting about the Tuticorin Harbour Project in my State of Madras, I asked two questions of the Minister : what is the target period within the project will be completed and what is the allotment annually for its completion ? The Minister wrote to me that all these

questions depend upon the Planning Commission.

It depends upon the allotment that is given to the Minister by the Planning Commission. In that case, where is the necessity for a Minister at all, and where is the necessity for a separate portfolio of a Ministry at all for transport, shipping and harbour and all that? That is why I say the Minister himself has no power; he is powerless. If any grant is to be sanctioned by Parliament that is meaningless if everything has to depend upon the whims and fancies of the Planning Commission. So, the Planning Commission is above the Government; it is above the Cabinet and it is above Parliament and above the wishes of the people.

What sort of Planning Commission is this? It is only some impractical theoreticians forming a Planning Commission. They have no practical knowledge of men and things in the world or at least in this country. Some theoreticians are there who have spoken much but have done little about anything in the country. They have not seen any village at all. Some theoreticians who have studied something in the books formulate some plan without reference to the actual state of things in the villages especially throughout the country.

The nature of the Planning Commission itself is very impractical. They have no practical knowledge and the plans that have been chalked out by them have nothing to do with the actual requirements to better the lot of the common man. Hitherto, three five-year Plans have been implemented, and it is an admitted fact that all these five-year Plans on which they have spent about Rs. 20,000 crores have ended in a dismal failure. That has been admitted and if that be so, if the plans that have been formulated by the Planning Commission by spending Rs. 20,000 crores have failed, where is the necessity for this Planning Commission at all? It should have been scrapped long, long ago. In fact, I will quote one or two instances just to show how their plans have gone wrong and how the Planning Commission has no knowledge, have no interest in the welfare of the people of the country. They have formulated the five-year Plans and for the implementation of these five-year Plans which they have formulated, we have borrowed on the recommendation or on

the lines indicated by the Planning Commission several thousand crores of rupees from foreign countries, but curiously enough, they have not given any plan or any scheme or any means or any ways to show how these loans are to be repaid to the foreign countries. There is no such plan envisaged by the Planning Commission in their plans.

Only two or three days ago, Dr. Sushila Nayar, a veteran Congress Member, has stated in Hyderabad that the future of our generation has been mortgaged to the outside world. If that be so, where is the necessity for such a Planning Commission? Take the indigenous plans that have been given by this Planning Commission and that should have been carried out by our Congress government. All their schemes aim at giving unproductive, unremunerative, luxurious plans. The public sector plants, involving several crores of rupees like the Rourkela plant, Bhilai plant, etc., etc., have ended in heavy losses. In spite of all these monetary losses the country's money is being thrown into the sea into the ditch without consideration being given to the money that is being drawn from the villages from the ryots. Nobody is prepared to revise his own plan, neither the Cabinet nor the Planning Commission. In fact, after seeing the enormous losses of public money in the public sector and other non-productive and unremunerative schemes and unwanted schemes, they ought to have revised the plan and scrapped the Planning Commission much earlier. I will cite just one or two instances. The family planning schemes, the NCC schemes, the block development scheme—these are schemes which are unproductive.

They are unremunerative and unproductive. Where is the urgency for all these schemes?

AN HON. MEMBER : Family planning means 'unproductive'—no production.

SHRI SXAVIER : It is an inhuman plan that does not bear fruit. There is no necessity to implement all these schemes.

Take the STC, Food Corporation, etc. One of my friends said, the Britishers came to India as traders and then became rulers. But the Congress became rulers first and then they have become traders. They

[Shri S. Xavier]

would not be able to deliver the goods to the people.

Has the Planning Commission ever set its dyes on the unemployment problem, which is very vital? Every day dozens of people come to see us MPs and MLAs saying they have no jobs. But the Planning Commission is sitting quietly not at all worried about these things. Because of the ill-planning, deficit financing, devaluation, inflation and high prices have resulted. The whole country has been buried in abysmal depth of misery and sorrow on account of their ill-advised planning.

In these circumstances, I would go to the extent of saying that the Planning Commission should be scrapped, because it is superfluous. There is the Cabinet and there are Legal Advisers, Financial Advisers, Economic Advisers, Educational Advisers; etc. in every department. There is no necessity for a separate body which is irresponsible and not answerable either to the Cabinet or to the country. If they are not prepared to scrap it, at least let them implement the recommendations of my friend, Mr. Hanumanthaiya, which are practical and which will prevent the country from getting into further trouble in future.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

"That this House is of opinion that the Planning Commission be reorganised on the basis of the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission.

Time is limited.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Muttur) : It is an important subject and time should be extended.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I cannot deprive the mover of the next resolution the opportunity to move it. The Minister would require about 20 minutes and the mover has to reply ultimately. Since there are a number of members, they should be brief and to the point. No irrelevant issues should be brought in. Then only I can accommodate more.

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज) :

उपाध्यक्ष जी, अभी मूबर महोदय की स्पीच को सुनकर आश्चर्य हुआ। उन्होंने कहा कि प्लानिंग कमीशन को स्क्रेप कर देना चाहिए। मैं जानता हूँ कि इस देश में कुछ ऐसी पार्टियाँ हैं जिनकी प्लानिंग से नफरत है, वे नहीं चाहती कि इस देश में कोई भी काम मिलसिलेवार हो। उन का हमेशा से यही मत रहा है कि प्लानिंग कमीशन नहीं होना चाहिये। वे चाहती हैं कि ऐसे ही काम किया जाये चाहे कहीं कोई काम हो या न हो लेकिन मिलसिलेवार काम नहीं होना चाहिये। प्लानिंग कमीशन की जरूरत इसनिये नहीं पड़ती है कि कुछ लोगों को रोजी रोजगार मिल जायेगा। हिन्दुस्तान जैसे गरीब देश में जहाँ कि बहुत कुछ करना है और सारे काम यकायक नहीं किये जा सकते इसलिए प्लानिंग कमीशन की जरूरत पड़ती है ताकि एक प्रायर्टी फिक्स की जा सके कि कौन सा काम ज्यादा जरूरी है जिसको पहले करना है। यदि प्लानिंग न की जाय तो हो सकता है कि गैर जरूरी काम पहले हो जाय और जरूरी काम पीछे होते रहे। इसलिए प्लानिंग कमीशन की जरूरत पड़ती है। उनकी बात समझ में आ सकती थी अगर वह यह कहते कि प्लानिंग कमीशन में यह, यह दोष है और इसलिए इन दोषों को सुधारना चाहिये और इस को ठीक तरीके से चलाना चाहिये। इस ए० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट को इम्प्लीमेंट करना चाहिए। ऐसा कहा जाय तो दूसरी बात है लेकिन प्लानिंग कमीशन को स्क्रेप करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन उनका यह कहना कि प्लानिंग कमीशन सुपर क्विनेट हो गया या वह सुपर गवर्नमेंट हो गया यह हवाई बातें हैं जो कि इस देश में चल नहीं सकती हैं। अगर चलें तो यहाँ अराजकता पैदा हो जायेगी और कोई काम ठीक से चल नहीं सकता है। प्लानिंग कमीशन का काम यह देखना है कि प्लानिंग कैसे हो ? प्लानिंग कमीशन का पहला काम फारमुलेशन ऑफ प्लांस है। कौन-कौन काम इस साल करने हैं और कौन-कौन काम अगले सालों में करेंगे, तीसरे वर्ष करेंगे या चौथे

[Shri S. Kandappan]

Whatever idea the Government have in mind, there is definitely a case for changing the set-up of the Commission and to see that it becomes not a sort of superfluous body sitting in judgment on even Cabinet decisions or decisions of States, but rather more of a co-ordinating body with a programme of guiding and helping the States and the Centre to promote the national economic activities in this country.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am opposing this resolution. I am completely surprised at the way of approach that the ARC has developed towards the Planning Commission and its working. I have read through all these recommendations of the ARC and I am glad that many of these important recommendations which really aim at reorganising the Planning Commission with a view to efficiently work out the planning of our country are being duly considered by the Government and many of these important recommendations having a bearing on the reorganisation of the Planning Commission are being considered and have also been accepted. But here what I am opposed to is the peculiar approach of mind to planning which this ARC has exhibited. It is something surprising. The recommendation is that as there is a mixed economy in this country, all the private sector people should be asked and should act in co-operation with the Planning Commission's deliberations, as if all the big monopoly houses in this country have not infiltrated into the Planning Commission itself and as if they are not influencing its working. Take the case of public sector projects : because, from the morning till evening, they are trying to scuttle them and in spite of that, if the ARC is not satisfied, it cannot be helped.

AN HON. MEMBER . Unfortunately that is your planning.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : You listen to me. You will be surprised to read this. It has been said that "we believe that having adopted the policy of mixed economy it follows that the private sector should be given an opportunity for

meaningful participation in the working of the Planning Commission." This is something against the very concept of planning and the creation of the Planning Commission itself, which Prime Minister Nehru at that time had envisaged when there was no planning in this country at all. Therefore, this approach is repugnant.

Secondly, it has been said that so far as the selection of senior posts in the Planning Commission is concerned they should be made from the public and private sector undertakings. How can one understand this ? Even somebody can plead for such a thing in this House, is beyond imagination. This is a kind of recommendation which perhaps the country, the Government and this House would oppose.

In the end, it has been said that the President of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry should be associated with the selection of persons from the commercial and industrial field. How can you ask the Federation ? They have their own planning forum and every day, from morning to evening, the capitalist friends are writing articles and they have their own writers, condemning planning from beginning to end, and the ARC wants the President of the Federation to be associated in the selection of posts to the Planning Commission. I imagine that they could as well have recommended that the President of the Federation should be the President of the Planning Commission ! That should have been the real recommendation of the ARC.

AN HON. MEMBER : But Shri Hanumanthaiya belongs to your party.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let him proceed ; take your time.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Let him say something to improve the Planning Commission.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : I submit this for the consideration of this House. In appointing Shri Gadgil as the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commis-

economic and fiscal policies of this country? Not at all. The targets that have been envisaged by the Planning Commission have not been achieved in any one sector, either the agricultural sector or the industrial sector, or the petrochemicals field or any other. In none of the sectors have they achieved any targets that they had set out to achieve. That is because they are not the final authority to implement planning in this country; not even the Central Government is the final authority; but it is the States. Excepting in regard to the public sector projects and certain things that come directly under the Centre, all that they do is to prepare the plan and give it to the State finally to implement it.

I would like to ask of the Prime Minister whether all these years they have on any occasion given any substantial thought to this issue whether they have associated the people who are really going to implement plans. Even the so-called National Development Council which used to meet once a year was just called at short notice and given some brief; some notes were circulated; whether they agreed with it or not, Government would go ahead with the so-called plan to implement it without knowing what are the priorities, what are the conditions prevailing in the States, what the approach should be to problems in particular States and so on. With the result that this sort of planning has no relation to the people who are to implement it. It is just like our orthodox type of marriage where the boy does not even see the girl. The parents fix up the marriage and the boy goes and puts the *thali*.

AN HON. MEMBER : It has changed now.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : Only in some places.

Unfortunately with this Government, it has not changed. They fix the plan and then ask State to get itself married to it whether they like it or not. This kind of attitude is in a large measure—I would not say totally—is responsible for the failure of planning in this country.

So here is a suggestion by the ARC which think Government should do well

to accept. I think they are thinking on those lines to see that there are planning cells or departments created at the State level. It should start from the base; they at the State level should draw up the plans and refer them to the Planning Commission here and they should be given some sort of final authority on deciding the priorities and going ahead with the plans in the respective regions. Then we will have an appreciation of planning on the part of the people. It will bring about a psychological change. As Shri Kamath has rightly pointed out in his dissenting note, we have totally failed to create a psychological atmosphere in this country in this respect. That has got to be created; otherwise, we can never succeed in this planning;

As regards making the planning body more an expert body, in their interim report in the very preface the Commission say.

“The most important of our recommendations is that the Planning Commission hereafter should be an advisory body freed completely of all its functions executive in character”.

It may be difficult after so many years to totally alienate the Planning body from the powers it has so far enjoyed, but I think still it should be attempted and it will be good to the country and the Commission also to be an expert body and not an executive body.

It is a strange development that has taken place with regard to the planning body. Even the Chairman of the previous Finance Commission, Shri Rajamannar, has pointed out in his report the anomalous situation in which the Planning Commission is placed. It has no statutory authority. We do not know from whom it derives its power. It is answerable to nobody, not even to the Cabinet, not to this House anyway. But it dictates our policies, it finalises our economic activities and determines all the aspects of or economic life. It is not controlled by, or answerable to, anybody in this country. This is a very curious position for the Commission to occupy.

It is high time it is controlled by somebody. It should derive its power either from Parliament or from the Constitution,

[Shri Sradhakar Supakar]

ago, can be considered and the present system of relations between the Central Government and the Planning Commission can be revised to a certain extent.

It is true that the Planning Commission should not be bogged with, should not have so much of executive functions. It should be in a position to yield dispassionate advice to the Government, and in as much as the Ministers of the Central Government are members of the Planning Commission or are associated with the Planning Commission, what happens? Of course, the Administrative Reforms Commission says that the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister should be associated intimately with the Planning Commission without becoming either the Chairman or a Member of the Planning Commission. I do not know if any substantial difference is made on account of their becoming or being Members of the Planning Commission. As it is, I think, the responsibility of the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister to this House, to the States, and to the country at large cannot be gained.

In my personal opinion, they should continue to be members of the Planning Commission and they should be responsible to this House and also to the country for whatever is done or omitted to be done by the Planning Commission.

My observation on the second point is covered by my observation on the first point itself. Wherever there is a difference between a high-powered committee and the Central Government, since the ultimate responsibility to this House and to the country at large rests primarily with the Prime Minister and also with the Finance Minister and her Cabinet, therefore, it cannot be gained that the Prime Minister and her Cabinet are free to brush aside the recommendations of the high-powered commission. But I think that they are not brushing it a side, and I am quite sure that they will give the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission the weight that they deserve and will take those recommendations into considerations.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur):
There is an interesting proverb in Tamil

that a potter set out to create an image of Lord Ganesh but ended by creating a monkey. That is exactly what has happened with the Planning Commission. The object of the creation of the Planning Commission was in a way quite laudable. But after creating the Planning Commission in the fifties, Government have miserably failed to utilise their experience and streamline it in such a way that there is appreciation of planning in this country and it would really deliver the goods for which purpose it has been set up.

what has happened in this country after the setting up of the Planning Commission? The Planning Commission has been set up for the economic development of this country. Congressmen have got a knack of side-tracking the issue and whenever we criticise planning they immediately say that we are against planning. It is not so. Unfortunately whatever they touch they bring it into disrepute or disgrace. Even in regard to the so-called socialism, I think if the Congress had not taken up that concept, it would have had a better chance in this country to thrive. It is after they had adopted that resolution on democratic socialism and then gone on to create monopoly concerns and monopoly houses in this country that the people began to suspect the very concept and have lost faith in the concept. That is what is happening in all sectors and that has been happening with regard to planning also.

During the last three years, there has been no planning whatsoever in the country, but we do not find any hue and cry or any clamour from the people that we should have planning. Instead of it, unfortunately even the people are very complacent in fact, some people feel very happy that there is no planning at all. That is the sorry state of affairs that we find today where Government by their mishandling of the situation have brought low the prestige of planning itself in this country.

In all these past three plans, what do we find? After all, planning means a certain scientific approach to a problem. Was there any scientific approach in our planning? Was there any approach on an all-India basis? Was there any real economic approach to give shape to the

है, लेकिन उस के पूरे परिणाम नहीं निकल रहे हैं। एक लम्बे चौड़े सेक्रेटेरियट की तरह से आप ने प्लानिंग कमिशन को ज़रूर बना दिया है लेकिन इस का कोई आभास वहाँ नहीं मिलता कि जो अर्थ विशेषज्ञ हैं, तिनको इस बात का अनुभव है उन के द्वारा योजनायें बनाई जा रही हैं। इस लिये मैं इस सुझाव को फिर दोहराऊँगा कि देश के विश्वविद्यालयों में जो योग्य लोग हैं, देश के भिन्न भिन्न विश्व-विद्यालयों के अन्दर जो अपने अपने सब्जेक्ट्स के विशेषज्ञ हैं उन को निर्मंत्रित कर के और उचित वेतन दे कर के योजना आयोगकी ओर आकर्षित किया जाय ताकि आप के योजना आयोग का ढाँचा सुधरे और देश का भाग्य भी जिस का इस से सीधा सम्बन्ध है, सुधरे।

SHRI PILOO MODY : I suggest that Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao should be asked to intervene. He is responsible for a part of the disease.

THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING (Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao) : Thank God ! You have said only a part of the disease.

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR (Sambalpur) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, two very important principles are involved in this Resolution moved by my hon. friend from the opposite side.

The first is that when there is a difference of opinion as between the recommendation of high-power Commission and the Government, what should be done. The second, equally important, is about the function and the responsibility of the Planning Commission. I would, first of all, deal with the second proposition, that is to say, whether the Planning Commission should be merely an expert body as is suggested by the Administrative Reforms Commission or whether, in the other extreme, it should be some sort of a super Cabinet which should be empowered to overrule the decisions of the Cabinet both at the State level and at the Central level. I would submit that there is no justification for accepting either of these extreme views and, I think, that we may tend to justify

the demand of both sides, namely, that the Planning Commission should have a very high responsibility on the one hand and it should also consist of experts who are real experts on planning.

This problem arose about ten years ago when the Estimates Committee was considering this matter. The late lamented Shri Balwantraji Metha was then the Chairman of the Estimates Committee and Panditji was the Prime Minister. At that time the Estimates Committee made a similar recommendation, namely, that the Planning Commission should not have so much of executive functions, but it should be some sort of an advisory body, that the Central Ministers should not have so much of involvement in the Planning Commission. I am only stating the sum and substance of the recommendations of the Estimates Committee. At that time, those recommendations of the Estimates Committee were not acceptable fully to the Government. The recommendation that is now made, so far as the main points of the nature and function of the Planning Commission are concerned, is similar to the recommendations that were made by the Estimates Committee at that time.

Now, the Administrative Reforms Commission made an interim report last year, which contains 14 points. Only this point is important and, so far as the other recommendations are concerned, most of those recommendations should be acceptable to the Government and there should be absolutely no difficulty whatsoever for the Government to accept those recommendations. For example, so far as the constitution and the function of the National Development Council is concerned; how many members there should be in the Planning Commission and whether there should be the responsibility of the Ministers of different departments regarding planning in their own departments—all those things... should be acceptable to the Government.

But so far as the fundamental point is concerned, I think, that needs a study and I hope, the Government will give a deep consideration to the matter and see whether the wise recommendation of the Administrative Reforms Commission now and the recommendation that was made by the Estimates Committee about ten years

[श्री श्रीचन्द गोयल]

सकता है, लेकिन उस के अन्दर इस प्रकार की गुंजाइस है कि वहां पर ज्यादा धन व्यय कर के, वहां की कृषि और उद्योग को प्रोत्साहन दे कर देश की समस्या को हल कर सकता है। इस लिये मैं समझता हूँ कि जितने साधन प्रदेश जुटाये उतनी ही सहायता केन्द्र देगा, यह सीमा न रखते हुए, उस की पोटेंशलिटीज का विचार करते हुए, उन्हें साधन दिये जाये। इस दिशा में भी सुभाव दिया गया है और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित ही है।

इस के साथ ही साथ श्री हनुमन्तयया ने एक सुभाव दिया है कि योग्यता के आधार पर, अच्छे प्रकार के जो लोग हैं उन को इस आयोग के कर्मचारियों के तौर पर रक्खा जाये या सदस्यों के तौर पर रक्खा जाय। इस के आगे उन्होंने यह भी सुभाव दिया है कि पार्लियामेंट का ज्यादा नियन्त्रण इस प्लैनिंग कमिशन की कार्रवाइयों पर रहना चाहिये और जो कुछ उस ने काम किया है उसकी रिपोर्ट पार्लियामेंट के सामने आती रहनी चाहिये। यह दुःख की बात है कि दो तीन वर्षों से उचित ढंग से लोक सभा के अन्दर इस योजना के ऊपर कभी विचार नहीं हुआ। कौन कौन से लक्ष्य उस ने पिछली योजनाओं के अन्दर रखे थे और किस हद तक उनको प्राप्त किया गया, इस के ऊपर विचार नहीं हुआ। इस लिये उन्होंने यह सिफारिश की है कि हर छः महीने के बाद लोक सभा के सामने एवैलुएशन कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आनी चाहिये और उस पर लोक सभा को विचार करना चाहिये। इसी तरह से राज्यों की जो विधान सभा में हैं, उनके अन्दर भी साल के शुरू होने के बाद छः महीने के अन्दर इस तरह का वृत्त आना चाहिये ताकि कितना लक्ष्य प्राप्त हो सका है इस पर विचार किया जाय सके तथा आगे की जो नीति है वह निर्धारित की जा सके।

आज तो ऐसा नजर आ रहा है कि हम इन पहलुओं से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रखते, आज ऐसा

समझा जाता है कि जो प्लैनिंग है वह देश के लिये उपयोगी नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान को समृद्धिशाली बनाना है, अगर उस को खुशहाल बनाना है तो प्लैनिंग को हम को स्थान देना पड़ेगा। आज प्लैनिंग के कारण ही हम अपने देश का आर्थिक दृष्टि से योग्य विकास कर पाये हैं। मेरी शिकायत तो केवल प्राथमिकताओं के बारे में है। हम ने गलत चीजों को प्राइरिटी दी हुई है। लेकिन आज प्लैनिंग कमिशन इस दिशा में विचार कर रहा है इस समय कृषि की ओर ज्यादा ध्यान देने की जरूरत है, आज बेकारी और बेरोजगारी को दूर करने के लिये हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों को किस प्रकार से रोजगार दे सकते हैं, किस प्रकार से काम दे सकते हैं, इस दिशा में विचार करने की जरूरत है, क्योंकि हमारी तीन योजनाओं के नतीजे के तौर पर बेरोजगारी और बेकारी की संख्या में वृद्धि हुई है। आज हम को छोटे समय की योजनायें नहीं लम्बे समय की योजनाओं के सम्बन्ध में विचार करना होगा क्योंकि यदि वार्षिक योजनायें होगी तो उन से समस्या हल नहीं होगी। मैं तो इस विचार का हूँ कि योजनाओं की अवधि पांच साल से भी ज्यादा रखनी पड़ेगी।

श्री हनुमन्तयया ने सुभाव दिया है कि जो हमारी सेंटर की योजनायें हैं पहले हम उन पर देश की दृष्टि से विचार करें कि उन के ऊपर हमें कितने साधन व्यय करने हैं, उस के बाद भिन्न भिन्न राज्यों के अन्दर जो योजनायें चल रही हैं उन के अन्दर भी हम राज्य स्तर पर इस बात का निर्णय ले कि हम को किन किन राज्यों में किन किन योजनाओं को प्राथमिकता देनी है, वरीयता में किस को कौन सा स्थान, देना है। अगर हम इस सुभाव पर विचार करेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस पर हम को पूरी तौर पर अमल करने की जरूरत है।

सरकार ने पिछले दस-पन्द्रह वर्षों से जो ढांचा बना रक्खा है वह उसी से काम कर रही

सकते हैं और उस का भी एक हिस्सा रखना चाहिये लेकिन इतना अधिक नहीं जितना कि अभी है। अभी जो वहां इम्प्लायीज हैं वह एकजीक्यूशन साइड में ज्यादा हैं उस से प्लानिंग का महत्व कुछ कम हो जाता है। मैं कहूंगा कि प्लानिंग कमीशन ऐडवाइज़री बोडी तो है ही और यह ठीक है कि वह गवर्नमेंट की कार्य-वाहियों पर डाइरेक्ट असर नहीं डाल सकता है लेकिन उसे अपनी ऐडवाइस निर्भीकता से गवर्नमेंट को देनी है कि इस प्लान पर काम करने से कितना हम को फायदा हो सकता है या देश कितना आगे बढ़ सकता है। इस लिए एकजीक्यूशन साइड में ज्यादा न जाकर प्लानिंग की साइड में अधिक काम कर सकें।

अभी लानिंग कमीशन पर एक करोड़ से ज्यादा रुपया खर्च हो रहा है। खर्च का का हिसाब देख कर यदि छानबीन की जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उस पर खर्चा कम हो जायेगा और हम समझते हैं कि 70-75 लाख से अधिक रुपया प्लानिंग कमीशन पर खर्च नहीं होना चाहिये। इस दृष्टिकोण को रखते हुए गवर्नमेंट को इस पर फ़ैसला करना चाहिये।

17.00 hrs.

श्री श्रीधर गायल (चण्डीगढ़) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री हनुमन्तय्या की अध्यक्षता में ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स कमिशन ने विशेषकर प्लानिंग कमिशन के सिलसिले में जो सिफारिशों की हैं, मैं उनका स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं उन को बहुत महत्वपूर्ण और मूल्यवान सुभाव समझता हूँ। श्री हनुमन्तय्या इससे पहले पंजाब ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्म्स कमेटी के भी अध्यक्ष रहे हैं, और वहां उन्होंने जो कार्य किया है, मैं समझता हूँ कि वह प्रशंसा के योग्य है। यहां पर मुझे यही निवेदन करना है कि जो हमारी सरकार है उस का इतिहास इस प्रकार का है कि जो आयोगों के वृत्त होते हैं, जो कमिशनों की रिपोर्ट्स होती हैं, उन को आम तौर पर वह कोल्ड स्टोरेज में फँक देती है। उन

कमिशनों की रिपोर्टों पर जितना ध्यान दे कर उस को कार्यान्वित करना चाहिये उतना आज तक यह सरकार कम कर पाई है। मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा कि जो महत्वपूर्ण कार्य श्री हनुमन्तय्या के द्वारा हुआ है उस को अमली जाना पहनाने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये।

श्री हनुमन्तय्या ने पहली सिफारिश यह की है कि आज का जो हमारा योजना आयोग है वह उस का एक भारी भरकम ढांचा है। उस के अन्दर 1816 कर्मचारी हैं जब कि उस के आगे कर्मचारियों से इस आयोग का काम एफिशिएन्सी के साथ चल सकता है। जो अंग्रेजी की कहवत है कि टू मेनी कुक्स स्थायल वि ब्राथ, उस का विचार करते हुये इस आयोग के कर्मचारियों की संख्या 50 प्रतिशत कम कर दी जानी चाहिये। उस के ऊपर जो इस वर्ष का 1 करोड़ 59 लाख रु० का बजट बना है, उस में भी इस बात की गुंजाइश है कि आगे धन से उस का काम चल जाये।

श्री हनुमन्तय्या ने बहुत उचित तौर पर यह सुभाव दिया है कि यह विशेषज्ञों का आयोग है। जो लोग इस विषय के एक्सपर्ट हों, जिन्होंने उस का अध्ययन किया है, जिन को इन बातों का अनुभव हो उन को ही इस में रक्खा जाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश के अन्दर जो भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के विश्वविद्यालय हैं उन को हम इस बात की सूचना दें और उन के अन्दर जो अर्थशास्त्री काम कर रहे हैं, जो एकानमिक एक्सपर्ट काम कर रहे हैं, उन की सेवाओं का उपयोग इस आयोग के मेम्बरों के तौर पर करें तथा वहां उन के नीचे जो कर्मचारी काम करते हैं उन का भी उपयोग करें तो अच्छा है।

आज तक राज्यों की योजनाओं के लिये धन देने का जो नमूना रहा है वह यह रहा है कि जितने साधन राज्य जुटा सकता है उतनी ही सहायता केन्द्र देता रहा है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह नमूना उचित नहीं है। आप हरियाना पर विचार करें। वह एक बिल्कुल पिछड़ा हुआ राज्य है और आज वह इतने साधन नहीं जुटा

[श्री डा० ना० तिवारी]

मानता हूँ कि जब कमिशन बनना है तो मतलब यही होता है कि सभी उस की सिफारिशों महत्वपूर्ण होती हैं और उन को सफलीभूत करने के लिये या उनको लागू करने के लिये ज्यादा से ज्यादा विचारपूर्वक काम किया जाय लेकिन यह भी सही है कि गवर्नमेंट के सामने कुछ प्रैक्टिकल डिफिकल्टीज होती है, वह क्या डिफिकल्टीज हैं, किन सिफारिशों की वजह से उनको कुछ डिफिकल्टीज बढ़ जायेगी और किन सिफारिशों की वजह से उनको आसानी होगी यह सब काम देखना उन का काम है। हम लोग यही कह सकते हैं कि उस में पूरा विचार करके जल्द से जल्द एक फ़ैसला लिया जाय। मैं उस कमिशन के सुझावों के महत्व व कौमत् को मानता हूँ। ए० आर० सी० ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में प्लानिंग कमिशन के सम्बन्ध में बहुत से महत्वपूर्ण सुझाव दिये हैं लेकिन इन सुझावों के लिए आप कह दें कि हम आज ही उनको मान लें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह ठीक बात नहीं होगी। आप एक समय निर्धारित कर दीजिये कि गवर्नमेंट इतने दिनों के अन्दर उस पर अपना विचार समाप्त कर ले (व्यवधान) मुझे अफसोस है कि हमारे मेम्बरान जो भी बात करते हैं वह आगामी इलैक्शन को अपनी दृष्टि में रखते हुए कहते। यह नहीं समझते हैं कि इन चार वर्षों में जो वह काम करेंगे उन का असर इलैक्शन पर पड़ेगा। लेकिन आप जब यही सोचेंगे कि हम एलेक्शन में कैसे कामयाब होंगे तो ऐसा दृष्टिकोण रखते हुए न तो आप प्लानिंग कर सकते हैं और न आप काम आगे बढ़ा सकते हैं। इसलिए माननीय सदस्य जरा सब्र करें। चार वर्ष अभी एलेक्शन में बाकी हैं। चार वर्ष ऐसा काम कीजिये जिससे पबलिक आप को खुदबखुद कहे कि आपने अच्छा काम किया है। पबलिक जज करके कह सके कि इस सरकार ने अच्छा काम किया अथवा खराब काम किया.....

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : How

is all this relevant? They are all irrelevant.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Since he is raising the question of relevancy, may I ask him one question. The Resolution is about the reorganisation of the Planning commission. But the sponsor of the Resolution said : scrap the Planning Commission. Was it relevant?

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : I think you have misinterpreted what the hon. Member has said. He had at no time said : scrap the Planning Commission. He said : if you cannot scrap it, at least implement the recommendations of the ARC. At no time had he suggested that it should be scrapped.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I was very closely following the speech. There were so many irrelevant remarks. But I never interrupted him. In the same way, it is not correct to interrupt another hon. Member. Let him proceed.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY : I am not going outside the Resolution I am only replying to the interruptions of the hon. Members. I have no intention to go outside the Resolution.

मैं आप से कह रहा था कि अभी दो चिट्ठियाँ हमारे चेअरमैन ए० आर० सी० ने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को लिखी हैं। एक इंटरिम रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में हैं पर अब फाइनल रिपोर्ट भी आ गई है। दोनों रिपोर्ट गवर्नमेंट के सामने हैं। गवर्नमेंट को उस पर अपना फ़ैसला लेना है। मैं यह कहूँगा कि अधिक से अधिक सिफारिशों को मंजूर कर लेना चाहिए। उस में ऐसी सिफारिशें भी की हैं जो प्लानिंग कमिशन के गठन पर प्रभाव डालेंगी।

दूसरी बात जो उस में कही गई है वह यह है कि एक्जीक्यूशन साइड को और प्लानिंग साइड को अलग-अलग होना चाहिए। एक्जीक्यूशन साइड में उन को कम ध्यान देना चाहिए यह नहीं कि हम एकदम उस को हवा में उड़ा

वर्ष करेंगे ? पांच वर्ष के लिए प्रायरीटी तय करके उस हिसाब से हम उस काम को चलायेंगे । फिर रिसोसेज कहां से आयेंगे, कौन से काम में कितना रुपया खर्च होगा और उसके लिये रिसो-सेज कहां से आयेंगे यह प्लानिंग कमीशन को तय करना है । तीसरे यह कि जो काम हो रहा है उस के परफोरमेंस का इवेलुएशन करना कि कितना काम इस साल हुआ और क्या जितना काम हमको करना चाहिये था उतना काम हमने किया अथवा नहीं । इस सब का इवेलुएशन करना है ।

चौथा काम फारमुलेशन और प्लान है, कामों की प्रायरीटी ठीक करनी है कि कौन काम पहले होना चाहिये और कौन काम बाद में होना चाहिये । रिसोसेज के अनुसार कौन काम इस साल कर सकते हैं और कौन काम दूसरे साल कर सकते हैं इसे तय करना होता है । अब यह सारा काम केवल ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव मशीनरी से कर लिया जाय, कोई प्लानिंग बोडी नहीं रहे जो कि उन का तख्तमोना कर सके जो कि उनको यह नहीं दिखा सके कि कितना काम हुआ या नहीं हुआ या कितना काम आगे और करना है अगर ऐसी प्लानिंग बोडी के रहे अगर आप समझते हैं कि ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव मशीनरी ही वह सारा काम सफलता से कर लेगी तो यह समझ की बात नहीं है । मैं अपने दोस्तों से कहूंगा कि क्रिटिसिज्म भी ऐसी होनी चाहिए जोकि मालूम हो कि यह सुधारने के लिए की जा रही है । ऐसी डिस्ट्रिक्टिव क्रिटिसिज्म नहीं होनी चाहिए जिससे कि यह मालूम दे कि उस को वह बर्बाद ही कर देना चाहते हैं उसको हटा ही देना चाहते हैं । (व्यवधान) माननीय सदस्य रिपोर्ट्स वगैरह नहीं पढ़ते हैं क्योंकि अगर वह उन रिपोर्ट्स को पढ़ते होते तो उन्हें मालूम रहता कि पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स में भी ऐसी बहुत सी अंडरटेकिंग्स हैं जिनमें कि नफा हो रहा है । माननीय सदस्य को मालूम नहीं है कि ऐसी 26 से ज्यादा अंडरटेकिंग्स हैं जिनमें कि डिबिडेंट डिक्लेयर किया जा चुका है और

उनमें नफा हो रहा है । 13 ऐसी अंडरटेकिंग्स हैं जिनमें नफा तो है लेकिन डिबिडेंट डिक्लेयर नहीं किया गया है । कुछ ऐसी अंडरटेकिंग्स जहां न नफा होता है और न जहां घाटा होता है । अलबत्ता ऐसी भी हैं जहां घाटा होता है । आपके दोस्त जो प्राइवेट सैक्टर वाले हैं कुछ काम नहीं कर सकते हैं इसलिए गवर्नमेंट को बंदोबस्त करना पड़ता है । इस बात को भी ध्यान में रखना होगा कि जो देश के लिए जरूरी चीजें हैं, जैसे ऐयरोनोटिक्स है, प्राइवेट वाले घुंकि इसे कर नहीं सकते इसलिए गवर्नमेंट को हाथ लगाना पड़ा है । हैवी इलेक्ट्रिकल्स हैं, हैवी इंजीनियरिंग है, प्राइवेट सैक्टर वाले इन के नजदीक नहीं जाना चाहते हैं इसलिए गवर्नमेंट को इन्हें करना पड़ता है । लेकिन माननीय सदस्य का ऐसा ख्याल करना कि पब्लिक अंडर-टेकिंग्स सब खराब हैं मैं इसे मानने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ और मैं चाहूंगा कि वह आगे से कुछ अधिक समय लगा कर इन रिपोर्टों को पढ़ा करें ।

योजना कमिशन के संबन्ध में आप को बतला रहा था वह किस काम के लिए है । मैं मानता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमीशन अपने दायरे से बाहर नहीं गया है लेकिन वह उन कामों में अधिक लग गया है जो काम की उसको करने नहीं चाहिये थे । ए० आर० सी० की रिपोर्ट गवर्नमेंट के सामने है और उस पर विचार हो रहा है कि किन-किन सिफारिशों को मंजूर किया जाय और किन-किन सिफारिशों को मंजूर नहीं किया जा सकता है । सारी सिफारिशों को स्वीकार कर लिया जाय या किस को किया जाय या किस को न किया जाय यह फैसला पूरी परिपक्व बुद्धि से विचार करके ही किया जा सकता है यह ठीक है कि ए० आर० सी० तक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण कमिशन है और गवर्नमेंट इन की सब बातों पर पूरा विचार करके, कोई जल्दबाजी में नहीं बल्कि पूरा समय लगा कर उस पर विचार करेगी और यह फैसला करेगी कि किन्हें मंजूर करना है और किन्हें मंजूर नहीं करना है । मैं

sion, the Government has considered in right earnest the urge for re-organising the Planning Commission so that it can really overcome the shortcomings which the Planning Commission has really faced. Mr. Gadgil himself said after he assumed office that it was an important question which relates to the new strategy of planning to be evolved. It was his concept of thinking; he said that all planning should be developed from below. Mr. Gadgil himself has formulated a new concept of planning when the fourth Plan will take effect. So, in that respect, the Government by appointing Shri Gadgil as Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission has also accepted the thinking of the ARC, to make the the Planning Commission an efficient and effective body.

About the mixed economy which the ARC is speaking of with regard to the public sector and private sector, may I say that the private sector had been given the greatest opportunity to develop in these 20 years? A recent analysis of the production and utilisation of capacity for 1965 and 1966 in respect of 400 industries in the private sector shows that production has declined in respect of 133 industries including agricultural machinery, steel castings, steel forgings, electric fans, electrodes, etc. In agricultural machinery only 10 per cent of the capacity was utilised in 1965 and in 1966 nearly 76 per cent remained unutilised. So, the private sector has been given the highest opportunity and scope to develop, but it has not utilised its licensed capacity. Now somebody says associate private sector with the public sector so that everything may go to dogs completely and there may be no planning at all. When Bhanswasura was given the boon by Shiva, he said, "I will first try it upon you". Like that perhaps the ARC is trying its boon first on the Planning Commission itself, so that whatever of planning is still left, it may completely vanish and no scope remains for planned development.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi): Sir, the most important recommendation of the ARC—they have muted it out of deference to the lady Prime Minister—is that the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister should be associated with, and

should not be Chairman and Member of, the Planning Commission. The reason for this had been exemplified in the report of 17th April and the Prime Minister has declared herself along with the Planning Commission against the ARC report. The question is, is she going to retreat from that condemnation and if not, is her Cabinet going to disagree with what the party and Parliament are going to do against the decision of the Prime Minister and the Planning Commission? This is the reason why the ARC has recommended that this planning body should not be given the superior status of doing what it likes with the association of the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister.

The second recommendation is that the Planning Commission should be an expert body and should have no executive powers. Nowhere in the constitution of the Planning Commission have executive powers been given. It amazes me that the Planning Commission should claim executive powers. It is essentially a body to advise the Government and not to carry out the work which is done in the ministries. It is not understood by this House and this country how this work is duplicated. We have not that much money to waste, the same number of officers doing to the same thing.

The third recommendation is that the private sector representatives should be associated with planning. I was rather amazed to hear the last speaker opposing this recommendation. Still it happens that in every ministry of the Government they associate the private sector. Is it any strange that the Planning Commission should do so. If our hon. friend thinks that he is in Russia, that the private sector should not exist at all and that it should be treated with not only suspicion but with aggression, then the position is different. But I am surprised that there should be a Member of the Congress opposing this and saying that the private sector has no right even to cooperate with or advise the Government.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: They had their opportunities, but they are not developing.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU : How much has your Public sector developed? Sir, I can talk till the cock crows about public sector and what it has done, but there is no time and you are rushing me.

These recommendations are simple. These are logical recommendations. If the Prime Minister only recognises that she should not commit herself in a small body against her own authority, she should be detached, free to decide what the Planning Commission recommends and free to decide what the Cabinet thinks, then if she expresses and commits herself to these views along with a body in a manner against the recommendation of the ARC I think she herself will feel unhappy. I would request her to withdraw from the statement and also to withdraw from the Planning Commission because that is the only way to get the Planning Commission give the right advice to her and to the country.

SHRI K. R. GANESH (Andaman and Nicobar Islands) : **MR. Deputy-Speaker, Sir,** I rise to oppose the resolution moved by the hon. Member, Shri Xavier. The recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission, since it is a high-powered body, deserve serious consideration by the Government. There is no doubt about that. But, Sir, I Join with my colleague and friend Shri Chintamani Panigrahi that some of the recommendations of the ARC cut at the very root of planning in this country. We have adopted planning as a way of building a prosperous economy. We have adopted planning because in a country of our magnitude, in a country of our complex situation, there is only one way to build a national independent economy to banish poverty and destitution from the country, to remove the disparities between the various regions of this country, to remove the disparities between the various sections of the people, and that is to put the public sector in a commanding position because only through the public sector being in a commanding position it will be possible for the Government to mobilise the resources of the country and to use them in the direction of a socio-economic change.

The Planning Commission was not a body of experts only. The Planning Commission was not conceived as a body which will tabulate figures. For that we

have many other agencies. The Planning Commission conceived of by the architect of planning in this country, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, was an instrument of social change in this country and unless that social change is brought about the concept of planning will continue in this country. So our difference is that the thinking of the Administrative Reforms Commission cuts at the very root of planning because if planning is decentralised and it is given to the various States then it is definite and quite possible that instead of centralised planning which alone will be able to establish an edifice which we require in the present period it will be spilt up.

Our friends in their anger towards the party in power go on criticising us saying that nothing has been done during the Plan periods.

I am not one of those who would say that planning has been implemented in a way that some of the socio-economic problems of this country have been solved. But the fact cannot be denied—it is a fact of our life—that planning during the last 15 years has established an economic base in this country. There is a heavy industry base in this country as a result of which we were in a position to stand up to Pakistan and China when all the foreign collaborators refused to help us. An economic base has been built.

SHRI S. Xavier : What has the Planning Commission to do with it?

SHRI K. R. GANESH : You think only of the Planning Commission. The very discussion of Planning is a discussion of the entire facet of the life of this country otherwise, you cannot discuss Planning Commission. The Administrative Reforms Commission Committed the mistake in the sense that it brought about a discussion of the Planning Commission in its narrow concept, without taking into consideration that the Planning Commission was envisaged as an instrument of bringing about a socio-economic change.

Only two days back we were discussing the changes that are taking place in a highly industrialised country like Czechoslovakia. The political changes that are taking place in Czechoslovakia today are as a result of the economic changes that have taken place there.

We were surprised to learn that there are many branches of the Czechoslovakian economy and Czechoslovakia is a highly industrialised country in Europe, which have been subsidised by the Government so that an industrial base might be laid. You will be surprised to know that Czechoslovakia has built a steel mill, which has cost much more than what it cost many of the European countries, because it wanted to be independent, as far as steel production is concerned, which is a basic thing for industrialisation.

It is not that we are saying that the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission do not deserve any serious consideration. But the talk of meaningful co-operation by the private sector with the Planning Commission, as my colleague has pointed out, is a very dangerous thinking and that should not be allowed, as far as the Planning Commission is concerned. This Parliament has discussed time and again how the association of the representatives of the private sector has brought about a set back for the economy of our country.

One of the biggest problems facing this country is the reorganisation of the entire administrative machinery of this country. I think the ARC would have done better if it had applied its mind to the reorganisation of the administrative machinery, which is the instrument for bringing about a social change in this country.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade): I rise to oppose this motion. But, in that process, I do not want to give an impression that I want to support the kind of planning that is going on in this country. Since there is very little time at my disposal, I can only state our basic position on the question of planning. I cannot go into much detail.

At the very outset, I would like to say that it is a pity that the report of the Administrative Reforms Commission has become a convenient weapon in the hands of those who want to destroy planning.

17-44 hrs.

[Shri G. S. Dhillon in the Chair.]

SHRI PILOO MODY : Who wants to destroy planning ?

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : You are very clear about it, I hope. The Mover of the Resolution, a member of the Swatantra Party, is very clear in his mind that planning should be scrapped and the Planning Commission should be scrapped. Shri Piloo Mody may not agree with him. That means that there is difference of opinion in the Swatantra Party.

SHRI S. XAVIER : I have been misunderstood.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : Anyway, in so many words he has said that the Planning Commission should be scrapped.

SHRI S. XAVIER : That is, as it now works.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : I think the meaning is very clear to all concerned.

SHRI PILOO MODY : But it is not consistent with what you have said earlier.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : I should like to make it clear that the words of the Administrative Reforms Commission are not so sacred. Their reports are not so sacred. Their reports are not the last word on the subject. The Government or the Parliament should not take the reports of the Administrative Reforms Commission in that spirit. Of course, they are supposed to be an expert body. There are eminent men in that commission. But the debate that has taken place already in the House is clear evidence that they also can go wrong. So, the Administrative Reforms Commission may not be depended upon by those who want to destroy planning and the Planning Commission. Let us look at the subject on its merit.

As my hon. friend from the other side said—there are at least some friends there who even now think that the Planning Commission was supposed to be an instrument of social and economic change in this country—I also am not prepared to deny certain achievements of planning; I am also prepared to accept that we were able to lay the foundations of heavy industry to a certain extent, but where have we landed ourselves today after 15 years of this process and is it not necessary for all of us to

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

consider seriously why we have landed in this mess ?

Everybody knows that today there is no plan. The plan is hanging in mid air. We do not know where it is. And our country today is passing through a very serious economic crisis. That shows that we have erred and erred fundamentally somewhere.

The Planning Commission is made a scapegoat actually. What is the Planning Commission ? Some people say that it is super-cabinet. But really the Planning Commission can only implement the policies of the Government. Basically we should look at the policies of the Government. There is no use finding fault with the Planning Commission by itself. Maybe, there are well-meaning people with a progressive outlook, not like the Swatantras and others in this country, who want to take this country out of this morass, in the Planning Commission. There may be experts disinterested in politics. There may be expert economists disinterested in politics of the right variety or of the left variety or of the centrist variety; but, maybe, their hands are not free because of the policies of this Government because ultimately the policies of the Government matter. There it is common knowledge to any person who examines the situation in a disinterested manner that in spite of all this talk of planning as an instrument of social change, we have only helped the establishment of monopoly in this country. Actually, the fight between this side and that side, according to me, is a shadow fight.

SHRI D. N. TIWARY : Question.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : There is not much to fight between the two. One can understand their opposition to planning because they want only the thriving of the private sector in this country. They want to eliminate absolutely any kind of planning, any kind of control and any kind of public sector. Of course, the Congress Party and the Central Government talk of a mixed economy. I do not know what is their perspective. They pass their glorious resolutions. Even after the debacle of 1967 elections they talk of the great ten-point plan and what-not. We all know

what happened even about this ten-point plan.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : It is put in the cold storage.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : The so-called nationalisation of banks has ended up in the ridiculous social control of banks and trying to control the employees thereby. We all know that. So, all the tall talk that had been going on in this country all these years has ended in the greatest of economic crises.

The point of view held by us, by people like us and our parties is very clear. There should be re-thinking about this subject. There is no doubt about it. But it should not be in the way suggested by these friends. There should be some heart-searching mainly by those sitting on the treasury benches, not by the people in this country. The people are paying very heavily for the Himalayan blunders, the wrong policies, that the Congress Party have been following all these years. If they talk about socialism and build up capitalism, if they talk about one thing and implement another thing, how can people have faith in them ? They are expressing their lack of faith in them and the lack of faith in the kind of planning that has taken place. I do not have time to go into various details as far as planning that has already taken place in this country is concerned.

It was only very late that they thought of having some decentralisation. Many of the State Governments were asking the Centre to allow them to have planning organisations. As far as I understand, for a long time, the Central Government stood against it. Even now, as far as I understand, the State Governments are not given real initiative in planning as far as their regions are concerned. I fully agree with my hon. friend, Shri Kandappan, on that question. The complete initiative should be allowed to the State authorities. You cannot have everything hanging in Delhi. All these questions have to be seriously considered but not, for God sake, on the lines suggested by Shri Hanumanthaiya and the Administrative Reforms Commission.

So, I oppose the Resolution. At the

same time, I would request the House, on another occasion, to seriously consider the question of reorganisation of planning from another direction.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA(Bangalore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I did not want to intervene in this debate. The allegation made that we have given planning a distorted look makes me explain the position correctly.

So far as the Commission is concerned, it is none of our business to go into matters of policy. So far as the constitution is concerned, so far as the policies laid down are concerned, they are there. Whatever administrative structure is required to implement these policies and the constitutional provisions has to be worked out.

Really, the two friends who spoke and the eminent member from the Communist Party spoke from ideological point of view with which I am not concerned, with which the Commission is not concerned. The Government of India, even under the late respected Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, through its Industrial Policy Resolution and through its various statements, has accepted mixed economy, the co-existence of private and public sectors. It would be the height of impertinence for me to advocate the policy of private sector. I can understand the ideological fervour of my hon. friend, Shri Vasudevan Nair, and some of his friends this side.....

SHRI PILOO MODY : And young turks.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA : As an ideology, there may be much to be said in favour. But, as I said, the Commission is not the authority that lays down ideology. If my two friends who spoke about planning policies and things like that are interested in it, they are welcome to bring a Resolution before this House and get the Parliament change the present policy of the Government regarding mixed economy concept of the Industrial Policy Resolution. For what they cannot get done at the hands of Parliament and the party, if they make the Commission a scapegoat, it is not the way of rendering justice to the Commission.

Also this Commission is not appointed by the Communist Party. Therefore, we cannot implement their ideology. This has been appointed by Government which commands majority in Parliament and whose policy is mixed economy. When you lay that basis, the foundation, of two sectors co-existing, working side by side, for the good of the country, this Commission can make recommendations in consonance with that policy. Therefore, there are some people who began to comment on the Commission even before we submitted our report a year ago. Some leftist people think that the Commission should make recommendations for planning of the type that exists in Russia or China or some other country and their anxiety to propagate their idea is such that they hold me responsible for that. I am not responsible for that. They have to bring into existence a communist, proletarian dictatorship and ask that body to do it. ...*(Interruptions)*

17.55 hrs.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

AN HON. MEMBER : Why proletarian ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I think, Mr. Hanumanthaiya's contention is that it is absolutely free from ideological barriers. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA : Therefore, for any member to say that we did not do a particular thing on the basis of ideology is out of court so far as this point is concerned. On the other hand, I would have welcomed them to point out the recommendations and say that this is wrong, this ought to be modified. I would have welcomed that. But this kind of general speech, I am not able to answer, and I beg of them to see the position of the Commission. We are not interested in changing the policy, nor are we authorised to do it. Our business is merely to suggest an administrative structure in consonance with the present policy of the Government.

Secondly, about Constitution. Our Constitution is a federal Constitution. Therefore, we have made recommendations

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

so as to fit into the federal structure of the Constitution, so far as the Plan and its performance is concerned.

I was saying, and I have to state, that even before we gave the report, even before the recommendation was made, paper controversy went on between the leftist ideologists and some other ideologists. Therefore, some sort of prepossessed ideas have taken hold of the mind of some members and they criticise from that point of view, and I would tell them that it is not a relevant criticism so far as the recommendations are concerned.

SHRI SHIV CHANDIKA PRASAD (Jamshepur) : Planning has admittedly become necessary to avoid economic savagery and waste, to make fuller and better utilisation of all available resources, to solve the unemployment problem, to achieve certain social objectives, to fulfil social obligations, to better poor man's living conditions and to regulate economic relations with other nations. To the extent that these should be achieved through advice, guidance and supervision, control should be avoided.

I might venture to give a suggestion. The Planning Commission, after it has fixed targets, should invite industrialists to pick up the projects they want within six months and pay substantial deposit to start production within a stipulated period or forfeit deposit, which should not be less than 5 per cent of the total project. What the people do not pick up, the State should take up to fulfil targets, but here also a project will go to an officer who guarantees fulfilment or else pays penalty, but get reward for fulfilment.

18.00 hrs.

It is desirable that profits go to the community. It is also desirable that, as against a few, many share profits through co-operative action. But how do such results follow automatically once an external set-up, machinery, is provided? Why should a public servant, without any stake or incentive, act more efficiently and honestly than an individual working for himself and for profits?

Without a well developed sense of social obligation and superior training, how

will he do so? What have we done to create such favourable conditions for him? In the absence of these, are we not wasting our valuable resources? A glance at the performance of our public sector will prove the validity of my statements. What is the remedy? I repeat that it is the raising of our consciousness.

श्री शिवचन्द्र भा (मधुबनी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो प्रस्ताव है कि एअर सी की जो सिफारिशें हैं उन के मुताबिक योजना आयोग का पुनर्गठन हो, मैं इस का पुरजोर विरोध करता हूँ। इस की कुछ छोटी सिफारिशें हो सकती हैं जैसे कि स्टाफ को कम करना, उस में मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है, लेकिन जो मुझे बुनियादी एतराज है वह इस सिफारिश के पीछे जो दर्शन है उस से है। वह दर्शन क्या है? जैसा अभी माननीय सदस्यों ने बतलाया, यह एक एक्सपर्ट ऐडवाइजरी बाडी है। इस का मतलब यह होता है कि लांग रेज में जा कर के आइडियोलोजी ओरिएण्टेड बाडी होनी चाहिये। समाज को नये रूप में बनाने और नई व्यवस्था लाने वगैरह की जो थोड़ी बहुत बातें हैं वह नो बाद की हैं, आज तो उन को आहिस्ते-आहिस्ते खत्म किया जा रहा है ताकि पूंजीवादी व्यवस्था सुचारु रूप से चलती रहे।

मैं मानता हूँ कि विशेषज्ञों की जरूरत होती है, लेकिन समाज को नये रूप से बनाने के लिये धीरज चाहिये, कल्पना चाहिये, एक आदर्श चाहिये। आप धाद करेंगे कि जब प्लानिंग कमेटी बनी थी तब उन दिनों में भी हिन्दुस्तान में एक्सपर्ट थे, लेकिन क्या उन एक्सपर्ट्स ने वह प्लानिंग कमेटी बनाई थी? नहीं। उन लोगों ने बनाई थी जो सपने देखा करते थे और सोचते थे कि हम एक नया भारत बनायेंगे, एक नया समाज बनायेंगे। जब उन दिनों में हम लोगों ने प्लानिंग कमेटी बनाई थी तब हम शेखचिल्ली कहलाते थे कि यह शेखचिल्लियों के सपने हैं। लेकिन अहिस्ता-अहिस्ता किसी न किसी रूप में वह सपना पूरा हुआ। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक्सपर्ट्स

से काम नहीं चलने का है। इस काम के करने वालों में एक विजन चाहिये और उन को आइडियोलोजी और एन्टेड होना चाहिये, जिस को खत्म करने के लिये यह सिफारिशें हैं। बल्कि मैं तो इस से भी जोरदार शब्दों में कहूंगा कि यह प्लान है, कांस्पिरेसी है, पूंजीवाद की कांस्पिरेसी है कि आज योजना के रूप में जो कुछ हो रहा है वह खत्म किया जाये।

मैं यह नहीं कहता कि प्लैनिंग कमिशन में परिवर्तन नहीं होना चाहिये, उस का पुनर्गठन नहीं होना चाहिये, लेकिन दूसरे रूप में होना चाहिये, न कि जिस रूप में प्रस्तावक महोदय कहते हैं या दूसरे लोग कहते हैं और एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफार्मस कमिशन कहता है। यह परिवर्तन किस रूप में होना चाहिये? वह ऐसे रूप में होना चाहिये कि अर्थ-व्यवस्था चल सके। आज योजना ठप्प है। योजना का थोड़ा बहुत दोष हो सकता है, जो आज कल उस के इन-चार्ज हैं उन का थोड़ा बहुत दोष हो सकता है, लेकिन कुछ आब्जेक्टिव फोर्सेज हैं समाज में जिन की वजह से भारत की अर्थ-व्यवस्था ठप्प है और गाड़ी चल नहीं रही है। वह आब्जेक्टिव फोर्सेज क्या हैं? यह फोर्सेज हैं वह मान्स्टर आफ फ्रैक्स्टाइन जो तीन योजनाओं की बदौलत पैदा हुआ है। यह मान्स्टर आफ फ्रैक्स्टाइन है जिस की वजह से गाड़ी चल नहीं रही है। वह फ्रैक्स्टाइन क्या हैं? प्रोइंग पब्लिक सेक्टर और प्रोइंग प्राइवेट सेक्टर। लेकिन खुश होना और मुंह फुलाना दोनों नहीं हो सकते हैं। उसी तरह से चाहे आप प्राइवेट सेक्टर रखें चाहे पब्लिक सेक्टर रखें। जैसे एक म्यान में दो तलबारें नहीं रह सकती हैं वही बात अर्थ-व्यवस्था पर भी लागू होती है। आज दुनिया की अर्थ-व्यवस्था का तकाजा है पूंजीवाद का खत्म करना, इस में दो मत नहीं हो सकते, चाहे आप मानें या न मानें। इस लिये इस का पुनर्गठन होना चाहिये, लेकिन दुनिया का जो तकाजा है उस को सामने रख कर होना चाहिये। इस लिये

योजना बनाने का एक सिद्धांत होना चाहिये जिस को हमेशा सामने रखा जाना चाहिये।

मैं ने पिछले बुधवार को एक सवाल किया था कि योजना के लिये सरकार ने क्या प्रिंसिपल बनाये हैं। उस का प्रधान मन्त्री ने यह जवाब दिया था :

"The Constitution lays down general directives for the economic and social policy of the state, and successive plans have elaborated the aims and objectives of planned development. A strategy of Indian planning is being framed in the light of all these. However, from time to time circumstances change and new problems and fresh experience gained. Each Five Year Plan has to take into account this broad context and try to make required adjustments".

यह उन का जवाब था। लेकिन यह कामन सेंस कोई सिद्धान्त नहीं है। मैं इस को नहीं मानता हूँ कि यह सिर्फ कामन सेंस है, कोई सिद्धान्त नहीं है। आदमी का दिमाग खराब नहीं है, सारी बातें नार्मल हैं, इस से काम चलने वाला नहीं है। यदि आप समाज को बनाना चाहते हैं तो क्या सिद्धान्त होना चाहिये यह मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ। आप जानते हैं कि प्रो० लैंगे ने अपनी पुस्तक एकानमिक थ्योरी आफ सोशलिज्म में क्या कहा है। मैं डाव की पुस्तक ग्रार्गुमेंट आन सोशलिज्म में से पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ। उस ने लिखा है :

"A socialist government really intent upon socialism has to decide to carry out its socialisation programme at one strike or to give it up altogether. The very coming into power of such a government must cause a financial panic and economic collapse. Therefore, the socialist government must either guarantee the immunity of private property and enterprise in order to enable the capitalist economy to function normally. In doing which it gives up its socialist aims or it must go through resolutely with its socialisation programme at maximum speed. Any hesitation, any vacillation and indecision would provoke the inevitable catastrophe. Socia-

[श्री शिवचन्द भा]

lism is not an economic policy for the timid".

आज कल जो योजना को चलाने वाले हैं उन की पालिसी टिमिडिटी की है। उस को खत्म कर के दृढ़ता लानी है। अर्थ-व्यवस्था का जो आदर्श प्लैनिंग कमेटी ने रक्खा था उस पर हमारी गाड़ी चल सकेगी। पेचिंग करने से गाड़ी चलने वाली नहीं है। इस लिये मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ और पुरजोर समर्थन इस बात का करता हूँ कि इस का पुनर्सं गठन हो हमारे आदर्शों के सन्दर्भ में।

श्री प्रेमचन्द बर्मा (हमीरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने पेश है मैं उस का विरोध करता हूँ। इस लिये नहीं कि वह प्रस्ताव विरोधी दल की ओर से आया है, बल्कि इस लिये कि जिस खयाल से वह पेश किया गया है वह उचित नहीं है।

ए अर सी की जो रिपोर्ट तैयार हुई है, इस में कोई शक नहीं कि वह महत्वपूर्ण है। उस के माननीय चेअरमैन साहब और उन के साथियों को, जिन्होंने यह रिपोर्ट तैयार की है, मैं मुबारकबाद देता हूँ। उन्होंने सब मसलों पर विचार किया है और उस के बाद रिपोर्ट पेश की है। लेकिन यह भी नहीं कहा जा सकता कि रिपोर्ट में जितनी बातें हैं वह सब की सब ठीक हैं और उन को आखें बन्द कर के मान लेना चाहिये।

रिपोर्ट में पहली सिफारिश यह है कि नेशनल डेवलपमेंट कौंसिल से सलाह मशवरा करना चाहिये। ठीक है। दूसरी सिफारिश यह है कि डिफरेंट सेक्टरों के बारे में डिफरेंट पीरियड निर्धारित किये जायें। ठीक है। आम तौर पर इस को माना जा सकता है। तीसरी चीज है प्लैनिंग रिसोर्सेज के बारे में। ठीक है। लेकिन 5 नम्बर पर बकिंग ग्रुप के बारे में है कि उस में आफिशल और नान-आफिशल नुमा-इन्डे रक्खे जायें। यह सोचने की बात है कि वह किस तरह से किया जाये। नम्बर 10 पर यह

है कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर दोनों से लोग लिये जायें। अब सब से पहला सवाल यह है, जैसा कि मेरे साथियों ने कहा मैं कट्टरपन्थी नहीं हूँ कि अपनी राय न बदलूँ— लेकिन इतना जरूर जानता हूँ कि जो पब्लिक सेक्टर है उस को प्राइवेट सेक्टर वाले सेवाटेज करना चाहते हैं। वह आज तक करते चले आये हैं, और करते आये हैं प्लैनिंग कमिशन की मार्फत। प्लैनिंग कमिशन में ऐसे लोग बैठे हुए हैं जो पब्लिक सेक्टर को सेवाटेज करना चाहते हैं और प्राइवेट सेक्टर को ताकत देना चाहते हैं।

मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमिशन में आज भी ऐसे लोग बैठे हुए हैं जो पब्लिक सेक्टर को चलने नहीं देना चाहते हैं। सब से ज्यादा मजे की बात यह है कि प्लानिंग कमिशन को एक आवागमन का महकमा बना दिया गया है। जिस किसी को भी पसन्द किया जाता है उस को प्लानिंग कमिशन का मॅम्बर बना दिया जाता है और उस के बाद दो साल के अन्दर अन्दर या डेढ़ साल के अन्दर अन्दर उस को वजीर बना दिया जाता है या अगर कोई दूसरा ओहदा होता है तो वह उस को दे दिया जाता है। इस तरह से प्लानिंग कमिशन की मॅम्बरशिप नहीं होनी चाहिये। प्लानिंग कमिशन ने बड़ा भारी काम करना है। सभी लोग जानते हैं कि उन्होंने कौम को बनाना है और कौम बनाने का काम दो साल में नहीं हो सकता है। अगर कोई दो साल तक ही वहां रहता है तो वह इस अर्से में कुछ भी काम नहीं कर सकता है। कौम को बनाने के लिए सालों चाहियें। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो भी प्लानिंग कमिशन का मॅम्बर बने उस को कम से कम आठ दस साल तो रखा जाए। इस तरह की जो बातें हैं ये प्लानिंग कमिशन को फेल करने के लिए, उस को खत्म करने के लिए बातें होती हैं, फिर चाहे ये रिपोर्ट में हो या दूसरे लोग इस तरह की बातें पेश करें। हम इसको नहीं

मानते। वह तो हमारे पब्लिक सैक्टर को ही खत्म करने की बात है।

मैं एक सुभाव प्रधान मंत्री जी को देना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात तो यह है कि योजना कमिशन में जितने भी लोग रखे जायें वे डिफेंड फीलड्स के एक्सपर्ट होने चाहियें। इस के अलावा कोशिश यह की जाए कि वे कम से कम दस लाख तक योजना आयोग में काम करें और उन के मन में कोई किसी प्रकार की दुविधा नहीं रहनी चाहिये। साथ ही पिछड़े हुए इलाकों के लिए और पहाड़ी इलाकों के लिए प्लानिंग कमिशन में एक अलग से महकमा होना चाहिये, एक अलग से इन के लिए मम्बर होना चाहिये। आज देखा जाता है कि जितना प्लानिंग होता है, वह शहरों के लिए होता है, दिल्ली जैसे बड़े बड़े शहरों के लिए होता है। जो दस हजार की बुलन्दी पर बैठे हैं, उन लोगों को कोई पूछता ही नहीं है। अगर आप ने ऐसा किया तो पिछड़े हुए और पहाड़ी इलाकों के लिए भी कुछ हो सकेगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ। साथ साथ चाहता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमिशन का दुबारा गठन किया जाए और सरकार को मौका दिया जाए कि वह दुबारा सोच विचार करके इसका नए सिरे से गठन करें।

SHRI DINKAR DESAI (Kanara) : Sir, I rise to support the resolution before this House. I would like to confine myself only to some of the main recommendations made by the Administrative Reforms Commission. I do not want to go into other matters because they are not very relevant. One of the most important recommendations is that the Prime Minister should cease to be the Chairman of the Planning Commission, and further, they have given very valid reasons for it. One of them is, how the Planning Commission began first. At that time, the Prime Minister of course was the Chairman but no other Minister, even the Finance Minister, was not a member of the Commission. Later on, the Finance Minister was added,

and some more Ministers were added and today it is a mixture of experts and Ministers. That is not the way to have a Planning Commission.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is the harm ?

SHRI DINKAR DESAI : I am going to tell you what is the harm. The Planning Commission should be only an advisory body to the Cabinet. It cannot be a body of mixtures, because then what happens is, it becomes a sort of parallel Cabinet ; especially when the Prime Minister is the Chairman and so many Ministers are members, it becomes a parallel Cabinet, and this has been clearly stated in the report of the Administrative Reforms Commission ; I would like to read it :

".....there is a view that the association of the Prime Minister with the Commission in this manner"—

that means, as Chairman—

"Has not been healthy. One of the grounds of criticism against this practice is that taking advantage of the Prime Minister's Chairmanship, the Planning Commission has steadily added to its functions and personnel, and has stepped into areas of executive authority and the Central and the State Governments. The Commission has been sometimes called a parallel Cabinet and sometimes a super Cabinet."

The Commission has agreed with this view and has made the recommendation, because it is also constitutionally wrong. The Cabinet is responsible to this House. The Planning Commission is not responsible to this House, and there cannot be two parallel Cabinets. There can be only one Cabinet and that Cabinet must be responsible to this House which is supreme. It is a very anomalous position.

The second recommendation is, the Finance Minister also should not be a member. But they have said, the Finance Minister and Prime Minister should be closely associated with the work of the commission. They must be kept informed from time to time of the work of the commission, the agenda of the meetings must be sent to them and they may be invited to attend and participate in the

[Shri Dinkar Desai]

meetings. Whenever the Prime Minister attends the meeting, she will preside, but not as a member.

This is a fundamental question of democracy. Nobody can usurp the power of the Cabinet. If some Cabinet ministers are members of the planning Commission, it is not fair to our State Governments. The fear is also expressed in the report that some ministers coming from different States may favour certain States in formulating the plan. Therefore, I fully agree with the recommendation that ministers should be kept away from the commission, particularly in the present political set-up when different parties are in power in different States. An impression should not be created that the Planning Commission is a partial body. We believe in the autonomy of the States and no State should feel that it is being discriminated against.

I appeal to the Prime Minister that it is in her own interest not to be Chairman of the Planning Commission, because when the Prime Minister is part of the Commission itself, he or she will not be in a position to study the plan in a detached manner. After all, it is an advisory body. If she is the Chairman, it ceases to an advisory body. The ARC have brought out a separate report about machinery for planning, but I have no time. It is not that I agree with every recommendation of the ARC, but on the whole its important recommendations are in the interests of the country. We have made many mistakes in the last 15 years of our planning. Let a trial be given to this new set-up.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, the main architect, Mr. Piloo Mody. He is the last member I am going to call from this side.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती (मेरठ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसी क्या बात है ? आपकी नजर हम से क्या कभी नहीं मिलेगी ? कभी मिली ही नहीं है आज तक। अब तक आपने एक मिनट का समय भी नहीं दिया है। यह दूसरा साल चल रहा है। जब कभी आप कुर्सी पर बैठते हैं, हमसे आपकी नजर मिलती ही नहीं है।

श्री शिवनारायण (बस्ती) : गरीबों को भी कुछ कहने दीजिये न।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Order, order I have given time to every party. I have to regulate the time.

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती : उनको आप मौका दें लेकिन इस चीज को मैं आपके नोटिस में लाना चाहता था।

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Sir, I am absolutely amazed at the level at which this debate has been going on, because member after member got up to say that the Swatantra Party does not believe in any planning. I defy anybody in this House to find any reference anywhere which has ever established that the Swatantra Party is against planning. As a matter of fact, for anybody in this whole world to say that they are against planning is in itself a negation of one's way of life.

Planning is the very essence of civilisation and everything that is happening in this world is as a result of planning. We have planned this debate today and that is why have discussed this particular subject instead of some other subject today, and to say that anybody does not believe in planning is only lowering the level of a debate which is meant to help the country in one form or the other.

About this Planning Commission, Shri Nair was entirely right the Swatantra Party is against the Planning Commission as constituted today. But he insists on saying "planning and the Planning Commission" which means two things, completely different not connected with each other. As a matter of fact, I personally am very much against the Planning Commission because 25 years ago I used to live in a rather charming house on the very spot where the Planning Commission has been housed now. If ever there was any deterioration in the condition of the country, that represents it.

There are several people who have complained that the Fourth Five-Year Plan is still not on the anvil. You have seen for yourself over the last three Five-Year

Plans a gradual deterioration in the condition of the country—the first Five-Year Plan, the Second Five-Year Plan which ended with nine million unemployed and the Third Five-Year Plan which would have ended with twelve million unemployed had it been successful, but being successful only to the extent of 56 per cent, it has probably left a backlog of 15 million to 20 million people unemployed. Now they say we are not going to have the Fourth Plan. Thank God we have no Fourth Five-Year Plan because that is the only way we can get out of the recession which the three Five-Plans have got us into.

What is more? This debate has gone on between Right and Left, between capitalists and socialists, between private sector and public sector and in quarrels within the Congress Party between the pragmatists, the wisemen, the old turkeys and young turks. I do not think this was what our hon. friend, Shri Hanumanthaia was trying to do. He was merely trying to make a particular organisation, which has been created and which over a period of time had acquired for itself more than it was ever intended to, more efficient. He was only trying to streamline it and make it more efficient in the interest of the country. I believe that the recommendation he has made we should accept, in all humility, for the betterment of the country.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Sir, parts of the comments have been a little outdated for they have referred not to the report which is mentioned in the present resolution but to the previous report which was an interim report. The Planning Commission has been reorganised and that question is not being reopened. I made a statement here—I think it was on the 17th July last year—indicating the decisions which the Government had taken. That is not a matter which is sought to be gone into now.

The present resolution, on the other hand, is rather premature because the report which is now being discussed was given to me by the Chairman on 14th March. It is quite a voluminous report,

and I do not think Government has had sufficient time to go into all of it. Nevertheless, I would like to tell hon. Members what decisions have so far been taken.

The hon. Mover of the resolution and also some other hon. Members kept on referring to some newspaper report. I do not know what report this is. But judging from their remarks I can safely say that it is entirely incorrect. There is no question of the Planning Commission rejecting the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission.

They have gone into them very carefully and they have accepted many of them, some with some modifications. The other recommendations are under examination, in consultation with various Central Ministries or with State Governments.

Governments agree with the approach—which of course is how the Planning Commission has functioned all along—that the Planning Commission should indicate the implications of alternative approaches and strategies of development and should also be a policy instrument which would help in accelerating the tempo of development.

Government also share the view of the Administrative Reforms Commission and so does the Planning Commission, that while formulating the Five-Year Plan, the Planning Commission should keep before it the perspective of development over a longer period, the period varying for different sectors of economy. In fact, perhaps hon. Members are aware, the Planning Commission has had a Perspective Planning Division, which has been looking at planning from the long-term point of view.

Similarly, Government agree that the Five-Year Plan should take into account internal contingencies, such as the failure of the monsoon. This is something which, after the event takes place, one can be wise about. Now, when we know that such a thing can happen, certainly we must keep in view every possible contingency.

But I am sure hon. Members will understand that it is not always possible to imagine what kind of calamities could overtake us. Certainly, the drought which took place in India was a very exceptional

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

happening; it was not something which one could expect.

Naturally, Government also agree that a realistic assessment of foreign aid should be made and it should be possible to devise a programme for reducing dependence on foreign aid for the Plan as a whole and not for each individual project or scheme.

The Administrative Reforms Commission have also suggested the detailed procedure to be followed by the Planning Commission in the process of plan formulation, such as the composition of working groups, optimum utilisation of advisory bodies working under the Central Ministries and association of Development Councils. Government consider that in these matters while the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission will be kept in view, the Planning Commission should, at the same time, have sufficient discretion and flexibility of approach.

Now, with regard to the next suggestion Government and Planning Commission agree that the Commission should confine its scrutiny only to such schemes as involve a substantial amount of investment, sizable foreign exchange component, considerations of inter-State interest, significant policy implications from the national standpoint or implementation of basic national priorities and that detailed sectoral planning, including preparation and execution of individual schemes and programmes should, as at present, be attended to by the States. Various hon. Members here gave the impression that some kind of plan was drawn up without reference to the States and then the States were forced to accept them. This is far from the truth, because all plans are made in very close and constant consultation with the States. By the way, one of the last speakers, I believe Shri Desai, was under the impression that a number of Ministers are members of the Planning Commission. That is not true.

SHRI DINKAR DESAI : They were.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Why are you talking of the past? We are now talking of the present. Now, in the Planning Commission there is no Minister

except myself and the Deputy Prime Minister, who is also the Finance Minister. We certainly thought that the whole working of the Planning Commission would be more realistic if the Finance Minister were associated with it.

Apart from the State Governments being consulted, each year the annual plans are finalised again in detailed consultation separately with each State Government and finally, at the level of the Chief Ministers themselves. The State Governments are also associated with the working groups.

There are certain suggestions regarding Central assistance to the States for their plans. This matter, naturally, cannot be decided upon without consulting with the State Governments. This will also be placed before the next meeting of the NDC in which, as you all know, all the State Governments are represented.

There was much criticism of the Planning Commission doing executive functions. In my last statement of July 17 last year, I had already made it clear that we have streamlined it considerably. There is no time now otherwise I was going to describe what functions have been given up. But I must assure hon. Members that by taking away these executive functions it is not at all our intention to decrease the importance of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission has a very significant place in the whole functioning of the Government and we consider that it would be disastrous if it were to be made less competent or less important.

I was very glad to hear from the hon. Member, Shri Pilloo Mody, that he and the Swatantra Party do believe in planning because, I must confess, there were many statements, not perhaps in this Parliament but on earlier occasions when I certainly had the impression that they did not believe in the concept of planning for the nation—they may have believed in other items of planning,—planning for the use of the resources of the nation, planning for the removing of disparities and, as my hon. friend on this side said, planning for creating social change without which, I think, we can neither strengthen our economy nor make it a reality for the people as a whole.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I hope, you have changed your opinion.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : There was another question about the size of the Commission and about pruning it to make it more economical. I think, I have answered a question in this House where I gave details of the recommendations made by an internal re-organisation committee, which is chaired by Shri Venkatappiah, many of whose interim recommendations have already been accepted involving a saving of Rs. 11 lakhs and a large number of posts.

Government has already decided that every year the Planning Commission should bring out a progress report on the implementation of the Plan and that this report should be placed on the Table of the House as soon as possible. I am sure, hon. Members are aware that evaluation reports prepared by the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission are already being supplied to all Members of Parliament. So, that keeps them in touch with what is happening.

The Administrative Reforms Commission have made a number of recommendations which pertain to the planning machinery in the States, such as the constitution and functioning of planning boards, responsibility of district development set-ups for planning at district level, preparation of annual progress reports and evaluation of programmes in the State plans. The attention of the State Governments has already been drawn to these recommendations and these also will be discussed at the next meeting of the NDC.

In spite of the denial, I must confess, I myself was under the impression that Shri Xavier was opposing his own Resolution because having started off by saying that we should accept what the ARC has recommended he went on to say that the Planning Commission should be scrapped. That is the impression that I and many Members got.

SHRI PILOO MODY : No, no. It is a figure of speech.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Some hon. Members made a point that the Planning Commission is some kind of a

parallel Government or a parallel Cabinet and somebody said that it is a super Cabinet...

AN HON. MEMBER : The A. R. C. also said that.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am sorry in that case I disagree with the Commission as well as all those who made this remark. Its functions have already been defined by two Members on this side. So, I need not go into that. There is no question of that. The Planning Commission to see what resources the country has and how those resources can be used. There is no conflict between that kind of evaluation of resources and planning as to how to use them. Decisions are taken by the Government. The Government can accept their recommendations or need not accept them. But the point is that they work very closely along with the Government and this is the reason for my accepting to be the Chairman so that it would not be necessary suddenly at any stage to say that this cannot be done because, at all times, we are in touch with both the State Governments and the Central Government.

SHRI PILOO MODY : If the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister recommend it to the Cabinet, how can the Cabinet reject it ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : There are also other members of the Cabinet. There is no confusion at all. This situation can arise with any proposal that comes to the Cabinet. You can say, if the Prime Minister is there, how can anybody say anything. That could happen in regard to any proposal. Here, a proposal comes and the Cabinet must honestly and frankly express its opinion on it. But, as I said, that occasion cannot ordinarily arise because whatever comes is discussed with the Ministries concerned.

Naturally, none of us can have such a thing as an ideal plan because the needs of States and the Ministries are vast and we do not have the resources to meet all these demands and, therefore, the Planning Commission has the unpopular task of pruning them. Even though we consider that many of the demands are right or just

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

and are very necessary for development, even then in view of the resources available, you have to cut some of these demands and, naturally, anybody whose plans are cut is not very happy about it. But, as I said, this has to be looked at in a larger perspective. The whole function of the Planning Commission is to keep all these needs of individual Central Ministries or of the States in a larger picture.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : The States have no say.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The States have a great deal of say in it.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : That never prevails.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Some friends opposite are very fond of drawing a picture of India which is on the downgrade all the time. I do not know how that helps them nor whether it cheers them to paint such a picture, or whether that gives a better image of India abroad...

SHRI PILLO MODY : We perk you up.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I don't need that to work me up. I am in touch with the people of India and they are constantly working me up. I do not doubt that at all.

India has gone through a tremendous ordeal in the last two years. That we have come out of that ordeal with flying colours is a tribute to the planning machinery, to the base we have laid here and all that. We may have made many mistakes, and we have made mistakes. We are facing many difficulties today. But let the hon. Members who spoke of the economic mess, look around the world and tell me which country they are not today facing economic difficulties, whether they have socialist planning or capitalist planning. They are all facing tremendous economic difficulties. We happen to be a part of this world. We are not living in some other world. So, that also has an influence on our economy and its growth.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : With all her contact with the people, I would like to be enlightened by the Prime Minister as to why the people in this country are not very much enamoured or enthusiastic about our planning.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The opposition go on saying day in and day out that it has failed. That is a major plank of their propaganda. Anybody who has a chance of going round in the country and comparing conditions, whether it is industry, whether it is agriculture...

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : रेट ग्रॉफ इकॉनामिक ग्रोथ के बारे में बताइये। बान्ना जैसे मुल्क में भी रेट ग्रॉफ इकॉनामिक ग्रोथ ज्यादा है।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : उन का पौलुेशन देखिये, और बहुत सी चीजें देखी जा सकती हैं।

This is not an occasion really to go into the details of planning. This was a very limited Resolution with regard to the proposals made in the final report of the A. R. C. But, for once in my life, I agree with something which the hon. Member, Mr. Jha, has said. I agree with him that the present situation cannot be faced with timidity; it does need boldness, it needs daring, it needs vision and also it needs a certain amount of unity. We have people who believe in daring, boldness and so on but they use it not for building, but unfortunately for taking us down—all the agitations and so on which take place are not helping to build the country or to take planning forward. We need vision. Here is this Parliament to provide the vision. The Planning Commission should certainly also have vision, but they are working in a limited context. The vision is to be provided by political figures... (Interruptions) I agree with you on this, and I think, we should all help to provide the boldness and give the vision and to create an atmosphere in the country where this work can be done. That is one of the most important things.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : Correct policies.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : What is the correct policy? Every time I have

to repeat the same thing. You think that one policy is correct; the Mover of the Resolution thinks that another policy is correct; we think that our policy is correct. Obviously, we admit that we have not always been able to implement our policies in the manner in which they should be implemented. That, We do agree, but I do not agree that the policy has failed. We do not agree... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiracherappalli) : The result is the guide to indicate which is correct or bad.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The result is there for all to see. If only you will try to look around the country and see what is happening and compare it with the stage at which the country was even two or three years ago, you will find that there has been a vast change; it is a continuous change; and it is a change which is strengthening our country and taking it forward.

I am am sure that what the Mover of this Resolution desired was just a discussion on the subject, and since that has been provided, I hope that he will not press his Resolution to the vote.

SHRI S. XAVIER : I have been completely misunderstood by the hon. Prime Minister and Mr. Nair also. To say that I did not want planning at all is not correct. That is not my view at all, nor is it the policy or the view of the Swatantra Party to which I belong. As the hon. Member, Mr. Piloo Mody, said, we are against the planning that is now being implemented, the wrong planning that we have seen; we are against that sort of planning. That is all. It is not that we do not want any Plan at all. In fact, we agree with the A. R. C. for a longer Plan, which should be reviewed biennially. It must be discussed in the House and the implementation of planning should be reviewed in the House every two years. We do not want to say, and we should not be misunderstood, that we are against any Planning at all. The hon. Prime Minister also said that I have contradicted my Resolution. It is not correct because I attack the Planning Commission as it exists today, as it has planned faultily, in a wrong way, which has led to the ills of the country—

unemployment, recession, inflation, high prices and sufferings to the people. It is because of these things that I attack the policies or the plan and the Planning Commission as it exists today. We do not say that the institution of Planning Commission should be scrapped, but we only say that this sort of Planning Commission should not be there. That is my view.

Then, the hon. Prime Minister said that my resolution was a bit premature. We are all aware of the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission. The Fourth Plan is likely to be shaped and implemented. Since we had wasted some Rs. 20000 odd crores over the past three Plans, I was thinking that on the Fourth Plan Rs. 23,000 crores should not be wasted again. So, I thought it wise to bring it to the notice of the Prime Minister and the House that the Planning Commission should be reorganised on the basis of the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission so that the past mistakes should not be repeated. That was the intention with which I had brought forward this resolution.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have already said that that reorganisation took place some time ago.

SHRI S. XAVIER : The hon. Prime Minister also said that the Opposition Members perhaps found pleasure in pointing out the mistakes or the bad plight of the country. I would submit that it is not our intention to point out the bad plight of the people or the bad condition in which the villagers, the ryots or the labourers or the people in the countryside or rural side are placed. If we go to the villages we see that there are no proper houses, there are no drinking water wells, the people have no clothes, and they are ill-nourished and under-fed and there is unemployment. All these things are there. If these are pointed out, it is not for creating a bad image of the country and its administration. That is not so at all. It is with the best of intentions that those are pointed out and brought to the notice of the Prime Minister and her Cabinet so that they could find out ways and means to better the lot of the ordinary people.

[Shri S. Xavier]

It is only with that good that we have made this suggestion.

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR : Does he suggest the abolition of the Planning Commission ?

SHRI S. XAVIER : We want to reorganise the Planning Commission. Left to myself, I want to say that the Planning Commission as it exists should be scrapped.

Then, the Prime Minister said that she was of one opinion, we were of a different opinion and Shri Vasudevan Nair and his friends were of a third opinion. I would suggest that as a *via media* we could have the Planning Commission and its work reorganised on the basis indicated by their own Congressman Shri Hanumanthaiya who is one of the best administrators and commentators one and one who knows things very well. So, at least let them adopt the recommendations that have been chalked out by their own Congressmen as a *via media*.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Is the hon. Member going to withdraw his resolution ?

SHRI S. XAVIER : No, I am not withdrawing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"This House is of opinion that the Planning Commission be reorganised on the basis of the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission."

The motion was negatived.

18.49½ hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : DIPLOMATIC RECOGNITION OF GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) : I beg to move :

"This House is of opinion that the Government of India should accord immediately full diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : May I suggest that the hon. Member may start his speech on the next occasion ?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Yes, that will be very well.

18.50 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, April, 22, 1968 (Vaisakha 2, 1890 (Saka)).