

मेंटरी अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर महोदय बहाना कर रहे हैं कि यह लोग बाहर खड़े रहे और वे अपने आदमियों को ला सकते थे। इसलिये दुबारा जो कुछ हुआ है वह साबित करता है कि वे अपनी पार्टी की मीटिंग को महत्व दे रहे थे और दुबारा कोरम बनाने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : शगड़े का समय निकल जाये, तय हो जाय मामला और बिल आये इसलिये वे यह सब कर रहे थे।

श्री बजर्राज सिंह (बरेली) : अभी जो हमारे मिनिस्टर आफ पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स ने कन्वेंशन का जिक्र किया और कोरम का जिक्र किया उस का सिर्फ बहाना लेकर वह आप पर आरोप लगाना चाहते थे कि जो कुछ आपने किया वह गलत किया था। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि कन्वेंशन और कोरम से ज्यादा खयाल उनको रखना चाहिये डि कोरम का। यहाँ पर जो सात मेम्बर्स बाकी रह गये थे, मेरे खयाल से अगर यह तमाशा न हुआ होता तो शायद उनसे जवाब तलब होता कि तुम लोग पार्टी मीटिंग में क्यों नहीं आये। इसके बजाय उन लोगों का सहारा लेकर वे कहते हैं कि हमारे सात आदमी मौजूद थे। अब आप इस पर गौर करें कि कन्वेंशन और कोरम इन दो चीजों का सहारा लेकर वे आपके ऊपर आरोप लगाना चाहते हैं, जिसको मैं बहुत खराब समझता हूँ।

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : हम इसको सहन नहीं करेंगे।

कुछ अना माननीय सदस्य : हम इसको बरदाश्त नहीं करेंगे।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am very sorry for the incident that has happened. A convention is a convention only as long as it is observed, and so when the quorum is challenged, I have no option but to adjourn the House if there is no quorum. I was

in the Chair when the House was adjourned, and according to the Constitution, I had to adjourn the House.

In fact, this point was raised on 22nd November, 1963. Shri Kamath raised an objection, and it reads:

"Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He has not said anything about the Anti-Quorum Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, the hon. Member is free. He has thrown a challenge that if the Bill is not brought before the session expires, he will not be bound by the unconstitutional convention as he called it. He can execute that."

It is implicit that when there is no quorum, there is no option but to adjourn the House, and I had to adjourn the House till 2 O'Clock. At 2 O'Clock the bell was rung twice, but the House could not meet for want of quorum. I hope such things will not occur in future.

15.14 hrs.

MOTION RE: REPORT ON MID-TERM APPRAISAL OF THIRD FIVE YEAR PLAN—contd.

श्री राधेलाल श्यास (उज्जैन) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इतने दिनों से जो इस प्लान पर चर्चा चल रही है उस में सब से बड़ी अखरने वाली बात यह है कि कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने प्लानिंग कमिशन के बारे में कटु आलोचना की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमिशन के जो सदस्य हैं वे काफी अनुभवी, योग्य, विद्वान और सेवा भावी हैं और उन्होंने देश की काफी सेवा की है, जो कि हमारे सामने है। उन्होंने अध्ययन करके जो आंकड़े और जो स्थिति रक्खी है उस से उन के प्रति हम जितना भी आभार प्रकट करें वह कम है। उन की कटु आलोचना करना कोई अच्छी बात नहीं कही जा सकती।

हमारी राष्ट्रीय आय जो ५ प्रतिशत प्रति वर्ष के हिसाब से बढ़नी चाहिये थी वह ढाई

[श्री राधेलाल व्यास]

प्रतिशत के हिसाब से बढ़ी है। इस का क्या कारण है। हमारी राष्ट्रीय आय का ४७ प्रतिशत भाग कृषि उत्पादन से पूरा होता है। हम ने यह देखा कि हमारे कृषि उत्पादन में कमी हुई, पिछले दो सालों में उस में कोई बढ़ती नहीं हुई, और पिछले साल में तो २२ लाख टन अनाज की कम पैदावार हुई। कपास में भी कम पैदावार हुई और यही कारण है कि राष्ट्रीय आय नहीं बढ़ सकी, और उस को वहीं पर रहना पड़ा। इसी तरह से इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन भी जहां ११ प्रति वर्ष बढ़ना चाहिये था वहां पहले वर्ष में वह साढ़े ६ प्रतिशत और दूसरे वर्ष में केवल ८ प्रतिशत ही बढ़ा है। इस लिये मेरा यह निवेदन है कि सब से पहले कृषि उत्पादन की ओर अधिक ध्यान देने की जरूरत है। कृषि उत्पादन को बढ़ाने के लिये सन् १९४७ से ले कर अभी तक यानी सन् १९६३ तक काफी प्रयत्न किये गये, हमारी खेती का जो ऋण एरिया है उस में भी लगभग ९ करोड़ एकड़ अधिक में खेती हुई है। इस के बावजूद भी जो इम्पोर्ट्स के फिगर्स हैं वह सन्तोषजनक नहीं हैं। सन् १९४८-४९ में ३० लाख टन अनाज बाहर से मंगाया गया जब कि सन् १९६२-६३ में उसे बढ़ा कर हम को ३८ लाख टन बाहर से मंगाना पड़ा। इस लिये यह एक बड़ा गम्भीर प्रश्न है और जब तक इस ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया जायेगा और ऐसे कदम नहीं उठाये जायेंगे कि हम कृषि उत्पादन को ठीक से बढ़ा सकें, तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि देश की आर्थिक स्थिति ठीक नहीं हो सकती।

हमारे ८२ प्रतिशत लोग देहातों में रहते हैं जिन में से ७० प्रतिशत ऐसे हैं जो कि केवल कृषि पर निर्भर करते हैं। इस देश की आर्थिक स्थिति को सुधारने के लिये बहुत जरूरी है कि जो हमारे देहात के लोग हैं, जो कृषकजन हैं, उन लोगों की स्थिति सुधरे, और यह तभी हो सकता है जब कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़े। इस के लिये काफी प्रयत्न किया गया। खाद की ओर

ध्यान दिया जाता है लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप कितनी भी रसायनिक खाद पैदा करें, उस से हमारी आवश्यकता की पूर्ति नहीं हो सकती। कम्पोस्ट, ग्रीन मैन्योर की ओर जितना ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये था उतना नहीं दिया गया है। उस का प्रचार खूब किया गया है लेकिन मैं देहातों में देखता हूँ कि कम्पोस्ट तयार नहीं की जा सकी है और गोबर जो होता है वह व्यर्थ फेंका जाता है या जलाने के काम में आता है। उस का कोई भद्रुपयोग नहीं किया जाता।

इसी तरह से लोन काफी किसानों को दिया गया, करोड़ों रुपये को आप्रोपेटिब्ज के द्वारा किसानों को दिये गये लेकिन किसान सुखी नहीं है। अग्रोक्स बैंक, रिजर्व बैंक सवा ३ प्रतिशत ब्याज पर रुपया देता है लेकिन किसान को हमारे यहां अन्तिम रूप से साढ़े १० प्रतिशत ब्याज तक पर जा कर रुपया मिलना है। इस में कुछ कटौती हो जाती है और दूसरे कामों में भी उसे कुछ खर्च करना पड़ना है। इस लिये किसान आज सुखी नहीं है। इस ओर ज्यादा ध्यान देने की जरूरत है।

मेरा सुझाव यह भी है कि हर एक जिले में एक सोयल टैस्टिंग लैबोरेटरी कायम की जानी चाहिये और तमाम जमीन की जांच की जानी चाहिये कि किस जमीन के लिये किस खाद की जरूरत है और उसे किसानों को बतलाया जाना चाहिये ताकि सूखी खाद से ही वह अपना उत्पादन बढ़ायें।

इसी तरह से बिजली के बारे में है। बहुत सी जगहों पर लिफ्ट इरिगेशन बिजली के द्वारा हो सकता है, कई जगह हैं, जैसे चम्बल नदी है जिस में काफी पानी है, लेकिन किसानों को बिजली नहीं मिल रही है। इस ओर भी ज्यादा ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये।

हमारा कृषि उत्पादन कम होने से कीमतें अधिक बढ़ी हैं। आपने अभी अभी अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा में

सवाल उठा कि कीमतें बढ़ रही हैं। हमारे यहां गेहूं वगैरह की कीमतें बढ़ रही हैं। यह बड़ा पेचीदा सवाल है। इस पर कई परीक्षण किये गये। सन् १९४७ के बाद कभी कंट्रोल किया गया, कभी कंट्रोल हटा कर, अभी प्राइस फिक्सेशन कर के, कभी डिक्ट्रोल कर के, लेकिन हम एक स्थिर नीति कायम नहीं कर सके हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि इतने प्रयत्न करने के बावजूद कृषि उत्पादन में तरक्की नहीं हुई। उधर कई किसानों को शिकायत रहती है कि कृषि उत्पादन की जो उचित कीमतें मिलनी चाहिये वह नहीं मिली हैं। इस के बारे में एक क्रान्तिकारी कदम उठाने की जरूरत है। मेरा मुझाव है कि एक अलकग स्टुट्टी बॉर्ड बनाया जाना चाहिये, एग्रीकल्चर प्रोडक्शन बॉर्ड, और उस का यह अधिकार दिया जाना चाहिये, कि जिस तरह से दूसरे देशों में ह्यूट बॉर्ड्स हैं, कनाडा में हैं, आस्ट्रेलिया में हैं, जापान में राइस बॉर्ड है जहां पर मना पानी प्रायोरिटी होता है, उसी तरह से इस बॉर्ड को भी अधिकार दिया जाना चाहिये कि कुछ कमांडिटीज के उत्पादन की तरफ, जैसे ह्यूट को ले लें, चावल को ले लें, वह ध्यान दे, उस के लिये बीज की व्यवस्था करे, उस के लिये वह कर्ज दे और उस का सब उत्पादन प्रायोरिटी कर ले और उस का वितरण करे। अगर यह व्यवस्था की जायगी तो कीमतें ठीक रखी जा सकेंगी और उपभोक्ताओं को चीजे ठीक कीमत पर मिल सकेंगी। लेकिन अगर यह नहीं किया गया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि कीमतों का बढ़ाव चढ़ाव हमेशा होता रहेगा और लोगों की परेशानियां इसी तरह से बनी रहेंगी।

बेरोजगारी का सवाल भी बड़ा पेचीदा है। एक करोड़ आबादी देश में प्रति वर्ष बढ़ती जा रही है। इस समस्या को हल करने के लिये गवर्नमेंट जितने भी कदम उठाती है उन की तुलना में यह समस्या मुरसा राक्षसी की तरह अपना मुंह बढ़ाती चली जाती है और यह समस्या हल नहीं हो पा रही है।

अगर आप को बेकारी को खत्म करना है। आप को ग्रामोद्योग और कृषि की ओर ध्यान देना होगा। आप इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन करके लाखों करोड़ों आदमियों को काम नहीं दे सकते। इस प्रश्न को हल करने के लिये यह बहुत जरूरी है कि कृषि के प्रश्न को युद्ध स्तर पर हल करने का प्रयत्न किया जाये। इस काम के लिये एक ऐसी एजेंसी बनायी जाए जिस में आफिशियल और नान आफिशियल दोनों हों और उन को पूरे अधिकार रहें, और यह एजेंसी राज्यों में भी काम करे और सेंटर में भी काम करे। उस के ऊपर जिम्मेवारी हो और उस के हाथ में अधिकार भी हों। अगर ऐसा कोई बॉर्ड बनाया जायेगा तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह समस्या बहुत कुछ हल हो सकेगी।

प्लान में कमी क्यों रही इस की जांच होनी चाहिये। यह सही है कि जनता की यह जिम्मेदारी है कि वह प्लान को इम्प्लीमेंट करे, लेकिन सरकारी कर्मचारियों की जिम्मेदारी जनता से अधिक है। पहली योजना में, दूसरी योजना में और तीसरी योजना में भी इस बात पर जोर दिया गया है कि जब तक एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव मशीनरी ईमानदार और एफिशियट नहीं होगी तब तक प्लान सफल नहीं हो सकती। खुशी की बात है कि श्री नन्दा का ध्यान इस ओर गया है और उन्होंने ने विजिलेंस कमीशन बनाने की घोषणा की है, लेकिन केवल घोषणाओं से काम नहीं होगा। इस के लिये ठोस कदम उठाने की जरूरत है। प्लान के सफल न होने की कुछ जिम्मेदारी अधिकारियों पर भी डाली जानी चाहिये उन की जिम्मेदारी और उन की लाएबिलिटी मुकर्रर की जानी चाहिये। जब तक अधिकारियों पर जिम्मेदारी नहीं डाली जायगी और उन को प्लान के लिये जिम्मेदार नहीं बनाया जायेगा, तब तक स्थिति में कोई सुधार नहीं हो सकता।

मैं एक बात की ओर केवल इशारा करना चाहता हूँ। अभी मध्य प्रदेश में मंत्रिमंडल में थोड़ा सा परिवर्तन हुआ है। नया मंत्रिमंडल आने के बाद से वहां काम में

[श्री राधेलाल भास]

फर्क पड़ रहा है। व्यक्तियों की भी अपनी कुछ बात होती है। जब से श्री मिश्र चीफ मिनिस्टर हुए हैं तब से कुछ अधिक काम होने लगा है। तो मैं ने यह इसलिये कहा है कि अगर मंत्रिमंडल में यह विचार कर ले कि नहीं हम को करप्शन दूर करना है, एफिशियेंसी को बढ़ाना है, रेडटेपिज्म को खत्म करना है, तो मैं विश्वास के साथ कह सकता हूँ, और अपने अनुभव के आधार पर कह सकता हूँ, कि यह चीज बहुत जल्दी हो सकती है। जब तक मंत्रिमंडल ऐसा नहीं करेगा तब तक इस में सफलता मिलना संभव नहीं है। इस लिये मेरा मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन है कि यह जिम्मेदारी वह अपने ऊपर लें और इस और कदम बढ़ावें।

इरीगेशन पर काफी रुपया खर्च किया गया, लेकिन उस से पूरा लाभ नहीं हो रहा है। इस में सरकार को ३० करोड़ का घाटा हो रहा है। जिन लोगों को कर्जा दिया गया है वे उस को वापिस नहीं कर सकते। न उस का ब्याज दे सकते हैं। इतना पैसा इरीगेशन पर खर्च हुआ, लेकिन उस से लाभ नहीं हो रहा है। इस बारे में कानून बनाया जाना चाहिये और उस पर सख्ती से अमल होना चाहिये और राज्य सरकारों को इस दिशा में कदम उठाने के लिये कहा जाना चाहिये। सेन्टर उन पर इस के लिये दबाव डाले और राज्यों से यह काम ठीक प्रकार से कराए।

शिक्षा के बारे में फिजिकल टारजेट तो पूरा हो गया है, लेकिन स्कूलों में बड़ा ओवर क्राउडिंग है, विद्यार्थियों की संख्या बहुत ज्यादा है, उन के लिये उचित मकानों की व्यवस्था नहीं है, और टीचर प्यूपिल सम्बन्ध ठीक नहीं है, शिक्षा का स्तर गिर रहा है। इस और बहुत ध्यान देने की जरूरत है।

अन्त में मैं एक शब्द स्वास्थ्य के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ। डाक्टरों की संख्या काफी बढ़ायी जा रही है, उन के कालिज बढ़ाये

जा रहे हैं, लेकिन इंडीजिनस सिस्टम आफ मेडीसिन की ओर सरकार का ध्यान नहीं है। अगर सरकार स्वास्थ्य सेवाओं का राष्ट्रीय करण करती है और केवल डाक्टरों की सहायता से यह काम करती है तो वैद्यों और हकीमों का क्या होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि इतने बड़े देश में अगर सरकार वैद्यों और हकीमों से काम नहीं लेगी तो लोगों के स्वास्थ्य को कैसे ठीक रख सकेगी। अगर ये लोग योग्य ही हैं तो इन को ट्रेन कर के योग्य बनाया जाए। ये लोग कम खर्च में लोगों को रिलीफ पहुंचा सकते हैं। अगर आप एलोपैथी और डाक्टरों के द्वारा ही जनता को रिलीफ पहुंचाना चाहते हैं तो आप इस बड़े देश में ऐसा नहीं कर सकेंगे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Bhagat.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: I am the only one left out.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. I have called the maximum number possible.

The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat) Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the hon. House has debated this question over a number of days. It augurs well for the Plan that repeatedly the time for the debate was extended as a larger number of Members wanted to participate. Though unfortunately the House was adjourned twice for lack of quorum, it has given me some advantage because I see larger number of persons present to hear my winding up the debate. In one sense the purpose of my motion for consideration of this mid-term plan appraisal document has been fulfilled because the discussions here have been very helpful; I have no doubt that it will create widespread interest in the country. The essence of democratic planning is that increasingly larger

number of our countrymen should not only participate in thought and action and implementation processes of the plan but should also be aware of the larger implications of our policies also. I have seen in the Press that the debate here has been followed with keen and critical interest. That was the purpose of my motion and it has been largely achieved. I made it clear that it was only the present picture of the implementation of the Plan during the 2½ years that has to be considered; the purpose of this appraisal was limited: to inform the House about the progress and to stimulate constructive criticism. I am grateful to hon. Members who offered such criticism because it shows their constructive impatience. I regret some hon. Members in their anxiety for other considerations have chosen to come with an all-out attack on the appraisal document.

Shri M. R. Masani: Not against the document of appraisal.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: In that sense they were wide of the mark and missed the target because the objective or approach or strategy was not in question nor was it the purpose of the document to discuss about them. During the Second Plan discussion and the Third Plan discussions hon. Members as well as people at large have gone into this question and after a good deal of discussion the House has broadly agreed with the objectives, approach and strategy of development. To question them now may serve some limited political interest of some hon. Members but it does not serve the purpose of stimulating constructive criticism or public opinion on the implementation of the Plan. I do not want to go into the basic question because it is not proper to do so at this time; besides the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister had gone at great length into the basic objectives, approach and strategy of the Plan. The hon. Member who said that this Plan is a document of gloom and tried to create a picture that everything is

wrong with the economy and created a climate of despair and despondency also, I think, agreed when he said that the Government should concern itself with the building up of what is called the infra structure and not that the priorities should be changed. I think he is a well-informed person, that he knows the modern trends in economics and the problems of science and technology. I think even if we take that limited objective today, what does this mean, namely, the building up of the infra structure? He himself defines it as transport, communication, power and education. If we accept this, the implication is that the strategy of development that we have adopted in this Plan goes towards the building up of those basic things.

Shri M. R. Masani: Question.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: He may question it. But I think he cannot rebut it by argument. Then he went on to say that the emphasis should be on agriculture. As a student of modern economics in the 20th century, he knows that agriculture cannot be built without a sound foundation of industry, because for agricultural development we need steel, cement and fertilisers. All these are basic industries. Unless all these basic industries are developed, agriculture cannot develop. So, from this point of view, whether we have to give emphasis more on agriculture or build the infra structure, social or economic everheads, it is necessary to agree that the strategy of development that has been evolved in this Plan is correct.

I should like to join issue with him and with some other hon. Members who have tried to build this gloomy picture from this point of view. I think it may be true that in order to gain some political advantage they may paint a darker picture, but at this juncture of our economy, when we are passing through an emergency, it may be remembered that only in the last budget session the House agreed to a larger defence expenditure and

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

increased taxation resources and others which was for just an incidental reason because it was coupled with a period in which agricultural production was smaller. That resulted in the pressure of prices. To paint a picture that because of mounting defence expenditure, the rate of defence expenditure had to go up and additional resources were raised with the willing consent and zeal of the House, and they came incidentally in a period when agricultural production was smaller—there was a rise in prices resulting in some restraint on consumption is not correct, because even in the last budget session we said that some of the taxation policy was to reduce consumption so as to build up export or restrict the prices. Inevitably, in a situation in a limited period, the consumption is bound to go down. Here, the hon. Member comes and says that this Government deliberately restricted consumption, that the basic needs of the community are not being fulfilled and they are being sacrificed at the ideological gospel of, what he says, building up the basic sector industries and others. I think it may be anything but it is not political honesty.

One may try to justify the situation by, agreeing, on the one hand, with the very nature of things, that the twin ends of defence and development have got to be taken care of, and in a limited period of two and a half years when we have come up against certain difficulties, we have very well analysed it, and they may criticise the Government for failure in implementation. But to say that deliberately we are trying to reduce consumption so as to subserve a political or ideological interest is not correct. It is not correct on facts; it is not correct on the basis of the policy and objectives of the Plan. That is what I wanted to point out on this occasion.

On the other hand, some hon. Member said that—I am glad he said that, belonging to the Opposition—we are

unnecessarily joining issue with a very limited volume of opinion, that does not believe in Plan, or who attack the very objective and strategy of planning. He said that is a very isolated opinion, I agree with him, that that is an isolated opinion. Actually, the Government should answer the criticism about the non-implementation of the Plan; that there should be greater planning, and better planning and there should be a better implementation and we should take care of the higher profits or concentration of income. He invited me to join issue with him on that account. I am willing, because on that also, we score. We have a very good case, but so far as the question of profits is concerned, the hon. Member gave certain figures of certain companies to show that they have declared dividends ranging from 15 to 25 per cent. These are isolated cases, and they may be true, and they may be true for a particular year. They may be true of companies which have a smaller capital base, and they could declare higher dividends, but I do not think they will be true this year or next year in view of the super-profits tax when we have particularly tried to tax those companies who have declared higher dividends and they have a smaller capital base. The hon. Member tried to give a picture that probably, on the one hand, the Government is talking of socialism and allowing, on the other hand, very high profits. That is not true. When we have adopted a policy of mixed economy, where the private sector is functioning, we have earmarked a role for them, and it is reasonable that they should function in a reasonable condition and that *ipso facto* means the acceptance of the philosophy that a reasonable and adequate profits will be allowed, and facilities should be extended, and it should be accepted that a better organised concern with a more efficient organisation might make some more profits than the other companies which are not efficient. I think the Government is not allowing very high profits

so as to injure the economy or try, through its policy, to create monopolistic conditions. Of course, reasonable and adequate profit is enough. I think this House has the power, and it has the public support and public opinion also, that if such profits or such tendencies of anti-social or unsocial nature are there, they can be curbed, and that has been done for other reasons. Certainly the legislative powers of the Government and of this hon. House are such that such tendencies can be curbed.

So far as the concentration of economic power is concerned, I think the hon. Member said that the Finance Minister probably gave him the impression that he is not aware of the concentration of wealth in the country, and that he is indulging in a sort of shadow-boxing. I think that was said by Shri Nath Pai, who is not here now. He is a very clever person, but this time he has used his cleverness to a wrong purpose.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You had better use it for a right purpose.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: He has tried to give the impression that the Government, the Congress Party, is trying to encourage rather the concentration of power and of wealth. This is what the Finance Minister said, precisely:

“...if there is concentration of power, concentration of wealth, it can be taken over, it can be seized, it can be put to good use, they can be persuaded to do so; the legislative weapon could persuade them to do so,....”

It was a casual remark. It was not as if he was justifying concentration of power. What he was saying was that the Government has the authority and the power to curb this. I think the policy that we have adopted, particularly, the policy of a dominant

public sector, attacks at the very root of any concentration of power.

A point was made in this connection which I would like to clarify. They say as if we are afraid of the concentration of wealth that is taking place in the country, and that although a Committee has been appointed we are not trying to publish the report. Repeatedly it has been said—and I would like to clarify it—that the Committee is sitting. It is deliberating. It has not submitted any report, not even an interim report. Because they found out that it is a very complicated matter, intractable in nature and so many statistical and other calculations are required, various cross-flow of income, etc. This is their opinion. I am saying that those who are on this committee have not yet submitted the report because of the nature and complexity of the work is such that they have not come to any definite conclusion.

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): When are they likely to submit the report?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Prof. Mahalanobis came only two days back. I met him day before yesterday. Now certainly he is going to devote all his time to this. I cannot say by when he will submit his report. But Government is committed to bringing this report to the notice of the House. Government is not going to conceal it. So, as soon as the report is ready, on a matter like this, the Government is committed to bring it before the House.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Convey our disappointment to them at their negligence.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I am sorry the hon. Member says negligence. There is no negligence.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: It is negligence.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Repeatedly the House has been told that as soon as the report comes it will be placed before the House.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): When you met him, did you give any time-limit for submitting the report?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: There cannot be any time-limit in the case of a committee like this. The committee is aware of the anxiety of this House and I think they will do their best to submit their report as early as they can. More than that I cannot say. They are up against various difficulties.

As I was saying, we have been trying to tackle concentration of economic power in various ways. The House will appreciate that the situation is such that it cannot be tackled in a day. It can only be tackled over a period. We have tried various ways. Apart from fiscal and other measures, the strategy accepted in the Plan is that we have to build up the public sector more and more. Over the successive years, the public sector has to occupy a commanding position and we have also to develop the small-scale sector and the cooperative sector. So, the economy should be composed of largest number of smaller people. Agriculture is a big private sector. Small-scale sector, the cooperatives and the dominant public sector—that is the picture of the economy and ultimately over a period, if we pursue this policy vigorously, as we would, there would not be any undue concentration of economic power so as to create dangers to the economic democracy that we want to build up in this country.

The point was raised about regional imbalance.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Have Government got any idea of the extent of land that is available to them for distribution to the poor landless people by pursuing their land policy vigorously?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: That is a different question. We have given that information. I did not remember off hand how many million acres are available. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have had a 19 hour debate. He should be allowed to reply.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: The regional imbalance in development and the need for looking after the backward areas of different States has been voiced by a number of hon. Members. One hon. Member from U. P. spoke with great feeling and also said that his district was not included in that. This question was very carefully considered in the formulation of the third Plan. Inevitably larger organisations and more advanced sections try to go forward quickly and the result is that the backward areas are left behind. As I said, some effort has been made in the third Plan. A special team has been appointed for U. P. 4 districts have been selected. It is not as if the other districts are not backward. This is a sort of pilot study in which all the factors creating this backwardness and the factors impeding the development of such areas will be studied. Study is being made as to how dynamism can be induced in the backward economy and in the backward areas of a particular region, whether through creating more urbanisation or creating an infra-structure. Various other studies are being made. Very soon the report of this team will be out and then that will give us a pattern which we can apply to all these areas, so that the district of the hon. Member will also be covered, as also the area of Pudukkottai. The hon. Member from that place spoke with great feeling and he even threatened the Government with mass action. I think all his fears are misplaced. Once the pattern is settled, I think in the coming two years or in the next Plan, we will do something. Something has got to be done to bring the backward areas in line with the developed areas.

Some points were made about agriculture. I do not want to go into details over this matter, because both the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister have dealt with this question. But broadly three problems have emerged from the speeches of hon. Members. One of the basic criticisms is that the irrigation potential is not being utilised. The hon. Member who just preceded me also raised this question. A number of other hon. Members also have referred to this. Then, there is the question of land reforms. They have said that land reforms have not been followed with vigour. Thirdly, there is the question of incentives agriculturists. These are the three broad categories of points that have emerged as a result of this discussion.

Regarding irrigation potential it is true that the utilisation of irrigation potential has not been satisfactory in the past. But vigorous action has been taken so as to improve the utilisation and it has improved over a period of 2 or 3 years. It has come up to even 80 per cent. But the main difficulty in this has been that the feed channels, which is the obligation of the beneficiaries, i.e. the farmers who want to take water, have not been ready. Now a number of States have passed suitable legislation that panchayats or block samitis construct them and take the cost from the beneficiaries, i.e. the farmers. In certain cases, the utilisation at the out-let point has not taken place. (*Interruptions*). The idea is to increase the percentage of irrigation potential. It has been found that the capacity of the existing irrigation facilities is going down, particularly in the South, because of their not being maintained properly. The old channels and tanks are silting up and, consequently, their capacity is going down. Even in States like Bihar and others, because of lack of renovation the capacity of the existing works is going down. Now special attention is being paid to this matter and the State Governments are being persuaded to

set up special funds so that they may be properly maintained.

Then, it has been decided that before we take up any irrigation project its utilisation pattern has got to be carefully studied. We will not take up any irrigation project in which the utilisation pattern is very slow or very unsatisfactory.

Coming to land reforms, as we have mentioned in the Appraisal itself, the progress of land reforms in various States is not very satisfactory. There is no denying that fact. It does not require to be a socialist or progressive to say that without land reforms, where the farmer has security of tenure, the tiller of the soil has interest in the land, production cannot go up. It is recognised by Western countries also and organisations like the Ford Foundation, which cannot be accused of any progressive leanings, have come to the same conclusion. It is an economic fact that unless the tillers have an interest in the soil the production cannot go up. This matter was considered by the National Development Council where great concern was expressed that because the land reform programmes were not undertaken by various State Governments there is an adverse impact on agricultural production. Therefore, in order to implement the land reform programmes wherever legislation has been passed and to introduce legislation wherever it has not yet been done, a committee has been appointed under the chairmanship of the Home Minister, which will meet periodically, every three or six months, to review the progress in each State. So that important question has been taken care of.

Then I come to the question of incentives to the agriculturist. This is a very important matter because agriculture, as the Prime Minister said the other day, is a very difficult industry.

एक माननीय सदस्य : मैं लैंड रिफार्म
के बारे में कहना चाहूंगा

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not now.
Please sit down.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I was talking about the incentives to the agriculturist. There is no denying the fact that unless incentives are provided, unless all the facilities reach the farmer, he will not be induced to produce more. Not only that, he has to be taught the new techniques, new ideas of farming. He has to be provided with all the facilities. But the biggest incentive will be the price that he gets for his produce. Apart from credit facilities and facilities of irrigation and better seeds, he must get the fruits of his labour. Only this morning, hon. Members must have heard with great enthusiasm the new sugarcane price which the Minister of Food and Agriculture announced. So, Government is alive to the situation. In the case of main crops like rice, wheat, jowar, cotton and wheat, we give price support, which changes from time to time. Then there is the question of procurement price. That is also very important and Government is quite alive to it.

Then I come to the criticism of the industrial sector, which can be divided into three categories—criticism of the industrial policy, criticism relating to faulty planning and criticism relating to shortfalls in targets and under-utilisation of installed capacity. Let me first take up the question of industrial policy. On the one hand, it is said that the industrial policy is very restrictive and impairs the initiative of the free enterprise. On the other hand, it is said that there is an attempt at erosion of the industrial policy. These are the two wide poles of criticism. I think the truth of the matter is that the industrial policy is being followed very scrupulously in the spirit in which it has been framed and adopted by this House. As the House has said, the industrial

policy will be very flexible. It is not a rigid frame, as the Plan is not a rigid frame. The situation is such and the dynamics of economics is such that it cannot be a rigid frame. So, we are trying to build up a public sector. At the same time, the private sector has been assigned a specific role. It is true that in some cases in the interest of production and in the national interest e.g., in the Case of fertilisers, a departure from that policy has been made because the need of production was very great. But it does not mean that there has been any erosion of the industrial policy.

Then I come to the question of faulty planning, one of the criticisms made by the hon. Member from Kerala. He said that whereas on the one hand the final estimates are being over-fulfilled, on the other, there are serious shortfalls in the physical targets. That is true and we have said it in the Appraisal itself. I accept that there has been some kind of bad planning in that respect. That has been due to the fact that our technical skill, organisation for designs and other things were not so fully developed at the beginning of the Third Plan that we were not in a position to correctly estimate the cost and the size of the various industrial projects. So, we were faced with a situation where either those projects should not be included because the estimates were not very correct estimates or they should be included pending further detailed estimates later on. We followed the latter course, and that resulted in quite a number of cases not only the dimension and size of the project increasing but also the cost.

Secondly, there has been another difficulty in planning, and that is also because of our lack of technical knowledge and experience. In the case of some projects, even though we were technically qualified, since we did not have enough experience, the period of gestation that we had evolved for some projects was found to be not

sufficient and they took a longer time, with the result that we suffered on both accounts. The estimates went up whereas the fruits or results came much later, after the Plan period. The result was that the financial targets were over-fulfilled while the physical targets remained the same. The result of all this is that the benefits could not be realised in the Third Plan but will be realised in the first and second year of the Fourth Plan. Therefore, from that point of view, I admit that there is faulty planning, but that could not be helped. We will see to it that such a thing will not happen in the future. Because, right from now we are going to take up the list of projects which should be undertaken, which will bear fruit or go into production, in the first two years of the next Plan. We will now take up only such industrial projects for the future. So far as the existing projects are concerned, we will try to cut out the various procedural and other delays. A committee has been set up to go into the whole question and when the report of that committee is received, it will be implemented soon so that the procedural delays in regard to licensing and other matters are removed so that whatever industries are to come may come in the next two years. So, in the next four or five years, we are trying to see that as a result of better implementation, as a result of better technical skill and experience and as a result of advance action taken for these projects, those difficulties will be removed and there will not be a situation—rather it will be minimised to the maximum extent—where there will be physical shortfalls although the financial targets will be over-reached.

16 hrs.

Then, I come to another point relating to shortfalls in targets and under-utilisation of installed capacity. I need not go into details over this matter because both the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister have gone into this matter. There are two ways of looking at it. In the Plan itself,

we have given projections of the estimated achievements. In certain sectors, like, railways or power, the targets will be fulfilled or even over-fulfilled. We have given a list of those things. I think it is very important for the House to note that in certain sectors, the key sectors, like, power, transport and other matters, we have over-fulfilled the targets and in other matters the shortfall is marginal, although I have said that in certain key sectors, like, steel or fertilisers, the shortfall is substantial. There is no denying the fact. But the point is: how do we approach this question? There is one way of approaching that say, in the case of cement instead of 13 million tons it is 12 million tons and, therefore, a serious calamity has fallen. But on the other hand, if you go over a period of five to six years, you will see that the production has gone up. Take, for example, the case of fertilisers where there is a very substantial shortfall—instead of 800,000 tons, we will not produce more than 500,000 tons. But if you go over the period of two or three years, in the case of nitrogenous fertilisers, in two years, the consumption has doubled and in respect of phosphate fertilisers, the consumption has gone up three times. There are two ways of looking at it. (Interruption). I am sorry, I do not want to be interrupted. I am trying to emphasize this. I admit, as I have said, that the targets will not be fulfilled in certain respects.

श्री विश्राम प्रसाद (लालगंज) :
 इसीलिए तो दिल्ली में २६ रुपये मन गेहूँ
 बिक रहा है ।

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Well, there are other reasons for that.

Then, I come to the question of under-utilised capacity. In this respect, as the House is very much aware, because of the shortage of raw materials or the components, we are not able to utilise the capacity in full although in certain respects, like, cement, 90 per cent of the capacity is

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

being utilised. There has been a considerable improvement in this. That is a very important point that is facing us today. I would like the House to appreciate the question of import substitution. For example, the main raw material for an industry is cotton. It has to be seen whether we are able to grow cotton which the industry requires or it should be substituted. The export pattern and all this has to be gone into. We have appointed a committee but that could not work unfortunately due to the Emergency. We will have another working group set up which will go into the economics of it, the other implications in regard to the perspective side of it, the export and other patterns so that not only those raw materials for the industry have either got to be manufactured or to be substituted but also those components—there may be small components—for the lack of which the whole machine is lying idle because we cannot import them due to lack of foreign exchange. We have to list out such items and industrial components which can be produced. It is a very complex and intractable field of study and activity. The working group is going into it and very soon they will list out items in which a line of action will be taken so that the import substitution problem can be solved. Only then we can come to a position where the utilisation of idle capacity in industries will be improved to a sizeable extent. These are some of the problems of the industry.

There were other points raised about girls' education, family planning, rural works programme, industrial estates and all that. I need not go into the details. Some of them have been dealt with by the Prime Minister and all the details are there. I agree that rural works programmes and industrial estates have not made progress—some of them. But every effort is made and

will be made to see that the rural works programme gather momentum.

Now, I come to two final points and I would like the House to bear with me a little more because they are rather important. This is about the technique of planning. A lot of criticism has been made about the technique of planning. As I myself said, in the field of industries and other things, there has been some faulty planning. But that was because we have not reached the level of expertise with which we can solve those problems. That was not due to any administrative lacunae. As the planning advances, it will become not only complex but also sophisticated. All the constructive criticisms about the methods of working of the Planning Commission and others will have a great impact on the Planning Commission. At present, it is engaged in an appraisal of its own functioning. I have no doubt, with the task that is before it, the complexity of planning and the dynamics of economy with its so many problems of sophistication, it will evolve some better method of working. I have no doubt about it. Unless it does, it will find it very difficult to justify itself. But the point which I want the House to appreciate is, we have reached a stage at which there should be complete co-operation of this august House and the Planning Commission and the people at large. I say with great regret that in spite of the fact that we have tried that there should be a complete publicity about the processes of planning and its work, still a lot of uninformed criticism takes place. Therefore, it is my sincere effort in the formulation of the Fourth Plan to make up whatever gaps there have been in relationship between Parliament and the formulation of the Fourth Plan. In the formulation of the Third Plan itself—the House is well aware—we set up sub-committees which went into various agricultural pro-

grammes, industrial programmes and other things. But now we want to take it to a greater detail so that there is consultation of the Members of Parliament and other organised bodies in the formulation of the Fourth Plan. We have drawn up a programme. For example, last November, the National Development Council approved its programme that the preliminary memorandum for the Fourth Plan will be ready in April, 1964. Then, in August-September, we will hold a series of discussions with various bodies, the State Governments and others and in January-February 1965, the draft outline of the Fourth Plan will emerge. So, I propose that at all stages there should be consultations with the Members of Parliament and their reactions taken so that they should have active co-operation in the formulation of the Fourth Plan. When the draft outline of the Fourth Plan emerges, certainly at that stage Parliament can discuss it and after consultation with the State Governments, discussing their State Plans, in October-November 1965, in January-February, 1966, that is, in one year from that, we will have a final report on the Fourth Plan which can be discussed by the House, adopted and all that. It is our idea that in the formulation of the Fourth Plan not only the Parliament should be consulted but really the democratic processes of planning should be extended to as far as length as possible and the defects that we have learnt as a result of the experience that we have gained in respect of planning, particularly in the industrial planning or in the coordination of agricultural programmes, should be removed. Even now, we have taken advance action. That is very important. We have taken a number of feasibility studies, whether a project is feasible or not. All that has to be gone into before we take up any project. A number of working groups are working at the various levels in various departments and even at State levels working groups are working and when the preliminary shape of the Fourth Plan will come, I

think, at that stage also the consultation of the Members of Parliament and all other informed opinion will be brought to bear on this through intimate discussions.

I am very grateful to the House for giving so much time to it and throwing the light of its criticism on the mid-term appraisal of the Third Plan. As I have said already, I can assure the House that I have benefited by the discussions. We are very keen in the Planning Commission and in the Government to benefit by the criticisms. I am also happy at the emotional impact it has made, because if the Plan succeeds, the country succeeds, and on the success of the Plan depends the future of the country and the fulfilment of the hopes of many millions of people. The Government and the Planning Commission are aware of this emotional impact, and the discussion has made it very clear that we rise and fall with the success and failure of the Plan.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The discussion is over now. There can be no more questions now. We shall take up the next item.

16.11 hrs.

INDIAN TARIFF (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of International Trade (Shri Manubhai Shah): I beg to move:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, be taken into consideration.”

This Bill mainly seeks to amend the First Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act in order to give effect to Government's decisions on certain recommendations of the Tariff Commission, which are: (a) to continue protection beyond 31st December, 1963, in the case of sericulture, antimony, ACSR (Aluminium Conductors Steel Reinforced) and AAC (All aluminium