

Appraisal of Third
Five Year Plan

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राजस्थान में जो भ्रमकाल की
स्थिति है उस पर ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव
किया गया था . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It has been
referred to the Ministry.

?

12.01 hrs.

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Further con-
sideration of the following motion
moved by Shri B. R. Bhagat on the
5th December, 1963, namely:—

“That the ‘Report on the Mid-
term Appraisal of the Third Five
Year Plan’, laid on the Table of
the House on the 26th November,
1963, be taken into consideration.”

Shri A. P. Jain.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): Mr.
Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I welcome the
attempt of the Government to place
before this House the mid-term Ap-
praisal of the Third Five Year Plan.
The discussion that has taken place in
the House, the headlines which it has
attracted in the press and the interest
which has been evoked in the public
is by itself an indication of the fact
that the public at large is very much
interested in the Plan.

Generally speaking, in all the dis-
cussion that has taken place, the need
for planning has been accepted—the
system of planned development
has been accepted. Of course,
there have been objections about the
shortfalls. There is only one Party
and that is the Swatantra Party
which has objected to the process of
Planning. I was present in the House
when an hon. Member, Mr. Tiwary
said that the Plan was a national
Plan and the two leading Members of
the Swatantra Party, Mr. Ranga
and Mr. Masani objected to it. The
voting at the last General Elections

will itself show whether it is a
national planning or it is only a
whimsical psychology of a Party
which has secured only a minority of
votes. Of all the organised Parties,
four Parties which secured about 70
per cent of the votes are for plan-
ning and it is only one Party, the
Swatantra Party which secured less
than 8 per cent of the votes, that is
opposed to planning.

Shri Ranga: They were the only
single largest Party in the Opposi-
tion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is too
much of noise in the House.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh:
Even the 8 per cent of votes are not
against planning.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Members
who want to carry on the conversa-
tion may kindly go to the Lobby.

Shri A. P. Jain: Of the remaining
22 per cent of the votes of which we
do not have any record, I believe
that an overwhelming majority of
those voters were also in favour of
planning. Then, if this Plan is not
a national Plan, what other Plan can
be called a national Plan? We have
been doing our economic develop-
ment on the basis of planning during
the last 15 years and all over the
country it has a wide support. There-
fore, to say that this is not a national
Plan is something very strange. My
friend Mr. Masani draws his inspira-
tion, his philosophy, from the Western
countries and I want to make a
presentation to him of some of the re-
marks made by one of the leading eco-
nomists of the United States of Ame-
rica. Perhaps, that will appeal to
him. I refer to the remarks of W.W.
Rostow in his book *The Stages of
Economic Growth*. In this book, at
about 15 or 20 places, Mr. Rostow
has supported the concept of plan-
ning for India and for other under-
developed countries. I will not take
the time of the House by reading
out different portions of it. But I

3937 Motion re: AGRAHAYANA 19, 1885 (SAKA) Report on Mid-Term 3938
Appraisal of Third
Five Year Plan

will refer to only one of them. On page 137, he says :

"There is no reason in the world, for example, why Britain should not lift its eyes from fair shares and hire-purchase and focus, as a major national enterprise, on making a success of the Indian Third Five Year Plan on which operationally the future of the Commonwealth so largely depends."

These are words of one of the economists who have been born and brought up in a country of free enterprise. It, therefore, comes with ill-grace that after so much has been done under planning, the very existence, the very basis of planning should be questioned. Undoubtedly, there have been certain shortfalls. I do not agree with the Minister for Planning that the shortfalls are all marginal. Some of the shortfalls are quite substantial. Some are marginal in some the targets have been fulfilled. In particular, so far as railways are concerned and power projects are concerned, there has been considerable improvement; shipping also has done well and the social services, the technical education, the general education and health have not only achieved the targets, but they have done something more. Therefore, there is no necessity to take a very gloomy view. Of course, there are shortfalls. We must take a realistic view of the situation and we must try to remove the weaknesses of the Plan.

Of all the speakers that have spoken, nearly everyone of them has criticised the implementation of the Plan. A newspaper report recently has summed up what the Prime Minister is reported to have said at the meeting of the National Development Council. It says :

"Some time ago, the Chairman of the Planning Commission described its work as "brilliant"; if there was anything wrong, it was not in the Planning Commission, it was not with the

Planning Commission. It was the people who executed the Plan who were at fault: the village level worker, the block development officer, the district officer and the State Government—it is they who were responsible for the failure of the Plan."

This statement is only partially correct. I think, there is a little too much tendency to make a whipping boy of the official machinery. Undoubtedly, the official machinery has not come up to the expectations and of all the chapters in this mid-term Appraisal, I find that the chapter on Administration is the weakest.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I just say that that report is not a very correct report of what I said? It was a private meeting. Somebody probably got hold of that.

Shri A. P. Jain: I stand corrected. I was reading out from the newspaper.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What I meant was, if I may repeat it, that the planning part was more or less correct, but the implementation of it was not correct. I was not blaming anybody particularly.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Surely, the hon. Prime Minister was blaming somebody for wrong implementation?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes, I was blaming many persons.

Shri A. P. Jain: I think that mere tinkering with the problem will not do. It is not only the implementation at the lower level that needs examination, but the whole system of planning and the various organisations set up for planning at the top level also need examination.

At present, the Planning Commission is constituted of ten members. Out of these, two members, namely the chairman of the Planning Commission and the Minister of Finance

[Shri A. J. Jain]

are persons who are concerned both with planning as also with implementation. The remaining eight members are concerned with the implementation.

Shri Jashvant Mehta (Bhavnagar): The Home Minister is also there.

Shri A. P. Jain: What is the result of this? Take some of the important subjects relating to planning. There is the Minister of Agriculture and there is also the member for agriculture in the Planning Commission. Then, there is the Minister of Education, and there is a member for education in the Planning Commission. Obviously, the members of the Planning Commission are concerned only with policy, but the Ministers are concerned with both policy as also implementation. I think that it creates a sort of confusion, and one has to understand where the policy-making power of the Minister ends in and where the policy-making power of the members of the Planning Commission comes in.

I would like to refer to a remark by one of the top writers on political administration, namely Sir Henry Taylor who said:

"He who has in his hands the execution of measures, is in truth the very master of them."

That is to say, the policy-maker must be the man who implements the policy. The man who does the day-to-day administration must be the policy-maker. Throughout the history of the British parliamentary system, only on two occasions, attempts were made when policy was separated from actual administration. One was during the First World War when Mr. Lloyd George created a war Cabinet consisting of five or six Ministers, and those Ministers were concerned only with the policy-making, while the actual work of administration was left to the other Ministers. Mr. Churchill tried the same experiment

during the Second World War. Due to the imperatives of war, both these experiments worked successfully, but as soon as the imperatives of the war were over, the system could not work.

On this particular question of the intimate connection, the close nexus between policy and its implementation, there has been a lot of argument in Britain. Mr. Amery advocated the system that there must be two sets of Ministers, one to deal with policy and the other to deal with administrative matters. In this connection, I want to read out a remark by Mr. H. J. Laski in his book *Reflections on the Constitution* at pages 144-145. He says there:

"...no administrator will even apply policy creatively unless he is profoundly aware of the philosophy which underlies and drives along the decisions it is his business to impose. That is why it is so urgent not to separate, as Mr. Amery does, the Minister who looks to the future from the Minister who is concerned with the present. For the man who decides upon current affairs is, in fact, the man who shapes the future. He gives its form to the matrix upon which new ideas are to be stamped—and if he fails to prepare the form of matrix that is required, the new idea will be stamped upon it only with difficulty, and may fail to get stamped upon it at all."

Now, the point is this. After all, what is a policy? The policy is a line of thinking which connects sporadic acts undertaken in the administrative capacity. The policy may be a short-term one or a long-term one. But, in any event, a policy, whether it is a short-term one or a long-term one, grows from the actual working of the administration as it is carried on from day-to-day.

My submission is that this is a time when the top-level organisation of

z
planning needs overhauling. I would submit that if a larger number of Ministers who are responsible for both policy and administration are very closely associated with the Planning Commission or, say, all the Ministers who deal with the economic departments are made members of the Planning Commission, and some two or three or four experts associated with them as members, the planning body would work more effectively. The non-minister members will do the work of coordination, the administration of Commission, conduct surveys, examinations and evaluations, if a Planning Commission which has to deal both with administration as also with policy-making is set up at the top, perhaps, the gap which today exists between policy-making and implementation may be narrowed and better results may be available.

I do not say this by way of criticism of any member of the Planning Commission. I have the highest respect for them as I have the highest respect for the Ministers. I believe that both the Education Minister and the member in charge of education in the Planning Commission are very able men. So are the Agriculture Minister and the member for agriculture in the Planning Commission. So, I am not saying this by way of individual criticism. It is only a question of policy relating to organization; how we can improve the system of planning. My opinion is that the system of planning needs overhauling not only at the village level or at the lower level but also at the highest level.

There is only one point more which I shall try to make out and that is about population. In this mid-term appraisal the problem of population has been rather scantily dealt with. There is an allocation of Rs. 27 crores for the whole Plan, and during the first three years, if everything goes all right, the total expenditure may be less than Rs. 9 crores, that is, only about 30 per cent of the Plan allocation.

There are some very interesting remarks in Appraisal and I shall refer to some of them. The report says:

"Studies made on family planning practices and attitudes have so far shown strong evidence of potential receptivity for the programme."

So, the psychology is there. But what about its implementation? Nothing has been done to manufacture mechanical contraceptives. Something has been done to produce chemical contraceptives, but there is no proper system of distribution, and I know from one very good authority that the foam pills distributed in a certain area were actually used for eating.

Then as regards research, hardly anything has been done. Now, I attach as much importance to family planning as I do to agricultural production. After all, we produce food for human beings to eat and if our population increases faster we need more of food. On family planning, the work of the Planning Commission has been the weakest. When the Second Plan was framed, the prospective estimates were extreme underestimates. The population increased during the two years of the Third Plan has much faster. Our population today is increased at the rate of 2.4 per cent, and our agricultural production has increased by 3 per cent. Standards of living are going up. Therefore, we want more and more food. So we have to deal with it in a two-fold way: one by increasing agricultural production, which is very important, and the other by controlling population at the same time because unless the population is controlled, the problem of food will continue to persist.

I will conclude by referring to a pamphlet *Planned Parenthood*, monthly bulletin of the Family Planning Association of India which carries a news item saying that a crash programme has been started by which a reduction in the birth rate to 25 per thousand

[Shri A. P. Jain]

will be achieved within a period of ten years. Family planning has been very effectively practised in Japan. During a period of ten years, they have been able to reduce the rate of increase of population to 1 per cent. I do not think, given proper efforts, we cannot achieve spectacular results in family planning. I would therefore, very earnestly request this House and to the Planning Commission to pay much more attention to family planning; they should pay as much attention to family planning as they pay to agricultural production or steel plants.

Shri Daji (Indore): Much has been said about the midterm appraisal of the Plan. The criticism has mainly fallen into two ambits. One was the line of the hon. Member for Rajkot who wanted to scrap planning itself. In a word, he recommended that the baby also should be thrown away with the dirty bathwater. That, of course, is almost a philosophy of despair with which we have nothing in common. The other line has been to put the blame mainly on the lack of administrative implementation for the shortfalls. I think to blame the administrative machinery is correct, but that is only a partial reason for the failure of the Plan.

This midterm appraisal is, really speaking, a gloomy and dismal document. At the same time, it represents a challenge to all those forces in the nation who want the country to advance rapidly along the path of national development and socialistic objectives. While reading this appraisal, I was reminded of a poem of my matriculation *Alice in Wonderland*. At that time, however, I thought that Alice in Wonderland could be only the result of rich poetic imagination. Never did I dream that I would live to see the day when Alice in Wonderland would be enacted in my own country. There Alice says: 'In our country, if you want to get somewhere else, you have to run very fast for a long time'. 'No', says the queen, 'slow sort of country

yours'. Now, here it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. So the midterm appraisal says that we are in the queen's country where we have to do all the running, as fast as we can, not to reach any particular place, but just to keep where we are. How long will the people accept this queen's pace, keep on running, keep on producing, keep on paying taxes, keep on the investment and after two or three years find that we are at the same place from where we began? That, in a nutshell, is what the appraisal says. I am not going into the details of the shortfalls in each sector which have been sufficiently analysed by various speakers. But this certainly is a serious situation and an urgent challenge.

What I want to pinpoint is that the report has revealed certain lags, shortfalls. What it has revealed is revealing enough. But what it has not, what it has sought to conceal, is still more urgent and important. It shirks responsibility. It makes no attempt to fix responsibility. It only contains vague observations and innuendoes about reasons for the failure. I submit an appraisal, if it has to be useful, must answer the why of the failure. Without that no moral can be drawn, no lessons learnt, no correctives worked out. In this respect, this appraisal singularly fails.

Industrial production is lagging behind, agricultural production is almost stagnant; unemployment now has almost ceased to receive any attention; by the end of the Plan, it will reach the dimensions of a crore. Unemployment not only leads to misery but in national terms represents so much idle manpower, which is a social loss. And the appraisal says that the new entrants are not being absorbed. That is not all. Not only new entrants are not being absorbed, but the old backlog continues. In a sentence, the appraisal says that no impact has been made on the economy of the country or the standard of living of the people during this period of 2½ years

I would beg of the House to consider one more point in this connection. It is not only the question of targets not being reached—the output is not as per target—but, considering it in another context, in relation to the input the achievement is far behind. In agriculture in the last two years of the First Plan, we put in Rs. 388 crores; in three years, we shall be putting Rs. 642 crores. After spending Rs. 388 crores in the first two years on agriculture, the foodgrains production when we began was 796 lakh tons. Now it is 775 lakh tons, a decrease. In regard to cotton, it has gone from 53 lakh bales to 53 lakh bales, sugarcane from 100 lakh tons to 92 lakh tons. This is after putting in hundreds of crores. After so much input, the output is nothing—zero. It virtually means that all that money has gone down the drain. I do not know where it has gone. No one seems to be bothered where.

My main complaint is this. My line is not that of Shri Masani's, that the plan has failed. I say the plan has failed because you had no plan; it has failed because of lack of planning, because of absence of planning, because of slipshod planning and absolutely frigid implementation. For example, let us take even the public sector. In industry and mining the targeted figure was Rs. 1808 crores. Now it has become evident that to reach the physical target laid down in the Third Plan, we shall be requiring not Rs. 1800 crores, but Rs. 2792 crores, an underestimate of almost Rs. 1000 crores. Even the Rs. 1800 crores have not been spent; even if we spend it, the physical target will not be reached. In many cases, we have not yet been able to complete even the spillover of the Second Plan. In industrial and other sectors, even the spillover of the Second Plan has not been completed, despite three years of the Third Plan. For example, taking the target for steel, we can easily see that the Third Plan target will not be achieved till the end of the third year of the Fourth Plan.

This being the picture, what we should seriously consider is how and why our planning has been slipshod and defective. For example, we are informed in this appraisal that industrial production lagged in the first two years due to want of power and transport bottlenecks. Are these God-sent phenomena? If there is planning, if there is meaning in planning, if there is logic in planning, you cannot plan for an industrial target without planning for power, coal and transport. If you plan without that, you are not planning; you are only imagining things, not undertaking the concrete work of planning. Similarly industrial growth is slower because of shortage of raw materials and foreign exchange. When you go in for this, should it not be possible to envisage that so much raw materials and so much foreign exchange would be required? Not one of the reasons given is God-sent, and this only shows that you have planned in a slipshod manner, not going to the basic things.

Let us take land reforms. We talked about land reforms in the First Plan, in the Second Plan and in the Third Plan. Now we are told at page 89 that administrative and legislative action taken so far has fallen short in several States, and even where it has been taken, practical action for implementation lags behind. Either you want land reforms or you do not. If you want them, there is no use repeating every time that the States are not implementing them. Who is responsible? Do you really consider this an important plank for raising agricultural production or not?

Not only that. I was surprised at the negation of the Plan indicated in page 66 where it has been said that several States have diverted the funds allocated to them, negating the accepted national priorities. If the States can do this, it certainly means that we have abdicated planning. We have only got the planning document in tact.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): It has to be ascertained whether the State Governments in so diverting were right or wrong. There is

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

no use blindly blaming the State Governments. Let the Government give instances where the funds have been wrongly diverted.

Shri Daji: Therefore, the crucial point is not the scrapping of the Plan, which will only result in mortgaging India's future development and well-being to the rapacious greed of money interests. That will not bring about the rapid development of the country. **Shri Masani** has not shown how it would bring about rapid development, because even within the subjects allocated to the private sector in the Plan, they have been defaulters. He says that the State should only build houses, give food, have police powers, and, he has kindly added, build schools. Why have police powers? Let him build the private sector minus the police powers and let us see what results he achieves.

What I am worried about is that this reappraisal completely ignores the social objectives of the Plan. The Planning Commission itself had this to say about these objectives:

"Essentially this means that the basic criterion for determining the lines of advance must not be private profit, but social gain, and that the pattern of development and the structure of socio-economic relations should be so planned that they result not only in appreciable increases in national income and employment, but also in greater equality in income and wealth...The benefits of economic development must accrue more and more to the relatively less privileged classes of society and there should be progressive reduction of concentration of incomes, wealth and economic power."

The appraisal is silent on how they have progressed in achieving these objectives.

I will remind the House and the Members of the Congress Party of a

note submitted by **Shri Dhebar**, ex-President of the Congress, which is very revealing. It has been with the Congress Party for more than two years without any action being taken. It says that 30 per cent of the people have 10 per cent of the national income, and that 10 per cent of the people have 36 per cent of the national income, which is higher than that in America or U.K. This is the condition in India which is supposed to be a socialist country. Further on, the figures show that 60 per cent of our people live below the minimum subsistence level; 30 per cent live on an income of Rs. 15 per month; 20 per cent live on an income of Rs. 12 a month. What is more startling is that at the present rate of growth, it has been worked out that till 1991, that is practically the end of the century, 30 per cent of our people will be living below the subsistence level.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Future generations will be wiser.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If you are wise, they will be wiser.

Shri Daji: Even this figure is based on two debatable presumptions. The first is that the birth rate would not be more than 2.2 per cent. It is already 2.4 per cent. The second is that prices shall remain stable till 1991.

Shri Tyagi: I think they have consulted some astrologer.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The communist party or the planners?

Shri Daji: This is indeed a very tall presumption, when they have not been able to hold the price line so far. Therefore, the picture is very dismal.

"Even on these assumptions, which are not likely to be fulfilled, you are damning more than 30 per cent of our people to abject poverty till the end of the century. Can this inspire the people to work and toil and rally round a programme of national reconstruction, and put their all in taking the

nation forward. So, there should be a reappraisal of the priorities and the work to be done under the Plan, so that in the next five or ten years we are able to wipe out at least the starvation level from the poor sections of the people.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: No hope.

Shri Daji: If we do not hold out this hope, then it is not planning worth the name.

We have heard much about man-eaters, but I am surprised to find that the person who talked about man-eaters has either become too soft or is in too much love with them. His redefinitions of socialism, and his definition of what is ill with our economy are totally wrong. I was convinced that they were wrong, but I have become all the more convinced after Shri Masani praising that definition, saying that he would be willing to accept it. Shri K. K. Birla says that realism is now dawning on the Government. So, I would beg of the Congress Party to pause and think. Shri Masani says that at Jaipur the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister were realistic and had set an example. I say the present crisis is because of double thought, double talk, wobbling action, about their own socialist objectives. As long as you do not get rid of this mentality, you will not be able to have new priorities fixed under the Plan. What is the result? The private sector has failed. I am not blaming the entire private sector, nor are we against the entire private sector, but the monopolist section in the private sector has failed. All the licences and imports are grabbed by a few big business houses, and they almost vote our industrial development. But again and again they get these licences and imports. Why? Because your own officers after leaving service are allowed to join them as executives. The travesty is so great that I would appeal to the conscience of the Prime Minister and the Congress, if any is left. Can there be a greater negation of democracy, leave

aside socialism, a greater misuse of the taxpayer's trust than allowing a senior IAS officer of the Government to maintain his lien with the Government, while working for one of the biggest business houses of India? He is going to become a director of that house. Can you expect the ordinary smaller business houses to be able to compete in the matter of getting licences and imports, when one of the top executives, Secretary to the Government, is allowed to maintain his lien? This shows the unholy bedfellowship of big business with persons in power. As long as this unholy bedfellowship continues, you cannot have any planning, any socialism worth the name.

That is what the Planning Commission itself complains about in this small booklet *The Planning Process*. They say they have no information about the private sector, they do not supply the information. The Planning Commission is not able to control or regulate the private sector. Therefore, that is the real challenge. You have to re-examine the whole thing.

The Mahalanobis Committee has gone underground. When the hon. Minister was giving out a number of committees appointed, I interrupted him and he got very excited, but I say that instead of all those committees, it is better to appoint a committee to find out where the Mahalanobis Committee has gone. Are the gentlemen living or not?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: The hon. Member is trying to create a wrong impression. It has not gone underground. Only their report is awaited. The Committee was appointed on the eve of the Third Plan to make us understand how the Third Plan should be oriented.

Prof. Mahalanobis was away. He is back now and he will be able to finish this . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Daji: I will give only three examples of the rapacious loot which

[Shri Daji]

all your fiscal measures enabled them to reap. Hindustan Lever with a paid up capital of 557 lakhs has a reserve of 387 lakhs and in three years, 1959, 60 and 61, they earned a profit of 700 lakhs and the dividend distributed is 24 per cent, 26 per cent and 26 per cent. Dunlop's paid up capital is 5.20 crores, reserves are 4.70 crores and profits are four crores and the dividend comes to 21.5 per cent. The total paid-up capital of Meta] Box is 1.91 crores while the total profits are 215 lakhs and the dividend distributed is 25 per cent. All these companies have trebled their paid-up capital within three years. That is the reason of the rising prices.

Shri Tyagi: May I request the Finance Minister not to use dark glasses against these facts?

Shri Daji: That is where our national wealth goes. It is an example of the total abdication of the duties by the Government.

While introducing the last Budget, Shri Morarji Desai to compensate the rise in the duty on kerosene oil lowered the duty on sweet oil; it was done away with; previously it was Rs. 4 per maund. Oil which was selling at Rs. 58-59 per maund at that time, when there was a duty of Rs. 4 on it, had gone up to Rs. 72 per maund after the duty was removed. At least if the duty had been retained, four rupees would have come to Government coffers instead of going into the hands of profiteers. This is an example of the total abdication of the powers of Government to take any action against the rapacious loot of the big business interests.

So, the need of the hour is not less planning but more planning, stricter planning. We have the example of democracy and Hitler's dictatorship in Germany. When it was said that democracy was going wrong, what is the redress? more democracy, not less democracy. So that the redress for plan shortage is more and better plan-

ning and not just like throwing away the baby with the washwater, re-examination of priorities so that within a period of ten years we may assure every citizen in India two square meals, a roof over the head and minimum cloth. If we cannot do at least this, let us own it up. People are not going to wait; they are restive. I am not afraid of people getting restive, as Mr. Masani is when he said that people in his constituency were restive. It shows that there is still life in them and that they protest against the slow rate of development. They will rise the force the powers that be to change the policy and outlook and to give them a worthwhile life.

Two things are needed when we re-appraise our planning. The way out of the crisis of the Plan and the march towards socialism are integrally inter-related. The Plan cannot be salvaged unless you enforce socialist policies. Mere administrative measures will not help; it is a question of political re-orientation. There should be a sense of urgency. The Planning Commission in 1949 wanted an economic and statistical service. It was sanctioned in 1961. The men were selected in December 1961 but the file is still lying with the Home Ministry. In 1963, the persons selected have not yet been appointed. Does this show any urgency? We may feel the urgency when Mr. Nanda or the Prime Minister speaks about poverty and all that. But we want urgency in action and not in words. People are tired of repeatedly hearing your words. They do not believe any more your words; they say they are election manifestos and palliatives. I conclude by saying that what we need is political reorientation which calls for a massive get together of all progressive forces, all those who fought for freedom, who love our country and our people, who want to build a new, strong and powerful and socialist India—an India that will be the envy of the world.

Shri K. C. Pant (Naini Tal): Sir, the great virtue of the mid-term

appraisal made by the Planning Commission is its frankness. The document before us is honest and straightforward, and yet, somehow, it does not read quite right. Perhaps it is too bloodless. There is no discontent in its tone, no painful heart-searching, no restless impatience, no urgent straining at the leash. All these things are missing and that is its greatest weakness.

I should like to welcome the appointment of Shri Bhagat as the Minister of State for Planning and Shri Ashoka Mehta as Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. Both are familiar figures and we are entitled to expect that each of them will bring a fresh mind and a dynamic approach to his new responsibilities. Of late there has been a great deal of criticism about the functioning of the Commission. Only yesterday, we heard Shri Guha and Shri Hanumanthaiya press for a complete reorganisation of the Commission. A few weeks ago, the Finance Minister is reported to have complained at Madras that the Commission's method of working and planning was wrong, lacking flexibility. Shri Asoka Mehta himself is reported to have said in London that the Planning Commission should not be involved in day-to-day activities but should look ahead. Everyone seems to be agreed that the Planning Commission should be free from the burden of day-to-day administration, and yet the burden has kept on increasing. We shall now look to the new Minister and the Deputy Chairman to introduce the much-needed reforms in the organisation without further delay. It may then be possible for Parliament to receive appraisals of the Plan not after two and a half years, during which much water has flown under the bridge, but perhaps after every six months, when discussion would be more purposeful and less academic.

There is no minimising the shortfalls revealed in the report, but to use them as an excuse for advocating the dropping of the Plan or of planning as such

—as my hon. friend Shri Masani has done—is nothing but a counsel of despair. I do not believe it is seriously meant. By combining the economic discipline of planning with the liberalism of parliamentary democracy, India has taken the best from the east as well as the west, and, what is more, this approach has been amply justified in terms of results. Let us look at some of the advantages bestowed on this country by planning. It has facilitated the pooling of resources in inter-State projects like the DVC. It has enabled the setting up of three steel plants simultaneously in the Second Plan, which is a big achievement by any standards. A still greater achievement, perhaps, was the creation of a vast agency, reaching into the lacs and lacs of villages of India and overcoming their differences of language, custom, habit, etc. to set up a broadly uniform pattern of community development all over.

Above all, I would like to ask the critics to ponder whether we would have got as much foreign aid as we have if it were not for planning. Our plans have clearly indicated to the World Bank and other creditors where we want to go and the means we want to adopt to reach our destination. They have seen from the Plans that the people of India are not only determined to shoulder the main burden of development themselves but are prepared to go it alone, if necessary. This has impressed them. Moreover, we have consistently honoured our commitments. Whether all this would have been possible without a clear-cut Plan is extremely doubtful. So, the suggestion to abandon planning, apart from being impractical and unscientific would lead to a great deal of harm if accepted.

Coming to the appraisal document itself, I am afraid it presents a bleak and cheerless picture of the progress of the third Plan. In a nutshell, the position is that, in spite of sufficient resources being available, physical

[Shri K. C. Pant]

achievement in terms of targets has fallen far behind. As against a planned increase of 30 per cent in agricultural production, 70 per cent in industrial production and 30 per cent in the national income, midway through the Plan we find that there has been no net increase in agricultural production; industrial production has gone up by only 15 per cent and national income by a bare five per cent, which is hardly enough to cover the annual increase in population. That is the present position. If one scrutinises the Tables assessing likely achievements by the end of the Plan period, one cannot help feeling that many of the projections are unduly optimistic. The fact that the progress observed during the first two Plans has flattened out in the third, calls for a thorough and searching enquiry to pinpoint the weaknesses and suggest remedial measures. Only swift and energetic action can salvage the third Plan and lay sure foundations for the fourth Plan.

I do not for a moment want to suggest that the report does not have any bright patches at all. We have done well in the matter of Health and Education, and the position in respect of coal, power and transport, which were strangling industrial production in the early stages of the Plan, has improved beyond recognition. In fact, a lesson has been drawn for the future that the development of essential overheads should keep a few paces ahead of the growth of the rest of the economy.

Another positive development is that all the steel plants are now working to rated capacity, and the Minister has introduced a much-needed element of autonomy combined with answerability in their administration. Another special and welcome feature in industrial growth is, in the words of the Plan appraisal, "the significantly larger growth of the producer and basic industries as compared to the general index of industrial pro-

duction." For example, the output in basic metal industry increased by 26 per cent over the 1960 level, metal products by 69 per cent, machinery by 20 to 22 per cent and chemical products by 23 per cent. This development is wholly in keeping with the basic strategy of economic development underlying the planning effort.

However, these advances, important as they are, are completely overshadowed by the seriousness of the shortfalls in certain crucial sectors. The most important of these, to my mind, are steel, fertilisers and irrigation. We are already one Plan behind in steel and so long as some definite arrangements are not made in regard to Bokaro, the prospects in the immediate future are rather depressing. Fertiliser production is expected to reach only about 60 per cent of the Plan target and this estimate too is rather optimistic. The shortfall in major and medium irrigation will be of the order of four million acres or about 18 per cent in relation to the original target. Shortfalls in all these key sectors are bound to have a widespread effect on the Plan.

The question naturally arises, why have things come to such a pass. The reasons, broadly speaking, fall under two categories: one, those which are beyond the control of the Government and two, those which flow from defects in procedure. The continuing tight position in regard to foreign exchange, for example, despite some progress in exports, belongs to the first category. And this leads to other difficulties; for instance, the under-utilisation of industrial capacity for want of imported raw material and spare-parts, etc. I will not dilate on this aspect. What we are more interested in at this moment are the deficiencies which lie within the power of the Government to correct. Some of these have been highlighted by no less a person than Shri Asoka Mehta. Returning from his foreign

tour, he is reported to have said at Bombay that "there was considerable irritation and frustration particularly in the USA and the United Kingdom at the way things were going in India. Businessmen of both the countries complained of administrative delays and procedural complexities being so great that they never knew when their proposals would get official sanction. A spokesman of a big U.S. firm told him that a collaboration proposal put forward by them was delayed and sanctioned only after three and a half years by which time they had lost all interest in the proposal. Things of this kind were giving India a bad name."

Three months earlier, Shri H.V.R. Iengar, Chairman of the National Productivity Council, had said much the same things in the following words:

"As regards foreign investment in this country the keenness or eagerness of foreigners had totally changed and given place to hesitation."

He went on to express an opinion which I am sure will be widely shared in the House. This is what he said:

"When the country was passing through a crisis, the stages for consultations and decisions should be curtailed to the absolute minimum so that the process of taking quick decisions was not handicapped and implementation became easy."

This suggestion may not be original, but it goes to the root of the matter and pinpoints a major defect in our system. We must reduce the time-lag between the approval of a project and its establishment. We must have a production-oriented and not a procedure-oriented approach. The web of red tape must be cut. I should like to know, if I may from the Minister, what the Government are doing to improve matters in this regard, particularly since Shri Asoka Mehta him-

self has expressed such a strong opinion on the subject. I for my part would suggest that a time-and-motion study should be made on the movement of files dealing with development projects, whether in the public or the private sector.

I now turn to agriculture, and begin by referring to a few telling remarks made by Shri S. S. Sivaraman, Programme Adviser in the Planning Commission. He is reported to have told a meeting in Delhi recently that:

"the current explanations for the fall in production during the last three years over-emphasised the fact of adverse seasons. Among the ill-conceived production programmes, to which he attributed the poor performance of farming, he listed the use of improved seeds without raising the level of manuring, use of fertilisers under rainfed conditions and extension of irrigation without proper attention to surface and sub-surface drainage."

Now, since our agricultural targets are determined purely on the arithmetical correlation between the input and the output, for example, one maund of fertiliser will produce two maunds of yield—without taking into account the kind of determining conditions mentioned by Shri Sivaraman, is it any wonder that we fail to achieve the target laid down in spite of effecting the inputs at the level planned? This is a basic lacuna in our agricultural planning.

Another lacuna is lack of capital. Somehow, there is a general impression that agriculture is less demanding of capital than industry. But is it really so? The FAO's annual report for 1962-63 gives a tentative finding that the capital requirements of agriculture, even excluding the value of land, are higher than in manufacturing and mining. As against

[Shri K. C. Pant]

this in our country, the flow of private capital into agriculture, except in the case of big plantations and the 10 per cent of holdings exceeding 15 dry acres or three wet acres, has all but dried up. Our capital resources being limited, what is the remedy? The only remedy is to convert idle labour into capital assets, such assets being preferably quick-yielding ones like minor irrigation works. As the House knows, Government has been following this policy but unfortunately only with partial success. The rural works programme has still to find its feet. Up to the end of March, 1963, it has provided jobs for only about 78,000 people. This is rather disappointing.

Capital is not our only scarce resource. We also lack farm leadership. What we need is an efficient extension service manned by persons with sufficient practical experience of farming, who are prepared to prove the superiority of modern techniques to farmers through the medium of demonstration farms.

13.00 hrs.

Logically the extension service should be under the Agriculture Department, but that is not so very important. Important are results, and to help achieve these results, I have an unorthodox suggestion. Just as the workers as well as staff in industry get a bonus for extra production, some method should be worked out to reward the extension staff for increasing farm productivity in areas under them.

Now, I should like to plead for a more determined effort to check the explosion in population. I am sorry to see from the report that as against the Plan target of 6000 family planning centres, less than 1000 centres have been set up in the last two years. This is most disappointing and even

the modest target is unlikely to be reached at this rate. Sir, of all the programmes, this is perhaps the one we can least afford to fail in, and I would earnestly urge the Minister, if I may, to see that there is no failure.

Sir, before I end, a few words about the general question of implementation. For effective implementation, Ministers have to carry their officers with them, and they cannot do this on the strength of the *danda* alone. An element of moral authority enters into the relationship. The source of this moral authority is rather standing as public workers. So, Ministers as a class can be only as effective as public workers as a class are respected. I make no distinction between Congress and non-Congressmen. Today public workers attach each other in terms which were unthinkable till yesterday. No one is spared. It has almost come to this that everyone is presumed guilty unless proved otherwise. The natural result of this state of affairs is that the bureaucracy is being steadily strengthened *vis-a-vis* the Ministers. The leaders of the different parties should take note of this and evolve healthy standards of public life; otherwise the grip of the Ministers over the continuing and deeply entrenched bureaucratic machine will become looser and looser and implementation will always be a problem, whichever the party in power.

Shrimati Vijaya Raje (Chatra): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the mid-term appraisal which has been circulated by the Planning Commission, I am afraid, does not present a very happy picture before us, for on one side it shows us the shortcomings and failures while on the other it forecasts short-falls in achieving the targets. Though no doubt the frankness with which the planners have admitted their difficulties in achieving the objectives must be appreciated, this does give us a fresh hope that they will be doing their utmost to complete the undertaking on which the

progress and well-being of our country depends. I am not one of those who would like to indulge in sentimental post-mortem or would like to make any capital, be it political or otherwise, out of the picture that has been painted by the Planning Commission. On the other hand, as responsible citizens of this country, I feel it is our duty not to indulge in criticism for the sake of criticism, but try to help the Government in profiting from past experience and to make up for the deficiencies and short-comings.

To my mind, the basic defect has been that we have taken at the time of preparing the plan too many things for granted. Take the agricultural sector, for example. We have not allowed for the adversities and vagaries of weather conditions in order to arrive at a balanced picture, for the entire Plan period. After all, when we provide for fertilisers, for agricultural implements, for equipments and supplies to fight pests and diseases or for irrigation projects and expansion of tube-well irrigation, it is our duty to see that the necessary industrial build-up is also achieved at a desired pace to enable us to realise our aim. Even now I think it is necessary to have an assessment made first of the available resources and potentialities in order to ensure that at least during the remaining period of the Plan the requirements are fully met.

So far as the agricultural sector is concerned, we must not forget that we have to cover 65 million farmers working under varying and contrasting conditions spread all over the country. We have to implement an integrated programme in the midst of these conditions of diversity. Yet, it seems our approach is based more on uniformity and assumptions only.

Let us take the industrial field. There also I can see no reason why progress should not have been maintained. After all, unlike agriculture, industry is not subject to any vagaries of weather conditions. Much has been

said about the failure of the private sector. It is not, however, sufficiently realised that under the present forms of governmental regulations and control, the private sector naturally has to depend to a large extent on Government's policies and initiatives. Therefore, a lot depends on the encouragement and incentives thus provided by the Government. The private sector, unlike the public sector, has to be guided principally by the profit motive no doubt. It is, therefore, the investment or income factor that would be predominant. After all, I see no reason why when we are so solicitous about the remunerative return to the farmer, we should not be equally solicitous for a remunerative return to the ordinary shareholder, in the companies or concerns. Whether it may be in the agricultural or in the industrial sector, there is one thing we must bear in mind and that is the basic psychology of the human mind to have some profitable return on the investment that a person makes.

We have to ask ourselves candidly whether our fiscal and licensing and other policies are such as to invite investment not only from banks, insurance companies and even big businessmen, but also from the small investor who would always be the backbone of the national effort in the industrial field. There is no doubt that today most of the taxation system is such as to inhibit rather than promote the private enterprise. I am quite sure that if Government were to examine critically the statistics of wealth-tax and income-tax, it will be seen that on one side the number of people who were enjoying higher incomes or possessing higher slabs of wealth is going down, and the increase in the medium incomes, from which always the largest amount of investment would come under suitable economic conditions, is also not taking place to the required extent.

After all, we have to bear in mind that the burden of a Plan of this size

[Shrimati Vijaya Raje]

which we have been implementing cannot fall only on Government or its resources or even on institutional credit. It has to fall on the common people and on the middle-class which is always the backbone of economic development. This is particularly so in a country like ours where agriculture is the predominant occupation. If I may humbly suggest to the Government, one touch-stone of its economic policies and measures should be whether the measures or policies concerned are such as to keep the large body of middle-class men in the national effort at a tempo or pace which the size of the Plan requires or whether it is going to prevent that class from making a contribution which would naturally be a dominant one. If it does not, the policy or measure must be given up. If it does, the policy or measure must not only be adopted, but enforced without fear or favour, prejudice or ill-will. At the same time, another thing I would like to point out here is that Government's policies and measures should be well thought out, firm and co-ordinated. It is also necessary to bear in mind our objectives first and then formulate the methods to achieve those objectives rather than stick to methods irrespective of what our objectives are. What we have to ensure is to see what serves the country best, whatever it may be. After all, we must not forget that there can be no higherism than patriotism. To follow a method just because it fits in with a particular ideology, irrespective of whether it suits our conditions or not is bound to produce unfortunate results, consequences and repercussions. From this point of view, I feel it is necessary that Government as a responsible body should avoid encouraging slogans or fall a victim to them.

I am afraid that even in the Mid-term Appraisal one comes across this frequently. A glaring example, for instance, is the reference to land reforms. We must not forget that land reform is not an end by itself; it is

only a means to an end. Whatever our ultimate goal may be, it has to be reached in a manner which does not in the interim period cause any unnecessary and avoidable dislocation or serious impediments in the efforts to achieve them. More than all this is the human factor which we have been neglecting so long and cannot afford to neglect any longer as our biggest national wealth is our manpower. Therefore, it is most essential to focus our attention mainly on education and public health, and it is a basic national need that we should conserve and strengthen the human talent and resources and give them necessary means of development both of scientific as well as cultural lines. That means a complete re-organisation and re-orientation of our educational system in the country.

The condition prevailing in the country at present is rather confusing and lop-sided; it needs clear and precise definition. It requires expert advice and expert handling also for implementing the settled policy with due regard, of course, to the human value and psychology.

These are some of the basic and fundamental facts of planning to which I wish to draw the attention of the House and of the Government in order to safeguard against such failures in future and to ensure success in whatever efforts we put in in the remaining period of the Plan.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I am grateful to you for having given me this opportunity to participate in this debate. I have tried to place before this House some ideas as they affect laymen like me. I do not pretend to be an expert in this line or that, but I do feel that as a common citizen of this country I can express some of the thoughts that have just come across my mind. Governmental policies and measures, howsoever highly conceived they may be, have at some time or the other to descend to the

level of the common man. To secure the co-operation of the common man, Government should know, therefore, how the common man reacts to its policies, its working and its pronouncements. If whatever I have said is worthwhile from that point of view, I shall feel very happy indeed.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना के मध्यकालीन मूल्यांकन सम्बन्धी रिपोर्ट पर जो वक्तव्य अब तक दिये गये हैं और उस रिपोर्ट को जहां तक मैं ने पढ़ा है उस से कुछ विशेष सुझाव जो मेरे मस्तिष्क में आये हैं वह मैं यहां देना चाहता हूं ।

पहली बात तो मैं आप के द्वारा सरकार से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि कोई शासन या कोई योजना तब तक लोकप्रिय नहीं हो सकती जब तक कि इस देश की जनता को उस की भाषा में वह चीज न पहुंचाया जाय । तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना की मध्यकालीन मूल्यांकन सम्बन्धी रिपोर्ट को देखने के बाद मेरा मन मस्तिष्क इस बात को कहने का साहस कर रहा है कि भारतीय भाषाओं को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए सरकार की ओर से जो यत्न अपेक्षित थे वह अब तक नहीं किये गये । यह बात न केवल क्षेत्रीय भाषाओं के लिये ही लागू होती है अपितु संविधान में जिस को कि राज भाषा का पद दिया गया है उस को प्रोत्साहन देने के लिए जो यत्न यथा शीघ्र अपेक्षित थे, उस दिशा में भी बहुत न्यूनता रही है । अभी जब इस तरह का एक विधेयक आया था तो हमारे पहले गृह मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने सदन को यह आश्वासन दिया था कि अब दूसरी बार इस प्रकार का विधेयक सम्भव है लाने की आवश्यकता न पड़े और यह दस वर्ष भी जो हम ले रहे हैं उस अवधि में भी हम यत्न करेंगे वापिक इस बात का निरीक्षण होता रहे कि हम ने उस दिशा में कितनी प्रगति की है । मेरी अपनी जानकारी इस प्रकार की है कि उस प्रगति को जांचने के लिए जो समिति निर्धारित

की गई है उस में सब ही प्रान्तों के मुख्य मंत्री रखे गये हैं । केन्द्र के गृह मंत्री हैं और शिक्षा मंत्री भी हैं । एक, दो और सरकारी अधिकारी भी उस के अन्दर हैं । लेकिन एक सामान्य सी बात है और संसद् इस बात को अच्छे तरीके से जानती है कि प्रान्तों के मुख्य मंत्री वर्ष में कितनी बार एक साथ सब एकत्रित हो सकते हैं ? और वह सब एकत्रित होकर किस प्रकार से कितनी प्रगति राज भाषा की हो रही है और उस के लिये भी जो १० वर्ष की अवधि हम ने ली है उस समय तक भी हम उस को राजभाषा के उच्च आसन पर पूर्णतया आसीन कर सकेंगे, इस में कितना संदेह है यह इसी में प्रतीत होता है कि जो समिति बनाई गई थी उस की प्रगति को देखने के लिए, वैसे उस कमेटी का कोई मूल्य नहीं है, हां, यदि संसद् के कुछ सदस्य उस समिति में रहते, राज्य सभा और लोक सभा के कुछ सदस्य उस में रहते और उनके अतिरिक्त देश के कुछ और गण्यमान्य व्यक्ति जिन्होंने कि हिन्दी को राज भाषा के पद तक पहुंचाने का यत्न किया है वह उस की प्रगति को देखते और फिर अपनी रिपोर्ट सरकार को देते तो यह बात व्यवहारिक हो सकती थी । जहां मैं राज भाषा हिन्दी के लिए यह कह रहा हूं वहां साथ ही साथ उसी से मिलती हुई शिकायत संस्कृत के बारे में भी करना चाहता हूं । मुझे इस बात को कहते हुए प्रसन्नता है कि पहले शिक्षा मंत्री डा० श्रीमाली ने संस्कृत के विकास के लिए कुछ लाख रुपये तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में निर्धारित किये थे । उस में विशेष रूप से गुरुकुलों जैसी राष्ट्रीय संस्थाओं के लिए भी लगभग ६ लाख रुपये उन को सहायता के लिए रखे गये । परन्तु इस प्रकार की राष्ट्रीय शिक्षण संस्थाओं को जितना अधिक प्रोत्साहन स्वतंत्र भारत में मिलना चाहिए था और उस दृष्टि से जितना ध्यान उन का रखा जाना चाहिए था, मेरा अपना अनुमान है कि सरकार उस में हाथ बंद कर के जैसे कार्य कर रही है, उस से न तो गुरुकुल ही पूरी तरह पनप पायेंगे और

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

न संस्कृत का ही स्वतन्त्र विकास हो पायेगा। वरसों जिस प्रकार से कि यहाँ एक विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में चर्चा चल रही थी कि संस्कृत जो सभी भारतीय भाषाओं की जननी है, जितनी प्राथमिकता उसे मिलनी चाहिए थी उतनी प्राथमिकता नहीं मिल पायी है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के मध्यकालीन मूल्यांकन सम्बन्धी रिपोर्ट पर विचार करते समय हमें इस सत्य को भी अपनी आँखों से ओझल नहीं करना चाहिए।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकारी धन के अपव्यय के सम्बन्ध में, जिस समय हम अपने राज्य की रामराज्य से तुलना करते हैं या गांधी जी को अपना आदर्श मान कर चलते हैं, वहाँ हम इस बात को क्यों भूल जाते हैं कि हमारा आदर्श एक इस प्रकार का संत था जो गोलमेज कान्फ्रेंस में भाग लेने लन्दन गया तो वह वहाँ भी अपनी उसी प्रतिदिन की सामान्य व्यवहार की वेश-भूषा में गया। जब किसी ने यह कहा कि आप जा रहे हैं ऐसे स्थान पर कि जहाँ आप को दरबारी परम्परा के नाते पैरों तक कम से कम कपड़ा ढकना चाहिए तो गांधी जी ने उत्तर दिया कि मैं उस गरीब भारत का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए यहाँ आया हूँ जहाँ कि आज भी करोड़ों व्यक्ति इस प्रकार के हैं जिन को कि शरीर का ढकने के लिए पुरा कपड़ा देश में नहीं है, मैं तो अपने देश की वास्तविक स्थिति का चित्रण करने आया हूँ, मैं अपने शरीर को ढक कर कोई प्रदर्शन करने के लिए यहाँ पर नहीं आया हूँ। उस गांधी की सरकार या उन का नाम लेकर संसार को प्रभावित करने वाली सरकार, उस के द्वारा जपता के धन के अपव्यय की स्थिति क्या है, इस का इमी से अनुमान लगाइये कि जिस सरकार ने विदेशों से इतना रुपया ऋण ले रखा है, अपने देश पर टैक्स पर टैक्स लगा कर इतना रुपया पिछली दो योजनाओं में खर्च कर चुकी है, उस के द्वारा होने वाले व्यय का एक ही उदाहरण

देना चाहता हूँ। अब तक हमारे देश पर जो विदेशों का ऋण है वह २८ फरवरी, १९६३ तक जिस को कि हम अपनी योजनाओं में लगा चुके हैं वह १८८०.१ करोड़ है जिस को अब तक हम प्रयोग कर चुके हैं और जिस ऋण के ऊपर १९८.७१ करोड़ रुपया केवल सूद के रूप में दे चुके हैं। बाहर से ऋण लेकर जब हम उस से भारी दब चुके हैं ऐसी स्थिति में भी फिर उस धन का दुरुपयोग करना और उस धन का सदुपयोग न करना यह भारतीय जनता के साथ और अगली पीढ़ी के साथ बहुत बड़ा अन्याय है। मैं ने एक बार पहले भी यह कहा था कि नीति शास्त्र में यह लिखा हुआ है :—

‘ऋणकर्तापिता शत्रु।’

जो पिता अपनी संतान पर अपना ऋण छोड़ कर जाता है वह संतान के साथ बहुत बड़ा अन्याय करता है। हम ने अपने देश को इतना ऋणी बना दिया है और ऋणी बनने के साथ ही जो अभी हम और लेते जा रहे हैं, तथा जिस शर्त पर वह मिल सकता है, हम उसे ले लेते हैं और फिर उस ऋण का उपयोग कैसे करते हैं यह भी जग देखें। मैं बहुत लम्बी चीड़ी बातों में नहीं जाना चाहता कि विदेशों में जो हमारे राज दूतावास हैं, उन के द्वारा किम प्रकार धन का अपव्यय होता है, उन चर्चाओं को छोड़ कर किस तरीके से रूस में हमारे जो एक राजदूत पहले थे जिन्होंने अपना घर सजाने के लिए स्टॉकहोम से फरनीचर हवाई जहाज से मंगाया था, अभी हाल की एक घटना, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप के द्वारा सरकार के सामने रखते हुए कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस समय जो रूस में हमारे राजदूत हैं उन को कुछ लैम्पशेड्स की जरूरत पड़ी। उन्होंने उस के लिए भारत सरकार को लिखा कि ८ लैम्पशेड्स उन के लिए भारत से भेजे जायें। अच्छी सिल्क और कागज के बने हुए लैम्पशेड्स यहाँ जो सेंट्रल काटेज इण्डस्ट्रीज इम्पोर्टियम है, वहाँ से

२१ मई, १९६३ को २४७.६० नये पैसे में खरीदे गये और चूंकि उन को जल्दी भेजना था तो १४० रु. या उन के ऊपर पैकिंग का खर्च आया और जब वह हवाई जहाज से भेजे गये तो ११४४.३ नये पैसे एयर इंडिया को उस का किराया दिया गया । २४७ रुपये ६० नये पैसे के लैम्प शेड थे, जिन पर १४० रुपये पैकिंग पर और ११४४ रुपये ३० नये पैसे किराये पर खर्च किये गये । बल्कि जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है, अभी तक यह पैसा बेचारे एयर इंडिया वालों को मिल भी नहीं सका है, क्योंकि अभी तो वह झगड़े में पड़ा हुआ है । यदि विदेशों में हमारे राजदूत सरकारी धन का इस प्रकार से दुरुपयोग करेंगे, छोटी छोटी चीजों पर इतना रुपया व्यय करेंगे और सरकार आख मूंद कर रुपया देती रहेगी, तो इस गरीब देश के साथ यह बहुत बड़ा अन्याय होगा । खास तौर से एक ऐसे देश में हमारा प्रतिनिधि बैठता है, जिस के एक राजदूत के विषय में मुझे एक बात याद आती है । जिस समय डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद पहली बार राष्ट्रपति हुए, तो उन के सम्मान में राष्ट्रपति भवन में जो आयोजन किया गया था, उस में हमारे देश में रूस का जो उस समय राजदूत बुश-शर्ट पहने हुए था, वह कमर से फटी हुई थी और सिली हुई थी । उस की बगल में बैठे हुए किसी भारतीय ने उस को पूछा कि "क्या तुम को इस बात का ध्यान नहीं रहा कि तुम भारत के राष्ट्रपति के सम्मान में आयोजित समारोह में आये हो ? तुम कोई अच्छी बुश-शर्ट पहन कर क्या आ नहीं सकते थे ।" रूसी राजदूत ने उत्तर दिया, "यह तो एक फटा कपड़ा है, जिस को सिला कर मैं ने ठीक कर लिया है । यदि मेरे देश की सरकार मुझे और कम पैसा देती तथा बुश-शर्ट पहनने के बजाये जूट की लंगोटी लगा कर राष्ट्रपति की दावत में आना होता, तो मैं ऐसा करने में सौभाग्य अनुभव करता, क्योंकि मेरे देश की सरकार ने इतना ही व्यय करने की अनुमति मुझे दी है ।" एक तरफ तो उस समृद्धिशाली देश के राजदूत हैं और दूसरी तरफ हमारे

गरीब मुल्क के यह प्रतिनिधि हैं, जो कि २४७ रुपये के लैम्प शेड के लिए ११४४ रुपये एयर इंडिया के किराये पर खर्च करते हैं ।

इसी तरह सरकार की लाल फीताशाही का दुष्परिणाम भी हमारे औद्योगिक विकास पर बढ़ा पड़ रहा है । मुझे खुशी है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार मंत्री इस समय यहां हैं । १९६१-६२ में हमारे देश में दूसरे देशों के सहयोग से, जो सरकारी उद्योग चल रहे थे, उन की संख्या ४३६ थी । लेकिन अब जिस तरह से हम ने टैक्सों पर टैक्स लगा कर विदेशों के पूंजी लगाने वालों के लिए कठिनाइयां पैदा कर दी हैं और इस के अतिरिक्त भी हमारे यहां जो लालफीताशाही का चक्कर है—जिस के बारे में पश्चिमी जर्मनी के उद्योग प्रतिनिधि मंडल के नेता ने, जो कि इस देश में आया था, चलते समय कहा था कि भारत में पैसा लगाने की हमारी इच्छा इसलिए मौन होती जा रही है कि एक तो यहां पर इतने फार्म भरने पड़ते हैं कि उषी में हम परेशान हो जाते हैं और दूसरे, यहां पर निर्णय देर से होते हैं—, उस का परिणाम यह है कि विदेशी साझेदारों की संख्या ४३६ से घट कर १९६२-६३ में २५६ रह गई है । यह हमारे देश के लिए शोभा की बात नहीं है—ऐसे गरीब देश के लिए, जिस को दूसरे देशों के पैसे को आमंत्रित करना चाहिए और इतनी सुविधा देनी चाहिए कि वे आ कर हमारे देश के उद्योगों में पैसा लगायें । लेकिन इस के बजाये हम अपनी नीतियों से ऐसी स्थिति न बना दें कि उन को पैसा लगाने से घृणा हो जाये और वे उदासीन हो जायें ।

जहां तक परिवार-नियोजन का सम्बन्ध है मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश की जनसंख्या में एक करोड़ वार्षिक की वृद्धि हो रही है, जो कि किसी भी देश के लिए चिन्ता का विषय है । पहली योजना में हम ने जन-संख्या में वृद्धि को रोकने के लिए ७० लाख रुपया लगाने का निश्चय किया । दूसरी

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

योजना में हम ने ३ करोड़ रुपया खर्च करने का निश्चय किया और तीसरी योजना में हमने २७ करोड़ रुपया खर्च करने का निश्चय किया है। यह २७ करोड़ रुपया अगर बांटा जाये, तो एक व्यक्ति के हिस्से में ६३ नये पैसे पड़ता है। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि जितना रुपया खर्च करना भी चाहिए था, हम इन तीन वर्षों में उस में से केवल ५ करोड़ रुपये, अर्थात् २० प्रतिशत भाग ही, व्यय कर पाये हैं और अभी तक ८० प्रतिशत भाग ऐसा है, जिसको व्यय नहीं कर पाये हैं। जनसंख्या में वृद्धि एक ऐसा चिन्तनीय विषय है, जो कि देश के हर एक व्यक्ति को परेशान कर रहा है। इसलिए सरकार कम से कम इतना तो करे कि इस के लिए जितना भी रुपया रखा गया है उसको उचित और व्यवस्थित ढंग से खर्च करे।

योजना मंत्री को मैं नम्रता और गम्भीरता से यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि परिवार नियोजन से सम्बन्धित एक और महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है, जिस की अगर सरकार इसी प्रकार उपेक्षा करती रही, तो फिर किसी दिन एक भयंकर प्रश्न उस के सामने विकराल रूप में खड़ा हो सकता है। यदि सरकार इस देश में परिवार-नियोजन की प्रणाली को चालू करना चाहती है, तो उसको विवाहों की भी एक सामान्य पद्धति चालू करनी होगी। कि एक समुदाय के व्यक्तियों को तो यह अधिकार दे दिया जाये कि वे चार चार विवाह कर सकते हैं और दूसरे समुदाय के व्यक्तियों पर इस बारे में प्रतिबन्ध लगाया जाये। इस भेदभाव का परिणाम यह हुआ, है कि १९६१ के जन-गणना में एक बड़ा और मुख्य समुदाय अपनी १९५१ की आवादी से ४ प्रतिशत घट गया है और एक समुदाय में जिसे विवाह के सम्बन्ध में कोई रोक नहीं, २८ से लेकर ३८ प्रतिशत तक उसकी वृद्धि हुई है। यदि इस बात को यों ही एक सामान्य बात कह कर छोड़ दिया गया, तो फिर किसी

समय एक भयंकर विस्फोट होगा, जिस को सरकार नहीं रोक सकेगी। परिवार-नियोजन के प्रश्न पर विचार करते समय इस गम्भीर प्रश्न को भी आंखों से झोझल नहीं करना चाहिए। (Interruption) वह कुछ भी कहें, लेकिन मैं आप को कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या है।

अपने वक्तव्य को उपसंहार की ओर ले जाते हुए मैं बरोज़गारी के बारे में दो शब्द कहना चाहता हूँ। जब पहली पंच-वर्षीय योजना प्रारम्भ हुई थी, तो हमारे देश में ४० लाख के लगभग बेकार थे। पहली पंच-वर्षीय योजना जब समाप्त हुई, तो ५३ लाख बेकार थे। द्वितीय पंच-वर्षीय योजना जब समाप्त हुई, तो ६० लाख लोग बेकार थे और तीसरी योजना की अब तक की इस अवधि में लगभग १७० लाख बरोज़गारों की फौज तैयार हो गई है। यद्यपि इस योजना में कृषि-कार्यों में लगाने के लिए ४५ लाख और अन्य कार्यों में १०५ लाख लोगों को लगाने का विचार है, लेकिन फिर भी तीसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना की समाप्ति पर ३० लाख लोग बेकार रह जायेंगे। तीसरी योजना के पहले दो सालों में यदि ३५ लाख लोगों को काम पर लगा भी दिया जाये, जो कि समूची योजना-काल के लिए निश्चित संख्या का एक-तिहाई है, तो भी सरकार ने जो अनुपात निश्चित किया है, वह पूरा नहीं हो सकेगा। योजना आयोग के एक बुद्धिमान सदस्य डा० वी० के० आर० वी० राव का कहना है कि अगर बरोज़गारों की संख्या इसी तरह से बढ़ती गई, तो पांचवीं योजना के अन्त में भारत में ६ करोड़ बरोज़गारों की फौज तैयार हो जायेगी और वे ६ करोड़ आदमी, जिन के सामने रोटी-कपड़े का प्रश्न खड़ा होगा, किसी भी समय इस देश में विद्रोह की स्थिति उत्पन्न कर सकते हैं। यदि सरकार चाहती है कि इस प्रकार की परिस्थिति उत्पन्न न हो, इस प्रकार की गम्भीर

समस्या देश के सामने उपस्थित न हो, तो वह अभी से ऋष प्रयत्न के समाधान करने का निश्चय करे, जिससे बेरोजगारों की स्थिति बिगड़ती न चली जाये ।

अन्त में कृषि उत्पादन के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कह कर मैं अपने वक्तव्य को समाप्त करता हूँ । देखा यह जा रहा है कि १९५५ से लेकर १९६३ तक कृषि-उत्पादन में धीरे-धीरे घटोत्तरी होती चली जा रही है । कोई वृद्धि नहीं है । पुराने आंकड़ों को मैं नहीं लेता हूँ । अभी हाल ही के आंकड़ों को मैं आपके सामने उपस्थित करता हूँ । १९६१-६२ में चावल की उपज ३,४० लाख टन थी और १९६२-६३ में वह घट कर ३,१० लाख टन हो गई है, यानी ३० लाख टन चावल का उत्पादन कम हुआ । १९६१-६२ में गेहूँ १,१९ लाख टन देश में पैदा हुआ, जब कि १९६२-६३ में वह घट कर १,०९ लाख टन रह गया, यानी १० लाख टन गेहूँ का उत्पादन कम हुआ । खाद्यान्नों का जो सम्मिलित सूचक अंक दिया गया है, वह १९६१-६२ में १३७.५ था और १९६२-६३ में १३१.३ हो गया है । यदि १९६५ तक दस करोड़ टन का लक्ष्य पूरा करना हो, तो जो दो वर्ष शेष रह जाते हैं, उनमें प्रति वर्ष ७० लाख टन के हिसाब से उत्पादन बढ़ाना होगा, जो कि सर्वथा असम्भव है ।

मेरा विचार है कि कृषि के सम्बन्ध में जितनी भी योजनायें बनाई जाती हैं, उनको व्यावहारिक रूप नहीं मिल पाता है । खाद्य स्थिति पर चर्चा के समय भी मैंने कहा था कि खाद्य मंत्रालय और कृषि मंत्रालय जितनी योजनायें बनाते हैं, नीचे तक वे योजनायें पूरी नहीं पहुँच पाती हैं । बीच में जो मशीनरी है, वह सरकार की नीतियों को व्यावहारिक रूप नहीं देने देती । इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि सरकार अपना निर्णय लेने से पहले अपनी मशीनरी को ठीक करे । अगर सरकार

की मशीनरी ठीक हो और वह सरकार की नीतियों को ठीक से व्यावहारिक रूप दे सके तो मेरा अनुमान है कि कृषि के सम्बन्ध में पन्द्रह वर्षों के बाद भी आज जो हमको शर्म से गर्दन झुकानी पड़ती है, उस स्थिति को हम समाधान कर सकेंगे । मैं आपको एक उदाहरण भी देना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार यहां से तो यह तय कर देती है कि सिचाई विभाग कृषि विभाग के साथ मिल कर चलेगा, लेकिन आज स्थिति यह है कि आज खाद किसान को मिल जाता है, और वह उसको अपने खेत में डाल देता है और उम्मीद करता है कि कल उसको ट्यूबवैल से पानी मिलेगा । लेकिन जब उसको समय पर पानी नहीं मिलता है तो चूँकि वह खाद गम होता है, इसलिये वह किसान के खेत को और उल्टा जला देता है । जब सरकार खाद देती है, तो उसके साथ साथ उसको पानी की भी तो व्यवस्था करनी चाहिए । सरकार का एक अंग तो सुविधा देता है पर उसका दूसरा अंग उस सुविधा को वापिस ले लेता है । इसी प्रकार से सरकार द्वारा कृषि के सम्बन्ध में दी गई अन्य सुविधायें भी बीच में ही अटक कर रह जाती हैं ।

मैं आशा करता हूँ कि तीसरी पंच वर्षीय योजना की मध्यावधि मूल्यांकन के समय इन तमाम बातों को ओझल नहीं किया जायेगा और सरकार इनके बारे में गम्भीरता से कुछ निर्णय लेगी ।

धन्यवाद ।

Shri Maniyangadan (Kottayam): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, for the last few days, several people have made speeches regarding the functioning of the Third Five Year Plan. Several speeches regarding the functioning of Almost all the Members were criticising the Government and also the Planning Commission.

The noteworthy thing is that the attack is based mainly on the facts and figures supplied by the Govern-

[Shri Maiyangadan]

ment in the Mid-Term Appraisal. I am happy that the Government has come forward with such a publication giving these details in an honest and frank way and I join with several others who have congratulated the Government for this. It is an invitation for frank criticisms and also for constructive suggestions for improvement. There is no doubt that Government are going to take remedial measures by locating the black spots.

The suggestion made by some that the whole Plan should be scrapped seems to me to be very fantastic, not because it is too late now to think in that line.

If the system of planning that we have adopted is fundamentally wrong, there is no meaning in continuing it. If that is so, we should have the boldness to scrap the whole thing and start afresh in the manner which is most appropriate for achieving the goals that we have in mind.

The nation has before it certain social and economic objectives, and if we are to reach them, there is no method other than planning. Those who have suggested that the Plan should be scrapped have not put forward any alternative suggestions. There can be differences of opinion in the approach to planning. What is needed is a practical approach having in view the social and economic objectives that we have in mind.

In the words of the Planning Commission themselves,

"In any social system, planning is a major instrument in the service of the basic values and objectives held by the community. India has a deep attachment to the values of freedom, democracy and welfare of the common citizen. The purpose of planning is to provide the economic sinews and the social motivation for furthering these aims."

India is the first country in the world to launch on a system of planned economic development under a democratic system with full guarantees for individual freedom. A mere doctrinaire approach ignoring the realities of the situation is likely to land us in difficulties.

I may, with your permission, quote a passage from the publication of the Planning Commission entitled *The Planning Process*. At page 5, in para 10 we find the following:

"There is no easy way out of the difficulties that beset a relatively backward society seeking rapid economic growth. Cause and effect interact. Unless a society breaks itself free from some of the shackles of the past, overcomes internal resistances and releases new forces of change, it is unable to achieve a high rate of growth. Rapid economic expansion greatly facilitates the solution of difficult political, economic and social problems inherent in an underdeveloped society, helps reconcile divergences of interest and stimulates support and participation from the people. To be meaningful, a high rate of growth must be sustained steadily over a long period, for a vast chasmic between the prevailing levels of poverty and the minimum conditions of well-being for the masses. Given such continuity, growth itself becomes self-sustaining. That is to say, dependence on foreign resources gradually disappears and the underdeveloped society acquires resources in skill, the infra-structure and the technical capacity to move into the future on its own strength. This brings greater stability to the developing society and opens up new possibilities of international exchange."

For successful implementation of planning in a democratic set-up, there must be responsive public opinion behind it. Planning was going on for the last thirteen years, and the question

naturally arises what the impact of it is on the common man in the country. Has he begun to feel that at least some of the miseries experienced by him are being wiped out? Are the planners and those responsible for its implementation able to say that the common man in the country is conscious of a change in his surroundings which makes him feel that he is on the path to prosperity? The sure test of success of planning is the capability of arousing this consciousness in the common man. The enthusiasm generated in the common man as a result of this feeling must be the motive force behind the implementation of the Plan schemes in various fields.

We budget for several crores of rupees and carry out several projects. The national wealth is increased, though not to our expectations, at least to some extent. What is the share that the common man gets out of this increased wealth? How far have his amenities of life improved? Grandiose schemes like the Bhakra-Nangal, Bhilai etc. are capable of creating some enthusiasm and hope, but this would not be sustained for long unless he feels that he also has begun to share in the benefits of development. I am not saying that there is absolutely no material advantage to the common man. There have been various facilities made available to him. They may not have gone to him to the extent that they should have, or according to our expectations, but it is not true to say that the result of planning has caused only additional tax burden and increase in prices of essential commodities, thus increasing his miseries.

It has to be remembered that the national emergency due to the Chinese aggression intervened and we had to concentrate on defence activities. In the new situation that arose as a result of the national emergency we were faced with two alternatives, namely either to stop all developmental activities and concentrate on defence preparations or to increase defence preparations side by side with the

developmental activities. This was a challenge to us, and I am glad that we decided to meet the challenge in a bold way. We decided to go forward with the developmental activities without substantial reductions and at the same time to take adequate steps for defence preparations. The Planning Commission and Government were conscious that development in agricultural and industrial and similar sectors were as important as other defence preparations to meet the Chinese aggression.

Of course, certain adjustments had to be made in the priorities. Subject to that, we decided to carry on the activities.

The reason for increasing the target of additional taxation is quite evident from this fact. The success in achieving the increased target is an indication of the will of the people to make the Plan a success. The people want that the Plan should be successfully implemented and not be scrapped as some people have stated.

It is true that the people are worried about the shortfalls in our achievements. What is needed is to correct the mistakes.

Several remedial measures have been suggested in the Plan appraisal and also in the speech made by the hon. Minister. On the whole, I do not feel that there is reason for despair. While admitting that the picture is not a rosy one, I dare say that there is every scope for improvement and that the plan could be implemented successfully.

Certain people see only shortfalls which are mentioned in the publication. But what about the successes? For example, the development of railways, road development, shipping, power, education health etc. have gone according to schedule, and in certain cases the targets have been exceeded.

Then, much was said about agriculture. It is true that we have not been able to achieve the targets that we had set before ourselves. Adverse weather conditions had caused serious shortfalls

[Shri Manyaganadan]

in agricultural production, mainly in the production of foodgrains in 1961-62 and 1962-63. I do not think that there is any country in the world where there is no fluctuation in agricultural production due to the vagaries of the season. The only thing that is possible is to lower the level of the fluctuations. From the figures supplied to us, there is the indication that there is this trend in our country as well. At page 69, the report on the mid-term appraisal of the Plan says:

"While seasonal factors have, no doubt, effected recent production levels, it is necessary to remember that over the past decade the general trend in the production of various crops has been upward and fluctuations from year to year have, on the whole, been relatively smaller than in earlier years."

So what is possible in the circumstances prevailing in the country is, according to me, being done and we have been able to minimise the fluctuations due to the vagaries of nature. In this connection, several members have referred to the organisational and other defects. I hope with the improvements suggested in that regard and to ensure co-ordination between various agencies connected with agriculture, we will be able to have a better future.

In this connection, I desire to refer to certain minor matters. On several occasions, failure to utilise the irrigation potential has been mentioned. I do not want to go into that. But it is not correct to say that has been the case everywhere; in several States the potential created has been almost fully utilised. For example, in Madras and Kerala, we find that.

With regard to irrigation, there is no provision for maintenance of channels and other things. Of course, it may be considered non-plan expenditure. But there must be provision for that also.

Regarding community development projects, I do not say that the scheme has not done much good. It has done a lot of good. But there are so many defects in that. The block development officer and the advisory council are given a set pattern, and they have to function within that, while what is called the schematic budget of the block does not, in many cases, fit in with local needs and conditions. The pattern which may be applicable to a particular area may not be so to others. An all-India pattern prepared in Delhi should not be imposed throughout India. The scheme should be suitable to local needs and conditions. The blocks should be given the freedom to prepare their own schemes.

Speaking about the village leaders' camps etc., in all blocks camps are conducted and training is given to agriculturists. But from my personal experience, I can say the block officer somehow manages to gather some people and the camp is held. There is absolutely no follow-up. This does not result in any good in the agricultural or any other sector.

Much has been said about the Japanese method of cultivation. That also presupposes certain facilities, e.g. assured water supply, adequate supply of manure, better seeds and other things. Without planning for these things, there is no meaning in implementing what is called the Japanese method. Similarly about the demonstration plots.

Coming to resources, resources for the plan are to be raised by the Centre and States and targets are fixed. But here the capability of States must also be taken into account. A State, because of its economic backwardness, may not be able to raise the resources which others may be able to. The planners should not refuse to help such States or areas. The plan is a national one and the State with the lowest per capita income must be helped to come up to the standard of the other States. Otherwise, there will be frustration.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

As I understand planning, it is for the prosperity of the country and so the achievement of planning should be judged from the prosperity it has brought to the country's general masses. As I come from the farmers' community, naturally my thoughts go to that community. In this country, they constitute 70 per cent of the population. They are about 31 crores living on agriculture. So I will discuss what prosperity planning has brought to them and the extent it has succeeded in bringing prosperity to the agriculturists.

Before I do so, I would quote some figures. In our country, the *per capita* income is Rs. 329·7 at current prices. What is the average annual income of a worker in a factory? In cotton mills in 1961, it was Rs. 1,658, in jute mills Rs. 1,693, in silk mills Rs. 1,266 and so on. It varies between Rs. 1,000 and Rs. 1,500, the average coming to Rs. 1,407.

Then a few people in our country pay income tax. They are 9,52,000 in number. They distribute among themselves Rs. 1,275 crores. A large slice is taken by these persons, mainly high salaried officers, factory owners etc. The average income of a man in government service, and semi-government service also, comes to about Rs.1,700 a year. This is not income. No expenditure is incurred in earning it. But let us now consider the average *per capita* income of one in agriculture. It comes to Rs. 189 gross income. A big amount and that too after 12½ years of planning! We have completed two plans, we have spent crores and crores on irrigation, fertilisers etc. and the prosperity we have brought to the person in agriculture is Rs. 189. With this state of affairs, we are not at all disturbed.

We are talking always of socialism. My hon. friends of the Communist Party talk of socialism. Socialism means equality. Where is equality considering the income of a man in agriculture? They talk of socialism in reference to labourers, government servants and such others. They do not care for agriculturists, and naturally they should not because they are followers of Marxism, and according to the Marxist theory, farmers are reactionaries.

Shri Umanath: Wrong, not at all.

Shri P. R. Patel: And they want to do away with these reactionaries.

Shri Umanath: Landlords are reactionaries.

Shri P. R. Patel: Anyone owning a and you will find that that is the general term used for farmers.

Shri Umanath: I have read.

Shri P. R. Patel: Anyone owing a piece of land, whether two acres, five acres or 20 acres, is a landlord, and my communist friends living in bungalows worth Rs. 50,000 and Rs. 100,000 are poor people, they are not landlords. But I do not want to go into it. What I am submitting is that the farmers' prosperity has remained where it was 15 years ago.

Shri Balakrishnan (Koilpatti): What is the remedy?

Shri P. R. Patel: I will give the remedy. If you look at the distribution of land, you will see that some 40 million people have five acres or less. A few have got more than 100 acres. Of course, the bigger landlords will be earning more, but what is the condition of peasants with five acres and less? There was a dispute in this House between three annas and 7 annas. Have you considered, that the income of farmers with five acres or less must be minus 2 annas, 3 annas or 4 annas. That also is their gross income. You can imagine their net income.

[Shri P. R. Patel]

When their income is so low, how are they treated? Very recently excise duty was levied on crude oil. My friends say that wheat production has gone down. Naturally, it must go down. A barrel of crude oil that cost Rs. 50 some years back is now costing the cultivator Rs. 92. With such high cost, who would do wheat cultivation? An intelligent farmer will not. So, unless and until we take some remedial measures to give the farmers at cheap rates all their requirements, I think prosperity will not come to them.

Let us take *gur*. It may be proper according to the Minister of Food, but the farmers of U.P. and Maharashtra get less price, and in Gujarat for every maund they have to pay Rs. 60 to Rs. 80. Nothing is done to supply them at control or reasonable prices.

Let us take corrugated sheets. I know the Gujarat Government has requested the Central Government to supply these sheets at least to cover the engines meant for cultivation, meant for more production, but the request has not yet been met. And the farmers in my State have to buy these sheets paying Rs. 82 to Rs. 90 per maund.

Similarly with cement. So, whatever be the requirement of the agriculturists, they are asked to go to the black market, to profiteers. If Government want more production, the cultivators should be supplied their requirements at their homes. Is it possible? That will not be possible because the planners are no doubt intelligent persons with good heart, but they know little of agriculture, they know little of the traditions and emotions of the agriculturists. Naturally, when they think of prosperity, and progress, they look to the factories, labourers etc.

Let us consider the housing scheme. For factory labourers, for low income groups we have got housing schemes; we subsidise them and give them loans. For agricultural labourers, the poorest

in the country, do we give subsidy for housing?

An Hon. Member: Not at all.

Shri P. R. Patel: No. Do we subsidise housing for agriculturists? No. We yet want more agricultural production, we say that agriculture is the base of our industry and our prosperity, but that base is very little cared for. We want more milk from the cow of agriculture, but we do not want to feed the cow and care for it. But the fashion nowadays is that everybody speaks on agriculture, the progress of agriculture, the improvement of agriculture etc., and those who know nothing about agriculture speak the most.

Now I come to land reforms. No doubt, they are good. I am not for any intermediaries, but in doing this, we have encouraged corruption. In the old Bombay State, we had a legislation which gave land to the tenant, and the compensation to be paid was 20 to 200 times the assessment. And the man who was to decide this was the revenue officer. So, it benefited the revenue officers rather than the land owners or the tenants. Everybody will agree on that, however much we may boast of our land reforms.

Then there is a fight of ideologies in land reform. My hon. friends talk of nationalisation, they want everything to be nationalised. But so far as land is concerned, let us understand the traditions and the feelings of the people, and let us work with them. We do not do it, and so we fail on the agricultural

14-00 hrs

front. The main problem before the country is not co-operative societies or collective farms. What should we do to get more production from the present agricultural system? I am finishing by referring to remunerative prices. The Plan on page 323 says: we give all incentives to the agriculturists. One incentive is wanting: remunera-

tive price. Minimum remunerative price should be guaranteed at the time of sowing. That assurance of the Planning Commission remains in the book. Have we implemented it? No. What is the support price that is often talked of? It is just declaring a support price of Rs. 12 when the prices that rule are Rs. 14 and Rs. 15. You can please small children by doing like this but the agriculturists of this country are today not in that position. Let us give them remunerative prices. I have often raised the question of fixation of remunerative minimum price. Government is rather not prepared for it. Are you going to progress agriculture like this?

Lastly, about birth control...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Enough has been said about it.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Ask him how many children he has.

Shri P. R. Patel: My hon. friend Shri Sharma always envies the wife and children of married persons. I am not going to refer to it. I only submit that what Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri said is a matter worth considering. We are having these operations and all these things; it affects the intelligent and middle-class people. Persons who are less intelligent are let free. The result will be a paucity of intelligent persons which we are feeling today. The second thing is that we have got Pakistan. If there is increase in population in one community alone, and decline in another, it is a matter to be considered. Hindu population is declining. I am not speaking for Hindus or Muslims now. When we have got Pakistan and Hindustan before us and all the other communal troubles, we have to take care of it.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): I wish to deal first with the attitude of the Government and of the Planning Commission to the development of markedly backward areas in each State. In each State there are such pockets. To say the least, the attitude is one of neglect. Typical of such area in Madras State is Arantangi, Pudukkottai and East Ramnad

—a contiguous area. The soil is good but there is no perennial source of irrigation except tanks relying on scanty rains. The Manual of Pudukkottai State itself says:

"Rainfall is scanty and precarious; the average rainfall for the past ten years being 35.9".... Even this average is not uniformly reached. Coupled with the low rain-fall the State experiences intense heat during the greater part of the year."

This has become a drought area. 1904-5, 1907-8, 1909-10, 1916-18, 1924-30 and 1934-35 were periods of continuous drought. The situation is not much different now.

104.06 hrs.

[**SHRI KHADILKAR** in the Chair]

This is evidenced from the following statistics for Pudukkottai between 1924-25 and 1934-35. The rice acreage has fallen from 1.19 lakh acres in 1924-25 to 56,000 in 1934-35; the groundnut acreage, from 45,900 to 15,400; the foodgrains and pulses acreage from 56,700 to 35,400. The situation is not anyway different now. These are ex-native States and ex-zamin areas.

The problems in such areas in each State are special problems—the existence of big developmental backlogs inherited from past. While in other parts of the country the question is of general development, in these areas it is one of eliminating these backlogs and gaps. So, the priorities, the rate of development and financial programmes will have to be different for these regions. Priorities related to the task of eliminating the backlog of each region will have to be concretely and separately evolved. The rate of development in these areas, since the general development and the elimination of backlog have to go hand in hand, will have to be higher than the rate of development in other areas. With different priorities and a higher rate of development our concept of financial requirements of developmental activities in such regions will have to differ—in quantum,

[Shri Umanath]

pattern of expenditure, pattern of raising resources and the very concept of economics of projects in these areas will have to be different. All this means that a programme should have been drawn up to undertake intensive surveys of backward areas of each State and to evolve priorities, rate of development and financial requirement for each of the areas in each State. It also means creation of agencies to execute this survey programme. The undertaking of such surveys is an immediate step recommended by the Asoka Mehta Committee in 1957 on page 122:

"The remedial measures for each of these areas would, therefore, depend on the nature and intensity of its problem. . . . But these areas also merit intensive studies for assessing the local factors, economic as well as social, and deciding upon the correct solution. Such studies are all the more important inasmuch as these areas are not only problem areas *per se*, but as we have explained earlier they also tend to upset the balance of the overall food situation."

In 1959, in a foreward to the book 'Rehabilitation and development of Basti District', Dr. P. S. Loganathan, Director General of the National Council of Applied Economic Research writes:

"In the context of economic planning of India as a whole, the need for rehabilitation and development of these depressed areas presents a serious problem which calls for not only urgent but drastic remedial measures. The nature and character of the problem differs somewhat from one depressed area to another, but precisely for this reason fact finding enquiries and investigations which will help formulate a plan of action for the economic betterment of such areas elsewhere in India, would seem to be necessary Moreover unless the

national plan give special emphasis to the rehabilitation and development of depressed areas, the economic progress of India as a whole is likely to be lopsided."

As to the nature of the survey to be conducted in those areas, Mr. Asoka Mehta committee states on page 129:

"I would say that such an enquiry will probably have to look into the difficulties created by (a) natural calamities, (b) backward conditions of agriculture due to (i) neglect of the area under British rule, (ii) lack of resources with the agriculturists, (c) lack of purchasing power among the people arising out of (i) inadequate employment opportunities, (ii) ill-balanced economy of the area."

After 13 years, the Planning Commission has not drawn such a programme of survey nor created agencies for undertaking these surveys. To prepare indicators to identify such areas they took five years since Asoka Mehta Committee reported. Even in the Mid-term Appraisal, the resolution of the National Development Council merely says that "the relatively less-developed regions in different States present special problems and call for sustained and integrated development." That is what they have been saying in the second Plan and the third Plan also.

This attitude of the Planning Commission will result in widening the existing gap between these areas and other parts of the country. It may be asked whether the State Governments are keeping quiet in those areas. They are not keeping quiet. They are doing something. They are applying the normal developmental measures in these areas as are applied in other areas. But the question is, whether these developmental measures are applied in the State Governments to those areas bearing in mind the need to eliminate the backlogs which I mentioned before? Absolutely not. Even with regard to Basti district, where the U.P. Government did more

than the Madras Government did for Pudukkottai and east Ramnad, the NCAER Report says at page 15 as follows:

"The Government of Uttar Pradesh has taken certain measures under the two Five Year Plans for the amelioration of Basti district. The efforts have been made on the familiar lines of economic development followed all over India. There has been some expenditure in local flood control and on provision of irrigation, etc.

All these measures are good, but in Basti they are deficient in two ways: (a) the needs of Basti are so much greater than those of other districts that 'equal' treatment will never enable it to catch up with the rest of India; and (b) the pattern of developmental expenditure in a district like Basti should be different from that in the rest of the State. Thus, not only is an intensification of activity needed for such areas, but also a reorientation or priorities for development functions."

So, it is very clear as far as this matter is concerned. That is why I brought this question to the notice of this House during the budget session of 1962 in the course of my speech on 12-6-1962. The Minister, while replying, completely ignored this. There has been no response. They did not even care to reply to it. Again, in a memorandum submitted by me to the Planning Minister, Shri Nanda, on 7-9-1962 the demands that were made as far as these areas were concerned were as follows. I quote:

"Hence, the people of this area consider it to be too heavy a price to miss the third Plan as well. It is their demand that:

(a) These areas, as the eastern districts of U.P. shall be treated on a special footing for battling with its marked backwardness and for accelerated development,

(b) A special division of the Planning Commission must be sent to this area, to enquire, investigate and recommend special measures for its accelerated development.

(c) Allot special funds in the III Plan for the execution of the special measures."

After this memorandum there has been no response either from the Government of India or from Shri Nanda or from the Planning Commission.

I would like to contrast this attitude of the Government with regard to another instance. When an hon. Member from eastern Uttar Pradesh described the conditions in eastern Uttar Pradesh districts in this very House, in 1962 budget session, that was enough for the Prime Minister to move the Planning Commission to send immediately a team to that area for undertaking investigations. Is it the misfortune of the people of Pudukkottai and east Ramnad in Madras State that our Prime Minister was not born in the Madras State? That is what the people of those areas ask after this was done. I do not say like that. It is the reaction of the people. Perhaps it is Uttar Pradesh patriotism. I would like to ask this: when this is the sort of attitude, partial attitude, what else will people think? I do not say nothing should be done for eastern Uttar Pradesh. They are our people; they are our brethren. They are suffering and, everything must be done for them. But why is it that this attitude is not extended to other areas, other similar areas in other States which are suffering (*Interruption*).

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: They are pleading their case well.

Shri Umanath: As though you are not pleading here. What are you doing—simply lecturing and going about? So, when this is the attitude, talking of national integration will

[Shri Umanath]

have no meaning as far as the people are concerned. Now also I am very clear and I am aware that when the hon. Minister replies to this debate he is not going to refer to this matter. I am quite aware of it. Yet, I am speaking in this House on behalf of all those people, with the mandate of all those people in those areas. They have missed two Plans, and the third Plan also they are going to miss. Though I am quite conscious that the Minister is not going to deal with this question in his reply, though I am aware of that, yet, I am carrying the mandate of those people: let this Government be given time till the next budget session to announce their decision not only in regard to these particular areas but similar backward areas in other parts of the country.

I am also aware that language of Parliament alone is not sufficient as far as this Government is concerned. I am quite aware that the language of Parliament will have to be backed up by the language of the masses to make this Government respond to the desires of the people, especially in the markedly backward areas, by the powerful mass struggle. The maximum that this Government can do is to jail people like me and others in such a struggle. We have been waiting for long; we have been waiting for 13 to 15 years, and yet, when there is no response to the memorandum, no response even to speeches in Parliament, no response even when individual approaches to the Minister on behalf of the people, the people will have no other go except to launch a mass struggle. The maximum that this Government can do is to jail us, but at that time, we will be satisfied that this august House will be remembering that we have been jailed for this cause, for having stood by the people, and we are sure that justice will be done to the people.

श्री अब्दुल गनी गोनी (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : जनाबेवाला, तीसरे पांच साला

मन्सूबे के मिड-टर्म एप्रैजल पर तीन चार रोज से बहस हो रही है। जब हम इस रिपोर्ट को पढ़ते हैं, तो एक तरफ तो दुख होता है कि हमारे प्लान में बहुत सी खामियां रही हैं, बहुत सी फ्लेयोजर्ज और नाकामयाबियां हुई हैं, लेकिन जब हम आखिर में दिए गए नेशनल डेवेलपमेंट कौंसिल के स्टेटमेंट को पढ़ते हैं, तो उससे इन्तहाई खुशी होती है और हमारे दिलों में उम्मीद पैदा होती है। उस स्टेटमेंट में प्लानिंग कमीशन कौम के साथ, मुल्क के साथ, एक वादा करता है कि वह आइन्दा इन खामियों को दूर करके प्लान को कामयाब बनाने की कोशिश करेगा।

जहां तक इस प्लान का ताल्लुक है, इस पर बहुत सी बहसें हुईं। जिस तरह एक घर या एक फ़ैमिली के लिए अपना मकान बनाने में प्लानिंग जरूरी है, उसी तरह मुल्क की तरक्की के लिए, देश को बनाने के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान को एक नई सुरत देने के लिए मन्सूवाबन्दी बहुत जरूरी है। हम पहले और दूसरे पांच साला मन्सूबे को पूरा कर चुके हैं और अब तीसरे पांच साला मन्सूबे में चल रहे हैं। यकीनी तौर पर हिन्दुस्तान आगे बढ़ रहा है और हिन्दुस्तान की जनता आगे बढ़ रही है। हमें उन इकदामात की तरफ से बिल्कुल आंखें बन्द नहीं कर लेनी चाहिए, जो कि प्लानिंग कमीशन या हुकूमत ने इस मुल्क की बेहतरी के लिए उठाए हैं और जिनमें कामयाबी हासिल हुई है। जहां तक मैं समझता हूं, हिन्दुस्तान का एक नया मिजाज उभर रहा है, एक नई तस्वीर उभर रही है, जिसमें नये नये कारखाने खुल रहे हैं और नई नई सड़कों के जाल बिछाये जा रहे हैं। जहां तक मैं देखता हूं, रियासत जम्मू-काश्मीर में एक बड़ा भारी इन्कलाब आ रहा है। उस इन्कलाब को लाने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान में एक मुनासिब वातावरण और एट्मोस्फीयर को मैं जरूरी समझता हूं, जिसमें हम ठोस इकदामात उठा सकें।

लेकिन बद-बढ़ती से जहां हमको एक तरफ पाकिस्तान का मुकाबला करना पड़ रहा है दूसरी तरफ चीनी का सामना करना पड़ रहा है, वहां तीसरी तरफ हमको इन्टर्नल डिसेन्स-आर्डर का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। पोलिटिकल मोटिव्स को सहारा देने के लिए या पोलिटिकल एंज को हासिल करने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान में जो एट्मास्फियर खराब किया जाता है वह प्लान की इम्प्लीमेंटेशन में बहुत बड़ी रुकावट है। हमको अपने प्लान में कामयाबी तब तक हासिल नहीं हो सकती है, जब तक कि सब के सब लोग उसमें सहयोग न दें। जब तक सब लोग हिन्दुस्तान को अपना मुल्क और देश न समझें, अगर हमारी नज़रे कहीं बाहर लगी हों, तो यकीनी तौर पर हम

श्री शौर्य (अलीगढ़) : क्या हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे लोग हैं ?

श्री अब्दुल ग़नी गौनी : आनरेबल मेम्बर क्यों घबरा गए ?

तो यकीनी तौर पर हम इस मुल्क की तामीर में उस तरीके से हिस्सा नहीं ले सकते हैं, जिस तरीके से लेना चाहिए। अभी अभी कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि साहब, फ़लां तबके की आबादी की औसत जो बढ़ रही है, उससे देश को ख़तरा पैदा हो रहा है। आज हिन्दुस्तान के कुछ लोगों के ज़हनों में एक अहमासे-कमतरी—या उसको एहसासे-बरातरी कहिए— है। जब तक वे ज़हन साफ़ न हों, यकीनी तौर पर हिन्दुस्तान में वह वातावरण, वह एट्मास्फ़ीयर पैदा नहीं होगा, जो कि मुल्क की तामीर और तरक्की के लिए ज़रूरी होता है।

जहां तक रियासत जम्मू-काश्मीर का ताल्लुक है, एक तरफ़ हम पाकिस्तान का मुकाबला कर रहे हैं एक तरफ़ हम चीन का मुकाबला कर रहे हैं और उसके अलावा हमें कई लोगों की फ़िरकापरस्ती का मुकाबला करना पड़ रहा है, लेकिन उसके बावजूद रियासत जम्मू-काश्मीर ने तरक्की की है।

मैं आपको एक मिसाल दूंगा कि १९५३ में हमारे यहां स्टूडेंट्स, तुलबा की तादाद ६४,००० थी, लेकिन आज इन पिछले दस सालों में वहां पर दो लाख चौतीस हजार तुलबा हैं, आज इतने तुलबा हमारे स्कूलों और कालेजों में पढ़ रहे हैं। यह जो चीज हमारे सामने आ रही है यह यह दिखलाती है कि एक नई जिन्दगी हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हो रही है, एक नई कौम हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हो रही है। यह तभी हो सकता है जब कि हम हर चीज पर सोच विचार कर आगे बढ़ेंगे। हमारी रियासत में जहां हम पहले देखते हैं, महाराजा के जमाने में, १९४७ के पहले, राजशाही में कि कोई कालेज नहीं है, वहां आज कई कालेज हैं, टैक्नीकल कालेज हैं, मैडीकल कालेज हैं, एग्रिकलचरल कालेज हैं साइंस कालेज खुले हुए हैं। यही एक चीज है जो कि एक नया नमूना हमारे सामने पेश कर रही है।

ज़रूरत इस बात की है कि यह जो प्लान है, इसको आप और हम सब अपनायें। हम समझते हैं कि यह हमारा प्लान है। अगर आप यह समझते हैं कि कुछ विदेशी लोग बैठ हुए हैं प्लानिंग कामिशन में, ये हमारे अपने लोग नहीं हैं, इनको कोई परेशानी नहीं है देश की और ये बैठे बैठे अपना वक्त जाया कर रहे हैं, तो यकीनी तौर पर इसको चलाने में, इसको इम्प्लेमेंट करने में खामियां रह जायेंगे। खामियां हैं, इसको मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन जब तक देश साथ नहीं है, जब तक सब लोग साथ नहीं हैं, और न ही लोगों ने इसको इम्प्लेमेंट करने में साथ दिया तो यकीनी तौर पर वह इसको उठाकर दूर फेंक देंगे और बे काम करने के लिए तैयार नहीं होंगे जिसके लिए हमने उनको मुकर्रर किया हुआ है।

इस प्लान का जो डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन है, जो हमारे फाइनेंसिस है, उन में आप सब से पहले ज़रूर जायें। आपने प्लान के इंट्रोडक्ट्री चैप्टर में लिखा हुआ है कि कुछ बुनियादी चीजें हैं जिनकी तरफ ध्यान देना है। उन

[श्री अब्दुल गनी गोनी]

से एक बुनियादी चीज यह है कि देहात के लोग, रूरल एरियाज के लोग निगलैक्टिड हैं और उनको ऊपर उठाना है। रूरल एरियाज में सड़कें नहीं हैं, रेलें नहीं हैं, आपकी जो यहां कोठियां हैं, वे वहां नहीं हैं, यहां की तरह से एयर कंडीशंड कमरे नहीं हैं, वहां पर जिस तरह से शहरों में पंखे लग हुए हैं, वे नहीं हैं, उनकी तरफ सब से पहले ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये। उनके पास बैठने के लिए जगह नहीं है, उनके बच्चों के लिए स्कूल नहीं हैं, उनके बच्चों के इलाज का इन्तजाम नहीं है, उनका बच्चा एक एक कुनैन की टिककी के लिए तड़पता और तरसता है और मर जाता है। ये जो चीजें हैं, इन सब की तरफ आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिए।

आपका यह प्लान ७५०० करोड़ रुपये का है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप सरकार में से रूरल एरियाज के लिए क्या दे रहे हैं? जम्मू और काश्मीर को इपमें से सिर्फ एक परसेंट मिल रहा है।

उस रियासत को जिस रियासत के बोर्डर्स डिस्टर्ब्ड हैं, जिसकी जनता एक शक्सी निजाम के तले दबी हुई थी, आप क्या दे रहे हैं, उसके लिए आप क्या कर रहे हैं। नेता को लीजिये, हिमाचल प्रदेश को लीजिये, नागालैंड को लीजिये। इन इलाकों को खसूसन आपको इमदाद देनी है क्योंकि ये बोर्डर एरियाज हैं। अगर आप बोर्डर एरियाज को मजबूत नहीं करेंगे, अहमियत नहीं देंगे तो यकीनी तौर पर हिन्दुस्तान की हिफाजत नहीं हो सकेगी और हिन्दुस्तान की डिफेंस मजबूत नहीं हो सकेगी। बदकिस्मती से हमारी लापरवाही की वजह से हमारे ये एरियाज कमजोर रहे हैं। ऐसी सूरत में यकीनी तौर पर इन्फ्लैट्रेशन का खतरा है। उन एरियाज को नजरअंदाज नहीं किया जाना चाहिये वहां पर डिसेसिटिसफिकेशन के लिये कोई गुंजाइश नहीं रखी जानी चाहिये,

उन लोगों में नाउम्मीदी पैदा नहीं होनी चाहिये, ऐसा अहसास पैदा नहीं होना चाहिये कि मर्कजी सरकार उनकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं दे रही है। मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारी रियासत को आज तक जो लोन मिला है जम्मू काश्मीर रियासत को सेंट्रल लोन जो मिला है, वह बहुत ज्यादा नहीं मिला है। इसको देखकर दुख सा होता है कि हम कर क्या रहे हैं। प्रापेगंडा होता है कि काश्मीर पर करोड़ों रुपया खर्च किया जा रहा है। मेरे पास फिगरज हैं। मैं उनको आपके सामने रखता हूँ। एंड आफ मार्च १९६३ तक ६७ करोड़ ३९ लाख रुपये उस रियासत को सेंटर से लोन के तौर पर मिले। उस में से हम ने १४.४० करोड़ रुपये पे कर दिये। इन लॉज पर हम ने जो इंटरिस्ट पे किया वह ८.७३ करोड़ रुपये था। जहां यह हालत हो, जहां इस तरह का स्टेप मदरली ट्रीटमेंट किया जाता हो, इस तरह के इलाकों के साथ वहां हम यह कह सकते हैं कि हम आगे नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं। जब तक आप जो बोर्डर एरियाज हैं, जहां पर हमारे मुल्क की सरहदें दूसरे मुल्कों से लगती हैं, जो मुहाज हैं, उनको मजबूत नहीं करेंगे, तब तक यकीनी तौर पर हम आगे नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं। जहां तक हमारी सरहदों का ताल्लुक है, हम फाद्य के साथ कह सकते हैं और मैं कहूंगा—मैं नहीं जानता हूँ कि कुछ आनरेबल मैम्बर्ज के मन में क्या है—कि काश्मीर में जहां जहां पाकिस्तान ने हमला किया वहां वहां हिन्दुओं और मुसलमानों का खून एक साथ बहा। ब्रिगेडियर उसमान और ब्रिगेडियर राजेन्द्र सिंह दोनों ने एक ही जगह पर खून दिया है और दूसरों ने भी दिया। लद्दाख में हमारे सरदार मारे गये हैं, हमारी सरहदों पर लोग मारे गए हैं। वहां पर किसी ने मौका नहीं दिया कि दुश्मन उसको गिरफ्तार करे। गिरफ्तार होने की शर्मिंदगी के बजाय हम मरना बेहतर समझते हैं और यही हम जानते हैं। हजारों भादमी गिरफ्तार हुए हैं कई

फंटियरों पर लेकिन लड़ाख पर या जम्मू और काश्मीर में कहीं दूसरी जगह पर एक भी गिरफ्तार नहीं हुआ है। हम गिरफ्तार होने से मौत को तरजीह देते हैं, हम गिरफ्तारी की जिन्दगी बसर नहीं करना जानते हैं। इस वास्ते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम तब तक आगे नहीं बढ़ सकते हैं जब तक कि इस तरह के जो एरियाज़ हैं, उनको हम डिवलेप नहीं करते हैं। मुझे दुःख होता है यह देख कर कि एक तरफ तो एयर कंडिशनड बिल्डिंग्स हैं, बड़ी बड़ी कारें खड़ी हैं, बड़े बड़े महल खड़े हैं और दूसरी तरफ एक झोपड़ी है और उस झोपड़ी में तो सात बच्चे पल रहे हैं और उस कोठी में, साथ वाली में तीन आदमी ही हैं। यह सोशलिस्ट समाज नहीं है जिसकी चर्चा हमारे दोस्त कांग्रेस वाले और दूसरे भी करते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो हमारा आईना है, जो हमारा कांस्टीट्यूशन है, उस में जब तक हम तरमीम नहीं लाते हैं, राइट टू वर्क गारंटी नहीं करते हैं, तब तक रेडी-कली कांस्टीट्यूशन को चेंज नहीं करते हैं तब तक समाजवाद हिन्दुस्तान में हम कायम नहीं कर सकते हैं।

हम पर बहुत अटक किया जाता है कि कांस्टीट्यूशन को दफा ३७० रखा हुआ है, इसको अलग कर दिया जाए। बदकिस्मती तो यही है कि हमारे जहन साफ नहीं हैं। यह दफा भी इंसान की बनाई हुई है। यह दफा भी है, ३७१ भी है, ३७१ ए भी है जिस में नागालैंड बनाया है। यह जो ३७० दफा है इसका एक्शन के साथ कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है। ३७० रहे या न रहे, काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का इंटिग्रल पार्ट है और रहेगा। यह बुनियादी चीज है, आइनी चीज है। इस ३७० दफा के क्या फायदे हैं, इसको आप देखें। जो एस्सेंस है उसको आप देखें। हमने वहां पर लैंड टू दी टिल्लर का स्लोगन लगाया था और उसको दे दी है। यहां भी अभी लैंड टू दी टिल्लर की चर्चा हुई है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब

तक कांस्टीट्यूशन में रैडिकल चेंज नहीं होगा, जब तक हम बड़े बड़े सरमायेदारों के असर में रहेंगे, तब तक लैंड रिफार्म नहीं हो सकता है। हम ने वहां पर २२ एकड़ या साढ़े बाइस एकड़ की हद मुकरर की हर एक इंसान के लिये और जो इससे ज्यादा जमीन थी उसको हम ने स्टेटअवे काश्तकार को दे दिया। हिन्दुस्तान में हमारी सरकार भी सोशलिस्टिक समाज का दावा करती है। अभी कांग्रेस सेशन में भी इसकी चर्चा हुई थी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से आईन इस वक्त है और जब तक इस में तरमीम नहीं की जाती है, तब तक लैंड टू दि टिल्लर आप नहीं दे सकते हैं बिना कम्पेंसेशन के। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कम्पेंसेशन के बगैर लैंड टू दि टिल्लर को जाये। आप हद मुकरर कर दें, २५ एकड़ की, ३० की, ५० की या सौ एकड़ की जितनी भी आप चाहें अगर आप बड़े बड़े जमींदारों के हामी हैं तो। लेकिन बाकी जो लैंड है वह स्टेटअवे टू दी टिल्लर को चली जानी चाहिये।

अभी अभी हमारे दोस्त ने फिगरज पेश किए हैं, जो बड़े बड़े फार्मर्स हैं या जो जमींदार हैं, उनके। शायद ए० पी० जैन साहब ने या किसी दूसरे साहब ने कहा है एक बड़ा आदमी पांच मन पैदा करता है फी एकड़। आज के जमाने में इस को देख कर हैरानी होती है। हमारे यहां एक मुंशी राम टेनेंट है। उसने ८२ मन गल्ला पैदा किया है। आपके बड़े बड़े सरमायेदार लोग—

श्री ओंकारलाल बरबा (कोटा) :
 ८२ मन नहीं निकल सकता है।

श्री अब्दुल गनी गोनी : मैं सच कह रहा हूँ। मैं इसको साबित कर दूंगा। आपको जमीन दिला दूंगा, काश्तकार दिखला दूंगा। गवर्नमेंट ने उसको इनाम दिया है।

जब तक आप टिल्लर को, किसान को काश्त की मिलकियत का हक नहीं देंगे तब तक

[श्री अब्दुल गनी गोनी]

कुछ नहीं हो सकता है। आप लैंड रिफार्म कीजिये। मुझे मालूम है कि कुछ लोग लैंड रिफार्म करो, लैंड रिफार्म करो, यह तो चिल्लाते हैं, लेकिन जब कदम उठाये जायेंगे तो वे सब के सब कहना शुरू कर देंगे कि यह क्यों कर रहे हो, कम्पेंसेशन दो। इस वास्ते जब तक कांस्टीट्यूशन में आप रैडिकल चेंज नहीं करते हैं तब तक कुछ नहीं होगा। एक तो यह बहुत जरूरी है।

दूसरे जो डायरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स हैं, इनको एवरोगेट करके उनको फंडेमेंटल राइट्स में ट्रांसफर किया जाय ताकि उन के मुताबिक गवर्नमेंट चले। उन को फंडेमेंटल राइट्स में जगह दी जाय। आप देखें कि आज जो अनएम्प्लायमेंट की फिगरें हैं, व बढ़ती ही जा रही हैं, पहले प्लान में कम थी, दूसरे में ज्यादा हो गई, तीसरे में और ज्यादा हो गई। अगर खुली डील रही तो वे बढ़ती ही जायगी फिर ये चाहे एज्जुकेटेड अन-एम्प्लायड की फिगरें हों या अनएज्जुकेटेड अनएम्प्लायड की हों। अगर आप आइने में राइट टु वर्क गारंटी करेंगे तो यकीनी तौर पर गवर्नमेंट आराम की नींद नहीं सो सकेगी, आफिसर्स जो बड़े बड़े हैं, बड़े बड़े प्रोडोदों पर हैं, आराम से नहीं सो सकेंगे, उन को रात दिन काम करना पड़ेगा ताकि जो बाहर हैं बेकार, उन को काम पर लगाया जा सके। हमारा प्लान भी तब ही चलेगा जबकि बुनियादी तौर पर जो कमजोरी हमारे आईन में है, उस को दूर कर दिया जाय। अगर इस तरह की गारंटी नहीं होगी तो हमेशा की तरह हमारे मिनिस्टर लोग सालाना रिपोर्ट दे दिया करेंगे। कि बहुत अफसोस है कि यह शाटफाल हो गया, वह शाटफाल हो गया। आज भी यही रिपोर्ट पेश है कि बड़ा अफसोस है कि शाटफाल हुआ है। यह कोई एक्सक्लूज नहीं है। यह कहना कि ये खामियां रह गई हैं, इस वास्ते शाटफाल हो गया है कोई बड़ी बात नहीं है। शानदार तो तब होता कि जो हमारे टारगेट्स

थ, उन से भी हम आगे बढ़ जाते। तब हम समझते कि हमारी जो इकूमत है वह सही मानों में रातदिन कोशिश कर रही है। बजाय इस के कि हम शाटफाल बतलायें, हमें चाहिये था कि हम सर्प्लस रिपोर्टें देते। हम सर्प्लस रिपोर्टें दे दें कि हम ने यह किया। काश्मीर के लिये मैं कहूंगा कि सन् १९५२ में हमारे पास एलेक्ट्रिसिटी की कर्पेंसिटी सिर्फ ४,००० कीलोवाट थी, लेकिन दस साल के बाद जब हम उस के फिगर पढ़ते हैं कि वह ३१,००० कीलोवाट हो गई है तो दिल खुश हो जाता है कि हम आगे बढ़ रहे हैं। इसी तरह से मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के दूसरे इलाकों में भी, जहाँ बड़े बड़े लोग बैठ हुए हैं, गवर्नमेंट में जिन के नुमाइन्दे बैठे हुए हैं पार्लियामेंट में जिन के नुमाइन्दे बैठे हुए हैं स्टेट्स में जिन के नुमाइन्दे बैठे हुए हैं, एक इन्कलाब आ रहा है। यह कहना कि हिन्दुस्तान में कुछ नहीं हो रहा है, इन्कलाब नहीं हो रहा है, यह ठीक नहीं है। यह वेइन्साफी है कि हम लोग उन के साथ इन्साफ न करें जो रात दिन काम कर रहे हैं।

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): Mr. Chairman, as I sat here and heard the speeches of many hon. Members, particularly the arguments against planning, I must say I was surprised. I agree that the targets of our plan have not been achieved. For that purpose, if you like, you may say that our implementation has been defective or we have partially failed. But I ask in all sincerity, does it make the concept of planning defective, does it make the concept of planning objectionable or unacceptable. I submit not. After all, what is the main purpose of planning? The purpose is to make a more efficient use of our limited resources, to bring a sort of rational control in our economy, to put our economy under a certain amount of Central direction, to put it under some sort of regimentation. And for what? For the larger interests of the country.

If you apply all these tests you will find that it is true that the plan in our system of political democracy has not succeeded, as it cannot succeed, to the same extent as it can succeed in totalitarian countries. Because, here we have got a different nature of Constitution, that is the federal constitution in which the States have their autonomy. And do not forget that 8 per cent of your plan projects have to be implemented by the States. The Constitution has given them their own autonomy and their own rights. There the position of the Centre is more advisory than anything else. If that is so, then the shortfalls or the lower implementation or the lack of achievement of targets, all these things can be explained just by this one thing, namely that there is no rigid regimentation, no complete and strict direction from the Centre. And I think it is good. When human values are involved, between rigid regimentation on the one hand and not achieving the full targets on the other, if a choice has to be made, I am sure the House will agree that even at the risk of not achieving the targets fully we must give liberty and freedom their due importance.

Having said this I must confess that the three reasons which the hon. the Mover of the Motion gave the other day for the shortfalls in the plan targets are not very impressive. The first reason that he gave was adverse weather conditions and inadequate administrative co-ordination in the field of agriculture. Much has been said about this adverse weather and nature. So I would not say anything more on that. Take the other thing, the inadequate administrative co-ordination in the field of agriculture. I am reminded of a speech which was made on the floor of this House by one hon. Member as early as 1958, and I would quote only one or two small passages from that. This is what he said:

"The agricultural production or food production today is the

charge not of one Ministry, but somehow or other it has happened that about five different Ministries and departments have got something to do with food production. Whether it is good or bad, it is for the House to decide."

And then he says a little later:

"So, for a larger food production, one has to streamline and co-ordinate the activities of all these five Ministries in a manner that it will go just like one machine and ultimately produce results which I am afraid are not being produced now to the extent to which it has got to be produced."

This was a statement made by a person no less than one of the Central Cabinet Ministers, Shri S. K. Patil who was Minister of Irrigation and Power at that time, on 26th March 1958.

And now after five years the Government is coming and telling us that there is no administrative co-ordination in the field of the agricultural departments.

The other reason given by the hon. Mover was inadequate advance planning and somewhat optimistic schedule of implementation. Why this inadequate advance planning? Who prevented you? And then 'somewhat optimistic schedule of implementation'. Do you seriously believe that the targets which were stated in the plan were 'optimistic'? Do you seriously suggest that the increase of about 40 per cent of steel production during the Third Plan was an 'optimistic' ambition, target or the increase of cement production by about 5 million tons per year was an 'optimistic' target?

There is a third reason given, and that is delay in obtaining foreign exchange and its speedy utilisation, on

[Shri Morarka]

account of procedural formalities. Is this the first time that we are obtaining foreign exchange? I ask, has the procedure been changed now. Why were these not taken into consideration at the time of framing the plan?

But let us see what the Planning Commission has to say in this Mid-term Appraisal on page 124:

"The lack of adequate preparatory planning has largely contributed to the delay in the implementation of certain projects in the public sector for which even foreign exchange credit was available".

It is not therefore want of foreign exchange credit; it was the inadequate planning, it was the inadequate organisation which was responsible.

There are two more reasons given, though not so clearly. One is the emergency and the other is the growth of population. There is no increase in the rate of growth of population. The rate of growth continues from the first Plan and the second Plan, and in the third Plan it has not jumped very much, it is the same. And I may also say that when the Plan was drafted, this factor was taken into consideration.

Then, take the emergency. What has happened on account of the emergency? Have the resources available for the Plan been diverted for any other purpose on account of the emergency? On the contrary, is it not a fact that during the emergency, because of industrial truce and many other factors, production has actually increased? The emergency actually has helped in achieving the targets of this Plan rather than hindering them in any way. Why is this reason, this bogey of emergency, put to justify the lack achievements, the targets the partial failure of the Plan? I do not think the emergency in any way has come in the way.

Then, what are the real reasons why the Plan did not succeed to the extent it should have succeeded. According to me the first reason is that there is a weak direction from the Centre. As I said, due to the autonomy of the States, the directions which the Centre can give are obeyed only partially and not to the full extent. You know that our hon. Prime Minister has said times without number and recommended to the States that the Chief Minister must hold the portfolio of Agriculture. He has repeated this advice. But I ask, how many Chief Ministers today, even after the Kamaraj plan, are holding this portfolio of Agriculture.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Only one.

Shri Morarka: They are enamoured of the portfolios of Industry, Finance, Home, some of which are Central subjects—not Home, but Industry, Commerce they are all Central subject. They are enamoured of both these portfolios, and in spite of the recommendation and advice of no less a person than the Prime Minister no Chief Minister has taken it up. This shows the attitude of mind. The autonomy of the States is given too much importance.

Then the other reason, according to me, is that our procedure laid down for approvals, for sanctions and for clearance is highly cumbersome and time-consuming. If you want to achieve the Plan target, and within the time given in the Plan, then all these things must be sanctioned as quickly and expeditiously as possible. We have created a number of autonomous corporations, and commissions so that they can function in an autonomous manner. True. Even then, the so-called strategic controls kept by the the Ministries are so vital and time-consuming that even today, in spite of all autonomy, things are not proceeding smoothly and processing,

sanctioning and approval are not coming within the time they should come.

Thirdly, we do not have enough trained personnel, particularly for the management of these industrial enterprises. I agree that the managerial cadre cannot be brought about in a fortnight. But, then, it is more than ten years since we decided that we are going to have public sector industrial projects and that they are going to expand. So, serious effort should have been made to create a managerial cadre. Once it was done and then it has been abandoned, and I do not know why. I do not think any serious move has been made even to train managerial personnel.

The fourth reason why the Plan has not succeeded fully is because at the time of framing the Third Plan the failures of the Second Plan were not taken into consideration. During the Second Plan itself, we did not achieve our targets. Lessons from that were not taken into consideration at the time of framing our Third Plan.

Having said this, I would like to say, that so far as the general picture of resources and public co-operation is concerned, you have got more than what you wanted and targeted for. In the case of additional taxation, for example, your target was to get Rs. 1,100 crores from the Centre. Instead of Rs. 1,100 crores, you are going to get Rs. 1,900 crores now. So far as additional taxation in the States is concerned, you are getting a little less, Rs. 500 crores instead of Rs. 600 crores. So far as borrowing is concerned, your target was Rs. 800 crores for five years. You have already got Rs. 550 crores. In the case of small savings, you have already got Rs. 300 crores out of Rs. 600 crores. In the case of deficit financing, which is another indirect burden on the people your target was Rs. 550 crores for the entire Plan period, as against which you would be injecting a dose of Rs.

580 crores within three years. In deficit financing, saving, borrowing, additional taxation, in every sphere you have got much more than what you have targeted for. So far as resources are concerned, both internal and external, you have got not only what you asked for, but even more. So far as public co-operation is concerned, you have got it in all the various fields and activities, but so far as the achievements of physical targets are concerned, you have not achieved even 50 per cent except in one or two items like social services.

Many hon. Members have already spoken about agriculture. So, I would like to concentrate more on industry. Before I actually come to any specific industry, I would like to preface it by saying that our industrial field should be divided into three sectors, the two well-known sectors *viz.*, private and public and, third, the co-operative sector. I think the time has come when we must allot certain industries to the co-operative sector. Let the co-operative sector function and justify itself, whether it can acquire itself properly or not. I feel that all industries based essentially on agriculture, particularly perishable agricultural goods, must definitely and necessarily belong to the co-operative sector. In that I include the sugar industry, fruit canning industry, fisheries, dairy productions and similar things. In due course, if they are properly trained, even the textile and tea industry could be given to the co-operative sector.

श्री श्रीकारलाल बेरवा (कोटा) :
 कोआपरेटिव्स में मिनिस्ट्रों के क्षेत्र होंगे
 तो चल सकेंगे वरना नहीं चल सकेंगे ।

Shri Morarka: So far as the co-operative is concerned, you may exercise all the regulation and control over them as you may please. But, you should look upon the co-operative sector with sympathy. Train people to run them and then hand over the management of the co-operatives to

[Shri Morarka]

the people to whom they belong rather than always imposing Government servants on them.

It is a strange thing that the failures of one sector are justified by the failures in another sector. I have heard people saying "Yes, the public sector has failed; but what about the private sector?". The private sector people say "true, we have failed; but what about the public sector?" This is not the attitude that is expected of either of these sectors. They have got two different spheres which have been earmarked and they have to function in their own spheres instead of blaming one another.

Now, in the limited time at my disposal, I would like to take a few industries which are common to both public and private sector. I will begin with steel. I think the performance of the steel industry at the present moment is rather poor and unless we do something, some Herculean effort is made, we may not be able to achieve even the revised target of the Third Plan. Our expansion programmes of the three existing steel plants in the public sector are delayed by one year. Bokaro is still in the stage of blueprints and drawings. The alloy steel plant, which was to produce 200,000 tons, according to the revised figures, would be producing about 50,000 tons. What does the Planning Commission Mid-term Appraisal say about this? It says that the targeted production of 6.8 million tons is now expected to be reached by the third year of the Fourth Plan": That is to say, our target of the Third Plan is now expected to be reached in the third year of the Fourth Plan. Then it continues to say that "in the above circumstances, the realisation of the steel target will be appreciably delayed". Between 1961 and 1963, two years alone, we imported steel worth as much as Rs. 200 crores.

Then I will pass on to another basic industry, fertilizer. The performance of fertilizer is still more dismal. Our capacity target was 1 million tons and our production target was 8 lakhs tons. Now, in 1963-64, in the third year of the Plan, our capacity is expected to be 3.86 lakhs and our actual production 2.40 lakhs tons. I think this is a very poor performance and the blame lies not only on the public sector but also on the private sector. This is a basic necessity for the development of agriculture and unless and until some special efforts are made, I am afraid, the target may not be achieved.

I have something more to say about cement and other industries but since you are ringing the bell, I will not deal with them. In conclusion, however, I want to say this to the Government: please do not forget that the Plan is financed either by additional taxation, or by borrowing or by deficit financing. All these impose hardship on the people. They are all means of compulsory savings, they involve forced savings of the people. If in spite of all the sacrifices the results are not achieved, if the targets are not achieved, people are bound to feel frustrated and planning is bound to become unpopular.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in the age in which we are living, each one has developed a particular fashion of planning. Everybody considers himself fashionable if he talks about planning. Whether the Plan ultimately brings results or not, is nobody's concern. The only concern is that there must be planning; we must be obsessed with planning, planning for the sake of planning and not for doing work. That has been the net result of all this planning for all these 15 years. I have been against it. I admit that I have stood against this planning in this sense that I wanted a progress of my country and

I did not want this planning business as planning and a new thing to be created for the sake of planning.

Dr. M. S. Aney: That is right.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The results are there for all of us to note. Figures have been given. I will not reiterate the figures that have been given to show the shortfalls and the shortcomings of this Plan. But the patent facts that are there must be noted by all of us. What has this planning brought to us after spending Rs. 8300 crores? Rs. 8300 crores have been wasted with the net result that the country is today poorer than what it was before. Everywhere we are seeing that people find it very hard to maintain themselves. Let us look at the Directives of the Constitution. It is on the basis of the Directives that this Plan was prepared and the basis of the Directives was that each one of us should get social justice and equality and at the same time a welfare State should be established. Have we established a welfare State? That is the question which we must put to ourselves. Have we realised the aim with which we started by the Directives that are put in the Constitution? I would say, "No." There would be nobody to challenge that proposition. Big words are being used; professorial attacks are being made. The people who do not know what agriculture is plan the things and they think that grams grow on a tree and that when you shake it the grams will fall on the ground. It is such people who have entered into this planning and who are planning. Now, what is the result? Look at the production of wheat. It has gone down. Look at the production of rice. It has gone down. Look at the production of cereals. It has gone down. Look at the production of foodgrains. It has gone down. Look at the production of sugar. It has gone down. Sugar is getting dearer; wheat is getting dea-

rer; cereals are getting dearer and everything that a man wants is getting dearer. What has happened to cotton? Where is it disappearing? Why are people not getting proper clothing? The things which were available at 6 annas a yard are not available to us at Rs. 1|10| a yard today. How is the poor man going to maintain himself? Sometimes people start talking that Rs. 18 of 1938 are better than Rs. 180 of today. It is a fact. The planning has not brought about any amelioration of the masses in any manner whatsoever.

Now, let us take the first and foremost thing that is being pushed down the throat of everybody and that is the land reforms, the wonderful land reforms. What is the object? When I was reading this Appraisal, I was wonderstruck as to who gave the idea that the poor tenant is going to be the owner of the land. Where has he been made the owner? What is that particular law which makes him the owner? I am a lawyer of some standing and have much to do with the land reforms in the cases with which I have dealt. I have always found that the first sentence that is uttered by every advocate-general in the court is that land belongs to the State—all land belongs to the State. There is no talk of the poor tenant, the poor cultivator. The land belongs to the State and the tenant is the tenant of the State. Why then talk in this Appraisal that the land is ultimately going to belong to the cultivator. It is not. The only thing is, intermediaries have been removed and then comes the picture, a very fine picture, which is now being presented to us, and very soon it is coming before us, the Constitution (Seventeenth) Amendment Bill. By one stroke, we are going to fortify the Government....

Shri P. R. Patel: On a point of order, Sir. I want to know whether

[Shri P. R. Patel]

a Member of the Select Committee which is considering this Constitution (Seventeenth) Amendment Bill can speak in favour or against the Bill.

Shri Brij Raj Singh: What an idea!

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order. The hon. Member ought to realise that the general line of criticism that he is following is within his ambit.

Shri Brij Raj Singh: It is the fault of his poor understanding.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: No, no. He understands all right, but he wanted to put emphasis upon it. I am very much obliged to him for that. He has succeeded in that.

Then, the question for us to consider is very simple. What are we aiming at by this Constitution (Seventeenth) Amendment Bill? We are aiming to arm all 144 Bills now in existence in various States with this power that the Government whenever it likes, ryotwari or no ryotwari, will take away the right of any tenant or any sub-tenant, even the right to the house that he might have built, the well that he might have built or even the godown that he might have built and, in fact, all the appurtenances that may be available on his land, the so-called "his land", and the Government will not pay him any compensation, if the Government so desires, or pay him anything that the Government may like. He will be a begger and the Government will be the alms-giver and he will be the alms taker. That is the position which by our land reforms we are reducing him to. We have been so narrow-minded in our outlook that we have never planned for the full period to begin with. When we started planning, we had no plan that if we started building a particular thing this will grow, this will

grow more and we went to plan for 10 persons to sit and ultimately we found that 20 persons had to be accommodated—and nothing is available. Then, we say, dismantle this telephone exchange because we had planned in the beginning for 200 lines only and now 1000 lines are to be supplied—where should we go; we cannot supply; so, dismantle this telephone exchange. I should say, you should thank the Britishers who without this planning built this Assembly Hall to be able to accommodate not only 180 who were there, not only 200 who were there but 509 of us who are here today, and many more can sit here. So, that was a better planning than we had done. But it was not done under the obsession of planning. It was done with a vision and when the vision is absent, this planning is no good. Absence of vision is very patent in our planning.

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Member's time is up. Your group has already taken some time. You have got only 14 minutes.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Perhaps you were not told that I have to speak for 20 minutes. I do not know. I am the leader of the Party and I had undertaken to speak today.

I will bring to your notice one thing, that is, the development of the railways that has been tom-tomed. I will drop other subjects which I wanted to bring up. I have got plenty of subjects on which I wanted to speak. But I will concentrate myself on the development of railways. Let us have this picture of the railways. Anyone of us who had time and leisure and who had a mind to read, as I read the Munition Board's Report, will be surprised to know, planning or no planning, when the First World War was on in 1917, a good deal of planning for all the processes that are available today was made available to us in 1917 by the

Munition Board's Report. And what did this Munition Report do? The progress of manufacture of locomotives in 1917 was planned and executed in 1918. Within one year, the Ajmer Loco factory manufactured 45 engines which we are not able to achieve today. We are now trying and with what a colossal waste! What did we do with that factory? Slowly and slowly we closed down the Ajmer Loco factory.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Railways (Shri S. V. Ramaswamy): The Ajmer Loco factory is one of the finest even now.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I know much better than the hon. Deputy Minister does not I challenge him to say that after 1953—when the last engine was of the broad-gauge and not a single engine has been manufactured in that factory. I know it. I know it by my heart. There is a furnace. What that furnace is? You have got scrap iron and you simply roll the iron there. You have no factory there to manufacture any engine. I know it.

15 hrs.

I think that my hon. friend also knows it. What has been the development of the railways? Let us look at the map of Rajasthan or at the map of Madhya Pradesh, for instance. In Madhya Pradesh, there are vast territories or vast areas without any railway line, and there are people who have not been on the train even for a travelling distance of about 150 miles.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Amabalapuzha): Our State is also like that.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: That is good. My hon. friend is in the same boat as myself, and, therefore, I shall not keep myself separate from him on this matter.

This is the position. And yet, what is going on? We have eaten away all the depreciation fund that was available to us. The Railway Reserve Fund has gone, and the Depreciation

Fund has gone, and we have spent so much money. But, what is the progress that we have achieved? I can give figures, but I had promised you not to burden this record with figures.

The whole thing is that we show our progress by expenditure. What a wonderful process! I would submit that expenditure never means any progress, and it may mean only waste. And it is a sheer waste. We have not progressed in the way in which we wanted to progress. So far as the railways are concerned, we are still buying engines from outside, and we have not been able to build anything for the railways in any particular item. Of course, one thing is true and that is that so far as the employees are concerned, we have certainly trebled their number. But so far as the other progress, namely the inanimate progress is concerned, the congestion on the railways and the way in which the third class traveller travels is still the same. People are still going by hanging from the trains all along for miles together. If we have to see any vision of that, I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways to go to the station of Katihar and see for himself how the public are travelling on the roofs. If he wants to go and see for himself, I would ask him to go to Mehsana where even today, in this winter season, when people are shivering with cold, they are travelling on the roofs. Is that the way in which we have done something to ameliorate the condition of the poor man? We have failed. I may tell you from the bottom of my heart that I feel that this plan is no good absolutely. I do not talk out of mere frustration. It is not a question of frustration. It is a question of a wrong method of doing good to the country. It is a wrong method of approach to the realisation of the ultimate aim or objective before this country, namely the achievement of a welfare State. Words will not do.

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

I heard a new word today, and I shall conclude my speech by saying it. I have heard of basic democracy at one place. I have heard of guided democracy at another place. I have heard of controlled democracy at a third place. I heard also of socialism in democracy very recently during the Congress Session. Today, I have heard a new thing entirely from my hon. friend Shri Morarka, namely 'political democracy'. What is political democracy? I fail to understand.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): What is the hon. Member's democracy?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I believe in simple democracy. I think that simple democracy is enough to bring about all that we want to achieve in this country and to achieve a welfare State. Simple and a purely simple democracy for the people and by the people is the only thing which can achieve the end which we have in view.

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi (Dharwar North): The achievements and the shortfalls that have occurred from the beginning of the Third Plan have been kept open before the House and have been made the subject of criticism, constructive or otherwise, from all corners of this House.

This House, as the trustee in the confidence of the people, has got every right to criticise and find out whether the money that the people have given and the confidence that the people have reposed in the Government through their elected representatives have been properly utilised for the purpose for which they are meant. With the acceptance of democracy, it is implied that every citizen has got to participate for the success of the democracy and this participation must be active and intelligent at the same time. In order to make the citizen intelligent and active to participate in the democracy, it is quite essential that all the fac-

ilities for proper development and growth have to be provided for, and it is his right to ask for these things. Proper and adequate and nutritious food and proper housing and proper facilities for education are quite essential for this purpose.

After thirteen years of planning, we find the Minister for Planning coming forward with the reasons for the shortfall, and the arguments in defence. Of course, they may not be quite sound arguments. But whatever that may be, arguments will not cure the disease. It is the proper and adequate implementation of the Plan which is required, and not a weak defence. I think that Government are not here to defend what has been done, but I think they are here to get the thing implemented. I think that the Plan belongs to the whole country, irrespective of what one of the speakers on the other side, namely the spokesman of the Swatantra Party said namely that the Plan should be scrapped. I do not think that he actually meant what he said.

After all, planning is essential either for the home or for the society or for any corporation or for the country at large. Within the limited resources at our disposal, what is the maximum benefit that we can derive and that the country can get? That is the soul and essence of all planning. How far the country or the society is able to achieve that particular target is dependent upon the efficient administration existing under the circumstances.

At the time the Plan was framed, that is, years ago, the resources available at our disposal were no doubt kept in view by the Planning Commission and our capable Ministers who gave their full-cooperation to the Planning Commission. I think that the Planning Commission did take into consideration the fact that certain changes might come about because of certain emergencies. Of course, I do not mean the Chinese

aggression, but other emergencies which might come up. I think that the Plan was framed after giving a due margin for these things. The Fourth Plan is now being framed, and I do not wish the hon. Minister to come forward later on with these weak defences at the time the Fourth Plan is discussed saying that this was the inadequate advance planning that we had and so on. After all, the Plan has to be framed keeping in view the material resources that we have got at our disposal and the calculated development that is likely to take place; with that, what is the target that we are going to achieve? That is how planning has to be done.

I hope that because of the discussions here and the criticisms made, bitter or otherwise, Government would not come down and reduce themselves to the position of bringing down the targets instead of increasing our efforts and accelerating them to reach the targets which have been set already. Instead of having optimistic schemes, let them not come forward and say, let us have some lower target so that we shall have the satisfaction of saying that we have achieved the targets. I hope the Ministry will not come down to this level and reduce the targets.

The most important things that the appraisal deals with are agricultural development and the shortfalls therein; industrial development and the shortfalls therein and also social services. As regards agricultural development, India is a country whose main occupation is agriculture, and 71 per cent of the people of India have resorted to agriculture. When that is the basic industry which gives us 50 per cent of the national income, and when that is the basis for a number of other industries including agriculture-based industries like sugar, jute etc., much attention has to be paid to it.

I do not say that the Plan is not good, but I say that there is defect in the implementation of the Plan. The action and reaction of so many factors will result certainly in deficits and shortfalls. We shall have to look into this action and reaction of a number of factors, and one Ministry or one particular agency cannot put the blame on the shoulders of another agency to escape from these things.

So far as the common man is concerned, he is not worried where the electricity is produced, how it is produced and who the inventor is, but he is concerned only with this problem namely whether it is distributed properly and adequately. What I mean to say is that it is no use giving these weak defences to the common man. Of course, he has not got the time and the patience to listen to all these things. He is only interested in the ultimate result namely that he should have adequate and nutritious food to eat, proper opportunities for the education of his children and proper housing facilities etc.

So far as agriculture is concerned, we cannot compare ourselves with other countries, like the USA or Canada or U.K. etc in the United Kingdom, the percentage of people dependent on agriculture is only 12 per cent, it is 16 per cent in France, and it is 40 per cent in Japan, but in India, the greatest percentage of the population is absorbed in agriculture, and unless the cultivator is given all facilities to improve his agriculture and to accelerate agricultural production, there cannot be any means to raise the income of this country. However, much we may talk of the facilities for education and other facilities such as the providing of seeds and manure etc. in proper time, I do not find that these are actually supplied to the cultivator in time. As regards credit facilities, of course, at one time, agriculture was credit-oriented, because all the villages had

[Dr. Sarojini Mahishi]

got only a credit co-operative society without any proper linking with the producers' society and the marketing society. It is no longer a credit-oriented occupation. It should be an agriculture-oriented economy in the country. That is why we find that credit facilities should be extended to the greater section of the cultivators. As things stand today, 60 per cent of the cultivators who hold very small holdings are not able to get the benefit of these credit facilities. If the small holder is not able to get this benefit, this incentive to accelerate his production, how will it ever be possible to attain the target.

A target of 100 million tons is there. But then the achievement may be about 77 or 79 million tons. If there is a shortfall in a particular year, it may be argued that it depends upon the vagaries of the monsoon. But taking into account the vagaries of the monsoon and other difficulties, all that is possible to achieve through human effort should be achieved. Of course, Members here will be wise enough not to ask why it rained on a particular day. They will ask why the irrigation facilities available were not properly exploited. 175 million acres have been brought under irrigation; out of these, 100 million acres have been brought under major and medium irrigation and 75 million acres are under minor irrigation. But there is a big gap between the potential and actual utilisation. Again, there is a big lag between completion of a project and utilisation of the facilities. To quote an example, though the Tungabhadra project was constructed in Mysore State, the irrigation facilities created were not utilised till very recently, because the cultivators could not dig field channels. Now the State Government is coming forward to give a subsidy for digging field channels, thus creating an opportunity for the cultivators to use the irrigation facilities.

Taking for granted the illiteracy, ignorance, religious superstition and laziness, we have to effect a change in the outlook of the cultivators, to induce them to use new techniques and scientific methods to grow more and more food. Unless he is given incentives, how can there be acceleration of production. Compared to other countries, the calory intake of the food of our people is very low. In Japan it is something 2,220 calories, in Great Britain and America it is 3,220 and 3,250 respectively. In comparison with these figures, our calory intake of food is very low and our people are not able to get proper nutrition.

In order to overcome these things, the only thing is to provide proper facilities to the cultivators in the sphere of irrigation and, in the sphere of credit facilities. I do not wish the Minister to come here next year to say that there was non-cooperation or no proper co-ordination among the different agencies at the Central and State level. We do not wish to hear this type of argument from him. I hope he will take note of it.

In spite of all our efforts on glazed paper and eloquent speeches made here and outside, what is the quantity of food we have had to import during the First and Second Plan periods? We are importing foodgrains from those countries, the economy of which is not agriculture-oriented. During the First Plan period, we imported foodgrains worth Rs. 538 crores, and during the Second to the extent of Rs. 711 crores. Within this short period of the Third Plan, we have imported foodgrains worth Rs. 200 crores or more. What does all this indicate? At one end we are framing a big plan. At the other, we are importing food. It may be under PL 480 or any other scheme. But the very fact that we are dependent on other countries for foodgrains, a country 71 per cent of the people of which are dependent on agriculture

depending on another for food, is a shameful thing.

Even taking account of the fact that we are an infant Republic, are we accelerating our production of agriculture? What about the industries which mainly depend on agricultural products, namely, cotton, jute, sugarcane etc? There also we have shortfalls. We imported raw cotton worth Rs. 484 crores in the First Plan and Rs. 244 crores in the Second; in the beginning of the Third Plan—I do not know what will be the position at the end—we have imported to the extent of Rs. 100 crores worth cotton. I wonder whether I shall be in a position to place the whole picture before this august House. But after all, we are having some constructive criticism. It is for the good of the whole country at large that we shall have to take note of all these things.

Taking national income, it has risen only by 2.5 per cent. It is admitted that there has been a fall compared with the figure in 1960-61. According to the Planning Commission, the population is going to be 492 million in 1966, 555 million in 1971. I do not think the Government will be afraid of the figures I am quoting. But in taking up advance planning, all these calculations have to be taken into account. Again according to the Planning Commission, even at the end of the 20th century one-third of the total population of India would not be able to get nutritious food. If this is the calculation, it is a very pessimistic plan we are having. I do not agree with the hon. Minister when he says that he is very optimistic.

In industry, the target fixed was 11 per cent. We have not been able to achieve it. It is something oscillating between 6 and 8 per cent. As far as the major and capital-intensive industries are concerned, of course, steel is the main industry. Here also we find that consumption is related with the economic development of the country. I do not mean that we shall have to produce all the steel alone

with raw materials required for that, because that would be aiming very high. Our target is something like 19 million tons by the end of 1966 and by 1975, it will be 28 million tons. Even other advanced countries, like Japan and USA are importing raw materials. The USA which is the biggest steel producing country in the world is importing raw materials to the extent of 30 per cent. To import things which are indigenously available is advantageous to our country. Why have we not been able to accelerate our production there also in order to help the other industries also which depend upon steel. We have been able to produce machinery worth Rs. 200 crores, whereas the demand is for Rs. 500 crores. I hope the Minister will pay the greatest attention to this particular industry which feeds other industries.

In capital-intensive industries, the gestation period is long. There are other industries also producing consumer goods. There are other small scale industries which are quite essential and which supply the necessary consumer goods at a very short interval to the consumer. They are very much appreciated by the people. The citizen of 1963 has not the patience to wait for all these products of capital-intensive industries which will come off the assembly line in 1971. Therefore, consumer goods ought to be supplied in time and in sufficient quantity. In order to supplement these industries, there are small scale and cottage industries. Here I quote only one example. What will be the impact on the rural economy of all these cottage and village industries? There is the Khadi and Gramodyog Commission in which not less than Rs. 179 crores have been invested during the whole of the previous decade. What is the impact on the rural economy? The *Indian Express* of 8th December, 1963 wrote an editorial on that saying that no progress had been achieved, even though 17 lakhs of people had been employed, including some part-time workers

[Dr. Sarojini Mahishi]

who work for a few paltry farthings. Other papers like *The Hindustan Times* wrote on 16th October, mentioning so things about mismanagement in this Commission. I hope the Ministry will take note of all these things and set right the administrative machinery in the different fields.

One word about the Planning Commission. They are experts planning for the whole country, but I may be excused for saying this. The Ministers have to face Members of Parliament, the representatives of the people, every day during the Question Hour, but I do not think the Members of the Planning Commission are required to face the people or their representatives at any stage. What is the check and control exercised over them, and is there any fixed period during which a Member has to be in his office? I do not want to add to the criticism that has already been made regarding the paraphernalia of the Planning Commission, but every human being has got his own weakness, and so there must be some check and control over all organisations that are working in the interests of the country.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदन का ध्यान एक ऐसी इंडस्ट्री की तरफ आकर्षित कर रहा हूँ जो कि अब तक बहुत उपेक्षित रही है। वह इंडस्ट्री है शिपिंग। मैं आप के सामने कुछ आंकड़े रखना चाहता हूँ। जब से हिन्दुस्तान में फर्स्ट प्लान आरम्भ हुई है तब से १३४० करोड़ रु० फारेन एक्सचेंज हम फारेन शिपिंग कम्पनियों को किराया के रूप में दे चुके हैं और १२४ करोड़ रुपया फारेन शिप को खरीदने के लिये फारेन एक्सचेंज के रूप में हम फारेन कन्ट्रीज को दे चुके हैं। इस प्रकार १४६४ करोड़ रुपया ११ वर्षों के अन्दर हम लोगों ने फारेन एक्सचेंज के रूप में विदेशों को भेजा है। इस प्रकार से यदि आप बेलें तो यह एक ऐसा अज्ञात देश है जिस से

हम लोग १३३ करोड़ रु० प्रति वर्ष फारेन एक्सचेंज के रूप में विदेशी कम्पनियों को दे रहे हैं। मैं नहीं समझता कि ऐसी स्थिति में इस अज्ञात देश की आर्थिक अवस्था कैसे ठीक होगी।

मैं इस सम्बन्ध में आप को एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। अमरीका से गेहूँ लाने के लिये हमारा एक एग्जीमिन्ट हुआ। ८० करोड़ रु० गेहूँ लाने का फ्रेट होता है, लेकिन आज एक टन गेहूँ भी हम अफ्रीका में नहीं ला सकते। इस ८० करोड़ रु० में से, जोकि हिन्दुस्तान की जेब में जा सकता था, एक कौड़ी, एक छदाम भी हिन्दुस्तान की जेब में नहीं गया। य तो हमारी अघोषित है।

मैं प्लानिंग कमिशन के लिये क्या कहूँ। सन् १९५२ में जब पहने पहल प्लानिंग आई उस समय शिपिंग पर जोर दिया गया क्योंकि कहा गया कि शिपिंग सेक्टेन्ड लाइन आफ डिफेंस है। उस सिलमिले में करीब करीब १३५ करोड़ रु० हर साल विदेशों को जाता है इस की हम का तर्ककी करनी चाहिये। बावजूद तीन प्लान्स के हमारा प्रोविसीज ट्रेड का परसेन्टेज सिर्फ १२ परसेन्ट है। प्रोविसीज ट्रेड में जो एक्सपोर्ट और इम्पोर्ट होता है उस का सिर्फ १२ परसेन्ट इंडियन बाटम में लाया जा रहा है। जब थर्ड प्लान बनी तो इस सदन में मैं ने कहा था कि शिपिंग बोर्ड ने यह सिफारिश की है कि १४ लाख टन का हमारा टारगेट होना चाहिये। प्लानिंग कमिशन ने उसे घटा दिया और कहा कि ११ लाख का टारगेट होगा। फर्स्ट फाइव इयर्स प्लान में इस सिलमिले में २.७५ लाख टन का एडीशन हुआ सेक्टेन्ड प्लान में ३.६० लाख टन का एडीशन हुआ और थर्ड प्लान में १ लाख १० हजार टन का एडीशन होने की बात हुई। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की जनता जागरूक थी। हिन्दुस्तान की शिपिंग कम्पनियाँ जागरूक थीं इसलिये इस १ लाख १० हजार टन का एडीशन हुआ। इस तरह

से कुल लगभग 6 लाख टन का एडीशन हुआ। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस एडीशन में हमारी सरकार का कंस्ट्रक्शन क्या हुआ। बहुत कम। आप देखिये कि जब हम ने फर्स्ट प्लैन शुरू की तो वर्ल्ड के शिपिंग टनेज में हमारा परसेन्टज ५२ था और आज ११ बरों के बाद भी हम बहुत कम खिसके हैं। अब यह परसेन्टज ६५ है। इस प्रकार से आप देखेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान इतना बड़ा मुल्क है लेकिन हमारे पास वर्ल्ड टनेज का १ परसेन्ट भी नहीं है जबकि वर्ल्ड का हमारे एक्सपोर्ट इम्पोर्ट का रेशियो १.७५ है। चूँकि एक्सपोर्ट और इम्पोर्ट का रेशियो १.७५ है इसलिये हमारी शिपिंग का रेशियो भी इतना ही होना चाहिये। हमारा ट्रेड हमारे हाथ में है किनी दूसरे के हाथ में नहीं है। अगर हम को सामान लाना है तो हम अपने जहाज में लायेंगे नहीं लाना है तो नहीं लायेंगे।

दूसरी तरफ़ आप देखिये। जब फर्स्ट प्लैन शुरू हुई तो आप ने एक पालिसी एडाप्ट की। शिपिंग कम्पनियों को लोन दिया जायेगा। फर्स्ट प्लैन में ढाई परसेन्ट का मिस्टम था। लेकिन आज तीन परसेन्ट चाहते हैं। शिपिंग कम्पनी को सरकार की तरफ़ से कोई मन्डिरी नहीं दी जाती इनकम टैक्स माफ़ नहीं है। चीप लोन नहीं है। लेकिन जैसे जैसे शिपिंग ट्रेड हिन्दुस्तान में बढ़ता गया उस का रेट आफ इन्वेस्ट ऊपर होता गया। और अब १० परसेन्ट से तीन परसेन्ट पर लोन दिया जाना लगा है।

इस के बाद मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूँ सेकेन्ड शिपयार्ड के बारे में। इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ दिनों से कोशिश हो रही थी कि फर्स्ट शिपयार्ड के बावजूद सेकेन्ड शिपयार्ड हो। लेकिन मैं शिपिंग कंस्ट्रक्शन के बारे में आप का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। हिन्दुस्तान अब तक १४१ करोड़ ६० के जहाज बाहर से खरीदे। जिस में से ११० करोड़ ६० प्राइवेट सेक्टर ने दिये और ३० करोड़ ६० जहाज खरीदने के लिये पब्लिक

सेक्टर ने दिये गये। इस प्रकार कितना खर्च रुपया बाहर चला गया। मन् १९६२ तक ११० करोड़ रुपया हम ने फारेन एक्सचेंज के रूप में शिप्स खरीदने के लिये दिये। लेकिन इन्वेस्टमेंट कितना किया गया। इन्वेस्टमेंट यह किया गया कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर को ४७.४५ करोड़ ६० के लोन दिये गये पब्लिक सेक्टर में ७.२० करोड़ ६० के लोन दिये गये। अर्थात् आज तक कुल इन्वेस्टमेंट ५४ करोड़ रुपये का तीनों प्लैन मिला कर शिपिंग के कंस्ट्रक्शन के लिये किया गया। हालांकि हम करीब १५०० करोड़ ६० बाहर भेज चके हैं। फिर भी वर्ल्ड प्लैन तक ११ बरों के अन्दर हमारा जो इन्वेस्टमेंट हुआ वह शिपिंग स बन्धी बातों को मिल कर ६० करोड़ ६० से ज्यादा नहीं हुआ। यह इंडस्ट्री एक ऐसी थी जिस की हम तरक्की कर सकते थे। हम इस को बना सकते थे। लेकिन नहीं बना सके। आज दुनिया में १५ करोड़ टन के जहाज हैं लेकिन उस में हमारा टनेज क्या है। हमारा कुल टॉगट ११ लाख टन का था लेकिन प्राइवेट सेक्टर के कारण यह कर १५ लाख टन हो गया है। हिन्दुस्तान में प्लैन बना कर क्या हुआ। आप के पास सिर्फ़ एक शिपयार्ड है जिस में आप ने कुल २५ जहाज बनाये तीन प्लैन के अन्दर। कुल २६ करोड़ रुपये के जहाज बनाये जब कि विदेशों से आप ने लगभग ११० करोड़ रुपये के जहाज लिये और उस को यह रुपया फारेन एक्सचेंज में दिया। इस प्रकार कि हिन्दुस्तान ने तीन प्लैस के अन्दर कुल २०१ जहाज खरीदे जिस में से १७३ जहाज विदेशों से आये और बाकी जहाज हम ने हिन्दुस्तान से लिये। इस प्रकार भारत १५४ करोड़ रुपया विदेशी कम्पनियों की जेब में चुपचाप रख देता है। बिना मुहब्बत के और बिना प्रेम के बल्कि मजबूर हो कर।

मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि शिप्स के कंस्ट्रक्शन की नया अवस्था है। एक छोटे से देश अगोस्ताविकिया का उदाहरण लिये।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

सन् १९५६ में उस के पास कुल २१ हजार टन के जहाज थे। आज उस के पास दस बरस के बाद तीन लाख टन के जहाज हैं। जबकि हमारे पास पहली योजना के आरम्भ में ३ लाख टन के जहाज थे और ११ बरस तरक्की करने के बाद टारजेट के अनुसार हम ११ लाख टन के बाहर नहीं जा सकते थे। छोटा सा मुल्क यूगोस्लावेकिया है। वह हर साल करीब करीब तीन लाख टन के जहाज तैयार करता है और उस की इकानमी करीब करीब इसी उद्योग पर निर्भर है। हिन्दुस्तान उस देश से जहाज खरीद रहा है और दुनिया के अन्य देश उससे जहाज खरीद रहे हैं। यूगोस्लावेकिया ने ४० जहाज इस साल फारिन क्रेडिट को बेचे हैं। कितना रुपया उन के पास इस उद्योग से आता है इस का अनुमान कीजिये।

रूस का उदाहरण लीजिए। रूस की पोलीशन आज से तीन बरस पहले बहुत अच्छी नहीं थी। रूस का स्थान दुनिया के शिपिंग में ११वां था, हिन्दुस्तान का १९वां था। आज रूस का स्थान आठवां हो गया है, और रूस ने १९६० तक का प्लान बनाया है। उनका प्लान ३ करोड़ जी० आर० टी० के जहाज बनाने का है और वह कम्पिटिशन में आ गया है। अगर उनका एशिया में किसी से कम्पिटिशन होगा तो हिन्दुस्तान से होगा।

हिन्दुस्तान की भवस्या ठीक इससे उल्टी रही है। हम ने इस दिशा में ज्यादा तरक्की नहीं की है। हमारी ओवरसीज ट्रेड १२ सेंट से अधिक नहीं हो सकी, जब कि इंटरनेशनल कन्वेंशन के अनुसार हमारी ५० परसेंट ओवरसीज ट्रेड हमारे हाथ में हो सकती थी। मैं कहूंगा कि यह पालिसी ठीक नहीं है।

आप नावों का उदाहरण लीजिए। बहुत छोटा मुल्क है। नावों के पास तीन बरस पहले ११ लाख ५६ हजार के जहाज थे, आज उस के पास १ करोड़ ३६ लाख टन के जहाज हैं। इन छोटे छोटे मुल्कों ने देखा कि शिपिंग

इंडस्ट्री में थोड़ा सा भी रुपया इनवेस्ट करने से तरक्की हो सकती है। इसलिए नावों, स्वीडन, टली और यूगोस्लावेकिया जैसे देशों ने इस में रुपया लगाया और काफी तरक्की की और उनकी इकानमी आज ज्यादातर शिपिंग पर आधारित है।

जापान का उदाहरण लीजिए। जापान हम से आयरन और खरीदता है। इटली भी हम से आयरन और खरीदता है। जापान हिन्दुस्तान से आयरन और खरीदता है और आज दुनिया का दूसरा मुल्क है जो कि शिपिंग इंडस्ट्री में सब से आगे है। इस के बाद बस्ट जरमनी का नम्बर आता है, उसके बाद इटली का नम्बर आता है। हम अपना आयरन और दूसरों को दे रहे हैं जब कि हमारे पास इतने बड़े बड़े स्टील प्लांट हैं। अभी हमारा बहिन श्रीमती महीपी जी ने कहा कि हम सब से ज्यादा स्टील प्रोड्यूस करने वाले देश हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप इतना स्टील उत्पादन करते हैं, इसको शिपिंग इंडस्ट्री में क्यों नहीं लगाते। आखिर इतने स्टील का होगा क्या? आयरन और आप एक्सपोर्ट करते हैं। आप अपने जहाज बनाइए। अगर आप जहाज बनायेंगे तो आज जो एशिया और अफ्रीका के बैंकबैंड देश हैं, और जो कि दुनिया के दूसरे देशों से अपने लिए जहाज खरीदते हैं, वे हिन्दुस्तान से जहाज खरीदेंगे। आप इन देशों को टैक्सटाइल गुड्स बेचते हैं। आप शिपिंग की इंडस्ट्री को भी अपने यहां बढ़ावें तो आप को बाहर से बहुत ज्यादा आमदनी हो सकती है। जैसा मैं ने पहले कहा, जहां तक शिपिंग इंडस्ट्री का सवाल है, उसमें हमारा इन्वेस्टमेंट बहुत कम है।

अब मैं कुछ आंकड़े देना चाहता हूँ। प्राइवेट सेक्टर में शिपिंग इंडस्ट्री में कुल २६ करोड़ ५६ लाख और पब्लिक सेक्टर में २४ करोड़ ४६ लाख रुपया हिन्दुस्तान में लगा है। जब कि हर साल १३५ करोड़ रुपया विदेशी कम्पनियों को देते हैं, फारिन एक्सचेंज के रूप में। इस तरह कैसे इस देश की इकानमी चलेगी।

कारिन कम्पनीज जो हमारा सामान लाती हैं वे रुपए में पेमेंट लेने को तैयार नहीं हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि इस बारे में हमारी नीति ठीक नहीं है।

जैसा मैं ने कहा, पहली योजना में आपने इस उद्योग के लिए ढाई परसेंट पर लोन दिया। इससे शिपिंग की कुछ तरक्की होने लगी, तो आपने ३ परसेंट कर दिया, बढ़ा दिया कोई सुविधा नहीं दी। इंग्लैंड में रेट आफ इंटररेस्ट होने तीन परसेंट है हिन्दुस्तान से कम है। वह हिन्दुस्तान से कम रेट पर लोन देते हैं। अमरीका में यह ढाई परसेंट है और उसके साथ ही साथ वहां सबसिडी भी दी जाती है। जितने दिन तक जहाज समुद्र पर चलता रहेगा उतने दिन तक वह सबसिडी देते हैं। इसके अलावा अगर जहाज खरीदा जाता है तो अमरीकी कम्पनी सेंट परसेंट लोन जहाज को मारगेज करके अमरीका की सरकार से ले सकती है। अगर एक करोड़ का जहाज कोई अमरीका कम्पनी से खरीदे तो एक करोड़ रुपया अमरीका से उस जहाज पर ऋण के रूप में ले सकते हैं। और हमारे यहां अवस्था यह है कि अगर कोई कम्पनी हमारे पास लोन की गारंटी के लिए आती है तो हम उसको तीन तीन चार चार बरस तक रखते हैं। इस कारण कितनी ही कम्पनियां तो फेल हो गयीं। मेरा कहना है कि इस पर नई दृष्टि से सरकार को विचार करना है। अगर सरकार नई दृष्टि से विचार नहीं करेगी तो हम इस उद्योग से ज्यादा लाभ न उठा सकेंगे और यह बड़े शर्म की बात होगी।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास (उरुजैन) : कोस्टल ट्रेड को अपने हाथ में रखनी चाहिए।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह: वह तो हमारे हाथ में है ही। उस को तो हिन्दुस्तानी जहाज ही करते हैं। लेकिन ओवर सीज में हम बहुत पीछे हैं यह बड़े शर्म की बात है। हम अमरीका से गह्र लेते हैं और उसके लिए ८० करोड़ रुपया फ्रेट होता है और इसमें से एक छटांक गेहूं भी हम अपने जहाजों में नहीं ला सकते और हम अपने को दुनिया में बड़े गौरव वाला देश कहते हैं। हम दुनिया के अनेकों देशों में गए, वहां के लोग इस बात पर ताज्जुब करते हैं।

आज दुनिया में १६ लाख टन का लेड अप टनेज है। ५० के० के जहाजों के पास काम नहीं है, अमरीका के जहाजों के पास पूरा काम नहीं है। जो बड़े बड़े देश कहे जाते हैं उनके जहाजों के पास पूरा काम नहीं है और उनके जहाज बन्दरगाहों में पड़े हैं। केवल हिन्दुस्तान ही दुनिया में ऐसा मुल्क है कि इसके जितने जहाज हैं सब काम पर लगे हैं, एक दिन के बास्ते भी हमारे जहाज काम बन्द नहीं करते। जब हमारे पास इतना काम है और इस काम से इतना रुपया आ सकता है, तो मैं नहीं समझ सकता कि ध्यान शिपिंग इंडस्ट्री की तरफ क्यों नहीं जाता।

आखिर में मैं पोर्ट्स के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। जहां तक पोर्ट्स का सवाल है है विजिगापट्टम तथा कलकत्ता को देखिए। बहुत ज्यादा जहाज इन पोर्ट्स में जाते हैं। कलकत्ता में विदेशी कम्पनी का कोई जहाज नहीं आना चाहता। उसका आधा माल पहले विजिगापट्टम में उतारा जाता है और जब वह हलका हो जाता है तो कलकत्ता पोर्ट में जाता है। आप को याद रखना चाहिए कि हिन्दुस्तान का ४५ परसेंट एक्सपोर्ट्स इम्पोर्ट्स

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

कलकत्ता से होता है। लेकिन जहाँ किसी विदेशी कम्पनी के जहाज ने मुना कि उसको कलकत्ते पोर्ट में जाना है तो वह कांप उठता है। वहाँ उनका फ्रंट चार्ज ज्यादा हो जाता है। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बम्बई में, कांदला में और मद्रास में तथा कलकत्ता में मिकेनाइज्ड लोडिंग अन लोडिंग का इन्तिजाम होना चाहिए। अब वह जमाना नहीं कि जहाजों पर हाथों से माल चढ़ाया जाए या उतारा जाए क्योंकि अगर कोई जहाज एक दिन एक पोर्ट में ज्यादा ठहरता है तो उसे दस हजार रुपया देना पड़ता है। उसको अपने टनेज के अनुसार पैसा देना पड़ता है। और वह आखिर में हमारे ऊपर पड़ता है। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि पोर्ट्स की तरक्की की तरफ ध्यान जाना चाहिए।

जहाँ तक सैकिड शिपयार्ड का सम्बन्ध है, मैं ने उसके बारे में बहुत दिन पहले कहा था। आपको याद होगा कि पहले पहल सन् १९५३ में हम ने अवाज उठायी थी कि सैकिड शिपयार्ड होना चाहिए। लेकिन उस पर प्लानिंग कमीशन ने ध्यान नहीं दिया। सैकिड प्लान में प्लानिंग कमीशन ने एग्री किया और ७५ लाख रुपया इसके लिए रखा गया। ३ नवम्बर १९५६ को यू० के० से एक मिशन आया और १९६३ में जापान से एक मिशन आया, और तीन चार दिन हुए कि श्री राज बहादुर ने बतलाया कि सन् १९६४ तक हम काम आरम्भ करेंगे और सन् १९६७ में हमारा पहला जहाज तैयार होगा और थर्ड प्लान में इसके लिए दस करोड़ रुपया रखा गया है। तो जैसा मैं ने निवेदन किया, १२४ करोड़ रुपया आपने विदेशों से जहाज खरीदने में दे दिया पर इस काम के लिए केवल दस करोड़ रुपया दे रहे हैं। समझ में नहीं आता कि क्या इसकी इकानमी है और क्या इसमें बुद्धि है।

इसमें सन्देह नहीं कि शिपिंग इंडस्ट्री ने, बाबजूद अनेक प्रकार के व्यवधानों के, शिपिंग

का जो टारजेट था उससे ढाई बरस में ६ गुना ज्यादा तरक्की किया है। इसका क्रेडिट जनता को और उन कम्पनियों को है जो इसमें लगी हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं प्लानिंग कमीशन से कहूंगा कि थोड़ा दूरदर्शिता का परिचय दें, दूरदर्शी का परिचय दें, और यह जो सैकिड लाइन आफ डिफेंस है इसकी तरफ भी कुछ ख्याल रखें।

Shri Khadiilkar (Khed): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, last year about this time this House was discussing a situation about which everybody was very anxious and agitated and ultimately we declared that we are determined to meet the challenge that was forced by China. In the first military encounter with china we had to suffer a small reverse. Today, after one year, when we are discussing our economic performance in this country, the first thought that strikes one's mind is how far that determination has been reflected or translated in our economic activities in this Country. Because, at that time, it was made perfectly clear that immediately we had to prepare for defending our sovereignty and integrity. But main question was, in the final analysis, to devote our attention to defence needs and to build up a broad, very strong economic base in this country. And if we want to pursue an independent, integrated economic effort in this land so as to build up the economic base to meet the challenge of China, on this occasion, I feel a little disappointed because what has happened to our determination? Has it been reflected in our action? Everybody will have to ponder over this. It is no use getting agitated emotionally unless some resolve, some urgency, a sense of urgency or emergency is translated in our economic activity. The economic high command of this land must be prepared not only to face the mili-

tary challenge but the economic challenge that is eternally with us, and for that purpose we are making this planning effort.

There are many critics of the Plan. Let us be very frank about it, because it is a national Plan, and when we discuss planning in this country, it is not just a academic exercise. It is not just an arithmetical calculation as to how far this target has gone up or that target has not been reached. It has an emotional impact on the people's mind. The question was posed by Dr. Lohia in a little dramatic fashion, in a dramatised way, as to what the consumption standard was of the Common people. I do not say he was right. He said it was three annas. I say it is seven annas. But that debate in this House did not confine itself to this House. It went to every village, and at every village tea-shop, wherever the villagers gather, they take the local newspaper and read about these things. Their mind is applied to the question as to how far we have advanced. Therefore, when we think of the Plan—I will come to the question later, as to whether we have advanced or failed—we feel that the time has come when we must shed a little of the staleness in our mind. Unfortunately, from top to bottom, we are having the bureaucracy. The Prime Minister, the other day, referred to it in regard to the community development. Bureaucracy has become today such a thing that all officers are concerned about their promotion, better placing; the bread and butter mentality has come to stay in all walks of life. Is this the way? Unless the people who have some social idealism, certain social objectives for which they were prepared to sacrifice, apply their mind and energy and put some enthusiasm in the people and mobilise them, I do not think we can get out of the present rut. No doubt we are just now in the rut and planning certainly has not fulfilled the expectations particularly in the background of the emergency.

I do not want to criticise planning as such. A few years back, the Reserve Bank of India made a survey about the rural credit and regarding co-operation they came to the conclusion that co-operation has failed but that co-operation must succeed. In the same manner, I would say, and repeat, planning has failed but planning must succeed. Why it has failed, we shall apply our mind to it very frankly. But planning must succeed. That must be the determination voiced in this House on this occasion. There are people, a few critics like Shri Masani, who are gloating over our failures: very naturally, because they feel that if we fail in our plans, perhaps some frustrated, a little disappointed and agitated people will rally round him. But he is thoroughly mistaken. Shri Masani quoted Galbraith. I would like to point out that so far as Galbraith is concerned, he has applied his mind in a better way. He has quoted from some of his lectures out of context.

Here is a book which contains the university lectures that Mr. Galbraith delivered. In one of the lectures, he has in a sarcastic manner stated using the words, Colonel Blimp, that "All this planning, it can lead only to chaos. But one thing you can say for chaos; it gives real scope for free enterprise." This is the mentality from which the Swatantra Group led by Acharya Ranga and Shri Masani are looking at our Plan and the well-being of the people and their emotional reaction to the people's agitated minds.

I have no time and so I would not quote long. Shri Masani attacked public ownership and so I would like to quote Mr. Galbraith on public ownership which has been referred to in one of the university lectures. Mr. Galbraith said: "With public ownership there could be planning; without public ownership there could be no effective planning." I will finish this point with one more small quotation.

[Shri Khadilkar]

"... about 20 per cent. of the American economy is planned. For India the comparable figure is 13-14 per cent. The market-economy of the United States has a larger public sector than the socialist economy of India."

These are Mr. Galbraith's observations. Of course, my hon. friend appears to have a poor opinion of American scholarship. Therefore, flagrantly, without much thought, he quoted some figures from a sort of journalistic book, *After Nehru. Who?* But American scholarship is now far advanced than Shri Masani who is not even in the camp of Kennedy, but he would like to take the camp of Barry Goldwater so far as American internal struggle, progress and reaction go. Why? I take his criticism very seriously? Once upon a time, Shri Masani was in the struggle and then he wrote a book. Even now, if anybody wants to know what is planning and what should be done, he could refer to this book. This book has been translated into almost all Indian languages. It is *Our India* first published in 1940. I do not want to quote at length from it, but I would only quote from that section in which he has said something very pertinent about the Plan. What is said there is applicable even today. But sometimes mean intellectually advance, grow mature in wisdom, sometimes they degenerate. That is the pity of it. Unfortunately, this has happened in the case of Shri Masani. He is my old colleague and friend.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): Thanks to the Swatantra party.

Shri Khadilkar: I have no time; I will quote a small passage from that book:

"Does that mean that a few Big Businessmen who own these big workshops and factories are to control the lives of our people and make big profits at their ex-

pense? Look at this picture. It shows you how today a handful of persons in India make a lot of money while most people earn so very little. You see a few rich people high up on the mountain and the rest low down in the wide, wide plain. It opens our eyes to a great danger. How are we to make sure that the people who own big workshops do not use their key positions to send themselves higher up the mountain?"

Then, he goes further and it is very interesting:

"Which is why many people think that Key Industries, that is those on which other industries and the life of the people depend, ought to be made the common property of the nation and to be run for its benefit.

So, in our picture of India Tomorrow, we have big industries owned by all the people of India put together, through the State, and small industries each owned by one man or by a group organised perhaps in a co-operative society. Alongside both, there is, of course, India's Biggest Industry—the cultivation of the land."

He was calling India "*Hamara Hindustan*" then. I do not know what he says today. The gentleman who wrote this book because he was in the struggle and he felt the pulse of the people at that time, today considers that by organising this party and attacking the Plan and taking delight in our failures, because he is devoting all his energy to thinking about the philosophy of management of private enterprise. And he imagines Ranga and Masani Private Limited, in case they get into power, will run this Government. That is how Shri Masani looks at national problems.

There are other critics also who consider the Planning Commission as

a frustration squad. I do not want to hide the faults of the Planning Commission, but unfortunately in this country the opposition is fragmented. They do not see any chance in the near future of coming to power. Therefore, they are getting more and more irresponsible. That is the greatest danger to Indian democracy. That we must understand.

Shri Banga: That is why you have gone over to that side.

Shri Khadilkar: Therefore, do not project your frustrated mind while judging the Plan for tomorrow. Look at the planning efforts objectively.

When I look at the Plan from the objective point of view, when I see the picture, I must confess my greatest disappointment over the performance on all fronts, not only on one front. In the little time at my disposal, I shall refer to a few things. Take agriculture. By law we have changed the land relations. Legally we have changed the titles, but the economic relations remain the same. Even now no serious thought is given as to how we should organise our agriculture. In Soviet Union and China, from their own experience of success and failure, they have come to believe that unless agriculture is given a new look, unless the dogmatic approach is cast aside and a certain parity—not exactly parity, but some relationship—between the price of agricultural commodities and prices of the industrial goods is established, it is extremely difficult to make any satisfactory progress on the agricultural front. In their appraisal, the Planning Commission are not frank enough. They ought to have been more frank in their self-criticism. Unfortunately in this country whoever is in power tries to gloss over the failure. I do not understand what harm is there in saying, "Yes; we made sincere effort and here we failed. We could not plan ahead." When people ask, "Why did you not plan ahead?", what is the reply?

Therefore, when you try to evaluate your performance, you should be brutally frank and self-critical; you should try to apportion the blame—where is the weakness, why has this sector lagged behind? These are the questions raised and answers must be there.

The same thing has happened about fertilisers. The production target was about 12 million and hardly 8 million tons have been fulfilled. They did not reach the target and so unless we create more surplus in agriculture, which is the backbone of our economy and leave aside the present dependence, we do not think we can make any advance anywhere in our economic progress.

The same is the position regarding industry. For instance, it has been stated that there are industrial units where full production capacity is not being used. Why then give new licences? Industrial licensing has become the biggest scandal in this country. More than 10 per cent licensing is fictitious and it creates a problem. Just as unaccounted money, like mercury, moving about in the country creates economic conditions which affect the poorer sections in an adverse manner, this scandalous method of licensing is really affecting production in every manner possible. This must also be understood.

There is a social objective which ought to be translated in our achievement. Have we done something? I know we have done something in the social services. Where there was no school, we have started a school. Where there was no dispensary, there is a dispensary. Some roads have been built and something is going on. But while making all this effort—we boast of Gandhian tradition—is there any reflection of it in implementation of the plan? "Why not mobilise local resources?" My house in the village built 200 years ago in mud and brick of the local manufacture, stands so long. But no community development

[Shri Khadilkar]

office can stand. Why not mobilise the local resources and create an atmosphere where people would feel that they are cooperating and advancing in a cooperative manner? Have you ever applied your mind to this?

We blame the bureaucracy. From the Government, there is not that social idealism, readiness to sacrifice, and translate it with a certain determination into day-to-day policy and its implementation. We blame the bureaucracy saying they do not care for the people and they look to their promotions only. I have no time, but I will read a small extract. Bureaucratic personnel are increasing more and more. Here it has been stated in this appraisal report:

"Services account for about 40 per cent of this increase, followed by manufacturing with about 30 per cent and transport and communications with 17 per cent. The increase in services has taken place due a general expansion in the administrative services, educational, medical and health services, etc...."

This is the problem that we have got to apply our mind to.

We want to integrate our country. What is the state of affairs now? In two States and that too in two big cities, about 50 per cent of our industrial potential is concentrated. Excluding these cities, there are backward areas. There are parts of the country where even the industrial beginning has not been made. Only there are boards about industrial estates where there are small huts, or houseless people build their small shanties and live there. This is the state of affairs. Unless we apply our mind and say that industry will be so dispersed that it will generate a new atmosphere where even the peasant will get an opportunity to pick up technic and apply his mind in a pro-

ductive manner, there can be no real progress. Has that been done? Nothing has been done.

With one observation I will conclude. So far as the cocentration part is concerned, that is a very serious matter. If our economic Plannig is operated in such a manner that a small minority takes hold of the big chunk of the national cake, ultimately, all our talks of socialism will remain merely on paper.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He must conclude now.

Shri Khadilkar: I am concluding.

Though our national income has gone up by about 43 per cent during the last ten years, the absolute profits went up to 76 per cent. What does it show? If we want to translate our social objectives by implementing the Plan, then this distortion of our economy operating in such a manner that a handful of people get the whiphand of the situation and they dictate the policy from behind the curtain, that should be put an end to, should be stopped. Otherwise, socialism has no meaning. So, I would appeal to the Planning Minister: let him be frank. We are worried about the defence of our border, but we are more worried about the failure on the economic front. Try to implement the Plan and the targets with determination. If we fail, we have to confess it to the House and go back with a fresh determination to implement it so that we build up in the final analysis, an independent and integrated economy which would be the real bulwark of our freedom and national sovereignty..

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Since many hon. Members want to participate in this debate, the House will sit up to 6 O'Clock today to give opportunities to more hon. Members. The Finance Minister will intervene at about 4.15 P.M.

श्री मौर्य (अलीगढ़) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्र का यह सर्वोच्च सदन आज केवल तृतीय पंच वर्षीय योजना के मध्यान्तर पर ही विचार विमर्श नहीं कर रहा है बल्कि जैसा माननीय मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था पच्चीस वर्षीय योजना युग के मध्यान्तर पर भी विचार कर रहा है अर्थात् इस योजना युग को स्थापित हुए साढ़े बारह वर्ष समाप्त हो चले हैं। हमने इस अवधि में कितनी उन्नति की है, इसका लेखा जोखा हमें बताना है और इसको देखना है। उसके पश्चात् ही कुछ कहा जा सकेगा।

हमारी योजना का लक्ष्य था या जो तरबकी हमें योजना काल में करनी थी, उसका लक्ष्य था भारत को समृद्धशाली यानी सैलर सफिशेट राष्ट्र बना कर संसार के बढ़ते हुए राष्ट्रों के बराबर लाना। अगर मैं देहानी भाषा में कह दू तो कह सकता हूँ कि भुखमरी, बेकारी, पिछड़ेपन को दूर करना। समाज में बढ़ती अराजकता, असमानता तथा अव्यवस्था को दूर करके समाजवादी समाज की रचना, करना तथा पूरे राष्ट्र को खुशहाल बनाना। यही लक्ष्य था, योजना काल का, है और आगे भी रहेगा।

लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि यह लक्ष्य पूरा नहीं हो रहा है। तृतीय पंच वर्षीय योजना के मध्यान्तर पर जब हम तृतीय योजना के लक्ष्यों को देखें तो हमें पता चलेगा कि जो हमारा लक्ष्य था कि खेती की उपज में ३० प्रतिशत की बढ़ौतरी होगी, उद्योग में ७० प्रतिशत की बढ़ौतरी होगी और राष्ट्रीय आय में ३० प्रतिशत की बढ़ौतरी होगी, आज ढाई वर्ष के पश्चात् भी हमारी यह इच्छा कुछ आशा में परिणत होती हुई नजर नहीं आती है। यदि मैं आदरणीय मंत्री महोदय की इस बात को भी मान लूँ कि प्रथम तथा द्वितीय वर्षों में बढ़ौतरी कम ही नजर आती है। और अगर हम एक तिहाई मान कर चलें कि इन ढाई वर्षों में एक तिहाई लक्ष्य पूरा हो जाना चाहिये और दो तिहाई बाकी ढाई वर्षों में

पूरा हो जाएगा तब भी वह नहीं हुआ है और न ही बाकी पूरा होने की वाद में आशा बंधती है। एक तिहाई लक्ष्य भी कहां तक पूरा हुआ है इसको आप देखें। जैसा मैंने कहा तृतीय योजना का लक्ष्य था कि खेती की उपज में ३० प्रतिशत, उद्योग में ७० प्रतिशत और राष्ट्रीय आय में ३० प्रतिशत की बढ़ौतरी होनी चाहिये। बार बार इस सदन के सामने यह बात आई भी होगी यह रिपोर्ट भी हमारे सामने है इसके दूसरे पन्ने पर यह लिखा हुआ है :-

“The Third Plan period has been for a variety of reasons a period of slow economic growth when the increase in national income was only of the order of 5 per cent.”

इसी रिपोर्ट के सातवें पन्ने पर थोड़ा सा उसको खोल कर बताया गया है :-

“In the period 1961-63, the annual rate of increase in national income is estimated to have been about 2.5 per cent; as compared to the rate of something over 5 per cent envisaged in the Third Plan.”

16.05 hrs.

[DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI in the Chair]

इससे जाहिर होता है कि सत्यता क्या है। एक तिहाई अगर मान कर भी चलें कि इन ढाई वर्षों में एक तिहाई लक्ष्य पूरा हो जाना चाहिये था—खेद है—यह भी पूरा नहीं हुआ।

अब आप देखें कि कारण क्या है। अपने भाषण में मंत्री जी ने बताया है कि बहुत से इसके कारण हैं जिन की वजह से हम इन लक्ष्यों को पूरा नहीं कर पाए हैं। संकट काल को उन्होंने सब से पहले रखा। उम के बाद मौसम तथा प्रकृति के प्रकोप की बात उन्होंने कही जिस की वजह से हमारी उपज खास तौर से खेती वाड़ी की उपज कम हो जाती है। एक कारण उन्होंने विदेशी मुद्रा का बताया है और कुछ क्षेत्रों में अधिक उन्नति हो गई

[श्री मीर]

है, यह भी उन्होंने कहा है। मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि एक इकोनोमिस्ट इन बातों से कहाँ तक लगाव रखता है या रख सकता है। प्रव्वल तो मैं एमरजेंसी की बात को ज्यादा छूना नहीं चाहता हूँ। हाँ, प्रकृति प्रकोप को बहुत बहुत ज्यादा छूऊंगा। आज बीसवीं शताब्दी के भारत के एक मंत्री महोदय इस बात की शरण लें कि प्रकृति का प्रकोप हुआ, बारिश नहीं हुई, सूखा हो गया या पानी अधिक बरस गया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह चौदहवीं शताब्दी की बात ही कहते होंगे उसी शताब्दी में इस तरह की बात कही जा सकती थी। वही राष्ट्र, वही मुल्क जहाँ पर कि प्रकृति का प्रकोप इससे भी ज्यादा होता है, अफ.सोस की बात यह है कि हम उन से ही भीख मांग कर खाते हैं। प्रकृति के प्रकोप की शरण आज के जमाने में नहीं ली जा सकती है।

जहाँ तक एक्सचेंज का सम्बन्ध है, विदेशी मुद्रा का सम्बन्ध है, हमारे एक कम्युनिस्ट मित्र ने बहुत खुल कर इसके बारे में कहा है। इसको मैं अधिक छूना नहीं चाहता हूँ। मैं केवल इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन बातों की शरण ले कर आप सत्यता को छिपा नहीं सकते हैं। जहाँ तक प्रकृति के प्रकोप का सम्बन्ध है क्या मैं बहुत ही विनम्र शब्दों में मंत्री महोदय से पूछ सकता हूँ कि क्यों नहीं हम ऐसी नहरें बनाते जिन से जब सूखा पड़े ज्यादा से ज्यादा पानी कम से कम पैसों पर किसानों को दिया जा सके? क्यों नहीं हमारी योजना में ऐसी नहरें बनाने की व्यवस्था की गई कि जब अधिक पानी पड़े ज्यादा बारिश हो, तो प्रकृति के प्रकोप को हम बरदान के रूप में ले कर बाढ़ के पानी को समुद्र में लेजाकर डाल दें? यह कोई २१वीं या २२वीं शताब्दी की बात तो नहीं है। इस तरह की बात क्यों नहीं सोची जाती है? हरबार यह कह देने से कि सूखा हो गयी या पानी नहीं बरसा, काम नहीं चल सकता है। इस तरह की बात जब की जाती है तो मैं सोचता हूँ कि इसका बुद्धि से अधिक लगाव

नहीं हो सकता, प्लानिंग से अधिक लगाव नहीं हो सकता। मुझे मंत्री महोदय इन शब्दों का प्रयोग करने पर क्षमा करेंगे, ऐसी मैं आशा करता हूँ।

उद्योगों के बारे में भी मैं अधिक नहीं कहूंगा। खेती बाड़ी को ही मैं अधिक लूना क्योंकि मैं किसान का बेटा हूँ। उद्योगों के बारे में मैं केवल यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि १९६१-६२ में केवल ६.८ प्रतिशत की बढ़ती हुई है जब कि हम दावा करते थे कि १४ प्रतिशत की बढ़ती होगी। मैं इसके ब्यौरे में जाना नहीं चाहता हूँ। इसके बारे में भी कहा जाता है कि कच्चा माल नहीं मिलता। मैं पूछता हूँ कि कच्चा माल क्या खुदा देगा। कच्चा माल नहीं मिलता तो क्या इन बातों को आप सामने नहीं रखेंगे? क्या आप यह नहीं देखेंगे कि कच्चा माल मिलेगा या नहीं मिलेगा और अगर मिलेगा तो उसके लिये कितना समय चाहिये। कारणों में कच्चे माल का न मिलना, ईंधन की कमी, यातायात के साधनों की कमी इत्यादि बताये गये हैं। जब यातायात के साधनों की कमी है तो इसको कौन दूर करेगा ईंधन की कमी को दूर कौन करेगा? योजना में इन सब को पूरा स्थान क्यों नहीं दिया जाता है। पूरी शक्ति इन कमियों को दूर करने पर क्यों नहीं लगाई जाती। इन कमियों को ला करके अगर हमारे सामने रख दिया जाए और यह कह दिया जाय कि यह नहीं हो रहा है, वह नहीं हो रहा है, तो उसका क्या मतलब लगाया जाए? आज भ्रंज की इस मुल्क पर हुकूमत तो है नहीं जिन को दोषी ठहराया जा सकता हो।

जहाँ तक बिजली का सम्बन्ध है मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज ३५३.१ मिलियन वाट की कमी है और ४५५.२ मिलियन वाट की कमी १९६६ में जा कर हो जाएगी। यह कमी बढ़ती ही चली जाएगी।

क्या आपने इन कमियों के बारे में कभी सोचा है ?

अब मैं खेती बाड़ी को लेना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि अधिक समय नहीं है और अधिक समय तब बोलने की आप मुझे आज्ञा भी नहीं देंगे। पहली बात तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ८५ प्रतिशत लोग इस राष्ट्र के खेती से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं चाहे वे छोटे किसान हैं या बड़े किसान, खेतिहर मजदूर हैं या मौसम में या ष.सलों पर काम करने वाले मजदूर। ये तमाम लोग मिल कर ८५ प्रतिशत होते हैं जो एग्रिकल्चर से, खेती से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं। क्या हमारी योजना का ८५ प्रतिशत रूपया, क्या आपकी ८५ प्रतिशत शक्ति, क्या राष्ट्र के निर्माताओं की ८५ प्रतिशत बुद्धि योजना बनाते समय किसानों की भलाई के लिये या खेती की उपज को बढ़ाने के लिये लगी है ? यदि मुझे इसका उत्तर देने को कहा जाये तो वह "न" में ही होगा। १९४९-५० से ले कर १९६०-६१ तक के ग्यारह बरसों के इनने लम्बे समय में खेतीबाड़ी में, गल्ले में, खेती से सम्बन्धित जो चीजें हैं, जो उपज है, उन में केवल ३.८४ प्रतिशत प्रतिवर्ष की वृद्धि हुई है। आप यह नहीं कह सकते कि आप ने पर एकड़ ज्यादा पैदा किया है, बल्कि मैं यहां पर कह दूँ कि जहां पर आप ने जमीनों के साथ बढ़ती लगी है वहां यह भी लगायें कि २.०८ फी सदी खेती जो थी उस से ज्यादा बढ़ती चली जा रही है। खेती की तादाद, खेती की शक्ति, वह खेत जिस में हल चलता है उस का भी स्कोप ज्यादा बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। अगर उस स्कोप को उस में से निकाल दिया जाय तो खेती से जो उपज बढ़ी है वह कुल १.४५ फी सदी बढ़ी है। क्या यह अफसोस की बात नहीं है, क्या यह संकट पैदा करने वाली बात नहीं है। सन् १९६१-६२ के वर्ष में ७९.७ मिलियन टन पैदा हुआ था और सन् १९६२-६३ में ७७.५ मिलियन टन पैदा हुआ। उस में २.२ मिलियन टन की कमी रही। उस वक्त

जब कमी को सामने रखा गया तो आदरणीय मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि इस में कोई घगराहट की बात नहीं है। मंत्री महोदय, उस पिना से पूछो जिस का बालक दर्जा पांच में पढ़ता है, और दर्जा पांच में पढ़ते-पढ़ते साल के आखीर में उस गरीब पिना को, जिस के ११२६० एक साल में खर्च हो गये हैं, मास्टर यह खबर दे कि तुम्हारा बच्चा दर्जा छः में न जा कर दर्जा चार में वापस कर दिया है। क्या यह संकट की बात नहीं है, क्या हमारे हृदयों को, शोधितों के हृदय को, मजलूम मजदूरों के हृदयों को शांति हो सकती है। आप अपने मन को, कुछ सदस्यों के मन को, कुछ खाते पंते इन्सानों को नसल्ली दे सकते हैं, लेकिन भूखे मरते हुए इन्सानों को, जिन को साढ़े बारह वर्षों में रोजी नहीं मिली, रोटी नहीं मिली, मकान नहीं मिला, कपड़ा नहीं मिला, जो खानाबदोश हैं, किसी तरह सांत्वना नहीं मिल सकती।

मैं ज्यादा देर तक आप का समय नहीं लेना चाहता लेकिन मैं यह जरूर कह देना चाहता हूँ कि खेती का जो ढंग है इस मुल्क का वह कुछ अजीब सा है। अस्वल तो मैं पूछना चाहूंगा आज की सरकार से, मंत्री महोदय यहां बैठे हैं, उन से पूछना चाहूंगा कि हमारे यहां की खेती का क्या लगाव अमरीका की खेती से है। हमारे यहां के ट्रैक्टर मार्का किसान, हमारे यहां के प्लैनिंग कमीशन के चेयरमैन, हमारे यहां के बड़े-बड़े मिनिस्टर, यहां के बड़े-बड़े सदस्य, जो कि खेती से सम्बन्ध रखते हैं, वह अमरीका जाते हैं। अमरीका मैं भी गया हूँ, इस किसान को भी उस अमरीका में जाने का मौका मिला है जहां पर एक किसान के पास एक हजार, दो हजार, तीन हजार और पांच हजार एकड़ जमीन है, जिस को वह अपने ट्रैक्टर के बल पर जोत देता है। हमारी समस्या यह नहीं है कि किस तरह मशीनों के बल पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा हम जोत सकें। हमारा मसला यह है कि एक एकड़ में ज्यादा से ज्यादा किस तरह से पैदा हो। मेरा

[श्री मौर्य]

धरणा विश्वास है कि हमारे यहां की सरकार को अगर किसान को भेजना है, अगर मंत्रियों को भेजना है, अगर प्लानिंग कमिशन के सदस्यों को भेजना है, तो अमरीका न भेज कर जापान भेजना चाहिये। हमारी समस्या है कि एक एकड़ में ज्यादा से ज्यादा किस तरह से हम पैदा करें। इस समस्या का हल हम अमरीका से नहीं सीख सकते, इस का हल जापान से मिलेगा।

इस के बाद मैं दो एक बातें और लेना चाहूंगा क्योंकि मेरा विश्वास है कि उन बातों को शायद किसी ने भी न लिया हो। अन-एकानमिक होल्डिंग हमारी एक समस्या है। यह बहुत बड़ी समस्या है। एक किसान मरता है। मान लीजिये कि उस के पास १०० बीघा जमीन है। वह मरता है पांच बच्चों को छोड़ कर। १०० बीघा जमीन पांच बच्चों में बंटी तो एक एक बच्चे के पास २०, २० बीघा रहेगी। उस के बाद उस बच्चे के भी पांच बच्चे हुए, तो फिर बंट कर वह कितना रह जायेगी। इस तरह से एक दिन होगा जब यह जमीन छोटी-छोटी इकाइयों में बंट कर रह जायेगी। आप कहेंगे कि आप कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग करेंगे। आप उस को ला कर रखते हैं लेकिन कोओपरेटिव फार्मिंग हिन्दुस्तान में सफल नहीं हो सकती, इस पिछड़े हुए मुल्क पर लागू नहीं हो सकती, गरीब मजदूरों पर लागू नहीं हो सकती, मजदूरों पर लागू नहीं हो सकती, जो निरक्षर हैं जिन के लिये काला अक्षर भ्रंस बराबर है उन पर लागू नहीं हो सकती। जहां भाई-भाई में कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग नहीं चलती वहां दो अलग कौमों में, दो अलग समुदायों के किसानों में कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग कैसे चलेगी। मैं आप का ध्यान खींचना चाहूंगा कि अनएकानमिक होल्डिंग दोनों रूपों में हमारे सामने है। एक तो यह कि एक-एक किसान पांच-पांच बीघे के ऊपर पूरा साल समाप्त करता है और दूसरा यह है कि एक-एक किसान जो कि किसान का नाम

भी नहीं समझते ठीक तरह से उन के पास आज भी हजारों बीघे जमीन है फार्म के नाम पर, और बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपतियों ने खास तौर से इन फार्मों को ख खड़ा है अपने ब्लैक मनी को ह्वाइट मनी में करने के लिये। खैर, मैं इसे ज्यादा उठाना नहीं चाहता। लेकिन जब मैं अनएकानमिक होल्डिंग के बारे में कहता हूं तो यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि कोई बुरा न माने, कोई मूझे गलत न समझे, यहां पर जो मजूर काम करता है यदि उस के हृदय में इस बात का विश्वास हो जाय कि वह जो पैदा करता है वह उसे मिलेगा, उस की पत्नी को मिलेगा, उस के बच्चों को मिलेगा, उस के बच्चों का निर्माण होगा, उस को बढ़ाने के लिये होगा, तो मूझे विश्वास है कि उपज बढ़ाई जा सकती। आज जो लेंडनैस लेबरर्स हैं, खेतहीन मजदूर हैं, जो दूसरों के खेतों पर काम करते हैं, उन्हें विश्वास नहीं है कि वह जो पैदा करते हैं वह उन्हें मिलेगा, इसलिये जिस खेत में वे हल चलाते हैं वह किसी विशेष व्यक्ति की करार न दे कर सरकार की करार दी जाय; सरकार की करार दी जाय। मैं कोआपरेटिव फार्मिंग नहीं, कलेक्टिव फार्मिंग में विश्वास करने वाला आदमी हूं। उन खेतों में काम करने वाले जो मजदूर इन्सान हैं, जो शोषित हैं, उनसे कहा जाय कि जहां चाहे खेती करो, जो सुविधा चाहो हम देंगे, जितना भी तुम पैदा करोगे उस का लाभ तुम को पहुंचेगा, बीच के इंटरमीडियरी को नहीं पहुंचेगा। बड़े किसान आज मजदूरी करने वाले, हल चलाने वाले, वहां पर जोतने और बोने वाले, गहाने वाले मजदूरों, और सरकार के बीच में इंटरमीडियरी बन गये हैं। उन को समाप्त किया जाये। आज हजारों इन्सान नहीं, लाखों इन्सान नहीं, करोड़ों इन्सान भूखों मर रहे हैं, नाहि-नाहि कर रहे हैं, इस के बावजूद आप की योजनायें उन्हें कुछ दे नहीं पा रही हैं। साढ़े बारह वर्षों में आप ने करोड़ों इन्सानों को भूखों मारा है और जो साढ़े बारह वर्ष रह गये

उस में भी आप सब को रोटी और कपड़ा नहीं दे पायेंगे, रोजी नहीं दे पायेंगे। पेश्तर इस के कि सन्न का दामन छूटे, पेश्तर इसके कि इस मुल्क के अन्दर बगावत फीते, पेश्तर इसके कि इकबाल की वह जोशमरी शेर सच साबित हो कि :

“जिस खेत से दहकान को मयस्सर न हो रोजी, उस खेत के हर खोशये गंडुम को जला दो।”

पेश्तर इस के कि मजलूम लोग, मजदूर लोग, भूखे नंगे लोग, सर्वहारा लोग, शोषित लोग बगावत पर उतर आयें, हमें कोई ऐसा कदम उठाना चाहिये जिस से सब को रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान मिल सके, वरना मुझे बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस मुल्क में बगावत हो सकती है और किसी भी दिन हो सकती है।

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Madam Chairman, the discussion that has been going on in this House during the last few days gives rise to an impression that the Plan and the Government have been subjected to heavy long-distance artillery. In fact, not having been in the House most of the time, I even expected to see a mangled corpse here in the shape of a Plan which was something intagible because of this concentrated attack on it. Fortunately, the persons who directed this long-distance artillery are poor marksmen. The net result of it is, no shot hit the bull's eye and I am glad the Plan remains as it did before with all its hopes, with many of its virtues comparatively in tact.

Madam, I hoped to have the pleasure of seeing those gentlemen, perhaps ladies too, who directed the long-distance artillery here. Alas, I do not see any of them here.

An Hon Member: They have gone.

Shri Tyagi: It was a guerilla attack.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Am I, therefore, to take them seriously, to take them at their word and reply to what they have said?

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I am here to represent him; the speech is made on behalf of the group.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Or, shall I ignore them notwithstanding the redoutable professor who as a sole representative of a powerful group offers his head on a plate as his sacrifice?

Well, Madam, it is not time for words. My hon. friend Mr. Masani who has been my friend for a long time, friend who has been with us on this side and friend who has been with us in this House on the opposite side, has a facile tongue, an adroit mind and a capacity for manufacturing words and quoting persons which is almost inimitable. I heard him quoting Mr. Gomulka when he thought he was a renegade; today he is not. I heard, he even quoted Chou En-lai. Who knows Mr. Chou En-lai might steady down sometime at least to please Mr. Masani? Since he is not here, there is no point in quoting him; there is no point in replying to him. So, let me proceed with the generality of the attacks on the Plan and try to deal with them to the best of my ability.

Hon. Members who spoke—many of them on my side—took a very grim view of the picture, of the situation before us. My own view is that it is completely unwarranted. But I would not say that they have not got any reasons for taking a somewhat pessimistic view of the situation. There may be two reasons for it. They might have looked at the first two years of the Plan as if it was the whole, and taken an isolated view of this period rather than treat it as part of a continuous and cumulative process ultimately leading to the targets. May I say that it is something like having planted a seed and not seen it sprout? The process that my hon. friends in this

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

House have followed is to dig up and see whether it has sprouted inside the ground. Very possibly, if they do so they will find that the seed does not flower. Therefore, one must take the Plan as something which has to build up for a future and to that extent the results that we witness today are only an infinitesimal part of what would happen. At the same time, I think we look at current performance of the economy in terms of certain targets for the given period of the Third Plan. Oftentimes, a child who does not grow quickly by the time he is ten, becomes a big man of 6 feet 3 inches at the age of 20. As to why he does not grow until ten, we do not know.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Have tonsils operation.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think the hon. Member has not spoken yet, and I hope that when he speaks he will recommend tonsillectomy for the Plan.

But it is a fact that we know. If I may mention my own personal experience, I had a son who lost his mother when he was very young, and he was stunted. I had not been with him for a long time, and once when I went back from Delhi, I saw that he had shot up and he was much taller than I am today. That is a contingency that might happen to the Plan.

16.22 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Tyagi: So, the mother has to be lost.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It might be that we have targeted in a way that was somewhat ambitious. I would mention an instance. I am not here, nor will it serve any purpose if I am here, for the sake of covering up the Plan and showing a different picture before such an intelligent and

august House. We have targeted for 800,000 tons of nitrogenous content fertilisers. At the time we did it, the Second Plan had not seen its end. The estimate in the Second Plan was 200,000 tons. In fact, we achieved only half of that. Because of that, the target might have been very high. In fact, it is high. The question was raised at one time whether we should lower the target. The decision ultimately was to keep the target at that figure and try to do what we can. It may be that we shall do 400,000 tons, it may be that we shall do 500,000 tons, or it may be that what we target today would be achieved in the Second year of the Fourth Five Year Plan, namely 800,000 tons. But I do not think that it is inherently criminal or even a matter of miscalculation to have targeted for 800,000 tons in the Plan.

I would like to say in all humility before this august House that the appraisal report submitted by the Planning Commission, which my hon. colleague has placed before the House, and which is now being discussed is an objective assessment of the facts and nothing more. It contains just the facts as they are. Certain explanations might have been offered, but the facts have not been hidden. In fact, it would not be wise to do so, because truth will come out at any time, nor is it the duty of the Planning Commission or the responsibility of the Planning Commission to hide facts. That is where we come to the crux of the situation here.

I have been quoted and so has been my Chief. We speak frankly sometimes, and we are proud of the fact that we are able to speak frankly. We speak frankly of our own mistakes. We do not highlight our achievements. In fact, may I tell you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that years back. I think, eight years back, when I was eight years younger, and I was foolhardy enough to think or to dream that we

should have a production of 6 million tons of steel by the end of the Second Plan, friends of Shri M. R. Masani, whom hon. Professor Ranga does not represent, thought it was wrong; their own assessment was 2.2 million tons. And they were saying 'Here is somebody foolhardy and who has been put in the position of a Minister, who is assuming a possibility of achieving a target of 6 million tons, which this country would not need. The resources of this country are being strained and diverted into production of steel, and everything is wrong because the Prime Minister is permitting a young colleague of his, or a younger colleague of his, to dream'. If I may be pardoned for using the personal pronoun, my failing is being foolhardy. I was foolhardy to tell my Chief that if my targets were not accepted, I had no business here; and I went away. I was called back, and we started the work. It lingered on. It missed the target date. But, nevertheless, today, my hon. friend who is sitting on my right just now can say with confidence that we are producing 6 million tons of steel in this country. And believe me if these 6 million tons of steel had not been there the dream of 11 or 12 or 13 or ultimately 18 million tons in which my hon. friend on my right indulges will not be a possibility. It may be, as somebody said this morning 'Oh, when are you going to produce these 18 million tons? You are not going to produce it in the Fourth Plan'. It may be that we have missed the plan. If you blame us for not having gone more fast, more accurately, and more persistently in the production of steel, I am willing to plead guilty. But do not tell me that I have done something wrong in concentrating on the production of steel as if it is an important luxury, as if it is something which will build up the resources of somebody in whose hands we do not want the resources to be built up. If they are not there today, the cry from all over the country wanting more steel would not have been met even in part; there is that cry from all over the country

wanting more steel, and more special steel, and we are not able to meet it because we are already 2 million tons short. If the hon. Members opposite who claim a certain degree of omniscience relative to the intellectual capacity of the Treasury Benches—and I concede it to them—had told me that 'In planning for steel, you have made a vital mistake, namely that you planned for 25 per cent flat products and 75 per cent of what is called merchant steel', they would have been right. It was bad planning; it may be so, but at that time I could not visualise that the demand for flat products would be what it is today, namely roughly 40 or 45 per cent. I could not then visualise that the momentum of planning and the momentum of industrial production in this country would enable us to fabricate something like 4 to 5 million tons of flat products in a year. If you put that against me, I shall plead guilty, but you do not do that. You condemn me for having thought of steel. You do not condemn me for not having thought of alloy and special steel production, but you say 'You are concentrating on something else and you are neglecting the consumer goods'. I have no doubt that my hon. friend who is absent, and who has chosen to be absent, and who has probably very good business advising some industrialists to put up a plant, is also doing a good thing, because that also aids the Plan. Everybody works in this country, even the capitalists and even the capitalists' advisers—I do not share the view of hon. friends over there; I will come to them later on. He says 'Why do you produce steel? Why do you concentrate on heavy industries?' I can very well understand if the steel interests of Pittsburgh in the United States say, 'We are prepared to give India steel at half price, even steel on PL 480 basis; so let them not produce steel, but produce consumer goods which will use steel'. For one thing, it keeps their industry going. For another, they can also export their surplus to India

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

which is a good market. But I cannot understand a person like Shri Masani, who has some remote, intangible, elusive affinity with steel interests, telling me 'Don't produce steel; produce consumption goods'.

The real point is that part of the consumption goods has to be produced by steel. Motor cars have to be produced by steel, tractors have to be produced by steel, ploughshares have to be produced by steel, and—this is to my hon. friend who complained about it a few minutes back—construction is now being done by steel and cement. Are we wrong in emphasising that steel is a basic industry on which we should concentrate? I am only highlighting one point of what he has said. I am not even going to categorise—though it is extremely fascinating—the mistakes of our Government.

I remember that in 1944—I was a Member of this House then—we had an extremely interesting member not with the Government but sitting outside it, Shri Jamnadas Mehta, who just took a dictionary and got out a word from each alphabet to characterise the budget of the then Finance Member. They were all of course words of abuse.

We have a beautiful garland of abuses for anybody in the Treasury Benches who would like to wear it. The document of reappraisal is an honest document—Oh, God, some concession to this document—'of wishful thinking, wasteful spending, excessive intervention, rigid regimentation, outdated dogmas, deepening discontent throughout the country'. Therefore, what should be done? The Plan must be scrapped. Nothing in this Plan is worth preserving or maintaining! I think my hon. friend, who is not here, must have spent a lot of time trying to select these words. I hope he used a good dictionary to characterise this Plan. But is this what any responsible Member of this House can do

in regard to this huge adventure of ours to raise the standard of living of the people of this country, when he offers his participation, his collaboration, even his blessings, if we go in the way he wants us to? Are we to take him seriously when a man has just been wasting his time taking the dictionary and sort of putting together words which have no meaning at all except that—if it is parliamentary to use the word—they are abusive?

Shri Ranga: Question.

Shri Dasappa: A very feeble question.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No, Shri Ranga can be heartening.

Shri Ranga: He has the floor. You do not expect me to interrupt him at every stage he uses words in such reckless manner.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: We are called hardened Marxists.

Of course, he has also given us some credits, some to my leader, and to a very small extent, to me, of having the capacity to absorb the cream of Swatantra intelligence. I suppose in these days when we speak with our feet on the ground, our wisdom comes from the Swatantra Party.

Shri Ranga: Quite right. Your wisdom is so great that you will . . .

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The hon. Member will have an opportunity to speak. Having been a professor, he should have some of the discipline that he taught his students.

He wishes that we had shown some realism. I may claim very humbly that we have always shown realism. We have never been swept off our feet either by enthusiasm or by slogans, and that is why we have criticism from these two sections, as I said the other day, from these two

§

distant poles, the Antarctic and the Arctic. Both of them find to their discomfort that the party in power is so realistic that it refuses to be jostled one way or the other from the path it has marked out for itself, and they are therefore angry. I am going to dismiss Shri Masani with these words. He is angry because, as my hon. friend there puts it, he sees no prospect of being able to wield power. Of course, he can always come back, and we shall always receive the prodigal son with the fatted calf. I do not propose to waste my time any more on him, nor do I propose to deal with the speeches of the other hon. Members here who are absent.

The Plan, to us, is a very serious effort. The document that we have presented, as I said, is only an appraisal of the facts as they stand today. Therefore, we are not going to be moved one way or the other by these criticisms.

One point that I would like to mention before I proceed to deal with the document itself is this. Hon. friends here have made jibes at our socialism, maybe some hon. friends of my own group. In fact, our socialism is not something which we want people to admire us about. It is to us something which is grim, which is real. The leader of my party, long before he ever intended to or even thought of assuming this office, had marked out this path, because that is the only philosophy, that is the only economic programme that can help the poor people of the country. A visitor who came a few days back, whose country and whose policy are wedded to encourage private enterprise, told a friend of mine the other day that things in India were different, that we could not copy anybody's example. And I had a telegram from him when he left Bombay. It is not a flattering one, but something which is real and genuine. He says that all foreigners who had come to this country feel that the economic policy and the economic

goals that we strive for are something which we have shaped, something, may, I say, to which we are giving shape.

In this context, I may say that hon. Members on the right side of the Swatantra Party leader speak to us of our failings, about the concentration of economic power, supported by facts that they have taken from blue books indicating the reserves that are being ploughed back by companies, profits which have been declared etc. We are not unaware of these facts. We are not unaware of the fact that there is concentration of power, but believe me—it may even be treason—that it is much better that something is made, something is produced; even if it is concentrated, it is better than to have nothing at all. So, 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, or we can make them agree to do so over a period of time, but it is much better than not producing anything at all. Instead of not producing anything, something is produced—no matter who does it. Somebody is enjoying the fruit of it. We will take it later on. We are not unaware of it. It is not that we are not unaware of money power. Everybody is susceptible to money power; everybody wants money. Even Communists want money, if I may say so; without money they could not live. Therefore, money power is there. It is only when the results of production are there we can take them and distribute them. As a Finance Minister, as a person who taxes partly for the purpose of distribution, where am I to take money from if no money is produced at all? What I am afraid of is not concentration of wealth, it does not worry me in the least, but my worry is the utilisation of that money power, political utilisation of the money power, which can pervade. We can all be purchased, so they say Concentration may be there; it can be wiped

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

out; it can be taken away. You do not have to tell me how to do it; that is my job.

An Hon. Member: Are you going to do it.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If you think that I am a fool enough to tell you how I am going to do it, you will be a bigger fool than I am.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): At least are you going to do it in that way?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If my hon. friend, having come all the way from Trichy, will have some satisfaction, he can have it. In relation to the Plan or even in relation to the socialist objectives of the Plan about which we are very keen, this is only a passing phase. Let somebody make money; I do not mind. But money must be made and goods must be produced. Production must increase, no matter from where. If it increases in the public sector, we are happy; we do not have to take the next step—a sort of a leveling down. But even if it is not produced there, the ultimate objectives of our plan, of economic growth are not affected. Government has to take the next step to see that there is equalisation, if there is maldistribution. Assuredly, there has been maldistribution. Why? Merely because there has been just a beginning of the public sector. We began with the public sector as late as 1955. In June 1955, the first sod was turned in regard to steel plants. Hon. Members cannot expect us to work miracles in eight or nine years and therefore much of the criticism of my hon. friends of the Communist Party is beside the mark. I am grateful to them at any rate for giving their support to the Plan, I think. In fact I welcome every criticism that has been made about the Plan, its methodology, its techniques, the manner of implementation and execution; I do not object to criticism. Where I object is opposition to planning as such and secondly attack on the members of the

Planning Commission. It is very wrong to do so. Somebody called them a frustration squad. I have no doubt that none of them has an element of frustration in them. They are doing their job to the best of their ability. There is some mistake in appreciation of the difficulties in economic planning in (a) a democratic set-up and (b) in a federal set-up. If we were a unitary State everything said might be right; it would be criticism of a Government which has to implement the Plan. But here it is all against the Planning Commission which is an organisation that fulfils very useful role—between the Central and the State Governments and between the State Governments. Over the State Governments, we have no powers, none whatever.

Shri Kashi Ram Gupta (Alwar): They are your party Government.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: They are Governments in their own right; they are party Governments next. They have a direct responsibility to the people for their progress. The Planning Commission comes in between. I cannot tell the State Finance Ministers. "You cannot do that." The Planning Commission may tell them that, because they say, "Here are the resources allocated. This is how you should use it. So, please do not do that kind of thing." Of course, if ultimately the States think that their responsibility to the people in the States is greater, they can reject the Planning Commission's advice. But they cannot expect the Planning Commission to help them any more. So, here it is a very useful weapon that we are using to by-pass the difficulties of a federal set-up.

The other fact is this. Hon. Members spoke of having to produce consumer goods. Are we not aware of it? Don't we have to look over our shoulders everytime to see that we do

not do anything that displeases the people of this country? Sometimes, we would like to have a little more regimentation and tell the people, "Do without these things for a time. Take the semi-durables. Don't buy them for a year. Let us give sugar to the children only. Let the others do without sugar for a month, and there will be no sugar shortage afterwards." But we cannot do it merely because the people's susceptibilities are such that they blame the Government. In a democratic Government it is not possible to overrule or override the wishes of the people for any length of time. You can do so for a very short time. We are constantly and consistently aware of the susceptibilities of the people in regard to consumption goods. I will even go a step further. I will say, and I for my part, speaking as an individual, feel that apart from the importance of the basic objective of the Plan, namely, to build up a basic sector of industry, spending more money on agriculture, communications, coal and various other things, we have also to look to providing some little marginal reliefs here and there to the people so that at least they may feel just that little sense of relief, what we call in my part of the country, *aswasam*,—breathe freely for a time—and say, "Ah, the Central Government is thinking of us; our Government is thinking of us; they are providing some little relief, some escape here and there so that we can breathe freely." That is a thing which we cannot escape. And believe me, we are constantly at work, finding out how we could give relief to the distressed, to the needy, to the people who need help either because of old age or because of decrepitude or because they are orphans. Something must be done; something will be done. Not that we are unaware of it. We do not want Shri Masani to come and tell us our basic obligations. But then all this has to be ultimately integrated into one major goal: that the country must progress.

Hon. Members have pointed out, and pointed out very rightly that the rate

of growth of the economy is almost coterminous with the rate of growth of population. It is a major preoccupation of this Government and no doubt in solving that preoccupation we want the help of everybody in this House. In fact, we should undertake population planning in all seriousness. I am not going to say what my leader would say tomorrow, but I would like to say, "enrol volunteers to tell the people that if we go on producing at this rate nothing that we produce by way of goods would show a substantial margin over the population that we produce." In fact, every foreigner who comes to this country, who is friendly to us, only points out all these facts: here you are striving and struggling to increase your growth in the economy; you are putting your people to trouble and you are putting yourself to trouble; at the same time, what is happening is the natural instinct of man is defeating you; how are you going to ask him to keep that under subjection? If hon. Members have said Government have failed to take adequate steps to make a concerted drive behind population planning, I will plead guilty. But I will say it is not the fault of the Planning Commission. It is the fault of the policy-makers. We, the Central Government and the Chief Ministers in the National Development Council make the policy. Planners do not make the policy. Why do you blame them over the Policy aspect of the Plan?

Therefore, Sir, while I accept the criticism, or at any rate the spirit in which many of the hon. Members have offered their criticism, the only objection, the only caveat that I would enter would be, please do not criticise the Planning Commission or its members. Do not name them; do not characterise them. It is not very nice. They are not here. You are missing the mark. It is not the mistake of the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission is mistaken, we can change it. We can tell them they are wrong. I would take the responsibility, so far as the central aspect of the Plan is concerned,

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

tirely on this Government and not shove any portion of it on the Planning Commission, who I think, in all conscience, are fulfilling a very difficult role, in the very best manner.

Shri Ranga: The Planning Commission is represented here by the Chairman. Why do you say that the Planning Commission is not here?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would like to take this opportunity of paying a tribute to my colleague, who I think has certainly lost quite a lot of his health during the period that he undertook this arduous job of being the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. I know that sometimes I disagreed with him. But the remarkable effort which the Planning Commission and he himself put forth in producing the third Plan and watching it subsequently certainly deserves a better word of appreciation than what has been given to it.

We speak of agriculture. Agriculture has failed. It is so easy to say that. My hon. friend, Shri Ranga, has been a kisan of various types. But I do not know if he ever produced anything.

An Hon. Member: He was a professor.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: He was a leader.

Shri Ranga: I am cooperating with the Government in family planning.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: May I thank him for the service he has rendered to this country?

In the field of agriculture, in the first two plans, we had 19 million acres. During the third Plan, the total acreage to be augmented will be another 20 million. That is the target and we have not seen the end of the third Plan yet. More than 70 per cent. of the resources required for

minor irrigation has been utilised in the first 3 years. The major projects, as I said, would add in two stages about 20 million acres. Maybe some of it may come to fruition by the beginning of the fourth Plan. If spending money is anything, we have spent Rs. 400 crores on it.

Even in regard to the question of fertilisers, apart from production of it, utilisation of it is very significant. The consumption of fertilisers at the beginning of the first Plan in nitrogenous content was about 55,000 tons. It rose to 2,00,000 tons in ten years. In 1963-64, it amounts to about 450,000 tons. Part of it is no doubt imported. The story of phosphatic fertilisers is equally good.

A great deal of talk was indulged in in regard to the failure of the co-operative and community projects programme. Hon. Members will realise that the Community Development project was first started in the First Plan. We started it by selecting areas in each State and a lot of concentrated attention was given to them. So, by and large, everybody said it was successful. Then there was a demand from the surrounding areas. We undertook what was called the National Extension Service, which is not as intensive as the Community Project but which also gives some of the benefits of it. With the Third Plan, we have started Community Projects all over the country.

Undoubtedly, all of them are not doing well, equally well. Sir, if I may again use a personal pronoun, I went to my constituency some time earlier this year. My constituency has got 13 community development blocks, which we call panchayat unions. One was exceedingly good, 5 or 6 were medium and the others were poor. We cannot say it is a failure because half of it is tolerable. If the other half is not pulling up, it is due to the fact that local leadership was wanting. In the one that was very good, we had

a leader who was there for a very long time, a moneyed man, who had spent a lot of money on the people, so much so that when he became the chairman of the panchayat union—he is no longer with us—he said “I am not going to tax the people at all because I have got enough resources”. That sort of man it is difficult to get. In the other places where we had some leadership it had functioned well. In one place there was a young man, a fresh graduate, who, because he had 20 or 25 acres of land, wanted to settle down, and he was providing some leadership, a little more activity. In some other places, the progress is not so good.

Again, I would like to say there are difficulties in the Community Projects. In those 13 projects I interviewed all the Gram Sevikas and asked them how they went about their jobs, were they being well-treated, was it possible for them to find houses when they went to villages, what their complaints were, what they thought about family planning etc. A gram sevika said some woman asked her how many children she had. Of course, it is a mistake to ask a young woman to go and preach about family planning because the elderly woman in the village will naturally retort, “How many children have you got? What do you know about it?” It is all a mistake. We should have sent along some elderly woman who could go to the villages and say “Look here, I have got three children; I do not want more; I want to do something about it” because there is nothing like a personal example.

Then there is another grim fact. When I met them, they asked me: “What is our future? We cannot be Gram Sevikas all the time. We should be trained as teachers or nurses”. I am merely highlighting these facts, because wherever you go you find people are facing difficulties. But the difficulties do not mean that the

scheme is bad. We have to look at those difficulties also. In fact, I have been talking with my colleague, the Health Minister that we should provide facilities for learning nursing in the headquarter hospitals of all the districts with stipends so that these people who want to make some living can take advantage of it and they may get married. They should be given an opportunity.

The same thing about package deal. An American scientist, who has been here in India before, in 1959, recently came back and he has been asked to look at the package deal districts. I may inform the leader of the Swatantra Party that he has toured a few districts and now he happens to be in the Circars. He has given the report that they are doing well. He says that though it made a late start,—it took more than two years to make a start—when it started functioning it was doing well. Probably, the hon. Member will be disgusted because the Congress Government has succeeded in making the package deal something real.

I am mentioning this to tell you that in the field of agriculture nobody can lay down the law; nor can I accept the advice of the hon. Member who spoke before me, that I should prevent floods prevent cyclones. I wish I could have done it in Nagapattanam, which is in my State, where we had 20 inches of rain in one day.

17.00 hrs.

Even a more omnipotent Government than the Government of Soviet Russia cannot stop rains. Floods must come necessarily. All that we can do is to give help after the floods. That is the sort of thing you ask the Planning Commission to do; you are asking them to do something which is impossible. It is not their job. It is my job. If the State Governments want to provide relief, I have got to provide relief for them and we have got

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

a system of providing relief. Therefore, in the field of agriculture, we cannot even go on the basis of input and output ratio. We cannot say, we have put in so much of fertilisers, therefore the yield must be so much because we might have put in fertilisers but we might not have the pesticides. Another leading agriculturist in my State mentioned to me that he sometimes felt it was a crime to use fertilisers. I asked him why? He said, "I am well-to-do and I use fertilisers. Crops are luscious. I have pesticides. Because luscious crops attract pests, I use pesticides. But the pests are driven to the next field where the poor man has neither the fertilisers nor the pesticides and he loses his crop. It merely shows that about the problems that they have to think of in regard to agricultural production, knowledge can only be acquired by experience, not by sitting in Delhi either in this House or in the Planning Commission. So, the problem of agriculture is a thing where we have to strive hard. My hon. friend, again, knows that if we use in any field fish ganoid, we have got to wait for three years for it to yield results, and if in the meantime a monsoon comes and blows it away, the whole thing is washed away. I can also provide refinements as to what they should do. In fact, in States like the southern States, irrigation is stabilised by tanks, not directly by rivers in all cases, like Godavari or Krishna or even like Cauvery. Most of the irrigation is stabilised by means of tanks. What has happened is these tanks have got silted up, some of them silted upto 6 or 7 ft. and most of these tanks get filled up once in three years. That is the average cycle of rainfall floods in that area. It has happened that one part of it which we have not looked to all along is desilting these tanks. It is an enormous job. Once we do it to stabilise agriculture, I am sure production in the area will be great. It happened in one district in South India in Tirunelveli where we

had a dam mainly for the purpose of stabilising agriculture and the lands which were not yielding anything for ten years have now started yielding tremendously. So, the refinements in regard to what you could do in the agricultural programme are many. They have to be thought of at the spot. State Governments have to do it. My hon. friend, I think, Mr. Morarka, suggested that the Chief Ministers should take up Agriculture. Maybe, we have also said that here. I join issue with him. If the Chief Ministers take up Agriculture, nothing could be done because the Chief Minister has got to do so many other things. Agriculture must be taken up by somebody else who gives it an undivided attention.

Shri Morarka: What I said was that the hon. Prime Minister had suggested this. In spite of that suggestion, nobody has taken to it.

Shri Ranga: Quite right.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The point is this. It is a question of giving attention by more than one Minister perhaps. Even in the Planning Commission, I have been urging my friends that we should devote more attention to agriculture, more attention to taking to the fields the results of research. Probably, more agricultural commissioners will go and direct the operations. The methods that are suggested are all good. They will be tried. There are other methods as well. The only thing that we have to recognise is that so far as agriculture is concerned, the Planning Commission do not go and sow; they do not take out seedlings and plant them; they do not weed them out, nor do they find the water. It has got to be done in various places.

Then, comes this question of land legislation. On land legislation, we have two extreme views. I do not

know what the Communists think. I do not know if they really think that the holdings should be economic. I know at one time in 1952, some Communist leaders in my State went on giving documents to various people saying, you can take this land. Ultimately, when the man went to claim the land, the landlord beat him.

And they found the next time that this kind of thing was of no use, and so, they voted for the Congress. So, I do not know what they have in mind.

Shri Nambiar: On no occasion did the communist leaders in that State issue documents like that. I dispute this claim.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: My hon. friend may continue to dispute it. On the other side, my hon. friend who represents the kisans is here, and I do not know what he wants. Why is he against land legislation? Here is one set of people saying that land legislation or land reform has not been implemented properly, adequately and satisfactorily, and another set of people say, 'We do not want it at all; we want no legis'ation', and yet my hon. friend is a kisan leader. I do not know the definition of kisans. I must probably borrow Shri M. R. Masani's dictionary.

The real point about land legislation is this. This is a huge country. We have not had a MacArthur as in Japan who merely said, or who laid a *hukum*, that seven acres was about all that a person could have. He made a distinction in regard to the northern part of Japan, namely Hokaido, where he allowed 15 acres, and the writ ran. Here, we are a democratic country, and our writ cannot run except by persuasion and by legislation. Assuredly, there are a lot of shortcomings in land legislation. It is equally true that landlords have beaten us in the game, but they cannot beat us for all time. This is where I join issue with my hon. friends here. As I say, these

capitalists have hoarded money, concentrated power in their hands, and they have got more reserves and more dividends, and these people are not going to keep their land for a long time. The *benamidars* will have to disappear some time. It may be that legislation was not right. It may be that the example of Mr. Nayak who was the adviser in Bombay in 1939, who just started with putting a ceiling on fresh acquisitions in 1939 was right, and, Bombay was able to effect land reform better than any other State because of the thoughtfulness of that adviser in 1939. But the process is difficult. That does not mean that the basic objective and the steps that are being taken are wrong. Ultimately, hon. Members have got a root in the soil. They are not people who are orphans. They have all got constituencies; they have got States. It is to the States that they should go and say this and that, and say this or that must be done. I am sure that hon. Members have a lot of influence in their States. Therefore, this plea of land reform, better land legislation and better implementation of legislation is something in which they should co-operate with us, and they must go and bring it home to the State Governments rather than make it a function of the Planning Commission here; who have neither legislation nor have they anything to do with the ownership of land. All that they do is to say, this is a better thing to do, the tiller must be the owner, and he must have an economic holding.

But, nevertheless, we are going on with our task. We shall not leave it. It may be that our production has been very good in relation to what it was in the past, and the key to production in the agricultural field or part of it at any rate, is power. Again, I am very proud to say that I belong to a State which has maximised the use of electric power for purposes of agriculture. The Madras State has got the largest amount of power which is being used for pur-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

poses of irrigation. May I say that in 1947, when the British were here, we had probably 1100 villages with electricity in Madras. Now, we have more than 11,000, and we propose to reach 18,000 by the end of the Third Plan. If one State can do it, I think other States must also be doing it. I do not think that there is anything to be ashamed of. I am rather proud of the power achievements made by the Government of India and the State Governments and the Planning Commission.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The Rajasthan target is 500 out of 17,000 by the end of the Third Plan.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If my hon. friend would permit me to say so, part of the mistake is his own. What about his powerful voice which he raises here?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: They had been asking for funds for transmission lines etc. and they have not been getting it. I have been arguing with the Minister of Irrigation and Power a hundred and one times. As against the target of 1000 villages in Madras every year, the Rajasthan target is 500 villages by the end of the Third Plan.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I agree with the hon. Member that it is extremely unsatisfactory. It should be looked into. The only trouble about it is that the Rajasthan Canal might suffer unless it is taken up as a Central project.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Yes, it must be.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That will be the difficulty. As far as the Bhakra dam is concerned, it has consumed Rs. 205 crores, out of which the bulk of the contribution has come from the Centre. The Centre, unfortunately—both the Planning Commission and the Finance Minister—happens to be like a mother with 16

children. Milk cannot be refused to any child. You have to give a teaspoon at least to each.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Yet there be family planning there.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I appreciate the hon. Member's joke. I believe he is a journalist, but he sometimes misses the mark, as journalists often do.

This problem of central resources is a problem I am up against. The problem, in all its intensity, in all its grimness, is this, that we have to ration out our resources. Shri Masani asked: 'What have you done? You only put taxes. You allow prices to go up'. But without taxes, can this be done? Can I meet the claim of my hon. friend from Rajasthan? I think taken all in all, the question of power production is something which we need not be ashamed of.

In regard to coal, I can tell you the same thing. In regard to railways, the position is extremely good. Today they are carrying 175 million tons, and fortunately or unfortunately,—I hope my hon. colleague will not take it amiss—we find that there are about 2,400 wagons surplus. But that does not mean that we should stop it. We should produce more wagons, we should improve the efficiency of the railways, we should increase the turn-round of wagons. So I would much rather have 50,000 wagons surplus than be in the position we were in June last year when we could not carry enough coal. If it costs money, we will pay it. If it means more money, we will find it.

In June last year, my chief gave me the task of looking into coal movements, power, transportation and a few other things. I do not say I have achieved anything. I have not done anything myself. All that I did was to bring the people together. That was all I was able to do. The result is that today coal is not in short sup-

ply—on the other hand, coal is piling at the pitheads. Railway wagons are not in short supply—we have got 2,400 surplus. Railway movement is going up. As regards power programmes, today States are vying with one another in wanting more money for such programmes. We have often placed orders for utilisation of credit, of credits which we have got so far for the first three years of the Plan. We have allocated 79 per cent; utilisation is of the order of 55-56 per cent. Orders are being placed and goods will come. In the case of power, every bit of money that is available for use in power has been utilised. I do not say I have done it. The Planning Commission has done it; the Ministries in the Government have done it; the States have done it; everybody has done it, together. When we can do it in the case of power, we can do it in the case of railway movements, we can do it in the case of production of coal. You can ask: 'why did you not do it somewhere else? Maybe there are gaps.

We have been told about industries. Of course, there has been slowing down of industries. The causes for this may be many. I acknowledge that there has been some excessive licensing without finding out whether the parties could utilise the licences. There has probably been in some cases an inadequate appreciation of the raw materials needed for industries. All these are there. I do not say they are not there.

That is why I have been saying for the last three or four months that the economy must move. Let us all move. When we find afterwards who has been eating more in the process, we will cut down his rations, later on. But let us move.

Therefore, the effort of this august body, of every Member here, is to see that we move. It was said that this was not a national plan. Maybe those people do not belong to this nation; they are not Indians; they are aliens who have been by mistake

returned to this House. Is that so?—I cannot find any other explanation. This is a plan to benefit every human being in this country. If anybody says in this House that this is not a national plan, I should humbly suggest that he is probably a refugee from somewhere else.

The Minister of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): No refugee.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: My hon. friend disclaims responsibility!

Another field where we can be very justifiably proud is education. In every field, whether it be in primary education or in the middle grade or high school education, we have hit the target, exceeded the target. We are bound to exceed the target by the end of the Plan. I think we can be very proud of it. It is some achievement really. Can you deny that the Planning Commission has helped towards this end? Can you deny that the States have co-operated assiduously towards this end? Is it not something that you should take into account when you condemn these people out of hand?

I will tell you the defects in the Plan myself. We have not been able to get enough technical people to man our industries. One of the major defects in the public sector projects today is that we lack managers, we lack technical people, merely because we are going fast. The problem of training has got to be more or less adjusted to the pace of our industrialisation. It can never be suitably adjusted because I believe that in this, as in every other thing, the supply is short of the demand. We are aiming at this Plan to see that the supply curve is higher than the demand curve, as in the case of railway wagons. Then, there can be no question of price control, then there can be no question of high prices. The basic factor that is operating today in the field of high prices is the fact that supplies are short of the demand

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

That is a fact which is also true in the case of technical personnel. We want more engines, we want more foremen, we want skilled artisans we want doctors, we want nurses. If I had the doctors and nurses today, I could have come out probably, even within the short period of time that I have been Finance Minister, with a bigger scheme of health benefits. It is not the money that will go into these health schemes that frightens me, it is the absence of the medical men, of nurses. So, the hindrance to our development happens to be shortage of personnel; also with regard to higher personnel like administrators.

Shri Bade: Then why is there still unemployment?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am coming to it.

So many harsh things are said about these administrators. One man taking a job in the private sector does not mean that hundreds of thousands of administrators are not functioning. Young boys from the IAS work from morning 6 to night 8 O'Clock anxious to see that the Plan succeeds, they are so much interwoven with the Plan, with the development of this country. People here, when they speak of administrators, must have a heart. What about these people who are doing so much work? Do you mean to say that they are doing the work for the Rs. 400 or Rs. 500 they are getting? Most of them get as much as we get as Members here. They have got a sense of duty. We want more of them. There is a shortage of managers of the public sector projects even for the implementation of the Plan.

May I say, in short, that if we have not been able to make the rapid progress that we envisaged in certain fields, which cover a wide area like agriculture, production of substitute foods, forestry, fisheries, animal husbandry, dairy farming, poultry keep-

ing and various other things, it is because we have not been able to raise the personnel for that purpose. The failure today is due to the failure of the apparatus to be able to handle it, because in size it has grown. An hon. friend here once asked me: you do not want the middle grade people, you want a top-heavy administration? We want administrators who work by themselves, not through clerks. The dimensions of the Plan have been doubling every time, and the Fourth Plan is something which is going to be much bigger. If this is the type of treatment that we get, what are we to do in regard to the Fourth Plan? I have been making attempts to pose certain problems of the Fourth Plan which I thought I might submit to my colleagues later on: How to balance things? Are we to look into the concentration of power and prevent it and in the process prevent growth? Shall we look to the distribution of wealth and not produce any wealth; shall we only see that wealth is not badly distributed? Shall we produce only consumer goods so that people may get them, and neglect the basic industries? These are some of the various alternatives before us in regard to the consideration of the Fourth Plan. Believe me, Government is considering the Fourth Plan when we are still 2½ years away from it.

I would like to wind up. I have taken more than an hour though I had not intended to do so. Maybe, I have not grasped the significance of all the comments and criticisms made by hon. friends opposite but I have tried to meet the criticism of people who are present. It is wrong to go on saying and quoting from some book as my hon. friend, who is not here, did while he waxed eloquent and said that even in the year 1999 we should still have about 10 or 15 per cent. of the people starving. It may be they are starving; population might spread or it may be that for some other reasons people may be made to starve. But that is not our intention.

Somebody said that in ten years we can make a spectacular advance. It is our hope that within ten years we shall cross the barrier which in economic jargon they say is the take-off stage. I thought in 1956 we reached the take-off stage in industry; but it does not seem to be a fact. But certainly, by the end of the Fourth Plan, we would have we will be able to say that no person who is decrepit, no person who is a destitute will be allowed to starve and no person shall remain uneducated. My hon. friend spoke about employment. Does he consider it in isolation? If I deny education today, there will be no unemployment because people will be prepared to do earth work which they will not do when educated. Does the hon. Member realise that unemployment is man-made today, not because of vested interests of tycoons but because of the addition every year of millions to the school-leavers. Unless we multiply industries and adopt various other methods to employ them, that will grow. The problem of tackling unemployment, not only current but also the potential one, is not going to be easy. So, let everybody produce something; let everybody give some employment. That is the policy we follow. If they do mischief with accumulated wealth, if they do things to the detriment of the welfare of the people, we have powers and we can look after that, provided hon. Members co-operate with me.

Shri Tyagi: Taxation measures?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Not only taxation, even punitive measures for preventing abuse of concentrated wealth.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Ask for these powers and we shall give gladly.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid that I have been sometimes refused those powers. But that is not the main requirement; that is something which we can manage. We are elected by adult suffrage and each one of

us has probably some lakhs of voters behind him. Do you mean to say that we are afraid of people who have got a few crores of rupees in their hands? Let them produce more. That can be syphoned off or even channelled for, better purposes. You may call this planning good, bad or indifferent. But it is something that has come to stay. It is a tiger. If you get off the tiger you will be eaten up. The hon. Member there said: you will have to face a revolution and all that. So long as you go on riding the tiger, so long as the plan goes on, people will be content because they see the evidence of the results of the Plan, but if we follow the advice from the right or from the left or from the hesitant centre, we are done for. We do not propose to disembark from the tiger at all. We will ride the tiger, and, I should say, we shall reach our goal, God willing.

17.26 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER
 OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—Contd.

LOCK-OUT IN LILLUAH WORKSHOP OF
 EASTERN RAILWAY

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now take up the Calling Attention Notice.

Some Hon. Members: Tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will go on till 6 O'clock today.

Shri Venkatasubbalah (Adoni): As per the statement laid on the Table by the Minister of Railways, the lock-out has been going on since 25th November. I would like to know whether any efforts have been made to lift the lock-out and enable the worker to resume work so that production may not be hampered.

The Minister of Railways (Shri Dasappa): The administration is in continuous touch with the people there who seem to represent the union. Unfortunately, there is no one