

Report on Mid-term
Appraisal of Third Five
Year Plan

15.28 hrs.

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

The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat): Sir, I move:

"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 Tyagi (Dehra Dun): May I make a request to you that the Ministers concerned with this subject may be summoned? There is no use commenting on the report as those Ministers are not here. Of course, the hon. Minister is actually in charge of this subject but he is also holding another man's baby. But then some Ministers who are concerned with the Plan must be present.

Mr. Speaker: At the same time he has said two contradictory things. He says that the other Ministers must be called and then he also says that the Minister who is now on his legs is in charge of the subject now. If that is so, then he is responsible.

Shri Tyagi: The question of agriculture and other things will come.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture is also present, whose love-birds have been lost! (*Interruption*).

Shri Warrior (Trichur): The spirit behind his request is well understood: the senior Minister of Planning may be also present.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: I think my colleagues will all come in due course because they did not know that it will come so soon. As I was saying, the appraisal of the third Five Year Plan has been undertaken by the Planning Commission with the object of identifying those elements in policy and the implementation which required a spe-

cial attention, so that greater progress can be achieved over the remaining period of the Plan.

There is another significant point in the journey of progress. Today, we are not only through the mid-term of the third Five Year Plan but also the mid-point had been reached in the 25-year period of planning, 1950 to 1975. Since we started in 1950, this is the mid-term of that period. We had given a picture of our country and the society that we want to bring about and the economy that has to emerge as a result of planned development of the country. It had also become necessary to secure as clear an idea as possible now of the base from which the fourth Plan was likely to commence in order to determine the advance action required for the fourth Plan. The third Plan consciously embodies programmes extending in some sectors beyond the five-year period. It looked, for example, upon plans in industry, transport, technical education and scientific research as an integrated whole and as a kind of continuum. Therefore, on this occasion the accent is on assessment of results, of locating deficiencies and finding ways of securing more effective and successful implementation. That has been the main burden of this appraisal.

The Planning Commission had been engaged in this task for several months and had been in continuous consultation with the departments of the Central Ministries and the State Governments. On the basis of the information obtained from time to time and discussions with their representatives and detailed examinations within the Commission itself, an objective assessment of the progress and possibilities of development in the third Plan period has been made. These findings were thereafter placed before the National Development Council, which met in the first week or early second week of November. The National Development Council, after

deliberating over this matter, issued a statement which, together with the appraisal document, forms part of the papers that had been laid before the House.

As was expected of a document of this kind, the appraisal report has aroused widespread publicity and a good deal of comments and criticism, some restrained and some quite pessimistic, have been voiced. I think in a sense the objective of undertaking this task has been partially fulfilled because so much public attention has been drawn and interest has been aroused, which augurs very well for the successful implementation of the plan in the coming years. Without in any way wishing to gloss over the shortcomings which are quite disconcerting or to encourage complacency, it seems to me that most of us are apt to think of the short-falls only and not of the progress which has been achieved. In the circumstances, I hope, Sir, the House will bear with me if I were to state the main findings of the appraisal document as we read them.

Firstly, over the past two years or so, the plan effort has been larger and more broad-based than before. The advances made in several branches of industry, including steel, machine-building, coal, power and transport are substantial, though not near to the targeted quantity for steel and have helped strengthen the economy. In spite of the set-back in the growth of national income, it has been possible, especially for the Centre, to mobilise in the context of the emergency much larger resources than could be contemplated earlier. It is no small achievement that the programmes of development have been carried forward despite the strain imposed by the mounting defence needs in the wake of the Chinese aggression.

Thirdly, except for marginal deviations in a few States, expenditure for the various sectors of the Plan has

followed fairly closely the pattern envisaged for the first three years. It is reckoned that over the five-year period as a whole, considering the actual pace of development in different sectors, outlay in the public sector, subject to availability of resources, might be close to Rs. 8000 crores, somewhat in excess of the financial limit of Rs. 7500 crores as envisaged in the third Plan. So, that much of more investment capacity has been created.

During the first two years of the Plan, seasonal conditions were unfavourable and the actual levels of production of foodgrains and other crops did not come up to expectations. There is no gainsaying that but for the investments in the agricultural sector creating additional potential, the level of production might well have been lower. It is also noteworthy that as compared to the second Plan period, the amplitude of fluctuations in the downward directions due to the adverse weather conditions has been somewhat reduced. Taking into account the special effort now being made to increase agricultural productivity, it seems reasonable to expect that with favourable seasonal conditions, there could well be a sizeable increase in the agricultural output during the remaining years. A likely shortfall of three to five million tons in the output of foodgrains, though serious enough, may not be alarming. The shortfall in respect of crops like cotton and oilseeds has to be read against attainment of the estimates in production of jute, sugarcane, rubber, coffee, tea and tobacco.

Coming to the industrial sector, targets of capacity and production in respect of several industries such as industrial machinery, agricultural machinery and implements, electrical transformers, motors and conductors, drugs and pharmaceuticals and sugar, etc., are likely to be achieved. The performance in respect of some key industries is expected to fall short of the planned targets to a limited extent such as of machine tools, alumi-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

nium, coal and iron, but more considerably of fertilisers and steel, due to the delay in obtaining foreign exchange.

There are other sectors where we have gone a little ahead of the scheduled planned, i.e. in respect of railways, road development, shipping, power, education and health programmes. The planned target will be exceeded in respect of these things. The shortage of coal, power, and transport which were causing serious concern till last year, as the House is very well aware, has now eased and the imbalances in the vital sectors of the economy are expected to be corrected by the end of the Plan period, although at a somewhat lower equilibrium point.

Let us come to the reasons for the shortfall as have been indicated in the appraisal document. Broadly these are: (1) adverse weather conditions and inadequate administrative co-ordination in the agricultural sector.

Shri Tyagi: We must congratulate you on this confession!

Shri Warrior: Why do you club them together? One is natural and the other is unnatural. (*Interruptions*).

Shri B. R. Bhagat: (2) Inadequate advance planning and somewhat optimistic programming of the schedules of implementation of some industries in the public sector. The private sector also has lagged behind due to delay in obtaining foreign exchange resources and arranging quick utilisation of foreign exchange commitments on account of procedural formalities. This has been also a contributing factor. Then again, it has to be recognised that even with more favourable conditions, the period of gestation and fruition of some projects and programmes would be a little longer than what was visualised at the time of the formulation of the

Plan. That has been the main cause of the non-realisation of targets in many industrial sectors, because the fruits of the projects instead of being available for utilisation in the third Plan will be available now in the first two years of the next Plan.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Let us hope so.

Shri Tyagi: Will the Minister get copies of his speech circulated tomorrow?

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Let me first complete my speech.

Now the question arises as to what action we are going to take to meet this situation. I must confess that since the appraisal document was prepared and since the National Development Council met and took decision over it, and now when the House is discussing it, the time spent has been short and therefore, all actions could not be taken. But certainly Government has been alive to it as it has taken certain steps to meet the situation. Broadly these are as follows. So far as agriculture is concerned—because there has been the most significant shortfall there—an Agricultural Production Board has been formed with a view to take speedy and coordinated action in regard to the agricultural programmes. As a result of the deliberations of a working group of Ministers, concrete recommendations have been forwarded to the State Governments about strengthening and streamlining the agricultural operations down to the level of the villages.

Then, it was found that due to the non-implementation of the land reforms bottle-necks have been created and they are coming in the way of agricultural production. A Committee has been formed with the Home Minister as the Chairman and some

of the Chief Ministers to take action in regard to this.

An Hon. Member: Set up committees after committees.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: At present the Planning Commission is engaged in discussions with the State Governments..... (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: While on the one side there is a complaint that committees after committees are being set up and no action is being taken, on the other side it is all action, no consultation and no patience to hear even the hon. Minister.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: These are all committees for action.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The appointment of a Committee is also an action.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: At present we are engaged in discussions with the State Governments in regard to their annual plans—the next year's plan—and in that we are going into each programme for agricultural development, particularly in respect of minor irrigation, soil conservation and provision of fertilisers so that all facilities to the farmers should be provided and in the shortest period there should be a commensurate increase in the agricultural production. The emphasis is on the quickest results and the line of action to be taken which could be co-ordinated and integrated at the district and village level so that the impact of agricultural production should be there even if additional resources are to be found to meet these programmes and also additional programmes that will come up. The programme has got to be extended. We are engaged in these detailed discussions and in every State Plan we are trying to see that this deficiency is made up so that agricultural production should go up in the shortest possible time.

Then, on the industrial side, we have found that because of the deficiency of technical personnel, because of shortage of technical organisations and consequent delay in project studies and framing of designs, even the formulation of projects has taken a longer period—we call it the 'gestation period'—and the project estimates have also been faulty. The immediate step that we have taken is that in each department and in each public undertaking the technical organisation is being strengthened so as to avoid delay in the formulation of the projects and their completion. Also, we have appointed a committee to review the procedural delays. We have asked them to quickly go into this matter so that any delay in the matter of licensing and planning of industrial programmes may be avoided. We have also embarked upon a programme of import substitution, because we have found that some of the agricultural commodities like cotton which are raw materials for our industrial production have to be grown quickly. Thereby we can save a good deal of foreign exchange and our programme in regard to textiles will not suffer. Sometimes for want of a small component the whole programme may lag behind. For want of proper designs for machinery the whole programme may lag behind. Efficient action has got to be taken in respect of all this. Therefore, all these connected problems are being tackled in a speedy manner.

Sir, the House is aware of the steps taken by the Minister of Finance for improving the climate of investment. The Ministry of Finance has also been negotiating with the Consortium and lending countries for the removal of procedural delays in the utilisation of foreign exchange and it is very much to be hoped that their co-operation will be forthcoming. It has been found that whatever foreign exchange has been committed, is not being utilised to that extent due to procedural

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

delays. Now they are trying to remove those delays.

Another important development in the wake of the Mid-Term Appraisal has been the acceptance of the need to take advance action—this is very important—particularly in respect of projects with long gestation period so that their benefits may be realised in the early years of the Fourth Plan. Unless we take action from now, Sir, all these projects might be delayed even in the Fourth Plan. Since planning is a continuous process we have to concentrate attention on all these points, and in this respect advance action in respect of all these projects is very essential. Concrete proposals for central projects are being framed and the matter is also being discussed with the States representatives along with their annual Plan. But as to how far we can undertake advance commitments will depend on the promise of foreign exchange assistance.

Now Sir this the picture. Let me summarise for the House the Appraisal Report. If I may sum up, the Appraisal Report, which has been placed before the House, has sought to present a true picture frankly and without any reserve (*Interruption*). The achievements have been indicated and the shortfalls have been underlined. A great deal has been done to broaden the base of development, strengthen the industrial and economic structure and create substantial capacities whose full effects will be realised only in the future. There are of course dark patches too and light of criticism has been focussed on them as well. The performance in the first two years of the Third Plan is much below the levels that we regard satisfactory. In agriculture there has been a setback. But we believe that the setback will prove temporary in character. The targets which are modest in terms of the needs of the economy can still be rea-

lised, at any rate substantially if all-out national efforts are made. And in galvanising and in harnessing the nation's efforts, the Planning Commission and the Government look up—and I think here the importance of the House comes in—to constructive suggestions from the House. We are all looking forward to the constructive suggestions from this hon. House. Let me assure you, Sir, that we are in earnest to profit by the deliberations here. We have to make good, we can do so, and it will be no use giving in to despondency and despair. It is to be hoped that the discussion in the House will give a positive lead to the nation in achieving the targets set in the Plan and in making up for the shortcomings which have been pointed out in the appraisal report. I cannot do better than to conclude by quoting from the address of our worthy Prime Minister in the last session of the National Development Council. He said:

"This is a testing time for us, this period, and if we fail in making good, it is not we that fail but failure is spread out in many directions. On the other hand, if we succeed that will be a remarkable thing that we have functioning as we do."

With these words, Sir, I move that the report be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"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 M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the objectives of the Third Plan as stated in the document were unexceptionable. They were, broadly, more savings and investment; secondly, greater production and productivity; and, thirdly, more exports. Unfortunately, Sir, the document that has been circulated to us and to which

the hon. Minister has referred, which as he said is an honest document and on which I congratulate the Minister, shows that the results are entirely different from what had been hoped. Even if the admission of failures is 'ambiguously worded' as has been complained of in the Press, even if the attempt is made to 'wrap up unpleasant facts in verbiage and equivocation', the fact remains that the picture is one of dismal failure. It is not that there are disappointing patches as the Minister just said. The whole picture is dark and without almost any redeeming patch.

In fact, it is the kind of picture which no Government should bring before Parliament without accompanying it with its own resignation. It is a picture of object defeat, as abject as the defeat on the NEFA front sustained by this Government last year.

Now, let me say that this is a fair summary of what the document itself says and I shall quote or refer because time does not permit quoting, the admissions in the document itself. On page 1, it says:

"It has been a period of slow economic growth. The increase in national income has been of the order of 5 per cent in 2½ years."

That is, a per cent per year, as opposed to what was hoped for, 6 per cent, one-third of the rate of growth expected to be achieved. And when it is recalled that our rate of population increase is more than 2 per cent, this means an absolute deficit, going back, not even keeping abreast. The Prime Minister often says we run hard but we do not move because the population increase takes up this increased wealth. But we are not any longer doing even that; we are moving backwards, instead of running fast. On foodgrains, the document says on pages 7-8:

"It was of the order of 77.5 million tons in 1962-63 as com-

pared to 79.79 million tons in 1960-61 and 1961-62".

In other words, there is a drop, going backwards. The present indication, they say on page 19, is:

"There may be a shortfall of the order of 3.5 million tons in the output of foodgrains."

Industrial production does not show a much better picture. This is what it says:

"Industrial production increased by 6.5 per cent and 8 per cent in the first two years of the Third Five Year Plan."

Once again, it is clear that these increases are not in consonance with the rise of anything like 11 per cent per annum anticipated in the Third Plan document.

"In some sectors"—I am quoting from page 21—"performance is likely to fall short of Plan targets to a limited extent, as for instance, in machine tools, aluminium, cloth, coal and iron ore. On the other hand, there are certain crucial projects like fertilisers or establishment of a fourth steel plant in the public sector, where the lag is not only likely to be considerable but also, in the present circumstances, unavoidable."

Then, on page 47:

"Shortfalls in production are expected in the case of steel, tea, oilseeds and cotton."

On page 75, it says:

"A major assumption in formulating the Third Plan programme for agricultural production was that consumption of chemical fertilisers would be considerably stepped up...it is clear that the level of availability of nitrogenous fertilisers at the end of the Plan period will fall short of the original targets."

[Shri M. R. Masani]

On steel it says on page 125:

"Against the target of 6·8 million tons of finished steel, it is anticipated that the output would be of the order of 5·8 million tons in 1965-66."

On aluminium on page 126:

"Against the capacity target of 87,500 tons the capacity available by the end of the Third Plan period is likely to be about 68,000 tons."

On machine tools on page 127 it says:

"Against the target of Rs 30 crores of machine tools envisaged in the Plan, the output is now expected to be about Rs. 25 crores."

I could go on quoting like this for one whole hour. If you turn page after page, as I said, you find not one redeeming picture, not one encouraging conclusion. It is the same about power, the same about industrial share values and small savings. Coming to employment, on page 53 it says:

"Taking a view of the additional employment to be generated during 1961-66, it does appear that in the first two years at any rate, employment has been somewhat below expectations.... The conclusion given above is reinforced by the increase in the number of persons on the live registers of employment exchanges...."

There are only two things that have increased during the Third Plan and they are welcome to take credit for them, and those two things are prices and taxes.

Shri Tyagi: Who should be proud for it?

Shri M. R. Masani: They should be proud of it because they inflicted further burdens on the people. They are welcome to take pride, if they want to.

On prices, it is said on pages 10 and 11:

"If one takes the period of nearly two and a half years since the commencement of the Third Plan, the increase in the general price index would work out to about 7 per cent."

On taxation, on pages 1 and 2, they admit:

"Against a target of additional taxation of Rs. 1,750 crores, during the first three years of the Plan, Central and State Governments have undertaken taxation yielding about Rs. 2,400 crores over the Plan period."

So, the only two achievements that they have are rising prices and increased taxes. Against that, there is failure on every aspect of the economic front.

I would, therefore, say that this document of reappraisal is an honest document on which I congratulate the Minister and the officials who have been preparing it. Thank goodness, we are at least allowed to know the facts. I would say that this document represents a summary of 910 days, because that is the period it covers, of wishful thinking, wasteful spending, excessive intervention, rigid regimentation, dated dogmas and deepening discontent throughout the country.

As I said, any self-respecting government which presented this document should have the courtesy to tender its resignation simultaneously to this Parliament.

The conclusion to which I come is

that this Plan must be scrapped. There is nothing in this Plan that is worth preserving or maintaining. The whole thing is wrong-minded. The whole approach has been wrong, and it is not a matter only of implementation. It is a very easy excuse to say that our Plans are good but the implementation is defective. I would only invite their attention to an effective cartoon in a Delhi paper two days ago on this subject. I refer them to my speech last August during the motion of non-confidence when I said that it is because the plans are defective, implementation is not possible. There is nothing wrong with the honest officials whom you ask to implement your plans. It is because your plans are wrong-minded, because your plans do not take into account human nature, because your plans are against economic realities, and economic laws, that they are bound to fail, however honestly and well they are implemented.

Now, even the most wooden people seem to have something penetrate into them, and I am very glad to say that in the last few weeks both the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister have been making occasional statements that show the first glimpses of economic realism. The Prime Minister has made three or four intelligent statements in the last couple of months, a somewhat unusually high ratio. He said at the Seminar at the India International Centre on 22nd September that big plants are all very well but it is the villages which need attention and that when there is no drinking water in the villages, to talk of big plans is rather idle. I was glad to read this because only last August I said the same thing from the same benches when the Prime Minister said "I did not think intelligent men like Masani did not favour priority for steel plants." I am very glad that some sense of priority has come at least even to this gentlemen opposite. Shri Nehru also said that the Planning Commission has developed into something which he had not in-

tended. He said it had become a huge bureaucratic organisation and went on to say that it has all the departments of government almost duplicated there.

Indeed, we from these benches have made this criticism that the National Planning Commission has no place in a democracy and that this Moscow Gostplan transplanted on our territory belongs to a Communist dictatorship and that if you have a Moscow Gostplan in India then you are setting up a parallel government to the Parliamentary government and to a cabinet responsible to Parliament and through it to the people. I am very glad that the Prime Minister at last has come down to earth and has seen that the National Planning Commission is seeking to duplicate the role of Government. I am also glad that my hon. friend, Shri Asoka Mehta, who has become the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission, has stressed that the Planning Commission should have only an advisory role and should not become a parallel government. It is all very good that, though belatedly, these confessions and admissions are being made.

Perhaps the most important of the change of front is made on agriculture. Let me quote the Prime Minister at Jaipur in November. He said:

"Agriculture is the key and the base of all progress—we dare not be slack. If we fail in agriculture, it does not matter what else we have got."

Not even steel, I presume, about which we have been so enamoured all these years! This is exactly what we have been saying. Read the manifesto of the Swantra Party. It also makes the charges that the villages and the rural areas are being neglected for the benefit of grandiose plans, and now even Shri Nehru has started talking about the rural areas. But who has done all this? It is the Prime Minister and his

[Shri M. R. Masani]

government which are responsible for creating this National Planning Commission as a parallel Government. It is the Prime Minister and his government who have been responsible for neglecting the villages and diverting their hard earned resources for these white elephant steel plants when they needed the resources badly for water, fertiliser, seed and so on. Let us, however, rejoice that, belatedly at least, wisdom has dawned on them. But while imitation is a sincere form of flattery and one is pleased to hear these gentlemen mouthing slogans lifted from the manifesto of my Party) .. (*interruption*), the question arises how sincere is this repentance, how sincere is this awakening?

16 hrs.

Mr. Harold Wilson, the Labour leader in Britain who is our counterpart in that Parliament, said recently about his Government something which is very applicable here. He said, "Imitation is the sincerest form of cal desperation. It is not only flattery but it is also political desperation. This Government knows that the country is turning against it. It knows that whatever majority it may have in this House, an inflated and unreal majority as I have explained in the past, it is no longer valid in the country.

This repentance has taken a long time coming. But is it sincere? That is what everyone wants to know. I am quite prepared to keep an open mind. I am quite prepared to watch and see by action whether this repentance is sincere. That is what the people of India are going to do. They are not going to be taken in by resolutions. They will watch and see whether these professions of priority for villages, recasting the National Planning Commission into the kind of mould that we have been suggesting all these years, that of a purely expert body of advisers, whether all this is going to be done or not. There are many issues by which they will judge.

They will judge by the form in which the Company Bills now before the House will finally be passed. They will judge by what happens to the Seventeenth Amendment, whether this piece of expropriation is persisted in or abandoned. That is how the peasants will judge. Finally, the people of India will judge by the next Budget. It is by these measures that the sincerity of the hon. Prime Minister and his Finance Minister who now talk the language of reason for the first time will be judged.

It is often alleged that we are just critical, that we have nothing to put in the place of this plan. Let me suggest an alternative approach. You will say, "Supposing the Plan is to be scrapped, what takes its place?" I am prepared to make an alternative approach. The starting point of that approach will be something said by Gandhiji. Gandhiji once said:

"I will give you a talisman. Whenever you are in doubt, or when the self becomes too much with you, apply the following test. Recall the face of the poorest and weakest man whom you may have seen, and ask yourself, if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he gain anything by it? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny "

Shri Tyagi: This is most inspiring. Thank you.

Shri M. R. Masani: I appeal to people here, many of whom have deep regard for Gandhiji's teaching, to recall these words and to test the policy of their Government in day to day action against this touchstone.

What are the realities? After 17 years, if this had been the approach of this Government, would we be where we are today? Would our per capita income today be Rs. 333|- a year, would the consumption of the average man in India be Rs. 300|- a

year, would large majority consume less than Rs. 150/- a year? Today, the lowest 10 per cent of our population—I am going by official statistics, I am not following my hon. friend, Dr. Lohia, I am following Shri Nanda—according to Government figures, consume 27·5 naye Paise daily. The highest 10 per cent, who are supposed to be fabulously rich, consume Rs. 1/-per day, and the highest 5 per cent, against whom the hon. Finance Minister has such venom with which he spoke an hour ago, consume Rs. 2·37 per day. This is a measure of our destitution and of our poverty. And this is after 17 years of administration by the followers of Mahatma Gandhi!

Recently in a book published abroad, *After Nehru Who?* by Wells Hangen the author has this to say:—

“India may boast a Parliament. It also has the lowest standard of living and the lowest *per capita* income anywhere in non-Communist Asia outside Pakistan.”

Then, he goes on to say—

“Nehru often talks about India having entered the bicycle age but he does not often mention that it will take a little over 400 years at current rates of output to produce one bicycle for every one living in India today.”

If this is the picture, are people going to wait for the Fourth Plan and for the Fifth Plan, as my hon. friends opposite expect? The other day when somebody asked a question as to when something will be done, the hon. Minister got up and said, “At the end of the Fifth Plan” and everyone laughed because he knew that he did not mean a word of it. But who is going to wait till the end of the Fifth Plan?

I want to warn this Government and this House that if they believe that the people of India are going to starve in silence and be exploited in silence by this new vested interest, this new

ruling class till the end of the Fifth Plan, they are making a mistake. They want change here and now. The people want change here and now. They are not going to stand this ‘pie in the sky when you die’ business. They demand an immediate return for their hard work.

Our plans have chosen the slowest possible method of advance, that is, the State Capitalist method which gives the lowest dividend. An average return of 0·5 per cent or $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on capital is no way of taking the country faster to a higher standard of living. Of all the paths open to us, we have taken the slowest and the lowest path.

Professor Galbraith was a good friend of our Prime Minister and his Government. He was a planner; he was a socialist; he was also the author of *The Affluent Society*. But he got cured after three years here. Let me read from the last talk he gave in this country. He talked to Bombay University before taking a plane out of this country. Read between the lines of what he says and you find a most damning condemnation of the whole pattern on which we have embarked. He says:

“The purpose of economic advance is not investment and economic growth. Rather it is the ends that these things are meant to serve, and that is improvement in well-being and popular enjoyment of life. This, the well-being or enjoyment of life by the average person, is the ultimate goal. Moreover, a poor country must make good on this promise with considerable promptness. The basic comparison in human affairs is always the present with the recent past.”

Then, he says:—

“An undue emphasis on the rate of growth...”

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Rate of growth of steel, Sir—

“can lead, and in important cases has led, to undue emphasis on current saving and on increase of these savings through taxation. As a result, in the name of increasing output in the long run there has been reduction in the well-being of the average person in the short run. This....”

says Professor Galbraith,

“can be dangerous policy.”

He had in mind what I said five minutes ago, namely, that the people will not wait for this . . . (*Interruption*). They want justice here and now.

What then is the remedy? I would say that what we need to do is to concentrate on producing the things that the people need immediately. What are those? They are, food, clothing and shelter, the needs of life, and some education for their children. I think, it is a fair summary of what comes first, that is, food, clothing, shelter, the bare necessities of life, daily comforts, and some education.

Let us just take food and clothing to understand what this means. A learned professor of economics has worked out—and people in the Planning Commission also have confirmed this—that a man needs Rs. 30/- a month or Rs. 360/- a year for the bare needs of life, that is, nutrition Rs. 21 per month, clothing Rs. 3/- per month and shelter etc., everything, Rs. 6/- per month totalling Rs. 30/- a month. This was worked out in a seminar by a spokesman of the Planning Commission. I accept it. I am not quarrelling about figures now. It is a miserable pittance. I do not think any hon. Member would dream of living on this for a day.

How is this to be secured? Modest as it is, can we get this? It means that

today's *per capita* income of Rs. 330/- a year must be converted into the national minimum by 1975. If even after 15 years you want this Rs. 30/- a month to be available to the average man, today's *per capita* or average will have to be the bottom or the minimum. In order to do that our *per capita* income will have to go up to Rs. 540/- a year. In order to get Rs. 330/- or Rs. 360/- a year as the minimum, the *per capita* income will have to be Rs. 540/-. These are things worked out in the Planning Commission itself. It has also been estimated that to get this *per capita* income of Rs. 540/- a year by 1975, we shall need a rate of growth, not of this miserable 2 per cent which has been put before us, but of 7 to 8 per cent a year, even more than the target which has not been fulfilled. Now, Sir, 7 to 8 per cent a year is achieved in many countries. Japan has touched 20 per cent; West Germany has touched it, and in Nationalist China which I have visited it was 7.7 per cent in the last two or three years. It can be done. But how can it be done and by whom? That is the question that really faces us. If the Plan has to be scrapped, how is it to be done otherwise and by whom?

Coming to this concentration on foodgrains and cloth, let us take an example. The *per capita* consumption of foodgrains in 1960-61 was 16.5 ozs. This has to be raised to 23.1 ozs by 1975-76 to give what may be called a decent nutritional minimum. This involves the doubling of food production in India from 80 million tons in 1960-61 to 160 million tons in 1975-76. About cloth, today's *per capita* consumption is 15.8 yards. What is required in 1975-76 is 22.1 yards. Again, it involves doubling of the production of cloth from 9 million yards today to 18 million yards in 1975-76. This is the first thing to double, more or less, the quantity of foodgrains, cloth and building materials which are needed by our people for food, clothing and shelter.

The second thing is to provide gainful employment to people so that their hands are used productively, so that there is money in their pockets, some purchasing power with which to buy things. This is important. I am not arguing humanism here. With these hardened Marxists opposite, humanism does not work. But let me put it even from the point of view of the rate of growth. Consumption is important. Production is certainly very important, but consumption is also important. A starving man cannot produce. A certain measure of nutrition is necessary before you can get a productive human being to produce. So, quite apart from humanism and decency, even from the point of view of increasing production, you want healthy, reasonably healthy able people. So, nutrition has relation to production itself. So long as the colossal under-utilisation of our man-power goes on, as it is today, we cannot expect production to go up. So, in some cases, consumption is even anterior or prior to production although by and large the production has to precede consumption.

Now, the implications of this are that if you must maximise production, the available resources have to be utilised where the return is highest. Every unit of production must give the highest possible return. And this can only be achieved where production and investment can shift in response to the needs of the consumers, where common citizen can indicate his needs for cloth, shelter and other articles. So, we must keep pace with the demand. This means the sovereignty of the consumer, consumer preference, which is economic democracy going alongside of political democracy.

This can only be done by ending the State Capitalist, bureaucratic, monopolistic system that we discussed earlier this afternoon. It can only be done if the people can produce to meet their own needs and are given

incentives and rewards for doing so. Nothing short of a complete reversal of the State Capitalist pattern will be required. Otherwise, you stick at your 0.5 per cent rate of return and take this country to its ruin.

Maximising production, therefore, means two things, first, a change in the order of priorities. Our Chinese Communist enemies, stupid as they are, have learnt at least that lesson. About a year ago, Chou En-lai went to the Chinese Communist Congress and said: Scrap all this heavy industrialisation. The new order of priorities according to the Chinese Communists, is (1) agriculture, (2) light consumer goods industries and (3) heavy and basic industries. This was the Great Leap Backwards after the Great Leap Forward which failed to materialise. Even these Communists, rigid as they are, the worst Stalinist lot, have come to the senses on this point at least. Why then are we going ahead following the old Stalinist model which even the modern Stalinists have discarded?

Secondly, it means a reversal to a different allocation of the role of the State and of the people. I have said it before and I repeat it. We stand for the State playing an active part in our economic life. We stand for a mixed economy of free and State enterprise cooperating in serving, or competing in the service of, the people. There are legitimate spheres for both. The appropriate sphere of the State is to build the infra-structure, the foundation for economic advance. That is not a minor thing. It means irrigation and water supply; it means power; it means roads, transport and communications of every form; it also means education. And finally, there is an essential minimum regulation to stop anti-social practices. All this is the legitimate role of the State as understood in civilised society. But that is where the role of the State stops. When the State starts making pencillin, when it starts making steel, it becomes an exploiting element, and it sells pencillin and

[Shri M. R. Masani]

steel at a price which is many times the cost it takes to produce or import.

That is why Professor Galbraith, the author of the *Affluent Society*, who preaches State enterprise in America, realises that in India something very different is required. And this is what he says in his book, which many of his admirers forget. He says:

"In poor and all-governed societies, private goods mean comfort and life itself. Food, clothing and shelter, all technically subject to private purchase and sale, have an urgency greater than any public service with the possible exception of the provision of law and order."

I think, Sir, you will agree that neither I nor any of my colleagues on these Benches have ever put a proposition as extreme as this. We have never said that, with the possible exception of the police, Government should do nothing else, and only private enterprise should give food, clothing and shelter to the people. That is a very extreme position for a planner and a socialist to take. We take a very much more modest position. But when a man like this is driven to saying this, with his experience of this country, we have got to realise what realism means.

Therefore, we shall have to change this whole approach. If we want our country to have a decent subsistence, if we want our people to have adequate food, clothing and shelter, this Five Year Plan must be scrapped completely.

This does not mean that you have to abandon socialism. I said in August that the socialist objective is one that every human being would accept. Who does not want a free, prosperous and more equal society? Of course, we want it. But the State Capitalist

path is the discarded nineteenth century, out-moded path to get to social justice. This is what socialists in one country after another have understood, except our own socialists. So, I am not calling for a surrender of the socialist objective.

Let me give an example. Only recently in October, the German Social Democratic Party, one of the strongest in Europe, decided as follows. I am reading from the *New York Times* of October 7th. It says:

"The German Social Democratic Party turned its back on 'economic planning'. A declaration of faith in private enterprise was proclaimed by Socialist leaders at an economic conference held by the party in Essen."

It further says:

"The Essen Conference... represented another long step in the evolution of German social democracy from a 'class' to a 'people's party'... Socialist leaders began the evolution five years ago by scrapping the party's Marxist manifesto."

So, let them not follow my pattern, let them not follow the Swatantra pattern. Let them follow the Western socialist pattern, and we shall join in that, because that kind of socialism makes sense to us, not this Soviet-obsessed, Stalinist pattern which has been imported into our country from Moscow.

President Kennedy was a great favourite of our governmental leaders, and we all admired him. Nobody called him a reactionary.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):
Whom?

Shri M. R. Masani: President Kennedy, whose loss we mourned only the

other day. He made a speech, reported in the *Time* magazine of November 29; it was made a few days before his death. I am quoting him. He said:

"We have liberalized depreciation guidelines to grant more individual flexibility, reduced our farm surpluses, reduced transportation taxes, established a private corporation to manage our state-lite communication system, increased the role of American business in the development of less developed countries, and proposed to the Congress a sharp reduction in corporate as well as personal income-taxes and a major de-regulation of transportation."

Here was the great progressive President listing measures which my hon. friends here will call capitalist. But he was a true progressive. If we want to admire Kennedy, let us at least learn a little from him.

Now I come to my conclusion. Since my return to the House in August, I have become aware of a queer sense of unreality about some of the discussions and the atmosphere in this House. Outside, in my constituency and elsewhere, I find seething discontent, I find raging anger among the common people, and the poorest of them I am referring to. There is widening cynicism and a lack of faith in the honesty of purpose of this Nehru Government. There is a sense of desperation that they do not see how they can escape from this mess. Even the hope of an alternative government, of a change of government, does not appear before their eyes. This is something I deplore, because I am a democrat to my finger-tips and I do not want anything to happen which is outside the scope of the Constitution and parliamentary democracy. But I am worried about it because I see signs of this impatience with the democratic process. People think of short-cuts, desperate expedients.

And when we came to this House, what do we find here? An amazing sense of smugness and self-complacency. Months go by, years go by and problems remain unsolved; but Ministers stand before this House radiant with self-satisfaction at their non-achievements. Only yesterday we had the spectacle of the Food Minister indulging in such a performance.

The economic policies of this Government have failed as miserably as their defence and foreign policies crumbled last year in October and November in NEFA. The patient grows steadily worse; his health subsides—he sinks. But the Chief Physician and his fellow-physicians gambol about the country proclaiming the soundness of the patient's health and their own magical curative powers. The Chief Physician is surrounded by sycophants who seek to transfer or transmute his record of dismal failure at home and abroad into a great end-less triumphal parade.

This image of total composure may be reassuring to the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches and those who support them here. But I want to ask: how long can they shut their eyes to grim realities? How long can they go on like this ignoring what the people are feeling, for the people have given through various manifestations in the last six—eight months the answer? They can go on like this only so long as the people remain drugged by ignorance, drugged by the cult of personality and drugged by absence of knowledge. I can assure you, Sir, and the House that this will not last for long. Even illiterate people have been known to rebel; even an illiterate people's patience comes to an end. The people of India today are suffering; they are getting desperate. "The mills of God grind slow but they grind exceeding small". And the wrath of the people can be just as terrible as God's wrath.

Mr. Speaker: No Member is catching my eye!

Shri Mahtab (Angul): In fact, I was preparing myself to speak tomorrow, but on hearing the speech just preceding mine, I felt tempted to speak just now; otherwise, I am afraid the discussion may take a wrong turn.

I must congratulate the Government on having published this report which gives us a free and frank assessment of the achievements or failures, whatever they may be, of the Five Year Plan. We must not report that we are in the midst of the Third Five Year Plan.

16.24 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

We have known the results of the First Plan, we have known the results of the Second; now we are in the midst of the Third, out of which 2½ years have gone by and we are assessing the report of the results in the meanwhile.

What can possibly be the object of the Government in publishing this report? If they had wished, they could have concealed the whole thing; if they had wished, they could have kept back the information which they have published now. The only possible object is that when the defects are made known to all, remedies will be suggested to them and ways will be found as to how to correct the situation. Therefore, frankly enough they have placed the entire report before the House and the country, just to know how the thing can be improved. Therefore, all the criticism made should be of a constructive nature.

As is well known, the Plan is attacked from both sides. One is the basic attack that you heard just now. There are many opinions, not only the opinion of the Swatantra Party, but also the orthodox Gandhian opinion. According to that opinion, the Plan should not have been drawn up on these lines, but on other lines. That is a basic attack on the Plan. That had

considerable justification at the time the Plan was first made. We are now in the midst of the Plan, we cannot all of a sudden go back and change the whole process. That is not feasible. It will not be a practical proposition.

I know that Vinobha Bhave in many of his speeches has criticised this Plan very vigorously, not from the so-called capitalist point of view, but from the Gandhian point of view. According to him, the Plan should have been built up from below, not from the top. He has described this Plan as the percolating plan. According to this Plan, the total national income must go to a certain limit so that the minimum income of the people down below would increase.

Shri Masani has quoted some figures. As far as I know, the Perspective Section of the Planning Commission have come to this conclusion that today according to the figures available, although the average shows that about Rs. 25 is the *per capita* income per month, actually about 80 per cent of the people have less than that. In order to reach Rs. 20 *per capita* per month by 1975, the present national income has to be quadrupled. The rate of growth should be about 12 per cent. Considering the increase in population, it will come to seven or eight per cent only as was said just now by Shri Masani. That being so, how will that be possible, wherefrom will the resources come? They are discussing all these in the Perspective Section.

Vinobha Bhave's point is that we should not have began from the top, but from the bottom. He has therefore called it a percolating plan, and he gave the example of pouring oil on the head with the off chance of some of it trickling down to the lower parts of the body. I told him what I am saying now, that it is all very good to think of a thing from a distance, but the plan has been discussed in Parliament and elsewhere many a time and finalise in this shape. So at this stage

to talk of other things seems to be unreal. We are in the midst of this Plan, let us think out how it can be executed.

I carefully listened to Shri Masani to know any alternative he would suggest. The alternative he has suggested is this, that food production and cloth production should be doubled. That is also what is wanted, the report says that. Let us double the production, but how to do it, that is the problem now. There is no dispute about the point that agricultural production and production of essential consumer goods should be increased considerably. All of us are agreed on that. The report as presented shows that these have not been achieved for some reason or other. In my opinion, the reasons for the failure should have been given in the report. In many places they have given the reasons, but in some they have not. Therefore, let us try to find out the possible reasons. We must consider this report from the point of view of the facts as they exist, not from mere wish. Mere wish is not achievement, whatever we wish is not likely to be achieved, because there are many factors and we have to strike a balance among them.

I would like to refer to some of the foreign economists and their observations on the Indian economy. We are here talking about going too fast in the direction of socialism, but in an article appearing in *the Economic Review* of the USA sometime, it is said that whereas all the departments at various levels in the USA control 20 per cent of the production, in India not even 8 per cent is controlled by Government.

Shri Masani: There is no licence and control there.

Shri Mahtab: That is to say the Indian economy is less responsive to Government control than in USA, that is their opinion.

Prof. Galbraith, before he became Ambassador in India in 1959, said that the most uncontrolled economy was that of India.

Shri M. R. Masani: He has learnt better now.

Shri Mahtab: Maybe, he had learnt since then. He said that the least controlled economy in the world is that of India. As far as I can remember, according to Prof. Galbraith, there is the smallish public sector at the top which is nothing but functioning anarchy. According to that opinion, India is not going too fast toward socialism. There is an opinion in India that we must go faster. I suggest that the report presented to us should not be considered very much from the point of view of party-slogans because it is after all a national Plan.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): No, no.

Shri Mahtab: By and large, Parliament has approved of the Plan and we are in the midst of that Plan. There is no doubt that till suitable and efficient machinery is devised by Government, it will be better if distribution of goods, particularly of essential commodities is left in the hands of private businessmen. I was present in Calcutta on that they when suddenly the price of rice went up to Rs. 52 and I got the information in the Government hostel where I was staying that looting was taking place in many parts of Calcutta and I went round to find what happened. Most surprisingly, the price came down to Rs. 35 after looting. There is something wrong somewhere. We are comparing our business people and industrialists with those of western countries of today. My observation is that business people of India today like the business people of the 19th century of the western countries.

Shri Ranga: Our Ministers also.

Shri Mahtab: Maybe. We should not ignore these things. We must

[Shri Mahtab]

consider this in a constructive manner and offer criticism in that spirit. The report presented should not be taken lightly. No attempt should be made to explain it away as if nothing has happened. It clearly says that our income has not gone up as expected. We expected the national income to grow at the rate of five per cent. But in the last two and half years it has gone up at the rate of only 2.5 per cent. But prices have gone up considerably. The Rs. 20 national minimum to be obtained by 1975 which I mentioned just now is at the rate of the prices prevailing in 1960-61. While the total national income has not grown as anticipated, prices have gone up. That means today the general population is poorer than in the beginning of the Third Plan. The effect must be felt by everybody. It is not a small matter. All of us should see how the situation could be improved and how the rate of growth could be increased. The report suggests that our attention should be focussed on agricultural production.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur):
Take more people into confidence.

Shri Mahtab: If confidence cannot be created in free discussions here in Parliament, I do not know how that can be created in private meetings elsewhere. Let us consider things here and create confidence here on this platform and suggest ways how to do it.

Take agricultural production. My fear is, some of the figures are based upon wrong data, which we know, but which is not possible for the Planning Commission to know. I suggest, therefore, a fresh assessment be made of the irrigated land, partially-irrigated land and non-irrigated land, because the records will show to everyone—we have seen it ourselves in our own areas many areas have been shown in the revenue re-

cord, as irrigated whereas the irrigation projects have gone out of repairs or are not maintained or they do not exist. They can be easily known. They have given us the figure, the total agricultural production from the total cultivated area.

Shri Tyagi: There are sample surveys. (*Interruption*).

Shri Mahtab: The report can be collected separately, for the irrigated areas, for partially irrigated areas and for non-irrigated areas. If information is collected separately on these lines, then it could be known whether areas which are shown as irrigated are really irrigated or not. That is the point.

In our constituencies, we know in many places that the minor irrigation projects have been executed, but many of them have gone out of repairs. Many of them have not been executed at all. I am saying very frankly.

There is another way by which, what I said, can be verified. No State budget—I throw out a challenge—has made any provision for the maintenance and upkeep of the minor irrigation projects. Show me from any State budget whether, for the minor irrigation projects which were constructed from 1952 onwards, any provision has been made for the maintenance and upkeep of those projects. The Planning Commission does not insist upon that. The State budgets do not take notice of them. How am I to believe that these projects do exist or that they are still functioning?

Here, the minor irrigation projects should not be confused with major irrigation projects. The cost of minor irrigation projects varies from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 10 lakhs. Those very small minor irrigation projects, I

have no doubt, which have no provision for their maintenance and repair, must have gone out of repairs or are not functioning. Similarly, take the irrigation works which were being maintained. I can say it from experience that in Orissa, West Bengal, Bihar, and Uttar Pradesh, the minor irrigation works which used to be maintained by the big zamindars in the zamindari areas are now completely out of repairs. They are not maintained because the zamindaris have been taken over by the Revenue Departments and the Revenue Departments of these States are not providing money for the maintenance/up-keep of the projects. Therefore, these are all non-existent. From that point of view, the information on which this calculation has been based seems to be wrong.

Similar is the case with regard to small-scale industries. If at all it is decided that small-scale industries should be encouraged and arrangements should be made to tie up small-scale industries with agriculture, then a definite policy has to be laid down and that policy should not conflict with the policy which is followed with regard to this policy. I give a very simple example, about large-scale industries. Agitation is made in Parliament to make available sugar at the cheapest rate possible and encouragement is given to cane growers and incentive is given to the sugar industry. All these are done so that sugar is made available at a cheap rate in the village areas also. Along with this, the manufacture of crystal sugar is also going on in the panchayat block areas with about a lakh of rupees as investment. The result is that the price of crystal sugar which is made through village industries is about 40 per cent higher than the price of sugar made in factories. As a result all those industries have failed. (*Interruption*).

Some Hon. Members: Khandsari.

Shri Mahtab: We call it crystal sugar in our parts. I do not know what it is called here.

Shri Tyagi: Khandsari.

Shri Mahtab: You go anywhere and find this out. You will see how the two things do not fit in. With regard to the large-scale manufacture and with regard to the small-scale manufacture, the policies do not fit in well. Similarly with regard to various other industries; the policy followed with regard to small-scale industries is diametrically opposite to the policy followed in regard to large-scale industries. Therefore, small scale industries are not progressing. The report says that the progress with regard to small-scale industries is not satisfactory. But they have not given the reason. On the contrary, the report says that more money has been spent on industrial estates. I invite members here to go and find out how the industrial estate buildings are being used. In many places, they are used for purposes other than industry. That is happening everywhere. (*Interruption*).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedi: To accommodate delegates to Bhubaneswar session.

Shri Mahtab: Let us not go at a tangent, but try to study why this is happening. If the Planning Commission takes care to know why a particular result has not been achieved and where the defect lies, they can know it.

There is a tendency which is noticeable in the report to pass on the blame to somebody else. The Planning Commission thinks as if it is connected only with the Ministries of the Government of India. In my opinion, the Planning Commission is connected with the whole chain of administration beginning from the panchayats to the Central Ministries. They must find out why the panchayat is not able to do a job. It is not enough to say that the State Governments did not do it. The Planning Commission must be in a position to say why the State Governments were not in a position to do it. The Planning Commission should

[Shri Mahtab]

go deep into these things and it is no use merely saying to us, Members of Parliament, that the State Governments did not do it. There is no representative of the State Governments here to say why they could not do it. They might say that it is because of the fault of the Planning Commission that they could not do it. They cannot say that the panchayats could not do it. The Planning Commission should not have said that, because the representatives of the State Governments and Panchayats are not here. As far as I know, having some knowledge of the working of administration from down below, the whole matter should be taken as one and the Planning Commission should take upon itself the responsibility of studying the whole matter from the panchayat stage to the Central Ministry stage. It is possible. I know that many projects could not be executed because the sanction order from the Government of India reached the State Governments just on the 31st March. How can it be executed?

These are all problems of administration. The Planning Commission should go a good deal out of the way to find out as to why many things are not happening. Let us take the example of land reform laws. So much talk is there about the law not having been given effect to in many States. We must know the reason why it has not been given effect to. The explanations of the State Governments should have been called for why the law has not been given effect to. It was announced the other day that a Committee has been appointed to find out and see that the land reform laws are made in the States and given effect to. I happened to be a Chief Minister also and I know it. I appeared before the committee of the Planning Commission thrice on that account. There was a committee for land reform; but it did not do the job. Again to go back to that committee stage is redundant. It seems to me that nobody is serious in the Planning Commission to give effect to what is decided upon.

[Shri Mahtab]

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Government is not serious.

Shri Mahtab: I do not know. The relationship between the Government and the Planning Commission also is mysterious.

Shri Tyagi: Wife and husband!

Shri Mahtab: I can only deal with the report as has been presented to us by the Planning Commission. If the Planning Commission at any stage finds that the Ministries in the Government of India are not taking good care of their recommendations, they ought to say so frankly in their report that they recommended such and such a thing, but that has not been given effect to by the Government. In that case, the Members can know where the defect lies. As the matter stands today, we have no other course open except blaming the Planning Commission, because they have presented the report in which they have blamed the State Governments and the panchayats.

Another most unreal thing is going to happen again. It is suggested in the report that whatever could not be done under the block arrangement will be better done under the panchayati raj. I shudder to think what will happen if such a hope is entertained here. Until the Panchayats settle down, I do not think the Panchayati raj is in a position to undertake any large-scale development in the States. To leave the developmental work to panchayati raj and be satisfied with that will be another dangerous thing because it is not possible for the Panchayats to do the job. They have started their career very recently. They must settle down politically. They must settle their own differences among themselves. What the relationship of the political parties with the panchayati raj will be is a matter of discussion at the present stage. All these will settle down in two or three years' time.

Then alone can we expect that panchayati raj will do something tangible. To expect that the panchayati raj will deliver the goods now will again be a mistake. That is my humble opinion.

With regard to the rest of the report, I very humbly suggest to the Minister of Planning and also, through him, to the Planning Commission, that precise details of all the programmes have to be studied, examined and placed before us. If that is done, I think there will be no scope for any difference between the so-called capitalists and socio-economists here in India, because here we are in the formation stage where such an acute controversy may not arise, in my opinion. Let us proceed methodically and systematically so that we may achieve our object. Today, again I repeat, this report should not be considered very lightly, because the report has arithmetically proved that 80 per cent of our people are poorer today than they were in 1960. That being so, it is a serious matter. Every one is feeling it. Let us all see how that position could be improved.

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने बड़े गौर से मसानी साहब की स्पीच को सुना है। मुझे लगता है कि मसानी साहब के दिमाग में कोई फिटर काम कर रहा है। कुछ भी क्यों न हो, उनका स्लोगन है कि गवर्नमेंट को हट जाना चाहिये, गवर्नमेंट को इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिये। मालूम होता है कि उन के दिल में जो बुरा भरा हुआ है जीत कर स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के टिकट पर इस बार आने के पहले का उसको वह भूल नहीं सके हैं। यह गवर्नमेंट लोगों की इलैक्टड गवर्नमेंट है। इसके पीछे वास्तु मैजॉरिटी है। एक दो चार सीटें इधर उधर हार जाने से या एक आध भूल इधर उधर हो जाने से गवर्नमेंट हट जाय यह किस डेमोक्रेसी की बात है। किस डेमोक्रेसी की बात मसानी साहब कहते हैं, समझ में नहीं आता है। यह ठीक है कि प्लान के इम्प्लेमेंटेशन में कहीं, कहीं गलतियां हुई

हैं, टारगेट्स पर हम पहुंच नहीं सके हैं। इस लिये हमें देखना है कि कहां क्या गलती हुई, क्या कमी रह गई और किस एफर्ट्स को करने से वह ठीक होगी। इसके बारे में सुझाव न दे कर वह एक मालूम होता है कि तुले हुए हैं किसी भी तरह गवर्नमेंट को क्रिटिसाइज करने के लिये।

अभी एक मानीय सदस्य ने कहा कि यह नेशनल प्लान है। इस पर उनकी तरफ से आवाज हुई कि नेशनल प्लान नहीं है

श्री श्री० द० मसानी : कांग्रेस पार्टी का प्लान है।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : नेशनल प्लान कहते किस को है? मैं समझता हूँ कि जो चीज इस हाउस से पास होती है, वह नेशनल चीज होती है

श्री श्री० द० मसानी : बिल्कुल नहीं।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : कोई एग्जी करे या न करे, दो चार ऐसे सिर फिरे लोग जरूर बराबर होते हैं सभी देशों में और सभी पार्टियों में कि जो बहुमत से पास होता है वही नेशन का कहा जाता है।

श्री श्री० द० मसानी : आप बहुमत से नहीं आये।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : बहुत बहुमत से जो चीज पास होती है (Interruption.)

I heard Shri Masani very patiently. He must hear me also. When he gives a kick, he should be ready to receive kicks also.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Do not give this logic every time. We have already replied to that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member may leave it to me.

श्री श्री० द० मसानी : आप ४५ परसेंट से आए हैं, ५० परसेंट से नहीं आए हैं।

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी : नैशनल प्लान किसको कहते हैं। नैशनल चीज उसी को मैं मानता हूँ जो इस हाउस से पास होती है। यह सारे हिन्दुस्तान का हाउस है।

Shri Ranga: No, Sir.

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी : यह कोई स्वतन्त्र पार्टी का हाउस नहीं, कोई कांग्रेस का हाउस नहीं। इसमें स्वतन्त्र पार्टी भी है, कम्युनिस्ट भी हैं, प्रजासोशलिस्ट भी हैं, जन संघी भी हैं और सोशलिस्ट भी है। सब लोग यहां आये हुए हैं, सब लोग अपना दिमाग लड़ाते हैं कि क्या उचित है और क्या होना चाहिये। अब उनकी बात बहुमत से, और बहुत बड़े बहुमत से नहीं मानी गई इसलिये यह नैशनल प्लैन नहीं है, और दस बीस आदमी जो कहते हैं, या शायद ज्यादा से ज्यादा ४०, ५० जो कहें, अगर उसी को हम मान लें तो यह नैशनल प्लैन हो जाये, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। इस तरह से किसी कंट्री में डिमाक्रेसी पनप नहीं सकती कि केवल अल्प मत के लोगों की बात मान कर प्लैन चले। यह डिमाक्रेसी कैसी होगी, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। उन्होंने कहा कि हम डिमाक्रेसी को तो मानने वाले हैं। क्या यही डिमाक्रेसी है कि जो चीज बहुमत से पास हो जाये उसे वे न मानें और कहें कि यह नैशनल प्लैन नहीं है। उन्होंने यह बुद्धि कहाँ से सीखी, यह मैं नहीं जानता।

अब मैं आपके सामने कुछ दूसरी बात रखना चाहता हूँ। यह ठीक है कि हमारी फेल्योर हुई है। यह फेल्योर किस वजह से हुई सका कारण तो बहुत साफ नहीं बतलाया गया है, लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इम्प्लिमेंटेशन में फेल्योर हुई है और हर स्टेज पर हुई है। गवर्नमेंट की मशीनरी डिफेक्टिव होने से उसका इम्प्लिमेंटेशन नहीं हो सका है। आप किसी भी मद में देख लीजिये। जो ऐग्रिकल्चरल सेक्टर है, जिस पर देश की उन्नति का दारोमदार है, और जिसकी नकम अभी भी हमारी नैशनल इनकम की ४६ परसेंट है, उस में भी आप

देखेंगे कि सारे देश में ऐग्रिकल्चर डिपार्टमेंट के अफसरों की एक सेना पड़ी हुई है। लेकिन उनकी मेन्टेलिटी क्या है। वह कोट, पैंट और हूट की मेन्टेलिटी है। वे कभी किसी के सम्पर्क में आते नहीं, गृहस्थियों के यहां पहुंचते नहीं, जानने की कोशिश नहीं करते कि क्या उनकी दिक्कतें हैं, किस तरह से उनकी उन्नति हो सकती है। इस मनोवृत्ति से काम नहीं चलेगा। जिस देश के लोग जैसे हों, अगर वही मनोवृत्ति मिनिस्टर से लेकर, आफिशल्स तक नीचे के कर्मचारी तक नहीं रखी जायेगी, तब तक कोई बात सफलतापूर्वक चल नहीं सकती है। सब से बड़ा डिफेक्ट यह है कि हमारे देश के हाकिम हुक्काम लोगों के सामने जाते नहीं हैं और उनकी दिक्कतों को समझने की कोशिश नहीं करते हैं। इसलिये उन लोगों की क्या जरूरतें हैं इसको वे समझ नहीं सकते हैं और इसीलिये योजनाओं की पूर्ति नहीं होती। आप किसी बात को ले लीजिये। एक नहर खुदबानी है, या इन्सेन्टिव की तरह पर आप जो रुपया देते हैं उसका रुपया लेना हो, अगर उसके लिये एक गृहस्थ को पचासों बार दौड़ना पड़े और उसमें से बहुत सा ग्रंथ इसमें खर्च हो जाय तब पैसा मिले तो लोग ऊब जाते हैं जब तक यह डिफेक्ट दूर नहीं होगा तब तक प्लैन का इम्प्लिमेंटेशन ठीक नहीं हो सकता।

जैसा मसानी साहब ने बतलाया, हर सेक्टर में शार्टफाल हुआ है, और इसी बात पर विचार करने के लिये यह रिपोर्ट आपके सामने आई है ताकि शायद आप कोई कंस्ट्रक्टिव सजेशन दे सकें। लेकिन आप कहते हैं कि प्लैन को स्क्रेप कर दो। स्क्रेप कर दें तो फिर लावें क्या। उन्होंने कहा कि ऐग्रिकल्चर को बढ़ाओ। वे बढ़ाने की बात तो कहते हैं लेकिन उसके लिये उनका सुझाव क्या है। जो प्लैन की पुस्तिका है उसकी जगह एक दूसरी पुस्तिका देते कि हमारा यह प्रोग्राम है, इसे लो।

श्री श्री० २० मसानी : मैं कहता हूँ कि १७वाँ ग्रमैडमेंट वापस लो ।

श्री ट्वा० ना० तिवारी : अगर बड़े बड़े व्यापारियों के घर से प्लैन बन कर आयेगी तो वह सिवा बिजनेस के और कुछ हो नहीं सकती

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: That is Masani Plan.

श्री ट्वा० ना० तिवारी : हमारे देश में ऐग्रिकल्चर प्लैन की सब से ज्यादा जरूरत है । मैं मानता हूँ कि पुराने जमाने में जो चीजें बनाई गई थीं, वह रिपेअर न किये जाने की वजह से खराब हो गई हैं, और उनसे जो सिचाई होनी चाहिये थी वह नहीं हो पाई । यह मानी हुई बात है, उसे हमने छिपाया कहाँ है, लेकिन वह कोई आल्टरनेटिव नहीं दे सके । हाउस में उधर बैठे हुए लोगों को सोचना है, उसकी कुछ नुक्ताचीनी करनी है, क्या उनकी कोई दूसरी रिस्पामिबिलिटी नहीं है ।

अब मैं अधिक जनरल बातों में न जा कर कुछ अपने स्टेट के बारे में कहना चाहता हूँ प्लैन का मतलब है, किसी भी पालिसी में, देश के सब अंगों में समानता हो । देश के लिये जितने हिस्से हैं अगर उनमें कोई बलवान हो और कोई कमजोर हो, तो ऐसी खुराक सब को दी जाय कि जो कमजोर हो वह ऊपर आ सके । इस बात की और न प्लेनिंग कमिशन का ध्यान गया है और न गवर्नमेंट का ध्यान गया है । बिहार की पापुलेशन सारे देश की पापुलेशन का थारहवाँ हिस्सा है और उमरों जो जमीन मिली है वह सारी जमीन का बीसवाँ हिस्सा है । इस से पापुलेशन का भार जमीन पर कितना है यह जाना जा सकता है । सारे हिन्दुस्तान का एवरेज ऐग्रिकल्चर पर डिपेन्ड करन बालों की संख्या है ७० परसेन्ट लेकिन बिहार में वह ८६ परसेन्ट है तो बिहार के लोग देश के किसी

भी दूसरे हिस्से के लोगों की बनिस्वत किसानों पर अधिक गुजर करत हैं बिहार की पर कैपिटा इनकम भी बहुत कम है । सारे ही हिन्दुस्तान की पर कैपिटा इनकम ३२६ रु० है जब कि बिहार की १६३ रु० ५७ न० १० है ।

बिहार में कमी किसी चीज की नहीं है वहाँ सब से ज्यादा मिनरल रिसोर्सेज हैं । लेकिन कमी है गवर्नमेंट के सहायता के लिये न आने की । आप देखेंगे कि फर्स्ट, सेकन्ड और थर्ड फाइव इअर प्लैन्स में बिहार में कोई बड़ा इरिगेशन का काम नहीं हुआ । दामोदर वैली बनी लेकिन उस से बिहार के इरिगेशन में कोई मदद नहीं मिली । कोसी प्रोजेक्ट बनी जो कि बिहार में है, लेकिन वह प्रोटेक्शन है नेचर के डैमेजेंज के खिलाफ । वह इरिगेशन प्रोजेक्ट नहीं है । हमारी इरिगेशन प्रोजेक्ट गंडक प्रोजेक्ट है जो कि हिन्दुस्तान की सब प्रोजेक्ट्स से अच्छी है, लेकिन उसे काम में नहीं लाया गया । दो वर्ष की अवधि उस की बढ़ा दी गई है । इस मनोवृत्ति से कमजोर लोग मजबूत नहीं हो सकते और हिन्दुस्तान का जो एवरेज है हर बारे में उस में आ नहीं सकते हैं ।

यह जो प्लैन की मिड टर्म एप्रैजल रिपोर्ट है उसमें आप देखेंगे कि बिहार में अनएम्प्लायमेंट पहले से बढ़ गया है । इस का क्या कारण है । क्यों बिहार में अनएम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ा । इस बात की स्टडी करके बताने के लिये कि उस की क्या दवर है, उस के मुताबिक समाधान के लिये कोई राह नहीं सोची गई । मैं गवर्नमेंट से या प्लेनिंग कमिशन के लोगों से अपील करूंगा कि इस बात पर नज़र दौड़ायें । बराबर हाउस में सुना गया कि जो कमजोर हिस्सा है उस का मदद की जाय । लेकिन बिहार का दुर्भाग्य यह भी है कि जितने बड़े बड़े बिजनेस हैं, चाहे वह टाटा का हो या डालमिया का हो, उन के हेड आफिस दूसरी जगह है बिहार में नहीं है । वे सारा धन बिहार से कमाते हैं लेकिन हेज आफिस दूसरी जगह रक्बे हुए हैं । उन को इनकम टैक्स दूसरी जगह देना होता है । इस से बिहार के लोगों को जो उचित हिस्सा उसका

[श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी]

मिलना चाहिये वह नहीं मिलता। दुर्भाग्य है कि हम गरीब हैं, हमारे पास इतना रुपया नहीं है कि खुद इंडस्ट्रीज आरम्भ कर सकें। बाहर के लोग जो आते हैं कैपिटल ले कर वह हेड आफिस दूसरी जगह बनाते हैं इस लिय उस का उचित फायदा हमें नहीं होता।

श्री बड़े : मध्य प्रदेश की भी वही स्थिति है।

An Hon. Member: We sympathize with you.

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : उसके लिये आप कहियेगा, बिहार की प्राब्लम्स को ले रहा हूँ क्योंकि मैं उन को जानता हूँ।

17 hrs.

जहाँ तक अनम्प्लायमेंट का सवाल है बड़ी बड़ी मिलों और फैक्ट्रियों में हालत यह है कि सब से नीचे की जो सर्विसेज हैं उन में भी लोग बाहर से आते हैं। मैं आप को बतलाता हूँ, सुब्रह्मयम साहब, कि आप किसी भी फैक्ट्री में चले जाइये, आप देखेंगे कि ग्रेड ४ में यह बात ठीक है कि अधिक हिस्सा बिहार का है, १९०० बिहार का है और १५०० दूसरी जगहों का है।

लेकिन ५०० ६० से ऊपर की नौकरियों को अगर आप देखियेगा तो बिहार के लोग उन में इने गिने शायद कहीं मित्त जाये। इसी तरह से आप दूसरे राज्यों को ले लीजिये मद्रास को ले लीजिये।

आप मद्रास को लीजिए, मद्रास में हम बता सकते हैं कि बड़े बड़े प्रोजेक्ट्स में या सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट द्वारा एडमिनिस्टर्ड फैक्ट्रियों में बिहारी नजर नहीं आते।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप खत्म करें।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : अभी मुझे ५ या ६ मिनट और लगेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप दो मिनट में खत्म कर सकते हैं तो अभी खत्म कर लीजिए।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : मुझे कम से कम पांच मिनट चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : तो आप कल जारी रखें।

17.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, December 6, 1963/Agrahayana 15, 1885 (Saka).