

[Shri A. K. Sen]

Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and Bombay is proposed to be put down on the Order Paper for Friday, November 22, as a supplementary item of business.

It is hoped that business preceding this Motion will be concluded in time so as to allow the motion being taken up for discussion on Friday.

**MOTION RE: SECOND FIVE YEAR
PLAN IN RELATION TO CURRENT
ECONOMIC SITUATION**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now resume further discussion on the motion regarding the Second Five Year Plan. One day, excluding the time availed of by the hon. Minister to reply, has been allotted for the discussion on the motion. The time-limit for speeches will be 20 to 30 minutes for leaders of groups and 15 minutes for other members.

Hon. Members will recall that a motion regarding the report of the Finance Minister's visit abroad has been admitted under rule 189 and published in Bulletin (Part II) dated 19th November 1957. Separate time is being allotted for that. I would, therefore, suggest to the hon. Members that the subject-matter of that motion may not be raised during the present discussion in order to avoid repetition.

I have since received amendments to the motion—two by Mr. Chaudhuri and the other by Maharaja Pratap Keshari Deo. Further discussion on the motion has started and 13 members have already taken part. The motion and the amendments were also treated as moved. If the amendments are now allowed to be moved, it will be rather inconvenient for those hon. Members who have already spoken. They cannot express their views. Normally, when once a motion is moved and debate has started, no amendments are allowed thereafter. It will be prejudicial to those who have already taken part in the debate. Therefore, I would suggest that what-

ever these hon. Members want to say, they may suggest if they get an opportunity to speak.

The House will now take up.....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Before we take up the other business of the House, I request you to tell us one thing. You were just now referring to the statement of the Finance Minister. I may remind you that I have given notice of a motion as early as the 11th of this month regarding, not only the Finance Minister's statement, but the statement of other Ministers which, to my mind, violate the joint responsibility of the Cabinet. I want that the motion should be discussed in this House and I request that you may be pleased to find some time for it.

I may invite your attention to another motion also in which my signature appears. That is a motion on behalf of 52 members of this House, asking for a day to discuss the statements of senior members of the Cabinet regarding the political perspective and the economic policy of the Government of India. I want to know your decision on these motions.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): In today's Bulletin (Part II), No. 789, there is a "No-Day-Yet-Named-Motion" following the motion tabled by Mr. Masani and 10 others, namely, that the statement of the Finance Minister on his visit to U.S.A., Canada, U.K., and West Germany, which was laid on the Table of the House on 13th November, 1957 be taken into consideration. Along with that, there is already a motion given by 52 members. We would like to know what has happened to that motion.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay City-Central): May I draw your attention to a third motion which was given notice of by me and signed along with me by Mr. Gopalan and Mr. H. N. Mukerjee? That refers only to the question of the statement made by the

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

Finance Minister. I request you to give your decision on that.

Shri Vajpayee (Balrampur): There is a fourth motion regarding the controversy resulting from the statement of the hon. Finance Minister, given notice by me. What is the fate of my motion?

Mr. Speaker: I shall give my ruling tomorrow on these. We will now take up further discussion of the following Motion moved by Shri Gulzarilal Nanda on the 13th September, 1957, namely:

"That the Second Five Year Plan in relation to the current economic situation be taken into consideration."

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Mr Speaker, it is nine weeks now since this motion was moved and debated in this House. During these nine weeks much has happened. Perhaps the most important thing, so far as this motion is concerned, relates to the food situation.

We welcome this discussion in this House because the subject of planning is an important matter and the economic or food situation demands the attention of all of us, to whatever group or party we might belong. Indeed, it is a problem of the whole nation. Many of the subjects that have come up here, although they may appear to be different subjects, are all closely related to this subject. For instance, you were pleased to remark that a debate on the food situation is intimately related to this discussion. It is the very basis of the planning that we have to do for the future. It is intimately related to planning.

The Finance Minister's statement on his visit abroad also covers more or less the same ground.

I looked through, to refresh my mind, the report of the speeches made on the last occasion and I looked through also the various amendments that had been put forward. I do not think in this debate it would be appropriate to deal with amendments or proposal, about any particular project, to do this or that. We are considering the question in its broad perspective.

May I refer to one very remarkable amendment which I think Mr. Bharucha has put forward. He has suggested that at the end of the Plan there should be a two years breathing space, when we don't plan, and rest. I must say that this shows such remarkable understanding of planning that it takes my breath away. Mr. Bharucha might as well if I may suggest to him to give rest to his body, stop the circulation of his blood for a certain period, so that his heart and lungs will rest and not be overburdened.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Is that the logical conclusion?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am venturing to put forward an argument which may not appeal to Mr. Bharucha, because he does not understand these matters very much, but it is a very relevant argument, because I cannot imagine anything more fantastic than for anyone to say: stop planning for two years, or give a two year period in which you allow matters to rest, to give a breathing space. That shows an utter lack of understanding of planning, what economics is, what the economic life of the country is today, how India is functioning, in fact, what this Parliament is functioning for today. Such amazing ignorance on the part of a Member is,—if I may say so—surprising.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: May I suggest that the hon. the Prime Minister should suspend judgement about my ignorance or otherwise, until I have spoken?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Am I not to speak about amendments which have been tabled. However, it is not a very important matter, what Mr. Bharucha's amendment is, or indeed what Mr. Bharucha might say in the future. We might consider this matter more relevantly.

Now Mr. Dange, naturally with his special bend of philosophy, thought that many of our ills were due to certain monopolist tendencies of capitalists,— I believe I am right.

Shri S. A. Dange: Anglo-American suppliers of capital goods.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I wonder what the foreign exchange difficulties of the People's Republic of China are due to at the present moment.

Shri S. A. Dange: There are none.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There I beg to differ from him. I do not know if his sources of information are very special and not above ground,—I do not know. Because all the public sources indicate, and we are in possession of many, that there have been. I am not criticising the Chinese Government; I am merely stating a fact their economy has been under very grave stresses and strains. Why? To some extent, conditions are different, for the same reasons,— because they have tried to go ahead at a fast pace in regard to industrial development. They are perfectly entitled to do it, and I have no doubt they will succeed in the final analysis. I am merely pointing out that because of that they suffer these grave strains and Chairman Mao Tse Tung and other leading personalities have referred to this in many speeches and tried to some extent pull back, to slow down. Essentially, it is the same problem, whether you deal with it in the Chinese way, or the Indian way, the Communist way or the non-Communist way. Apart from that China unfortunately has had to suffer a very severe drought also, just as we

have had to suffer. But it has not so much to do with economic policies as with the whims of nature. —It is rather extraordinary that the problems we are facing in India today, these difficulties are strangely duplicated in China of today, some of them in a bigger scale, some in a lesser scale.

Naturally, their foreign exchange difficulties are of a different type from ours, but there are foreign exchange difficulties. However, it is neither here nor there.

The first thing to understand is that planning is a continuous process and there is no breathing space, when you don't plan. The development of a country's economy is a continuous process and planning means to show how a country's economy should develop. Apart from that when some people talk of our Second Five Year Plan having been overambitious—this word has been used many times beyond India and sometimes in India—well, I do not know exactly what the tests are. The tests are, let us say, what we aim at, in the shape of capital formation; that is an important and essential thing, whether your economy is communist socialist or capitalist, or whatever it may be.

A developing country, a developing economy must have capital formation for investment for future growth and one of the tests is how much you advance in that direction. In the First Five Year Plan, I believe our rate of advance approached 5 per cent. per annum which was low of course. On this occasion in the Second Plan, I think we aimed at 10 per cent. or round about that. I think it is from 7 to 10 per cent. I understand the rate is more or less 7 to 7½ per cent. Now if we aim at a 10 per cent. advance, it is not a very big step and I can show other countries, whether capitalist or communist, which have a much bigger rate of advance. So, I do not understand the statement of the Plan being overambitious.

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

Certainly it was a Plan, it was meant to be a Plan, which would compel us to stretch ourselves, as much as we could. There can be no advance in these conditions without stretching to your utmost, without taking some risks, if you like, without expecting something from your own people or from others, which is rather unusual. Otherwise, you remain in the same rut. As it happens the strains increased on, because of various factors, foreign which the House knows fairly well, and some internal.

I am perfectly prepared to admit that with a little more careful planning, with a little more looking ahead, with regard to our imports and exports, etc., the stress would have been a little less, not very much, but slightly less. We should have done that we should do that. But I do not think that has made any major difference to the situation that has arisen. Anyhow all these developments in recent months, or if you like last year or two, have had at least one good result and that is that they have drawn us—when I say us, I am not only referring to the Government, but others too and the people generally—out of a certain feeling of complacency which had arisen two or three years ago partly because of good harvest and partly because of the success of the first Five Year Plan. It is dangerous to be complacent at any time, more especially these days. We have to face these stresses and strains now because of that complacency. So, that is one good result. We are shaken out of it. We are evolving now a much closer integration of all these matters with the Planning Commission in regard to import, export, in regard indeed to any kind of revision or review of the Plan.

Question arises about what is called pruning of the Plan, sometimes called re-phasing it. There can hardly be without great loss any kind of re-phasing or pruning of the major things that we have undertaken. We cannot

stop a steel mill or plant from being built. We cannot stop big things. If we do,—of course, we can do—we do at a great loss. We delay the process of recovery. Inevitably if we have not got the resources, we have to stop some things or delay some things. But we have absolutely no intention of doing anything radical to the basic structure of the Plan. We shall keep this in view all the time.

Even previously the House may remember we had said that the Planning Commission will consider the question every year and have annual surveys. We shall have that. We shall have even more continuous surveys as to how the Plan is working so that if necessary any changes that may be required may be made. It is a little difficult at present to finalise things that is, in regard to the Second Plan. Many of the things are final. We have to go through. Some other matters depend on the developing situation, what resources we have and what resources we can get internally or externally. We cannot go beyond those resources obviously and function in the air.

In the course of the speeches made in September last here, stress was laid on agriculture. It was said that in the Second Plan, agriculture has been given a somewhat lesser place than industry. I do not think that is quite correct. It is correct perhaps to say that agriculture has not been discussed at length in the Plan. Because, there is not so much room for discussion of many matters although there is considerable discussion. Because we have always believed and even at the time the Second Plan was being passed subsequently, we made it perfectly clear that important as we thought industry was,—very important and indeed without the development of industry and heavy industry, we saw no real increase in the living standards of India—but that industry itself could not progress without the development of agriculture, and agriculture became the basic and most important thing in India.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

That being the basic fact, the recent developments and events on the food front have made that even more clear. It is obvious that if you wish to have money for investment, for capital formation, how do you do it? An industrialised community does it through industry. We are building up our industry. We put in money into industry, not taking out from it much. How do we put in money? The obvious thing is, from agriculture if we can do it. If not, then, we neither put it from industry nor agriculture and our resources, our capacity, would be very limited

We cannot lay enough stress on the importance of agriculture, on the importance on the food front of cereals for the reason that I have given and also for the other reason that if we cannot feed our people properly, apart from surplus food, everything suffers. If we talk about foreign exchange, we have to buy food from abroad at a terrific cost. It is a great strain on us. So that, there is nothing more important—I make no exception—there is nothing more important than improvement in agriculture in India. I would limit that to more perhaps, improvement in the cereal situation. It is of the utmost vital importance. Nothing can be given greater priority than that.

When the Second Plan was framed, I think it was said that we should aim at a ten million tons' addition to the food production. On discussing it in the National Development Council, we decided to increase this figure to 15 millions. I regret I have not read the full report yet of the Asoka Mehta Committee. I believe they have calculated that the feasible figure would be 10.3 million tons. It is not for me to say because after all, this is in the realm of making estimates and guess work. The Asoka Mehta Committee will forgive me if I also indulge in making guesses.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi):
Planners also make some guesses.

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada):
May I say, Sir,.....

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am not interested in the figure; I am really telling you the position.

These figures are usually arrived at naturally in consultation with the States concerned, with what the States say. What will happen or not, I am not able to say. I have not the shadow of a doubt that we should aim at and try our utmost to achieve a minimum of 15 million tons. I say it should be much more than 15 million tons and I do not merely talk in the air. That would be discourteous to the House if I should merely talk in the air. You can take any figure like this.

If one calculates, first of all one sees the very low rate of production at the present moment in India. It is very, very low. It is almost the lowest in the world. It is a shame, a disgrace for us that it is so low. Remember that when a thing is very low, it is easier to increase it. There is room for increase. It is at the top level difficult if you have to increase that by a higher percentage. You are so low and even a slight effort increases it and where that effort has been made in India, it has been increased considerably, not 10 or 15 per cent. but 30, 40, 50 per cent. In the community development areas it has been increased more. In effect, the future progress of India on the food front depends very, very largely on the work done by the community projects, community development areas. It depends on the development of co-operatives. It depends in the final analysis on the village taking this matter in hand.

Now, just before this matter was taken up, a statement was made on the unfortunate disaster in Andhra. Questions were asked about the help to be given to Andhra, more especially in regard to tanks. I am not

speaking about Andhra, nor about the tanks in Andhra. What should be done, that is another matter. But, I should like to put to the House something that troubles me greatly nowadays: this amazing capacity to ask for help and the amazing incapacity to do a thing oneself. It is astonishing how for everything the State Government asks the Central Government for help and the Central Government asks a foreign country for help. It is a question of everybody asking without getting down to do things. Here is a tank which requires repairs. Of course, I do not say that the Centre should not help. Shri M. V. Krishnappa said, we are going to take it up. I say, it is the job of the village to do it, getting some help or no help. This type of vicarious responsibility—I say it is not a question of tanks—it applies to everything that we are doing. The main object of the community development movement was to fight this outlook. I do not know if it has succeeded in fighting it, i.e., to develop the outlook of doing things themselves, with help of course—it is the function of the Government to help—to develop their self-reliance, self-help; and from such reports as I have, I think the community development movement, not everywhere, but in many areas, has succeeded in that to a great extent.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): You are totally mistaken. It has failed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Hon. Members may have some experience of their patch of earth where they come from. I have experience or reports from the whole of India, and therefore I can speak with some greater knowledge and experience. I said to begin with in certain areas, not in all—in many areas; in fact, in more areas than I expected. But I entirely admit that whatever is done is insufficient, whatever is done is not adequate to our purpose; much more should be done. I do not challenge that fact at

all. But anyhow, my point is this, that unless we realise this and lay greater stress on this factor of village help, self-reliance etc., I do not think we will be able to meet many of our urgent problems.

Take another thing. We are faced with drought, a serious drought difficulty in Bihar and U.P. and the rest—and it is a serious situation. May I here say that the latest reports that we have received from a high level enquiry commission that the Planning Commission sent out to these areas are somewhat better than previous reports, i.e., about the damage done in U.P. and other areas. By and large they indicate that the damage done is round about 35 per cent. Previously the figure was 50 per cent. These are all estimates, but they are fairly careful estimates.

Now, you are aware of this difficulty. Some hon. Members say the solution is doles to large numbers of people, I would venture to say that we should make a rule that doles should never be given; never I say, except naturally to the infirm, to children that is a different matter—but able-bodied people should always be given some kind of work. The work may not be economic, that is a different matter, but it is good from the point of view of our economy and is good from the point of view of self-respect and self-reliance of the individual.

Here we have to face a situation. Let us take Bihar. Immediately what can you grow before waiting for the next big crop? What short-term crop can you grow?—does not matter what it is, potatoes, bananas, some kind of grain, because in a crisis like this.... Some Hon. Members think it amusing for me to say potatoes and bananas, but what are the alternatives, I put it to you? If we have not got enough, the alternative is to buy food abroad. Either we grow things in the country,

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

or we buy from abroad, because nobody is prepared to allow our people to starve.

Acharya Kripalani: Bananas even today are dearer than foodgrains.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If I may suggest, if a village grows bananas and eats them, they are neither dear nor cheap. It is their property which they can eat.

However, that is not the point. Here you do not bring in market economy in these matters. It is a question of growing for consumption.

Take a short-term crop. We should do everything, of course, for the long-term crop, whether it is rice or wheat or whatever it is. That is admitted, but we cannot wait for the long-term crop. We want some short-term crop. How can we do it? There are some things which you can grow in six, seven weeks' time provided you get a little water. Where do you get the water? How did people do things a little earlier before these wonderful machines came into existence? They dug *kutch*a wells. The villagers did not send a deputation to the Planning Commission, the State Government or the Central Government. In Bihar it is a well-known fact they dug *kutch*a wells. In the olden days it cost them Rs. 5; may be it costs them Rs. 25 now, I do not know.

An Hon. Member: Rs. 200 now.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: This depends on how near the water is, obviously. If the water, as in parts of Bihar, is eight feet below the surface or ten feet, then it is easy. You dig a *kutch*a well, get some water immediately from it. The well will not last more than a season, I admit it. Does not matter. You get water for the short-term crop immediately, and for the next season

it is not completely destroyed. You can revive it or make it *pucca*, that is a different matter. Make a short channel from the river. This thing indeed is being done. We talk again about a big canal system, but make short channels or canals of water, *kutch*a channels, two, three or four miles out from the river. These are things indeed which are being done. Acharya Kripalani perhaps is not aware of the fact that this is being done actually with success.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh (Sasaram): He has not seen his constituency.

Shri Gajendra Prasad Sinha (Palamau): In his own constituency these things are being done.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I should like the House to consider how much we have changed in our mentality when a simple proposal for self-help evokes laughter. It is an extraordinary state of affairs.

Take this *gram dan* movement. I do not pretend to understand all the philosophy, all the background of the *gram dan* movement. I do not pretend to agree to every item in it, but I do fundamentally and absolutely approve of it, and think it is worthy of commendation and every help because principally it relies on self-help and co-operation between the villagers. I approve of it, I want to help it in every way. And it is this attitude that all my life and Acharya Kripalani's life, most of it, we have learnt, many of us learnt this principle of relying on ourselves as an individual, as a group, as a village, as a community, as a country, in the old days when we fought for the freedom of India. Now, what has happened? Has all this vitality oozed out of us? Are we only expecting Government to do things? Criticise Government by all means, I am not trying to defend the Government, but I say in the final analysis the growth of India depends on the growth of the

villages. Of course, you want steel factories, but in the final analysis growth depends on the growth of rural India, that means the growth of the villager and the villager becoming self-reliant, self-dependant and co-operative—on the development of the village panchayat, on the development of the village co-operatives. Both these things are included in the community development schemes.

These are the basic approaches apart from the big schemes you undertake of iron and steel plants and river valley development. Those, of course, are in a different category, but this is utterly important, and it is important from the point of view of agricultural development, of food, of greater food production, because regardless of any Government which might be in authority or power, these are hard facts of life—for example, we have to increase our food production, because not only is the population increasing in India, but consumption is increasing per capita. Remember that per capita consumption is also increasing. People get more money to spend, they eat more—and a good thing too. On the other hand, population is increasing—apart from the normal increase. It is increasing more rapidly than normally, now. In other words, it is increasing, because people die less. In other words, health conditions are improving. (Interruptions). Health conditions are improving. These are statistics, and I can supply the statistics if the hon. Members want.

Now, take Bengal. Here is a country afflicted for generations with malaria. Malaria is gradually becoming a thing of the past. It is a tremendous thing. It is a big revolution in people's lives, which you can imagine. We do not discuss here the eradication of malaria, the biggest thing that has happened in Bengal or in India. Now, it is not a question of curing an ordinary individual by taking him to a hospital. But all these things have added to this increase by lessening the death

rate every considerably and increasing the expectation of life.

An Hon. Member: Improvement also.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am only looking at this from this point of view. In the last census, our population increase was, I think, 1.5 per cent. per annum. Now, not because the rate of population increase has become higher, but because the rate of death has become lower the population increase is nearly 2 per cent. It is very heavy. And you can imagine, in the vast population of India, 2 per cent. per annum becomes 20 per cent. in a ten-year period.

And you can only meet this obviously either by limiting population increase or by far greater production or both; and it is not merely a question of food production; it is a question also of employment and all those. Obviously, I am not going into this matter. But what is called family planning or birth-control is of the utmost importance to meet with these problems. It is not, as some people imagine, a joke to talk about birth-control and family planning.

Acharya Kripalani: Are all those who refuse to die in time accentuating the food problem?

Shri Tyagi: Married people are dying more.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Let us take the problem in Eastern U.P., Gorakhpur, Deoria, Ballia and in Bihar next door. It is geographically a heavily populated area—terrible; in Ballia, it is one thousand persons. Of course, in South India too, there are very heavily populated areas. But I am referring to this drought area for the moment.

I should like to put before the House another aspect of this question also, how a certain lack of interest—or whatever the reason may be—has

*Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation*

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

led to the cutting down of forests in the past, and I think this is having a very serious result on the rainfall. Now, if you read the newspapers or have personal experience, you might have found that in parts of Bihar, in parts of Eastern U.P., the rain that came down recently came down in terrific downpours. It did not rain at all; then, there was a terrific downfall. Then it does not rain at all. So, there is drought.

This is a typical sign of semi-desert conditions, because the temperature changes so much in a desert between hot and cold that rain comes down in tremendous volume at the same time, and then it does enormous injury. You cannot benefit by it. Now, something of that kind was noticed—not the same kind in the downfall in Western Bihar and the drought area in Gorakhpur etc. That is, dust bowls are being created.

So, the question of reafforestation is of the highest importance. We started about three or four years ago with this tree plantation or Van Mahotsava, which became a bit of ritual, for a certain day some people doing something. No doubt, it has done some good. But I do submit that is a very serious matter. It is not a question of planting an odd tree but planting whole forests, because otherwise the rainfall does not come down in a normal regulated way, but as a heavy downpour; it comes down all together, and spoils the harvest by erosion and other things, and it does not come when it is wanted.

Reading the reports of the speeches made here on the last occasion, I noticed a particular speech by one of our colleagues, who to our very great regret, is no more, Shri Saif Faiz Tyabji, who particularly laid stress on this question of forestry, and very rightly so. And it is partly because this matter was brought to my mind when reading his speech

that I have laid stress on it, apart from the fact of its high importance.

Now, we are facing, as you all know, a difficult foreign exchange situation. Nevertheless, I would venture to say that now or hereafter, the more important thing is always internal resources. Internal resources do not meet foreign exchange; I admit that; but the whole basis is internal resources. And I do not want people to run away with the idea that the foreign exchange situation being met, everything is met. The foreign exchange situation will be met, or partly met, or whatever it is, after a year or two, when we pass this period. But the internal resources question remains today, tomorrow and the day after, and all the time.

In so far as the internal resources are concerned, I am not for the moment talking about taxation etc. Of course, that is the principal way. Then, there are these loans; there are savings etc., which are of high importance.

Again, I go back to what I began with, the self-help movement I have received reports of a very considerable amount of self-help, crores of rupees of work having been done and cash even being collected by the villages. Ultimately, it is this capacity for doing things for oneself, this capacity for all of us and others, apart from taxation and subscribing to loans etc., which will add to the resources at our disposal, and thereby somewhat lessen the strain and tensions that exist.

The House knows very well that the very difficulties that face us today are the difficulties of a dynamic economy, of an advancing economy, of progress. They are not difficulties of stagnation. Those are the bad difficulties, the difficulties of stagnation.

*Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation*

People criticise sometimes and they say that the private sector ran away with us in regard to foreign exchange, in the last few years, and that is one of the reasons for our difficulties about foreign exchange. Well, that is partly true. But really that is not a very important element in it. It might have been less. By stopping some private sector developments, we could have saved some crores undoubtedly. But I do not think it would have made a major difference. But we should be careful about this in future, not because it is private sector, but rather because the thing for which it is spent may not have had a high priority. The money should be spent for a higher priority.

But if that is one criticism of the private sector, there is another criticism which has often been made, and that is that the private sector does not play its part properly, does not go ahead, is not dynamic enough, is not enterprising enough, does not do this or that. Now, as a matter of fact, what we have seen is a little bit too much of enterprise on the part of the private sector, not lack of enterprise. What might have happened is that the enterprise may have been directed, if you like, not in wrong channels, but in secondary channels. I am prepared to admit that. But, anyhow, you will admit that the private sector has shown a good deal of enterprise in going ahead in this way. Anyhow, there is no doubt about it that in future, we have to be very careful that money is spent on things of first importance and not on others unless we have something left over.

13.00 hrs.

People talk about our toning down our programme and the rest. Inevitably, to some extent, one has to shape things, rephrase things and we thought of that even at the time of first ushering in the Second Five Year Plan. But the whole purpose

is to gain a certain momentum and if you gain that momentum and then stop the thing, it is harmful, apart from the fact that you cannot again gain that momentum till you go through the same process again. Therefore, it is of vital importance, whatever minor things you may prune here and there, that the momentum gained should not be lost and we should go on in a major way.

Many things have happened since we discussed this matter on the last occasion. Among those things is one thing which is not in India, something which is not of any direct consequence in our economic situation. That is the launching by the Soviet Union of what is called the Sputnik, that is, an earth satellite. This has affected people in various ways and most people are, of course, interested in it. The fact that the Soviet Union did it is a compliment to the high development of its technology. But, there is no doubt, of course, that in a few weeks or a few months you will see the United States doing it too; and so may be other countries.

But the immediate point is, whoever does it, this brings very much before us this tremendous factor of the pace of development of modern science and technology. It is terrific—this pace of development—and it is obvious that this development of technology influences our lives all over the world, not immediately, but influences it powerfully. It influences our ways of living, our ways of contact, our ways of travel; our economic organisation and everything is connected with that, just like the last industrial revolution which took place in Europe—which began 200 years ago—has powerfully changed life, certainly in Europe and America, but really all over the world and, in fact, we are trying to catch up to some extent with that revolution here.

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

This is something which is equally revolutionary. It shows that the atom bomb which is so revolutionary and the development of atomic energy which is now taking place is likely to lead to far-reaching results. So, I want this House and the country to remember in what a tremendously revolutionary age we live from the technological point of view and because of that our theories, political, economic, national, international, all are affected by this technological advance. It affects everything. And many a theory which was a good theory in the past may be out of date and bad and inappropriate in future. Therefore, we have to get abreast of these things, in our thinking at least if not otherwise.

I am glad that in this question of atomic energy development, India, considering everything, has done fairly well. We have some able scientists and what is much more we have a considerable number of very promising young scientists, hundreds and thousands of them coming up, especially in the atomic energy field. Of course, we do not think of competing with the great powers in this matter; but, nevertheless our pace of advance has been considerable. We even now have to give thought to atomic energy for the production of power for civil use because power ultimately is the test of what you do.

Somebody, I think it was here, in the course of a question today referred to the waste of cow dung. I was irreverent enough two years ago to call this age in India the cow dung age because it is astounding when we see that 75 per cent. or more—I am not quite sure—of the total power consumed in India today comes from burning cow dung. It shows how backward we are in this matter.

All our major power resources, thermal stations, hydro-electric stations and like are just a handful of what we want and it is calculated that we have hundreds of millions

of tons of coal and we have many unexplored power resources and hydro-electric power. But, if we use our coal, let us say at the rate the United States is using it, all our hundreds of millions of tons of coal will disappear in 30 years' time. Of course, we are not going to use it at that pace because we cannot. That is another matter. I do not know what we will do after 10 years or 20 years. Therefore, it has become of the greatest importance for us to search for power supplies and atomic energy is obviously one that is indicated in the present conditions.

Even now we have to consider putting up power stations for civil use with atomic energy. I merely mention this matter not because it affects our present economic situation or the food front or anything but in order that this House and the country might keep in mind that in this very revolutionary age that we are living, science and technology and their offsprings are more important than almost any theory you might hold. Old or new theories could be derived from them and not impose themselves on science and technology and that any kind of plan that we make is not a plan for two years or 5 years. Of course, it is; but in the womb of those five years lies the plan for the next five years and the fourth Five Year plan. You do not have a sort of finishing it the fifth year and starting afresh in the third plan. It is a continuous process like life itself—planning for the economic life of a nation—and therefore it is of the utmost importance that in our plan today we are not only doing the big jobs that we wish to finish in this Plan but we are laying the foundations of the Third Five Year Plan and possibly the Fourth. Otherwise, we will be hung up and there will be many things that we have done which will not be able to be used fully because something else has not been done which is of great importance.

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

This is where the necessity and the need of perspective planning comes in. We plan; but perspective planning means that ultimately we are planning at the same time for 10 years later or 15 years later. Many of these schemes take more than five years for fruition and we have to plan today. If we plan, as we do, for a machine-making plant, unless we have a machine-making plant we cannot make our machines—and we are depending on others—and the plant takes shape gradually, parts of it or in an integrated way and we have to lay the foundations of it today which would really work out in the Third Five Year Plan. We have to keep all these things in view. No doubt, we have made mistakes and we shall make mistakes. But there is no other way and we welcome the fullest consideration of this problem by this House and the country.

I am glad that since this debate last time the country has been full of discussion on these matters, the newspapers even. That is a good thing because we want the hundreds and millions of people to think about these matters because it is only through their help, in the village or town or city, anywhere that these things will take shape, not by a decree of the Planning Commission, not by Government or even by Parliament unless it is given effect to by the country.

Acharya Kripalani: Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to talk about this Plan. Whenever one tries to point out the drawbacks of the Plan, one is accused of hampering the country's economic's progress. If, therefore, today I offer any criticism, it is that a better and more scientific approach may be made to our future planning and mistakes made in the past so far as it is possible may be corrected.

This is not the first time that I am speaking on the Five Year Plan. Last year when the Plan was discussed I

spoke about it and pointed out what I considered to be its defects. Again in last May, I spoke upon the Plan on the Address of our President. On both these occasions, I pointed out that the Plan was not scientifically drawn. I said that it was mechanically drawn. The plan frame was drawn under the overall direction, if I mistake not, of a statistician. It is easy for a statistician to make a plan. He plans for so many additional tons of steel, so many kilowatts of electricity, so many engines, so much food and so much other things. Then he also finds out how much money will be spent on each item. He then calculates how much will come from the taxes, how much from deficit financing, foreign borrowing and home borrowing. The two sides are made to square.

Once a statistician, because I happened to be in the Opposition, told me that I should keep a plan on behalf of my party before the country. I asked: how can a party which is not in power, which has not got the necessary experts, engineers and technicians, form a plan? He told me that it was very easy. You allow me to do it and I will do it—he said. This is how I am afraid our Plan was conceived or at least what they call the Plan frame was conceived.

We were advised about this Plan by foreign experts. These foreign experts came from Eastern Europe where also they have planning. Those people were experts about planning for heavy industry and planning for the next possible war. They do not care in their planning as to what happens to the people in the meantime and what happens to their economy. Some of them, or at least Russia, has carried out its plans and it has eminently succeeded. But so far as consumer goods are concerned, they have all miserably failed. Poland and Hungary have miserably failed and they are re-shaping their plans so that there may be a balanced planning, in food and agriculture, big industry and consumer industries. Here also, there should have been a balance between

[Acharya Kripalani]

the production of food and our industrial advance. I am very glad to note that the Prime Minister has said that everything primarily depends upon food, that all our planning will depend upon food.

In the Plan as it was drawn, we were told that the food increase would be to the extent of 15 per cent. Afterwards the Prime Minister corrected it and said that it would be 40 per cent. Not only that. He told us that we will be able to export agricultural products in order to get the very greatly needed foreign exchange. He has said that we were very optimistic and we were delighted. We did not calculate properly. Who was delighted? It is the Government, the authorities who told the people that the First Plan had succeeded and that we were self-supporting in food. It is the Government that did not take into consideration that it was the two good monsoons that brought about the easing of the food situation. Therefore, they misguided the people. Now, what do we see today? The food position appears to be very depressing. There are famine conditions in three or four States. The prices of foodgrains are rising. I do not know who calculated that we would be able to increase our food production to the extent of 40 per cent. and gain foreign exchange from that. I am afraid that our planning has not been very scientific.

When the Plan is not scientific, a doubt begins to rise in the minds of the people whether it would not be better to have a couple of years of respite from planning. This, the Prime Minister considered, was a very absurd and a very foolish proposition. There are more countries that are doing without a plan and there are less countries that have plans. It is China and the Eastern Europe that have a planned economy and all the other countries in the world have no planned economy. I do not see what absurdity there is if a person says: let us have two years' rest and allow the economy to take its natural course,

as it is taking its natural course with a very slight regulation in other countries. I see absolutely no absurdity.

Shri Tyagi: That will be more socialist perhaps.

Acharya Kripalani: May be socialist, I do not know. But I can tell you that the countries that have no plan are more socialist today than the countries that have a plan. I will tell you, if you do not mind, a story. It may be a story but it is worth hearing. In Western Germany, when a labour leader was asked: what is it that labour needs today, he began to think and after a while he said: labour today needs 'parking space'. I assure you that the standards of living in Western Europe and the equality that exists in Western Europe are greater than the socio-economic equality that exists in the Eastern Europe. They do not have this kind of planning. You may plan, but I can only say that it is not such an absurd proposition if a person in the Parliament gets up and says, let us have two years' respite to take into consideration all the factors and again think in other terms if it is possible. If after two years we think of another kind of planning and further planning is necessary, we may do so.

I have said that there is no co-ordinated direction to our economy, and wherever I have seen planned economy there are at least three conditions of planned economy. There is strict regimentation. No plan has ever succeeded without strict regimentation. Even the plans that have failed had very strict regimentation. What is the meaning of this 'regimentation'? It means that there must be the utmost economy, there must be the utmost austerity and there must be efficiency.

So far as economy is concerned, I talked of it on a previous occasion. So far as austerity is concerned, I think it is cruel to ask the people, the masses of India, to have any further

austerity. Austerity can come only from those whose stomachs are full and over-full, whom food injures rather than helps. But to ask the common people to undergo austerity any further than what they are undergoing today would be cruel. So far as austerity in other classes is concerned, it is conspicuous by its absence. It is these classes, even if the poor were to squeeze themselves further, that have to make the example. The Prime Minister rightly said that we, naming me and himself, relied before independence upon ourselves. I humbly say that we relied upon ourselves but the masses relied upon us. We have to give a direction. We have to show the way. We have to undergo austerities ourselves. And, then, they did do their bit and that bit was greater than what we could have done. May I suggest that if there is to be austerity, if there is to be efficiency, if there is to be economy, it must proceed from the leaders of the people.

So far as efficiency is concerned, I have only to give one example. This Rourkela steel plant is behind time by one year. But I am sorry to say that the plans of the planners are changing so rapidly that nothing has yet been done. I hear that contracts have not yet been finalised. There was partnership between a West German firm and our Government. I hear that partnership no more exists, and other steps have not been taken to expedite the work. This is our efficiency.

Efficiency also is shown by the priorities that are given in the Plan. I hear the priorities are such that today, when the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister are anxious to save the core of the Plan, they have already begun certain projects which they cannot stop in the middle. I entirely agree with the Prime Minister that you cannot stop these things in the middle, but how is it that things of less importance got priority over things of greater importance, that they proceeded with the work and you can-

not get out of there. This is the now position.

I say that even in the Plan there was no conception of priorities, that certain important industries that formed the core of the Plan should be taken up first and everything else should be put aside for one or two years to be done at leisure.

Again, I submit, there have been minimising of the financial requirements of the scheme. For instance, there is the railway expansion. The railway expansion would naturally cost much more than is provided for in the Plan. The coal production would cost much more than is provided for in the Plan. I do not know why there is this under-estimation of money to be spent. That is also one of the defects of the Plan.

It is very strange that we should not have known our financial position, what it would be even one year after the Plan. I think it should not have been difficult for our Finance Ministers to know what the foreign exchange position would be. But, so far as I remember, in 1955 and 1956, when our present Finance Minister was not in his present exalted position but was only the Commerce and Industry Minister, he went on indiscriminately giving import licences. One day I had a talk with him, not in this House but outside the House, and he told me that I do not know any economics. The economics that he knew and that he told me of was the economics of *laissez faire* and free trade. "Why should not import licences be given? This is a free country and everybody is free to purchase what he likes." These were his economics when he was, I humbly submit to the Prime Minister, the Commerce and Industry Minister. Today he sings another tune as Finance Minister. If this is our position, how can our planning succeed?

We could not foresee things and we have been going from one extreme to another in the pattern of our

[Acharya Kripalani]

foreign trade. In 1955-56 we had a surplus trade balance of Rs. 4 crores. This year the deficit is of Rs. 300 crores. How can such oscillations take place in the course of one year? It is ridiculous for a country whose economy is developing to have a surplus trade balance, but it is still more senseless to undergo a reckless deficit. Not only that, there is the inflation that exists here. We could have guarded against that inflation, but we did not guard because we threw open the flood-gates of foreign imports, among other things. I do not think any country in Europe suffered more on account of the last war than India. But the sufferings of the European nations were on the surface. Their factories were destroyed; their houses were destroyed; their people were killed. Everybody could see this destruction wrought by war. But there was a greater destruction in India and very few people saw it. This was the destruction that was consequent upon inflation. We had an inflation of 300 to 400 per cent. and when we came to power, instead of curing that inflation, we have been adding on to it. Nothing can be more impoverishing to the common people than inflation. This inflation is growing and we are asked to pay more and more taxes. Where is the capacity of the people, I ask, for paying more and more taxes?

We have been having huge expenditure on heavy industries and the consumption goods are less and less, especially food. This creates greater inflation. The total import of food so far has exceeded the total provision of imports in the entire Second Five Year Plan. The problem of foreign exchange also has been accentuated by this immense amount of food that we have been obliged to import.

The technique of plan-making seems also to be defective. The Ministries submit their plans to the Planning Commission, who after much baggling cut down their financial

allocations while keeping the physical targets in tact. When the railways repeatedly protested that this could not be done, they were asked to spend the entire money within three years and then their case would be reviewed. So far as food is concerned, the Prime Minister has told us that we must depend upon ourselves, that without self-help we cannot succeed and he has also told us that unless we have co-operatives, we cannot altogether solve our food problem. May I humbly suggest when the 15 per cent. target of increase in food was increased to 40 per cent., no finances were provided for that? No finances were provided.

I know that in other countries co-operation has not worked except when Government has made large sums available for it. Our villagers are unpoverished; they are in perpetual debt. If you want to give them good implements, good seed, and if you want to give them good co-operatives, the co-operatives must have funds. I have seen in other countries, co-operatives get every sort of facility from the Government before co-operation is started. Co-operative farming is prospering because credits are given to it and money is given to it. I have heard that a plot of 5 acres of land receives a grant of £ 1,000. It is only when money is provided that co-operatives can work.

The Prime Minister reminded us of the gramdan movement, and I am intimately associated with it. I called Anna Saheb Sahasrabudhe and told him, "I saw in foreign countries large amounts of money being granted before a co-operative could succeed. You are working in gramdan villages. What is your experience?" He told me, for 7 acres of land Rs. 300 of capital will have to be invested every year for three years; and after three years, after Rs. 900 are invested in 7 acres of land, in the fourth and fifth year, the cultivator will be self-supporting only in food. If he is to proceed further, if he is to do poultry

farming or cattle farming, much more money will be required. This is what I was told. I consider gramdan and bhoodan as revolutionary movements. I asked only a few days back a person who is intimately connected with and who works in the bhoodan movement, "You have been in bhoodan and you are now working in gramdan. How will you reconstitute the gram? Wherefrom will you bring the money? Has Vinobha Bhave considered this question?" I want the Prime Minister to note this; do you know what reply he gave? He said, "Vinobha says, go on getting land after land and village after village and then the Government will be obliged to give money for development." Government will be obliged to give money but here we contemplate 40 per cent. increase of food production and provide no money for it. We talk glibly of co-operatives not knowing what enormous amounts of money co-operatives need.

I think somewhere our thinking goes wrong. It is not I who have not the knowledge of my country, but this knowledge, I am afraid, is lacking somewhere else. I yet do my khadi work; I yet do my village work. May be that some production has increased in some community project areas, but I say it has made no particular difference. I can say that the rich in the villages have become richer, but it has not affected the poor. That is the report of other people also.

When the Prime Minister talked of afforestation it took me by surprise. In Europe I have not seen a place where there is no forest. Every city is surrounded by a forest. How do these forests grow? In Germany no body can fell a tree. If a man wants to fell a tree, he has got to put in an application and then a commission will be appointed to see whether that tree can be felled without disadvantage to the economy of the country. I went to Israel and they have created forests in a desert in ten years' time. Here we have a symbolic afforestation ceremony.....

An Hon. Member: Vana Mahotsava.

Acharya Kripalani: Vana Mahotsava and I know sometimes Rs. 600 were spent so that one Minister could go and plant one tree. And what happened to that tree, God alone knows. We do only symbolical things.

I will give you another example about this symbolical way of doing things. I have seen that in every country children are the first charge on the Government. I have seen how they are healthy and in other countries. But here we do not have blooming children. But we have a children Mahotsava. We have already started it. What is the date?

An Hon. Member: 14th of November.

Acharya Kripalani: Whether these children are prospering and blooming and whether they get enough food does not occupy our attention. We are only concerned with holidays. We are only concerned with symbolic things. Do you know what happens on the Children's Day? The poor parents are oppressed to give them new dresses on that day so that they may go to the *utsava*. We do not know how these things are arranged. Our girls are being insulted. We do not arrange for them protection. I have not the least objection to the children enjoying and enjoying freely. But, first of all let us see that they are properly fed, properly nourished and properly educated; not that they just go out for a holiday once in a year and we satisfy our conscience. If we really want to satisfy our conscience, we have to do the thing that other countries have done instead of merely doing them symbolically. We are not able to do the things. So, we do them merely symbolically. We want to raise our economy. The economy that was raised in European countries in 100 to 150 years, we want to do it in five years. I say that we cannot do it unless we impoverish the people. Russia could not do it. Poland could not do it. Budapest could not do it. So, we also cannot do it. It is

[Acharya Kripalani]

Impossible. You want a man who is suffering from indigestion to be brought up on Mughlai Pulao. How can he digest Mughlai Pulao? Gandhiji, therefore, said: you cannot give Mughlai Pulao of big industry to those patients. You can give them small doses of industry. You can give them the decentralised industry. You can make them work they can do with their hands. In China everything is being done by hands. A congressman who had been to China recently said that nothing is done by machines there. Everything is done by hands. There is no cattle in China. Everything that is done here by the bullocks is done by men there.

Shri Tyagi: What is it?

Acharya Kripalani: Everything that is done here even by bullocks is done by man there. Why? It is not their fault. They have no cattle. So, everything is done by the hand and not by machines.

What did I expect from the Prime Minister today? What did the newspapers expect and what did the people expect? Not a criticism of his criticism. What he gave us was a criticism of his criticism. He was replying to criticism. Where are his proposals? What does he propose to do?

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjan): There was no constructive suggestion from you also.

Acharya Kripalani: Now the taxes are given to the Prime Minister. When you give them to me, I will show you what I will do. You pay him crores and crores of rupees every year and you ask me to do things. Let him vacate the chair; I will show you how it is to be done.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): You get the vote first.

Acharya Kripalani: Then why do you ask such . . .

An Hon. Member: Silly question.

Acharya Kripalani: I won't use any adjectives. Why do you ask me such questions?

You talk about self-help. The Central and the State Governments take money from their blood and then you tell them: help yourself. You say that they are burning cow dung. Do you think it is a pleasure for a cultivator to burn cow dung? What have you provided him with? Have you given them little forests where they can get fuel? Have you given them coal? What have you given them? You always complain that they are burning manure. But, what can the poor people do? They have no resources. Give them resources. At present, they cannot do anything. They can't work for eight hours a day. They are exhausted. They are in perpetual indebtedness. Whenever there is drought, the Prime Minister will glibly say that a well can be sunk for Rs 5

An Hon. Member: 5 annas.

Acharya Kripalani: It can be done for five annas also if the water is one inch below. When there is drought, how can they get water?

I will now come to subsidiary food. There was one Food Minister who used to speak always about subsidiary food. Mr. Munshi of blessed memory.

एक माननीय सदस्य : वह मरें तो नहीं हैं ।

आचार्य कृपालानी : मरे भाई, यहाँ से तो मर गए हैं ।

Acharya Kripalani: He told us to take Moongfali. He also advised us to take bananas. In India even a middle class family cannot take bananas.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: It is a luxury.

Acharya Kripalani: We expected—I can say that at least I expected—from

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

the Prime Minister that he would tell us how the Plan is going to be worked and how the finances are going to be obtained and what schemes will be given emphasis and what schemes will be left aside. I wanted to know how we are going to cut our coat according to our cloth. We have been talking only about foreign exchange. What about the home front? Our savings have dwindled to one-third. Am I not correct?

An Hon. Member: Half.

Acharya Kripalani: Yes. It has dwindled to half of what it was.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must have some idea about the time.

Acharya Kripalani: I am very sorry. I only wanted to say that we must have some realistic idea of the country in which we are living and the Plan should be according to our genius, according to our circumstances and, if I may say so, according to the instructions and advice of the Father of the Nation, who wanted us to plan in a particular way.

Mr. Speaker: I am now going to call Mr. Masani.

An Hon. Member: What about the Socialist party?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mahanty has spoken from that side. I will give opportunities to as many members as possible.

1.49 hrs.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi-East): Mr. Speaker, this House has waited with anxiety for the speech that the Prime Minister was to deliver this morning. There were many things in what the Prime Minister said with which almost all members of this House would agree. I myself found that there were three or four aspects of what he said which I would like respectfully to welcome. I think we all respond to the stress that he laid and the highest priority that he gave

to agriculture. Quite apart from whether that priority of his has a place in the Second Five Year Plan or not, this recognition that the problem of the land must come first is one that is endorsed by all of us in this House.

I for one welcome the rather belated recognition of the fact that the private sector, as it is called, or the public sector, as I would prefer to call it, is the only sector that is delivering the goods, and if any crime has been committed, it is not the crime of not showing enterprise, but of showing more enterprise than had been given place for it in the Second Five Year Plan.

Thirdly, I was happy to see that consciousness or recognition is there now on the part of the Prime Minister that, to quote his own words, "with a little more careful planning, the stress on the people of this country would have been somewhat less". I responded, Sir, also to his stress on self-help. If he had been here, I would have taken the liberty of telling him that if the people of India are turning away from the concept of self-help, which Mahatma Gandhi placed before them, it is because of the policies of his own Government. The policies of a Government which are based on bureaucratic State Capitalism are not calculated to bring out the qualities of self-help which he wants our villages and our common people to show.

Self-help only comes when the qualities on which it is based are given recognition and encouragement. What are those qualities? Those qualities are the qualities of enterprise, of hard work, of taking risks, of trying to improve the condition of oneself and one's family, to get a little more for one's children and oneself than people round about have.

What incentives have been provided by this Government to encourage hard work and enterprise among the people? On the contrary, I make bold to say that, by and large, the policies of this Government, whether in the field of agriculture or of industry or trade,

[Shri M. R. Masani]

have been such as to discourage enterprise, hard work and the capacity to take risks. The policy of spoon-feeding the people, of expecting the *ma-bap sarkar* to do everything for them, from producing steel, to producing fertilisers, to producing various other things, is not a policy which evokes the sentiments of self-help and self-respect among the people.

Therefore, while I agree entirely with the Prime Minister in saying that what this country needs above all is the spirit not of wanting Government to do things for us, but of doing things for ourselves, Government will have to change their policies quite radically before they evoke these qualities of self-help which we all want to see.

Now, Sir, in the brief time that we have, I would like to place before the House three outstanding facts with which we are faced and three priorities which I venture to suggest. The first fact is that of inflation. This inflation has been proceeding for quite a long time and nobody has denied its existence.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair.]

The Finance Minister and the Planning Minister have both admitted that this is not an accident, that this inflation is a consequence, and a direct consequence of the Second Five Year Plan. Mr. Nanda, in his opening speech in this debate said:

"The major explanation is.... what we have done ourselves. It is the steadily gathering momentum of the Plan and something for which we were not quite prepared."

May I ask, Sir, why we were not prepared for this? It is not as if no voices were raised pointing out that the Planframe and the Second Plan were inevitably going to create inflation in this country. May I remind the House, Sir, that one of the Members of the Planning Commission, Mr. K. C.

Neogy, had the prescience and the courage to voice this view to the point of what came to be called almost a minute of dissent to the Second Five Year Plan, because he realised that this consequence was going to follow. Is it not also now time to pay a tribute to that lonely member of the Panel of Economists, Prof. B. R. Shenoy, who also had the wisdom, compared to the remaining twenty who were blindly led into the fold, to point out that the deficit financing contemplated in the Plan would inevitably raise prices and create inflation in this country? So, warnings were not wanting. But the warnings were ignored, because the voice of false prophets and quack economists were listened to. People who talked of "physical planning" and slogans taken from totalitarian countries were listened to rather than other economists and trained administrators.

Recently, one of the fathers of this Plan, Prof. Mahalanobis, wrote an article in *the New Age*, the journal of the Communist Party of India, in which he made this interesting statement:

"Socialist transformation requires the concurrence, and support, voluntary or otherwise, of the persons affected by each decision."

What, Sir, is involuntary support? What kind of involuntary support from the people of India does this gentleman expect? Considering that the article appeared in a communist journal, considering that it accepted altogether the methods of communist China, it is quite clear that the kind of support which Prof. Mahalanobis expects is that secured by terror and secret police. And yet, these were the people whose judgments were listened to rather than people like Mr. Neogy and Prof. Shenoy.

If there is inflation today, let us accept the fact that Government and its Plan are alone responsible for it.

Now, Sir, the Finance Minister while introducing his Budget and in particular his excise duties claimed that the

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

effect of those excise duties would be counter-inflationary. At that time, speaking in this House, on the 28th May, I took the opportunity of saying:

"I am sorry to be a pessimist and I hope the Finance Minister will prove right. But I venture in all humility to express a fear that the result of this taxation, in the context in which it has come alongside of a large dose of deficit financing, is going to set in process the very vicious spiral of inflation, rising prices, rising wages and rising costs which he, I and all of us are so keen to avert."

Now, what are the developments of the last few months and what have they got to say on this point? The rise in the general price index from the time when I made that speech in this House, from May up to August 1957, is no less than 29 per cent, a very steep rise in a few months. If you take it commodity-wise, you find that the index figures have risen as follows—

Rice	from 666 to 683
Wheat	from 541 to 548
Sugar	from 280 to 309
Coffee	from 618 to 648
Fuel, power, lighting, lubri- cants, etc.,	from 109 to 114

So, in spite of the excise duties which were claimed to be counter-inflationary, in spite of all the efforts of Government to mop up purchasing power, inflation has been proceeding at a galloping pace since the Budget was introduced, and unfortunately my pessimism has been more justified than the Finance Minister's optimism.

That in the first glaring fact we have to face, and its implications are very unhappy, because inflation is both anti-social and anti-socialist in its implications. It helps people who live on speculation; it oppresses people who have fixed incomes and salaries;

it takes away the money from the pockets of the poor and puts it into the pockets of the rich; it discourages thrift, savings and investment; it encourages consumption and hoarding. These are the consequences of a policy which was wrong from the start, of a Plan which was mistaken from the start, implications that could have been avoided if better planning and more cautious planning had been undertaken.

The second important fact is the food shortage. The Congress Working Committee have said that the deficit is one of "only 10 per cent." I did not know whether to laugh or to weep when I read that it was only 10 per cent. Only 10 per cent. of what? Only 10 per cent. of a total foodgrain production of 68.6 million tons in 1956-57. That is a deficit of 7 million tons of foodgrains. This is not a thing to which the word "only" can be applied. It is something terrific; it is something very alarming; it is something that calls for a sense of urgency which I missed from the Prime Minister's speech. If this House is to do its duty by the people, it has to bring a sense of urgency to this terrible situation in which we find ourselves today. That sense of urgency I want to know is it there? Why do I say that 7 million tons is a very big deficit? Let us see how much we imported into this country in the years when we imported more than any others. Our highest foodgrain imports were during the years 1947 to 1951. Let us see how much we managed to import. In 2.84 million tons, in 1949, 3.62 million 1947 it was 2.37 million tons, in 1948, tons, in 1950, 2.09 million tons and in 1951, the highest figure, 4.68 million tons. In the very peak year of import of foodgrains, we were able only to get together 4½ million tons from abroad. Here, we are faced with a deficit of only 7 million tons. Where is that food going to come from?

14.00 hrs.

What are the implications of this, again? It means, on the one hand,

[Shri M. R. Masani]

distress and starvation. Secondly, it means that we have to impose controls in a vain effort to control the situation. What is the result of controls? On the one hand, we want a 15 per cent. increase in food production. Are we providing the incentives for increased food production? The only incentive to the peasant is to get a better price for his foodgrains with which to purchase the consumer goods that he wants. There is no other incentive. Our controls are directed exactly to the opposite end: to deprive the peasant of his higher price, to blame the peasant for hoarding when he is doing nothing more than an intelligent self-interest point of view. dictates, of trying to get the best price for his products. We all try to get the best price for our products. For that, he is called a hoarder and Ordinances and Bills are passed to suppress him. This, whatever the ethics, is not going to bring more food production. I hope, in spite of the Report which has been placed on the Table yesterday which we shall discuss another time, we shall be very careful in doing things, however well intentioned, which may come in the way of increasing food production that we all desire.

Thirdly as the Prime Minister pointed out, increased import of foodgrains means using up valuable foreign exchange. Therefore, we come to this, that unless there is a radical change in Government's policy, the 15 per cent. increase that the Prime Minister desires and we would all like to see is not likely to materialise: certainly not with the present policy.

The third major fact to which I would like to draw attention is the inadequate resources for our efforts. The foreign exchange gap is well known to be one of Rs. 700 crores or 1,400 million dollars. I am told that the hump is still to come, that the deficit will still widen before it can shrink. However, since the Speaker has requested that we keep off the topic of foreign exchange because of

the motion that would be separately debated, which stands in the name of some of my colleagues and myself from the Independent Parliamentary Group and the Ganatantra Parishad, I shall desist from any reference to the foreign exchange gap.

What is more alarming than the foreign exchange gap is the gap in our internal resources, of which we are not yet quite conscious, of which, I am sure, by the end of this year we shall all be talking. What is the gap in our indigenous resources? What is the crisis in Rupee finance which is looming round the corner? The target for small savings was Rs. 100 crores a year. In 1956-57 we managed to collect Rs. 61.54 crores. In April to October this year for which figures are available, the collection is only Rs. 26.33 crores, a lower rate than even last year when we fell short of our target by Rs. 40 crores.

Similarly, the target of borrowing in the Plan was Rs. 140 crores a year or Rs. 700 crores for 5 years. The total net loan subscribed in 1956-57... (the bell rings).

May I mention, Sir, I am speaking for a Group and the Speaker said that they will have 20 to 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: What he said when he was leaving the Chair was, 15 minutes for each.

Shri M. R. Masani: In the beginning when he announced the debate, he said that spokesmen of groups will have 20 to 30 minutes and others 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Anyhow, the House understands that so many Members are desirous of speaking and it is only one day that is allotted for this. So each Member should try to make his observations briefly.

Shri M. R. Masani: I am afraid, I must have another ten minutes, and I crave your indulgence.

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

The borrowing target was Rs. 140 crores. The net loans subscribed in the last two years were Rs. 160 crores, at the rate of Rs. 80 crores a year as against 140. It is not only foreign exchange that we are short of. We are short of internal savings to invest in our Plan. These three facts, in my view, call for a radical re-thinking on the part of the Government.

The Prime Minister, this morning, used phrases like "slightly" more careful planning, "slightly" less. I think this is under-stating the problem. He said there was no need for radical re-phasing of the Plan. I do not know about Plan. I will certainly say that there is need for radical re-thinking on the subject of planning. We have been very mistaken in the last two years. Unless we get back to a correct plane of thinking on the subject of planning, we shall invite further disasters on our country. I was very glad when, in beginning the debate, Shri Nanda, the Minister for Planning, showed a great sense of realism in many things he said. One remark particularly I would like to quote from his speech:

"We have to do nothing which would queer the pitch of subsequent phases of development."

That shows the great danger of this misconceived emphasis in our Plan which might come in the way of our future development, apart from doing immediate harm. It is precisely from the point of view of successful planning that I am making a plea for radical re-thinking on the part of the Government and its Advisers. Mere tinkering with this Plan will not do.

I wonder if the lesson has been fully learnt? Are we prepared to discard the fanciful concept of physical planning? Are we prepared to admit frankly the fact that we have tried to put too much in heavy industry and neglected the needs of consumer goods and of agriculture? These are the two very patent defects

in the Plan which, unless they are put right, will continue to plague us.

I was delighted this morning to hear from the Leader of the Praja Socialist Party a very realistic assessment of what planning meant. He pointed out that in the countries of so-called planning, namely, Russia, China and communist countries of Eastern Europe, conditions are immeasurably worse than in the countries of Western Europe where there is no planning of that particular kind. I think he has oversimplified the matter. There is a certain kind of planning in Britain, in the U.S.A., in Sweden, in Switzerland, in West Germany, and so on. That is minimal, essential planning, real democratic planning, leaving the laws of the market and the enterprise of the people to find vent. The kind of planning that takes place in the communist countries is not only inconsistent with democracy, but has failed to deliver the goods to the people. We have to make a choice between the British, Scandinavian and American kind of planning and the planning of communist dictatorship. Until we are clear on this distinction, we shall continue to find ourselves in the kind of mess in which we find ourselves today.

What do I suggest concretely? I suggest three concrete things. One is the elongation of certain portions of investment in the Plan, as in the case of the Steel works, and the curtailing of certain other parts of the Plan. That is a matter for the Government and the Planning Commission to work out.

The second is the creation of a climate more favourable for foreign investment. That is a matter for a separate debate and I shall withhold comment on it. But I would like to say, having been in the United States a few days after the mission of the Finance Minister, that he has done a great job for the country in that visit. I did not meet any Member of the Government there. That was not

[Shri M. R. Masani]

my function. But I did meet leading figures in the world of industry and banking and I can say that the way in which the Finance Minister put across the needs of this country and the problems of this country and made out a case for support without strings on economic grounds has been a very fine piece of work for which this country should be grateful to him. As one who has crossed swords with him and will cross swords with him again, I would like to pay my tribute for the way in which he has tried to get resources for this country which it so badly needs.

Thirdly, I think, above all, we shall have to create a climate in this country which provides incentives to hard work and production and saving. If the Prime Minister found that the House was unsympathetic to his talk of self-help, as he said there was an amazing capacity to ask for help and an amazing incapacity to help oneself, what was the reason? It is because, as I have said, of the pattern of our planning. The State Capitalist drift in which we are indulging now is not one that brings out the capacity for self-help. Acharya Kripalani referred to a country, West Germany, which has managed, almost outstandingly in this world today, to solve its problems. Our Finance Minister, during his visit to West Germany met the great economic expert of West Germany, Dr. Erhard, who has been recognised for his great service to his country by being made the Vice-Chancellor or Deputy Prime Minister of that country. How did West Germany get out of a situation a hundred times worse than ours, with complete destitution, complete destruction of industry and so starving people? It did so because of the wise leadership given by Dr. Erhard, and I would like to conclude by telling you in what that leadership lies.

In June 1948, Dr. Erhard as Finance and Economics Minister terminated all rationing and all price controls. He

changed the tax laws by giving incentives to those who would build new factories, by giving more tax incentives to those who would find markets abroad and export goods from Germany. This decision of his was revolutionary. It startled not only his own advisers but it upset the British, French and American authorities who were then in possession of West Germany. Gen. Lucius Clay, the American chief in Germany, called Dr. Erhard to tell him that he was very worried about what he was doing. Gen. Lucius Clay said: "Dr. Erhard, my advisers tell me this is a terrible mistake you are making." Dr. Erhard replied: "General Clay, pay no attention to them. My own advisers tell me the same thing".

And what has been the result? The result is the phenomenal, magnificent progress that West Germany has made in the years since the war, which is unequalled by any other part of the world, capitalist or communist. We see the result before our eyes today. That was the policy of lowering taxes, letting money fructify in the pockets of the people, encouraging the peasant, the professional man, the businessman and the industrialist to make more honest profit by putting in hard work, by taking risk and showing enterprise.

An Hon. Member. And American aid.

Shri M. R. Masani: These are the qualities which we need to encourage in this country, and I can suggest no better model to our Finance Minister than to draw inspiration from Dr. Erhard and West Germany.

I shall end by quoting the memorable statement with which Dr. Erhard popularised this policy: "Turn the people and the money loose, and they will make the country strong."

श्री स्वामी (देहरादून) : सभापति महोदय, मुझ बहुत बुरी हुई कि कलानी साहब ने इतने पुरखोर तरीके से ज्ञान की

सपोर्ट में तकरीर की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्लान में न इधर की तरफ से कमी बतलायी जा रही है न उधर से बतलायी जा रही है। सब लोग यही कहते हैं कि प्लान भ्रष्टा है, इसे कामयाब बनाना चाहिए।

श्री बजराम सिंह (फिरोजाबाद) : इधर से बतलाया जा रहा है।

श्री स्याही : इधर से तो यह तकाजा था रहा है कि प्लान को बढ़ाया जाये। प्रसल में जो चीज बतलायी जा रही है वह है काम करने के तरीकों में कमी। इस बारे में मेरी कुछ नुक्ताचीनी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमीशन की धीर गवर्नमेंट को इस बात से बाखबर रहना चाहिए कि काम करने के तरीकों में क्या क्या सामियां हैं, क्योंकि सब से भ्रष्टा प्लान सभी हो सकता है जब कि प्लान करने वालों का अपनी कमजोरियों और गलतियों की तरफ ध्यान हो।

सबसे बड़ी बात जिसकी मुझे धाक खुषी हुई वह यह है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने अपनी तकरीर में कबूल किया कि अकेले एक्सटर्नल फाइनेन्स की ही कमी नहीं है बल्कि डोमेस्टिक फाइनेन्स की भी परेशानी है। यह पहली मर्तबा गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से बात आयी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि एक्सटर्नल फाइनेन्स की वाकै इतनी कोई परेशानी नहीं है कि जितनी इंटरनल फाइनेन्स की है और इस कमी की जिम्मेदारी किसी न किसी को धोड़नी पड़ेगी। अकेला यह कह देना कि सामी है डेमांडेसी के उसूल के खिलाफ है। या तो कोई मिनिस्टर साहब यहां खड़े होकर कहें कि हमारी गलती से ऐसा हुआ या प्लानिंग कमीशन कहे या धीर कोई कहे। वह तहकीकात होनी चाहिए कि यह कमी हुई तो क्यों हुई।

पहले पब्लिक सेक्टर के लिये यह प्लान ३५०० करोड़ का किया गया था। उसके

बाद स्टेटिस्टिकल प्लान का फिगर आया थी महालानोबीस का जिसमें बतलाया गया कि यह ४३०० करोड़ हो जायगा। उसके बाद मैथमेटिकल फिगर आया, जो कि प्लानिंग कमीशन की तरफ से आया, जो कि फेकनुषल चीजों को देखकर बनाया गया था, और वह फिगर था कि यह रकम ४८०० करोड़ होगी। फिर मैनन साहब की तरफ से डिफेंस वगैरह का फिगर आया कि डिफेंस पर ७०० करोड़ और ज्यादा खर्च होगा। उसको मिला कर यह रकम ५५०० करोड़ की हो गयी। इस तरह से यह चीज बढ़ती गयी। यह प्लानिंग कमीशन का या मिनिस्टर का फर्ज था कि इन चीजों की जांच की जाती कि किस किस तरह की चीजें इसमें आयेंगी और कौन कौन सी अन्य मुश्किलें सामने आयेंगी। इस प्लान को चलाने में भी कुछ सामियां हैं। और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बेहतर मौका है कि मेम्बर साहिबान ने जो मामलात मालम किये हैं उसका फायदा उठाया जाये।

मैं भ्रज करूँ कि पब्लिक सेक्टर के लिए यह फिगर था कि १००० करोड़ रूपया तो करेंट एक्स्पेंडीचर में खर्च हो जायगा और लोन और नये इनवेस्टमेंट जो होंगे वह ३८०० करोड़ के होंगे। करेंट एक्स्पेंडीचर से जो रकम मिलनी है वह तो टेक्सेशन से मिल जायेगी और खर्च कर दी जायेगी। प्रसली सवाल तो नये इनवेस्टमेंट का है जिसकी तादाद ४५०० करोड़ रखी गयी थी। उसके लिए यह तदबीर लोची गयी थी कि सेंटर की और तमाम स्टेट्स की ग्रामवनी में खर्च कुछ कम करके ३५० करोड़ बच जायेगा। बानी यह कि हर स्टेट सरप्लस बवट बनायेगी और उससे जो बचत होगी वह ३५० करोड़ की हो जायेगी और इतनी रकम करेंट करेंट रेवेन्यू से मिल जायेगी। अब यह बात किताब में लिख देना आसान था, लेकिन

[श्री त्यागी]

वह कौन सा शकस था जिसकी जिम्मेदारी यह चीज लिखने की थी। भाग उसको नेशन के सामने इसका जबाब देना पड़ेगा, क्योंकि हम देख रहे हैं कि हर एक स्टेट डेफिसिट में बस रही है हम देखते हैं कि कुछ नहीं बच रहा है स्टेट्स के बजट से और कुछ नहीं बचता है सेंटर के बजट से। इस तरफ प्राइम मिनिस्टर को और औरों को भी तबज्जह देनी चाहिए और किसने यह छापी की है उसका नाम बताया जाये। प्लानिंग कमीशन का फर्ज है कि वह इस बात की तहकीकात करे। यह तो ५० करोड़ बालाना का डेफिसिट है। इस तरह से प्लान कैसे चलेगा। इस बात की तरफ तबज्जह क्यों नहीं दी गयी कि स्टेट्स के बजट डेफिसिट हो रहे हैं, उनकी आखें कहाँ थीं, फाइनेन्स के वे एक्सपर्ट कहाँ हैं और क्या कर रहे हैं। पहले प्लान यह था कि करेंट एक्सपेंडीचर से इतना सरप्लस होगा और अब ५० करोड़ के करीब डेफिसिट हो रहा है।

अगर इसी रेट से चलता गया तो पांच बरस में २५० करोड़ के करीब डेफिसिट फाइनेन्स का सामना करना होगा। क्योंकि जिस मद को हम ग्रामदनी की मद समझते थे वह डेफिसिट की मद हो गयी।

उसके बाद ८५० करोड़ के नये टैक्स लगाने की बात थी। यह प्लान था कि पांच बरस में ८५० करोड़ की ग्रामदनी इस तरह से नये टैक्स लगा कर हो जायेगी। नये टैक्सों की उम्मीद इसलिए की गयी थी कि तेजी से काम होगा, लोगों की ग्रामदनी बढ़ेगी, इनफ्लेशन होगा और इसलिए नये टैक्सों से इतनी ग्रामदनी हो जायेगी। लेकिन यह खयाल किसी ने नहीं किया कि अगर सिर्फ इनफ्लेशन ही बढ़ा और लोगों की ग्रामदनी न बढ़ी तो ये टैक्स कैसे वसूल किये जा सकेंगे और कैसे लगाये जा सकेंगे। पिछले दो सालों में ८० करोड़ और १०६

करोड़ के नये टैक्स लगाये गये हैं यानी दो सालों में १८६ करोड़ के नये टैक्स लगाये गये हैं। अब बाकी तीन सालों में ग्रामको इतना और वसूल करना है कि कुल ८५० करोड़ हो जाये। अगर इतना वसूल नहीं होता तो यह भी डेफिसिट हो रहा है। इस तरह से ग्राम इस काम को कैसे पूरा कर पायेंगे। हम कुछ नहीं जानते कि ग्राम इससे बाखबर हैं या नहीं क्योंकि ग्राम हमसे इसके बारे में कुछ कहते नहीं हैं। बूँकि ग्राम हमसे इस बारे में कुछ कहते नहीं हैं इसलिए हम समझते हैं कि ग्राम बेखबर ह और यह बेखबरी ही हमको तकलीफ देती है। अगर सरकार इस तरह से बेखबर नहीं है तो निहायत प्राजिबों के साथ प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को और उनके साथियों को नेशन के सामने अपनी गलती को कनफेस कर लेना चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि ये नये टैक्स इतनी तादाद में नहीं मिल सकते। जो अब तक काम हुआ है उसको देखकर हम ऐसा अनुमान लगा सकते हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : ग्राम हमारा काम कर रहे हैं।

श्री त्यागी : जो काम ग्राम नहीं करते उसे हमें करना पड़ता है।

इसके बाद उम्मीद थी कि मार्केट से लोन लेकर कुछ इंटरनल फाइनेंस मिल जायेगा। ७०० करोड़ का लोन लेने का प्लान था। खयाल था कि इनफ्लेशन होगा, लोगों के पास रुपया काफी होगा और लोन प्रासानी से मिल जायेगा। यह ७०० का लोन हर साल १४० करोड़ लेकर पूरा करने का इरादा था। अभी तक १४० करोड़ के बजाये शायद १०० या ११० करोड़ का लोन लिया गया है। लेकिन इसका काफी हिस्सा पुराने लोन्स का रिज्यूथल है। इस लोन से ग्रामको सिर्फ यह फायदा हुआ कि ग्रामको पुराना लोन

नहीं देना पड़ रहा है। लेकिन आपको नहीं धामदानी क्या हुई। मैं नहीं कह सकता कि इसमें ज्यामेट्रीकल, स्टैटिस्टिकल, मैथेमेटिकल या ट्रिगनामेट्रिकल फार्मूला लगेगा। लेकिन ज्यादा से ज्यादा हम यही मान सकते हैं कि हमको जो देना था वह नहीं देना पड़ेगा और इसी को हम चाहे जो भी मानें। रेनुब्रल्स के अलावा काफी तादाद ऐसी है जो कि आपके रिजर्व बैंक ने लोन खरीद लिया है, उदाहरण के लिए खयाल कीजिये, यह भी एक फ़ैलेसी है। अगर रिजर्व बैंक लोन खरीदता है और आपके उस लोन को लोन तसब्बर करके यह मानता है कि आपने पब्लिक से लोन ले लिया तो आप इस बात को कहिये कि रिजर्व बैंक का दिया हुआ रुपया ऐसा ही है जैसे कि ज्यादा करंसी नोट छाप दिये। वह रुपया कितना लिया है क्योंकि रुपये वैसे के मामले में मैं उदाहरण के लिए क्वैटल हिसाब जानना चाहता हूँ और हाउस का फर्ज है कि वह उस को जाने। मैं प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर साहब से बहुत आज़िजी के साथ यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कितना रुपया रिजर्व बैंक से मिला है और रेनुब्रल्स का कितना है? आप मेहरबानी करके हाउस को कौन्सिल में लीजिये और यह इनफ़ॉर्मेशन हाउस को दीजिये, खाली आपका यह फ़ीमस दे देना कि इतना लोन लिया, हमारे ऊपर इसका यह असर पड़ेगा कि आप हमको कुछ भजब तरीक़े से बात बता रहे हैं और कुछ बीच बीच में हम से छिपा रहे हैं, पूरी बात नहीं बता रहे हैं और इससे हमें तकलीफ़ पढ़ेगी। आप हमको पहले अपनी मजबूरियाँ तो बताइये। कृपलानी जी ने आज ठीक ही कहा, अब उनसे यह कहना कि वह कोई एक कंस्ट्रिक्ट तजवीज़ करें तो वह तो उसको तब करेंगे जब आप उनको अपनी कैबिनेट में ले लेंगे, बिना उसके कैसे कर देंगे। अब मुझको कैबिनेट में ले निकाला गया है, जब तक मैं कैबिनेट में था तब तक आप कंस्ट्रिक्ट तजवीज़ महसूस

कर सकते थे लेकिन अब मुझ से यह उम्मीद न कीजिये। आज भी मैं कंस्ट्रिक्ट तजवीज़ कर सकता हूँ बशर्ते आप हाउस के सामने सच्चाई के साथ सब कन्फ़ैस कीजिये और अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो हाउस आपके साथ सहयोग करेगा। उस हासत में मैं आपको यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हाउस आपके साथ सहयोग करेगा। मैं आप से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्लानिंग के काम में आप उस हाउस का सहयोग लीजिये। यह तो आपके लोन की कैफ़ियत हुई।

स्मोल सेविंग्स लोन के मातहत आप को दो साल में २०० करोड़ रुपया वसूल करना था, ५०० करोड़ कुल आना था स्मोल सेविंग्स से। इसकी कैफ़ियत यह है जैसा कि मेरे दोस्त मसानी साहब ने बतलाया था कि ६० या ६१ करोड़ आपकी पिछले साल मिला था १०० करोड़ की जगह और इस साल आपको २०, ३० या ४० करोड़ तक मिलने की उम्मीद की जाती है। इसका फ़ाइनेंस के आसपास के लोगों से इशारा मिलता है।

Shri Naushir Bharucha: You have got Rs. 26 crores only for six months.

Shri Tyagi: The hon. Member seems to have some closer relations with somebody. Anyway, he knows better.

अगर यह कैफ़ियत आपके स्मोल सेविंग्स की है तो मैं इसको आपके इंतज़ाम की खात्री मानता हूँ और मैं इसको आपकी नाकामयाबी मानता हूँ और आप भी इसको तसलीम कीजिये कि यह आपकी खात्री है और फ़ेल्सोर है जो कि आपने मंजूर नहीं की। इससे आपका प्लान यकीनन गिरेगा। आज जाहिर है कि आपकी खात्रियों और नाकामियत की वजह से यह प्लान गिर रहा है क्योंकि आपने जो प्लान किया था वह सही साबित नहीं हुआ और वह प्लान साबित हो रहा है।

[श्री त्यागी]

१५० करोड़ रुपये रेलवेज का कंटी-ब्यूसान वा लेकिन १५० करोड़ रुपये का कंटीब्यूसान आपको मिलना नहीं है और चायद यह रेलवे बुध डेफिसिट में चल रही है ।

प्राविडेंट फंड का जहां तक साल्लुक है तो गवर्नमेंट सर्वेटस का तो आप से ही सकते हैं और यह सच हो सकता है कि २५० करोड़ आपने उसमें लिया था ।

फारेन रिसोर्सज का ८०० करोड़ रुपया था । अब फारेन रिसोर्सज की बात बहुत तकलीफदेह है, मैं इस मौके पर उसकी बाबत कुछ और ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता और जान बख़र चुप्पी साधना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि आजकल की दुनिया बड़ी गुबहे की दुनिया है । अभी मैं अपने पुराने पेशे पर नहीं आ सका हूँ उस मुहल्ले से निकल कर अभी साखा साखा धाया हूँ तो जरा अपने पुराने पेशे पर लौटने में मुझे कुछ देर लगेगी ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : इधर आ जाइये ।

श्री त्यागी : ८०० करोड़ जो आपने फारेन रिसोर्सज से लिया था वह आपको मुबारक हो लेकिन मैं यह आपसे जानना चाहता हूँ कि वह ८०० करोड़ खर्च कैसे होगा ?

डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग आपकी १२०० करोड़ की थी । लेकिन यह नोट छाप कर सिटरेल डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग १२०० करोड़ की रकना और बाकी इन्डस्ट्रियल तरीके से जो यह डेफिसिट १८०० और २४०० करोड़ की हो सकती है उसको आपने गिना नहीं, वह डेफिसिट जो स्टेट्स में बाएँ तरफ से हो रही है उसको भी तो आपने सामने रख कर हिसाब लगाइये । यह आपकी सिटरेल डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग १२०० करोड़ की है जो आप ज्यादा नोट छाप कर डेफिसिट

फाइनेंसिंग करना चाहते हैं । आपके पास जो ४०० करोड़ का भनकबर्द डेफिसिट था वह अब बिल्कवर होगा, मैं कह नहीं सकता ।

डिफेंस पर हम ७०० करोड़ रुपये की खर्चा सुनते हैं । डिफेंस की ७०० करोड़ रुपये से प्लानिंग की जा रही है । अभी मैं फिसहाल इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता ।

अमली सवाल है कि आप वह जवाब दीजिये कि आपको टोटल डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग कितनी है और ५ वर्ष में इन तमाम खामियों और खपोज की वजह से वह कुल टोटल कितना पहुँचेगा, तब ही हाउस इस बात का अन्दाजा लगा सकेगा कि आपका प्लान इस काबिल है कि उसे मंजूर किया जाय या उसमें कुछ तरमीम की जानी जरूरी है ।

मुझे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब से आज यह सुन कर खुशी हुई कि हमारे इस प्लान का कोर कोयला, लोहा, इस्पात और कारखाने ही नहीं हैं बल्कि एग्रीकल्चर है । मैं इस सिलसिले में हाउस को यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि एग्रीकल्चर की दिशा में जो कार्य किया जा रहा है वह सफल नहीं हो रहा है ।

फारेन एक्सचेंज की बाबत मैं आपके सामने कच्चा चिट्ठा रखना चाहता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि उसकी बाबत जो गलतफहमियाँ लंबी में हैं उनको रफ़ा कर दिया जाय । आपके अपने हिसाब से पब्लिक सैक्टर में ४८०० करोड़ रुपये में से १७०० करोड़ का फारेन एक्सचेंज एनबाल्ड था और प्राइवेट सैक्टर में ४५० करोड़ रुपये का फारेन एक्सचेंज एनबाल्ड था । मुझे मालूम हुआ है कि प्राइवेट सैक्टर ४५० करोड़ रुपये के एसाटमेंट का १० फी सदी का सामान ले चुका या ले रहा है । अब ४५० करोड़ रुपया जो प्राइवेट सैक्टर के वे उसने वह

इस्तेमाल कर लिखा है और आपका कारेन एक्सचेंज डेपॉजिट हुआ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इसका भी जरा जवाब दिया जाय कि यह कैसे हो गया? क्या आप कागज नहीं देखते हैं या आपके अफसरान ठीक कर और सही सही रिपोर्ट नहीं करते हैं या आपको सेक्टर या स्टेटमेंट बनाने से फुरसत नहीं मिलती है? मैं नहीं चाहता कि हमारे यहाँ फाइनेंस का काम इतना बीसा डासा हो कि इस तरीके से रुपया खिसक जाय। ४५० करोड़ का उनका एलाटमेंट था जिसका कि वह ६०फी सदी इस्तेमाल कर गये और उसके बाद जो डेफ़ेंड पेमेंट का कमिटमेंट किया है वह मेरी समझ में एक बड़ा भारी खतरा है और वह हमारे ऊपर एक बड़ा नाज़िल होगी। इसके मानी तो यह हुये कि आपकी असली प्लानिंग यह है कि किसी तरीके से यह पांच वर्ष अपने निकाल देना और पांच वर्ष के बाद की कोई पर्बाह नहीं करना क्योंकि खुदा जाने हम तब रहें या न रहें, ऐसा रवैय्या अस्तित्वाय करना में समझता हूँ कतई सलत है। पार्लियामेंट को इस किस्म की चीज करने के लिये मंजूरी नहीं देनी चाहिये। अगर हम कोई बुरा करते हैं तो उसकी सजा हमें अपने आप ही भुगतनी चाहिये और पांच वर्ष के बाद आने वाली पार्लियामेंट के ऊपर किसी किस्म का बोझ डालना मेरे खयाल में मुनासिब नहीं है और यह आगे आने वाली नई पार्लियामेंट के साथ बेईसाफी होगी।

सेठ गोबिन्द दास (जबलपुर) : समापति महोदय, आज इस योजना पर वर्तमान परिस्थिति में विचार करने के लिये हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी का जो भाषण हुआ, उससे हमारे देश को एक नई स्फूर्ति मिलेगी और एक नई आशा प्राप्त होगी, इसमें मुझे सन्देह नहीं है।

आचार्य कृपलानी ने उसके बाद जो बातें कही हैं मुझे उन्हें सुन कर कुछ आश्चर्य हुआ। उन्होंने कहा कि हमें अभी दो वर्ष और बाला चाहिये। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में वह

कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि हम दो वर्ष ठहर गये तो फिर योजना बना कर कार्य करने का हमारा जो तरीका है, हमारी जो प्रचाली है उसे सदा के लिये हमें समाप्त कर देना होगा। कृपलानी जी ने दो बातें और कही हैं। एक तो उन्होंने वन महोत्सवों पर कटाख किया और दूसरे १४ नवम्बर को जो बाल दिवस मनाया गया उसकी हंसी उड़ायी। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन तरीकों से देश को एक नई स्फूर्ति मिलती है। मैं एक छोटा सा नाटककार हूँ और नाटककार होने के कारण मनोविज्ञान को भी थोड़ा सा समझता हूँ। जिन राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी की बात आचार्य कृपलानी सदा किया करते हैं, उनके साथ केवल उम्मीं को रहने का सीमाग्य प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है, हम सभी को उनकी छत्रछाया में कार्य करने का सुभवसर प्राप्त हुआ है। हम सब यह जानते हैं कि गांधी जी भी देश की मज्ज को किस प्रकार देखा करते थे, और वन महोत्सव के मधुश और बाल दिवस के सदुश जो दिन मनाये जाते हैं उनको वे किस तरह से मनवाते थे। तो वनमहोत्सवों से चाहे उतना लाभ न हुआ हो जितनी कि घाशा भी, परन्तु यदि देखा जाये तो मायूम होगा कि उनसे भी लाभ हुआ है। जो बाल दिवस हम मनाते हैं उससे भी बड़ा लाभ हुआ है और बहुत बड़ा लाभ होने की संभावना भी है।

कृपलानी जी ने एक फूहड़ सी बात कह दी। कम से कम हम उनके सदुश व्यक्ति से यह आशा नहीं करते थे।

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad):
Is it parliamentary to say 'phoohad'?

सेठ गोबिन्द दास : आप सावध हिन्दी समझते नहीं हैं।

मैं कृपलानी जी की बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ। जब हमारे एक मित्र ने वहाँ से पूछा कि आप कोई विचारक सुझाव दीजिये।

[सैठ गोविन्द दास]

तो उन्होंने कहा : कुर्सी खाली करो, तब विधायक सुझाव दंगा। उसका कुछ उत्तर तो मेरे मित्र त्यागी जी ने दे दिया। लेकिन कृपलानी जी यहां नहीं हैं, मैं उनसे कहना चाहता था कि हमारे देश में प्रजातन्त्र चलता है। प्रजातन्त्र में चुनावों का सब से बड़ा महत्व होता है। अभी चुनाव हुये बहुत समय नहीं हुआ। घाठ महीने ही बीते हैं। इन घाठ महीनों से पहले कुर्सी पर रहने की देश और देश की प्रजा ने किस को अनुमति दी है। वे इस बात को जानते हैं सन् १९५२ के चुनाव में वे नहीं आ सके थे और यदि वे यहां भाज पाये हैं तो इसलिये कि कांग्रेस ने उनके खिलाफ कोई दूसरा व्यक्ति खड़ा नहीं किया।

उनके बाद श्री मसानी जी का भाषण हुआ। मसानी जी ने अपने भाषण में जो तीन सुझाव दिये, मैं उन्हीं तीन सुझावों से पूर्णतया सहमत हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि हमें इस पंचवर्षीय योजना में कुछ कार्यों को रोकना चाहिये। देश की वर्तमान परिस्थिति में हमें योजना पर पुनर्विचार करके कुछ कार्यों को रोकना अवश्य चाहिये। दूसरी बात उन्होंने कही कि बाहर की पूंजी को हमें आकर्षित करने का प्रयत्न करना चाहिये। यह भी उनका कहना ठीक है, और तीसरी बात जो उन्होंने कही उसको मैं सबसे महत्वपूर्ण मानता हूँ कि हमें देश में इस प्रकार के वायुमण्डल की उत्पत्ति करनी चाहिये जिससे कि हमारी यह योजना सफल हो जाये।

कठिनाइयों से हमें थोड़ा भी डरने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हमने स्वराज्य प्राप्त करने की लड़ाई के समय सन् १९२० से लेकर १९४७ तक २७ वर्षों में बड़ी से बड़ी कठिनाइयों को देखा है, हमने उन कठिनाइयों का सामना किया है और जिस अव्यय साहस से हम वे उन कठिनाइयों का सामना किया

है, उसी अव्यय साहस से हमें आज भी अपनी योजना को सफल करने के लिये उन कठिनाइयों का सामना करना चाहिये।

मैं यह नहीं चाहता कि पंचवर्षीय योजना दो वर्ष के लिये रोक दी जाये, या उसे घाने को बढ़ाया जाये। देश और विदेश के सहयोग और सहानुभूति के लिये अवश्य हमें ऐसे वायुमण्डल को तैयार करने की आवश्यकता है। इस वायुमण्डल को तैयार करने के लिये मैं कुछ सुझाव रखना चाहता हूँ। हमारे करों की प्रणाली में हमें परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है। अभी कपड़ा, शकर और तम्बाकू पर से जो बिक्री कर हटा, वह एक सही कदम है। इसी प्रकार और करों के सम्बन्ध में हमें बहुत कुछ सोचने की आवश्यकता है जिससे जो घन हमें मिलने वाला है उस घन में भी कमी न आये और लोगों को करों का भार भी महसूस न हो। दूसरे जनता की एक और शिकायत है जिसके कारण वायुमण्डल नहीं बन रहा है, वह यह कि जनता से जो घन लिया जाता है उस घन का ठीक उपयोग नहीं होता। उस घन का बहुत सा हिस्सा भ्रष्टाचार और घूसखोरी में जाता है। जनता की यह शिकायत बहुत धंधों में सही है। अगर जनता को विश्वास हो जाये कि वह करों के रूप में गरीब होने पर भी जो घन अपनी गाढ़ी कमाई का देती है, उससे सचमुच भ्रष्टाचार और घूसखोरी नहीं होगी, और उस का घन ठीक ढंग से खर्च होगा तो जनता को यह घन देने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होगी। तीसरी बात जो इस वायुमण्डल के लिये आवश्यक है, वह यह है कि हमको कुछ ऐसे काम करने चाहिये जिनसे उनका तुरन्त नतीजा निकले। दामोदर पाटी की योजना, साखड़ा मंगल की योजना, हीराकुंड की योजना, यह सब योजनायें बहुत अच्छी हैं, उनसे लाखों एकड़ भूमि सींची जा सकेगी, लाखों किलोवाट बिजली मिलेगी,

लेकिन उससे जनता वा इस देश में रहने वाले अधिकांश भागों के लोगों का सम्बन्ध नहीं है। हमको इस तरह के कार्यों की आवश्यकता है कि जिनसे जनता का तुरन्त सम्पर्क प्राये और जिनसे वह तुरन्त लाभान्वित हो। इसके लिये हमें दो बातें करनी हैं। एक तो हमको इस प्रकार की सिंचाई योजनाओं को कार्य रूप में परिणत करना है जिनका तुरन्त फल हो। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा भी कि वे माइनर इरिगेशन प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं। मैंने अभी कोई चार या पांच हजार बीस के अपने प्रदेश का दौरा किया और उसमें इस बात को देखा कि माइनर इरिगेशन प्रोजेक्ट्स का बहुत बड़ा काम हमारे देश में हो सकता है। न जाने कितने नाले हैं, न जाने कितने तालाब हैं, न जाने कितने कुएं हैं। इन नालों को अगर थोड़ा सा बांध दिया जाये, तालाबों को थोड़ा सा खोद दिया जाये, कुओं को अगर थोड़ा उधाड़ दिया जाये, तो हमें न जाने कितना पानी मिल सकता है।

इसी के साथ हमें एक दूसरा भी कार्य करना है कुटीर उद्योगों का। यह जो बड़े बड़े कारखाने बने हैं, उनकी आवश्यकता भी मैं मानता हूँ। लेकिन उसी के साथ कुटीर उद्योगों की हमें इन बड़े बड़े कारखानों से अधिक आवश्यकता है। इस प्रकार यदि हम थोड़ा सा ध्यान देकर कि इस समय की परिस्थिति में कौन से परिवर्तन आवश्यक हैं अपनी योजना के सम्बन्ध में कुछ करें तो हमें तुरन्त लाभ हो सकता है। इसके लिये हमें कुछ विशेषज्ञों की राय चाहिये कि माइनर इरिगेशन प्रोजेक्ट्स और कुटीर उद्योगों को हम इस देश में किस तरह से अधिक फैला सकते हैं। दूसरे जो कम्प्यूनिटी ब्लॉक्स और नेषानल एक्सटेंशन सर्विसेज के लोग हैं उनको इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ विशेष हिदायतें होनी चाहियें। यह जो बातें मैंने आपसे कहीं उनसे समूचे देश का सम्बन्ध है।

अब कुछ बोर्डे से समय में मैं अपने प्रान्त

की बात भी अवश्य बताना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक मेरे प्रान्त का सम्बन्ध है, मैंने अभी आपसे निवेदन किया कि मैं कोई चार या पांच हजार बीस का दौरा करके आया हूँ। हमारे प्रान्त में दो बड़े कार्य चल रहे हैं—एक चम्बल घाटी योजना और एक भिलाई योजना—चम्बल की सिंचाई से अनाज की अधिक उत्पत्ति तो होगी ही, लेकिन कृषि विशेषज्ञों को एक बात और देखनी है कि क्या इस सिंचाई से हम कुछ ऐसी महंगी फसलें भी उत्पन्न कर सकते हैं जिनसे हमारे कृषकों को अधिक लाभ हो। दूसरे जो बिजली चम्बल घाटी योजना से निकलेगी उसकी मांग बड़े बड़े कारखानों वाले अभी से करने लगे हैं। उनके कारखाने तो अब भी चल रहे हैं, वे केवल सस्ती बिजली चाहते हैं। अगर यह बिजली उनको न मिले तो भी उनके कारखाने बन्द होने वाले नहीं हैं। अतएव चम्बल घाटी की जो बिजली निकले वह बिलकुल कुटीर उद्योगों के ही काम आनी चाहिये। अगर बड़े बड़े कारखानों को उसमें से एक किलोवाट बिजली भी नहीं दी जायेगी तो मुझे बहुत खुशी होगी। हम चम्बल घाटी योजना की बिजली कुटीर उद्योगों को फैला दें।

इन दो बड़ी योजनाओं के अलावा हमारे प्रदेश में कुछ और भी काम हैं। जैसे हमारे प्रदेश में खनिज पदार्थ बहुतायत से हैं। इसकी खोज और होनी आवश्यक है कि कहाँ कहाँ कितना खनिज पदार्थ है और उसका हम कोई उपयोग कर सकते हैं या नहीं। फिर हमारे यहाँ बड़े बड़े जंगल हैं। इन जंगलों की चोंचों का ऐन पदार्थों के लिये उपयोग करना चाहिये कि जिन पदार्थों की मांग अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में भी है। जैसे कि मैं आपको एक दृष्टान्त दूँ। हमारे जंगलों में रोसा नामक बास है। इस बास से ऐसा तेल निकाला

[सेठ गोविन्द दास]

जा सकता है जिसकी मांग अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र में भी है।

फिर हमारे प्रदेश में ऐसे स्थानों पर विशेष ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये जहाँ प्रादिवामी और हरिजन रहते हैं जैसे छत्तीसगढ़ जिले, और मंडला जो कि पुराने महा-कोशल क्षेत्र के हैं, पुराने मध्य भारत के झाबुआ और धार और पुराने विन्ध्य प्रदेश के समस्त जिले। इनकी ओर विशेष ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये।

हमारे प्रदेश में यातायात के साधनों की बहुत कमी है इसलिये वहाँ पर अनेक योजनाएं अशुद्धी तरह कार्यरूप में परिणत नहीं हो पातीं। हमें इसके लिये अधिक मड़कें चाहिये, अधिक रेलें और उनके लिये हमें अधिक रूपाया चाहिये।

फिर मध्य प्रदेश में नर्मदा के ब्रह्मान होशंगाबाद श्रीकारेश्वर, हंडिया और बड़वानी के चार पुल जल्दी से जल्दी बन जाने चाहिये। इन पांच पुलों को हमें बहुत अधिक आवश्यकता है।

इसमें मुख्य जरूरत धन की है जो हमको घर से मिल सकता है, बाहर से मिल सकता है। लेकिन यह रूपाया हमको तब मिल सकता है जब हम इसके लिये जनता में एक वायुमंडल पैदा करें। और जहाँ तक हम वायुमंडल का सम्बन्ध है मैं हमेशा से यह कहता रहा हूँ कि कुछ कार्य ऐसे हैं जिनको हम सब दलों को मिल कर करना चाहिये। चुनावों में हम लड़ सकते हैं लेकिन अगर राष्ट्रीय कार्यों में सब दल मिल कर काम करें तो हमें बहुत सफलता मिल सकती है। यदि प्रजातन्त्र में रहकर हमें निर्माण का काम करना है और उसे सफल बनाना है तो इस सहयोग की नितान्त आवश्यकता है। जैसा कि अभी त्यागी जी ने कहा, और उन्होंने ठीक ही कहा, कि वहाँ तक इस योजना का सम्बन्ध है वहाँ

तक किसी का मतभेद नहीं है। वह किस प्रकार कार्यान्वित की जाय इस में भेद हो सकता है। परन्तु इसमें भी मतभेद न हो और सब लोग मिल कर काम करें इसके लिये वायुमंडल उत्पन्न करने की आवश्यकता है जिसके लिये अभी मसानी जी ने भी इतना कहा है और जिसके लिये मैंने भी जोर दिया है। उस वायुमंडल को उत्पन्न करने के लिये मैंने कुछ सुझाव भी प्रस्तुत किये हैं।

मैं इस पंचवर्षीय योजना और सभी रचनात्मक कार्यों का बड़ा भारी समर्थक रहा हूँ और आज भी हूँ। मेरा विश्वास है कि हम इन कठिनाइयों का अदम्य साहस से सामना करके आगे बढ़ते चलें जायें तो यह पंचवर्षीय योजना सफल होगी। फिर जैसा कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है, हमारी इस योजना की सफलता पर हमारी त्रितीय योजना निर्भर है, और उस पर चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना निर्भर है। इस में और दूसरे देशों में जहाँ योजनाएँ कार्यान्वित की गयी हैं और सफलता मिली है उनमें से अनेकों स्थानों का मैंने देखा है और मैंने देखा है कि अनेक कठिनाइयों के बावजूद जब ये देश अदम्य साहस के साथ आगे बढ़े हैं तभी अपने उद्देश्य को सफल कर सके हैं और अपने ध्येय पर पहुँच सके हैं। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस विषय में खाज की आयेगी कि हमारी योजना में किन बातों को घटाया जाये और किन बातों को बढ़ाया जाय और यह खोज करके हम हममें आगे बढ़ेंगे और इस देश के सब राजनीतिक दल और सब नेता हयको अपना सहयोग देंगे।

Shri Bhagavati (Darrang): We have today to review the Plan in relation to the current economic condition of the country. It is obvious that there is a growing strain on the economy of the country. The strain is mainly due to the internal rise in price and

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

external payments deficit. The Reserve Bank of India report—June 1957—has noted that the high and continuous deficit in external payments is the main feature in the economy of the country during the year. As regards the internal situation it may be noted that there is a rise of wholesale prices by 8.3 per cent between June 1956 and June 1957 on the top of a rise of 13.8 per cent during 1955-56. Reviewing the Plan in the first year, it has been noted that the revised estimate is about Rs. 760 crores as against the budgeted figure of Rs. 830 crores. The pattern of outlay reveals a deficit of about Rs. 270 crores. So, the economy of the country is very much strained.

Now, the question arises whether the Plan has to be pruned with a view to meet the financial emergency or whether a certain rephasing has to be done. A controversy has been raised on this issue. When the Prime Minister in the initial stage said that the Government was determined to go ahead with the Plan in spite of the financial difficulty, the country felt assured. When later on the Finance Minister talked about the core of the Plan only, some misgivings were created. Now, there is so much of confusion about the future of the Plan. The Government also does not seem to be very definite about the future. I beg to submit that this is a very bad situation. We have to face this situation boldly. Every year we talk of some crisis or the other. Such talks only create confusion in the minds of the people. The people are confused about what the Government is going to do in certain matters. The people should have some certainty about the Plan.

I have heard some prominent Members raising the question whether there should be a plan at all, whether the Plan should be cut down, whether the fundamentals of the Plan should be this way or that way and so on. If we go on arguing like that, I think we shall never be able to build a national psychology which

is essential for the implementation of the Plan.

We all know that our people have not the enthusiasm for working out the Plan. We have developed the psychology of asking something from somebody else. In this atmosphere if we always go on saying that there are so many difficulties and we may not take up this work even after the Parliament has accepted the Plan, I think the people will only lose their enthusiasm and there will be no enthusiasm for working the Plan.

We all say that what is most needed is not money but enthusiasm. If the man-power in our country can be harnessed, as the Prime Minister has told us today in this House, then much can be done. It is obvious that other countries have gone ahead in that way. We have to follow suit. But here we always create a pessimistic atmosphere. Criticism is necessary, nobody denies that. We have to criticise the Plan. But once the House has accepted the Plan it is no good arguing about the fundamentals of the Plan. Now we can only discuss the achievements or the progress made during this year. The House can blame the Government if they have failed to reach the targets according to schedule. That is I think the right way of implementing the Plan.

I, therefore, submit that the Government should make it clear to the people that they are going to implement the Plan. There should be no curtailment. I know we have to take a realistic view. There is the financial difficulty and all that. It is no good repeating them. We have to see how these difficulties can be overcome. We can raise money within our country. I should like to suggest that a good reserve of gold may be raised in this country. That will raise the prestige of the rupee in the world. That will also make our internal position stronger. Foreign exchange difficulty will be there, but we can overcome

{Shri Bhagavati}

that later on. We cannot go on debating on that. We have to go ahead and implement the Plan. We have to create an atmosphere for the implementation of the Plan. But our discussions should not be allowed to create a pessimistic atmosphere in the country. That will be, I believe, suicidal.

I would also like that the Ministers also talk in the same way. They may have to make different statements from different angles in different contexts or circumstances, but it must be seen what the total impression of their statements on the people is, how the people feel about what they say. That is very important.

Now I would like to refer to some facts relating to the State of Assam.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has only five minutes more. He may just refer to the important points.

Shri Bhagavati: Under the First Five Year Plan nothing was taken up in the central sector in the State of Assam. Next to USA India has the highest resources in waterpower. I believe the water resources of Assam is the highest in India. Even then the electricity position of Assam is the lowest.

The largest concentration of tea is in Assam. It may be seen that in 1954 82,000 tons of fertilisers valued at Rs. 2.80 crores was purchased by the tea industry alone. Even then a fertilizer factory is not situated in Assam.

In 1954 freight earnings on river and rail transport from tea were Rs. 3.86 crores. Yet the transport difficulty in Assam is very great. I can only cite one instance, which is given in the Third Annual Report of the All India Handloom Board, to show the disadvantages from which the industries in Assam suffer. It is stated in that report:

"Due to breakdown of communications the major portions of the yarn ordered in July 1954

arrived in Assam in 1955-56. Only 157 bales were procured by the Government during this year. As a result of the higher price of the yarn imported in July 1954 many societies and institutions suffered heavy loss."

This is a Government report. This fact alone will show what amount of transport difficulty is there. I would, therefore, urge that in future planning the problems of Assam may be taken note of and some major projects under the central sector may be taken up there.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, we are supposed to discuss planning in all its aspects when our economy and Second Plan is running into serious difficulties. In order to make a proper appraisal of the situation I would like first to diagnose the disease or the defect which has ultimately brought these difficulties with which we are face to face today.

In my opinion we are doing planning with a very short-term thinking and planning for a long-term period, and all the difficulties regarding foreign exchange, regarding food and internal resources stem from the very weakness of the planning machinery. This is my first submission. I do not know what the function of our planning machinery is. Neither is it an advisory body consisting of technicians giving advice in planning, which would be binding on the Government because the Government representatives are always there nor is it entrusted with the overall direction of national economy for the period of the Plan. The difficulties that we are facing naturally arise from this peculiar situation.

15.00 hrs.

For instance, there is the foreign exchange difficulty. Everybody is talking about it. But I would like to submit that during the period of 18 months imports at a rate almost

double the average rate of such imports provided in the Second Five Year Plan, were allowed to be made—statistics prove it—what was allocated for 5 years has been exhausted in terms of foreign exchange. Was there no budgeting? The Prime Minister said at an earlier stage that we must do some perspective planning. Where is that perspective, I would like to know. If there had been perspective planning, if there had been proper budgeting for import of goods, if priorities had been fixed and if allocations from the public sector to the private sector had been properly demarcated, the present difficulties would not have come up as they have come up today. But this has not been done. This must be clearly understood.

The budgeting was not done because, as I said, I do not know exactly what the Planning Commission is supposed to do. Whose task is it? Either the Planning Commission is entrusted with the overall direction and control of economic development in this country or it is just, as I said, an advisory body and advising, it is said, is just like kissing. It is very cheap and Government can discard it at any time they choose. Therefore, nobody at the high-up could be said to be responsible for the present anarchic state in which we are placed. Therefore, either the Planning Commission is made all-powerful or it is made a technical body giving advice from sphere to sphere as situations arise. When there is the question of food, the Planning Commission's advice is there and it should be made public, so that we will be in a position to know whether the Government have discarded it or not. Then there is the question of imports and licences being granted. The Planning Commission should have a check on every step that is being taken from stage to stage. If this is not done, I am afraid our planning, with all the goodwill and the sacrifices made by the people—and people are ready to make tremendous sacrifices—will not achieve

the objective that is before us. I repeat this submission with a view to bring basic weakness of our planning body so that it would be remedied forthwith.

Regarding foreign exchange and food, I would like to make a few observations. As we all know, the main consumer of our foreign exchange is food. This has been the position from year to year—statistics prove it—excepting one or two good seasons when times were easy and we thought that we were producing more and we should discard importing food. We make tall declarations without looking to the consequences and without caring to build up reserves for times of need, with the result that today we find ourselves in great difficulty.

As my friend, Mr. Masani, just now observed, we are seeing that in West Germany, there is phenomenal development. Why has that development taken place? He has failed to mention one important factor. It is because of the foreign aid, particularly American aid. Whatever is given by U.S.A. to the foreign countries, a major portion of it—I have not got the figures just now—has gone to West Germany and therefore West Germany has developed phenomenally. That is not available to us. Primarily we will have to depend upon ourselves.

The Prime Minister just mentioned that China is facing the same difficulties. I know it; I am a close student of Chinese developments. Instead of making some rambling remarks on planning as he did, I would have liked the Prime Minister placing a concrete statement as Chou En-lai has placed from year to year, making self-criticism, showing the targets, showing where they have reached the targets and where they have failed and why they have failed. I would point out one small instance. In the last statement that he made, he discovered that in the backward side of China, they are trying to raise agricultural production and there the production could not be raised to that

[Shri Khadilkar]

level. So, he has said that as in other areas, we will have to give a greater impetus to production there by giving a fair deal to the primary producer I mean the agriculturist. He has pointed out that in his general review of the situation. Is there such a critical review here? I am puzzled. I always find it missing.

We are supposed to discuss planning in a vacuum, with what appears in the Press. As Mr. Masani said, it was quite obvious. The Press is more interested in playing what we call *Shallya Neeti*; it counsels caution magnifying all our difficulties because the Press in this country is under the domination of the private sector. They are bringing forward argument after argument for pruning the Plan, for rephrasing it, adhering to the core and there is a core within that core. I do not know after all what this loose talk means and what remains to-day which we are really determined to carry out. This is the Plan and come what may, we will carry it out—this note is lacking. One is puzzled by all this propaganda on one side and very loose talk from the ruling party and some people not exactly belonging to the ruling party indulging in such talk and creating an atmosphere of defeatism and demoralisation all-round and I do not know what is going to happen.

You take the instance of China. Is there such a propaganda going on there, I would like to know. There, before the decisions are taken, all people and all parties are consulted. But once the decisions are taken, you can examine the decision in its execution, whether it is wrong and so on. Once the decision is taken, all the parties concerned are responsible to see that it is implemented. Here nobody is responsible to implement the decisions.

Today we have got the question of food. As I said, we are importing food sometimes to the tune of Rs. 120 crores a year. This year, if I mistake not, already we have imported to the

tune of Rs. 80 crores, excluding Rs. 25 crores worth of food we are getting by way of loan under the American agreement. Then, there is a big document produced by Shri Asoka Mehta. Why has the question of food in a backward country like ours not been tackled primarily? When we think of planning, planning in India means raising a super-structure on the basis of agriculture. 50 per cent of our national income comes from agriculture and if we neglect that sector, then with all our tall talk there is no question of our going ahead with the Plan. If the present attitude is not changed in time pruning will have to be done. Some targets will have to be given up, whether we like it or not.

But, what have we done to strengthen the agricultural base of our Plan? As you all know, two delegations were sent to China. Their reports are out. What have they said: they have unmistakably pointed out that as in China, in India we must declare what price our primary producer will get before sowing season is over. He should not be made dependent on the free market price. If that price is guaranteed, then certainly, he will get greater energy and enthusiasm and he will produce more and thereby our difficulties will be much lessened. Our two delegations have pointed out this thing. But nothing has been done.

I am told—I do not exactly know whether it is correct—that in 1955-56 even the Planning Commission suggested this to the Government. They recommended that the stability of the agricultural economy should be maintained and a minimum price should be guaranteed before the season. But nothing has been done. As I have said earlier, I have no data to verify whether the Planning Commission had advised our Government and they have discarded that advice.

When we are in difficulties, as in the good old days, we take resort to committees or commissions. Another

Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation

committee has come out with a big volume. I had no time to go through it. Nor is it available. Yet, I have seen a summary of it. In the matter of food we never had a definite policy. Sometimes it is a short term policy and sometimes it is a long term policy. Sometimes we plan for even a week or almost a season, and sometimes we are supposed to plan for a few years.

This question of food, had it been properly tackled at the proper time from the beginning, I am sure the difficulties that we are facing today regarding foreign exchange would not have been of such a big magnitude. But nothing has been done so far. In 1948 we were ready to abandon controls without much thought. Next when two seasons were good, we thought we need not import anything more without building up reserves. Now, when we are in difficulties, we are again thinking in terms of controls and partial rationing. But the ruling party is allergic to controls. They have been brought up in a free market economy and therefore they cannot bear controls. They want to give some protection to the primary producer. That can be done only if control is properly imposed. Unfortunately, the situation in which we are placed is of an anarchic nature.

I will give a few statistics regarding food. From the pre-Plan period of 1950-51 up to 1954-55 we have been importing foodgrains to the tune of roughly Rs. 120 crores in value on an average every year. In 1953-54 and 1954-55 we imported roughly Rs. 72 crores and Rs. 68 crores worth of foodgrains respectively. It is true that in the year 1955-56 our import of foodgrains totalled only Rs. 17.68 crores. In the first nine months of the year, from April to December, 1956 we imported wheat and rice worth Rs. 40 crores. From the beginning of the year 1956-57 the Union Government had a programme of purchasing about 2½ million tons of wheat every month. Other foodgrains have also been purchased. Since the

beginning of the year, the total purchase, as I have said, comes to roughly Rs. 40 crores. It is certainly a very disturbingly large figure. After reaching the peak year of 1953-54, there has been a fall in production in the subsequent years. How much of foreign exchange is being lost in this way? We must also remember that along with foodgrains, we are also importing raw cotton and jute. So, unless our efforts are directed towards raising the production of foodgrains, whatever aid by way of loan we may get, would not give stability to our economy under any circumstances. That is how we have tackled our food problem. Before turning to foreign exchange position, I would repeat, if the primary producer is guaranteed price, certain land reforms are immediately introduced, if certain minor irrigation works are undertaken and other facilities are given to the agriculturist, instead of subsidising food which ultimately profits the hoarder and not the primary producer, if these measures are taken, I am sure we will have sufficient internal resources.

Regarding foreign exchange, the Prime Minister has stated—and the Speaker also ruled it—that we should not mention our missions that were abroad in search of aid; how it affects us and how it was tackled by three different missions that visited foreign countries, that will be discussed later. But, incidentally, I think I should mention this issue also because, otherwise the discussion won't be complete.

On the eve of his departure to America, our Finance Minister placed a very big value on my friend, Mr. Dange. He thought that by making a casual remark—perhaps he must have made it casually; it has been published without its proper context; I take it; he never meant it; he never meant to cast aspersions on our neighbours like China or Soviet Union, that also I take it. He would perhaps be able to satisfy at least the Republican element, which is terribly anti-communist, and that they would certainly under-write our Plan to the tune

[Shri Khadilkar]

of 1,000 million dollars. Unfortunately, American business people are hard-headed. They are not prepared to underwrite Mr. Dange and his associates to that level and now the present value placed on their head or their capacity or the social force they represent is worth about 250 million dollars to 100 million dollars; if I mistake not, these are the figures.

I am reminded about the story which, perhaps, was on the mind of the Finance Minister when he made that remark in a jocular way. When Marshal Aid was being distributed in Paris this story was current. Two innocent islanders went to the Marshal Aid Directorate. They thought: their country is very backward and its economy needs help and Marshal Aid is being distributed very generously to all the countries. They went to the Marshal Aid Directorate and pleaded: Look here, ours is a very tiny State. Will you oblige us with some aid? Then, certain enquiries were made and the Marshal Aid Directorate found out that there is no question of communism or communist party there. So, they bluntly told them: look here, you don't need much of aid at our hands because your problems are totally different. Realising the political difficulties, these two political innocents went to *La Humanite*, the Communist Party organ in Paris and requested them to lend the services of two people like comrade Dange and others so that they could visit the State and, in a few years' time, rear there a small party so that Marshal Aid would be given to them. This story was current when Marshal Aid was being distributed in Paris. This shows how dollar aid is given as well as the method of approach to it. I thought, when I read about this, that in order to secure funds from foreign countries, our Finance Minister had just jocularly made this remark placing a certain value on the head of Dange and his compatriots. But that trick has also failed. Today the position is this.

From his statement we can obviously expect some aid, but we do not know exactly at what time it would come. Whether one likes it or not, one must draw conclusions.

In China for their first Five Year Plan, whatever the Chinese Government and people needed by way of help to build up their industrial base was assured and given by the Soviet Union and the development of China took place according to their plan. Somebody made a reference to Rourkela. I know what difficulties Rourkela is facing and we are not sure whether it would succeed or not, because we are at the mercy of many parties we have taken the contract. There is not one responsible party for execution of the project. The three missions, the Finance Minister, the Governor of the Reserve Bank and the private industrialists who went over all the Western world have appealed for help to the Western world. They gave an impression that we are in serious trouble, unless you come forward with generosity and help our plan, we are likely to be doomed. I am afraid this method of tackling the foreign exchange problem is basically wrong and it does not do credit to a Government elected by the people in this land. This must be taken note of. It has brought discredit to this Government. If Government to Government negotiations had been carried on, showing them clearly our needs, as equals we want this help from them; if they give well and good; in what way we want the help we could have clearly indicated, from plan to plan, from project to project. We could have told them that if they are prepared to under-write we were ready to welcome it. But unfortunately this method has not been followed, whatever G. D. Birla & Co. might say the difficulties for the public sector will be there. So far as private sector is concerned looking to the import figures they have built up raw materials. They have imported machinery and they are going to over-fulfil their plan. The

private sector will go ahead in many ways. So far as the public sector is concerned, we are more or less hamstrung.

We do not know what would be the fate of these projects at the present juncture, when we are discussing the Plan. As I said, I had expected from the Government an unequivocal statement on the Plan; that they mean business; that they do not want just to toy with the idea of planning. This has been done in other countries; so we must have a Plan. This is not our ideal. They have big power plants and now they are thinking of atomic plants; so we will have them. This way of imitation will lead us nowhere and will achieve no results. Let the people in the country be taken into confidence and told once and for all in unequivocal and convincing words that we mean business. We want to stick to this steel plant, because steel plants are the base by which we can transform our backward economy into a progressive economy. One man employed in a steel mill will provide employment for seven men outside. Out of that the whole process of industrialisation will percolate from that Centre, radiate from that Centre to other areas. This is not being done unfortunately.

So, I would request the Planning Minister to come forward with an unequivocal statement. There is another thing as I said about the Finance Minister raising internal resources, human and material. Our Planning Minister thought that he could raise resources by organising *sadhus*. Excuse me for criticising him. Do *sadhus* understand what is planning? In my opinion, *sadhus* are more concerned with the affairs of the other world—and their tribe is encouraged to join forces for planning in this world, I am afraid the consequences would not be desirable. The Prime Minister criticised my friend Shri Bharucha for not understanding planning and perhaps rightly criticised. But do *sadhus* understand planning? Do they understand the implications of the

plan? They know how to beg and perhaps....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought the fling was meant only for the front and not the sides.

Shri Khadilkar: *Sadhus* understand how to beg and beg with good results. They know how to hypnotise people with all the talk of spiritualism and what not. Do Government want to learn the art of begging by organising these people?

As the Prime Minister said we want to stand erect, on our own legs; we want to go ahead. That sense of urgency, that sense of determination, we want to impart at this juncture to the whole Plan. That is the question. We have been hearing all these speeches. Some are cynical, some are coming out of frustration, some are coming out of ignorance, some out of adherence to the outmoded method of Keynesian economic, stimulate demand and all that. I do not want to repeat without understanding the implications of a backward economy in a country like ours, how our planning can be made a success we must leave old groves of thought. Unless the men in power are prepared to shed these cobwebs from their heads, regarding planning, I am afraid our Plan will flounder, not because there is shortage of foreign resources, not because people are not ready to sacrifice, not because people are not eager to build up. As I said, they want schools, they want good roads, they are prepared to give *shram dan*. I have seen it with my own eyes that with all the grumble they have taken the burden of taxation. There is shortage of food. Whatever little attempt at rationing has been made in Calcutta and Bombay to remove the hardships—people would not fail us, if we are serious.

So I would suggest that a Government recently elected on the basis of the Plan as their programme must stick to it. In this democratic set up they must go to the people. If they fail, if the Plan fails in all honesty

[Shri Khadilkar]

they must say: we are not equal to the task; we do not deserve the trust which people have placed in us.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Thiruvella): This morning I had been listening to the speech of our hon. Prime Minister with great care and attention, but to be frank I must say that I was really disappointed. As the hon. Prime Minister himself has stated, after September 13th, the day when we had a discussion on the Second Plan, many things have happened. We naturally expected that the Prime Minister would go deeper into those developments and show the way out of the present difficulties and crises which the Plan is facing. But we could not find any concrete solution for our difficulties in the speech of the hon. Prime Minister.

Now the whole country is discussing the difficulties of the Second Five Year Plan. I want to point out that the present difficulties, the present crises were not quite unexpected. Many prominent economists, many political parties in this country at the time of the framing of the Plan itself, pointed out that if we go in this way, if the present policies and methods of the Government are not changed, we will be landed in difficulties in the near future. I pointed out this not to say that we have said and you have not cared to attend to this. I would like to say that we do not take pleasure in pointing out the failures of the Government. It is not a pleasure for any one in this country to see that our Plan is facing a serious crisis.

Some 18 months back, the Communist Party of India in a resolution adopted in its Party Congress at Palghat pointed out that the present policies of the Government will create large difficulties for the Plan. The Party Congress in its resolution said:

"The Second Five Year Plan proposes to raise resources through foreign assistance, increased taxation, forced savings and heavy deficit financing. While excessive reliance on foreign assistance makes the Plan precariously dependent on certain factors beyond our control, increased taxation and forced savings place fresh economic burdens on the people and deficit financing on such a big scale as proposed in the Plan without measures to counteract the activities of monopolists and speculators gives rise to the dangers of inflation and further accumulation of wealth in the hands of the rich."

All these endanger the realisation of even the existing targets and make the future of the Plan uncertain.

We should examine whether during the last two or three months, the Planning Commission or the Central Government have made genuine attempts to get out of the present difficulty, whether there is any attempt on the part of the Planning Commission to change the present policies of the Government, to change the present methods, to change the present approach to the whole problem. The whole trouble lies in the present approach to the problem. If we take the question of foreign exchange, if we take the question of the internal resources, if we consider the question of the food problem, in all these questions we can find that the present policies of the Government have created the crisis. The real reason for the crisis is the present policy or the present methods adopted by the present Government. Unless we change the present policies, unless we adopt a really national democratic approach to the whole problem, we cannot solve our present difficulties and we cannot get out of this crisis.

This question of foreign exchange would be solved if the Ministry of Commerce and Industry took care when they issued licences for imports. Other hon. Members have made it very clear that in the past, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry did not take any care in issuing licences for imports. As a result of that, the private sector has gained at the expense of the public sector. Really, the question is which sector, private sector or the public sector, should be given more importance. That is the real question before us according to me. Really there is a campaign going on throughout the country for the last so many years so to say, especially for the last so many months, there is a tussle going on between the private sector and the public sector. My fear is that the private sector in its struggle against the public sector has won its case or it is going to win its case if the present policies of the Government are going to be pursued as they are pursued today.

If we go into the facts of the case, if we go into the crisis of foreign exchange, we can see that imports in 1956 stood at Rs. 1076.5 crores, an increase of Rs. 326 crores over the previous year, they were not only considerably higher than the Plan forecast for 1956-57, but even exceeded the peak level anticipated therein. The divergence between the expected and actual imports may be attributed to an unexpected larger tempo of industrial activity in the private sector coinciding large-scale import demand in the public sector, showing absence of adequate phasing, or some under-estimation in the import content of the Plan, particularly in regard to iron and steel, or larger imports of foodgrains or the cumulative effect of successive liberalisation of import policies.

Of the total increased imports that is Rs. 326 crores, during the year, the share of the private sector was Rs. 184 crores and of the Government only Rs. 142 crores. That is the real posi-

tion. That is why I say that in the struggle that the private sector is carrying on against the public sector, against the policy of giving more importance to the public sector, the private sector is winning its case. Of the Government imports, foodgrains amounted to Rs. 102 crores out of Rs. 142 crores. Our policy in respect of imports and exports, our policy on the question of foreign exchange is an erroneous one. Government is not taking care to see that our commitments with regard to the public sector are given predominance or preference over our commitments with regard to the private sector.

Our foreign exchange difficulty is almost the result of our difficulties on the food front. Our Prime Minister dealt at length with our food problem. The Congress Working Committee some days back dealt with the problem, but they reached the conclusion that it is not as serious as it is supposed to be by some people. Really, the problem is very serious. The report of the Asoka Mehta Committee has come to the conclusion that in the coming years of the Second Plan, per year, we will have to import about 3 million tons of foodgrains from other countries. When the Second Plan was framed, nobody thought that we would have to drain our resources for importing so much of foodgrains from other countries. Now, we have come to that position. Our Prime Minister, in order to overcome the difficulties on the food front, in order to overcome the difficulties on the front of agriculture, made several suggestions. He talked of short term crops, he talked of eating bananas and potatoes; he talked of manure; he talked of all these things. But, I was surprised to find that he did not even make mention of the most important problem of land reforms.

We know that the Planning Commission had a panel to go into the whole question and they did a lot of work, useful work I should say. They

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

submitted some proposals to the Planning Commission. I think it has a history of three or four years now. Our Prime Minister himself, I think in the first session of the Second Parliament, admitted before this House that the State Governments—all the State Governments so to say—have failed to implement the vital and fundamental land reforms and that they should pay more care in implementing land reforms. The National Development Council has fixed a date that all the States should implement the land reforms within the next three years. But, when we were discussing the Plan and when the hon. Prime Minister was speaking on it, when he dealt at length with ever so many small problems, he did not even make mention of this vital issue. That shows that this problem is not uppermost even in his mind. That shows that this problem is not uppermost in the minds of the planners in our country, of the Members on the Treasury Benches. Unless we tackle this problem, there is no solution for this crisis that is facing us for so many years.

We know it may be a difficult problem for the ruling party to tackle because they have to take into account certain interests that are entrenched in the ruling party. That may be a difficulty for the party, but for the sake of the country, for the sake of the Plan, for the sake of progress, we have to tackle that problem. Some people have to suffer a lot if the whole country has to progress. So, unless the basic, fundamental land reforms are implemented, we are not going to get over the food problem. There can be *vana mahotsava*, there can be some other programmes like that, there can be irrigation facilities—we should give more irrigation facilities to the peasants—but with all these steps, the most important step should be land reforms and the Government is missing that. The Planning Commission is not placing the necessary emphasis on that aspect of the problem.

Some hon. Members have given the figures of small savings and public loans. The situation in respect of them is also very deplorable. Public loans raised by the Centre and the States in the first two years of the Second Plan total Rs. 160 crores only, but the estimated annual receipt was Rs. 140 crores. That is, there is a gap of Rs. 120 crores. In small savings, in the first year we could get only Rs. 65 crores, but our estimate was Rs. 100 crores.

So, our crisis is not a crisis of foreign exchange only. It is equally, or on a bigger scale, a crisis of internal resources. How can we expect the people in the rural areas to save money for the Plan, to contribute to the public loans that we are raising for the Plan unless there is an equitable distribution of what we produce. So, the fundamental problem is that land reforms are very closely connected with the equitable distribution of what we produce on the fronts of industry and agriculture, and unless we adopt such an attitude, we cannot expect our people to make sacrifices, to contribute to the public loans and the small savings scheme. So, fundamentally there should be a departure from the present policies of the Government, and that departure has to be made in the direction of upholding the interests of the public sector against the private sector. The private sector will have only a secondary place.

I want to know whether the Government have changed their position now and are now giving a more prominent place to the private sector than the public sector, or whether it is given as important place as the public sector. As we have understood it, the policy underlying the Second Plan is that the public sector should have the first place and the private sector should have only a secondary place. So, if we are unable to check and regulate the activities of the private sector, and if we

are unable to distribute in an equitable way what we produce, we cannot expect our people in the rural areas and in the towns, the popular masses, to contribute their mite for the implementation of the Plan.

Really, my doubt is whether there is some kind of joint activity in which even the members of the Government are involved, to make a change in the accepted policy of the Government with regard to the Second Plan. Several statements of our Ministers' especially several statements of our Finance Minister, indicate that there is some such attempt to change the accepted policy of Government, to change the policy accepted by this Parliament.

For example, our Finance Minister said in New York that there will be no more nationalisation. Is that policy accepted by the Government, by the Planning Commission, by this sovereign Parliament? Is it a fact that there is going to be no further nationalisation? We want to know that, because unless we are able to nationalise our scheduled banks and take over the foreign trade entirely in the hands of the State Trading Corporation, we will not be able to solve our present difficulties. Our leader Shri Dange suggested these things when we began the discussion in September, but the statement of the Finance Minister shows that they are trying to reverse the present policy accepted by this House, the well-laid policy with regard to the Second Plan.

Even the Chairman of the Reserve Bank, Shri H. V. R. Iengar, when he was in San Francisco in connection with some industrial development conference, made certain statements in which he said that in India the private sector plays a dominant role. He made several such statements. Our friend Shri Masani was also there. Of course, we know his views. They are very clear and everybody knows what his views are, but the Chairman of the Reserve Bank, Shri Iengar also

made similar statements, and the Chairman of the World Bank, Mr. Block, who was present there said that certain Governments were fighting shy on the question of private capital, were against the principle of profit-making; they should leave their prejudices against private capital, they should with both hands welcome private capital. Such speeches were made in that conference, and we had our representatives there. From all these speeches we get the doubt that there is an attempt on the part of very responsible people to change the policies already laid down by the Government.

I wish to impress upon the Government upon the Ministers, that in order to find a way out of the present difficulties, the Government should call together representatives of all the parties in this country. Let us sit round a table, discuss the problems; then we will be able to find out ways and means of solving the present difficulties. I hope the Government and the Planning Commission will take necessary steps in this direction.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): I must say that the speech of the hon. Member opposite just now seemed to give the impression that the most important factor that has stood in the way of progress and implementation of the present Plan is over-emphasis on the private sector as against the public sector. If I have understood the Plan correctly, the Plan has one clear objective and that objective is that somehow or other the wealth in this country must be increased, the development and the potential of production in this country must be rapidly increased. Of course, the wealth that is produced must be equitably distributed. His second objective is also there. It is with that objective that our present policy of taxation and various other measures have been undertaken. We want to make use of every possible resource that we have. They are not merely material resources. Material resources are very important, money is very important, physical material.

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

resources are very important, but along with that, talent in the country and the manpower in the country are equally important. There is no reason why we should not make use of the talent and experience of industrialists, business men and those engaged in the lines of production for increasing production and for increasing the wealth of the country. And that is what Government are trying to do, and that is why the Plan has given a very important place to the private sector along with the public sector.

I agree that ultimately the means of production should not vest in a few individuals, that ultimately the means of production should not be monopolised, but the means of production should be vested either in the State or in the people in such a manner that the potentialities of a few individuals accumulating a lot of wealth are eliminated as far as possible. But, at the present moment, when we have to develop those means of production, when we have to develop the wealth of the country, when the object is to take the people from the starvation level to something like a living level, we must make use of all possible resources, and the talent and ability and experience of those private individuals who have been in this line for many many years should be exploited to the fullest extent. There is no reason to believe that those people are enemies of the nation, that they are not patriotic and only the Government servants are patriotic.

Now, what does nationalisation mean? It means that you put all your production, all your plants and all your factories in the hands of a few Government servants, few or many as the case may be. And some of them may do a very good job, as, in fact, they are doing, in the Chittaranjan Locomotive Factory and in some other places. But there are other places where they have not done so well. I am not criticising them. It is because of lack of experience; it is because

they have not been in this business, in the commercial line, and they do not know that. As they learn, they will become better people who will make use of their experience, as they gain it, for the betterment of the country.

Therefore, today, the question is not, to my mind, nationalisation. The question is not, to my mind, the respective roles of the private sector vis-a-vis the public sector. The question is how the private sector, the public sector, the nationalised industries and the industries in the hands of private people can all be made to produce to the maximum extent. In order to do that, the concept of planning has been accepted by our country. It has come from the countries that have accepted the socialistic economy, Russia, Eastern Europe, China etc.

As our respected leader Acharya Kripalani from the opposite benches was saying, there are these countries that have accepted planning, but there are many other countries that have not accepted planning. He made a plea that those countries that have not accepted planning have also done very well, and, therefore, if we had a respite from planning for a couple of years or suggested by another hon. Member, there was nothing ridiculous or nothing absurd about it as was pointed out by the Prime Minister. But Acharya Kripalani seemed to forget how the prosperity of the Western European countries came about without planning. How many centuries has it taken them? How many centuries of industrialisation has it taken them? For how many years have they been in that line? And it is after all this that they are so prosperous today.

But we in this country, when we want to make up in a short span of time the lag of centuries as compared with these Western Powers and Western countries, we have to accept the concept of planning. We have to make use of our resources in the best manner possible. In order to do that, we have to plan, and we have to lay

down priorities. I can understand that there may be mistakes in the laying down of the priorities. I may think that some other priorities are more important and not the ones that have been laid down in the Plan, while some other hon. Members may have some other opinions. Such differences can be brought up. But the fact remains that planning, as the Prime Minister pointed out this morning, is like the beating of the heart, on which the life processes of the whole organism of a living body depend. The life processes of the nation, the life processes of the developmental activities of the community depend on this concept of planning. And we must do everything possible to make a success of it and to achieve our targets, and also continuously go on planning for the future.

The process cannot be broken. The process has to be a continuous one. One after the other, the plans must follow. The plans may change. We do not need to stop planning for a couple of years in order to change the direction of the plans, if any change of direction is necessary. Therefore, I entirely agree with what the Prime Minister said this morning, that the planning has to be a continuous process, and we cannot afford to lose the momentum that has been gained; the momentum must be pushed forward.

But the point that is most important is that in order to make a success of the Plan, in order to make the maximum use of the resources at our disposal, there are certain prerequisites. Those prerequisites are efficiency and honesty before everything else. Today, a few instances of lack of efficiency were given by some of the speakers. About honesty and the need to check corruption, a lot has been said in this House on various occasions.

I would plead with the planners that they must find out ways and means of carrying out reforms in our law, which today create the greatest difficulty in bringing dishonest people to book. You may find people committing acts

of dishonesty, and yet when you take the cases to court, it becomes almost impossible to prove their guilt and convict them. I have been a Minister, and I know in some of the cases, where we were hundred per cent. sure that the men had been dishonest, when we went to the court, we not only had to acquit them, but we had to reinstate the accused and pay them their past salaries. And when one man is acquitted in this manner, it has a demoralising effect upon a lot of other people. A way must be found to root out dishonesty and corruption.

Some railwaymen have sent me some information regarding some of our new bridges that are being built, there is such adulteration of the materials used that nobody knows how long they will last. We are all the time hearing of various kinds of railway disasters that are taking place. Now, we must find a way by which this kind of thing cannot take place and what we build upto the specifications and as requirement of safety.

Such things take place because we have contractors, and these contractors are allowed to have sub-contractors. A man takes a contract for Rs. 50 lakhs, and he is allowed to sell it off to two or three people, and may be, he sells it off for Rs. 55 or 60 lakhs, and he gains Rs. 5 or 10 lakhs for just nothing, for just distributing part of the contract. And how are these people to make up those Rs. 5 or 10 lakhs except by adulterating and using inferior material? Everybody knows it. Everybody has been talking about it. Yet, no step has been taken to check it.

I feel it is the duty of the planners to see that such things cannot take place and do not take place and the money is utilised properly. Here, in Delhi, we go around, and see roads being newly built. After a few weeks or every month or two months there are big holes on those roads. What does that mean? Why does not

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

somebody look into it, and why is no way found out to rectify the situation? We have limited resources in our country. The common man in this country is poor, is hungry, and his stomach is sticking to his back-bone already, and yet he will be willing to make further sacrifices; he is making further sacrifices; he will take your rupee shares or buy your small savings certificates, this, that and the other, and he will further cut down his consumption, but let him be sure that the money that he is finding is being utilised properly, honestly and efficiently.

Acharya Kripalani said this morning that there were three prerequisites, economy, austerity and efficiency for the success of the Plan. To those, I add two more, and they are honesty and ability. Let proper men be in charge of proper projects.

For instance, what justification can there be for a member of the Railway Board being put in charge of the Penicillin factory at Poona? After all, what experience has he of Penicillin factory? An ICS man is supposed to be omniscient; he is supposed to know everything, and, therefore, he can be transferred from one job to another and he is expected to do it well.

Now, in those countries where planned economy has been accepted, the experts are put on the jobs, and not a man who has just some commonsense. I have some very good friends among ICS officers. I know some of them are men of great ability. Some of them are men of great vision. I am also conscious of the fact that they have rendered very great service to this country during the transition period, after the British left, and when due to the influx of refugees, we were in a very difficult situation. All the same, today, in the face of our present day developmental activities, it is very necessary that we should have proper men in proper places, men with ability and men

with expert knowledge of the subjects that they are dealing with, particularly, when we are thinking in terms of taking over more and more commercial and industrial projects under the public sector.

And that brings me to a very important subject, and that is personnel planning.

I wish to ask the planners in this country: what have they done about personnel planning? There is so much need of personnel of various kinds. We have some vague statements from time to time about that. Really what is necessary is that each boy and each girl should know before he or she gets out of the college what his or her place is. Today what happens?

I am very much interested in the handicapped children and I was thinking in terms of finding some way to start some institute or something like that for the rehabilitation of crippled children. I learnt of a man who is one of the most highly trained men for that job. I do not think there is any other man of the same training in the care of the blind, deaf and the dumb. I find him in the All India Radio. Why? The Government of India had sent him and he had this training in various countries. When he came back to India, they wanted him to work on Rs. 250 or Rs. 350. In the meantime he got a job on Rs. 1,000 in the All India Radio and he went there. He was interested in this type of work and he came and offered his services in his spare time. He was willing to work morning and evening. Unfortunately, he has been transferred from Delhi and so far as I am concerned I cannot make use of his services. That is one instance. I know of many other instances. I know of doctors who have specialised in a branch, for instance a doctor trained in eye surgery, being posted in a village dispensary. One man after being trained as an orthopaedic surgeon in the United States has been put down as an anaesthetist

*Plan in relation to Current
Economic Situation*

in some small hospital. That kind of thing happens day in and day out and somebody has to look into them.

We have universities and we are spending a lot of money on them. I want that we should stop further expansion of the university education and give greater emphasis to the lower strata—primary, lower secondary and higher secondary education—so that all get education up to that level. I am fully aware that technical education is necessary at higher levels and it will have to be organised. The teachers will have to be organised. What are we doing to them? A person will go and take job with the private firm or the Government. They would go into the Indian Administrative Service and do work there because the salary of the topmost men in that service is far higher than the salary of the topmost man in the University. If you want good teachers, you must see that the salaries of the topmen in the universities are at least as much as for the other services. The teachers must not be neglected.

As a matter of fact in China and Russia, the countries which have followed a planned pattern, the top salaries are enjoyed by technical men and not by administrative service personnel. But here your Secretaries take monstrous salaries quite out of proportion to the other types of people. I do not mind the Ministers being paid less because we, at any rate, are people's representatives and have some status in society. But are these admitted to the teachers? We expect them to be noble, to have a missionary zeal and so on but we do not give them respect or money or status in society. But he is the man moulding the future of India, the children of today who are to take the responsibility in the India of tomorrow. It is in the universities that our leaders are being trained and our technicians are being trained. Today in America what do they say? Russia has got Sputnik I and II. They have not. They admit and they say

openly in the Press: we have not succeeded because we have not paid our technical men sufficiently; Russia has succeeded and has advanced in science because they pay them sufficiently.

We are in India in a growing stage. I plead with the planners to give all emphasis that they can possibly give to this personnel planning. If we are to make a success of our Plan, proper persons should be placed in proper places.

Training has to be linked with the Plan. There are a lot of training schools today. Our Community Project Administration is a growing concern and people have to be trained for it. I realise the importance of it. But why should there be some 60 or 80 schools for the training of the project personnel? Why could not our universities take that up? Why not that be a wing of the universities so that they are in touch with the living conditions in the country and produce the personnel needed for the development of the country.

Similarly, we have a number of institutions which are called All India institutions. They have every contact with the universities. We have got the All India Institute of Medicine. Why should they be outside the purview and discipline of the universities? They are supposed to be of All-India importance and therefore, the result is that if a hospital is built at Madras, Calcutta or Bombay, the cost is Rs. 12 or 13 per sq. foot but the cost of the All-India Medical Institute must be Rs. 23 per sq. foot because it is of All India importance. I do not understand this kind of reasoning. Therefore, I plead that all these new institutions that are coming up—if we are to have the maximum use out of them—should be within the purview of the universities and not under the control of somebody else. It is under the control of one or two I.C.S. officers. Nobody knows how the appointments are made or how the budgets are made.

[Dr. Sushila Nayar]

Then you have got an architect here. I believe he is being paid fabulous sums because he is being paid certain percentage of the total cost of the building. It is in his interest to inflate the cost of the building as much as possible because he is going to get a percentage on the cost of that building. I think it is wrong on the planners to allow this to proceed. Why cannot we stop these huge buildings for five more years?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up. There should be planning in time also.

Dr. Sushila Nayar: I am finishing now. Good work, good research and good discoveries do not depend upon buildings. They depend upon personnel, brains and ability. Give them equipment. I will not quarrel with that but it is not necessary to spend money at the present moment on the buildings. The Prime Minister said that. From the buildings, I would now come to the estimates.

The estimates for so many of our plans keep on increasing. The estimates of our steel plants are going up. We must take proper care of them. Our planners must see to it that our plans are comprehensive I believe in some of the steel plants, they have not included the provision for the houses for the workers or some very necessary things when formulating the plan. That kind of omission is inexcusable when we have a separate big Planning Commission in this country. The plans must be comprehensive and the estimates must not be continuously increasing.

Similarly, there are our prices. They must be kept under some sort of a control. When we say that the prices must be kept under control, what I mean is this. I do not say that the producer should get a lower price. The producer must get an adequate price. But the profits of the middlemen must be cut down. If we could not eliminate them, at least let us control them. In this country in certain types of food pro-

ducts, the profits of the middlemen rise up to one hundred or two hundred per cent. I have no time to quote instances or figures. Otherwise, I can substantiate this with statistics. Even in some of the countries that have a free economy, they have said that the production price is so much and the selling price is so much. The profit is not more than ten or 20 or at the most 25 per cent. There must be some control over the profits of the middlemen.

Now, in the case of food production everybody agrees that it is necessary. We had the greatest emphasis on food production in the First Five Year Plan. In the Second Five Year Plan we started talking about industries, everybody started talking about industries, and we forgot about food production. It is true it was expected that the emphasis that had been given to it in the First Five Year Plan should be carried along. That brings us to the point that we must see to it that there is a follow-up, there is an implementation of the schemes and projects that we have. We are all the time ready to have new projects. We are all the time ready to have new Bills in this House. We are all the time out to see that something new is done. But do we see how what we have done is applied, how it is implemented, how it is put into use in the day-to-day life? That is very important. Unless we do that it is just like what they say in Punjabi:

झाना झाना दोड़, पीछे पीछे छोड़, प्रागे प्रागे
बढ़ते जाओ । पीछे से नारा काम खराब होता
जाता है ।

That does not carry us anywhere. If we are to go forward we must go forward, but we must see to it that what we have left behind is not spoiled, that is not neglected and that is implemented.

In the First Five Year Plan we made all these hydro-electric projects. We have plenty of water. I

am told by a very good authority that much of that water is not used. The cost of that water is too high. I would say, why cannot we reduce the cost of that water? Why cannot we give free water, if necessary, to the farmers for one or two years? When the farmers earn more profit than what they are getting today, when they get more production from the land, out of that they will be willing to pay for that water and invest in that water. Today that water is doing nothing. We have spent money on that and we are not getting anything by withholding that water from the farmers.

Similar is the case with regard to fertilisers. We must do something to use the human excreta, the excreta of animals, cow dung and so on. That must not be allowed to be wasted. As the Prime Minister said, 75 per cent. of our power can be had by burning cow dung. We must do something about it. How can we do that? It is only by mobilising men. We must make the people of the country feel that they are partners in the reconstruction of this country. There is nothing very ethereal, un-earthly or very superior about it. There are definite techniques about making people enthusiastic. There are social techniques recognised in the scientific world. We must make use of them. We must make our high administrative officers and workers in the field work in that way. They must be taught what are the techniques, how to enthuse the people, how to make the people feel that they are partners in the reconstruction of India.

One word about priority in the Plan. I do not have the time to go into all the details, but I would like to say that with regard to food production we must have a uniform land policy in this country. We have land reform Acts in various States. They are all of different types. In many of them there are big loopholes. They have not succeeded in the object for which they were enacted. We must have a

uniform land policy in this country. All this talk of co-operative farming will go to naught unless we first of all make a man feel that he is the owner of the land. Even in China where they have all these co-operatives for two or three years they made the people everywhere feel that they were the owners of the land whether it be half an acre, three-fourth of an acre or one acre. Afterwards when the people have the security that they are the owners of the land that they till they will come and join in co-operatives.

With regard to co-operatives I just want to say a word. We must simplify the co-operative law so that it is within the comprehension of the common man, the farmer, the peasant, before he can really make use of it and run these co-operatives effectively. Co-operatives cannot be run by your inspectors sitting in their offices and who do not know anything about agriculture. Co-operatives will have to be run by the farmers themselves, who are the owners and tillers of the land. For that the co-operative law must be simplified and the planners must see to that.

With regard to priorities I would like to point out a clear omission. In this Plan there is no provision for child health. There is maternal and child health, but there is no mention of health of school children. The Prime Minister talks of school lunches for children, the need for their care and so on, but there is not a penny provided for this health.

Similarly, provision for adequate supply of pure water for rural and urban areas is most inadequate. Again, not a thought has been given to the need for drug production in the country which creates a big whole in our foreign exchange.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I propose to confine myself to the question of internal resources for the Five Year Plan. I will not touch any other subject. My idea is first to show

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

what estimates the planners themselves made, secondly to show what have been the actual realisations, thirdly to show what is the character of the deficit and, fourthly, what is the nature of our difficulties.

In order to appreciate the magnitude of the Five Year Plan we must appreciate this fact, that the total outlay involved in it is so much that out of that outlay you could distribute Rs. 20 to every man, woman and child in the entire world.

An Hon. Member: In the entire world?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Yes, in the entire world. You have not appreciated that fact. It is no use laughing because . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He only laughed because he had not appreciated the fact.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: It is simple arithmetic. The world's population is 2,700 million and Rs. 5,400 crores is the estimated cost. It is a simple question of division. Or, to put it in the other way, every family in India—assuming a family of man, wife and three children, five people—is called upon to contribute in the course of five years Rs. 750 towards the Plan.

Now, the Planning Commission has said, we cannot help it, things have cropped up which we did not anticipate, we did not anticipate bad monsoons, we did not anticipate rise in the price of capital goods, we did not anticipate rise in prices at home and so on. I ask, if the planning commissioners did not anticipate these while formulating a Plan of this magnitude, are they planning commissioners or what? It is their job to anticipate. They have failed miserably in that.

What is the actual estimate by the planners themselves? A part of it was given by my friend Shri Tyagi. Revenue on the basis of existing

taxation is Rs. 350 crores, plus an additional taxation of Rs. 450 crores making a total of Rs. 800 crores. Then, borrowings Rs. 700 crores from market loans and Rs. 500 crores from small savings. There is the railway contribution of Rs. 150 crores plus Provident Fund Deposits etc., Rs. 250 crores. External resources are Rs. 800 crores and deficit planning Rs. 1,200 crores. The gap to be covered by additional measures is Rs. 400 crores making a total of Rs. 4,800 crores. Add to that Rs. 600 crores, because now the Plan is expected to cost Rs. 5,400 crores, between increase in prices and other things. Add to that increased cost of importing foodgrains this year. 7 million tons is not a joke, if that is going to be a shortage. Add Rs. 150 crores on that account and Rs. 50 crores additional on defence expenditure. The total now is Rs. 5,600 crores.

If you want to put through the Plan within the next 3½ years we will have to produce Rs. 5,600 crores minus the amount we have spent. On the basis of existing revenues, at the most optimistic estimate, supposing out of Rs. 800 crores you realise 70 per cent. or even 80 per cent. of your expectations there might be a shortfall of Rs. 100 crores. I am taking the shortfall at Rs. 100 crores only. About public borrowing, it is true that we are not going to have Rs. 700 crores, we are not going to make it up, but I assume that we will make it up. In addition to that we have to repay loans of Rs. 430 crores. You have to raise that additional amount, we will not be able to do that. There will thus be a shortfall of Rs. 430 crores that way. Small savings deposit will be Rs. 250 crores. As my friend Shri Tyagi pointed out our target is Rs. 100 crores this time. Within six months we have got Rs. 26 crores and double that is Rs. 52 crores. There will be a shortfall by Rs. 250 crores in the Five Year Plan. I expect that the railway contribution will be as it is, let us hope so.

and that the Provident Fund—of course, that is in our pockets—will remain as it is. Then there is Rs. 800 crores external resources. Mr. Birla said 250 million dollars may be forthcoming. I assume that we will have Rs. 500 crores by external aid. Assuming that, even then the short-fall will be Rs. 300 crores. Then there is deficit financing of Rs. 1,200 crores. Already deficit financing is showing signs of inflation. I will even put it to more than Rs 800 crores. As I said, I am even prepared to say Rs. 1,000 crores as a matter of sheer necessity; even then that means a shortfall of Rs. 200 crores. So far as domestic resources are concerned, I do not know what they are going to do. Assuming they get Rs. 300 crores out of Rs. 400 crores—they are not going to be successful in doing that—but supposing the short-fall there is only Rs. 100 crores, the total short-fall will be Rs. 1,300 crores. Add to that the difference between Rs. 4,800 crores and Rs. 5,600 crores, i.e. Rs. 800 crores. That means in the Plan expenditure at the present level of prices amounting to Rs. 5,600 crores, there will be a short-fall of Rs. 2,100 crores.

I am not referring to foreign exchange now. I am leaving that aside. Broadly speaking, what will be the resources for making up this gap of Rs. 2,100 crores? Rs. 300 crores we draw from our sterling balances. Added to that, we expect Rs. 100 crores by way of flow of private capital. These are figures given in Government publications. Invisible earnings come to Rs. 250 crores. Thus, we can tap Rs. 650 crores. Deducting from Rs. 2,100 crores Rs. 650 crores, we are left with a net deficit of Rs. 1,450 crores, on the assumption that there will be a deficit financing to the tune of Rs. 1,000 crores on the top of it. That is the position. All this is on the assumption that there will be no further bad monsoons and that there will not be any further increase in the defence expenditure or any fur-

ther increase in the price of capital goods.

What is the nature of the difficulty? It is not as if we are at liberty to fill up this gap of Rs. 1,450 crores over a period of 3½ years. That is not the point. In the first year of the Plan, we spent Rs. 750 crores. This year, as a maximum, we can spend Rs. 950 crores. The total is Rs. 1,700 crores. So, the average which we have to spend in order to complete our Five Year Plan would be Rs. 1,100 crores a year. In other words, if we deduct Rs. 1,700 crores from the amount which we should normally spend, then within 12 months we must spend Rs. 1,600 crores. I ask, wherefrom is the amount going to come? I am not against curtailing the Five Year Plan or giving breathing space for two years. The hon. Prime Minister says that my amendment is born of ignorance. If these figures are born of ignorance, I can tell him that they have been taken from Government publications. We should make good these Rs. 1,600 crores within the next year. Why? It is because we have already reached the so-called hump. During the last war, when China was being assisted by air lifts, our pilots, the allies' pilots, had to cross the Himalayas. They called it a hump and they crossed it breadthwise. We are going to have a hump which will have to be crossed lengthwise, because our difficulties are not immediate only. Our difficulties are continuing. We will have hump after hump and the first hump is to find Rs. 1,600 crores and that too within the next year, because we are already committed to that expenditure. The imports are on their way and so fixed commitments are there. Let the hon. Prime Minister say that these are the sources from which we shall make good the amount and I have nothing to say.

Does the hon. Prime Minister expect that a Plan of this magnitude can be put through without stresses and strains on our economy? I say that our economy will collapse. I

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

have no doubt about that. Let us come down to brass tacks. It may be difficult to rephrase the Plan because we have committed ourselves to the expenditure. But we went in for three steel plants. Who would not like to have ten steel plants? We have not got the resources for even three. What is the use of the hon. Prime Minister saying, "Look what has been done in America and U.S.S.R." If I have Rs. 50,000 and if I want to construct a house, I cannot look at Parliament House or the Prime Minister's building and say, "Look at what they have done; I will do on the same lines." Surely, we should have some sense of proportion. If we are to keep our head up in the cloud, we will have to keep our feet firm on the ground. Therefore, immediately we should decide. There is no use vacillating and wasting time. My amendment only says, categorise and decide which plans we are definitely going in for and make provision for that and then discard the rest. That is the first suggestion.

The second suggestion is, you must encourage at all costs the import of foreign capital. I will give more details about it when I speak on my resolution on that subject. The third point is, never let the deficit financing go above Rs. 800 crores. Otherwise, the results will be disastrous. The fourth point is that when a Plan of this magnitude has been put, the stresses and strains on the economy are so vast that you must give two years time to the nation to lick its wounds. This is something on war-footing. You cannot keep on incurring expenditure year after year at a feverish pace.

The Five Year Plan may be a good maxim for the time being, but that has got to be spaced and some recuperation time to the nation had to be given. That is what I call breathing time of two years. What does the hon. Prime Minister say? Does he suggest that I asked for two years time to stop the circulation of blood

and all that? During that two years time, we are not going to close down the shop, sit and do nothing. Whatever the balance, the odds and ends of the Second Five Year Plan remain, that will have to be summed up during the course of two years. By two years breathing time, I mean no new major project for two years to come. Let the people who pay the taxes have some time to recuperate; let the investments which we have incurred bear some fruit. If you give this two years breathing time, you will be able to put forward a third Five Year Plan much greater in magnitude, which will make up for this breathing time. To say that this amendment was born of ignorance, I do not understand.

I do appeal to the Government: We are not out here to have political advantage out of our difficulties. This is our country and we feel for it. We want the country to progress and the plans to succeed. But let us take a realistic view. It is unfortunate that the Planning Minister is not here; probably he is busy, with the Rajya Sabha. Let anybody, any Minister, point out that the figures I have given are wrong. If any Minister asserts that we will put through the Five Year Plan at any cost, I will say to him, "Tell me where are the resources." We are not such fools and ignorant people as the hon. Prime Minister or anyone else might take us to be.

Shri T. Subramanyam (Bellary): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, obviously the purpose of economic planning is to utilise and mobilise the human and the material resources of the country with a view to produce the maximum amount of economic goods and this maximum production must also ensure employment to the people and also good balanced diet, clothing and living accommodation for the people, besides health, education and other things. This is the purpose of planning.

In the second Five Year Plan, greater emphasis was laid on indus-

trialisation, particularly heavy industries. It was only natural, because before that, our main objective was to spend all our resources upon consumption goods and we entirely ignored the heavy industries, particularly steel and iron. Therefore, now the three plants at Durgapur, Rourkela and Bhilai were taken up as also the improvement and development of Bhadravati in South India and other plants. But if iron and steel form the base of industrial economy, the base of our entire economy must be production of adequate quantities of foodgrains and raw material. We cannot ignore it; in the present context, it is becoming more and more significant and it cannot be ignored.

Irrigation, power, agriculture and community development now account for an expenditure of Rs. 1,461 crores under the present Plan. This assumes importance in the present context of drought in Eastern U.P., Bihar and other places. A couple of years ago, due to good seasons, we had a slight surplus in the matter of foodgrains. But this surplus was of a marginal character, so far as our economy is concerned. In 1956-57 we produced about 68.6 million tons of foodgrains, of which 28.1 million consisted of rice and 9 million tons consisted of wheat. With regard to cotton, there was an increase of 7 lakhs bales. In the case of sugarcane also, there was an increase of 7 lakhs tons.

The target for foodgrains in 1961 was placed at 80 million tons. But the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee and others said that this target is too high and it cannot be achieved or realised and that the production will only be of the order of 75 million tons. I say that 80 million tons is a modest estimate. No doubt, it may be difficult to realise it. But we have enough resources to reach that target. We have got enough irrigated area. In the first Five Year Plan we had an extra irrigated area of 16 million acres. In the Second Five Year Plan we contemplate bringing under irriga-

tion an extra acreage of 21 million acres. I am sure that we are going to develop that area by the end of 1961. If there is any difficulty in achieving that target, that should be overcome.

For instance, the Government must find out whether the ryots and the agriculturists who are residing in this area have got the economic resources and whether they require financial help to bring land under irrigation. They must also supply the ryots with manures, seeds and implements and loans on easy terms. The ryots must also do their part of the work. I urge upon the Government that they must pay special attention to irrigation development and that they must receive quarterly reports on the development of various areas.

Then, we must supply the agriculturists with seeds, manures, implements and the results obtained in the various research centres. I submit that the results of the various research centres are not put to practical use by the ryots. To me this appears to be a weak link in our economic system. We have got very good research centres. I have seen some of the demonstration farms where the yield per acre has been increased three or four times the yield of the neighbouring farms. But the ryots are continuing the old process of agriculture with less yields. Our yield per acre is the lowest in the world. Still, we are not paying enough attention to that. I submit that Government should pay sufficient attention to that.

So far as National Extension Services and Community Projects are concerned, the idea is excellent. But, even there we have got such a large number of officers who do not pay sufficient attention to this important work. The main task of the NES and the Community Projects is to propagate the results of research so that the per acre yield may be increased 3 or 4 times. That is an urgent task

[Shri T. Subramanyam]

and we should lay special emphasis on that factor.

Then, our production of foodgrains must be placed on a war footing. We are often told that we must work on a war footing. But, during the last two years, a complacency has overtaken us. We do not work on a war footing. Our mechanism, whether it is official or non-official, has not been geared up to that level. In this connection we must remember that we are fighting against hunger. Today we are having drought in eastern Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. Today our food shortage is of the order of 10 per cent. It is necessary for us to import foodgrains. So, it is a matter of shame for us that when we have got all these river valley schemes and irrigation projects and abundant natural resources, we are put to the necessity of importing from other countries millions of tons of foodgrains.

When we come to the picture of cloth, I am glad the position is more optimistic and is more heartening. The target for the Second Five Year Plan has been put at 8200 million yards, of which 1,000 million yards would be for export. We have got 435 textile mills in our country, with a capital investment of Rs. 115 crores, employing 7½ lakhs of workers. Next only to the U.S.A. India is the world's largest producer of cotton textiles. With regard to handloom, we are making improvement. From 1,600 million yards the production is expected to increase to 3,000 million yards by 1961. I do not wish to go into details of production of items like sugar, cement, etc.

Capital and producer goods industries, of which iron and steel form the base, are now engaging our attention. It is true that the three factories at Bhilai, Rourkela and Durgapur alone consume about Rs. 440 crores, out of Rs. 1,094 crores of investment in the industrial sector. Out of this Rs. 1,094, Rs. 550 crores come from

the public sector. In this connection I would like to say that we should not ignore the development of Bhadravati. Its production is small compared to that of large units where millions of tons of steel are expected to be produced. The production of Bhadravati is only of the order of 10 000 tons. I submit it is rendering good work and that it should not be ignored, or the policy of go-slow should not be applied to it.

I would like to give a few figures as to the position we occupy in the matter of steel production. We have to realise in what conditions we are living. The beginning we have made is very very modest. The USA produced in 1955 115 million tons of steel; USSR 44.5 million tons; West Germany 21 million tons; UK 20 million tons; France 12 million tons; Japan 9 million tons and Belgium 5.8 million tons. At the end of the Second Five Year Plan our object is to produce 6 million tons of crude steel which will be 4.5 million tons of finished steel. I shall not go into other matters.

With regard to production of power, I submit that we must try to maximise the production of hydro-electric and thermal stations. For instance, this morning in the papers I read that the Rihand project in the UP is going to be taken up seriously, because it happens to be the kingpin of the economic development in Eastern and Southern UP. In Mysore there is the Sheravati river project where current will be produced at the cheapest rate. The current produced there is necessary for the industrial and economic development of that area. This project should be proceeded with.

I next come to the employment potential under the industries Second Five Year Plan. The employment potential of large scale industries wherever they may be, whether it be steel plant, or fertiliser plant or locomotive plant, is not much. If we take all the organised industries in India,

an organised industry is a factory where about 20 people work using power, in 1953 there were 7,104 registered factories, out of which 6,239 factories submitted returns. All these big factories employed only 16,27,857 people of whom only 15,00,000 were workers. About Rs. 800 crores were invested in all these registered factories. Therefore, the employment potential of these factories is very small, though from the point of view of production, particularly of strategic material, it is of utmost importance and significance. Therefore, we must pay special attention to the improvement and development of small scale industries like handloom. Some people may not like ambar charkha, but still from the point of view of providing employment, these are absolutely necessary and we must see that in every State in every district these small scale industries are given encouragement. This is a people's plan. We must try to evoke all the enthusiasm of the people. On the one hand, the official agencies and on the other, the non-official agencies in this mechanism must work wholeheartedly. The officials must take a helpful attitude in this matter and do their bit efficiently and honestly. These procedures, the rules and departmentalisms should not be allowed to come in the way of fulfilling our task in helping the people. The peoples attitude should be one of self-help. This morning, Acharya Kripalani took lightly the Prime Minister's appeal that he made that we must evoke the spirit of self-help. He also quoted a story where was spent about Rs. 600 for inaugurating the *vanamahotsava*, by planting a tree. If the Minister caused to be spent Rs. 600 for that function, or the officers concerned, I may straightway say that they were guilty of phenomenal want of a sense of propriety and wisdom; I shall stop there.

There is also another side of the picture. There were people, local leaders whether it be at the taluk level or district level or at the State capital level where there this func-

tion took place. What was their responsibility in the matter. All of them were not starved. This sum of Rs. 600 did not come from starving people nor from the Minister nor from the officers. It must have come from some local people. These people who participated in that, the local leaders, to whichever party they may belong, they have a responsibility in the matter. They must also see how best to spend the amount, how best to evoke local self-help, on what projects or programmes the money should be spent. It is easy for any one of us to go to a village and find out their small needs, not big needs. It does not require the State Government or the Central Government to come and fulfil all these necessities or requirements. I went to a village. As I entered the village, I saw at the entrance of the village the road. One side of it was at a higher level and another was at a lower level. So that, if a double bullock-cart went there, it would be lopsided. If it was fully loaded with any bags, it would topple down. I went and sat in a choultry 50 yards away, and was speaking to my friends. Within 15 or 20 minutes, a bullock cart, loaded with some bags did come and it toppled down and caused some injury. For such a thing we do not need an Executive Engineer or an Assistant Engineer.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps it would not have happened had not the hon. Member thought of it.

Shri T. Subramanyam: That these small needs do not require either the attention of the State Government or the Central Government. They do not require an Executive Engineer or an Assistant Engineer. I mean these small repairs to roads, filling up of pits, etc. I do not mean to say that the Central Government or the State Government have no responsibility in the matter. They have a responsibility in the matter. They have to fulfil their responsibility to the maximum extent. I am only saying that the

[Shri T. Subramanyam]

people, the official agencies and non-official agencies, the people and the Government are partners in this game of implementing the Second Plan and they must do it conscientiously and honestly with a view to see that the Second Plan succeeds with a view to make this country prosperous and great.

श्री बाबूदेवी (बनारसपुर) : उपर्युक्त महोदय, इस में पहले कि इस योजना के सम्बन्ध में जो कठिनाइयाँ पैदा हो गयी हैं, उनके बारे में मैं अपने विचार प्रकट कर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने आज प्रारम्भ में जो भाषण दिया है उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। आज देश की जनता और यह सदन इस बात की आशा करता था कि प्रधान मंत्री अपने भाषण में पंच वर्षीय योजना को पूरा करने में जो कठिनाइयाँ पैदा हो गयी हैं उनको हज़ कर्ग्स का रास्ता बतलायेंगे और जो निराशा छा रही है उसको दूर करने और देश में उत्साह का वातावरण पैदा करने का प्रयत्न करेंगे। मुझे यह कहने में बिन्दुन संकोच नहीं है कि प्रधान मंत्री का भाषण सुन कर मुझे बड़ी निराशा हुई है और उनका भाषण सुन कर ऐसा लगा जैसे कि वह भारतीय गणराज्य को संसद् में भाषण नहीं कर रहे बल्कि योगाश्रम द्वारा आयोजित किसी जन सभा में भाषण कर रहे हैं जिसमें न केवल पैरों के बल पर खड़ा होना सिखाया जाता है बल्कि सिर के बल पर खड़े होने की शिक्षा भी दी जाती है।

आज देश सरकार से इस बात की आशा करता है कि वह इस योजना को पूरा करने के लिये जिन उपायों का धवलसम्बन्ध किया जाना चाहिये इसके सम्बन्ध में धसंदिग्ध शब्दों में घोषणा करे। योजना के कार्यान्वयन में जो कठिनाइयाँ उत्पन्न हो गयी हैं वे ऐसी कठिनाइयाँ नहीं हैं। प्रकृति की,

या स्वेज नहर के संघर्ष को या पाकिस्तान से होने वाली हमारी ख़तपट को दोष देकर हम अपनी जिम्मेदारी से बच नहीं सकते। जिनके सामने इंडो चाइना और कोरिया का संघर्ष था वे यह मान कर कैसे चले कि दुनिया में शान्ति रहेगी और हमें योजना को पूरा करने में कोई कठिनाई पैदा नहीं होगी। अतिवृष्टि या अनावृष्टि भी हमारे देश में लगी ही रहती है। उनके कारण फसल बिगड़ गयी और उसके फलस्वरूप योजना ख़टाई में पड़ गयी इस बहाने को भी स्वीकार करने के लिये जनता तैयार नहीं है।

अभी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने देश को यह उपदेश दिया कि हमें आत्म निर्भर होना चाहिये। जिस सरकार के वित्त मंत्री दुनिया के देश देश के द्वार द्वार पर भील का कटोरा लेकर "भिक्षा देहि भिक्षा देहि" की रट लगाते घूमते हैं और इस प्रकार भारत के सम्मान को वाशिगटन, लन्दन और बोन के बाजारों में नीलाम पर चढ़ाते हैं उस सरकार के प्रधान मंत्री देश की जनता को आत्म निर्भर होने का उपदेश दें इससे बड़ कर मजाक की बात और क्या हो सकती है। यदि आत्मनिर्भरता का पाठ पढ़ना है तो हमारी सरकार को पढ़ना है।

जब दूसरी योजना बनायी गयी तो उसमें ८०० करोड़ की विदेशी सहायता का अनुमान किया गया। यह सोचा गया था कि अमरीका हमको ८०० करोड़ की विदेशी सहायता देगा क्या हम समझते थे कि अमरीका में सब दानवीर कर्ण निवास करते हैं? क्या हमको नहीं मालूम था कि अमरीका की नीति भारत के प्रति क्या है? यह नीति कोई साल डेढ़ साल का सवाल नहीं है। यदि हम विदेशी नीति के क्षेत्र में स्वतन्त्र मार्ग पर चलना चाहते हैं तो हमको अमरीका जैसे देश से इतनी आशा नहीं लगानी चाहिये थी। अगर अमरीका हमें थोड़ी सहायता दे भी दे और पाकिस्तान को उठी

अनुपात में अधिक हथियार दे दे तो पाकिस्तान के हथियारों के मुकाबले में जो पूजी हमको मिलती है वह बराबर हो जायेगी क्योंकि हमको उतना ही रुपया अपनी सुरक्षा पर खर्च करना पड़ेगा। आज कहा जाता है कि हमें सुरक्षा के लिये इतना रुपया लगाना पड़ेगा इसकी हमको कल्पना नहीं थी। अगर कल्पना नहीं थी तो इसका दोष किसके ऊपर है। पाकिस्तान की भारत विरोधी नीति नई नहीं है और अमरीका और पाकिस्तान का मैनिफेस्टो भी नया नहीं है। जो इतनी दूर का नहीं देख सकता वह देश का निर्माण कैसे कर सकता है इसके बारे में मुझे सन्देह है।

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री स्वप्नदर्शी हैं, वह सपने देखते हैं। मगर उनका आस-पास ऐसे लोग नहीं हैं जो उन स्वप्नों को साकार करने के लिये दिखा सकें और इसका परिणाम यह है कि हम गणराज्य बनाने जाते हैं और बन्दर बन जाता है। विनायक प्रकुर्वाणी, रचयामास बानरं। इनपर कहा जाता है कि थोड़ी गलती हो गयी जो सूड आगे लगानी चाहिये थी वह पीछे लगा दी। गलती तो जरूर थोड़ी सी हुई मगर उसका परिणाम आज हमारे सामने है। हम दूसरी योजना को सफल बनाने के लिये कोई भी रास्ता निकालें इस से पहले यह आवश्यक है कि योजना के सामने जो कठिनाइयाँ आ गयी हैं उनके मूल में जा कर हम विचार करें आज विदेशी मुद्रा की दृष्टि से जो कठिन परिस्थिति पैदा हो गयी है उसके लिये उत्तरदायी कौन है? योजना बनायी योजना आयोग ने। उन्होंने दूरदर्शिता से काम नहीं लिया। अब कहा जाता है कि आयात के लिये लाइसेंस दिये गये और आज के वित्त मंत्री जब वाणिज्य मंत्री थे तब उन्होंने अपना शनाप लाइसेंस दिये। वाणिज्य मंत्रालय लाइसेंस देता है पर रिजर्व बैंक को और फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर को उन लाइसेंसों का सब तक पता नहीं चलता जब तक कि

बिल सामने नहीं आ जाता। और वाणिज्य मंत्रालय ने जितने लाइसेंस दिये हैं उनमें से कितने काम में लाये गये और कितने नहीं इसका पता उस मंत्रालय को भी नहीं होता और न योजना आयोग को इस बारे में पता होता है। जो कैबिनेट की इकानमिक कमिटी है वह आयात नीति निश्चित करती है और जो वह आयात नीति निश्चित करती है उसके लिये सारा केन्द्रीय मंत्रिमंडल उत्तरदायी है। अतएव हम विषय में केवल पूर्व वाणिज्य मंत्री को दोष देने से काम नहीं चलेगा।

आखिर जो प्राइवेट बैंकटर के लिये लाइसेंस दिये गये वे किस आधार पर दिये गये? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि निजी क्षेत्र में विदेशी मुद्रा का आवश्यकता से अधिक उपभोग किया गया? और यदि किया गया तो क्या वह दूसरी योजना में निर्धारित लक्ष्यों को पूरा करने के लिये किया गया? लेकिन लक्ष्य तो निर्धारित करना योजना आयोग का काम है, तो क्या लक्ष्य गलत निर्धारित किये गये? मंत्रिमंडल की आर्थिक समिति आयात नीति का निर्धारण करती है। जो विभिन्न मंत्रिमंडलों के ऊँचे अधिकारियों की समितियाँ हैं लाइसेंसिंग कमिटियाँ हैं, वे अलग अलग प्राजेक्टों के बारे में निर्णय करती हैं और यह सेविंग्स बैंक और रिजर्व बैंक का काम है कि उसके लिये विदेशी पूँजी को व्यवस्था करे। मुझे सन्देह है कि इन सभी संस्थाओं में शायद समन्वय नहीं है, उनके बीच में तालमेल नहीं है।

विदेशी मुद्रा का संकट अगर खड़ा हो रहा था, कहा जाता है कि १५ महीने पहले चेतावनी दी थी तो इस चेतावनी पर कान क्यों नहीं दिया गया? आज इस बात का पता लगाने की आवश्यकता है कि इसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है। ऐसा हम इसलिए नहीं कहते कि गिरे हुए दूध के लिए हम कोक

[श्री बाजपेयी]

मनाना चाहते हैं बल्कि ऐसा इसलिए चाहते हैं ताकि आगे चलती न हो, इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा मुझाव है कि योजना आयोग का पुनः गठन किया जाना चाहिए। योजना आयोग में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री भी हैं और आयाजना मंत्री भी हैं। वे सर्व व्यापी हैं, योजना आयोग से लेकर साधु समाज के लोगों तक उनकी गति है। उसमें श्री कृष्ण मेनन भी हैं। बौद्धिक मामलों में उनका उपयोग हो सकता है किन्तु योजना आयोग में, मेरा निवेदन है कि विशेषज्ञ रखे जाने चाहिये जो निर्लेप होकर, निष्पक्ष होकर और निर्भीकता के साथ अपनी बात कह सकें। प्रधान मंत्री के महान् व्यक्तित्व के सामने कौन क्या कहता है, इसकी मुझे बड़ी शंका है और उसका परिणाम यह है कि हमने एक ऐसी योजना बना ली जिसके कि पूरा करने के लिए हमारे पास उपयुक्त साधन नहीं हैं। जब यह कहा जाता है कि योजना ऐम्बिगस है, ओवर ऐम्बिगस है तो गलत नहीं है। यह जरूरी है कि हमारी जो योजना बने उसके लिए हमारे पास साधन हों। इन दिनों एक अमरीकी विशेषज्ञ आये थे जिन्होंने यह विचार प्रकट किया कि जहां तक इस देश की जरूरतों का सवाल है, योजना ऐम्बिगस नहीं है लेकिन मेरा नम्र निवेदन है कि उसके लिए हमें अमरीकी विशेषज्ञ की सलाह की आवश्यकता नहीं। देश का बच्चा बच्चा यह जानता है कि हमारी योजना यथार्थवादी है या नहीं और इस चीज का निधारण हमारे साधनों में होगा। आज हमारे पास साधन नहीं हैं। जितने हमारे पास साधन उपलब्ध हों उसी के अनुसार हमें अपने पैर फैलाने चाहिये। किन्तु हमने पैर लम्बे पसारने चाहे जबकि चादर छोटी है। अब जाड़े का मौसम आ गया है और पैर सिकोड़ने की बात हो रही है।

आयात के बारे में मेरा निवेदन है कि लोहा और इस्पात आवश्यकता से अधिक आयात किया गया। जो आंकड़े दिये गये हैं

उनसे पता लगता है कि पिछले १० महीनों में ४ ३ मिलियन टन स्टील मंगाया गया। सन् १९५६-५७ में सवा ३ करोड़ रुपये का लोहा और स्टील मंगाया गया। उपभोग वस्तुओं में भी वृद्धि हुई और करीब ६५ करोड़ रुपये की उपभोग्य वस्तुओं का आयात किया गया। कंजूमम गुड्स के आयात में जो पिछले साल वृद्धि हुई उमी सब का परिणाम यह है कि विदेशी मुद्रा की हमारे देश में कठिनाई पैदा हो गई।

हमारे देश में प्रतिष्ठित कर्मचारियों की भी कमी है। अभी भिलाई के स्टील कारखाने के सम्बन्ध में जो रिपोर्ट निकली है उसके बारे में कहा जाता है कि वहां जितने सिविल इंजीनियर चाहिये उममें तीस फ्रीसदी कम इंजीनियर लगे हुए हैं। वहां पर कोई चीफ मैकेनिकल इंजीनियर नहीं है, चीफ इलेक्ट्रिक इंजीनियर भी नहीं है और सीनियर डिवाजन इंजीनियर की भी कमी है, फिर भी भिलाई का कारखाना चल रहा है।

हम आशा करते थे कि हरकेला का कारखाना पहले उत्पादन करेगा। प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्तिम वर्ष में हरकेला के कारखाने में स्टील का आंशिक उत्पादन कार्य आरम्भ हो जाना चाहिए था मगर वहां अभी भट्टी भी नहीं बनी है और जब वह बन जायेगी तब उत्पादन आरम्भ होगा।

इसके साथ ही साथ वस्तुओं के दामों में भी निरन्तर वृद्धि हो रही है। मैं उन आंकड़ों को दुहराना नहीं चाहता जो मेरे मित्र श्री भमानी ने सदन के सामने रखे थे, मगर आज थोड़े से अग्रर कहा जाय तो यह है कि हम आज एक ऐसी कठिनाई में फंस गये हैं जिसमें से निकलने के लिए जिन आधारभूत मांग्यताओं को लेकर हमने द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना का निर्माण किया था, उनमें परिवर्तन और सशोधन करने की आवश्यकता है।

हम देश को एक बाढ़ के चक्कर में जकड़ देना चाहते हैं और मजा यह है कि हमारे विलत मंत्री महोदय जब अमरीका में जाते हैं तो पूँजीवादी बन जाते हैं और भारतवर्ष में जब आते हैं तो समाजवादी बन जाते हैं। बाहर वालों के लिए हम पूँजीवादी हैं और देश वालों के लिए समाजवादी, आयद देशवासियों का वोट लेने के लिए समाजवादी और विदेशी सहायता के लिए पूँजीवादी होना जरूरी है। आज हमारी स्थिति त्रिशंकु जैसी हो गई है। जहाँ तक देश के जीवन को आगे बढ़ाने का सवाल है, विषमता को मिटाने और हर एक व्यक्ति को उसके व्यक्तित्व के विकास के लिए समान सुविधाएँ देने का प्रश्न है, कोई मतभेद नहीं है लेकिन इसके लिए हम देश के जीवन को किसी एक चौखट में जकड़ दें, यह उचित नहीं होगा और अनुभव यह बता रहा है कि इस तरह का प्रयत्न सफल नहीं होगा।

मैं चीन की बात नहीं करता। मैंने चीन का चक्कर नहीं लगाया। जिन्होंने वहाँ का चक्कर लगाया है उन्होंने वहाँ की बात की है। मगर हमारी योजना का आधारभूत सिद्धान्त है लोकतन्त्र के आधार पर नवनिर्माण करना। अगर लोकतन्त्र हमने छोड़ दिया और हमने नवनिर्माण कर भी लिया तो वह एक शव का शृंगार होगा जिसमें कि आत्मा नहीं होगी और मैं स्पष्ट शब्दों में कहूँ कि हम अपने देश के तानाशाही के आधार पर निर्माण करने के प्रयत्नों का समर्थन नहीं कर सकते। चीन का रास्ता अलग है और भारत का रास्ता अलग है। अपने देश की प्रतिभा को और अपनी परम्परा को समझ कर हमें अपना निर्माण करना चाहिए। इसलिए मैंने जो संशोधन उपस्थित किया है उसमें माँग की है कि ५ साल की योजना को हम ७ साल में पूरा करें। इसको थोड़ा सा आगे बढ़ायें और इसके साथ ही साथ जो काम सरकार को हाथ में नहीं लेने चाहियें, उनको सरकार

हाथ में न ले। मगर हम दूसरी योजना की रिपोर्ट के ४०० वें पृष्ठ पर पाते हैं कि हमारी राज्य सरकारों ने कुछ कचड़े बनाने, चीनी और मिट्टी के बर्तन बनाने के लिए कारखाने खोलने की योजनाएँ रखी हैं। अब अगर राज्य सरकारें मिट्टी के बर्तन न बनायें तो उसमें कुछ बिगड़ने वाला नहीं है। हम यह कार्य निजो क्षेत्र के लिए छोड़ दें और स्वयं खाद्य उत्पादन के कार्य को प्राथमिकता दें। चूँकि हमने उसकी अपेक्षा की इसलिए आज हमें यह दिन देखना पड़ रहा है।

एक बात मैं और कहूँगा। हमारे आदर्श-पीय मित्र गेठ गोविन्द दाम ने सभी दलों से अपील की है कि वह योजना को सफल बनाने में सहयोग दें। सहयोग तो हम देना चाहते हैं मगर सहयोग लेने के लिए कोई तैयार नहीं है। सामाजिक क्षेत्र में हम छद्मप्राधान्य खत्म कर रहे हैं मगर राजनैतिक क्षेत्र में उसे शुरू कर रहे हैं। भारतीय जनमंच ने एक प्रस्ताव द्वारा सरकार की अल्प बचत योजनाओं में सहयोग देने का निश्चय किया है। हमने इस प्रस्ताव की सूचना राज्य सरकारों और केंद्रीय सरकार को भी दे दी है पर सहयोग लेना तो अलग रहा, अभी तक हमें उस चिट्ठी का जवाब भी नहीं मिला है।

भारत सेवक समाज जो जनता का सहयोग प्राप्त करने के लिए बनाया गया था वह भी कांग्रेस सेवक समाज होता जा रहा है। यह बात मैं नहीं कहना बल्कि भारत सेवक समाज का जुलाई १९५७ का जो अंक है उसमें श्री रामनारायण चौधरी का एक लेख छपा है। उस लेख का शीर्षक है "क्या हम ईमानदार हैं?" कुछ प्रश्न उन्होंने खड़े किये हैं और बाद में उन्होंने उनका उत्तर भी दिया है। उन्होंने अपने उत्तर में इस प्रकार लिखा है :

"मैं अपने इन उत्तरों से खुद सन्तुष्ट नहीं हूँ और, निश्चय ही प्रश्न करने वाला भला इन से कहीं सन्तुष्ट होगा। इतना सब कहने

[श्री बाजपेयी]

के बाद और अपने विचारों को ऊंचे स्तर में प्रकट करने के बाद एक जिज्ञासु और आत्म-चिन्तक के हृदय में यह प्रश्न फिर भी बार बार उठता है कि क्या हम ईमानदार हैं ?

श्रम और रोजगार तथा योजना मंत्रों के समा-सचिव (श्री ल० ना० मिश्र) : यह उनकी व्यक्तिगत राय है ।

श्री बाजपेयी : यह भारत सेवक समाज का मुख पत्र है, मैं इसमें व्यक्तिगत राय नहीं मान सकता । भारत सेवक समाज में जो काम कर रहे हैं उनकी यह राय है ।

श्री बी० चं० शर्मा : आपकी भी यही राय है ।

श्री बाजपेयी : अगर आप भी गम्भीरता से विचार करेंगे तो आप की भी यही राय होगी ।

भारत सेवक समाज को और अधिक व्यापक बनाने की जरूरत है । हम उस में काम करना चाहते हैं मगर कर नहीं सकते ।

श्री ल० ना० मिश्र : आपका स्वागत है, कीजिए ।

श्री बाजपेयी : अगर जन सहयोग प्राप्त करना है तो उस के लिए उपयुक्त वातावरण

का निर्माण करना होगा और सरकार देश में यह वातावरण उत्पन्न करने में असफल रही है । देश का नव निर्माण किसी एक पार्टी के बूते की बात नहीं है, वह पार्टी चाहे कितनी ही बड़ी हो । इस के लिए देश की करोड़ों भुजाओं के सोए हुए सहास को और उस की नव निर्माण की शक्ति को जगाना होगा, और जब वह जागेगी तभी देश का नव निर्माण होगा । आवश्यकता है कि हम यथार्थवाददिता में काम लें । रिफ्लिज्म इन प्लैनिंग होनी चाहिए । हम में यथार्थवाद नहीं रहा, और उसका परिणाम हमारे सामने है ।

मुझे आशा है कि जो सकट खड़ा हो गया है, वह हमारी सरकार को इस दिशा में पुनर्विचार करने को विवश करेगा और देश की जनता सरकार के साथ कंधे से कंधा लगा कर राष्ट्र निर्माण की योजनाओं को पूरा करने में हाथ बटाएगी । इस आशा के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ ।

17.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 21st November, 1957.