

Bill

is going to come to his rescue. It is the duty of the Government to help him—and this is all the more important—and this importance has been increased by your confession that he was kidnapped from our soil. Are we to be silent witnesses there? First, there was a report that he was under duress. Then he was tortured. Now, they are going to make a show that some kind of a legal aid is being given. We are naturally very agitated. We want something more concrete from the spokesman of the Government that we will do everything to see that this man is saved. They are going to punish him and tell the world that he was duly tried, that all the judicial processes were followed, and that he has been convicted. We do not want to see this happening. Therefore, the Government must try to do something more than telling us that he did not ask for aid. He was never allowed to ask.

Mr. Speaker: The Government will take note of all that has been said and appeared.

12.43 hrs.

DELHI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
(AMENDMENT) BILL*

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, 1957."

The motion was adopted.

Shri Datar: I introduce† the Bill.

12:44 hrs.

MOTION RE: THIRD FIVE YEAR
PLAN

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister on the 21st August, 1961, namely:

"That the Third Five Year Plan laid on the Table of the House on the 7th August, 1961 be taken into consideration."

Shri Somani.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): Sir, I had just begun yesterday; I was on my legs.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri Achar: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was referring yesterday to the railway lines in the south. Now, I would refer to the relevant passages in the report. I would like to invite the attention of the House and of the hon. Minister to page 548, paragraph 28, where it is observed as follows:

"The following new lines are under consideration for inclusion in the railway programme:"

Four lines are mentioned therein, namely: (i) Mangalore-Hassan; (ii) Bangalore-Salem; (iii) Manamadurai-Virudhunagar; and (iv) Sikinda-Daitri mining area in Orissa. Then, after that, I would like to invite the attention of the hon. Minister to the passage with respect to the Mangalore port. That occurs on page 561 and reads as follows:

"The programme for the development of ports includes—

the word used is 'includes'—

"two projects for the upgrading of two minor ports into all-weather ports, Tuticorin and Mangalore."

*Published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II—Section 3 dated 22-8-1961.

†Introduced with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Achar]

A little down below, the following observation about Mangalore occurs:

"Mangalore is proposed to be developed primarily to handle about 2 million tons of iron ore expected to be exported from Chitaldrug and other mining areas in the vicinity of the port. Technical investigations in connection with the development of the port are in progress."

First, let me convey the gratitude of myself and the people of Mysore to the Government for including Mangalore port in the third Plan. This was the dream of our great Indian statesman, Sir M. Visveswaraya who, happily as a centenarian, is happily with us still. We are so happy about it. I am certain that when he hears that Mangalore port has been included in the third Plan he will be very happy over it. He dreamt of it when I was a student more than half a century ago. This is being achieved in the country when it is now independent. Even in the time of the Britishers, this question was raised, but Mysore could not have the outlet for trade in the international world. I thank the Government, the Minister of Planning and the Planning Commission for having included Mangalore port in the third Plan. I am so glad and happy over it. (*Interruption*).

I was just now referring to one sentence in the report with regard to the Mangalore-Hassan railway line and other lines. All that is stated in the report is, "it is under consideration." I raised this point in the Consultative Committee also and I think we were more or less assured that it will be included. But I would like to have a clear assurance that both the Mangalore-Hassan and the Bangalore-Salem lines are included in the third Plan. Consideration about the Mangalore-Hassan line has been going on for the last half a century. A railway line was first laid at Mangalore in 1907. A railway cess

was also collected. I do not want to argue about it again, and all that I want to say is that this argument, namely, that it is almost impossible to have the port unless you have the Hassan-Mangalore line and all that, need not be repeated. The Hassan-Mangalore line is absolutely necessary. Similarly the Bangalore-Salem line is also absolutely necessary for the industrial development of that area, especially with the growth of industries like the Neyveli project and so on. I would submit that both these lines are absolutely necessary. So far as the Hassan-Mangalore line is concerned, it is practically the life-line for the trade of Mysore State, and for the development of Mangalore port. I only appeal to the Minister to make this point very clear, and to state in his reply, that the Mangalore-Hassan railway line is included in the third Plan.

Now, I shall turn to a subject which is included in the Plan but which we do not want. I represent practically the whole of the district of Coorg, except a small portion of it. We have a great number of hill people in Coorg, and except perhaps a very small number of people, they are all against two river valley projects contemplated there. One is at Harangi and the other is at Kambakada. Kambakada is on the Cauvery and Harangi is on the Harangi river. This is a matter affecting if not the whole State of Mysore but the district of Coorg which was formerly a separate State. It had its own identity. It is a hilly district more or less situated at a height of about 3,000 to 4,000 ft. It is having very heavy rains. In fact, the other day the papers called it the Cherrapunji of South India. It had about 90 inches of rain per annum formerly. This year, it has had already nearly 200 inches of rain. It is full of hills and valleys and streams. It is a very wet area. You know that it has got excellent coffee estates earning foreign exchange. The district has got so many streams and so much of water. They propose to build two big dams there,

one at Harangi and the other at Kam-bakada. By stagnating the water and by having all these valleys filled up with water, great damage would be done to the district. The economy of the district will be jeopardised. They feel that this accumulation of water will in the end practically ruin the valleys and there may be even land-slides. In fact, we have read in the papers how in the recent floods, on account of heavy rain, even hills have slid and terraced fields and coffee estates have been destroyed to a considerable extent. Even as a result of heavy rain, the district is suffering.

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): Even the Coorg Government, before it was integrated into Mysore had their own plan for Harangi, not a high dam, but a lower dam.

Shri Achar: I am thankful to Shri Dasappa for what he has said. If alternative schemes can be found and water can be utilised in that manner, nobody has any objection. But the real objection is for the construction of these dams, because there is a great anxiety in the district that it will destroy most of their coffee estates. In view of the water accumulation not only will a considerable portion of the estates be submerged, but there will be very great havoc, because if the valleys are filled with water, some of these hills will become peaks and the rest will be surrounded by water.

In view of this, there is a strong feeling in Coorg that these high dams should not be undertaken. I understand they were included in the Plan without having full particulars about this matter without estimates, without considering what would be the effect of these high dams on the coffee estates and terraced fields and without considering what would be the effect on the weather conditions, moisture, etc. All these things should be considered. Probably it has been put in a hurry. Submissions have been made by the Coorg people and there was an impression that the whole matter will be reconsidered. I do not say that

the water should not be utilised in the interest of the country. I do concede that point. I also concede that if it is only a small number of people suffering or a small acreage which would be submerged and the benefit will be much more, it is perfectly right that in the national interest, such dams should be constructed. But we have to consider at the same time the huge loss and damage done to the district, which was practically an independent State at one time.

I am told that at the time of merger, they have been given assurances that their interests would not be jeopardised at any time. I submit that the Planning Commission should consider all these aspects of the matter. I am told there has been some reconsideration in the State level. I understand the Minister also had gone there and I was very happy to learn that one of the Members of the Planning Commission also had been there. Considering all these aspects, I submit that the Planning Commission and the Planning Minister reconsider this and find out whether another alternative cannot be found. In the national interest, every drop of Cauvery water has to be used, but at the same time, they should do it without affecting the economy of the district. These are some of the items which affected my State and I wanted to deal with them first.

Now, I would like to refer to two points regarding the Plan. The first point is about the point that has been raised by several hon. Members with regard to the public enthusiasm that has to be aroused in the country for the proper working of the Plan. Shri Asoka Mehta, the leader of the PSP, made special reference to this aspect. So far as people who come from the rural areas are concerned, we feel that in spite of the big projects and in spite of the national income increasing, much has not been done in the rural areas to arouse the enthusiasm of the people there. I think something has to be done in this regard. Even the community projects are not properly working. In this

[Shri Achar] connection, I would like to draw the attention of the Planning Commission to the scheme of rural industrialisation as contemplated by the new Chief Minister of Orissa, Shri Bijoyanand Patnaik. He has been explaining this at several places. He has an idea of developing several industrial schemes in the villages. I wish very much that the Planning Commission also pay attention to this question and rural industrialisation is attempted with greater zeal in the third Five Year Plan.

Then, I would like to refer to the regional development which is referred to in this book. No doubt often it is stated that there should be balanced development, every part of the country must be developed, etc. But when we see the actual position, we find that only some areas are getting the benefits. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister especially to the Malenad area in Mysore and also Kerala State. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Sometimes, if hon. Members do not want to hear a particular speech every minute becomes an hour. He started at 12.44 and now it is 12.56.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan (Coimbatore): He spoke yesterday also.

Mr. Speaker: Only for a few minutes. I may also say that hon. Members also will watch. The speech is not merely for recording, but they must also convince the House and carry the House with them. In a public meeting, if the audience go away, what happens?

Shri Achar: They are not willing to listen.

Mr. Speaker: I am willing.

Shri Achar: In the Malenad areas, there are ample resources. Forests, mines and all the resources are there, but there has not been a proper economic survey of the area. That has to be carried out and special attention

must be paid to the Malenad area, which is very backward.

Another important aspect I would like to urge, which is very important is, a proper techno-economic survey and a geological survey of that area should be carried out. Often it is stated that we do not have the necessary mineral resources. Even with regard to coal, I do not know whether there has been a regular geological survey in that area. Only the other day we found that there was iron ore in Gopichettyaiyayam in Coimbatore District. Nobody knew anything about it. Hardly a year ago, iron ore was found very near Mangalore, hardly 30 or 40 miles away from it. This was never known all these years on account of the fact that there has been no proper geological survey of that area.

Then, Sir, I would like to say only one word about the export policy. Of course, on the question of foreign exchange export is the most important factor. We find that with regard to that sufficient attention is not being paid—at least that is what I feel. For example, there is our traditional export of spices. With regard to spices, what are we, to export if there is no production? Production is the most important factor. I have been asking the Government to develop its cultivation. For that purpose I have been asking for a Spices Board for the last three or four years. So far as the hon. Minister is concerned, he was very sympathetic. He said that we could have a Spices Board. But sometimes what happens is, the Planning Commission comes in the way. Finally, Sir, I am told that they have also agreed to the proposal of setting up a Spices Board and a Board for cashew also. It would certainly help very much the export of spices if a Board is established for that purpose.

13 hrs.

At the same time, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister as well as the Planning Com.

mission to the Coir Board that has been formed. It is also one of the items which earns foreign exchange. What we find is, so far as the Coir Board is concerned almost all the members of the Board except one or two come from one State with the result that whatever amount is given is naturally spent in that State. Mysore also, especially on the western coast, has plenty of coconut growth and coir can be produced in large quantities. But nothing has been done to develop that industry there. I would request the hon. Minister of Planning to pay attention to that side of it. These Boards must also work in a manner that would help the development of a particular industry in all the States where it is possible and the representation on these Boards must be from all such States.

Then, Sir, the last point I would like to refer to is with regard to the question of inflation. No doubt, so far as one important matter—deficit financing—is concerned, I see that in the Third Plan it has been very much reduced; it is hardly Rs. 500 crores. But there is another aspect and a very important aspect which would probably lead to inflation, and that is the taxation policy. Several speakers also have referred to it, and that is with regard to indirect taxation. We are going to have taxation to the tune of Rs. 1,700 and odd crores. If indirect taxation is further increased, it is sure to result in the prices rising. No doubt, we have got the Income-tax Bill on the anvil and by its modification and by having a higher income from direct taxes indirect taxes may be reduced to some extent; but as we see the report of the Plan it looks as if they are going to have more indirect taxation than direct. Even persons like Mr. Mahalanobis seem to think that the rural area is getting more richer and so they should be taxed more. But is that position correct? Even the Agricultural Labour Enquiry Report has said that the income of the labour class is going down. The small farmers are in no way in a better

position than these labourers. It may be that their income has increased a little; but the point is that probably from starvation they might have moved on to half starvation. Should such people be taxed still more? I would submit, Sir, that as far as possible the necessary income must be drawn from direct taxation and not from indirect taxation and you must thus see that inflation also does not come up.

Mr. Speaker: Shri G. D. Somani—I will call Shri Masani next and then Shri Braj Raj Singh.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Has not, Sir, a spokesman of the Swatantra Party spoken already?

Mr. Speaker: He has spoken. But it must be left to me to decide. I was looking here for the hon. Member yesterday, because I wanted to provide an opportunity for every group particularly in this debate on Planning. But hon. Members have a knack of choosing their own time and they want me to abide by it.

Shri Maniyangadan (Kottayam): There are certain States from which no Members have spoken so far.

Mr. Speaker: I know that a few States have not been represented at all. I will call them after this.

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): Nobody on the Congress side has spoken from Bihar.

Shri Bihwanath Roy (Salempur): Nobody from eastern U. P. has spoken.

Shri Harish Chandra Mather (Pali) It is not only a question of individual States, Sir; we have got certain all-India aspects to say.

Mr. Speaker: I have a list here. Representatives from Bihar and Assam have not spoken. One Member has spoken from Rajasthan.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur): What about backward areas?

Mr. Speaker: Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur and Orissa have not been represented so far.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: I want to talk about the backward areas in the whole of India.

Mr. Speaker: I shall first of all give an opportunity to those States which have not been represented so far. At least one hon. Member from each State has to be called first, whether he comes from the Congress side or the Opposition. After that, I shall have another round exhausting the others.

Shrimati Parvarthi Krishnan: Apart from States, Sir, there are also specific problems relating to women.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to call her. She may speak not only of Kerala but of women also.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: Not Kerala, Sir; Tamilnad.

Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra): Nobody has spoken from the PSP.

Mr. Speaker: His party has been amply represented, unless another hon. Member wants to speak from that party. Shri Asoka Mehta spoke very well.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Sir, the Prime Minister also spoke very well; therefore, nobody should be called from the Congress side.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Somani—

Shri Somani (Dausa): Mr. Speaker, Sir, planning in our country has been unique in various ways. As a matter of fact, ours perhaps is the only country which has enjoyed a stable democratic government during the last 14 years under the inspiring leadership of our Prime Minister. Our national Government has also initiated this comprehensive socio-economic planning with social consent rather than mass coercion. Naturally, therefore,

Sir, the tempo of progress in our country, to some extent, has been affected by the fact that we have been so keen to uphold our democratic pattern of constitution.

Even then, the achievements that we have made during the last two Five Year Plans will show that from a stagnant condition of our economy we have been able to achieve a dynamic economy during this period of two successive Five Year Plans, and I have no doubt that our Third Five Year Plan will take us forward to a, what is called, "take-off" stage, to a stage where our economy will ultimately become self-sustained and self-reliant.

There was a lot of criticism in the beginning when the magnitude of the Third Five Year Plan was announced of the order of Rs. 10,000 crores, but I think every section of the country now realises that so far as the size of the Plan is concerned, it is quite realistic and it is within the capacity of our country to achieve provided no unforeseen factors intervene in the Plan period.

Sir, we have been able to increase our annual investment both in the public and in the private sectors from Rs. 500 crores per year to something of the order of Rs. 1,600 crores. Thereby our economy has had a rapid expansion. Whatever investments we have made, no doubt, have not been able to fructify, but when all these investments will be functioning productively, there is no doubt that then we will be able to make some impact on the problems of our standard of living.

Coming to certain specific problems, I would like to say something first on the question of pricing policy, about which a lot has been said in the Plan. I would like to submit that ultimately the solution of the pricing policy lies in adequate production, both in agriculture and in industry, and it is therefore very essential that we must aim at a policy which will lead to increased production in all possible

ways. After all, we must not under-rate the saving capacity and the incentives that are necessary to produce mass enthusiasm and mass creative action so that in all sections of our economy we will be able to increase productivity all round. In the narrow context of the pricing policy, I would like to draw the attention of the Planning Minister to the very rigid policy which is being followed by the Government and the Planning Commission in the matter of fixing prices for certain industries which are treated as of basic importance to our economy.

For instance, the saving capacity of the corporate sector in industries like steel, cement, coal, electric power, heavy chemicals and heavy engineering is very adversely affected due to the very rigid policy of price control in regard to the prices of manufactured goods of these industries. It is, therefore, very desirable that a rational price policy should be followed in order to regulate the flow of resources required for the development of the basic industries. Indeed, it has been laid down in the Plan itself that:

"Since real resources needed have to be mobilised through monetary incentives, and a fairly high degree of profitability secured for those sectors of the economy which have to be expanded rapidly, it is essential to be prepared for a moderate rise in the price level while directing every effort possible towards preventing a rise in the prices of essential goods."

It is already embodied in the Third Plan itself. In this regard, it would be pertinent to point out certain basic flaws in our pricing policies. One fundamental defect of pricing policy is that it does not take note of the necessity to align incentives with priorities. For example, in the list of planning priorities, the top place has been given to basic industries such as coal, electricity, steel, cement, heavy chemicals etc. which are in-

cluded in the core of the Plan, but the profit incentives provided to them in price control measures are very low compared to the profit incentives prevailing in the case of uncontrolled industries of secondary importance, which are placed low on the priority list. This anomaly creates distortions in the allocation of resources for investment purposes, because, investors naturally prefer to put their money in ventures in unimportant industries rather than go in for basic industries. This explains the latest craze for new shares in industries not likely to fall under price control at the cost of basic industries. Therefore, there is a flow of investment in those industries which are not of basic importance to our national economy. I, therefore, plead with the Planning Minister that every possible consideration should be given to the need for giving reasonable prices, which have to be controlled, so that the industries may be able to expand their resources in a proper manner.

I would now come to the question of regional disparities about which so much has already been spoken by so many hon. Members. That, we are told, is a major objective of our Planning. Indeed, it has been laid down in the Plan itself: that the balanced growth of all regions is a major objective of our planning and economic development, and yet the situation is one which requires to be properly examined. In this context, I would like to give certain figures of industrial investment in both the public as well as private sector. The total investments in the Second Plan period is Rs. 1,620 crores, but of which Rs. 770 crores have been invested in the public sector and Rs. 850 crores have been invested in the private sector. Regarding the investment of private sector, only investment pertaining to large industries has been made available to us by the Planning Commission. Out of the available figures, out of an investment of Rs. 521.8 crores, it appears that large-scale private industries have invested Rs. 1.5 crores in Assam, Rs. 3.9 crores in Kerala and Rs. 5.9

[Shri Somani]

crores in Rajasthan. The picture would not be different if the figures for the remaining investments are available.

So far as Rajasthan is concerned, there has not been a single investment, so far as the public sector investments are concerned. That means, out of a total investment of Rs. 1,620 crores, both by the public as well as private sectors, in the industrialisation of our country during the Second Plan, Rajasthan has got something of the order of Rs. 6 crores for industrial development investment. This is really a state of affairs which should cause a lot of disquiet to our planners.

We are functioning under a democratic process of planning and there is absolutely no question of any compulsion being exercised on any of the private investors. It is absolutely left to the choice of the investor in a particular State or in a particular region, although certain steps have been taken taken by way of regulating the issue of licences according to a certain pattern of priorities. Yet, the fact remains that whatever steps have so far been taken, have not only not arrested this tendency of the very progressive areas getting more and more industries, but, on the other hand, the whole question has become more aggravated and something more radical is necessary and more effective measures have to be taken if this question of the development of the backward areas is to be tackled effectively. There may be various ways of doing it, but the other day I had suggested in the course of the discussion on the Income-tax Bill that the additional depreciation allowance should be given for the development of industries in areas which may be declared as backward. In that connection, I had also quoted the opinion of the economic development committee in the United States to show how even in such a highly developed and industrialised country like the United States, they have recommended that certain areas which are backward or where the unemploy-

ment is much more severe than in other areas, should be given more incentives by way of additional depreciation so that investment would be automatically diverted from the more advanced areas to the less developed ones. Now, opinions may differ. I do not say that this is the only effective remedy. There may be other measures which can be considered to ensure that the investment on industries will result in a balanced growth of all the areas. But the question remains, and it is really of a very serious character.

So far as the statistics of the Second Plan are concerned, out of an investment of Rs. 1,600 odd crores in public and private sectors, Rajasthan has got only Rs. 6 crores, a figure which will show the glaring disparity which has been accentuated and aggravated during the Second Plan period, so far as industrial development of the country is concerned. Therefore, I plead in all humility and with all earnestness with the Planning Commission that whatever has been provided in the Plan is not sufficient. They have expressed a hope in the Plan that the priorities laid down in the Plan will result in the elimination of disparities, but looking at the picture as it has emerged from the Second Plan, I do feel that the position will not be rectified unless the whole question is discussed on a more realistic basis and some more positive and concrete measures have been taken to ensure really that the backward areas get preferential treatment in various ways, and there are steps which can be suggested and which can be discussed. But in my view the problem has not been tackled with the urgency which it deserves.

Now I would like to say a few words about the next vital question of export promotion. Under the Third Five Year Plan our export target has been placed at Rs. 3,700 crores which means that we must export something at the rate of Rs. 750 crores per year. Our exports have been very stagnant

throughout the ten years of our planned development. We have been exporting at the rate of something like Rs. 600 crores every year and from the figures that have been given it appears that we have lost ground in the export market so far as the total world trade is concerned.

Here again, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Planning Minister and ask for the basis on which the exports at the rate of Rs. 750 crores every year have been taken. From whatever one can see from the present trend it seems very doubtful whether we will be able to achieve this target of Rs. 750 crores per annum. This matter of exports again requires to be tackled in a much more realistic and urgent manner than what has been done so far.

The Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry had submitted a very comprehensive memorandum to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry giving various additional suggestions to boost the export trade. The only thing that the Ministry did in response to that representation was to appoint a committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Ramaswami Mudaliar. I have no doubt that that high-powered committee will produce a very useful report, but I cannot understand, when our export problem has to be tackled in a much more urgent and realistic manner, how this reference of this vital problem to a committee will solve it. We are rather accustomed to believe that the Government, whenever they do not want to decide any issue decisively, just take recourse to the appointment of these committees and thereby delay the decision on a particular point. My submission to the Government is that so far as this problem of exports is concerned, unless some more radical, more imaginative and more bold measures are taken to stimulate our export trade, we will continue to have the stagnant conditions which prevail today.

This question of the European Common Market and the UK joining the

European Common Market will again create a lot of complications so far as our export trade is concerned. The textile industry alone is exporting something like 200 million yards every year to the United Kingdom. That is, one-third of our total export of textile industry goes to the UK. If the UK joins the European Common Market there is every likelihood of our exports being adversely affected. At a time when we should do everything possible to boost our export trade, here we are faced with a situation where whatever we are already exporting may be adversely affected. It is in the context of this present need of boosting the export trade that I would request for a proper reappraisal of the measures that have been taken so far so that some new and more effective and realistic measures may be taken to boost the export trade.

Lastly, I would like to say a word about the targets which have been fixed for the textile industry, that is, about the target of 9,300 million yards of textiles. So far as fixing a low target for the organised mill industry is concerned you will appreciate that it suits the interests of the industry just to have a production which is less than the actual demand. What I am pleading with the House is that the industry should not be made the scapegoat of ill-informed criticism whenever any shortage of textiles takes place and whenever there is a rise in cloth prices as happened only last year. My submission is that the textile industry throughout has been representing to the Planning Commission and to the Government that the targets should be fixed somewhat higher than the anticipated increase in cloth consumption so that conditions will never arise where we will be faced with scarcity. It is from that point of view that I think that the target of 9,300 million yards is low. It means only 17.2 yards per capita consumption of cloth. We must remember that our per capita consumption even in the pre-war period was 16 yards. Therefore this

[Shri Somani]

17·2 yard per capita consumption of cloth in the Third Five Year Plan cannot by any stretch of imagination be regarded as realistic. But apart from this target, the allocation that has been made between the organised industry and the decentralised sector also does not seem to be realistic in the sense that the textile industry has been asked to produce only 5,800 million yards and the remaining 3,500 million yards have been allocated to the decentralised sector.

Here, we have no quarrel so far as the handlooms are concerned. The handlooms and the organised industry co-exist. They have been co-existing for a very long time, and the industry is not at all opposed to any of the measures that have been taken to protect the interests of the handlooms. But what is happening is this. The production of handlooms has been estimated at something in the neighbourhood of 1,800 million yards. But actually it has been shown and proved by the Indian Textile Mills Federation that so far as those figures are concerned, they are incorrect. The major portion of whatever is regarded as being produced by handlooms is actually the production of powerlooms. Both the organised industry and the handloom organisations are opposed to this mushroom growth of powerlooms. I do not see why the Planning Commission should not enquire into the loss that is done to our national economy, into the loss that is done to the Government in the shape of excise duties and into the loss that is also done in various other ways. Last year it was announced that the powerlooms will be licensed and that certain steps will be taken to regulate these powerlooms. Somehow those steps have not been taken further. I am, therefore, submitting that this division of the textile target of 9,300 million yards between the organised sector and the decentralised sector should be properly analysed so that we may not be faced with the situation that the de-

centralised sector may not be able to produce the 3,500 million yards, that it has been allocated today and again certain scarcity conditions may be brought about.

I would not like to take much time of the House on any other point except to say that it is never possible to get unanimity so far as any plan is concerned and specially a plan of that magnitude and complexity which has been presented to us. Differences are bound to remain. But a plan which has been formulated after a series of discussions and consultations with all interests concerned must be regarded as a national Plan and every section of the House here and outside must be determined to see that we shall do everything possible to bring success to the Plan.

Shri M. R. Masani (Ranchi—East): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the substitute motion disapproving the Plan moved by my hon. friend, Professor Ranga. --

An Hon. Member: It was expected.

Shri M. R. Masani: In considering this Plan it is useful in the beginning to cast an eye at the situation or the picture that faces us at the end of the Second Five Year Plan.

What are the main facts of life with which we are faced today? From these we must start. I suggest that these main facts are three. First, there is the phenomenon of rising prices. That does not need to be established by me because the Reserve Bank's report on currency and finance for the year 1960-61 and the Economic Adviser's general index of wholesale prices show a net rise of 7·2 per cent during the past year on top of a rise of 5·8 per cent in 1959-60. The Governor of the Reserve Bank himself in a recent speech has complained that there has been a steady rise, a continuous rise, in prices at the rate of 6 per cent per year during the Second Plan period without

any reduction at any point of time. The Plan itself at page 121 concedes that wholesale prices have risen by about 30 per cent.

The second important fact with which we must start is the stagnant income of the large mass of our people. In so far as the landless labourer is concerned, the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Report laid on the Table of this House on the 21st December, 1960, shows a material decline in wages and an increase in unemployment and indebtedness on the part of our agricultural labourers between 1950-51 and 1956-57. That process, to those who observe, has been further accentuated during the past four or five years. In so far as the industrial worker is concerned, my hon. friend the Minister of Planning and Labour said in the House on 11th April, 1960,

"Between 1939 and 1947, the standard of living of the workers had declined by 25 per cent. By 1951, they had just covered the lost ground. By 1955, the real wages had increased by 13 per cent. But, since 1956, when again prices started rising, their gains have been to an extent wiped out."

So far as the lower middle class is concerned, I would say that their standard of life has gone down during the past five years. It is not only a matter of stagnating; there has been a cut back in their standard of life.

Who then has benefited by these Plans? The answer would appear to be that it is the new ruling class who are in power and in office on the one side and their satellites, a few privileged businessmen who have been given private monopolies of a limited kind on the other. It is these classes that are the only beneficiaries of the first two Plans.

The third main fact of life is the bankruptcy of this country. Our

foreign exchange reserves have gone down below the safety point. The total credits so far obtained as a result of all the agreements signed by this country are, I understand, of the order of Rs. 1750 crores. That is the best figure I have been able to ascertain from official quarters. That is the present measure of the credit that we have agreed to take or which have been vouchsafed to us in the aggregate as a result of all the agreements signed with various countries. To this sum of Rs. 1750 crores, we now propose to add a further foreign indebtedness of Rs. 2200 crores. These are figures that make one shiver. Because, it really means that in the effort to repay these amounts and to pay interest and service charges on these loans, the future of this country for many many years is being mortgaged. On the other hand, exports through which alone we can possibly pay back our foreign intake of loans, are stagnant. I shall say a little about this later. But, while we go on increasing our loans from the rest of the world, we have shown our inability to repay them. This is the Rake's Progress from which we must now desist. This is the picture.

What are the prime needs of the Third Five Year Plan? The Third Plan itself sets out these needs admirably in certain parts of that long and verbose document. These needs are set out as three: (i) more saving and investment; (ii) greater production and greater productivity—that is, efficient production at low cost; (iii) export. That is an excellent summary of the primary needs of the country which the Third Plan must carry out. I do not think any one can improve on the Plan itself in setting out its needs: more investment, more efficient production at low cost, and export.

How does the Third Plan set about carrying out these three purposes? If my hon. friend the Minister will not mind my saying so, it sets of about the purposes by frustrating or denying every one of these three objec-

[Shri M. R. Masani]

tives, by sabotaging each of them, if I may use a strong word. I was going back to Bombay on a short visit on Monday. In the plane, I read a book—and it chanced to be on the eve of this debate—'Indian Economic Policy and Development' by Prof. P. T. Bauer, Professor of Economics and in particular of under-developed Economies and Economic Development at the London University, published by George Allen and Unwin. It gladdened my heart to read this book, because I found in it a complete vindication of those of us who have rejected the Second and Third Plans as being disastrous to the interest of the country. Let me read just one passage from this book to illustrate the point I am making that the Plan in its effect, in the measures that it suggests, defeats all the purposes which it itself sets out. I am quoting from this book at pages 97 and 98:

"There is the massive expenditure on heavy industry, when the economic demand for its products is highly problematical; at the same time, there is the neglect of education where the needs are evident and pressing and can only be met by Government. There is the comparatively small expenditure on agriculture, and also the restrictions on movement of agricultural products, in the face of the manifest, urgent and desperate need to increase agricultural productivity and to extend production for the market. There are the severe restrictions, or complete prohibitions, on the supply of certain categories of both imported and even locally produced consumer goods, in the face of the urgent need both to raise living standards and to provide incentives to agricultural production for the market. There are restrictions on the extension of efficient industrial capacity in the face of a manifest need to economise resources and satisfy wants at low costs. There is the

exclusion of private Indian and foreign enterprise and investment from a wide range of industrial and commercial activity, in the face of the urgent need to encourage viable economic activity."

So he goes on. Here, in a paragraph, he has stated the paradoxes of the Third Plan. On the one hand, it tries to do something; with the other hand, it completely defeats all its purposes by the actual detailed functioning and measures of the Plan.

What are those aspects of the Plan which, in fact, defeat its purpose? I would list them under five heads.

First, persistence in increasing direct and indirect taxation which is already excessive. By that insistence, certain effects are produced. Secondly, persistence with deficit financing to the extent of Rs. 500 crores. Thirdly, insistence on or obsession with forced industrialisation irrespective of cost, a kind of recklessness—let us produce; it does not matter at what cost; so long as industrialisation takes place, it is legitimate in itself. Industrialisation for itself without the justification of efficiency: this is the third major aspect.

I would like to document this a little. There is priority for low and slow return heavy industries, the particular highwater mark of that being the needless, premature setting up of a fourth steel plant. On each of the three steel plants that have been set up already, we have spent—on each of them—twice the entire expenditure on elementary education in our country. Just think of this. Similarly, the cost of the heavy industrial programme in the public sector exceeds the entire outlay on agriculture. In a country where 70 per cent of our people live on the land and work on the land, we are spending more than half of the total outlay on industrial enterprises in the public sector. That particular State sector of our indus-

trial enterprises takes half of the entire cake, while 70 per cent of our people live in the villages and work on the land. This is the lopsided, top-heavy, unbalanced nature of our Plan.

It finds particular expression in the tendency to gigantism, to talk of big things, striking things. Nowhere is this waste of public resources better embodied than in our fad for Atomic Energy.

Even the United States, which leads the world in this race for Atomic-energy, is cutting back. It is realising that so far as industrial purposes are concerned, it is a chimera and a distant prospect. Six years ago, the Atomic Energy Commission of the United State predicted a capacity of 2 million kw. of atomic generated electricity by 1960. That year has passed. Last month, the Commission admitted that the United States would be lucky to have 750,000 kw. of atomic generated power capacity at the end of the year. Similarly, it has now been announced that the cost of nuclear power is prohibitively high and will remain so for a long time.

An Hon. Member: It is not so.

Shri M. E. Masani: The lowest cost of that power is 15 mills per kw-h. Even the most expensive form of present day conventionally produced electricity costs only 9 mills per kw-h. This is a big gulf. The Prime Minister said in this House on the 19th that India should proceed with atomic power "irrespective of the cost factor."

He went on to say,

"...even if it is not economical, we have to do it for tomorrow and the day after."

If I may say, we are living in one world and one part of the world can benefit from technological advances in another country. Every country does not have to go through the same thing on an autarchic basis. This is a fallacy.

Mahatma Gandhi was able to see this flaw in the hon. Prime Minister's economic thinking a long time ago. On 29th June, 1939, Gandhiji wrote a letter to Rajkumari Amrit Kaur on the subject of Pandit Nehru's planning. This was what he said. This is the whole letter; it is a three-sentence letter dated 29th June, 1939.

Mr. Speaker: Is it published anywhere?

Shri M. E. Masani: It is published in a Collection of Gandhiji's letters published by the Navjivan Press. It is letter No. 184 in the series.

Shri Ranga (Tenali): On the eve of the war.

Shri M. E. Masani: It was written when the National Planning Committee was just being set up by Pandit Nehru.

Shri Ranga: It was being wound up then.

Shri M. E. Masani: This was what Gandhiji wrote:

"I have advised you about Jawaharlal's invitation. In my opinion, the whole of his planning is a waste of effort. But he cannot be satisfied with anything that is not big."

Sir, I would hesitate to make such a crushing comment as Mahatma Gandhi has done.

The fourth factor of this Third Plan is the domination of the State sector. We know that the Third Plan tries to force savings or investments away from the people's enterprise into State monopolies. At page 14 of the Plan, it is said:

"As compared to 1950-51, by the end of the Third Plan, the contribution of the public sector will increase from less than 2 per cent to nearly a fourth in organised manufacturing industries and from less than a tenth to over a third in mineral production."

[Shri M. R. Masani]

The Governor of the Reserve Bank has given comparable figures. He says that the percentage of total investment in the State sector was 21 per cent in the First Plan, 53 per cent in the Second Plan, and it will now be 58 per cent in the Third Plan.

Today, the people of India, outside the State sector, produce 90 per cent. Third Plan wants to cut this down to 40 per cent, and this in spite of the fact that while private enterprise has achieved nearly more than 40 per cent of the target set for it in the Second Plan, the public sector or the State sector fell down on its job by a ten per cent shortfall. That part of the economy that functioned better than expected in the Second Plan is to be punished, but that part of the economy that failed to deliver the goods is to be boosted—in spite of the preference of the people.

Finally, there is the persistence with the collectivisation of land mentioned on pages 209 to 211 of the Plan. If hon. Members think that that particular fad has been laid to rest by the Opposition that was voiced in this Parliament and outside, they will be making a mistake. I want to warn the House and the country against any complacency. Let this present Government win the next elections, and the peasants of India will find that a very dangerous attempt will be made to snatch their lands away from them under the deceptive slogan of "joint co-operative farming". This is necessary, because every State Capitalist plan has to collectivise the land, since there is no other known method of squeezing what is called surplus value, what Marx called "surplus value", out of the earnings of the peasantry.

If these are the four main aspects of the Plan the results are inevitable. If this Plan is passed, I would forecast that the following things are bound to happen.

One is that there will be further inflation. The Plan itself concedes further inflation. On page 127, it says:

"... it is essential to be prepared for a moderate rise in the price level . . ."

How moderate it will be is still to be seen. At another place, in page 132, it says; in trying to justify this calamity which it is inviting on the country, that:

"Price rigidity is incompatible with development and some prices cannot but rise."

It all depends on what you do. If you carry out these misguided policies, the prices will rise; there is no good blaming the prices; you must blame yourselves alone.

Secondly, what will follow will be increased unemployment. The Plan concedes that also. It admits at one place that on top of the 9 million unemployed who today exist, there will be another half a million unemployed added as a result of the Third Plan.

Shri Ranga: It is 3 millions.

Shri M. R. Masani: Half a million; as far as I can recall. 500,000 more will be added to the unemployed force.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: As a result of it or in spite of it?

Shri M. R. Masani: As a result in my view, and in spite of it, in my hon. friend's view; and I can see that the Plan would say 'in spite of it'.

Thirdly, what will happen will be increasing misery for our people through the denial of the necessities of life. The Plan is full of repetition about the need to cut down the consumption of the people. This is very comparable to Mr. Khrushchev's new

programme recently published, where it is said that, at the end of another twenty years, the Soviet people are going to enjoy consumer goods, 1980 is the time when taxes will disappear, and water, electricity and so many other things would be free in the Soviet Union! Pie in the sky when you die, jam tomorrow, jam the day after, but never jam today. That is the slogan, and that is the model. And what is the result? The mighty Soviet regime can fly their rockets to all parts of space, but they cannot make the simple things of life that the people want for their daily needs.

This was illustrated very well the other day, when Mr. Khrushchev was at a dinner party at Moscow only last week. At that dinner party, Mr. Khrushchev boasted that the Soviet Union would be able to make hydrogen bombs equal to 100 million tons of TNT, with which no doubt West Berlin and other places of the world could be blown up. At the end of the same dinner, a menu was passed to the Soviet dictator, and he was asked for his autograph; along with the menu, a Soviet ball-pen was handed over to him. But the wretched thing did not work. So, Mr. Khrushchev took out his own pen from his own pocket and signed his name, and then said—I am quoting Mr. Khrushchev's own words—

“Mine writes. It is American. You have to recognise when a thing is well made.”

This is Mr. Khrushchev's own comment on the state of consumer goods production in Soviet Russia. Finally, what we shall get is high-cost economy.

Mr Speaker: What about the food?

Shri Masani: Food was good; food at Soviet dinner is always good for the ruling class, and for visitors of the ruling classes.

Then again, the effect of this Plan will be a high-cost economy. Today,

State and private monopolies are extorting what a professor has called “near-ransom prices” from the consumer. Just to give an idea of the gap between the price in the world market and the price in India, let us take penicillin. The import price of penicillin is 10 np. per million units. The cost of production at Pimpri, or the price of the Pimpri penicillin, is Rs. 1.25 per million units. So, when we can get penicillin at 10 np., we have to buy Pimpri penicillin at Rs. 1.25 per million units. This is the gap. This is the price that the consumer has to pay for this kind of planning or misapplication of planning.

The result is that large-scale smuggling is going on into this country, because when you create a big gap like this between the import price and the local price, smuggling is inevitable in any part of the world. So, we have a high-priced economy.

If you have a high-cost economy, how do you propose to export? Shri Somani who spoke before me has made, and the Plan itself makes, constant references to the need to export. But how can you export when your cost of production is so high?

Look at the price of sugar. The price of Indian sugar is Rs. 700 per ton. The world price of sugar is Rs. 400 per ton. Not even the ablest Minister can persuade people abroad to buy our sugar when it is selling at so much above world prices. Therefore, the export effort, which is so important, will fail.

Mr. Speaker: Is sugar in the public sector or in the private sector?

Shri M. R. Masani: That does not matter. My point is that the whole economy is being made high-cost. I was not saying that the private sector is cheap. On the contrary, I say that limited monopolies created under the barrier of protection are fleecing the consumer, and the private entrepreneur is doing at least as much as

[Shri M. R. Masani]

the public entrepreneur. That is why you find that.....

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: May I just ask a question? What happened before the public sector came in? What were the sugar prices much earlier, before the Plans started?

Shri M. R. Masani: My hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur is forgetting that I am not speaking on the essence of the public sector or the private sector. I am pointing out that, as a result of the priorities of this Plan, we are producing at high cost. We are producing certain things that we need not produce, and not producing other things that we should produce. I am not trying to judge between the private sector and the public sector. I said earlier that private limited monopolies are holding the consumer up to ransom by charging very high prices. If Pimpri could have been in the private sector, it might have been just as expensive as it is now, because we insist on producing things which should be imported, while not producing food, raw materials and other consumer goods at which we are good.

Now, the question may be asked: Why the Third Plan on the one hand got such good objectives, and why on the other, does it by its measures defeat its own purposes? Why this perversity, which Professor Bauer has so well defined? There are two possible reasons. One is that it may be ignorance of the economic science, a lack of understanding of the problem. I have to much regard for the hon. Minister and the gentlemen who sit on the other side to think that they are doing something that is so self-defeating with their eyes open.

Therefore, one has to look at some other factor which must make them behave in this manner, and I cannot help saying that that factor is the factor of doctrine or dogma. I make bold to say that this Third Five Year Plan is not a plan of economic deve-

lopment at all (*Interruptions*) because its primary interest is not in the development of the economy but in certain political and social objectives which are frankly stated at in other parts of the Plan. I go so far as to say that this is not even a socialist plan of economic development because Socialism implies two things, a rising standard of living for the common people and greater equality. I have shown earlier that far from trying to raise the standard of living of the people, the Second Five Year Plan has either depressed it or is making it stagnate and the that Third Five Year Plan gives us ample warning that if one thing has to be cut down, it is the consumption of goods by the people.

Now, at page 26 of this document, this is what is said:

"As it proceeds, economic development may widen disparities between rural and urban areas, increase differences in levels of development in different parts of the country, and accentuate the problems of economic inequality."

Therefore, I say this is not even a socialist plan of development (*Interruptions*). Then what kind of plan is it? I would say it is a plan to foist on the people of this country the Soviet pattern of State Capitalism.

Mr. Andrew Schonfield, who is a Liberal and a great friend of this Government—he has visited this country, I think, twice by now as the guest of our Government to study our institutions—has said about the Second Plan, not the Third, after going back to London after a visit to India:

"It is a Soviet type plan—and it is a Soviet type plan which errs towards Khrushchev rather than Malenkov"—

This is from the London Observer, and this is very interesting. Mr. Schonfield refers to two types of Soviet

plan. As is well known, Malenkov believing the people a little more to eat, more to wear and a little more of consumption goods and comfort, while Khrushchev stood for tightening the belt in the interest of heavy industry and militarisation. Mr. Shonfield says:

"It is a Soviet type plan which errs towards Khrushchev rather than Malenkov; the consumer gets a very small look-in".

I do not want to suggest that my hon. friend, the Minister of Planning, is consciously trying to impose a Communist economy on this country, but I do suggest to him that he is being made a party to that attempt, without his understanding where he is being taken (*Interruptions*). He may yet open his eyes even now and watch the direction in which the Mahalanobises are taking him, with their undisguised admiration for the Soviet and Chinese dictatorships. After all, Prof. Mahalanobis, who is a Communist fellow-traveller, is a member of the Planning Commission, of which our Minister is the Deputy Chairman.

Now, why do I say this? Why does Mr. Shonfield say this? It is because this Plan is obsessed with autarky. Autarky is a desire to attain self-sufficiency.... (*Interruptions*.) If my hon. socialist and communist friends would care to listen, they would learn a little.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: We doubt it.

Shri M. E. Masani: Then they will be in a better position to reply. Let us put it that way.

Why are we obsessed with autarky? I tried to count in this document the number of places at which his obsession with autarky finds its way under the phrases "self-reliant" and "self-generating" economy which is to be attained at some places in ten years and at other places in fifteen years. The Plan is a little inconsis-

ent on that point. But over and over again, it is said that this Plan will make India completely self-dependent and independent of the rest of the world within 10 to 15 years. For reference, I might mention that this claim is made at pages 24, 26, 29, 48, 50, 107, 116 and 138. If somebody goes into it more carefully, I am sure he will find double the number of references I have given.

Now, why this idea of self-sufficiency? Where does it come from? I suggest it comes from the Soviet Union. You will remember that the Soviet Union started its planning at a time when Soviet Russia's hand was turned against the rest of the world and the hand of the rest of the world was turned against Soviet Russia. There are three differences between us and Soviet Russia.

An Hon. Member: Only three?

Shri M. E. Masani: Yes, three big differences. One is that in Russia, there were not enough people, and a great deal of land; in our case, we have too many people and not enough of land. The second big difference was that Soviet Russia started with the zeal of converting the world by force to its own doctrine, while we have no such pretensions or professions. The third is that the rest of the world was hostile to Soviet Russia while, in our case, there is an Aid to India Club which is pouring out its wealth for our benefit. Therefore, there is nothing in common between our position and the position of the Soviet Union in 1919 and 1920. Yet we are blindly copying this obsession with heavy industrialization which came from the desire in Soviet Russia to strengthen the nation militarily and materially against an onslaught which was expected from the rest of the world. In other words, being a peace-loving Power, being the country of Gandhi, without knowing it, we are following a track which may make sense for a military power out to conquer the rest of the world but

[Shri M. R. Masani]

which makes no sense for a power which is not able to defend even its own frontier. The idea of self-sufficiency is at the very root of this Plan.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member mean to say that without industrialisation the standard of living can be increased? Does he mean to suggest that we should have only an agricultural economy?

Shri M. R. Masani: No, Sir. We believe in all-sided industrialisation. I used the word 'obsession', because there is concentration on a certain type of heavy industry like steel and not on consumer goods. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. lady Member has become a little vociferous. Let me ask my question.

The simple point is this. I am talking from the ordinary layman's point of view. We have to industrialise, whatever may be the proportion of industries. Otherwise, the standard of living cannot be raised.

Shri M. R. Masani: Correct.

Mr. Speaker: If so, some more money is being pumped into the economy. In the First Plan, it was Rs. 5,000 crores; in the Second, it was Rs. 6,000 crores. It is equally divided between the public and private sectors—practically.

Shri M. R. Masani: Not now.

Mr. Speaker: In the first two Plans.

Whatever additional money is put into the country by way of industrialisation in the public sector can be easily mopped off in two days. One is by withdrawing it by way of savings; the other is by producing more consumer goods.

Shri M. R. Masani: Quite right.

Mr. Speaker: Agriculture, sugar cement, cloth—wearing apparel, housing, production of foodgrains—every blessed thing is in the private sector. What prevents the private sector from producing more and more and then mopping this off?

Shri M. R. Masani: I agree that should be the policy. But what is happening....

Mr. Speaker: On the other hand, the impression is created that the private sector wants to depend on a scarcity economy. There are two ways of mopping up this money. If the same quantity is there, the prices will increase. Therefore, to cope with that, additional goods must be produced. But instead of taking the trouble to produce additional goods, we get the old goods and they get all the money for the same goods. Are they not trading in a scarcity economy?

Shri M. R. Masani: I have said before and I say it here that today we are being dominated by a vested interest which is more dangerous than any other.

Mr. Speaker: If there is famine in Bengal, people run towards the Government and agitate for opening fair price shops. Is there a single merchant anywhere in this country—producer—who opened a fair price shop? Therefore, ultimately Government has to satisfy the wants of the people. Whatever may be the form of government, is it a means to an end or an end in itself? Therefore, the ordinary man is obsessed with this.

Shri Ranga: The Government has to perform certain functions. It has got to justify itself. But that does not mean that it should monopolise all the people's savings.

Mr. Speaker: I want a simple answer to my question.

Shri Tyagi: He cannot discuss with the hon. Speaker like this.

Shri Ranga: I can discuss with the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot understand it unless you say that there shall be no industrialisation. People do not eat steel. There are some machinery and other things which produce more money in terms of goods and other things in the country. How is it to be taken away except by production of more goods, which is in the private sector?

Shri M. R. Masani: You have put your question, Sir, and I shall try to answer it. I have said before in this House, and I repeat, that the threat to this country's economy today comes not only from Government; it comes from a very unfortunate combination of elements in Government and elements in which you have called the "private sector." I have said earlier that today the vested interests in India of which the Indian people ought to be aware are those in office and their satellites in business who are working hand in glove to exploit the masses of our people. This is a combine, this is a cartel, organised by those in office and those in private business for, whom certain monopolies are created, certain protected fields of consumer goods are created where no competition is allowed.

14 hrs.

As you know, Sir, I stand for a point of view which believes in competitive enterprise, which believes that there should be no controls, no restrictions, that any one wanting to produce anything should be able to do so without going to the Government for a licence. It is the issue of licences, giving licences to some and denying it to others, that creates monopolies where the private sector is able to exploit the consumer in the manner you have depicted. And I say that the speech that you heard just before mine from the Congress benches, welcoming the Plan in a fulsome manner, gave expression to that alliance between those in office

and in private business making the best of the good time provided by this "socialist pattern". I do not stand for that private sector. I think the bulk of the private sector does not deserve a pat on the back for its behaviour any more than the Government does. Therefore, it is an unholy alliance between the State capitalists and some private capitalists against which we have to fight on behalf of the interests of the middle class and the peasantry of this country.

Shri Tyagi: He repeats "State capitalists". I cannot understand what he means.

Shri M. R. Masani: The State Capitalist system has been described extremely well by the Yugoslav Communist leader, Mr. Djilas, in his book *The New Class*, of which I shall be glad to present my hon. friend with a copy. The whole book is on the phenomenon of State capitalism. This phenomenon, if I may explain, is that people who talk of "communism" or "socialism", masquerading in those colours, are really creating a society where they and their children and their friends and their clients are able to exploit the common people for the benefit of the new ruling class of the State capitalists. I will not go further into that. I leave it to Shri Tyagi to study that book. The answer comes from Communist sources. State Capitalism is what the Yugoslav Communists describe as the prevailing state of affairs in the Soviet Union, which we are trying to copy.

I was saying that this obsession with autarky is completely unintelligent, because we are not in the position of the Soviet Union, because we are not opposed to the world, because every one wants to help us, and we do not want, in the next ten years, to turn our back on the world. Here is what Shri G. L. Mehta, our former Ambassador to the United

[Shri M. R. Masani]

States, said at the beginning of this year. He said:

"It is now recognised that the need of foreign exchange is not an occasional rescue operation, but a continuing phenomenon necessary to enable emergent countries to have development with stability"

This continuing development may well take us half a century. There is nothing to be ashamed about it. Even today in the United States there is more foreign and European capital invested than there is American capital in Western Europe. The Americans do not mind it. It is not a sign of backwardness.

We are short of capital. That is not a position that is going to change in the next ten or fifteen years with all our efforts, and I support them, to control our population. That imbalance will remain for many generations to come and, while it remains, we shall want more capital per man, and that capital not being available, we should be able to get it from abroad. Therefore, this whole Plan is visited by this position that it desires us to become independent of the world in the next ten or fifteen years.

I want to ask the Minister: if we proclaim our desire to become independent of the world, why should they buy our exports? Surely the corollary of selling our exports is that, when we have balanced our own economy, we shall buy their imports, we shall allow their goods to come into this country. But if we are obsessed with this idea of autarchy, how will the rest of the world be reconciled to it? If we try to dump our goods below cost to the sacrifice of our own people, it is not going to be countenanced by the rest of the world. That is the difficulty.

I therefore feel that this Plan, instead of developing our economy,

places it in a strait jacket, ties it hand and foot, and then asks the Indian people to deliver the goods. No people, not even the Indian people, can deliver the goods if their hands and feet are tied in this manner. The danger is this, that by over-centralisation, the States will lose their rights, will become mere glorified municipalities and district local boards if they do not look out. Secondly, there will be a concentration of political and economic power in a few hands. This will mean that the Fundamental Rights under the Constitution will be endangered. I do want to say to my friends on the right who are interested in trade unions, that if they think that while other rights will be destroyed, their right to strike and the right of collective bargaining will remain sacred, they are making a mistake. One of the first curbs and blinkers will be on the working class, not to ask for higher wages and not to go on strike in pursuit of their demands.

Therefore, I say this Plan is a threat and a danger to the working class, to the peasantry whose land it wants to take away, and to the middle class who make up the bulk of the nation. The job of those who believe in the real economic development of this country is to educate the bulk of the people to this threat not only to their standard of life, but also to their way of life.

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : अध्यक्ष महोदय, स्वतंत्र पार्टी के प्रवक्ता श्री मसानी के भाषण के बाद मेरा यह सीमान्वय है कि मैं इस योजना का विरोध करूँ, लेकिन उन शब्दों में नहीं जिन में स्वतंत्र व्यापार के प्रवक्ता श्री मसानी करते हैं। मैं मानता हूँ कि यह आयोजन हिन्दुस्तान को प्रागे ले जाने वाला नहीं है। लेकिन मैं इस के साथ साथ यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो विज्ञापन श्री मसानी प्रकट करते हैं, उस की वह विज्ञापन नहीं है, बसल मैं दूसरी ही विज्ञापन है। श्री मसानी और स्वतंत्र

पार्टी के दूसरे लोगों का कहना है कि मुल्क में उपभोग की जो वस्तुएं हैं, श्रृंगार की वस्तुएं हैं, कंज्यूमर गुड्स हैं, उन का ज्यादा उत्पादन होना चाहिये। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि भारी उद्योगों पर बल नहीं दिया जाता है, स्टील, तेल और दूसरी इसी तरह की चीजों पर बल नहीं दिया जाता है, तो किसी तरह भी कंज्यूमर गुड्स जिन को कहा जाता है, उन के उत्पादन का कोई प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता है।

दूसरा प्रश्न यह भी है कि यदि भारी उद्योगों को चलाना है तो उन उद्योगों को क्या प्राइवेट सैक्टर के लोग चलाने के लिये तैयार हैं? यहां प्रा कर जब प्राइवेट सैक्टर का सवाल उठता है तो ये लोग तो उन उद्योगों को ही चलाने के लिये तैयार होते हैं जिन में सरकार की तरफ से मदद मिलती है। सरकार की तरफ से उन को सहायता इस में भी मिल रही है और इस तरह से सरकार और बड़े पूंजीपतियों के बीच एक प्रतहोली ग्लान्ग है। यह बात जब उन्होंने कही तो मैं उन से महमत हो गया और सहमत हो सकता हूँ। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि भारी उद्योगों का भ्रगर विकास करना है तो वह सिर्फ सरकार के द्वारा ही हो सकता है और भ्रगर ऐसा नहीं होता है तो बिना भारी उद्योगों के विकास के हिन्दुस्तान का भी अधिकाधिक विकास नहीं हो सकेगा।

जहां तक इन भारी उद्योगों के विकास का सम्बन्ध है, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह सही दिशा में नहीं हो रहा है। हम कुछ प्रन्दाओं लगाते हैं लेकिन उन प्रन्दाओं पर हम आखिर तक सही नहीं निकलते हैं, दो तीन गुना हमारा लार्च बढ़ जाता है। हम राउरकेला स्टील प्लांट को ही लें। वहां पर अजीब ढंग से काम चल रहा है। वहां पर ३० लाख रुपया मजदूरों को मजदूरी के तौर पर मिलता है और ७० लाख रुपया हम मीनेजमेंट पर, टैक्नीशियन्स पर तथा उन बोर्दों पर लार्च कर देते हैं जोकि अपने हाथ से काम नहीं करते

हैं और सिर्फ देखा करते हैं कि दूसरे ठीक से काम करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं। इस तरह से कोई भी उद्योग चाहे वह पब्लिक सैक्टर में हो या प्राइवेट सैक्टर में चल नहीं सकता है। मेरा निवेदन है कि जो उद्योग सरकार की तरफ से चलाये जा रहे हैं, जिन को पब्लिक सैक्टर के उद्योग कहा जाता है, उन में सब से बड़ी गलती यह है, मूलभूत गलती यह है कि लार्च इतने बड़े हुए हैं कि उन की बजह से कभी भी कोई चीज उपभोग की जनता को सस्ते में नहीं दी जा सकती है। एंटीबायोडिफेंस फैक्ट्री जोकि पिंपरी में है और जिस का बिक्र हमारे मसानी जी ने भी किया है, उस के बारे में मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार की नीति क्या है तथा उन उद्योगों के बारे में भी क्या नीति है जिन को वह खुद चलाती है, जिन में वह खुद उत्पादन करती है? पिंपरी फैक्ट्री में जहां एक शीशी तीन घाने की बनती है, जनता को वह आज बारह घाने की दी जाती है और इस पर भी कहा जाता है कि हम सस्ते पर दे रहे हैं, सस्ती कर रहे हैं। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक इस योजना में इस तरह का सिद्धान्त निर्धारित नहीं किया जायगा कि जो उत्पादन का व्यय है वह किस प्रकार से कूना जाय और जब तक इस के बारे में जो निश्चित सिद्धान्त बिजिनेस के हैं, उन को मान कर नहीं चला जायगा तब तक लोगों को उपभोग की चीजें सस्ती देने का सवाल ही पैदा नहीं हो सकता है। इस तरह से हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता है कि ३० लाख तो हम वर्कर्स पर लार्च करें और ७० लाख मीनेजमेंट पर लार्च करें। जब इस सिद्धान्त को मान लिया जाय उस के बाद यह निश्चय किया जाय कि जो उत्पादन व्यय कारखाने में है, उस से ब्याड़े से कम ही कंज्यूमर के पास वह चीज पहुंचनी चाहिये। भ्रगर इस से अधिक मैं उस के पास वह वस्तु पहुंचती है तब फिर पब्लिक सैक्टर के कोई माली नहीं रह जायेंगे, तब फिर सही कहा जायगा कि पब्लिक सैक्टर भी उन्ही तरह से चोचन करता है किस तरह से प्राइवेट सैक्टर

[श्री बजराम सिंह]

करता है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि प्राज के हिन्दुस्तान की पृष्ठभूमि में प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में और द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में एक इस तरह का रास्ता बनाया गया जिस से ग्राम जनता का, गरीब जनता का, निम्न वर्ग के भ्रातृमियों का शोषण हो रहा है, और तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना उसी दिशा में एक कदम है, वह कोई अलग नीति निर्धारित नहीं करती है। आगे भी लगातार इन पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के अन्तर्गत यही नीतियाँ चलेंगी, जिस का नतीजा यह होगा कि बेकारी और बढ़ेगी। हम लोगों को शिक्षित नहीं कर सकेंगे, टेकनिकल शिक्षा नहीं दे सकेंगे और उत्पादन जितना हमारा होना चाहिये वह आगे नहीं बढ़ सकेगा। इसी के साथ साथ कुछ इस तरह के मूलभूत संकट पैदा होंगे जैसेकि प्राज कोयले का संकट आया है। कोयला हम खोद सकते हैं, कोयला हम पैदा कर सकते हैं, लेकिन उसे ढोने के लिये रेलवे की क्षमता नहीं होगी, दूसरी क्षमतायें नहीं होंगी। सीमेंट पैदा हुआ पड़ा रहेगा कारखानों में, लेकिन उस को ढोने की क्षमता हमारे पास नहीं रहेगी। यह मूलभूत गलतियाँ हैं पंचवर्षीय योजना में, जिस की तरफ इस सदन को और मुल्क को ध्यान देना चाहिये।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक इस योजना में हम सिद्धान्त रूप से परिवर्तन नहीं करेंगे संशोधन नहीं करेंगे तब तक यह योजना मुल्क के हित में नहीं हो सकती। लुद आयोजक मानते हैं कि अभी हमारे यहाँ करीब ६० लाख लोग बेकार हैं, उन के साथ तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्त तक ३० लाख लोग और जुड़ जायेंगे। आखिर यह किस तरह का आयोजन है कि हम योजनायें भी बनाते जाते हैं फिर भी हमारी समस्यायें हल नहीं होती? दो योजनायें क्लम हो चुकी हैं, तृतीय योजना चल रही है, इस के लिये हम मुल्क के लोगों से कहते हैं कि तुम को क्या करना पड़ेगा बलिदान करना पड़ेगा क्योंकि

हमें योजना को सफल बनाना है, साथ ही हम मानते हैं कि तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्त तक मुल्क में १ करोड़ २० लाख लोग बेकार होंगे जिन के लिये सरकार को काम देने की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं होगी।

14.11 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

मैं पृथना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह मुल्क को आगे बढ़ाने की योजना है? अग्नेजी ने इस मुल्क का विकास बिना किसी योजना के किया, हमारे मुल्क का शोषण करते हुए विकास किया और करोड़ों रूपयों की बिल्डिंगें बनाई, सेन्ट्रेटोरियट बनाया, यह पार्लियामेंट की बिल्डिंग बनाई। आखिर उन्होंने भी तो यह काम किया बिना किसी योजना के। मैं कहूँगा कि यह जो पंचवर्षीय तृतीय योजना प्राज हमारे सामने रखी गई है वह कोई योजना नहीं है जो इस तरह से विकास से हमें हटाये और जिस में बेकारी लगातार बढ़े। जिस योजना में जो हमारे कांस्टीट्यूशन के मूलभूत सिद्धान्त हैं उन की भ्रवहेलना की जाय वह योजना किस तरीके से मुल्क को प्रेरित कर सकती है? जब इस योजना के लिये कहा जाता है देश की जनता से, दूसरी पार्टियों से, जो विरोधी दल हैं उन से, कि यह नेशनल प्लैन मानी जाय, राष्ट्रीय योजना मानी जाय और इस के सम्बन्ध में हमारा हाथ बटाइये, तब मुझे अफसोस होता है। संभवतः अपनी पार्टी की भलाई के लिये यह सारी बातें कही जाती हैं। यह जान कर भी दुःख होता है कि कुछ विरोधी दलों के लोग आते हैं और कहते हैं कि हम विरोधी दल के हैं, लेकिन साथ ही साथ यह कहेंगे कि कर लगाने का जो कार्य है वह राजनीति से बाहर निकाल लिया जाय। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कर लगाने का कार्य राजनीति से बाहर निकाल लिया जायेगा तो क्या यह राजनीति में रहेगा कि प्लैनिंग मिनिस्टर कौन रहे, कानून मिनिस्टर कौन रहे, गृह मंत्री कौन

हो? यही काम राजनीति के द्वारा चलेगा ? इस लिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि तृतीय पंच वर्षीय योजना को यदि सफल बनाना है और सही दिशा में सफल बनाना है जिस से कि बेकारी की समस्या हल हो सके, शिक्षा की समस्या हल हो सके, लोगों को खाना मिल सके, लोगों को जरूरत की चीजें मिल सकें और उन का जीवन स्तर ऊँचा उठ सके, तो इस में मूलभूत परिवर्तन करने पड़ेंगे। और यदि इन मूलभूत परिवर्तनों के साथ इस योजना को सफल बनाना है तो फिर वही बातें माननी पड़ेंगी जो ग्राम तौर से इस मुल्क में कही जा रही हैं। यह कोई तरीका नहीं है कि हमें समानता लानी है, बराबरी लानी है लेकिन उस के ऊपर भ्रमल न किया जाय।

अब हमारे सामने जो तृतीय पंच वर्षीय योजना का ड्राफ्ट पेश हुआ है, उस के जो पहले दो तीन चैप्टर्स हैं उन्हें पढ़ने से ऐसा लगता है कि शायद हम सही दिशा में जा रहे हैं, लेकिन वह सिर्फ लक्ष्य मात्र रह जाता है, शब्द मात्र रह जाते हैं। उस को भ्रमल में नहीं लाया जाता है, उस को बकिंग में नहीं लाया जाता है और कहीं पर कोई भ्रमल करने का सवाल नहीं है, वरना इस तरह की स्थिति हो नहीं सकती थी। हम बराबरी का समाज बनाना चाहते हैं। बराबरी और समता का समाज बनाने की जब बात है तब यह क्यों कहा जाता है कि अब मुल्क में जो टैक्स लगेंगे वह अप्रत्यक्ष लगेंगे, प्रत्यक्ष करों के बढ़ाने का सवाल नहीं है? प्लैनिंग कमिशन खुद एक कमेटी बनाता है पहली पंच वर्षीय योजना और दूसरी पंच वर्षीय योजना का जो फल निकला वह कहाँ कहाँ गया इस का पता लगाने के लिये। प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि उन को मासूम नहीं है, सरकार को मासूम नहीं है कि दो पंच वर्षीय योजनाओं का जो फल निकला, जो कैपिटल मचाया गया उस का फल कहाँ गया किन लोगों की ओर चला गया। इस के लिये उन को कमेटी नियुक्त करनी पड़ती है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस के लिये

किसी भी कमेटी के नियुक्त करने की जरूरत नहीं है। इस के फल निश्चित रूप से जो आप के गुर्गे हैं उन के पास हैं। ग्राम जनता कराह रही है, अस्त है, शोषित है, परेशान है, उस को पूछने वाला कोई नहीं है। यह योजना का प्रभाव है, ग्राम की नीतियों का प्रभाव है।

आज हमारे मंत्री महोदय को १५०० ६० मिलेंगे, २२०० ६० मिलेंगे, लेकिन साथ साथ बंगलों पर कितना खर्च होगा, कितना टूर पर खर्च होगा, कितना और तरह की सुविधाओं पर खर्च होगा, इसकी कोई सीमा होनी चाहिये। जब इसकी कोई सीमा नहीं होती है तो यह कहना कि हम बेतनों में समता ला रहे हैं, ठीक नहीं है। अब तक हम यह नहीं कह सकते कि जो पूँजीपति हैं उसकी ग्रामदनी क्यों बढ़ रही है। इस लिये पहली चीज जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि अगर हमें तृतीय पंच वर्षीय योजना को सफल बनाना है और देश के हित में सफल बनाना है तो हमें नीति निर्धारित करनी होगी कि देश में लोगों की ग्रामदनियों में क्या अन्तर होगा। हम को इस में १ और १० के फर्क का लक्ष्य बनाना होगा। हम जानते हैं कि जब हम बिना इस के बराबरी नहीं ला सकते हैं, जब हम पूरी तरह से समता नहीं ला सकते हैं, तो इस के लिये लक्ष्य निर्धारित करना पड़ेगा कि छोटी से छोटी ग्रामदनी इतनी हो और बड़ी से बड़ी ग्रामदनी इतनी हो। मैं देखता हूँ कि तृतीय पंच वर्षीय योजना में इसकी और कोई इशारा नहीं मिलता है, अगर किसी तरह का कोई इशारा मिलता है तो यह कि आज जो प्रतिरिक्त सुविधाएँ लोगों को मिली हुई हैं वे बड़ी रहेंगी। एक तरफ पूँजीपति हैं जो ग्राम में मिल रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ ग्राम की सुविधाएँ हैं जिन के ग्राम अपना जीवन स्तर बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। ग्राम जनता का जीवन स्तर बढ़ता चला जा रहा है। ग्रामिण क

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

तरीका आप आपनायेगे देश की जनता के जीवन स्तर को ऊंचा उठाने का ?

आप मानते हैं, देश मानता है, सब लोग मानते हैं कि हर साल कोई ६० या ७० लाख लोग हिन्दुस्तान के नये नागरिक बन जाते हैं। आप की पंच वर्षीय योजनायें किसी भी शकल में चलें, सब मिलाकर ४० या ५० लाख से ज्यादा लोगों का जीवन स्तर ऊंचा नहीं उठता है। इसका नतीजा क्या होगा ? हर साल २० लाख ऐसे भ्राम्यी पैदा होंगे जो आप की इस योजना के फलस्वरूप बेकार रहेंगे और जिनका जीवन स्तर नीचा ही रहेगा। आप केवल ४० से ५० लाख तक लोगों का जीवन स्तर ऊंचा उठावेंगे। ७० लाख नये लोग पैदा होंगे जिनका जीवन स्तर पहले में गिरा हुआ है, उनके जीवन स्तर को ऊंचा बनाने का सवाल नहीं उठेगा। हर साल आप २० लाख नये लोग जोड़ते जायेंगे। उनका जीवन स्तर नीचे गिरेगा और वे गरीबी के दलदल में फँसेंगे और नागरिकीय जीवन व्यतीत करेंगे। इस लिये अगर हमें कहीं पर भी देश की जनता का कोई हित करना है कोई ऐसी योजना बनानी है जिस से हम देश की जनता का जीवन स्तर ऊंचा उठा सकें तो हम को इस योजना को किसानों की और अभिमुख करना पड़ेगा, मजदूरों के लिये, शोषितों के लिये पीड़ितों के लिये बनाना पड़ेगा। हम देखते हैं कि इस में इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। अगर कोई व्यवस्था इस तरह की नहीं है तो क्यों नहीं है ?

इस योजना में यह बुराई पाई जाती है कि मुक्त के अन्दर जो अक्षिप्त भूमि है उस अक्षिप्त भूमि को सिंचित करने के लिये कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है। कहीं पर भी कोई व्यवस्था नहीं है कि १५ सालों में या २० सालों में इस तरह का प्रबन्ध हम कर दें कि आज जो भूमि अक्षिप्त है, जिस को

पानी नहीं मिल रहा है, उस को पानी देने के लिये व्यवस्था हो सकेगी। कोई व्यवस्था कहीं पर नहीं है कि जिन छोटे उद्योगों को चलाने के लिये बिजली की जरूरत है उन को इतने दिन के अन्दर हम बिजली दे देंगे। जब तक हम नीचे के लोगों के जीवन स्तर को ऊंचा नहीं उठा पाते हैं तब तक ऐसी चीजें नहीं पैदा की जायेंगी जो कि सिर्फ उपभोग की चीजें कही जा सकती हैं, जिन को आराम की चीज कहा जा सकता है, ऐसी कोई व्यवस्था इस योजना में नहीं है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि एक तरफ तो तीसरे दर्जे के डब्बे करोड़ों लोगों के लिये नहीं हैं दूसरी तरफ कुछ लोगों के लिये एअर कंडिशनड कोचेज तैयार की जाती हैं तो क्या हम रेलों के वे डब्बे और बंगन नहीं बना सकते जिन के द्वारा हम कोयला और सीमेंट ढो सकें जिन की उपभोक्ता को जरूरत है ? तीसरी तरफ हम ४, ४ करोड़ २० के तीन हवाई जहाज खरीदते हैं। आखिर यह क्यों किया जाता है ? मैं कहता हूँ कि सारी योजना गलत है, यह देश की जनता के हित में नहीं है। यह कुछ लोगों के, जो कि प्रशासक लोग हैं, जो राज्य में आकर झकड़ा हो गये हैं, उन के हित में है। उन्होंने अपने हित के लिये इस को बना लिया है, इस से देश की जनता का भला होने वाला नहीं है।

इस लिये मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि यदि इस देश की जनता के हित में इस योजना को बनाना है तो हमें ऐसी नीति निर्धारित करनी होगी जिस से देश के किसानों का देश के गरीब मजदूरों का, और ऐसे भ्राम्यियों का जो मेहनत करने वाले हैं, कुछ भला हो सके। मैं इस दलील को नहीं जानना चाहता कि इस योजना से हिन्दुस्तान की जनता की आमदनियों में कोई बिछेद अन्तर नहीं पड़ा है या उन की आमदनियों को आप बढ़ावें। यह तो एक तरह से जब से मन्-

विदा प्रकाशित हुआ है, एक साल पहिले, तभी से मुल्क में चर्चा का विषय रहा है, और जो इस सदन में बहस हो रही है उस में भी इस के सम्बन्ध में कहा गया है, लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब ग्रामदिनियों में फधकं नहीं पड़ा है नीचे के लोगों के ऊपर अधिक ध्यान देने की जरूरत है तो हमें यह सोचना पड़ेगा कि जिस किसान का उत्पादन कम होता है, जिस किसान की जमीन से ज्यादा लाभ नहीं होता है, उस पर लगान लगे या नहीं। आप कहेंगे कि अब इनडाइ-रेंट टैक्सेशन नहीं हो सकता है, अप्रत्यक्ष कर में कोई क्षमता नहीं रह गई है, इस लिये आप अप्रत्यक्ष कर बढ़ायेंगे। अगर आप अप्रत्यक्ष कर बढ़ाने वाले हैं तो वह हर उस आदर्म पर पड़ेगा जो उस चीज का उपभोग करता है जिम पर कर लगता है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के जिन किसानों के पास अनाधिक जोतें हैं, जिनके पास ५ एकड़ से कम जमीन है, और ऐसी जोतें ८० प्रतिशत हैं, क्या उनके लगान को माफ करने की कोई बात सोची जाती है? उसके बजाय यह कहा जाता है कि चूक तृतीय योजना में १७१० करोड़ रुपये के नये कर बढ़ाने हैं इस लिये इन जोतों का लगान घुना किया सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यदि इस योजना को किमी भी शकल में किसान के हित में चलाना है तो ये जो ८६ प्रतिशत अनाधिक जोतें हैं, जो कि पांच एकड़ से कम की हैं, आप को उन का लगान माफ करना पड़ेगा। ऐसा करने से आप को ५० करोड़ रुपये सालाना ज्यादा का नुकसान होने वाला है नहीं है। मेरे पास बक्त नहीं है नहीं तो मैं आपको ऐसी तीन चार योजनायें बतला सकता हूँ जिनके द्वारा आपको यह ५० करोड़ रुपया मिल सकता है जिससे मुल्क का भला हो सकता है और इन ८६ प्रतिशत किसानों की अधिक उत्पादन की क्षमता बढ़ सकती है और उनको अधिक उत्पादन करने के लिये प्रोत्साहन मिल सकता है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार ऐसा नहीं करेगी। और उसका कारण

है। उसका कारण यह है कि अगर इन ८६ प्रतिशत किसानों में अधिक उत्पादन करने की क्षमता पैदा हो जाती है तो वे भी हिन्दुस्तान के शासन में शामिल होना चाहेंगे और आज जो हिन्दुस्तान में हुकूमत की गदियों पर कलक्टर, कमिश्नर, सैक्रेटरी आदि के रूप में बैठे हुये हैं वे उन गदियों पर नहीं रह सकेंगे। इस लिये उन गदियों को सुरक्षित रखने के लिये यह जरूरी हो जात है कि हिन्दुस्तान का जो यह शोषित वर्ग है इमको आगे न बढ़ने दिया जाये।

मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब से देश का आजादी मिली है उसके बाद से कितनी अच्छी नौकरियां हरिजनों और आदिवासियों को मिल पाई हैं। उनको ये नौकरियां क्यों नहीं मिलीं। इस की एक वजह है। मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार यह जानती है कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में एक प्रति शत से ज्यादा ऐसे लोग नहीं हैं जो कि अंग्रेजी जानते हैं फिर भी राजकाज को चलाने के लिये अंग्रेजी को कायम रखे हुये हैं क्योंकि अगर ऐसा नहीं किया जाता तो देश की भाषायें विकसित होंगी और तब फिर वे लोग जो कि आज गदियों पर बैठे हुये हैं वह वहां कायम नहीं रह सकेंगे। अगर देश की भाषायें विकसित होंगी तो वह किसान जिनकी जोतें अनाधिक हैं उठेंगे और जब वे उठेंगे तो जो आज का मंत्री है उसको कंठे बीनना पड़ेगे और चूकि कंठे बीनना उनको पसन्द नहीं है इस लिये वे ऐसी व्यवस्था करते हैं जिस से किमी न किसी तरह वे अपनी गदियों पर कायम रह सकें।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम को देश के हित में इस योजना को चलाना है तो हमको धाने बढ़ाना होगा। मैं श्री मन्-नार्ड साह से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिन्होंने अभी तक छोटे उद्योगों को बढ़ाने के लिये क्या किया है। देश में सब लोग मानते हैं कि हम छोटे उद्योगों में ज्यादा लोगों को काम

[श्री ब्रजराज सिंह]

दे सकते हैं और देश की बेकारी की समस्या सारे बेकार लोगों को काम दिये बगैर हल नहीं हो सकती, लेकिन कभी इस तरह की बात सामने नहीं आती जिस में हम देखें कि सरकार कोई ऐसी योजना बना रही है कि जिसमें सब लोगों को काम मिल सके और छोटे उद्योगों को बढ़ावा मिल सके ।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सारी योजना की दृष्टि ही ठीक नहीं है और जब तक इस दृष्टि को मंजूर नहीं किया जाता तब तक हमारे देश के शासकों को यह कहने का अधिकार नहीं है कि यह राष्ट्रीय योजना है, उनको यह अपील करने का अधिकार नहीं है कि आप सब लोग मिलकर इस योजना को चलायें । आज स्थिति यह है कि एक तरफ तो लोगों को खाना नहीं मिलता और दूसरी तरफ बड़ी बड़ी प्लान्स बनायी जा रहे हैं और नये नये टैक्स लगाने की योजना बनायी जा रही है कि जिनका असर अपने ऊपर न पड़े कर दूसरों पर पड़े । जब तक यह तरीका राष्ट्रीय योजना को चलाने का रहेगा तब तक जनता से मिलकर इसे सफल बनाने की अपील का कोई असर होने वाला नहीं है । इसलिये इस अवस्था में मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आप चाहें कि हम इन टैक्सों को राजनीति से अलग कर दें और आपको जनता पर १७१० करोड़ के नए टैक्स लादने का अधिकार दे दें, तो हम ऐसा नहीं करेंगे, हम हर उस टैक्स का विरोध करेंगे कि जो कि आम जनता पर जा कर पड़ेगा और जिस से आम जनता का हित साधन नहीं होता । हम देखते हैं कि आपकी यह योजना देश के हित में नहीं जाती । आपकी दो योजनायें समाप्त हो चुकी लेकिन आप देखें कि इन से किसको फायदा हुआ है । यह मेरा कहना ही नहीं है, इसको हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री भी मानते हैं और उन्होंने इस बात का पता लगाने के लिये एक कमेटी बनायी

है कि इन योजनाओं से किसको लाभ पहुंचा है । यह कमेटी साल दो साल में अपनी रिपोर्ट देगी । लेकिन हमको वैसे ही पता है कि इन योजनाओं से किसको फायदा पहुंचा है, उसके लिये कमेटी बनाने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

अब वक्त आ गया है कि अगर आप चाहते हैं कि इस योजना को राष्ट्रीय योजना माना जाए तो इसमें जो मूलभूत गलतियाँ हैं उनको आप सुधारें । इनमें बेकारी को दूर करने की एक निश्चित योजना होनी चाहिये चाहे और काम रुक जायें, चाहे मिनिस्टर्स के लिये बड़ी बड़ी इमारतें न बनें, चाहे कीमती कीमती हवाई जाहज न गायें, चाहे एअर-कंडीशन्ड डब्बे न बनें, लेकिन यह व्यवस्था अवश्य होनी चाहिये कि अगर कोई आदमी काम करना चाहे तो उसको काम दिया जा सके । इस तरह की घोषणा होनी चाहिये । इस तरह की घोषणा होनी चाहिये कि हमारे माविधान के मूलभूत सिद्धान्त के मताबिक जब यह योजना खत्म होगी तब मुक्त में कोई आदमी निरक्षर नहीं रहेगा । क्या ऐसी घोषणा की गयी । मैं निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि ऐसी घोषणा होनी चाहिये कि जो लोग अपने खर्च से ऊँची शिक्षा प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं उनके लिये कालिजों और विश्वविद्यालयों के दरवाजे बन्द नहीं किये जायेंगे । आज लोग किसी तरह से पैसा जुटा कर अपने बच्चों को ऊँची शिक्षा दिलाने का खर्च उठाने के लिये तैयार हैं, लेकिन यह कहा जाता है कि नहीं तुमको ऊँची शिक्षा नहीं दी जायेगी । आज लोगों के लिये ऊँची शिक्षा के दरवाजे बन्द हैं । यह कहा जाता है कि ऊँची शिक्षा केवल कुछ सिलिकेट्स लोगों को दी जायेगी । मैं निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि जब तक आप इस योजना में इस प्रकार के मूलभूत परिवर्तन नहीं करते तब तक इसको राष्ट्रीय योजना नहीं कहा जा सकता । और जब तक यह राष्ट्रीय योजना

नहीं है, आप हम से कहें कि हमको टैक्स लगाने का अधिकार दीजिये, उसमें रुकावट मत डालिये, तो मैं कहूंगा कि यह सम्भव नहीं है। जब तक यह एक पार्टी की योजना है, जो कुछ लोगों के भले के लिये चलायी जा रही है, और जब तक कि यह कुछ लाख लोगों की उन्नति के लिये चलायी जा रही है, और जब तक ग्राम जनता को इसमें लाभ नहीं होगा, तब तक आप यह आशा नहीं कर सकते कि हम आपको ग्राम जनता पर टैक्स लगाने का अधिकार दे दें।

हम देखते हैं कि इन योजनाओं के फलस्वरूप देश की ग्राम जनता की ग्रामदानी घटी है, केवल कुछ लोगों की ग्रामदानी बढ़ी है, ऐसी योजना को चलाने के लिये आप ग्राम जनता पर १७१० करोड़ का कर लगाने का अधिकार चाहते हैं। और यही नहीं, इसके अलावा आप ५५० करोड़ का कर नए नोट छाप कर लगाना चाहते हैं और ४४० करोड़ आप पंजीमालिन की तीन आने की शीशी को १२ आने में बेच कर जैसे माधनों में प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं। इस तरह आप यह ४४० करोड़ रुपया पार्लिकेन्ट में चलने वाले उद्योग में प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं। इस सब को देखें तो मालूम होगा कि आप १७१० करोड़ का ही नया टैक्स नहीं लगाना चाहते अगर इस ५५० और ४४० करोड़ की रकम को भी इसमें जोड़ा जाए तो आप देखेंगे कि कुल मिला कर २५०० करोड़ में भी ऊपर का टैक्स हो जायेगा। मेरा निवेदन है कि जनता इस टैक्स को देने के लिये तैयार होगी यदि यह बात स्पष्ट कर दी जाए कि यह रुपया ग्राम जनता के हित में खर्च होगा, इसका उपयोग किसान, मजदूर और शोषित वर्गों उन्नति के लिये किया जायेगा। लेकिन आप देश की जनता की दशा को देखें तो आप को मालूम होगा कि इन योजनाओं में ग्राम जनता को लाभ नहीं हो रहा है। और जब तक इस योजना में ऐसी व्यवस्था नहीं की जायेगी कि इसमें ग्राम जनता का हित हो तब तक

इसको राष्ट्रीय योजना नहीं कहा जा सकता। ऐसी व्यवस्था में मैं नहीं समझता कि इस योजना को राजनीति से बाहर रखा जा सकता है और कोई नए करों का विरोध नहीं करेगा। इन नए करों का विरोध होगा क्योंकि यह योजना जनता के हित में नहीं है और ये टैक्स जनता के हित में नहीं होंगे।

अन्त में मैं एक बात कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ। जैसा कि आपको मालूम है, देश पर चीन ने आक्रमण किया और देश की एक लाख वर्ग मील भूमि पर अपना कब्जा कर लिया है। उसे उस भूमि से हटाने के लिये कोई बात नहीं कही जा रही है और न ऐसा करने के लिये कोई तैयारी की जा रही है, न अपनी रक्षा पंक्ति को मजबूत बनाया जा रहा है और न और कोई बात की जा रही है। इस लिये मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर आप इस योजना को जनता के सहयोग में चलाएँ, चाहते हैं तो आपको यह भी सोचना पड़ेगा कि किस तरह हम उस खोई हुई जमीन को फिर अपने कब्जे में करें। और यह काम तब तक नहीं हो सकता जब तक कि मुक्त मजबूत नहीं होगा। और ऐसा तब तक नहीं हो सकता जब तक कि आप इस योजना में मूलभूत परिवर्तन और संशोधन परिवर्तन और संशोधन नहीं करेंगे। मैं आशा करूँगा कि इस प्राक्सिरी स्टेज पर भी शासकों में बुद्धि पैदा होगी और वे इस योजना में तमाम परिवर्तन करेंगे जिससे हमें देश की ग्राम जनता के हित में लगाया जा सके।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri P. S. Daulta. Now, I would like to say that no hon. Member should try to take more than 15 minutes. I will ring my first bell at the end of 13 minutes of the hon. Member's speech, and the hon. Member should stop when I ring the second bell.

Shri P. S. Daulta (Jhajjar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I first wish to congratulate the Leader of the House who happens to be the leader of the

[Shri P. S. Daulta]

nation also for presenting this national Plan.

Before I come to the Plan, there are two prerequisite foundations which are necessary for the success of the Plan; one is national and another international. In the international sphere, if a third World War comes, we should have nothing to do with it. If we involve ourselves in that, this Plan goes off. There is a determined effort on the part of America to bring India in its orbit through various means. We need money and they promise aid. So far as the dramatic performance of President Ayub is concerned, whatever he said, he was asked by America to say, so that India may be forced to seek America's protection. An apparent misdeed by a neighbouring state and the non-fulfilment of its duty by a political party in India has created an atmosphere that some vested interests in our country as well as in the international sphere want to force us on the issue of China and many other things to seek American protection. If we do that, we are doomed; our Plan is doomed, I congratulate our leader who categorically stated the other day that we are not under American protection.

The second thing I want to submit is about national integration. Many things have been said and I do not want to go into detail. While planning, it is a good thing that we should uplift those people who are economically backward. But I have serious objection to this type of criteria that a man who happens to be born in a particular caste is backward or some area is backward. Even in the so-called backward classes, there are forward men, rich men having resources. By forward I mean men having opportunities to have educational facilities, etc. This is an anomaly. The Minister of a State who happens to be a scheduled caste man has a Brahman cook. The

sons of both go for an interview for a job. The Minister's son is selected, because he belongs to a backward class or scheduled caste and the cook's son is rejected, because he is a Brahman. This is no planning. In planning, the criteria should be that one whose income is below Rs. 100 is backward; they form 99 per cent of the people of India and they are backward people. Those who have higher incomes are the so-called forward people.

Coming to the Plan itself, we have two main fields for our economic development—industrial and agricultural. While dealing with industry—the question of the tussle between the private sector and public sector. I do not want to repeat those points which have been covered already. But I want to say three things. If we are true to socialism—now I am here on these benches and 'if' is not needed—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Only 'if' has been removed or something else has been removed also? (*Interruptions*).

Shri P. S. Daulta: If we want to have socialism, we shall have to curb the so-called private sector for the benefit of the public sector. For that I have three suggestions to make.

Firstly, the industrial houses in the private sector do not make only cement or iron; they make public opinion also. They control the Press and through the Press they underestimate the public sector; they criticise and do so much propoganda on the achievements of the private sector and the failures of the public sector. Unless we break this monopoly of the Press by the industrial houses, the poor public sector shall have no defence.

My second suggestion is this. This is a hard fact that the bureaucracy which has to implement our policy of socialism is being approached by these houses. I do not want to

scandalise, but there is a rumour that many Government servants who have to implement this Plan of ours get more pay from some houses than what they are actually getting from Government service. We have to examine this question very thoroughly. Otherwise, the machinery—bureaucracy—will not let us implement the schemes.

Thirdly, the private sector has another thing which is very dangerous. They have a lobby of their own in the ruling party, which wants to achieve socialism. There are Chambers of Commerce and they donate money and purchase tickets. People who sit in Calcutta and Bombay earn pocket boroughs in backward areas like Rajasthan. With these people bargaining with the help of these Chambers of Commerce, are we going to achieve socialism?

So, my three suggestions are to break the monopoly of the Press, to see that these people have no approaches to the bureaucracy and thirdly to see that the ruling party does not sell our seats to the private houses.

I come to Punjab now. I think the money allotted under various heads to Punjab is very meagre. I confess that for this we Punjabis are responsible. We pose before India and the world that our issues are not economic issues. We do not want economic development of our State. There is one agitation and another agitation at another time. That agitation has reached a climax; there is one person fasting there and another fasting here. All people who talk of Punjab talk of the language problem. Nobody talks about the economic problems and of the man in the street in Punjab. The Punjab's problem is not the problem of fasting leaders; it is the problem of the peasants whose lands are waterlogged. Punjab's problem has been associated with problems which have nothing to do with the man in the street in Punjab.

Then, I resent that there is no clear indication in the third Plan about one thing, I leave the railway apart now. Let me come to water and electricity. We give water to Rajasthan. We give electricity to Delhi and to other States. But the peasant in Punjab has to pay betterment levy for the electricity which Delhi consumes and Delhi raises a legal question that the Punjab Government cannot levy a betterment levy in Delhi. If Punjab Government cannot levy the betterment levy in Delhi, why do they consume the electricity of Punjab? In spite of many representations, the attitude taken here by the big men is, at the cost of the Punjabi peasant they want to consume electricity. I submit that these planning masters should take note of it and such a thing ought not to be allowed to happen.

About water, in the hot season, when Punjab peasant wants water, the Delhi authorities say, give more water to Delhi for the taps. When rain starts, they say, "Put your shutters down and flood your Punjab". Even the natural flow of rain water is stopped. I say, there must be national integration in the field of water flow. I am glad the hon. Minister, Hafizji, is going to Bahadurgarh;—the problem there is acute. Last time it was planned that two drains will bring the flood water from Rohtak to Yamuna. It took one full year, the bureaucrats here gave one excuse or another and then the drains have not been connected with Yamuna. If this is national integration, then Punjab must suffer. Many other things are to be said, but I am conscious of my time.

I come to another thing a problem which is known as Punjabi problem. Formation of a linguistic State is no constitutional obligation. Articles 2 and 3 of the Constitution deal with the reorganisation of States. Specifically or even generally they do not speak of any linguis-

[Shri P. S. Daulta]

tic State. There is Schedule Eighth where 14 languages have been enumerated. It is nowhere provided that each language should have one linguistic State. There is, for instance, Urdu. Which is the linguistic State for Urdu? As I said, there is no constitutional obligation. If we want to have it, we can form one.

With regard to Punjab, Sir, I want to say that things are done which are prejudicial to that part which is known as Hariana. Nobody takes the people of Hariana into confidence. Things are being discussed without taking them into confidence. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, with due respect to the Prime Minister and also the Home Minister, I want to say that if the authorities want to ascertain the views of the people of Hariana, they should not consult a defeated man in the Parliamentary constituency or a dethroned raja—they are not our representatives—but they should consult those hon. Members who have come here to this House on adult franchise. They are the true representatives of our people. No meeting is called of the Members of Parliament from Punjab. Things are discussed and decision taken by having meetings with some leaders who have nothing to do with the reorganisation of States. Reorganisation of States is a subject for the Parliament to decide. At least let the Members of Parliament from the State concerned be consulted, let there be a formal discussion with them where the matter can be examined. There is also one independent Member from Punjab. We Sir, people of the Hariana do not want any change in the *status quo* at present. It may be made clear to the authorities and to the so-called leaders—they can be leaders from heaven, but they are not from Hariana. Why do we not want it? It is because this question of reorganisation of the State firstly because of the dishonesty of those who were put in Dhar Committee and now because of the activities of the communalists, has been so much confus-

ed that at this stage any change in the *status quo* will only result in great harm.

There was the Dhar Committee which went into the question of reorganisation of States. There was also the All-India Linguistic States Conference. There would have been no harm if the Punjabi Suba had been created by that Committee. The Hariana Prant also could have been created then. It is really a shame that in that report it is written that because the Sikhs live here, because the Jats live here and these people have those feudal tendencies to be rulers and therefore this area should be excluded from linguistic States. This is the root cause of the entire trouble.

Sir, two years before, here in this very House, out of 500 Members—you can take into account the 250 Members in the other House also—I was the only person to say that after the Gurdwara elections a great agitation would be coming, you would have to tackle this question when the communalists take up the initiative and it would be better if the question was decided before that. When I said that nobody paid any heed to it. Now when the communalists have taken the initiative, every day there is a letter, there is a letter at 2.0 A.M., there is a letter at 5.00 p.m. What is it all going to do? It is not going to solve any problem.

Sir, the Punjabi-speaking State and creation of Hariana Prant should not be confused with the question as to how the communalists are to be fought against. This has nothing to do with it. At this juncture if any change is made, it would mean another concession to the communalists. They have already secured two points. One point is that your executives have no access to mosques, gurdwaras and mandirs. Another point that has been secured is that the courts also have been excluded from the precincts of gurdwaras and masjids. Now you cannot get a court's decree executed

Plan

within the precincts of a gurdwara. Sir, the communalists have secured many points in Punjab. For God's sake do not write so many letters. Sir, there is a race between the Opposition parties and the Government to appease the communalists. I say they are not going to be appeased, they are to be fought with, and fought with courage.

Sir, I do not want to take much time of the House, but I must point out one aspect of discrimination. The position of the people of Haryana is like this. So far as we Members of Parliament are concerned, we are not for any change at this juncture. Certainly, we are not for a unilingual State, and except for the two gentlemen who have put in their signatures, we, Members from Haryana, all differ from the Prime Minister's statement that Punjabi is a predominant language of Punjab. In the Haryana area the local people never speak Punjabi. Even the people who have come from outside and have settled there certainly have not chosen to speak Punjabi. This is a secular State. One can change one's religion, one can change one's home. You, Sir, can change your home from Montgomery to this State. Why can't an individual choose his own language? It is not for the Prime Minister to decide, it is for me to say which is my language. Take the census. That is the way Government ascertains the truth. What is the position? Not even one per cent of the people in Haryana, according to the census, speak Punjabi. How much are we? We are 42 per cent of the Punjab. In Kangra, if you say Punjabi is the predominant language there, unfortunately, the Punjabi Hindus who speak Punjabi refuse to say that it is Punjabi. This is a bad thing. But there is another thing also. When somebody associates a particular language with his religion as the Akalis have done saying that Punjabi written in Gurmukhi is their language, another religion has the right to dissociate with it and say that it is not their language. So it is a bad thing that Punjabi is not the dominant or

subordinate language in Haryana and in Kangra the Punjabi-speaking Hindus do not accept it as their language.

Shri Tyagi: I think, Sir, what the hon. Member speaks about is not relevant to the discussion. Let him say something about the Third Five Year Plan.

Shri Rajendra Singh: The Prime Minister has raised this matter in his speech.

Shri P. S. Daulta: Sir, before I sit down I want to say one more thing. In the papers some solutions are offered, taking away of two or three districts of Haryana or part of Punjab. Further disintegration is being suggested. We oppose that. We disintegrated in 1837, we refuse to be further disintegrated in 1962. We are part and parcel of Punjab. If the *status quo* is to be changed, then the Haryana Prant has to be created. Let the Government be ready to face another agitation. We will not like two or three districts being merged with Delhi and placed under the municipal corporation thereby depriving us of our rights.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude now. Whatever he may do outside, he should not do the same thing with the Chair.

Shri P. S. Daulta: Sir, I conclude with these words that neither the creation of a linguistic State nor the disintegration of Haryana is acceptable to the Members of Parliament here—it may be acceptable to two defeated candidates or some ex-rulers.

Shri Bhagavati (Darrang): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, while moving the motion the other day, the hon. Prime Minister made a pointed reference to the social aspect of the Plan. In the report itself much stress has been given on the social objective of the Plan. I think it is good and proper that emphasis has

[Shri Bhagavati]

been given on the social objective of the Plan.

Sir, two aspects of the Plan are very important. One is the method by which we want to implement the Plan. I think that is the democratic method. A big question has been posed before everyone of us in this country, whether we are going to make the Plan a success through democratic methods or not. If we fail to make the Plan a success through democratic methods, I am afraid, we are doomed.

The second important question is, what is the objective for which we work? Now, it has been made clear that socialism is the objective. We want to change the social structure on the basis of socialism. What I want to say is this, that so far so many political parties swear by socialism, but very few of them speak about socialism to the people. We have very much less education on this subject. People generally do not know what is socialism. What are the fundamental ideals or principles on which socialism is based? Shri Asoka Mehta has written in one of his books that socialism in underdeveloped countries means solving the problem of capital formation, production and also equitable distribution. These aspects have to be made clear to the people in general. There should be good education in this way. Otherwise, we cannot enthuse the people for a socialistic plan. And unless we have the proper climate for it, I am afraid, we cannot make the Plan a success. So, it is very important that every one of us tries to impress upon the people the necessity of realising the importance of socialistic planning. At present, there are forces in this country which are working against socialism. We can very well see and hear in this House how those forces are at work. They are propagating very cleverly; they have tried to

show that the public sector is not functioning properly; they have tried to show that co-operative farming is no good for the peasants. At this stage, if those who want socialism to succeed in this country, do not come to the people and tell them "Look here, the solution of your problem lies in the socialistic planning" what will happen? People, for whom we want socialism, they may be swayed away by interested propaganda. They are, as a matter of fact, swayed away by interested propaganda. So, it is very important that we build up a strong public opinion in favour of socialism.

I also feel that it is necessary for national integration. It is no good asking the people to feel as one nation. We are now speaking off and on about national integration. Personally I feel that in pre-independence days we lived and acted as one nation, because then we had the ideal of fighting for our freedom before us. Now it is no good telling the people of that. It is better to have some other ideology which can inspire the people to feel as one people. I feel that only socialism can do that; only that idealism can do that; only that philosophy can do that. If we can give such an inspiration to the people, that they have to build a new society, that they have to change the social structure, that they have to build a new socialist economy, then they may forget all these communal and provincial and other feelings. We have to hit the demon of communalism etc., indirectly, so that it cannot rebound. If we merely go on repeating those terms, we are only accentuating them; we are not minimising their effects; we are not lessening their effects. I think we can do away with the evils only if we can inspire the people with new ideals of building up a new country on new socialistic basis.

There is one important thing, and that is the implementation of the

Plan. The crux of the Plan is the implementation of the Plan. Nobody says that the Plan has not provided for this or that. I have read the amendments and I have also listened to the speeches. In those amendments and speeches hon. Members have made very many suggestions. There are provisions for all these suggestions in the Plan. Nobody can say that there are no provisions for all the suggestions; there are provisions. The amount allotted priorities may not be according to one's wish.

So, the main problem is how we can implement the Plan. Generally, people accept the Plan. They do not complain much against the Plan. What they complain is about its implementation. So, it is for us now to decide how we can implement the Plan and how we can achieve the targets within the scheduled time. As a great economist has stated, socialism ill-executed is worse than anything else. We must be very cautious about that. We say that we are going to have a socialist economy and we are talking of socialistic schemes in the Plan. But if in spite of that we cannot prove to the people that there is change in the social structure, then they will feel disappointed. This ill-execution of the socialistic Plan will create dissatisfaction among the people and they will lose faith in socialism. That will be a real danger, because then people will not give their full support to it. So, I think it is very important that when we talk of socialist economy in this country, we have to go to the fullest length. Half-hearted measures would not give any result and half-hearted measures cannot satisfy the people. We have to go to the fullest length.

I feel at present we are not very earnestly or enthusiastically implementing the schemes in these socialistic lines. I do not want to give very many figures, because figures

may be manipulated every way. I want to give one instance from my experience, from what I have seen in this capital city. In this capital city, New Delhi, there are many schools which have no buildings and which have no land. There are schools which have no playgrounds. It is astonishing that even after so many years nobody has paid attention to that. Yet, there are individuals who occupy big buildings and big compounds. That is an absurd state of affairs. We cannot go on allowing individuals to have such big compounds and, at the same time, deprive schools lands, buildings and playgrounds. It is an absurd state of affair and it must go. If these things continue, people will not appreciate our philosophy and they will not appreciate that we want to have a socialistic State. This is just one instance. There are so many others, but I do not want to refer to them.

Even now, the disparity in wages and income is very much in this country. That should go. As a trade union worker, I know that the wages of the workers have not risen very much or to the expected level. There is no doubt that they have got something more, but prices have risen, everybody knows that and, according to the present price level, their real income has not gone up. It is also a general complaint that the increase in national income has not been equitably distributed. It is very important that we should see that the income is distributed equitably, at least as far as is practicable in the situation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should now conclude.

Shri Bhagavati: I will now refer to some problems in the State of Assam. As against a national Plan of Rs. 2,376 crores, Assam's first Plan was of the order of Rs. 20.84 crores, one of the most modest in the country. It did not touch even a fringe of the problem. In the Second Plan, the outlay for

[Shri Bhagavati]

Assam was Rs. 57.9 crores, and that has not been able to do justice to the State except a co-operative sugar mill at Dergaon, nothing worth mentioning has emerged at the end of the Second Plan.

So, Assam has a very special case. The Third Plan, I hope, will compensate for the shortcomings in the first two Plans. With its vast and variegated resources, Assam presents a great challenge, a challenge not only to develop a hitherto under-developed region of the country, but of building up a sound and prosperous industrial economy in this strategic frontier State. It is hoped that the Government will take effective steps to meet this challenge.

15 hrs.

The economy of the people of Assam, specially in the agricultural sector, has always been adversely affected by floods and erosion. This is a chronic disease. Measures which have been taken so far are not enough to control the situation. A master Plan has to be drawn up. A high-powered technical body should be set up to draw up a master plan and also to implement it. The importance of it cannot be over-emphasised.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up.

Shri Bhagavati: I am concluding within two minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have concluded after two minutes.

Shri Bhagavati: Just a few points more.

The process of industrial growth in Assam failed to keep pace with the rapid industrial expansion in the rest of the country owing to difficulties of transport together with non-availability of power and other facilities. There are vast hill areas in Assam

with resources untapped for want of transport. The partition of the country has put Assam in a very disadvantageous position so far as transport and communications are concerned. Before partition, the distance between Gauhati and Calcutta was 394 miles. Now it is 627 miles. Increase in distance has increased the cost of transport considerably and as a result the living in Assam has become very expensive.

Assam imports roughly 10.5 lakh tons of goods per year and exports roughly 8.5 lakh tons. The imports are distributed between.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now he should not take up new points. He must conclude.

Shri Bhagavati: I request that the Planning Commission should consider to allocate more funds for improving the transport conditions, rail, road and river transport in Assam. Also, it is very necessary that new railway lines are built, specially one railway line to Garo Hills connecting Golpara with Pandu is essential.

With these words I conclude.

Shri Amjad Ali (Dhubri): Garo Hills?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has gone to every part of Assam. Now he was in Garo Hills.

Shri Amjad Ali: He was entering into my constituency.

The Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Sardar Swaran Singh): Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to explain and clarify one or two points that have been raised in the course of this debate about the steel programme. I would like to state that our approach has been that in the course of the Third Plan we should build capacity for meeting our requirements in the various sectors of our economy. There

are certain built-in capacities in our three public sector plants. Our object has been to utilise this built-in capacity. That has been the overriding principle while planning for steel expansion.

The additional expansion that we propose in the Durgapur and Bhilai steel plants will meet most of the requirements of the Railways and other construction purposes. If we analyse our demand pattern over the last several years we find that a good part of the steel consumed in the Country has been utilised for railway purposes but both replacement and expansion programmes, and another major part has gone to construction in one form or the other, whether it is construction of new buildings or of new factories, projects and the like. The additional capacity that we propose to add in the course of the Third Five Year Plan to the Bhilai and Durgapur steel plants is to meet the additional requirements in the course of the Third Five Year Plan and thereafter for railways and for general construction purposes.

It is well known that this is not enough and we have our requirements in other sectors, namely, the industrial sector. Whereas certain percentage of the products that would be produced in Durgapur and in Bhilai would meet the increasing requirements of industry, particularly in a development stage where lot of construction will be undertaken the raw material as such consists generally of flat products. Even at the moment we find that whereas the supply position with regard to other products is somewhat easy, the supply position of flat products, namely, sheets and the like, is somewhat difficult. In view of this we have to plan our steel expansion in such a manner that the additional requirements of flat products are also met by expanding our existing capacity in Rourkela which the House is, no doubt, aware produces only flat products, namely, plates, strips, cold rolled strips, sheets,

tin plate and the like. We have made some assessment of our requirements of these flat products and we feel that even with the expanded programme at Rourkela which will be increased from 1 million ton capacity to 1.8 million ton capacity and after taking into consideration the additional production that would be available from the private sector steel plants, that is, the Tatas and the Indian Iron, still there will be a shortage so far as flat products are concerned. Our industries are going in a very large measure through a stage where, as it may appear even for agricultural improvements, there will be a good demand for flat products of various types. It becomes necessary, therefore, to make a provision for manufacturing additional flat products. That justifies the necessity for Bokaro because Bokaro is to produce only flat products.

Some people say that we could concentrate on expansion in the existing steel plants, namely, Durgapur, Bhilai and Rourkela, and that there was no necessity for planning a fourth steel plant, namely, the one at Bokaro. I have attempted to explain that it is very necessary.

श्री म० सा० शिवजी : मैं एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कब तक मुल्क में इतना प्लेट प्रोडक्ट बनने लगेगा कि हमारी इंडस्ट्रीज की जरूरतें पूरी हो सकें। आपने टाइम लिमिट नहीं बताया।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिन्हा : जहाँ तक टाइम लिमिट का सवाल है, मेरे स्थान में प्राइवेट मिनिस्टर साहब ने एक दो बार कहा है कि आधुनिक युग पन्द्रह साल में हम जितना प्लेट प्रोडक्ट या दूसरी चीजें पैदा करके बे हमारी इंडस्ट्री की जरूरत के लिए काफी नहीं होगी। उनका मतलब यह था कि जैसे-जैसे हम य चीज पैदा करते जाएंगे, हमारी इंडस्ट्रीज भी बरफार बढ़ती जाएंगी और हम उनकी सारी जरूरतें पूरी नहीं कर सकेंगे क्योंकि हमारे रिकॉर्ड्स बताते हैं।

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

I was trying to mention this point in relation to the establishment of the new plant at Bokaro, namely, the type of products that will be manufactured there. There is another very important reason. The hon. Prime Minister explained in his opening speech—and that has been mentioned also in the plan itself—that we should take a long range view. What are going to be our requirements after the Third Five Year Plan and even thereafter? It is necessary therefore to have another nucleus for further expansion. It is, therefore, necessary that we build up Bokaro in the course of the Third Five Year Plan and this Bokaro could be the nucleus for further expansion when we can utilise whatever additional capacity is still left unutilised either in Durgapur or in Rourkela steel plant and will also be able to expand further the plant that will be started in the course of the Third Five Year Plan, namely, the Bokaro plant.

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Have any arrangements been made against breakdowns?

Sardar Swaran Singh: Breakdowns are breakdowns. Just as Acharya Kripalani can intervene in the debate, breakdowns can also come in. They have to be faced just as I have to face, even though he is such a venerable leader, his criticism.

It has been mentioned and pointed out in a characteristic way by the revered leader opposite Acharya Kripalani, who, unfortunately, sees always the dark side of the picture and, obsessed by the present difficulties, refuses to take a long range view. I admit that the production in the steel plants has not been up to the rated capacity. It is not even up to our expectation. We have, however, to view this shortfall in a realistic manner. We have to remember that even in industrially advanced countries, capitalist as well as communist, the general experience is that these new steel

plants, particularly, if they are established in virgin areas, take anywhere between 2 to 3 years before they come up to the rated capacity. That has been the experience of advanced countries. We have to remember that in those advanced countries, there is a large reservoir of trained technicians—not only trained, but highly experienced technicians. Generally, they have got the advantage of drafting some of the experienced people for the running in period for their new plants. So far as we are concerned, we took some care. I think with a great measure of success, to train a large number of engineers and technicians. We had to recruit them from the market because, our existing private steel industry also was expanding and they could ill-afford to spare any of the trained personnel. We recruited these people, bright young people, and gave them training.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Was there any regional balance in the recruitment of these people?

Sardar Swaran Singh: That is a very minor matter.

Shri Rajendra Singh: It is a very serious matter.

Sardar Swaran Singh: That has nothing to do with planning and little to do with the point that I am developing.

Shri Rajendra Singh: It has got everything to do.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Sardar Swaran Singh: I will come to that.

The people whom we recruited, bright young people, with academic qualifications, and with the keenness and the will to learn, have really picked up the training well and with that background and with that training, they can equal any other of their counterparts in any part of the world. But with all that training, unfortunately, training is no substitute for experience. It is here that our bright

young technicians have yet to go through the period of actually handling the situation and handling the various parts of the plants. That would take some time. We are trying to strengthen them by having people with experience and that is producing results. Therefore, when we talk of the short-falls, we should view this in this background.

My hon. friend Shri Rajendra Singh has an eye on the general elections and therefore raised the regional issue. Probably he may reproduce his speech when he goes for the general elections and so attaches more importance to that regional aspect. Regional aspect is important only to a point. Let us not forget that these steel plants are national plants and it is a matter of high importance that we should get the maximum out of them. Therefore, suitability for that type of work should be the overriding principle. Even with all the regional patriotism that Shri Rajendra Singh may have, I am sure, the national outlook—because he belongs to a party which claims very high ideals—should always be there and he should not be over-obsessed, even on the eve of the elections, by the regional aspect, which, unfortunately, has gripped his mind so much.

I was submitting that the short-fall in production in these plants has to be viewed in the background of what I have submitted.

Acharya Kripalani mentioned about breakdowns.

Acharya Kripalani: I mentioned about acts of God.

Sardar Swaran Singh: Acts of God and acts of man; we have to face both. It is not only acts of God, but also acts of man that we have to face and I think we are facing them with whatever little courage or determination that we may have in spite of the temporary and short-term difficulties. We talk of these various difficulties and the like and in this effort, are,

sometimes, and if I may say so, on many occasions, likely to forget the achievements that have already been secured. To establish our steel capacity in the course of the Second Plan and quadruple it in this period is an effort which has not been undertaken elsewhere. We had to undertake that heavy burden on account of the heavy population whom we have the honour and responsibility to serve. We could not, therefore, plan lower targets, because, we knew that the requirements of the country are so large. We have to make a choice—to take an easy line, have lower targets and then try to achieve them perhaps with a greater measure of success and on the other hand, in view of the larger requirements and increasing requirements of the country, to plan higher targets and do our best to achieve them. I think we have succeeded in achieving the targets in the sense that the steel plants have been established and the expansion of the two private sector steel plants has been completed.

Low production in the steel plants, particularly in Rourkela has been the cause of concern. To that extent, I value the criticism and also the suggestions that hon. Members have been making from time to time. On this occasion, it is not my intention to go into these details, because we are discussing in an overall manner the steel programme in the context of planning.

Acharya Kripalani and also, I think, one or two other hon. Members have also said something about the higher costs. I have no intention to go into those details. At the time of the last Budget discussion, I ventured to place certain facts and figures before the House. I attempted to explain why the original estimates were exceeded. I would like to reiterate very briefly two points in this connection. If we analyse all these increases in the estimates as they were first given, they come under two categories. One is escalation, that is, higher wages in India and abroad and higher prices in India and abroad. Secondly, the civil works in relation to these sites turned

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

out to be larger in magnitude and more complex as compared with the stage when these estimates were framed. So far as the first aspect is concerned, it can be roughly described as escalation factor. That is the common experience all the world over. There is nothing peculiar and nothing objectionable in that. You can say that the original estimates that were given were rather conservative and were not elastic enough and had not taken all these things into consideration. But that does not mean that the expenditure that has been incurred is incorrect or improper.

Even in regard to the reason which I submitted a moment ago, namely that the soil conditions and the conditions on the site turned out to be somewhat different, there are two approaches to it. One is that in these foundations which are generally very deep, 30 ft. or 40 ft. or 50 ft. sometimes, either at the time of framing those estimates or later, deep pits may be actually drilled at all the points where various components of the plant are to be located, and after having the detailed data, merely for the purpose of satisfying some criticism that the estimates should be prepared in a more realistic manner, we can prepare all those estimates, after incurring an additional expenditure and wasting a good deal of time, so that later on an argument may not be built, 'Oh, you said, that it will cost so much, but you have spent more.' That is one way. The other way is to have a preliminary examination of the type of site which we are likely to get and then go and start the work, saying that this is going to be the order of expenditure, and then execute the work, effecting all the economies that are possible, but not ignoring the realities as they are unravelled, when we do the boring and like, and then undertaking the construction work in accordance with the situation that we find. No one can say that the method and the procedure that were adopted have resulted in

expenditure which can be avoided. It can be said perhaps that the original estimates have been exceeded, but no one has been able to point out that the expenditure incurred either in civil works or in escalation—the two heads which account almost for the entire increase in the actual cost over and above the estimates—was incurred in an incorrect or wasteful manner.

While talking of this aspect, I would venture to submit one point more in this connection. We have to remember that even with all their experience, the Tatas also have had to incur more expenditure than what was estimated; as compared to their original estimates, their actual expenditure turned out to be 30 to 33 per cent more than the estimate, at the time when they embarked upon their expansion programme. I am not trying to criticise them. My contention is that the nature of the work is such that there is this likelihood of the original estimates being exceeded; and we should view it in that perspective and not draw unwarranted conclusions from this.

Even with all this expenditure, I am confident that we can produce steel competitively as compared to any other country in the world. It is not for me to compare our general industrial set-up and our cost of production in relation to it, with those in other countries. But I can say without fear of contradiction that there are very few spheres in our industrial economy with regard to which we can say the same thing; on account of our underdeveloped stage and on account of the lack of experience and skills which can be acquired only in course of time, we cannot say that with regard to many other industries, but I think that steel is a sector in which we can produce in competition with the world, although, for several years to come, we shall not be in the competitive market for export. We would very much like to export, if we can, but

our estimate is, our judgment is, that the requirements in the country would be expanding so regularly and so progressively that we shall be consuming most of our steel in the country. If we have to export, we may export some marginal quantities, because steel is not a bulk commodity where tonnage only decides the requirements; it is the tonnage and the various shapes of the finished product that should actually fit in with the requirements. All steel-producing countries are exporting some varieties and importing some varieties, because there can be temporary shortages and temporary surplus requirements. Everything that we sold in the world, whether it was pig iron or billets or steel, it was never sold at a price which was lower than the retention price. So, I think that that is a factor which we should always keep in mind.

We are lucky in the matter of our resources. Our iron ore is particularly good. We are not so lucky in the matter of coal, but with beneficiation of coal, we can definitely improve its quality. Our boys have got the eagerness to learn; with the training and with the encouragement that is given, I think they are also very rapidly picking up experience.

I am sometimes amazed at the note of pessimism that is struck and the way our achievements are sought to be belittled. It is a great pity that this should be so in regard to a sector where such vital achievements have been made. It is a difficult sector; a huge metallurgical plant is a very complex industrial unit. I do not want to compare, but, for instance, in a steel plant, the maintenance workshop is almost as large as, if not slightly larger than, the Chittaranjan Locomotive Workshop. The by-product plant in a steel plant is almost as large as Sindri; in certain plants, it is even larger than Sindri.

When we talk of a steel plant, we should take into consideration the complex nature of the various processes that go on. I am sure that if

Acharya Kripalani had given me the honour of accompanying me and had been good enough to pay a visit to one of these steel plants and had sized the atmosphere there by meeting people and having a look at the plant, I am sure that his attitude would have been somewhat different from what he has shown here in the course of the debate. A steel plant is one where a continuous process of smelting is involved, where nature is conquered, and the resources of nature are transformed into material for the service of mankind. It is not just a simple sort of process like grinding flour or even turning out small consumer goods, but the work is fairly complicated and difficult. Therefore, the running in period is somewhat large, but we need not take any pessimistic view of this.

Acharya Kripalani: Did not the planners consider all these things? I thought that they were clever people.

Sardar Swaran Singh: Yes, we did consider all that. But this aspect that the running in period is likely to be long was not visualised at that time. I admit that at that time we should have said that after the steel plants are completed, they will take some time to pick up production. I would like to enter an alibi now that even in the course of the next Plan period, even when we complete the expansion, we should not look forward to full production, as my hon. friend Shri Naushir Bharucha was pleased to mention in the course of the debate; we cannot expect these new steel plants to come up to rated capacity soon.

We have to keep this in mind that the production of steel is necessary to save the continuous drain on foreign exchange. Even in the initial stages, when these steel plants have just gone into production, there have been very sizable savings in the form of foreign exchange, because the material that we would otherwise have had to import to sustain our economy at the present level would have been a very

[Sardar Swaran Singh]

terrible burden. Each steel plant in production saves roughly half its foreign exchange component each year. So, that is the economy that is involved both in the matter of producing essential goods and in the matter of giving impetus to our industry and to our economy, and that would also save continuously the foreign exchange that would otherwise have to go out of the country.

These were some of the points that were raised in the course of the debate, and these I wanted to clarify.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: In assessing the Third Five Year Plan which is before us, I would like, as my hon. friend, Shri M. R. Masani, did, to review the first two Plans. The only thing is that just as he used that review in order to try and argue against any form of planning whatsoever, what I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Planning is to see how this Plan could be improved so that the fruits of it would be available to a large number of people than we see today.

Yesterday, when my hon. colleague, Shri Indrajit Gupta, spoke, he emphasised the point that the weakness that we see in this Plan is that we do not see the prospect of the public sector industries dominating the flow of our economy, dominating the pattern of production and dominating the social pattern that is now developing in this country. For instance, if we take the question of the availability of cereals *per capita*, we find that in spite of ten years of planning, we have not yet reached that stage which we had reached in pre-war years in our country. Quoting from government figures themselves, according to the Nutrition Advisory Committee, the *per capita* availability of cereals in pre-war years was 16.3 ounces per day per adult. During the last four years, the figures have been as follows: in 1957, 13 ounces; in 1958, 12 ounces; in 1959, 13.7 ounces and in 1960, 13.1 ounces.

Similarly with regard to cloth, in the pre-war years, it was 16 yards per head. During the years of the Second Plan, it was as follows: 1956-57, 16.4 yards, 1957-58, 16.3 yards, 1958-59, 16.2 yards, 1959-60, 15.9 yards and 1960-61, 16.3 yards.

Within the limited time at my disposal, I cannot go into further details on all these points, but I would like to show how so far as the general economic progress that we have registered in industry is concerned, particularly in the steel plants that have been set up, about which the hon. Minister has already spoken just before me, in these big public sector industries such as HMT, HAL and so on, in spite of all that, we find that today if one has an overall picture of our country, the general position of the common man leaves very much to be desired. If we are to think in terms of mass enthusiasm being roused for the Plan—a point on which many hon. Members have spoken—then that mass enthusiasm and mass participation of the people can be generated only if the people can see before them the fruits of the Plan. If today my hon. friends, like Shri M. R. Masani and Prof. Ranga are in a position to attack the Plan, and attack the progress that has so far been registered—and in that process try to attack the very concept of planning and the very underlying principles that the majority of our people are agreed on—if these voices in the wilderness are allowed to be heard today, it is because they try to play upon these defects that do exist. We have to recognise that these defects exist.

Of course, it is a pity indeed that time and again when this question of planning is discussed, Shri Masani and Prof. Ranga draw a red-herring across the floor of this House, accusing the Government of trying to imitate the socialist planning that is taking place in the Soviet Union or the planning that is taking place in China. Immediately, instead of poin-

ting out where the defects are and how they are going to be overcome, the tendency of the Treasury Benches, unfortunately, is to get up and say, 'We have nothing to do with the Soviet Union; we are absolutely patriotic; it is an Indian Plan'. They do not go down to concrete issues and say how they are going to overcome these problems which are today very real. It is indeed very strange that people like Shri Masani and Prof. Ranga claim to speak on behalf of or in the interest of the working classes, the peasantry and the toiling middle classes, and in so doing, attack those very principles which the Plan has put forward as necessary for bettering the condition of those classes.

We are all agreed—it is not only here, but world opinion and world economists are all agreed—that if a backward country has to develop and keep pace with modern science and modern economy, then heavy industry has to be built up. Industrial progress is one of the indices of a nation's or country's prosperity. Yet we have these hon. Members talking in terms of progress, at the same time trying to tear to bits and pieces that very limited progress we have so far registered.

Therefore, it is necessary that the attention of the Government and the Planning Commission should be drawn to this fact that today, in spite of ten years of planning, we do not see sufficient progress or advance in the provision of those amenities and social services which are necessary for a prosperous and happy people. Even with regard to health, the hon. Health Minister said this at the 8th meeting of the Central Council of Health in October 1960:

"In so far as the doctor-population ratio was concerned, the country was at present practically where it was in the First Five Year Plan because the outturn of doctors had only just kept pace with the growth of population".

364(A) LSD—8

It is not only with regard to the number of beds and the number of doctors that our health services are sadly lacking in this country, but we find that even schemes for drinking water supply and for drainage are very far behind the times, and need to be looked into very carefully. For instance, when one goes through the Third Five Year Plan, one finds that drainage schemes are there for important and large cities, growing industrial cities. They are not being included in the Plan.

In Madras State today, one of the cities that is growing very fast industrially is the town of Coimbatore. Water supply and drainage schemes for that town have been matters taken up time and again by the Municipality. In spite of all representations and attempts, I am sorry to find that this rapidly growing industrial town has not been given any consideration in the Plan; nor is there anything to show in the Plan that this matter is going to be taken up as one of the basic things necessary for the Plan to be a success.

With regard to education, we find that literacy has gone up by just 7 per cent from 18.6 in 1951 to 23.7 in 1961. Even the prospect of all the children in our country in the age group 6—11 being assured of education is not being held out in this Plan. Let us not be complacent about this question of education, because the future generation that is coming up will have to carry forward the fruits of freedom, and that generation will have to build up the new India. If we are complacent about it and if we allow this question of illiteracy to continue in this manner, we are certainly going to lag behind and, may be, we will have in future more Masanis and Rangas to continually try and militate against the Plan using this very factor.

As regards primary education, for the age group 6—11, we find that the percentage of the sums that are being allocated is steadily going down.

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

This is very sad because, unless side by side with your industrial progress you also have social objective of the Plan the Prime Minister referred to will not be achieved, because it is not only industrial goods that are necessary, you also want a people who will be satisfied with the conditions that they have to live in and who will be part of a growing and a developing society as a whole. It is not enough you have economic progress, you should have social progress also.

One of the things that we find here in the Plan with regard to education is that in reviewing what has happened in the past with regard to the Second Plan it is said here that there is difficulty with regard to getting the girls to attend the schools and therefore the number of girls may be much lower than we estimated or might be planned for. When that is the position, one does not find any picture held out in this Plan for encouraging girls in larger numbers to go to schools, or for guaranteeing that the girls in the various areas will be helped to go to school.

I myself have seen how the single teacher schools in the various villages are really not enabling our students in the rural areas to get adequate education. These single teacher schools are such that when the students reach the stage when they have to go on to a school of a higher grade, they are not able to compete with pupils who have had better educational facilities, greater educational attention from the teachers, and therefore a very uneven development is taking place. Really, our children of the rural areas today have not got that help or those educational facilities which will enable them to make the best of the educational facilities further on. It is no good just guaranteeing that scholarships will be there, free schools will be there, free books and pencils and so on will be given. What is necessary is that the

education that is given to them should also be of a more even type.

In the towns and cities you find that the different classes have different teachers meant for the particular levels; but in the single teacher school, one teacher has to look after from the Kindergarten to the fifth class. This is next to impossible, and naturally what happens is that it becomes more or less self-education. Sometimes the children are not interested, there is nobody to arouse their interest, so they stay at home and do not go to school. The parents find it difficult to take them to school, discipline suffers and so on. Therefore, side by side with the plan for education, there has also go to be a very systematic plan of training a sufficient number of teachers and finding the resources to see that those teachers are employed and that the students in the rural areas, particularly of the age group six to eleven, are given the same facilities and benefits as the students who live in the big cities and towns. Then only would we have an advance in our educational system, and be able to visualise our country as a whole going forward, and the various disparities in the various regions that exist in the educational and social field also being overcome.

Prime Minister made a very fervent appeal for integration, for greater understanding between people of one State and another and so on. Surely, one of the foundations for creating such an understanding, one of the foundations for creating co-operation between the people of different States, is that our education should be on a very sound basis, and that can only be done if the teachers get a fair deal on the one hand and the students also are given the attention they deserve. Therefore, I would appeal that this question of seeing that our resources are directed in such a manner as to give the maximum benefit to the maximum people should be looked

into, and I feel that this can only be done if in the economic sphere the Government comes forward with bolder measures to see that greater control is exercised on the pattern of the economic development in our country.

For instance, my hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta yesterday posed the question why with regard to trade Government is different in seeing to it that the State Trading Corporation enters the field and takes up certain strategic materials where India has got a near monopoly, where the export trade can be controlled and the resources arising out of which could be certainly turned towards various social measures that are necessary.

The socialist pattern of society is not to be defined only in terms of income. We must clarify the object in relation to the means of production and in relation to trade. Today under-invoicing and over-invoicing is going on in the import and export trade, and that will have to come under control. That can be controlled if Government is bold enough to take appropriate measures.

We must recognise that it is not only through modern science and technology that we can turn our country into a prosperous one. Modern science and technology can certainly help us to march forward to an opulent society, but that does not mean that thereby we will be achieving the object of a socialist pattern of society. If we want a socialist pattern of society, let us be clear about the definition of it, about the fact that more and more fruits of the economic progress that we are registering should be shared by a larger and larger number of people. It is true that today we find that there are in the ruling party sections of the private sector who are pulling in the direction of the interests of the private sector. That is what we have been seeing time and again on the floor of the House. That is what is to be com-

bated, and I would appeal that the public sector should be strengthened.

In conclusion, I would remind hon. Ministers of a fairly well-known writer who has said:

"However refreshing the existence of the Welfare State may be, we will live in the menacing shadow of indifference unless we can spread the idea on a grand scale that society is only healthy and virile when its members believe in its democratic purposes, and are willing to play their part in maintaining its vitality."

If you want mass enthusiasm, if you want every one to participate in this magnificent endeavour that is before us, then certainly you will have to bear this in mind, and not issue directions such as the one the Home Ministry has done, saying that a clarification was sought from them by the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply whether the Government servants could attend election meetings, and that the Home Ministry advised that Government servants should not attend election meetings organised by any political party except to the extent necessary for maintaining law and order and affording normal protection to Ministers. If our administration is to serve the needs of the people, it will have to do it by arousing the mass of the people to participate in the Plan, and therefore, I would appeal that such circulars should not be issued.

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): Our Prime Minister who moved this motion the other day characterised the Plan as an exciting pilgrimage. The leader of the PSP called it a valuable strategy of economic development. The leader of the Swatantra Party called it an election manifesto. Some conservative opinion in the country has called it a blueprint of inflation. So, you would see that for the progressive people it is a *sine quo non* of progress, and for the conservatives it is the quintessence of

[Shri Morarka]

evil. So far as I am concerned, I regard this Plan as good, modest and realistic, and I feel that the persons who criticise it do not appreciate the difficulties of the planners.

I have said on a previous occasion and I think that it bears repetition that the planners have to reconcile—seemingly contrary objectives. For instance, they want higher rate of saving and they want to raise the standard of living. They want to raise more and more commodity taxation and yet they want to hold the price line. Then, the planners have to satisfy certain competing claims. For instance, there is agricultural development versus industrial development, urban development versus rural development, capital goods industries versus consumer goods industries and so on. The planners have also to reconcile certain conflicting needs—private sector and the public sector, centralised industries and decentralised industries and so on.

Now, the main handicap of our planners, according to me, is the lack of reliable and dependable statistics in this country.

Acharya Kripalani: Yet, they plan!

Shri Morarka: I was saying.....

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Sir, Mr. Morarka would forgive me for my intervention. I have raised this objection ever since I had been in Parliament. Here, we are discussing the Plan for the next five years. There is no single member on the Treasury Benches who has had any direct part with the making of the Plan or the presentation of the Plan. I mean no offence to my hon. friend who is from the northern part of Jharkand or to my hon. friend Shri Sadath Ali Khan. It is a serious thing and I do want you to protect us. It is not right that a most important thing—

the Plan for the next five years—should be discussed like this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I agree with the hon. Member. Shri Mishra was here and perhaps he has gone for a couple of minutes.

The Deputy Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri L. N. Mishra): Shri Nandaji was here all along.... (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There ought to be a larger number of Ministers when the Plan is being discussed. I hope it will be done soon.

Shri Jaipal Singh: I have raised this....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have said that there ought to be a larger number of Ministers when the Plan is being discussed. I hope care would be taken and immediately some more hon. Ministers would be here.

Shri Morarka: I was saying that the main raw material for preparing the Plan is reliable statistics. Unfortunately, in this country we have not yet developed proper agencies for collecting and processing those statistics.

Acharya Kripalani: What about Mahalonobis?

Shri Morarka: The planners are also faced with limited resources, presenting in a democratic set-up, the present administrative set-up that we have and above all, the growing population. If all these factors are taken into consideration, I am sure the critics would sympathise with the planners and they would agree with our revered colleague, Dr. Aney, who yesterday showered some bouquets on them.

Prof. Ranga said that he was not opposed to planning but he is opposed to the development of the public sector. It is just like saying: I agree with the diagnosis but no treatment should be given.

Acharya Kripalani: It should be different.

Shri Morarka: Planning presupposes State initiative and State ownership. If the State is not prepared to come forward for certain projects and if private initiative is lacking in them, planning would remain incomplete and, in a sense, illogical.

Even in America there is a substantial sector in which the resources are organised by the State. In terms of gross national product, fully controlled and disposed of by the State, about twenty per cent of the American economy is planned by the Government.... (*Interruptions.*) In India, the comparative figure is only fourteen per cent. As you know, America is the recognised citadel of private enterprise; India is not. Professor Ranga gave up his whole argument by calling this Plan as on the eve of election Plan'.... (*An Hon. Member: Professor Ranga:* Yes, Professor Ranga. That is the biggest compliment that Shri Ranga could have paid to this Plan.

15.55 hrs.

[DR. SUSHILA NAYAR in the Chair]

Shri Jaipal Singh: He said, Professor Nanda.

Shri Morarka: If on the eve of the election, the ruling Party could put forth this Plan almost as its manifesto, surely the Party has the confidence of its acceptance by the largest majority in the country.

Then, Acharya Kripalani gave the figures of four countries, Germany, Japan, Italy and Canada and said that while the national income there was rising by twelve per cent, the price level was rising by only one or two per cent.

Acharya Kripalani: Not in all the countries. I said so in respect of Japan and Germany.

Shri Morarka: I stand corrected. He gave the example of four but quoted the figures of two. Now, Acharya Kripalani was comparing two incomparable things. Those countries are industrially matured.

Acharya Kripalani: Comparing donkeys with horses? It is right.

Shri Morarka: Acharya Kripalani may choose his own expression, with which he is so enamoured. I am only saying that so far as we are concerned, we have not yet established a firm industrial base; we are still in the initial stages of development and our economy has not yet become self-generating and hence the comparison is absolutely fallacious. So also, I am sorry to say, the comparison of Shri Asoka Mehta who said that Turkey, Iraq and Thailand made quicker progress than India. True. Those countries did not suffer from that growth of population as India suffers. Not only that during the last decade all our population has increased by 77 million; it has almost doubled the increase in the previous two decades.

Acharya Kripalani: It is only 1.8 per cent; in many countries it is more than 1.8 per cent.

Shri Nath Pal: There are many countries in which the rate of growth of population is more than 1.8 per cent.

Shri Morarka: I am not talking of the whole world; I am talking of the three countries whose examples were given by his Leader. In those countries the population increase has not been like this.

Shri Rajendra Singh: In Iraq the rise in population is two per cent, every year.

Shri Nath Pal: Madam Chairman, may I ask Shri Morarka who is trying to make a cogent point, one question? Shri Asoka Mehta did not mention the point of growth of per capita income where the factor of population

[Shri Nath Pai]

becomes pertinent. He spoke about the rate of growth of the national economy and I do not see the point of bringing in population at this stage.

Shri Morarka: I am sorry to say that the followers of the leader did not follow what the leader wanted to say. All that I am saying is this. He complained against the slow pace of our progress. My only justification is that so far we are concerned, we have got the problem of increasing population which nullifies our efforts to a certain extent.

Shri Nath Pai: We have followed his point.

Shri Morarka: Madam Chairman, if I may have less of these interruptions, I would like to say...

Mr. Chairman: Please allow him to proceed: time is running out.

Acharya Kripalani: We are helping him.

Shri Morarka: The leader of the Communist Party, Shri A. K. Gopalan said that while the Third Plan advertised about the achievements of the Second Plan, it did not admit its defects. I think it is very unfair criticism of the plan document, which is not only comprehensive and complete but I think it is only brutally frank; in fact, it is more frank than it ought to be. As a matter of fact, whatever criticism one wants to make, one can find in this voluminous book.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give some of the figures of the performance of the Second Plan which would bear out what I have said just now. The Plan says:

"During the First Plan, owing largely to the progress recorded by agricultural production, national income increased by 18 per cent as against the target of 12

per cent. During the second Plan, on the other hand, the increase in national income was 20 per cent as against the target of 25 per cent."

The Plan also says that the targeted increase of taxation was Rs. 450 crores under the head of additional taxes. But the actual tax collected under the same head was Rs. 1,052 crores. Then, so far as the balance of payment is concerned, the Plan says that the deficit over the five year period is estimated at about Rs. 2,100 crores as compared to the Plan estimate of Rs. 1,100 crores. The deficit expected was Rs. 1,100 crores, but actually it turned out to be Rs. 2,100 crores. The planners estimated that our foreign exchange resources would be drawn to the extent of Rs. 200 crores, but actually they were drawn to the extent of Rs. 600 crores. Similarly, it says that the food import provided for in the balance of payment estimate for the Plan was six million tons. The actual food imports over the Plan period were about 20 million tons. The import of raw cotton has also been on a substantial scale.

16 hrs.

Acharya Kripalani: Does it show that it is a Plan or it is confused thinking?

Shri Morarka: Then the planners say at page 453 as follows:

"The main industrial targets which have not been achieved are those set for iron and steel, fertilisers, certain items of industrial machinery, e.g., paper and cement plant machinery, heavy castings, forgings, aluminium, chemical pulp, newsprint, raw films, soda ash, caustic soda, dye-stuffs, and cement."

They further say:

Shortfalls have unfortunately occurred in some of the very indus-

tries which are of crucial importance and have deprived the economy of benefits reckoned on for the start of the third Plan."

What can be a more frank admission than this?

Acharya Kripalani: A very frank failure!

Shri Morarka: I would request Acharya Kripalani to listen. He is such a senior man and he cannot go on interrupting such a junior man like me.

Acharya Kripalani: I apologise.

Shri Morarka: The difficulty is that whenever a point is answered like that, they feel nervous, howsoever big the leaders may be. After all, this is a House where we are debating the points, and if they are so nervous they should not make the point.

Anyway, there is one other point to which I would like to draw your attention. That is again mentioned in the Plan. So far as foreign exchange requirement is concerned, from Plan to Plan it is increasing. In the first Plan—I am talking about the public sector—90 per cent of the resources was Indian and ten per cent only was foreign; in the second Plan, it was 76 per cent internal and 24 per cent foreign; in the third Plan, the ratio has changed further; it is only 70 per cent Indian and 30 per cent foreign. That shows that as we progress further and further, our requirement of foreign exchange even for the public sector is increasing larger and larger.

We have heard references to export trade. I cannot go into the details, but I must mention one point. That is again mentioned in the Plan. So far as invisible exports are concerned, they are falling rapidly. From Rs. 111 crores in the year 1956-57, it came down to Rs. 71 crores in 1959-60 and to Rs. 55 crores in 1960-61. It is expected to come down still further to Rs. 22 crores in the year 1961-62. That means, over the second Plan

period, our invisible exports have come down from Rs. 111 crores to Rs. 22 crores. This is a matter of anxiety and I think the Government and the hon. Ministers concerned will pay their attention to this malady.

I would like to make some suggestions in regard to matters where I think the third Plan is noticeably incomplete. My first suggestion is that while the Plan sets the targets for the five years, it does not set the annual targets for anything. What happened in the second Plan period? We did achieve the targeted production of coal, but we achieved it only in the final year of the Plan. Industrial development takes place from year to year. It is not as if industrial targets are achieved only in the last year of the Plan. If we do not have coal or power spread out evenly during the entire Plan period, I am afraid the Plan may run into serious difficulties. Shortage of coal or steel or power at any one stage can upset the whole appecart. Therefore, I request that over and above the fixation of overall targets for the entire Plan period, some annual targets, which need not be rigid and which may be flexible, should also be fixed.

Secondly, in our Plan, in addition to fixing the physical and visible targets that so much steel will be produced, you must fix also what are known as invisible targets, i.e., quality of the steel, price of production, productivity of human labour and so on. In this connection, I crave your permission to quote what Prof. Galbraith has said recently in Bombay:

"I think it extremely important that the modern plan set firm targets for this invisible achievement. As valuable as firm targets for steel output are firm targets for man-hour productivity, costs and returns. Goals so set become binding on all concerned. All are challenged to meet them. All have

[Shri Morarka]

a sense of failure if there is a shortfall in performance. And there is, in addition, the highly practical fact that failure can be identified with those responsible. If there are no standards then no one fails in the examination. Promotion and honour accrue to all alike. Life was not meant to be that easy."

I think this is a very valuable suggestion, particularly for fixing personal responsibility, etc. So, this system of fixing invisible targets must also be introduced in our planning.

As many hon. Members have stated, our Plan is defective in one sense. It begins with a backlog of 9 million unemployed people and it is going to end with a backlog of 12 million unemployed people, i.e., an increase of three million during the five-year period. I know such a thing is inevitable in a growing population. But one thing that the planners could have done was to give a little more emphasis to house-building activities. That is one activity which requires least investment and does not require any foreign exchange. From the performance in the second Five Year Plan period, we know that there is a backlog of 5 million houses in urban areas; in rural areas, it is still more. Therefore, if the planners had given proper attention—I am sure they could give at least now—and if they give incentives for increasing the building activities, then the unemployment problem could be solved at least to some extent.

I would like to say a word about transport and power supply. I think the transport target is again fixed on the lower side. Our planners have said that our industrial production would increase by 70 per cent, but for carrying that 70 per cent, they have fixed a very low target of increase in railway transport facility. I believe they have increased it to 245 million tons. Even on the most conservative basis, it should have been 280 million tons. Even if you have coal in the

pithead, if you have no transport facility, coal could not be transported; if coal is not transported, power is not generated and if power is not generated, then the progress of industry and to some extent agriculture would be seriously affected.

About the power position, during the second Plan, our target of power was not fully achieved. It was 6.9 million KWs, but we achieved only 5.7 million KWs. It is said that the shortfall was due to the shortage of foreign exchange. That may be so. During the Third Plan period, our industrial production is going to rise by 70 per cent. A study of the last 12 years indicates an average rate of growth of 15 per cent per annum in the consumption of power. While it is estimated that the demand progresses at 20 per cent per annum. The consumption of electricity in India bears a close correlation with industrial growth. A study of this for the period 1948 to 1955 shows that every 10 per cent increase in industrial output necessitated an increment of at least 16 per cent in power consumption. Similarly, during the period 1955-60, for every 10 per cent increase in industrial production, there was an increase in power consumption to 25 per cent. So even on this basis the power increase should have been....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri Morarka: Madam, I was interrupted for a few minutes. I may be given a few minutes more.

Mr. Chairman: I have given the hon. Member 8 minutes more than the average time. He should finish in two minutes.

Shri Morarka: Our target fixed for the Third Plan is 12.7 million kilowatts. I think even on the most conservative basis it must be at least 15.5 million kilowatts:

Madam, since you want me to conclude, I will skip over some of the points and conclude my speech with only two quotations, again from Professor Galbraith. This is what he says in a lecture delivered by him in Madras or Calcutta:

"India is by far the largest and most populous of the under-developed countries, China apart."

Then he says:

"As a result, the world has come, in far greater degree than has been realised, to identify development as a whole with the experience of India."

Again he says:

"Students of economic development must be especially grateful to India. For, from having attempted the most, she has been our best teacher."

This is the opinion of an eminent economist for whose opinion the world cares. I do not know what the critics here have to say about it.

The Deputy Minister of Planning (Shri S. N. Mishra): Madam Chairman. I am intervening in the debate at this stage to make some brief observations on certain points raised by the hon. Members, but the main burden of the reply, as you already know, is going to fall on my senior colleague, the Minister for Planning. We are very grateful that during this interval one of our colleagues in the Government has taken the opportunity to explain certain important aspects of our steel programme. To that extent my burden is lighter.

Now, with this Plan, I would like to say with a certain amount of pride, we are entering the next decade which is going to be characterised by history as one of the most momentous decades in our history. This decade—1960 to 1970—is going to be one of decisive transformation. In fact, even during the past there have been great

structural transformations in our economy, and they are apt to be missed by hon. Members in the maze of details. The last decade has seen a structural transformation in what we might call a pre-capitalist, largely feudal and traditional economy, and that has been mainly because of the fact that we took certain steps in all spheres of our national life which are bound to prove to be of a greatly transforming character. We are going to widen and deepen this process of structural transformation. Therefore, I say that this Third Five Year Plan is going to be of vital importance to the nation.

Let us look for a moment at industry. What has happened in that sphere? There has been a great structural change there also, in the pattern of production, in the sense that there has been a shift towards the basic and producer goods industries and also the share of industry in the domestic product has been progressively increasing. Similarly, if you take into account the rural sector, there the property relationship has been changing in favour of more functional and more productive elements of our national life. To that extent, we look forward to great increase in our agricultural production. We are also witnessing a process of diversification in our agricultural production. Thirdly, in the public sector, which has rightly been emphasised by some of the hon. Members as the spearhead of our economic and social advance, there has been great increase from Plan to Plan and its share in the national product has been increasing. Subject to confirmation, because I would not depend upon my memory, probably the share of the public sector has increased from 6 point something to more than 10 point something. Then, in the occupational structure which is an important thing indicating the structural change, you may not find great transformation at present but now we are looking forward in the next decade or so, may be in the next fifteen years, to a substantial change, and we are thinking of bringing

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

down the population engaged in agriculture from 70 to 60 per cent. This is going to involve us in a great and stupendous task, because the nation will have to produce about 70 million jobs in the next fifteen years, and out of these 70 million jobs, two-thirds will have to be produced in the non-agricultural sector.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): Not 70 million?

Shri S. N. Mishra: That is going to be the working force in the next fifteen years and, therefore, I say that even to produce jobs to the extent of 70 million jobs we have to undertake a stupendous task. But that is going to bring about a substantial shift in the occupational pattern.

Then we may look for a moment at the organisational and institutional changes. I have not enough time to go into these subjects and so I will only make a passing reference. You know about the *panchayat raj*, democratic decentralisation and of the development of co-operatives that we are thinking of.

On the basis of all this, I have tried to make a claim that there has been a great structural change in our economy and we look forward to the next decade for a much greater change.

Also, in the next ten years, probably within even the Third Plan, what I am hoping for is a tremendous tide of industrialisation, and this industrialisation is going to be brought about by massive capital formation, both in the public and in the private sector.

Many of my friends on the other side have taken the opportunity to point out to us that this process of industrialisation has also led to increase in the concentration of economic power. That there is a real danger inherent in this process, I admit, and therefore this country has undertaken to undergo the double process of industrialisation and socialisation. This

process of socialisation is concurrently going on with the process of industrialisation. That is, in all conscience, a tremendous task and probably it has never been attempted in human history. But with faith we have undertaken this, and the results that we have got so far justify our expectation that we would be able to accomplish this task successfully.

When this document was signed about two weeks back, the Prime Minister pointed out that this was a mere skeleton. It is, in fact, a mere skeleton, although it is a voluminous document. It may sound paradoxical, but it is so. It is mere algebra, a mere book of notations and we have to develop it. We will have to develop it not only at the official level but also at the non-official level. The full potential of the Plan, both in social, economic, emotional and other terms can be fully brought out only with the co-operation of the people and their representatives.

The ball was thrown in our court the other day when some of the hon. Members tried to say to us, "You have produced the Plan, but what about implementation?" If the attitude is taken that implementation is the exclusive concern of the Government and its representatives, I would submit with all humility that this is a wrong attitude to take. Implementation is the concern of all the people and of their representatives. Therein lies the true test of leadership.

This Plan, if it has to succeed, and more than this Plan, if the process which it initiates has to succeed, this process extends over a longer period, it will have to become the central challenge of our life. It has not become so. All of us will have to make it the central challenge. I would like to suggest to hon. Members to look into their hearts and say whether they have done all that they could do during the last decade by the Plan.

Sometimes it is pointed out to us that the full irrigation potential has

not been utilised. What more is expected of the Government? (*Inter-ruption*). It may be that there are many things which are left which are to be done. Acharya Kripalani also pointed out this gap in the utilisation of the irrigation potential.

Acharya Kripalani: I did not expect anything better.

Shri S. N. Mishra: What I wanted to submit is this—here is an instance. How is the water that has been brought to the point where the village begins to be taken to the fields? Is it the concern of the officials alone and is it not the responsibility of the public representatives to see to it that people take the water to their fields? Perhaps this is the conclusion reached by the ex-Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, namely, that each year we will have to construct about 30,000 to 40,000 miles of field channels for utilising the irrigation potential. Here is a great challenge. It is not a challenge thrown in the face of the Government and its representatives but a challenge thrown to all the political parties because all of us are concerned in the development of agricultural production.

There is another important instance. We have got to develop about 250,000 to 300,000 village Panchayats and have to train a large number of persons to run these village Panchayats. We are pinning our faith and hope a good deal on the development of the village Panchayats, but we will have to train about 2 million persons to run these village Panchayats. Is it not the concern of all of us to see that this training takes place? I do not find many of my Communist friends now on the Benches here. My hon. friend, Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan, while speaking a few minutes ago, said that members of the Treasury Benches very assiduously try to explain to persons like Professor Ranga and Shri Masani that we are not concerned in the Soviet or the socialist plan and that we take good care to

see that their mind is completely disabused of it. But may I submit to her that in Soviet Russia there are to my knowledge about 10 million Communist workers working in the countryside to spread new techniques among the people.

Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan: On a point of clarification. What I said was that there was no need to answer that and to compare the two, but on the other hand to constructively face those difficulties which face us.

Shri S. N. Mishra: I see the point. I was simply mentioning that because that reminded me to remind my hon. friend of the responsibility in democratic planning that has to be shouldered by political parties. I was saying that these are the two or three fields among many others in which all of us have to co-operate.

History is in a hurry. Demogaphically, India is running so fast that unless we did our best, we cannot keep our head above water. That is what has been revealed by the last census. The only strategy that is indicated to India at the present stage of development is the strategy of the "big push." We cannot do anything less than going in for this big push. By gradual changes, let us be quite clear in our minds that we cannot solve the problem of 44 crores of people. This is the vast problem that is facing us. In fact, what I am trying to point out is that the Third Plan, by pressing two plan periods into one, has indicated that it has got this faith in the theory of the big push and it does not believe in gradual change. Whatever investment was undertaken during the last 10 years is going to be undertaken during the course of the next five years. This is indeed very inspiring.

My hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta, while speaking yesterday, said that there was not the same thrill and enthusiasm and expectation and all the rest of it which characterised the presentation of the Second Five Year Plan. I am a little surprised at this statement, particularly because of the

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

logic which Shri Indrajit Gupta sought to advance. His logic was that the Second Plan opened before us a new vista, and that it gave to us the key to a bright future. If that is his logic, I am perfectly at a loss to understand what has happened in the Third Plan to keep us away from that kind of enthusiasm. For the structure, the build up of the Third plan, is exactly similar. In fact, what has been sought to be done during the Third Plan is to widen and deepen the process which was initiated in the Second Plan. The logic which he has advanced is completely untenable. Madam Chairman, I ask you in all humility, should people feel less enthusiastic because they would find—all of them—that their children would be going to school? Should people find themselves less enthusiastic because they would find that more and more of their fields would be coming under irrigation and good seed? Should people find themselves less enthusiastic and hopeful because they would find in every area an approach road, and in every village drinking water supply which they needed so much? Are they going to be less enthusiastic because they would find that whereas only 15 years ago, the shops contained 100 per cent of foreign goods, now there is not going to be even 1 per cent of foreign goods in any shop in the villages? Are they going to find themselves less enthusiastic and hopeful because this is the state of things in the villages in the country. I do not quite understand. It seems to be a subjective kind of pessimism from which our friends in the communist party seem to suffer. Or, it may be a kind of whipped up pessimism only for what looms ahead in the form of the next general elections so that they infect others with that kind of pessimism.

But, there is no doubt that this enthusiasm could have been much more if all the political parties had deemed it their responsibility to spread the consciousness and perspective of plan-

ning amongst the people. The enthusiasm and thrill could have been much more. I do not make any exception in favour of any political party so far as this dereliction of duty is concerned.

Secondly, it has been stated that had there not been so much of strains—in the process of development—some strains are inevitable; there can be no getting away from them—then also, this enthusiasm could have been a little more. But, here, I would like to remind you that the thing that is happening, so far as the Members of the Opposition Parties are concerned, is somewhat astounding. They advocate a particular structure of the Plan in Parliament, and they say that the Plan must have heavy-industry orientation, the Plan must have basic industries and all that. But when it comes to accepting the consequences flowing from a plan structured like this, there is going to be hullabaloo about it. This is not fair. There cannot be this kind of thing, namely, structure? Yes; Strains? No.

I would like to remind my hon. friend from the Communist Party what Marx and Engels said in their *Communist Manifesto* about the process of development and what it involves. They said:

“.....this process of development involves constant disturbance of the whole social system, perpetual agitation and uncertainty.”

Now, through the Five Year Plans, we bring about this kind of agitation and uncertainty. Would it be then fair for any political party to exploit those very strains which are generated almost inevitably during the process of this development?

Some observations were made by my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee yesterday, and since they have been taken notice of very widely, I would like to say something about them.

The first point that Shri Vajpae made was that co-operation was not taken at the stage of formulation, and that the Plan had been formulated on a party basis. I am not able to understand how, of all persons, Shri Vajpayee could make this allegation. He happened to be a member of a very important but small committee. Perhaps, that committee consisted of 13 persons, and Shri Vajpayee happened to be a member of that committee—which was presided over by the Prime Minister. This committee was meant to give consideration to the basic principles which should have governed the Third Five Year Plan. Probably ten meetings were held of this committee, and I have looked into the record and I find that Shri Vajpayee was present at seven meetings.

Then, again, you know that we have got the informal consultative committee consisting of Members of Parliament, which consists of about 83 Members; and all parties are represented on that. It has held a number of meetings.

Pandit Brij Narayan 'Brijesh' (Shivpuri). We are not there.

Shri S. N. Mishra: 83 Members are there. I do not know whether the Hon. Speaker would have been pleased to convert the entire House into a committee; sometimes, that might happen, but he has not been pleased to do that. So, 83 Members happened to be on that committee. This committee has held a number of meetings, and has given consideration to many of these aspects.

Then, you would also be pleased to know that there are many panels on which Members of Parliament happen to be members. Probably, Madam Chairman, you also happened to be a member of one of the most important panels. All these panels have done very useful work, and about 32 Members happen to be on those panels. I would like to pay

a tribute to their work in these panels and also in many of these committees. You know what hard, useful and intensive work was done by the informal consultative committee, when it broke into A, B, C, and D committees, and it gave concentrated attention to many of these important problems. So here even at the national level so much care was taken to associate Members of Parliament with this process. You would be pleased to know that at the State level, at the district level, in all the 328 district development committees and in all the block committees, there are opportunities for all shades of opinion, for representatives of all political parties, to make their contribution to the process of planning. So I do not know how this charge would hold water.

Shri Vajpayee wanted the National Development Council to be enlarged to include Members of Parliament and of the State legislatures, to be elected on the basis of proportional representation. I do not know what I am to say about this because it betrays a complete misunderstanding of the nature of this body. This body is at the governmental level and mostly it is for giving opportunities to the Chief Ministers, on whom falls the burden of implementation, to participate in important decision making. If it is proposed to include people from outside in that, I would not be surprised if some time next month, Member comes forward with a suggestion that the Planning Commission itself should consist of the representatives of the various political parties to make it more representative. Nothing would be more untenable than this kind of suggestion.

Another charge, of a more serious nature, made by Shri Vajpayee is that the Plan is claimed by the ruling party as its own and that the ruling party should abandon the habit of claiming the Plan's achievements as those of its own. The charge is that the ruling party exploits this Plan for political purposes. I would like to express

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

myself most strongly against this charge. I do not quite know what is meant by this. If the members of the ruling party speak on the Plan, I think they do their duty by the Plan and if the members of any other party do not speak on the Plan, I do not think they show the proper amount of allegiance to the Plan. The Plan requires the allegiance of all of us once Parliament has set its seal of approval on it, and if any member of any political party speaks on the Plan, he spreads plan-consciousness and perspective. It may be that we in our ignorance also spread some kind of a wrong perspective, but that is something else. It may be that during election periods the members of the ruling party speak about the Plan. Who would deny the opposition parties the privilege of speaking on the Plan and claiming that it is their own?

Then I would like you to consider one very difficult situation which we face when such a charge is made. If at any time any member of any political party tells the people that no impression has been made on their problems of poverty, unemployment and the like, what are the members of the ruling party to say to it? Are they expected to say: 'We are complete duds; we have no imagination; we do not think about these plans?' What exactly are we expected to say about these things? We must say with a legitimate amount of pride, 'Yes, the nation has a Plan for eradicating poverty; the nation has a Plan for eradicating unemployment'. We say that this is the nation's Plan. But one would have to bear with this kind of phenomenon that some members might speak day in and day out about the achievements made by some other countries, but they would not allow us to speak about the achievements made by people in our own country! If we are doing that, we are only showing legitimate national pride; we are showing the

necessary patriotism which we must show. We cannot be accused for that. So, I would like to submit that this charge must be taken away for good. It is no use digging it up on occasions and flinging it in our face. After all, what are we expected to do?

I would not like to prescribe to them election gimmicks, but the Members of the other party could very well say to the people: "Look here, this Plan would not have been of this size and character had we not been there. If we are put in power, we shall give you a much better Plan." They can say things of that kind in a much larger measure.

Then I shall say a few words about the contribution made by Shri Asoka Mehta. In fact, I have been feeling all the time that I have not done justice to the very valuable contribution which he has made during the course of the debate. Although we do not agree with him on all points, we always appreciate the constructive spirit in which he speaks on the Plan, and in fact, it is always a pleasure to hear him, because every speech of his is, indeed, a great contribution to the process of planning. I would particularly like to commend to the House the suggestion that he made about taking taxes out of politics. I hope hon. Members on the other side would ponder over this suggestion.

This is indeed a very important suggestion because we have found in the past that there is not a total acceptance on the part of many political parties so far as the obligations of the Plan are concerned. We have seen in the Punjab the anti-betterment levy campaign being raised. After every budget session we find there are anti-tax campaigns. If this spirit pervades, I am sorry that we would not be displaying the right kind of plan consciousness. In a sense I am very much alarmed at the very dangerous attitude that is being fostered in the

country, particularly among the simple and ignorant people. We ask them to bear the burden for the sake of their children and for their own sake, but there are others who say they can achieve all these things without bearing these burdens.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: What do the capitalists say?

Shri S. N. Mishra: What happens is that a wrong attitude is gradually developing or is sought to be developed, but I have every faith in the maturity of the people that after the democratic experiment of the last 10 or 15 years they will not listen to those who do it. One seems to say: the Plan must succeed, but at the cost of others. Ultimately, it comes to this that the Plan must succeed, but at nobody's cost. That indeed cannot be. The Plan has its price, and that price will have to be paid. Once we accept the Plan, concomitantly we have to accept the price also.

To relax from the strain with which I have been speaking and to provide some amusement, I would like to tell you of a proverb in my area in Hindi which runs as follows:

“मोग हुए दे भीर शादी हो गई”

That is, you cannot have a marriage while asleep. Consummation in anything does not come about without making an effort.

Only a few minutes remain, but I have some important points still to touch.

I wanted to say all this, for, having listened to the debate for the last two days, I wanted to bring in something which I thought was missing to a certain extent.

I would be failing in my duty if I do not refer to some points made by Acharya Kripalani. He asked very pertinently a question—and nobody is more interested in this question than, Madam Chairman, you yourself are—

“We are building machines to make machines. But what about men?” This is a question which we face in many places and this requires to be answered. We cannot afford to be deficient so far as the development of man is concerned. We are quite clear in our mind that even economic development cannot proceed without this human factor. But to think in terms of any contradiction between machine and man at this stage, particularly when we are functioning in a democratic set-up, does not seem to be quite proper. In fact, even physical capital is meant for removing the obstacles in the way of development of the mind and spirit of men and women of India; this is not meant for anything else. We stand for both steel and velvet in men and women of India. Therefore, we have taken care a good deal to see that the other aspect of life is not ignored and I will come to that in a few moments. I would also like to mention that it has been amply illustrated by the developments in some other countries also that unless there is adequate investment in personnel development, economic development cannot take place at a fast enough pace. During the course of seventy years of its history, America registered a 3.5 per cent rate of growth every year but more than half of it is accounted for by the non-physical inputs, that is, by technological advance and by improved skills.

Many hon. Members here have quoted Prof. Galbraith and I would like to mention what he has said in this connection. He says that this is the age of the transcendent man; this is not the age of transcendent machine. He says in an inimitable style that man has not retreated before the machine; rather machine has become desperately dependant on man.

I would like to submit that we have taken good care to see through education, through health facilities and through social welfare activities that the development of men and women of India, of women and children of India who are the vulnerable and weaker

sections of our society are given adequate opportunities for development.

Since time does not permit me, I would not like to go into details but I would like to mention something about education. This point seems to have been very much in the minds of the hon. Members that in education, although we are having a quantitative increase, we are not paying enough attention to its quality.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister's time is up.

Shri S. N. Mishra: I will require five minutes as I have to deal with two or three more points.

An Hon. Member: Leave something for the Minister also.

Shri S. N. Mishra: In five minutes I will have done. We are trying to improve the quality of education. Since I have been a teacher myself, no one is more anxious than myself to see that in some places the catastrophic fall in standards that has taken place must be stopped and for that the most important thing is to pay attention to the training of teachers. We would find from the third Plan that the percentage of trained teachers of all categories is going to rise from 65 or so to 75. It is of course known to the House how the children in the age-group of 6—11 are going to have universal education. But another important point that must not be missed is that for those in the age-group of 11-14 also we hope to give universal education by the end of the fifth Plan.

There is large provision for scholarships for poor and meritorious students. The provision for these scholarships has increased from Rs. 3.5 crores to Rs. 18 crores during the last decade and we are going to have an additional provision to the extent of Rs. 37 crores. This is an important programme which must always be borne in mind.

As the House already knows, there is the programme of orientation of the elementary schools to the basic pattern and there is going to be phenomenal rise in facilities in regard to technical education.

Points were raised about health also. You will find that there has been significant increase in health facilities and remarkable results have been produced in the reduction of death-rate and in the eradication of epidemics and things like that. The provision has been progressively stepped up since the commencement of the First Plan. In the first Plan, it was Rs. 140 crores; in the second, it came up to Rs. 225 crores; and now in the third Plan, it stands at Rs. 341 crores. So, it is not a very insignificant step up, although we do think that if we had more resources we could have provided more. But in all these respects, whether it is social welfare activity, or any other sphere of social services, we will have to remember it always that on this production base, on this thin base of industrialisation, there cannot be all the wherewithals for development which we require. After all, if we had all those things, what was the need for planned development?

Then I shall refer to land reforms, because my hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan devoted a major part of his speech to that aspect. He mentioned that certain deficiencies are there. He said that certain 'inams' still remain to be abolished; that in several States the rents exceed the level recommended in the last two Plans; that there had been ejectments and collection of rent from tenants; and that legislation about ceiling had still to be enacted in several States and that due to transfers, the main object of ceiling and distribution of land to the landless had been defeated. He suggested that the planners should persuade the States to plug the loopholes. I would like to say that Shri Gopalan's observations about the deficiencies consisted mainly of quotations from the Plan. He has

attempted to present only one side of the picture. For example, he has not mentioned about the revolutionary nature of the programme for the abolition of intermediaries and how, as a result of it, about 20 million tenants have come to hold land directly from the State. I would also like to mention that it is not in many countries that such a change has been brought about through peaceful and constitutional means.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): What about the inams he has mentioned? What does the report say about it?

Shri S. N. Mishra: Yes, about inams. It is said that there are still some minor inams, but they comprise altogether an insignificant proportion of the total area held by the intermediaries. Whatever is required to be done will have to be done very speedily.

Now, about the rents. In many places rents have already been reduced, but there are certain places where they exceed one-fourth or one-fifth—the limit which has been recommended by the Plan. In some States they have been reduced much more, particularly in Gujarat, Maharashtra and Rajasthan. In some other States, if they happen to be higher than the one-fourth or the one-fifth, it is because of historical reasons. Sometime back they happened to be much more. But it is hoped that they will be brought down soon to the level recommended.

About ejection, I might say that ejection or surrender is not only a legal problem. It is more a social and economic problem. The economic weakness of the peasants comes in the way. For that, all the political parties will have to help the peasants to get rid of certain of the harassments to which they are put.

So far as ceiling is concerned, legislation has been enacted in 12 States and even in the remaining three States, legislation is on the anvil. They have been reported upon by the Select Committees. . .

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Your ceilings are a mockery.

Shri S. N. Mishra: . . . particularly in Madras, Mysore and Bihar.

Shri Tangamani: Are they not given exemptions?

Shri S. N. Mishra: I do not have enough time to reply to all these points. There is no doubt that because of the transfers, there has been substantial reduction in the expected surplus. But there is also one aspect of it, which is to be borne in mind, particularly from the point of view of the landless labour and the small peasants. Some of the lands might have been transferred to the landless and small persons and so we should take care to see that they are not put to any difficulty.

Shri Gopalan also rather tried to paint a very rosy picture that 90 million acres are available. We have already made a survey through a committee and further surveys would be made at the district level. We have identified some land which would be cultivable. All the lands are not cultivable at economic cost. Some lands are required to be left as such in the interest of soil conservation and for afforestation. I would also like to say that 50 lakhs acres are going to be made available to 7 lakh families during the course of the third Plan. That is our proposal at the present moment.

Shri Gopalan presented a one-sided picture; that was not a balanced picture. The whole picture should have been placed before the House. I am conscious that I have very much exceeded the time you had in your mind. But it often falls to the lot of a Member of the Treasury Benches to go into many of the points; otherwise, hon. Members would not feel satisfied.

There is only one point which I would deal within a minute, because that is very crucial and important. That point relates to exports. Yester-

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

day, my friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta referred to this. We are now attaching a good deal of importance, rather should say the highest importance, to exports. We are talking about our economy being self-generating during the course of the next 10 or 15 years. If we want to accomplish that, export promotion becomes of the greatest and crucial importance. Therefore, we are thinking in terms of stepping up the average rate of export, which has been of the order of Rs. 614 crores to about Rs. 740 crores during the course of the third Plan. We want to step up our export efforts, so as to bring our exports to the level of about Rs. 1300 to Rs. 1400 crores by the end of the fourth Plan. That would be making it twice the present level.

In spite of the fact that we have devoted a whole chapter indicating the concrete measures which we want to adopt for the promotion of exports, my friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, chose to characterise that chapter as completely imponderable or useless.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I only said that chapter is minus the ECM and therefore it is imponderable.

Shri S. N. Mishra: On the ECM, a very exhaustive statement has been made by the hon. Finance Minister and I would not like to say much on that. It might be that our export effort might be affected to a certain extent. But the entire export programme is not dependent on that. We do hope that we would be able to accomplish the programme that we have set before us. With these words I conclude. I am grateful to you for your indulgence.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): The hon. Deputy Minister has enunciated a very dangerous doctrine by saying that ejection is not a legal problem. I would like the hon. Planning Minister to enlighten us on that point. If this thing gets abroad, I think the case of tenants will become very hard. It is already hard and I

hope the hon. Minister for Planning would enlighten us on that point.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest that the hon. Minister for Planning make a note of it and refer to it in his reply.

The Minister of Labour and Employment and Planning (Shri Nanda): Yes.

Shri Maniyangadan: Madam Chairman, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to take part in this discussion. Various aspects of the Third Five Year Plan have been discussed by several hon. Members who took part in the discussion. It is gratifying to note that there is general agreement as regards the approach and also the objectives of the Plan.

17 hrs.

Some hon. Members have tried to stress the shortfalls in the Second Five Year Plan. Of course, it is true that we have not been able to achieve fully the targets in all the fields in the Second Five Year Plan, but we have every reason to be proud of the achievements we have made in the last ten years.

The most important thing is that the outlines of the country's future social and economic structure have been established. Impartial and unbiased experts from foreign countries have expressed their appreciation of the developments we have made and have praised the manner in which the Five Year Plans are working.

I do not say that there have been no mistakes. From the experience we have gained by the working of the two Plans, certain modifications have been made in the frame of the Third Plan.

It was asked by an hon. Member, what has been done during the last ten years for the benefit of the common man. Well, Sir, I would first submit that ten years is not a

very long period in the life of a nation. But it can be said without fear of contradiction that in this short period we have made tremendous progress, and it can be said that the progress we have made is much more than what any other country was able to achieve in so short a period. Countries where planning has been resorted to have not achieved so much as India has done in such a short period. Let us go to the villages of India and find out the attitude of the people. If we compare the conditions in the villages of India at present with what it was 10 or 15 years back, we can know the change. The working of the community development projects and other activities have created a sense of self-respect and confidence in the people.

It is true, much remains to be done. But it has to be remembered that we started from scrap. Now things have taken a shape and the people are coming into their own. I am not saying that everything that ought to have been done has been done. But a beginning has been established, and if things are allowed to go smoothly the face of India will be much brighter.

It has to be remembered that we are functioning in a democratic way. Authoritarian or totalitarian methods are not acceptable to us. It is in this context that the achievements we have made have to be measured.

This is a new experiment that we are trying. Planning pre-supposes controls. But the question is, how far it should go. It has been conceded by all that our planning in the democratic set up has by and large succeeded. It was said that there is concentration of wealth. Nobody denies the fact that all the wealth that is produced is not flowing to the people. And it is not contended

by anybody that it is a good thing. But the question is how to tackle it. We have a mixed economy. How could the equitable distribution of wealth be done? Several taxation and other measures have been adopted. Moreover, this problem is engaging the serious attention of the Government and the Planning Commission and it can be hoped that a solution will be found. I may also submit that in the set up we are having it is, to some extent, inevitable.

In the matter of fixing priorities in the Plan, every aspect of nation's interest, both present and future, have been taken into consideration and the perspective of the coming 10 to 15 years has been kept in mind.

17.06 hrs.

[SHRI HEDA in the Chair.]

In the matter of industries, I would like to stress that the planning of industries should be in such a way that would enable the establishment of a number of ancillary industries. The manufacturing of components of industries should be diffused widely and ancillary industries should not be allowed to concentrate in a particular centre. If an industry is established, there should be possibilities for a large number of ancillary industries concerning the very same industry, and they should be set up in various parts of the country.

In this age when science and technology are advancing so rapidly, we have to take measures in those lines also. I have to stress here the necessity for research and scientific advance in every field. I am of the view that this aspect has to be given more importance. We find that in the advanced countries machineries which are being used today are improved upon the next day and changed, and it is because of research and scientific advance. Unless we keep pace with these advances, we will be lagging behind. So, this has to be given sufficient importance.

[Shri Maniyangadan]

Then I would like to deal with the question of balanced regional development. It has been the declared policy of the Planning Commission and also the Government that balanced regional development is one of the important aims. This was so in the last two Plans. In the Third Plan also, it is stated:

"In each region the nature of the problem and the impediments to rapid development in particular fields should be carefully studied, and appropriate measures devised for accelerated development."

With special reference to the State which I represent, namely, Kerala, I may say that in achieving the objective of balanced regional development we have not succeeded. The other day, Shri A. K. Gopalan quoted certain figures to illustrate the backwardness of Kerala in spite of the over all development. I do not propose to repeat those figures, but there cannot be any difference of opinion as regards facts. Development in the agricultural field alone cannot solve the problems of Kerala, the main problem being unemployment. The pressure on land is more acute in Kerala than in any other part of India. The problem of unemployment, especially educated unemployment, is so acute that a parallel cannot be found anywhere else. Moreover, there is no further land to be brought under cultivation. The problem in Kerala is not to bring more land under cultivation, but afforestation; that is to say, convert the land already occupied by people into forests. We are seeing reports of large number of unauthorised occupations of Government land by people. It was only recently that nearly 2,000 families were evicted from Udumbuchola taluk in Kottayam district. All of them were in unauthorised occupation of Government land. It is reported that several thousands of people remain to be evicted from Government land. This unauthorised oc-

cupation by the people took place because there was no occupation for the people.

It was because of their desire for existence and of finding out livelihood that these people went and occupied the land. One solution suggested for this is migration of people from Kerala to other parts where land is available. Of course, that will give some relief. But I would submit that that would not solve the problem. Means for employment have to be found out. The problem of unemployment in Kerala is a challenge both to the Government and to the Planning Commission. Industrialisation is the only solution. But no step worth the name has been taken in that line.

One travelling from the north of India to the south finds several factories coming up, but on crossing the Western Ghats one finds the old conditions. It is undeveloped and full of unemployed people. Figures have already been quoted. It is said that in the matter of locating industries technical and financial considerations have to be taken into consideration. I do admit that. All people in Kerala expected that the Heavy Electricals would be put up there, but it is said that on technical grounds it is going to be located somewhere else. I do not allege discrimination as far as the Government is concerned. But what are the grounds for this? I do not understand that. We are entitled to know them.

Kerala is a part of India and its needs, I would stress, are to be considered as national needs, as the needs of India. The problem has to be viewed on a national plane. Has the Planning Commission taken pains to study the special problems of Kerala and attempted to devise measures for the accelerated development of that area? If there is a technical difficulty in starting one particular industry, schemes must be devised to meet such a contingency. It is a challenge, as

I submitted, and it must be met. Failure to do so is a failure of the nation. Financial considerations should not be given undue importance in this respect. That is what I have to submit.

With regard to the second ship-building yard, there is no certainty even now. Why is it not given any importance? It is included in the category of new projects for which external credit has yet to be arranged and it is said in the Plan itself that the larger element of uncertainty attaches to the projects falling in this category. So, the hope that the second ship-building yard would be started without much delay is also receding.

Has a study been made of the industrial potentialities of this region? In Kerala there is no coal, oil or iron, but there are other facilities. Power could be produced at a very cheap rate. There is the Idukky scheme the project report of which also, in spite of several months since the investigations are over, has not yet been finalised.

Then I would submit with regard to communications, namely, the railways. In the south the hon. Railway Minister said that certain railways would be provided. We find in the Plan that some have been provided for. But in this matter also Kerala has been completely ignored. When the question of starting new industries comes, one question asked is: Are railways there? Are communication facilities there? Because of absence of communication facilities, industries are not given. When the question of opening new railway lines comes, it is said that there is not much industry and therefore there is no necessity for any railway. This is a vicious circle and it must be broken.

The State Government have proposed a plan involving about Rs. 300

crores, but only Rs. 170 crores have been allowed. At that time the impression was that investment to the extent of Rs. 100 crores in the Central sector would be made available. I desire to impress upon the Planning Commission and the Government the necessity for investing this amount in the Central Sector in Kerala. Only then can small industries grow and a solution of the unemployment problem of Kerala can be found.

I may refer to the question of plantation. Rubber is practically the monopoly of Kerala. Of course, in the Plan, certain amounts have been allotted for the purpose of developing the rubber plantations. But, I would submit, something more has to be done. It is now taken for granted that the big plantations will develop by themselves. But, in the present state of affairs, it is not possible for them to develop rubber. So, my submission is that something should be done to help them to develop the rubber industry. I would suggest that a Plantation Finance Corporation must be set up. Then, again, with regard to putting up houses for labourers in the plantations, in industries other than the plantation industry, for putting up residential houses, for labourers, the Government gives 25 per cent as subsidy and 50 per cent as loan. In the case of the plantation industries, there is no grant at all. Why this discrimination, I ask? My submission is, it has to be given equal importance and the plantation industry should be allowed to flourish. This industry saves foreign exchange and in the industrial development of India, rubber is very important. Other plantation products also earn foreign exchange. My submission is, it has to be given its due place.

By the fact that I refer to certain matters immediately concerning Kerala,.....

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member's time is up. Many hon. Members are waiting.

Shri Maniyangadan: I am concluding. The fact that I referred to certain matters immediately concerning Kerala does not mean that I have not interest in other parts. I am happy at the developments taking place in India and I am proud of that. Public co-operation is of very great importance.

I will quote one sentence from the Plan and conclude.

"The foremost need now is that the attitudes of the people and the pattern of conduct which prevail in the community should be in harmony with the national purposes. Love of the nation and faith in its great destiny should become the dominating feeling in every heart."

Mr. Chairman: Shri Brij Narayan Brajesh.

Shri Rajendra Singh: One thing I would like to know: whether this debate is going to be finished today or it is going to be carried over to tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman: We sit till 6 o'clock today. It will continue till then and also tomorrow. What time will be available for other Members tomorrow, I am not certain. The Speaker will decide that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: We sit only upto 6 o'clock?

Shri Rajendra Singh: Are we going to have some discussion tomorrow or not?

Mr. Chairman: That would have to be decided by the hon. Speaker. What is the hurry about it?

Shri Rajendra Singh: Nobody has been called from the P.S.P. side in the last two days.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I should not suffer because I do not belong to any party.

पंडित ब्रज नारायण "ब्रजेश": समापति महोदय, योजना के सम्बन्ध में समस्त दलों के द्वारा अपने विचार व्यक्त किए गए हैं। जिस समय सम्माननीय सदस्य अपने विचार व्यक्त करते हैं तो मैं ने देखा है कि दल अथवा पार्टी उनके मन से जाती नहीं है। जिस दल का वे प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं, उस दल को ध्यान में रख कर योजना के सम्बन्ध में विचार करना, न्याय-संगत नहीं है। चाहे वह कांग्रेस पार्टी हो, रूलिंग पार्टी हो अथवा विरोधी दल हो, शुद्ध स्वदेश की भावना से हमको योजना के सम्बन्ध में विचार करना चाहिये ही। यह कहना कि अभी तक देश में कुछ नहीं हुआ है, नितान्त असत्य है और साथ ही यह भी कहना कि सब कुछ हो गया है, यह भी वैसा ही है। देश के निर्माण के लिये, देश को आगे ले जाने के लिये योजना बनाई गई और कार्य हुआ और कुछ बना भी। अगर कोई कहता है कि बिल्कुल कार्य नहीं हुआ है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उसकी आँखें फूट गई हैं और अगर कोई यह कहता है कि इतना हो गया है कि अब और कुछ जरूरत करने की बाकी नहीं रह गई है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह दूसरों को मूर्ख बनाने की चेष्टा कर रहा है। इतना अवश्य है कि जितनी शक्ति लगाई गई, जितना धन लगाया गया, उससे जो प्राप्त होना चाहिये था प्राप्त नहीं हुआ है, और यह बात भी सत्य है कि जनता को योजनाओं द्वारा जो सन्तोष मिलना चाहिये था, जो शान्ति मिलनी चाहिये थी वह प्राप्त नहीं हुई है। उस का कारण जो मैं समझ सकता हूँ, जो समझा हूँ, वह यह है कि किसी भी कार्य को सम्पन्न करने के लिये जिस प्रकार की भावना होनी चाहिये, वैसी पवित्र भावना होनी चाहिये, उस भावना का भी अभाव हो गया है, और सम्पत्ति हम उधार ले रहे हैं। वैसा बाहर से ला रहे हैं और हमारा आचार छुट हो गया है।

"आचारहीन न पुनन्ति वेदाः"

अष्टाचार जब होगा तो उस से दुविचार उत्पन्न होगा और जब दुविचार उत्पन्न होगा तो उस दुविचार के द्वारा जो कार्य हम करेंगे उस कार्य में सफलता की प्राप्ति करना निराधार है, एक प्रकार से निःसार है। तब भावना एक प्रकार से अशुद्ध होगी, दुविचार होगा और पैसा उधार होगा। पैसा उधार, तो मन में होगा दुविचार और फिर सफलता की प्राप्ति करना भी ई बेकार। इस का परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि हम देखते हैं कि राष्ट्र निर्माण के लिये.....

श्री बाल्मीकी (बुलन्दशहर—रक्षित अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : क्या प्राप ने कमी उधार नहीं लिया ?

पंडित ब्रज नारायण “ब्रजेश” : सारे देश उधार लेते हैं और देते हैं। यहां लेने का सवाल नहीं है। लोग ऋण करते हैं,

“ऋणकर्ता पिता शुभु : माता च व्यभिचारिणी”

मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि जो बड़े बड़े कार्य किये जा रहे हैं, उन कार्यों के द्वारा जो लाभ देश को मिलना चाहिये था, वह नहीं मिला है, और हम कुछ कार्य तो इस प्रकार के करते जाते हैं जिन से हानि ही हानि होती है, लाभ नहीं होता है। उदाहरण के लिये मध्य प्रदेश में माता टीला बान्ध बनाया गया। माता टीला बान्ध में करोड़ों रुपये लगे और विद्यार्थियों ने अब यह निर्णय दिया है कि न वह सिंचाई के काम आ सकता है और न बिजली के काम में आ सकता है।

श्री ज० ला० द्विवेदी : (हमीरपुर) सिंचाई हो रही है।

पंडित ब्रज नारायण “ब्रजेश” : नहीं हो रही है।

श्री ज० ला० द्विवेदी : हो रही है, मैं बुर देखता हूँ, मेरे क्षेत्र में है।

श्री राजेश्वर सिंह : प्राप के क्षेत्र में सिंचाई हो रही है।

श्री ज० ला० द्विवेदी : २६,००० एकड़ में सिंचाई हो रही है और ६५,००० एकड़ में होने वाली है।

Mr. Chairman: I would request hon. Members not to have conversation across the Bench.

पंडित ब्रज नारायण “ब्रजेश” : मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि जो राय विद्यार्थियों ने दी है उस पर ध्यान दिया जाय। सिंचाई नहीं हो सकती है, इस का यह मतलब नहीं है कि उस में से एक बूँद पानी नहीं निकल सकता है। जितना उस पर खर्च हुआ है, जिस वृष्टि से उसका निर्माण हुआ है वह उपयोग नहीं हुआ है। एक ही उपयोग हो रहा है, कहीं अधिक वृष्टि हो गई तो लखितपुर और झांसी बच नहीं सकेंगे जैसा कि बहुत से बान्धों से हुआ है। पहले जब प्रतिवृष्टि देश में होती थी तो केवल फसलों को हानि होती थी लेकिन अब यहां प्रतिवृष्टि होती है तो फसलों के साथ साथ बाघ, पशु और बालबच्चे, इन सब का पता नहीं लगता है। सभी कुछ साफ हो जाता है। (Interruptions) मेरा निवेदन है कि मुझे प्राप बोलने दें। यदि प्राप बाधा डालेंगे तो मेरी हानि नहीं है। यदि प्राप मेरे समय में से लेंगे तो दूसरों की हानि होगी। मेरा कुछ नहीं बिगड़ेगा।

मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि जो कार्य हुए हैं जो बान्ध बनते हैं व ठीक से नहीं बनते हैं। सड़कों के बारे में देख लीजिये एक छोर से दूसरे छोर तक सड़क बन नहीं पाती है और उस का खर्च घारण्य हो जाता है। किसी कार्य में जो दक्षिणता, सावधानी और परिश्रम बरती जानी चाहिये उसी बरती नहीं जाती है। उसमें हमारा पैसा भी लगता है और समय भी लगता है। बन लकित भी बनती है, लेकिन परिणाम 'द'

[पंडित ब्रज नारयण "ब्रजेश"]

निकल सकता है वह नहीं निकल पाता है। एक योजना को सफल करने के लिये जिस प्रकार का वायुमंडल देश में निर्माण होना चाहिये, जैसी भावना सरकारी कर्मचारियों में और जनता में होनी चाहिये, उस भावना का अभाव देश में हो रहा है। न तो जनता इस विषय में गम्भीर है और न शासन के कर्मचारी गम्भीर हैं। इस लिये यदि विरोधी लोगों को यह कहने का अवसर मिलता है कि यह सभी प्रयत्न पार्टी को फलरिख करने के लिये, पार्टी का पोषण करने के लिये योजना के रूप में किया जा रहा है, तो यह असय बात नहीं हो सकती है क्योंकि उन में इस चीज को गम्भीरता से लेने का जितना प्रयत्न होना चाहिये उतना नहीं है। लोग समझते हैं कि पैसा बाहर से आ गया, अब खूब खाओ, मोज उड़ाओ। लोग समझते हैं कि यह कर्जा देना ही पड़ेगा। स्थिति यह है कि करोड़ों रुपया का व्यय हर वर्ष हमें देना पड़ रहा है। यह हमारी सब से बड़ी गैरजिम्मेदारी है कि हम जिस सन्तान को भ्रान्त देना चाहते हैं उन पर इतना कर्जा लाद कर जाये कि उन को कपड़ालतः भी पहिने के लिये न मिले। विदेशी लोग इस लिये प्रसन्न हो रहे हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान को स्वतन्त्रता राजनीतिक दृष्टि से मिल गई पर आर्थिक दृष्टि से देश धीरे धीरे जकड़ा जा रहा है और इतना जकड़ जायेगा कि उस को सांस लेने के लिये भी अवसर नहीं रहेगा। इस लिये कर्जा लेने की जब स्थिति होती है तो कर्जा लिया जाता है, जैसा पीछे से एक माननीय सदस्य ने पूछा कि क्या मैंने कर्जा नहीं लिया है, लिया है। लेकिन कर्जा बाहर से बिच की तरह लिया जाता है। जिस प्रकार से शरीर को रोग मुक्त करने के लिये बिच खाना परमावश्यक हो जाता है तो वह बिच की तरह खाया जाता है, आहार की तरह नहीं खाया जाता। इस लिये जो कर्जा आज लिया जा रहा है वह बिच समझ कर लेना चाहिये और अत्यन्त लीध्र हमें कर्ज को लौटाना उड़ेगा व दृष्टि से विचार करना चाहिये। लेकिन

ऐसा मालूम होता है कि हम कर्जा लेने के बिचबुझल होते जा रहे हैं। जनता में यह स्थिति होती जा रही है कि बाहर से धाँख मूंद कर कर्ज लिया जा रहा है, यह समझ कर कि शायद इसे चुकाना नहीं पड़ेगा। जिन के पास खेती बाड़ी नहीं है, भूमि नहीं है, उन लोगों ने कर्जा लिया हुआ है। हमारे ऊपर कर्जा लदता जा रहा है। जिन को जरूरत नहीं है वे कर्जा लेते हैं और जो सो काल्ड लीड्स बीच में होते हैं वे कमिशन खाते हैं। वे समझते हैं उन को तो देना नहीं पड़ेगा, अगर देना भी पड़ेगा तो दूसरे लोग देंगे, हमें क्या करना है। इस तरह से बीच में ही सारा पैसा खत्म हो जाता है। इस प्रकार सम्पत्ति का अपव्यय हो रहा है। बाहर से कर्जा जो आ रहा है उस कर्ज का जिस प्रकार से उपयोग होना चाहिये वैसा उपयोग नहीं हो रहा है।

“माले मुपत दिले बेरहम”।

इस प्रकार की स्थिति देश में निर्माण हो गई है कि लोग समझते हैं कि मुफ्त का माल है, खाओ पियो और मोज उड़ाओ। मुझे यह दुख हो रहा है कि यह जो कर्ज के रूप में सम्पत्ति आ रही है उस का उपयोग ठीक से नहीं हो रहा है कोई इस को देखने भालने वाला नहीं है। इस प्रकार की गैर जिम्मेदारी देश में चलने नहीं दी जानी चाहिये। जो हमारे संयोजक लोग हैं, उन को इस बात को क गम्भीरतापूर्वक समझना चाहिये था कि दो योजनाओं समाप्त हो जाने के बाद भी उन का जो परिणाम निकलना चाहिये था अगर वह नहीं निकला तो तो उस का कारण क्या है? कारण है अष्टाचार जब हमारे प्रादमी ही अष्ट हो गये हैं तो हम किसी कार्य को सम्पन्न कैसे कर सकते हैं?

दूसरा मेरा निवेदन यह है कि राष्ट्र के हित को धर की तरह से लीजिये। धर को सम्पन्न बनाने के लिये सब से पहली चीज

यह होनी चाहिये कि घर के लोगों को अनाज पूरा मिलना चाहिये, देश को रोटी मिलनी चाहिये। पहली समस्या यह है कि हम लोगों को, प्रत्येक व्यक्ति को तृप्त करें। उस को भूख से मुक्त करें फिर राष्ट्र और संसार की ओर देखें। आदमी संसार की ओर तभी देख सकता है जब उस को पेट भर रोटी मिले। यदि उसे रोटी नहीं मिलती है तो उस के सामने संसार की बात करना व्यर्थ है। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब देश में लोग भूखें हों तब हमें गदियों पर बैठने का, पंखा चलाने का और तरह तरह के नाच नाचने का क्या अधिकार? यह सब से पहले बन्द होना चाहिये। यदि हम ह्यूमैनिटी का नारा लगाते हैं तो पहले यह होना चाहिये। यदि हम सोशलिस्ट पैटर्न का नारा लगाते हैं तो मिनिस्टरों और बाहरी लोगों में कोई फर्क नहीं होना चाहिये।

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि देश में अन्नोत्पादन करने की दिशा में हमें जिस प्रकार की सावधानी बरतनी चाहिये थी वह वास्तव में बरती नहीं गई है और अन्न के उत्पादन में हम जागरूकता से काम नहीं कर रहे हैं। हम ज्यादा अनाज पैदा करने का नारा लगाते हैं। कौन किसान है जो नहीं चाहेगा कि अधिक अनाज पैदा करें? लेकिन होता यह है कि यदि उस के पास खेत हैं तो बैल नहीं, यदि बैल हैं तो खाद नहीं है, खाद है तो अनाज नहीं है, अनाज भी है तो उसके ऊपर चौकीदार है, पटवारी है, कलक्टर है, मिनिस्टर है और सी.ए.ए.। इतने आदमी उसके सिर पर हैं, अब आप बतलाइये कि इस स्थिति में वह ज्यादा अनाज कैसे पैदा करेगा? उधर के ऊपर कम से कम बोझ हो, उस के सिर पर बजन न हो और वह क्षतिपूर्वक तथा सफलतापूर्वक अधिक से अधिक अन्नोत्पादन कर सके। आज हम उस को इस की सुविधा प्रदान करते तब तो ठीक है, पंडित जी की तरह से उपदेश करने से क्या फायदा है कि ज्यादा अनाज पैदा करो। आप मुझ से कहें कि

तुम पैसा पैदा करो तो पैसा पैदा करें कैसे यह भी तो बतलाना पड़ेगा। सब चाहते हैं कि उन के पास ज्यादा पैसा हो और कृषक भी चाहते हैं। इसके लिये कृषकों को जितनी सुविधा देनी चाहिये वह आप नहीं दे रहे हैं, केवल उसे उपदेश दे रहे हैं। मैंने अनेक स्थानों में देखा है कि पहले खुदाई प्रारम्भ हुई लेकिन लोगों को खाद नहीं मिली, यदि खाद भी बांट दी गई तो यह नहीं बताया गया कि खाद डालने के बाद पानी कितना देना चाहिये। परिणाम यह हुआ कि खाद ने फसल का जला दिया। इस खाद के लिये ज्यादा पानी लगता है। उस के साथ में इतना तीव्र पदार्थ होता है कि यदि उस को पूरी तरह पानी नहीं दिया जायेगा तो वह फसल को जला देगी। इस लिये पहले उनको खूब पानी दिया जाय। तो वह खाद बेकार हो जाता है। और अन्न का जो सरकार ने संग्रह किया है उसमें अन्न सड़ जाता है, कुछ आपस में बंट जाता है, और उसके बाद जब हिसाब लगाया जाता तो है। कम हो जाता है कम हो जाता है तो फिर उसके लिये भी हिसाब बना लिया जाता है, और हमारी आँखों में धूल झोंक कर सरकार के पास पहुंचा दिया जाता है। तो इस प्रकार की अन्न कोष की स्थिति है। पर्याप्त अन्नकोष बने नहीं हैं, और जो बने हैं वे उत्तम नहीं हैं, उनमें अन्न सड़ता है, खराब होता है और ठीक प्रकार से उसका वितरण नहीं होता। तो यह अन्न की स्थिति है।

फिर कहा जाता है कि दुग्ध का अधिक उत्पादन किया जायेगा। कलकत्ते के बाजार में गायों का जून बहाया जा रहा है। यदि गोहत्या होती है तो साम्प्रदायिकता बढ़ती है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किस मुसलमान ने यह मांग की है कि गायों की हत्या की जाये, लेकिन गायें कटवायी या रखी हैं और उसका दोष उनके सिर पर लादा जा रहा है, जिस के कारण हिन्दू और मुसलमानों में द्वेष पैदा होता है और फिर आप कहते हैं कि मुझ को आपस में

[पंडित ब्रज नारायण "ब्रजेश"]

लड़ना नहीं चाहिये । पहले तो झगड़ा पैदा करते हैं और फिर पंच फंसला करने बैठते हैं । तो इस चीज को क्यों जीवित रखा जा रहा है जिस से देश में दो वर्ग में द्वेष पैदा होता है और झगड़ा बढ़ता है ।

इस के अतिरिक्त खेतों के लिये बैलों की आवश्यकता है उसको पूरा करने के लिये भी आपको गायों की रक्षा करने की आवश्यकता है । एक और आप मुद्रा स्फीति के कारण ट्रेडरिजेशन नहीं कर सकते दूसरी ओर गायों की हत्या के कारण बैल कम हो रहे हैं । जो साधन हमारे पास हैं उनको हम नष्ट कर रहे हैं और जो साधन नहीं हैं उनको हम प्राप्त नहीं कर सकते । हमारी स्थिति यह है :

यो ध्रुवाणि भरितज्य, अध्रुवाणि निशेवते ।
ध्रुवाणि तस्य नश्यन्ति, अध्रुवम नष्ट मेव हि ॥

जो हमारे पास है उसको पहले साफ कर दिया और जो नहीं है उसको प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं, यह हमारी नीति है ।

फिर भूमि के वितरण के सम्बन्ध में यह व्यवस्था है कि जो पहिले से खेती करते आ रहे हैं उनको गारंटी नहीं है कि उनकी जमीन उनके पास रहेगी या नहीं और जिन्होंने कभी खेती नहीं की है वे ताक लगाये बैठे हैं कि जमीन मिलेगी तो फिर देखेंगे कि उसका क्या किया जाये । तो इस प्रकार भूमि वितरण में भी गड़बड़ी है । और अब तो किसान के मन में यह भावना उत्पन्न हो रही है कि उसकी भूमि छीन ली जायेगी ।

दूसरे यह जो योजना बनी है इसके सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि यदि लड़ाई छिड़ गयी तो फिर कुछ नहीं हो सकेगा । यदि ऐसी अवस्था है तो फिर कोई कैसे योजना के गीत गाया करे । लड़ाई तो कभी भी छिड़ सकती है । तो फिर हमको युद्ध का सामना करने के लिये रहस्ये इतना काम करना चाहिये और इस योजना में सुरक्षा

के सम्बन्ध में जितनी गम्भीरता से सोचा जाना चाहिये था उतनी गम्भीरता से विचार नहीं किया गया है । इस में वर इंडस्ट्रीज पर ज्यादा पैसा लगाया जाना चाहिये था, और इस देश के शत्रुओं का मुकाबिला करने की तैयारी का वायुमंडल निर्माण करने के लिये योजना कमीशन ने कुछ करना चाहिये था ।

फिर शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन यह है कि इस देश में या तो अशिक्षित हैं या कुशिक्षित हैं, सुशिक्षित इस देश में नहीं हैं । यदि देश में सुशिक्षित होते तो देश का वायुमंडल खराब न होता । इसलिये शिक्षा के बारे में भी गम्भीरता से विचार करना चाहिये और उसके लिये उचित धन राशि खर्च की जानी चाहिये थी जो नहीं की गयी ।

अन्त में मैं एक और निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ । यद्यपि मैं इस वृत्ति का नहीं हूँ, पर मध्य प्रदेश के लोगों में यह भावना उत्पन्न हो रही है कि जब सरकार हम को डाकुओं से नहीं बचा सकती वह चीन और पाकिस्तान से हमारी रक्षा कैसे कर सकेगी । वहां आज तक डाकुओं की समस्या हल नहीं हो पायी है । एक डाकू मारा जाता है तो दूसरे चार उसकी जगह भड़े हो जाते हैं । कारण यह है कि पुलिस और डाकुओं के बीच में गठबंधन है और वे दोनों मिल कर जनता को नष्ट करते हैं और सारे इलाके में हाहाकार मचा हुआ है ।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो योजना बनी है उस से कुछ फल तो होगा ही । पहली जो दो योजनायें बनीं उनसे भी फल हुआ लेकिन जितनी धासा भी उतना नहीं । इस लिये यह तो नहीं कहा जा सकता कि यह योजना किसी काम की नहीं है और इसको फेंक देना चाहिये । लेकिन जितनी जागरूकता से और दक्षिण होकर

काम करना चाहिये या वह नहीं किया गया ।

अन्त में मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ और बहुत सी अन्य बातें कहने की इच्छा होते हुये अपने लोभ का संवरण करके अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूँ ।

Shri Rajendra Singh: The hon. Deputy Minister made a very spirited and eloquent speech. I heard him with all the care at my command, and I have been left unconvinced. My worst fear has been confirmed, the fear that this Government has a rigid and fixed mind and will not re-orient its policy in the light of the facts which are available to us today in this country.

Sir, in the last one decade that we had been through the economic planning, has brought out in sharp relief that the present political leadership of this country is inept to take the ship of this nation to the heaven of incessant progress and general satisfaction. The strain and tenor in which the Prime Minister made his introductory speech epitomises the hesitancy and the indecisiveness of the present leadership to perform the task with courage and conviction and determination. This is the situation which this country is facing so far as the leadership is concerned.

So far as the last two Plans are concerned, I have no manner of hesitation or doubt in my mind that both of the Plans have failed miserably in terms of political and social objectives.

17-37 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The Deputy-Minister said that there had been structural changes and foundations were being laid for more vital and bigger changes in the years to come. I feel completely confounded. I can concede that there has

been certain increase in the industrial production and similarly certain increase in agricultural production although not to the extent or in proportion to the investments that had been made. But if anybody claims that any structural change has been made or certain direction has been devised for the future, then most humbly but determinedly, I disagree. It is being made out or claimed persistently by the ruling party that the expansion of the public sector in the Third Plan or whatever has been done in the Second Plan has created a basis where social transformation can take place. Nothing is far from truth. Public sector is only in those industries or those projects are brought into being in sectors where the Indian private capital could never have gone, either because of its inability to make an investment of that size or because of the very long gestation period required in those industries. It took so many years for Tatas to found a steel industry which had a capacity of one million ton production. I do not understand whether there is any single business house which has the capacity of putting up a steel mill on its own within a span of two or three years. Therefore, there is nothing in unique; there is nothing surprising; there is nothing for this Congress Government to take credit of for a steel mill having been put in the public sector. This was inevitable in the circumstances. Similar is the case with regard to heavy engineering works, big irrigation works, dams, power projects, roads and transport, etc. All these industries are inevitably taken up by the Government because Government alone have the resources, either domestic or foreign, to undertake them.

Now, about structural changes, what structural changes have been made? So far as the realm of ownership is concerned, we have seen in this country many a time—I do not have so much time to dilate upon it and to document it—and we know that all the business-houses, whether

[Shri Rajendra Singh]

big or small, in this country, have increased their assets and their capital. They have increased their volume of business on an average by 300 per cent during the last ten years. The claim of the authorities is that there has been a rise of 42 per cent in our national income and nearly 50 per cent in *per capita* income. That might be so. I do not dispute it. But where has it gone? Even an hon. Member like Shri M. R. Masani, who is opposed to the human aspirations of having a society of brotherhood and equality, has conceded in this House that the working class, the landless labour, the peasants and even the lower middle-classes have suffered devastating erosions in their income. Where has this accretion in the national income gone? Naturally it has gone to those people who had been at the Olympian heights during the time of the Britishers and who have largely, I should say mostly, profited by the Plan. I do not deny that there has been some improvement in industrial and agricultural production. But my contention remains: as the Deputy Minister has said, when a process of social transformation takes place, the nation has to be prepared to accept disturbances in the normal life. They have to suffer not only hardships but even great difficulties to which the present imagination might not go. But the question is this: an individual or a nation makes sacrifices, suffers difficulties, only when it knows that the fruits of such sacrifices are to be owned communally, are to be owned jointly. But in this country, during the last decade, what do you find? You find that every industrialist has added more and more industries to his business. Even where there has not been any further addition to his business, there has been a phenomenal rise in profits. There has been a phenomenal rise in the increase of his assets. So, this is the situation which calls for correction, for very bold measures and steps on the side of the Government.

When the draft Plan was being discussed last time, the Prime Minister confessed that there has been such a lopsidedness in this Plan, in the working of the Plan and in the results of the Plan that a committee was set up to enquire into it. But before we await the recommendations of that committee, we should have also devised at least certain tentative measures to see that this lopsidedness does not aggravate in the years to come. There is nothing in the third Five Year Plan to suggest that this type of lop-sidedness would be checkmated. This is our grievance.

It has been said by many hon. Members that our projects have cost more than what was estimated and the performances have been and are much below what was expected. That might be so; that is so. My allegation against the Government is that it is suffering from a certain shortsightedness which scientific planning should not. As you know, in these three steel mills which we have put up, 50 per cent of the fabrication works and even 20 to 25 per cent of designing works and structural works could have been done in this country. But we did not do it. We are dependent even for a small nut on foreign exports. In Rourkela, Durgapur and Bhilai, we find there are officers and engineers, but they are just something like fixtures with no courage; they think that something has been put into their hands safely, and easily. Possibly Government did not give them an opportunity to behave as go-getters. Even a small screw which is needed is imported.

Even in the consultative committee, I have said many times that so far as fabrications and designs are concerned, it has to be done on the spot and it has to be given the highest priority, if you want that you should be free from dependence on imports of foreign machinery. But in the third Plan, I see nowhere a line suggesting that fabrication work and

structural work and designing work would be given the highest priority. No accelerated economic development can take place and no freedom from foreign dependence can take place unless these things are given top priority.

There is another aspect of it.

Mr. Speaker: He should finish in two minutes.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Yesterday nobody from my party has spoken.

Mr. Speaker: Does not Shri Asoka Mehta belong to his party?

Shri Rajendra Singh: He spoke day before yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: Must I allow his party every day?

Shri Rajendra Singh: Every day Members from the Communist party and the Congress party have spoken.

Mr. Speaker: The Communist party has a strength of 33, but his party has only 19. I will give him 2 more minutes. I have already allowed him 15 minutes. I want to call one more member.

Shri Rajendra Singh: Sardar Swaran Singh intervened and said that there are a large number of people who are being trained to man our industrial enterprises. I asked him whether the people are being trained keeping in view the balanced development of all the regions. He made a mockery of it and said that I am asking this question since the next elections are coming. I want to submit that ever since I came into this House, I have consistently insisted that the people of all regions should be given an opportunity to develop themselves. But my experience has been quite different. At Hatia, there is an industrial enterprise of a huge size. The sons of the soil could have been given an opportunity to train

themselves and to acquire the proper type of skill. They have not been touched even with a pole.

Again, socialism does not mean simply the development of this class or that class or this section of the people or that section of the people. The benefits and advantages have to be evenly spread over.

Now, I am very glad—and I congratulate the Minister—that at Bokaro we are going to have our fourth steel plant. But so far as the State of Bihar is concerned, Sir, I think possibly only disappointment is in store for us, because although the first steel mill was put up in Bihar and three steel mills have already been put up in its neighbourhood not even one fraction of the people required in steel mills are being trained in Bihar. Now, what would happen is, although Bokaro is situated in Bihar, the people of Bihar who are suffering beyond all descriptions are not going to have any advantage. The only thing is, they will have to part with their land, their homes and in return they are going to get nothing. Therefore, Sir, I would say to the Planning Minister that so far as balanced development of all the regions is concerned the undeveloped parts of the country have to be taken due note of.

Sir, I do not know whether you ever had an opportunity to go through my constituency. I am not saying this because I come from that area or from that constituency. I say this because there is not a single instance anywhere else in this country where an area presents such a catastrophic picture. There you have 5,000 people in one square mile and there is not a single industry worth the name, not even a small-scale industry.

Mr. Speaker: Bihar is the most highly industrialised State in the whole of India.

Shri Rajendra Singh: I am not talking of that, I am talking of Sonapur, I am talking of North Bihar.

Mr. Speaker: Does he say that each tahsil also must have a separate industry?

Shri Rajendra Singh: I am not talking of tehsils. I am talking of districts. I just want to bring it on record that whereas before independence there were 6700 industrial works in our district, after independence, after the two Plans have been completed and the third one is in the offing, the number has come down to 5400. It is pitiable, it is very disconcerting that while development and progress are being registered in other parts of the country a certain part which is as vital to the country as any other part should not be given its due share in the total prosperity of this country.

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : ग्रन्थमहोदय, नियोजन हमारे देश में नव निर्माण के मंगल प्रभात के रूप में आया, जिसके प्रकाश की किरणों से भारत के प्रत्येक कोने को आलोक मिला है, और इस सुखद प्रयास के लिये हम मंत्री महोदय को धन्यवाद देंगे। लेकिन अनेकों भाग ऐसे भी हैं जिन पर पिछड़ेपन के मघन बादल अब भी छाये हुये हैं। इन भूभागों का दुर्भाग्य है कि योजना के सूर्य का प्रकाश अभी तक पिछड़ेपन के बादलों का भेदन नहीं कर पाया।

Mr. Speaker: Is it poetry that he is reading?

Shri M. L. Dwivedy: No, Sir, I am not reading.

An Hon. Member: It is prose-poetry.

श्री नाथ पाई (राजापुर) : राष्ट्र भाषा का प्रचार चल रहा है।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : इसका प्रत्यक्ष फल यह हुआ है कि इन भूभागों में अब भी अन्धकार छाया हुआ है। यह बात सही है कि उषा के रूप में प्रथम योजना आई और

चली गई। दूसरी योजना में हम ने उन कमलों को विकसित किया जिन को शहरों और नगरों के नाम से पुकारा जा सकता है। लेकिन तीसरी योजना में हम जिस सुगन्धमय समीर को बहाना चाहते हैं वह हवा इन पिछड़े हुये क्षेत्रों तक पहुंचेगी, इस में मुझे सन्देह है।

पहली और दूसरी योजना के सम्बन्ध में हम ने जो काम किये हैं वे, भविष्य में जो हम आश्वासन दे रहे हैं उसके लिये दर्पण हैं, आइने के समान हैं। उस दर्पण में हमें क्या चित्र मिलता है? भारत मां के दिल्ली रूपी दिल पर हम ८१ करोड़ रुपयों के मणियों की माला पहनाने जा रहे हैं, जबकि बूंदेलखंड में उतनी ही आबादी है जितनी कि दिल्ली में है पर वहां पर १ करोड़ से अधिक योजना का खर्च होने नहीं जा रहा है जब पिछड़े हुये इलाकों की यह स्थिति है तब हम एक शहर दिल्ली के ऊपर ८१ करोड़ ६० खर्च करेंगे। यह योजना का सबसे विकराल रूप हमारे सामने आया है। आप देखिये, शहरों रूपी आभूषणों पर रत्न जड़े जा रहे हैं, बड़े बड़े बान्धों के बावजूद, पाजेब और कंकण मां की शोभा बढ़ा रहे हैं, बड़े बड़े कारखानों के उद्योगों के, चूल्हे, चक्की, बेलन, तथा और कड़ाही मां के पास रख दिये गये है, समाज कल्याण का सुरमा, सांस्कृतिक कार्यक्रम का पाउडर और सामुदायिक विकास का उबटन मां के शरीर पर लगाया गया है। लेकिन ग्रामीण जनता रूपी मां के शरीर पर अब भी वही पुरानी और फटी साड़ी लटक रही है, हां उस पर सामुदायिक विकास के चमकदार कागज के सितारों हम जरूर जड़ते जा रहे हैं।

हम देख रहे हैं कि नियोजित विकास होते हुए भी पिछड़े क्षेत्र अभी पिछड़ बने हुए हैं। इस से भी आश्चर्यजनक बात यह है कि योजना के फलस्वरूप कुछ बड़े बड़े क्षेत्र और भी पीछे से जाये जा रहे हैं। उदाहरण

के लिए मैं उत्तर प्रदेश की बात कहना चाहता हूँ। सदस्य लोग कहें "उत्तर प्रदेश दैट इज इंडिया दैट इज भारत", लेकिन उन को मालूम नहीं है कि उत्तर प्रदेश की हालत क्या है। आप देखिये कि औद्योगिकरण की दिशा में सरकार ने कुल १५ करोड़ ६० लाख रुपये खर्च किये। उस में से पश्चिमी बंगाल को २ करोड़ ६६ लाख ६०, मद्रास में १२ लाख ६५ हजार ६०, सौराष्ट्र में १ करोड़ ४० लाख ६० लाख खर्च किये गये, लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश को सौराष्ट्र से भी कम यानी १ करोड़ २६ लाख ६० लाख दिये गये, जब कि वहाँ की आबादी सारे भारत का १६ है। एक तरफ वहाँ जो पुरानी कम्पनियाँ हैं उन को ऋण नहीं मिलता है और नईयों को खोलने की इजाजत नहीं मिलती। तमाम देश में जब १४७ उद्योग खोले गये तो उत्तर प्रदेश में केवल ५ उद्योग खोलने की इजाजत दी गई।

अब शिक्षा की दिशा में देखिये। शिक्षा की दिशा में उत्तर प्रदेश अब सोलहवाँ राज्य है जब कि पहले प्रथम था।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माधुर : १५ ही तो रियासते हैं, १६वाँ कैसे हो गया ?

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : मैंने हिसाब लगा कर बतलाया है, आप जोड़ लीजियेगा। उत्तर प्रदेश में छोटे उद्योगों की स्थिति बहुत खराब हो रही है। हम ने सन् १९६० के आँकड़े जब देखें तो पता लगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश में ५ लाख ८४ हजार लोग बेकार थे। उन में से उस योजना में केवल ६४ हजार को रोजगार मिला, बाकी ५ लाख और कुछ हजार आदमी बेकार बने रहे। नये बेकार और बढ़ते जा रहे हैं।

श्री बी० चं० झाड़ा : यह आँकड़े कहाँ से लाये हो ?

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : आँकड़ लाया हूँ फ़िरावाँ से।

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माधुर : धरे भाई, १५ स्टेट्स हैं, १६वाँ नम्बर कैसे हो गया ?

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : जहाँ पर शिक्षा न हो, उद्योग न हो, बरोजगारी बढ़ रही हो, वहाँ के लोग भाग्य कर क्या करेंगे ? मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ सदन की सूचना के लिए कि जहाँ सौराष्ट्र में ७७ हजार, बंगाल में १ लाख ३४ हजार, मद्रास में १३ हजार लोगों ने इनकम टैक्स दिया है, जिनकी आमदनी १०,००० ६० सालाना या इस से अधिक कूती गई है, वहाँ उत्तर प्रदेश में केवल १०,००० आमदियों ने इनकम टैक्स दिया है। इतनी आमदनी वहाँ के लोगों को है। (Interruptions) वहाँ के लोगों की आमदनी नहीं बढ़ पाई है।

अब आप शिक्षा की दिशा में देखिये विश्वविद्यालयों को अनुदान दिये जाते हैं। १९५९-६० में बम्बई विश्वविद्यालय को २४ लाख, बड़ोदा को २१ लाख, गुजरात को ४ लाख, पूना को १८ लाख, मद्रास को ३९ लाख, कलकत्ता को ४३ लाख और आन्ध्र प्रदेश विश्वविद्यालय को २८ लाख ६० विश्वविद्यालयों के अनुदान के रूप में दिये गये। अब उत्तर प्रदेश की सुनिये। आगरा को २ लाख, लखनऊ को २ लाख और गोरखपुर को ४ लाख ६० दिये गये, और इस के बाद इतिश्री हो गई। इस तरह से उत्तर प्रदेश को, जो किसी समय में अग्रगण्य कहलाता था, गवर्नमेंट पीछे ले जा रही है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अलीगढ़ को क्या दिया गया है ?

श्री म० सा० द्विवेदी : अलीगढ़ का यहाँ पर कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है क्योंकि वह केन्द्रीय यूनिवर्सिटी है। मैं ने बंगाल के शांति निकेतन के बारे में नहीं बतलाया है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : लखनऊ को क्या मिला ?

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : लखनऊ का नाम मैं ने गिनाया है। इस प्रकार से उत्तर प्रदेश के कुल विश्वविद्यालयों के लिए, जिन की संख्या ७ या ८ है, केवल १२ या १३ लाख रु० दिया गया जबकि दूसरे विश्वविद्यालयों में से एक-एक को २४ लाख, ३६ लाख, २१ लाख रु० तक दिया गया। आप भ्रन्दाज लगा सकते हैं कि इस योजना के फलस्वरूप जो क्षेत्र किसी समय में सम्पन्न और बड़े हुए थे उन को पीछे ढकेला जा रहा है। पिछली दफा जब बहस हुई थी तो श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा ने पिछड़े हुए इलाकों के लिए एक योजना बतलाई थी। सेकेन्ड फाइव इयर्स प्लान में लिखा गया था :

"The NDC (i.e., the National Development Council) recommended that there should be a continuous study of the problem of diminishing regional disparities and a suitable set of indicators or regional development evolved."

उस समय नन्दा जी ने यह आश्वासन दिया था कि पिछड़े क्षेत्रों की जांच करायेंगे। लेकिन आज तक इस सदन के सामने ऐसा कोई प्रतिवेदन नहीं आया है जिससे पता चले कि रीजनल डिसरेटिज की जांच कब की गयी है, और न यह बताया गया है कि पिछड़े हुए इलाकों की परिभाषा क्या है।

18 hrs.

मैंने कहा था कि मेरे इलाके में किसी नदी पर पुल नहीं है और सड़क नहीं हैं, और कोई उद्योग भी नहीं है, तो नन्दा जी ने कहा कि आपके यहां की सब सड़कें डामर की बन रही हैं, सब पुल बन चुके हैं, केवल एक कालपी का पुल नहीं बना है पर उसकी मंजूरी दे दी गई है। वहां तो केवल एक कालपी के पुल को बनाने की मंजूरी दी गयी थी जो बना नहीं, और किसी पुल का सवाल ही नहीं था। सड़कें वहां अब भी नहीं हैं

जब मैंने कहा कि हमारे यहां जो विकास खंड है उसमें बड़ा भ्रष्टाचार है तो उन्होंने कहा कि जांच कराएंगे। फिर बाद में कहा गया कि वहां जांच की गयी पर वहां कोई भ्रष्टाचार नहीं है। लेकिन जब कांग्रेस कमेटी ने बराबर ६ महीने कोशिश की तो २५ आदमी गिरफ्तार किए गए। वहां यह भ्रष्टाचार थी कि ब्लाक डेवलपमेंट आफिसर कुर्बे बनाने के लिए रुपये देते थे जो कभी नहीं बनाये गये। जिस आदमी को रुपये देते थे उसको केवल ३०० रुपये देते थे और स्वयं ५०० रुपये अपने पास रख लेते थे। इस तरह आठ सौ रुपये का वितरण होता था। इसी तरह से भ्रांसी में भी हुआ है। जब एक साल कोशिश की गयी तो लोग पकड़े गए और उन पर मुकदमे चल रहे हैं।

विकास का चिन्ह यह होगा कि माता का शरीर ढके। लेकिन आज हो यह रहा है कि और और चीजें तो हो रही हैं लेकिन माता का बदन नंगा है। ग्रामीण जनता की पुकार नहीं सुनी जाती। हम बड़े बड़े आश्वासन देते हैं। दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में लिखा था :

"The Plan seeks to rebuild rural India, to lay the foundations of industrial progress and to secure to the greatest extent feasible opportunities for the weaker and under-privileged sections of our people and the balanced development of all parts of our country."

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आज भी ग्रामीण जनता की बही हालत नहीं है जो कि उस समय थी जब कि पहली पंचवर्षीय योजना लिखी गयी थी। पहली योजना में यह लिखा था :

"The size of the agricultural holdings has progressively diminished, the old cottage and small-scale industries have been decaying and the rural population which

constitutes about 83 per cent of the total population suffers from chronic unemployment and low income."

क्या आज भी वही हालत सही नहीं है। अगर नन्दा जी कह दें कि यह हालत आज नहीं है तो मैं मात खा जाऊंगा और भागे कभी एसी बात नहीं कहूंगा और केवल पंचवर्षीय योजना की तारीफ करूंगा। मैं योजना का समर्थक हूँ और जनता में जाकर इसका प्रचार करता हूँ लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि आपका ध्यान ग्रामीण जनता की ओर नहीं है। कानपुर शाह में प्राय यूनिवरसिटी भी बना रहे हैं। मेडिकल कालेज भी है। इंजीनियरिंग कालेज भी वहीं बन रहा है, इंडस्ट्रियल एस्टेट भी कानपुर में ही बनायी गयी। ये सब काम कानपुर में ही होंगे। मेरा मतलब कानपुर से ही नहीं है। ऐसे काम दिल्ली मद्रास आदि बड़े शहरों में ही हो रहे हैं। लेकिन ग्रामीण जनता के लिए कुछ नहीं किया जाता। जो डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन की बात कही जाती है वह सामने नहीं आती। यह प्रक्षरशः सत्य है।

हमारी प्लान को अधिकारी, जिनको देहात का कोई अनुभव नहीं होता, बनाते हैं, और मंत्री महोदय बगैर देहात का दौरा किए हुए उसको मंजूर कर लेते हैं। कहा जाता है कि यह जनता का प्लान है, जनता के द्वारा बनायी गयी है और जनता के लिए है। लेकिन मेरा दावा है कि यह कर्मचारियों की प्लान है, कर्मचारियों द्वारा बनायी गयी है और उनके ही उदरपोषण के लिए है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय मुझे धनी बहुत कुछ कहना है। मुझे कुछ समय कल को दे दिया जाए।

Shri D. C. Sharma: He should be given more time.

Shri M. L. Dwivedy: I speak for all the backward areas of India. I

will bring facts and figures. I should be given five minutes more than the normal time.

Shri D. C. Sharma: He is speaking for my constituency. He should be given more time.

Shri M. L. Dwivedy: I am speaking for your constituency and for everyone's constituency. I am speaking for the rural population that has not been cared for by the Planning Commission. The Block Development workers are simply putting the money into their pockets and are not doing anything in the rural field. The houses of the Block Development officers are built, their gardens are laid and tea parties are arranged for Ministers and officers. But for the rural population, the village street, the village bridge, the village roads are not constructed and they are in the same absurd condition in which they were 15 years ago.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any provision for tea parties in the Plan?

Shri M. L. Dwivedy: Yes, Sir; there is.

Shri D. C. Sharma: He should finish his speech today because he is in great form today.

Mr. Speaker: I will give five more minutes.

श्री म० ल० द्विवेदी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने एक समय पर सदन के सम्मुख पिछड़े क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिए प्रस्ताव रखा था और उस प्रस्ताव को सदन ने पास कर दिया होता लेकिन मंत्री महोदय ने आश्वासन दिया कि हम पूरा प्रयत्न करेंगे और पिछड़े क्षेत्रोंकी परिभाषा करेंगे। और उसके लिए एक कमेटी भी नियुक्त करने का आश्वासन दिया था लेकिन आज तक कोई कमेटी नियुक्त नहीं की गयी।

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

योजना में कहा गया है :

There should be dedicated leadership.

जो इस योजना का उद्देश्य वह यह बताया गया है :

At each step, the Third Plan will demand dedicated leadership.

मैं कहता हूँ कि डेडीकेटेड लीडरशिप उस समय आती है जबकि आप जनता के नेताओं की आवाज को सुनें। यदि आप ऐसा करेंगे तो जनता में से त्यागपूर्ण नेतृत्व पैदा होगा और वह देश के लिए काम करेगा। लेकिन आज उसका अभाव है।

दूसरे मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि योजना तभी सफल हो सकती है जब कि अधिकारी दक्षता से काम करें। लेकिन प्लान को देखने से नहीं मालूम होता कि कर्मचारियों की दक्षता बढ़ाने की ओर भी ध्यान दिया गया है, न यह मालूम होता है कि भ्रष्टाचार को कम करने के लिए क्या किया जाएगा। आज दफ्तरों में यह अवस्था है कि अगर कोई एक घंटे का काम होता है तो उसमें दो दिन और दो हफ्ते लगा दिये जाते हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आपने इस योजना में क्या व्यवस्था रखी है जिसके अनुसार कर्मचारियों की दक्षता बढ़ेगी और उनमें ईमानदारी आएगी। यदि वे ईमानदारी और दक्षता से काम करने लगे तो हम को प्रसन्नता ही होगी क्योंकि वे हमारे भाई-ही हैं और उस अवस्था में हम उनके कंधे से कंधा मिला कर काम कर सकेंगे। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस योजना में आप ऐसी व्यवस्था करें कि इस बात की जांच भी की जाए कि जो लोग इस योजना को चलाते हैं वे कहां तक निष्पक्षता से और ईमानदारी से काम करते हैं।

माताटीला बांध का यहां चित्र आया तो मैंने कहा कि उससे सिचाई हो रही है, लेकिन

जब वह बांध बना तो यह हाल था कि अगर तीन ट्रक सीमेंट आता था तो दो ट्रक रास्ते में ही बेच दिये जाते थे और केवल एक ट्रक सीमेंट बांध में इस्तेमाल होता था। आप अनुमान लगा सकते हैं कि ऐसा बांध कितना अच्छा हो सकता है।

तीसरी बात यह कही गयी है कि जनता को इस योजना के लिये अधिक करों का बोझ बरदाश्त करना चाहिए। जनता तो इस बोझ को बरदाश्त करने को तैयार है लेकिन उसकी आमदनी तो नहीं बढ़ती। दूसरी योजना में जो देहातों में औद्योगिक संस्थान खोलने की बात थी वे नहीं खोले गए, कम से कम बूंदेलखण्ड में तो नहीं खोले गए। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि वे आमदनी जिनकी आमदनी नहीं बढ़ी है और महंगाई बढ़ गयी है वे अधिक करों का बोझ कैसे बरदाश्त कर सकते हैं। जो आमदनी भ्रष्टा है वह अधिक कर कैसे दे सकेगा। वह कर दे सकता है लेकिन उसकी आमदनी बढ़नी चाहिए। उस तरफ आपका ध्यान जाना चाहिए।

आपने बड़े बड़े शहरों में अधिक रोजगार के अवसर उपलब्ध किये हैं लेकिन ग्रामीण जनता के लिये रोजगार के अवसर नर उपलब्ध नहीं किए गए हैं। आपने देश की ८३ प्रतिशत जनता के लिए रोजगार के अवसर उपलब्ध नहीं किए हैं।

जहां तक शिक्षा का सवाल है आप कहते हैं कि हमारा धर्म निरपेक्ष राज्य है। हम धर्म की तरफ से उदासीन हैं। लेकिन हमारे देश में धर्म कोई मजहब नहीं है। धर्म तो हमारा कर्तव्य है। और जब हम उस धर्म की ओर से जो कि हमको कर्तव्य की शिक्षा देता है उदासीन रहेंगे तो हमारी शिक्षा योजनाओं से क्या लाभ होगा। स्कूलों में लड़कों को न गीता पढ़ायी जाती है, न कुरान पढ़ाया जाता है न बार्बिस पढ़ायी जाती है। लड़के सिनेमा आदि देखते हैं जिनका

उन पर बुरा प्रभाव पड़ता है और वे भागे जाकर भ्रष्टाचारी बनते हैं।

राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने वार वार कहा है कि इस देश की शिक्षा पद्धति में ग्रामूल परिवर्तन करने की आवश्यकता है, लेकिन प्लानिंग कमीशन ने और उसमें जो बड़े बड़े विगषज्ञ हैं उन्होंने शिक्षा पद्धति में कोई परिवर्तन करने की बात नहीं सोची और न सरकार ने सोची। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप ६ से ११ वर्ष तक के बच्चों को शिक्षा देने जा रहे हैं, पर वह शिक्षा किस प्रकार की होगी? क्या वह शिक्षा इस प्रकार की होगी कि मंत्री के लड़के तो पब्लिक स्कूल में पढ़ें और जनता के लड़के बेसिक स्कूल में। बेसिक स्कूलों की यह हालत है कि पढ़ने के कोई साधन नहीं है, स्थान की वहाँ कमी है, टाट बैठने के लिए नहीं है, पानी टप टप गिरता है और यह उन लोगों के बच्चों की हालत है जिन को आज मालिक कहा जाता है, जिनके बोट से हम सब चुन कर भाते हैं। पानी का वहाँ कोई इतिजाम नहीं है, टैक्स नहीं है। आपके बच्चे तो पब्लिक स्कूलों में जायें और जो मालिक हैं उनके बच्चे बेसिक स्कूलों में जाएँ जिन की हालत मैंने अभी बयान की है, तो यह आपकी योजना कैसे चल सकती है। इस प्रकार की शिक्षा होगी और इस प्रकार से विकास किया जाएगा तो यह जो आपकी योजना है, चल नहीं सकती है और मैं सच कहता हूँ कि जनता इसका बोझा बर्दाश्त करने के लिए तैयार नहीं होगी। मेरे जिले में एक एडवाइजरी कमेटी है। वहाँ पर हम से सुझाव मांगे गए और कहा गया कि सड़कें बनानी हैं, एक बीस साला योजना बना दीजिये। हमने केवल दस छोटी-छोटी सड़कें बताईं, लेकिन उसमें से एक या दो या तीन को भी स्वीकार नहीं किया गया। जब ऐसी हालत है तब कैसे कहा जा सकता है कि यह जनता का प्लान है। जनता के प्रतिनिधियों और जनता के मत, के अनुसार अगर हम प्रायोरिटीज मुकदर करते हैं तब तो हम कह सकते हैं कि जनता का

प्लान है लेकिन जब जनता के प्रतिनिधि सुझाव देते हैं और उनमें एक को भी नहीं माना जाता है तो कैसे कहा जा सकता है कि जनता इसको चलाये। हमें समिति में बताया गया कि ऊपर से कहा गया है कि सुझाव आप अलग से दे सकते हैं। अगर सुझाव वहाँ पर नहीं देने हैं और अलग से देने हैं तो कमेटी किस लिए है। अफसरों ने योजना बना दी और उसी पर वहाँ मुहर लगा दी गई तो उससे लाभ क्या होगा। उस सूरत में कैसे यह जनता का प्लान हुआ। कंसल्टेटिव कमेटी बना दी, उसकी कुछ कुछ बैठकें हों गईं वहाँ पर चाय पानी पिला दिया गया और उसके बाद संसद में इसको रख दिया गया और थोड़ा सा समय बोलने का दे दिया गया, इससे क्या लाभ हो सकता है। यह इतनी मोटी किताब है कि इसको तैयार करने पर आपके अफसरों को भी दो तीन वर्ष लगे होंगे और शह-बारह घंटे भी मौका नहीं दिया जाए, इस पर विचार करने का इसका क्या मतलब है। देहांत के स्तर पर, प्लाक के स्तर पर, जिले के स्तर पर और डिभिजन के स्तर पर जनता इस पर विचार करे और उसको इसका पूरा मौका दिया जाए कि वह सुझाव आदि दे तब तो मैं मान सकता हूँ कि यह जनता का प्लान है।

इस सदन के साथ साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहूँगा कि मैं कांग्रेस का एक निष्ठावान सदस्य हूँ और कांग्रेस का और सरकार का इस मामले में साथ दूँगा लेकिन मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि वास्तव में अगर आप इसको जनता की योजना बनाना चाहते हैं तो इस को आप लचीला रखिये और समय समय पर जहाँ जहाँ भी आवश्यकता हो, इस में मुबार कीजिये, इस में संशोधन कीजिये। अगर आप न ऐसा किया तो इस को जनता का पूरा पूरा सम्बन्ध प्राप्त होगा और यह सफल भी हो सकेगा।

जहाँ तक बिरोधी दलों का सम्बन्ध है, बिरोधी दलों के माननीय सदस्यों का सम्बन्ध है वे निर्माण कार्यों में कोई हाथ नहीं बँटाते हैं

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

और जब चुनाव आयेंगे तो झंडा ले कर खड़े हो जायेंगे, स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के, प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के, जनसंघ पार्टी के और जनता से कहेंगे कि कुछ भी नहीं हो रहा है। ये लोग दुर्गंत नहीं उठावेंगे, फावड़ा हाथ में नहीं उठावेंगे। और न ही कोई निर्माण का काम करेंगे। ऐसे ऐसे लोग भी चुनाव में मत मांगने के लिये खड़े हो जाते हैं। इस प्रकार का विपक्ष जहां हो, विरोधी दल जहां हों, जो केवल चुनाव को दृष्टि में रख कर काम करना चाहता हो, चुनाव पर ही जिस की नजर हो और कोई रचनात्मक काम न करता हो, तो जो योजना है वह कैसे सफल हो सकती है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है। विरोधी दल ही और सच्चे तौर पर निर्माण की दिशा में जनता को ले जाये और कुछ काम कर के दिखलाये और तब बोट ले, तब तो मैं समझूंगा कि उस का विरोध सच्चा है अन्यथा यह विरोध उन का केवल निकम्मा विरोध है और केवल बोट को खातिर है।

इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि जहां मैं सरकार से योजना के सम्बन्ध में तरह तरह की बातें कह सकता हूं वहां पर मैं विरोधी पार्टियों के माननीय सदस्यों से भी कह सकता हूं कि वे अपने कर्तव्यों को समझें और जब तक वे अपने कर्तव्यों को नहीं समझेंगे तब तक देश आगे नहीं बढ़ सकता है। हमारे एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि चीन का खतरा है, लड़ाई का खतरा है और प्रतिरक्षा की योजनायें बनाई जानी चाहियें। लेकिन वह क्या कर रहे हैं? हिन्दू महा सभा के वह माननीय सदस्य माथे पर तिलक लगा कर और टोपी लगा कर घूमेंगे जनता में और बोट की मांग करेंगे लेकिन जनता में जागृति पैदा करने की कोशिश नहीं करेंगे। अगर हम सब कहें कि हमें तैयार होना पड़ेगा और देश की रक्षा

करनी होगी, देश से गरीबी को मिटाने के लिये तैयार होना होगा और हम सच्चे अर्थों में तैयार हो जायेंगे तो सरकार को बाध्य होना पड़ेगा —

Shri Tangamani: May I make a submission? This kind of reference to an hon. Member of this House should not be allowed. Making a reference to a Member here and particularly referring to a particular person is not proper.

Shri M. L. Dwivedy: I am referring only to a Member, only to a particular person, but I have not mentioned any name. If I have mentioned any name, I am prepared to withdraw it. I do not want to mention any particular name. The hon. Members opposite are all my friends. I withdraw that word which may be offensive.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The hon. Member also should withdraw now!

श्री० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया। समय नहीं है कि मैं और अधिक कुछ कह सकूं और किसी अन्य अवसर से लाभ उठा कर मैं अपने विचार व्यक्त करूंगा। लेकिन मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं कि जो कुछ मैंने कहा है उस को मंत्रीगण धन्यथा न समझें। जो कुछ मैंने कहा है वह देश के रचनात्मक विकास की खातिर और भारत माता के प्रति प्रेम होने के कारण कहा है। मैंने, सच्चे अर्थों में सुधार हो, इस वास्ते यह सब कुछ कहा है, वैमनस्यवश नहीं।

18.14 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till eleven of the clock on Thursday, August 24, 1961/Bhadra 2, 1883 (Saka).