

**NOTIFICATION UNDER ALL INDIA
SERVICES ACT, 1951.**

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (2) of section 3 of the All India Services Act, 1951:—

- (i) The Indian Administrative Service (Probation) Amendment Rules, 1961 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 768 dated the 10th June, 1951.
- (ii) Notification No. G.S.R. 964 dated the 29th July, 1961 making certain amendment to Schedule III to the Indian Administrative Service (Pay) Rules, 1954.
- (iii) Notification No. G.S.R. 965 dated the 29th July, 1961 making certain amendment to Schedule III to the Indian Police Service (Pay) Rules, 1954. [*Placed in Library, See No. LT-3142 61.*]

12.11½ hrs.

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH REPORT**

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): I beg to present the Hundred and thirty-ninth Report of the Estimates Committee on the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Fifth Report on the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs.

12.11½ hrs.

**PETITION RE: GRIEVANCES OF
THE MARTIN S. LIGHT RAILWAY
YATRI SANGHA**

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I beg to present a petition signed by 1405 petitioners relating to the grievances of the Martin S. Light Railway, Yatri Sangha.

12.12 hrs.

**MOTION RE: THIRD FIVE YEAR
PLAN—Contd.**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru 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 Naushir Bharucha (East Khair-ud-din): Before the House proceeds further with this motion, may I submit a few words regarding the amendment which I have moved and which you were pleased to order to be circulated today?

Mr. Speaker: He cannot have another opportunity. Yesterday I gave him an opportunity and I also said that it will be circulated for the benefit of Members, so that when further proceedings come up before the House, they might know what exactly they have to say on this amendment. He had ample opportunity yesterday to refer to this amendment.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I am merely mentioning that it is not admitted.

Mr. Speaker: I did not admit it. I said I would circulate it and I allowed ample opportunity to the hon. Member. But if he wants to say that under the rules it ought to be admitted, and that notwithstanding the ruling that I gave yesterday I am bound to admit it, I am prepared to hear him.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: That is exactly what I want to point out.

Mr. Speaker: Does he mean to say that I am bound to admit whatever amendment is given at whatever time?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Rule 345 says:

"Notice of an amendment to a motion shall be given one day before the day on which the motion is to be considered, unless the Speaker allows the amendment to be moved without such notice."

The motion was to be considered on the 21st and one day before is 20th, which was a Sunday and Notice Office was closed. May I point out that it cannot be done on the 19th because only on the 19th we came to know that this would be taken up on Monday, and there would be hardly any time for hon. Members to table amendments.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that the notice was circulated to all hon. Members on the night of Friday. He could have tabled the amendment on Saturday.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Unless the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs makes a statement on the floor of the House about the business to be taken up next week, mere circulation has no meaning. This statement is generally made on Friday, but last week it was made on Saturday.

Mr. Speaker: As a special case, I will allow this amendment.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Sir, I move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the Third Five Year Plan, laid on the Table of the House on the 7th August, 1961, recommends to the Government to consider the desirability of making further or additional provision for—

1. (a) subsidising electricity for lift irrigation and other agricultural purposes so as to make the same available to cultivators at not more than 9 nP. per kWh (unit);

(b) subsidising rural electrification so as to make available to rural domestic consumers electricity at a rate not more than 20 nP. per kWh (unit);

(c) subsidising water rates for agricultural purposes to enable the cultivator to take full advantage of irrigation facilities from major irrigation schemes;

(d) subsidising rural water supply, with top priority in subsidies for drinking water in villages where it is inadequate;

(e) subsidising provision of timely and adequate supply of—

(i) good seeds through seed multiplication and distribution societies;

(ii) manures and fertilisers in adequate quantities;

(iii) improved agricultural implements;

(iv) storage facilities;

(v) cheap kerosene, corrugated iron sheets and other necessities of life of the agriculturist.

(f) contour bunding, soil conservation, extension of veterinary facilities and disease control;

(g) promotion of village industries, in particular hand-pounding of paddy; oil seed crushing; tanning and leather; Gur and khandsari; construction of bullock cart and rehabilitation of village smithy;

(h) increasing through subsidies production of vegetables, fruits and such produce of universal consumption;

(i) setting up of very small or 'baby' industrial estates in suitable villages;

(j) subsidising scheme of intensive employment at village, block or district levels.

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

2. Minor or 'baby' irrigation works to be undertaken in consultation with local leadership.
3. Improving agricultural marketing organisation, in particular so that, commodity prices do not fall with the end of harvest season, and soar again after the produce has passed into the hands of the middlemen.
4. Announcement by the Government at the commencement of each season, of 'floor prices' for major agricultural produce, such as wheat, rice, cereals, Jowar, Bajra, groundnuts, etc. to ensure to the cultivator a minimum reasonable return.
5. Promotion of agricultural insurance schemes, including those for indemnifying cultivators who may have become victims of natural calamities.
6. Distribution of available cultivable lands to persons willing to cultivate; regularising unauthorised cultivation of food-grains; and immediate stoppage of eviction of agricultural tenants.
7. Prompt and adequate rehabilitation of cultivators displaced due to execution of multi-purpose river valley or other schemes, and in particular, those displaced by the Girna Project in Maharashtra, with top priority in assignment of alternative lands to such persons and rehabilitation of their village economy.
8. Speedy extension of democratic institutions at district, block and village levels and grant of greater resources to village panchayats.
9. Immediate provision of free elementary education and rudimentary technical education to the village youth.
10. Creation of a separate Ministry to deal with problems of Scheduled Castes, Buddhists, Scheduled Tribes and others, and in particular to deal with the problem of allocation of available lands to these communities.
11. Construction of village roads; extension of public Telephone Call facilities in bigger villages; and of postal facilities to villages where postal deliveries are now once or twice a week.
12. Inclusion in and completion during the Third Five Year Plan of—
 - (a) Konkan Railway;
 - (b) Conversion of Pachora-Jamner Railway to broad gauge;
 - (c) Inter-connection of Jalgaon, Aurangabad, Osmanabad by broad gauge Railway;
 - (d) Hatnur multi-purpose scheme."

Some Hon. Members: Other Members also have tabled amendments.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; so many other hon. Members also have tabled amendments. Notice was given to him on Friday. He could have tabled the amendment on Saturday. Normally, if Sunday had not intervened, he could have waited the whole of Saturday and submitted his amendment on the next day. But the last day happened to be a Sunday. Very often, when the question of limitation arises, when the last day for filing a petition or suit falls on a non-working day, it is allowed to be filed on the next day. Therefore, Shri Bharucha seems to be right. I must allow him to move his amendment. If there are other similar cases, I have no objection to allowing them

also. I am not going to discriminate. This will stand admitted.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): What will be the position if the House does not sit on a Saturday and it is not a working day?

Mr. Speaker: Non-working day is different from holiday. We do not meet on Saturdays, but on that account, the office is not closed. But if Saturday also happens to be a holiday, I will extend the rule to two days and so on. But if Saturday is a working day for the purpose of office hon. Members must submit their amendments to the office on Saturday.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): I have no objection to Shri Bharucha being permitted to move his amendment, but I may point out that we got the notice on Friday and we had the whole of Saturday. We knew two weeks ago that the Plan debate was starting on Monday. I am not able to understand his difficulty.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: May I point out that notice of Bills are given and they are not taken up for months together? How are we to know when it will be taken up until the announcement is made by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs in the House?

Shri A. P. Jain (Saharanpur): Let us see what after all is the object of allowing time for tabling amendments. The object is that the Members of the House should have time to consider the amendments. If you apply the ruling of limitation and say that if the date on which limitation expires is a holiday, then the amendment can be given on the next day, you are depriving the Members of this House to give due consideration to the amendment.

Therefore, I would very respectfully submit that in this particular case, the example of limitation does not apply. I am not objecting to your allowing Shri Bharucha's amendment to be moved, but if you want to lay down

a general ruling, I would very respectfully submit that if the last date on which an amendment can be given is a holiday, then the hon. Member should give it on the day previous to the holiday and not on the next day.

Mr. Speaker: I suppose the hon. Member is a lawyer himself. I do not know how he says it can be pushed to the previous day. In addition to the Sunday, suppose there is a Saturday also intervening; which is a holiday. Am I to count all these days against the hon. Member? Therefore, I will strictly follow the rule. It is not a question of showing any concession to Shri Bharucha. As I said, as a matter of fact, even without waiting for any advice I ought not to allow it. I refused to allow it for the reason that hon. Members will be taken by surprise and some of them would have spoken already. If this point had been brought to my notice yesterday, I would have allowed it yesterday itself. I do not want to go against the rules. The rule is there, unless we want to waive it. Normally—this may be taken as a word of advice to Shri Bharucha also—whenever a holiday intervenes, hon. Members may table their amendments earlier so as not to embarrass the House. If by chance he has done it this time and he wants to stand strictly on the rule, I have to abide by that and allow him to do so.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Sir, yesterday you gave this ruling that Shri Bharucha's amendment will only be circulated and it will not be admitted. Other hon. Members who wanted to send in their amendments did not do so because you refused to admit Shri Bharucha's amendment. Now, I would like to know, in view of your present ruling, whether other hon. Members would be allowed to table their amendments today?

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Because Shri Bharucha was anxious he did so, and he did not wait for my advice. It is not that after coming here I am

[Mr. Speaker]

going to allow somebody to table his amendment; certainly not. If they misinterpreted the rules, they must thank themselves.

Shri Tangamani: Sir, a position may arise that when a Bill is taken up for consideration today and if I have not given notice of any amendment the previous day I would not get a chance in the second reading. Will it be open for me to say that today I have given notice of my amendments and the second reading may be taken up the following day?

Mr. Speaker: Absolutely not. The rule is clear. It is before consideration. This is an exceptional circumstance, an extraordinary circumstance that has occurred. If any such case occurs, I will strictly follow the rule.

An Hon Member: Will it be a precedent?

Mr. Speaker: Certainly, whatever I say here will be a precedent for the future, unless I myself say that it won't be a precedent for the future.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): Sir, I gave notice of five amendments yesterday. They have not been printed.

Mr. Speaker: After what, after even the first motion was made?

Raja Mahendra Pratap: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I can't allow an exception.

Now, let us proceed with the discussion.

Dr. Melkote was in possession of the House.

Dr. Melkote (Raichur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was saying yesterday that the Second Five Year Plan had by and large succeeded very well but that in the implementation particularly the people in the village sector were not entirely satisfied. I mentioned yesterday that when we speak of

huge dams, big places, palatial buildings, big offices and other things we feel that we have done something really very good, something very big. It is actually so. But when the common man approaches the officials, whether it is at the district level, taluka level or a higher level, he does not receive that amount of sympathy and consideration that is due to him, and it brings about a kind of soreness and people talk ill of the Government and of the Plan. It is here that I said that though the Plan by and large in the matter of target and expenditure had come up to the expectations, the expectations of the common man had not been fulfilled to the extent that one expected of it.

In this connection, I would like to say that so far as labour is concerned our dealings with the private sector has to a large extent been smoothed by the various measures that the Labour Ministry has taken. But these very laws and those precedents that have been created for a healthy atmosphere are not being accepted by the public sector undertakings themselves. This is the largest grouse against these public sector undertakings. Because they are part and parcel of the Government machinery they feel that they can get over the rules and that they need not implement whatever has been there for them to implement. This has caused the greatest amount of suffering to the workers in the field.

Apart from this, it has been my experience that while in the health department it has done exceedingly well by starting more medical colleges as a result of which more doctors have come out and these people are being sent to the rural sector, just because it is the patient that is in the hospital and the sympathies of the public go to these patients, the workers in the hospitals are made to work not merely for eight hours but ten hours and sometimes even more hours but no overtime wages are paid to them. It is

expected of them to work as many hours as is necessary. They are not given any holiday, not even a Sunday is allowed to them. On the plea that the patient is suffering they are made to do such duties. I can understand the workers being made to do their duties, but I cannot understand Government taking these duties from the workers and not compensating them for the work that they have been taking. While the workers in the industrial sector get over-time wages, holidays regularly and double their wages if they are made to work on holidays, the workers in hospitals, particularly in the big hospitals which are in the public sector and which are run by the Government, do not get a fair deal from the Government. Somethings; has to be done about this. They are not allowed to go on strike. The workers themselves feel that they will not be doing a good thing by doing so. Just because they happen to be good workers, the Government seems to be taking the fullest advantage and exploiting the workers. I feel that the attention of the Government should be particularly drawn to this aspect, because the feeling all over the country has been that these workers are organising themselves and may organise themselves for something big. It is not good for the Government to lay down the laws and themselves break the same laws.

Similar is the case, as I said, in many of the public undertakings. It is in these aspects of the question that while the Plan is very good and is being implemented, the people at the lower levels are not feeling happy about the implementation of the Plan. Similar is the case with many of these industrial undertakings. When I say industrial undertakings, they are being set up in many of these larger places like Bombay, Calcutta and others. Dispersal of these industries in the backward areas is absolutely necessary. The measures taken so far to disperse these into the backward areas have been absolutely insufficient. Now is the chance, when many of these industries are expanding and

new industries are being started both the private sector and in the public sector, for us to put an embargo and say that any further expansion of these industries have got to take place necessarily in the backward areas. If we do not do that now, we will be too late in the picture. I understand that more than about 99 per cent licences have already been issued and these industries would get started again in those areas where we need them the least. Therefore, while these industries have got to be started, many of these industries have got also to be told here and now that further expansion in respect of those items of products which necessarily could be manufactured by the ancillary industries should be stopped and ancillary industries should be encouraged to crop up in many of these backward districts. If these measures are not taken here and now, what happened in the Second Plan will pursue us in the Third Five Year Plan, and at the end of it we will again feel that we have not satisfied the people.

It is in these aspects of the question that the planners have not given us a clear indication. While they have mentioned some of these things, they have not exactly said where they will be started, what are the measures that would be taken and what type of measures they would strictly follow in order to encourage these industries.

The next question, Sir, and which affects a very large section of the population is the unemployed in the agricultural sector. While we have been planning in a large measure, I feel that these unemployed, particularly in the rural sector and the agricultural sector, have not received that kind of attention that they ought to have received. When all kinds of facilities and money are also being given for larger industries in order that they thrive, I do not see why this unemployment should not be minimised to the largest possible extent by giving the maximum amount of help to the cottage industries, particularly

[Dr. Melkote]

to the khadi and other industries. The way we have been going about it would take another 30 or 40 years by the time we would be in a position to abolish an all unemployment. Meanwhile, we would not be in a position to tell the people that they should wait for 20, 30 or 50 years before they could get full unemployment. So that, large-scale financial help and other kinds of help may be given to the village industries so that they can be subsidised and the villagers get adequate wages. There again, the question of implementation of the minimum wages in the agricultural sector is a very important aspect and unless we create more inspectorate and more employment exchanges in the rural sector in the taluka level we would not be in a position to assess the employment clearly. So, that is also necessary. Then, when thousands and thousands of crores of rupees are being spent in developing the country, a few crores, may be twenty or thirty or forty crores, in subsidising some of these industrial undertakings and equally on wages to the small or lowly-paid employees in the agricultural sector will go a long way in making the people evince greater interest in the Plan. These aspects of the question, again, has not, to my mind, received that amount of weightage that it should have received.

Whilest, therefore, I bring these things to the notice of the Government, I would like to repeat again that we have succeeded very well both in the First and Second Plan. During the course of the ten years we had achieved much more than what Russia could have achieved in ten years. Russia had no plan till 1928, and that plan also they revised in 1932 and allowed the capitalist class to start industries. We have gone ahead with a consistent Plan and definite policy and we feel that within ten years we have achieved much more than what Russia could achieve. I do not have all the facts and figures for the last ten years; so, it is very difficult to compare India

with China. Even so, a democratic country like India has progressed very much.

I have heard what Professor Ranga and other speakers have stated. But if they are asked to prepare a Plan which would satisfy themselves and everybody in this country, it would be miracle. No Government would be in a position to do it. All the same, being a democratic Government, the maximum amount of unanimity and acceptance has been brought about in this Plan. It has been planned in a biggish manner according to our own capacity and the planners have done the maximum amount of service to the country. People are aware of this situation. So, I hope and trust that in the Third Plan we would succeed as we have done in the past.

Shri Rameshwar Rao (Mahabubnagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Third Plan document presented to us for our consideration is certainly a natural and logical growth from the First and Second Plan. It is needless for me to say that this document certainly puts forward an integrated plan which will take us a long way on the road to self-sustaining growth.

I was listening with great interest to the brilliant analysis put forward by the distinguished friend on the opposite side, Shri Asoka Mehta. I must confess that I agree with much of what he says, and so it would probably be worthwhile to take up the threads from where he left and go forward. Instead of going over all the details he mentioned the various facts and figures. He also referred to the frontier of the new horizon that the Third Plan is opening up before us. Then he said that there was a hesitation in the planning and among the planners to break through into these new frontier and go beyond. I wonder if Shri Asoka Mehta realises that he himself came to this frontier of the new horizon and hesitated; after posing the problem, he failed to answer what is the method of break-

through. Merely to say that a political break-through is required is not a sufficient answer. He rightly says that the problem of the Third Plan is certainly not the magnitude of the Plan. The magnitude is certainly not the problem of the Third Plan. There is no argument about the proportion of investment in the capital goods industry or the consumer goods industry. The problem that we have to face in the Third Plan is the problem of financial resources of administrative ability and of political capacity to push through the programme of the Third Plan. This is the central factor and this is the problem that we have to face if the Third Plan is to really to succeed.

He was right when he said that the success of the Third Plan depends largely on the massive response that we will succeed in evoking among the people. The Prime Minister on an earlier occasion called this massive response as the dedicated and burning zeal that would be required of our administrators, politicians, managers of industry, scientists and technicians and farmers; in fact, from people in all fields of activity. Unless there is that dedicated and burning zeal, I am afraid we will face a great many difficulties in the process of the execution of our Third Plan.

The Third Plan cannot and will not succeed without a response similar to the one we had in our struggle for freedom. We must be able to generate and evoke this response in the people. Without this dedication, our growth will not increase from 3½ per cent. to the required 5 per cent.; our total investments and savings will not grow from the present 8 or 10 per cent. to the required 20 per cent. to break through on the economic front. Even the planners agree that the response in the First and Second Plan has to some extent been inadequate. There has certainly not been total response, and that is briefly mentioned in the introduction to the Third Plan which I would like to quote. On the second page they say:

"Efforts to prepare plans at the district, block and village level, specially for the development of agriculture, co-operation, education and rural industries, were an integral part of the process of drawing up the plans of the States as well as the national Plans. These local plans are a vital element."

I would like to emphasise the phrase "these local plans are a vital element".

"... in the success of Panchayat Raj which places in the hands of the people of each area the initiative and responsibility for their own development and the means and resources for rapid advance."

It is at that level that the response has to come if our entire Plan is to succeed. The implication of the statement is that people at the village, district and block level have indeed been consulted in evolving this Plan. I certainly wish that this was true. Because, if this was true, then I have no doubt about the national response that we would get for the success of the Third Plan. But there is an element of self-delusion about this, and I am glad to say that our planners accept that this national response is required in evolving the plan and in the execution of the Plan, and we appreciate this fully. Here I would like to quote from the Plan document itself. At page 334, they say:

"Although efforts were made in several States to prepare block plans specially in agriculture, in the main, the plans of States have been prepared independently of local plans."

They confess that the State plans were prepared independently of local plans. They say further:

"This inference to be drawn from this is that much more effort will be needed before local plans can become a distinctive stage in the initial preparation of a Five

[Shri Rameshwar Rao]

Year Plan. In the present context of the Third Plan as formulated, what is important is that local plans should be worked out as a means for the more effective implementation of the State Plan."

That is a confession that really the participation of the people in the formulation of the Third Plan has not been brought about. I would like to ask the planners: How can you have the massive and mass response to your Plan that is needed if in the preparation thereof there is no participation by the people? Unless I feel that I have shared in the preparation of the Plan, how will I be enthused to work for it? What is the vested interest that I have in the Plan? At the village level, at the block level, at the zila level, at the State level—at every stage there has to be participation by the people not only in the implementation of the Plan but also in the formulation and evolving of the Plan. There must be public discussion; otherwise how can this response be evoked?

Another aspect I would like to draw your attention to is this. On an earlier occasion, speaking in this hon. House, I had drawn attention to the fact that planning has to be from below. There must be a decentralised plan. I had also suggested that 6½ per cent. of the total investment in the Plan should be earmarked for village and block plans and 12½ per cent. of the total investment for zila or the district plans. In the Third Plan the per capita investment roughly works out at Rs. 250. Of this, if my formula had been considered, only Rs. 15/50 would be invested per capita in the village. Another Rs. 15/50 would be invested in the block and about Rs. 31 would be invested per capita in the district. That still leaves Rs. 180 per capita for national and State plans. At the present moment under the proposed Third Plan, I am sorry to say that, if you roughly work out the per capita investment in the village, it is less than Rs. 2. With a per capita investment

of less than Rs. 2 in the villages, hundreds of villages will not be touched by the Third Plan. They have not been touched by the First Plan. They have not been touched by the Second Plan. They will not be touched by the Third Plan. Where from will we get the national response required to push through the Third Plan?

Acharya Kripalani (Sitamarhi): Ask the planners.

Shri Rameshwar Rao: Acharyaji will forgive me for saying that not only we on this side but he is also a part of this whole process of planning and development. It is not a question of trying to find fault with each other at all. I hope we can evolve a common endeavour and a common programme of action.

Besides this general analysis, I would like to draw particular attention to three important facts. Firstly, what is the future of the community development programme?

Acharya Kripalani: Zero.

Shri Rameshwar Rao: What are the projections in the post-intensive phase of community development? Very soon the entire country will be covered by community development blocks. Many blocks are already reaching the stage of post-intensive development. I would like to know as to what the future projections are. Merely to say that the development process and the investment of the last seven or eight years have taken the community development blocks which have reached the post-intensive phase to a period where there can be self-generating growth is evading the issue. They have not reached that level where there can be self-sustaining growth in the community development areas.

The Plan report at page 335 says:

"The principal extension functions entrusted to the community development organisation fall within the fields of agriculture,

animal husbandry, co-operation and rural industries."

I am in full agreement with that formulation, but I would like to know as to what our projections in this field are. I would personally like to see the community development areas becoming the centre of an agro-industrial community. I would like to see in the community development areas a research laboratory to which a farmer can go for soil analysis. Today he has to go, if he can afford it, to the State Capital and most farmers do not go because they cannot afford it. But in the community development area there must be a laboratory where he can bring his soil for analysis, where he can enquire as to what kind of chemical manure he can use, what kind of crop rotation he can practice and what type of seed resistant to local pests he can have. This is what has to be done in the extension service field.

Then there is the question of our wanting the farmer and the peasant to push ahead with rapid improvement in modern techniques of production which means that he must instal a pump in his well or an engine probably, or probably he should take to the modern tillers if he cannot afford a tractor. If he can afford a tractor, he will get a loan from the co-operative and buy one. Where is he going to find a workshop which will provide him the necessary repair facilities for these things? I would like to see in the community development area a workshop so located which can become a centre where the farmers can bring their problems of engines, tractors, tillers, etc. for repair and guidance. I would also like to see in the community development area the centre of rural credit. The real bottleneck for a break-through in agriculture today is rural credit. We are not in a position to provide rural credit adequately, extensively and, according to me, in time. Unless we are in a position to do this, our agricultural break-through will not come.

Another factor that I would like to see in the community development area development is technical training for technicians. If the rural areas have to be pulled out of the present morass of underdevelopment, there is no alternative but to develop agro-industry—decentralised Industry. If industry has to be developed on this massive scale, on this wide front, it is necessary to have enough technicians trained. While the Third Plan provides adequate training for graduates and for licenciates in polytechnics, I have not come across sufficient attention being paid for training of lower grade technicians. I visualise technical training in this country at five different levels, namely, in the colleges of technology for post-graduate work, in the degree colleges for training of engineering and technological graduates, in polytechnics wherein the diploma courses will be available and in the industrial training institutes and craft schools where the basic craftsmen, the artisans, the mechanics and the technicians will be trained. The fitter, the mechanic, the welder—this is the class that needs to be trained. We cannot have rapid and large scale industrialisation on a wide front unless this base of technicians is built up. I would like to see developing in every community development block an industrial training institute where these technicians are trained. I agree that it cannot be done overnight; but do we have the necessary projection and plants? Do we have a vision of all that we are going to community development area into? I would like to see in the next ten years in the community development area an industrial training institute located. I would like to see in the next ten or fifteen years a rural industrial estate located where rural agro-industry can grow. This should be projection for the next ten or fifteen years. Unless we are able to visualise it from now on, how can we evoke the response and how will the Third Plan come to fruition?

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): See the documentary.

Shri Rameshwar Rao: Unless we achieve the break-through in agriculture, I am afraid, the Plan will remain at best a partial success. It will do a great thing for centralised and heavy industry which will certainly go ahead. But by and large the total fulfilment will not come about early.

The second point that I would like to draw particular attention to is minor irrigation. I am surprised to see that confusion still persists in the field of minor irrigation. Whenever one talks of minor irrigation, people talk of tubewells and pumps. There are other and more important fields of minor irrigation. In the whole country, south of the Vindhyas, there are hundreds and thousands of minor tanks. I shall, to avoid this confusion, call them micro-irrigation projects. That is the only way to put an end to this confusion between minor irrigation projects and tubewells, wells, etc., and these tanks and so I have coined a new phrase and call these things micro-irrigation projects. At least 20 per cent of these minor tanks are in disrepair. I have repeatedly had the honour of urging in this House that something must be done to restore these breached tanks. It will not take very long to restore them—may be 18 months or two years. You do not need technical skill. All that you require is organisation and labour. You require no cement, no steel. You can, in 18 months or two years restore all these minor tanks and I am certain that nearly 30 lakh acres which are not being cultivated will come under irrigation and your agricultural production will leap forward.

In this connection, I would like to refer to the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee report which, on page 28 points out three essentials for agricultural growth and development:

- (1) the setting up of a country-wide extension service organisation,

- (ii) the acceleration of minor irrigation programmes, and
(iii) the provision of adequate rural credit."

On page 110, the same report, which has been considered by this House, says:

"There was a general complaint that while new irrigation works were being completed, the existing works were not being properly maintained, so that the net increase in irrigation is less than the figures of the new constructions would show."

This is something which we have already considered and it has been accepted by the Planning Commission. I urged when we were discussing the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee report that the Planning Commission be asked to set apart Rs. 20 crores a year for the restoration of these minor tanks for the next five years so that the entire backlog of 50 or 60 years can be covered and 30 lakh acres could come under the plough.

Finally, while I conclude, there is one particular aspect to which I would like to draw the kind attention of the hon. Minister for Planning. We are growing rapidly in industry and other fields of developments. What is the relationship, I would like to ask, between our growth and development to the growth and development that is taking place in the countries around us? Is there any relationship? Are we projecting any relationship? Are we going to consider this important and pertinent problem? I shall not go into details at this stage. I shall pose the problem and leave it to the hon. Members of this House and the member of the Planning Commission to consider. There will be enough time to come back to it and discuss it in detail.

श्री बाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक अविकसित और अर्धविकसित देश में आर्थिक नियोजन आवश्यक है,

जिस से अल्प साधनों को कम से कम समय में प्रयोग में ला कर उससे अधिक से अधिक परिणाम प्राप्त किये जा सकें ।

जो व्यक्ति अथवा दल आर्थिक नियोजन में विश्वास नहीं करते वे शायद वास्तविकता से दूर कल्पना के ऐसे राज्य में निवास करते हैं जहाँ करोड़ों लोगों को जीवन की न्यूनतम आवश्यकतायें उपलब्ध करने का सवाल उनके सामने नहीं है । यदि हम अपने देश की परिस्थिति पर विचार करें तो इस बात से किसी को इन्कार नहीं हो सकता कि हमें आर्थिक विकास की एक रूप रखा निश्चित करनी पड़ेगी । हम प्रति वर्ष बजट बनाते हैं जो एक वर्ष का आर्थिक नियोजन है और यह आर्थिक नियोजन पांच वर्ष का या उससे आगे के समय का भी हो सकता है ।

हमें विचार यह करना होगा कि इस आर्थिक नियोजन का आधार क्या हो । भौतिक समृद्धि के साथ जीवन की हम और जो मान्यतायें लेकर सड़े हैं, उनकी कहां तक रक्षा की जाये ? हमने लोकतन्त्रात्मक तरीके से आर्थिक विकास का संकल्प किया है । हम विश्व में एक महान प्रयोग कर रहे हैं, और भारत में लोकतन्त्री तरीके से आर्थिक विकास किस सीमा तक सफल होता है इस बात के ऊपर एशिया और अफ्रीका में लोकतन्त्र का भविष्य निर्भर करता है ।

इस दिशा में हमने कुछ प्रगति भी की है और प्रत्येक भारतीय नागरिक को उस प्रगति के लिये गर्व होना चाहिये । लेकिन तस्वीर का दूसरा पहलू भी है जिसको हमें ध्यान में रखना होगा ।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने योजना को कार्यान्वित करने के लिये सर्वदलीय सहयोग की मांग की है । मेरा निवेदन है कि इस प्रकार का सहयोग यदि योजना बनाने से पूर्व धामनिष्ठ

किया जाता तो उसको देने में किसी प्रकार का संकोच नहीं होना चाहिये था । लेकिन योजना दलीय आधार पर बनायी जाती है । योजना के निर्माण में सब दलों की सहमति नहीं प्राप्त की जाती और जब योजना बन जाती है तो फिर उसके कार्यान्वयन के लिये सब को निर्मात्रित किया जाता है । मेरा निवेदन है कि पंचवर्षीय योजना की सफलता के लिये देश में जन सहयोग का जैसा वातावरण उत्पन्न करने की आवश्यकता है, उस दृष्टि से यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है ।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने केन्द्र में एक सर्वदलीय समिति का निर्माण किया था जिस में प्रायः सभी दलों के प्रतिनिधि थे मगर उस समिति को ठीक तरह से काम करने का अवसर नहीं दिया गया । योजना के सम्बन्ध में उसे अपनी निर्णायक सम्मतियां रखने का अवसर प्रदान नहीं किया गया । और जब यह मांग की गयी कि इस प्रकार की सर्वदलीय समितियां राज्यों में भी गठित की जायें तो उसके प्रति शासन की प्रतिधियां अच्छी नहीं थी ।

नियोजन केवल केन्द्र का विषय नहीं है । जन सहयोग के लिये तो हमें गांव गांव तक जाना पड़ेगा, और इसलिये आवश्यक है कि प्रत्येक स्तर पर जनता का सहयोग प्राप्त करने के लिये प्रयत्न किया जाये, नियोजन का सर्वदलीय स्वरूप दिया जाये । इस के लिये मेरा मुझाव है कि जो नेशनल डेवेलपमेंट काउंसिल है उसमें केन्द्रीय मंत्रियों के प्रतिरिक्त अभी एक सभी प्रांतों के मुख्य मंत्री होते हैं । शासन इस बात पर विचार करे कि क्या उस नेशनल डेवेलपमेंट काउंसिल में मंत्रियों के और मुख्य मंत्रियों के प्रतिरिक्त संसद् से और राज्य विधान सभाओं से प्रोपोजनल रिप्रेजेंटेशन के आधार पर चुने हुये कुछ सदस्यों को लेना उपयोगी नहीं होगा । आखिर में विकास योजनाओं का स्वरूप नेशनल डेवेलपमेंट काउंसिल

[श्री बाजपेयी]

की बैठक में निर्धारित होता है और जनता के चुने हुये प्रतिनिधि यदि उसमें अपने विचार रखें सकें, आर्थिक योजना को प्रभावित कर सकें, तो देश में एक ऐसा वातावरण बन सकता है जिससे हम निर्माण योजनाओं को दलगत राजनीति में अलग रख सकें।

प्राक्कलन समिति ने यह गुआय दिया था कि योजना आयोग में से मंत्रियों को हटा दिया जाये। योजना आयोग एक विशेषज्ञों की समिति रहे क्योंकि मंत्रिमंडल के सामने योजना आयोग की सिफारिशें जाती ही हैं। उसमें मंत्रियों के रखने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। पता नहीं क्यों इस सुझाव को भी अभी तक कार्यान्वित नहीं किया गया है।

13 hrs.

विरोधी दलों में यह आशा की जाती है कि वे पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं को आगामी आम चुनावों से अलग रखेंगे। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस तरह के विचार एक भेंट में प्रकट भी किये हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी पहले इस सम्बन्ध में अपने घर में बैठ कर फैसला करे। क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी आगामी आम चुनावों में पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं की उपलब्धियों के आधार पर जनता से वोट नहीं मांगेगी? अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी इस आधार पर वोट नहीं मांगेगी और योजनाओं से जो भी राष्ट्रीय आमदनी में वृद्धि और विकास एवं निर्माण कार्यों में प्रगति हुई है, उसे एक राष्ट्रीय उद्योग और उपलब्धि के रूप में उपस्थित किया जायगा तो योजनाओं को चुनाव से अलग रखने की बात सफल हो सकती है। लेकिन यदि कांग्रेस पार्टी अपने मंच से योजनाओं की सफलताओं को सफलतायें बना कर प्रकट करेगी तो योजना में जो कमियाँ हैं धक्का खावियाँ हैं, उन्हें विरोधी दल वाले जनता के सामने रखने के लिये विचल होंगे। मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर

योजना को चुनाव से अलग रखना है तो इस सम्बन्ध में कांग्रेस पार्टी को अपनी नीति स्पष्ट रूप से निर्धारित करनी चाहिये।

जहाँ तक योजना से जनता की समृद्धि का प्रश्न है राष्ट्रीय आय में अभिवृद्धि हम सब के लिये आनन्द की बात है। लेकिन हम एक बात का विचार करें कि हमारे देश में हमें दो क्षेत्र दिखाई देते हैं। एक तो गांवों का क्षेत्र है, ५ लाख गांव, जिन में कुल जनसंख्या का ८५ फीसदी भाग रहता है और एक शहरी क्षेत्र है जिनमें १५ फीसदी जनसंख्या निवास करती है। यह जो समृद्धि आई है, यह जो विकास के चिन्ह हमें दिखाई देते हैं, वे किस भाग तक सीमित हैं? क्या ८५ फीसदी गांवों की जनता जिस क्षेत्र में निवास करती है उसमें इतनी मात्रा में हम प्रगति कर सके हैं जितनी मात्रा में अपेक्षित थी? मुझे लगता है कि इस दृष्टि में हमारी विकास योजनाओं में एक मूलभूत दोष है। हम उद्योगीकरण भी इस ढंग से कर रहे हैं कि यह जो शहरी आबादी का क्षेत्र है उसको बढ़ाने में होता है और उसके परिणामस्वरूप जो ८५ फीसदी आबादी वाला गांव का क्षेत्र है उसके उद्योग धंधे प्रतियोगिता में नहीं टिक पाते और हम दूधरे संकट में फंस गये। गांव में रोजगार नहीं है इसलिये गांवों से बड़ी संख्या में जो शहरों की ओर आने वाले लोग हैं उनके लिये हमारे सामने सामाजिक सेवाओं की, निवास की और उनके लिये भोजन की व्यवस्था करने का प्रश्न है। दूसरे बड़े शहरों में जो उद्योग धंधे केन्द्रित हो रहे हैं और पश्चिम का अनुकरण करके बड़े पैमाने पर जो वहाँ उद्योगीकरण हो रहा है, वह हमारे कुटीर उद्योगों को और छोटे उद्योगों को समाप्त कर रहा है।

प्रति व्यक्ति आय के जो धाकड़े दिये गये हैं अगर हम गांवों में निवास करने वाले व्यक्तियों की आय का हिसाब तय करें तो

हमको यह बात माननी होगी कि सम्पूर्ण देश में शहरी आवादी के क्षेत्र में जो प्रति व्यक्ति की आय है, वह ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में निवास करने वाले व्यक्ति को नहीं है।

उत्तर प्रदेश में इस तरह का कुछ अनुमान लगाया गया था कि गांव में निवास करने वाले व्यक्ति की प्रति व्यक्ति आय कितनी बढ़ी है। उससे पता लगता है कि १९४८-४९ के मूल्यों के आधार पर गांवों में प्रति व्यक्ति आय १९४८-४९ में आज तक लगभग १९७ रुपये के आसपास हो रही है। १९४९-५० में यह १९७ रुपये और ६३ नये पैसे थी और १९५८-५९ में १९३ रुपये और ४७ नये पैसे है। मैं नहीं समझता कि अन्य प्रांतों में इस बारे में कोई आधारभूत अन्तर होगा यद्यपि अन्य प्रांतों में थोड़ा बहुत इससे फर्क हो सकता है। गांवों में जो खपत है अगर हम उसका अनुमान लगा कर देखें तो वह भी सरकार के एक सर्वेक्षण के अनुसार उत्तर प्रदेश के गांवों में १९५९-६० में प्रति व्यक्ति खपत आय के आंकड़े हमारी आँखें खोल देने वाले हैं। इन से पता चलता है कि पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में प्रति व्यक्ति दैनिक खपत ८.९१ छटां और ५१९.६ ग्राम है। पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में १०.६२ छटांक है। प्रति व्यक्ति की रूपत में भी वृद्धि नहीं हुई है। शहरी आवादी की तुलना में ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में प्रति व्यक्ति आय में भी कोई अन्तर नहीं पड़ा है। अब यह जो शहरी आवादी और ग्रामीण क्षेत्र का अन्तर बढ़ता जा रहा है उसके लिये तीसरी योजना में इस बात का कोई संकेत नहीं मिलता कि इस अन्तर को किस तरीके से कम किया जायगा? यदि हमारा आर्थिक नियोजन और उसमें चलने वाला औद्योगीकरण इसी गति में और इसी दिशा में चलता रहा तो इस अन्तर को पाटा नहीं जा सकेगा और यह अन्तर और भी बढ़ता चला जायगा। उस के लिये आवश्यकता है कि ग्रामीण अर्ध-व्यवस्था का पुनर्गठन किया जाय और हम विकेंद्रित अर्ध-व्यवस्था की ओर ध्यान दें।

तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में कुल ८४ करोड़ रुपया छोटी मशीनों से चलने वाले उद्योगों के लिये रखा गया है। अगर दूसरी योजनाओं में और तीसरी योजना में छोटे उद्योगों के लिये दी गयी धनराशि का विचार करें तो तीसरी योजना में दी गयी धनराशि छोटे उद्योगों, कुटीर उद्योगों और हाथ की कारीगरी के धंधों को पुनर्जीवित करने की मांग को पूरा नहीं कर सकती और जब तक हम गांवों के उद्योग धंधों को उनके स्वयं के पैरों पर खड़ा नहीं करेंगे हम देश के आर्थिक विकास के प्रयत्न में सफल नहीं हो सकते हैं।

इसके लिये यह भी आवश्यक है कि भूमि सुधारों के सम्बन्ध में एक दृढ़ नीति अपनाई जाये। भूमि की सीमा निर्धारित की गई है अगर कहीं भी उस सीमा के अन्तर्गत भूमि को लाने के लिये कोई प्रबल प्रयत्न नहीं किया गया है। कुछ राज्यों ने तो भूमि की अधिकतम सीमा को निर्धारित करने की अवधि इतनी बढ़ा दी है कि उस बीच में जिनके पास सीमा से अधिक भूमि थी उस अनिश्चित भूमि को उन्होंने अपने घर वालों में और कुटुम्ब वालों में वितरित कर दी है और जो भूमिहीन हैं, जिनके पास अनआधिक जोत है उनको देने के लिये कोई भूमि नहीं बची। लेकिन अभी भी भूमि वितरण के जो आंकड़े मिलते हैं उन से पता चलता है कि आजकल ४० प्रतिशत परिवारों के पास प्रति परिवार एक एकड़ से भी कम भूमि है और उनके पास कुल भूमि का केवल १ प्रतिशत है। इसके विपरीत ४ प्रतिशत परिवारों के पास कुल भूमि का एक तिहाई भाग है। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि भूमि सुधारों को दृढ़ता से कार्यान्वित किया जाये। जिनके पास आवश्यकता से अधिक भूमि है और जो व्यक्तिगत देबजाल नहीं कर सकते वह खपत छोटी के उद्देश्य में सफल नहीं हो सकते। उन से मर्यादा से अधिक भूमि लेकर भूमि-

[श्री वाजपेयी]

हीनों में सहकारी समितियों में नहीं वितरित की जानी चाहिये। लेकिन राज्य सरकारें इस सम्बन्ध में केन्द्र के आदेशों का ठीक तरीके से पालन नहीं कर रही हैं। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि निहित स्वार्थों ने राज्य सरकारों को प्रभावित किया है और यह भूमि वितरण के मार्ग में रोड़ा बन कर बैठी हुई है और इसका परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि हम अनाज की पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिये भी ग्राम किसान को अधिक परिश्रम करने के लिये और सधन खेती करने के लिये प्रोत्साहित नहीं कर पा रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अब अपना भाषण समाप्त करें।

श्री वाजपेयी : श्रीमन, मैं अपने ग्रुप की ओर से बोलने वाला एक ही सदस्य हूँ और मुझे बोलने के वास्ते कुछ अधिक समय दिया जाये। अब यह बर्ड प्लान का इतना बड़ा पोषा है और १५ मिनट में उसके साथ न्याय करना सम्भव नहीं है और इसलिये मुझे कुछ अधिक समय मिलना चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य को १८ मिनट दिये गये हैं।

श्री वाजपेयी : मेरा निवेदन है कि मुझे कम से कम २५ मिनट मिलने चाहियें। अभी कई महत्वपूर्ण विषय बाकी बच रहते हैं जिनकी ओर मैंने संकेत भी नहीं किया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ठीक है। माननीय सदस्य, दो, चार मिनट और ले लें।

श्री वाजपेयी : गांवों में निवास करने वाले व्यक्तियों की ग्रामदानी का क्या हाल है इसका मैंने थोड़ा सा दिग्दर्शन कराया था। उत्तर प्रदेश में अभी हाल में एक सर्वे किया गया है जिस से पता लगता है कि ४५ प्रतिशत परिवार ऐसे हैं जिनका कि मासिक खर्च ५० रुपये प्रति परिवार से भी कम है। ५० प्रतिशत परिवार ऐसे हैं

जिनका मासिक खर्च १५० रुपये है और कुल ५ फीसदी परिवार ऐसे हैं, जो महीने में १५० रुपये से अधिक खर्च करते हैं। अगर इस रोशनी में हम राष्ट्रीय ग्रामदानी बढ़ने के दावों को देखें, तो हमें पता लगेगा कि जो हमारी ग्रंथ-व्यवस्था का ग्रामीण क्षेत्र है, उसके साथ न्याय नहीं किया जा रहा है। भारत की जनता अन्ततोगत्वा इस ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में ही निवास करती है। अगर हम उसके लिये आर्थिक समृद्धि बुनियादी चीजों की पूर्ति के रूप में नहीं ला सकते हैं, तो राष्ट्र के निर्माण के महान् प्रयत्न में ८५ फीसदी जनता को अपना योगदान देने के लिये प्रोत्साहित नहीं किया जा सकता।

इस आर्थिक योजना के साथ सुरक्षा का कोई मेल नहीं बिठाया गया है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि अगर विश्व में किसी ने पलीता लगा दिया, तो हमारा आर्थिक नियोजन भी उस के साथ उड़ जायगा। हमें आशा करना चाहिए कि विश्व में शान्ति रहेगी, लेकिन हमारा आर्थिक नियोजन सुरक्षा की आवश्यकताओं को धिन्कुल दृष्टि में धोखल कर के चले, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती। इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि हम आर्थिक योजना के साथ साथ सुरक्षा की भी योजना बनायें और वह हमारी आर्थिक योजना का एक हिस्सा होनी चाहिए। दोनों को मिलाने की जरूरत नहीं है, लेकिन देश के सामने यह बात स्पष्ट की जानी चाहिए कि आर्थिक नियोजन के साथ-साथ सीमा सुरक्षा का प्रबन्ध भी ठीक चल रहा है। उस के लिए हम कौन से काम करने जा रहे हैं, कितनी धन-राशि देने जा रहे हैं, उस की एक पूरी तस्वीर हमारे सामने आनी चाहिए। कभी कभी ऐसा होता है कि जब विदेशी आक्रमण के विरोध का सबाल पैदा होता है, तो कहा जाता है कि हम इसलिए इस सम्बन्ध में कार्यवाही नहीं करेंगे, क्योंकि हमारी आर्थिक योजनायें सट्टाई में पड़ जायेंगी

और आर्थिक योजना बनाते समय शायद इस बात का हम ध्यान नहीं रखते कि हमें इस प्रकार के किसी सम्भावित संकट का सामना करना पड़ेगा। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आर्थिक नियोजन को देश की सुरक्षा के प्रश्न में प्रलग नहीं किया जा सकता है और उम का भी पूरा विचार होना चाहिए।

इस योजना में नये टैक्सों के जो लक्ष्य निर्धारित किये गये हैं, एक बात मैं उन के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूँ। अगर हम विकास के नये कार्यक्रम हाथ में लेते हैं, तो जनता पर अधिक बोझा पड़ेगा। अगर जनता के किम वगं पर बोझा पड़ना चाहिए, इस का विचार करना आवश्यक है। यदि हम इस परिणाम पर पहुँच गये हैं कि प्रत्यक्ष कर लगाने की गुंजायश नहीं है, जैसी कि वित्त मंत्री ने घोषणा की थी, तो फिर हम आर्थिक नियोजन के लिए रुपया प्राप्त करने के लिए ऐसे टैक्सों का सहारा लेंगे, जिन का बोझा आम आदमी पर पड़े और इस का परिणाम यह होगा कि हम जिन का जीवन-स्तर उठाने की बात करते हैं, उन के जीवन-स्तर को उठाने में कठिनाई पैदा होगी। अगर पिछले कुछ सालों के आकड़े देखे जायें, तो जात होगा कि अप्रत्यक्ष कर (इनडायरेक्ट टैक्सज) का अनुपात धीरे धीरे बढ़ता जा रहा है और प्रत्यक्ष करों का अनुपात धीरे धीरे कम होता जा रहा है। एक्साइज इयूटीज भी बढ़ रही हैं। इस के अनिश्चित केवल प्रान्तीय सरकारें और केन्द्रीय सरकार ही टैक्स नहीं लगातीं। इस योजना में केवल उन का विचार ही नहीं किया गया है, अपितु जो स्वतंत्र संस्थाएँ हैं, नगरपालिकाएँ और जिला परिषदें इत्यादि, उन से भी हम यह आशा करते हैं कि वे अपने साधनों को इकट्ठा करेंगी और सरकार से मिलने वाली सहायता के बराबर कोई इस तरह की सहायता, मैचिंग ग्रान्ट्स, जोड़ेंगी। तो कुल मिला कर जनता पर कितना बोझा पड़ता है, इस का विचार होना चाहिए और अगर हम इस का विचार करते हैं, तो यह कहना पड़ता है कि जनता की आवश्यकताओं को देखते हुए आर्थिक नियोजन के हमारे लक्ष्य

कर्म हैं, किन्तु हमारे साधनों को देखते हुए शायद वे हमारी शक्ति के बाहर चले जायेंगे। यह आवश्यक है कि हम जनता की बोझ उठाने की मर्यादा का भी ध्यान रखें, क्योंकि हमें भूलना नहीं चाहिए कि हम लोकतंत्रीय ढाँचे में नियोजन कर रहे हैं। अन्य देशों से हम तुलना नहीं कर सकते और ही करनी चाहिए। केवल आर्थिक लक्ष्य ही हमारे सामने नहीं है, अपितु नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक मूल्य भी हैं।

बढ़ती हुई बेकारी का हम ध्यान रख। तीसरी योजना के निर्माताओं ने इस बात को माना है कि आज देश में जितनी बेकारी है, पांच साल बाद तीसरी योजना पूरी हो जाने पर उस से ज्यादा बेकारी होगी। बेकारी से केवल कुछ लोगों का श्रम अनुपयोगी होता है, केवल इतनी ही बात नहीं है। बेकारी हमारे लिए एक सामाजिक और राजनीतिक संकट पैदा करेगी। पठे-लिखे लोगों की बेकारी तो हमारे राज्य के स्थायित्व के लिए भयंकर वस्तु है। अगर हमारा नियोजन ऐसा है, जो बेकारी को बढ़ाता है। इस का एक ही तरीका है कि हमारी योजनाएँ पूजी-प्रधान कम होनी चाहिए, श्रम-प्रधान अधिक होनी चाहिए। हमारे यहाँ जन-बल ज्यादा है। यह हमारी सय से बड़ी पूजी है। अगर हम उस का समुचित उपयोग करें, तो हम अपनी विकास-योजनाओं को काफ़ी सीमा तक पूरा कर सकते हैं। भगवान् अगर किसी को जन्म देता है, तो केवल खाने के लिए पेट दे कर नहीं भेजता है, उम पेट को भरने के लिए दो हाथ दे कर जन्म देता है। लेकिन हम उन दो हाथों का उपयोग नहीं कर पा रहे हैं और इस का कारण यह है कि हमारे औद्योगिकरण का ढाँचा ऐसे देशों की पद्धति पर आधारित है, जिन के सामने बढ़ती हुई जन-संख्या को काम देने का शायद सवाल नहीं था। लेकिन हमारे सामने लोगों को काम देने की समस्या है। काम का अधिकार सब से बड़ा अधिकार है। हम ने इस भूमि को कर्म-भूमि माना है, लेकिन आज कर्म-भूमि में काम नहीं है और अगर हम उत्पादन के ऐसे तरीके अपनायें,

[श्री वाजपेयी]

जिस में उत्पादन बढ़ जाये, लेकिन श्रम की बचत हो, तो वह तरीका आज की देश की हालत में कारगर नहीं हो सकता। आज की स्थिति में भारत में आटोमेशन लागू करने का कोई मतलब नहीं है। हम मशीनों से काम लें और मनुष्य को बेकार कर दें, तो मशीनों के द्वारा पैदा किये गये माल को, मशीनों की पैदावार को खपाने के लिए बाजार कहाँ से मिलेगा? विदेशी बाजार पर निर्भर रह कर हम अधिक दिनों तक अपने आर्थिक ढाँचे को स्थायी रूप से खड़ा नहीं रख सकते। यदि हम ने अपने आर्थिक ढाँचे को एक दूढ़ और ठोस आधार प्रदान करना है, तो फिर हम को बड़ी हुई पैदावार के लिए अपने देश में ही बाजार तैयार करना होगा और वह यहाँ के आम आदमी की श्रम-शक्ति को बढ़ाये बिना सम्भव नहीं है। उग के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि हम देश के हर सबल और मक्षम आदमी को काम देने की व्यवस्था की जाये। लेकिन पंच वर्षीय योजनाये हर सबल आदमी को काम देने में सफल नहीं हुई है।

पंच-वर्षीय योजना को कार्यान्वित करने में, जो हमारे उद्योग-घाटों में और सरकारी कार्यालयों (दफ्तरों) में लगे हुए कर्मचारी हैं, उन्होंने कितना परिश्रम किया है, इस से कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। पब्लिक सेक्टर बढ़ता जा रहा है। अधिकाधिक काम सरकार अपने हाथ में लेती जा रही है। लेकिन अब समय आ गया है कि सरकार इस बात पर विचार करे कि सरकारी कर्मचारियों और सरकारी उद्योग-घाटों में काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों के अधिकार क्या होंगे, उन्हें अपने संगठन बनाने की छूट होगी या नहीं, जब से कर्मचारी-संगठनों की मान्यता वापस ली गई है, योजनाओं को सफल करने में कर्मचारियों का उत्साह बढ़ा है, यह विश्वास के साथ नहीं कहा जा सकता। लेकिन मान्यता वापस करने की बात तो चल रही, गृह मंत्रालय ने एक आदेश निकाला है, जिस में केन्द्रीय सरकार

और राज्य सरकारों के कर्मचारियों को चुनाव की सभाओं में भाग लेने से मना किया गया है। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि किसी कर्मचारी को चुनाव की सभा में भाग लेने से, चुनाव की सभा में जा कर भाषण सुनने से कैसे मना किया जा सकता है। वे राजनीति में भाग न लें, यह ठीक है। वे किसी दल से सम्बद्ध न हों, यह आवश्यक है। सरकारी कर्मचारियों को सक्रिय राजनीति से अलग रहना चाहिए, लेकिन अगर उन्हें वोट का अधिकार है, तो उस अधिकार का ठीक तरह से उपयोग करने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि वे राजनैतिक दलों की गभाओं में जा कर इस बात पर विचार करें कि वे देश को क्या आर्थिक कार्यक्रम देते हैं, देश के भविष्य को कौन सी तस्वीर उन के सामने रखते हैं। अगर होम मिनिस्ट्री ने एक फरमान जारी कर दिया। मेरे पास गृह मंत्री द्वारा दिये गये उद्देश्य की प्रतिलिपि है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान इस ओर खीचना चाहता हूँ।

खान और तेल मंत्री (श्री के० दे० मालवीय) : सम्भवतः आपके इस वक्तव्य में यह भ्रम फैला जा रहा है कि किसी सरकारी नौकर को किसी आम सभा में जो बात कही जा रही है, उसको सुनने तक का अधिकार नहीं है। ऐसा तो कोई भी प्रादेश गृह मंत्रालय की ओर से नहीं निकाला गया है, जहाँ तक मैं जानता हूँ।

श्री वाजपेयी : जरा मुझे मौका दे बोलने का और मैं आपको सब कुछ बता देता हूँ। मैं और मेरे साथ साथ श्री सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी ने स्टार्ट इन्वेस्टमेंट नम्बर ६५७ पृष्ठा या और उसका होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो जवाब दिया है, वह मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा है :—

"But on a reference from the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply, received in June last, the Home Ministry advised that

Government servants should not attend election meetings organised by any political party."

इसका क्या मतलब है ? चुनाव के दौरान में अगर कोई राजनीतिक दल मीटिंग करे तो आप सरकारी कर्मचारी को एटेंड करने का मौका नहीं देंगे ? यहां पर यही लिखा हुआ है । ये माननीय गृह मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर यह बात गलत है तो वह इसका खण्डन करे । अगर आपको राजनीतिक दलों को चुनाव सभाओं में सरकारी कर्मचारियों का जाना पसन्द नहीं है तो आप २० लाख कर्मचारियों के वोट के अधिकार को छीन लीजिये । लेकिन अगर आप वोट के अधिकार को कायम रखना चाहते हैं तो उन्हे चुनाव सभाओं में जा कर सुनने से आप रोक नहीं सकते हैं । वे चुनाव सभाओं के आयोजन में भाग न लें, चुनाव सभाओं में बोलें नहीं और किसी भी चुनाव गतिविधि में भाग न लें, यह तो समझ में आ सकता है, मगर आप मीटिंग में जा कर सुनने भी नहीं देना चाहते, यह समझ में बात नहीं आती है । शायद नई दिल्ली को पराजय को आप अभी तक भुलें नहीं हैं । मगर यदि रखाये कि यह नई दिल्ली मार देना में दोहराई जायेगी अगर आप सरकारी कर्मचारियों को उनके प्राथारभत अधिकारों से वंचित करेंगे ।

Shri Karni Singhji (Bikaner): When I was a little boy, I used to be terribly critical about everything, I criticised everything, whether it was right or wrong, until one day my father called me and told me: "If you want to criticise anything, make quite sure that you put yourself in the place of the other man, and if you are convinced that you do it better, then you have a right to criticise." I have put myself in the shoes of the Prime Minister and I am quite convinced that nobody in this country can bring out a Plan better than this. Because of this I would like to congratulate our Prime Minister, who is not only a great figure in this country, but a world figure.

947 (A) LSD—1.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
प्रधान मंत्री तो यहां हैं नहीं, आप बधाई किस को दे रहे हैं ?

Shri Karni Singhji: I am an Opposition Member, I do not want a Congress ticket.

Shri Vajpayee: That is our misfortune.

Shri Karni Singhji: I would like to congratulate him also because of the fact that the Government have done a fine job, and I think all of us who are Independents, who like to think independently, would extend our congratulations to him.

No Plan can be absolutely perfect, and neither is ours, but the more important thing is that we have made an attempt, and that, in my opinion, is more important than merely criticising. We have a tangible Plan, we have something to go on. Of course, it can be bettered, I have no doubt, but until something better is produced, I do not see why anybody in our country need feel ashamed of this.

Yesterday the Prime Minister spoke at length, and some of the things he said particularly impressed me. He said that India was a dynamic country, expanding and growing, and that he liked to give opportunity to everybody who had the youthfulness and vigour to come up with new ideas and new projects. Even if it was 85 per cent good, he was willing to take the risk. I think that is a wonderful approach, but before we go and accept that risk, it is important that the people who come up with these plans and projects are fit enough to measure up to the Prime Minister's estimation. Unfortunately in our country today we have lost that youthfulness and vigour. Everybody is far too obsessed about himself, about his party tickets and the elections and one thing and the other, and unfortunately India seems to take second place. The Prime Minister is a man whom I have admired since my childhood not because he belongs to any political

[Shri Karni Singhji].

party, but because he is a great man. The world admires him, and the more I travel throughout the world, the more I come to that conclusion myself. He is a man who is head and shoulders above anybody else in this country. Surely the younger generation amongst us can give the support he needs to build a new, a dynamic India. Therefore, I request that if we want to make this Plan a success, let us measure up to him.

I will only give you one example. If you write a letter to the Prime Minister today, it is replied to by return of post. It surprises me how a man who is as busy as Mr. Nehru is, can possibly send such a quick reply. Other Ministries will take months. If we as a nation begin to emulate that example, India could be an entirely different country.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: I have sent him a letter, but he has not replied to it.

Shri Karni Singhji: You ask him.

I would now like to focus attention on an altogether different aspect. Any plan of this gigantic nature, any plan so ambitious, can never work unless we examine the population factor. The population increase, something that is destined one day to blow the lid off the country unless we plan from now. This expanding population will be responsible for the per capita income, the per capita expenditure, the plan outlay can make, and ultimately, at the end of 15 years or say two decades, for the question as to whether our plans will really bear fruit as much as we want them to or not. I am quite sure all of us who have had this 700 page volume in our hands have had the occasion to go through the various aspects. I for one have concentrated on a study of the population growth in our country, and I would like to put forward certain facts and figures which have certainly staggered me.

13.26 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

I shall just quote to you a few figures which have been given in the Plan. At the end of 15 years from today, India's population, it is reckoned, will be 625 million. That means that the population of India will have increased by a figure equal to the present population of the United States, in 15 years from today. This thing we must realise because it is a very important factor. Can a poor country like ours support such a big population?

I shall like to quote a few more figures. Between 1961 and 1966 that is in five years from now, our population will have increased by 5.3 crores, which is almost twice the population of Rajasthan. Between 1966 and 1971 we will have increased—when I say increase, it is net increase, increase over deaths—by 6.3 million (6.3 crores) people. Between 1971 and 1976 we will have increased by 7.1 million (7.1 crores). Thus, the total increase by 1976 would be 18.7 millions (18.7 crores), which is equal to the present population of the United States.

Our increase every minute is 25, and by the time I sit down after making this speech, the Government will have to contend with 250 more Indian citizens. By tomorrow morning there will be 28,000 more Indian citizens to feed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he can cut that short by concluding his speech earlier.....

Shri Karni Singhji: I wish that the remedy were as simple as all that. I would sit down straightaway!

These are the population increase figures that the Five Year Plan has given to us, and I think everybody in this House will agree that if some sort of remedy can be found on an

all-India basis which can control this phenomenal increase, we would have far more money available for the average man and for his basic needs.

I was talking to a friend of mine about population control, and he asked me: "Why are you worried? You can afford to educate more children." That is correct, if one takes a selfish view. Let us assume that a particular citizen is favourably placed in life, to be able to educate, look after and bring up a family of more than three. It certainly means that if he does have more than three children, he is going to elbow out the other boys and girls from less fortunate families. So, it is unfair that any man should go ahead and raise a large family, almost akin to litters, and elbow out other unfortunate people from school space, hospital space, transport space etc., because every additional citizen that we produce in this country more than the optimum members of 3 per family means additional burden on the nation.

I had a rather interesting discussion last night with a very interesting doctor whom I met for the first time. He is a Burmese by origin, and a United States citizen now. He is Dr. Maung Sein. I found he was completely dedicated to this idea of family planning. He was very keen to have an opportunity to discuss his ideas with the Prime Minister and if possible, with Members of Parliament. He was staying at the Asoka Hotel and will be returning to the United States shortly. He is a man who has made a study of population growth problems in our country and I shall quote to you from his recent article that he has written for one of the American journals. Dr. Sein does not call it family planning; he likes to call it by an entirely new name—"fertility design." You could have your choice of the names. The new word is used in America now in place of the words such as family plan-

ning, birth control, planned parenthood etc. Dr. Sein in his article dated August 9th, 1961 says:

"When family size is pre-determined and kept within those limits during its life span, only then can the health, nutrition and economic wellbeing of the family especially the mother, can be improved and maintained. Designed fertility is an integral part of modern scientific medicine. Reduction of birth rates and a simultaneous reduction of death rates constitutes a sound health programme. In the revolution of 'rising expectations' of 1300 crores in the Free World one out of every three is an Indian. One contraceptive clinic for every 110,000 users today or 1 clinic per 27,000 users by 1965 would hardly even meet the bare requirements of a simple educational programme. The Government will spend eight annas per couple per year for all their requirements. Only 125,000 males have been sterilized by all the surgical teams in the country. There is at present no indigenous contraceptive industry; the local industry can at present hardly meet 20 per cent of India's needs. Only herculean measures, newer approaches and almost fanatical dedication will change it."

It is the same view, I am sure that the Prime Minister will take in discussing further India's problems, what he considers to be the remedy, he says:

"Permanent sterilization of the male is impractical, because of insufficient surgical facilities. The lack of adequate laboratory facilities for sperm counts rules out temporary sterilization of the male by oral drugs. Only contraceptives taken orally by the woman hold any hope of acceptance."

That is his opinion and it is for our research team to find out more. I

[Shri Karni Singhji]

personally believe that oral contraceptives may not be so successful not only because of their contra-indications but also because of their after-effects.

The Doctor goes on to say:

"The problems are unique, intimate and require tact, sensitivity, ingenuity, far-sighted imagination. The use of visual media has hardly started. We have no prior experience to guide us. Fertility design will improve family health and save lives. This is the message that has hardly reached ten per cent of the families."

The Doctor sums up by saying:

"A designed fertility, an adequate nutrition and a nationwide good medical facilities are the three absolute necessities that an Indian villager must have to change his sickly, painful, despairing subhuman existence to a healthy, happy, energetic one. Thus the world's largest democracy, when freed from the 'slavery of reproduction' is bound to vastly influence world history and events."

There is no doubt that if we have smaller families, the same Plan with Rs. 12,000 or 11,000 and odd crores will yield far better results and larger income *per capita* as also larger *per capita* expenditure by the State. This Doctor suggests that the optimum size family that a country like ours should work on as a basis should be three children in each family. I think that it should roughly be the right figure. That brings us to the question: what is the answer to this problem? We have beaten about the bush for a long time. Perhaps the answer, first and foremost, for a big country like ours, would be "motivation." We should through visual means try to create a desire in the masses of our country for the

need for such a measure of population control. Secondly, we need dynamic men in charge of this scheme because, unfortunately in our country people do not quite realise how important this problem is or in likely to be in the years to come.

You may be asking me as to why I am obsessed with the idea of population control. The answer is very simple: because my generation in fifteen years more from now will be called upon to handle important positions and we will not only have the present population but the present population of India and the United States put together to contend with: India's population would have grown that much. We know that this is not going to be an easy problem because we cannot increase our land mass. We can increase the wealth up to a point, but cannot increase agriculture at the same rate to keep pace with the tremendous growth of population.

Having said so much on the credit side, I would say a few words about the debit side. We have built some of the greatest dams in the world and we are proud of them. But we are not proud of the way in which the work had been executed, the way in which our dams have broken and let down our people, killing thousands of people, as in the recent Poona floods. We are also not proud of our bad roads. After having spent millions and millions on them, we find that they require repairs within a year of being made. We are also not proud of the bad buildings that we make which leak at the end of the first rains. Neither are we proud of our postal system because we know that ten per cent of the letters posted today do not reach the other end. In India people would be very well advised to post important letters in duplicate, as I do because the chances are that an important letter will not reach. That is my experience.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is he sure that only one would be lost?

An Hon. Member: It is high.

Shri Karni Singhji: Ten per cent is the rough estimate of losses. I have got facts and figures and I hope one day to present them before the House; I am collecting data. We also know our trunk telephones which at the time of Independence worked like clock work but today, we may as well forget about them.

However, you cannot blame any Minister or Prime Minister or any single person for it. That is a national failure and we must blame each one of us for it. It will be so till the day of realisation comes and we realise that we, as a nation, have a bigger job to do. You cannot blame A B or C for it. We shall try and bring up a new generation of men and women who are more conscious of their duties to their country, who are aware not only of their personal interests but of their counter-obligations to the nation. With that change of outlook all these problems will solve themselves.

I should like to say a word or two on one of the biggest problems facing our country which hampers our national development, whether it is planned development or otherwise. That problem is something, I am sure, the Prime Minister has first in his mind and that is the business of caste, communal, regional and language barriers. My generation, I am sure, is trying to raise above all these barriers. We want to see India as one United Nation where everybody will be regarded only as Indian citizens and no more. Whenever I go to our schools and colleges, while trying to speak to the boys and girls I ask one question: who are you? If anybody tells me his caste or community, it shocks me and I tell him that the only answer that I expect from the new generation today is: "I am an Indian citizen." That is all. What my caste or community is, it is nobody's business. I hope that we in

Parliament will see that during the next general elections the caste and communal barriers are not further created and that we fight the elections like gentlemen, as Indian citizens and with no further sub-divisions.

I shall just briefly mention a few points that relate to the State I represent i.e. Rajasthan. I feel that the power allocation made to our State is not adequate. It has a vast desert area which requires special consideration and because of that power for the villages and some of the smaller towns must be given the highest priority, and larger allotments in the Plan.

Somewhere in Rajasthan, close to where I live, in Palana, there is a colliery which has fifty lakh tons of coal. The present system of pillar and stall used yields only 15 per cent return for quite some time. Now, there is a proposal to have the open pit system whereby far greater coal can be made use of. I would recommend it to the Government and I hope they will examine it and see that it becomes an integral part of the Third Plan.

Lastly, I come to the aid given to certain Community Development areas in Rajasthan. I believe that townships of 5,000 and over like NAPASAR for example are not given any aid by the Government for water works, tanks, and construction of new wells etc. Certain desert areas come under altogether a different category where water can run as low as 300 to 400 feet deep. Therefore, I feel that this limit of 5,000 should be raised to include towns of 10,000 people for the purpose of aid during the Five Year Plan in certain water scarcity areas.

I shall not take up too much time of the House. I support this Plan. There are other suggestions which of course other hon. Members would like to make. I am very glad to have this opportunity of congratulating the

[Shri Karni Singhji]

Prime Minister and the Government, and I hope that my generation will dedicate itself to the task of building up a new India which the Prime Minister is trying hard to do. I am quite sure that if the youth of our country came up and gave that great man, our Prime Minister, the full support that he needs, India will be a new country very soon.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu and Kashmir): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, many hon. Members have already covered a good deal of the several aspects of the third Five Year Plan, and so I would like to limit my remarks only to the agricultural part of the Plan. Before I go to that aspect, I am tempted to make a few references to Shri Ranga's speech which he made yesterday in this House. Shri Ranga said that the Third Five Year Plan is the *Ramayana* of the Congress Party. While giving a new name to this national Plan, he presented the *Ramayana* of his Swatantra Party. Going through his speech and also going through the *Ramayana* of the Swatantra Party, there is one aspect of it which has pained me the most. About co-operative farming, Shri Ranga has said that "co-operative farming sought to deprive the peasant of his freedom." He further said that it was a "per-
version of social values."

Again and again, whenever there is an opportunity, whether it is a discussion on the Plan or on any other subject, like agriculture, etc., we always hear this criticism from the Swatantra Party regarding co-operative farming. Shri Ranga said that if co-operative farming is successful in India, the peasants will lose all social values and the peasants would become slaves. I am really surprised and astonished to hear such remarks from a personality like Shri Ranga who claims to be an experienced leader of the Indian farmers.

Yesterday again, while speaking on the Plan, Shri Ranga said that he

would like social and moral environments of the Indian masses to be changed. I just want to ask him, "what about economic environment of the Indian masses?" I am sure that 99 per cent of the population of this country, men and women, are more concerned about the economic environment first, and the moral and social environments come only afterwards. Unless we are able to produce food and cloth sufficient to provide to the masses, what good are the moral and social environments and the moral and social values to the people?

After referring to this aspect, Shri Ranga also mentioned that the Swatantra Party is opposed to this national Plan. I am very glad that he came to the real reason why they are opposing this Plan. He said that they are opposed to the public sector. When anybody opposes the public sector or that aspect of the Planning relating to the public sector, it is clear to my mind that there can be only one reason for it: the big capitalists, the private sector, the monopolists in the private sector, are going to be affected as we make progress in the public sector. Therefore, when anybody objects to the public sector, naturally, I would come to the conclusion that he is one of the interested quarters and he is one who is for private monopolies in this country.

During the First and Second Five Year Plans, we made a good deal of progress as far as agriculture is concerned. Especially during the second Plan period, we had not to face the food crisis as acutely as we had to previously.

Very rightly, yesterday, when the hon. Prime Minister initiated the debate on the national Plan, he referred to agriculture. He said that we still lack in agriculture department and he made special reference to the agricultural administration and agri-

cultural services. I have also emphasised this point right from the very beginning and have said that unless and until we bring the agricultural services, whether on the administrative side or on the research side, at par with and equal to the other administrative services in our country, we will not be able to attract bright, young men and the available talent of the country for working in the agricultural administrative services or for doing agricultural research. I would strongly plead for the improvement of the agricultural aspect of the Plan—both on the administrative and the research side.

From time to time, when there had been a discussion on the Nalagarh Committee's report—it was also known as the Agricultural Administration Report—the hon. Minister always stated in his replies that the matter is under consideration in consultation with the Governments of the States and that the various recommendations and proposals are being framed and those proposals would be implemented during the third Plan period. I think that this is the most appropriate moment when the Central Government can take a decision for the betterment of the agricultural services. Especially when the hon. Prime Minister has also felt the need for this, certainly there cannot be any difficulty about it, and therefore, when they accept the principle, why not the Government come out at the end of this debate and say that all the recommendations of the Nalagarh Committee's report for the betterment of the agricultural services are accepted by the Central Government and those recommendations shall be implemented?

We have seen what progress has been made in the field of agricultural research by other countries. We certainly are much behind, compared to the United States or Soviet Russia in the field of agricultural research. Why? Because firstly we lack in good men to work in that field, and secondly,

there is not the required research incentive or initiative in the field of agriculture. We can overcome all these basic difficulties when we provide better emoluments and better facilities for the agricultural research workers. As I have already mentioned that can be done only if we accept all the recommendations made by the Nalagarh Committee.

Now I would like to say a few words about Jammu and Kashmir State. During the first two Plans, just as in other parts of the country, we have made a good deal of progress in Jammu and Kashmir State also, specially due to the personal efforts of our Prime Minister, Shri Bakshi Ghulam Mohamed, Jammu and Kashmir has made good progress in food production and in other fields of industries. During the third Five Year Plan, our greatest need is railways. We were promised that during the period of the second Plan, we would get at least 5 miles of Railways in Jammu and Kashmir State, but nothing has been done yet we hear that still the contracts are being finalised.

Our State is rich in minerals, forests and other raw materials required for industries all over the country. All this cannot be exploited unless there are better means of communication. There cannot be any other better means of communication except the Railways. We are grateful to the Central Government for the help—financial aid and technical aid—which we get from time to time. I am thankful that during his last visit to Srinagar, the hon. Railway Minister announced that during the third Plan, they would take the railways up to Jammu.

I only want to plead that now we have got tired of listening to these assurances about the Railways. I would only say that let it be said that in the coming two years, we would go up to Kathua and in the coming two

[Shri Inder J. Malhotra]

years, we would go up to Jammu. I would plead with the Central Government that all efforts should be made to see that during that period the Railway reaches the Jammu and Kashmir State. Otherwise, with these assurances, I am afraid we would be losing faith in the Railways and nothing else.

Another aspect of the third Five Year Plan in Jammu and Kashmir would be the development of industries. So far as small and medium-scale industries are concerned, to a greater extent the State Government have made efforts to establish small-scale industries. With the help of the Central Government, the State Government would be able to establish medium-scale industries also. As I have already said, we are rich in raw materials and what we need is financial and technical aid. That can only be given by the Central Government, keeping in view the availability of raw materials there and also the anxiety of the people of the Jammu and Kashmir State to develop all aspects of industries. I would appeal and request that the Central Government should consider it favourably and give more financial and technical aid for the development of industries to our State.

With these words, I fully support all aspects of the third Five Year Plan.

Ch. Brahm Prakash (Delhi Sadar):
Sir, I rise to support this Plan. I am glad to find that all sections of the House have not only supported this Plan, but in many respects given enthusiastic praise. No doubt there are exceptions, particularly Shri Ranga, who has always been an exception. The fulfilment of the first two Plans has given us strength and more faith in our objectives to build a socialist economy and democratic society.

We find that in this Plan certain broad objectives have been laid. I am

glad to find that the ambit of the public sector has been further increased. In certain fundamental aspects of the Plan also, we have gone forward. The foreign exchange problem is not there to that extent as it was in the first and second Plans. We are, no doubt, having an increased saving. We are now building certain heavy industries also, and laying down certain other fundamental bases of the Plan.

But in one respect, I feel diffident, viz., how far we are marching towards a socialist society. No doubt very good objectives have been laid down here. But the question is how and to what extent we are building the necessary institutions, because only laying down certain fundamental principles at the head of every chapter cannot take us towards our objectives. I can also accept that socialism cannot be built in a day or two or in a few years or in the course of the implementation of the few Plans, third, fourth or fifth, but certain steps have to be taken.

I find that the steps taken already are not sufficient and we have to take certain further steps. We have to create certain other institutions. We have to further broaden the public sector. Today we are almost under a sort of a capitalist economy. We are building no doubt a sort of managerial economy, but a managerial economy of nationalised industries is better than a capitalist economy, because a nationalised industry can be given over to other institutions of a socialist type, which can give strength and base to democracy. In the last analysis, it is the centre of economic power which determines the policies, the type of society we would like to live in, etc. If such centres of power are concentrated in a few places and in a few hands, naturally however loudly we may speak about our objectives, we will find in our day-to-day affairs that

our politics is controlled by those economic centres of power.

Here, in this Chapter on Co-operation, we have laid down:

"In a planned economy pledged to the values of socialism and democracy, co-operation should become progressively the principal basis of organisation in many branches of economic life, notably in agriculture and minor irrigation, small industry and processing, marketing, distribution, supplies, rural electrification, housing and construction and the provision of essential amenities for local communities."

It is again laid down:

"Economic development and social change are equally vital elements in the construction of India's social and economic structure. Co-operation is one of the principal means for bringing about changes of a fundamental nature within the economy."

14 hrs.

So we find that co-operation has been adopted as one of the principal means to determine the aspect of our socialism and also the aspect of the democracy we want to build. In that respect, no doubt we are speaking quite a bit and we have laid down very broad principles, but when we come to concrete terms what have we done about it? We have our big steel plants. We have also raised the production of electricity quite high. We are developing our minerals. But where are these minerals, this energy, this steel and all other basic materials ultimately going? They are going in the hands of few companies. They are being utilised mostly by a handful of companies in India. That means, all the investment is being concentrated in a few places. That is not good for the healthy growth of socialism or democracy.

We have bifurcated the public sector. We have allotted a certain amount of our investment to that sector. If we want to build democracy and socialism we must create a co-operative sector. No doubt, it is laid down here clearly that slowly we should build a co-operative sector. But what is the allotment that is being made to that sector? No doubt, from Rs. 200 crores it has been raised to Rs. 230 crores for development of co-operation and from Rs. 200 crores it has been raised to Rs. 530 crores for loans to agriculturists. I agree that a stipulation has been made in different places that priorities will be given to the co-operative industries. Of course, there are a few co-operative sugar mills, but that is not enough. A time has come when we must demarcate the co-operative sector, because the planners have accepted it as a basic line of development for our country.

Whatever could be said about this aspect has been said in the best possible way in the Plan, and I cannot add much to it. But I would urge upon the Government of India and the planners to appoint a high-powered board for the development of this sector, provide separate financial allotments for this sector and create a machinery to implement the schemes. Without taking these steps, all these formulations and all these objectives will just remain objectives on paper.

I also suggest that—no doubt, we have already certain centres of power: in the cities or in the urban areas; but in the village life, in the rural life we are creating a new power based on individual pursuits—at least in the rural areas, whether it is electric power or whether it is some other line of industry—except agriculture, which as a private concern is enjoyed by a limited section in the rural life—the benefits of loans, power, processing industries and other things in the villages should all be mostly given to the co-operatives or the panchayats or the block samitis or zilla parishads and not to individuals. New centres of

[Ch. Brahm Prakash]

power in the village life should not be created, because it will become a sort of a drawback on the development of our good democratic institutions.

Sir, I am fully in agreement with the basic conceptions of the Plan. They have laid down certain very good priorities, but for future development no immediate steps are being taken. Very good things have been said, but no concrete steps are shown.

Then, we have made certain suggestions about housing in the cities. With the increase of population in the urban areas every city is growing and the problem of slums and the problem of housing are very much on the increase. They have increased more than what we have been able to show here in our documents. No doubt, certain suggestions have been made in that connection also. Definite and sound steps have to be taken by every government and by every municipality. Funds also should be provided for that. I suggest that for the needs of the next 20 years all the land should be acquired by Government at public expense in every city. That will ultimately pay. A strong town planning organisation should be set up. I have been hearing for the last so many years that a town planning cell is being set up, but I find nothing concrete being done in that direction. That is very important.

Then I come to my last point, and that is in relation to an appeal made by the Prime Minister, that harmony and peace both internally as well as externally is very necessary for implementation of the Plan. Everybody including myself will be in full agreement with that. I also agree with my learned friend Shri Asoka Mehta that as far as possible all tensions, particularly political tensions should be removed. I agree with the policy of the Prime Minister in the present context and what he has been trying to do to remove these tensions wherever they occur.

It is also our wish that a constructive atmosphere is created in the country so that this basic Third Five Plan can have its success and then we can go on to the fourth and fifth Plans and move towards a self-sustaining economy. For that internal peace and harmony are no doubt necessary and so we should do our best to have emotional integration. It is true that our minds are at times working under the pressure of the past political and historical compulsions. If the Plan develops, the other social and economic compulsions will come into play, ultimately, and some constructive approach will come out. In this particular context, if we have any political objective, we try to achieve it, not by violent actions or by *bulch ha-tal* or by some such other means, we always try to solve the problems in a democratic way. After saying that, I have to say that I have not been able to find myself in agreement with the Prime Minister's assertion that the dominant language of Punjab is Punjabi. It is dominant in the Punjabi region of Punjab, but not in the whole of Punjab. The Prime Minister has stated that so many times in the last few months and it has definitely created a very adverse reaction in the Hariyana region of that State. If things like Punjabi is the dominant language of Punjab are said, it undoubtedly hurts the people living in the Hariyana region.

No doubt, this language question has been very dominant in our public life but, I am sure, that ultimately it will not have that sharpness and slowly we will be having our States according to administrative convenience. The present formation of States is not very satisfactory, though it may be politically very convenient to the whims and aspirations of one section or the other. But, administratively speaking, it is not very convenient.

I feel that the process of democratic decentralisation has been very slow

and it has been completed only in three States. Other States are only talking about it, but, ultimately, in course of time, it will come and will have its full play and the panchayat and block samities and zilla praisnads will ultimately develop into some zonal administration, because the distance from the zilla parishad to the State headquarter is too big. It has to be bridged by some administrative and political means.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi (Ludhiana): Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are in the first year of the Third Plan and we have seen two Plans. I am afraid, I cannot agree with those hon. Members who have criticised some aspects of the two Plans. It is certainly true that there have been shortfalls here and there; it is also true that there have been hurdles in the way in certain aspects, but the overall picture has certainly been very bright. It must be said to the credit of the planners as well as of those who have implemented it that it has been successful, particularly in the industrial sector. It has gone very well in public sector of industries more specially, in the industrial potential of the country and it has strengthened India. But there are, however, certain features of the Third Plan to which I would like to draw the attention of the Minister and I will limit my observations to three aspects, namely, firstly, the income disparity between the rural and the non-rural population in the First and Second Plan and its probable accentuation in the Third Plan; secondly, the necessity of emphasis on agricultural and rural economy and, thirdly, the elimination of regional disparities in the industrial development.

I am afraid that the gap between the rural and the non-rural sector, which has been very wide from the very outset, has become wider in the First and Second Plan and it is expected to become much wider in the Third Plan. Taking all the reports which have been given to us, you will find, that in the First Plan the increase

in the aggregate income has been 42 per cent. This modest increase in the national income does not, of course, give a full indication of the growth of potential of the different sectors in this country, but it does indicate the disparities that exist between the rural and non-rural income. While the income from the agricultural and the allied sector, which accounts for nearly half of the national income, is distributed over 70 per cent. of the population, and the increase there has been only a little over one-third in the First and Second Plan, if we look at the total income from the organised manufacturing sector, it has doubled and has spread over 30 per cent. of the population. Sir, you will see that in the non-rural and rural sector what a heavy disparity existed previously; which has been accentuated in the last ten years and what is going to be the condition in the next five years of the Third Plan is also obvious and patent from the Third Plan which we have in hand. This Plan does not go far in eliminating this disparity.

It is estimated that during the Third Plan period the increase in income will be 34 per cent. with the prices at 1960-61 level. Here you will find that the increase envisaged under the chapter on agricultural and allied sector would be only 25 per cent, whereas in the mineral and the factory establishments it will be 82 per cent. and in other sectors it will be 32 per cent. This clearly and patently establishes that these disparities which have already been accentuated in the First Plan and further accentuated in the Second Plan will become much wider in the Third Plan.

Not only this. Now the hon. Prime Minister was pleased to say, which the Report also indicates, that the per capita income of an individual in 1960-61 is Rs. 330. Let us see what the Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee says. The Second Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee has highlighted the fact that the per capita income of the casual agricultural labour is only

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi]

Rs. 93 per year and that of the unattached agricultural labour is Rs. 84 per year. So you will find that a vast majority of the agricultural labour, which is both unemployed and underemployed, has such low income. How much disparity prevails? With the *per capita* income at Rs. 330, of an Indian the income of an individual agricultural labourer is only Rs. 84 or Rs. 93. So, on the basis of this we have got to see how far the Third Plan eliminated this disparity and whether the emphasis on the agricultural and rural economy is as much as the circumstances call for and the previous experience of the two Plans shows.

I am afraid that much emphasis has not been placed on rural and agricultural economy. I concede that on paper the emphasis is there. The Report also shows that. It is stated that agricultural produce is very small, that output is very low, the fertilisers are going to be provided; better seeds shall be supplied, that farmers shall be given education to switch on to mechanical cultivation and do all that. I concede that they will be helped. But I would submit that the ultimate end of the Third Plan is 25 per cent increase in the income in agricultural sector. In the factories sector it will be 82 per cent, and in other sectors it will be 32 per cent. The overall increase will be 34 per cent. But my apprehension is that we may not be able to reach that target of 25 per cent, as the conditions are, because, you will find that land in the country is limited. The hon. Minister of Agriculture told us that in India the percentage of culturable land under cultivation is the highest. In such circumstances, is it possible that we would be able to reach that target and bring the level of the living standard of the rural population to that extent which prevails in the case of the urban population and the industrial population? Therefore my respectful submission is that there shall have to be a rethinking on this matter.

How can we properly implement our programme and planning pertaining to the bettering of the condition of the population in the rural areas where 71, per cent of our population lives? I concede that with the efforts to increase agricultural production we may possibly be able to reach the target of 100 million tons during the Third Plan. But that would not be sufficient unless two things are taken into consideration. First thing is the decentralisation of industry, that is, rural industrialisation as I would put it. The second thing, which is an essential thing is that you must have a price formula for foodgrains.

I was looking up the entire Report, particularly page 132 and others which deal with prices, just to see how far the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the planners are going to implement that commitment, namely, that there should be a minimum price to which a farmer is entitled. It is most essential. You are having that in the matter of consumer goods and industrial production where you keep a certain minimum. You give the producer a certain profit.

Over and above this, I wish that the planners had been kind enough, before they reached the final conclusion, to have had an economic survey to see how much it costs an agriculturist to produce foodgrains and other agricultural products and what should be the minimum to which he is entitled. My personal experience is that the price of foodgrains, particularly of wheat, if it is assessed how much it costs an individual farmer, would not be less than Rs. 22 per maund. I am afraid, this will create a lot of trouble in the urban areas. It might even upset the Plan if the prices are taken too high. I am not asking for that price. But I do ask: What has been done? What steps have been taken to have a proper survey for the fixation of the minimum price to which an agriculturist is entitled? That is my first point.

My second point is that it is very essential that we should have rural industrialisation. That is the only solution. It is essential that not only big projects should be taken to the rural areas but small-scale and medium-scale industries should be there. Greater emphasis should be on the cottage and village industries which should be brought up in the villages. That is essential. How shall this be done? I certainly agree with the suggestion which has emanated from one quarter and which has been supported by the hon. speaker who has preceded me that there should be an autonomous board for the purpose of rural industrialisation. It should have branches in each of the States which should look after a circle of a certain number of villages, say, 1,000 or 2,000 villages. It should see how we can have industries there. This board should have a large amount of money at its disposal. It should have autonomy in the matter of finances and it should see how we can have rural industrialisation. That is one way of doing it. I wish decentralisation in administration should take place. We are having Panchayats. We will have Zila Parishads and all that. They can be entrusted with this work. But it should be the function of an autonomous board. That should see how rural industrialisation can be had.

My next point is about disparities. I have already said that the only solution for bettering the condition of rural areas and looking after them is that industry should be decentralised. Rural areas should be given an opportunity, a chance, scope for the population there to have employment in spare time. That can be done if they are provided with industries nearby where they can get work and provide labour, casual or otherwise, or can send certain family members. That will save you from urbanisation also to which you are heading with heavy industries that are going up there. Heavy urbanisation also does create problems inasmuch as that further disparities occur because of the rise in the price of land in the towns which

means concentration of wealth in a few hands. So, decentralisation of industries and taking them to the rural areas to which, I feel, the Third Plan does not give sufficient emphasis though it has been touched upon, is a solution and to which attention should be given.

My third point pertains to regional disparities. I am glad that a whole chapter of this 700 and odd page volume is devoted to regional disparities. Quite a large number of figures have been given in one of these pages showing that the underdeveloped or backward areas have been given certain heavy projects. I will only mention about the Punjab. Other States would care for themselves. I am grateful, certainly, that a heavy machine tool factory of Rs. 7 crores which was long overdue has been given to Punjab. But I am afraid whether it is sufficient. I wish the planners while dealing with this chapter of regional disparities had given us figures of the *per capita* investment out of these Rs. 880 crores of investment. What is the *per capita* investment in each State in the heavy industries and public sectors? They should have shown how much disparity prevails. I remember in the beginning of the Second Plan, the *per capita* investment that was expected in the Punjab at the end of the Second Plan was Rs. 13 as against Rs. 48 in Madras, Rs. 104 in Bihar, and Rs. 98 in Bengal. But, I am afraid, some factories were not given to Punjab. The heavy industrial projects were not given. Now, for the first time, a heavy machine tool factory has been allotted for which I am grateful. I cannot understand why Punjab was not given the cement factory that was promised in the Second Plan and also the paper factory about which announcements have been made so often by some Punjab Ministers that there will be a paper factory in Kangra and other areas. I must submit that it is essential that these regional disparities should be removed. Punjab has got a concentration of smallscale

[Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi]

industries; but that is done by the people themselves. In the heavy industries sector, it is backward. I do expect that Punjab would be given justice and a fair deal.

About small-scale industries, I have a word to say and it is this. I am afraid, in the matter of financing small-scale industries sector, sufficient attention has not been paid. I know the hon. Minister for Industries is very keen about small-scale industries for they are the biggest employers. But, I am afraid, the treatment to the small-scale industries has not been very fair. It is admitted in the report that production of consumer goods in the small-scale industries has not increased and they have not been able to produce more goods because of lack of raw materials. May I ask what steps are being taken to see that the small-scale industries get sufficient raw materials. So far as I am submitting, the two things that the small-scale industries sector needs are finance and raw materials. Otherwise, the technical know-how is there and the Government is providing facilities in that connection. But, sufficient attention has not been paid to give them finance and raw material.

The last point is about education. I am glad that the investment in the Third Plan pertaining to education is gratifying. What I have to submit is about the teachers in the educational institutions. I do say that the teachers are the nation builders, for they are the educators. Unless you give them that status, that position in society and those emoluments that are necessary, I am afraid you will not be able to bring education to that level or make that progress that is necessary.

The last point which I am taking up is, it is very kind of the Prime Minister....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already dealt with three last points.

Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi: This is an additional point and I will finish in two minutes.

I was submitting that the Prime Minister was right when he said that no planning can stand unless there is emotional integration. I am afraid, my hon. friend Ch. Brahm Prakash, who spoke before me, was broaching a subject which is rather controversial. He said that Punjabi is not the dominating language in Punjab. I possibly cannot understand how Punjabi is not the dominating language in Punjab. The 93 lakh population of the Punjabi region is purely Punjabi-speaking. That is admitted. The 11 lakh population of Kangra is purely Punjabi-speaking, because Kangri is a dialect of Punjabi. That is also admitted authoritatively. The Haryana Prant, whose cause my hon. friend has taken has a population of 58 lakhs. At one time, it contained a large number of Muslims—one third—who have been all replaced by Punjabi-speaking people. If you look at the total population today, 78 per cent of entire Punjab is Punjabi-speaking. Yet, it is stated that it is not the dominating language. I am glad that the hon. Prime Minister has taken it up that in Punjab, Punjabi is the dominating language and it is broadly uni-lingual and the state language can be only Punjabi under the formula of 6th September, 1956 which the Union Ministry has recommended. If the Haryana people do not want let them settle themselves, we want emotional integration with the country. We are glad that the Prime Minister and the Central Government are keen to solve our problems by negotiations, by talks. That is a very welcome feature. I am sure steps will be taken to solve this intricate problem and save the tragedy that might come. I am sure, and I would believe that they will do something in this context.

Shri D. A. Katti (Chikodi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, the first two Plans are over and now the Third Plan is

ready to be put into operation. The first two plans were comparatively moderate; but the third plan is very big, the implementation of which will cost Rs. 10,500 crores. As the Plan embraces all aspects of life, it needs close scrutiny before this House approves it. Also it is essential to look back over the decade of planned development and to see how far the objectives of the Plan have been realised and promoted. This should be done most earnestly and I think an honest assessment of the results of the Plans would certainly be very much helpful in the implementation of the Third Plan.

At the very outset of this Plan, the basic objective of planned development is given. The basic objective is to provide the masses of Indian people opportunities to lead a good life. This objective can be realised by more production and by more even distribution of wealth, by shifting economic power from a few hands to the many. The question is, after the implementation of two plans, whether there has been more production and whether there has been more even distribution. So far as production is concerned, various figures are given in the Plan. According to these figures, the increase in national income is 42 per cent, per capita income 16 per cent, food-grains 46 per cent, industrial production 94 per cent, and power 148 per cent. Whether this is satisfactory production in proportion to the total investment is also a question. One thing is plain. Whatever targets were fixed have not been achieved. That is why we may not say that production is satisfactory.

Secondly, whether this is only on paper or this increase has actually occurred, whether it is statistical or factual is also a question. Hon. friends in the other side insist that this has been the progress, this has been the growth in the wealth of the country and this is a very considerable progress. For their satisfaction, I will

agree with them. But most important point for me is whether this wealth has been shared by the masses of the Indian people. That is the more important thing. Whether the social purpose of planning has been served: that is more important. Social purpose is the core of planned development. In 1954, Parliament adopted the socialist pattern of society as the objective of social and economic policy. Even yesterday, while initiating the debate on the Plan, the hon. Prime Minister laid so much stress on this point. That is why the question is whether that objective has been realised. The reply is, it is very unfortunate that this very objective, which is fundamental, which is the core, which is the essence of planning, has been completely neglected in spite of all the slogans of socialist pattern of society and all that. I think, if the ruling party is honest, it must accept this. Whether the social purpose has been served is the criterion. After applying that criterion, we must measure the success of the Plan. If we do it, I am sure, everybody will feel that the Plans have failed from this point of view. Forty-two per cent increase in national wealth, 16 per cent increase in per capita income, 41 per cent increase in agricultural production, 94 per cent increase in industrial production, all these have done nothing in improving the condition of the majority of the people.

On the contrary, the income of the common man has decreased in real terms. The Prime Minister once said that there has been an increase of 46 per cent in the national income, but he did not know where this had gone. He said this here some time back when the Draft Outline was being discussed, and he had then expressed his desire to have a probe into this matter. I do not know what has happened to that. But one thing is certain namely that this 46 per cent increase in the national income has not been shared by the common people or by the

[Shri D. A. Katti]

majority of the people. There are the landless labourers, for instance. Then, there are the poor peasants, whose number cannot be less than 50 per cent of our population; their wages have not increased. There is such an inflation. There is under-employment. So, they have not in any way been benefited on account of these Plans. This fact cannot be disputed. As for industrial labour also, there is no change in their wages. They have also not participated in this increase in national income. So, the industrial labour has not been benefited; the agricultural labour has not been benefited; the poor peasants have not been benefited; and the middle class people have been very hard hit because of inflation, and they have also not been benefited. There is no change in the villages also, and the villages are as they were. The developments that have taken place in the small-scale and village industries sector have also not solved the problem of unemployment, nor have they increased the wages of these poor workers. This is the result of the two Plans. If all these people have not been benefited on account of this planned development, and they have not been able to share in this 46 per cent increase in the national income, then who are the people who have been the shareholders in this increase in national income? Naturally, it follows that it is only the industrialists, it is only the big merchants, it is only the contractors, and it is only the men in power who have been benefited.

Therefore, I am very sorry to say that there is such a gap between the policy statement and the actual performance. There is such a startling contradiction between deeds and words. Unfortunately, those who have produced this increased wealth, and who should have been the beneficiaries of the planned economic development have been the people who have had to make sacrifices in order to make these handful of people happy. That is why there is frustra-

tion among the people today. There is seething discontent among the people.

I agree that this Third Plan is a march towards generating a self-sustaining economy, and it must be successful. But, for that purpose, there should be public co-operation also. But because of the past results, because the plans are not meant for the general public, the general public is not going to extend any co-operation in this matter.

In the Plan itself, it has been stated that:

"The existence of under-developed and poverty-stricken nations or peoples is itself an abiding danger to the maintenance of peace."

This statement can very well be applied to our country. There is the existence of poverty of a kind which the world does not know. That is why the existence of this poverty is also an abiding danger to the maintenance of peace in our country. But the ruling party does not take into consideration this factor. Rather, the poverty of the people is very much of an advantage to the Congress Party. Because of the poverty in the rural areas, the poor people cannot go against the Congress people or the Congress party at the time of elections. They are at the mercy of the rich people, and that is why it is very easy for them to retain power, with the help of this poverty. But a day will come when they will have to face a crisis.

Agriculture is given very great importance in the Third Plan. While rapid industrialisation of the country is very much essential, agriculture is bound to remain the foundation of India's economy. Therefore, any scheme to increase agricultural production, which does not take into consideration the question of reconstruction of agriculture will be doomed to disappointment. In the First

Plan, agriculture was given a priority. In the Second Plan, though priority was not given, yet, it was not neglected. In the Third Plan, stress is laid on agriculture and it has been stated to be the foundation of our economy.

In spite of all the efforts that have been made, agricultural production has not been increased. Some say that though irrigation potential was made available it was not exploited for agricultural purposes, and that was the reason for no increase. Some say that it was due to natural calamities that the production could not increase. Some say that fertilisers were not produced in sufficient quantities, and we could not import also more fertilisers because of foreign exchange difficulties, and that is why the production has not gone up. These may be the reasons, but the most important reason is this; the primitive method of agriculture, that is being followed is the root-cause why there is no increase in production. So, cultivation by primitive methods will have to be abandoned, and agriculture will have to be mechanised. But, mechanised agriculture will necessitate large-scale farming; that is to say, cultivation of small-scale holdings will have to be replaced by large-scale farming, and this can only be done by introducing co-operative farming or collective farming. That is being done, but that has not been successful, because the big landlords think that the service co-operatives would ultimately lead to collective farming, and even those who are having just one or two acres of land are not prepared to go in for common cultivation, because there is that love for individual ownership in them. That idea of individual ownership is the root-cause why people are not coming forward to cultivate their lands in common.

Therefore, in order to bring about agrarian reforms through co-operatives, what is essential is that an atmosphere of equality and non-exploitation should be created, and this

can be done only by resorting to a radical type of land reform. The land reform should have two objectives. One is discouragement of cultivation through hired labour, and secondly, there should be non-exploitation. Land must be made available to those who would like to live on it by working on the land. Whatever land reforms have been undertaken so far lack the force of reform at all. We find that the same old policy which was followed in the First and Second Plans is being followed in the Third Plan also. The land reforms that have been made so far have not been able to create the new atmosphere or change the structure of the land holdings. Since the same policy is going to be continued in the Third Plan also, we cannot expect any change in the structure of land-holdings. Therefore, we cannot expect to solve the problem of the landless labourers without whose labour all the lands will lie fallow.

On the contrary, the present land reforms have disturbed production, because nobody is sure as to what is going to happen; the landlords are not certain, and the tenants also are not certain about what is going to happen to the lands. Therefore, there is no proper development of the land also. That is the reason why production has been hampered. Therefore, it logically follows, or rather it is imperative that if we want co-operative farming to be successful, without which mechanised farming is not possible, individual ownership will have to be abolished, and ownership will have to be vested in the co-operatives, that is, land co-operatives. Of course, for this purpose, land will have to be taken over; you may call it nationalisation of land; I am not bothered about these terms. But in order to do that, possession of land will have to be taken, and instead of the land being redistributed to the individuals, the co-operatives should be made to own all these lands; then, it will be possible to have this joint farming possible and also a fair distribution of wealth. Then, people will

[Shri D. A. Katti]

certainly try their best to produce more, because there will be the incentive to work more. Now, the agricultural labourer who tills the land gets only 12 annas per day. There is no incentive for him to work. There is no justification for exploiting labour in this way. This may appear to be very revolutionary to many people, especially our friends representing the Swatantra Party. But in view of the dire need to produce more and minimise disparities in income and to achieve the objective of a socialist pattern of society, this will have to be done. Rather, I would say that this is not such a radical step at all. We have the joint Hindu family; this will be a bigger family the only difference is that there will be no right to ask for partition as it is in the joint Hindu family.

After saying so much about agriculture, I come to indirect taxation. Indirect taxation will have to be avoided under any circumstances if the Government are not going to allow the situation to worsen. There is already so much rise in the prices of essential commodities. There is unemployment and under-employment. The wages are not high. In spite of all this, if Government would try to collect Rs. 1,600 crores by way of indirect taxation, that will certainly hit the people very badly. So Government will have to think twice before doing this. They must try to find some other source of revenue and must drop this idea of levying additional taxation to the tune of Rs. 1,600 crores. Some people have described this taxation as 'grinding taxation'. It will definitely grind the people. They are now worst hit. This will be the greatest blow to them.

There are other sources of revenue which can be exploited. For example, in the Third Plan also, the policy of Prohibition is continued. We had thought that Government would pay some attention, take into account the experience of the past and do away with Prohibition. But not only is

Prohibition to be continued but it is going to spread over more States. That is the policy. This policy of Prohibition has not done any good. Even from the equity point of view, there is no justification for Prohibition. The general public is made to pay the cost of Prohibition. Why should the general public be made to pay the cost of reforming a lakh or two habitual drunkards, addicts. Why should the general public be made to pay the cost of reforming a lakh or two habit-wants such as education, health and housing are crying for remedy? Why not make use of this money on development work? Why not give priority to the hungry over the drunkard? The question is, who should get greater attention, the drunkard or the hungry? These are pertinent questions one would like to ask. But from the other side, there is no reply to any of these except arrogance and obstinacy. That is why I suggest that Prohibition should be scrapped throughout the country. It will give the Government Rs. 200 crores or more during five years. There will also be saving of money now spent on the enforcement of Prohibition.

Then I come to the community development works on which we are going to spend Rs. 300 crores. I have said in this House on many occasions that the community development programme is a big farce. It has not done any good whatever. This work can very well be done by the revenue department, the agriculture department and the public works department. Now they are doing it. So why is this agency required? I do not know. What is this community development work? Some gram sevaks goes to a village. It is a very depressing sight to see him there because he does nothing. He takes Rs. 10, Rs. 15 or Rs. 20 for issuing a certificate that a certain person has planted so much sugarcane and so on. This is an additional burden on the people. So as I said, the community development organisation has not done anything. Its work can be done

by the other departments which are doing it. So this should be done away with and we can save Rs. 300 crores.

I am sorry to say that in the name of social welfare, some of the voluntary organisations that are being financed are doing party work for the Congress Party. They are carrying on party propaganda.

Some Other Members: No, no.

Some Other Hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Shri D. A. Katti: I say this out of my personal experience. This is a true thing. Public money cannot be utilised for this work of the Congress Party. Therefore, that expenditure should also be cut.

A lot of money is wasted in construction works. Money is wasted on dams. The dams are so strong that within one or two years they burst causing unparalleled loss of life and property. This is due to corruption. There is no honesty, there is no efficiency. They say that people must have a sense of duty to the country. There is no sense of duty in these people. They are after money. Corruption should be put an end to. Wasteful expenditure should be avoided. If these things are done, I am sure we will not be required to levy additional taxation to the tune of Rs. 1,600 crores. And, it will save the people from a great disaster.

I will say one or two words about the plight of the people who are the worst hit. They are the Scheduled Castes, the backward classes and the Scheduled Tribes. For them only Rs. 114 crores have been provided in the Plan. Out of this amount, only 30 crores are ear-marked for Scheduled Castes who constitute number 8 crores in the country. I do not understand why only Rs. 30 crores are given for them. Then Rs. 9 crores; or Rs. 10 crores are given to the backward classes and the rest to the Scheduled Tribes. I do not un-

derstand this discrimination. The population of the Scheduled Tribes is not even one third of the Scheduled Castes. Many of them are landlords; amongst them there are rajas also whereas among the Scheduled Castes, there are no landlords; they are all labourers. But the Scheduled Tribes are getting more than double of what the Scheduled Castes are getting, and the backward classes are getting only Rs. 9 crores. This is nothing. Out of Rs. 30 crores, Rs. 15 crores will be spent on the education of the Scheduled Castes. The Scheduled Castes people are asked to produce income certificate. Amongst them, not even one in a lakh has any good income, whereas amongst the Scheduled Tribes, there are so many people with good income. But in the case of Scheduled Tribes, no income certificate is required. More money is given to the Scheduled Tribes and less is given to the Scheduled Castes, though their number is 8 crores. A sum of Rs. 15 crores is ear-marked for the economic uplift of the Scheduled Castes i.e. per head per year it works out to 5 annas. That is what Government are giving them for their economic uplift, whereas because of taxation, they are getting more than 10 annas from them every day per head. But no benefit goes to them. This is the economic unliftment Government are providing to the Scheduled Castes. This is a great injustice being done to the Scheduled Castes' people. That is my feeling.

When they ask for lands, even wastelands are not given. For their education, they have to furnish income certificate. So far as trade is concerned, there is a monopoly created and the Scheduled Castes cannot enter there. They are wage-earners but their wages do not increase, and nothing is done by this House or this Government to increase their wages. This is the lot of the Scheduled Castes people, and therefore I consider the ruling party is not at all doing anything in the interests of the Scheduled Castes. They should take note

[Shri D. A. Katti]

of it, and increase the amount for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes people.

15 hrs.

राजा महेश्वर प्रताप : श्रीमान् जी, मेरा तो एक ही कहना है ज्यादा तर कि जो मोचने का ढंग है, उसको बदला जाये। यह जो नक्शा बनाया गया है, यह बहुत बड़ा बनाया गया है और इसमें बड़े सब्ज बाग दिखलाये गये हैं। बहुत अच्छी बात है। बहुत सी बातें जो हमारे दोस्तों ने कही है, वे मैं भी कहना चाहता था लेकिन जब उनको उन्होंने कह दिया है तो फिर उनको दीहगने की जरूरत नजर नहीं आती है। मेरा कहना यह है कि आप ज्यादा नक्शे मत बनाइये, लोगों को अपने नक्शे आप बनाने दीजिये, आप सारी ताकत अपने हाथ में मत लीजिये, लोगों को मच्चे मानों में ताकत दीजिये। मैं तो स्वतंत्र हूँ और स्वतंत्र पार्टी का भी सदस्य नहीं हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सभी लोग जो यहां हैं, स्वतंत्र हो जायें, यह पार्टी के फंदे उनके गले में से निकल जायें। साथ ही साथ मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि तमाम देश भी स्वतंत्र हो जाये। आज स्वतंत्र नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आजकल जो तरीके मोचने के हैं, उनको बदला जाये। जो तरीका आजकल चल रहा है उसमें किसी का दोष नहीं है, किसी की कोई गलती नहीं है। हमारे जो बजुर्ग हैं, हमारे जो नेता हैं, हमारे जो वजीर साहिबान हैं, उन्होंने एक खास तरह की तालीम पाई है और उसके मुताबिक ही वे किया करते हैं। इसलिए किसी का भी दोष नहीं है। मैंने यह कई बार कहा है कि इसमें उनकी कोई गलती नहीं है। जब हिन्दू घर में रह कर कोई लड़का बड़ा होगा तो वह मंदिर ही जायेगा, मुस्लिम घर में बड़ा होगा तो मस्जिद ही जायेगा। मैं जो बड़े हुए हूँ, धंधेजी तालीम में बड़े हुए हूँ। इन के लिए संदेन ही मका है। ठीक है, इसमें कोई हर्ज की बात भी नहीं है। लोगों को आजादी होनी चाहिए।

इस वक्त कोशिश यह की जाती है कि जो कुछ हो वह सरकार करे, कारखाने सरकार बनाये तथा और जो काम भी हो वह सरकार करे। हमारी सम्यता में यह लिखा हुआ है कि जब राजा व्यापार करने लगता है तो देश का सत्यानाश हो जाता है। हमारी सरकार जब व्यापार करने लगी है तो ईश्वर जाने इस देश का क्या लगेगा।

मेरा कहना यह है कि व्यापार जो है, इसको व्यापारियों को करने देना चाहिए। हमारे जो महकमे के लोग हैं, वे उतनी अच्छी तरह से लोगों का इतिजाम नहीं कर पाते हैं। लोग काम नहीं करते हैं। इसके लिए हमारी सरकार कुछ कोशिश नहीं करती है। मैंने बारहा कहा है, इसी सदन में कहा है, आप कानून मत बनाइये, लेकिन रोज ही एक कानून बना दिया जाता है। कोई ठिकाना भी हो। आप आदमी बनाइये, इसके लिए कोशिश करिये। मेरी सदाचार गुट है, मेरा प्रेम धर्म है, मेरा संसार संघ है। मैं तो इसी कोशिश में हूँ कि जहां तक हो, आदमी बनाये जायें। इसके लिए हम खास तरीके से, एक डिपार्टमेंट या एक संस्था बनायें, इसके लिए कोई अलहदा वजारत बनाय। जैसा हमारा समाज चल रहा है, उसको देखते हुए हमें कार्रवाई करनी चाहिए।

यहां पर गांवों की बात एकसर की जाती है। यह हकीकत है कि गांवों में कुछ लोगों के पास जमीन है, कुछ के पास नहीं है। यह कहने के लिए बड़ी अच्छी बात है कि सब को बराबर बना दो, जमीन उन सब में तकसीम कर दो, जिन के पास जमीन नहीं है। शायद उनको ऐसा जब कहा जाता है तो अच्छा भी लगता है। मगर मेरा कहना यह है कि एक तो आपने राजा महाराजाओं को मिटाया और यहां तक नहीं मोचा कि कौन अच्छा राजा है और कौन बुरा राजा है। आपको याद रखना चाहिए कि महाराजा बड़ोदा जैसे भी महाराजा हुए हैं जिन्होंने

अप्रेजों को भी रास्ता दिखाया था । इस चीज को तो आपने सोचा नहीं, सब को मिटा दिया । जो अच्छे थे उनको भी मिटा दिया . . .

उदाध्यक्ष महोदय : महाराजाओं को मिटाया, राजा तो हैं ।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : अब महाराजे जो हैं वे मुसाहब बन गए हैं कांग्रेस वालों के और उनकी तारीफ करने लग गए हैं । ठीक है, उनको तारीफ करनी भी आती है । यह तो हुआ । जागिरे मिट गई, इमको भी हमने देख लिया । उन सब को मिटाने वक्त हम यह तो देखते कि कौन अच्छे राजे थे, कौन हमेशा मेवा करने थे, कौसे अच्छे, उनसे से किन्हीं के ख्याल थे, मगर इन सब चीजों पर हमने पानी फेर दिया । वे भी गए । अब गांवों में भी जिन के पास कुछ जमीन है, उनको लाले पड़ गए हैं । वे ममझने लग गए हैं कि यह सरकार कौसी सरकार है जो कहती है कि सब को आजादी दी हुई है, हमारी आजादी को ही छीनने लग गई है, हमारे घर भी लेने को तैयार है, हमारी जमीन भी लेने को तैयार है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक हम तरह के गांव हैं जहां पर कि कुछ जमीन वाले हैं, कुछ मजदूर हैं, तब तक हम यह देखें कि मजदूर को अच्छी मजदूरी मिले, उसको तकलीफ न हो और सब मिल कर रहे । गांव में तीन तरह के लोग हैं, एक वे हैं जिन के पास जमीन है, एक वे हैं जिन के पास जमीन नहीं है और जो मजदूरी बगैरह करते और तीसरे वे हैं जिन को धाटिजेन कहा जाता है, ममलन, बर्डी है, लुहार है, कपड़ा बुनने वाला है, रंगरेज है जो कि कुछ चीजें बनाते हैं और उनकी जरूरियात को पूरा करते हैं । अब इनमें कुछ मजदूर तो जरूर रहेंगे ही । हाँ एक बात है । जब मेरा जो तर्ज-अमल है, जो मैं कहना हूँ अगर उसको मान लिया जाए और उसके मुनाबिक काम किया जाए तो हालत बदल सकती है । अगर गांव गांव में स्कूल खुल जाए और इनको इस तरह का बना दिया जाए

कि जो विद्यार्थी हैं वे खेती भी करें, कारखानों में भी काम करे और सब मिल कर मालिक हो जाएं जमीन बगैरह के तो आज जो तरीका चल रहा है वह नहीं रहेगा । आप सड़ाइये मत । होना यह चाहिये कि हम आसानी के साथ तबदीली कर दें अपने समाज की और कोई लड़ाई बगैरह न हो । मेरा सब से बड़ा मंत्र यह है कि सब को सब के लाभ में लगा कर सब को सुखी बनाया जाए । हमारा उसूल यह है कि हम देखें कि कौन बिचार लड़ाता है, कौन बिचार मिलाता है और जो बिचार लड़ाता है, चाहे वह दीन के कपड़े पहन कर आए, चाहे पार्टी के पहन कर आए चाहे आसमानी कपड़े पहन कर आए या कुछ और पहन कर आए, वह बुरा बिचार है और जो बिचार मिलाता है वह अच्छा बिचार है । हम तो ऐसा समाज बनाना चाहते हैं कि किसी को किसी तरह का कोई तकलीफ न रहे ।

मान लीजिये कि आपके पास एक लाख रुपया हो गया । अब हमें देखना चाहिये कि यह रुपया किमी बुरे काम में इस्तेमाल न हो । हम सारे अपने कानूनों को, तमाम अपनी स्कीमों को, तमाम अपनी ताकत को इसमें इस्तेमाल करे कि कोई धादमी शराबी न रहे, कोई जुधारी न रहे, कोई बदचलन न रहे और इसके लिए हम से जो कुछ हो सके, हम करें । इसके लिए हम मुहल्ले मुहल्ले में, गांध गांध में, जगह जगह पर ऐसी मस्यारों कायम करें जो यह देखें कि आया यह धादमी शराब तो नहीं पीता है, बदचलन तो नहीं है . . .

उदाध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर बुरे नहीं रहेंगे, तो फिर नेक भी नहीं रहेंगे ।

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : अगर बुरे रहते हैं तो यह सारा जो प्लान है यह चलेगा किमे जब धादमी शराब होंगे, बुरे होंगे, शराबी होंगे, जुधारी होंगे तो फाइर प्लान चलायेगा कौन ?

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि हम सब यह कोशिश करे कि जहाँ तक हो सके, ऐसी

[राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप]

समाज बनाये कि उसमें किसी तरह की किसी को कोई तकलीफ न रहे।

आज क्या हालत हो गई है? पंजाब में आज पंजाबी सूबे को ले कर आन्दोलन चलाया जा रहा है। हमारी सरकार इस मामले को तय नहीं कर पाई है। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी हमारे निहायत माननीय, मुहतरम प्रधान मंत्री हैं। उनके पास मैं गया था। मैंने उनको छः सफे का एक नोटि दिया था उस वार में जो कुछ मैंने ताई उन और जापान इत्यादि में देखा : मैंने एक और सफा पंजाबी सूबे के बारे में भी दिया न है। मैंने उनका याद दिलाया कि जब पंजाब में हिन्दो आन्दोलन चल रहा था तो आपने मुझे जोप दी, कार दी, आदमी दिए और चौ० ग्णवीर सिंह और दौलता साहब मेरे साथ गए और हम ने आन्दोलन किया, हमने प्रचार किया १६ जगह रोहतक में, तीनों आदमियों ने। इस का नतीजा यह हुआ कि जो आन्दोलन था वह खत्म हो गया, और कांग्रेस ने मुझे धन्यवाद दिया। अभी मैं ने अर्ज किया कि उस को आप याद कीजिये। मैं यह दा। करता हूं कि दो महीने के अन्दर पंजाब में कोई लड़ाई नहीं रह जायेगी। मैं कहता हूं कि आप पंजाबी सूबा बन जाने दीजिये और यह मेरा काम है। कि हिन्दू और सिख मिल जाये। और वह कैसे? मैं ने कहा कि दसों गुरु जो हमारे थे, गुरु नानक से ले कर गुरु गोविन्द सिंह तक, यह दसों गुरु खन्ना थे। जिस तरह से ब्राह्मणों ने राजपूतों को उठाया और राजा बनाया, उसी तरह से हमारे खड़ी भाइयों ने जाटों को उठाया और राजा बनाया, फिर अहलुवालियों और अरोड़ों को उठाया। यह चार कौमें हैं जो सिख समाज में चलती है, यानी खत्री, जाट, अहलुवालिया और अरोड़ा। अगर आप इन चार कौमों की जमातें बना दें, संघ बना दें तो काम चल सकता है। खत्री संघ, जिस में सिख खत्री हों और हिन्दू खत्री हों, जाट संघ, जिस में जाट सिख और हिन्दू सिख हों, इसी

तरह में अहलुवालिया और अरोड़ा संघ के अन्दर भी हों।

श्री बाल्मीकी (बुलन्दशहर) : रक्षित अनुसूचित जातियां) : मजहबियों का क्या होगा ?

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : मजहबी चमार, भंगी सब हमारे भाई हैं, उन के लिये भी हमारी यही कोशिश है।

श्री बाल्मीकी : मैं ने कहा कि मजहबी सिखों का क्या होगा ?

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : मैं अर्ज करता हूं कि हमारे गुरुओं ने मजहबी सिखों को भी गम्ना रियासा है कि वे इस दुनिया में भी गुन्बी रहें और दूसरी दुनिया में भी उन का भला हो।

श्री बजरज सिंह : पंजाबी सूबे के बारे में आप क्या कह रहे थे ?

राजा महेन्द्र प्रताप : मेरा कहना यह है, और हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी यह बात कही है कि अगर दुनिया में कही लड़ाई हो गई तब फिर क्या बनेगा ? यहां कुछ भी नहीं हो सकेगा। यह बात बिल्कुल ठीक है। उन्होंने बड़ी अच्छी बात कही कि अगर दुनिया में लड़ाई हो गई तो सभी कुछ पर पानी फिर जायेगा। आज आप क्या कर रहे हैं जिस में दुनिया में लड़ाई न हो। सिर्फ व्याख्यान देने से लड़ाई खत्म नहीं होगी। इस के लिये मेरा एक तरीका है, एक कार्यक्रम है। वह यह कि आप संसार संघ को अपनाइये। जैसे हसियों ने कम्युनिज्म को अपनाया है, जैसे अंग्रेजों और अमरीकनों ने डिमाक्रेसी को अपनाया है, उसी तरह से हम अपना क्रीड, अपना मजहब, अपना दीन और धर्म बना लें संसार संघ को और उस के लिये काम करे। इस के लिये तरीका यह होना चाहिये कि जो योरप की छोटी छोटी रियासतें हैं उन को आप साथ लें।

वे हमारे साथ आयेंगे। लैटिन अमरीका के जो राष्ट्र हैं, वे हमारे साथ आयेंगे, एशिया अफ्रीका में जो आजाद रियासतें हैं वे हमारे साथ आयेंगे और जर्मनी और जापान हमारे साथ आयेंगे। अभी जब मैं जापान में गया था तो वहां के भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री किशि ने कहा था कि हमारे लिये सिर्फ एक ही रास्ता है कि हम संसार संघ को अपनायें तबाम दुनिया में एक हकूमत बनायें तो तमाम दुनिया में अमन रहेगा और हम तरक्की करते चलेंगे। तमाम मुल्क तरक्की करते चलेंगे और मुल्कों में लड़ाई नहीं हो सकेगी।

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Sir, I pay my tribute at the outset to members of the Planning Commission for the laborious study they have made of economic requirements and the material wealth of the Indian Republic for the last ten years and for the coming fifteen years and presenting them in the form of this report to this Parliament for their consideration. It is a stupendous work and those who have devotedly laboured at it deserve our thanks and gratitude. In the report elaborate statements are given showing what has been achieved in the first two Plans, the targets for the Third Plan and its outlay in all its details and the targets to be achieved in the Fourth and the Fifth Plans also. The Third Plan is a big broad bridge on which you can stand and take a view of the past ten years and a glimpse of ten years after 1965 and hence at one glance you can see the whole view of the river of Planning effort of the Indian Republic over a distance of 25 years and even there you do not see the end of it. My point is this. For the present its further progress is bound to be indistinct and hazy owing to the distance of time. What will be the nature beyond fifteen years after 1961 is suggested, however, in one remarkable observation in the report. It says that "the period of the Third Plan, 1961-65, represents the first stage of a decade or more of intensive development lead-

ing to a self-reliant and self-generating economy." In this passage the main point of difference between the economy of the period of 1961-75 and the period thereafter is clearly laid down. If I have understood the passage right, it means that for the development in that period, i.e. after 1975, India will be self-reliant and its economy will be self-generating. In plain language it means that it will not need to approach other nations for monetary assistance and perhaps even for technical assistance. Our own resources at that time will be enough for all our requirements thereafter. It is, therefore, inevitable that this Plan and the two coming Plans will call for the maximum rate of investment. The question is how to get the huge sum needed for carrying out these Plans. It can be done by getting loans from the money markets of the big nations of Europe, America, etc. Government decided on the policy of including most of the key industries in the public sector. A fraction only is left for the private sector. Already there was a nucleus of the public sector—the Indian Railways and the Post and Telegraphs Department which are mainly commercial departments and also looked upon by the people as utility concerns. They were owned and run by them. But the real reason, in my humble opinion, for expanding and widening the field of the public sector was more of an ideological nature; than of economic nature. There are examples of countries which have made great economic progress in Asia and in Europe without being committed to the ideology of socialism. But the Prime Minister in opening the debate on this motion made it perfectly clear that this is not merely a Plan of pure economic advance but it aims at something more ambitious; it has to lead the people to accept a social revolution by following a socialist pattern. I do not know why he has not stated that the Government of India's policy is to make India a socialist State, why it has not been put like that to be sufficiently intelligible to the man-

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

in-the-street that the Indian republic will be a socialist State. It is no use beating about the bush and not naming the thing as it is. For some years in the past the people are seeing it, some with understanding it and with all its implications, many without grasping its full significance. The rise of the Swatantra Party—of which Shri Ranga is the leader in this House, and the leader of that party is interpreting the Congress programme and the various measures of the State Governments in that light to which I referred. That party is proclaiming itself as the champion of the rights of private property and individual liberty. That is the stand that the Swatantra Party has taken as regards the Congress programme.

But there is one aspect which I want to refer to. I am not concerned with the question as to whether the idea is good or bad. That is not the question; I am not referring to the theoretical point of view. I am drawing your attention to a practical thing which I wish those who are present on the Government Benches should note carefully. There is one aspect which perhaps has not attracted much attention so far. Our Prime Minister has made a statement here on the 21st instant, that is, yesterday. In a few days he will be proceeding to Belgrade to attend an important international conference. This is just the time when the tension between the western nations—U.S.A., U.K., France and West Germany—on one side and Soviet Russia and some others on the other is unfortunately growing and increasing. I am afraid that the statement made by the Prime Minister in moving the motion for adoption of the third Five Year Plan is likely to be very critically read by the diplomats in the two groups and is very likely to be understood or misunderstood by each party in its own way or interpreted in its own way. The position of India as a neutral State, a common friend of all States, irrespective of the ideologies which is believed in by them or the form of their own Gov-

ernment, is a matter of great significance to India. Anything that may give rise to a slightest suspicion or doubt about that stand must be scrupulously avoided as far as possible. His power of influencing world opinion on matters of international importance must remain in that. I want that it should remain unimpaired. That is my excuse for dilating on this point at such a length.

I do not want one party to say that he is going nearer the socialist States dominated by Russia or others, and I also do not want Moscow to say the same thing about him that he is one of the capitalist nations. That misunderstanding between these two groups of nations about India's position, owing to the show of courtesy, and the show of respect shown by them, is not always openly expressed. But there is in a way a reservation in their minds. The statements of the Prime Minister may not be taken as candid expressions, and received with full and perfect understanding. That is the danger. But the policy which is now followed by India is the thing which has really given strength to India in the present time—the position that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru occupies today is very important and essential and our whole strength and position in the international world depends upon that position being maintained. From that point of view, I have looked at his statement made in this House, and I began to entertain these apprehensions after reading his speech very carefully.

It was generally understood on the statements made by responsible Ministers of States, when the first and second five year Plans were being prepared and discussed in the public platforms in the two Houses of Parliament, that in the developing economy of the under-developed countries deficit budgeting was not only permissible but even inevitable. This was taken as an axiom, the validity of which could not be questioned by those who are not supposed to have

a thorough knowledge in the science of economics. This was the proposition of experts. Our distinguished Finance Minister boldly departed from this policy by introducing a surplus budget for 1961-62 by raising revenue and heavily taxing the people. We have passed the Finance Bill and the taxes imposed by it. I do not want to discuss the taxation policy of Government in this speech. I was anxious to find out why our very shrewd Finance Minister thought of departing so suddenly from the policy of his predecessors who were also very distinguished economists.

The other day, our Prime Minister replied to the wild allegations made by Gen. Ayub Khan, the President of Pakistan, particularly regarding the aid given by America to the Government of India. Gen. Ayub Khan's allegation was that the money given as aid to India by America for economic and industrial projects enables India to spare money and spend more on defence and that constitutes a source of insecurity to Pakistan. That was his complaint. In the reply, I think the Prime Minister stated that every aid given to India for economic purpose requires India to spend some money from her own pocket to make use of that help. It is well known that all help given to us by America was without any strings, without any political condition or understanding between the two. But the U.S.A. seem to have agreed to help the economic projects provided the Government of India gives proof of doing their best to start those things on our own resources.

One of the things on which our Finance Minister was warmly congratulated by our countrymen on his return from his visit to the U.S.A. was his great success in persuading that Government and the business concerns of that great country to give enough assistance in money and expert technicians to promote our programme of economic development and industrial progress. If I have correctly interpreted the statement of our Prime

Minister, it is obvious that the Finance Minister was drawn to the necessity of getting money in India by various means including taxation also. That seems to me to be the main reason for him to approach the House with heavy taxation proposals and preaching a homily to the people on the necessity of making sacrifices in the interest of the future generations. That seems to be, in my opinion, the main motive behind the Finance Bill and the financial proposals which imposed heavy taxation on the Indian people, in spite of the fact that his predecessor and he himself also sometimes went by the principle that the economy of the underdeveloped country requires a deficit budget. And he did away with the idea of deficit budget. Whether that is going to be for that year only is a matter to be seen. But there may be a departure from that also. He has departed by imposing a heavy taxation to the extent of Rs. 45 crores, if I am not mistaken, either directly or indirectly, for getting a small surplus. If that policy is to be followed, we have got years ahead of us and what are likely to be the burdens hereafter to come? That is a thing which I want you to take into consideration, because the report before us is not only the third Five Year Plan, but it gives you an idea of the development for the next two five-year periods, i.e. for another decade, after the third.

I am anxious to know whether what the hon. Finance Minister has done is merely a casual thing done for one year's budget or that is the policy he is going to stick to hereafter, viz., to bring in only surplus budgets. That is a point of great importance to my mind in judging of the merits of the third, fourth and fifth Five Year Plans which are embodied in this report. Then alone, knowing fully well the policy, the people of India will know what their liabilities are going to be. Money has to come from the people and if no deficit budgets are to come, they should know how the gaps are going to be made up. So, in order to

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

give a complete idea to the people about their liabilities, there should be some statement on the part of the Finance Minister as to whether what he did last time was only a matter for that year only or that is the beginning of a new financial policy which is going to be pursued for the sake of carrying out the recommendations of the Five Year Plans hereafter.

What troubles my mind is that the people of India have to go at least through a period of 15 years more to intensify this effort of industrialisation of India in order to make it self-reliant and self-sufficient. If nothing goes wrong, the people can stand that strain—that seems to be the view of the authors of the report. All that can be said is that they do not apprehend anything to happen to disturb their calculations. I sincerely wish that they prove good prophets and not the Oracles of Delhi, whose language, always flexible, admitted of a variety of interpretations suited to the taste of the man who questioned them.

On one point, there can be no difference of opinion. There are certain factors which are essential for the success of the scheme. The price-line must be held. Otherwise, the estimates will be completely useless. So far we cannot say that we have found out a sovereign remedy against the fluctuations of the price-line. Even the index numbers of the prices of the foodgrains, money crops and industrial products show a tendency to fluctuate.

Secondly, our exports must be steadily on the increase. That is a very doubtful point. We have to face the competitive market. Unless our costs of production are visibly reduced, our goods cannot find it easy to capture foreign markets or even hold their own against competitors like Japan and certain other countries. The problem of exports is most intimately connected with the question of foreign exchange. There are several other

factors such as want of trained technicians to handle and work the machines.

Leaving aside these things, there is one factor which is the most important of all. It is after all the man of India that has to work, be vigilant, honest and co-operative. How this man will be like that is the problem. Of course, suggestions have been made as regards education, etc. But all these things will take time to give proper results. In the meantime, the machines will be working and you have to work with the persons as you get them today. Giving them training may take its own time.

It is the paramount duty of the State to see that all ticklish questions on which public feelings have been expressed most unmistakably should be immediately taken up and if they are unable to accept the solution of any of the parties concerned immediately, they should be persuaded to declare a truce for the time being, and a clear assurance should be given to them that the Government will be prepared to investigate the whole problem and to give if necessary an opportunity of plebiscite or self-determination to decide the matter once for all, in accordance with the wishes of the people.

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

Dr. M. S. Aney: I am sorry; I could not hear the bell.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That has been to his advantage rather.

Dr. M. S. Aney: In the meantime, responsible officers of State should be warned not to take any unnecessary action against those people and introduce bitterness in that. There are tracts where this feeling exists. Punjab is one of these tracts, which is unfortunate. There are tracts like Vidharba, some part of Assam and

other places also, where this feeling of dissatisfaction with their present status exists, which is also unfortunate. My submission is that some immediate steps should be taken with a view to assure the people that their claims will be properly investigated. Officers of the State should not make any statement that this thing shall not be done or this change not take place. This kind of statement coming from highest people of the State goes to perpetuate the tension and possibility of any understanding is altogether removed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should conclude now.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I shall conclude by saying two things. Firstly, there are some local problems of Vidarbha. I want the possibility of utilising the Godavari waters to be properly investigated, to see whether it cannot be canalised to irrigate lands on the northern part of Godavari extending into Vidarbha and Marathwada. More than 70 per cent of the water that is carried to the sea is contributed by rivers flowing in Vidarbha.

The next point is this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Next to Godavari must be Cauvery.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Having taken a dip in the only waters of Godavari, I do not want to spend more time. I wish that the reforms and proposals which are before us in the third Five Year Plan are given an honest trial and all of us give what is best in us to co-operate with the Government to make the Plan a success.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Radhelal Vyas.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Sir, my ship also is anchoring for a very long time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry, I am still—on the surface. In the first instance I am trying to call at least one hon. Member from each State. When each one of them has

been represented, then I will call the second hon. Member from that State. Therefore, hon. Members would co-operate with me in that.

Shri P. S. Daulta (Jhajjar): In Punjab there are two parts—one Hariyana and the other Punjabi-speaking.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I was told by the hon. Prime Minister that yet there is only one.

श्री राबेलाल व्यास (उज्जैन) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी अपने उन साथियों, माननीय सदस्यों, के साथ, जिन्होंने प्लानिंग कमिशन को और इस प्लान को तैयार करने वाले सज्जनों को बधाई दी है, अपनी ओर से हार्दिक बधाई प्रस्तुत करता हूँ। इन योजनाओं का मुख्य उद्देश्य हमारे देश के लोगों की आर्थिक और सामाजिक उन्नति कर के उन का जीवन सुखी बनाना है। पहले और दूसरी योजनाओं में ये लक्ष्य सामने रखे गये थे, लेकिन इस विषय में हमारा जो स्पष्ट लक्ष्य होना चाहिए, जो नीति होनी चाहिए, उस को खास तौर से तीसरी योजना में ध्यान दिया गया है और यह संकेत दिया गया है कि हम कैसे समाज की स्थापना करना चाहते हैं, हमारे लक्ष्य क्या हैं और उन की ओर हम बड़ी तेजी के साथ और पुरुषार्थ के साथ जाना चाहते हैं। यही कारण है कि तीसरी योजना उस का पहला अंग है और चौथी तथा पाचवी योजनाओं की रूप-रेखा अभी में तैयार की जा रही है और अध्ययन किया जा रहा है और पंद्रह वर्ष के बाद भी हम अपने लक्ष्य की ओर निश्चित रूप से आगे बढ़ सकेंगे।

इस योजना में जिस विशेष बात की ओर ज्यादा जोर और ध्यान दिया गया है, वह यह है कि देश के कुछ ऐसे हिस्से भी हैं, जो पिछड़े हुए हैं, जिन का जितना विकास होना चाहिए था, वह नहीं हुआ है और इसलिये इस बात की पूरी सम्भावना है कि वे काफी पिछड़े रहें तथा इस प्रकार देश के दूसरे हिस्सों में बहुत काफी असमानता बनी रहे। इस असमानता,

[श्री राघोलाल ध्याम]

को दूर करने के लिये पंच-वर्षीय योजना में एक अध्याय रखा गया है और उस में यह कहा गया है कि देश के इस तरह के अलग अलग भागों का अध्ययन किया जा रहा है और इस बारे में विचार किया जायगा। लेकिन कुछ बातें तो बिल्कुल स्पष्ट और जाहिर हैं, जिन पर ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिए। मैं मध्य प्रदेश की ओर आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

मेरी यह मान्यता है कि हमारे देश के शासकों और योजना बनाने वाले विद्वानों का ध्यान जितना मध्य प्रदेश के इस विशाल प्रदेश की ओर होना चाहिए, वह नहीं रहा है—न पहली योजना में और न दूसरी योजना में। दूसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना में वहाँ के लिये कुल १६० करोड़ रुपया मंजूर किया गया, जब कि खर्च के लिये १५० करोड़ रुपया दिया गया। इस सम्बन्ध में यह कहा जायगा कि इस राज्य ने पूरा हिस्सा नहीं दिया और अपनी तरफ से उस को जितना रुपया मिलाना चाहिए था, वह उस में नहीं मिलाया, लेकिन यह बात सही नहीं है। राज्य की तरफ जितना रुपया रखा गया था, उसे मे ज्यादा लगाया। यह सही है कि री-प्रांगनाइजेशन की वजह से एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में जो डिमलोकेशन हुआ—खालियर, भोपाल, जबलपुर, इन्दौर, रायपुर और रीवा, इन छः स्थानों पर अलग अलग विभाग बंटे हुए थे, नया राज्य बना था और भोपाल को राजधानी बनाया गया था, सब महकमे एक दूसरे से काफी दूर थे, सड़कें न होने के कारण आने-जाने की कठिनाइया थी, आवागमन के साधन ठीक नहीं थे—उस के कारण पहले रुपया कम खर्च हुआ, लेकिन उस के बाद यह शिकायत नहीं रही और राज्य को जितना रुपया प्रति-वर्ष एलोकेट किया गया था, जो सीलिंग फ़िक्स की गई थी, उस से ज्यादा उस ने खर्च किया। इसलिये इस तरह का दोष मध्य प्रदेश सरकार के सिर पर नहीं मढ़ा जा सकता है।

मध्य प्रदेश के लिये जो कुल रुपया रखा गया था, वह १६० करोड़ था और उस में से ४७.७० करोड़ की स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को और १४३.२० करोड़ की केन्द्रीय सरकार को व्यवस्था करनी थी। राज्य सरकार ने ५४.६५ करोड़ रुपये की व्यवस्था की, जब कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने सिर्फ ६४.४० करोड़ रुपये की व्यवस्था की, अर्थात् उस ने ४८.८० करोड़ रुपये अपने हिस्से में कम दिये। इसी तरह से १९५६-५७ के बाद से हर साल के फ़िजार्ज देखे जायें, तो पता लगेगा कि जि ना रुपया एनुअल प्लान के लिये मंजूर किया गया, उस से ज्यादा रुपया हर साल मध्य प्रदेश सरकार ने खर्च किया। इसलिये यह दोषारोपण नहीं किया जा सकता है कि मध्य प्रदेश सरकार की इतना क्षमता नहीं थी, सिवाये एक साल के, जिस के बारे में मैंने अभी निवेदन किया है।

दूसरी पंच-वर्षीय योजना में हम बहुत पीछे रह गये हैं। मैं अपने राज्य की विशेष परिस्थिति की ओर आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। १९५६-५७ के आकड़ों के अनुसार मध्य प्रदेश राज्य की पर-कैपिटल इनकम २५६.२ रुपये है, जब कि घान इंडिया फ़िगर २६१.५ रुपये है। जहाँ तक पर कैपिटल कनजम्पशन का सम्बन्ध है, हमारे राज्य में वह १८ रुपये से भी कम है, जो कि करीब करीब सारे हिन्दुस्तान में सब से कम है। उस की घान इंडिया फ़िगर २१.१३ है।

हमारे यहाँ जो जन-संख्या केवल कृषि और उस से सम्बन्धित उद्योग-धंधों पर निर्भर करती है, उस का प्रतिघात ७८ है, जो कि मेरे ह्याल में सारे भारत-वर्ष में सब से ज्यादा है। इसी तरह आबपाणी की नीजिए। हमारे यहाँ जितना क्षेत्रफल कुल खेती में है, उस का केवल ७.३ परसेंट ही सिंचाई में लिया गया है, जो कि भारत में सब से कम है। उस के अतिरिक्त आकाश से जो पानी बरसता है, जो दैव की कृपा होती है, उस पर निर्भर रहना पड़ता है, जिस की वजह से एक ही फ़सल

उगाई जा सकती है। इस प्रकार कृषि में हम बिल्कुल पीछे हैं।

जहां तक प्रति-एकड़ उत्पादन का संबंध है, मध्य प्रदेश में व्हीट, पैडी और काटन क्रमशः ३६३, ४८३ और ८६ पाउंड होती है, जब कि हिन्दुस्तान का औसत ५७८.७०४ और ६२ पाउंड है। इस प्रकार उपज में भी हम बहुत पीछे हैं। व्हीट, पैडी और काटन की ही यह हालत नहीं है, अगरकेन और दूसरे कृषि-जन्य पदार्थों के उत्पादन में भी मध्य प्रदेश कम है। इस का कारण यह है कि वहां पर इरिगेशन की व्यवस्था नहीं है। वहां के लोगों के पुराने सामान हैं और पुराने तरीके हैं, जिन को बदलने के लिये काफी पैसा चाहिए। इन्स्टाल्ड कैपेसिटी आफ पावर की बात को ही लीजिये। दूसरी योजना के समाप्त होने पर हमारे यहां ८ ५ किलोवाट पर थाउजेड रही जब कि जो आन-डिडिया फिगर है वह १६.५ रहा। इसमें भी हम बहुत पीछे हैं। इसके अलावा हमारे यहां एक तिहाई जनसंख्या शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शैड्यूल्ड ट्रिब्स को है। पहाड़ों पर ये लोग रहते हैं, वहां पर सड़कें नहीं, शिक्षा सुविधा नहीं, अन्न गाड़ों का जो एगिया है, जो बस्तर में है, वहां को यह हालत है कि उन लोगों ने सम्पत्ता की रोगनी तक नहीं देखी है। उस प्रदेश का विकास कैम होगा, इस पर भी आपको विचार करना होगा।

शिक्षण सर्विम की जो हालत है, उनका जो लेबन है, वह भी बहुत नीचा है। ६ में ११ उम्र तक के बालकों के लिए हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा पंचम प्रतिशत बच्चों की पढ़ाई की व्यवस्था ही कर पाए हैं और ११ से १४ वर्ष तक की उम्र वालों के लिए १४ प्रतिशत के लिए ही व्यवस्था कर सके हैं जब कि हिन्दुस्तान का जो औसत है वह ६० प्रतिशत और २३ प्रतिशत क्रमशः इन उम्र वाले बच्चों के

लिए है। इसी प्रकार से अस्पतालों की व्यवस्था हमारे यहां बहुत कम है। मैं तो यहां तक कहूंगा कि वह बराएनाम है। वहां बहुत कम अस्पताल हैं। लोगों को इलाज वगैरह की जो सुविधाएं होनी चाहियें, नहीं हैं। इसी तरह से हमारे यहां आबादी तो कम है लेकिन क्षेत्रफल बहुत ज्यादा है। हिन्दुस्तान में क्षेत्रफल के लिहाज से सब से बड़ी स्टेट तो यह है ही। जहां आबादी कम होती है और क्षेत्रफल अधिक होता है वहां सोशल सर्विसेज देने के लिए, तथा दूसरी एमैनिटीज देने के लिए जो खर्चा करना पड़ना है वह बहुत अधिक होता है। यह भी हमारे यहां एक विशेष समस्या बनी हुई है।

इसी तरह से रोडज, और रेल कम्युनिकेशन को आप देखें। इस लिहाज से भी मध्य प्रदेश बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ है। वहां पर ला एंड आर्डर का भी प्राबलम है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको मालूम ही है कि हमारे यहां चम्बल कुबारी आदि नदियों के बीहड़ तो मशहूर ह ही और वहां पर हमारी सरकार को लाखों रुपया डाकुओं के उन्मूलन के लिए खर्च करना पड़ रहा है। वह सब जो खर्चा है, यह हमी में से होता है।

हिन्दुस्तान में अनाज की भी कमी है। हमारे यहां बहुत अच्छी भूमि है। अगर साधन जुटाये जायें, इरिगेशन फीसिलिटीज को बढ़ाया जाए, फर्टिलाइजर्स की व्यवस्था की जाए, किसानों को अधिक ऋण दिए जायें, तो कृषि उत्पादन बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ सकता है जिसमें सारे देश का हित निहित है। लेकिन इसके लिए व्यवस्था कहा है? ये सब विशेष परिस्थितियां हमारे राज्य की हैं। अगर इनको ध्यान में न रखा गया तो मुझे भय है कि हम और भी ज्यादा पीछे रह जायेंगे।

डीप्टी रिजनाल डिप्लोमेट की जो बात इसमें कही गई है, उसकी ओर विशेष ध्यान

[श्री राघेलाज व्यास]

देने की जरूरत है। केवल आबादी को देख कर या उस स्टेट की क्षमता को देख कर और यह देख कर कि पैसों देने की इसमें कितनी शक्ति है, अगर हमने तीसरे प्लान में उस प्रान्त के लिए राया निर्धारित किया तो मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि हम न्याय नहीं करेंगे। आज हम देखते हैं कि भारत में विकास कार्यों के लिए अगर हमारे पास राया नहीं होता है तो हम विदेशों में सहायता प्राप्त करने का इंतजाम करते हैं। इसी तरह से मध्य प्रदेश की विशेष स्थिति को देखते हुए, उसके सीमित साधनों को देखते हुए और यह देखते हुए कि उसकी आमदनी ज्यादा नहीं हो सकती है, अगर हमने ज्यादा रकम उसके लिए निर्धारित नहीं की तो हमारे देश का जो हृदय है वह पीछे रह जाएगा और इसमें न केवल यही प्रदेश और यही राज्य कमजोर होगा बल्कि हमारे देश के लिए यह चीज दुःखदायी होगी और देश को कमजोर करना होगा। मैं प्लानिंग कमिशन से और विशेषकर प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर साहब से नम्र निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि और कुछ नहीं तो कम से कम हमारे यहां की रोड़ज के लिए कुछ और राया दिया जाए। हमारे यहां की हालत बहुत ज्यादा खराब है। नागपुर प्लान की बड़ी तारीफ की जाती है और कहा जाता है कि जो लक्ष्य निर्धारित किए गए थे, वे पूरे कर लिए गए हैं। लेकिन मध्य प्रदेश में क्या हालत है। हमारे यहां अभी तक कुल १८,८८६ मील ही सड़के हैं, जब कि २५,००० से ज्यादा होनी चाहिये। इसमें हम काफी पीछे हैं। १८,००० तो मैं ने जो डाफ्ट था दूसरे प्लान का उससे बता दिया कि वे समझते थे कि इतनी लम्बाई हो जाएगी लेकिन वह भी हुई नहीं और केवल १४,००० ही होती है। कई प्रदेश हैं जहां हम पहुंच भी नहीं सकते हैं। वहां पर इतने अधिक नदी-नाले हैं कि हजारों पुलों और रपटों की व्यवस्था होना बंध है। दूसरे प्लान में इसके लिए काफी व्यवस्था

की गई थी लेकिन २४ करोड़ रुपये मध्य प्रदेश के लिए प्रस्तावित किए गए थे उसमें से १२ करोड़ ही मंजूर हुए और खर्च केवल ८ करोड़ ही हुए। कहां २४ करोड़ और कहां ८ करोड़, किस तरह से काम चल सकता है। अभी १४ करोड़ रुपये का काम हमारे यहां दूसरी योजना का बाकी है। उसके अग्रेस्ट तो करोड़ कुल इस तीसरी योजना में हमें मिलेगा। क्या इस तरह से कहीं काम चल सकता है? मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां ऐसे-ऐसे गांव हैं जहां से लोग चार-चार महीने तक इधर से उधर नहीं जा-आ सकते हैं। अगर कोई बीमार पड़ जाता है तो उसको अस्पताल नहीं पहुंचाया जा सकता है। ऐसी अवस्था में मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि अगर लोगों के लिए पुलियां बना दी जाएं, रपटें बना दी जाएं, आने जाने के लिए फेंग बेंदर रोड़ज बना दी जाएं, कच्चे रास्ते बना दिये जायें तो बहुत हद तक उनकी तकलीफ दूर हो सकती है।

मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि स्टेट्स रिफॉर्मोनाइजेशन कमिशन ने भी इस और शासन का ध्यान दिलाया था कि उस राज्य में आवागमन के साधन बहुत कम हैं और कठिन भी हैं, इसलिए वहां ज्यादा से ज्यादा कम्युनिकेशन के साधन जुटाये जाने चाहिये। रोड़ज बगैरह के लिए जो थोड़ी सी १७ करोड़ की रकम रखी गई है उससे इतने बड़े मध्य प्रदेश में क्या पुलियां बनेंगे, क्या जो अभी सड़के हैं, उनकी दुरुस्ती होगी, कितने मील सड़के डामर की जा सकेंगी, कितनी रपटें बन सकेंगी। मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि रोड़ज इत्यादि के लिए कुछ करोड़ रुपये और मध्य प्रदेश को दिए जायें और अगर ऐसा नहीं किया गया तो वहां के लोगों के दुःख दर्द को दूर नहीं किया जा सकेगा। मध्य प्रदेश की विशेष परिस्थितियों पर जरूर आप ध्यान दें और १७ करोड़ रुपये जो रखा गया

अगर उसको बढ़ा कर ५ या ६ करोड़ रुपया सड़कों के लिए और नहीं दिया जा सकता है तो पुलियों के लिए, रपटों के लिए अगर धन दे दें तो लोगों को मामूली सी मुक्ति तो दी ही जा सकती है और उनकी रात दिन की जो तकलीफ है, उसको तो आप दूर कर ही सकते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो आपने मुझे समय दिया उसके लिए मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर साहब जो मुझसे बातें किए हैं उनकी ओर विशेष ध्यान देंगे।

Shri P. G. Deb (Angul): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, my picture of criticism is going to be somewhat different on the Third Five Year Plan. It is a blue-print of unquenchable optimism. The Plan document is undoubtedly an impressive document but it lacks imagination. Going through the Plan I find that it is bound to fail in evoking the enthusiasm among the common man. To the common man the most important fact, and the most prominent fact too, is the additional taxation to the tune of Rs. 1,710 crores. While the man is already being crushed under the weight of rising prices, and ever-increasing unemployment in the country, there can be no doubt that he is bound to be hit hard, and very hard indeed. It is a fact. To achieve this additional taxation, our Finance Minister has already given indications in his typical way in the first budget which has been presented under the Plan last April. There, we see that the Governments, both at the Centre and in the States are going to squeeze the common man's pocket to the utmost. The common man, of course, is always ready to contribute to his best for augmenting the financial resources of the country. But, surely, he wants to get in return something, some tangible benefits, by the end of the Third Plan.

16.00 hrs.

But the question arises; Is he going to get the tangible benefits and how? Surely I shudder to find any answer to it. Therefore I would like to stress upon the Government that it should not lose sight of the fact that the electorate today requires an immediate solution, something more than the shortages, more than the high prices and more than the crisis in the balance of payments.

On the other hand, the Plan Proposes to invest the savings of this country in such industries which will only give rise to post-dated cheques to our people. I would suggest that we should prefer to have industries which will give more output with less amount of capital. Then again, we are dependent on the technical know-how and managerial skill. For want of this we have already had the experience in the last two Plans. Therefore this bottleneck has to be realised. We must not refuse to learn from our experience. Probably, we are too complacent at times and we do not learn from experience. That is my fear. May I ask why not have a little more emphasis on industries which promise a good flow of goods which is going to be beneficial to the people at large? Thereby it will give more employment to them also. I am of that type of thinking which believes that the present generation should not be sacrificed for the sake of posterity. We must have optimum utilisation of resources. We must have a rational distribution of emphasis over in the present and the future. All this the Plan certainly lacks.

Coming to the rising prices, whatever economic benefits are supposed to flow to the people by the end of the Third Plan will be more than counterbalanced by the ever-rising spiral of prices. I am of the opinion and I think I am right that it is going to be counterbalanced. So, people would be robbed off totally and the real purchasing power of

[Shri P. G. Deb]

money will go on decreasing instead of increasing. Today to say frankly the value of the rupee, 16 annas, is two annas. That is the fate of the country. The rise in the general index of wholesale prices has been about 30 per cent. Prices of food articles as a group have gone up by 27 per cent, of industrial raw materials by about 45 per cent., of manufactured goods by over 27 per cent. This is the economic picture of our country.

Again, as it was estimated during the Second Plan, there was deficit financing of the order of Rs. 948 crores. During the Third Plan deficit financing is estimated to be Rs. 550 crores. Therefore in the Third Plan we have sought to make a retreat. This is not going to help us. The Government, in fact, do not seem to be aware that there is bound to take place considerable increase in the money supply and the banks, deposits which will raise the prices much higher during the Third Plan period. So, I am of the opinion that there should be a proper monetary and fiscal policy to remedy these matters. The matter, as we know very well and as it stands today in the country, shows a dismal picture before us. Black-marketing is rampant in this country. Speculators are having their own way. What is worse is, there is adulteration in foodstuffs and even in medicines and essential drugs. This is a fact which has to be accepted by all. Nothing can be worse than this. I would only wish that at the end of the Third Five Year Plan, these things are no more there.

Coming to regional development in the country, I wish to say that while the Plan accepts the principle of widespread benefits of development throughout the country, in practice, we see political considerations are allowed to have the upper hand in matters of location of projects and the like. States which have a powerful leadership, with a good pull at the Centre, get a large number of projects, both in the public sector and the private sector, located in their

areas. The merits of other sites, far more suitable, are brushed aside lightly. If we want a balanced regional development, we must sacrifice party politics for the sake of proper economic development in our country. Let not the animality of the man override rationality.

We, the people of Orissa, have been pressing here, since the beginning of the Second Plan for inclusion of the railway project of linking Rourkela with Talcher *via* Barkote. But all in vain. Similarly, a railway line from Sukinda Daitari mining area which is very important in Orissa to the main line at Kharagpur, is mentioned in the Third Plan. It is stated simply that it is under consideration of the Planning Commission for inclusion in their Railway programmes. That shows the typical attitude of the Centre to the economic needs of Orissa. Here, I am again to bring to the notice of the House—it will be wrong on my part if I did not do so—that there is a proposal to construct two more dams namely Bara-mulgahti dam across the Mahanadi river and the Rangali dam across the Brahmani in the State of Orissa. Sir, I have my fears that these dams will not serve much useful purpose at this stage. I wish to point out that when more urgent needs of the people are being sacrificed, these resources can be used for items of higher priority. We want things of higher priority. I suggest, therefore, that these two schemes should not be executed to avoid more waterlogging. I use the word more waterlogging, because, we have faced what the Hirakud dam has given us, as mentioned in the Flood reports. This is going to be there. If they come off a threat not only for the people of North Orissa in general, but of coastal Orissa in particular.

Next, I come to the very important problem of unemployment. Strange at it is, the number of unemployed people is increasing with the com-

mencement of every Plan. Our enemy No. 1, unemployment, is getting stronger and stronger in spite of successive plans. Coming to figures, it was admitted that at the end of the Second Plan, there would be only 5.3 million unemployed persons in India. But, according to the latest estimate, there are at present 9 million unemployed people in our country. Besides, the Third Plan states that out of 17 million new entrants to the labour force of the country during the Third Plan period, it is estimated that only 14 millions are likely to be absorbed in new jobs. Therefore, there will be an addition of 3 millions to the rank of the unemployed in this country. So, at the end of the Plan, there will be in all 12 million unemployed people in this country.

16.11 hrs.

[DR. SUSHILA NAYAR in the Chair]

I need hardly dilate on the dangers involved in keeping such a large number of people unemployed in this country. It is quite obvious as to what they will be. At the same time, I wish to say that we should set up as many labour-intensive industries as possible, so as to absorb these unemployed people. If that is done, in my opinion, we shall be able to solve to a great extent our greatest problem.

In conclusion, I wish to wind up my remarks by saying that the connotation of 'Socialist pattern' does not become clear at any stage of our Third Five Year Plan period, as we study this Plan. Confusion has been worse confounded. I can say with confidence on the floor of this House that an ideal which is misconceived—and let me be very forceful, and I hope I shall be excused for saying this—and badly presented is undoubtedly incapable of bringing the energies of the nation into a clear focus. Therefore, I tend to suggest that if possible the planners should decide to revise the Plan on a rational basis.

247 (A) LSD.—

Shri Indrajit Gupta: More than one hon. Member has referred in the course of this debate to the obvious lack of enthusiasm both inside this House and outside, at the very commencement of this Plan. I am reminded of the state of affairs which prevailed at the time when the Second Plan was presented to this country. I think that the contrast is therefore quite evident for everybody to see, because at the time the Second Plan was presented, it certainly represented a new orientation of outlook as compared with the First Plan, and it put forward certain targets before the country which I think even its critics admitted at that time did open up a completely new vista. It created some sort of a thrill or expectation that the old face of this ancient land of ours was going to be changed. That kind of thrill or that kind of expectation or that kind of enthusiasm is not there this time. I was trying to think what could be the reason, so far as the ordinary man in the street is concerned. I do not want to repeat the arguments that have been cited here at great length about the fruits of planning and to whom they are going and all that, though that is a basic point.

I became curious, when the Leader of the House in his introductory remarks referred particularly to the ruling party, or rather the Congress Party—because it was not the ruling party then—and its aims and objectives as stated in 1929. He referred more than once to that and said that since 1929, the goal of democracy and socialism had been put forward before the country. My curiosity was aroused, because I first thought that perhaps the Leader of the House was making a slight error in the date, and perhaps he was referring to 1930 and the Independence pledge taken at that time, which was certainly a historic document in our national movement, and which made particular references to the fact that the country's aim should be to enable the people of our country

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

to enjoy the fruits of their labour and things like that.

Then, I took a little trouble to look up what happened in 1929, and I thought that an answer to this question could be found there. It might interest some of the hon. Members on the other side too. In 1929, the AICC met at Bombay. There was an official resolution moved by Shri Sri Prakasa on social and economic changes. A part of that resolution reads as follows:

"In order to remove this poverty and misery and to ameliorate the condition of the Indian masses, it is essential to make revolutionary changes in the present economic and social structure of society and to remove the gross inequalities, provision should be made for providing a living wage for every worker, to tax heavily all unearned income, to supply adequate land to the peasants and to protect them from the interference of all middlemen".

A very good resolution, although at that stage there was no question of the Congress Party coming into power. It is in the consequences of this that I am interested. What happened after that? An amendment to this resolution was moved stating that the whole passage from "providing a living wage for every worker" to the end where it says "protect them from the interference of all middlemen" should be deleted. The argument put forward by the mover of the amendment—I do not wish to name him; probably he is no longer alive; I do not know—was that we should not commit ourselves to details of this kind. This amendment was then put to vote in the AICC and the first vote resulted in a tie. Therefore, the vote had to be taken again. The second vote also resulted in a tie. Then it was put to vote a

third time and the amendment was carried by 25 votes to 23. This passage was deleted.

Since a reference was made to 1929, I was interested in finding out what happened. I would humbly suggest with all due respect to the Prime Minister that this type of thing apparently is not something which we are facing today only after we had become independent and got our Planning Commission and National Government and all that. I would suggest that the ruling party, the Congress, even at that stage in 1929, was dominated by the conservative section—if you like to call it that—when attempts were made to get down to detailed, concrete cases of interpreting what the social and economic objectives should be, and they carried the day with an amendment which took away some of the great objectives which had been put before the Congress and the nation.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): That group now functions as the Swatantra Party.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Who?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Those people.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I do not know who has gone to the Swatantra Party. The hon. Member can decide. I hold no brief for the Swatantra Party.

My point is that the Third Plan also, as many speakers have underlined, suffers precisely from this defect as far as the common man in the street is concerned. After all, he has had experience of two Plans. What are the concrete, specific targets which are put before him which he will be interested in, in the form of the fruits of this Plan as we proceed further along? There is a lot of very good expressions and phrases in the Plan, no doubt. Nobody can quarrel with

them; I do not quarrel with them. Excellent objectives are laid down. There is no basic difference in those objectives between the Third Plan and the Second—stated on paper. But when we come down to concrete matters, we find that in the Planning Commission, in many respects, they prefer to indulge in vague generalities, some kind of wishful thinking, vague suggestions, avoidance of certain unpleasant problems; they do not want to tackle them or commit themselves to any detailed, concrete, specific things. I suggest this is one reason why enthusiasm this time is not being generated to the extent that it was when the Second Plan was presented.

As far as we are concerned— I must say this to make it clear— because I certainly hold views which are completely different from those aired by Shri Ranga and his friends—there is no doubt that historically speaking, when the history of the development of the independent Indian economy comes to be written, certainly the construction of some of these big projects, heavy and basic industries which are growing in our land,—the steel projects, the drilling of oil lying beneath the surface of our country which we are finding after so many centuries, the big machine building plants which are going up, all these will constitute a very important landmark. There is no doubt about these are things which everybody is proud of, except perhaps a handful of people, I do not know, but my central criticism of the whole approach to the Third Plan is this: after ten years of planning, can we say that we have reached a stage where the whole concept of a centrally planned economy is clear to us? It is a mixed economy, I admit that. Nobody is suggesting at this stage that the private sector should be abolished or done away with. It is a mixed economy, nevertheless we have committed ourselves to a centrally planned economy. In a country which is economically underdeveloped, which has only won its

independence recently, which has to make up the huge lag of so many centuries, what is the object or the purpose of this central plan? Is it simply that in order to keep parallel pace with the private sector, a few industries and a few enterprises must be taken over by the Government? Surely not. That is not the concept of our Planning Commission too. Surely it was never the concept of Prof. Mahalanobis who was in a sense the inspirer of the Second Five Year Plan. Anyway, the idea is that the growth of the public sector, the intervention of the State in economic affairs, is necessary today in economies of our type in order to overcome the relics of the past, the backwardness of the past, and to be able to really take the country rapidly along a line of independent development which is necessary as the economic counterpart of our political independence.

We have to measure our success or failure by that. This is not socialism. I am very sorry that after ten years we are still in a position where we consider, some people consider it necessary to be so much on the defensive, to try to explain to Shri Ranga or somebody else, I do not know, that they must get used to this thing, that this is a thing which is accepted now even by the Pope, the Papal Encyclical. Why is it necessary to explain it so defensively? Of course, anything that the Papal Encyclical approves, cannot be, whatever else it may be, socialism or communism, but some gentlemen are shouting in the country that the State sector means communism, Sovietism and so on and so forth, and half our energies are spent in making defensive apologies and trying to explain to them that even the capitalist, anti-communist or Roman Catholic institutions have understood that this thing is necessary. Why must we be on the defensive like this?

The question is this: what should be the place of the public sector in a

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

centrally planned economy, in a country like ours? I should have thought that it should be the decisive factor in our economy. In planning, the main tool, the main instrument, in our hands should be this public sector, holding on to certain strategic positions; the strategic heights of the economy as somebody has called it must be commanded by this State sector, so that it is able to direct this whole terrific campaign of planning, this huge experiment which we are carrying out.

Have we been able to do that? After two Plans, can we say honestly that we have broken through on that front, that the State now holds the decisive strategic position? The private sector, of course, will be there. That is why I say that all our ills flow from this. They have been cited at length here—unemployment, inflation, high prices, this, that and the other. What is the root cause of it all? I do not agree with Shri Asoka Mehta that we are proceeding at a trotting pace taht it is necessary to break into a canter. If you see it in the proper perspective, we are moving at a pedestrain pace. What is being done is good, everybody supports it, but it is far from adequate, because, side by side with this public sector exists a very powerfully entrenched private sector. I am not referring to the small people, the small industries, the medium industries, the village industries which have all been referred to. In fact, I would like to see them get a better deal. But the big private sector is powerfully entrenched even in those sectors where the State is trying, correctly trying, to make an entry and has made an entry to some extent. Can we say that even in those sectors the State commands the decisive voice now? In a vital thing like coal, for instance, the NCDC is there on the one side and the privately owned collieries on the other. Compare the two and tell me whether the State is

in a position to say: I command the whole strategy of the coal sector which is so vital for our development. Take oil. It is a new thing and very good results have been attained in a very short space of time. But the whole time the State sector in oil is being sniped at by these powerful interests in the private sector which is a dominantly foreign-owned sector. It is still there, so powerful. We can see what is going on. Questions and discussions are raised in this House every day on this question. In steel also, I hope the future holds something better but at the moment, despite the huge sacrifices, expenditure etc. correctly in my judgment where are we? Where are we even in the question of power generation? Therefore, my main submission is that in this central task we have failed. The huge man-power which we have got in our country, a big capital advantage and the vast resources a major portion of it has not even been touched by us. If we are able to harness this manpower and vast resources, we can make a terrific breakthrough on the economic front in the State sector so that we can hold on to all strategic lines. That is where we have failed, are failing and are lagging behind.

I do not wish to repeat all this discussion about the national income that has gone on but I would mention a new point because it is good to see things in their perspective. I am quoting only such things as will not be challenged by the other side. The *AICC Economic Review* of the 6th January, 1961 states that the per capita income today is lower than it was in 1931-32. You can check it up for yourself. Because, in 1931-32 the per capita income at the prices prevailing at that time was Rs. 65. In 1958-59, the per capita income has risen to Rs. 276.9 at 1948-49 prices which were five-six times higher than the prices in 1931-32. It was also a period of depression, as we all remember.

There is growth of course if we limit it to the period of planning. But how far have we gone, historically speaking?

Many friends have referred to this and I wish to make one or two remarks about this committee set up to go into the mystery as to where the national income is going. They are welcome to do the work. I doubt very much whether their report will see the light of the day, before the general elections. It may come out after the elections. I doubt if it will be published before the elections. It is very good if they go into it and see how much goes and where. But there is no mystery about it. What has happened to it? Where has it gone? How much is going? Statistics, percentages and all that should be given to us. But it is no mystery at all as to where it is going. I would invite the Committee to pay one visit to my home town, Calcutta. If they take the trouble to go round the streets and have their ears and eyes open, they will see where the national income is going. It is there, a living symbol of a city. You need not go into the researches and statistics and things like that. I want to know what sort of growth is going on when we know these figures. The Tatas, Birlas, Mafatlals, Walchands, Mohindras, Dalmias and Martin Burns—these seven houses are controlling an asset of Rs. 776 crores. Where is the national income going? Out of a total block capital of Rs. 2800 crores, over Rs. 700 crores are controlled by these seven houses. That means 25 per cent of the total. 156 companies, each of which have got a paid-up capital of more than one crore each control Rs. 602.6 crores out of Rs. 1300 crores. Two-thirds of the entire corporate sector is dominated by 100 companies which have got a paid-up capital of Rs. 334 crores, net assets of the total of Rs. 1017 crores. Even in the agrarian sector, which I am not dealing with because Shri Gopalan has spoken about it, a very prominent economist of our country has calculated that thirty per cent of

the total additional income in the agrarian sector during this last decade has been appropriated by about three per cent of the big farmers. Therefore, I do not think there is any great mystery as to where it is going. You can calculate how much has gone where. As you know, the foreign capital is also coming in and because of our position regarding the resources, we have to offer new concessions now to attract foreign capital and I think that this private sector is being allowed to maintain such a powerful position in the economy that we have even got to a stage of denationalisation! Hon. Members will remember that towards the end of the second Plan, when the question of denationalisation arose—where it is a question of expanding the public sector at a much more rapid rate—a cry arose that some public sector enterprises should be sold back to the private capital and they should be allowed to buy shares. That was the beginning of denationalisation. Of course, I am very happy that on behalf of the Government it has been stated in the House that this proposal has been dropped. But how does it come at all, after ten years of Planning? That shows the working of the public sector.

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

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I shall finish in five minutes. I want to make a few remarks about the question of resources. Many things have been said about this, though I fail to see how enthusiasm can be generated when the Planning Commission itself counsels despair. I do not know. Despair is there in the pages of this book itself, where they say that the physical cost of our development programmes will be Rs. 8,300 crores but that we cannot allocate more than Rs. 7,500 crores. The confession of defeat is there; they have no confidence that they can reach the physical targets. Then how do they expect the country to be enthused about it. I say that the Government and the Planning Commission seem to have an obsession

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

that the only source of raising domestic resources is taxation. That is practically the only major source, as they think. Everybody agrees that that also is reaching the saturation point. As far as indirect taxation is concerned, many speakers have mentioned that when Rs. 1,600 crores are going to be imposed, it will only raise the prices further and lead to inflation. As far as direct taxation is concerned, the higher income-groups must be taxed much more, but for certain reasons this is not being done. But apart from taxation, when you have a centrally planned economy, are there no other sources for raising resources except taxation? Certainly there are but what are the new steps taken towards achieving that? What about nationalisation? Are we never going to nationalise anything more? What about banks? Here you want to hold the price-line and control inflation when this huge amount of banking capital is available mainly for strengthening and allowing the private sector to develop and indulge in its activities which are uncontrolled in a sense that much of this money—perhaps 60 per cent—is utilised for non-priority purposes and non-essential purposes such as for luxury and semi-luxury production. If the banks are taken over by our Government—and this is a vital, strategic instrument of planning—and if you keep the banking system in your hands—not that it will immediately bring you a huge lot of liquid capital—that control of banks will allow you to divert the resources according to the Plan into channels which are in the national interests so that the resources are not frittered or wasted away.

Then, our public sector undertakings are going to make a very miserable contribution to the public exchequer, to the developmental revenues. There is nothing in the Plan to inspire one to feel that the capacity of these sectors is there to contribute much more, that there is capacity and it can be and will be exploited.

Then State trading in floodgrains was once mooted by the ruling party at some session in Nagpur or some other place. It has been quietly dropped. It was calculated that it would put a profit of Rs. 700 crores in the hands of the Government by eliminating the excess profits made by the middlemen. That would have left something in our hands—State trading in industries in which we still enjoy to a very large extent a near monopoly position in the foreign markets as in jute goods. Still, the Government does not intervene. I think such things are happening as, perhaps, would lead to the complete ruin of this industry. After a few years more, the markets will be lost to us in an industry whose exports are giving us from Rs. 130 crores to Rs. 150 crores a year by way of foreign exchange.

In conclusion, I would like to refer to the subject-matter of one of my substitute motions. I would like to ask, how is it that such an important thing—I would call it imponderable—is left out completely out of the reckoning of the Planning Commission's aims and objectives, viz., this question of our export trade? Many Ministers have stated many a time that if we are to service our foreign loans and pay for our imports, this is the most vital thing.

We are running a huge deficit in our balance of trade. The question of the ECM has come today. I read in the papers today that the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Britain and the Bank of England are putting pressure on British firms operating abroad to remit back a bigger proportion of their profits. We have been quite pleased that they have been reinvesting a big portion of their profits, but they are now being pressurised by the Bank of England to remit back their profits.

Then comes the ECM. Even the Finance Minister has made the state-

ment that we are entirely dependent on the good offices of Britain to secure some sort of protection and safeguards for us. But what is our role? Britain, ECM countries and we are members of the GATT and these restrictive tariffs and preferences are quite contrary to the spirit of GATT. What is our independent role? Do we fight ourselves to protect our trade and to develop our exports? Are we going only to rely on Britain's goodwill to fight on behalf of us when they negotiate with the ECM countries and say, "You must give some safeguards to poor India also."?

If this is the method we are going to follow, I would suggest that this whole chapter of foreign trade on export objectives and targets should be scrapped for the present. Let it be put into cold storage. Do not ask the House to approve it, because it is a complete imponderable. We do not know what the future holds for us. There can be very serious consequences. Tell us what you are going to do about it. Let us see where the position stands regarding that.

The hon. Prime Minister spoke of the vision of the future, the great pilgrimage on which the people have embarked, etc. But I would submit with great respect that the burdens imposed on the common man have to be compensated by something else. Maybe we cannot lower the prices just now. Maybe we cannot give them cheap consumer goods. There are other countries where, although the prices of their consumer goods are high, it is partly compensated by cheaper social services. But in our Plan, the expenditure on social services is to be cut down. The real wages of the workers have declined to the pre-war level. In these circumstances, you cannot expect the people to be enthusiastic or willing to sacrifice more if they find that this is the way targets will remain unfulfilled and whatever national wealth is generated, a major part of that will be appropriated by a small handful

of rich people, while they continue to suffer.

Mr. Chairman: As soon as I ring the bell, I expect hon. Members to wind up within two minutes. Otherwise, many people will not get any chance to speak. Shri Bangshi Thakur.

Shri Bangshi Thakur (Tripura—Reserve—Schd Tribes): Sir, without entering into details and controversy, I would like to point out some important aspects of planning in the light of current world situation both economic and political. The present chaotic political tension in global sphere has its main root not in politics, but based on two diametrically opposite economic outlooks, i.e. between free enterprise of the USA, and the economic policy of the U.S.S.R. the say of U.S.S.R. about free enterprise of the U.S.A. is that it has not been able to ensure minimum economic security to all sections of our people. On the other hand, the USA version about Soviet economy is that her general standard of living is too poor and USSR has taken away most of the attributes of political liberties of its people. Up till now, these are the facts based on which the two world outlooks are playing mutually hostile roles. Therefore, the fundamental problem before the world-states is to create a state pattern in such a way that it would be able to ensure to its people both political liberty and economic security.

In this context we should discuss the economic planning of our country. Our Constitution has guaranteed the political liberty of our people and, at the same time, through the Directive Principles of State Policy it has declared its ultimate aim in achieving economic security to our people. Hence, as if to overcome the shortcomings in economic planning of both sides our Government has adopted a systematic policy of economic development through planning. This is the distinguished feature of our economic planning. The success of our economic planning will solve the world's hardest problem.

[Shri Bangshi Thakur]

Madam, in industrialising our country, if we are to keep pace with the highly industrialised countries of the world, the help of the private sector is essentially required to fill the deficit of the public sector. Such scope is there in our planning.

To strengthen the defence and for overall industrialisation of the country, establishment of basic industries is indispensable. So in our planning priority has been given to the growth of basic industries.

In the opinion of some of us, our progress is insignificant. In this res-

pect, I would like to say that the highly developed and advanced countries of the world had to work hard for long years to come to their present status. So, one cannot expect a backward country like India to show miracles in 14 years. I will quote some statistics regarding production in the different countries of the world which will be helpful for comparative study. I am giving the figures for 1951 and 1958 in respect of petroleum, coal and iron. The figures are like this:

(In thousand metric tons)

	Petroleum		Coal		Ironore	
	1951	1958	1951	1958	1951	1958
U.S.A.	303754	330934	519857	389355	95376	36701
Canada	6435	22497	14845	8558	3236	7923
U.K.	152	146	226463	219287	4504	4008
France	313	1306	52972	57721	9332	19320
Germany Federal Republic	1367	4432	119925	133582	3243	4132
Czechoslovakia	119	106	17900	25812	530	541
Japan	339	367	43312	4967	620	1144
U.S.S.R.	42253	113295	202464	352999	26057	51593
India	265	495	34858	46063	2378	3739
Australia	17891	20723	1428	2395

With all this documentary evidence before us, I cannot understand how the picture can be called gloomy. Besides, the implementation of our Planning has been started from 1952. So our rate of progress is satisfactory and quite commendable.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Is it so?

Shri Bangshi Thakur: Now, I would like to say a few words about Tripura, one of the most backward regions in India. Tripura has stepped into the Third Five Year Plan. In the First and Second Plan the money allotted was about Rs. 2 crores and 9 crores respectively. In the Third Plan Rs. 16 crores have been allotted to Tripura. But, in the light of the big amount

spent in the First and Second Plan, it can be said that the implementation has not been satisfactory. The way in which the last Plans have been implemented has created doubts about the efficient and successful implementation of the Third Plan. Naturally, the question arises in the minds of the people whether such a big sum will be properly utilised or not.

There is no progress in regard to food production in Tripura though many lakhs have been and are being spent. Similarly, no progress is seen in regard to Government-run fishery, though very big sums are being spent. It seems that the authorities concerned are either indifferent or inefficient to shoulder the responsibility of feeding the hungry people.

As far as refugee rehabilitation, jhumia rehabilitation, establishment of small village, and cottage industries postal Communications and irrigation are concerned, the functioning of the Government is not at all satisfactory. So, the people are suffering very much.

The setting up of the new zonal system in Tripura has invited agitation and demonstration from its people. One of the main points against such a new step is that the transport system in Tripura is still backward.

Being inhumanly treated by the Pakistan Government, some tribal families of Chittagong Hill Tracts were compelled to take shelter in Tripura. The Tripura Government did not give them shelter in Tripura. On the contrary, they have been handed over to Pakistan Government. On the way to Pakistan, on foot one woman had given birth to a child, but owing to hardship and exhaustion, both the mother and the child died on the way. Such an action on the part of the Tripura Government cannot be supported.

From the erosion of river Feni production of the Sabroom sub-divisional town of Tripura has become impossible because of the objection raised by the Pakistan Government against our adopting any measure to serve the purpose, even though negotiations have been going on for a long time to reach an agreement in this matter between the Government of India and the Government of Pakistan.

In Tripura, due to the upward trend of price-index, the sufferings of the people at large know no bounds. Government seem to be completely unaware of this. To remedy all these drawbacks, the only alternative is to give adequate power to the people of the Union Territory of Tripura in the form of a Legislature.

श्रीमती उमा नेहरू (सीतापुर) :

मैडम चेयरमैन, मैं इस विषय पर बोलना चाहती थी लेकिन हाउस में चारों तरफ से

जो लोग बोले उन्होंने कोई ऐसा विषय नहीं छोड़ा जिस पर और लोग भी बोल सकें।

मैं इस तीसरी पंच वर्षीय योजना का स्वागत करती हूँ और इसका स्वागत इसलिए करती हूँ कि इन प्लानों की वजह से आज देश की सूरत में बराबर फर्क पड़ रहा है। देश में बराबर प्लानिंग हो रहा है और आज वह समय इस आजाद देश में आया है कि हम तीसरी प्लान बनाने बैठे हैं।

तीसरी योजना जो हमको दी गयी वह तो बहुत मोटी है और हमारे पास इतना बकन नहीं था कि उसको उठ सकें, इसलिए हमने उसकी समरी को पढ़ा है और समरी पढ़ कर हमने देखा है कि हममें क्या क्या चीजें हैं। समरी पढ़ने के अलावा हम देश में योजनाओं का अमर देख रहे हैं। हम केवल पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर ही नहीं हैं बल्कि हम वक्ता भी हैं और बाहर भी काम करते हैं। हम देशों में और शहरों में घूमते हैं और हम रचनात्मक काम करते हैं। हम बाहर देख रहे हैं कि देश में पहली और दूसरी योजनाओं का क्या अमर हुआ है। हमारा योजनाओं का ज्ञान किताबी ही नहीं है, बल्कि हम अमली तौर से देख रहे हैं कि उनका क्या अमर हुआ है। उसे देख कर हमें खुशी होती है। हमें शहरों की सूरतें बदली हुई दिखायी देती हैं। कारखानों का देखात है कि वे कितनी अच्छी तरह से चल रहे हैं। यह सब तरहकी देख कर हमें खुशी होती है।

और आज जो यह तीसरी योजना हमारे सामने आयी है इसको देखने में हमको खयाल होता है कि हमने देशों की तरफ लक्ष्य कर रखा किया गया है, जो कि बहुत जरूरी है क्योंकि आज हमारे देशों की हालत अच्छी नहीं है। देशों की तरफ जो लक्ष्य है उसको देख कर हमें उम्मीद है कि इस प्लान में हमें सफलता हांकी।

[श्रीमती उमा नेहरू]

16.52 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने यह तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना पेश की और जब उन्होंने इसे पेश किया तो उन्होंने हाउस से कहा कि यह कोई पार्टी की योजना नहीं है, यह सारे देश की योजना है, यह सारी पार्टियों की योजना है और यह सभी की है, क्योंकि आजाद देशों में जो योजनाएँ बनती हैं वे सारे देश की होती हैं किसी एक पार्टी की नहीं होती और हर एक को उनमें मेहनत करनी होती है।

यहां पर हमारे भाइयों ने योजना पर अलग अलग व्याख्यान दिए, लेकिन किसी ने कोई विशेष मजेगन्स नहीं दिए, कोई बाने नहीं बतायीं कि यह हो या वह हो सिवाय हमारे एक भाई श्री अशोक मेहता के। उन्होंने कई ऐसी तजवीजें पेश की जो कि काबिले गौर है और मैं समझती हूँ कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर उन पर गौर करेंगे और देखेंगे कि उनको कहां तक अमली तौर से मंजूर किया जा सकता है।

इस समय हमारे सामने एक खास सवाल है और वह सवाल यह है कि अगर इस योजना को हम कामयाब बनाना चाहते हैं तो हमको एग्रीकल्चर की तरफ ध्यान देना है। हमको तीन चीजों की खाम जरूरत हानी है कि हमको खाना मिले, मकान मिले और कपड़ा मिले। इस वक्त हमारी हालत यह है कि चाहे हमको कपड़ा और मकान कुछ कम भी मिले लेकिन हमको खाना जरूर मिले क्योंकि बगैर मित्रा के इन्सान जिन्दा नहीं रह सकता। यह मूरत है। तो एग्रीकल्चर को हमको ज्यादा बढ़ाना है।

इस प्लान को जो हम देखते हैं कि इसमें कोषाया की गयी है कि अनाम्पलायमेंट को कम किया जाए, एग्रीकल्चर को बढ़ाया जाए, कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज और कोआपरेटिव

मारकेटिंग सोसाइटीज का भी इसमें जिक्र किया गया है, और हमे यकीन है कि अगर ये चीजें हुईं तो हमारे सारे देहातों में और दश में बहुत कायावी होगी।

इस योजना की जान एग्रीकल्चर है। इसके साथ ही मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि जहां आप देहातों में एग्रीकल्चर की तरफ ध्यान देने हैं वहां आपको काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज की तरफ भी ध्यान देना चाहिए। यह बहुत जरूरी है। इसके लिए उद्योग सब बनाने चाहिए और इस तरह काम करना चाहिए कि काटेज इंडस्ट्री केवल नाम को न चले बल्कि वे मेन्फमर्फीशेंट हो जाएं। अगर ऐसा होगा तो अनाम्पलायमेंट का प्रश्न बहुत कुछ हल हो जाएगा।

एग्रीकल्चर के द्वारा हमको फूड प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाना है ताकि दश फूड के मामले में भी मेन्फमर्फीशेंट हो सके।

साथ ही हम देखते हैं कि आपने इस योजना में साइडिफिक और टैक्निकल शिक्षा को और भी ध्यान दिया है, और मुझे उम्मीद है कि अगर इस पर अमल किया जाएगा तो बहुत उन्नति होगी।

सब से बड़ी चीज जो कि इस प्लान में होने वाली है और जिसे मैं कि मुझे बहुत दिलचस्पी है वह पंचायत राज है। पंचायत राज जो कि इस योजना में कायम होगा वह बहुत ही अच्छी चीज होगी, और मैं समझती हूँ कि अभी भारत में सच्चे मानों में स्वराज्य होगा। हमको अपने पंचायती राज को कामयाब बनाना है क्योंकि अगर हमारे पंच काबिल होंगे और अपने हाथ से अपनी हुकूमत करेंगे और अपने भरोसे काम करेंगे तो इससे बढ़ कर कोई दूसरा स्वराज्य हो भी नहीं सकता। यह देख कर हमें खुशी होती है।

इस प्लान का जिक्र करने हुए बहुत से लोगों ने सोशलिस्ट पैंटन ग्राम सोसाइटी का जिक्र बड़े लाइट तरीके से किया। मैं उनसे कहना चाहती हूँ कि ये जो प्लान आपके सामने पांचवें साल सरकार लाती है इनकी क्या जरूरत है? ये प्लान आपके सामने इसलिए लाए जाते हैं कि आपको बताया जाए कि इनके जरिए क्या कॉन्ग्रेशन की जा रही है। इन प्लान्स के द्वारा गरीबों को रोटी देने की कॉन्ग्रेशन की जाती है। यह इन प्लान्स का मकसद है कि जो भी दोलत और धन देश में पैदा होता है उसकी तकसीम इस तरह से करें कि जिसमें इतना ज्यादा फर्क न रहे, न कोई ज्यादा रईस हो और न कोई गरीब रहे। इस मकसद को पूरा करने के लिए ये प्लान आपके सामने लाए जाते हैं कि मूलक प्रागे बढ़े।

अभी मेरे कुछ भाइयों ने सोशल वेलफेयर बोर्ड का जिक्र किया। मुझे तो उन भाइयों से कहना है कि जो सोशल वेलफेयर बोर्ड यहाँ पर है उसको औरते चला रही है और वह बहुत अच्छा काम कर रहा है। मुझे नहीं मान्य कि जब वह इसकी चर्चा कर रहे थे तो उनका मतलब किम देश के सोशल वेलफेयर बोर्ड से था। हमारा सोशल वेलफेयर बोर्ड जिसका बहिने चलाती है वह तो बहुत उम्दा काम कर रहा है। मैं उसका काम अपने भाई को दिखाऊँ तो उनको उसको देख कर ताज्जुब होगा और उनको गुरू भी होगा कि बहिने उनसे बहुत ज्यादा अच्छा काम हम वक्त हम सोशल वेलफेयर बोर्ड में कर रही हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि इस सोशल वेलफेयर बोर्ड को बन्द करके इसका जो रुपया है वह इसमें लगाया जाए। यह बिल्कुल बेकार चीज है।

दूसरे उन्होंने कम्युनिटी डेवेलपमेंट की चर्चा की। यह सुन कर मुझे एक अंग्रेजी की कहावत याद आ गयी—इग्नोरेंस इज ए विलस। अगर वह बाहर जाकर देखें तो उनको मान्य होगा कि कम्युनिटी डेवेलपमेंट का

कितना काम हो रहा है। मान्य होता है कि कम्युनिटी डेवेलपमेंट का इतिहास उन्होंने नहीं पढ़ा। उसके बारे में जानकारी हासिल नहीं की लेकिन केवल अपने स्थाल से एक चीज कह दो और कह दिया कि इसका रुपया भी प्लान में डाल दिया जाए।

तो ये चीजें मैं सुनीं।

अभी एक दूसरे भाई रामेश्वर राव जो ने जिक्र किया कि दो योजनाएँ प्रायीं लेकिन बहुत से देहातों में और गावों में कुछ भी काम नहीं हुआ है। मैं उनको बताऊँ कि जिस वक्त आजाद मुल्क में एमपी योजनाएँ प्राती हैं तो उस आजाद मुल्क के बच्चे, मद और औरते अपने पूरे दिल से उनमें लगती हैं और हम वजह से देश के कोने कोने में तककी होती है जिन भाई ने कहा कि वहाँ कोई तरबकी नहीं हुई है उनसे मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि अगर नहीं हुई तो उनका धर्म था—यहाँ कहने का नहीं वहाँ काम करके दिखाने का। उनको वहाँ काम करना चाहिए था। जब तक जनता में जोश नहीं आएगा और आप जब तक जोश के साथ काम नहीं करेंगे तब तक कामयाबी नहीं होगी।

मुझे अपने प्लान्स से शिक्षा पर जो उन्होंने रुपया रखा है उसके बारे में कुछ कहना है। मैंने देखा है कि उन्होंने लड़कियों की शिक्षा के लिये कम रुपया रखा है। आप गौर से देखेंगे तो आपको मान्य होगा कि लड़कियों के बाले उनका पैसा नहीं दिया गया है जितना कि लड़कों की शिक्षा के बाले दिया गया है। किमी देश को प्रागे बढ़ाने के लिये यह जरूरी है कि उसकी लड़कियों को ज्यादा तालीम दी जाये, ताकि वे योग्य और बिडान् मातायें बनें और उनके बच्चे भी बने ही हों।

17 hrs

ज्यादा न कहने हुए मैं यह उम्मीद करती हूँ कि जो तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना हमारे सामने आई है, वह उकर लफन होगी, बाह

[श्रीमती उमा नेहरू]

लोग कितना ही बिगड़ें, नुक़म निकालें और शिकायतें करें कि हमारे प्राविन्स के लिये काफी रुपया नहीं दिया गया है। जो स्पीचिज़ मैंने सुनीं, उन को मुन कर मुझे यह ख्याल हुआ कि मैं प्लान पर नहीं बल्कि बजट पर स्पीचिज़ मुन रही हूँ, क्योंकि बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने यह शिकायत की कि हमें रुपया नहीं मिला। जो लोग कांग्रेस पार्टी में नहीं हैं, दूसरे ख्याल के हैं, दूसरी पार्टियों के हैं, मैं उम्मीद करती हूँ कि वे पार्टी की नज़र से इस योजना को नहीं देखेंगे और इसको अपना समझ कर आगे बढ़ायेंगे।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं योजना आयोग को इस योजना के वाशमय के लिये धन्यवाद देना हूँ।

Mr. Speaker: I want somebody to speak on shipping. That is why I have called the hon. Member.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Yes, I shall be speaking on shipping.

जब मैं इस योजना में शिपिंग के विषय को देखता हूँ, तो थोड़ा नैराश्य होता है। नैराश्य इस कारण होता है कि फ़स्ट फ़ाइव ईयर प्लान में शिपिंग का टारगेट ६ लाख टन का था, दूसरे प्लान में टारगेट ६ लाख टन का था और तीसरे प्लान में टारगेट ११ लाख टन का रखा गया है, अर्थात् पहली योजना में ३ लाख टन का एडीशन हुआ, दूसरी योजना में करीब ४ लाख टन का और तीसरी योजना में जब कि प्लानर्स कहते हैं कि हमारा एक्सपोर्ट और इम्पोर्ट ६० परसेंट बढ़ने जा रहा है और इस कारण हमारा टारगेट दूसरी योजना से ज्यादा होना चाहिये था, शिपिंग में १,८१,००० टन का एडीशन रखा गया है, जो कि इस पुस्तक में दिया गया है। इससे मुकाबले में दूसरी योजना में ४,२५,००० टन का एडीशन रखा गया था। जबकि दूसरी योजना में ५४ करोड़ रुपया शिपिंग के लिये दिया गया था, तीसरी योजना में सिर्फ ५५

करोड़ रुपया रखा गया है अर्थात् सिर्फ एक करोड़ रुपया ज्यादा रखा गया है। इस सम्बन्ध में हम को यह भी स्मरण रखना चाहिए कि हम ८० करोड़ रुपया फूडग्रेन्ज के लिये अमरीका में फ़ेट के लिये देने जा रहे हैं और आज तक एक पैसा भी फ़डग्रेन्ज के फ़ेट से हमने अर्ज नहीं किया है। स्टील, आयरन और और काटन धातु का जो एक्सपोर्ट और इम्पोर्ट हम करने जा रहे हैं, अगर उतना भी इस में जोड़ें, तो यह धनराशि बहुत ज्यादा हो जाती है। सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि आठ करोड़ रुपया प्रतिवर्ष हम फ़ारेन एक्सचेंज के रूप में आयल रिफ़ाइनरीज़ का, फ़ारेन कम्पनीज़ को दे रहे हैं, जिसमें हमारी अरनिंग विन्कल नहीं है।

आज हमारे शिपिंग वॉर्ड टनज का ५ परसेंट है। अगर हम इस लक्ष्य को मान लेते हैं, तो पांच बरस के बाद हमारी शिपिंग ३ परसेंट हो जायगी, अर्थात् २ परसेंट कम हो जायगी। कल के स्टेट्समैन में एक ख़बर छपी है कि आन्ध्र में एक कम्पनी फ़्लोट हुई है जयन्ती कम्पनी। डा० नेजा के स्टेटमेंट से यह जाहिर होता है कि वह इन दो बरसों में चार लाख टन का एडीशन इण्डियन शिपिंग में करने जा रहे हैं, अर्थात् जो गवर्नमेंट का टारगेट है, उसका दुगना एडीशन दो वर्ष में होने जा रहा है। इसका मतलब यह है कि गवर्नमेंट इस बारे में बड़ी दूरदर्शिता से नहीं देख रही है। उन्होंने एक दूसरी इम्पोर्टेंट बात यह कही है—

"Answering questions, Dr. Teja said that the ships would be manned by foreign crew for the present because of difficulties in securing Indian personnel".

हम यहां पर राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात बहुत करते हैं लेकिन डा० तेजा का यह स्टेटमेंट है कि वह दो बरस में चार लाख टन का एडीशन करने जा रहे हैं, जो कि हमारे टारगेट

का दुगुना तिगुना है। वह कहते कि हमारे पास इण्डियन कू नहीं हैं। मैं गवर्नमेंट से पृच्छता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद हुए तेरह बरस हो गये हैं और इस अवधि में यहाँ पर उसने इंजिनियरिंग कालेजिज का जाल सा बिछा दिया है, लेकिन क्या कभी उसने यह ब्याल किया कि हिन्दुस्तानी परसानेल को यहाँ पर ट्रेण्ड किया जाये। मान लीजिये, कल वार छिड़ जाती है, तो ये फ़ारेन परसानेल, जो कि हमारे शिप्स में हैं, इस देश के प्रति लायल होंगे, या अपने देश के प्रति। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि इस बारे में ठोस कदम उठाया जाये और इन परसानेल को, जिनकी तादाद आठ दस हजार होगी, हिन्दुस्तान में ट्रेन किया जाये, ताकि उनकी लायन्टी अपने देश के प्रति हो।

फ़राक़्का बैराज के बारे में मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर माह्व को धन्यवाद दूंगा कि उन्होंने कम से कम एक स्टेटमेंट में बड़े जोरदार शब्द में यह कहा कि फ़राक़्का बैराज बनना चाहिए। मैं प्लानिंग कमीशन को भी धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि उसने फ़राक़्का बैराज के लिये काफ़ी रुपया ५६ करोड़ रुपया रखा है, जिनमें से २५ करोड़ रुपया थर्ड फ़ाइव-यीअर प्लान में खर्च होगा और बाकी ती बरस के अन्दर खर्च होगा। मैंने पहले भी यहाँ पर कहा था कि मिन्ध वाटर ट्रीटी करने में पहले फ़राक़्का बैराज का मामला तय होना चाहिए। मेरी बात पर उस वक़्त किसी ने ध्यान नहीं दिया। मिन्ध वाटर ट्रीटी करके पाकिस्तान ने अपनी समस्या हल कर ली। आज जब हिन्दुस्तान फ़राक़्का बैराज के लिये तैयार होता है, तो पाकिस्तान झड़गा लगाना है और कहना है कि हिन्दुस्तान को फ़राक़्का बैराज बनाने का कोई हक़ नहीं है। मैं प्रधान मन्त्री जी को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने इस बारे में एक मजबूत और ठोस स्टैंड लिया है कि पाकिस्तान माने या न माने, फ़राक़्का बैराज बन कर रहेगा।

जहाँ तक कोल के शार्टेंज का सम्बन्ध है, सरकार को बहुत दिनों के बाद ब्याल धावा

कि कोल कोस्टल शिपिंग से जाना चाहिए। आप जानते हैं कि हमारी फ़ोट पालिसी क्या है। अगर रेलवे से कोल जाता है, तो एक हजार मील के बाद उसका कोई फ़ोट नहीं लगता है, उस का कोई भाड़ा नहीं देना पड़ता है। अगर सरकार चाहे कि उसी रीति से कोस्टल शिपिंग वाले भी एक हजार मील के बाद फ़ोट न लें तो वह सम्भव नहीं है, क्योंकि रेलवेज तो राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति है, वहाँ तो सरकार कर सकती है, लेकिन ६० परसेंट कोस्टल शिपिंग प्राईवेट सैक्टर में है और प्राईवेट सैक्टर का ट्रेडर, बनिया, ऐसा कोई काम करने के लिये तैयार नहीं होगा, जिसमें उस को किसी प्रकार का लाभ हो। अगर कोल शार्टेंज को दूर करना है, तो कोस्टल शिपिंग की तरक्की होनी चाहिये और फ़ोट स्ट्रक्चर ऐसा होना चाहिए कि इण्डियन शिपिंग को फायदा पहुंच सके।

विशाखापत्तनम् शिपयार्ड की कैपेसिटी यह आंकी गई है कि वहाँ पर प्रतिवर्ष ५० हजार टन के जहाज तैयार होंगे और पांच बरस बाद साठ हजार टन के जहाज तैयार होंगे, अर्थात् सिर्फ़ दस हजार टन की तरक्की की गई है। हम देखते हैं कि डा० नेत्रा ने जितने आर्डर दिये हैं, वे फ़ारेन शिपयार्डों को दिये हैं और एक पैसा भी हिन्दुस्तान शिपयार्ड को मिलने वाला नहीं है, क्योंकि वहाँ पर जहाज बनाने की कैपेसिटी नहीं है, उसका विकास नहीं किया जा रहा है और अर्द्ध जहाज वहाँ पर नहीं बनाए जा सकते हैं। ऐसी अवस्था में अगर कोई शिपिंग कम्पनी स्टार्ट करेगा, तो वह किसी दूसरी जगह से जहाज लायेगा और कम्पनी स्टार्ट करेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि विशाखापत्तनम् का इनका विकास होना चाहिए कि हमारी आवश्यकता की पूर्ति हो जाये। कोचीन में सैकिड शिपयार्ड के बारे में बहुत दिनों से बात हो रही है लेकिन हमका काम अभी तक एक नहीं हुआ है। हमें चाहिये कि जो जहाज हम बाहर से खरीद रहे हैं, उन जहाजों को हम हिन्दुस्तान में ही तैयार करें, यहीं पर कंस्ट्रक्ट करें।

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

विशाखापत्तनम् के बारे में मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। ड्राई डाकिंग के वास्ते हमारे जहाज आज मिगापुर जाते हैं, अदन जाते हैं, लन्दन जाते हैं, फारेन हार्बरज में जाते हैं। यह रूपया हमें बचाना चाहिये हम करीब दो तीन करोड़ रूपया साल का इस काम में खर्च कर देते हैं और यह फारेन कंट्रीज को जाना है। यह धर्म की बात है। आप कम से कम विशाखापत्तनम् में ड्राई डाक बना दीजिये। मान आठ ब्रस से यह मांग खिनी आ रही है। इससे दो लाभ हो सकते हैं। पहले शिप का कंस्ट्रक्शन आपन डाक मिस्टम से होता था और यह तरीका ठुगना पड़ गया। अब ड्राई डाक मिस्टम को काम में लाया जाता है और इससे शिप कंस्ट्रक्ट किया जाता है। एक तो यह लाभ है और दूसरा लाभ यह है कि रिपेयर का काम हो सकता है। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि विशाखापत्तनम् में ड्राई डाक होना चाहिये ताकि इन दोनों लाभों में हम वञ्चित न रहें और फारेन एक्स-चेंज भी बचा सकें।

जहां तक शिपिंग का सम्बन्ध है, यह बहुत दिनों से अपरिचित सा विषय रहा है। इसकी आज के जमाने में उपेक्षा नहीं की जानी चाहिये। यह हमारी मैकिण्ड लाइन आप डिफेंस है। आप देख रहे हैं कि युद्ध के बादल चारों ओर मण्डरा रहे हैं। हमारी कोस्ट लाइन 3,000 मील के करीब है। उसकी हमें रक्षा करनी है। उसकी रक्षा करने की हम में ताकत होनी चाहिये और इतनी ताकत अवश्य होनी चाहिये कि अगर कोई विदेशी ताकत हम पर हमला करे तो हम उसका जवाब दे सकें। बेशक डिफेंस के खर्च को प्लान में स्थान नहीं दिया गया है लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हमारे पास अच्छा शिपवाइंड होगा तो उसमें सब-मैरीज भी तैयार हो सकती है, डार-शिप भी तैयार हो सकते हैं, क्रूजर भी तैयार हम कर सकते हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप इन सब को तैयार करना

शुरू कर दें लेकिन हम इस स्थिति में हों कि अगर जरूरत पड़े तो इनको भी तैयार कर सकें। मैं नयी कहना कि आर्माइंट की तरफ आप जायें लेकिन आप व्यापार की तरफ तो अपना ध्यान दें और कल अगर जरूरत हो तो व्यापारी चीज को आप आर्माइंट में भी बदल सकते हैं।

मैं अन्न में यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि ड्राई डाक का जहां तक सम्बन्ध है, शिप का जहां तक सम्बन्ध है, ज्यादा से ज्यादा रूपया इस काम के लिये खर्चा जाए।

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Govind Das, I shall call Shri Raghubir Sahai also. He is an expert on decentralised democracy. I am not minimising the importance of other Members.

Shri Achar (Mangalore): No one from Mysore has been called.

Mr. Speaker: One has been called already.

Shri Achar: Not from this side.

Shri P. S. Daulta: None has spoken from the Hindi-speaking area of Punjab.

Mr. Speaker: I shall keep my eye on Shri P. S. Daulta.

डा० गोविंद दास (जबलपुर) : अध्यक्ष जी, इस तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना का मैं हृदय से स्वागत करता हूँ और जब मैं ऐसा करता हूँ तो इस का एक प्रधान कारण यह भी है कि इस निर्माण के युग में हमें देश का दो प्रकार से निर्माण करना है—(१) प्राथमिक वस्तुओं का निर्माण और (२) नई पीढ़ी का निर्माण, उस निर्माण में सब से पहले इस तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में कुछ नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक निर्माण की बात भी कही गई है। हम प्राथमिक निर्माण में तो, जब से स्वतन्त्र हुए हैं, तब से लगे हुए हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में, चाहे

हमारी किन्तनी भी आलोचना क्यों न की जाये, किन्तु यह मानना होगा कि हमें आधि-भौतिक निर्माण में बहुत दूर तक नहीं तो कुछ दूर तक सफलता भी मिली है। लेकिन अब तक हमारा ध्यान नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक निर्माण की ओर जितना होना चाहिये था उतना नहीं था और अब से पहले मुझे यह देख कर हर्ष हुआ कि तृतीय योजना में नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक विषयों के बारे में भी कुछ विचार किया गया है।

अध्यक्ष जी, मैं एक छोटा सा साहित्यकार हूँ और भारतीय संस्कृति में मुझे प्रेम है। इस समय संसार की जैसी अवस्था है, उस अवस्था में जब भारत सब से मैत्री रखने का प्रयत्न कर रहा है, तो उस प्रयत्न में हमें तब तक सफलता नहीं मिल सकती जब तक कि हम अपनी नई पीढ़ी का निर्माण नैतिक और आध्यात्मिक विना पर न करें। जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि भारतवर्ष ने आकाश की ओर ही देखा है पृथ्वी के ओर नहीं उन से मैं सहमत नहीं हूँ। हम ने आधिभूत और अध्यात्म दोनों की ओर देखा है। लेकिन इस के साथ ही हम में भी संदेह नहीं हो सकता कि भारतवर्ष में अध्यात्म प्रमुख रहा है। आज भी भारतवासियों के स्वन में वही भावनाये प्रधान रूप में है और मुझे यह देख कर हर्ष हुआ कि इस योजना में इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ विचार किया गया है।

हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति बड़ी दोषपूर्ण है। इस शिक्षा पद्धति के परिवर्तन के सम्बन्ध में कई आयोग बने, कई समिति बनायी, उन की रिपोर्टें भी हमारे सामने आयी परन्तु यह खेद की बात है कि हमारी शिक्षा प्रणाली में कोई आमूल परिवर्तन नहीं हुए, जिन परिवर्तनों की अत्याधिक आवश्यकता थी, वे भी नहीं हुए। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि जब इस तीसरी योजना में नैतिकता और आध्यात्मिकता की बात की गई है तो हमारी शिक्षा पद्धति में भी आमूल परिवर्तन करने का प्रयत्न किया जावेगा।

अब कुछ बाने मैं आधिभौतिक निर्माण के विषय में भी कहना चाहता हूँ। जहाँ तक

आधिभौतिक निर्माण का सम्बन्ध है, यह बात सब लोग स्वीकार करेंगे और अभी मेरी बड़ी बहन उमा नेहरू जी भी कह रही थी और उन से मैं सर्वथा सहमत हूँ कि आधिभौतिक निर्माण में जब तक हम खेती को प्रधानता नहीं देगे तब तक हमारा काम चलने वाला नहीं है। जब श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन कृषि मंत्री थे उस समय मैं ने उन से इसी लोक सभा में एक आश्वासन लिया था कि तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में खेती को सर्वप्रथम स्थान दिया जायेगा, प्राथमिकता दी जायेगी। मुझे हर्ष है कि यह बात भी हुई है।

जहाँ तक खेती का सम्बन्ध है, उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये तीन बातों की प्रधानता आवश्यकता है, आबपाणी की, खाद की और अच्छे बीज की। जहाँ तक आबपाणी का सम्बन्ध है, हम ने बड़े बड़े बांध बना दिये हैं जिन से हजारों और लाखों एकड़ जमीन सींची जायेगी। लेकिन मुझे क्षमा किया जाये, अध्यक्ष जी, अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि यदि भारत में ही हम इन बड़े बड़े बांधों को पर्ये रख कर लघु मिर्चाई योजनाओं को प्राथमिकता देने का आग्रह जितना लाभ हमें इन बड़े बड़े बांधों से हुआ है, उन की अपेक्षा कहीं अधिक लाभ होता। फिर इस योजना के सम्बन्ध में यहाँ की जनता के मन में बहुत उत्साह भी नहीं है। इस का यह कारण है कि ये बड़ी बड़ी आबपाणी की योजनाएँ एक विशिष्ट स्थान को महायत्ना देती हैं, और ज्यादातर आबादी और ज्यादातर स्थान ऐसे रह जाते हैं जहाँ बड़ी बड़ी मिर्चाई योजनाओं में कोई विशेष लाभ नहीं पहुँचना। जब तक खेती करने वालों की यह बात महसूस नहीं होगी कि ये योजनाएँ गाँव गाँव में उन की महायत्ना के लिये हैं, तब तक उन के मन में इस योजना के प्रति उत्साह का उत्पन्न नहीं हो सकती। और बिना उत्साह के कोई काम नहीं चल सकता। कम से कम प्रभावपूर्ण देशों में, जहाँ कोई भी योजना बिना प्रजा के सहयोग के नहीं चल सकती वहाँ प्रजा के मन में योजना के प्रति

[डा० गोविन्द दास]

उत्साह की आवश्यकता है। इसलिये मुझे हर्ष है कि इस योजना में लघु मिचार्ड के सम्बन्ध में बहुत कुछ कहा गया है। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस पर सब से अधिक ध्यान दिया जायेगा और जो कुछ कहा गया है उसे कार्य रूप में परिणत करने का प्रयत्न किया जायेगा।

इस मिचार्ड, अच्छे बीज और खाद के कारण कृषि की उप्रति तो होगी लेकिन उसी के साथ लघु उद्योग धंधों की आवश्यकता है। हमारे यहां बिजली की उत्पत्ति हो रही है, बिजली बढ़ रही है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो नई बिजली की ताकत हमें मिले वह जो पुराने बड़े बड़े कारखाने हैं उन को न दी जाये। उस बिजली का उपयोग कुटीर उद्योगों में हो। गांव गांव में बिजली पहुंचाई जाये जिस में कृषि के साथ साथ हमारे कृषकों के लिये छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधे भी बन सकें। इसलिये यदि हमें लोगों की आर्थिक अवस्था सुधारनी है और अधिभूत की ओर ध्यान देना है तो मैं दो बातें जड़ की मानता हूँ, एक तो लघु मिचार्ड की योजनायें जो गांव गांव में जायें और दूसरे लघु उद्योग धंधे।

प्रतिवर्धी पक्ष में कुछ बातें कही गयीं उन के सम्बन्ध में मैं कुछ संक्षेप में कहना चाहता हूँ। कल यहां कहा गया कि कीमतें न बढ़नी चाहियें। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि रिपोर्ट में इस सम्बन्ध में बार बार ध्यान खींचा गया है और एक पूरा अध्याय ही इस योजना में इस विषय में है। इस सम्बन्ध में निश्चित बातें सुझाई गई हैं, और वे बातें ये हैं: सरकार को इस समय उन स्थानों में खरीद करनी चाहिये जहां भाव गिरते हों। इस से सरकार को कम कीमतों में, सस्ते दामों में धान भी मिलेगा और साथ ही ऐसे स्थानों पर खरीद होने से वहां पर जो भाव एकदम घट जाते हैं वे घटेंगे भी नहीं। फिर सरकार को जो धनाज हो उस को ऐसे स्थानों पर भेजने के लिये

तैयार रहना चाहिये जहां पर एका एक मंहगाई हो। हमें इस बात का ध्यान रखना है कि न तो भाव इतने बढ़ जायें कि लोगों को मंहगाई के सबब से कष्ट हो और न भाव इतने गिर जायें कि किसानों को उन के उत्पादन का उचित मूल्य न मिल सके। पूरा कंट्रोल तो हो नहीं सकता। उस के बुरे नतीजे हम देख चुके हैं, और न यह हो सकता है कि विल्कुल किसी तरह का नियंत्रण न रक्खा जाये। इस लिये इस योजना में मध्यम मार्ग सुझाया गया है कि न भाव बढ़ने दिये जायेंगे और न अधिक घटने दिये जायेंगे, इस का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ। लेकिन कार्य रूप में इस विषय को परिणत करना आसान नहीं है। इस सम्बन्ध में कृषि मंत्रालय को बहुत सजग रहने की आवश्यकता होगी और बहुत बड़ी जम्मेदारी कृषि मंत्रालय के ऊपर इस बात की होगी कि वह इस बात को बराबर देखता रहे कि भाव जहरत से ज्यादा बढ़ने भी न पायें और जहरत से ज्यादा घटने भी न पायें।

फिर आर्थिक समानता की बात कही गई। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि योजना के पहले प्रस्ताव में ही इस विषय के सुझाव हैं। मुख्य सुझाव टैक्सेशन की नीति के सम्बन्ध में है। इस विषय में शहरों में कुछ काम हो रहा है, और शहरों में होना भी चाहिये क्योंकि गरीबों से हम बहुत टैक्स वसूल नहीं कर सकते। इनकम टैक्स का जो विधेयक हमारे मामले उपस्थित हुआ है वह आर्थिक समानता को दूर करने का अवश्य प्रयत्न करेगा। इसी के साथ कम्पनी ला में उचित परिवर्तन किया गया है। फिर एक नीति इस योजना में और निश्चित की गई है कि जिन लोगों के पास पहले से बड़े बड़े उद्योग धंधे हैं उन को नये उद्योग धंधे डालने के लिये प्रोत्साहन नहीं दिया जायेगा। नये उद्योग धंधे ऐसे लोगों को डालने को दिये जायेंगे जो कि अभी इस क्षेत्र में उतरने नहीं हैं। धन: जो धनवान हैं उन को अधिक धनवान न बनाया जाय, नये

नये लोगों को नये नये उद्योग धंधे दिये जायें जैसा कि इस योजना में कहा गया है ।

इसी के साथ आर्थिक असमानता को दूर करने के लिये इस तरह की शिक्षा की भी आवश्यकता होगी, जिस को हम टैक्नीकल शिक्षा कहते हैं । इस सम्बन्ध में भी इस योजना में कहा गया है । मैं ह आशा करता हूँ कि इस प्रकार के लोगों को हम अपने देश में तैयार कर सकेंगे जो अपनी शिक्षा की बिना पर अपनी रोजी पैदा कर सकें और आर्थिक दृष्टि से स्वयं उन्नत हो सकें तथा इस देश को उन्नत कर सकें ।

बाहरी सहायता पर हमें कम से कम अवलम्बन रखना है । अभी भी हमारी योजनाओं पर अधिकतर रूपया हमारा ही खर्च होता है । आत्मनिर्भरता के सम्बन्ध में भी यह योजना बहुत कुछ कहती है, और इस विषय में सब से अधिक ध्यान रखना होगा बचत पर । जब हम इस पर ध्यान रखेंगे तो हमें फिजूल-खर्ची को रोकना होगा, सादगी को लाना होगा । इस सम्बन्ध में हमारे यहाँ जो नेतृत्व है उस के उपर सब से बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है । नेता जो कुछ करते हैं जनता उस का अनुसरण करती है । यदि सादगी का जीवन हमारे नेताओं में नहीं आयेगा, हमारे मंत्रियों में नहीं आये, तो हम यह आशा नहीं कर सकते कि सादगी का जीवन हम इस देश में ला सकेंगे । इसलिये यदि हम को इस गरीब देश में आत्म-निर्भर होना है, यदि हम को अपनी योजनायें अपने द्रव्य से चलानी हैं, यदि हमें बाहरी अवलम्बन पर निर्भर नहीं रहना है, तो इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि अधिक से अधिक हम अपने घर की फिजूलखर्ची को रोकें और दूसरों से ऐसा करायें । इस के लिये मैं फिर यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सब से बड़ी जिम्मेदारी हमारे नेतृत्व की है । हमारा नेतृत्व जब सादगी से रहेगा और इस का उदाहरण हमारे सामने उपस्थित करेगा तभी देश उस का अनुसरण कर सकेगा । महात्मा गांधी का बहुत बड़ा अर्थ हमारे सामने है । क्या गांधी जी इस बात को मानते

नहीं थे, कि उन के लंगोटी लगा लेने से सारे हिन्दुस्तान को कपड़ा नहीं मिल सकता, क्या वे जानते नहीं थे कि सेवाग्राम में एक छोटी सी झोंपड़ी में रहने से सारे हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को मकान नहीं मिल जायेंगे ? लेकिन यह सब जानते हुए भी वे देश के सामने एक आदर्श उपस्थित करते थे । इस बारे में आप उन के जीवन को देखिये । हमें एक आदर्श पर चलाने के लिये उन्हीं ने लंगोटी लगाई । जिस प्रकार वे रहते थे लोगों का ध्यान उस तरफ जाता था । अथ्यक्ष महोदय, इस देश में कभी शान व शोक की पूजा नहीं हुई । इस देश में सदा सादगी की, सादे जीवन की पूजा हुई है । हमारा प्राचीन संस्कृति बाल्य यह देश समस्त बातों को एक तरफ रख त्याग को प्रमुक्तता देता है । इसलिये मैं आशा करता हूँ कि यदि इस योजना को आध्यात्मिक और आधिभौतिक दोनों दृष्टियों से सफल करना है तो हमारे नेतृत्व को प्रागे धाना पड़ेगा ।

जैसा मैं ने आप से कहा, मैं इस पंचवर्षीय योजना का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ । ऐसी कोई चीज नहीं है जिस में दोष न निकाले जा सके, दोष इस में भी निकाले जा सकते हैं, लेकिन आवश्यकता है कि दोषों को कम से कम कर के जो गुण हों उन को अधिक से अधिक बढ़ा कर हम इस योजना को सफल करें और आध्यात्मिक और आधिभौतिक दोनों दृष्टियों से इस देश को प्रागे बढ़ाने की कोशिश करें ।

Shri Raghbir Sahai (Budaum):
Sir, I am very grateful to you for having given me this opportunity to speak on the important subject of the third Five Year Plan. A comprehensive document has been presented to us in regard to this Plan, which gives us an idea as to how the development would take place in our country within the next five years. It is very gratifying to note that in framing this Plan, a larger perspective has been kept in view, viz., how

[Shri Raghubir Sahai]

the development would take place in the next 15 or 20 years with regard to the growth of national income, growth of *per capita* income, growth in agricultural production and industrial production and so on. This Plan, as the first and second Plans, has before it the amelioration of the condition of the rural masses in our country, which constitute virtually 80 per cent of the population of this country. Now, for this very object the programme of community development was launched, and as everybody knows that programme was launched about 9 or 10 years back in our country.

Sir, with the passage of time every year we gain some experience in regard to the working of this programme and now, at the present moment, the panchayati raj has come into existence. The whole programme of panchayati raj has been accepted by the entire country, and it is a matter of gratification to know that in many of these States they are going ahead with this programme of panchayati raj. For instance, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Orissa, Madras, Mysore, and Punjab have gone ahead and they have implemented this programme in toto in almost every one of these States. There are some States where relevant legislations have been passed. For instance, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh have passed legislations. We also find that in Maharashtra and in Gujerat they are contemplating to introduce relevant legislations in regard to this. We are sorry to note that only in Kerala as well as in West Bengal there is some amount of indifference in regard to this programme. Well, how long this indifference would go on we cannot foresee, but the Planning Commission as well as the Ministry of Community Development should see to it that the indifference shown by these States is also converted into enthusiasm.

The working of the panchayati raj programme has posed certain problems, and I would like to discuss two or three such problems before this House. The other day, Sir, we had the privilege of listening to a very brilliant speech on the Five Year Plan by our distinguished friend Shri Asoka Mehta, and in the course of his remarks he pointed out that all these Plans and specially the community development programme has not done any good to the poorer section of our people. I feel there is a lot of truth in what Shri Asoka Mehta has said. But he should know that the Planning Commission as well as the Government of India as also the Community Development Ministry are alive to this fact, that the poorer section or the weaker section of our people have not been very much benefited by this movement.

Sir, it is a difficult problem and there cannot be any cut and dry solution to it. For instance, it is very difficult to define who are included amongst the weaker sections. It is not only the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes who come within this expression, but there are also many other people who can easily come within the weaker section. Steps are now being taken to see that the weaker sections are also benefited by this movement.

We find that more and more allocations are now being made to the panchayat samitis, to the zilla parishads and to the village panchayats to see that the needs of the weaker sections are met. We also find that sub-committees are being constituted to look to the interests of these people, composed of the representatives of these very sections. This very problem has been referred to a committee under the distinguished leadership of Shri Jai Prakash Narain to look into, and we hope that very soon the report of that committee would be available and something tangible would come out of it.

There is another problem which is also posed by the *Panchayati Raj*. Recently we have had elections to the village panchayats in many of the States like Rajasthan, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh and now some real problems have come up to the surface. For instance, we have seen in the course of these elections that bitter feuds have come into play and feelings of caste, sometimes resulting in affrays, riots and murders. Corruption has also been noticed and the resultant litigation, involving a lot of money. When all these factors come into play, they cannot be entirely ignored. If in the wake of *Panchayati Raj* all these things have come to stay in the villages, then we shall have to very seriously consider whether *Panchayati Raj* would be to the benefit of the people or not. That makes us think about the problem as to how these elections in the villages should take place in regard to these panchayats. There is a very weighty opinion expressed in the country by responsible people that these elections, at least at the village level, should be on a unanimity basis where there is no contest. It is very easy to say that the election should be held on a unanimity basis. But how to achieve that unanimity? Firstly, in order to achieve that unanimity, it is very necessary that the village people should be educated; it is very necessary that the village panchayats and all the people in the villages should know that they have to return candidates to the village panchayats on the basis of merit and qualifications, and not on the basis of feelings of caste, group or religion.

I am glad to notice that in Rajasthan the State Programme Evaluation Organisation Committee investigated into this matter and came to the conclusion that the smaller a panchayat, the more chances there are for unanimous elections of *panch* and *sarpanch*. This is the finding that has been arrived at by the Rajasthan State Programme Evaluation Organisation and it should be pursued further.

There is another gratifying feature to be noticed, and that is that in Punjab and Rajasthan, wherever unanimous elections have taken place, they have given incentives and rewards to those village panchayats. This should also be pursued further. But, so far as the village panchayats are concerned, we should make up our mind that the elections should be on a unanimous basis.

There is another problem which is being posed under the *Panchayati Raj* and it is this. What is the proper role of the District Collector? There are different patterns in different States. In Rajasthan we find that the Collector is a non-voting member of the Zila Parishad. But when we go to Andhra Pradesh we find that he is the Chairman of all the standing committees of the Zila Parishad. They say that the real power is being wielded by the standing committees. When we go to Madras and Mysore, we find that he is not virtually but is actually the President or the Chairman of Zila Parishad.

Shri Balakrishnan (Dindigul—Reserved—Sch. Castes): The Collector has not got voting rights.

Shri Raghuraj Sahai: But he is the President. This variation from State to State, one thing in Rajasthan, another thing in Andhra Pradesh and a third thing in Madras and Mysore, is confusing. That is inexplicable. I feel that the time has come when a definite policy should be enunciated in regard to the role of the District Collector. I am glad to find that in the course of the discussion in the Third Plan the role has been defined like this, namely, firstly to ensure.

“coordination at the district level between the Zila Parishad and the technical officers in different fields close contacts between the latter and the Panchayat Samitis and Extension Officers at the block level, and a continuing flow of technical advice

[Shri Raghur Sahai]

and guidance from the departments at the State level."

and, secondly,

"to assist democratic institutions and the public services in developing the right conventions in day-to-day work and in administrative relationship based on recognition of their distinctive contribution in fulfilling common objectives."

These two different roles of the District Collector can be efficiently performed only when he is away from these institutions but to be sufficiently near them. He should not be a part and parcel of the arena of the Zila Parishad which many a time is controlled by political parties and where, naturally, differences are bound to exist. So, the role of the District Collector should be properly defined. The time has come for that definition and not for procrastination. I find that there is a tendency to postpone the definition of the proper role of the District Collector in certain quarters. I think the time has come when the definite role of the District Collector should be properly defined.

Another problem that is being posed under Panchayati Raj is this. What is the distinct role that the MLAs and the MPs should perform in regard to these bodies? Here also, from State to State we find different patterns. In Rajasthan and in Andhra we find that MLAs and MPs can hold executive offices. For instance, they can become Chairmen of the standing committees as well as of those bodies, whereas in Uttar Pradesh and certain other States they can only be non-voting members or members of the Parishad. Here also, some distinct understanding should be reached and the role of the MLAs and MPs should be defined

I am glad to find that at the recent Hyderabad Conference of the States Ministers and Development Commissioners they came to a decision, namely, the MPs, MLAs or MLCs should be associated with the Panchayat Samities and Zila Parishads, but should not have the right to vote or hold office in these institutions. I think this is a very right role for the M.L.A.s and M.P.s in these bodies. The earlier the decision is implemented by all the States, the better.

In regard to Panchayati Raj, there is also the question of training of both officials as well as non-officials. If we want to make the Panchayati Raj institutions a success, both the officials as well as the non-officials should be fully trained with regard to their functions and they should see that one should not try to usurp the functions of the other. This desideratum can only be achieved if provision for continuous training is made to train both officials and non-officials at all the levels. We find, at the present moment, there is a lot of confusion in the minds of both officials as well as non-officials as to the role which they have to perform. In my own estimation, if the District Boards had failed, one of the reasons for their failure was that the officials were not associated with these bodies and these non-official bodies did not have the co-operation of the technical officers and their expert advice. In Panchayati Raj, this has already been provided. It is very necessary that both the officials and non-officials should understand what their proper functions are.

My last point in this connection would be that we should see that proper resources are placed at the disposal of these Panchayati Raj Institutions. If we look at the provisions of the various legislations passed by the different States, we find that all these bodies viz. the village Panchayats, the Panchayat samities and the Zila Parishads have the power to raise certain taxes. They are reluctant to make use of this provision. They depend mostly on the grants and allocations made

by the Government. They are not prepared to levy those taxes on the people. This is not a laudable feature. This is not a feature which ultimately will go to the making of Panchayati Raj a success. It is very necessary that these elected people should be able to stand on their own legs and should be able to raise their revenue resources, although I feel that enough resources should be placed by the Government at their disposal. But, they should be able to raise their own resources at the same time.

Lastly, I feel that both the First and the Second Five Year plans have been a great success and they have created a very favourable impression on the entire country. I wish that the Third Five Year Plan should again be a great success. I congratulate and I compliment the Planning Commission for having framed this comprehensive plan.

Shri Balakrishnan: Mr. Speaker, after the successful implementation of the First and the Second Five Year Plans, our country is going to the Third Five Year Plan. It means that our country is marching fast on the road to prosperity. If at all we plan, we plan for the prosperity of the country. Economic planning is meant not merely for the construction of big buildings like the Ashoka Hotel or the multi-storeyed buildings that we see in Parliament Street, or for the mere developmental work on research schemes, but it means something more than that.

Yesterday, our hon. Prime Minister took pride in his introductory speech to refer to the fundamental aim and object of the Plan. In his speech, he said that the fundamental object of the Plan was to achieve the socialist pattern of society, to remove social injustice, to remove the disabilities of the social structure, and to remove inequalities of wealth and income. It is obvious that unless the backwardness of the weaker section is removed and they are upgraded, the fundamental object of the Plan cannot be

fulfilled. I hope that this aspect has been fully kept in view in the Plan.

But, as far as the Scheduled Caste people are concerned, in spite of the special preferences given to them under the Constitution, they are still behind the race. In spite of the successful implementation of the First and Second Five Year Plans, the Harijans are still behind the race. This has happened because of the inadequate and insufficient allocation of funds for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes.

In the First Five Year Plan, the allocation for the welfare of these weaker sections was only Rs. 7.8 crores. In the Second Plan, it was Rs. 27.66 crores, and in the Third Plan also, it is only Rs. 40.40 crores. Out of the outlay of an enormous and huge amount of Rs. 10,000 crores odd on this Plan, only these small doses are given in order to upgrade and strengthen the weaker sections.

It may be argued that even the Scheduled Caste people are gaining from the general provisions made in the matter of health, education and housing. It may be true to some extent. But I can say that unless the general economic condition of the Scheduled Castes is improved, it will be very difficult for them to race with other advanced communities. Unless their economic conditions are improved, they cannot utilise the general provisions. For example, even in the Second Plan, several crores of rupees were allotted for protected water supply; several crores of rupees were allotted for rural housing and for the starting of cottage industries in the community development blocks. But I would like to know how many Scheduled Caste people have been benefited by the starting of cottage industries with those general provisions. I want to know also how many Harijan villages were benefited through the protected water supply scheme. If at all Harijan colonies are constructed, it is not out of the general provision or through the community development schemes, but through the special pro-

[Shri Balakrishnan]

vision made for the Scheduled Castes by virtue of the special privileges which have been granted to them. So unless their economic condition is improved, it is very difficult for them to come on a par with the other communities. We should remember that all these special privileges are going to continue only for ten years. So within these ten years, their economic position will have to be improved so that they can stand on their own legs on par with other advanced communities.

Here I am reminded of a golden simile which is being used by our Chief Minister, Shri Kamaraj, whenever he speaks about the welfare of the Scheduled Castes. He used to compare the Scheduled Castes to the last child of a mother who has five children. The last child is very weak and the mother takes more care of that child, giving him extra milk and nutrition. So there is no use the elder children quarrelling about it. Here also the Government are giving extra privileges and help to the Scheduled Castes. We have to see that within these ten years, the position of the Scheduled Castes is improved to such an extent that they are able to stand on their own legs. Otherwise, after the special privileges in the Constitution are abolished, what will be the position? No Scheduled Caste person will be able to contest election and get elected to this House or to the State Assemblies. One parliamentary election costs Rs. 50,000. A State Assembly election will involve an expenditure of Rs. 25,000. This is the minimum expenditure one will have to incur. Do you think that a Scheduled Caste candidate will be able to contest elections along with the other advanced communities?

So I want to know whether we are going to continue this reservation for ever. If we are continuing it for ever, I have no quarrel. But if we want to abolish it, we will have to bring them up to the level of the other communities so that they can race with the

other communities. Regarding the Plan provision, very little amount is given. Unless sufficient amount is allotted, their position cannot be improved. So I would request the Planning Commission to make a sufficient allotment for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes.

As regards the construction of railway lines in the south, I am thankful to the Planning Commission that at least in the Third Plan favourable consideration will be given to the question of constructing some new lines in the south. In respect of railway lines, almost all the Southern States are ill-served. So I am glad that at least in the Third Plan, those lines which are under the consideration of the Planning Commission would be taken up and construction completed by the end of the Plan period.

As regards the Heavy Electricals Plant, I am sorry the request of the Madras Government was ignored. Madras State is ideally suited for the location of the Heavy Electricals Plant. Madras State stands first in the extension of electricity to rural areas. So the consumption of transformers and other heavy electrical goods is higher in Madras than elsewhere. Hence this Heavy Electricals Plant should have been located in Madras State.

So far as the location of an atomic power station is concerned, even after the supply of Kundah power, the power supply in Madras State will not be sufficient for the consumption of industries. So an atomic power station should also be constructed in Madras State.

As regards the community development schemes, I have heard some Members criticising them. I am sorry that Members of Parliament like Shri D. A. Katti do not realise the real benefit of the community development schemes. At least the elemen-

tary needs of the villages like protected drinking water, food, clothing etc., are being fulfilled by the community development scheme.

18 hrs.

Regarding public co-operation for the Third Plan, I can assure the House that the whole of Madras State under the leadership of our Chief Minister, Shri Kamaraj, will support the Plan wholeheartedly.

Shri Achar: The previous speaker, as well as Shri Raghuraj Sahai, who is more or less a specialist on community projects, have spoken about the working of the community projects and panchayat raj. I would like to say a word on that question because it is one of the most important aspects of our planning. Panchayat raj is one of the most important items to which we have to look for the working of the Plan. Especially, I would like to say a word about what exactly the position is in my State.

Unfortunately, the legislation as it stands now is not working properly at all. The District Development Council—in these parts I think it is called by some other name—is practically without any power, it is a purely advisory body. Added to that the Collector is the chairman of that body. So, it is not at all functioning properly.

Just below that we have got what is called the Taluk Development Councils. There, no doubt, the chairman is elected, but unfortunately, though he is elected, he has got an executive officer, who was formerly the community projects officer, who is entirely free from the control of the Development Council Chairman. He is directly under the control of the Government, of the Ministry, and it often happens there is actual conflict between the elected Development Council Chairman and this executive officer. Sometimes it looks almost

ridiculous. Such a conflict happened in one of these Development Councils. The Chairman asked for the tour programme of the executive officer. He feels he is free from the Chairman, and so he said that he had no paper and so could not supply a copy. It goes to this ridiculous extent. Then the Chairman sends him paper and says: "I have herewith sent a paper; kindly send your tour programme." I am giving this only as an illustration, not for the importance of it, but to show how there is absolute conflict going on between the executive officer and the Chairman of the Development Council. You can very well imagine how, in this state of affairs, these community development projects or panchayat raj or the Taluk boards can work. The present legislation has to be amended. There was a proposal that there must be almost uniform legislation all over India. Whether that is feasible or not—there is controversy over it—I would request the Government as well as the Planning Commission and our very enthusiastic Minister of Community Development and Co-operation who is taking a lot of interest in these matters, to look into this aspect of the question and see that the legislation is brought to a level where these institutions can work well.

Before I go into any other point, I would like to have a clarification. I raised this point in the Consultative Committee also, and I would like to have a clear clarification on one or two points which are of vital importance to my State. I refer to page 548, para 28 of the Third Five Year Plan Report. It is with respect to the new railway lines in connection with which there was so much of agitation in the South for so many years. Our Prime Minister also interfered in the matter and finally it was more or less conceded that some new lines must be constructed in the Third Plan period in the South. In this connection, I would like to draw the atten-

[Shri Achar]

tion of the hon. Minister to page 548
of the Third Plan report.

13.06 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may
continue his speech tomorrow.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till
Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday
August 23, 1961/Bhadra 1, 1883
(Saka).*
