

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not here for their comfort. They should be told that we are not for their comfort.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us come to the discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We shall say what we consider...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are repeating. You have already said that.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But then what is the result?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have said it. Please resume your seat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not saying for the sake of saying.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is what it seems.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want some result. I want some statement from you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whatever you have said has been noted. Please resume.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We make submissions. You never consider them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every thing that the hon. Member has said has been noted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But we would like to know whether these two things can be accommodated. Government should get up and say. (*Interruptions*) Every biennial election sends at least two interruptors against me. That is my experience.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Honourable Member, please resume. Let us go to the Plan discussion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I welcome it very much because you are the life of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I welcome that. Every biennial election sends at least two.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have said that twice

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All I say is there should be a discussion on these. You kindly accommodate me.

SHRI MANUBHAI MOTILAL PATEL: The time of the House is precious.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: There will be many.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Kindly consider this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every thing has been taken down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, Uttar Pradesh solution will be found here.

MOTION RE. DRAFT FIVE YEAR PLAN—1978-83—contd.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us go to Plan discussion. Before we commence discussion on this, I have to say that time has been allotted to different parties. Now some Members take a long time on the plea that they are taking their party's time. The Whips of the major parties have consulted among themselves and they are of the opinion that 15 minutes should be the limit for any speech so that more and Members of the respective parties could take part in this discussion. So please keep this in mind while participating in the debate. Shri Parnab Mukherjee.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:

Sir, I was drawing the attention of the Finance Minister and I am happy that he is here now. I am thankful to Bhupesh Babu that he has at least provided some cushion time so that the Finance Minister can listen to my observations because he was not here then. What I was trying to suggest is that if he wants to curb smuggling by selling indigenous gold, the price at which it is being auctioned, as reported in the newspapers, is at the prevailing market price and, therefore, the difference between the international price and the prevailing market price continues and the incentive for the smugglers to bring gold and sell it at a cheaper price continues. If he wants to sell it at the international price, the Government will have to pass on an element of subsidy to the relatively affluent class.

The second danger that would come out of this policy is this. Now he is expecting to have the savings of the community invested either in the equities, or in the shares, or even in the fixed deposits. He has cut down the interest rate. That is a disincentive for the depositors to keep their money in time deposits. Secondly, Sir, the people find, as it is today, with our craze for gold and more confidence in gold, when gold is being sold, if they can invest their surplus money in gold, who is going to invest it either in equity or in bank? Therefore, it was the duty of the Government, if they wanted to see that the surplus money and savings of the community are to be invested in a particular direction, to come forward with a proposal and make adequate arrangements. But, unfortunately, this scheme will completely frustrate the Government's expectation that there will be fresh investment and people will come forward as he has provided some incentives for investment in equities of the new companies

and so on and so forth. Moreover, when we are having a discussion on this, apart from the economic maladies, the whole country is passing through tremendous social and political tensions. Some times, it appears to us whether there exists any Government at all. I would not like to mention the name of a particular Government which has its record of running the administration by resorting to police firing more than once in a week. And this is not the individual case of one particular State Government. This is a common feature. Law and order position is deteriorating. Power position is almost on the verge of ruination. Industrial unrest is growing day by day. Whatever lip sympathies they might have shown to the workers when the question of repression comes they practically follow the most brutal way to suppress the demands of the workers. Now, immediately the Finance Minister will ask: What did you do during the emergency? You cut their bonus. You impounded their bonus. All these stock phrases they have already at their command.

Regarding land reforms, Sir, it has been very highly eulogised in the Plan document that the previous Government failed to do it. But what are you doing? What is happening in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh is not merely rivalries between two castes or communities. The whole problem started because the poor people, the landed people have been divested of their land. Whatever small benefits they got after waiting for many years, when the new Government came and that Government identified themselves with the interests of the rich peasantry by providing all sorts of subsidies in spite of opposition from the Finance Ministry, subsidies in fertilisers, subsidies in other agricultural equipment, in the form of tax concessions and so on and so forth, when the Government identified themselves with the interests of the rich peasantry in the rural areas they got

[Shri Pranab Mukherjee]

the incentive to divest the poor people of their small pieces of land which they got after waiting for many years.

It is easy to incorporate in the Plan document. But do you have that political will for land reform in all seriousness. And if you do have it, have you shown any ingredient of your desire during the last 12 months? That is the moot question. An artificial conflict is being created between the rural sector and the industrial sector. I do not know whose brain wave it is. But even today the Prime Minister mentioned while quoting certain figures that during the past 25 years only 17 million hectares were brought under irrigation and in this proposed Plan Document, they are asking for 27 million hectares. Can he ignore the fact that if the industrial infrastructure was not built in this country by having industrial policies so long since 1956 laying emphasis on the major industrial development and large scale industries, building up technology, would it have been possible to have their agricultural revolution which we have had in which during the period of ten years food production doubled itself from 60 million tonnes to 121 million tonnes, and whatever they are expected to have...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Morarji Desai has his own therapy for every disease.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Including urine therapy. Anyway, let him have his own therapy. My humble submission to the House through you, Sir, would he not to apply his pet therapy to this economy and to this country. That is my only submission. Therefore, there is no question of conflict between the rural sector and the urban sector. But my moot question is: This is just lip sympathy and nothing else. The Finance Minister himself admitted that he has not expanded a single

rural bank. What is he waiting for? For an expert committee report? We had also, while we were Ministers, appointed expert committees. We know that the experts frame their policies according to the political will of the political executives. This is not a new thing to this administration. Does he want to do the same things? Unless you take care of the problem of rural credit, whatever amount you may allocate in the rural sector, whatever you may talk of agricultural development and more allocation, greater emphasis, all these things are not going to solve the problem. It is not unknown to the Minister and to the planners that the co-operative sector, regional rural policy, rural branches of the commercial banks taken together, in other words, financial institution cannot meet more than 50 per cent. of the total requirement. And I do not find anything in the Plan Document in what way they are going to solve the problem of rural credit. Certain sketchy ideas have been given. Look at the past history.

Because, if you look at the history of how lands were transferred, you will find that mainly because of credit problems lands are transferred from the poor people to the relatively richer sections of the community. Even if you give them land, if you do not provide credit it would not be possible for them to retain them, and unless you have land reforms, I am afraid, any amount of investment and enhancement of allocation is not going to improve the agricultural sector. (Time-bell ring) Sir, I will complete within four or five minutes.

The third thing to which I would like to draw his attention is the problems of the public sector undertakings. A sum of Rs. 69,000 odd crores has been allocated to the public sector. At the same time, in this year's Budget he has come forward with a reduced allocation to the public sector undertakings. I do not know how these things can go side by side. On the one hand you are encouraging

multi-nationals, you are encouraging big companies, you are encouraging the private sector, you are encouraging big private houses and, on the other, you are saying, "No, we are going to enhance investment in the public sector by making larger allocations." If you look at the industrial growth rate for 1976 which was 10 per cent, it was largely due to the contribution of the public sector undertakings, not the private sector undertakings. Even the NTC mills which were sick mills and which were brought under the public sector management, did not yield profits, but they reduced their losses. A public sector culture has been developed. But the way you are framing your industrial policy and trying to hoodwink the people by quoting bigger figures in your Budget documents to show that you are doing all sorts of things for the public sector undertakings is going to completely frustrate the public sector economy and take us away from the cherished goal of having commanding heights in the economy through public sector undertakings.

Therefore, Sir, to me this Document is nothing but a reflection of the sketchy ideas of a conglomeration styled as Janata Party. It has no positive direction; it has no positive policies before it. It is, in the language of one of the eminent English poets, "A shape without form, a shade without colour, and it is paralysed force, gesture without motion."

Thank you, Sir.

SHRI MANUBHAI MOTILAL PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to welcome the step taken by the Government to place before us the Draft sixth Five-Year Plan for our consideration. In the beginning Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was objecting to it and said, "It is all right; it is here only for consideration." Yesterday, though it was irre-

levant, he was saying, "Let the Plan discussion come tomorrow. We will see that we vote it out." So, he is here with a closed mind. But I am not surprised. We are with an open mind in the open world. But ultimately the question is about the basic philosophy because planning which started in this country, started with the concept of democratic planning. This idea of democratic planning was introduced in our country by the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Before this, in those days of the undivided Congress and even in the pre-independence days it was carried out successfully. But, because we had not sufficient experience, it is true that though we tried our best during this period of the Five-Year Plans, that is, 25 years, the national goals directed by the Constitution in the Directive Principles were not achieved. And that is why the emphasis in this Plan has been shifted from those goals to different ones. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee in the beginning was trying to ask: Where are the goals? Which are the new goals different from the old ones? I am sure the learned Member has gone through the new goals and also the old goals prescribed in the Third and the Fourth Plans. In the last Plan, the national goals which were accepted by the Indian people were the achievement of full employment, the eradication of poverty and the creation of a more equal society. Because of some faults with planning, it was aiming at a growth of economy only. We had to shift it from merely a growth of economy to the betterment and welfare of millions of poor people. And that is why the new objective set out in the Draft Plan on page 3, 1.25 is: "It is proposed, therefore, that the principal objectives of planning should now be defined as achieving within a period of ten years". Here is a definite change. It is a time-bound programme. A period is there. We have to achieve these objectives within a period of ten years. And it was in tune with this that the Prime Minister was

[Shri Manubhai Motilal Patel]

announcing that we want to remove unemployment within a period of ten years. Some Members were taking it very lightly. But those who know the Prime Minister well know that he does not speak things which he won't do. And here it is in consistency with that announcement outside that these objectives are included. And what are these objectives? The objectives are:

"(i) the removal of unemployment and significant under-employment;

(ii) an appreciable rise in the standard of living of the poorest sections of the population;

(iii) provision by the State of some of the basic needs of the people in these income groups, like clean drinking water, adult literacy, elementary education, health care, rural roads, rural housing for the landless and minimum services for the urban slums."

Sir, here are the objectives very clearly laid down. And the emphasis changes from economic growth to the welfare of the poorer people because it has something to do with the basic philosophy of planning. We believe in democratic planning. But for that also a democratic society is essential. During the dark days of some four or five years some of the Members opposite were trying to support the regime which not only killed democracy but also did not allow the democratic process of planning to function—and that is why it was shelved for some time. It is a credit to the Janata Government that it has re-linked the process which was started in independent India because unless this democratic process is linked up with the people and the involvement of the people is there, that democratic philosophy will not work. Sir, at the same time, *vice versa* is also true. For democratic planning, a democratic atmosphere is also necessary. And it is a credit to the Janata Government that practically democracy is

re-established in the country. It is as a result of this new phase that again a democratic planning process has started. That is why the National Development Council and the Planning Commission should be congratulated that within a span of a short period of eight months only they have been able to produce such a valuable and comprehensive document in which practically all the aspects of development of our total economy are covered.

That is why, Sir, when these objectives are laid down very clearly, the task becomes a little easy because then we have the strategy to implement it. And what is the strategy they have worked out? The strategy is also there. The first thing is to give employment to those who are unemployed within a period of ten years. My friend, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, was emphasising the point of economic growth. Sir, during 1971 to 1978 the problem of unemployment rose to the tune of 35 million practically. Unemployed labour was increased. It was only 9 million which the non-agriculture sector was able to give employment to. The remaining were with the agriculture sector, but there also the question of unemployment was there. The question of unemployment which is known as chronic unemployment was to the tune of something like 44 million and the part-time, weekly employment, was to the tune of something like 11 million. But because of the faulty programme or the faulty arrangements or the faulty functioning or thinking of the last Plans, the vast mass which was created which is known as poor people or those who were below the poverty line, was to the tune of 40 to 60 per cent. And here is the real problem. How are we to tackle this problem of unemployment, chronic unemployment, part-time employment and also at the same time of those who are below the poverty line, those who have full-time job but cannot live in a decent standard of the present day society? Though

they earn, but because of low wages they are below the poverty line. Now, Sir, these problems are to be tackled.

Along with these, another important problem which we should consider very seriously is the problem of educated unemployed. Sir, the number of educated unemployed will increase from 68 lakhs to 95 lakhs in 1983, an increase of 27 lakhs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Those who are registered.

SHRI MANUBHAI MOTILAL PATEL: Yes, the educated will be registered through their universities or institutions.

But, Sir, every year 5.37 lakhs will be added to these, out of which, according to the Plan proposals, 3.91 lakhs will be absorbed in the organised sector, but the remaining lot of 1.5 educated unemployed will also remain. How to absorb these people? Over and above these, Sir, during this period one crore of matriculates will also be added to these. So, the question of solving the problem of unemployment is on two fronts: one is on the labour front, another is on the educated unemployment front, and for this the strategy which has been worked out is to have job-oriented economy and the system, even in education, which should be introduced should be job-oriented, the formal education should be reduced so that the expenditure is also reduced, and the correspondence courses etc. should be increased. There a provision has been made that the nationalised banks should come forward to give loans to the students for the expenditure for their studies.

Sir, the main and the biggest avenue which can absorb these two sections of the society, very huge sections, is agriculture. In agriculture, not only seeds and fertilizers but also marketing facilities, storage etc. will have to be thought of.

Then, Sir, there is the Minimum Needs Programme, in which, according to the Plan proposals, more men can be absorbed. And as described in the Fifth Plan, nine items were included in the Minimum Needs Programme. One was primary education, which should be universalised. Another was adult education. The third was rural health. Then, rural water supply, rural electrification and housing for landless labourers. Though pieces of land were allotted to landless labourers, houses were not provided for them. Then, nutrition, environmental improvement and lastly the question of urban slums. These are the items which were included under the Minimum Needs Programme in the Fifth Plan. And the present Plan suggests maximum allocation on these items, which are for rural development. So the strategy which Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was enquiring about is already suggested here in the Plan. This is the strategy. One is the rural front under which all these items are there—agriculture, its ancillaries and the minimum needs. Then there are certain problems which require the attention of the planners and the National Development Council for the proper or successful implementation of this Plan. As it is suggested, during the five years of this Plan, we will be spending not less than Rs. 1,16,240 crores, which comes to Rs. 23,148 crores every year, to Rs. 1,937 crores every month and to around Rs. 64 to Rs. 65 crores daily. Now, if this much money will be spent and if simultaneous growth will not be there, if simultaneous economic development will not be there, then there is every chance of inflation. So the Government will have to take care of this aspect. So, they have suggested, through the rural economic programme, cottage industries, village industries and small-scale industries, on which they have given the maximum emphasis.

Then they will have to improve the administration from the State level to the district level, to the block level,

[Shri Manubhai Motilal Patel]

so that the implementation is properly done. The present administration will not be sufficient because this Plan is practically double the Fifth Plan and the allocation is 46 times more than the First Plan. So the machinery to implement it also will have to be adequate.

In regard to social welfare, etc., I fail to understand how the programme of prohibition has escaped the sharp eye of the Prime Minister. Unless and until that is linked with the social welfare programme, whatever will be achieved will not be beneficial to the people. Here is a very small reference to it. I will quote it and finish my speech. The small reference is regarding the prohibition programme.

"Sustained educational programmes through mass media to mould public opinion in favour of prohibition will be undertaken. Voluntary agencies and local bodies like Panchayati Raj institutions will be associated in the implementation of this programme."

Sir, this is the Sixth Plan, and it is as if we are going back because in those days the Government had only lip-sympathy towards the prohibition programme. But this Government is committed to it. They have undertaken the programme to be completed within four years. And this is the importance they have given to it in this Plan. Sir, in the Third Plan they had said:

"Proposals relating to the programme for prohibition were reviewed in the Second Plan. It made suggestions regarding discontinuance of advertisements and stoppage of drinking in public premises and at public receptions. Several State Governments have taken measures placing restrictions on public drinking and have declared dry areas and increased the number of dry days. Steps have also been taken to encourage soft drinks. The Central Committee...etc. etc."

While so much importance was given in the Third Plan, in the Sixth Plan it is, we see, practically nil, though this Government is committed to it.

So, while concluding, I will say that in order to make this Plan a success there must be involvement of the people, because our basic philosophy is democratic planning. Involvement of people should be there at all levels, not only in Parliament, in both Houses but also at the university level among the students, at the district level, by different public institutions, different political parties. They all should discuss and deliberate and then you should finally come to a decision. The form of the Plan should be so developed that it becomes a national plan, so that it is acceptable to everybody, so that it does not become a plan of the Government; neither does it remain a plan of the party concerned; so that it becomes a Plan of the whole nation. And if we can implement this within a period of one year or two years from the start when it starts reaching the last villager, especially the backward areas—that is, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes people—then only will the fruits of planning be reaching them. In case you have any differences of opinion, you should thrash them out here. But after we pass this Plan, if we try to place hindrances in the implementation of it, we will only be doing a great disservice to the nation. With these words I welcome this Draft. After proper consideration at all levels, after discussion and deliberation at all levels, it will go before the National Development Council, and, if possible, it should finally come before Parliament again for reconsideration so that we okay it and it goes for implementation.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, it is good that the Prime Minister has presented the Plan for consideration of this House. The Plan should be a charter for the progress of the entire nation. It is essential that this House considers this Plan very carefully and because it

concerns the nation, the debate has to be non-partisan; the debate has to be non-political; it has to be a debate so that the hopes and aspirations of the people can be reflected in the Plan. And I welcome this initiative taken by the Government for consideration of the Plan because there are certain grave distortions that have taken place in the Plan that has been presented, certain serious deviations from nationally accepted policies; there has been some attempt at devaluing our basic goals. Therefore, I welcome this discussion.

There has been a lot of talk about changing the priorities of the Plan and this talk has concealed the basic failure of the Plan; that is to say, this Plan is not commensurate with the needs and aspirations of the people and is too small, taking the objective considerations existing today. Today there are three factors, which are mentioned in the Plan document itself which enable us to take a big leap forward. The first factor that has been mentioned is that a savings rate of 19.8 per cent—about 20 per cent—which was the planners' dream, has been achieved. That is the first positive factor. The second positive factor is that we have a massive foodgrain reserve and an unprecedented stock of foreign exchange reserves. The third factor which the Plan document recites is that there is sufficient unutilised capacity in industry so that with small investment we can achieve large results. In this situation the small Plan that has been presented is a timid Plan; the Plan lacks vision; the Plan lacks imagination. A small Plan can satisfy only the big people, but the poor people are the persons who can least afford a small Plan. The maximum we can get should be the minimum that we should attempt to do now.

What has been the experience? In the First Plan the outlay for the public sector was below Rs. 2000 crores. The Second Plan was about 407 RS—8.

Rs. 4,600/- crores. Double. The Third Plan was a little more than Rs. 8,000/- crores. Again double. The Fourth Plan was more than Rs. 16,000/- crores. Double. The Fifth Plan originally was more than Rs. 37,000 crores—more than double. Later at the final stage it was Rs. 39,000 crores and with inventories it was Rs. 42,000 crores. The step-up was 160 per cent. What is the step-up in this Plan? From Rs. 42,000 crores, the increase in the Plan is upto Rs. 69,000 crores. The step-up is a little over 60 per cent. Last time it was 160 per cent and now it is only 60 per cent. This is a very small step-up.

In 1976-77 the rate of increase in the Plan outlay was 31 per cent. The next year the increase was 27 per cent. What is the rate of increase in the first year of the Sixth Plan? Only 17 per cent. Sir, a Plan should take the nation forward. The Plan should not make an attempt to decelerate the progress of the economy. As I said, there are positive factors such as 20 per cent increase in the savings rate which is the planners' dream, our foodgrains and foreign exchange reserves and lastly unutilised capacity in the industrial sector. When the nation is poised for growth, if we have a small size of the cake and then divide this cake among so many claimants, then there will not be much development. It is for this reason that there should be a fresh look on the question of the size of the Plan.

The Government should not fail utterly in the matter of mobilising resources. If we do not mobilise sufficient resources in all sectors, the result will be disastrous. So far as the estimate of savings resources is concerned, in the household sector it is 14 per cent, at the beginning of the Sixth Plan and at the end of the Sixth Plan they say that the household savings would also be 14 per cent. It is under-estimated. There has to be a proper management of the economy by which we can generate resources because our poor people cannot afford to have a small Plan.

[Shri Sankar Ghosh]

Only people with vested interests can have a small Plan. As I said, all the present conditions are favourable. Today if we have been able to control inflation if we have foreign exchange reserves and if we have foodgrains reserves, then the savings should take a leap forward and the plan should be big. This is about the size of the Plan.

What about growth rate? Growth rate is linked with the size of the Plan. The growth rate is 4.7 per cent. Last year it was 6 per cent and they say that an average between 3.2 per cent to 3.8 per cent growth rate has been achieved in the Indian economy. But when you have all these favourable factors, should you not have a higher growth rate than a mere 4.7 per cent? They say in the Plan document that the growth rate is somewhat on the low side because it is not 5.5 per cent. But they say in one place of the document that later on if considered necessary they will revise it. In another place also they say the same thing. Sir, Plan is not something which is formulated only on the basis of past performance. There is an element of challenge in the Plan. The ultimate object is to see that the nation strains its resources—financial, physical and psychological resources—to take the country forward. This approach to the growth rate has been influenced only by the past experience and therefore you have decided to go slow. This is a timid approach; this is an unimaginative approach and it is the approach of an old and tired man. The nation needs a bold, dynamic and vigorous approach which is warranted by the objective conditions existing in the country. That is with regard to the growth rate.

Along with the growth rate, there is the concept of the Rolling Plan. If it is intended to change the priorities, you can change the priorities within the framework of the existing Plan. If it is intended to bring out a mid-term review or annual review, you

can have it within the existing framework. This Rolling Plan concept is something which was thrust upon the Planning Commission because the statement made by the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission makes it clear that he does not support the Rolling Plan fully.

The statement made by 3 P.M. Shri Raj Krishna, I think was a qualified kind of support in the Planning Commission, we have people who are dedicated, who are devoted, who are efficient and who can deliver the goods. But they should not be restrained by this kind of pulls and pressures. The concept of the Rolling Plan was foisted upon them and that was a kind of a fiat on them. That was the first assault on our planning process.

What do we find today? When the Janata Party came to power, the first thing they said was that the Planning Commission would become a part of the Finance Ministry. That was the first assault on the planning process in the country. Then they said that planning would be indicative planning and the Planning Commission would only make mid-term projections and would not be concerned either with the project appraisal or with monitoring or with implementation. They said that it would, on the other hand, be a sort of indicative planning. If the idea behind the concept of the Rolling Plan is that we do not have any fixed targets and everything would be flexible, then there will be no incentive and there will be no accountability. Sir, mid-term appraisals, annual appraisals, reviews—all these are needed and all these are necessary and the right type of mechanism should be provided for that. But if the idea behind the Rolling Plan is not to introduce flexibility, but really to remove accountability first and then to remove the restraints on planning, then it would be a dangerous thing.

The Administrative Reforms Commission had said that the idea of Rolling Plan will introduce confusion.

From all the statements made by the Planning Commission and the other Ministers, we have not had any idea of what a Rolling Plan is. They have said that it is not this, it is not that—“Neti, neti”, that is, not this, not that. Therefore, this concept of an indicative Plan for the country is akin to the old concept of a working plan. So, the first assault is on the planning process. The second attack was that the project appraisal and monitoring should be taken away from the Planning Commission.

What has happened now, Sir? In respect of the Rolling Plan, it has been said that every year you have a Five Year Plan. What is the position for this Plan? In this document, it has been mentioned explicitly and clearly that they have not even given the Annual Plan for the five years for which this Plan is presented.

The Rolling Plan concept is a more complicated concept. Every year, when the first year goes, there is a Five Year Plan for the next five years. But, Sir, in this Plan document, it is said that they have not been able to prepare the Annual Plan for the next five years covered by the Plan. But even then they are talking of Rolling Plans and they talk of review immediately after a year ends. What you need is sophistication in the collection of data, in the analysis of data. Do you have that? So, Sir, if the idea of a Rolling Plan is really to weaken the planning process, really to make our planning indicative planning and not an operational planning, really an assault of the vested interests on our planning process, an attempt to take the country back to the free enterprise economy, an attempt to ensure that the public sector does not have commanding heights, then, Sir, I submit that every Member of the House should resist that attempt. (Time Bell rings). Sir, I have not even taken ten minutes.

Now, so far as the declared goals are concerned, that is, their goals with regard to employment and with re-

gard to rural development, I welcome those goals. But does the Plan contain the policy instruments needed to remove unemployment within the next ten years? One year has already gone. In the organised sector, unemployment has increased by 12.5 per cent. This is from the official documents. Now, so far as the position in the Employment Exchanges is concerned, in October 1976, the number of persons registered with these Exchanges was 9.5 million and in October 1977, that is, after one year, it was 10.8 million, that is, a 12.5 increase in unemployment. I would have welcomed if this Plan document contained some formula for the removal of unemployment. But what it contains is only data about unemployment, only projections about unemployment but no unemployment removal programme. Sir, the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme is not even touched with a pair of tongs because it is a scheme of the Congress Government and they do not want to introduce that scheme even with certain refinements and corrections and modifications. Similarly, the Rural Production Programme and the special Employment Programme of the West Bengal Government they do not want to touch at all because they were the results of the policies of the Congress Government. I can understand if they had some other employment programme. They say: no, we do not believe in any crash employment programme. Then you must have a large size plan by which, through the planning process you can tackle unemployment. Do you have a large-size plan? The Fifth Plan had 160 per cent increase in the public sector. You have 60 per cent increase for the public sector. How then can you solve the unemployment problem? There is no significant increase; there is no scheme of employment.

What about the small-scale sector? They want to give emphasis to Good. But what is the allocation of

[Shri Sankar Ghose]

the small-scale sector? So far as the small-scale sector is concerned, the allocation is 2 per cent of the Plan funds. Just 2 per cent. What was the allocation for the small-scale sector during the Second Five Year Plan when the Mahalanobis model was operating which is now being attacked as a capital-intensive model? It was 3.8 per cent. What was the allocation for the small-scale sector during the Third Five Year Plan? It was 2.8 per cent. Now, for the small-scale sector there is an allocation of only 2 per cent.

Sir, apart from the Plan funds what is the allocation for the small-scale sector so far as financial institutions are concerned? After the Baratwala Committee was set up in June 1977, there is an embargo on further expansion of rural banks. Unless you extend financial assistance to the small-scale sector, how do you deal with the small-scale sector? There is no policy instrument for the small-scale sector.

What about the priority so far as agriculture is concerned. For agriculture, in the Fifth Plan the allocation was 11 per cent. What is the allocation for the Sixth Plan? Twelve point four per cent—1 per cent increase. It is said that it is a radical change in outlook.

Sir, apart from this, so far as social services are concerned they say that they will give emphasis on minimum needs programme. Sir, so far as social services, which include education, health, family welfare, backward classes, etc., are concerned, the percentage given in the Fifth Plan was 15.8. In the Sixth Plan it has decreased to 13.5 per cent—2 per cent decrease. For transport—roads and railways—with which the people are concerned, the allocation in the Fifth Plan was 17.6 per cent; now it has decreased to 15.3 per cent.

So far as agriculture, irrigation, flood control, etc. are concerned, even

during the Fifth Plan the allocation was increasing. And now though Mr. Charan Singh wanted 40 per cent on agriculture, the allocation is 26 per cent. The corresponding figure on rural development during the Fifth Plan was 37.1 per cent. Therefore, there is no basic change in priorities.

But some basic change has taken place so far as our programme of industrialisation and modernisation of the public sector is concerned. There is a clear attack on our industrialisation; there is a clear attempt to slow down the process of modernisation; there is a clear weakening of the public sector. Science and technology is given the back seat. Sir, what is the position so far as the industry is concerned? There will be massive imports of steel, non-ferrous metals, fertilisers, etc. Steel we are producing. In certain sectors there is no new start at all, so far as this Plan is concerned.

So far as industry is concerned, there are two aspects: management and labour. So far as labour is concerned, there is only one page given in this Document. So far as the working class is concerned, there is nothing. What about workers in the agricultural sector—small farmers, marginal farmers? There is only one page.

So far as industries are concerned, basically there will be no expansion in coal mining, petro-chemicals, cement, engineering, iron ore and paper. But there will be massive imports of steel, non-ferrous metals, etc. Sir, India is the tenth largest industrialised country. India is the first industrialised country among developing countries. India is the third largest country in scientific and technological man-power. All these are achieved because of the vision of the Indian nation and because of the importance they had given to these things.

Agriculture and industry is inter-dependent. Here the plan document says that agriculture and light industries will be encouraged. The Clay

Committee, Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States said that no foreign aid should be given to India if India chooses the path of industrialisation which it enables it to produce goods which will compete with the goods of foreign countries and nations. I think there are contradictory pulls and pressures. This plan document is a contradictory document. The Planning Commission, it is clear, tried to resist the pressures and pulls. They have succumbed to some extent and they have resisted to a certain extent. There is need for a vigilant public opinion for ensuring that there is no retreat from our commitment to a complementarity between agriculture and industry, from our commitment to industrialisation, from our commitment that the public sector will have the commanding heights of the economy. If we become merely an agricultural country with light industries so that the post-industrial revolution countries, the western countries, will give us manufactured goods and we, as hewers of wood and drawers of water, will give them raw materials, then we shall go back to the pre-industrial era and we shall not be able to maintain our economic independence. Could we preserve our freedom in 1962 or in 1965 or in 1971 if we had not built up this industrial base? Sir, during the Goa incident when Dulles gave that threat, could we have preserved our independence? When the Seventh Fleet was in the Indian Ocean, could we have preserved our independence unless we had built that strong industrial base?

What is the policy about the industrial sector? About the industrial sector, there is Mr. Charan Singh's thesis which apparently the Planning Commission partly resisted and partly incorporated in this contradictory document. This document has a very neat, sophisticated and computerised analysis. This is one aspect of the document. The other aspect is half-baked theories. The third aspect is

plain hunches. This document represents a combination of all kinds of pressures. Certain statements made in this document are such that they will amaze the entire country. Sir, at page 187, paragraph 12.30 it is stated:

"Industries which are basically unviable or cannot stand up to limited international competition in certain specified product areas which the liberalised import policy will create will be allowed to close down."

Sir, this is a planning document under which, under pressure, it is being said that our Indian industries will be allowed to close down and foreign industries, foreign competition will be encouraged. Sir, is this the industrial policy of a developing, proud and an advanced nation? (*Time Bell rings*) Sir, there is another statement in this document which says:

"Where there are substantial economies of scale, the policy of fragmentation of capacity in the interest of avoiding monopolies.... will be reviewed."

Again, Sir, we are reviewing our policy about monopolies because of the pressure that is there. Now monopolies will be encouraged, foreign multi-nationals will be allowed to come in, public sector will be denigrated and public sector will be denuded of funds and we shall have a purely primitive agricultural nation. In that case, we shall not solve our problem of unemployment and we shall not have a self-reliant economy.

So far as foreign aid is concerned, the net aid is Rs. 5954 crores and the gross aid is 8017 crores of rupees out of Rs. 69,000 crores. Therefore, more than 10 per cent foreign aid is there. Therefore, this discussion is necessary because there is an attempt in some parts of the plan document, not all, to do all these undesirable things.

(Shri Sankar Ghose)

As I said, it is a contradictory document. There are all kinds of pulls and pressures. It is a compromise document. But where there is an attack on our planning, it shall have to be resisted. In so far as it denigrates the public sector, it shall have to be resisted. In so far as it encourages the monopolies and the multi-nationals, it has to be resisted. In so far as there is no concrete programme for employment, it has to be resisted. In so far as the allocation of meagre funds by the public financial institutions to the small sector is concerned, it has to be resisted.

Sir, the plan is not a document which is prepared only by economic experts. It is not something which has to do only with economic matrices or equations for programming on sophisticated tools. The Plan must express the hopes and aspirations of the people. Its success will depend to the extent that the energy and enthusiasm of the people can be involved in it. You cannot involve the energy and enthusiasm of the people in a Plan which will encourage multi-nationals or will destroy our public sector or will weaken our economic independence or will not give planning the role which from 1938 was given to it, when the Indian National Congress, under the Presidentship of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, appointed a National Planning Committee with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as its Chairman. The nation is committed to planning and all this attack on planning has to be resisted. The first attack is to reduce the size of the Plan, to depress the size of the Plan, to depress the growth rate and with this deceleration in economic progress the size of the cake will not increase. Sir, we cannot go back in this way.

Sir, so far as this Plan document is concerned, we see that there is not only an attack on certain aspects of our planning and public sector, modernisation and development of science and technology, but

it has also been clearly stated that so far as education is concerned, there will be no fresh universities, there will be no fresh schools. This has been clearly stated. So far as the secondary schools are concerned, the statement is very clear. At page 222 it is stated:

"While establishment of some new secondary schools may be inevitable especially in backward areas, the general policy to be adopted is to discourage the indiscriminate opening of many new secondary schools...Most of this demand should be met, not by establishing new schools."

Then, Sir, at page 223, in paragraph 14.21, it has been stated:

"No new universities are provided for in the Plan 1978-83. If colleges are to be set up, they would be established with great restraint."

Sir, we cannot go forward unless we participate in the technological and scientific revolution. Sir, we had missed the industrial revolution. It should not be said of us that we shall miss the second scientific and industrial revolution also.

The Plan document must transcend the party barriers because commitment to the Plan is not a commitment to a Party. It is a commitment to the nation. The commitment to the Plan was a commitment before our Independence, because we felt that independence is not mere termination of the British rule; independence was an integral, complete concept which included not only political independence but economic independence and social justice also. Therefore, this Plan document has to be reshaped. I hope that this consideration which the Prime Minister has asked for is not a ritualistic exercise and that they will merely say that there has been some consideration.

Sir, the National Development Council have not accepted this Plan.

For the first time, a Plan has been returned by the National Development Council. They have said that you should give greater emphasis to land reforms. They have said that you should give greater emphasis to the public distribution system. They have said that you should have greater control over the private sector. All this the National Development Council have said. Therefore, Sir, I ask the Prime Minister—the Finance Minister is also here—that the Government should consider these matters very carefully and reshape and recast the Plan in such a way that the real hopes and aspirations of the people can be reflected in it. Thank you.

DR. (SHRIMATI) SATHIAVANI MUTHU (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I would like to pay my thanks to my leader Puratchi Thalaivar, M. G. Ramachandran, for giving me this opportunity to serve my people and the State in this august House of Rajya Sabha where my revered leaders like late Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and Arignar Anna stood and fought for. Sir, I am glad that my first speech in this House is on the Sixth Five-Year Plan. It is momentous for the rapid balanced and integrated development of a country. But, Sir, the time allotted for the discussion of the vital subjects is too short considering the crucial importance of the Plan.

Sir, in the introduction, Mr. D. T. Lakdawala says that "we will find this draft of assistance in promoting a closer understanding of the problems that face the Nation at its present stage of development." What are the problems that we are facing now? Is it the problem to fill up rich man's belly? No. There are crores of people who suffer without food to eat and clothes to wear and shelter to live in. The poverty kills many thousands and many of them are daily dying. About 40 per cent of the population lies below the poverty line. The top few have cornered the

major portion of the wealth of the country. It is said in the Plan. In Outline: "The expansion of large-scale industries has failed to absorb a significant proportion of the increment to the labour force, and led in some cases to a loss of income for the rural poor engaged in cottage industries like textiles, leather, pottery etc." Sir, who are the people engaged in these activities? Handloom weavers are engaged in textiles; the Scheduled Caste people are engaged in tannery and most of the backward class people are engaged in pottery and due to mechanisation in ploughing, income of most of the agricultural labourers is reduced. No alternative employment is given to them. If the Plan holds out a hope of a break-through in the lives of these unfortunate brothers, then only we can say that we have made an honest approach.

Sir, it is well-known that agencies for implementation of these Plans are mainly the State Governments who are in the closest contact with the people. Successful implementation implies the highest degree of decentralisation of power and prompt allocation of funds, supported by an in-built device for concurrent monitoring and evaluation of results. It is also imperative that funds earmarked for a specific objective should be utilised for that purpose only and not be subject to political and administrative expediency. Some time back, Central allotment of funds was made for particular purposes, in the framework of the Plan. But now, Sir, block grant is made. It is my bitter experience as a Minister for several years in Tamil Nadu that this system of block grants leads to diversion of funds by the Finance Department of the State. For example, in Tamil Nadu, 8½ crores of rupees were allotted in the Fourth Five-Year Plan for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. But during the third year of that Plan, the then Education Minister, Shri S. S. Ray, wanted an account of the expenditure incurred by the States so

[Dr. (Shrimati) Sathiyavani Muthu]

far since the States had not utilised the amounts according to the Plan, except one or two States. In Tamil Nadu the then Chief Minister, Mr. Karunanidhi, who was also the Finance Minister, gave a reply that because 52 per cent of the population belong to the other Backward Classes, they had to meet the expenditure for all the schemes, both Plan and non-Plan. In spite of many instructions from the Centre, that is, from the Social Welfare Department, no change was made. Sir, Rs. 16 lakhs were earmarked in the Fourth Five Year Plan for propaganda purposes in relation to the removal of untouchability. But unfortunately this was diverted to the Information and Publicity Department and no propaganda was done in relation to the removal of untouchability. I had to fight on this issue. As a result, I was ousted from the Cabinet. This was one of the charges against Mr. Karunanidhi. This is under investigation by the CBI even now. I also presented a memorandum to the then Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, who took action against the State Government under article 339(2) and this proved to be one of the main reasons for the dismissal of the DMK Government, as stated by the then Prime Minister at a public meeting at Madurai in 1977, during her Lok Sabha election tour.

Sir, I am referring to this incident not to claim any credit for the dismissal of a Government which was breaking all the norms of Government in which I, myself, had been there and had made sacrifices for the formation of the Government, but to emphasise my point that Plan allotments for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes should be earmarked categorically and there should be an overall supervision every now and then in regard to the utilisation of funds. This will help to promote the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled

Tribes according to the provisions envisaged in the Constitution, namely article 339(2).

The overall Plan size is Rs. 1,16,240 crores out of which the Public Sector outlay in Rs. 69,380 crores which represents an increase of 76 per cent over the Fifth Plan outlay. As regards resources, I find that the Plan envisages a heavy dose of taxation: Rs. 9,000 crores by the centre and Rs. 4,000 crores by the States. As things stand, I feel propoundly sceptical about the capacity of the people to stand further taxation. The remedy obviously lies in raising resources at existing rates and waging a relentless war against the tax-evaders, the blackmarkeeters and the smugglers. This is more easily said than done. But it is an inescapable commitment to the law-abiding citizens that no longer the taxevaders, the corrupt and the smugglers will be allowed to have a field day.

Sir, I am afraid, a credit of Rs. 3,150 crores for small savings and Rs. 2,950 crores for provident fund is far too meagre for a plan of this magnitude. There is ample scope for added resources under these heads provided the community is galvanised and given a sense of participation in this, a noble adventure for building up of our economy. In this connection, I am constrained to point out with regret that a huge amount of provident fund contributions from private employers have not been deposited with the Government. I am surprised that such employers are practically scot-free despite committing an offence under the relevant Act.

The credit of Rs. 5,955 crores for external assistance is rather large and may cut into our tempo of self-reliance unless the assistance is really and genuinely used for such technology and skills we do not possess. The uncovered gap of Rs. 2,225 crores looks ominous from the point of view of its impact on our inflationary economy,

but need not cause alarm provided the targets of production for various items are purposefully attained.

As regards the outlay, I welcome the increased outlay on Agriculture from Rs. 4302 crores of the Fifth Plan to Rs. 8600 crores, on Irrigation from Rs. 4226 crores to Rs. 9650 crores, on Energy from Rs. 10,219 crores to Rs. 20,800 crores etc. Of course, taking into account the rise in population and the rise in price during the intervening period, the increase in outlay may not appear to be considerable. But the physical targets, namely increase of foodgrains production from 121 million tonnes to 140.49 million tonnes, decentralised cloth-sector from 5200 million metres to 7600 million metres, electricity generation from 100 G.W.H. to 167 G.W.H. represent desirable magnitudes, well within the compass of our achievement. What is of crucial importance is that the projects should be implemented with dynamism and zeal without waste of time and money. In this connection, let me sound a note of caution that the proposed heavy investment in agriculture should be scientifically regulated so as to benefit a large number of small farmers and that a handful of wealthy landlords who control a disproportionately large area of land get further enriched at the cost of the really needy and weaker sections. The need for land reform need hardly be stated I should confess my disappointment at the outlay of Rs. 9355 crores on social services which represents only 30 per cent increase over the first plan. The impact of Education, Health, Housing, Water supply etc. on productivity is too well known to need iteration.

It is vitally necessary that additional funds should be found for this important sector of our development. Particularly disappointing is the outlay of 545 crores on Backward classes and Harijan Welfare. It is a mere Rs. 218 crores of increase. Considering that the Harijans and backward classes

constitute nearly 80 per cent of the population the outlay on their welfare will be seen to be far too meagre. I am sure that the Government can even now revise their outlay so as to conform to the crying needs of the weaker sections.

Before concluding, I would like to lay stress on the imperative need for meaningful implementation of the strategies evolved, so that the weaker sections of society are enabled to share the fruits of an expanding economy. The grants allotted for the welfare of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes should be earmarked and properly supervised so that the funds are utilised purposefully and not diverted.

SHRI ANANDA PATHAK (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Sixth Five Year Plan which has been presented here paints a very rosy picture before us as well as lists a number of pious wishes. We do not find any clear-cut direction and reason in it as to how they are going to implement it, or how and in what direction they will take the future economy of the country. This is not clear.

In the perface to the Plan Outline, it is stated:

"to translate ...the goals of social and economic policy prescribed in the Directive Principles of the Constitution...into a national programme based upon the assessment of needs and resources."

What are those Directive Principles? As far as we know, these are—removing the disparities and inequalities; removing unemployment; and work to all citizens. There are so many other things also. But what we find is that after 25 years of planning and 30 years of Independence, the disparities are widening more and more and unemployment is rising rapidly. Despite several Five Year Plans, the number of unemployed is growing rapidly. We find that the rich are becoming richer and the poor are becoming poorer. So

[Shri Ananda Pathak]

this is how they have implemented these Directive Principles in practice. More wealth has been concentrated in the hands of a few people. All these things are the result of planning because the very process of planning from the very beginning was faulty and misdirected. That is why all these things are coming out. Again, in the outline it is stated:

"On the other hand, the numbers of unemployed and under-employed are still very high and more than 40 per cent of the population lives below the poverty line."

I would say that this is an under-estimation of the gravity of the situation. As a matter of fact, the number of unemployed has crossed the figure of 5 crores and more than 70 per cent of the population lives below the poverty line. These are the facts. And yet time and again our Prime Minister says that within 10 years they will remove unemployment from the country. How are they going to remove unemployment? What are their plans? What is going to be the way for doing that? We do not find anything here. These are just pious desires repeated every now and then because in these about 14 months of the Janata Government, even a fraction of the problem of unemployment has not been solved. How can we expect that within 10 years, all the 5 crore unemployed people will be provided employment?

Apart from that, the Government and the people who are at the helm of affairs attribute all the blame for all the ills to the previous Government and they say that they have inherited this from the previous Government. But we say it is not the thing. In reality the path followed by the previous Government seems to be followed by them also. They are doing exactly what they were doing. There is no change at all. Therefore, attributing the blame to others' shoulders and making others scapegoats cannot help. The basic thing is the path they are following. The moot question is whe-

ther in today's context the path of capital development will help our country, whether it will take our country forward to the desired goal. But with the path they are following we find they cannot take the country forward to the desired goal of socialism. Therefore, we cannot support what they are repeatedly trying the people to believe in.

Another main point is this. India mainly is an agricultural country. Eighty per cent of its population lives in villages and depends on agriculture. But what is happening? Our rural economy has been shattered. The entire economy is in the grip of monopoly land-holders, moneylenders, zamindars and other vested interests. I do not find them prepared to have a grip over this thing. We do not find anything in this plan. Without breaking their grip how can we take the rural economy forward?

You say you are going to spend a lot of money for rural development. But without breaking this vicious circle, without effecting land reform, without giving land to the tiller the poor peasant and agricultural labourer and without changing the basis and relation of production, we do not know how by only spending more money the rural economy will develop. We cannot understand that.

From the Reserve Bank report we find that 80 per cent of the lower rung of the people have assets of 0.1 per cent. The upper 10 per cent. have assets of more than 50 per cent. So whatever money you invest for further developing the villages, without the basic change, as I stated just now, without complete elimination of landlordism, without breaking the powerful vicious circle you cannot improve the lot of the poor people these people cannot get the benefit of irrigation facilities, bank loans, power supply and other facilities as we stated. Therefore, if you want to improve their lot if you want to invest more money on rural economy, first of all, you have to bring about these basic changes otherwise it will not help. That is my view.

In the villages what do we find? When there is harvesting we find that the blackmarketeers and money-lenders suddenly bring down the prices and the producer does not get a remunerative price for his product. He does not have any marketing facility himself. Therefore, these people suffer. They take everything in their hand and suddenly raise the price. Therefore, without breaking their monopoly what can you do?

Without doing this you cannot have any development of the rural economy. I hope the leaders of the Janata Party would seriously think over this matter and basically change the thing.

You are talking about unemployment and investing so much money in the rural areas for cottage industries, this and that. But, first of all, as I have already stated, basic land reforms have to be effected and, by that, land should be distributed to the tillers, the poor peasants. Once their purchasing power improves, naturally they will come to the market and purchase our industrial products. By that, those industries which are moribund at present will be reopened and when the condition of the rural people improves, more industries will be required. By that we can provide employment opportunities in the rural areas as well as in the urban areas. That is the path, that is the way. Without doing this if you think that by only pumping more money you can change the lot of the poor people in the rural areas, it is not correct. What do we find in the industrial sphere today? As the crisis is deepening and the market is deteriorating there is no scope for further expansion. That is why many industries are closed and accumulation of industrial products is there. These are the reasons why our industries are suffering. Therefore first we have to create the market and that can be done only through basic land reforms. It is only when the lot of the people in the rural

areas improves that we can have an easy market for our industrial products.

What is the picture now? All these industries are in the hands of big monopoly houses and they have become so powerful that without bringing about basic changes we cannot go forward. It has been admitted that there has been more concentration of wealth but what are you going to do to break this concentration? You are only posing the problem. But if you do not suggest any solution or take any action and if you merely pose the problem this cannot be solved. In the last Five-Year Plan period they have increased the rate of production at the cost of the common people and now they are trying to hand over the market to sources outside the country. We find that instead of subsidising the poor people and supplying them commodities of their day-to-day requirement at cheaper rates, the Government is encouraging these companies to export and increase their profits. That is not the way to solve the problem. Therefore, we have to create our internal market by land reforms in the rural areas and improving the lot of the rural people.

Now, what do you find? The big capitalists and monopolists are collaborating with the multi-nationals and they are having agreement in many spheres; and they are very much interested in re-orientation of our domestic as well as foreign policy to suit their interests. That is why we find there is a serious danger to our democracy to our independence and to our self-reliance. Therefore, we are all along warning the Government of these dangers. It is for the leaders of the Janata Party to consider this matter seriously and find a way out; otherwise, things would go on like this. On the one hand, in the industry the grip of the monopolists, the big capitalists and the multi-nationals is growing day by day. On the other, in the rural areas, we find that the

[Shri Ananda Pathak]

landlords, the moneylenders and the vested interests are holding their grip tightly and are exploiting the people. To get rid of these things there is nothing in the Plan. We do not find any difference in approach after going through the Draft Plan. Whether in the planning process or in the implementation of the Plan, the same things were there during the previous administration also. Now also, what is the guarantee that the planning process will succeed? The same outlook is there. There is no difference, there is no change in outlook. Therefore the outlook which they are adopting is not keeping up with the pace of rapid changes all over the world in all walks of life of the people and also in the life of our nation. If we do not keep these things in mind, we cannot succeed. Again, regarding implementation, from the very beginning, from the stage of framing a Plan, the people at the grass-root level have to be taken into confidence. That is, whatever you plan, you have to see that it is discussed at the village level, at the panchayat level, and thereafter at the block level, the sub-divisional level, the district level; and then discussion takes place in the Assemblies; then it comes to the National Development Council, the Planning Commission and finally to Parliament. In this way, if you start having the participation of the people in the formulation of the Plan, then only will you have a very right atmosphere for implementation. Therefore, I would like to say that, unless these things are done, the problem would not be solved. The Draft Plan, therefore, should have been sent to the grass-root level and there it should have been processed at different levels. Then the people could have got the opportunity to make concrete suggestions and we could have made very good planning which would have taken the country to the path of socialism.

Although we have in the Preamble of our Constitution the word "social-

ism" inscribed, with the way they are moving, can we reach to that goal? We cannot. That would ruin our economy, that would ruin our country. That is the state of affairs today. Therefore, I would like to request them to change their outlook and to reorient the Plan in the new perspective that we are trying to put forward.

Sir, now, first of all, what is the resource mobilisation? In regard to that, they have said that they will impose new taxes of Rs. 13,000 crores, out of which Rs. 9,000 crores will be imposed by the Central Government and another Rs. 4,000 by the State Governments. But, just now, an Hon. Member asked whether any State Government is in a capacity to impose further taxes. It is not possible because the people in different States are so much over-taxed that they are not able to pay any more taxes, nor will the State Governments be prepared to impose more taxes. That is not the way. There are ways if you want to have new orientation and want to have resources for the development of the country, for the progress of the country. There are other sources, other alternatives. The other alternatives are:

(1) Nationalisation of the big industries owned by the big capitalists and monopolists. Let us say good-bye to the multinational corporations and let them have no place in our country.

(2) Confiscation of all the foreign monopoly capital. By this way we can get abundance of money for the development of our country.

(3) Moratorium on the payment of all foreign loans so that we can have enough money for our planning.

(4) Stoppage of repatriation of money out of the country.

(5) Utilisation of the richest manpower so that we will have the

greatest force for the implementation of our Plans;

(6) Implementation of the land reforms. That I have already said; and

(7) Setting up of basic industries.

These are the ways by which we can rejuvenate our economy and take our economy forward.

They have stated that they will have rolling Plan. I do not understand that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please resume now.

SHRI ANANDA PATHAK: I do not know whether it is on an experimental basis or not. After one year they will again have a new thinking. That means, what will happen after that? Will it be a Plan holiday or what? There is a pressure coming from the monopolists and the multinationals to give the go bye to the planning. If that happens, I think, there will be a disaster to our planning and to the future of our country. Therefore, I would like to say that there is no clarity in the concept of the rolling Plan. We do not understand that. There are the things. Therefore, I would like to say that if our economy is to be taken out of this crisis and the grip of the monopolies and taken forward you need an entirely new orientation new outlook and new thinking.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. Please conclude.

SHRI ANANDA PATHAK: Otherwise, we are doomed to failure. What will happen in that case? With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

4 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, we have had so far five Five Year Plans. If you leave out the First Five Year Plan, which was really no Plan at all but a collection of some projects and

programmes, this Draft Sixth Five Year Plan is easily the worst of the kind. Well, Sir, this draft document enumerates a number of failures and shortcomings of the previous Plans. And with many of these criticisms, made on this score. I am in agreement. But what is surprising is that having made some valid criticism of the previous Five Year Plans, as if to draw some political advantages out of it, the present Government or the planners totally ignored drawing any lesson from the past experience. This, however, is not accidental if we have in mind the current thinking in the Government, its projection of various economic policies and its attitude towards the various classes in society. The present Government, being biased in favour of the worst exploiting elements, the monopolists and the landlords would naturally, when it comes to planning, look after their interests more than those of any other section of the community. And that is what they have done.

As a result—before I deal with various aspects of the planning—we find the following very visible things in the draft document. Self-reliance as a national objective is all but given up. The need for structural changes in the economy, the need for which we have been keenly feeling all along is not even acknowledged. As far as the building of a modern industrial economy is concerned, it is left entirely to the tender mercies of the private sector, the monopolistic and other elements, in the name of giving so-called primacy to agriculture. The public sector is ignored or, if not ignored technically, is given a back seat and is sought to be really scuttled.

Now, Sir, coming to agriculture or the rural sector, about which there is so much eloquence on the side of the Government, all that we find is that there is a higher provision of outlay, but there is no promise whatsoever

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

that there will be radical structural changes in agriculture by way of faithful and vigorous implementation of the ceilings and other land reform measures. Sir, in the Plan we find that the proposals for raising revenue are all directed against the masses and the working people, while the benefits of planning and development, whatever they are, will go to the exploiting classes. Benefits for the rich and the burdens for the poor—that is the philosophy of the planning that we have before us today. Development is literally robbed of all its social objectives—the objectives of social justice, reduction in the income disparities, raising of the level of living standards. All are given a go-bye. Those are all something which is not likely to happen under this planning. Naturally all the worst features of capitalist planning are aggravated in this planning, under this Plan, and put forward with a vengeance. That is the proclamation of the Sixth Draft Five Year Plan. I am not one of those who believe that proper, good, planning can ever be possible in the interests of the working people in full measure within the framework of capitalism. But whatever little possibilities were there of advance or of improvement or of doing some justice to the down-trodden, exploited, masses, those possibilities have been choked and stifled at different points of this Plan. This is another aspect of it.

To illustrate this conclusion I should like to take the major items of the Plan one by one. Take the size of the Plan. Now it may appear that the Plan Outlay is quite substantial because it is shown that the Plan Outlay will be of the order of Rs. 69,380 crores. in the public sector. The amount may seem quite big, taken as it is, compared to the last Plan which was of the order of Rs. 40,000 crores. Well, if you take the Fourth Plan

into account, you will find that under the Fifth Plan the public sector outlay was more than doubled, because under the Fourth Plan the public sector outlay was Rs. 16,000 crores. Therefore, the present increase, if you take the rate of increase, is much lower than the rate of increase that took place from the Fourth to the Fifth Plan. Therefore, even on this score, the Government cannot claim any kudos from anyone. Besides there is the problem of prices. The prices will go up. The physical size of the Plan that is, the size in terms of the physical targets of the Plan—the size—will be lower, as we all know, as we have past experience in this matter. Therefore, let us not talk much of the size of the Plan as far as the public sector outlay is concerned.

Take another aspect of it—the rate of growth. It has been admitted on all hands that for keeping the population at the present level of living, taking into account the growth in the rate of population, we need at least 6 to 7 per cent growth. This was said even when the Second Five Year Plan was being formulated, and I remember, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was one of those who stressed that point at that time at various meetings with the leaders of the Opposition, that at least we must have 6 per cent growth in order to maintain the existing living standards of the people. The Janata Party, in its election manifesto and other public pronouncements, promised a 7 per cent rate of growth. But the Plan provides for 4.7 per cent rate of growth. Well, if this rate of growth is to be relied upon then we should be ready for a fall in the living standards of the masses generally speaking, even without taking into account various other factors. Therefore, we are not planning for rise in the living standards of the masses, but we really are planning for a fall in the living standards of the masses, according to the broad computation and calculations of the planners of our country. Even then

the planners say that this rate of 4.7 per cent growth will depend on whether conditions are better than the average. This stated in the Plan itself. Therefore, part of the planning is left to what they call the rain God. If the weather conditions are not good, it will go down. You can understand what the situation will be.

Similarly you find that in the industrial sector the rate of growth is small. In the agrarian sector it is small. It is bound to be so when the average growth rate is put at a lower level. That is the minimum required for keeping the people where they are so far as living standards are concerned. I leave the rate of growth at that. I need not dilate on that point any longer.

Now I come to the question of resources. Here, investment is very much important and is, therefore, a vital factor from the point of view of raising the tempo of economic activity. The resources mobilisation of the Plan gives out not only the general class approach of the present Government, but its specific hostility and animus against the toiling masses and bias and servility in favour of the exploiting classes, monopolists and the rural rich in particular. The resources will be stepped up. Look at it from the point of view of ratio of taxes to the gross national income. It is envisaged in the Plan that the proportion will be raised from the present, level of 18.4 per cent to 23 per cent. It sounds very good. Whether it will be possible, I do not know. I have my own grave doubts. We are concerned with the other problem as to how they propose to raise these things. The Plan itself clearly says that the money will have to be found from commodity taxes. It is clearly stated in the Plan document itself and therefore you come across the provisions for bus fare increase, postal rates increase and elimination and reduction of subsidy on food and controlled cloth. These are stated in the

Plan. Resources will have to be found by attacking the living standards of the masses. You will be surprised, Sir, that in the Plan document itself, they very nakedly give up the idea of direct taxes because they say that direct taxes have no scope. You will find this on the appropriate page, in the appropriate column, of the document itself. Then, Sir it goes on to say:

“Indirect taxes have, therefore, to play a major role in resource mobilisation.”

These are the words in the Plan. Indirect taxes have already reached, even if you take the excise duty, about five thousand crores of rupees and more of such levies will be put on the people to raise the funds for the Plan. This is another serious aspect of it. But what do you find about direct taxes? They say that efforts will be made to reduce evasion, to minimise evasion and yet we find from the figures provided to us by this Government last month and this very month that the 45 big monopoly houses, the top business houses, have increased their profits during the last four years, not the last four years, but between 1972 and 1975, both included, by about sixty per cent or more. This is how they are increasing their profits. If you take the Tatas and their concerns, according to the latest figures, their assets have gone up, between 1972 and 1975, to Rs. 1760 crores. Now, if you take the other families, then it will be something different. Full figures are not available. This is from what they have given. This is the position and yet we are told that these sources will not be taxed any more additionally for the purpose of resource mobilisation for the country. What happens to the constitutional commitment, to the social objective of the Plan? Therefore, Sir, when we do not mobilise the resources from the rich, those who are in a position to pay, you have to take recourse to these measures and you have planned for it already.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

These measures, as I will presently show, are anti-democratic, anti-people and, generally, inflationary in character.

Sir, the Minister is sleeping. All right. Let him sleep. Now, Sir, you will find that things are given very interestingly. They talk of deficit financing, an uncovered gap of Rs. 2,226 crores, which does not sound very much for a five-year period. But this is not all. We know that deficit financing exceeds in practice what is envisaged. Leave aside that. Then, public borrowing will be relied upon which again would help inflation and, then, Sir, there is commodity taxation. Therefore, commodity taxes, deficit financing and public borrowing will be the three pillars of the resource mobilisation programme all of which will lead to inflation and strengthen the inflationary spiral and two of which will definitely hit the toiling masses of the country and the common people of the country. This is what is called their resource mobilisation. First of all, Sir, this would be an invitation to the people to go against any kind of planning and this will not be an encouragement to the people. Certainly, this is not the way to seek popular co-operation. Sir, this is one thing. Secondly, this will create social disparities and widen those disparities instead of narrowing them down. It will widen the social and economic disparities or inequalities, as you call them, and, what is more, these will generally distort the economic development in a very wrong direction. That is why the resources mobilisation plan is a very dangerous scheme here, which is manifestly anti-people, anti-democratic. This scheme is nothing new. Mr. Eugene Black, who was Chairman or President of the World Bank was prescribing precisely this type of resource mobilisation as a kind of pre-condition or condition for inviting foreign capital and foreign assistance from various American agencies or authorities.

Food subsidy will go. They are against controlled cloth. In fact, the production of controlled cloth is made responsible in this Plan Document for the mills going sick. Can you imagine such a thing, Sir? Mills go sick because of defalcation, mismanagement, corruption, mal-practices, etc., and here in this Document it is said that because of production of controlled cloth mills are going sick. Sir, I am sick of this Government. (*Time Bell rings*)....Point by point I am finishing.

Then, I come to the agrarian section. We are all for building up our agrarian economy, from where we get almost 50 per cent of our national income. Who will be opposed to it? The question is, how to reorganise it? This is the main thing. Here, Sir, the Plan document provides some outlays. But what are they providing for? More tractors. They have given the figures of tractors, how their number will be increased. For whom? For capitalist farmers for rich people, landlords and so on. Tractors are not for agricultural workers and poor peasants. Credits will go up? Where will the credit go? Fifteen per cent of the rural households own 66 per cent of the total land. Credit will go to these very classes, not to the poor, not to agricultural labourers. As you have seen from experience, inputs are meant for them. So far as agriculture is concerned, they are helping the landlords, the kulaks, the rich peasants leaving the question of radical agrarian reforms, implementation of land ceiling, redistribution of land, surplus land to agricultural labourers and poor peasants. Therefore, Sir, even the agricultural sector will not be looked after. Sir, income disparities will grow, social disparities will grow, social problems will arise, unemployment will increase, and so on. Sir, for modern agriculture or agricultural development of the kind that you envisage, you require an industrial base and many other things. You require an expanding industrial base.

Where is it? The emphasis is on the reduction of that base or freezing of that base, at least to begin with.

Coming to industrial development, I am perturbed. The capital goods that we need for industrial development will be imported more and more, and not produced within the country. The result will be neglect of science and technology, neglect of scientific and technological development. No wonder, the CSIR is being treated in the manner in which it has been treated in the recent months. We find that the industrial sector, the public sector will be given a relatively small share. This is stated in the plan document. I will read out just this portion. The plan document says :

"While a substantial step-up in the public sector investment is planned, the share of this sector as a whole is expected to fall."

Therefore, it is admitted that the share of public sector in the spectra of industrial sector will decline rather than rise. Where is the commanding height of the public sector?

The public sector is not given that position. In fact, its position has been brought down, really speaking. Who will get the benefit? It is the monopoly sector. The planning is aimed at promoting free market economy, free enterprise and all opportunities and advantages to the monopoly sector. This is another example of planning. Therefore, this is something which is most objectionable. Now about the small sector. Much is said about the small sector. It is said that production in the small sector will go up from 6,700 crores to 26,700 crores. But how? Nothing is laid down. There is no control on monopoly. Monopoly will have a free run of our economy. If the monopoly is allowed to operate freely without curbs and restraints and with money going to them through the banks and other agencies, the small sector is sure to suffer.

The policy of Monopoly Capital is to grow by weeding out

the small and smaller industries to a relatively lesser position in the economy. The plan is certainly in favour of the monopolies and the share and position of these smaller elements who may be large in number will be worse than what it is today and you will not get the production of 26,700 crores from the small sector. It requires tremendous expansion of the small sector. How will it be possible? Then there is the problem of marketing. If the living standard of the common man is not raised at the consumer level, how do you think that the small sector can think when they do not have the market? Market means better purchasing power with the people. There is no provision for that in the plan.

There is another important point which I would like to raise. What I have said about the small sector should be noted. Then unemployment is another major factor, another major problem along with the problem of poverty. 21 million people are unemployed today. Even according to the Employment Exchange registers, the number is 10 million people out of which 53 lakhs are educated unemployed. What is the projection of the plan? What do we get from the plan? They say that in the five-year period ahead, 29.5 million people will enter the labour force. But these are assumptions. They think they can provide jobs to 30 million people. We have heard such things before. The assumption is that some how or the other, they will get jobs. There is no planning at all for this. It is said that a little over 27 million people will be provided work in agriculture or they will get jobs in agriculture and the remaining 2.5 million or so will be absorbed in the organised sector. And, even when you come to the organised sector, the public sector is not taken as a major force of providing employment potential. It is the private sector which is looked upon as a force which will create employment opportunities. We are not going to have that.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Even after saying all these things, this Plan document itself says that the number of graduate unemployed persons in the next five years will be doubled. It is the language of the Plan document. It says the number of unemployed technicians and engineers will increase. Therefore, it waves the white flag even before the plan is launched and says that insofar as the educated unemployment problem is concerned, the problem will be aggravated. Sir, you know very well that unless the public sector grows, unless the agrarian reforms are carried out, the massive and staggering problem of unemployment will never be solved.

Coming to the problem of poverty, the Plan document notes that 46.53 per cent of the population live below the poverty line, and having noted it, it says that they will reduce the percentage—of the un-fortunate people—to 37.95 per cent. How they will do so, they do not say. On the contrary, their schemes are such, their planning is such that they will increase the number of people who are living below the poverty line. (*Time bell rings.*)

I began by saying that their rate of growth investment is such whereby they would not be in a position—according to all the previous computation of planners—to raise the living standards of the people, when they have not provided for structural changes in the economy, and assume that many will go above the poverty-line. This is an entirely wrong assumption. Sir, there are many such wrong assumptions.

Coming to the social welfare and related services, you will see that much is left to the non-Plan expenditure. The Plan expenditure is not much. If you take foreign capital, the problem is the same.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member may please complete his speech now

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, today we have Rs. 2,000 crores of investment in the private sector. This morning only we showed that at the time of Independence it was Rs. 261 crores, foreign private capital investment under various heads in this country. That was in 1948. Now, whatever official figures they have got, according to them it is Rs. 18 hundred odd crores. There are four thousand collaboration agreements, mostly with Britain, West Germany and the United States of America. Now, there is nothing said about this thing. On the contrary, the planning proposes to throw the door wide open. We heard at one time: the womb of India is opening, a scandalous statement made by one of the persons who was at the time head of the Planning Commission, and that there will be back-seat driving. All that we have heard. All this is there in the Plan document—except the Plan philosophy—in addition to the notorious concept of the rolling Plan. Sir, the World Bank's philosophy, the World Bank's outlook and the World Bank's approach today pervade this Sixth Draft Five-Year Plan.

(*Time bell rings*)

Sir, I do not need to say more on the subject. I think enough has been said. Finally, I want to say that this document, as it is, should be rejected by the nation. I am very glad that the National Development Council did not endorse it. Some Chief Ministers have taken serious exception to it. I would appeal to those Chief Ministers and to the members of the National Development Council from the States that this Plan document is an affront on the part of the Government, and that it should be rejected. This Plan document will embody something which is intended to sabotage planning in the country. In fact, it can be described as a Plan for putting an end to planning, putting an end to such kind of planning that we

need. This is the Plan document. Sir, instead of going forward, we have sought to turn back. The clock is going to be put back. This is the philosophy and this is called planning. Sir, this is an insult to the common-sense of our people; this is an affront to the experience of our people. It is a challenge to the working people of our masses, because it is they who are called upon to finance a plan whose sole object, whose main object is to appease the exploiters and the monopolists. This is to fatten them and to allow them to make unrestricted profit at the cost of the working people, the consumers and the nation as a whole. This is a Plan which is an invitation to the multi-nationals and other foreign exploiters. This is a Plan which proposes to perpetuate poverty, unemployment and hunger. This is the Plan which is wanted by the Tatas. A Tata memorandum at the instance of Shrimati Indira Gandhi was drafted by Mr. J.R.D. Tata which this House did not accept. Any how, you know the fate of it. Well, Sir, some of the very preposterous ideas of Tata Plan, some of the recommendations of the World Bank and the speeches that are made by the Chairmen of the business concerns and the Presidents of FICCI and other Chambers of businessmen, are reflected in this blessed, disgraceful and outrageous Plan document, not the urges and aspirations of the masses. It takes into account none of the living experience of our planning. It takes into account the demands of the vested interests, their rapacity, their cupidity and their demand to get as much as possible out of an obliging and blind government, like this Government. Therefore, Sir, in one of my last amendments you will find that we are asking the House to reject this Plan, in a polite language, that this Plan should be re-drafted keeping in view such an objective which I have stated in my amendment. (*Time bell*).

One word more and I finish. Sir, it is very unfortunate. I never thought that I would live to see the day when even the proclaimed objectives of the Second Five-Year Plan which we adopted in this House in 1956, would be abandoned after so many years of planning, almost after 22 years, in this Draft Sixth Five-Year Plan. Is it called progress? This is reactionary reversal of the worst type, of the abominable type. Sir, I know, so long as this Government is there in power, a Government so unashamedly wedded to serving the vested interests...

(*Time bell rings*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: ...you cannot get a better deal. But let us at least raise the voice, obstruct it, expose this thing, expose the black face of the black Plan and along with this, the black face of the discredited Government that today occupies the Treasury Benches.

Sir, the past Government was not fundamentally better. But this is one of the worst imaginable institutions that we have got in the seat of power. Shame on this Draft Five-Year Plan. It is a disgrace to the nation and an insult to the nation.

SHRI GIAN CHAND TOTU (Himachal Pradesh): Sir, I do not want to dilate on the concept of planning as the concept of planning, at the moment, is accepted by all the parties including some constituents of the Janata Party. However, Sir, it is very disappointing that the present rulers have not left the habit of decrying the achievements made by this country when they were in the opposition.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Syed Nizam-Ud-Din) in the Chair.]

[Shri Gian Chand Totu.]

They forget that they have become the rulers today. They continue to decry the progress made by this country during the last thirty years whether it is in agricultural production, where we have become self-sufficient, or whether it is in industrial capability, where we are, today, rated as the eighth largest industrial country by some and as the tenth largest industrial country by others. or whether it is in the production of coal or the spectacular progress made in the production of oil and gas, or whether it is in foreign trade, where we are, today, exporting not only traditional items, but non-traditional items as well, particularly, engineering goods and where the foreign countries marvel at our sophistication. It is very unfortunate that they still go on decrying these achievements of the previous Government.

Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to para 1.12 which says:

"Much of the benefits from infrastructure have accrued largely to the relatively affluent. Our pattern of investment, particularly, in the provision of social infrastructure, has been biased in favour of urban areas. Thus, though the output of doctors is numerically adequate and the urban well-to-do have reasonable hospitals to go to, rural areas continue to be poorly served in respect of access to medical services."

I have tried to go through this Draft and I have also tried to go through the speech of the Prime Minister when he placed the Draft before the Lok Sabha. But I have not been able to see any departure in the method of expenditure of the last Five-Year Plan and the present Plan. There is absolutely no departure, not even one per cent departure, in the way of expenditure. Therefore, if these inadequacies had been there in the last Five-Year Plan, how would they not

be there in this Plan? I would have understood if they had said that this was the administrative change they were going to make or this was the change in the financial structure which they were going to make. The Draft itself makes only a passing reference to the administrative changes. It does not spell out the details. It says:

"The State administration at all levels will need to be revitalised. The most radical restructuring may be needed in the field of agriculture and rural development administration. The personnel of all categories dealing with development projects in the States have to be persuaded to a system of values where service in rural areas and work with rural agencies is regarded as more important."

They just stop there after expressing those pious sentiments. The Planning Commission is a body of experts and the Indian taxpayers give a lot of money towards its maintenance. But it has not been able to spell out as to what would be the difference in the administrative structure for the current Five-Year Plan and how far it is going to be different from the last Five-Year Plan in relation to the expenditure pattern. Sir, the Prime Minister has said that the fruits of development have not percolated to 60 per cent of the population and, particularly to the rural areas. Now, Sir, kindly see the pattern of expenditure in the current Five-Year Plan. The other day, the Industry Minister had announced here that they were **going to have industrial centres in all** the districts of India. May I ask whether these district industrial centres will be in urban areas or rural areas? Is it not that the employment which is going to accrue by opening of these industrial centres will go to urban areas and not to rural areas? All this expenditure is going to be spent in urban areas and any employment which is going to accrue from these industrial centres will be in the

urban areas. My experience as Minister of Industries in erstwhile Punjab States is that unfortunately, these Departments of Industries and others, which a common person thinks are there for bringing in more industries, in the name of controlling industries rather bar the industries from coming up. Then, Sir, there are contradictions. On the one hand the Finance Minister wants to make the power dearer. He wants to raise the freight rates of the railway. So, on the one hand they want to raise the cost and on the other they want to spend the money which they are going to collect, on entirely non-productive activity of opening district industrial centres. What are these centres going to do if in the rural areas there are no roads, there is no water, there is no power and if at all there is any power, it is going to be dearer? How are the industries going to come up there?

Then, Sir, I am sure, the same thing would happen with the other activities which are mentioned here, for instance animal husbandry, dairying, fishery, forestry, etc. Even today there was a news in the newspaper that the Fisheries Corporation is undergoing heavy losses and the Government of India is intending to close down that Fisheries Corporation. It is very unfortunate that in India our monitoring services wake up after ten years. I have myself seen the monitoring services of the Planning Commission for the last seven or eight years. All that monitoring is unrealistic. It is misleading and it is just spending the scarce resources of the Government on entirely unproductive lines. Sir, if you see to the different fisheries centres, or sheep breeding centres, or poultry centres, or sericulture centres, you will find in 90 per cent of the cases the entire funds are just wasted on just establishment of these centres. Howsoever you may try to run those centres economically. I am sure it would be an entire failure. These Government farms, sericulture and fisheries centres and other centres are a highly costly affair and they are

there just to mislead the people. So, in case the present Government is going to open the district industrial centres on the pattern of fisheries centres and other centres which I have enumerated, it would again mean unproductive employment for urban sector. The whole stress which is claimed to be on the rural sector would not be there. I have just tried to explain that the Planning Commission and the Government of India have failed in the giving an outline of the administrative restructuring which they propose to do. If the present norms are to continue, they are going to add some more Joint Secretaries, some more Deputy Secretaries and some more Under Secretaries. Likewise, in the States also most of the expenditure is going to be incurred either in the Capitals or in the district towns. I, therefore, fail to appreciate as to how they are going to create more rural employment. Sir in this connection, I have also noted the stress that they have placed on the village industries. There also two points arise. What type of village industries they want to bring in? There are two types of village industries. One are those for which local requirements are there and they are going to cater to the requirements of the population around them or within the district at the most. And the second are those which they are going to set up in the name of handicrafts and in the name of village industries. What they are going to do is that they are going to subsidise some of the industries and the major portion of that amount is going to be spent again in urban in the name of marketing. Big airconditioned show rooms and halls will be opened for handicrafts etc., in places like Delhi and Chandigarh and if you just see the economics of those show rooms, you will find that the people are highly paid, they are indifferent to the customers and they incur heavy losses. Secondly, unless they reduce the road transport freight cost, unless they reduce the railway freight cost, unless they reduce the power cost, how

[Shri Gian Chand Totu]

are they going to popularise the industries or make these small village industries economical? If it is done on a small scale, I am sure, the Industrial Centres will entirely fail; it will be a complete wastage of the scarce funds.

The Finance Minister agrees that the funds at their disposal are very little and even if you go on taxing this country for the next ten, twenty or thirty years, the Government is not going to generate enough funds whereby they can have these activities throughout India. I would, therefore, suggest that they should distribute the districts. If they feel that some of the districts have scope for industries, let them open Industrial Centres there. If there are other districts which have scope for fisheries, then let them not open a District Industrial Centre there; let them open fisheries centre, or a cattle-breeding centre, or a sericulture centre. What is happening is this. Take, for example, sericulture in Himachal Pradesh. I am not aware of the position in the last two or three years. But I know that in the earlier period there was a Sericulture Department. They tried to popularise it and to have Sericulture Centres in 5 or 6 places in the State. And if you go into the economics of those Centres, you will see that those Centres are going into losses; their production is nil. As I said, the Government is not going to generate funds even in the next 30 years to cater to all these activities. I am sure the Finance Minister will agree that the endeavour of the Government is to create Centres and enthruse the local people, to help the villagers to take up such activities themselves. It would only be possible if instead of frittering away their energies and capabilities at 10 places, they have one Centre at a place and make it economical. Let its presence be felt by the villages around it or by the district, so that the people may take up those activities. Otherwise—well I need not say this, but—I am sure,

whatever be the laudable aims, they will not be able to achieve them. They will only add to the present unproductive expenditure of the Government.

Again, Sir, I have seen some figures projected here and I have not been able to agree on them. These figures are based on the assumption that the non-Plan expenditure would be to the tune of 5 per cent. If you look to the last ten years, the non-Plan expenditure every year has been increasing by about 10 per cent. The increment in the salaries to staff alone comes to 5-7½ per cent. And, as I said earlier, the escalation in the cost of goods is about 10 per cent. The increased taxation of Rs. 16,000 crores proposed in the next five years is going to escalate the prices all the more. Therefore, this increase of 5 per cent. in the non-Plan expenditure is absolutely wrong. The assumption is absolutely wrong.

Again, the foreign assistance which they are going to get from other countries has not been mentioned here. No mention of the assistance which India is now giving to its neighbouring countries has been made in the resources available with the Planning Commission.

There is some mention of backwardness. Some backward areas have been mentioned. Pious platitudes have been expressed. Nothing has been specifically said as to how they are going to help the backward areas or as to how their expenditure is going to help the other backward areas or the backward people. Obviously, this expenditure is going to be concentrated in the urban area. Therefore, I fail to appreciate how it would help the progress of other backward areas or backward classes.

Again, in this report it is said that in the next five years they expect rise in steel production. As far as fertiliser production is concerned they will have to import fertiliser even after five years and they do not expect India to be self-sufficient. I just want

to know what type of Planning is this that you want to bring a new steel plant in the country and thereafter you will become surplus in steel production but in fertiliser production you would not be self-sufficient even after five years. Is it not defective planning? Is it the planning which this Government should feel proud of?

There is mention of craftsmen training. In the name of craftsmen training, I may bring to the notice of the hon'ble Finance Minister that funds are just being wasted. There was one training centre in Jullundur. Its job was to give training to the boys and girls in musical instruments. About 150 boys and girls passed from that school. When a survey was made it was seen that only three students who passed from that Institute actually went in the business of musical instruments. The rest have not entered into that profession. In reply to questions put to these boys and girls, they said that they had come there only to get the stipend of Rs. 50 because they did not get any employment anywhere.

They have mentioned drinking water. The Planning Commission has tried to be clever. They claim that with an expenditure of about Rs. 600 crores only, 10 per cent. of the villages have been covered so far for drinking water supply scheme. With an investment of Rs. 675 crores in the next five years, they have put it very cleverly that hundred per cent. of these critical villages will be covered. If with Rs. 600 crores, only 10 per cent. of the villages have been covered in the last five years, how with higher construction cost they will cover more than 10 per cent. villages? And if you are not going to allocate more funds, how are you going to change the shape of India in the next five years?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): Please conclude.

SHRI GIAN CHAND TOTU: Thank you.

5 P.M.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): (Started speaking in Telugu):

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): Because you have not given notice for speaking in this particular language, there can be no translation.

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : मुझे आने तेलगू में ओथ लेने की इजाजत दी थी ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): That is correct because there was some information. Oath-taking is different from speaking in the House. You could have given notice for speaking in this particular language so that the Secretariat would have been ready for reporting and interpretation.

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : ठीक है । मैं चाहता था कि मैं अपनी ज़बान में ही भाषण करूँ, फिर भी चूँकि यहाँ पर ज्यादातर लोग हिन्दी समझेंगे इसलिये मैं हिन्दी में ही बोलता हूँ । मैं तेलगू में अपनी बात इसलिये कहना चाहता था कि जब मैं इस सभा में आया हूँ मैं यह देख रहा हूँ कि सभी लोग जो अंग्रेजी जानते हैं वह भी और जो अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते हैं वह भी अंग्रेजी में बोलते हैं । और वह लोग जो हिन्दी जानते हैं और अंग्रेजी नहीं जानते वह भी अंग्रेजी में बोलने के शौकीन हैं । अकमोस की बात है कि कई माननीय सदस्यों ने यहाँ पर यह बात कही कि उनको भाषा की तरक्की नहीं हो रही है । जकारिया साहब ने उर्दू के बारे में कहा । वह उर्दू भाषा की तरक्की चाहते हैं,

[श्री जी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी]

उस के दोस्त हैं लेकिन उसकी तरक्की की बात उन्होंने उर्दू में नहीं कही, वह बात अंग्रेजी में कही। इसी तरह से तमिल के बारे में कहा गया लेकिन वह बात तमिल में नहीं कही गयी, वह बात अंग्रेजी भाषा में कही गयी। तो कैसे तरक्की हो सकती है तमिल की। कैसे तरक्की हो सकती है उर्दू की। कैसे तरक्की हो सकती है तेलगू की। कैसे तरक्की हो सकती है मलयालम की। भूपेश साहब को शुरू से ही मैं सुन रहा हूँ। वह कभी भी यहां बंगाली ज्ञान में नहीं बोले। तो बंगाली की तरक्की कैसे हो सकती है। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम अपनी भाषा में लोग यहां पर बोलें ताकि जिस भाषा में उन्होंने अपनी जनता से वोट मांगे है उसी भाषा में वह यहां भाषण दें।

तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ यह कि जो भी योजना हम मुल्क के लिये बनाते हैं उस योजना का मकसद क्या होना चाहिए। उस योजना का मकसद यह होना चाहिए कि उस मुल्क के रहने वाले एक खुशहाली की हिन्दगी गुजारें। वहां कोई बेरोजगारी का मसला न हो। वहां सब को काम मिले और खेती बारी के लिये सब को जरूरतें पूरी हों और आम लोगों को, जो गरीब हैं या खेती करने शाये हैं या कारखानों में काम करने वाले हैं, उन सभी को कुछ न कुछ काम मिलना चाहिए और उनको जरूरत की सब चीजें सस्ती मिलनी चाहिए ताकि अपने काम को वह ठीक ढंग से कर सकें। तो जब योजना बनाते हैं तो इन सब बातों का ख्याल उस योजना में रखा जाना चाहिए। सब से बड़ा मसला जो हमारे सामने है वह बेरोजगारी का मैं देख रहा हूँ 30 साल की हुकूमत में, कांग्रेसी राज में इनकी योजनाएँ बनीं मगर आज तक यह बेरोजगारी का मसला हल नहीं हुआ।

श्री शिव चन्दा साहू : वह हल करना नहीं चाहते थे।

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : वह अलग बात है। तो 80 फी सदी लोग जो गरीब तबके के हैं, जिन में हरिजन है, बैकवर्ड क्लासेज के लोग है, गिरिजन है और खेती-बारी करने वाले छोटे छोटे किसान है, एग्रीकल्चरल लेबरर्स है, वह आज 80 फी सदी लोग गांवों में बसते हैं लेकिन उनकी तरफ कभी भी किसी योजना में तबज्जह नहीं दी गयी और इस तरह से गांवों में जाने के लिए रास्ते नहीं है। वहां जाने के लिए ट्राम्पोट का कोई इंतजाम नहीं है। वहां दवाखाने नहीं हैं। बाज गांव ऐसे है कि जहां अगर कोई आदमी अपने बच्चों को पढ़ने के लिये भेजना चाहता है तो उनके लिये कोई स्कूल नहीं है। इतने सालों से यह हालत गांव में है। एक और अफसोस की बात यह है कि 30 साल हो गये हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद हुए लेकिन वहां पैसे के लिये पानी नहीं। 5, 6 या 10 मील जाना पड़ता है और पानी लाना पड़ता है। इसका इंतजाम आज तक नहीं हुआ। जब योजना बनाते है, तो इन तमाम चीजों को इस योजना में आना चाहिये।

अब जो योजना हमारे सामने है, कुछ हद तक पूरे तरीके से नहीं, लेकिन कुछ हद तक यह पहली मर्तबा उस तरफ कदम उठाया गया है और खास कर वह लोग जो रात-दिन मेहनत करके मुल्क के अन्दर जो किसान अनाज पैदा करते है, उसको आगे आगे बढ़ाने के लिये एक कदम आगे बढ़ाया गया है। इसके लिये हम जनता पार्टी की हुकूमत को मुबारकबाद देना चाहते है कि कम से कम उन्होंने इस चीज को महसूस किया है जब तक हिन्दुस्तान के गांव में रहने वाली जनता और खेतीवाड़ी करने वाले लोगों की और खेती वाड़ी की तरक्की नहीं होगी तब तक हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की नहीं होगा। इस चीज का इस प्लैन में कहा गया है और इसको

महसूस करके इस तरह तबज्जह दी है, इसके लिये मैं जनता सरकार को मुबारकवाद देना हूँ।

दूसरी चीज यह है कि जब किसान को सहायित्व दी जाती है, कुछ सहायित्व दी गई है, तो उसमें सब से ज्यादा खयाल यह रखना चाहिये कि उनकी सिचाई का पूरे तरीके में इन्तजाम हो। आजकल कुछ बड़े-बड़े प्राजैक्ट्स और इरिगेशन फैसिलिटीज हैं, मेजर इरिगेशन फैसिलिटीज, माइनर इरिगेशन फैसिलिटीज और मीडियम इरिगेशन फैसिलिटीज कुछ हैं। कुछ को बीस साल हो गये, लेकिन आज तक पूरी नहीं हुई। इसके साथ-साथ जो छोटे-छोटे किसान हैं जिनकी छोटी-छोटी जमीनात है, वह ज्यादातर जो बड़े बड़े प्राजैक्ट्स या बड़े-बड़े इरिगेशन प्राजैक्ट्स जैसे नागार्जुन सागर या भाखड़ा-नांगल है, उनके नीचे उनकी जमीन नहीं है। उनकी छोटी-छोटी जमीनात है। उनके छोटे-छोटे तालाब और कुओं को दुश्स्त करने की जरूरत है। इस प्लान में जहां तक मेरा खयाल है, उन छोटे-छोटे तालाब और कुओं की तरफ उतनी तबज्जह नहीं दी गई है जितनी देनी चाहिये। फिर भी कहा गया है। लेकिन हम यह चाहते हैं कि खास कर छोटे किसानों की तरक्की के लिये और उनकी जमीनात के उत्पादन की सहायित्व को बढ़ाने के लिये कुछ और छोटे-छोटे तालाब की मरम्मत के लिये कुछ ज्यादा पैसा खर्च करने की जरूरत है।

तीसरी चीज यह है कि जहां तक मीडियम और मेजर इरिगेशन प्राजैक्ट्स का सवाल है, जहां तक आन्ध्र प्रदेश का तालुक है हम यह जानते हैं कि नागार्जुन सागर कई साल पहले उसका काम शुरू हुआ, लेकिन पूरी तरह से वह आज तक पूरा नहीं हुआ है। इसी तरह से पौचमपोड का है और श्री सलिम प्राजैक्ट भी इन्कम्प्लीट है। अभी

पूरा नहीं हुआ। इस तरह भी तबज्जह देना की सख्त जरूरत है। जब किसान अपना अनाज पैदा करता है तो उसको रेम्युनेरेटिव प्राइस भी मिलनी चाहिये। किसान अनाज पैदा करने के बाद जब मार्केट में उसे लाता है तो कम कीमत में उसे बेचना पड़ता है। लेकिन जब उसे चीजों की जरूरत पड़ती है, तब वह ज्यादा कीमत अदा करता है। इसकी तरफ ज्यादा तबज्जह देने की जरूरत है। इसके साथ-साथ किसान को जिन चीजों की खेतीबाड़ी के लिये, एग्रीकल्चर के लिये चीजें खरीदने की जरूरत है, जैसे पम्प-सेट है, आयल है, इलेक्ट्रिसिटी वगैरह, उसको बहुत सस्ते दाम में उसको मुहैया करनी चाहिये ताकि वह जो अपनी मेहनत खेतीबाड़ी में लगाता है जो अपना सारा पैसा खर्च करता है, वह कम से कम उसको उसका मुआवजा मिलना चाहिये।

हम आज देखते हैं कि किसान अपनी सारी जिन्दगी को काम में लगाने के बाद उसको उतनी कुजरत नहीं मिलती जो एक अफसर को मिलती है या दूसरे दफ्तर में काम करने वाले जो क्लर्क है, जो उनको मिलती है, उतनी भी नहीं मिलती है। कम से कम इतना इन्जाम जरूर होना चाहिए कि जब किसान मेहनत करे, पदावार करे तो उसकी मेहनत का दाम उसे जरूर मिलना चाहिए।

तीसरी चीज जो मैं इस सदन की तबज्जह दिलाने के लिए कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है, कि, खास कर फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं, आज पहली मर्तबा जो छोटेछोटे उद्योग धंधे हैं, इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, विलेज इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, इनकी तरफ पहली बार तबज्जह दी गई है प्लान में और हिन्दुस्तान की तरक्की के लिए खास कर गांवों में रहने वालों की तरक्की के लिए एक नया रास्ता है। मगर इसमें एक चीज और मैं सरकार की तबज्जह के लिए बताना चाहता हूँ कि जब इंडस्ट्रीज, छोटी छोटी, विलेज या काटेज

[श्री श्री. सत्यनारायण रेड्डी]

इंडस्ट्रीज हम शुरू करते हैं तो उसके लिए आवश्यक प्रबंध होने चाहिए। अगर हम देश में 30 साल पहले काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज या विलेज इंडस्ट्रीज शुरू हो जातीं तो हिन्दुस्तान का नक्शा ही बदल जाता। 30 साल में कुछ नहीं हुआ। पहली बार जनता सरकार बनी, जनता सरकार ने कम से कम इस तरह अपना कदम उठाया, मगर इस चीज को करने से पहले एक चीज का ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि छोटी-छोटी काटेज और विलेज इंडस्ट्रीज जिस इलाके में हम कायम करते हैं, हमको सबसे पहले यह देखना चाहिए कि उस मशीनरी को चलाने के लिए, ठीक ढंग से चलाने के लिए सही इंतजाम होना चाहिए। सिर्फ इंडस्ट्रीज कायम करें और वहां कोई इंतजाम नहीं तो फिर वह इंडस्ट्रीज वहां खत्म हो जाती है। मैं आपको एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। कुछ साल पहले हमारे इलाके के अन्दर एक फैक्टरी सोप की और एक मेच फैक्टरी खोली गई। हम यह समझ रहे थे कि इनमें कुछ बन रहा है। एक आदमी ने बताया कि सोप फैक्टरी बनी है उसमें कई लाख रुपये गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से मंजूर हुए। बाद में हमको पता चला कि जो सोप फैक्टरी थी वहां कुछ पैदा नहीं होता और इस तरह गवर्नमेंट का पैसा सारा नुकसान हो गया। इस तरह नहीं होना चाहिए, इसके लिए हमको बहुत ही सावधानी के साथ देखना चाहिए कि जब छोटी-छोटी काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज लगती है तो वहां के लोगों की सहायता के लिए, वहां के लोगों की भलाई के लिए वह फैक्टरी ठीक से चल रही है या नहीं, इसको भी हमको देखना चाहिए।

चौथी चीज मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि खास कर हिन्दुस्तान के हर गांव में हो सकता है कि मेरे इलाके में हो ऐसा नहीं होता हो, हर जगह यह स्थिति होगी कि जो गांव में जाने के लिए सड़कें होती हैं, सड़कें बनाई जाती हैं और गांवों में रोड बनाई जानी है,

ये पंचायत राज जिन-जिन इलाकों में है ये सब उनके द्वारा बनाई जानी चाहिए। उनकी तरफ से रोडस वगैरह बनाने के बारे में कुछ कदम उठाये गये हैं, लेकिन उनमें भी कई ऐसी मिसालें हैं और ऐसा पाया जाता है कि जहां कागज पर ही सड़कें बनी हैं। इस पर गवर्नमेंट का पैसा सर्फ हुआ। लेकिन वहां पर आज भी सड़कें नहीं हैं! पैसा वह-वह लोग लिये हैं, सब कुछ है, लेकिन वहां सड़कें नहीं हैं। तो जब हम प्लान बनाने हैं तो हमको इस तरफ ज्यादा तवज्जह देनी चाहिए कि प्लान के मुताबिक जो पैसा हमने सड़कों के लिए या पुलों के लिए या पब्लिक वर्क्स के लिए दिया है इसको देखना बहुत ज्यादा जरूरी है।

जहां तक बहुत से अवाम के फायदे की चीजें हैं, जैसे कि एग्रिकल्चर के बारे में है, इरिगेशन के बारे में है, रोडस हैं, किसानों की बेहतरी के लिए ये सब चीजें जो हैं उनके बारे में भी काफी रकम इसके अन्दर मंजूर हुई है। ये तमाम चीजें जरूर काबिजे गौर हैं और इस ओर सरकार ने तवज्जो दी। जैसा मैंने पहले कहा जो प्लान के अन्दर पैसा मुकरर किया गया है, तय किया गया है उसका ठीक ढंग से सर्वे होता रहे इसको देखने की जरूरत है, तब ही यहां के गांव के लोगों की हालत सुधरेगी।

तीसरी चीज इंडस्ट्री के बारे में है। खादी, हैंडलूम की छोटी-छोटी इंडस्ट्रीज हैं। जो आमतौर पर गांव में रहने वाले हैं खास कर जो औरतें हैं उनको काम देने में, एम्प्लायमेंट देने में ये बहुत ही सहायक है। इस तरह प्लान में काफी गुंजाइश दी गई है। इससे एम्प्लायमेंट का मसला कुछ हद तक हल होगा। आप जानते हैं कि एम्प्लायमेंट का मसला बहुत बड़ा है, इसके लिये नये-नये रास्ते ढूँढने की हमको सख्त जरूरत है। मेरी अर्ज है कि प्लान के अन्दर एम्प्लायमेंट का मसला हल करने के लिए जो रास्ते बताए गए हैं वे काफी नहीं हैं, इसलिये इन ओर ज्यादा

कदम उठाने की जरूरत है। मैं समझता हूँ इस बारे में हुकूमत गौर करेगी। हिन्दुस्तान के या हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों के जो मन्सूबे हैं, कामनाएँ हैं, वे यह हैं कि आजाद होने के बाद हिन्दुस्तान के लोग एक नया समाज, एक नये हिन्दुस्तान की रूप रेखा देखना चाहते हैं। हमको एक मौका मिला है। जब जनता सरकार को इस रूप रेखा को अमल में लाना है। अब जनता सरकार को एक नये समाज, एक नये हिन्दुस्तान की तामीर में लग जाना चाहिये। जो हमारे अपोजीशन में बैठे हुए साथी हैं मैं उनसे भी कहूँगा कि बात कह लेने से मसला हल नहीं होता। उन्हें भी अपना हाथ बटाना चाहिये। इस काम को करने के लिये, नये हिन्दुस्तान को, नये समाज को बनाने में वे अपना हाथ बटायें, सिर्फ कहने, बात करने से काम नहीं चलेगा। इतना कह कर मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

श्री जगदीश जोशी (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, लुढ़कती योजना का प्रारूप आज बहस के लिये सदन के सामने है। मैंने काफी देखने की कोशिश की कि इस योजना का कहां आधार है, कहां इसका लक्ष्य है, कहां इसका उद्देश्य है और किस प्रकार जो लम्बी चौड़ी बातें कही गई हैं उन तक पहुंचने की कोशिश की जाएगी तो मुझे निराशा हाथ लगेगी। गरीबी मिटाने की बात काफी जोर से कही गई है, केवल नारे के तौर पर मैं सरकार चलाने वालों को और योजना का प्रारूप लाने वालों को यह आगाह करना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1971 में गरीबी हटाने के सवाल पर ही एक बड़ा चुनाव हुआ था। जो आपने आंकड़े दिये हैं। इस योजना के अन्तर्गत उनसे पता चलता है कि नारों से गरीबी हट नहीं सकी बल्कि कुछ बढ़ी है, गैर-बराबरी के आयाम बढ़े हैं। अगर आप ईमानदारी के साथ गरीबी को मिटाने के रास्ते पर चलना चाहते हैं तो आपका दूरगामी

लक्ष्य क्या है, आपका अल्पकालीन कदम क्या होगा, यह बताना चाहिए था। साफ बात है, जमीन की बाबत, खेती की बाबत लम्बी-चौड़ी बातें कही गई हैं। खेती की बाबत आपने बताया कि हमारी अमुक योजना यह है लेकिन आज तक ईमानदारी से लागू नहीं हुई है। इतनी बात मैं आपसे तसलीम करता हूँ कि जमीन सुधार कैसे होगा जब कि आपने जमीन के मामले में कोई मापदण्ड नहीं दिया। आपने गरीबों को, जमीन के बंटवारे को माकूल ढंग से नहीं लिया है। मैं आपसे कह रहा हूँ कि अगर आप ईमानदार होते तो आप कहते कि न्यूनतम और अधिकतम जोत के बीच एक और तीन से अधिक का अन्तर नहीं होगा। न्यूनतम जोत और अधिकतम जोत के अन्दर क्या अन्तर होगा, जब तक आप इसको परिभाषित नहीं करेंगे तब तक आप खेती में कोई मूल क्रांतिकारी परिवर्तन करेंगे, इसमें मुझे संदेह है। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि खेती के संबंध में कोई क्रांतिकारी परिवर्तन किया जाय। आपने अपने कागजों में इस बात को स्वीकारा है कि छोटी खेती से पैदावार बढ़ती है। लेकिन आपने कहीं भी न्यूनतम और अधिकतम जोत के अनुपात को बताने की कोशिश नहीं की है। हमारे देश में गो आमदनी और खर्च का अनुपात है और उसमें जो फर्क है, उसके अन्तर आपने कहीं भी बताने की कोशिश नहीं की है। इसके अलावा आपने कहीं भी यह नहीं कहा है कि आपकी योजना में न्यूनतम और अधिकतम आमदनी में कहां पर जा कर रोक लगेगी और कितने साल में आप इस अन्तर को रोक पाएंगे। मैं तो सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप कहीं पर भी यह कहते कि अगर न्यूनतम आय एक होगी तो अधिकतम आय दस होगी। इसके अलावा आप यह भी कह सकते थे कि अगर न्यूनतम आय एक होगी तो अधिकतम आय बीस होगी अथवा आप यह भी कह सकते हैं कि अगर न्यूनतम आय 1 होगी तो अधिकतम आय 15 होगी। इस प्रकार के आंकड़े आप

[श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी]

दे सकते थे और कोई अनुपात बता सकते थे। आप हमारे देश से गरीबी मिटाना चाहते हैं और कंगाली के गढ़ों को पाटना चाहते हैं। लेकिन जब तक बड़े-बड़े पूँजीपतियों के धन के कलश को तोड़ा नहीं जाएगा तब तक लम्बी चौड़ी बहस करने से कोई फायदा होने वाला नहीं है। हमारे सदन में बार-बार मल्टीनेशनल या एकाधिकारवादी घरानों की बात कही जाती है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि जब आप सम्पत्तिशाली वर्ग के कलश के शिखर को तोड़ेंगे नहीं, तब तक आप कंगाली के गढ़ों को नहीं पाट सकते हैं। जब तक आप इस प्रकार का कोई क्रान्तिकारी कदम नहीं उठाएँगे तब तक योजना का कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप इस बात को भुला दीजिए कि आप इस योजना से हमारे देश से गरीबी हटा देंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस योजना पर ठीक ढंग से विचार करने की जरूरत है। अगर कांग्रेस की सरकार ने कोई गलतियाँ की हैं तो आप उनको दोहराने की कोशिश मत करिये। इस योजना के मसौदे को देख कर तो ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे किसी नई बोतल में पुरानी शराब डाल दी गई हो। मूल रूप से कोई चीज बदली नहीं है। मैं सदन में कुछ मोटे-मोटे सुझाव देना चाहता था। आपने अलग-अलग हिस्सों में जो कुछ रकम रखी है उसको देखते हुए ऐसा लगता है कि इस योजना में आपने दामों के बाबत कुछ भी नहीं कहा है। दामों के बारे में आपकी क्या नीति है, इसकी आपने कहीं भी परिभाषा नहीं की है। मैं समझता हूँ कि दाम नीति के सम्बन्ध में इस योजना के मसौदे में कोई न कोई जिक्र होना चाहिए था। हमारे देश में औद्योगिक उत्पादन और कृषि उत्पादन के दामों के बीच में क्या संतुलन होगा, इसकी व्याख्या इस पत्र में होनी चाहिए थी। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि आपने इन बातों की व्याख्या इस योजना में नहीं की है। आज

स्थिति यह है कि आज जिस प्रकार की मूल्य नीति चल रही है उससे लोगों को कोई फायदा होने वाला नहीं है।

जहाँ तक छोटे उद्योगों का संबंध है, दिल्ली के आस-पास जो छोटे उद्योग हैं उनको आज कच्चा माल नहीं मिल रहा है, लोहा नहीं मिल रहा है। दो साल पहले लोहे के क्षेत्र में हमारे देश में इतनी बढ़ोतरी हो गई थी कि हम लोहा बाहर के बाजारों में भी भेजने लग गये थे। लेकिन आज स्थिति यह हो गई है कि अब हमें लोहा बाहर से मंगाना पड़ रहा है। पहले हमारे देश के सीमेंट के कारखानों में इतना सीमेंट पड़ा हुआ था कि उसके स्टॉक भरे पड़े हुए थे। लेकिन आज सीमेंट की क्या स्थिति है? बाजार में सीमेंट नहीं मिल रहा है। हमारे देश में छोटे उद्योग तब तक नहीं पनप सकते हैं, जब तक आपके पास समुचित मात्रा में लोहा नहीं होगा, लोहे के वितरण की व्यवस्था नहीं होगी, सीमेंट नहीं होगा, सीमेंट के वितरण की व्यवस्था नहीं होगी। मैं समझता हूँ कि इन वस्तुओं के अभाव में छोटे उद्योगों का भला होने वाला नहीं है। इसके साथ-साथ जब तक आप उद्योगों को प्लास्टिक उपलब्ध नहीं कराएँगे और उसके वितरण की व्यवस्था ठीक नहीं करेंगे, तब तक उनका विकास नहीं हो सकता है।

जहाँ तक यातायात के साधनों का संबंध है, इसकी तरफ भी उचित ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि गावों के अन्दर सड़कें बनाई जायें। आप जानते हैं कि टाटा ने अपनी मरसीडीज कार की कीमत 10 हजार रुपये बढ़ा दी है। देश के अन्दर हर चीज के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में जब आप कोई समतावादी लक्ष्य नहीं रखेंगे तब तक हमारे देश में विकास की गति ठीक नहीं चल सकती है। आपको यह लक्ष्य रखना चाहिए कि हम 20 साल में इतनी टेक्सियाँ बनाएँ, इतनी बसें बनाएँ

लेकिन निजी कारे कतई नहीं बनाएंगे। अगर आप ऐसा करते तो बात कुछ समझ में आ सकती थी आप अपनी योजना के मसौदे में कहते कि हम 20 साल तक कोई भी ऐशो-आराम की चीज नहीं बनाएंगे। न तो देश के अन्दर, क्रिम बनाया जाएगा, न पाउडर बनाया जाएगा और न ही लिपिस्टिक बनाया जाएगा। आज हमारे देश में गरीब लोगों को साधारण कपड़ा भी नहीं मिल पाता है, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ टैरेलीन और काटन टैरेलीन की बिक्री बढ़ती जा रही है। कपड़े के बड़े-बड़े व्यापारियों को करोड़ों रुपये का फायदा हो रहा है। एक तरफ तो इस प्रकार की स्थिति है और दूसरी तरफ आप शराब बन्दी की योजना लागू करना चाहते हैं। यह बात आसमान में तारे तोड़ने जैसी है। तो मैं आपसे कह रहा हूँ कि आसमान में मत खड़े रहिये, जमीन पर आइये। जमीन पर आकर ऐसी चीजों पर बहस करिये और समझिये। अगर आपके कन्धों में मजबूती है तो आपको अपने ऊपर अंकुश लगाना पड़ेगा और देश के ऊपर अंकुश लगाना पड़ेगा। केवल आयात करके आप देश को आत्मनिर्भर नहीं बना सकते हैं। केवल थोड़ा बहुत भूमि सुधार करके, 100 या 50 कुयें खोद करके आप देश की समस्या को हल नहीं कर सकते हैं। इसके लिये देश के प्रजीपतियों पर आपको सीधी चोट करनी पड़ेगी। करीब करीब 10 हजार करोड़ का सोना, चांदी, जवाहरात वगैरह उनके पास घरों में आज भी पड़ा हुआ है। क्यों पड़ा हुआ है? वित्त मंत्री जी इसके लिये क्या करेंगे, वह आराम से सो रहे हैं। अभी उनकी नींद टूटी नहीं है। मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि अगर

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): He is meditating on your ideas. He is absorbing all your ideas in a state of meditation.

श्री जगदीश जोशी : मेरा निवेदन था कि अगर आपके अन्दर दृढ़ता है और आप समानता की बात या गरीबी मिटाने की बात कर रहे हैं तो इन सारी सम्पत्तियों को जप्त कर लें। एकाधिकार वाले घरानों के कारखानों को खुद समेट लें तभी मालूम पड़ेगा कि आपकी नीयत बिल्कुल साफ है और आप इस दिशा की तरफ जा रहे हैं और वह दिशा इस देश का किसी नये आयाम की तरफ ले जा रही है। रोजगार की बात कही गई है। बेकारी को दूर करने की बात बड़े जोर शोर से कही गई है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि बेकारी कैसे दूर होगी। एक आदमी, सरकारी आफिसर भी है, उसकी खेती भी है, उसका दुकान में हिस्सा भी है। आप इसके लिये कोई कानून बनायें। 60-70 करोड़ आबादी का यह देश हो गया है। इसलिये आपको यह नियम बनाना चाहिए कि एक आदमी को एक ही रोजगार मिलेगा, नौकरी खेती या व्यापार। क्या आपमें इतनी शक्ति है? अगर यह शक्ति आप में है तब तो आप 10 वर्षों के अन्दर इस देश में बेरोजगारी को खत्म कर सकते हैं। लेकिन जब तक जो विशेष सुविधाएं प्राप्त वर्ग है, जिसके पास 10 रोजगार हैं, खेती भी है, नौकरी भी है, कारखाना भी है और अन्य आय के साधन हैं तब तक आप यह कर नहीं सकते। तो मैं कह रहा हूँ कि सख्त कदम लेंने की ताकत आप में है या नहीं? कहा यह गया है कि यह लोकतंत्रीय योजना है। प्रधान मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि हमने सब को निर्भयता दे दी है। निर्भय कौन हो गये हैं? चोर, डाकू, बदमाश गिरहकट यह सब निर्भय हो गये। शरीफ घर के लोग, औरतें और गरीब वर्ग सब डर कर घर के अन्दर बैठ गया है। आपने लोकतंत्र की स्थापना की। बड़ा अच्छा किया। लेकिन लोकतंत्र किसे मिला है? आज एक शरीफ आदमी को लोकतंत्र नहीं मिला है बल्कि जो दिल्ली, लखनऊ, कानपुर आदि के दादा हैं, उन दादाओं को मिला है। वह कही भी झगड़ा कर सकते हैं, ट्रेनों को लूट सकते हैं,

[श्री जगदीश जोशी]

बसों को लूट सकते हैं, राह चलने वाली औरतों के गले के जेवराहत निकाल सकते हैं और ऐसी व्यवस्था में आप इस देश में गरीबी को दूर करने का स्वप्न देख रहे हैं। वह केवल एक कपोल कल्पना है। लेकिन फिर भी क्योंकि आपने योजना को कागज दिया है तो इसके लिये मैं मोटे तौर पर कुछ मुझाव देना चाहता हूँ। भूमिहीन, हरिजन आदिवासी महिलाओं धार्मिक अल्पसंख्यकों या गरीब वर्ग के लोग जो हैं, जिगको आप ऋण मुक्त कराना चाहते हैं उनको कम से कम राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंकों से व्यक्तिगत जमानत पर 1 हजार रुपये तक का कर्जा खेती के लिये मिला करे। हमारे, स्वावलम्बी उत्पादकों के लिये 5 से 10 हजार रुपये तक का कर्जा कम दर की सुद पर मिले। वह भी बिना किसी जमानत के। तभी आप बड़े पैमाने पर लोगों को काम दे सकते हैं। अगर आप यह न कर सकें तो आपकी सारी योजना कागज में रह जायेगी। इसमें अच्छे कागज छप चुके हैं, बंट चुके हैं और उनमें कार्यवाही हो चुकी है। गंगा गंगोत्री मैं अटकी रहेगी, नीचे उतर नहीं पायेगी तो फिर गंगोत्री में इसके अटकाये रहिये। अगर आपको गंगा को मैदानों में लाना है तो आप सत्ता का विकेन्द्रीकरण करिये, निर्णय का विकेन्द्रीकरण करिये, सारी आर्थिक व्यवस्थाओं का विकेन्द्रीकरण करिये और जनता को उसमें हिस्सा लेने दीजिये, तभी आपकी योजना चल सकती है। और आप जब इस को करने के लिये कटिबद्ध होंगे तो मैं आपको एक सूत्र बता रहा हूँ कि अगर देश के लिये एक घंटा भी आप लोगों से मांगे और यह एक घंटा देश के 60 करोड़ लोग या 30 करोड़ लोग भी यदि देंगे तो समझिये कि इससे 15 करोड़ रुपये रोज का खर्चा आपको मिल जायगा। इसके साथ ही यह भी जरूरी है कि लोगों का उसके साथ जोड़कर यदि आप कोई मजदूर कदम उठावेंगे, जिससे कि लोगों में आशा की लहर जगे, विश्वास जगे, इस प्रकार से सशक्त

बनकर आगे बढ़ियेगा तभी आपकी योजना से कुछ रस निकल सकेगा वरना यह योजना एक कपोल कल्पना होगी, एक असफलता ही हाथ लगेगी। उस असफलता से देश को जो क्षति होगी उससे फिर वही सारी शक्तियाँ इस देश को दबाना चाहती है, प्रभावशाली हो जायेंगी तथा इस देश के इतिहास के लिए एक बार और खराब दिन आने की संभावना हो जायेगी। इसलिए, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं अंत करने के पहले यह सादर निवेदन करता हूँ कि आप अपने आर्थिक आधार, आर्थिक नीतियों और आर्थिक लक्ष्यों को निर्धारित करके दीर्घकालीन और अल्पकालीन योजना को साफ कीजिए, सगुण कीजिए और फिर उसके बाद इस योजना की रिपोर्ट को लाईय ताकि हम लोग कायदे से उस पर विचार करके अपनी मुहर लगा सकें।

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY (West Bengal): Sir, the concept of planning, as you are aware, dates back to the days of the Congress when Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose was elected the President of the Congress, that is, in 1938, and during his presidentship, he brought out a Plan for a neat national planning with the object of establishing a socialist economy and making India a model socialist State. And, Sir, you may also be aware that during his presidentship, a Committee was appointed with the late Jawaharlal Nehru as the Chairman. Since then, Sir, the concept of planning and the idea of socialism we have been hearing and we have heard several times. The other day, Sir, in the papers we saw that the Prime Minister was saying that he stood for socialism and he was against exploitation of man by man. For some time Sir, he also used to say that he was following the path of Gandhiji and he was following Gandhism. Which one is correct, it is very difficult to understand. How can socialism, in which the exploitation of man by man does not find any place, and Gandhism can be accommo-

dated? We fail to understand this and this has become the most sorrowful thing in the whole country today and in the whole economic system of our country today. Now, you will find that during the last thirty years, the word "socialism" was being uttered, pronounced and announced by the late Jawaharlalji, then by his daughter, and they were saying all the time that they were for socialism. What sort of socialism? Yes; socialism has been achieved. But what sort of socialism it is? It is not the socialism established on a scientific basis and it is not the socialism in which the poor people of the country will get their share and will establish themselves in the society. But it is the socialism in which a few people have been exploiting the poor people and will exploit the poor people for all times to come. We have heard several times the slogan of *garibi hatao*. By this slogan the people have been hoodwinked. By raising the slogan of *garibi hatao* several times, the poor people have been dragged to a place in which they believe that these people are enjoying socialism. But what is the present condition? 75 families are ruling the country and they are controlling the finance, 66 per cent of the national finances within their control. The poor people have become poorer and the rich people have become richer. When the country was heading towards fascism, at that time, the Janata Government restored democracy; the Janata Government has at least saved this country from autocracy. But what about planning? We expected that the economy or the Plan should be based on the socialist outlook. As in the past from the days of *Avadi Socialism* as pronounced by Nehru and Socialism as pronounced by Indiraji, we expected this time from the Janata Government at least to give a new light to the nation and give a lead to real Socialism. If I am not wrong and if I understand what the Prime Minister has stated that the exploitation of man by man would be stopped and real Socialism will be established. Sir, we are completely

frustrated, our hopes are belied and we are completely disallusioned with this Plan document.

Another thing has been imported into the Plan. You have seen that the National Development Council has not accepted the Draft. Why? This is a vital question. Sir, you would remember that some of the States, specially the Chief Minister of the State of West Bengal, sent a Memorandum to the Centre and also to other States for fiscal re-arrangement and there is no whisper anywhere therein against the integrity or sovereignty of the country. But, a peculiar situation arose. Our Prime Minister came forward with a statement. Our President came forward, supporting our stand and saying: yes, at least a dialogue may be started for re-allocation of fiscal measures. If I read out one sentence from the Resolution adopted by the N.D.C. at its meeting, it supports our case: NDC welcomes the larger role of Draft Plan assigned to State Governments in development planning execution; fiscal rearrangement will reflect this development and needs to be further discussed, having regard to the constitutional provisions. We never for a moment suggested anything beyond the constitutional provisions or beyond the constitutional bindings. We only demanded that the Constitution may be amended and its articles may be re-arranged making re-allocations of necessary finance for development and growth in different States. By that we never suggested that Defence may be given to States or the Finance may be given to States or Foreign Policy should be controlled by States. Why then are we afraid of? There is no monolithic government. Now, there is multi-party Government working in India. Even the representatives from Maharashtra, Punjab and also from some other States including Kashmir came to have a dialogue on this matter. At least in that dialogue some allocation could be made for the rural development of the country and the nation as well of which the States are the units. But I do not know

[Shri Amarprosad Chakraborty.]

what is frightening the Prime Minister. He made a statement yesterday also. We have gone through the statement. He says that it is the union of States and that it is not a federation. Most of the distinguished Members will remember the Supreme Court judgments in the Golaknath case and in the Indira Gandhi versus Rajnarain case and the judgment of Shri Gajendragadkar. Apart from the Supreme Court, many constitutional authorities are there. Who say that this Constitution has a federal basis. That is what the Supreme Court says. The basic structure of federalism could not be and should not be changed. When the 42nd Amendment of the Constitution was being discussed, the Janata Party Members and others also raised a hue and cry saying that the federal structure is going to be destroyed by the 42nd amendment. Now, the Prime Minister comes and says that it is not of a federal structure. It is a union of States. Why is this so? I am insisting on this point because the plan itself says this. It is a lame report. It is not complete. The report says that we shall remove inequality and we shall bring down the poverty level. I am taking just one example. It is an admitted fact for the last 30 years that 40 per cent of our people are below the poverty line. Now, in the beginning of the Plan they have said that we shall try to remove this inequality and bring equality. How? If real allocation is not made in such a way that rural development can not take place effectively in different parts of the country, then this objective cannot be achieved. This is what they say. I quote from 129:

“Main Approach in Five Year Plan, 1978—83.

The aim of agricultural and rural development will be the growth for social justice, achievement of full employment in the rural areas in a period of ten years.”

Now the Prime Minister has amended it and made it 9 years because they

have already passed one year. It is further said:

“The realisation of self-sufficiency will continue to be one of the policy objectives.”

How can it be done? The Government desires to solve the problem of unemployment through this plan. What it says that agriculture and rural development is essentially a State subject and the strategy as spelt out in the subsequent section will depend for their success on the efforts of the State Governments. Sir, shall I be wrong if I say that within the federal structure, within the constitutional framework there should be some fiscal re-arrangement to that effect. Unless adequate allocations are made to the States for the agricultural development—agriculture being the State Subject, most of the Plan money is spent by the States—, unless proper allocations are made to the States, their hopes regarding solution of unemployment problem will be belied. So, Sir, only some loud thinking, only some high praising words or some liberal statements would not serve the purpose. This is a capitalist economy and not a socialist economy. We take a liberal aspect of the Constitution and criticise that. So, also our request to the Janata Government is that let the Plan be redrafted taking into confidence all the leaders of the different States. But that has not been done. I do not know whether the hon. Members are aware as to what happened in the meeting of the National Development Council. Though in the opening address the Prime Minister said that they have all more or less agreed—if I followed him correctly—, I can say categorically on behalf of the State of West Bengal, on behalf of the Left Government, that we have not agreed to the way it has been done. That is why there was a resolution and it was suggested that a committee should be set up to discuss further the question of fiscal rearrangement. If that was so, why this hurry, why this undue haste? Sir, to some extent we are friendly with the present Government, to some extent we

supported them but on the basis of economic policies we have a great difference because the economic policies based on the capitalist structure, or capitalist set up, are not supported by us. But, in this framework within the boundaries of the Constitution, if, Sir, proper assistance and allocations are not given to the different States for the development and for the objectives which had been laid down in the very beginning to remove the inequalities, to raise the standard of the poor people, or to bring down the poverty and solve the problem of unemployment, our aspirations will not be fulfilled. Never,

Then Sir, in the beginning of the Constitution we have got the Directive Principles. Every one of us is aware what the Directive Principles are. There are so many articles in the Chapter on Directive Principles. These articles are meant to give benefit to people, provided there is allocation of funds; otherwise we cannot. Without that it is not possible. Keeping this point in view, my submission is that the Plan, as it is, is a hurriedly drafted document, or, I think, it is a defective Plan. So, our request to the Janata Government and to the Janata Party is to redraft the Plan in consultation with, or after taking into confidence, all the States for the effective solution of the problems. So, Sir, I am afraid, unless you have a clear ideology, unless you have a clear policy, unless you have a clear belief that you believe in socialism, socialism not of Indira type, socialism not of Nehru type, but socialism which is based on scientific gains, I am afraid without that socialism the Plan cannot be made a success or fulfilled for the betterment of the poor and the solution of the problems of this country. Only some palliative measures may be taken. Somebody may be ill and you may give him some medicine. That is a temporary measure. I will be satisfied that he is well now after the ill is cured. I might have some satisfaction; otherwise, there will be no solution to the actual problem of the country.

With these words, Sir, I would request that the Plan may be re-drafted. It should be properly drafted in consultation with different States with the end in view that ours is a federal structure and our plan should be made accordingly and plan allocations should be made accordingly to different States so that these different States play an effective role and put into real action whatever effective measures are suggested in the plan regarding social welfare, regarding development of cottage and small-scale industries and regarding all other aspects, so that the problem may be partially solved at least. Without socialism, however this problem cannot be solved.

Thirdly, Sir, we must mention the danger from the multi-national houses. Of course, this point has been put forward by the various hon. Members and I need not repeat. But I would only utter a word of caution. Already, we are in the grip of this capitalist economy. Already, we are in the grip of a few houses in the country. Already, the poor people are being exploited. So, at least, the present Government, according to their manifesto and their policy statements, should give a real shape to it in future by re-drafting this Plan as suggested.

With these words, Sir, I conclude.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman. Sir, perhaps, it would be better to take this Draft, in the very nature of things, as a tentative one and not as one to be endorsed here or out of hand rejected. The resolution adopted by the National Development Council at its meeting held on March 18 and 19, as has been quoted at the beginning of this debate, is a clear indication that this Plan obviously cannot be taken as having received a final shape or could receive a final seal of approval. At least, it can be a document for an extensive and intensive discussion from certain points of view.

(Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee.)

The first thing that occurs to me is the point which has been referred to by my friend, the previous speaker, comrade Amarprosad Chakraborty along with whom we are a constituent of the left front from West Bengal. A point has repeatedly been raised from different sides of the House, regarding a certain aspect of a national consensus. There was a resolution which was adopted at the time of the Second Five-Year Plan. Comrade Bhupesh Gupta was lamenting that the proclaimed objectives of the Second Five-Year Plan, as was adopted by this House, had been turned down. I am at a loss to understand as to what are those objectives whose rejection Comrade Bhupesh Gupta laments. From the time of Pandit Nehru we have seen an utter confusion in semantics when socialistic pattern and then socialism were imposed on us as the national objectives while maintaining the essential capitalistic structure of our economic policy. A novel thing has been introduced in our country mixed economy, the private and the public sector. But it has been proved to the hilt after a lapse of 25 years, more than 25 years, of planning that this is a device to buttress and to strengthen the private sector, that is, the capitalist sector at the expense of the public sector, namely, public money. It will be evident from the various statistics provided by the Government itself. It is a known fact that 73 monopoly houses control a major part of our finance. Much was made of the nationalisation of banks. It is also a known fact that these monopoly houses draw their finance mainly from these nationalised banks and the banks in the private sector. Only the other day, in this House, the hon. Finance Minister very firmly rejected a suggestion for the nationalisation of banks having a deposit of over Rs. 100 crores. This reveals the mind of the present Government that they are not only not in favour of doing away with private capital, but, they are for strengthening it. These monopoly houses are

drawing finance from the nationalised banks. At the same time, they have banks with large public deposits at their command. So, mixed economy is really another name for capitalist economy as will be borne out by the picture that is presented in the country in the economic field. It is a very well known saying that the rich have grown richer and the poor poorer. The extent of this aspect is not, perhaps, fully revealed by these clichés. The concentration of wealth had become larger since the time of the findings of the Monopoly Commission headed by Prof. Prasanta Mahalanobis. So, unless we are ready to examine the question of fundamental approach towards our national economy, perhaps the solution of the problems facing the country will not be possible. If we just flounder within the framework that has been presented in this country all these years, then, what happened from 1975 to 1977, that is, the evil of authoritarianism, unabashed authoritarianism, may be re-enacted. What happened in the Lok Sabha elections and thereafter was a verdict of the people in favour of restoration of democracy against authoritarianism. But side by side, it was a verdict against the rule of unabashed exploitation of the common man. If that aspect is not recognised and we do not take a new look in our fundamental approach, perhaps, the repetition of that sordid and traumatic experience

may not be avoided in spite of the best wishes on the part of those who are ruling the destiny of our country and upholding democratic institutions. The democratic institutions were given the go-by during the emergency years, or I should say, even long before that in my part of the country, i.e. in West Bengal, in other parts, in Andhra Pradesh, in a portion of Bihar. People had a bitter taste of this during emergency and even long before that time. If we do not want repetition of the very same thing, we should be prepared to examine seriously the question of changing the existing social system that has been in vogue in our

country. It is no use just examining the details within the framework of the existing social structure.

Even views from that point of view this document leaves large gaps. It is apparant that the removal of unemployment and the removal of illiteracy have been given high priority, but in concrete terms what does it amount to? Apart from the question of percentage, the details that have been worked out are fantastic, largely a guess-work. It is a bit surprising to find such large gaps in a Plan document. At the same time, our Prime Minister is very specific in saying, when he assumed power, that in the course of ten years' time the problem of unemployment will be solved. We came to the House one year later and so it could be said that in nine years' time unemployment will be solved. The other day one of the senior-most Members of this House, Comrade Bhupesh Gupta, corrected it when he was confronted with that question. He said 8 years and 10 months, to be more specific. But there is no blueprint, no trustworthy picture as to how this employment would be secured. It is largely a guess-work, nothing to inspire confidence.

In the educational field with which I am concerned direct it is good that the priority is given to the spread of the elementary education, to the removal of illiteracy, but then I find a very strange theme in the background of such loud protestation. On page 220, item 14.4, it is said:

"It is now proposed to accelerate the pace of expansion considerably and to fulfil the directive of article 45 of the Constitution in about ten years."

Our consistency is phenomenal in 1950: When the Constitution was promulgated, we said that the objective will be achieved in ten years. And now in the year 1978 after we have covered a long path, again we say that in about 10 years' time it is expected to achieve this object.

Now the details that have been worked out in regard to the spread of elementary education, removal of illiteracy, the task of formal or informal education, the task that has been elaborated in this connection presuppose an administrative apparatus which is very effective but it is nowhere there. So the expectations are bound to be belied if a very straight forward course is not adopted in this regard, regarding the spread of elementary education and removal of illiteracy.

Regarding secondary education, a dangerous proposition has been put forward—contraction of even the opportunity of secondary education. So long we had been told that higher education was not meant for all. Now it is said that even secondary education is not meant for all. It is clearly stated that it would be necessary to just restrict further expansion of secondary education. Now there is a demand side by side that education should be made free up to the secondary stage. In many parts of the country, already education up to the secondary stage is free. Here an idea has been put forward that the secondary education should not be free, "It should bear reasonable relationship with the cost of providing education." Now this is a very pernicious idea. In the name of egalitarian society; it has been said that the public schools and the high priced schools are inconsistent with it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): Please conclude now.

SHRI SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE: Simultaneously with it, in an egalitarian society, education at least up to the secondary stage cannot be made a commodity to be sold and bought.

In the case of higher education, that idea has been made more pronounced. It is said that the universities may not be proliferated. I have expressed my opinion against this even earlier but

[Shri Sourendra Bhattacharjee]

the existing ones have to be maintained at State cost and those who are fit to receive higher education should be encouraged by the State and should not depend on private income. Just by providing scholarships, the poorer sections of the society cannot be given support and cannot be given proper education and proper protection. So, on the one hand, I would suggest that we should have a fresh look regarding the fundamental approach towards our economy and, on the other, I would say that it is a very incomplete and

very faulty draft with many pernicious suggestions and it should, therefore, be totally re-drafted and re-examined.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SYED NIZAM-UD-DIN): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at eight minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 11th May, 1978.