

House on this problem. Apart from the impossibility of providing unemployment allowance, apart from the question of finding huge resources for that, I would also say that I do not want to create another army of parasites who will be living on doles without contributing to production in the country. That aspect has also to be taken into consideration.

Now, Sir, this problem has many aspects and other speakers who spoke before me have dealt with this problem from various angles. As for myself, I do not want to look at it on a short-term basis. I am not trying to look at it from the point of view of what can be done immediately or next year or in the coming five years. Looking at the growth of the problem since independence, I am convinced that it is high time that we looked at the problem from the long-term viewpoint. We should find some solution on a long-term basis. When I say that our Plans were not based on correct methods, principles and strategy, I mean that our planning did not lay emphasis, in the beginning, on the most important and basic industry of this country, i.e., agriculture. The Second Five Year Plan completely neglected agriculture. The Third Five Year Plan tried to hobnob with the idea of doing something to agriculture. Only in the Fourth Five Year Plan I find that an attempt has been made. The neglect of agriculture, which employs about 80 per cent of our population, is one of the basic causes for not having developed our economy on correct lines. If the economy is not developed on correct lines, naturally it cannot provide employment which is very necessary and which is a part of it. Secondly, this is a basic question that I want to place before the House. We talk of industrial revolution. We talk of developing our economy through industrialisation.

It is quite correct. We must try to develop industrially and try to catch up with other industrially developed countries; try to be modern, try to be a big nation. But the question that was posed before this country after independence was: What should be the strategy and basis of our industrial programmes? Unfortunately we tried to imitate and copy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Das, can you finish within a couple of minutes or will you continue after Lunch?

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS: Sir, I have just started it. I will continue after Lunch.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

1 P.M.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING GOVERNMENT AND OTHER BUSINESS DURING THE CURRENT SESSION

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held on the 1th December, 1970, allotted time as follows for Government legislative and other business to be taken up during the current Session of the Raja Sabha:—

Business	Time allotted
(1) Statutory Resolutions regarding repeal of—	
* <i>(a)</i> The West Bengal (Prevention of Violent Activities) Act, 1970; and	3 hrs.
* <i>(b)</i> The West Bengal Maintenance of Public Order Act, 1970	
(2) Motion for reference of the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1970 to a Joint Committee ..	1 hr.
(3) Consideration and passing of :	
<i>(a)</i> The Salaries and Allowances of Officers of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 1970 ..	1 hr.
<i>(b)</i> The Tea Districts Emigrant Labour (Repeal) Bill, 1970 ..	1 hr.
(4) Short duration discussion under Rule 176 on the rising trend in prices of essential commodities and Industrial raw materials	2 hrs. and 30 minutes

*To be discussed together.

The Committee also recommended that in order to complete Government business the House should sit daily upto 6.00 P.M.

Now the House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House adjourned for lunch at two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, **MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING GOVERNMENT BUSINESS FOR THE WEEK COMMENCING 7TH DECEMBER, 1970

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA): With your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House during the week commencing from 7th December, 1970 will consist of:—

- (1) Discussion on the Resolution seeking disapproval of the Foreign Exchange

[Shri Om Mehta]
(Regulation) Amendment Ordinance, 1970 and consideration and passing of the Foreign Exchange (Regulation) Amendment Bill, 1970, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(2) Consideration and passing of:

The Agricultural Refinance Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1970.

The Coal Mines (Conservation and Safety) Amendment Bill, 1970, as passed by Lok Sabha.

(3) Consideration of a motion for reference of the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1970, to a Joint Committee.

(4) Discussion on the Resolutions tabled by Shri Bhupesh Gupta and others seeking repeal of the West Bengal (Prevention of Violent Activities) Act, 1970, and the West Bengal Maintenance of Public Order Act, 1970.

(5) Discussion under Rule 176 on the steps taken by Government to check rising trend in prices of essential commodities and industrial raw materials.

RESOLUTION REGARDING AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION FOR INCLUSION OF THE RIGHT OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS—contd.

SHRI BIPIN PAL DAS: Sir, I was saying, whenever we talk of industrialisation, we think only of the western model, and that was a fundamental and basic mistake committed by our planners right from the beginning. Because in the western countries they had the unique advantage of exploiting their colonies for mobilising resources for capital formation; they also had the unique advantage of a very low density of population. We have neither of the advantages, and therefore we cannot just imitate the west in order to build up an industrial structure on the western model; neither do we have resources, and also we have a very huge population to feed and to be gainfully employed. If you take the case of Communist countries like Russia and China, that example will not hold good in the case of India because of the differences in the two political systems. The advantages of a totalitarian system are not available in a democratic system, and therefore we have to think absolutely on new lines, and this should have been done right from the beginning.

In the development of our economy we must take care of one thing in a democratic country, and that is to minimise the social tensions as far as possible. Because without minimising the social tensions a democratic system can not work. Therefore, in our effort to develop the economy we should have taken note of that, and

unemployment is one of the factors which causes serious social tension in the country. From this angle I would simply say that if we had taken into account our position regarding resources on the one hand and the huge population on the other hand and the democratic structure under which we have to function and develop our economy, we should have decided on emphasizing on small and medium-scale technology rather than large-scale technology. Large-scale technology ultimately will not solve our problem. We should have emphasized on the medium-scale and small-scale technology. By this I do not mean that large-scale industries should be done away with altogether. No, Sir. There are certain sectors, there are certain fields, where large-scale technology is inevitable, is essential; but generally speaking the emphasis should have been overwhelmingly on the side of small-scale and medium-scale industries.

I may draw your attention to the fact that today Japan is industrially the third richest country in the world. What is happening in Japan? How have they achieved this? Ninety-nine per cent of the industrial units in Japan belong to what they call medium and small-scale industries; 70 per cent of the industrial working population belong to these industries; 50 per cent of the total GNP has been produced by the same industries. More than 44 per cent of the exports are managed by these very industries. This is how Japan has today become the third richest country in the world. Therefore, if somebody says that if we simply insist on small-scale and medium-scale industries we shall never grow, our economy cannot grow, we cannot grow at the desired pace, Sir, that has been proved to be entirely wrong and baseless by the example of Japan. Therefore taking the facts of the situation into account, we should have built up a different kind of strategy, drawn up a different kind of strategy for our industrial development. And that we did not do, and that was the fundamental, basic mistake that we committed when we started our planning. In the Fourth Five Year Plan, the Planning Commission has talked about labour-intensive programmes instead of capital-intensive programmes. But what kind of programmes? Construction of roads, small irrigation and such kinds of things. These kinds of programmes give employment only for a part of the year, only casual employment. They cannot provide sustained employment. Therefore, whereas on the one hand I would certainly welcome these measures whereby a large-population can be employed, on the other hand the entire economic structure, the entire industrial structure should be so reorganised that employment becomes sustained in this country, not casual or three-month-a-year employment.