

का आंदोलन चला है, जमीन भूमिहीनों को वितरित करने के लिये, बेकारों को काम दिलाने के लिये, 18 साल का बालिग मत-धिकार के लिये, 1500 रु० मासिक अधिकतम आय के सीमा के लिये, अंग्रेजी हटाने के लिये, दाम बांधने के लिये, इन तमाम बातों को लेकर के जो आंदोलन हमने शुरू किया है, उस आंदोलन को दबाने के लिये आज मुख्य मंत्री लोग इस तरह का तुगलकी फर्मान जारी कर रहे हैं, मैं चाहूंगा, चूकि केन्द्र की सरकार का विश्वविद्यालय से संबंध है, तो बनारस के उस विश्वविद्यालय में ऐसी जो उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री ने घृष्टता की है उसमें अंकुश करे और जब तक वाइस चांसलर की अनुमति नहीं मिले तब तक विश्वविद्यालय के प्रांगण में पुलिस के प्रवेश का निषेध हो इसलिये आप सरकार को आगाह करें क्योंकि अगर ऐसा हो जायेगा तो इसका नतीजा सबके लिये बुरा होगा, हमारे देश के लिये बुरा होगा, सरकार के लिये बुरा होगा, विद्यार्थियों के लिये बुरा होगा, और शिक्षण संस्थाओं के लिये भी बुरा होगा। काशी विश्वविद्यालय के छात्र इस तरह की अनियमितता को बर्दाश्त करने वाले नहीं हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

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

MOTION REGARDING THE FOURTH FIVE YEAR PLAN 1969—74—
(contd.)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, though late this debate has given an opportunity to discuss the Fourth Five Year Plan of which more than one and a half years have already passed. This Plan has been discussed earlier and the preface to the

Fourth Five Year Plan is not necessarily a preface but an interlude in the Fourth Five Year Plan. This preface according to me is an interlude, but even then it reflects on the mind and intention of the Government. This Plan, having a total outlay of Rs. 24,882 crores, will have an average growth of 5½ per cent every year and, during the Fifth Five Year Plan, according to the planners it will be to the tune of 6.2%. Before I proceed with the Plan itself, I would like to refer to some vital points that are raised in this House by some hon. Members. Some have attacked the mixed economy itself. Some have said that land should be nationalised. My friend, Shri Chattopadhyaya, said that land in the country should be nationalised, and some have opposed the monopolistic trends in the country. Sir, I am very clear about the issues and I feel that in the country today nationalisation of the whole of the land is not required. It will be a most unwise step. What is required is the rationalisation of land. What is required is the proper distribution of land to the tillers and to the actual cultivators with a fixed ceiling and, from that point of view, as they have not carried out the land reforms—the State Governments and the other Governments—we see a lot of dissatisfaction, and so the best possible course would be not to nationalise but to rationalise the land, having regard to the cultivators' problems and all that. Regarding the mixed economy, I feel that the present trend in the whole world is that in the capitalistic countries more and more socialisation is gradually taking place and in the Communist countries where there was authoritarian rule more and more democratisation is gradually taking place. Naturally this has affected the economies in both these camps, whether capitalistic or communist. In both these sets of countries we find that mixed economy is gradually being accepted. In this background, we have certainly shown wisdom in accepting mixed economy. The fault lies not in the mixed economy. The fault lies in not properly maintaining the relationship between the private sector and the public sector. It is true that we have adopted the Industrial Policy Resolution and it is true that the guidelines were given, but while giving licences to various industrial houses, the Government did not utilise its discretion in a judicial manner or in a manner which was necessary for the socialistic economy in this country. We find today that big monopolies have grown up. I may urge here that the Industrial Policy Resolution requires

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

further clarification and the fears that are now existing in the minds of small entrepreneurs have to be removed. What is going to be the relationship of the public sector with the private sector and within the private sector what is going to be the relationship between the big industries, medium size industries and small-scale industries and the handicraft industries? How are we going to take care to see that these small industries or handicraft industries are in no way disturbed because of the keen competition from the bigger ones and at the same time no exploitation is allowed? In that direction, we have not been able to put proper control over the functioning of these industrial sectors. If I may put it properly, ours is not merely a mixed economy; it is a mixed economy under social control. Even though it is there in the Industrial Policy Resolution, we have forgotten that it is under social control. That is why we see today in this country a lot of dissatisfaction and maladjustments so far as the productive units are concerned.

The most important aspect that we and the planners have neglected is the distribution system in the country. Ultimately it is the proper distribution system which is more material. What care is being taken here so that at the time of distribution the common man is not exploited? Today whenever there is scarcity there is exploitation and all possible undue advantage is taken by those who are producing, through their agents legally or illegally. The planners have not taken proper note of this aspect.

Regarding monopoly, it is being said in this House that if you want to curb monopoly, you will harm production. I may here make a plea that because of the building up of big monopolies, all possible unfair trade practices are carried out and it is these monopolies who are harming production in this country. If proper production has to be maintained in this country and if production has to be increased in this country, big monopolies, who are not only exploiting consumers, but are not allowing other industries to grow, shall have to be controlled. The Monopoly Commission which is now in existence in this country shall have to restrict their growth.

Sir, it is most unfortunate that at one end the Government has made this Act applicable from the 1st of June and

without taking the necessary advice from the Monopolies Commission the government goes ahead in giving the licences to those who have been declared as monopoly industries, as monopolists, in the previous Report. This inconsistent behaviour is perhaps the root cause for our suffering.

Sir, it is in this background that I would like to say to the planners and the government that we shall have to clarify our objectives. Well, it can be argued that they are clarified. Even in the Preface, the hon. Prime Minister has very categorically said about the objectives that we intend to have. Sir, if these objectives are here, are we prepared to act according to those objectives? Are we prepared to take some basic decisions in that direction? What are those basic decisions?

And, here comes the question of the various disparities, both in the economic and the social spheres, that exist in our country. Sir, I would like to say on this question that I was looking with great expectations to Dr. Gadgil who happens to be the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. I felt that it may be possible for this great Indian economist to mould the whole character of the Planning Commission. But, I am really sorry to say today that Dr. Gadgil, instead of moulding the whole of the Planning Commission and its character, has now become a victim and the Planning Commission has moulded him into a super-bureaucrat. I am really surprised. It was never expected of Dr. Gadgil. I have heard him on the First Five Year Plan—I have heard him in Poona and on the Second Five Year Plan also and this Dr. Gadgil is the person who declared that it was nothing else but a list of few constructions and buildings and all that and now it has to be applied to this Plan. What else is it? With this present rate of 5½%, may I know from the hon. Prime Minister how we are going to solve the basic needs of the people in this country? It is one of the points in the 10-Point economic programme that food, shelter, clothing, education and medical facilities will be made available to the common man. To be frank, it is there in the very programme that by 1975, we shall see that it is substantially fulfilled. With this Plan, may I know from the hon. Prime Minister how we are going to expect to fulfil this requirement in this country. It is there in this Plan. It is stated that in the year 1980-81, the net domestic

product will be to the tune of Rs. 58,200 crores. It will be two times that of the net domestic product of 1968-69. By that time, there will be rise in population by one-third more and the per capita output in the year 1980-81 will be Rs. 844. It is today Rs. 512 and if it is to be compared with 1961, what happens? In that year, Sir, the cost of living index was 100 and today it is 208. So, if we compare this figure of Rs. 844, which will be the average national product in the year 1980-81, in the price structure, in comparison with the price structure of 1960, it will be hardly Rs. 400. If it is to be only Rs. 400, how could the common man be supposed to be a gainer? On the contrary, if we look at the present prices and the wage structure, what do you find today? Those who were getting Rs. 100 in 1960—and what they could purchase in 1960—they have to spend Rs. 208 today. That much increase has never been given by any government or corporation and naturally, the wage structure, including that of the government employees, has gone down today and there is no upward trend. So, is it adding to the betterment of their lives and how are we going to solve this problem? Sir, it is in this direction that I feel that the government has been failing some where.

Sir, yesterday there was the question of housing. This country requires nearly seven crores of houses in the rural areas and nearly one crore and fifty lakhs of houses in the urban areas. It is the statement from the hon. Minister. During the course of the last fifteen years, the government could provide hardly one lakh and fifty thousand houses. Now, may I know how we are going to provide reasonable shelter to our own people? With this Fourth Plan and also the Fifth Plan, according to the present rate of progress, this country will require at least 1,000 years to complete this programme. Is it planning? Similar is the case with education. In this country today the number of illiterates has gone up. There are nearly 35 crores of people who are illiterate. How are we going to solve the problem? Sir, today some question came up about unemployment. It is most unfortunate that the Government does not even have proper statistics about the people who are employed, who are unemployed and who are underemployed. How are we then going to solve the problem? Therefore, Sir,

I am thoroughly dissatisfied with the analysis made by the planners because they have not taken into account the gravity of the situation. Thousands of youngsters are coming on the streets and they are gradually losing faith in our parliamentary institutions and parliamentary democracy. If this Plan is not going to render justice to our youngsters, how can they have faith in our democratic processes? And if there are some other movements, e.g. the land-grab movement and other movements, they will naturally welcome those movements and join them. When I look at the whole Plan, I feel that the Government has been lacking in taking the basic decisions that are called for. If we want to remove these disparities, we shall have to take some radical steps and decisions.

Sir, it is said by the hon. Prime Minister in the preface to the Fourth Plan that the Fourth Plan represents a conscious, internally consistent and carefully thought-out programme for the most efficient exploitation of our resources possible in existing conditions. May I know from the Prime Minister what is this 'most efficient exploitation'? Are we prepared to take some radical decisions? Ceiling on urban property is one of our programmes. If we introduce a ceiling on urban and rural properties and if we declare that all the properties above that particular ceiling belong to the country, all those resources will be available for the Government. Are we prepared to mobilise these resources? But it will be argued that compensation will have to be paid for it. A Bill has been circulated that for the property above a particular ceiling full compensation will be paid. If this is the understanding of the Government, the Government does not understand even the ABC of socialism. Sir, this Government shall have to declare that in order to achieve our socialistic objective, this right to property in our Constitution cannot be a fundamental right. Here again it is immediately said that these people want to grab utensils, furniture, etc. No. Let us declare in our Constitution that whatever is the property below a particular ceiling, whether in the urban or the rural areas, that property can be treated as a fundamental right. I am coming to some kind of compromise with a view to removing all the misunderstandings that are carried on by Mr. Nijalingappa and others, because Mr. Mishra is enjoying the speech...

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA) : It is thoroughly enjoyable.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Mysore) : We have advocated capital levy. Let the Prime Minister introduce capital levy.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, we should take a firm decision as to what should be the ceiling in the urban and rural areas and up to that ceiling let that property be declared as a fundamental right and if it is to be taken over, then naturally full compensation should be paid. But above that ceiling the property necessarily vests in the State and it shall be utilised for the implementation of our own Plans. Are you prepared to take that decision ? Take the Death Duty. Why should the inheritance go on ? Why not declare that for a family whatever is required below the ceiling will be allowed ; otherwise, after death, we shall have that much of Death Duty exorbitant that the other property will vest in the State. It is in the form of a capital levy. Similarly in gold, we have left the Bill regarding Gold Control because of the half-hearted decisions taken by the Government. Instead of touching the goldsmiths had the Government taken proper decisions it would have been different—and here I would submit for the consideration of the House—let the Government declare that a family or one married woman would be entitled to have about 20 or 25 tolas and above that, whatever gold is lying in the house should necessarily go to the State, it should go to the Imperial Bank or some other State Bank, if this drastic decision is taken, those who get agitated will not get agitated because the majority of the families, 99 per cent. of the families will be covered by this decision. There will not be any irritation and the goldsmiths also will not get irritated and the Government will get gold worth Rs. 5,000 crores. When this Government is in need of foreign exchange and when this much property is lying in our country, is it not to be used for the development of this country ? For whom is it meant ? Ultimately socialism is the will of the millions of masses of this country. It cannot be the goodwill of a privileged few. The present efforts of the Government to satisfy a privileged few, or to reconcile with the Princes this way and that way are not going to bring in socialism

in this country. What is this heavy compensation for the abolition of the privileges and the Privy Purses ? I oppose tooth and nail any heavy compensation to the Princes. Is it socialist thinking ? This whole Plan is a *status quo* plan. This whole Plan is nothing but a list of few conceptions here and there. This Plan is nothing but a bundle of assumptions of a few *ad hoc* projects suggested by the State and the Central Government. In this direction, is the Government prepared to take some drastic decisions ? I have been urging on the PM since the last two years to take the black money. Let us examine deals of property transactions since the last 20 years above. Rs. 5 lakhs. There is no doubt whatsoever that in all these property transactions more than 100 to 200 per cent. blackmoney have been invested in a very nice and sophisticated way. Let us find out what was the market price and what was the registered price in that particular register meant for property. What was that deal ? Let the Government take action. Let the property be acquired by the Government and again auction to the people. Thousands of rupees will come to the Government which has now gone to the black market. Why are you not prepared to take that action ? I know of deals where properties worth Rs. 2 crores have been registered only at Rs. 40 lakhs or Rs. 50 lakhs and the other amount has been paid in cash being black amount but here the Government shall have to take some courageous decisions. Is the Government prepared for it ? This is again a problem. Some other decisions also will have to be taken. The Prime Minister rightly said that we must be self-reliant and if I am to quote her again, she has given a very valuable piece of advice where she says :

“We should rely more and more on our own machinery and technical know-how even though it may entail some initial difficulties”.

It is quite true but if we want the manufacturers to do it, if we want the common people to do it, should we not expect from the leaders the same sort of treatment ? To-day when we ask for self-reliance, why should we go in for foreign cars ? What is the need for it ? Let us create that love for this country. If there are some difficulties, we shall accept them and those inconveniences but we shall be self-reliant and we should use our own cars. Who has prohibited the P.M. and her colleagues from taking this action ?

They say that perhaps if it is a long journey, it becomes troublesome. Is it not your advice, Prime Minister, to accept some difficulties and inconveniences? Why should it not be made applicable to all? If this new economic discipline is to be enforced—and without enforcing new economic discipline, no Plan could be successful—you start from the leaders and I am here to appeal and insist on the Prime Minister to-day to say 'Yes'. She should come forward and take a decision and say that from 2nd October, 1970, no Minister at least belonging to her party will use a foreign car. You can use it for persons coming from foreign countries. You can use it for tourist purposes. I am not prepared to lose that sight; I can understand that much. But, our Ministers, even though Hindustan Machine Tools have been producing such fine watches—[fortunately, our Prime Minister wears that watch; I know—the other Ministers, they are proud in showing how nice watches they have imported from foreign countries. It is a matter of shame for this country that those who are supposed to take care of the country's self-reliance and to infuse that spirit in the country should behave that way where such behaviour is not expected at least of them.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You should wind up now please.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Sir, the hon. Prime Minister has already declared in her speeches in Bombay and also in Delhi at the A.I.C.C. Sessions—and in other speeches also—that the Government has declared a war against poverty. But, Sir, this Plan is not a war against poverty. It is a surrender to the big monopolists. It is a surrender to poverty, and I am here to demand that if we want to establish socialism in this country, this Plan shall have to be radically changed, and this Plan, as it is, cannot usher in socialism in this country. Let me be very clear about it. And, Sir, in that regard, what is required is again the support of the people. Sir, planning without people has no meaning. Today, we are planning for the people but, unfortunately, we have been lacking all support from the people. Why? There is no involvement of the people. Whether they are trade unions, whether they are fields or whether they are factories, where is that sense of involvement felt by the people? Only slogans are there that the workers shall

have a feeling of participation, that they shall have participation in the managements, but no firm decisions are yet taken by the Government in that regard. Every session I have been asking this question of the hon. Minister, and the reply is, "Yes, the matter is receiving attention". Sir, may I urge on the Prime Minister that we want these crores of hands in this country to be used? It is perhaps the best possible resource to be mobilised. If it is properly utilised, if we do not allow our foreign exports to grow—on the other hand, in the case of cotton we are importing Rs. 90 crores worth of cotton every day—is it not a matter of shame for us that we import cotton worth Rs. 90 crores into this country every year? Why should we import that? What efforts have we made? What efforts have the planners made in this regard? Sir, I feel that this is absolutely improper and this is not the way to bring in socialism. Let us take the people into confidence. Let us create a new sense of patriotism in the country, and let us put it to the people and say, "Yes, we stand by our social objectives and we shall implement them". And I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind that, yes, we can proceed and we can proceed with better speed. But for that purpose we shall have to resolve ourselves that we are wedded to socialism and we shall see that the basic socialist principles are accepted and implemented by us. Otherwise, the Plan will not be in a position to bring any sort of fruit whatever may be the desire of the Prime Minister.

Thank you very much.

SHRI RAJANARAIN (Uttar Pradesh): Surrender to poverty?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, just following after Mr. Mohan Dharma I need not refer to some of the points that have been referred to by him in the course of his criticism of the Fourth Five-Year Plan.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : What are you? Mr. Dharma is a disillusioned socialist.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I am a socialist. I have got that courage to say that we shall create that atmosphere in the country. It is persons like Mr. S. N. Mishra who have fled away from our ranks to the other

[Shri M. M. Dharia]

side and are now working under the reactionary leadership of Mr. Nijalin-gappa.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Is that not expressing disillusionment with the Plan ? There could be no greater disillusionment with the Plan.

श्री राजनारायण : जो प्लान बना है वह पौवर्टी बढ़ाने के लिए बना है और इस तरह की लीडरशिप को मानकर क्या तुम सोशलिस्ट हो जाओगे। तुम इधर आ जाओ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Mr. Mishra may be disillusioned but I did not find any flavour of socialism when I heard his speech yesterday when he initiated the debate. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, though I agree with some of the points that have been raised by Mr. Mohan Dharia I cannot say I agree with him in all points, but I am not going to cross swords with him here in this House at this hour. I entirely disagree with him about his conception of mixed economy. I can never think that through the path of mixed economy you can ever achieve socialist economy because the very idea of mixed economy is born out of the concept of welfare state. Let us not forget that. After the second world war with the conception of expansion of social activities for the poorer sections of humanity the idea of welfare state developed and this idea of mixed economy was a by product of the welfare society. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I do not want to go into those aspects but again I want to say that I do not entirely blame Prof. Gadgil for all the mishaps that have occurred here because whatever might be the mistakes of Prof. Gadgil, is it not a fact that after the fourth general election the status of the Planning Commission has been downgraded ? I know those days when the Planning Commission was at the helm of affairs, was controlling and guiding the economic policy of the country, whatever be the mistakes that were committed. Then there was a criticism in the country from the vested interests that that was a super-cabinet and I think the impact of that criticism on the Government was so very great that particularly after the fourth general election the status of the Planning Commission was downgraded. It is now no more than a consultative committee of Parliament. Now I shall not go into that aspect also.

Now I am astonished about the Question of unemployment which has been referred to here. I heard with rapt attention. Dr. Mahavir also when he asked some questions. Now if you compare the draft Fourth Five Year Plan and the Fourth Five Year Plan that we are debating today, whatever might be the statistical errors in the draft Plan, there was a clear analysis of the problem of unemployment but here in this Fourth Five Year Plan document the Government has forgotten to analyse this aspect. Again I am not going into this aspect also; I am only concerned with certain salient features of the Fourth Five Year Plan.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in one way it may be an improvement on the approach document because if you analyse the approach document you will find more emphasis was given on the aspect of growth with stability. The ideas of social justice that have been injected here in the Fourth Five Year Plan were absent in the approach document. I do not say that giving some social justice to certain communities will usher in any change in the society or any structural change in the economy but this aspect that was neglected in the approach document has to a certain extent been made up but I want to say that the aspect of stability has been neglected in this final document. The Planning Commission or the Prime Minister perhaps thinks that the giving of social justice is contradictory to stability in the country. I think growth can accompany social justice and also stability. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, planning does not mean particularly socialist planning does not mean, how much or what quantum of commodities you produce in the country and what methods you adopt so far as distribution is concerned. Socialist economy primarily deals with the question to what extent you are going to change the structure of the economy, the structure of the society. Even if this plan succeeds 100 per cent tomorrow is there any hope in the horizon of this country that the economic structure, the political fabric or the social structure of this country will change with the ideas that have been incorporated in this Fourth Five Year Plan ? They may be giving in certain areas certain aspects of social justice. I know about fifty districts will be chosen for some amelioration of the economy but that is not going to change the economic situation in the country.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I only want to highlight a few aspects here because the time at my disposal is very

short. I want to go into the question of agriculture. We should not forget that more than 50 per cent of the national income is derived from the agricultural sector and we should not forget also that more than 75 per cent of commodities production in the country is from the agricultural sector. National income may be 50 per cent, but the percentage of commodities production from agriculture is more than 75 per cent. So, any Plan which neglects agriculture can never succeed in this country, not only in this country but in any backward country in this world which wants to tread on the path of planning. Although in the First Five Year Plan there was some emphasis on agriculture, the Second Five Year Plan and the Third Five Year Plan had neglected it. The Fourth Five Year Plan has not done enough justice to this sector. I want to say here that the hope has been held out that by 1971 imports will be completely stopped. The hope has been given that while in the first year of the Plan there was a production of 98 million tonnes, by the end of the Plan it would be 128 million tonnes, a rise of about 31.6 per cent. I want to say that if the climate is not favourable at least for four years out of the five years, this target is not going to be achieved in this country. In spite of the fact that we have had three good monsoons in this country, what has been the economy of this country? It is a matter of regret that we are discussing this Plan document after one and a half years, but it has given enough experience to us. In spite of the target of 5.5 per cent growth in the economy, in spite of the target that the industrial growth will be about 9 per cent or 8 to 10 per cent, in spite of the fact that the growth rate of export was 7 per cent, what has been the achievement during the first year of the Fourth Five Year Plan? You will find that already we have started getting jerks. The economy has not grown to that extent as was anticipated. The industrial production which was anticipated to be 9 per cent is not 7 per cent, as my friend, Mr. S. N. Mishra, said the other day, but it is 6.3 per cent. The export which was expected to be 7 per cent has reached a target of 3.8 per cent, in spite of three successive good crops in this country and all types of help given for export promotion. The price level which was to be stabilised and the very basis of the Plan, which is to be achieved on conditions of stability has also gone wrong. It rose to the extent of 7 per cent within one year. So, already the weakness in the imple-

mentation of the Plan is on the horizon. If the Prime Minister and the entire country does not take care of all these factors which have been evident in the first year of the Fourth Five Year Plan, then I am afraid, all the targets may not materialise. Discussing in the context of agricultural production, I have no doubt in my mind that if the irrigation potentialities are not developed at a greater speed, the five per cent growth in agriculture is not going to materialise during the Fourth Five Year Plan. Is it not a fact that in this country when we have 158 million hectares of agricultural land, about 82 million hectares can be brought under irrigation? That is the potential that has to be calculated in the context of planning. During all these years, in spite of our three Plans, we have created a potential of 37.5 million hectares, of which the utilisation is 35.9 million hectares. What will be the result at the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan? After investing in this sector about Rs. 953.8 crores, the additional potential of irrigation that will be created will be 4 million hectares. Even if the utilisation is to the extent of 3.9 million hectares, we will be creating a potential of 42.3 million hectares only, which is half of the potential of this country—the area that can be brought under irrigation. Can anybody think that in this condition we can achieve a five per cent growth rate in agriculture, if irrigation is neglected to that extent? It is not enough to spend Rs. 900 odd crores. This is what I want to warn the Prime Minister. Even if you succeed in your Plan under conditions of stability, you cannot achieve the target unless the greatest input of agriculture, the irrigation potential, is developed to a great extent. Mr. Deputy Chairman, here I want to make a suggestion. In spite of our foreign aid, in spite of our imports in spite of all the rosy picture of the green revolution that has been painted before this country, the per capita foodgrain availability in this country is gradually going down. It was 447 gm. per capita in 1960 and it is only 396 gm. in 1967. How can you provide social justice to the common man when the growth in the agricultural sector is so low, when the per capita availability of foodgrains in spite of all the imports that you are having is gradually going down? That is why I am giving a warning here that unless you give more importance to this agriculture aspect, all this green revolution may be pink revolution, may be red revolution, but it is not going to be green revolution. Again I want to warn the

[Shri Banka Behary Das]

Prime Minister that though I am a votary of the green revolution, though I have a fascination for high-yielding varieties of seeds, the so-called revolution is a technocratic revolution in this country. It is confined to a few sections of society and a few areas in society where the irrigation potential has been developed, and I am afraid that if this technocratic approach is not changed, if this concept is not changed, if you do not give more importance to the lower sections in the society not by creating 45 districts just to help them but by a complete change in the policy and attitude towards the whole problem, this 5 per cent growth may not be possible even after the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan period.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want to remind the House again that the small-holders having less than two acres in our villages constitute about 52 per cent of our rural households, and agricultural labour households are about 24 per cent; both together, those who either have no land or have two acres of land or less constitute more than 76 per cent of the rural households in this country. If your revolution is technocratic, if your revolution is going to depend on tractors, whether imported or indigenous, you cannot bring about a change in the rural economy in this country, nor can you bring about a change in the conditions of society of this country. Mr. Deputy Chairman, some of our friends talked so much about agriculture. I may agree with them in certain aspects but I cannot agree with them in one respect because I see in the Parliament there is a powerful lobby who want tractors not only to be produced in this country but to be imported. Within these twentytwo years have you ever thought of the economy in terms of power tillers? Have you ever thought that those owning 5 acres or 10 acres, who can change the face of the rural economy, should be given a certain amount of mechanised implements, so that there can be a technocratic change if you so like? Because of the powerful influence of the tractor-owners and industrialists and because of the influence of the foreign lobby in this country, for these twenty-two years we wanted to import tractors from other countries but we never thought of producing power tillers so that the small man in the village even with the help of the nationalised banks can go in for a power tiller which will not cost more than Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000.

Shall you not think in terms of small implements which are even modern, which can be secured and procured at a reasonable cost? Because of the powerful lobby of the big peasants they always think of tractors. Even now I want to challenge that in spite of the fact that two or three concerns have been given permission to produce power tillers in this country, the production has not started. This is the picture. Who is going to benefit out of this green revolution? With all the money that you are spending on fertilizers and other things, the only picture is the smaller man in the rural sector, the landless labourer, the small peasant, the person owning five to ten acres through whom you want to change the entire structure of the economy of this country will get frustrated, and there will be no sense of involvement in him, not only for our planning but for our implementation also. That is why I want to say here that if your whole green revolution idea, the concept of green revolution, is not small peasant-oriented—so that not only you give him credit, not only you give him a small unit of machinery to cultivate his land, you also provide water to him—then the green revolution will be confined to a few sections of the society and rural tensions will develop into activities of Naxalites. You cannot confine them within the four corners of the law. I want that they should be dealt with strongly. I do not deny that. But I want to emphasise here that your policy creates conditions of rural tension by giving all types of support to those big peasants. If you create a condition of rural tension, not only will the Naxalites grow, but also democracy will be endangered. There are two dangers in this country, from one side the danger of the Naxalites because of poverty and squalor at the lower levels of society and from the other side, because of the unemployment problem among the educated sections. I want to again tell this to the Prime Minister and others. Yesterday I heard Mr. Krishan Kant speak about technology. Can you think of very sophisticated technology in this country where you have a high density of population? Can you solve the problem of unemployment in this country if you think in terms of sophisticated forms of technology in this country. Sophisticated forms of science and technology have their own place. I am not against them. We will have to get them, we will have to develop them in certain sectors where they cannot be avoided. At the one end, you talk about labour-intensive projects. On the other, you talk about

high sophisticated technology. Both cannot go together. If China and the Soviet Union had a higher population density or a density equal to that of India, I am sure they could not afford to have a sophisticated technology, sophisticated economy ; they would have to go in for intermediate technology. So the Planning Commission's policy on science and technology should be very clear in the respect that though a highly sophisticated technology may be found necessary in certain areas where it cannot be avoided, by and large, the entire economy, the entire mechanics of production should be based on intermediate technology, which is not a primitive conception.

I do not want to say more about all these things. Within one minute I want to close my speech. I do not want to say much about the licensing policy. But what I want to warn you is that if the entire licensing policy which is being now and then modified in favour of the big monopolists is not changed, then your Fourth Five Year Plan is not going to succeed. Within four years, from 1963-64 to 1967-68, Tatas increased their assets by 39.9 per cent ; Birlas by 96.6 per cent within a span of four years in spite of talks of socialism ; Martin Burn has gone up by 16.3 per cent ; Banglors by 60.3 per cent. and Mafatlals which was 15th in the hierarchy of industrialists of the country rose up to the fourth position by a rise of 195.9 per cent, more than treble. This is the licensing policy that has resulted in this type of society.

I have no time to say more. But I warn the Government that if these aspects are not looked into, the Fourth Plan and the subsequent plans will gradually create a condition of desperation in the society, and that is why we should have a clear conception of our path and our goal.

With these words, I thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. T. N. Singh.

SHRI T. N. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I am grateful to you for permitting me to say a few words on this subject...

SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA (Mysore) : Sir, will you give me a chance ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You will get a chance.

SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA : I have not been given a chance for the last...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You will get it.

SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA: I have not come here to waste my time, to sleep at Delhi.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I told you this morning and I am telling you now that you will get your chance to speak today. You cannot get a chance out of turn.

SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA: Very good, Sir.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : I have risen here not only to make an analysis of the Fourth Five Year Plan, as presented now, or to point to certain defects or good points, I rise principally to suggest and advocate the need for an urgent change in the strategy of planning. The time has come when we must learn from experience and change the whole strategy because it has not worked as was expected.

Sir, Pandit Nehru evolved this planning technique to put India on the economic map at an early date. But it did not simply function. What has happened ? The gross national product has been going up at the rate of 2.6 per cent. during the last decade. Our population has been going up by 2.5 per cent. all these years. So, all in all, there has hardly been any per capita increase in our income and production. Whatever we achieved was wiped out by the increase in population.

What is the position of the per capita income ? With 1960-61 as the base, the per capita income from 319 in 1963-64 went up to 333 in 1964-65 but it went down again to 319 in 1968-69. This is the position. While the annual consumption of the most ordinary cloth was 4.8 metres in 1960-61, in 1966-67, for which figures are available, it was only 3.8 metres. The foodgrains per capita consumption in 1960-61 was 170.8 kg. in 1966-67 which dropped by 14 kg in 1968-69. This has been the position. On the contrary, what has been happening in the pattern of consumption is disturbing. The consumption of higher priced items has been going up. Art fabrics consumption went up by 380 per cent. in one year

[Shri T. N. Singh.]

from 1964-65 to 1965-66. Use of refrigerators and airconditioners went up by 370 and 210 per cent. respectively in the same period. In the meantime the purchasing power of the rupee has also been going down. With 1961-62 as the base, as compared to 100 then, in 1969-70 it was 59. This is the position. Surely there must be something wrong with what we have been doing. We have been trying to achieve development, progress, economic stability and economic growth but we have failed. Is it not time for us, therefore, to sit up and think whether there is need for a change of strategy today or not? That is the question I want to put before this House.

Sir, I have had my association with the Planning Commission for a number of years. When I was appointed to that august body I had great hopes. I went there with a great amount of zeal and worked for six years. On the whole the programmes and plans are not very badly conceived. They are within possibility. There were no reliable statistics, no data. Yet something was done, good plans on the whole were conceived and framed. And what has been happening on the implementation front? We have been failing all along the line in this regard. Our Prime Minister is very keen to socialise the country. She has been talking of equality, fraternity and all kinds of high principles. But I want to know whether the policies that we have been pursuing so far are going to reach us to those positions. I say the will not. The experience of the last two decades indicates that our strategy has gone wrong somewhere and, according to me, it is mainly on the implementation field. Even a bad Plan would have succeeded if the implementation had been good. That is my contention. But the implementation is very very faulty. The administration of plans has failed. And why is it faulty? If one wants to do a certain thing and does it with conviction then only it succeeds. But if he does it merely for form's sake, he will never succeed. That is the tragedy of the situation to-day. We talk of poverty in India, unemployment in India and so on. But are we closer to the poor people? From 1920-21, under Gandhiji's inspiration, at least the middle classes—the upper middle classes and the lower middle classes—came closer to the poor. Now, in all these years after independence, I am sorry to say, the gap has grown. I am not so much worried about a few rich individuals. We can always take care of them. If the

Government is strong enough, we can deal with a few hundred big capitalists. Slogan mongering is not going to help us. What is very important is the right approach. I have seen with my own eyes that when I came here in Parliament in 1950—I am a very old fashioned man; I still live in the old way; I still happen to wear the same kind of clothes—it was something *infra dig* to wear anything but bush-shirts and pants. We started with nationalism—*swadeshi*. Where nationalism and *swadeshi* to-day? These concepts have been thrown into the background. We cannot really implement the Plan if we, who are supposed to implement the Plan and put it into action, do not feel closer to the people. That is the greatest missing link in the whole situation. And unless we do that, I am afraid the best of plans will not succeed. You can increase the size of the Plan, from Rs. 10,000 crores to Rs. 22,000 or Rs. 24,000 crores. You can do all that. But that is not going to help us. There again, as regards the increase in the size of the Plan, there is a lot of wishful thinking. I am sorry, I have got a lot of things to say, but I do not know how to say them in the short time at my disposal. That is my problem just at present.

Anyway, we have estimated the total domestic resources over a period of five years at Rs. 12,438 crores, out of which we propose to raise well over Rs. 3,000 crores by way of taxation in the course of five years, out of which again Rs. 725 crores are supposed to have been raised already. Now most of the States are having deficit budgets. Deficit financing is going on to-day in most of the States. The financial position is very bad in most of the States. And yet we think they would raise resources to the tune of Rs. 1,000 crores in these five years. We think we at the Centre also will raise resources to the tune of over Rs. 2,000 crores by way of taxation. Will that be possible? It might be possible, but then it is the poor man who will suffer because the tax levels on the higher income groups are pretty high at present. You can get some additional income from them. That will be marginal only and the bulk of it will have to come from the poor people through indirect taxes. And what is the *per capita* income? It is Rs. 319 only after all these years of planning. So it is the poor man who will suffer. My greatest objection to our raising large resources today is that for the last five

years we have been replying more on indirect taxation. I would not mind raising resources if you can raise them from the higher income groups. But actually speaking, the bulk of the resources are being raised by indirect taxation. It is the few rich, who mostly benefit by your schemes, by the Government schemes—the contractors, the big businessmen and others—who can afford, who increase their consumption buying refrigerators, cars, etc., and get even tax rebates. This is what is happening; the bulk of the income will again come and resources will again be raised, from the poor people. Yet we seem to be going ahead with this kind of estimates of resources for the plan. Prices have been going up. Inflation is going up. Everytime there is deficit financing. And yet we are making these calculations about high internal resources and indirect taxes. I can tell you all our calculations are wrong. They have not proved to be correct in reality. And yet we seem to credit ourselves by saying that we can estimate such things with accuracy. This is what we are saying. But how do we calculate all these things? It is not going to happen. My own contention is that actual costs of the projects will go up considerably. We have been calculating like this in the past also. I have had the privilege of sharing in the drafting of the first draft of the Fourth Five Year Plan for which, I am glad, some praise has been showered by my colleague, Mr. Banka Behary Das. Even so I had my own differences with it. The Prime Minister is aware of it. I felt that it was unrealistic in certain respects. And if we now have got still bigger plans, what is going to happen? You are going to tax more and more but in this way indirect taxes only will go up. Inflation will go up. Prices will go up. And at the same time your dependence on foreign aid will grow. You are saying that your dependence on foreign aid will taper down. I do not believe a single word of it. I have been in the Planning Commission and I know something about it. I can say with authority that all these calculations are wrong. In actuality our dependence on foreign aid is going to be much more. It is a tragic story today.

I want to take the House into confidence and say that after the Chinese war and after the Pakistani war we learnt to our cost that the moment foreign aid or availability of foreign exchange

was restricted, our production went down steeply. Our entire economy, our production in the industrial sector, is highly dependent on, and sensitive to, foreign aid. Is that a good thing? Is it not time that we changed the situation? I fully endorse the idea of self-reliance. But how can we have self-reliance? While we talk of self-reliance, we yet must get the latest fashionable things. The latest fashionable things must be produced here in this country. We cannot be content with something to which our people have been accustomed for centuries. We want the latest things, most modern things, here. And for those, foreign collaborations with latest techniques are very important. I am amazed at this hunger for the latest fashionable things. I do not know how the people in the Government talk in that language. There is the talk of purchasing repetitive technology by the Government. Now, this grand idea was a kind of revelation to our former Industries Minister. You have been toying with this idea for the last three years. How are you going to implement any of these things? Has anybody thought and worked out as to how we should proceed about it? How do we implement such concepts? I also have had the occasion to comment on the question of purchase of repetitive technology. That is true. But how to proceed about it? It is all right to talk that we will do this or that. We are suffering from the complex of grandeur. It is a weakness. Panditji used to say that ours is a big country. Our country is big no doubt. But we are really very small men struggling against the enormous problems of a big country. Let us realise that and let us approach the whole problem with a sense of humility.

I must say that for the first time—I am not trying to be partial with a man who is no more in the world today—it was Shri Lal Bahadur as Prime Minister who could inject a sense of practicality in our planning. I have attended many meetings of the National Development Council. But it was he who gave highest priority to our agriculture, to our small industries and to the problem of unemployment. But this Fourth Plan fails to talk of unemployment. What is the position of unemployment today? I can give you some figures. But I cannot vouch for them as our statistics are scanty. However the same set of people have estimated these comparative figures. So there is comparability. In 1964-65 unemployment was estimated at 9.5 millions.

[Shri T. N. Singh]

In 1965-66 it went up to 10 millions and in 1966-67 it further went up to 15 millions millions—one and a half crores of unemployed people, leave aside the question of under-employment. There is also hidden unemployment. Its extent is not known. Imagine the lot of these people...

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) : जो फिगर्स दी जाती हैं उसको प्रधान मंत्री मानती नहीं, कहती हैं वह इनकरेक्ट है, पता नहीं वह क्या मानती हैं, क्या कहां से फिगर्स लेती हैं। सवाल यह है कि कुछ ऐसा डेटा दीजिये जिसे कि वह करेक्ट माने।

SHRI T. N. SINGH : I am quoting these figures from the same source to which the Prime Minister has approach. If he wants to deny them, it is her job. I can rebut it also later on.

I was taking about Lal Bahadur's approach to the whole problem. He wanted to do something first for the small men. In the year 1964-65 foodgrains production was not bad. It was a good harvest. Even in that year he talked of agriculture and laid the greatest emphasis on agriculture. He talked of unemployment. He talked of the needs of small industries. What is the position of small industries today ? We pay only lip sympathy. The Prime Minister will kindly excuse me. So, what is the policy regarding small industry ? Many years ago two principles were evolved—reservation of fields for the small industries and common production programmes. These were the principal ideas evolved by the Planning Commission. But we have virtually forgotten them. When this question was discussed in the Administrative Reforms Commission, of which I was then a member, I wanted to get exact connotation of those ideas as then thought out by the authors of the Plan. With great difficulty, I got a cyclostyled copy of it, not from the industry Ministry but from the Planning Commission, though the Ministry has to implement these ideas. These concepts were spelt out in some detail. But it has been completely forgotten now by the implementing Ministry I ask where is the reservation for small industries? Everywhere the large sector is coming up. We are worried about Birlas or Tata getting licences. Why are we not worried about the small industrial units? Why are we allowing them to be competed out? For a small thing, say, even for book binding industry which

should be reserved for the small sector. Large number of latest machines are being imported by large units with Foreign collaboration for book-binding.

Sir, I will tell you an anecdote when I was a victim of my zeal for the small man and nationalism. I was opposing foreign publishing houses invading this country. And I opposed such proposals as a member of the Planning Commission. But somebody was interested in giving them licence. Later at a meeting at which Pandit Nehru was presiding, that friend quietly told Panditji, "There are Members of the Planning Commission who are opposed to spread of knowledge if it is foreign". Imagine what the reaction of Panditji was. Panditji reacted very violently. He started talking at me right and left and I was upset. Defending at that time would have been bad. I had the presence of mind and I told him, "I will talk to you later on the subject, not in your present temper". I talked to him later. The licensing was postponed. But later the same concern got...

AN HON. MEMBER : The same concern got what?

SHRI T. N. SINGH : The same foreign concern got the publishing licence. Sir, this is what has been happenign. Everyday similar things are happening. The small sector is being squeezed out slowly.

Now, what is the position regarding employment? I feel everybody is guilty in this regard. When we go to the public, we pour out our heart, in all sincerity and sympathy, and give the impression, as if we are dying for the small man, dying for the poor man. But, when we come here to Delhi, we care little for him. Has there been any reduction in our standards of living, in our ways of life? Has there been any lowering of our standards? If we cannot better the lot of the poor people we should at least lead a simpler life. I admit there are obvious difficulties in overcoming disparities. In a country with a population of ever 500 million, the population growing at such a rapid rate with a worsening situation internationally—virtual hostility of many nations to us, the situation is difficult, all that I concede. But, supposing we cannot improve the lot of the poor quickly, what is there to prevent us, the better placed few from leading a life of austerity even in this city of Delhi ? I often feel that this city of Delhi is something outside India. Whenever I come here I feel like that.

It does not seem a part of India. What a contrast between affluent Delhi and the rest of the country and yet, we talk about socialism. There was great pressure, even in this Plan for higher allocations to Delhi—I have not worked out the figures, I will work out later on ; they are not available now—Delhi is getting, I am afraid, plan allocation out of all proportion to its population and area. That is what is happening. Somebody said that is its alter all the capital of India.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is inevitable.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : But is it inevitable that the poor people should go on starving all these years ? Here in the case of Delhi it becomes inevitable. But, is it inevitable there in the case of poor millions ? I say we are sitting on the brink of a volcano. This will not be tolerated for long. What is worse, we talk of socialism, almost every one, but we do not really mean it. There is a story in our *S. astras*.

When a new Indra, Lord of the Gods, wanted some Rishis (sages) to carry his palanquin they did carry him but were walking slowly. Indra asked: स्कन्धं बाधति What's the matter ? Are your shoulders paining ? The Rishies replied स्कन्धं न बाधते राजा यथा बाधति बाधते च । i.e. we are not feeling as much pain in our shoulders as we are pained by the ungrammatical use of the word 'pain'. Similarly, Sir, it does not pain me much if there are setbacks in our march to socialism. But, when we talk of socialism and lead the life of an aristocrat that is more painful. This hypocritical talk of socialism is the most painful part in the whole situation.

Sir, I feel guilty of having taken so much time of the House when there are so many members wanting to speak. But I wish to make this request to the hon. Prime Minister through you that she should involve Members of Parliament in the planning processes. This year it has not been done. Let us jointly think about the Plan ; let us sit for longer hours because there is need for a full discussion. I would plead for a little charity. I want that the Government should have all the points of view before it, not only some, two-fifths or three-fifths.

Now, Sir, I do not know, you have put me in a dilemma whether to close my speech or to proceed with it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You can continue for about 5 minutes.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : In all humility I would plead for some charity because the subject requires a full discussion. So, Sir, I started by saying that I am rising here to advocate the need for a change in our plan strategy.

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar) : Please explain the strategy.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : You want me to explain it. Where is the time ? Well we have been following a certain method of planning, a certain plan structure, certain ideas about the rate of our economic growth and all that. We have been taking about all these things. The whole plan document is there for anybody to read. I will not dilate on the subject at any length. I would only say that there is great need for husbanding our limited resources and utilising them for the best purpose. We are not in a position to go on borrowing from foreign countries. We have got to rely on ourselves. It is true that in the first few years if foreign aids is not forthcoming, our rate of progress might be slowed down as it slowed down due to the stoppage of foreign aid after Pakistan war. We should learn from it and once that happens, the rate of growth will rapidly increase. I do not like the philosophy of Mao Tse-tung but I feel that his approach in regard to self-reliance is correct. In China Russians overnight stopped foreign aid and yet China has attained so much progress. It is just like giving up the habit of smoking of cigarettes. Sir, I was once a heavy smoker, a chain smoker. I tried to reduce smoking but could not succeed. Similarly, you are trying to reduce foreign aid, you will never succeed. But one fine morning I decided to give up smoking and I succeeded. Give up foreign aid from today and you will be self-reliant.

श्री राजनारायण : सही है। आदने तोड़ी जाती है, छोड़ी नहीं जाती है।

SHRI T. N. SINGH : So please take a decision in this matter now. I want the House to cooperate fully with the Government in such an endeavour. I am speaking from this side of the House. Let the Prime Minister take a decision "Come what

[Shri T. N. Singh]

may, we shall live even as Maharana Pratap lived on grass-bread but we shall not go to foreign countries with a begging bowl." If you do that, we offer our full cooperation to you. We will offer you our unstinted cooperation provided you choose from tomorrow to live as one of the poor people and live among them. We will offer you full cooperation, if you go back to the policies and programmes as well as aspirations which Gandhiji taught and gave us. If for a change, you enter into the spirit of Gandhiji's policy, you will find us cooperating fully. It may not be in conformity with what is described in communistic or socialistic jargon, in the accepted sense of the term, such a policy that will take the country towards progress on the basis of self-reliance and *Swadeshi* which we have forgotten. So that is the strategy, I would suggest. How will we do it? Having worked in the Planning Commission for some years, I do not wish to be rhetorical. Hard-headed issues will have to be decided in a hard-headed manner. I am prepared to discuss this in this House provided I get the time. So I am closing. I thank you, Sir, and the House very much for the attention it has given to what I have said. There are many things which I would like to say if I get an opportunity later on. I will not be just trying to project certain of my ideas and talk in generalities. I am prepared to go into practical details and submit you alternative suggestions as to how to proceed about it. But there is nobody to listen so far as I can see the situation today. I thank you.

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना के संबंध में दो दिन से सदन में जो बहस चल रही है उसको मैंने बड़े ध्यानपूर्वक सुना।

श्री राजनारायण : कैसे मालूम हुआ ?

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : मूरख हृदयन चैत् चाहे गुरु मिलहि विरंच सम।

उपसभापति महोदय, आपने मुझे चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना की चर्चा पर अपने विचार सदन में प्रगट करने का अवसर प्रदान किया है, इसके लिये सर्वप्रथम आप को हार्दिक धन्यवाद दे रही हूं।

जहां तक चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना का संबंध है, यह प्रथम अवसर है कि वह अच्छा परिवर्तनों के साथ सदन में प्रस्तुत की गई है और इसके लिए मैं प्रधान मंत्री जो को बधाई दिये बगैर नहीं रह सकती हूं।

श्री राजनारायण : घर जाकर दीजिये।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : आप के पेट में दर्द क्यों हो रहा है।

उपसभापति महोदय, अब सदन के माननीय सदस्यों व देशवासियों का यह कर्तव्य है तथा उन पर यह सब निर्भर है कि राष्ट्र के हित तथा उसके चतुर्मुखी विकास में योजना को सफल बनाकर लाभ उठा लें या बाधाएं उत्पन्न कर उसे असफल बनाने की चेष्टा कर देश को पीछे की ओर ले जाय।

महोदय, किसी भी विषय की आलोचना एक अच्छी बात है, परन्तु समालोचना पक्ष-निर्माणात्मक होना चाहिए ना कि विध्वंसात्मक राष्ट्र के हित में हमें दलीय या व्यक्ति हितों में ऊपर उठकर मोचने की मनोवृत्ति अपनानी पड़ेगी, केवल छिद्रान्वेशी होने मात्र से हम देश को, समाज को आगे नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं। परन्तु, माननीय सदन की चर्चा सुनने के पश्चात् मैं अनुभव करती हूं कि अपने कर्तव्य व मार्ग से विचलित होते जा रहे हैं। मुझे आश्चर्य है कि कल तक जो सत्ता पर आमीन थे, जिनकी जिम्मेदारियां थी, जो देश की पुरानी असफलताओं और सफलताओं के लिए जिम्मेदार हैं, आज वे ही दूसरों के मध्ये यह जिम्मेदारी मढ़ने में संलग्न हैं और पैर खींचने में प्रयत्नशील हैं।

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : प्लान आपका बहुत अच्छा है।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : It is a direct hit on the Deputy Minister of Planning. That should not be allowed.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : On a point of order. Mr. Mishra and Mr. Rajnarain must be chivalrous enough to allow the lady to continue.

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : हम इस सत्य को छिपा नहीं सका है कि तीन पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं के दौरान आलोचकों के बावजूद हम ने बड़ी बड़ी उपलब्धियाँ हासिल की हैं। मैं यह तो नहीं कहती कि उन से निराशा नहीं हुई है, लेकिन इतने के बावजूद भी देश में बड़ी उपलब्धियाँ हासिल हुईं और देश की जनता उसे भूल नहीं सकती। हमारे माननीय सदस्य और वह काम करने वाले भले ही उन उपलब्धियों को भूल जायें, और यह मैं मानती हूँ कि हमारी वे योजनाएँ जन भाकाक्षाओं को पूर्ण रूप से पूरा नहीं कर पायी हैं, परन्तु यह निर्विवाद है कि अनेक बाधाओं के बावजूद भी देश में अल्प माघनों के माध्यम से पिछले 18 वर्षों में काफी तरक्की हुई है और हम आगे बढ़े हैं। परन्तु इस चौथी योजना में सबसे बड़ी बात और महत्वपूर्ण खूबी यह है कि इस में देश के पिछड़े वर्ग, समाज और क्षेत्र की ओर ध्यान दिया गया है जिस की ओर अभी तक हमारा ध्यान नहीं गया था। अभी तक हम उस कमजोर हिस्से को देख नहीं पाये थे। उस निर्धन, बेकार और साधनहीन समाज और उम क्षेत्र को विनियमित करने को प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो संकल्प चौथी योजना में किया है वह सराहनीय है और ऐसी प्रधान मंत्री सच्चे समाजवाद और लोकतंत्र को सुदृढ़ बनाने की एक आधारभूत शिला है और ऐसा लगना है मानों वर्तमान शासन इन्हीं कमजोरियों को पूरा करने के लिए कटिबद्ध है।

उपसभापति महोदय, समाजवाद को लाने के पूर्व कुछ पृष्ठभूमि तैयार करनी पड़ती है। उस के लिये कुछ सहायता साधनों और कुछ मूलभूत आधारों को जुटाना पड़ता है जिन को जुटाये बगैर समाजवाद नहीं लाया जा सकता। अतः उपसभापति महोदय, सदन को विदित है कि शासन ने सर्वप्रथम इस योजना के दौरान बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया, सघन

कृषि कार्यक्रम अपनाया, सभी क्षेत्रों में आत्मनिर्भरता, आयात और निर्यात की नवीन नीति, निम्न वर्ग के ऊपर उठाने का संकल्प, छोटे बड़े भेद जो है उस को घटना और मिश्रित-अर्थ व्यवस्था को सुदृढ़ बनाना तथा अर्थिक विषमता को समाप्त करना, इन सब के लिये काफी कुछ किया है। उसने सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में औद्योगिक क्षमता बढ़ाने के लिए और उसमें सुधार और वृद्धि करने के लिए कदम उठाया है, कृषि में क्रांतिकारी परिवर्तन किये हैं और बेरोजगारी को समाप्त करने का प्रयास किया है। अपने आंतरिक साधनों की अधिकाधिक वृद्धि, आत्मनिर्भरता आदि अनेक इस चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना की विशेषताएँ हैं कि जिन की अच्छाइयों से हम इन्कार नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना के अंतर्गत हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कुछ विशेष तरीके अपनाये हैं जिन के लिए हम उन की अच्छाइयों से इन्कार नहीं कर सकते। यदि हम योजना को सच्चे संकल्प से लेव मिल जुल कर काम करने की भावना से प्रेरित हो कर प्रयत्न करें और इसे सफल बनायें, उस के लिए कटिबद्ध हो तो हम निश्चित रूप से समाजवाद लाने की भूमिका अदा कर सकेंगे? किन्तु, उपसभापति महोदय यह सब निर्भर करता है हमारे जन सहयोग पर, हमारे माननीय सदस्यों के सहयोग पर, चाहे वह विरोधी हो अथवा हमारी पार्टी के और यह निर्भर करता है हमारे शासन पर।

माननीय, हम समाजवादी होने का दावा करते हैं। हो सकता है कि हमारे कुछ मतभेद हो दलीय आधार पर, और यह होता अस्वभाविक नहीं है, उपसभापति महोदय, परन्तु देशहित से उपर कोई दल नहीं होता। दल देन के हित के लिए बनाये गये हैं। इस लिए मैं अपने माननीय सदस्यों से निवेदन करूंगी कि राष्ट्रहित के लिए वे दलगत राजनीति और छोटी बातों का इनमें समावेश न करें और इस पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो अच्छाइयों हैं उनमें पूरा पूरा सहयोग दें।

[श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी]

अंत में उपसभापति महोदय, मैं कुछ चन्द सुझाव देना चाहूंगी। और वे इस तरह से हैं। जैसा कि अभी तक होता रहा है, मैं चाहती हूँ कि हम पुनः उन गलतियों को न दुहरायें जिन को हम कर चुके हैं और जो हम निर्णय करें उस को हम असली रूप से यादा पहचाने। कागजों पर कई बार बड़ी अच्छी योजनाये आयीं लेकिन किसी कारण से हमारे अंदर के जो कुछ तत्व थे वे उस में बाध्य बने और हम उन को असली रूप न दे सकें। मैं चाहूंगी कि हम को इस दृष्टि से सोचना और समझना चाहिए कि जो पुरानी गलतियाँ हुई हैं उनको दुबारा दुहराया न जाय।

उपसभापति महोदय, जहाँ तक पिछड़े वर्गों का सम्बन्ध है हमारी चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में उसका समावेश किया गया है किन्तु पिछड़े वर्गों के साथ साथ पिछड़े क्षेत्र भी हमारे देश में बहुत से हैं और उन पिछड़े क्षेत्रों कयी तरफ भी हमारा ध्यान देना निहायत जरूरी है। हमारे देश में बहुत से ऐसे क्षेत्र हैं जो कि पिछड़े हुये हैं। मैं सदन का ध्यान उपसभापति महोदय आपका ध्यान और आपके द्वारा चूकि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय अभी नहीं हैं तो जो मंत्री हैं उनका ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना, चाहती हूँ कि जिस क्षेत्र से मैं आती हूँ वह बुन्देलखंड का क्षेत्र बहुत ही पिछड़ा हुआ क्षेत्र है।

श्री ए० डी० मणि : मध्य प्रदेश से।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : मध्य प्रदेश पिछड़ा हुआ है और मध्य प्रदेश के अन्तर्गत जो बुन्देलखंड है वह भी पिछड़ा है। मध्य प्रदेश के अन्तर्गत ही नहीं, मैं तो कहूंगी कि यू० पी० के अन्तर्गत जो बुन्देलखंड का एक एरिया है वह पिछड़ा हुआ है और उसकी उपेक्षा की गई है। वह शुरू से ही आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ता रहा है। आजादी की लड़ाई में वहाँ वीर सेनानी पैदा हुये हैं।

श्री पीताम्बर दास (उत्तर प्रदेश) : बुन्देलखंड के लिये अलग राज्य की मांग है, तो साफ साफ कहिये।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : आप सुनते रहिये सब समझ में आ जायगा। हमारा कहना है कि इन बीस वर्षों में उसकी उपेक्षा की गई। अंग्रेजों के समय में और बाद में भी बुन्देलखंड के अलग अलग टुकड़े कर दिये गये कुछ रियासतों के हिस्से में दे दिया, कुछ यू० पी० में मिला दिया, कुछ महाकौशल में मिला दिया और इस तरह से उसके टुकड़े कर दिये और आज उसकी स्थिति यह है कि इन 20 वर्षों में वहाँ कोई भी योजना या किसी तरह का कोई भी काम नहीं हुआ। क्या औद्योगिक, क्या कोई आवागमन के साधन का, क्या सिंचाई के साधन का, बिजली का या जो रोजमर्रा की जरूरत है उनका कोई काम नहीं हुआ है यहाँ तक कि जो हम सघन कृषि द्वारा एक हरित क्रान्ति लाना चाहते हैं उस तरफ भी हमने वहाँ अपनी दृष्टि नहीं फैलाई कि हम वह कृषि की तरक्की कर सकें। वहाँ कम से कम सिंचाई के छोटे मोटे साधन भी नहीं जुटा सके ताकि वह क्षेत्र सरसब्ज हो, वहाँ पर बेरोजगारी दूर हो और गरीबी दूर हो। यह मैं इसलिये भी कहती हूँ कि उस क्षेत्र की एक और बिकट समस्या है और वह डकैती की समस्या है। उस क्षेत्र की जनता दुहरी चक्की में पिस रही है। मैं यह नहीं कहती हूँ कि शासन कोई व्यवस्था नहीं कर रहा है लेकिन आज शासन की उस व्यवस्था का दुरुपयोग भी कही कही हो जाता है। एक तरफ डाकू आ कर के जनता को पीड़ित करते हैं, परेशान करते हैं; उनके सीने पर बन्दूक रख कर खाना मांगते हैं तो मजबूर हो कर उन्हें अपने बच्चों के मुँह से निकाल कर देना पड़ता है। उपसभापति महोदय, कोई भी माननीय सदस्य अपने हृदय पर हाथ रख कर बतायें कि जब कोई उसके सीने पर गोली तान कर मांगे तो फिर वह क्या करें। उनको यह देना पड़ता है और दूसरी तरफ पुलिस वाले पहुंचते हैं। स्वाभाविक है कि पुलिस को जानकारी लेनी पड़ेगी कि कौन इनको पनाह देता है, उसकी उन्हें खोजबीन करनी पड़ती है। तो दूसरी तरफ पुलिस पहुंचती है और उनको परेशान करती है।

तो, उपसभापति महोदय, वह इस तरह से परेशान होते हैं। वहाँ कई तरह की समस्याएँ हैं और उसके लिए केवल मेरा एक सुझाव है उस समस्या का हल करने के लिये। दो चार डाकुओं को मार देने मात्र से कुछ नहीं होता, चार डाकु मारे जाते हैं तो आठ पैदा हो जाते हैं। मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूँगी कि यही एक उपाय है कि उस क्षेत्र के लिये जो कि बुन्दलखंड का है एक अलग से आयोग बनायें और वह यह देखे कि 22 वर्षों में वहाँ क्या प्रगति हुई है, क्या खामियाँ रही हैं, वहाँ की क्या समस्या है और उनको किस तरह से हल किया जा सकता है और उस सब पर विचार कर के वा जिस तरह की रिपोर्ट दे उस पर पूरा ध्यान दें ताकि वहाँ के लोग अपना जीवन निर्वाह कर सकें और अपने देश की प्रगति के साथ भागीदार हो सकें।

तीसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि देश में कुछ ऐसे तत्व हैं जिनका कार्यकाल देश के तथा राष्ट्र की प्रगति में बाधक है और जो कि राष्ट्र को गलत मार्ग पर ले जाते हैं। थोड़ी सी भी जनता में परेशानी होती है तो वहाँ राजनैतिक दल और इस तरह के विध्वंस करने वाले जो तत्व हैं वह उसका फायदा उठाते हैं और देश में अराजकता फैलाते हैं। मैं प्रधान मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करूँगी कि ऐसे तत्वों का सखती के साथ दमन करना चाहिये, चाहे वह किसी तरह के भी हों, चाहे नक्सल-पंथी हों चाहे वह साम्प्रदायिकता फैलाने वाले हों, चाहे वह शान्तीयता, छोट छोटे समूहों में बंटने की बात को या जातिवाद को फैलाने वाले हों, इनका आपको डट कर मुकाबला करना पड़ेगा। देश आपके साथ है। आज देश का बच्चा बच्चा आपकी तरफ नजर उठाए बैठा है, आपकी एक निगाह में आपके साथ बड़ी से बड़ी कुबानी करने के लिय तैयार है।

उपसभापति महोदय, इसके बाद यहाँ बड़ी चर्चा हुई है सीलिंग की या ज़मीनों के ऊपर जबर्दस्ती कब्जा करने की। प्रजातंत्र में एक तरीका होता है। मैं इनके विपक्ष में नहीं हूँ कि

सीलिंग न हो, लोगों को भूमि न दी जाय... (Time bell rings) महोदय, मुझे तो बहुत कम समय मिला है। मैं जल्दी खत्म कर दूँगी। तो मैं इसके विपक्ष में नहीं हूँ, लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहती हूँ : क्या प्रजातंत्र में कोई व्यवस्था होती है कि नहीं? प्रजातंत्र के अंदर कानून है, संविधान है, एक प्रणाली है। हम उनके द्वारा, प्रजातांत्रिक तरीके से, उन चीजों को रखवा सकते हैं। यह नहीं है कि हम ली एन्ड आर्डर को तोड़ कर जबर्दस्ती हम कहे किसी की भूमि पर, घर पर कब्जा करो। अगर ऐसा करेंगे तो इसका कहीं अंत नहीं होगा। आज घर पर करेंगे, कल आप किसी की सम्पत्ति पर करेंगे। मुझे तो उपसभापति महोदय, कहने में शरम आती है कि-हमारी जैसी बहू बेटियों की इज्जत भी सुरक्षित रहेगी, इस तरह की प्रक्रिया में।

उपसभापति महोदय, जो यह बंटवारे की सीलिंग की बात है, यह अच्छा तो है लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहूँगी कि क्या आपके पास इतनी भूमि है कि जितने भूमिहीन हैं आप उनमें बंटवारा करके उनकी समस्या का हल कर सकते हैं। देश में जितनी भूमि है मैंने माना आप पांच पांच एकड़ सबको दे सकते हैं तो क्या केवल भूमि वितरण मात्र से समस्या का हल हो जायेगा। अगर आप 5 एकड़ भूमि एक एक भूमिहीन को देते हैं तो क्या आप नहीं समझते हैं उस भूमि के लिये आपको बैल जुटाने पड़ेंगे, उस भूमि के लिये, पाच एकड़ के लिये, कुआ देना पड़ेगा, खाद देनी पड़ेगी, बीज देना पड़ेगा, हर चीज की व्यवस्था करनी पड़ेगी। क्या आपके पास इतने साधन, इतनी व्यवस्था है? अगर इतना कर सकते हैं तो मैं आपका शुक्रगुजार हूँगी। लेकिन उपसभापति महोदय, यह कुछ असम्भव सा मुझे लगता है। मेरा इस संबंध में एक सुझाव है। हमारे देश में आज सैकड़ों एकड़ ज़मीन, बड़े से बड़े प्लॉट पड़े हुए हैं, जिनमें कृषि की जाती है। मैं चाहती हूँ शासन उस ज़मीन को कृषियोग्य बनाए, बड़े बड़े ट्रेक्टर और दूसरे साधनों को जुटा कर

[श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी]

उन भूमिहीनों को उन पर खेती करने के लिये मौका दे, उस पर वह मजदूरी करें और पैदावार बढ़ाएं, मजदूरी करना चाहें तो उनको मजदूरी मिले और उसके बाद पैदावार जो मिले उसमें पचाम, पचहत्तर प्रति शत उनको पैदावार का हिस्सा मिले मेरा खुद का अनुभव है उपसभापति महोदय, मैंने कम से कम 3 ऐसे हरिजन देखे हैं जिनको भूमि दिलाई लेकिन वह भूमिहीन के भूमिहीन हैं क्योंकि उनके पास साधन नहीं और बड़े बड़े लोगों के यहां गिरवी रखनी पड़ी। तो अगर वैंसी जमीन दी जाये तो गिरवी भी नहीं कर सकेंगे और जमीन की मेहनत भी मिलेगी तो जरूर उस भूमि में मेहनत करेंगे। इसलिये भी मेहनत करेंगे कि उसकी पैदावार में हिस्सा मिलेगा। तो यह मेरा सुझाव है जो मैं अपनी तुच्छ बुद्धि के अनुसार दे रही हूं।

उपसभापति महोदय, अब मैं औद्योगिक क्षेत्र के बारे में थोड़ा सुझाव देना चाहती हूं। जहां तक मेरा खयाल है, जो हमारे सार्वजनिक और व्यक्तिगत उद्योगों के क्षेत्र हैं, उनमें तरक्की हो लेकिन हमें उनमें जो सुधार करने हैं वह निहायत जरूरी है। इसके साथ साथ हमें जापान की तरह छोटे छोटे उद्योग घर घर को देना पड़ेगा, आज बड़े लोगों की समस्या उनकी विकट नहीं है, मैं तो कहती हूं जो सबसे छोटा मजदूर तबका है वह इतना परेशान नहीं है, जितना परेशान मिडल क्लास है, उसके यहां एक कमाने वाला, दस खाने वाले हैं। आज आपको छोटे छोटे उद्योग जापान की तरह देने पड़ेंगे। इसके लिये आपके लिये जरूरी है कि आप शेर और बकरी को एक घाट में पानी नहीं पिलाइयें। वे उद्योग जो घर के उद्योग हैं उनकी सीमा आपको निर्धारित करनी पड़ेगी, आया कौन कौन से काम, कौन कौन सी मशीनरी कौन कौन सी चीजें बड़े कारखाने में बनेगी और कौन सी चीजें घर के उद्योग धंधों में बनेगी, ताकि मार्केट में उनको जगह भी मिले और टिक भी सकें क्योंकि एक

कारखाने का बना माल और एक हाथ से उत्पादन किया माल, दोनों में फर्क होता है। इसलिये इसमें आपको सीमा बनानी है, चाहे कपड़े में हो, चाहे मशीनरी में हो। आपको यह निर्णय लेना ही पड़ेगा। आज हमारे बेकार इन्जीनियर मारे मारे फिर रहे हैं। कालेज और युनिवर्सिटी से हमारे विद्यार्थी निकल कर बेकार रह जाते हैं। आज हमारी शिक्षा की पद्धति भी ऐसी है, अगर मैं कहूं कि हमारे, शिक्षा शास्त्री यह तय नहीं कर पा रहे हैं कि हमारे देश में किस तरह की शिक्षा हो। आज जो हमारे यहां मिडिल की शिक्षा पढ़ लेता है, मिडिल पढ़ने के बाद गांव छोड़ देता है जो मैट्रिक पढ़ लेता है वह शहर छोड़कर जाना ही नहीं चाहता है। जो ग्रेजुएट हो जाते हैं वे आलसी हो जाते हैं, श्रम नहीं कर सकते, मेहनत नहीं कर सकते हैं। आज बजाय यूनिवर्सिटी डिग्री देने के गांव गांव में इस तरह का काम सिखलाना चाहिये, उन्हें इस तरह की डिग्रिया देनी चाहिये और साधन जुटाने चाहिये ताकि वे लोग आत्म निर्भर बन सकें। स्वयं अपन काम कर सकें और खेती कर सकें। आज गांवों में इस तरह के काम खोले जाने चाहिये ताकि लोगों को औजार बनाने, साइकिल बनाने और घड़ियां बनाने के काम में लगाया जा सके। इसी तरह से दूसरी कितनी ही चीजें हैं जिनका हम उत्पादन कर सकते हैं और इस तरह से देश में बेकारी दूर कर सकते हैं

आज सरकार के पास कोई इतना बड़ा खजाना नहीं है जिससे वह कह दे (Time bell rings) उपसभापति महोदय मैं दो मिनट में खत्म कर दूंगी। अभी हमारे सिंह साहब कह रहे हैं कि टैंक्स जो बढ़ाया जा रहा, लगाया जा रहा है, वह बड़े बड़े पूंजीपतियों पर लगाया जा रहा है और अब उन पर लगाना अन्याय होगा और जो छोटे लोग हैं अगर उन पर लगेगा तो उनके ऊपर लगाया नहीं जा सकता है। (Time bell rings)

एक माननीय सदस्य : उन्होंने कहा था कि उन पर लगाना उचित नहीं होगा।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : उन्होंने कहा होगा कि छोटे लोगों पर लगाना अनुचित होगा। लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहती हूँ कि चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना या हमारे देश में जो विकास निर्माण का काम आप चाहते हैं क्या वह बगैर खजाने के हो जायगा। क्या आपके पास कोई अलादीन का चिराग है जिससे आप कहेंगे कि हे शमा जल जा और इतना खजाना दे दे ताकि हम अपना काम पूरा कर सकें।

जब हम टैक्स लगाते हैं तो यह स्वाभाविक है कि जनता में रोष आता है, क्रोध आता है। (Time bell rings) उपसभापति महोदय, मैं एक मिनट में ही खत्म करने जा रही हूँ। तो मैं यह कह रही थी कि जब टैक्स लगाया जाता है तो जनता में रोष होता है और उस रोष का फायदा हमारे उन लोगों को मिलता है। लेकिन जब हमारे खजाने में रुपया आयेगा तब ही तो हम योजना बना सकते हैं। जब खजाने में रुपया होता है तब ही तो बड़े बड़े कार्य होते हैं, स्कूल, कालेज और फैक्टरियां बनती हैं। आज हमारे देश में भाखड़ा जैसी चीज बन गई है, चम्बल जैसी योजना बनती है और इस तरह की कितनी ही योजना बन चुकी है और बन रही है। जब जनता इन चीजों को देखती है तब उसकी आंखें खुल जाती हैं। जब कोई बड़ा कार्य किया जाता है तो उसमें आलोचना होती ही है और आलोचना करना बहुत कुछ उन लोगों का कार्य हो गया है जो कि सरकार की कोई भी चीज को अच्छा नहीं समझते हैं। सब को खुश करना यह असंभव चीज है। मुझे यहाँ पर एक कहावत याद आ गई है और उसको कहकर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त कर दूंगी। हमारे कुछ माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि यह सरकार मन्दार गति से चल रही है और कुछ ने कहा कि यह बड़ी तीव्र गति से जा रही है। यह एक बड़ा मुश्किल कार्य है कि किस की बात को माना जाय।

तो मैं यहाँ पर इस संबंध में कहानी कहने जा रही हूँ। एक गांव में एक बाप और बेटा

घोड़ा लेकर जा रहे थे। जब गांव के बीचों-बीच पहुँचते हैं तो गांव वाले कहते हैं कि देखो ये लोग कितने बेवकूफ हैं कि दोनों पैदल जा रहे हैं और घोड़ा खाली जा रहा है। इस पर बेटा पैदल व बाप घोड़े पर बैठ गया। जब बाप घोड़े में बैठ गया और लड़का पैदल चलने लगा और जब वे आगे पहुँचते हैं तो फिर उन्हें राजनारायण जैसे कुछ लोग मिलते हैं और वे कहते हैं कि बूढ़ा बाप तो घोड़े में बैठा है और लड़का पैदल चल रहा है। उनकी बात सुनकर बाप ने बेटे से कहा कि तुम बैठ जाओ। जब वे कुछ आगे बढ़े तो लोग कहने लगे कि बूढ़ा बाप तो पैदल चल रहा है और लड़का घोड़े पर बैठा हुआ है।

श्री राजनारायण : यह कहानी बाप बेटे की नहीं होगी बल्कि बाप बेटे की होगी।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी : आप की तुच्छ बुद्धि मैं जो आये। वही तो उपसभापति महोदय, मैं कह रही थी कि गांव वालों की बात को सुनकर वे दोनों फिर घोड़े पर बैठ गये। जब वे और कुछ आगे बढ़े तो लोग कहने लगे कि कितने ये बेवकूफ हैं जो दोनों घोड़े पर बैठे हुए हैं और घोड़ा भार से दबा जा रहा है। तो मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि हम किसी की आलोचना में न आये बल्कि जो हमारी आत्मा या कांग्रेस कहती है उसके मुताबिक काम करना चाहिये। इसलिये मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से कहूंगी कि वे आलोचनाओं की परवाह न करते हुए उन्होंने देश को जो नया मार्ग दिया है, जो अपनी नई नीति स्थापित की है, उस पर अग्रसर हों, उसको बहादुरी और दिलेरी के साथ आगे बढ़ायें जिस तरह से उन्होंने अभी तक आगे कदम बढ़ाये हैं। उनके इस कार्य में आज देश की जनता उनके साथ है और हमेशा रहेगी।

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : Sir, the hon. lady Member has given a very sound advice to the Prime Minister not to listen to the criticisms and to act according to her own

[Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee]

whim. It is quite so sound and a wise Circumlocution particularly on the floor of the House.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : Not to listen?

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : Not to act. I am sorry.

Sir, when I go through the document of the Fourth Five Year Plan, it seems to me that it is punctuated with so many 'ifs'—if the monsoon and weather are favourable, then our agricultural advancement would proceed, if the Centre-State relation is cordial, our public sector enterprises will go on with advancement, if the foreign aid comes regularly, we can reach the Plan targets and so on and so forth. Undoubtedly, in all planning the planners have to depend on certain assumptions because the science of economy does not relate to that of physical science and the rules governing the economic principles are not as definite as those of the physical aspects. That I admit. But in spite of that there are so many 'ifs' and certain very big 'ifs' in the Indian planning. For example, on price control it has been pointed out that if there is no increase in the dearness allowance, if there is stabilisation in the internal prices, then the Government may expect that there will be a balance of relative internal and external cost and price. That 'if' is a very big 'if', and it is not possible. When we are going to have a discussion on the Plan, we already know that so many industrial organisations, so many public undertakings and even the Government itself, have admitted that the prices are rising, the dearness allowances are to be increased. But even at that time the planners are thinking 'if the prices are stabilised, if there is no demand for further increase of dearness allowance, then they can maintain the balance.' This is by way of example, only one example.

Now, Sir, some have tried to eulogise the Fourth Plan document as a socialist one, some as a pseudo-socialist one, some others as a capitalist, sugar-coated socialist one, and so on and so forth. But I do not like to either justify whether the Plan is a socialist one or it is a sugar-coated capitalist one. I want to visualise some of the objectives of planning from the experience which we have gathered during the Third Plan period. The Prime Minister in her thesis on planning has pointed out that there should be an involvement of the public as a whole for the success of the Plan. And that involvement is possible if social objectives are secured, the reduction of disparities

in income and wealth is aimed at and if, by-planning, the redressal of regional imbalances is possible. These are not new. In almost all the Plan documents these slogans, these words, are usually repeated. And if you go through the objectives and achievements of the Three Plans, the First, the Second and the Third, you will find that very little of these objectives has been fulfilled. It has been pointed out on the floor of this House and outside how social justice is denied to the largest section of the people of this country and how, even after the implementation of so many progressive legislations, and conditions of the weaker sections of the community are not improved up to the expectation. It has been pointed out on various occasions.

Sir, the question of unemployment has been discussed in detail by various Members. I do not like to go into detail. Simply I would like to point out that only the other day in the Lok Sabha the Minister of Labour and Employment pointed out that at the end of the Third Plan period the total number of unemployed reached 15 millions. At the end of the First Plan it came to 8 millions, at the end of the Second Plan it came to 12 millions, at the end of the Third Plan it came to 15 millions. I do not know how many Five Year Plans we will require to make out entire country without unemployment. Today in the morning the Prime Minister herself has admitted that it is very difficult to assess how many persons are unemployed or the magnitude of unemployment. In reply to a question on the floor of this very House it was pointed out the other day that the number of jobless engineers would be of the order of one lakh in 1973-74. When the Third Five Year Plan was taken up it was pointed by the national leaders and the planners that we would require more and more technically trained persons, that we would require technocrats and engineers. We could not then visualise that within ten years our planning will come to such a stage that a large number of highly technically trained persons engineering graduates would be rendered, jobless and that their order would be one lakh at the end of the Fourth Plan period. If we go on in this way how can we expect that the targets of the Fourth Plan could be met? We are entering the Fourth Plan in peculiar political and economic conditions. This Plan is completely distinct from the earlier three Plans. We know that the First, Second and the Third Plans were taken up when there was stabilisation in the Central and the State Go-

vernments. We all know that there was one party in almost all the States and the Centre. There were cordial relations between the Centre and the States and they could implement the Plans.

Sir, the success of the public sector depends much on the efficiency of the Government. It depends much on how the States and the Centre co-operate with each other. It depends much on how much co-ordination there is in the relations between the Centre and the States. Therefore, now it is very difficult to expect that all the targets of the Fourth Plan would be reached if this political instability remains there and if there is no stable government to implement the Plan targets either in the States and, if necessary, at the Centre.

Coming to regional imbalances, it has been pointed out by the Prime Minister that the removal of regional imbalances is necessary for the success of planning. I would like to refer to some of the recommendations of the Fifth Finance Commission. If we go through the recommendations of the Fifth Finance Commission, we shall find that several States are left with a huge surplus of Rs. 1,271 crores. The State which I represent, namely West Bengal, submitted a memorandum to the Fifth Finance Commission pointing out that if the non-Plan revenue gap of West Bengal is not met by the Finance Commission it would not be possible on the part of the States to invest more money for the State Plan. And actually the same thing has taken place. The Fourth Plan total outlay for West Bengal is of the order of Rs. 322.50 crores. For Maharashtra it is Rs. 898.12 crores. For Tamil Nadu it is Rs. 519.36 crores. For Andhra it is Rs. 420.50 crores and for Assam it is Rs. 261.75 crores. It may be argued by the hon'ble Minister that the other State Governments have augmented their Plan resources from their internal resources. It is correct. The Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and the Tamil Nadu Governments have invested more in the Plan from their own resources. If we go through the recommendations of the Fifth Finance Commission we shall find that these were the surpluses given by the Commission to the various State Government :—

	Rs. (in crores)
Bihar	199.46
Gujarat	156.99
Haryana	79.88

	Rs. (in crores)
Madhya Pradesh	150.09
Maharashtra	419.29
Punjab	177.22
Uttar Pradesh	280.87

The Fifth Finance Commission has left seven States with a surplus of Rs. 1,271 crores while the Fourth Finance Commission left only six States with a surplus of Rs. 373 odd crores. Therefore, Sir, it is very difficult to reconcile the recommendations of the Fifth Finance Commission and the assurance of the Prime Minister that the regional imbalances will be removed during the Fourth Plan period. It is very difficult to reconcile these two contradictory things. And not only that, almost all the financial institutions like the Life Insurance Corporation of India, the Unit Trust, the State Bank of India and the Reserve Bank of India have their head offices at Bombay. We shall concentrate all the financial institutions in one place: we shall render some States with surplus money, we shall render some States with deficit and we shall talk of removing regional disparities. These things cannot go on side by side.

New, coming to the problem of the land, it has been pointed out by various Members that we should tackle the land problem because the problem is explosive. I agree. Particularly the State from which I come has almost reached the explosive point. During the three Plan periods we could not implement the land reforms which were passed long ago. It has been pointed out in the report of the Study Team appointed by the Home Ministry which made a review of the year 1968-69:

“Agrarian reforms which made an enthusiastic start immediately after independence have almost ground themselves to a halt. Not surprisingly, the consciousness of injustice and wide prevalence of the land hunger have been used by certain political parties to organise agitations.”

The same thing has taken place in West Bengal. Lands are to be given to the tillers. Land reforms are to be implemented. Land laws have to be modified. So long as the Government will not do these things, it cannot but be a victim of the land agitation, and “land grab” or “land occupation” movement in various parts will go on.

There is another observation in the same report that the small farmers and small land-

[Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee]

owners are not provided with financial assistance. When the 14 major banks were nationalised, it was expected that they would come forward to help the small farmers and small land-owners. But what is the practical experience? I can cite an example from my own State. The Agro-Industries Corporation of West Bengal have recommended to the State Bank of India according to an agreement reached by the State Bank of India with the Agro-Industries Corporation of India, for the supply of 1,200 pump sets to the small farmers. But till to-day only 280 pump sets have been given to the farmers and the rest have not been supplied. (*Time bell rings*) If these things go on, if the bureaucracy does not act according to the desire of the Planners, if the bureaucracy is not made efficient, how can we expect that we will reach the Plan targets and the planning would come to a success? Therefore, as I said in the beginning, there are so many "ifs", and if these "ifs" are not removed, our planning cannot be successful. Thank you.

SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA : Sir, thinking Indian people, by and large, know why some politicians are vociferous about land-grab slogans without knowing rural problems intimately, and without living in the villages, or after having migrated to the cities or towns for good. And even on the Government side, they are defrauding the gullible people of the villages with their slogans and tall talks about their Five Year Plans. Yet their Five Year Plans do not show that they are truly uplifting rural people socio-economically. What is the rough and ready indicator of the progress of a developing country like India? It is the percentage of the population depending on land. If in a country the percentage of people depending on agriculture is more than 70 per cent as in the case of India, it has to be dubbed definitely as a very backward country in this modern technological age.

In India, the percentage of people dependent on land on 15th August, 1947 was about 73. To-morrow on the 15th August 1970, after three Five Year Plans, the percentage of population dependent on land is nearly the same. Take any advanced industrialised country of the West, or Japan. The percentage of population dependent on land is very much less than that in India. In the U.S.A., the percentage of population depending on land is about 12 per cent only. The other day I sent an interpellation asking what was the per-

centage of population depending on land at the beginning of the First and the Fourth Plans. The Prime Minister who is also the Chairman of the Planning Commission could give figures for 1951 only from the Census Report. The 1961 census has conveniently omitted to give this figure. And, perhaps, it was deliberately planned to omit this figure in the 1961 and 1971 censuses also. This important and vital information is not sought to be made the basic information necessary for proper planning of balanced development of rural and urban economy. How then can we say that our planners are genuinely interested in the socio-economic uplift of the rural people?

If the population dependent on land in 1947 was about 25 crores, it has now risen to 35 crores. You have crammed and herded and packed 35 crores of people today into 32 crores of acres of farm-land. How then can you bring about socio-economic development in the countryside? Can you bring prosperity to the peasantry by giving one or two acres of land to a family and condemning that family to permanent and perpetual underemployment, debt-load, hovel-living, illiteracy and misery? Is it the only method you know in this technological age to solve the Himalayan rural under employment and unemployment problem? Should you not give technical education to the Harijans, Adivasis and other surplus manpower in the villages and draw them to the rural and urban industries and Government services in appreciable numbers and lessen the burden on the groaning and already heavily burdened land?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH) in the Chair]

Please do not vie with each other in calling the surplus manpower in the villages as landless people but call them as the unemployed people of the villages and try to give employment and better living facilities by employing them in rural and urban industries and in other professions. As Mr. Mohta suggested yesterday, take up on massive scale the much-needed construction of roads, primary schools and hospitals in rural areas and spend a thousand crores in the next ten years and thus give employment to the unemployed. Take up the construction of low-income group houses in urban and rural areas on a massive scale and prevent the pavement and hovel-living.

If you want to know the realities of the situation in rural India, the depth of misery to which you have condemned the

peasantry and the middle-class of the villages and the facts of life in this country, ask the unemployed of the cities whether they will go to live in the villages with two or three acres of land for a family. You will not find even 1% of them willing to live in the villages with the present-day conditions of misery and insecurity.

Then again I have asked an important and vital question relating to the rural people. I have asked for the per capita income of the rural and urban people in 1951 and in 1969. But the Prime Minister has told that the figures are not available.

How many Members of Parliament realise that almost 80 per cent of the land-holdings in rural India are mortgaged to this society or that bank or that money-lender? In effect, even with the nationalisation of banks rural credit cannot reach the needy farmers with uneconomic holdings as they are already secured for their existing loans.

Do you know that the average debt of an Indian farmer is at least 60 per cent of his annual gross income? Does the Five Year Plan proceed on the basis that Indian farmers pay a colossal amount of Rs. 12,000 million yearly immediately after the harvest, as interest first before they find money for manure and other expenses connected with agriculture?

I repeat and emphasise that the socio-economic development in this country is lopsided as between the urban and rural sectors even in spite of our pious Bibles or Ramayanas of Five Year Plans in our hands. We cannot deceive the rural people all the time when we have to run to the villages from Delhi for the stability of the nation. I appeal to the Prime Minister who is also the Chairman of the Planning Commission to cry a halt to this lopsided development in the country and march on to prosperity, taking the brethren in the villages on equal terms with her and not leave them far behind. I strongly demand on behalf of the rural people of India, to show in the Five Year Plan books firstly, the progress in the reduction of the percentage of the people dependent on land and secondly, to show separately the per capita income of the rural people as against the per capita income in India as a whole.

And lastly, I would like to bring to the attention of the people in authority that there are only two sectors in the world

which can produce wealth and raise the standard of living in a country. Land is not infinite. Its area is definite. Industry can grow. But it too can not grow infinitely as it can only grow with necessary natural and financial resources. Therefore, in India or any developing country where the population has reached a saturation point, we must talk not only in terms of "land reforms" and "industrial reforms" or "industrial licensing policy", but also talk of the other vital "social reforms", namely, "population control" which we may call "golden reforms". All of us know that the demon of swelling population is overtaking all the plan-developments and devouring all the increasing production leaving our people with a low per capita income in the world all the time. The time has come when we must do all that is necessary to keep the Indian population stationary at fifty crores only. I appeal to the Prime Minister to bring forward courageously a Bill putting a ceiling on "family-holdings", i. e. on the "family offspring" to three as you have been showing in the family planning documentary. This will solve greatly our economic ills with which the Government, the Parliament and the thinking people of this nation are greatly exercised. Thank you.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated) : Sir, I have listened with interest to the speeches of most of the speakers, and I find that they have gone into the details of the Plan and in a way answered each other. I do not wish to go into the details of the Plan and cover the same ground. I would very much prefer to emphasise what should be the general approach to the Plan now that it is in operation and will continue to be in operation for some years. And in this approach I would suggest, request, appeal, that all the sides of the House should participate.

After all, I know of no country and no plan anywhere which always meets the expectations and needs of the time. All plans are, to some extent, I think, an exercise in what I might call reluctant compromises with the reality. It is not that the wishes in anybody's heart can always be fulfilled if the objective conditions do not permit. The plans have some insufficiencies inadequacies, some commissions.

We have to be careful that the plans are conditioned by two factors : First, the resources in men and money available and when I say men, I am not talking only of

[Shri Jairam Das Daulatram.]

numbers; I am talking of the quality of man, the man who has to implement the plan, whether in the field, factory or office.

Similarly the other factor is that of demands. We have to balance the resources and the demands. I sometimes feel that the best way to describing our Plans is that they are very much like a sea of waves. Each wave is struggling for freedom to move and it is obstructed all around by other waves which also want to move. It is not possible to permit the movement of all the waves. Nature would not permit it. Naturally, the movement has to be slower and not always to the extent one may desire.

Therefore, I would suggest to all my friends who made their criticism against this Plan to realise one thing. If they had to handle the same situation when they are, in a different position, I am not sure whether they will not produce a document more or less of this character. We had before us an emotional speech from an ex-member of the Planning Commission and also an ex-member of the Council of Ministers. He held both these positions. In each position he felt that the objective restrictions did not permit more to be done. It is this situation which I would suggest to the opposition to realise.

I would make one more request to them. Let them not think of the people as the electorate. Let them think of the people as Indian human beings who have to be assisted and helped by all of us, whether we are temporarily in this political structure opposing each other in this Chamber or not. After all, we here are the trustees of the welfare of these people jointly, even though we may be temporarily in our present opposite positions.

We sometimes forget that we here, about 200 men and women, who are leaders of the country, are in charge of one-seventh of the human race. I do feel that it is necessary to recollect each time the tremendous responsibility which we have in deciding how to conduct our discussions and how to function in this Parliament—the great sounding board of India—from where our voices reverberate to our opponent countries and all outside countries of the world.

Now, what I feel is that the time has come when we should reconsider which way we want to take the country so far as these four years are concerned.

Is it that this Plan contains nothing which is in the right direction? Is it that this Plan consists only of things which are in the wrong direction? If the Plan is entirely in the wrong direction, then there is every justification in opposing it. But if there are many directions which are right and many proposals which are sound, though they may not be as speedily implemented as we may wish or in terms of quantum not as we would wish, if the move is in the right direction, I would humbly suggest that it is the duty of every patriotic Indian to assist in the implementation of this Plan.

After all the opposition is also sharing the responsibility of government in several parts of the country. Different parties are in power in different regions, zones and States of India. The Plans are to be implemented there too. It is in the interests even of the local people—if the sense of nationalism does not appeal to us—that the Plans should be implemented. I did not wish to speak much. I only want to make a brief appeal. Is it in the interests of the people that we should continue to dissent and criticise the Plan in the coming three or four years? Is it not in the interests of the people of India—forgetting the electorate for the time being whether they all are today the electorate or not—whose trustees we are that we should see that this Plan is implemented to the best extent possible under the limitations which I have outlined?

I do not think any other course is patriotic. We talk of a debate at a high level. It is action at a big level that is needed. Can we rise to the level of supporting this plan in spite of its omissions and inadequacies? If there are many directions in which it is moving rightly, properly, correctly, then our duty to the people is clear.

A small country of Europe rose to eminence. It dominated almost the whole of Europe. But later it fell on evil days. A great philosopher-politician of that country be named, "All are for the party, none for the State." We are passing through that phase the party feeling is so strong. It is evident in every speech, in tone and word and gesture. If this is the position, I do not think that the people of India can benefit from anything we can try to do. As a humble servant—with all of you of the people of our country, I would request that we should rise to the occasion and support the Plan which has many

features to show that we are moving in the right direction. And, I would like to congratulate the government, for they have had the courage, despite criticism, despite deficiencies, despite the need to face criticism and opposition in the country, to sponsor the Plan and I think now the duty lies on the rest of us to see that we and the people implement it. Thank you.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, for the last three days we are discussing the Fourth Plan which has been placed before us by Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our revered Prime Minister. Sir, when I was listening to the speeches made by the Members of the Opposition, I was amazed to find that those people who represent different parties, those parties which do not have any mooring in our country, which are fostering a different culture altogether, the culture of violence, they speak of democracy here and they speak of socialism here and they criticise our Plan.

Sir, this is not a country which believes in dictatorship; India is not a country which believes in forced labour; and this is not a country which believes in proletarian dictatorship. So, our plans and our efforts cannot be compared with the plans, with the functions of those countries who can force their people to accept a thing and work for it without any payment and at the point of revolver.

Sir, we have Article 226 before us to deal with when we try to acquire a land for development. We have to take Article 226 into consideration when we have to pass any legislation where any human rights or any liberties are threatened to be infringed. Article 226 is there. In those countries they do not have civil liberties to protect their persons. So, our plans and our efforts cannot stand any comparison with them. But, when they speak here they forget the very fundamental difference. Sir, I am amazed to find the Members of the Congress (Opposition) there criticising our Plan. They are the people who, when they were Members of the Planning Commission, had drafted the Plans and now, when they come here, because they are now sitting in the Opposition, they speak against this Plan and it is because they are sitting there. They

were the Ministers since 1952. What were they doing so long when they occupied the Treasury Benches? If there is any failure, they are equally responsible for that. They should not be ashamed to own that failure. Because they are now sitting in the Opposition, they speak against the government and for its failures they are criticising for which failures they themselves are responsible. But, it is because of the sanctity of the Opposition that they think they can speak anything they want or anything they like. Sir, I am amazed to find that the people who participated in different committees, in different organisations, even in the government, who shared the powers and functions of the government, because they are now differing with us on some party affiliations and some other points and so sitting in the Opposition, now come forward with their criticisms, not only of the government, not only of the Plan, but also criticisms at personal level, and they go down to personal squabbles and personal bickerings which I have very much.

Sir, I have only 10 minutes at my disposal and therefore I cannot dilate on any of the points and I have got to go down straight to the problems which are being faced by the State of West Bengal. Sir, when discussions were taking place and when the officers came from the Government of West Bengal, they submitted their plan of Rs. 600 crores but the Planning Commission in its wisdom curtailed it and only Rs. 322.50 crores were sanctioned for West Bengal. Sir, I may remind this House, as my friend, Mr. Pranab Mookherjee, has already done it, that whenever any Finance Commission is set up, we from the Government of West Bengal always try to point out the injustice that is being faced by the West Bengal Government from the Finance Commission. To the Fifth Finance Commission we gave a categorical assurance that whatever money they would be giving to us, it would be going towards the welfare of the whole country ultimately. But it seems that the Finance Commission has never taken into consideration the complexities of the problem that is being faced by West Bengal. It has allocated a sum of Rs. 36 crores only, whereas we have to spend Rs. 60 crores only for the payment of DA to our employees on par with the Central Government employees. Sir, wherefrom can we get the resources to meet such gaps? They are asking us to find our own resources. We have taken into consi-

[Shrimati Purabi Mukhopadhyay.]

deration all the avenues to mobilise our resources and there is no further scope left now. Moreover, Sir, West Bengal is a highly-taxed State. As a Minister in West Bengal I can tell you from my experience something about the problems of West Bengal. The refugee problem is not the problem of West Bengal alone but we have to find some resources to meet the gap. That is number one. Number two is that the per capita taxation is the highest in West Bengal; it has already reached a saturation point. We have therefore to find the resources to meet the gap. So we appeal to the Government of India to take into consideration these special problems which we have to face in our State.

Then, Sir, I might mention something about the Calcutta port and its affairs. I spoke here in this House about it long back but, Sir, it seems that nothing has been done so far about the Calcutta port. It is now a funny thing that we are finding. The representatives of the Tea Brokers' Association from Assam came and met us here and they told us that Gauhati was going to be the venue where the tea would be auctioned. If that is done, Sir, the Calcutta port will lose about 30 per cent. of its income which it is to get by the handling of tea.

The Railways will have to give to the Assam Government some subsidy for utilising another port for the disposal of tea. Why should it be done? If the Calcutta Port dies, the whole economy of the country will be shattered. The World Bank has given money as a loan to develop the Calcutta port, with which Fatrakka Bridge is also linked up. I will appeal to the Prime Minister to personally look at the fate of the Calcutta Port, especially with regard to this aspect to the Assam Government trying to take away the disposal section of tea from Calcutta.

Then I would be failing in my duty if I did not mention about the small farmers' programme in the Fourth Plan. It is an outlay of Rs. 115 crores and along with that I suggest that efforts should be made to tap the underground water wherever there is dry land especially. Particularly in some parts of my State where we have chronic droughts, we should like the Government of India take up in all earnestness the possibility of finding underground water. Along with it rural electrification is linked. The Government of India have done

a very fine job about it because I find prior to independence there were only 3132 electrified villages out of a total of 5.67 lakhs. In the First Plan we made the first attempt, we allocated Rs. 20 crores and 7400 villages were electrified. In the Second Plan Rs. 75 crores were allocated and 21,547 villages were electrified. In Third Plan Rs. 153 crores was the total expenditure as against a Plan provision of Rs. 105 crores. The higher investment resulted in 46,290 localities being electrified by the end of the Third Plan as again a target of 43,000. In the Fourth Plan the State sector will spend Rs. 285 crores on rural electrification, the Union Territories Rs. 9.54 crores, Centre (Rural Electrification Corporation) Rs. 150 crores. The target for energising pumps in the country will be 250,000 pumps. I would very much wish for the States, where they have to face droughts chronically, that these energised pumps should be allocated more and more to those States.

Before I finish I congratulate the Prime Minister for the Preface she has given us, along with the Fourth Plan. That is a very bold preface and we pledge our loyal support and we shall make attempts to see that this Plan is made a success.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, now we are debating planning. If it was really planning, then we could have debated it thoroughly from a constructive point of view but if it is planning for growing poverty, if it is planning for mounting unemployment, if it is planning for ever-growing concentration of monopoly capital, if it is planning for growing dependence of the country on foreigners particularly the foreign imperialists then what is the planning about and what is the patriotism about it?

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated): To reduce all that.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : You are planning for the growth of these. After each successive Plan all these things have grown. That is the experience. You say it is mixed economy. I say it is mixed confusion. If public sector is meant socialism, then France is a socialist country, Italy is a socialist country and the US is also a socialist country.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar) : According to you.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : No no according to you. If you define socialism by saying that there is some public sector in India, then all those countries, in spite of being imperialist countries, would be socialist countries. But still we support the public sector if it makes for independence of our economy and not for growing dependence upon outside powers or foreigners or the Western powers in particular. Now how is the public sector run in our country? It is a paradise and a happy hunting ground for the collaborators, for the bureaucrats on the management and also the contractors, and it feeds the private sector, particularly the higher echelons of the private sector. I will illustrate how it is run in an anti-national way by taking as an example of the Durgapur steel plant, which is very much in the news. Sir, I would like to put the record straight as regards planning in the public sector, particularly in the steel plants. Now, the bureaucrats on the management of HSL and the British collaborators conspired and bought obsolete machineries. There was a crack in the foundation plinth itself.

Secondly, Sir, there are four blast furnaces. One is totally out of commission—it is their construction. One or two others work. That is how the British collaborators and the HSL management there are functioning. Again in Durgapur, out of the nine steel furnaces four or five were out of commission, not due to any labour unrest or trouble, although the union there suggested their proper maintenance. But it was never heeded to by the management. Now the hon. Minister, Mr. B. R. Bhagat, came, just because he had the Ministerial privilege to come and see things for himself. But he went away with a thoroughly misleading statement. Mr. D. J. Bell, the British Managing Director, pushed up production up to 1.1 million but at the cost of the damage of the entire machinery of the plant, breaking down the machinery. The workers said, "Don't do it. You will sabotage the plant." And when he left, he left a sabotaged plant. And the present General Manager, Mr. Wadhera, is a military person. He is a chauvinist. He has imported provincialism. People from Haryana will be posted at the top with no technical knowledge. It has become a hot bed of nepotism, corruption and favouritism. This is the general impression. Four hundred high-ranking ...

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra): You are talking on the Plan ?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Yes. This is how the public sector plant is being run by this Government. (*Interruptions*) I dare say that in almost all public sector plants these evils are more or less there in existence in a more intensive or in a less intensive form. That is why I have taken this as an example. Of the agreements the management entered into with the workers, a majority of them the management has broken.

And the mother unit, the coke ovens, are all damaged. The coke oven is the mother of the steel plant. All the coke ovens are damaged. That is the contribution that the HSL management and the British consortium have done. I say it with a full sense of responsibility before this House that the British collaborators and the HSL management have acted as saboteurs. This plant, unless it is completely overhauled, will never work at its rated capacity. And in order to hide this sabotage, this anti-national activity, this smoke screen of labour indiscipline etc. is being talked about. And this Government sitting there is a party to it. Are you a national Government, a patriotic Government, working for the interests of the country or are you working for the foreigners? I charge that there is nothing national or patriotic in whatever you do. That is how the public sector is being run. And in the alloy steel plant where the plates are produced there is no machinery to produce fine sheets. So you have to sell the sheets to Japan at Rs. 100/-. Then they will make it into fine sheets and sell it at Rs. 600/- to Rs. 700/-. It was deliberately done; another act of sabotage. This is how the public sector is being run. Look at the pilferage and the theft by the management and the bunch of contractors in each and every public sector plant and the budding bureaucrats who are growing rich in these, becoming almost capitalists after they retire from service there; this is how the public sector is being run in our country for the benefit of the foreigners, for the benefit of the bureaucrats and for the benefit of this Government which is the patron of the foreigners and the bureaucrats against the country, against the people. That is how this Government is running the public sector. Still we support public sector; we do not support the private sector or private monopolies in the hope that things would not go on

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

in this way for ever. Some day or other there will be change in the Government, there will be a change in the State, and consequently there will be a change in the public sector also.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: Also give a good example of the public sector.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: That is why there is this animus against the public sector.

Now in the so-called planning what is the role of the States? Almost nothing, cipher, zero. They have no role whatsoever. Perhaps once annually or bi-annually the Chief Ministers are called and given some documents. They prate about and then go back to their States. They have nothing to do with the planning. How can you plan in this vast country in this manner? If any State wants to introduce any scheme to end unemployment, to end poverty, they are thwarted. Suppose a State wants that all foreign concerns in that State should be taken over and the profits of the foreign concerns should be ploughed back in order to set up new industrial units the Centre comes in the way saying you have no right to do that. Then what can they plan for? What is their role? Are they rubber stamps? Suppose a State comes forward and says that they have a plan to re-open the closed factories, the Centre says, no, you cannot take them over; you have no right to do that. Then what are they? In my State the foreign concerns make hundreds of crores annually. Suppose my State wants that this huge amount should stay in the country, if the people of the State want that it should be used for the benefit of the State who is the Centre to stand in the way in favour of the foreigners and against the country divesting the State of its rights?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH): The hon. Member should finish within two minutes now.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I say this planning is dead planning. Unless the States feel that they are full and active partners unless they have full power over trade, commerce and industry, I dare say this unemployment, poverty, concentration of riches, all these evils could not be put an end to. If some powers are vested in the States in the

matter of planning perhaps they can go forward and if they do not the people of the States will see to it that they do.

Then, Sir, I come to the 14 nationalised banks. I am sorry to say we supported it and we again support it if the foreign banks are taken over. As I said, we are in favour of nationalisation, but what is the change in the situation? Almost absolutely nothing. I talked to one of the top executives of one of the big business concerns. In trade union matters, workers and they have got to negotiate. Off the record I asked him if he would not suffer if the banks were nationalised. He said 'No'. If we get all credit facilities and accommodation as we use to get then what does it matter if the Central Bank of India remains in Tatas' hands or it is run by the Government of India? Now, the custodians are still at the helm of affairs of the banks. So, all the 14 nationalised banks are being utilised in order to favour the forty houses, the so-called monopolies against whom our Prime Minister says so much in order to hoodwink the people. I say, no insincerity or dishonesty . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH): It is time.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: She must learn a lesson from Mrs. Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, a small country. She could dare to take over the foreign monopolies. I daresay Mrs. Indira Gandhi will never do it because this Government is servant of the monopolists. I accuse this Government that they departed from their policy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH): Hon. Member, will you now end here? Just listen. We have two other speakers and the hon. Member has already taken more than 12 minutes.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: When Mr. Rajnarain has taken thirty minutes, I can take some two minutes more.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: He is talking sense now.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: What is this export drive? What is the character of this export drive?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH): I would request you to finish in two minutes.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I would put it to you . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH): The Chair has nothing to do with this Plan.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Export drive is connected with the Plan. The Prime Minister's preface refers to it, what is the character of our export drive? It is to supply the outside countries with commodities which they do not produce or do not want to produce at damned cheap prices. Secondly, take your foreign exchange. It is used to import spares and components which are mounting. It is now Rs. 1,000 crores, on which at least they are making Rs. 200 crores at cartel prices. Also we have to service those debt payments. So, it is a boon to foreigners in that respect. It is not an export drive which is conducted to build the country. It is an export drive conducted in favour of outside powers and foreigners. This is the character of the export drive.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH): Will the hon. Member now resume his seat?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: One minute more. As I said, agriculture is the base. We are an agricultural country and unless something is done here, industry cannot thrive. I do not want to go into the theory and all that.

But what is this hoax of a green revolution? It is another big hoax that is being played. A very small stratum of landlords and rich peasantry will get India out of the crisis—that is their hoax, without giving the peasantry land or relieving them from debt. Has anybody ever heard of this anywhere? There is not historical example anywhere in the world. Only this Government brags about it. I know the peasantry will never get land unless they fight for it. These bureaucrats, this Government, will they ever give land to them? Have any peasantry got feudalism ended and the country has become modern without the peasantry conducting a desperate fight for it? Cite one example for it. There is no such example. So, they are anti-peasant in that sense. The Government is anti-India, is throttling India, is stifling India. What is what they have come to. I would wish that in the so-called land grab movement—it is not land grab; the land has been grabbed by others and by Satyagraha I suppose

they will not be able to get anything—really the multi-million peasantry went ahead and took those lands which are theirs, whether it is democratic or not. What is democracy if it is democracy for the landlords, for the Tatas and Birlas and the foreigners? It is not democracy for our country. It is not democracy for the people of India. I wish the multi-million peasantry of India does go forward and take that land. I wish they do so whether Shrimati Indira Gandhi wishes it or not.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI SINGH): Just listen. Will you please resume your seat?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: It is not a Plan for the people. It is a Plan oriented towards the monopolists, oriented towards the landlords, oriented towards the foreign imperialists and oriented towards the dependence of India on others. As such it is an anti-Indian Plan.

श्रीमती पुष्पाबेन जनार्दनराव महता (गुजरात) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह चौथा प्लान देख कर मुझे चिन्ता हुई कि हमारे देश के जो इतने प्रश्न हैं और इस गति और विधि से जो प्रश्न को हल करेंगे तो कितने साल लगेंगे। इस योजना में राष्ट्र के कई प्रश्नों पर लक्ष्य केन्द्रित नहीं किया है और इस योजना के कई विधान विचारणीय हैं। मैं याद दिलाना चाहती हूँ कि तीन योजनाओं के बाद भी हमने अपनी विधियों पर, अपनी त्रुटियों पर विचार करने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया, अपनी विचारधारा की त्रुटियों पर भी विचार करने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया वरन् अपनी अपूर्ण विचारधारा को और फिर से पुनरांकित किया है।

हमारा राष्ट्र कृषि प्रधान है। कृषि के साथ पशुओं का प्रश्न भी कई प्रदेशों में सम्मिलित है। भारत में कई ऐसे प्रदेश भी हैं। जो कि पशु-पालन का खास व्यवसाय करते हैं। सीराष्ट्र, कच्छ, राजस्थान और उत्तर भारत के कई प्रदेशों में यह व्यवसाय होता है। मैं भी इसी एक प्रदेश की रहने वाली हूँ। मुझे दुःख है कि भारत के कई राज्यों में जब कि कृषि के बाद सबसे अधिक महत्व पशु-पालन का रहा है फिर भी उनकी स्थिति के प्रति अभी तक हम

[श्रीमती पुष्पावेन जनार्दन महंता.]

उपेक्षा की है। जो मिलकड कैटिल है, उनकी वृद्धि के लिये कुछ प्रयत्न नहीं किया गया है। हमारे देश में कई प्रदेशों में दुष्काल का सामना करना पड़ता है और पानी और चारे की तंगी के कारण दुष्काल का सबसे अधिक प्रभाव पशुओं पर पड़ता है और इसमें पूरा बलिदान पशुओं का होता है। लाखों की संख्या में ये मारे जाते हैं। माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, दुष्काल के समय हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार की ओर से लाखों रूपयों की सहायता राज्यों को दी जाती है, हर साल एक या दूसरे प्रदेश में दुष्काल की परिस्थिति होती है, परन्तु दुष्काल के बाद हम यह कमी नहीं सोचते हैं और हमारा प्लानिंग कमिशन भी नहीं सोचता है कि दुष्काल के बाद कायमी तौर से पशुओं का निर्वाह कैसे करना चाहिये। ऐसा मैं सोचती हूँ कि इस योजना में भी उसका कोई भी उल्लेख नहीं किया गया है। अन्य बातों के साथ विषम परिस्थिति यह भी है कि हमने इन योजनाओं में कई करोड़ रुपया इस प्रश्न के निवारण के लिये खर्च करना चाहा था, वह भी नहीं करते हैं। दुष्काल में पैसा दे देते हैं, उसके बाद सब कुछ ठीक हो जाता है और भूल जाते हैं, पानी और चारे के अभाव में कितने पशु मर गये हैं। दूसरी बात यह भी है कि जब पानी और चारे की सुविधा होती है तो रश इतना होता है कि पशुओं को पानी और चारा कम तो मिलता ही है, आने जाने में लौटते समय मृत्यु भी हो जाती है। आज हम जानते हैं दूध की भी कितनी तंगी हो रही है। इसलिये मैं यहाँ यह उल्लेख करना चाहती हूँ कि यह जो चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना है, इसमें यह देखना है कि आर्थिक सहायता की स्थिति को देख कर क्रियान्वित रूप से पशुओं को कहाँ रखना है। इस योजना में एनीमल हस्बेन्डरी के लिये 15 करोड़ ६० है, मगर इसमें उसके बारे में कुछ नहीं सोचा गया है। कल एक माननीय सदस्य ने, अपोजिशन वालों से सहमत होते हुए भी कहा था कि कुछ ठीक ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है और एनीमल हस्बेन्डरी की ऐसी

योजना बना दी है। मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ, जब तक हमारे पशुओं का बचाव नहीं होगा, हम उनके बारे में कुछ नहीं सोचेंगे, तब तक हमारी डेरी की, दूध की, न्यूट्रिशन की कोई योजना पूरी नहीं होने वाली है। पशुओं के पालन के लिये ग्रास लैन्ड की बात होती है। यह योजना में बताया है कि दो, तीन योजनाओं के बाद चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में लो लाइंग ग्रास लैन्ड की योजना का उल्लेख हुआ है। मैं सोचती हूँ हमारे देश का जो इतना बड़ा प्रश्न है, वह लो लाइंग ग्रास लैन्ड से हल होने वाला है। यह लास्ट बजट के समय भी मैंने कहा था। उस समय राजस्व के जो मिनिस्टर थे, मिस्टर सेठी, उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया था कि हम उसके लिये कुछ सोचेंगे, करेंगे, उसके बारे में भी मैं सोचती हूँ, इसमें कुछ उल्लेख नहीं है, कुछ सोचा नहीं गया।

दूसरी बात यह है कि पानी और चारे की कमी के कारण हमारे नोमेडिक ब्रीडर्स को इधर-उधर भ्रमण करना पड़ता है। हमारी जो नोमेडिक योजना है, उसमें भी नोमेडिक ब्रीडर्स को सम्मिलित नहीं किया गया है। इस समय जो ऐसे ब्रीडर्स हैं, उनकी आर्थिक परिस्थिति बहुत खराब है, और वह पशुओं का पालन नहीं कर सकते हैं।

तीसरी बात यह है कि क्रेडिट भी प्रोड्यूसर्स को नहीं देते हैं। यह पंचवर्षीय योजना में सिर्फ गौशाला और डेरी को लक्ष्य में रखा है। जो व्यक्ति प्रोड्यूसर है, जो अपनी गुजर पशु-पालन से करता है, उसके लिये कुछ नहीं किया है। सिर्फ एक इशारा किया है कि प्रोड्यूसर्स को क्रेडिट दिया जायेगा। मैं यह पूछना चाहती हूँ कि प्रोड्यूसर्स को आप कितना क्रेडिट देंगे, उनको किस चीज पर क्रेडिट देंगे। उसके पास जमीन नहीं है, वह लैन्डलैस है। आज लैन्डलैस लेबर का प्रश्न मैं सुनती हूँ, राज्य सभा में। मुझे याद आता है, जिसके पास पशु-पालन की व्यवस्था है, उसको पहले आपको लैन्ड देना चाहिये, क्योंकि पशु-पालन और लैन्ड दोनों साथ-साथ जाते हैं। बिना जमीन आज पशु-पालन करना बहुत मुश्किल है। इसलिये

मैं पंचवर्षीय योजना में जो अग्रस्थान है खेती के बारे में, उसके बारे में प्राइम मिनिस्टर से निवेदन करती हूँ कि खेती की जमीन पशुपालक को देनी चाहिये, क्योंकि पशु-पालन और जमीन दोनों साथ-साथ चलते हैं। पानी, घास और जमीन पशुपालक के लिये जरूरी है। जो हमारे गऊ चरक हैं और जो ग्रास लैन्ड्स हैं, वे आज कम हो रहे हैं, जिससे पशु-पालन का कार्य बड़ा कठिन हो गया है।

मैं विस्मित हूँ कि जब मैं पंचवर्षीय योजना में डेरी के बारे में पढ़ रही थी, तब उसमें यह बताया गया है कि जो बल्ड फूड प्रोग्राम है, उनके पास से हम मुफ्त 41 करोड़ 90 लाख रु० का दूध का पाउडर लेंगे और इसमें पानी मिला कर बम्बई, कलकत्ता, मद्रास और दिल्ली में पानी पाउडर में मिला कर दूध बनायेंगे और दूध बना कर बाटेंगे, इससे हमारी आम-दानी 95 करोड़ 40 लाख रु० होगी, इस पैसे से हम अपनी डेरी को, पशु-पालन की, गो संवर्धन की सारी योजनाएँ बढ़ायेगे। मुझे ताज्जुब आता है, कि किस तरह से योजना बढ़ी। माना कि मिल्क का पाउडर नहीं मिले तो क्या हमारी योजना बंद रहेगी और 5 साल तक परदेस से जो पाउडर आता है, क्या उस पर देश को निर्भर होना पड़ेगा ?

दूसरी बात यह है कि हम दूसरे मुल्कों से मिल्क पाउडर लेते हैं, लेकिन हमारा देश जो एक कृषि प्रधान देश है, जहाँ बहुत सी जमीन और पानी है, वहाँ पर गऊ के व्यवसाय के लिए कोई अच्छी योजना नहीं है। पहली, दूसरी और तीसरी योजनाओं में मैंने हमेशा इस बात पर जोर दिया था, लेकिन इसके बारे में कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया। यह जो नीति है वह एक गलत नीति है। इसलिए मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहती हूँ कि जो एनिमल हसबैंडरी की योजना है, उसके बारे में फिर से सोचा जाय। मैंने इस संबंध में डा० गाडगिल भाई जो प्लानिंग के चैयरमैन हैं, उनको लिखा था, मगर मालूम नहीं क्या हुआ। आज हमारी जो परि-

स्थिति कैंटिल्स और मिल्क प्रोड्यूसर्स की है वह बहुत खराब है, इसलिए मैं चाहती हूँ कि सरकार इस और अवश्य ध्यान दें।

दूसरा प्रश्न शीप और गोट्स का है। हम सब लोग जानते हैं कि ये लोग जो इन्हें रखते हैं काश्मीर से लेकर कन्याकुमारी और कलकत्ते से लेकर अमृतसर तक फैले हुए हैं। उन लोगों के पास न मकान होते हैं और न ही जमीन होती है। वे साल भर इधर उधर ही घूमते रहते हैं और जब बाढ़ आती है तो उनके हजारों पशु बह और मर जाते हैं। इस तरह आज हमारे देश में ऊन का उत्पादन भी कम हो रहा है और इस तरह से हमें क्वालिटी और क्वाण्टिटी में सफर करना पड़ता है। इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में खास तौर पर इस चीज के लिए आपको प्रबन्ध करना चाहिये।

तीसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहती हूँ, वह फिशरीज के बारे में है। जहाँ पर इस मछली पकड़ने का काम होता है, वहाँ पर मैंने देखा है। आज हमारे देश में इस मछली का जो एक्सपोर्ट किया जा रहा है वह काफी हो रहा है। वह काम कठिन तो है, मगर खतरे से खाली नहीं है। लोग समुद्र और दरियाओं में जाते हैं और मछली पकड़ कर ले आते हैं और एक्सपोर्ट करते हैं, पंचवर्षीय योजना में इस संबंध में टार्गेट रखा गया है, मगर मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि सरकार इस व्यवसाय की ओर भी उचित ध्यान नहीं दे रही है। वह समझती है कि समुद्र से तो मछली मिल ही जायेगी और इसी वजह से वह इस बात की ओर ज्यादा ध्यान नहीं देती है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि सरकार को पंचवर्षीय योजना में इस उद्योग की ओर भी ध्यान देना चाहिये।

चौथी बात मैं जंगलों के संबंध में कहना चाहती हूँ। आज हम जंगलों को खेती के काम के लिए ले रहे हैं। आज हम जंगलों को तोड़ रहे हैं ताकि उसमें खेती की जा सके। एक तरफ तो हमें दुष्काल का सामना करना पड़

[श्रीमती पुष्पावेन जनार्दनराय महेता.]

रहा है और दूसरी तरफ हम जंगलों की जमीन को तोड़ रहे हैं और खेती के लिए दे रहे हैं। जब हम जंगलों को इतना महत्व देते हैं, जंगलों की बात करते हैं तो आज सरकार की ओर से जंगलों का संरक्षण नहीं हो रहा है। आज हमारे देश में प्राइवेट जंगल भी है। किसी जगह पर ग्रास लैंड होता है, तो उसको जंगल मानते हैं। तीसरी योजना में तीन लाख, तीन हजार हैक्टर में जंगल लगाने की योजना थी, लेकिन तीसरी योजना के बाद मालूम हुआ कि सिर्फ 13 हजार 400 हैक्टर में जंगल लगाये गये हैं और इसके अलावा और कोई काम नहीं किया गया। आज हमारी परिस्थिति बहुत खराब है और काम बहुत कम हो रहा है। इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जो फारेस्ट ऐक्ट है, उसमें सुधार किया जाना चाहिये। वह अपूर्ण ऐक्ट है और उसमें जंगलों को संरक्षण देना चाहिये और इसके लिए योजना में प्रयास किया जाना चाहिये ताकि जंगलों का अच्छी तरह से संरक्षण हो सके। आज जंगलों को बढ़ाने के लिए हमारे पास कोई योजना नहीं है। इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस काम को आगे बढ़ाने के लिए हमारे पास कोई योजना होनी चाहिये।

हमारी जो अनिश्चित नीति है, उसी के कारण हमारा जंगल का काम कम होता है। होना यह है कि जब दुष्काल आता है तो जो भी थोड़ा बहुत जंगल और ग्रास लैंड है, उसमें पशुओं को धकेल देते हैं। होता क्या है कि वहाँ सीड्स भी नहीं रहते हैं, पानी भी नहीं रहता है। वहाँ पानी का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिए और इसके लिए योजना होनी चाहिए। जंगल को बनाना हो, ग्रास लैंड को सुरक्षित करना हो, तो हर एक स्टेट को एलार्म देना चाहिए कि जब दुष्काल हो जाय तो कहाँ पशुओं को स्थानांतरित करना है। इस तरह से जंगल सुरक्षित होंगे और हमारा काम आगे चलेगा।

मेरा खास विषय है समाज कल्याण। हमारी प्रधान भी इसमें दिलचस्पी लेती है और पहले हमारी उपाध्यक्षा भी थी। मैंने देखा कि

इसमें लिखा है कि तीसरी योजना का टार्गेट पूरा नहीं हो सका। मुझे कहने में दुःख होता है कि 41 करोड़ मंजूर हुआ था, उसमें से 19 करोड़ का खर्चा कर सके। उसमें सेन्ट्रल वेलफेयर बोर्ड की कोई गलती नहीं थी, मगर जो ग्रान्ट थी मकानों के लिए वह पर्याप्त न होने के कारण नहीं कर सके। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि '67 और '68 में बजट 3 करोड़ 68 लाख का था और मंजूर हुआ 1 करोड़ 73 लाख; 1 करोड़ 95 लाख कम हुआ। 1967 से 1970 तक 2 करोड़ रुपया कम रिलीज हुआ। मैं जानना चाहती हूँ कि जो सैक्यन्ड बजट है, उसकी ग्रान्ट भी क्यों रिलीज नहीं होती? मैं सोचती हूँ कि राष्ट्र का जो धन है, वह उसका संस्कार है। हमारे पास कितनी भी जमीन हो, कितने भी कारखाने हों, कितने उद्योग बढ़ जायँ, हमारे संस्कार नहीं होंगे तो हमारे भावी बच्चों का सुधार नहीं होगा और बच्चों का सुधार नहीं होगा तो राष्ट्र का क्या होगा वह आप सब जानते हैं। मुझे याद है एक समय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने कहा था कि राष्ट्र का धन उसके बच्चे हैं और बच्चों के लिए कुछ करना चाहिए, लेकिन इस तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि उसके बारे में सोचना चाहिए।

डेस्टीट्यूट्स के बारे में आज परदेशों से मदद आती है। दिल्ली में 15-20 अनाथालय हैं, परदेशों से उन्हें सहायता मिलती है, मगर पंचवर्षीय योजना में इनकी और कोई इशारा नहीं है। जब हम बोलते हैं तब मालूम होता है कि कोई पैसा हमारे पास नहीं है, फाइनेशियल डिफीकल्टी है। इसलिए मुझे दुःख है कि जब परदेश से भी इस काम के लिए मदद आती है तो पंचवर्षीय योजना में इसकी तरफ कोई इशारा क्यों नहीं है। यह एक बड़े दुःख और मुश्किल की बात है।

एक बात की ओर मैं प्रधान मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाना चाहती हूँ। प्लान में लिखा है कि जो डेस्टीट्यूट और आरफन्स हैं, उनको एडाप्शन

के लिए दिया जायगा और फोस्टर केयर के लिए दिया जायगा। फोस्टर केयर की बात तो मैं समझती हूँ, लेकिन एडाप्शन के लिए किसी संस्था को अनाथ बच्चे को देने का कोई कानून नहीं है। विस कानून से दे रहे, है मुझे मालूम नहीं। हा जो एडाप्शन के लिए कानून आता है वह चला जाता है। फारेन कन्ट्रीज में हमारे बच्चों को एडाप्शन के लिए देते हैं। मैं पूछना चाहती हूँ कि हमारे बच्चों की नेशनलिटी को, जिनके माता-पिता नहीं हैं, आप कैसे इग्नोर कर सकते हैं। हम अपने बच्चों को पाल नहीं सके, उनको परदेश भेज कर हम संतोष करें कि हमारे बच्चे सुखी हैं, यह सही नहीं है और इसे बन्द करना चाहिए। जो आरफन्स है और डेस्टीट्यूटस है, उनवे लिए रकम को बढ़ाना चाहिए और उसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ करना चाहिए। साथ-साथ मैं याद दिलाना चाहती हूँ प्रधान मंत्री को कि अपनी ओर से डेस्टीट्यूट चिल्ड्रन के लिए राज्य को कानून बनाना चाहिए। आज बच्चों की कोई सीक्योरिटी नहीं है, प्रोटेक्शन नहीं है। और यहां पार्लियामेंट के पास, राज्य सभा के पास मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जो हमारे अनाथ बच्चे हैं, उन को हम अनाथालयों में दे सकते हैं, लेकिन उसके बाद उनकी कोई फिक्र नहीं करता। उनके लिए प्रोटेक्शन क्या है? उन की मिक्चोरिटी क्या है? अगर विदेश उन को ले जाते हैं तो हम उसके लिए खुशी मनाते हैं, लेकिन वहां ले जा कर वे उन बच्चों को गुलाम बनाते हैं, गुलामों की तरह बच देते हैं या किस तरह से उन को रखते हैं, इस बात को हम नहीं जानते। तो इसके लिए कानून होना चाहिए और उसके जरिये हमको मनाही करनी चाहिए कि कोई भी अफनेज किसी को अपने बच्चे एडाप्शन के लिए न दे। यह मेरा खास प्रश्न है और मैं जानती हूँ कि इसका हल हमारे लिए बड़ा कठिन है।

इसके अतिरिक्त प्रि-प्राइमरी एजुकेशन के लिए समाज कल्याण बोर्ड की ओर से कुछ

संस्थाओं को कुछ ग्रान्ट दी जाती है। मेरा निवेदन है कि यदि हम जल्दी ही सारे भारत-वर्ष में अपने सारे बच्चों के लिए प्रि-प्राइमरी एजुकेशन की व्यवस्था नहीं कर सकेंगे, तो इस का हमारे बच्चों की शिक्षा पर बड़ा बुरा असर पड़ेगा। इसके साथ ही मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहती हूँ कि हमारी जो प्रि-प्राइमरी एजुकेशन है, सोशल वेलफेयर है, एनीमल हस्बैंडरी और फारेस्ट है, इस के लिए प्लानिंग कमीशन को और भी अच्छे तरीके से सोच विचार करना चाहिए। वी आर टायर्ड आफ आल दीज एक्सपर्ट्स। वे वहां बैठ कर सोचते हैं और सच्ची स्थिति को समझ नहीं पाते।

आपने मुझे मौका दिया इसके लिए मैं आप को धन्यवाद देती हूँ।

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have been directed by you to confine my observations and conclude them within five minutes and I will do so. I have heard the speeches of honourable Members with great interest and edification. But I was disappointed in one thing. I should have thought that the criticism would have produced an alternative plan. But what has been done is that various parts of the Plan have been criticised asking more money for this project and more money for that project. The real approach of the Opposition should be to take all the resources of the Plan and within those resources the Opposition should produce an alternative plan. That role has not been fulfilled, if I may say so. I could understand if they had produced an alternative plan showing that these are the resources and these are the allotments that we want for different purposes. Then we could have known that that was a real opposition. But what has been done is that the Plan has been attacked on political grounds. I recognise it that the Opposition must play a political role and that it is not their role to support the Government. They should criticise the Government they should attack the Government, they should expose the Government. After all that has been done they should show their alternative plan, they should show as to what plan they would have produced. They should do it in a skeleton form since they are not assisted by any commission. They failed to show any

[Shri M. N. Kaul.]

alternative plan to the one that was presented by the Government. That is my first observation.

My second observation is that we should know the limits under which the Government of the day is working, the limits imposed by our Constitution and the limits imposed by our traditions. The whole concept of plans originated in Soviet Russia. And their plans, whatever successes they have achieved, they have achieved great successes from time to time. But we are working under a different system. The first difference is that the Soviet Government has total control over its economy which our Government does not have. Secondly, theirs is an authoritarian regime while ours is not. We have our limitations. We have, to a substantial extent, to depend upon the willing cooperation of the private sector which operates in large areas. Secondly we have to depend on the cooperation of the people. And unless proper cooperation comes from the private sector and from the people—these are the two assumptions underlying this Plan—you cannot just ask the Government to deliver the goods.

After all, the Government has, after consultations and with great deliberations sketched a Plan for the acceptance and working out by the people of this country. The Government can only set out targets. The ultimate success of the Plan will depend upon the co-operation that they receive from the private industries and other agencies which are operating within the four corners of the Plan. Even in the Public sector there should be peace and cooperation from workers.

I believe that the vital task of the Government is to generate confidence and the first step in that direction was the nationalisation of the banks. The second step was the budget. I feel, after watching the economic situation of the country for some time, that these two were important factors. The third step is the Plan itself. But the effect of the Plan is not the same as the effect of the bank nationalisation. The effects of the bank nationalisation and the Budget are felt because they are concrete enough to produce their immediate impact. But the Plan is a whole document which sketches the position several years hence and the individual effects of the various factors in the Plan are not immediately felt. But I do believe that if the people give their full

cooperation to the Government the Plan can also prove to be a great and dynamic force.

The last observation I have to make is that the key to the Plan lies in the moderate stability of the prices. I am one of those who believe in this principle and history also supports me. For instance, in Europe in the medieval times the prices were falling. Falling prices were associated with economic stagnation and moderately rising prices were associated with periods of prosperity. It is true that for some decades, we have had rising prices. I have no time to develop it. But I will just conclude my observations by saying that I have studied this phenomena in various countries and I have personally come to the conclusion that a rise in prices within the limit of about 3 per cent is a safe rise in prices which the economy can absorb. If it goes beyond this limit, then the matter gets out hand. Please remember that if prices are not controlled, then the entire targets for the Plan go out of gear, as it were. The stability of prices within limits is the most important factor and that has got to be watched and kept under control. If that gets out of hand, then the entire concept of the Plan gets upset.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is not easy to discuss a Plan simply because our past experience is that there was always a very wide gap between what was proposed and what was actually implemented. Still, I would like to express my views on what has been proposed in the Plan document leaving for a later occasion the implementation part.

Sir, broadly speaking, I think the Fourth Five Year Plan is an improvement over the earlier Plans in some respects. Agriculture, for the first time I believe, has received some attention from the planners. The proposals made for the mobilisation of additional resources not only indicate a determination to make efforts for achieving self-reliance, but also aim at reducing the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few. I do not know how far these proposals would be implemented. But they do indicate a healthy direction. Then again deficit financing, which did a havoc in the past, has been brought down from Rs. 1133 crores that is, 13.2

per cent of the total outlay of the Third Plan, to Rs. 850 crores, that is, only 5 per cent of the total outlay of the Fourth Plan. Foreign aid has been proposed to be reduced to half by the end of the Fourth Plan period. This objective, if achieved, will no doubt bring self-confidence and internal strength to the nation. But fulfilment of this objective largely depends on our ability to expand the export market. I am glad that the import requirements have been properly classified and assessed and import substitution and elimination of non-essential imports have been emphasised. With greater efforts and determination it should not be difficult to raise our exports from Rs. 1373.32 crores of the year 1969, to Rs. 1,900 crores as estimated for the year 1973-74 so that we may meet our foreign exchange requirements and reduce our dependence on foreign assistance to half.

Another improvement that I have noted in the Fourth Plan is that some rational formula has been applied to determine the quantum of assistance the Centre has to give to the States and the Union Territories for the implementation of the State Plans. I, however, think that there is perhaps room for further improvement in this regard.

Having said this, Sir, I must submit that I have some doubts about some of the proposals made in the Plan. Firstly looking back and taking into consideration our experience of the past, particularly of the first 1½ years of the present Plan period, I am not very sanguine that 5½% rate of growth of our economy can be achieved during this Plan period. I am also not sure whether the investment of Rs. 13,655 crores in the public sector during this period is a practicable proposition or not. The targets set by the Plan to raise the national income from Rs. 28,800 crores to Rs. 37,900 crores may be achieved only if we succeed in raising the domestic savings from 8.8% to 13.2% and raise the net investment from 11.3% to 14.5% of the national income. It would be a gigantic task. Although I have my doubts, I do not say that it will be impossible to reach the targets if the government, the Planning Commission and their entire machinery put in real and hard and serious effort, and provided that the coming General Elections do not upset the balance of political power in the country.

The target of food grain production which is to rise from 98 million tonnes to 129 million tonnes and the promise to become self-sufficient in food by the end of 1971 are indeed very heartening prospects. But I do not understand why the planners have underestimated the need to further raise the production of cash crops also. The cash crops are important not for our internal consumption alone, but for export as well.

As regards the targets of industrial production, some have been rated so high as to create genuine doubts about their fulfilment.

The Plan has put sufficient emphasis on the objective of social justice to be achieved through the dispersal of benefits. But the planners have not made it clear and convincing as to how this objective is proposed to be achieved and what would be the measures of such achievement.

Sir, although I have said that the agricultural sector has been treated slightly better in this Plan than in the earlier Plans, I am afraid the planners have not gone far enough. The investment in agriculture and the allied sectors including irrigation and flood control in the Third Plan was 20.3% of the total as against 55.7% in industry, minerals, transport, power, etc. taken together. In the Fourth Plan, the corresponding figures are 21.1% and 56.1% respectively. Even if the anticipated investments by the Agro-Industrial Corporation, Land Development Banks, Central Co-operative Banks and the Rural Electrification Corporation are taken into account, the total investment in agriculture and allied sectors would not go beyond 26%.

Sir, in this country, agriculture is the predominant industry and, I believe, will continue to be so for long long years to come. In fact, agriculture constitutes the base of our economy and, if properly treated, should be able to contribute substantially to capital formation. And, from this point of view, I think the investment proposed for this sector is proportionately low. Indian agriculture needs massive investment if we want to stand on our own.

I am also not happy about the proposed extent of investment on education and particularly, scientific research. Sir, the present educational system in our country is completely out-dated and

[Shri Bipinpal Das.]

needs thorough overhaul. In my humble opinion, for a developing country like ours, education must be overwhelmingly utilitarian in character. It should cater to the needs of the man-power requirement, more for productive economy and essential social services than producing an army of parasites as at present. Technical and vocational education should not only be emphasised right from the middle school stage, as has been done in the East European countries, but should aim more at self-employment and creation of entrepreneurship. A mere 3.5% outlay will never be able to meet such a requirement. The importance of scientific research need not be over emphasised for the achievement of our objective of self-reliance, but the planners have done a great injustice to it by allocating only 0.6% of the total outlay for the purpose.

Sir, one of the main objectives of our planning is to progressively raise the public sector to the commanding heights of our economy. But the investment ratio between public and private sectors in the Fourth Plan has remained the same as in the Third Plan, *i.e.* roughly 3:2. This does not indicate a progress of the public sector vis-a-vis the private sector. Then again I may say that while I am hundred per cent. in favour of the public sector particularly in the field of key, basic and essential industries, I am not blind to the fact that the public sector in India has so far failed to show the desired results. The basic and the most important reason of such failure is the absence of a trained cadre of personnel to run and manage these industries. The civil servants, the so-called Generalists and the ex-service personnel put in charge of the public sector are absolutely unfit for the job. Neither do they have the requisite training for industrial management nor are they tuned to the social objectives and ideals of democratic socialism nor are most of them free from interests in and connections with the private enterprise and big business. Unless and until the Government and the Planning Commission build up a trained and separate cadre of personnel specially suited for the purpose I am afraid, the public sector will continue to be mismanaged and misdirected and will fail to come up to the mark.

Sir, the Prime Minister in her preface to the Plan has stated and rightly so, that a sense of involvement, a sense of participation by the people

is vital for the success of the Plan. But how? How can a climate be created for such involvement and for a voluntary and willing participation by the people? In my opinion, there are five basic requirements for the creation of such a climate, *i.e.* immediate and complete land reforms, stability of prices, rapid progress towards equality, expansion of the employment market and removal of regional imbalances. These are the five factors in Indian situation today which have created grave social tensions and these tensions stand in the way of creating the climate of involvement and participation. Failure to solve the land problem even after 23 years of independence is a standing shame. It can be solved and must be solved on the basis of one single principle of land to the tiller and to the actual tiller, subject to a ceiling of 15 acres of average productivity. Regional imbalances can be corrected by plans and schemes drawn up for the backward areas on the basis of solution of acute and perennial local problems like floods and droughts and full exploitation of local natural resources for industrial development.

Sir, it is a matter of deep regret that the fourth Plan document has not given us a full picture of the actual situation today regarding prices, unemployment and economic disparity. Although some very general suggestions have been made we are completely in the dark about the specific measures and schemes by which these burning problems are proposed to be solved. Sir, planning under a democratic system, unlike the totalitarian systems, is a great adventure and I am proud that this country has chosen this path right on the morrow of independence. I have absolutely no doubt that without planning the economy of this country would have gone to ruins and democracy to pieces. But I would like to sound a note of warning to the Government and the Planners. If planning under democracy has to succeed these five basic problems I have pointed out must find rapid and effective solutions. Land reforms and price stabilisation call for immediate and urgent action, whereas progress towards equality, full employment and regional balance must show concrete results during the current Plan period itself. Otherwise not only planning will fail to inspire involvement and participation of the people, but our democratic system itself may face a serious threat and irrecoverable disaster.

Now, I would like to raise a very fundamental issue. Should we imitate the Western technological pattern for our industrial development? The capitalist countries took 100 to 150 years for full industrial development and they had the unique advantages of extremely low man-land ratio and extensive and free colonial exploitation to build up their capital formation. Soviet Russia too had the same advantage of man-land ratio and the special advantage of their political system. We have none of these advantages and still we have been trying to industrialise this country on the basis of their technological pattern. This is a highly capitalised and wholly centralised pattern which is hardly suitable for India with poor financial resources and very high density of population functioning under a democratic system. Still there is time to make necessary corrections in this matter. Some industries and installations, by their very nature are bound to be highly capitalised and centralised in their technological pattern. I do not deny that. But there are hundreds of other industries which can utilise modern science to the full and can still come under the medium scale or even small scale with low capitalisation under a decentralised pattern. So, what, in my opinion, India needs to-day is not only an industrial revolution but also a technological revolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the debate on planning is a truly national occasion and I am glad that hon. Members have taken it seriously even though there has been much criticism. We have got used to such criticism. First it used to be on the very concept of planning. Fortunately that stage is over and we have come to a phase of development when all parties, I hope, approve of the idea of planning. Some have approved of some portions of the Plan but have reserved their criticism. For the manner in which many programmes have been implemented. There are some who do not at all approve of the manner in which we plan. Now, obviously, each one of us, that is, not as individuals but as representatives of parties, stand for certain ideas and for certain methods of functioning. We have after considerable thought and deliberation, decided on the sort of Planning Commission which we should have and the manner on which it should

function. The Planning Commission consists of independent, non-party, non-political experts but even they are not solely responsible for the Plan. The Plan is drawn up on the basis of numerous discussions with people at different levels from every single State and the Plan takes its final shape in the National Development Council in which all the Chief Ministers, and many of them belonging to different parties, sit together and express their views. It is true that at these meetings there is also disagreement, not normally at the method of planning but more about how much each State should get. We all know that none of our programmes is adequate for our population or for our needs. At all times there has to be balancing between available resources and what our people need, what we think should be done for them or even what should be done for one area or another. By and large the Plan is a charter of progress for the next four years. We have some idea of how it has functioned already since it has been in existence for a year. Although this formal discussion of the final Plan is taking place now, we have had a very full debate when the Plan was settled in its draft stage. An hon. Member has said that there was no sense of urgency in the Plan. I think that this is the difference between the Draft Plan and the final document.

We have tried to inject a sense of urgency in the final document, and the proof of it is that it has recognised the major problems of the day, whether it is unemployment or regional imbalances or other major problems. Yesterday or the day before yesterday I mentioned the increased outlay both for the public sector and for the State Plans. We do realise, and I think the Plan realises, that the solution to some of these problems brooks no delay and they must be tackled with urgency and with determination. But there are certain conditions in which we must work. The hon. Member, Shri Kaul, drew attention to this when he spoke just now. There are certain accepted parameters. One is the democratic process. Many people would like us to do many things, some of which we also agree are the right things to do. But we are committed to the democratic process. We are committed to securing the consent of the people. We are committed to trying to take along with us as many of the people and as many of the parties as possible. And sometimes this does slow the process, but I think that, even though it makes the process slower,

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.]

it strengthens the process and it strengthens whatever work we take in hand. Now the second parameter, with which perhaps some people do not agree but which is one which we have set for ourselves, is that of a mixed economy. A mixed economy may have many faults but in the circumstances in the country, our Government, those who preceded me and those who are my colleagues today, feel that this is one of the conditions which we must set ourselves. I do not think that 'a mixed economy' means merely that some big families should be allowed to take advantage. Because many of the fields—whether it is agriculture, or small-scale industry—are in the private sector but for the benefit of the smaller man. This is our concept of a mixed economy, namely, that people should be able to take many programmes in hand and work for themselves. I know that some families, some groups, some business houses, have taken advantage of a particular situation as it arose immediately after independence. It is our endeavour now to see how we can curb this kind of monopolistic tendency. It is not possible suddenly, in the circumstances in which we are, to put a sudden brake. You cannot say that a particular situation should be changed overnight. It has to be done in a way which gives the least shock to the economy. But it must also be done in a way which lessens the delay. By lessening the shock I do not mean that we go so slow that our programmes become ineffective, because that would be defeating the very purposes for which we are making new programmes. But it does mean that, along with the desire for social justice, which is surely a genuine desire, the practical needs of the country today must be attended to, the needs of production and growth as well, so that they enable us to give greater social justice. There was another point made by hon. Shri Kaul, which was that with all these different types of criticism there was no clear alternative put forward by any hon. Member. There is a party which has put an alternative on previous occasion and I shall say something about it later on.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Do you seriously think that it can be done during this discussion ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It does take away from the discussion when there is no viable alternative in front of us to discuss alongside with this.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN (Kerala) : I have referred to it in my amendment; am prepared to place this on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No interruptions please.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Sometimes it is said here that the Plan is made by city-dwellers and therefore perhaps they have no idea of agricultural problems. We have in the Planning Commission agricultural experts and in drawing up the Plan they are in touch with many more people all over the country who are actually working in the field or who are themselves concerned with the day to day problems of the rural areas. Although, I myself happen to be born not in a city but in a town, it is one of those hundreds of small towns in India which are very close to the rural areas and which are constantly in touch with the problems of the rural areas. My own earliest memories are not only of visits to villages but of thousands, if not lakhs, of peasants, with and without their families, coming to our house to discuss their problems and to put their difficulties in front of my father and the many other political leaders who were often in our house. Therefore this was my earliest memory of the political struggle in India and of the problems of the Indian peasant. So in a way I have grown up with a very full and deep awareness of the problems of the kisan, of his hopes and his aspirations. Now, we realise that the implementation of land reforms is inextricably linked with any question of social justice for the rural population. In these last twelve months we have tried to mount pressure from all sides so that we could go ahead with many of these programmes, some laws which have been passed but have not been implemented, others which have yet to take the form of enactments. I do not know whether there is time to go into details of these reforms but I have spoken of them on other occasions. What I would like to say is that we do realise the importance of land reform and when we met the Chief Ministers or the Agricultural Ministers of the States we have given them a time-bound programme. So we are going ahead with this. In the States under President's rule, we have tried to set an example by pushing ahead even faster. But we cannot slur over the legal, constitutional and sometimes political difficulties which State Governments, whether they are of the Congress or of other parties, have faced when they

have set about implementing land reforms and it is these difficulties which have to some extent slowed down the pace of implementation. But my own assessment is that these difficulties are increasingly being got over and the State Governments are now displaying a greater sense of urgency and earnestness in enforcing land reforms.

Now, some parties represented here have taken another method of enforcing land reforms. I must confess that this is not a right method. It is not a right method because I do not think that it even gives justice in the long run. It is not a right method because it is based on feelings of hatred, of envy and even of the promotion of the acquisitive spirit.

One hon. Member belonging to my own party, I believe said one of these days that had I not been in office, perhaps I myself would have led the land grab movement. I must seriously repudiate this statement. I do not wish to associate myself with anything which will increase lawlessness and the tendency to grab things. In this connection, people brought in Gandhi's name. They brought in the memory of the freedom struggle. But the conditions were entirely different. I had the privilege of being close to Gandhi and I know that he would not approve of any kind of movement like this or any kind of grabbing. We were then living under a system which did not permit any kind of change, as we were under the British regime.

Often many things had to be done which perhaps one would not normally approve of, but today change is possible. People have shown that they do change. They have voted for other ideas. They have voted for other parties. They have brought governments of different hues and views into power. Therefore, all those who are committed to democratic methods should abide by these rules and processes of democracy.

Of course, there were some suggestions made for the efficient implementation of land reforms which, in my view, are eminently reasonable. Some Members suggested that peoples representatives at the village level should be associated with the enforcement of land legislation. The central problem which faces our democracy today, and which was touched upon by many Members who spoke, is the problem of how to have the

people's participation in the implementation of the Plan and especially in some of these programmes which affect them very closely. No one can sit back and relax thinking that, having elected the Government or having given the vote to the people, their participation in the processes of Government will be automatically ensured. We have to work actively for such participation and to build up public opinion. But there must be a common understanding between us all and acceptance of the fact that changes will be brought about through persuasion and peaceful means and that consensus will not be brought about by the welding of the big stick by any one. I do not approve of the grabbing because I feel that it is not possible to promote understanding in these conditions.

The other question, which has been agitating hon. Members for some time, is the Government's Industrial Licensing Policy and the role of the large industrial houses. I have just touched upon this without mentioning the word licensing earlier on. We do stand committed to an equitable distribution of wealth and income, but equally we must have production and growth because without this we cannot make an impact on the great poverty in our country. The House should look at the Industrial Licensing Policy as a whole and its total impact on the economy. As hon. Members know, we have reserved a large field for smallscale industry and a far larger field for small and medium entrepreneurs. It is only in respect of the core sector and heavy investment sector that large industrial houses have been allowed to come in. If the managerial, financial and technical resources of the public sector as they exist today were unlimited, then certainly we could have taken a decision here and now that this field should be completely reserved for the public sector and that no licences should be given to the large industrial houses.

But we know that the situation is not such. The public sector has grown considerably and we want to build it up to a position of commanding influence in our economy. But in respect of projects in the core sector which the public sector is not in a position to take up because of want of financial or technical or other resources, the choice before us is either to import what we need or else to allow some of these bigger industrial houses to come in and give the country

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

the benefit of higher production and employment. No decision has been taken which is in conflict with the objectives of our licensing policy. Government has at its disposal adequate powers to regulate, to control and direct the large industrial houses and to ensure that they function in conformity with national interests. We are looking at this problem constantly and where we have gone wrong is because the circumstances were such that some people were able to take advantage of the situation. We do keep a close look at this problem to see how it can be corrected. It is our constant direction to all Ministries that these bigger houses must function in conformity with national interests.

The other major question is that concerning the rise in prices. I do not think we have been complacent about the price situation, nor can we afford to be. I am fully conscious of the deep distress that the rise in prices causes to all people but more specially to vulnerable sections such as landless labourers, fixed income groups, and so on. But let us not be swept off our feet by alarmists who interpret the rise in prices as a prelude to some kind of a galloping inflation. We should get the facts straight about how much rise there is and what items have contributed to this rise. I have the figures for two days, one, the week ending 18th July, 1970, and there the wholesale price index is higher by 3.5 per cent as compared to the price index of a year ago. The other is the wholesale index for the week ending July 25th, and that is higher by 3.3 per cent than its level a year ago for the same week. The index for foodgrains is lower by 1.5 per cent, and except for rice the prices of all other foodgrains are running lower than last year's level. Government's objective is to hold the prices of four items of family consumption stable.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : Take April 18th, 1970 with April 19th of last year; wholesale price index rose by 10.5 per cent.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : While rice prices have shown some increase, that is 1.7 per cent, the prices of wheat, jowar and bajra are lower than they were on the same week a year ago. So the trend in prices has underlined the crucial importance of taking all steps to stimulate the production of commercial crops. I am glad that mention was made of the importance of cotton. Some of these items have been neglected in the past

and we must make every effort to have research and other measures, which were taken with regard to wheat, extended to these other items. Growth with stability will be within our reach if we do not slacken, and if we maintain the rate of progress achieved in agricultural production. That is why we are also pressing ahead with the building up of buffer stocks of foodgrains.

I think some Hon'ble Member rightly mentioned that to some extent in a developing economy prices must go up. He spoke just in time.

We find that the rise in prices is not a phenomenon unique to India but is found in most places in the world today. At the same time, we want to keep the prices down for the consumer. But simultaneously, we have to assure remunerative prices to agricultural producers that is, maintaining incentives for increased production. In fact, when a statement was made by my colleague, the Finance Minister, the other day in Parliament about the rise in prices and the steps taken to arrange for imports of edible oils, etc., one of the Chief Ministers, not belonging to my party, wrote immediately stressing the need that we should not, in the process, overlook the need to assure remunerative prices to producers. Therefore, at all times you have to try and maintain a balance between the different points of view.

The other major problem is that of unemployment. We have had some little discussion on its this morning and hon. Members were understandably exercised—since they do not like the word 'excited'—that some figures were not given. As I explained then, up to now, the Plans and the National Sample Surveys and other studies have all been giving figures. When I said that they were not correct, I was not expressing my personal view or the view of a particular Ministry or department. The House knows that an Expert Committee was set up to look into this matter. It has come up with the view that they do not think the methods for collecting these figures were right and therefore they do not think that the figures themselves are correct. And as we know, these various figures given by different bodies are conflicting.... (Interruptions) They may be higher or lower. That is not the point. The point is, when we know that the figures are not correct there is not much sense in placing those figures before the House. But this Committee has also set out—it has not also

taken a negative attitude—the various steps to be taken immediately whereby we can get more correct figures....

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: By what time would you get ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: We are trying to expedite the work. We have immediately informed the State Governments and I hope that we will get the figures, even if not of the entire country, at least, in the interim, of the special districts which have been selected for special programmes. At least those figures we should get very soon. Some programmes have been outlined in the Plan for dealing with this problem.

As I said earlier, nobody will claim—and neither does the Plan claim—that it can provide an adequate solution to this problem or that the question of unemployment can be dealt with in this Plan or another, in one stroke. But we have made a beginning by opening out many avenues, schemes for rural employment, and some schemes for urban employment. And we certainly think that these will make some dent in this figure of the unemployed.

I entirely agree with the hon. Member who spoke before me who said that the system of education also needs to be geared so that the young people who get their degrees can immediately fit into some jobs. But this is such a big problem—the question of changing the educational system. It can only be dealt with on a national scale and with the cooperation of all political parties.

I do not know whether the hon'ble Members would like me to go into these employment schemes. I think they have been placed before the House. Some of them are small Farmers' Scheme, Marginal Farmers' scheme, Agro-Service centres Scheme of Rural Works in drought-affected areas, institutional finances through banks, and also something that was in answer to a question which had been put with regard to employment of engineers and so on. As I said, all these schemes are there. But they are far from adequate. They mark a beginning. Apart from giving employment to a certain number, what is more important is that it will give an opening for young people to use initiative in creating jobs for themselves. This must be so in any developing nation to enable it

to grow, and to advance. Young people must learn how to make the best use of any adversity. It was out of the drought situation, that much of our agricultural strategy developed to enable our farmers to go ahead much faster. The strategy was accepted by farmers because they found themselves in a difficult situation where only a change in methods could help them out. So they immediately adopted this change in methods. Therefore, a difficult problem can help to reorient our thinking and the thinking of our young people so that they get more resourceful and use their initiative. There are many opportunities for self-employment in our country. There are many villages which need services. They are willing to pay for the services and these services could be provided by the unemployed. But today there is a feeling of insecurity in taking up such jobs. The banks are helping young people. Even so, there is some hesitation. I hope this state of affairs will soon change as indeed it is already changing.

Now, I said earlier that nobody had given an alternative Plan. And some friends opposite there called out that they had got what they call a Swadeshi Plan. Of course, the word "Swadeshi" like all words is sometimes stretched to have all kinds of meaning. The present Plan, as it is today, requires a 28 per cent. increase in income to be ploughed back for investment. It calls for mobilisation of resources of Rs. 3,200 crores and most of us here feel that it is a very difficult task. This so-called Swadeshi Plan calls for a marginal saving rate of 40 to 50 per cent and involves a mobilisation of additional resources to the tune of Rs. 9,600 crores over the five-year period, that is, an additional taxation of Rs. 1,600 crores in a single year.

In a children's classic there is mention of a "Never, Never Land". It seems to me that some people live in the "Never, Never Land". For them the solution of all problems seems to be easy. They say, "Cut out foreign aid, have levies on imports, have a pie in the sky and a bomb in the pocket and you will solve the problems of economic growth, employment, self-reliance and security all in one stroke." Exponents of this philosophy are welcome to practise it if ever they have the opportunity of doing so. I personally feel that they will soon discover that they have been deluding themselves, if not others.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

A question which I have not so far mentioned is the question of the importance given to agriculture. The Government is fully aware of the importance of agriculture. Agriculture, as we all know, and as hon'ble Members have said, contributes 50 per cent. of the national income and provides livelihood for about 70 per cent. of our people. Apart from the outlay shown under the heading "Agricultural Production", funds are being provided on a large scale through various co-operatives, banks and so on. And also much of what is put under programmes such as production of fertilisers, rural electrification, etc. are intended to build up our agriculture. More pump sets were energised during the three years of the Annual Plan than were in position in 1966. In the Fourth Plan 1.25 million pump sets are proposed to be energised. The number of pump sets energised will thus be doubled in the five-year period.

My good friend sitting opposite me here said that the Plan is out of date. Perhaps it is his information which is out of date. So far as we know, in the first year of the Plan the projected rate of growth, *i.e.* 5.5 per cent, has been achieved. The food production has been 100 million tonnes and industrial production increased by 7 per cent. Therefore, the economy should grow at the rate of 5.5 per cent as estimated in the Plan. While reference was made to the downward revision of some targets, for instance fertilizers and petroleum crude, other items where the targets have been raised, were conveniently ignored.

श्री राजनारायण : दिल को बहलाने को गालिब यह खयाल अच्छा है ।

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I had mentioned certain targets which you are not fulfilling. Please go into them.

श्री राजनारायण : वह पन्ना कहीं गिर गया, श्री के० के० शाह बगल में बैठे हैं, ढूँढ कर दें ।

श्री उपसमापति : आर्डर, आर्डर । शान्ति से सुनिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : जब बोले तब तो सुनें, वह तो पन्ना खोज रही हैं ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Shrimati Punshpaben made some very useful points about animal husbandry, especially about the difficulties of the nomadic tribes, and grasslands, and also about cutting down of forests or jungles. These are very real problems, especially that of forests, because in our desire and in our earnestness to help our landless, we should not make the great mistake of cutting down more forests. As it is, we have cut down far more forest land than we should have done and this has adversely affected the area round about. It has affected rainfall and created many new problems. So each problem has to be seen alongside with many others. If we just try to solve one problem by itself, quite often new problems are created, which create difficulties even for the original problem. Shrimati Pushpaben was perhaps understandably emotional about the adoption of some of our children by foreigners. Now, I myself am not in favour of our children being adopted by foreigners. But the number of such children is exceedingly small. I can assure her that those few who have been adopted abroad that I know of are living in good conditions, and that reports are got by the agencies through whom the adoption takes place about the condition of health and how the child is growing up. We are in a position to know that the child is not being ill-treated. The answer is not to stop these few adoptions, but to try and persuade our own people to adopt such children. It is no life for these children to live in some of these orphanages. I can say from personal experience that many children in similar conditions just because in some of these orphanages here they do not have love and affection which are as necessary for the growth of a child as are adequate nourishment and shelter. We have a huge task before us to look after these children not through institutions but through love which only a family can give them. In India most adoptions have taken place only because somebody did not have an heir for property or something like that. But these adoptions which are taking place now are because somebody wants to give love and affection to a child. People have gone out of their way to adopt a child that is very ill and often enough the child could not get the necessary treatment there even if we had the money and other equipment. So we must try and change the attitude of our people.

The problem of refugees in West Bengal has been dealt with on previous occasions. I will only say that it is a very real

problem and it is indeed a national problem. We do not regard it as a problem merely of West Bengal.

Some honourable Members spoke of disorder. What is happening in the country today might perhaps be called disorder; some of it is disorder. But much of the unrest is a kind of ferment and it is a ferment which is not confined to our country. It is visible in countries where there is no unemployment, where there are no economic difficulties such as our people face. Therefore, it is part of a crisis which is very much deeper. It is a crisis of humanity, a crisis where people are trying to look for something which they have missed. The younger people discard the older values either because they do not approve of them or because they think the older generation has not lived up to their values. It is one or the other. But it is certainly much deeper than merely a quest for jobs, security or any such thing. These do form part of the crisis in India but there is something beyond that.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : Will you remove the GRP from West Bengal?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I think the people of Bengal want the GRP there so that the outward disorder, which is not connected with this kind of mental ferment, can be put down and the situation made peaceful. Then we can all sit together to find a way of release or some fulfilment for the younger people.

Some honourable Members have also spoken of uncertainty. I do not know; perhaps they themselves feel uncertain or their parties feel uncertain. I can assure them that so far as we are concerned, we do not think there is any uncertainty either amongst us or amongst the people of India. I have been travelling a great deal and wherever I go, I find the people are certain of what they want. To be restless is something different. The people are certain of what they want. They are certain also of the changes they desire. And it is up to us to try and bring about those changes as quickly as possible through democratic and constitutional means. Had it been humanly possible to have an ideal plan here or anywhere in the world, I am sure, somebody would have produced it. But it has not been produced either in India or in any other country. An ideal

is something towards which one works. It is not something that you can immediately grasp. The ideal itself can be a moving thing, in the sense that the needs of our people are not stagnant. As they obtain something, they will want and rightly want, other things, and we are trying towards them....

AN HON. MEMBER: Material needs.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : We want both. You may want only one. But we think that the mere fulfilment of the material needs of the people is not enough for any nation. Many nations today which are affluent, have discovered this truth for themselves. So we think that while it is important to give the people their basic needs, which is the most important thing and which is a short-term measure, we have to look beyond that as well.

One other honourable Member. I believe the Member who spoke last, spoke of the great adventure of planning, the great adventure of building up this country. Another honourable Member said that we have rather grandiose schemes. I do not think that anyone looking at this plan or at the schemes we have formulated will call it a grandiose Plan. It is on the whole a small Plan compared with the needs of the Indian people. I want to say—I do not know how many Members will agree with me—that I do have grand dreams for this country and I think all the people of India, especially the young people of India, do have grand dreams. No people can survive or grow unless they have such grand dreams and unless they aim higher than they can grasp or reach.

All of us have before us a vision of India, an India which is strong and prosperous, a country which will produce some day 100 million tonnes of steel per year and one billion kilowatts of power when no family will know the pangs of hunger. But this vision has to be translated into reality through hard work and dedication and sacrifice. While drawing up the Plan, we have to combine our idealism with a realistic appraisal of our resources and our capabilities in this short time.

I am sure that hon Members know that this Plan is already in the process of implementation in every State regardless

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

of whether they have a coalition Government or Congress Government or non-Congress Government. Also while it is being implemented, we are constantly in touch with the planning Commission, and the administration along with all these bodies at the State level. We should pledge our support to the Plan so that if it is not adequate, we can see how by implementing it and fulfilling the targets sooner we can raise till more resources to do the many things which we have not been able to indicate in the Plan. I am sure that this is possible. Some hon. Members have spoken with depression and pessimism. I do not share their attitude. I am optimistic and I know that the people of India, with all their difficulties are also optimistic about their future and the Plan forms part of their future.

So, I should like to request the hon. Members who have moved amendment to the main motion, not to press them but if they do press, I request the House to reject the amendments. Of course, there are one or two points in the amendments which we ourselves would like to do for instance, to make certain structural changes which are necessary. We have to find the means by which to bring them about with the consent of the people and through democratic means

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: We have to seek....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No clarifications....

(Interruptions).

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: You have a particular duty in the circumstances.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have raised the points and the hon. Prime Minister has replied to them. There cannot be any clarifications...

(Interruptions).

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Since it concerns you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am constrained to seek a clarification. The Parliament of India had always been given the opportunity of serving in various committees to go into detail the various aspects of the Plan. This was a point which was raised by me.

It was, I think, on behalf of the entire House that I had raised this point. Why was this opportunity denied to us? That is No. 1.

And, may I submit to you again that we have been utterly disappointed. The Prime Minister has no right to disappoint us to the extent she has done. As the Chairman of the Planning Commission, she did not deviate into planning at all except on one or two occasions planning as an integrated whole....

(Interruptions)

She did not deviate into planning at all and in her speech, Mr. Deputy Chairman she was mistaking the wood for the trees... (Interruptions)

It was like Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark....

(Interruptions)

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH): Are you going to have a discussion on the speech?

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: The hon. Prime Minister has thrown a challenge to us that we should produce an alternative plan..... (Interruptions). We are prepared to do it if the Prime Minister is prepared to sit now. We are prepared so accept the challenge.... (Interruptions). We require an answer to this question: Why a Parliamentary Committee was not given an opportunity?.... (Interruption) And, you as the Deputy Chairman and as the guardian of our rights and interests, you have to seek this clarification from the Prime Minister as the Chairman of the Planning Commission. It should not be left to us to raise this question..... (Interruptions) Don't you think (addressing the Members) that we are entitled to an answer on this question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Because it refers to a Parliamentary privilege and in respect of the Plan we had an opportunity of serving on the various committees.... (Interruptions) Why was this denied to us? We require an answer to this question.

SHRI K. K. SHAH: If the speech is not satisfactory, the Prime Minister loses the vote. But, after the speech, there cannot be any explanation. Either the people are satisfied and they vote, or they are not satisfied and they do not vote.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: An alternative plan we can produce.

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आपके द्वारा नेता सदन से बहुत अड़ब के साथ, इज्जत के साथ अपील करना चाहता हूँ। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिवा प्लानिंग कमिशन की चैयरमैन है और तीन दिन तक जहाँ यहाँ डिबेट हुई है उसका उन्होंने रिप्लाय दिया है, ईमानदारी के साथ कोई भी सदन का सम्मानित सदस्य बता दे कि एक पाइंट का भी उन्होंने मीट किया? एक पाइन्ट को भी मीट नहीं किया। (Interruptions) देनाए, डिबेट का एक अर्थ होता है। अन्त में मैं केवल इतना ही कह देना चाहता हूँ—

तु इधर उधर की न बात कर यह बता कि काफिले क्यों लटे,

हमें राह जनी से गरज नहीं, नेरी रहवरी का सवाल है।

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi): Sir, a very pertinent clarification

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Sir, this has been permitted. (Interruptions)
We are not going to make speeches.

(Interruptions).

श्री राजनारायण : इस तरह का रिप्लाय हमने कभी सुना नहीं। अगर कोई आनरेबिल सदन होता तो इस तरह के बोलने वाले को बैठा दिया जाता।

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Sir, the hon. Prime Minister referred to some of the ideas which have been mentioned here about self-reliance and about doing away with foreign aid and all that. Now, what I want to know is whether it is not a fact that right from the First Plan Document it has been held out before us that the country would become independent of foreign assistance at some date and that date has been postponed, Plan after Plan, gradually. (Interruptions) Now, is it proper. (Interruptions) Now, is it proper for us to consider or is it proper

for the hon. Prime Minister to decry the idea of a self-reliant Plan as a 'Never-Never Land'? We have always been. (Interruptions)..... We have always been assured of a time, of a stage, when we will be completely independent or self-dependent and now we have been kept by the government.

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: ... we have been kept by the government with the promise of the 'Never, Never Land'. We have always been promised with the date as coming. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the clarification? You are making a speech.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: No. I am asking whether we shall write off the possibility of having a self-reliant plan and self-reliant growth. If not, by when the government hopes to achieve it? (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, please sit down.

(Interruptions)

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: And, secondly, about the figures of unemployment. In the morning also, we exercised ourselves greatly to find out from the government as to why, if the methodology of estimating the unemployment figures was defective and we have lived with that defective methodology all these years, we cannot afford to leave that old methodology, if not for anything else at least for keeping the figures correctly.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. more speeches. Please sit down, please sit down.

(Interruptions)

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Is she prepared to answer?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I do not want any clarification. I want to make a submission. Before you proceed with voting I have a submission to make. In this House of ours, there are a dozen Members

[Shri Pitamber Das]

who have been nominated by the President of India for their special knowledge and practical experience in arts, science, literature and social services.

Sir, they are supposed to be non-aligned people that is not belonging to any political party. I would, therefore, appeal through you to them. . . . (*Interruptions*). At least give me a patient hearing. You may or may not agree with me, that is a different matter. I would, therefore, appeal to such nominated Members not to put their weight on this side or that side. Although they have a right to vote; they, in all fairness, should abstain from voting on this issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every Member has got a right to vote. I am now putting the amendments to vote.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Sir, since the Prime Minister has appealed to . . . withdraw our amendments. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the stage of voting has come.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Sir. . . .

(*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

1. "That at the end of the motion the following be added namely :

"and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that the Fourth Five Year Plan, 1969-74, embodies the same bankrupt policies underlying the earlier Plans which resulted in growing unemployment, inflationary rise in prices, increasing disparities in income between classes and sections of people and between States and regions in India, increasing dependence on foreign aid, further penetration of private foreign capital, increasing concentration of economic power and monopoly both in industrial and agricultural sector, continuance of feudal and semi-feudal relations and continued impoverishment of the broad masses of people, and therefore calls upon the Government of India to completely reverse these policies on the basis of the document submitted by the State Planning Board, Government of Kerala, on "Alternative Policies for the Fourth Five Year Plan"."

The motion was negatived

SHRI T. CHENGALVAROYAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I move for leave to withdraw my amendment.

*Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

"and having considered the same this House is of opinion that the Fourth Five Year Plan is a plan of surrender to the big bourgeoisie and that, contrary to the declared objectives, capitalist development has been sanctioned and encouraged in the Plan."

The motion was negatived

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Sir, with regard to my amendments (No. 4 and 5) I am pressing them by saying a few words.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No not at this stage. The Motion and all the amendments have already been discussed. So you have no right to speak now.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Sir, may I say in passing that since all our criticism have been like water thrown on the duck's back and her choice has fallen on Shri M. N. Kaul alone and since Shri M. N. Kaul does not constitute the entire Parliament and also since our criticisms have been treated with such indifference, we are constrained to treat her appeal to us to withdraw our amendments with the same contempt? Therefore I press my amendments. I would read out my Amendment No. 4.

My amendment reads. . .

SHRIMATI PURABHI MUKHOPADHYAY: While you are taking vote, is there any rule to prove that any speech. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is only reading the amendment.

SHRIMATI PURABHI MUKHOPADHYAY: You must observe certain rules.

*For text of amendment, *vide* Debate dated the 12th August, 1970.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: My amendment reads :

4. "and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that there should be a standing Committee of Parliament on Planning analogous in status to the Committee on Public Accounts or Public Undertakings to keep a watch on the implementation of the Plan and submit periodic reports on its progress."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

4 "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

"and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that there should be a Standing Committee of Parliament on Planning analogous in status to the Committee on Public Accounts or Public Undertakings to keep a watch on the implementation of the Plan and submit periodic reports on its progress".

The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—53; Noes—82.

AYES—53

Advani, Shri Lal K.
Anandan, Shri T. V.
Angre, Shri S. C.
Bhandari, Shri Sunder Singh
Bindumati Devi, Shrimati
Chatterjee, Shri A. P.
Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal
Chavda, Shri K. S.
Chengalvaroyan, Shri T.
Das, Shri Banka Bahary
Doogar, Shri R. S.
Ghosh, Shri N'ren
Goray, Shri N. G.
Gupta, Shri Balkrishna
Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.
Jain, Shri Rattan Lal
Kaul, Shri B. K.
Kemparaj, Shri B. T.
Mahanti, Shri B. K.
Mahavir, Dr. Bhai
Mandal, Shri B. N.
Mariswamy, Shri S. S.

Mathew Kurian, Dr. K.
Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad
Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Mitra, Shri P. C.
Mohammad Chaudhary A.
Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
Nawal Kishore, Shri
Panda, Shri K. C.
Pande, Shri C. D.
Patel, Shri T. K.
Pattanayak, Shri B. C.
Ptamber Das, Shri
Prem Manohar, Shri
Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shrimati
Rajnarain, Shri
R. ddy, Shri Mulka Govinda
Sahai, Shri Ram
Sardesai, Shri S. G.
Shah, Shri Manubhai
Shanta Vasisht, Kumari
Shejwalker, Shri N. K.
Sherkhan, Shri
Singh, Shri Sitaram
Singh, Shri T. N.
Thengari, Shri D.
Tripathi, Shri H. V.
Tyagi, Shri Mahavir
Varma, Shri Man Singh
Varma, Shri Niranjan
Yadav, Shri J. P.

NOES—82

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.
Ahmad, Shri Syed
Anandam, Shri M.
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah
Appan, Shri G. A.
Arora, Shri Arjun
Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore
Chandra Shekhar, Shri
Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprasad
Chaudhari, Shri N. P.
Das, Shri Balaram
Das, Shri Bipinpal
Dass, Shri Mahabir
Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
Dharia, Shri M. M.

Goswamy, Shri Sriman Prafulla
 Gujral, Shri I. K.
 Hussain, Shri Syed
 Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri
 Kaul, Shri M. N.
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali
 Kollur, Shri M. L.
 Krishan Kant, Shri
 Kulkarni Shri A. G.
 Kurup, Shri G. Sankara
 Maragatham Chandrasekhar, Shrimati
 Mehta, Shri Om
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mohamod Usman, Shri
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja
 Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar
 Nagpure, Shri V. T.
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati
 Narayani Devi Manaklal, Shrimati
 Neki Ram, Shri
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda
 Panjhzari, Sardar Raghbir Singh
 Patel, Shri Devdatt Kumar Kikabhai
 Patil, Shri P. S.
 Prithwi Nath, Shri
 Punniyah, Shri Kota
 Purabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati
 Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh
 Rajendran, Shri S. S.
 Raju, Shri V. B.
 Ramaswamy, Shri, K. S.
 Ramiah Dr. K.
 Reddy, Shri Gaddam Narayana
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunath
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa
 Roshan Lal, Shri
 Biren
 Salig Ram, Dr.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.
 Sarojin Krishna Rao Babar, Dr. Kumari
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati
 en, Dr. Trguna
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad
 Shulka, Shri Chakrapani
 Shulka. Shri M. P.

Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder
 Singh, Shri Dalpat
 Singh, Shri Jogendra
 Singh, Shri Triloki
 Sinha, Shri Awadheswhwar Prasad
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri
 Tilak, Shri J. S.
 Tiwari, Pt. Bhawani Prasad
 Tohra, Sardar Gurcharan Singh
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati
 Vimal Punjab Deshmuk, Shrimati
 Yadav, Shri Shaym Lal
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 5. Mr. Mishra, are you presenting this amendment?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then I put it to vote.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Let me read out my amendment before you put it to vote. And this should be the practice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I insisted even on the President's Address that you should give us the opportunity of reading it. And it was conceded at that time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendments have already been circulated to hon. Members and you need not read out your amendment No. 5 now.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Is it right? When we press any amendment, there is certain importance attaching to it.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM: On a point of order, Sir. All these years the convention or the rule has been that when a motion or an amendment is put to vote, at that time it is the Chair who has to read out the motion or the amendment, and it is not the mover of a motion

or an amendment who is to read out his notion or amendment at the time of voting. It will be setting a bad precedent for the first time today in the hon. Member's allowed to read out his amendment at his stage of voting on it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Actually, I had allowed the hon. Member to read his amendment earlier. But now, as there is some objection being raised to this procedure, I think the procedure that only the Chair is supposed to read out the amendments and put them to vote, and not the hon. Members who moved them earlier— is there is objection—I think we should follow the usual procedure.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: With regard to this point of order may I make this submission that at the time of the President's Address our point of view was conceded that the Member who moves an amendment, if he presses it, he will have the opportunity to read it out? And I had read out my amendment at that time

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So far as I remember, I think the amendments were read out by me only because I was presiding at that time, and I had to read all the amendments including, I think, four many in the name of Mr. Rajnarain.

श्री राजनारायण : डिप्युटी चेररमैन साहब, जेरा सुनिये । हमने खुद पढ़ा है अपना अमेन्डमेन्ट और हमेशा, बराबर, पालियामेन्टरी प्रैक्टिस इसको मानते हैं कि जब हमारा अमेन्डमेन्ट वोट को जाये तो उसको हम वापस क्यों ले रहे हैं, उसके निये एक दो मिनट हमको कहना पड़ता है । (Interruption) अरे आप बूर्जुआ दिमोक्रसी की बात कर रहे हैं, मैं डेमोक्रेटिक डिमोक्रसी की बात कर रहा हूँ ।

There is difference between you and myself.

श्री उपसभापति : आर्डर प्लीज ।

SHRI M. N. KAUL : Normally, to save time, the Chair does not read the amendments, but where an individual

Member desires that his amendment should be read, it should be read so that, as one Speaker humourously put it, the House would be persuaded by the intervening speeches and would know exactly what they are to vote on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I put amendment No. 5 standing in the name of Mr. S. N. Mishra.

श्री राजनारायण : सबका नाम पढ़िये ।

श्री उपसभापति : सुन लीजिए । सबका नाम होगा लेकिन अमेन्डमेन्ट केवल एक ही सदस्य ने मूव किया है । इसलिये बाकी सदस्यों के नाम की जरूरत नहीं होती है ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप तो ऐसा नीबेल नियम निकालना चाहते हैं जो न हमने सुना न समझा । लोगों को जानना चाहिये इस अमेन्डमेन्ट को मूव करने वाले कौन लोग हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : केवल एक सदस्य ने मूव किया है . . .

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये डिक्लेटोरियल वे मै चलाना चाहेंगे तो हमारा विरोध हो जायेगा ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

5. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:

"and having considered the same this House is of the opinion that the Plan should be recast with a view to creating adequate employment opportunities, ensuring price stability, fulfilling the basic needs of the people in terms of food, clothing, shelter, education, health, etc. by 1975-76, and giving greater attention to the backward areas and the backward sections of the society".

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

6. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that Government has failed to continue after 1968-69 the scheme of post-matric scholarships to Scheduled Caste Scheduled Tribe, denotified, nomadic, semi-nomadic Tribe and lower-Income Group students as a centrally sponsored scheme.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

7. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same this House is of the opinion that Government has failed to keep a constant watch on the progress, implementation of land reforms and the distribution of surplus lands available, due to the ceiling on land holdings, among the landless scheduled caste and scheduled tribe agricultural labourers.'

The Motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN The question is

8. "That at the end of the Motion' the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of the opinion that Government has failed to curb the increasing number of gruesome incidents of Harijans being burnt alive or murdered by the non-scheduled castes in the country.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

9. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Fourth Five Year Plan should be revised keeping in view the following programmes of action :

(a) land reforms by reducing the ceiling on land to 15 standard acres and omitting all the existing exemptions provided in the land reform laws and by giving peasant proprietorship to the tenants and actual tillers and by allotting surplus lands and waste lands to landless labour and small peasants, to be completed within 1970-71 ;

(b) inequality in the existin income should be reduced to have a disparity within 1: 10 at the maximum;

(c) industrial licensing policy should be revised not to allow larger business houses to get any further licences with a view to curb the power of monopolists in the economy;

(d) preparation of a phased programme to bring about 50 per cent of agricultural land under irrigation, either flow or lift, with in five years;

(e) effective steps to maintain price stability; and

(f) expansion of job opportunities to provide employment opportunities to unemployed youth of the country'."

Division.

श्री राजनारायण : हमारा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है . . .

(Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When I have called for division, there is no point of order.

श्री राजनारायण : आप कृपा करके मुनिए । ऐसी अनवश्यक बात मत कहा करिए ।

श्री उपसभापति : हमने डिबिजन काल किया है ।

श्री राजनारायण : यह जो 9 नम्बर का एमेंडमेन्ट है इसके अंग है ए बी सी डी ई एफ . . .

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order please.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: May I point out there cannot be any speech before a division?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: You are proceeding with absurdity, parliamentary absurdity.

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए । आपका पाइन्ट आफ आर्डर समझ में आ गया ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): This amendment is a very sensible one which embodies many of the policies at least in theory accepted by the Government. May I request the Government to accept it?

HON. MEMBER : No, no.

SARDAR RAGHBIR SINGH PANJHAZARI (Punjab : How can it be accepted?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. I have called for a division now.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: A sensible Government can accept a sensible amendment at any stage.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please sit down.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: Let there be freedom of conscience.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Now, with regard to voting on this, my submissions are two. One is that in (a) it is not clear and, therefore, we would like clarification . . .

HON. MEMBER : No, no.

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : यह राज्यसभा है, इसका स्तर मत लोअर करो ।

श्री उपसभापति : मिश्र जी, आपको क्या कहना है ?

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि रूलिग पार्टी की जो जिम्मेदारियाँ हैं अगर वे आप उनसे नहीं निभवाएंगे तो हमें आपके साथ सहयोग करना मुश्किल हो जायगा । (Interruption) रूलिग पार्टी हल्ला पार्टी हो रही है ।

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh): The ruling party must not be unruly.

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : आपने देखा जब माननीय प्रधान मंत्री महोदया बोल रही थीं... (Interruptions)

SHRI K. K. SHAH : When a division, is called and when votes are to be taken you are asking for clarification.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Voting for what?

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : जब माननीया प्रधान मंत्री बोल रही थीं तो हम लोगों का एक आदमी भी शोर नहीं कर रहा था ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: During division stage there can be no point of order.

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : मैं आप से पूछ रहा हूँ । आप हमारा संरक्षण करें । मेरा कहना यह है कि अमेंडमेन्ट में जहाँ पर हदबन्दी की बात आयी है, सीलिंग की बात आयी है तो वहाँ क्वालिटी आफ लैड् के बारे में कोई जिक्र किया गया है ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a clarification about the amendment. If you want to say anything about the voting, you can say about the voting.

SHRI N. G. GORAY: They are finding it difficult to decide.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: We are finding it difficult to understand. We are not quite clear about the concept of 15 acres, so it will be difficult for us to vote. Therefore, my submission would be that you should ask for voting separately.

(Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, please. Amendment No. 9 is one complete amendment. It cannot be separated in parts.

श्री राजनारायण : आप क्या बात करते हैं ? इस अमेंडमेन्ट के सब्सटेंशियली अलग अलग पार्ट्स हैं . . . (Interruption)

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिये मैं बोल रहा हूँ ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप बैठिये बैठिये क्या कर रहे हैं ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order order.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: It is not the proper way of conducting business.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I will have my say. The House should be conducted in a proper way. एक अमेंडमेंट है, उसके अलग अलग अंग हैं और उस के अलग अलग गुण दोष हैं...

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिये, मैं बोल रहा हूँ।

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Since it is a matter of procedure, we should seriously consider the implications of the procedure. It is correct that it may be very difficult for Members to agree with some and disagree with other portions of the amendment. Therefore, if we have a block voting, that difficulty would arise. (*Interruption*). Have patience. The difficulty is genuine, but if the movers of the amendment were keen on having the support on some portions of the amendment, then he should not have taken the risk of putting all of them together in one amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are right there.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: He ought to have broken it up into many portions. That is how the amendments should have come for voting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As pointed out by Mr. Pitamber Das. ...

श्री राजनारायण : उत्तर प्रदेश में जमीनदारी एवालिशन बिल पास हुआ था...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please sit down?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: On this point of order, I beg to submit that if any Member has any objection to any clause of this amendment, then he ought to have given notice of amendment to amendment. So long as that is not given, vote should be taken on the whole amendment.

श्री राजनारायण : यह तो हमारी डिफिकल्टी नहीं है।

श्री उपसभापति : इस के बाद भी आप को समझ में नहीं आ रहा है।

श्री राजनारायण : आप जो प्रोसीजर एडाप्ट कर रहे हैं वह गलत है क्योंकि हर अमेंडमेंट के अलग अलग गुण हैं उस के कई अंग हैं...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. As I have said already, if the mover of the amendment wanted to have separate amendments on separate subjects, he could have definitely moved separate amendments. Even if the mover of the amendment has moved one amendment covering various subjects, as pointed out by Mr. Tyagi any other Member could have moved an amendment to his amendment asking for deletion of certain portions. But nobody has moved any amendment to this amendment. So I have now to put amendment No. 9 as a whole

श्री राजनारायण : आप की व्यवस्था से हमारी असहमति है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

9. "That at the end of the Motion the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the Fourth Five Year Plan should be revised keeping in view the following programmes of action—

(a) land reforms by reducing the ceiling on land to 15 standard acres and omitting all the existing exemptions provided in the land reform laws and by giving peasant proprietorship to the tenants and actual tillers and by allotting surplus lands and waste lands to landless labour and small peasants, to be completed within 1970-71.

(b) inequality in the existing income should be reduced to have a disparity within 1:10 at the maximum;

(c) industrial licensing policy should be revised not to allow larger business houses to get any further licences with a view to curb the power of monopolists in the economy;

(d) preparation of a phased programme to bring about 50 per cent of agricultural land under irrigation, either low or lift, within five years;

(e) effective steps to maintain price stability; and

(f) expansion of job opportunities to provide employment opportunities to unemployed youth of the country.”

The House divided:

Ayes 13

Noes 79

AYES—13

Chatterjee, Shri A. P.

Das, Shri Banka Behari

Ghosh, Shri Niren

Goaray, Shri N. G.

Mahanti, Shri B. K.

Mandal, Shri B. N.

Mathew Kurian, Dr. K.

Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania

Pattanayak, Shri B. C.

Rajnarain, Shri

Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda

Sardesai, Shri S. G.

Shanta Vasisht, Kamari

NOES—79

Abdul Samaud, Shri A. K. A.

Ahmad, Shri Syed

Anandam, Shri M.

Ansari, Shri Hayatullah

Appan, Shri G. A.

Bachchan, Dr. H. R.

Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore

Chandra Shekhar, Shri

Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprasad

Chaudhari, Shri N. P.

Das, Shri Balram

Das, Shri Bipinpal

Dass, Shri Mahabir

Deshmukh, Shri T. G.

Dharia, Shri M. M.

Goswami, Shri Srinan Prafulla

Gujral, Shri I. K.

Hussain, Shri Syed

Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri

Kaul, Shri M. N.

Khaitan, Shri R. P.

Khan, Shri Akbar Ali

Kollur, Shri M. L.

Krishan Kant, Shri

Kulkarni, Shri A. G.

Kurup, Shri G. Sankara

Maragatham Chandrasekhar, Shrimati

Mehta, Shri Om

Mishra, Shri L. N.

Mohamod Usman, Shri

Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja

Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar

Nagpure, Shri V. T.

Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati

Narayani Devi Manaklal, Shrimati

Neki Ram, Shri

Panda, Shri Brahmananda

Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh

Patel, Shri Devdatt Kumar Kikabhai

Patil Shri, P. S.

Prithwi Nath, Shri

Punnaiah, Shri Kota

Purabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati

Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh

Rajendran, Shri S. S.

Raju, Shri V. B.

Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.

Reddy, Shri Gaddam Narayana

Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha

Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa

Roy, Shri Biren

Salig Ram, Dr.

Samuel, Shri M. H.

Sanjivayya, Shri D.

garojini Krishnarao Babar, Dr. Kumari

Satyavati Dang, Shrimati

Sen, Dr. Triguna

Shah, Shri K. K.

Sharma, Shri Anant Prasad

Shukla, Shri Chakrapani

Shukla, Shri M. P.

Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati

Singh, Shri Bhupinder

Singh, Shri Dalpat

Singh, Shri Jogendra

Singh, Shri Triloki

Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad

Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri
 Tilak, Shri J. S.
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad
 Tohra, Sardar Gurcharan Singh
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati
 Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati
 Yadav, Shri Shyam Lal
 Yajce, Shri Sheel Bhadra.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

10. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that the professed social objectives of the Plan cannot be achieved without basic structural changes in our economy and without a radical change of the implementing agencies'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

11. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely :

"and having considered the same, this House is of opinion that there is no mention therein of any measures to solve the problem of unemployment and similarly there is no

provision therein for the development of Madhya Pradesh".

The motion was negatived.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE. DERAILMENT OF TRAIN NO. 40 DOWN DELHI-HOWRAH JANATA-EXPRESS NEAR THE DOWN DISTANT SIGNAL OF KHAGA STATION OF NORTHERN RAILWAY ON 12TH AUGUST, 1970 AND SUBSEQUENT SIDE COLLISION OF TRAIN NO. 7 UP TOOFAN EXPRESS WITH THE DERAILED COACHES OF 40 DOWN JANATA EXPRESS

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Deputy Railway Minister will now make some statement regarding railway accidents.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI ROHAN LAL CHATURVEDI): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is a long statement...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You lay it on the Table.

SHRI ROHANLAL CHATURVEDI: I lay the statement on the Table. [Placed in library. See No. LT-4018/70.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A. M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-two minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 14th August, 1970.