

Besides we have also brought to the notice of the House the disclosures of John Smith and some of these have been corroborated by the subsequent publication by Mr. B. M. Kaul and other publications also. Why are these things not gone into? Mr. Chavin said that he had enquired into it when we raised this matter in 1967. I believe in this House. But since then no disclosures have come. The Government knows that John Smith has even written a letter the facsimile of which has been published in papers pointing out as to who were acting in the Army and the Government as C.I.A. agents. I should like to know whether they have held any concrete investigations into such cases including the financing of the cases against the leftist parties in this country.

I think Madam hon. Members can cite other examples if they like. I have cited certain concrete cases on the floor of the House. I am entitled at least to an answer. I leave upon the Government again and again to come out with an answer.

Before I sit down I would urge that whatever they may do these concrete specific allegations that I have made and others have made on the floor of the House about the financing of very many things by the U.S. Embassy should be directly gone into by the Intelligence Branch and the Home Minister should come and make a specific statement on the specific charges as I have made.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN That will do now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA Bugtaderi Sen has not been asked as to where he gets the money from.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA and how much he was paying to Mr. Chigla. They have not asked Mr. Chigla. They have not asked me. I say C.I.A. intelligence is really financing them.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA Madam whenever any instances come to our notice whether inside the House or outside the House we do make discreet enquiries

into all of them and collect such information as we can to take suitable action. But it is not correct and it would not be proper to disclose and make open enquiries in such matters. Therefore it is not possible for us to say what action we have exactly taken and what action we are going to take on the basis of such information. Madam here in this statement I have made specific points and I have also indicated what action the Government wants to take in pursuance of the conclusions they have come to.

I have confirmed that foreign money has been used in the last election. This confirmation has come from the Government. I have also said that in several educational and cultural institutions it is suspected that such assistance might have been received. We have already taken action against one such institution. Action will be taken against such other institutions in future whenever our enquiries confirm or doubts exist for such action to be taken.

As far as preventive action is concerned I have indicated what preventive action we want to take in this regard. May be that further action may be necessary in future. But we have to be very careful. The Government will constantly review this problem because this is not a problem which can be ignored. We will have to constantly review this problem and see that we keep on meeting the threat of this external subversion in this manner.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN Mr. Kishan Kant

*(Interruption by Shri Raghunath)*

No more. We cannot go on in this way. We have to look to the time also.

MOTION FOR THE FOURTH FIVE YEAR PLAN 1969-74 (DRAFT)—*contd.*

SHRI KRISHAN KANT HANUWA Madam Deputy Chairman while I welcome the Fourth Five Year Plan which has after all come out and its Draft placed on the Table of the House I fully agree with what Mr. A. P. Jais said that the very functioning of the Plan is very important for this

country because if planning does not function properly the whole economy can really go out of gear.

Madam, the Plan has been prepared under the able leadership of Dr. Gadgil. Dr. Gadgil is known not only for having a great insight into the Indian economy but also for his bold and unconventional analysis. Madam, the very first chapter of this Draft Report indicates how conscious the Deputy Chairman and his colleagues were about the problems that they have to tackle in this country and the attempt they have to make in solving them.

The reading of the First Chapter is a great delight. It gives the proper approach in which the whole problem has to be solved. But, Madam, the very moment when we go to the Second, Third and the last chapter we do not find any correlation between what has been said in the First Chapter and the last Chapter, there is no connection.

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. ble Minister and the House to the very salutary quotations from the Directive Principles which have been given on page 1 of this Chapter which, for the first time, underlines the importance which the Government and the Planning Commission attach to this. It says —

The State shall endeavour to provide . . .”

(Interruptions from Congress Bench)

Madam, shall I speak or do they speak?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. You will speak. I am looking at you.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): Madam, the Congress Parliamentary Party election has created such a turmoil here that even Mr. Venkatasubbiah has hung a sign board in front of the Congress Party office which says ‘P. Venkatasubbiah, Secretary A.I.C.C.’ I do not know if the Congress Party can have any office here. It is an intrusion into the Parliament House. The point is it should not be allowed to be put there. Who allowed him to do so? There must be some enquiry. Madam, Parliament is not the A.I.C.C. office.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not want any discussion on that now. Mr. Krishan Kant, please continue.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Madam, Deputy Chairman, I was referring to the ‘Approach and Policy’ in the very first chapter that underline the importance of the functions which the Plan has to undertake. In it they quote the Directive Principles which shows the importance they attach to the subject. It says —

The State shall endeavour to provide, within a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of fourteen years.”

Madam, if you look at what they have done in the last 18 years of planning on page 280 where the matter of education has been dealt with, it is clear that though they have quoted the Directive Principle in the Approach and Policy chapter, the achievement that they expect at the end of the Fourth Plan is that only 60.9 per cent of the children in this country will be going in for primary education. That shows that the Directive Principles to which they refer in the first Chapter are not to be implemented even at the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan.

Going further:—

The State shall promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people and in particular of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation.”

Now, Madam, it is really very difficult to imagine how they will do it. On pages 59 and 60 of the Draft Plan the extent of the Third Plan and the outline of the Fourth Plan has been given. It shows that the outlay in the Third Plan was about Rs. 8,577 crores which has risen to Rs. 14,397 crores. It means an increase of 67 per cent. But what has been increased in the outlay for the welfare of the backward classes and Scheduled Castes and others. From Rs. 991 crores it has gone up to Rs. 1,443 crores which means hardly an increase of 44 per cent. After reading this the impression that

one gets is that the Plan has been drafted by an old man who has all pious wishes and prayers to God for the children of India but the moment he tries to implement it he feels tired.

Madam, I do not want to repeat the good points which Mr. A. P. J. has already referred to yesterday. Now though the Planning Commission says that it will try to keep a control over the inflationary tendencies, what precise measures has it to offer with regard to a wage-income and price policy for the country? Madam, perhaps you may know that a few years back the Reserve Bank of India had organised a study on the need for evolving a national policy of prices, wages and incomes. But this Plan does not refer to this policy at all; it has not even commented on the recommendations of the study group of the Reserve Bank. A policy of prices, wages and incomes is very important. This is the basis on which the whole super structure of the Plan can function. If this policy is not there, it cannot function and the whole super structure of Plan will fail. Now what do we find here? It is surprising that the Government has gradually been reducing the number of industries which are under price regulations. Sixteen industries have been taken out of the price regulations. I do not know how they will control the prices. Similarly, in regard to the private sector, the salaries remain uncontrolled which adds to the avoidable cost of production. Even the census of manufacturers has revealed that the non-manufacturing cost in the private sector has been continuously rising during the last 10 years. The gap between the cost of production and the price that the consumer pays has continued to remain large. Unless these profits are reduced and an income-price policy is evolved in the private sector, the gap between performance and expectations would continue to be large. So, Madam, this is a very basic lacuna that this Plan contains.

I may now refer, before going to other things, to science. I am very glad that the Prime Minister, while speaking at the first meeting of the COST, said that there should be a correlation between performance in science and technology and our objectives to achieve self-reliance. It means that correlation needs to be built up so that our scientific research becomes purposive and that

there should be correlation between the development schemes in the Plan. But, Madam, I am afraid there is nothing like that either in the Planning Commission or in the COST or anywhere in the country. Prof. Mahalanobis said even three years back that even after three Plans we have no Science Plan in the country. When I suggested last year that there should be a Science Plan, the Government did not accept it. I fear that without a Science Plan it is not possible to fulfil the other plans because it is on the basis of scientific research, basic and applied, that our industry, agriculture, transport and irrigation and power have to grow. Unless that conclusion is there, this gap between planning and performance will remain. The main thing is that we must identify the areas which are growing points of science which are likely to yield results, and this is not possible unless there is a separate Science Plan for the country as there is in France and some other countries are trying to evolve.

Now, Madam, no mention has been made in this Plan document about the Plan document that was produced in 1966 by the previous Planning Commission, but if we compare the two documents, what do we find? We find in the present draft under the heading Science and Scientific Research only the National Laboratories of the CSIR, Atomic Energy and Scientific Surveys in the Ministry of Education. But there is no mention of Medical and Public Health, Agriculture, Irrigation and Power and Defence. Does it mean that Science does not include these things? As a matter of fact, the allocations for this sector gets merged in the allocation of respective sectors in general. It does not give a clear picture. In the Third Plan at least an attempt was made to collect the relevant data for these sectors and also to consolidate their development schemes at one place. It was expected that in the Fourth Plan the programmes and allocations for the totality of scientific research would be presented in a consolidated form so that the whole scientific plan could be discussed in the proper perspective of the economic plan. Madam, if we compare the previous Plan draft with the present Plan, there is a great difference in the emphasis on science and scientific research. Though some mention has been made about the application of research and all that, there is no mention of scientific

research its role and functions, to achieve self-reliance, in the whole perspective. Does it mean that the vision or the thinking that was there has gone? There was specific mention in the old Plan—Dr. Rao is here and he must be knowing—to increase the expenditure on scientific research with a view to attaining technological self-reliance. At least that was the aim. But it is nowhere mentioned in the present Five-Year Plan. I am glad that the Prime Minister in her opening speech mentioned about development, etc. But about augmenting design and development facilities there is no mention at all. I do not know whether she was conscious of this lacuna in the present draft which needs to be rectified. My own personal feeling, after reading this Plan draft, is that the emphasis on science that she wants is not there. That is why I said that there is no correlation with regard to what has been stated in the first chapter of the draft Plan.

As regards allocations for the C.S.I.R., Atomic Energy, etc., in the Fourth Plan the allocation for Plan expenditure is Rs. 133.96 crores and for non-plan expenditure Rs. 189.25 crores, total Rs. 323.21 crores. Now, Madam, for calculating the required non-plan expenditure, we have to take into account the normal annual increment in expenditure and the normal expected rise in prices. Accordingly, if we calculate on the basis of the Third Plan and the annual Plans, the requirement of non-plan expenditure would be Rs. 258 crores on the basis of the Third Plan, and Rs. 297 crores on the basis of the annual Plans. The amount provided in the draft is Rs. 189 crores. So, there is a gap of Rs. 68 crores on the basis of the Third Plan, and a gap of Rs. 108 crores on the basis of the annual Plans. Now, what does this mean? Since it may not be possible to increase the allocation now, it would erode or eat into the Plan expenditure for scientific research. So, as a matter of fact, there will be no development in scientific research. This point, therefore, needs to be looked into very carefully and unless this is done, I do not think science and scientific research will progress in any way.

Madam, the main thing is that investment in scientific research has to be made in such a way that it is correlated with investments in industry, agriculture and other fields.

But if we look at the first, second and third Plans, what do we find? In one Plan there is emphasis on irrigation and power and in the other, on industry, and so on, but there is no correlation between scientific research, and development in other fields in any particular Plan, or between the allocations and targets. The main thing that has to be seen is whether our allocations, vision and thinking are correctly correlated or not. Now I have a paper with me called "Investment on Scientific Research and Development—A sectoral analysis". From the figures given there we find . . . (*Time bell rings*) I will just take five minutes more. At least in areas where we are having foreign collaboration, attempts should have been made to develop scientific research in those sectors. In areas like machinery, electrical equipment, chemicals, transport equipment, etc., we are having foreign collaboration. But there is no scientific research there. Our import bill is very high. Instead of developing research in this direction, where for the last 3 years 50 per cent of our foreign exchange is spent, we have not spent any amount for research in that period. Madam, what do we find? We find a complete lack of scientific research because of a distortion in our thinking. So unless science is correlated to our planning, this will not suit us. This is the basic defect. That is what I say unless there is correlation between science and planning—I use the economic term "correlated"—I do not think this lacuna can in any way be removed. Even in our public sector undertakings, what do we find there? There is no development research in the public sector undertakings. They have no correlation with our national laboratories. Unless the national laboratories become consultants of these public sector undertakings, I do not think it will really be possible in any way to have self-sufficient economy and economic plans. This correlation is very much necessary. But what do we find in our universities also? In our universities the same subjects which we were teaching before independence—chemistry, mathematics, biology, etc.—are being taught now without any modification whereas subjects like electronics—modern scientific and technological subjects—have become part of the curricula of university education in all foreign countries. But in India the standards of subjects like even Mathematics have

completely gone down after independence, a subject which is the basic thing for scientific development and research . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must wind up now. Your time is over. It is already 1 O'clock.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I hope the Prime Minister while replying to the debate will keep in mind the need for science planning in this country and see that something is done in this subject because I know she has so much interest in this.

Then, I have got just one point more, Madam, and that is about the concentration of economic wealth and power. On page 2 it is said that the first benefits of economic development must accrue more and more to the relatively less privileged classes of the society and there should be a progressive reduction in the concentration of economic power. But, what do we find. Madam? They say on page 8 that we have no data. After 18 years of planning, there are no data on the economic disparities. Perhaps the data which are available are very much difficult for the people to digest. The Agricultural Labour Enquiry Committee's report of 1957 showed the *per capita* income of agricultural labour as Rs. 107. In 1962 the report of that Committee stated that this *per capita* income had gone down to Rs. 100. Our planning is increasing. We are working. But the *per capita* income of agricultural labour, the lowest rung of the ladder in the country, has gone down from Rs. 107 to Rs. 100 . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. You must wind up now.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Eightytwo per cent of our population has an income which is lower than Re. 1 per day. Madam, you see what is happening in big business houses. Take, for example, the Mafatlal Group. They have increased their assets by more than 100 per cent during the last three years while our *per capita* national income is going down. The big business houses like the Birlas and others are becoming richer, at whose cost? At the cost of the common man. While replying to the debate I hope the Prime Minister will reply to this point. Are we really trying to achieve our objective? I find in the Plan that the emphasis

is more on the private sector. It has increased by 40 per cent. The outlay that has been given in this Plan has increased from Rs. 6,000 crores to Rs. 10,000 crores to the private sector. But if we have to achieve new heights in our planned economy, we have to give more to the public sector. And then let us come to the financial institutions. When these financial institutions were supposed to give only Rs. 130 crores in the Third Plan, what happened in the private sector was that it got Rs. 360 crores. Are we trying to build up the private sector? The main question that I would like to ask the Government is this. There should be a committee to examine the working of the public sector and there should be an inquiry into the working of the private sector. There should be a regular examination of how the private sector is functioning. Only after making such an examination can we say that the private sector is really better than the public sector.

Madam, I hope the lacunae which I have pointed out will be taken into consideration and removed by the Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chatterjee will speak next. The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock. THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) in the Chair.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are facing now the Fourth Plan which is just a draft that has been presented before us. The very fact that after three years of plan holiday the Fourth plan has come before us, that itself perhaps is a welcome feature because we had almost thought that our country will live from hand to mouth and the annual plans will be the order of the day. In fact certain monopolistic concerns and interests in the country were bringing pressure to bear upon the Indian Government that the Indian Government should not try to formulate a Fourth Plan and should be satisfied with the annual plans and the annual plan outlays, as they would call it and in that way they wanted in a

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

manner to stall the growth of any industry and other branches of economy on the part of India. Even now the Fourth Plan that has come before us is a plan wherein we find that the expenditure in the public sector has been reduced to the minimum and this is not a plan with such a bold vision and outline, at least with such a bold vision and outline which was at least announced in the Third and Second Plans. No doubt in a capitalistic economy however bold we may be in our announcements and pronouncements, really the mountain is in the labour and the product is the proverbial mouse. Actually we have been through three plans, the First Plan, the Second Plan and the Third Plan, and we know that after going through all these plans, the economy of our country went from bad to worse. Nothing tangible was achieved by the Indian economy except increase in unemployment, dependence on foreign aid and in the amount of foreign loans that are to be repaid and the higher amount of interest that has to be planned out for the servicing of those loans. Of course so far as corruption is concerned, that also has become so rampant that people have begun to think of it as a concomitant of the Congress rule in the country. This is the position now. As far as the other points of advancement are concerned employment or educational, we are almost where we were in the very beginning. Naturally so, because the socialistic pattern of society which was announced with such a fanfare at the time of the announcement of the Third Plan, the very coining of the term itself proves that it was not socialism but something else. That has been the bane so to say of not only Indian economists but Indian politicians also. Regarding economic policy, unless you know how to trim your policy to progressive objectives, you really cannot put the best foot forward and you cannot even advance. It is the formulation of the policy which really determines in what way we shall progress and which determines the line for development; but the Indian Government as in foreign affairs, similarly in internal affairs is always trying to beat a third track so to say. That may be a kind of tight-rope dancing for which you have got encomiums and praise from certain interested sections and that may give a certain amount of self-satisfaction to certain persons who may

think that by this tight-rope dancing and by such third-road walking they are doing something miraculous. It may give some self-satisfaction to those persons but the whole point is this, that even after this hard third road tracking and the tight-rope dancing, what we find is that our economy is now in shambles. We have been, in the international sector, trying to tell the entire world that we are neutralists, we are non-aligned, etc., but how can you be non-aligned and how can you be independent in your foreign policy when we find that the proportion of foreign debt to the entire public debt of India is as high as 45 per cent? What was 1 per cent in 1955-56 has risen to 45 per cent now. If that is so, then we can easily visualise what will be our position either in point of prestige or dignity in the international comity of nations. Therefore we find that when there is the question of recognition of East Germany, we find that the West Germans and the American imperialists and the junior partner of the American imperialists—Great Britain are bringing pressure to bear on us and we find it difficult to give diplomatic recognition to East Germany. It is due to these influences of the foreign concerns, the foreign imperialists that we have been compelled to stop trade with North Vietnam and Cuba. I know that the Government will try to explain this by saying about strategic materials and non-strategic materials and they will try to split hairs in order to show that really it is not stoppage of trade but to call a spade a spade, it is quite clear that as far as Cuba and North Vietnam are concerned, we have stopped trade with them. We have stopped trade because the imperialists do not like us to continue to trade with Cuba and North Vietnam. This is because that our debt has increased so much and we depend so much on foreign aid. This is the position. The position has come to this pass that in spite of our non-alignment and in spite of so many protestations about peace and our aspirations for good neighbourliness, we have not been able to settle our problems with our neighbours, Pakistan and China. Well, I do not say that if you cease to be frigid, immediately China and Pakistan will begin to respond. I do not say that. But the frigidity on our part remains and we have not been able to reorientate our attitude to these neighbours. And because of this lack of orientation, lack of a helpful attitude towards these

neighbours, two disastrous results are flowing. One result is this that we are spending one thousand crores of rupees per year on a so-called defence. I say so-called defence because we are trying to defend our country with rifles borrowed from Great Britain and bullets borrowed from America. So that is a kind of so-called defence. Because we depend so much upon that, perhaps when there will be the question of a real military confrontation with either of them, then we shall find that the bullets perhaps may not be coming, and the rifles may not be coming. But yet we will be spending one thousand crores of rupees per year for so-called defence. Now Mr Vice-Chairman, this one thousand crores of rupees for defence, we could have saved if the frugidity in our relations with China and Pakistan were increased. And Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, our position has become so ridiculous now, in days that we assess the relations of the different countries of the world towards us on the basis of what they are giving to Pakistan or what they are giving to China. Well, whenever Prime Minister Kosygin comes to arrive in India or whenever an emissary from our country comes to visit the Soviet Union, the only topic of conversation that we hit upon for a conversation with the Premier of the Soviet Union is this: Why are you giving so much arms to Pakistan, and is that not a blow in your relationship with Pakistan and obditiying or straining of relations with us. We have begun to look upon the relations of other countries with Pakistan and China as a touchstone for the friendliness of those countries with us. That is a great danger, and that danger has attacked and raided our own theory of foreign relations and our entire infrastructure and superstructure of foreign relations with other countries. Now this is the position in regard to foreign countries. What I am trying to put forward before you, Mr Vice-Chairman, is this that in every sector of our public life we have been failing, and we have failed in our foreign relations, and we are failing in our economic sphere also.

Look at the economic sphere in our country, the industrial sector. Well, with all these three Plans what we find is that where the Gross National Product was 8.4 per cent in 1961, in 1967 it dwindled down to 1.4 per cent. In the Second Five Year Plan we declared from the rostrum, from the house

tops, peeping out from the balconies and from the windows of our houses, we said that we shall double our national income in 1970-71. Of course there we have well, modified our promise a little, and we have said this in its place, namely that we shall double our national income by 1975-76. But Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is a question of mathematics. If you well continue to increase your national income at 1.29 per cent, as we are doing, we shall double our national income well not in 1975-76. But fifty-five more years more will be required, and we shall do it perhaps at the end of the twentieth century, perhaps at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Perhaps it may be well. I do not say whether we shall be back to Methuselah or whether Methuselah will be back in our midst, but it may be that then also we will be thinking of doubling our national income. This is what I am saying.

*(Interruptions)*

It is quite clear, Mr Vice-Chairman, that as far as Indian Government is concerned, capitalist-oriented is it, it cannot solve any of our problems. *(Interruptions)* Mr Vice-Chairman, look at the industrial sector once again. Look at the increase in the assets of the monopolistic concerns. In 1960 the Monopolies Enquiry Commission has mentioned in its report—that Commission gave its report perhaps after the three Five Year Plans were over—and we find there that 70 business houses are owning 19 per cent of the entire assets of India, and 41 are owning about all the entire paid-up capital of non-Government non-banking companies. And what we heard from Mr Morarji Desai, the hon. Deputy Prime Minister, the other day when we were discussing the Finance Bill, the hon. the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister, Mr Morarji Desai said: Well, that is bound to happen because after all those who have already shown larger success in a particular field, naturally we don't want to restrict their activities. Of course he might not have said it so bluntly, but that is what he meant. Even in the Hazari Committee's Report, the Hazari Committee cannot be said to be hostile to the big business, and partial to the other entrepreneurs—the Government, it has been said in that report that, as far as the licensing policy of the Government

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee]

of India is concerned, the licences tend to be given to the monopolistic concerns on the ground that the monopolistic concerns are thought to be more efficient in industrial production. Therefore, all the coal is carried to Newcastle because Newcastle is a place where coal abounds. This is the mechanism which is being followed in this country. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are finding Congressmen like Mr. Krishan Kant because he said—it is not my case—because he said a little while ago, just before me, that within a few years Birla has increased his assets by 70 per cent. Perhaps he said that Birla has increased his assets by 74 per cent. Now this is the result of the three Five-Year Plans. And what we see as far as we are concerned? We are finding this that unemployment is increasing, we are finding the engineers, the top technically qualified persons, young men, in the country, we are finding that they are now almost on hunger strike. They are knocking at the gates of Parliament in order to find avenues for employment. And what more do we find? We find that the public sector is being scuttled. Even in this Fourth Five-Year Plan we find—it has been admitted here—that they are not going to do much. May I just read one portion from that, one portion from paragraph, paragraph 1.31 on 'Approach and Policy'?

'These measures which seek to limit the extent of foreign aid and resort to inflationary financing have their impact on the total investment outlays proposed in the Plan. The outlays are modest.' \*\*\*

That is to say, shorn of euphemistic phrases what appears is this that the Government of India in its so-called Fourth Five-Year Plan is not giving as much attention to the public sector as it should have given. They are scuttling the public sector. This is the beginning of the end that we can easily see if the Fourth Five-Year Plan does not give any attention to the public sector. It is quite clear; perhaps in the Fifth Five-Year Plan they will say, "It is better to go on with private planning of the private sector. Let the public sector go. Let the public sector be debunked."

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we have come to this position because of the faulty economic planning and the faulty dependence

upon foreign aid. As far as foreign aid is concerned, we are finding this that these foreigners, they are taking away not merely the profits of the concerns that they have set up in this country, with the connivance of the Indian Government, they are even repatriating the capital outside the country. Can the Indian Government not put a moratorium on the flight of profit from this country by foreign concerns? Can the Government not put a moratorium on the repatriation of capital from this country? Mr. Vice Chairman, they say they will have to depend upon foreign sources for aid. And saying that they say that if we do not go to foreign sources for aid then perhaps our planning may be stopped. Mr. Vice-Chairman, we, leftists, have been giving certain concrete proposals to the Government of India but our suggestions are not being heeded at all. We have been saying that we should put a ceiling upon the profits of the monopolistic concerns and whatever profit is earned by the monopolistic concerns above that ceiling it should be mopped off as loan if not confiscated and used to augment our resources. As far as the monopolistic concerns are concerned we know that 75 Houses have captured so many industries. What stands in the way of the Government nationalising those concerns? These concerns could be nationalised immediately. Mr. Vice Chairman, we have also said that, as far as the question of resources is concerned, resources can be got by a greater trimming of expenditure. We have said that if the price line is properly kept down then domestic savings can also give a lot of contribution to national resources. The domestic savings position is so bad that once it was only 8.5 per cent then it rose to 11.5 per cent and now it has dwindled down to 6.4 per cent again. The reason is this. The price policy is so bad; the inflationary trend is so bad that the ordinary common man from whom we have to get the savings has to spend everything on the necessities of life. Therefore nothing is left with them to save. So I say the approach to the Plan has to be reoriented. The socialistic pattern which has been repeated like a mantra so to say by the Government won't do. Merely chanting those words will not create any magic effect. What they should do is, they should take certain radical measures in regard to monopolies, in regard

to land reforms. They should see that land is not grabbed by the feudal landlords but the land goes to the tiller and that the landlords and the moneylenders do not keep them stranglehold upon the ordinary agricultural labourer, on the ordinary poor peasant or the middle class peasant. As far as industries are concerned we have to depend more and more on our national talents. Why should we go for designing and for equipment erection to foreigners? They may give us a blue print but we can use our own national talent for erection of plants and for designing. By giving this work of designing and erection of plants to foreigners we are throwing away crores of rupees. So we have given many concrete proposals and unless the Government listens to the Opposition and unless the Government gears its economy to the real social objectives there cannot be a real healthy socialist Fourth Five Year Plan. But perhaps I am crying in the wilderness from this Government which is capitalist-oriented.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Not capitalist oriented but capitalist through and through.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I accept the amendment. From this Government which is capitalist through and through we cannot help a healthy socialist Plan. Perhaps it is a cry in the wilderness if we ask for that.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश): श्रीमन्, हम लोग इस चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना पर विचार कर रहे हैं और इसके बारे में करीब चार साल से चर्चा चल रही है। देखा जाय तो चौथी योजना के बारे में पहला प्रतिवेदन आया है 1965 ई० में और अगस्त 1966 ई० में चौथी योजना का प्रारूप पेश हुआ है जब कि अप्रैल 1966 ई० से चौथी योजना आरम्भ हो जानी चाहिये थी, और चौथी योजना का दृष्टिकोण मई 1968 ई० में आया और चौथी योजना का प्रारूप मार्च 1969 ई० में आया। तो चार प्रकार से यह चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना इस देश की जनता के सामने विभिन्न समयों पर प्रस्तुत की गई। अब जिस रूप में यह

आई है उसको भी यदि अच्छी तरह से देखा जाय तो मैं बहुत ही सफाई के साथ यह कह सकता हूँ कि यह योजना भी विश्वसनीय नहीं है, न तो इस योजना पर सरकार को विश्वास है और न तो इस योजना पर देश की जनता को विश्वास है। यह योजना किस समय अधर में लटक जायगी इसकी भविष्यवाणी कोई कर नहीं सकता।

तो आखिर यह दिक्कत क्यों पड़ी? क्यों तीन पंचवर्षीय योजना समाप्त होने के बाद जो योजना की प्रक्रिया थी वही समाप्त हो गई? इस पर अच्छे प्रकार से सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को विचार करना चाहिये और जब तक इस पर विचार नहीं करेंगे तब तक इस योजना के गुण और दोष को अच्छी प्रकार से हृदयगम नहीं कर पायेंगे। मेरे नजदीक चौथी योजना को अंतिम रूप इसलिये नहीं दिया जा सका कि विदेशी सहायता और विशेष रूप से अमरीकी सहायता कितनी मिलेगी, कहा तक मिलेगी इसका कोई निश्चयात्मक उत्तर अमेरिका से प्राप्त नहीं हो रहा था। और यह भी समझना चाहिये लोगों को कि ऐसा क्यों! इसका कारण है। वह यह कि जो विदेशी-सहायता-दाता-मुल्क है विदेशी सहायता उनकी विदेश नीति का एक अंग है, वह समझता है कि किस मुल्क को कितनी सहायता देनी चाहिये और किस मुल्क को नहीं देनी चाहिये। आज मैं इस निश्चित मत का हूँ कि अमेरिका और रूस दोनों की दृष्टि में भारत महत्वहीन हो गया है, इसका महत्व रह नहीं गया है क्योंकि अमेरिका भी यह समझता है और रूस भी यह समझता है कि भारत आज ऐसी स्थिति में नहीं है कि वह स्वतंत्र रूप से कोई निर्णय ले सके, स्वतंत्र रूप से कोई फैसला ले सके, फैसला कर सके।

तो जिस मुल्क की यह दयनीय स्थिति हो कि आजादी के साथ वह कोई रुख न ले

[श्री राजनारायण]

सके उसको दूसरे मुल्क उपेक्षा की दृष्टि से देखेंगे। आज अमेरिका और रूस दोनों भारत को उपेक्षा की दृष्टि से देख रहे हैं। अब भारत को अपने पक्ष में करने के लिये न तो अमेरिका के लिये जरूरी है कि मुंह मांगा ऋण या महायुता दे और न तो रूस के लिये जरूरी है कि भारत जितनी मांग करे उसकी पूर्ति करे ही। उस स्थिति में भारत तब होता जब कि भारत के पास अपनी स्वयं निर्णय लेने की क्षमता और कुव्वत होती और उसके अभाव में आज भारत की स्थिति दयनीय है। इसलिये हमने प्रथम इसके चार स्वरूपों को आपके द्वारा सदन की खिदमत में पेश किया ताकि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस बारे में भी कोई मूल्यांकन करे।

यह जो योजना आई श्रीमन्, प्रारूप के रूप में यह इतनी जल्दी जल्दी आई कि बिना किसी तकनीकी आधार के, यह एक प्रकार से उठा कर रख दी गई। कैसे यह साबित होता है? आप देखेंगे श्रीमन्, कि योजना पेश करने के बाद वित्तीय पक्ष विस्तार से जांच करने के लिये एक पेनल बनाया गया। यह एक मजाक है, यह एक हंसी है। जब वित्तीय पक्ष की जानकारी ही हमको नहीं है तो योजना का प्रारूप देने का मखोल क्यों। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, इस चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना के प्रारूप से देश की जनता को मोहित नहीं होना चाहिये। देश की जनता को बराबर इत्मीनान में रहना चाहिये कि यह योजना भी खटाई में पड़ेगी।

श्रीमन्, हमें कुछ ऐसा याद आता है, जैसे मान लीजिए कि कोई गाय हो, कोई भैंस हो, अगर उसका बच्चा मरता है तो दूध देगी नहीं। इसलिये उस मरे बच्चे के खाल में भूसा भरा जाता है और भूसा भर के उसे खड़ा कर दिया जाता है, ग्वाला गाय या भैंस को दुहने लगता है। इसी तरह में आज जो प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना का प्रारूप

है वह उस मरे हुए बच्चे के समान है जिसमें प्राण नहीं है, उसके खाल में भूसा भरा जा रहा है और भूसा भर के उसे खड़ा कर दिया जाता है और विदेशी ऋण और जनता पर नये नये कर और नये नये ऋण की व्यवस्था कर यह सरकार एक साजिश कर रही है। श्रीमन् इसको अच्छी तरह से देखना चाहिये। आज की जो यह सरकार है वह उस ग्वाले के समान है जो ग्वाला चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना के प्रारूप की खाल में एक झूठी जिन्दगी पैदा करके जनता को दूहना चाहता है, जनता से कर और ऋण लेकर और विदेशों से सहायता लेकर। माननीय श्री टी० एन० सिंह इस समय विद्यमान हैं, और जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है यह योजना आयोग के सम्मानित सदस्य भी रह चुके हैं। प्लानिंग की एक प्रोसेस होती है, उस प्लानिंग की प्रोसेस में यह योजना गुजरी ही नहीं। हमें आश्चर्य है कि जब मैं इस चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना के प्रारूप पर बोल रहा हूँ तो श्री गाडगिल साहब जो इस समय योजना आयोग के एक प्रकार से तथाकथित सर्वेसर्वा हैं, उन्होंने गोखले इन्स्टीट्यूट आफ पोलिटिक्स एन्ड इकानामिक्स में अपने एक भाषण में कहा था :

“मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि मेरी यह बात असंगत नहीं होगी कि हम लोग योजना आयोग का पुनर्गठन इस प्रकार से करें कि उसमें युवकों का अपेक्षाकृत अधिक प्रतिनिधित्व हो। 65 वर्ष की ऊपर की उम्र के बजाय हमें यह सोचना चाहिये कि उसमें 55 वर्ष से कम आयु वाले लोगों का बहुमत हो।”

यह श्रीमन्, गाडगिल साहब का मत था। आगे कहते हैं कि : “आयोग की रचना के संबंध में नया रुख जरूरी है। जाहिर है कि प्रधान मंत्री व वित्त मंत्री को इसका सदस्य नहीं रहना चाहिये और मंत्रिपरिषद् का कोई भी सदस्य

योजना आयोग का सदस्य न रहे। यदि कोई योजना मंत्री हो तो वह योजना आयोग में रहे, उसका अध्यक्ष हो। उपाध्यक्ष कोर्ट प्रशासनिक अनुभव का व्यक्ति हो तो मंत्रालय अच्छा। यह इसलिए जरूरी है क्योंकि योजना आयोग प्रमुख रूप में मंत्रालयों, सरकारों और उनके वरीय अधिकारियों के माध्यम से काम करने हैं और उनके तौर तरीकों को जानने वाला ही कोर्ट आदमी सगटन का प्रशासनिक अध्यक्ष होना चाहिये। गेप सदस्य विशेषज्ञ हो जिन्हें व्यावहारिक सम्स्याओं के निबटाने का अनुभव हो। विशेषज्ञता प्राकृतिक विज्ञान, तकनीक, समाज विज्ञान, सांख्यिकी और अर्थशास्त्र के क्षेत्र में हो। सदस्य मख्या ज्यादा नहीं होनी चाहिये क्योंकि विशेषज्ञता का काम प्रमुख रूप से आयोग के उंचे अफसर और सलाहकार निकाय—पैनल आदि—करेंगे।”

यह गाडगिल साहब का योजना आयोग के संबंध में मत है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो सम्मति गाडगिल साहब ने अपने भाषण में व्यक्त की थी उसकी पूर्ति आज कहा हो रही है? आज योजना आयोग पर कितना धन का अपव्यय हो रहा है। गाडगिल साहब का वह स्वप्न दर्शन कहा गया, जब कि वह कहने थे कि योजना आयोग में प्रधान मंत्री का रहना अनावश्यक है, वित्त मंत्री का रहना अनावश्यक है इनके रहने से योजना आयोग की स्वतंत्र प्रक्रिया का हनन हो जाता है। और यह सरकार उसी तरह योजना चलाने के लिये बराबर चेष्टा किया करती है। तो गाडगिल साहब आज हंसाई कर रहे हैं, जैसा कि कल एक मानीय सदस्य ने यहाँ कहा, मैं सुन रहा था, कि जब तक कोई आदमी किसी जगह पर नहीं रहता तब तक लम्बी बातें करता है और उस जगह पर पहुँच जाता है तो नीचे उतर जाता है। मचमच गाडगिल साहब के साथ मैं यह बात शत प्रतिशत चरितार्थ हो रही है। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये था।

मैं इस समय कहना चाहता हूँ कि योजना का लक्ष्य क्या है? वह योजना योजना नहीं है, वह प्लान प्लान नहीं है, जिसमें समयबद्ध ढंग से कार्यक्रम न हो। योजना का मूल होना चाहिये समयबद्ध ढंग से कार्यक्रम। चौथी योजना के प्रारूप में श्रीमन् उसका पूर्णतः निषेध है। यह योजना है ही नहीं। इसको हम सालाना दोहरा बजट कह सकते हैं क्योंकि पहले ही जैसा मैंने कहा कि योजना की प्रक्रिया में यह गुजर ही नहीं है। इसको श्रीमान् अगर देखें तो केवल दो ही लक्ष्य इसमें हैं जो लक्ष्य होना नहीं चाहिये था। तो आज सरकार की इस चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना के प्रारूप के दो लक्ष्य हैं। पहला लक्ष्य है ऐसा ढाँचा पेश करना जिसके आधार पर विदेशों में ऋण दान मांगा जा सके। दूसरा, ऐसा दस्तावेज जो जनता को भर्मा सके और समझ द्वाारा भी जिसकी हिमायत की जा सके, जिसमें जनता से भी ज्यादा कर और ऋण वसूल किया जा सके। इस योजना का इसके अनिश्चित और कोई लक्ष्य है ही नहीं, इसके अनिश्चित और कोई उद्देश्य है ही नहीं क्योंकि जिस ढंग की योजना चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना के प्रारूप में है, निश्चित रूप में इसके दो ही लक्ष्य दिखायी पड़ते हैं। ऐसी योजना पेश करो जिससे विदेशों से सहायता मिल सके और जिससे अपनी जनता पर कर और ऋण बढ़ा सकें। जैसे श्रीमन्, आपको अनुभव होगा कि राज्य सरकारें जब अपना बजट पेश करती हैं तो उस बजट में कुछ ऐसी स्थिति पैदा करती हैं कि उनको केन्द्र से ज्यादा अनुदान मिल सके। उसी तरह से आज भारत की सरकार अपनी योजना के जरिये ऐसी स्थिति पैदा कर रही है जिससे विदेशों से उसको ज्यादा अनुदान मिल सके। यह पूर्णतः देश हित में नहीं है, देश हित के विरुद्ध है। श्रीमन्, पहली योजना से लेकर चौथी योजना के प्रारूप में ये दोनों लक्ष्य प्रगट हो रहे हैं, यह नहीं कि केवल चौथी ही में है बल्कि दूसरी,

तीसरी और चौथी, तीनों में यह लक्ष्य साफ साफ दृष्टिगोचर हो रहे हैं। वास्तव में पहली योजना, जैसा कि लोग जानते हैं, कोलम्बो प्लान में शामिल होने के लिये बनाई गई थी और वह कोलम्बो प्लान के नाम से भी कहा जायेगा। दूसरी योजना का जब निर्माण होने लगा तो कुछ इतिहास पर भी सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को जाना चाहिये। भारत में उस समय के जो भारत के विशेषज्ञ थे, उनको यह पता नहीं चलता था कि आखिर यह योजना किस ढंग से बनायी जाये जिससे कि उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा रकम विदेशों से हासिल हो सके। इसलिये श्रीमन् आपने यह देखा होगा कि इसमें अमरीका और रूस के विशेषज्ञों ने अच्छी दिलचस्पी दिखायी है। मैशासुट्स इन्स्टीट्यूशन आफ टेक्नालाजी और हार्वर्ड विश्वविद्यालय के विशेषज्ञों ने, और दूसरी ओर रूस और पोलैन्ड के विशेषज्ञों ने भारत सरकार की योजना को बनाया। यह सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को समझ लेना चाहिये कि दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना जो अपने देश की थी वह पूर्णतः विदेशी योजना थी, उसको विदेशी विशेषज्ञों ने बनाया था, उसको अमरीका और रूस के विशेषज्ञों ने बनाया था। अमरीका के प्रोफेसर गैलब्रेथ और प्रोफेसर रूस्टोव और कम्युनिस्ट देशों से आस्कर लांगे और चारल्स विलहाइम ने दूसरी योजना का ढांचा बनाने में पूर्णरूपेण भाग लिया था, उन्हीं के इशारों पर, उन्हीं के विशेषज्ञों की राय पर, उन्हीं के सुझाव पर यह पंचवर्षीय योजना बनी जो आज भारत की गरीब जनता को खाये जा रही है, जैसा कि हर पंचवर्षीय योजना के अंत में बेकारी भी बढ़ती है, गरीबी भी बढ़ती है और देश की तरक्की एक हास्यास्पद रूप में रह जाती है।

इसलिए लोगों को इसकी जानकारी होनी चाहिये। इसलिए आज जो प्रारूप

हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत है, अगर उसके पृष्ठ 1 और 2 को देखा जाय, जिसमें इस योजना का सामान्य दृष्टिकोण बतलाया गया है और योजना के संबंध में उद्देश्य और लक्ष्य बतलाये गये हैं। इसमें कहा गया है कि हम कीमतों में स्थिरता चाहते हैं। किम तरह से कीमतों को स्थिर करेंगे, इस चीज का कहीं पर भी वर्णन नहीं किया गया है। हम इस चीज को बारबार यहां पर कहते आ रहे हैं और आज भी सफाई के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि इस चीज के बारे में सरकार को बिल्कुल अपनी नीति बतला देनी चाहिये। किसी भी के निर्माण में जो रकम लगती हो, उसकी बिक्री की कीमत में कुछ अनुपात तय कर देना चाहिये। हमारा तो कहना यह है कि यह कीमत 1 या  $1\frac{1}{2}$  गुने से ज्यादा नहीं होनी चाहिये। हम यह कहते हैं कि कल-कारखानों में जो चीज तैयार होती है उसके लागत के  $1\frac{1}{2}$  गुने में बिक्री होनी चाहिये। इससे ज्यादा में किसी भी चीज की बिक्री नहीं होनी चाहिये। लेकिन मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या इस सरकार ने अभी तक लागत और बिक्री का कोई अनुपात तय किया है। फिर मुझे इस बात को पढ़कर हंसी आती है कि योजना निर्माता चाहते हैं कि कीमतों में स्थिरता लाई जानी चाहिये। यह बिल्कुल झूठ और गलत बात है।

दूसरी बात उन्होंने यह कही है कि हमें विदेशी सहायता की निर्भरता में कमी करनी चाहिये। सरकार कहती है कि हमारा यह सामान्य दृष्टिकोण है कि सरकार विदेशी सहायता पर निर्भर नहीं रहेगी और उसमें कमी होती चली जायेगी। मैं माननीय सदस्यों की खिदमत में यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि विदेशी सहायता की निर्भरता किस द्रुतगति से बढ़ती चली जा रही है। प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में विदेशी सहायता 188 करोड़ रुपये की थी, दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में विदेशी सहायता 1,090 करोड़ रुपये की थी और तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना

में विदेशी सहायता 2,455 करोड़ रुपये की थी। चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना का जो प्रस्ताव हुआ था पहले उसमें 6,300 करोड़ रुपये की विदेशी सहायता की योजना बनाई गई थी मगर इतना रुपया विदेशों ने देने से इन्कार कर दिया। इसलिए जो आज प्रारूप है, उसमें भी 3,700 करोड़ रुपये की विदेशी सहायता है। इस तरह से यह सरकार गिगमगोल कर रही है। जिम तरह से शूतुरमुर्ग बालू में अपना सिर डालकर नाचता है, उसी तरह से यह सरकार आज बालू में सिर डालकर शीर्षासन कर रही है। वह अपना सिर नीचे कर रही है और टांग ऊपर कर रही है और फिर नाच रही है। इस तरह से यह सरकार आज इस देश की जनता को गुमराह कर रही है। आंकड़े कुछ कहते हैं, सत्य कुछ हो, डरादा कुछ लिखा जाय कि हम आधी सहायता करेगे, यह कितना झूठ और असत्य है।

(Time bell rings.)

माननीया, मैं अपने समय में अपना भाषण समाप्त कर दूंगा। यह सरकार सामाजिक न्याय और समानता की बात करती है। तो मैं सरकारी पक्ष के आदमियों से पूछना चाहता हूं कि कोई यहां पर माई का लाडला है जो यह बतलाये कि इस सरकार ने अब तक कौनसा सामाजीक न्याय दिया है? आज उसकी योजना की क्या स्थिति है और इस सरकार की क्या स्थिति है। आज वह युग आ गया है कि इस कांग्रेस सरकार के राज में, नारी प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के प्रधानमंत्रित्व काल में नारी हरिजन मां के ऊपर उसके निजी बेटे को गंगा चढ़ाया जा रहा है। इससे बढ़कर दुर्दशा आज इस देश की क्या हो सकती है। आज असहाय हरिजनों का क्या होगा। आज हरिजनों के गांव के गांव जलाये जा रहे हैं, उनके सिर फोड़े जा रहे हैं और उन पर गोलियां चलाई जा रही हैं। आज इस नारी प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा नेहरू

गांधी के प्राधनमंत्रित्व काल में जितना हरिजनों के ऊपर अत्याचार हो रहा है उतना पहले सुना नहीं गया था। फिर भी यह सरकार कहती है कि हम सामाजिक न्याय और समानता देना चाहते हैं।

यह सरकार कहती है कि हम सारी जनता को समानता देना चाहते हैं लेकिन जिस तरह से यहां मोनोपली बढ़ रही है, उसको सब लोग अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। किस तरह से 75 परिवार इस देश में जमीन से आकाश तक पहुंच गये हैं। किस तरह से बिड़ला, टाटा, सिंघानिया और जयपुरिया का इतना विकास हो गया है। इसलिए ये जो आंकड़े हैं वे मिट्ट कर रहे हैं कि यह सरकार आय की असमानता को दूर नहीं कर सकती है।

हमारी सरकार कहती है कि स्थानीय योजनाएं बनाई जानी चाहिये और निर्बल समाज की समस्याओं का हल करना चाहिये। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह सरकार निर्बल समाज की समस्याओं को हल कर सकती है। इस प्रारूप में वे कौन से उपाय हैं, कौन से ऐसे कदम हैं जिससे हम कह सकते हैं कि उनके द्वारा निर्बल समाज की समस्याएं हल हो जायेगी। सरकार कहती है कि हम क्षेत्रीय असंतुलन को दूर करेंगे, तो मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि आज तक सरकार इन 20 वर्षों में इस क्षेत्रीय असंतुलन को दूर नहीं कर सकी और आगे वह क्या करेगी।

क्षेत्रीय असंतुलन के बारे में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि जो हमारी तीन पंचवर्षीय योजनाएं चलीं, उनके पूरे आंकड़े देख लीजिये। उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के लोगों की इसके द्वारा कितनी प्रति व्यक्ति औसत आमदनी बढ़ी है। इसमें आगे जो कुछ दिया गया है वह मैं अभी बतलाता हूं। यह श्री गाडगिल साहब की चिट्ठी है जिसमें 1967-68

तक प्रान्तों को जो सेन्ट्रल सहायता मिली है वह दी गई है। इसमें यह बतलाया गया है कि प्रति व्यक्ति उस प्रान्त को कितना मिला है। इसमें बतलाया गया है कि आसाम को 182 रु० मिला, बिहार को 99 रु०। अगर बिहार का यहाँ पर कोई प्रतिनिधि हो तो उसको याद होगा कि बिहार को 99 रु० मिला है। शायद श्री बी० एन० मडल यहाँ पर हैं। इसमें गुजरात को 120 रु० मिला। जम्मू काश्मीर को 361 रु० मिला, केरल को 146, मध्य प्रदेश को 152, मद्रास को 119, महाराष्ट्र को 91, मैसूर को 139, उड़ीसा को 201, पंजाब को 231, राजस्थान को 185, उत्तर प्रदेश को 102 रु० मिला है। प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना से लेकर 1968 तक, इन 18 मालों में उत्तर प्रदेश को प्रति व्यक्ति कुल 102 रु० सहायता मिली है। इस 102 रु० से क्या होगा। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से यह सरकार क्षेत्रीय असमानता को दूर कर सकती है। किस तरह से क्षेत्रीय असमानता दूर होगी, क्या इस बारे में कोई मार्ग बतलाया है। नहीं बतलाया गया है। (Time bell rings) अभी तो मैंने आपकी इजाजत से कहा है और अब कुछ थोड़ी बात और कह देना चाहता हूँ।

मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ पर श्री चन्द्र शेखर और श्री मोहन धारिया बार बार यह कहते हैं कि मोनोपली बढ रही है, मोनोपली बढ रही है। श्री कृष्णकान्त भी, जो अपने को "सजनी मैं हूँ राजकुमारी" कहते हैं, वे भी कहते हैं कि यहाँ पर मोनोपली बढ रही है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मोनोपली तो बढेगी ही। तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में सरकारी क्षेत्र में 6300 करोड़ रु० था यानी 60 प्रतिशत था और निजी क्षेत्र में 4100 करोड़ रु० था यानी केवल 40 प्रतिशत। अब जो चौथी योजना का प्रारूप बना है, उसमें सरकारी क्षेत्र में 12252 करोड़ रु० का विनियोग रखा

गया है और निजी क्षेत्र में 10 हजार करोड़ रु० का विनियोग रखा गया है। इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि सरकारी क्षेत्र 60 की जगह से 55 में आ गया है और निजी क्षेत्र 40 से बढ़कर 45 में आ गया है। यानी निजी क्षेत्र में 10 हजार करोड़ रुपये की पूँजी चौथो पंचवर्षीय योजना में लगाई जा रही है। तो मैं श्री कुलकर्णी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि तुम लोग क्यों नहीं उठते हो और इस भ्रष्ट कांग्रेस की सरकार को आग लगाते हो और उसको जलाकर भस्म करते हो।

अनावश्यक ढंग पर सदन का समय नष्ट मत किया करो। इस दस हजार करोड़ रुपये का कितना हिस्सा जायेगा टाटा को, कितना हिस्सा जायेगा बिरला को, कितना हिस्सा जायेगा सिंघानिया को। अनावश्यक यहाँ पर झटी बात किया करते हो और सदन का समय नष्ट किया करते हो।

श्रीमन्, यह योजना की रूपरेखा है। इसको जग सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य समझ लें। सरकारी क्षेत्र की कुल विदेशी सहायता है 3730 करोड़ रु० और विदेशी ऋणों की पुनः अदायगी में इसमें से 1216 करोड़ रु० लगेगा। अगर इसको हम निकाल दें तो 2514 करोड़ रु० शुद्ध विदेशी सहायता आयेगी इस क्षेत्र में। योजना के लिये कुल 25398 करोड़ रु० की कल्पना की गई है। इसमें से सरकारी क्षेत्र में 14398 करोड़ रु० और निजी क्षेत्र में 10,000 करोड़ रु० रखे गये हैं। इसमें से सरकारी क्षेत्र में विनियोग होगा 12252 करोड़ रु० जो पुनः ऋण की अदायगी की जायेगी वह 1216 करोड़ इसमें से ही निकलेगा। शेष 2146 करोड़ रु० चाल व्यय है। निजी क्षेत्र में विनियोग 10 हजार करोड़ रु० है। अर्थात् कुल विनियोग 22252 करोड़ रु० है। यह 22252 करोड़ रुपया क्यों रखा गया। इस को 23 हजार करोड़ रुपया क्यों नहीं लिखा गया। सारी यह भरमाने की बात होती है। ये

लोग चाहते हैं कि कुछ ऐसे आंकड़े दें जिस से लोगों को यह अहसास हो जाये कि अक्यूरेट हिसाब लगाया गया है, बहुत बढ़िया हिसाब बनाया गया है इसी लिये 200 या 300 या 500 रु० लिख दिया जाता है, वरना मीधे कह सकते थे 25 हजार, 24 हजार, 23 हजार। इससे ऐसा हम को लगता है कि इस योजना के प्रारूप को तैयार करने वाले जो हैं उनमें शायद बाटा कम्पनी से सम्बन्धित कुछ लोग हैं। बाटा कम्पनी के जूतों को कही देखिये तो उन पर लिखा होगा 19 रु० 99 पैसा। वे 20 रु० नहीं लिखेंगे। इसी तरह से किसी पर लिखा होगा 11 रु० 99 पैसा और वे 12 रुपया नहीं लिखेंगे, एक्यरसी के लिये। इस लिये जनता को भ्रम में रखने के लिये यह जो कांग्रेसी सरकार बाटा कंपनी की मालिक बनी हुई है इस ने इस ढंग से फीगर और आंकड़े यहां पर दिये हैं जिस से जनता को गुमराह किया जा सके। श्रीमन्, इस तरह से लोगों को फुसलाया जा रहा है। इस का आकार फैलाया जा रहा है, इस रहस्य को भी मैं खोल देना चाहता हूँ...

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री राम निवास मिर्धा) :**  
आप सक्षेप में कहिये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** बहुत सक्षेप में ही मैं बोल रहा हूँ। मैं आधे घंटे पर उठा हूँ। मेरे चालिस मिनट हैं, जिन में से 10 मिनट मैं मडल जी के लिये छोड़ रहा हूँ। देखिये हम दोहरायेगे कुछ नहीं।

1960-61 की कीमत के आधार पर अगर इस को हम लें तो कुल व्यय जो 14,680 करोड़ रुपया है उस की अगर तीसरी योजना की कीमत के आधार पर तुलना की जाय तो वह करीब करीब उस के बराबर आता है। यानी तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना पर जितनी कुल रकम रखी गयी थी 1 हजार करोड़ रुपया उस में वृद्धि नहीं हुई है। करीब करीब उस के बराबर ही है,

मगर चालू कीमत के हिसाब से जो दाम बढ़ा है उस के मुताबिक इस को फैलाया गया है। वस्तुतः यह तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के बराबर ही है। 1960-61 की थोक कीमतों का सूचकांक 124.9 है। 1969 जनवरी में यह सूचकांक 207.5 हो गया। तीसरी योजना का कुल व्यय है निजी 12,677 करोड़ रुपया और अब है 14,680 करोड़ रुपया। इस तरह से आप देख लें कि तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना और चतुर्थ पंचवर्षीय योजना करीब करीब एक ही आंकड़े को ले कर चलती है। मगर इस को फुला कर के दिखलाया जा रहा है लोगों को भ्रम में डालने के लिये।

श्रीमन्, हम को जो सब से बड़ी तकलीफ है वह तकलीफ इस में है कि जहां इस सरकार ने पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्य अंगों को नहीं चालू किया वहां इस ने सुरक्षा के साथ भी बहुत बड़ा खिलवाड़ किया है। हम को कहा गया था कि 1964 से 1969 तक सुरक्षा की पंचवर्षीय योजना बनेगी। इस सुरक्षा के प्रश्न पर सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को हड़ता के साथ अपनी भावना प्रकट करना चाहिये वरना यह देश किसी दिन भी गुलाम हो सकता है। तो हम से कहा गया था कि 1964 से 1969 तक की योजना बनेगी, लेकिन जब वह नहीं बन सकी तो फिर, हम से कहा गया कि 1966 से 1971 तक अब हम योजना लायेंगे। श्रीमन्, देखा जाय कि इसमें आज हम हैं कहां। 1963-64 में कुल 816.12 करोड़ रु० सुरक्षा के लिये था और 1969-70 में कुल 1110 करोड़ रुपया रखा गया है। 1969-70 में अगर 1963-64 की कीमत के आधार पर हिसाब लगाया जाय तो 1969-70 में प्रतिरक्षा पर जो 1110 करोड़ व्यय के लिये रखा है वह केवल रह जायेगा 723 करोड़ रुपया। जब कि 1963-64 में 816.12 करोड़ रु० व्यय हुआ था। तो एक प्रकार से 1963-64 में जो रक्षा पर

[श्री राजनारायण]

हमने रुपया खर्च किया, उतना ही रुपया 1963-64 की कीमत की बुनियाद पर 1969-70 में भारत सरकार खर्च करने जा रही है। इस से बढ़ कर बेहदा और अप्राकृतिक योजना देश के उद्धार के लिये क्या दूसरी बनाई जा सकती है।

इस लिये मैं एक भविष्यवाणी करना चाहता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह सब लोगों को मैं बता दूँ कि चौथी योजना को इस आकार में चला सकना इस सरकार के लिये संभव नहीं है और यदि यह चली भी तो बेकारी बढ़ेगी, घाटे की वित्त व्यवस्था चलेगी, विदेशों पर निर्भरता बढ़ेगी, असमानता बढ़ेगी, थोड़े से लोगों के हाथ में आर्थिक सत्ता का एकाधिपत्य जायेगा, क्षेत्रीय असमानता भी बढ़ेगी, भारत की विषमता भी बढ़ेगी और जो कमान वाला है वह मरेगा और जो खाने वाला है वह लटेगा।

श्रीमान्, मैं आप का बहुत अनुगृहीत हूँ कि आपने मुझे थोड़ा समय दिया। मगर मेरे जो 40 मिनट थे वे मैं नहीं ले रहा हूँ क्योंकि मडल जी दस मिनट बोलेगे। इस लिये मैं अपने ऊपर स्वयं अकुश लगा रहा हूँ। वैसे योजना की पूरी किताब रह गई है। अगर आप इजाजत दें तो पांच मिनट और बोल दूँ।

अब मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज देश की जनता इस कांग्रेसी सरकार से अपना पिंड छूड़ाये। जब तक इस से जनता का पिंड नहीं छूटेगा तब तक न भ्रष्टाचार में रूकावट आयेगी, न गरीबी हकेगी, न बेकारी हकेगी। आज भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ता जा रहा है। यहाँ पर प्रधान मंत्री साहेब नहीं हैं। कुछ बातें जिन से उनका सीधा सम्बन्ध है मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ कि उनकी अनुपस्थिति में कहूँ। आज जिस ढंग से प्रधान मंत्री साहेब इस मुत्क को ले चल रही हैं उसने राजनैतिक

नैतिकता का दीवाला निकाल दिया है, आज कही नैतिकता रह ही नहीं गई है, आज नैतिकता नाम की कोई चीज रह ही नहीं गई है। आज हमारे विद्यार्थियों को देखिये। यहाँ पर उनकी भूख हडताल हो रही है। इसी तरह से आप बेकारों को देखिये, मजदूरों को देखिये, हरिजनों को देखिये, ग्रध्यापकों को देखिये, जीवन के हर क्षेत्र में आज एक विस्फोटक स्थिति है। इस लिये इस विस्फोटक स्थिति पर काबू पाने के लिये आवश्यक है कि इस सरकार को हटाया जाय और इस प्रकार की सरकार की थोथी योजनाओं से देश को बचाया जाय, तब कही जा कर के यह देश सुखमय हो पायेगा। यह जो इस प्रारूप की जगलरी है, इस जगलरी में, इस जादूगरी में देश को नहीं फसना चाहिये। यही हमारा निवेदन है।

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra)  
Mr. Vice Chairman Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me the time and opportunity to speak on the Plan. I want to say that the strategy of the Fourth Plan as mentioned in the document seems to rely heavily on stability and self-reliance. This involves that the massive investments required to attain a sustained growth to remove income disparities and to take the nation boldly and quickly on to the path of the take-off stage seems to have been relegated to a backward place.

The adoption of a strategic approach based on programmes and investments tuned to the existing resources sounds to me promising too much on caution.  
I am, however, if we want to run faster in order to move forward, we need massive investment as far as possible. The assumption that the economic balance is still delicate and health cannot sustain a higher rate of public investment is a half-hearted timid thinking.

Mr. Vice Chairman facts suggest that the economy has never been so close to a major breakthrough on the farm front with another good year the agricultural economy should be in a position to make a

substantial contribution to Indian development. The share market has also never been so happy since 1962. The recession has had a chastening impact on the industry, and now there is greater emphasis on modern technology, rationalisation, modern methods of management, more attention to cost and export consciousness and advance planning in industry. Without a bold plan, this process of industrial adjustment and modernisation will be slowed down, if not retarded. Even the question of using under utilised capacity calls for a forward looking co-ordinated planning to link up new capacities.

The innocent and interested persons did blame the Plans for the recent recession. But even many industrialists now admit readily that the set back caused by drought was aggravated by the cut in investments, first in the public sector, and then, sympathetically in the private sector. The casualty of all adjustments has been not civil expenditure but it has always been investment much to the detriment of growth and human progress. This grave mistake of passing the burden of modesty and political dithering on to investment is being perpetrated again.

Originally the total public sector investment in the 1966 Fourth Plan was Rs. 16,000 crores which has been now downgraded to Rs. 14,398 crores. However, the investment for the private sector is raised considerably from Rs. 4,100 crores in the Third Plan to Rs. 10,000 crores in the Fourth Plan. Can such massive investment create equality? It is seen that the average rate of investment during the Third Plan was 13 per cent and climbing, however, even with enhanced private sector investment, the rate of investment for the Fourth Plan will be still lower.

Dr. D. R. Gadgil emphasised the virtues of the "Effective regulatory Plan frame" and the analogy of "War economy and preparedness" was given to the planning process. One has, therefore, to see the Draft Fourth Plan in the light of the emphasis given by the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission and the need of investment to such a scheme to remove income disparities and create a feeling of hope in the eyes of masses and a ray of

encouragement to the vast educated unemployed who will be able to transform their technological talent into an economic national product.

If the broad objectives of planning is "rapid economic development accompanied by continuous process of social change", there then ought to be a programme commensurate with such an aim.

The present financial outlay of Rs. 14,398 crores is some 20% to 25% below the 1968 Fourth Plan outlay, or in real terms, it might be about 35 per cent below the peak year of the Third Plan. The pattern of investment again comes across a substantial change. It is seen that the outlay on public sector in the Second Plan was about 135 per cent above the First Plan and that of the Third Plan was 88 per cent above the Second Plan, while the present Fourth Plan shows an increase of only 67 per cent, and in real terms this is much smaller. This is the present state of investment in the public sector by the Government as has come out in the Fourth Plan.

The most significant feature of the Fourth Plan seems to be a sharp step-up of private sector investment. The quantitative increase proposed in the private sector amounts to as high a rate of 144 per cent, over the Third Plan as against an increase of 32 per cent in the Third Plan over the Second Plan. It seems now that the Plan has very little to offer to the so-called weaker section of the public and to the poor unemployed in the rural areas. Even though the projected investment programmes are fulfilled, the investment per head may be no more than Rs. 15 larger than the investment in the earlier decade. This confirms the accusation that the investment has been the biggest casualty of the new policy of 'stability and self-reliance'.

Mr. Vice Chairman, I could not follow yesterday the Prime Minister's statement in the other House that in the Plan there is a hope of the technical unemployed being employed. How that miracle is going to happen I could not understand.

It is seen that planning can play a crucial role in the national development only if it gives greater push to investment

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

and growth which can be seen from a study of the Government's domestic revenue and expenditure relative to the gross national product and it is a fact that even Burma and Ceylon and Taiwan are currently engaged in a relatively much larger effort than ours.

It is well known that difficulties and developments are inseparable and it is the aim of the economic and plan policy to minimise difficulties. When we say 'failure' of Plan, it is the policy that has failed and not the strategy of development. It was a tragedy that the Plan was put into reverse gear during the last three to four years and it is high time that we take courage and sit at the front driving place and put the car into the forward gear with the bolder strategy on the investment by planning process.

The question is not whether the Plan is big or small, or should be big or small. In the present conditions, when the economy is in a better balance, when the price situation is seemingly at ease and more manageable and industry, agriculture, business-men and everybody else wants to push ahead and build a lasting foundation for growth, the Plan that we want must be responsive to the conditions and yet bold enough to give the lead. What we are now getting as the Fourth Plan is absolutely a half-hearted offer looking to the present economic conditions in the country. The present Draft is every inch out of line with the current psychology. The volume and pattern of investment projected will only prolong our catch-up period of growth.

If we discount the fortuitous spurt, we cannot say that the economy is safely on the path of growth. Consequently, pointers for expansion have been too weak. The Draft Fourth Plan here disappoints because it preaches *status quo* on such things as levels of Plan investment. It should have realised that a low level of investment in a developing country is but the best guarantee one can get of low equilibrium, low output and frequent shortages etc. If this year, and in the next year, we could push up the investment levels by about 400 to 500 crores per annum above the Plan levels, we could have ensured that the multipliers kept the demand growing and the recession

at bay. Only through this process could we hope to mobilise larger resources for a further step-up in investments and growth rates in subsequent years.

Apart from growth, structural change is another objective of development and modernisation. The earlier development did bring about preliminary changes in the structure of our economy, but that is about all. Unfortunately, the present Plan promises to do very very little in this direction. Public and industrial investment is in fact one of the victims of the Plan approach. The Second Plan had devoted 23 per cent. of the total investment to industry, the Third Plan 25 per cent., the ratio was to rise over 29 per cent. in the 1966 Fourth Plan. At a stage like this, when the technological claims and requirements are larger and expansion of demand crucial industrial investment is being cut down to a little over 22 per cent. in the Fourth Plan.

While the proposed increase in the industrial investment in the private sector is 144 per cent. over the Third Plan, the increase in public sector investment is 95 per cent. of the total outlay of Rs. 2,910 crores in the Centre's industrial Plan, nearly Rs. 1,951 crores or roughly two-thirds of the total is committed to the completion of the present industrial schemes. New schemes are few and far between. The investment which will go towards new industrial schemes during the five years is a mere Rs. 959 crores, less than 33 per cent. of the total. The planners, with the fulfilment of the existing scheme, will ensure a steady increase in the growth rate during the Plan. But what happens after the end of the Plan? The assumption seems to be that Plan targets can be fulfilled without additional industrial investment. Let us look at this proposition in a different way. Is the growth at the end of the present Plan the final goal? What we are really seeking is not a temporary phenomenon, but a sustained high level of growth over a long period of time. It is only because large investments and sacrifice had been made in the past—and the present planners are strangely critical of this—that we now have the necessary capacity and technological skills for fuller utilisation to-day. Both technology and industrial development are a continuous process and so must be investment. No doubt, the schemes on hand must be completed. But this cannot detract

us from new pastures, continuous new investments and new projects. If we curb investment now, we will be reaping disaster at the end of the Plan, when there will be no sufficiently large extra unutilised capacity to draw on.

Another important fact is that the pace setter cannot afford not to take risks. We have seen how in the last few years when the State retreated, the psychological impact on the private sector was so damaging that recession got deepened. Demand was artificially curbed. Since demand has to go up now, the only way it can be done is by larger investments in the public sector programmes, at least until we arrive at the stage when self-sustained investments on a big scale become available.

Since the average initial gestation period in the present conditions is around five or six years, according to a study of the Reserve Bank, it is necessary that there is a steady increase in investments in capital goods, intermediate and other industries. Yet, in the Central sector, it is a pity to see that the amount allocated to new capital goods projects is only of the order of Rs. 622.52 crores over a five-year period, and for intermediates, only Rs. 125.57 crores. Even for such a critically important field as atomic energy development, the new allocation is a mere Rs. 19 crores for five years. When non Plan outlays of the Government are growing at the rate of 13 to 14 per cent every year, one fails to understand how essential developmental investment is so callously held back.

I, therefore, demand, Mr. Vice Chairman, that the investment in the Fourth Five Year Plan should be stepped at least by Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 2,500 crores, of which the State sector should receive half the amount, to be invested in irrigation and power generation. Out of the balance, an amount of Rs. 600 crores should be invested in new public sector projects to create the infrastructure for transferring the entrepreneurs' ability of the educated unemployed into a process of industrialisation in dispersed areas, which will add to the generation of National Product.

Another point that I would like to mention is about the States and the Centre, particularly about the Maharashtra State

which I represent. Mr. Vice-Chairman, you will see that in this Plan the Government has allowed the States to create their own resources. They are dangling the carrot before them by saying "You increase the resources and you can increase your Plan." It reflects on the Central Government when the State Plans are pruned according to their stability and the resources available, and the States are required to put in more resources for irrigation, power generation and distribution and electrification of pumps. I have already stated that I am not against the approach and strategy but against tying the Plan to stability and the resources available. What we want is a bold and imaginative approach whereby more resources will be created. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I can say that at least in my State, there is a limit to agricultural tax. The House will be surprised to know that the agriculturists in the Maharashtra State are paying the highest rates for irrigation. Let it be lift irrigation or flow irrigation we are paying between Rs. 500 and Rs. 600 per acre per year. No other State has got such high rates of irrigation. And we are raising cash crops. The Central Government again says "You increase your resources from the rural areas." But how it can be done, I do not understand. Mr. Vice Chairman, I might also say that certain other States are collecting only between Rs. 15 and Rs. 20 per acre on flow irrigation whether in the North or in the South. What I mean to say is that the high rate of irrigation in Maharashtra State is telling on the capacity of the agriculturists to raise crops. So, I do not understand what logical right the Central Government has got to ask the States to create more resources. I can say that you have got duplicate administrative officers here. What is the Agriculture Department of the Central Government doing? What is the Health Department of the Central Government doing? What is the Irrigation Department doing? Mr. Vice Chairman, these are all State problems and it is for the States to take the initiative. As rightly pointed out by Dr. Gadgil, it is the State and district level planning that is very important. Mr. Vice Chairman, you will be surprised to see that the Central Government's administrative expenditure has risen from Rs. 135 crores in 1966 to Rs. 164 crores in 1968, i.e. a rise of 21 per cent. The Maharashtra Government, the Reserve Bank and some other State Gov-

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

ernments had made a study as to what should be the normal rise in administrative expenditure; it is 5 per cent. The Central Government's expenditure is rising by 21 per cent, and it expects the States to contribute more and so on. It seems the time has come when the States must be given more resources. States like Maharashtra have got special problems, particularly like Bombay, of course, Calcutta also might have similar problems. Though Maharashtra is an industrially advanced State, there are also backward regions in Maharashtra. You will be surprised to know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that except in Bombay and Poona, the consumption of electricity for industrial purposes is pitifully lower than the all-India average. These are the present difficulties of Maharashtra. I should particularly like to say that in the Third Plan and in the three annual Plans, Rs. 1,750 crores were spent on agriculture, while the demand of Maharashtra itself in the Fourth Plan, to create irrigation capacity commensurate with the all-India average, is Rs. 2,000 crores. Where is the money to come from? That is why I say, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the time has come when the Central Government and the Planning Commission should take a second look at the Centre-State relations in regard to mobilisation of resources. The Central Government must be the pace-setter in this respect. They must prune their expenditure in the redundant departments like the Agriculture Department, Health Department, etc., which have nothing to do at the Central Level. If you talk of co-ordination, we have got these research laboratories and the C.S.I.R. and so things can be co-ordinated. If we look at industrialisation, Maharashtra's contribution to the National Product which was 27.6 per cent has come down to 24.5 per cent. That is why more investment has to go into Maharashtra, into the backward areas, so that they come at least to the all-India average. So, considering the special problems of States like Maharashtra, the Central Government and the Planning Commission should review their attitude of pruning public investment in the Fourth Plan, particularly at the State level. It should be increased by Rs. 2,000 crores and more money should be given to the various States. The Prime Minister should take a second look. Between the draft Plan in 1966 and

this 1969 Plan, one can see how much reduction has taken place in public investment. The Central Government, if it is really going to be alive to the problems of the people like the educated unemployed, should take a second look. The present Plan is absolutely a failure and it shows that the Government's aim on public investment has utterly failed. I request, therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the Prime Minister and the Planning Commission should take a second look at it.

**SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to congratulate the Government for having been able to produce the Fourth Five-Year Plan after a lapse of three years. Of course, it is very well known that there were annual Plans in the place of the Fourth Plan. That arose on account of a very critical situation, a very bad economic situation, arising out of two droughts. Why, it may even be said that there were three or four droughts because in the South, most of my area has been affected by drought this year also, the fourth year in succession. Therefore, on account of this peculiar situation, this critical situation, the Plan could not be got ready and I am sure everybody will sympathise with the Government for their not being able to bring forth their Fourth Five Year Plan in time. Anyway, on account of the break in the agricultural situation in the country, on account of the green revolution, though it has not yet come into its full force—it seems to be setting in—the Government have taken the courage to draft the Fourth Plan. Therefore, I offer my congratulations to the Government for having produced this Plan.

It is pertinent in dealing with the Fourth Plan to have a look at the state of our national economy. A lot is being talked about the green revolution and a certain amount of complacency has come over everybody, whether it is on the Government or the people on account of the big talk and publicity that has been given in the press about our green revolution, etc. But let us not forget that that green revolution is still to come because though there was a large production of 95.6 million tons last year, it is supposed to be very much less this year and in spite of last year's big production we imported something like 5.8 million tons of foodgrains last year. That shows that we have not yet been able

to produce the foodgrains required for the minimum consumption, even for a low consumption, in this country. I shall just quote a paragraph of the Plan in this connection:

The slow rate of growth in agricultural production not only depressed the rate of growth of the economy but also led to an alarming increase in the dependence on imports of foodgrains and other agricultural commodities. During the Third Plan the country imported 25 million tonnes of foodgrains, 3.9 million bales of cotton and 1.5 million bales of jute. During the subsequent three years, the imports continued to be heavy. Despite increased imports of foodgrains, *per capita* availability was lower than the 1961 level, except in 1965, and there was severe pressure on prices."

This is the appraisal of the situation. Therefore, let not anyone of us be under the impression that a green revolution has been achieved and that there is very little that we have to do. Let us take into consideration the national income as such. It has risen if we take from the 1960-61 till 1968-69 like this. An annual growth rate of only 3.5 per cent is recorded. This achievement is far less and if you take agricultural production into consideration the growth rate is only of 1.5 per cent which is much lower than the total national income growth. Our population has been increasing by 2.5 per cent while our agricultural growth rate is only 1.5 per cent. This reveals an awfully bad picture of the agricultural situation in the country. Not only that. Even from the point of view of national income growth this 3.5 per cent as against the population growth rate of 2.5, is offset completely. Therefore, our economy has been almost stagnant during this decade or so. That is the situation that is obtaining. This growth of national income has been far less than what is required for the growing population. Keeping in view the growing population, the growing standard of living of the people in this country, the national income, which is the main aim, the main end of all the Plans has been erratic, insufficient and incapable of advancing the country's economic development. That is the situation, Sir.

Then, coming to the approach of the Fourth Plan, with regard to the policy laid down, it is exceptional. Though our friends, Mr. Arun Chatterjee and others from the other side, were saying that the very approach and policy was wrong, situated as we are it could not be in the way the Left Communists or the Right Communists, whatever their point of view would have wanted. Ours is a mixed economy. Our approach is very correct. We have to develop not the way which somebody else dictates to us, but in our own way, keeping in view our traditions, our economic goals, our beliefs

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Getting money from the Birlas

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: No, not at all, not at all. That is the phobia that is haunting the members of the Communist Party and the sooner you get rid of that phobia the better for the country. Anyway, this is a policy with which I am in full agreement, the policy as laid down in this Plan. I quote:

"The most notable lesson is that the current tempo of economic activity is insufficient to provide productive employment to all, extend the base of social services and bring about significant improvement in the living standards of the people. The continuity of even this moderate rate of growth is likely to be threatened if instability emerges because of the weakness on the food front and too great a dependence on foreign aid."

This is verily true.

"The Fourth Plan aims at acceleration of the tempo of development in conditions of stability and reduced uncertainties".

This is the aim. Therefore, the accelerated tempo of economic development in the country is completely to be accepted by everybody. The method may be different but not the one that is preached by the communist platform. Therefore, when that is the case, let us examine this aspect now. I want to confine my remarks to the agricultural aspect because that is the basis. Agriculture is the basis of all economic

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.] progress. A profitable strategy of any economic development should be based on prosperous agriculture. It is not enough if agriculture feeds the population. Agriculture, the prime national occupation of our country, should not only feed and sustain the population, but it should result in sufficient capital formation. Sir, if we examine the history of the Western countries or of the more developed Eastern countries like Japan, we see that all the capital required has come through the capital formation in agriculture. Before the industrial revolution took place in the West, they were dependent entirely on agriculture and the capital required for the industrial development came through agriculture. That is the surest and the most reliable method for the development of industries and of economic development. The entire superstructure has got to be built basing it on the capital formation in agriculture. Has any capital formation taken place in this country? I think not. That is the greatest economic malady from which this country is suffering. Unless that is done, our dependence on foreign countries is inevitable. Mr. Arun Chatterjee and others were talking very eloquently of putting a stop, of declaring a moratorium, etc. They could say all those things. The communists could talk in that way. But we could not do so because we are anxious to keep our honour and dignity by paying back every pie of the foreigners which we have borrowed for our purposes in the present circumstances.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala): By borrowing more.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Maybe, by borrowing more if necessity arises and if our economic development needs it. And we have to do it. There is no other way. That is what we believe in. Therefore, Sir, what I wanted to impress upon this honourable House is that agriculture should occupy, it should be given, a pride of place in the economic development of our country. That is the point that I wanted to make.

That is the point I wanted to raise. Unless capital formation takes place in agriculture, the economic super-structure cannot be solidly and firmly built. Certainly the Plan has given sufficient importance

to agriculture. The total outlay in the Third Plan for agricultural development was Rs. 1089 crores and in the Fourth Plan it is Rs. 2,217 crores, more than double. What I am astonished at in this connection is that there is no fresh thinking or approach. That is my disappointment when I see the Plan. It is a true copy of the Third Plan. Not a word is changed. Only the allocations are more than in the previous Plan. For instance agricultural production programmes are the same, minor irrigation is the same. The heading is also the same, like minor irrigation, soil conservation, development of dairies, community development etc.—they are all the same headings. I have gone through both the Third and the Fourth Plans. There is no change in the thinking so far as the thinking aspect of the Plan is concerned. There seems to be no change. I want a change which should be this way. I am a farmer. According to me there are two ways of achieving a sound agricultural base, an agriculture through which sufficient capital formation can take place year by year and a high income and happiness of the people both in food supplies and in the raw materials for small industries which have to develop through agriculture. Therefore instead of simply copying the production programmes, etc. there should have been fresh thinking on these. There is another aspect of agriculture, namely, the creation of an infra-structure for the development of agriculture. What is happening in this country to-day? There is no infra-structure. You are harping on artificial things. The soil is getting depleted of nutrition, right from the Himalayas to Cape Camorin, from Dwarka to Assam, all over. Of course for thousands of years the soil has been under cultivation for such a long time and on account of the very unscientific methods followed, the soil has been reduced to the lowest level of nutrition. Therefore the first and foremost attention should have been given for enriching the soil as such through natural processes. What is the position? The amount of destruction, that is deforestation, that is taking place is very colossal. I find the trees grown in the fields and the villages were contributing the organic matter required. That infra-structure has to be built up. That is a long range programme. There is no talk of organic manure. At least previously there were such things as mobilising the

organic manure. There is no talk of it now as if it is no concern of anybody. One can burn any amount of cow dung. This way the infra-structure is not created in the country. There are monkeys, rats, etc. Monkeys alone take away 5 per cent. of the agricultural production year by year. Not a word is said about it. Such practical things are omitted. Then rats, pests, etc. are there. The Plan is completely silent about it. This is what I call the infra-structure. It has to be created and it has to be created over a number of years because it is not possible to create it over one year or two years or in one plan period. It is a continuous process. Something has to be done for that.

I have not the time to speak about other things but I would lay stress on another aspect. Having said this much about agriculture, I would go back to another point. What is the structure of the society? The salient aspect of the society has not been taken notice of. Ten per cent. of the people in the entire rural area are fairly well off. You may not call them rich but they are those who produce all the requirements of their food and other crops but also something more for marketing. Another 50 per cent. produce enough for themselves. There are 40 per cent. of the rural people even according to the census who are called the weaker section of the Backward Classes, maybe the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. This 40 per cent. of the people are either landless or who own less than an acre. Their fate is not taken care of by this Plan. A mere Rs. 1.34 crores has been set apart for this. Nearly 160 million people are absolutely without any means of production in their hands. They are dependent on the precarious labour that is available in the rural areas in agriculture. Such people are not taken notice of. Unless the poverty of this 40 per cent. is eliminated, this poverty is going to be stabilised and it will take deep roots in this country. That aspect has not been taken notice of by the Plan. That is my mortification. This sort of planning will not remove it. Therefore I want this 40 per cent. of the people who are landless labourers or who own only an acre or less should be enumerated. A statistics of these people must be taken and they must be settled on the available vacant cultivable land at the disposal of the various Governments.

This subject came up for discussion in West Berlin when there was an international seminar on agricultural production programmes in which very eminent men participated. I had the good fortune of leading the Indian Delegation.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): You are also eminent.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I am not that eminent. I had gone only to learn.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: We concede you are eminent.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I thank you very much. This is the problem in all the 60 or 70 developing countries in the world. The problem is of the weaker sections. Unless they are uplifted there cannot be any happiness. It is quite possible that social tensions will be created in the rural parts. Probably we are heading to a disastrous situation if we do not in time take care of this weakness that is obtaining in the rural side. Therefore I want that at least 10 per cent. of the weaker sections to be settled. There should be colonisation because you cannot immediately provide for them in the agricultural sector. Therefore 10 per cent. of the people must at least be settled on Government vacant cultivable land by providing them all the necessary facilities like housing, cattle requirements, credit, etc. and they must be settled. This was what we arrived at after discussions for a week. This is what we decided. I am convinced that the decisions we took were good and sound decisions. That is why I make bold to say this and bring that aspect here because some very eminent men participated in that seminar. Ten per cent. can be settled that way.

Another 10 per cent can be settled this way, on account of your Plan programme extra facilities may be created wherein the could be easily employed. Another 10 per cent could be employed in the rural works programme. We have to employ them. There is no other way. Profitable employment could be created through a proper rural works programme for a 10 per cent. And another 10 per cent at least must be lifted from the rural area to the non-agricultural sector, like industries, etc. This is the way to uplift them, to lessen the rural

[Shri N. Sri Rama Reddy.]

poverty that is existing in the rural parts. I may say this before the Prime Minister that the real problem of this country is the problem of poverty 40 per cent of the weaker sections of society who are landless labourers or are farmers owning less than one acre of land.

Now, having said that I would like to pose some questions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Now you have taken a lot of time.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: I am concluding, Sir. Therefore I demand a separate plan for the upliftment of the weaker sections of society, and having demanded a separate plan for the 40 per cent of the weaker sections of society, may I now pose a few questions before the Prime Minister? Of what use is all this agricultural strategy of new science and technology and new inputs to this 40 per cent of the people, who do not own any means of production? Of what use are they? They are absolutely of no use to them. What use is social control of banks, or even nationalisation of banks as demanded by the Opposition Members, to them? What use is it to these weak men in the society, the men there in the villages? Of what use are your production programmes to them for which you have set apart Rs. 2,217 crores? They are absolutely of no use to them. Apart from the marginal benefits, he may get by way of protection a little more of employment, that too precarious employment, more precarious because of the rural electrification. He is also driven out because of tractorisation, because of the mechanisation of agriculture that is being talked of. Of course, by all these things he is going to be worse off. What is the use of major irrigation? What is the use of medium irrigation? What is the use of minor irrigation? To these people they are absolutely of no use. These do not affect the situation at all. Of what use is rural electrification to them? Therefore what should we do? Here, Sir I demand a separate plan for the upliftment of these weaker sections of society who are 160 millions today and who at the close of the Fourth Five-Year Plan will be 200 million.

Thank you very much.

SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this Fourth Five-Year Plan (Draft) and in doing so I may draw the attention of the House to the objective conditions prevailing now in the country, even after more than two decades of the country's independence.

(Interruptions)

When we launched the first Five-Year Plan, our slogan was to establish a socialistic pattern of society and to raise the living standard of the common man. Now how far have we reached in our social objective? Has anybody thought, while framing one Plan after another we are at the beginning of the Fourth Five-Year Plan; before this we had only Annual Plans for the immediately preceding three years, and before that we had three Five-Year Plans covering a period of fifteen years, and after this Fourth Plan we will possibly be launching another Plan, the Fifth Five-Year Plan—has anybody thought how far we have succeeded in our objective? It reflects on the sincerity of the opposition also, reflects on how far they are concerned about the common man. They cry hoarse over it but try to mislead the people. They never concentrate on the real objective, the objective of uplifting the common man, but they go on haranguing and misleading the people, and there are certain parties also who do not want any planned progress in the country. Of course now, this Plan, this Fourth Five-Year Plan (Draft), I find, is an objective Plan. Its highlights are to keep the price-line in check, to do away with the monopolies and to take to self-reliance, not depend much on imports. And this doing away with the monopolies was thought of only recently, much later than when it should have been. It is stated in this Plan that the big business houses which are in possession of big industries should not be given industrial licences any more and they should be asked to invest proportionately their money when they want to establish any industry. The financial institutions had been going out of the way to show undue favours to the big industrial houses. In this way the big industrial houses wanted to control the economy of the country for their own benefit. Then of course came the social control over banks for which the legislation was enacted. Mere social control over banks will not do. Government

should exercise full control over banks and other financial institutions to see that the economic imbalances, which are so glaring, are not allowed to go out of hand. Now take this. What is the income of a labourer or a *kisan* toiling for hours together in the hot sun and in the chill weather? What is his income? He works for barely a pittance, for even a rupee. And that too is not assured to him for a whole month. He gets an average income of Rs. 15 in a month. See the disparity in the incomes of people. There are people in the big business houses who are drawing Rs. 10,000 per month, and even more than that in the shape of so many other emoluments. Now these people should think of the common man and the country too. Unless we pay attention to ameliorate the plight of the small man, the common man who produces the wealth of the country, it would be very difficult to administer the country smoothly and keep the unwholesome elements including the rising prices in check.

In the industrial field we now see that industrial labour is being misguided by certain interested political parties. Why? It is because the industries in the private sector or even our public sector undertakings do not see that the man who toils, who labours, who works, does not get his fair deal. Unless we do all this, what we have experienced in our elections in West Bengal we may experience again, and Mao's thoughts, infiltrating into this country from the other side of the border, will gradually spread. Not only is the philosophy of Mao confined to the Naxalites—it is not confined only to West Bengal where there is a Communist Government and where there are the Naxalites—it has also spread up to the borders of Orissa with Andhra, with a lot of trouble created in the Andhra region in the belt inhabited by the Adivasis. The Naxalites could not penetrate deep into Orissa. Yet the Parliamentary Committee for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was requested to go and visit those parts on behalf of Parliament. They visited that area to know the objective conditions prevailing in the Sika-kulam district of Andhra Pradesh bordering my State.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY. The Naxalites have killed two landlords.

SHRI N. PATRA: They are doing all that. Unless we try to wean away the mass of the people and do something to uplift them economically, matters will not improve. We must do something concrete for them, not just promise, not just go on promising, it is just full of assumptions and hopes.

Unless a motivation is created, unless a patriotic ardour is created in the country it will be very difficult to implement these Plans. He must have a sense of participation. A sense of involvement must be felt by the people who are creating all this wealth. Unless he feels that he is somebody in the Indian Union and he is, not only there just to give his vote and unless he feels that his needs will be met you cannot implement these Plans. Today his needs are not being met. What is the Government doing in this direction? We want to do away with disparities but how far have we succeeded? What are you doing in the Plan itself? From the Plan itself I will show how you want to perpetuate disparities that exist between backward States and the richer States. Let me take my own State of Orissa. In this Fourth Five Year Plan the allotment for my State in the Central sector is Rs. 160.50 crores and the Government there, the Swatantra Government, the nothing-doing Government do nothing to exploit the resources of the State. They are incapable of raising any amount. They say that they cannot get more than Rs. 20 crores and so the whole amount comes to Rs. 180.50 crores. But our population, you should know, is of the same dimension and if barely comes to an expenditure of Re. 1 *per capita*.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Are you 160 crores?

SHRI N. PATRA: No; 160 lakhs.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Then it comes to Rs. 100 and not Re. 1.

SHRI N. PATRA: Yes; one hundred rupees. With an expenditure of Rs. 100 *per capita* for 5 years you want to develop the backward State of Orissa? Orissa is full of resources and we want to exploit our resources.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA (Orissa): Orissa was your Government all along.

SHRI N. PATRA: Not my Government; It is your Government and what is your Government doing? It has done away with land revenue which had been recognised even by puranas and shastras. Why has land revenue been abolished? Nobody asked for its abolition. The kisan who sells his paddy and gets the money would never have cared for this small levy which has been customary and traditional. Actually all of them were paying, the Rajas and Maharajas and the landlords in the other parts who have all joined together to form the Ministry thought it fit not to pay any tax on their lands. And the Rajas and Maharajas were not paying much; they were paying only a small pittance to the British Government and even that small amount they did not want to pay now. The Government there does not know how to augment the resources of this poor State. If you sanction grants to the States only on the basis of the resources raised by the States it will be very difficult for Orissa. The divisible pool of Central resources should be equitably distributed on the basis of population. Why are you not doing that? And why don't the richer States agree to this, States like Maharashtra, Gujarat, etc.? Why do you want the poor States that need finance to come to you, to wait on your dispensation with a begging bowl? Why don't you distribute your divisible resources on a population basis to all the States? Unless you do this, these imbalances will go on growing. It must be a need-based Plan. Have you ever attempted to make your Plan need-based? Ours is a poor country. You ask the Maharajas to do away with their Privy Purses; you abolished the zamindaris, you want the mill-owners to pay taxes but the affluent States of the Indian Union do not want to do justice to their brethren living in other States which are poor and backward. Here I would say one thing. Now Calcutta is there. Of course Calcutta is not so rich but yet proportionately it is richer than Orissa. The Roukela project as you know is in Orissa but its sales office is located at Calcutta. Now there was a decision earlier, a fair decision, to transfer this sales office to Roukela, which is the place of actual production. But there was some wire pulling, some influence which was brought to bear on this, and now it is not going to be done. And the result is you produce something in Orissa but its sale will be some

where else. This is how places like Bombay, Calcutta, Ahmedabad, etc. are cornering all the trade of the country and getting much. These richer States do not want to agree for a fair distribution of the divisible resources on a population basis.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: In the same way all the products of Hindustan steel are sold through a particular area.

SHRI N. PATRA: That is why I say the divisible resources should be distributed on a population basis and the needs of the backward areas must be met; otherwise disparities will go on growing between the mill-owners, Rajas, Maharajas and the common people and those disparities will be perpetually there. You have provided for some safeguards for the Adivasis and the Harijans. Similarly why don't you have some safeguards for the poor and backward States like Assam, Orissa, Nagaland and others? Why don't you meet their demands and do justice to them? What is the difficulty for the Centre? In these big rich States like Maharashtra, Gujarat, Rajasthan and other places they have Congress Governments. Why should they not all sit together and evolve a fair and equitable basis for the distribution of the available resources among all the States?

With these few observations I conclude.

4.00 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the beginning I would like to ask the Planning Commission and its Chairman what exactly they mean by planning and for whom they are actually planning. The Prime Minister has provided no answer to this crucial question and as far as the Plan is concerned we find the answer is given and that answer is they are planning for the monopolists at the cost of the people. Now, naturally such a Plan and its approach and strategy can never be acceptable to the masses and the people of our country. We do not think that a fashion parade of pious wishes, platitudes and tall claims make an economic or developmental plan, nor do we think that an array of financial and physical targets arbitrarily fixed, without any clear commitment to the masses and ideas of planning, can make a plan.

All that we have got in this document is the most defective and miserable assessment of the developments and situation in our economic life on the one hand and a presentation of a whole number of reduced targets and financial outlays. We are served with these things in the name of modesty, but what is sought to be paraded in the name of modesty is nothing but downright capitulationism in the interests of the monopolists. The Plan is a surrenderist Plan. That is why it has evoked no interest among the masses and even among the thinking sections of our population who generally would like to give thought to a document of this kind.

Now, let me deal with some aspects of the Plan. It is not possible for me to go into the details, nor is it necessary here for our purpose. All that I would like to do is to indicate my line of criticism and thinking and also what, in my view, should be the ingredients of an alternative Plan. As far as this Plan is concerned, as I have said before, it has surrendered to the monopolists. It seeks to reduce the tempo of development and so arrange development in our country that the masses continue to suffer and the millionaires continue to prosper.

Under the Third Five Year Plan, despite targets and financial allocations, we did not have the envisaged growth of national income at the rate of five per cent. It was somewhere around 3 per cent and the *per capita* income declined in later years. Even in the sector of industry, where it was thought that the rate of growth would be 11 per cent, the performance was only 7 per cent or so. In our agriculture the Third Plan envisaged that there would be a rate of growth of five per cent, the minimum required for our agriculture, but even the Fourth Plan would not claim that it has been anything more than 3.5 per cent. If we look at other targets, we are face to face with a catalogue of shortfalls and failures of the Third Plan. One should have thought that they would learn something at least from the negative experience of the Third Plan and from its failures. If targets and allocations settle the problem of planning, then we have already solved the problem. Despite the financial allocations and higher targets compared to the Second Five Year Plan, the Third Five Year Plan ended up as a

planned failure. Therefore, planning in this country is not one of just setting targets or financial outlays. Planning must mean something much more vital and basic and here I should like to state that the time has come for the Government and the country to make up its mind, whether we are prepared to maintain the *status quo* or whether it is not necessary to bring about the needed structural changes in our economy.

Unfortunately the Fourth Five Year Plan document does not at all indicate that it has even given thought to the problem of structural changes. I am not here to say that these estimable gentlemen who adorn the Yojana Bhavan are not intelligent and knowledgeable people. Some of them are undoubtedly intelligent and knowledgeable people, but the trouble is that they are the unfortunate prisoners of the basic policies of the Government and they so much like their prison life that they would not even like to be released on bail by us here on the side of the Opposition. Hence we find that planning has become a command performance by a commanded body called the Planning Commission of India.

Here I would like to deal with the problem of growth. Undoubtedly our economy has to solve the problem of growth and ensure a certain minimum rate of growth, which is absolutely essential for keeping the population at least at the existing level of living. I am saying it because what has been promised would not keep the population, which is growing in the country at the rate of 2.5 per cent, at the existing level of living after four or five years of planning. In order to maintain the population at the present level of living and taking into account the rise in population, we need at least six to seven per cent growth in our national income. The rate of growth, therefore, envisaged in this Plan falls short of the minimum required even to maintain the position where we are. But we want to go ahead. I am afraid the *per capita* income under this Plan will decline, even if we assume that some of the targets would be fulfilled. Therefore, I find a failure on this score. The problem of investment, if you come to it, we find again, has been tackled in a very weak manner and, in fact, it has not been tackled at all. It does not require the gentlemen of Yojana Bhavan to tell us that we need investment at 18 or 20 per cent of our

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

income and domestic savings should be of the order of 14 per cent after some three or four years. The question is what are you doing to bring about the required domestic savings in a manner which would not run counter to your social objectives and would ensure a fair deal to the masses. There is no indication at all that a change is going to be made on this score. I think on the domestic savings front they will fail and they will more and more rely on fleecing the masses by intense exploitation of the working people through high taxes, rising prices, inflationary pressures and deficit financing of the order of Rs. 850 crores as proposed in the Plan. It leaves no doubt that they want to fleece the masses.

So I think that will be their line and on the top of this general line, the line of the capitalist class always is to bring about a cut in the consumption of the population in the name of promoting exports and of finding investible resources. Therefore, the masses are to be warned here and now that the Plan is a challenge to their living standards and to their future and needs to be fought on that score.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, regarding agriculture, it is said in the Plan draft that improvement in the rate of growth in agriculture would be of the order of 4 per cent or so which is actually 1 per cent lower than envisaged in the Third Plan. The tempo of industrial development is proposed to be 9 per cent or so, whereas under the Third Plan it was 11 per cent. Here again it is surrender. I only say this thing to illustrate the point that I made:

What about the distribution of national wealth? That is a very vital question because of the supreme urgency in our national life today. But there is no solution to the problem. Here again it is *status quo*. Am I to understand that the social objectives so glibly talked about in this miserable Plan document are going to be fulfilled without bringing about structural changes and changes in production relations which alone can ensure a fairer distribution of national income in the country? National income is not distributed according to the pious wishes expressed in the Plan document in different places. Distribution of national income is an objective law

of economic process which takes place according to the socio-economic conditions in general and the production relations in particular. Do we see any structural change in order to bring about certain minimum changes in the outdated and obsolete production relations where the few at the top corner the fruits of the labour of others and run away with the gains of the nation through economic activity and development? There is no indication whatsoever that things are going to change. What do we need the planners for if they cannot tell us even that? I do not mind if they are not making the direct suggestion in the absence of Government policy, but if they are learned men, if they are intelligent men, if they are men who have got the well being of the people at heart, at least in this document they should pose the problem before the nation and tell the country that unless certain changes of a fundamental nature are brought about in agriculture and in industry and in production relations or in what we may call broadly the structural changes, no breakthrough will take place. Certainly the socio-economic disparities will not be reduced. On the contrary they will widen. They should have told us. Even that they do not tell us. So, Mr. Vice Chairman, that is their failure, and their failure is due to the fact that it is capitalist planning. It is planning for the capitalist class weighted in favour of the foreign and Indian monopolists, which is why we find that even the small and medium industries in the country not tied up with foreign collaboration, not tied up with the monopolists, had been given a step-motherly treatment under the Plan and in the scheme of this Plan.

Otherwise why a sum of paltry Rs. 300 crores should be allocated for village and small industries for the entire country when everybody knows that this backward country of ours with so much of regional imbalances and with so vast backward areas would require to build itself up from the grassroots by stepping up small and medium industries? Am I to believe that the States would be in a position to carry out small and medium industries projects if they are given a paltry sum for the whole country of Rs. 300 crores? The Planning Commission does not even tell us that something more is required. So, I find that

a theory has been built up, a wonderful theory, that is, planning with stability. I tell the phrase-mongers of the Planning Commission and the Government that they should not try to bamboozle the masses by presenting the question of stability. They are supposed to be planning with stability, a clever formulation, but I think it is so vulgar and crude that any man who has any knowledge of economics will immediately understand. Even Mr. V. K. R. V. Rao, while he was speaking in the seminar at Calcutta, has pointed out that if the planning does not maintain a proper tempo of development and also subserve the social objectives, there would be instability and uncertainty. This is a Plan for bringing about instability and uncertainty in our economy. It is not a Plan which, in the final analysis, assures us that there would be even this stability which it pretends to have offered us here. So this again is sheer bunkum when the Planning Commission talks about the so-called stability in order to hide its poverty of thinking, its bankruptcy of ideas, its complete subservience to Mr. Morarji Desai and the Government of India. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think I have dealt with that aspect of the matter.

Now the surrenderist document is there. Take industry, for example. The Planning Commission itself says that no new projects will be taken up, that the Plan is confined only to the projects on which a decision has already been taken and which are under implementation. It has written off new projects of industrial development, and this is put in cold print. What is planning for? Are we the managers of the monopolist class? It seems that they have accepted the slogan of the monopolist class of consolidation and efficiency, which is the cover for scuttling development of the public sector or rapid industrialisation along the desired lines under the aegis of the State. That is what I find in the Plan document. I protest against this. Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the time of the Second Plan we were told by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru that the public sector is taking the commanding heights in the economy, but we find in this Plan, after eighteen years of planning, that the public sector in industries and minerals is given Rs. 2,800 crores as against the private sector allocation of Rs. 2,400 crores.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra): It is less than the public sector.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is certainly less

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said that it is complementary and supplementary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that, Mr. Chinai. I am sure you are also less than the lady, Shrimati Satpathy, and Mr. Singh in size, but you are not really less I say in economic size. That is not the point. The point is about greater reduction in public sector, and the private sector is given a boost with Rs. 10,000 crores outlay. Not only that. When you talk about the public sector, you account for the investment of every rupee. But when you talk of the public sector, much is not taken into account. We know the private sector investment takes place outside the computation of planning. The actual investment in the hands of the monopolists would be much higher. May I know if that is the way the commanding height is to be secured?

SHRIMATI VIMAL PUNJAB DESHMUKH (Maharashtra): We are discussing the Fourth Five Year Plan. I fail to see why the Treasury Benches are almost empty.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I do not mind. I think the absence in the Ministerial Benches matches with the Five Year Plan Draft here. The only thing that I would say is that Shrimati Nandini Satpathy who is sitting here is much more forthright and honest than this Five Year Plan. I can understand her and her honesty is beyond question. But here is a hypocritical document, a surrenderist document which, as a Plan, has come to us, for the acceptance of Parliament and the nation. It is insulting to our intelligence.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: There is some point in what the hon. lady Member has said that on a discussion on the Plan, at least there should be one or two Cabinet Ministers. What are they doing? What are they meant for unless they attend Parliament? Where are they? Are they in the Central Hall canvassing for some member for the Executive of the Congress Party?

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER (SHRIMATI NANDINI SATPATHY):** The hon Prime Minister was here a few minutes back and she has gone to the Lok Sabha.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** It is because these Ministers are so ignorant about planning, they feel bored. Why bore them here? Let them have some tea there. Useless fellows. Do not bring them here. But let us speak to you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, and to the hon Members here.

**SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN:** May I appeal to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that this point raised by this lady Member is so very important that by any kind of humorous chivalry you must not rub away the idea, by saying that the Ministers are ignorant, they do not understand. Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are now discussing a very important matter, and what she says about this, is equally important. I mean no disrespect whatsoever to the Deputy Minister sitting here. But it is gross disrespect to this House that she alone is sitting to listen to this debate.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I fully share the sentiment. But, as you know, being an old hand, I have got fed up. I agree with you, with your sentiment. I fully respect your sentiment. But if you live here as long as I have done, you will also feel the same thing in this House. Surely, you are wiser and matured. I know that the Prime Minister came here. You know she came here just as some Members come to sign the Attendance Register for the daily allowance. She came here to sign the Attendance Register for more daily allowance.

**SHRI OM MEHTA (Jammu and Kashmir):** She was here for a pretty long time.

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:** Sir, it is very unfair to say that. When the debate started in the morning, the Prime Minister was there the whole day throughout. She went just now because she had to attend to some work. To say this is very unfair on the part of the hon. Member.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** If I am unfair, I stand corrected but always for the fairer people.

**THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI):** I am here.

**SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY:** Better apologise.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Now it is all right. But you see, Mr. Babubhai Chinai, they are not here. But I am not asking for her to be present or anybody to be present as long as you are here.

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:** I will take note of it.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Now, let us take the Plan's entire proposition-self-reliance. They want to make us believe from the document that they have given that they are planning for self-reliance. And these gentlemen do not even understand what they mean by self-reliance. They want to make it out that reduction in the quantum of foreign assistance would mean self-reliance for this country. Is that so? It is not that reduction is not important. It is very very important. Reduction should take place. In fact, it should ultimately be eliminated. I am talking about the foreign assistance. But that does not by itself make the economy self-reliant or self-generating.

Besides, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have a national objective inherited from the freedom struggle, the objective of attaining economic independence to which we pledged ourselves on the banks of the five rivers in 1930. What about that? I should like to know whether the Planning Commission has at all cared to read the independence pledge that the nation took many years ago when they were fighting the British and launched many hard days' struggle for freedom. I should like to know. Now, is it not said there that we have been subjected to ruthless plunder of our resources by the foreign monopolists and exploiters? Today even after 21 or 22 years of independence, do not exploitation and plunder continue to the eternal shame of all of us? I should like to know why the Planning Commission does not even record this fact in this document.

Mr. Vice Chairman, in 1948 at the pre-devaluation rate, foreign private investment other than banking amounted to Rs. 256 crores in this country. Today the foreign private investment in this country, coming mostly from British, American and West German sources, amounts to Rs. 1,100 crores. The figure has been revealed by the

Government itself in this House and in the other House. Now, as a result of this huge investment, huge quantities of wealth are being drained out of the country every year as profit, dividend, interest, royalties, commissions and other charges. And it has been stated by the Government itself that the drain on our resources on that account is to the extent of Rs. 50 crores a year and the net outflow of capital is today higher than the net inflow of private investment.

On the top of it, we have a plethora of collaboration agreements between the foreign monopolists on the one hand and the Indian monopolists on the other, which agreements are tied to purchases from the creditor countries, resulting in a heavy loss in our resources, and they fully utilise this situation in order to dictate the devaluation to us and compel this nitwit and cowardly Government to accept devaluation on the 5th June, 1966. This Planning Commission does not even care to make a proper assessment of the negative effect and harmful consequences of the devaluation of the Indian rupee. While it persists in planning, it does not speak of offering suggestions as to how we can overcome these harmful consequences, disastrous to our country, which followed the devaluation of the Indian rupee.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, therefore we find that in this Plan there is not even a hint of a promise that this country will overcome some day or the other the foreign dependence which exists in the form of plunder and exploitation of our resources by the foreign monopolists. The Plan on that score is unpatriotic, the Plan on that score is insulting to our national tradition and intelligence, and hence it cannot be accepted.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, even on the score of the aid, they say that we would get Rs. 4,000 crores or a little more, out of which more than a half of it has to be spent for servicing the outstanding debts which are already of the order of Rs. 6,000 crores and we shall be getting, for actual development purposes, about Rs. 1,700 crores for the entire Plan period. Now, the Planning Commission wants to make out as if they have reduced this thing. Gentlemen think that they can fool us. You are not getting more aid from the United

States, West Germany and other members of the Aid India Club because they are themselves in a crisis. They have decided not to give you more aid; despite all your visits to Washington, Bonn and London, they have turned down your plea and now you are trying to make a virtue of what has happened and pretend as if you are yourselves cutting the foreign assistance. It is all blown up. The Planning Commission should tell us how many visits have taken place abroad in order to get bigger loans, how many Ministers had gone and what happened to the negotiations that took place. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, here again, there is no solution.

Then I should like only to point out that our indebtedness abroad, as I said, is about Rs. 6,000 crores. Are we not going to do something about it? When we suggest that there should be moratorium in respect of certain debts, Mr. Morarji raises a moral question. But in international law and in international relations moratorium is not tabooed. It is not something which cannot be enforced. I think it is possible to discuss these matters seriously and do something about it.

Mr. Vice Chairman, the Planning Commission takes credit that our foreign exports would increase at the compound rate of 7 per cent. This is another wishful thinking, a pie in the sky.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Why?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA. Just by their performance and the present pattern of trade and trade relations I have no doubt that these targets will not be attained. Hon'ble Members can wish. But even after the Third Five Year Plan this year we had been running adverse trade balance of the order of Rs. 470 crores. But I think for this we need reorganisation of our trade relations, diversification of trade and, above all, nationalisation of foreign trade so that we can have a better grip over the external trade in order to serve the requirements of the Plan. Now, I know my friend will not like it.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: How can I like it because your suggestion would mean that we need not pay back our debts at all. If you nationalise foreign trade you will not earn any more foreign exchange

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai]  
and without foreign trade where is the foreign exchange to come from?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Babubhai Chinai does not know anything about business.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: I agree you understand "everything" about business. I do not understand anything, even the A.B.C. of business.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: When I nationalise foreign trade, does it mean I will not trade with foreign countries? Shall I trade with Manipur?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: By barter trade we only earn in Rupees; we do not earn any foreign exchange.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I agree we should have more of Rupee deal. . .

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Now the cat is out of the bag.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. Why should the trade be in the grip of two, three powers like the United States of America, West Germany and Britain? While we are running heavy deficits in trade, why can we not export to other markets where the trade can be better? There are possibilities in the other parts of the world today.

(Time bell rings.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): You have taken a long time. Now please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: With regard to agriculture I should like to say something. I have said about industry. With regard to industry I would like to say that the monopolists are given everything they want. It is planning for a free market economy, for de-control, for delicensing. The Planning Commission has completely ignored the report of the Mahalanobis Commission and yet we find that in the last three years the Tatas and Birlas alone. . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Mahalanobis is a monopolist himself. He pockets Rs. One crore from the Government of India himself through the semblance of some organisation there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now I find that in the last three years the Tatas and Birlas have augmented their industrial assets from Rs. 707 crores to Rs. 1,100 crores, and the Mafatlal group has increased their wealth by 1 am told.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: You have no business to misguide this House. It is not Mafatlal's estate. It is the estate of the shareholders of the Corporation. Therefore, please do not misguide this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not misguide. It is Mafatlal group of industries. I am speaking in the language of Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed. (Time bell rings). Please ask him not to misguide the House. So they have increased their wealth in four years by 172 per cent. or so. This is the position. In this Draft Plan there is nothing to check this trend.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, then why nationalisation of banks is not accepted by the Planning Commission? Nationalisation of banking is a very important matter from the point of view of not only controlling the economy but also for finding resources when we know that a sum of Rs. 3,000 crores passes through these banks.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Please wind up. You have taken a lot of time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just one more point.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: I do not want to interfere. But there is some time limit for everybody. He has taken more than 35 minutes. You have allotted 15 minutes only to others. He should also understand that others also would like to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are also waiting for our turn.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I fully understand that.

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Perhaps Mr. Chinai would realise that this Vice-Chairman is sharing the same weakness of every other Vice-Chairman, including even the Chairman, of never being able to put

the speaker at the proper time back in his seat.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA.** Mr. Vice-Chairman, since you are suffering from so many weaknesses I do not want to increase them any further. So I finish. Give me a few minutes. (*Time bell rings*). As far as agriculture is concerned, there is no question of land reforms at all. Your land policy is leading to the development of capitalist farming forgetting the fact that this will lead to a highly explosive situation in the countryside.

Today 5 per cent. of the land owners at the top in the rural areas control 40 per cent. of the land under cultivation whereas at the bottom 20 per cent. do not have any land at all. We have got 60 per cent. of our rural population either in the category of agricultural labourers or poor peasants. We have got 9 crore acres of land which can be distributed among them if the planning was real. But nothing of the kind is being envisaged. Yet the Planning Commission writes that the Third Five Year Plan was engaged in paying compensation to the landlords and that Rs. 641 crores have been sanctioned as compensation. The Planning Commission is mightily proud that one-half of this thing has been paid.

(*Time bell rings*)

Finally, about unemployment there is no mention at all. I do not know what to call this Planning Commission. All other Plan documents made a reference to the backlog of unemployment. When we started with the First Plan the unemployment was 3 million. Today it is 12 million. But this Draft does not mention . . .

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:** It is mentioned.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** The figure is not given. Although in the earlier Plan documents there has been an attempt to give the backlog of unemployment this is not done here and no solution is given for overcoming, reducing, unemployment. Only pious wishes. It is one of the biggest problems that we are facing today.

Then they tell us that by the next few years the unemployment will be of the order of 20 million.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, last point with regard to resources mobilisation . . .

(*Time bell rings*)

**SHRI B. I. KEMPARAJ (Mysore):** The statement that the hon'ble Member is making is not correct.

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:** I would like to draw the attention of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to page 341 of the Five Year Plan (1969-74). In the Chapter on unemployment it is mentioned. Therefore, to say that it is not mentioned is not correct.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Where is the figure?

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:** It is there.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** It is not there. I have read the whole thing. You read one line and show me where it is mentioned.

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:** Please see page 343. You will find there that total employment is given as 16.33 million.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** . . . I am talking about unemployment, the backlog of unemployment. That is not mentioned.

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI:** You never said backlog of unemployment.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** It is not there; I have gone through it. All I say is—Mr. Chinai, I know, will agree with me—there is no mention of backlog of unemployment. Even in the earlier document that they had circulated, it was mentioned as 10 million or so. The earlier Plans had mentioned about the backlog of unemployment. Not only that, figures were given from Plan to Plan. Here it has not been mentioned that way. All other figures are given to hide that fact.

**THE VICE CHAIRMAN (RAM NIWAS MIRDHA):** Please wind up.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I am finishing. The resources question is a very vital question. The idea of financial resources in the conventional way is not going to take us anywhere any more. The Planning Commission plans, apart from deficit financing,

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

that Rs. 2,700 crores should be found by additional taxation. We know how difficult it is. Most of the States have said that they would not be in a position to collect Rs. 1,100 crores which is supposed to be their share. Therefore, I say, the resources should be found by nationalisation of banks, by nationalising foreign trade, by nationalising wholesale trade in foodgrains to the maximum extent possible and by nationalising several big industrial undertakings in the hands of the monopolists. Unless you have a profit-yielding, revenue yielding, public sector; built up not only by starting new projects but also through the process of nationalisation of the existing ones, you will not solve the problem of resources in the country. And the Planning Commission does not even mention the importance of abolishing the privy purses; though it is a small sum, it has a big impact on our life. Therefore, their idea remains one of taxation, of taxing the poor people. We cannot accept it. Finally, in the Centre-State relations also. . . (*Time bell rings*). Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is absolutely the last point.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: He has already taken 45 minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You also mentioned Centre State relations; I liked it. And in the Centre-State relations again there is *status quo*. Am I to understand that the States are going to carry out the Plan and development projects when you have granted them only Rs. 3,500 crores of Central assistance, the total outlay being Rs. 6,000 crores, and when you know that they will not be able to raise that money? And the States are being told "Unless you find money by taxing the people"—while denying them proper revenue sources—"you will not get anything from us and you have to cut your Plan projects and so on." Now, this is again an advance announcement to the States that planning must be centralised and the States would not have any say in this matter and they would have to be satisfied with the crumbs that the Planning Commission and the Government will throw from here. Therefore, I demand a change in the Centre State relationship in financial matters. The existing Centre-State relations should be carefully gone into and the States should be given not only greater financial assistance, but

certain sources\* of revenue now exclusively available to the Centre, should be thrown open to the States. That is very important because in our country we cannot develop planning, specially if you want to associate the masses with it, unless we bring the States into the picture in a bigger way. So that is another point.

Before I sit down, I thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I am very sorry that we have been treated in Parliament in this cavalier manner by the Government in the matter of planning I am here since 1952. I took part on behalf of my party even in the consultations since the *First Five-Year Plan*. In every discussion I have participated and every committee I have joined. I have gathered some experience in this matter. It may not be very rich, but I can tell you that never has Parliament been treated in this shabby manner as it has been treated over this Fourth Five-Year Plan. They wanted to give a burial to the Plan, indeed they have given a burial to it. Now, what goes in the name of planning is planning to sabotage the economy. It is specially for the monopolist class, and it is clear to-day that along this capitalist path of development, and planning under the aegis of monopolists and the Congress regime, the country will not find a correct solution to its problems and we will not have a correct road to planned economic development of the country. Hence the lesson, the only one, is that the Congress Government at the Centre has to be replaced by a left and democratic Government, should we mean to have a Plan for the masses. At the same time, we must make a break from the capitalist path and take to the non-capitalist line.

Finally, all I would like to say is, I condemn the Government; why has this Planning Commission ignored the demand for the need-based minimum wage of the employees and workers, which has become a national demand? On the contrary, their line is one of wage-freeze, one of attack on the trade union rights, which is why the Planning Commission in this document does not even show concern for the systematic and mounting attack on the trade union rights of the working people. Do they think that they can plan for the country by treating the people as hewers of wood and

drawers of water, or by treating them as so many beasts of burden? If that is so, the time has come for the nation to take up this challenge and make a breakthrough at political and economic level so that the masses themselves, guided by the interest of the nation, can formulate their own Plans and implement them in a democratic manner, where the monopolists would be pushed back, economic independence would be achieved, and the peasants, workers and employees would get a fair deal, and our cultural and material life would be assured continued advancement. Planning must show to the nation every day that planning means improvement in your living conditions, in your material and spiritual life. It must not mean, as it means here, exploitation and plunder of the masses for the sake of a handful of exploiters and millionaires at the top. Thank you.

**SHRIMATI VIMAL PUNJAB DESHMUKH:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, at long last, the eagerly awaited Fourth Five Year Plan, after enjoying three years' holiday, has been presented to this august House. It is earnestly hoped that this Plan will be able to revitalise the country's shattered economy and relieve the teeming millions of untold hardships due to spiralling prices and shortage of food, and afford plenty of employment opportunities and freedom from the clutches of the corrupt administrators.

The first and foremost thing to be done is to free the country from dependence for food on other countries such as the USA, Canada and Australia. Sir, that this "Bharat Varsh", land of *sujalam-suphalam*, which because of plenty of prosperity and abundance, attracted invaders for centuries, should go with a begging bowl to feed its teeming millions is a matter of shame. Realising this, it is imperative that we lay more stress on increasing agricultural production. It is heartening to see from the Plan that the topmost priority is given to agriculture. Nearly 32 per cent. of the total outlay on public sector has been allocated to agricultural production. Similarly, Rs. 5,667 crores are allocated for rural welfare and benefit schemes. I do sincerely hope that every pie of this allocation will be wisely and scrupulously utilised on family planning, health, provision of drinking water and other facilities in the remotest villages.

In the short time at my disposal I wish to restrict my comments to agricultural production which is and will always remain the prime need of this over populated country.

Irrigation is the important input needed for cultivation. After the country's partition in 1947 hardly 2 per cent. of irrigation facilities existed in this country. After the Third Plan we have not increased the irrigation facilities much. Our State of Maharashtra even after three Plans has hardly 6 per cent of irrigation facilities. I am proud to say that in spite of the meagre irrigation facilities in our State this year the Maharashtra State has increased the food production and almost achieved a green revolution by adopting a new strategy and has amply proved that a breakthrough in agriculture is possible. I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the toiling farmers who have readily responded to the nation's call of "Grow More Food" and achieved a tremendous success. Secondly, I wish to heartily congratulate our agricultural research scientists who by evolving new strings of high yielding variety seeds, proved to the world that they are second to none. Vidarbha also has not lagged behind in the agricultural production programme. I once again humbly wish to request the Central Water and Power Commission to give clearance to the Upper Vardha Project so that it can be included in the first year of the Fourth Five Year Plan and thus be instrumental in stabilizing the green revolution in this area.

It is gratifying to note that Rs. 950 crores have been provided for major and medium irrigation and flood control schemes. In addition, Rs. 176 crores are set apart for minor irrigation.

Fertilizer and organic manure is the second 'must' for agricultural production. Our farmers have become fertilizer-minded. So much so that it is difficult to meet the demand for some years to come. In the absence of the availability of chemical fertilizers which are very necessary, it should be our endeavour to make the maximum use of the organic manure such as cow-dung, urine of our live-stock and also the nightsoil which we have in abundance due to large population. It is a pity that we

[Shrimathi Vimal Punjab Deshmukh]  
are wasting this rich and valuable nitrogenous organic manure by burning the cowdung cakes which are used as fuel. I would request the Government to see that the burning of cowdung cakes be prevented by supplying cheap fuel such as coal, gas, electricity, etc. It seems that this has escaped the attention of the planners.

We are celebrating Gandhi Centenary this year and it will be in the fitness of things that we practise what he preached. I wish to draw the attention of this House to Mahatmaji's article, "Scavenger's All", in which he estimated that the nightsoil of Delhi for one year would be a rich source of manure for 40,000 acres. Since this article was written the population of Delhi has increased almost eight times. The country's needs of nitrogenous fertilizer are calculated to be 3.70 million tons at the end of the Plan. By using the nightsoil and other organic manure it will be possible to meet some part of the nitrogenous manurial deficiency.

Before I conclude I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the family planning programme and request the Government to provide more funds for this programme as this is very very necessary in order to achieve our needed goal, and I am sure that every pie that is allocated to this programme will be scrupulously utilised for that purpose.

With these words I conclude my speech.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I wish Mr. Bhupesh Gupta were here when I spoke on this. I do not believe in speaking things behind people. But if Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, the so-called veteran parliamentarian, does not stick to the general norms of the House, I cannot help it. The normal practice in the House is that one has to stay on till one's successor speaker has finished. But he does not care for it. Whatever he has to put in he puts in, he vomits out. His Marxist theory is not his own. It is an acquired theory from some other country. He vomits it out here whether it is digested or undigested. Then he walks out. He has his own way. All the same, even if he is absent, since what he has said appears to me as a bundle of confusion and contradictions—he is a personality in confusion—I

would like to say a few things on what he has said. He started by saying that planning should not be imposed from the top. When dealing with these things, Sir, I hope the Congress Party would give me some time; otherwise, the Congress Party would have had to reply to all these questions. When I am doing the job which they would have had to do, I think the Congress Party should contribute some time to me.

The point is he was complaining about an imposition of the Plan from the top. There is no doubt about the fact that I and my party have been consistently resisting it. We are opposed to it. Everybody knows that. But what is the special consideration on the part of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to oppose it? He believes in a particular ideology and the ideology believes in a particular type of planning. The planning started from Russia. The ruling party tried to impose it on India. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru took it from Russia and tried to impose it on India. The country that inspires him with the Marxist ideology, if that country imposes it and that is the only way how it can be, then, why should he complain here that planning should come only from the bottom and not from the top? Is that because he has one or two Governments in one or two States that he wants to have his own way, that is, evolve something from the State and impose it on the Centre? He cannot have it both ways. He cannot have the cake and eat it too. He has either to accept the system of planning that is prevalent in Russia which is their ideal or he has to say, "I do not believe in communism or the socialist type of Russia. I am against it. I am opposed to it." If he says that, then, there can be some justification in what he says here. Time alone does not justify one's speech. If by consumption of a volume of time, which he does in the House, his contributions could have been effective, then there was some justification in his speaking for 50 minutes. But if he goes on repeating the same Marxist philosophy which he had probably read 20 years ago, which is outdated and totally obsolete now, it would impress nobody. Neither does it contribute to the proceedings in the debate nor does it impress upon anybody except probably his own partymen, and I do not know except his own partymen if anybody else in this House gets impressed by what he speaks.

He is a good theoretician. There is no doubt about it. He is an absolute theoretician. He is a theoretician who should have belonged to the 19th century wrongly born in the 20th century. Now, Sir, I will make one or two references in connection with his speech when I come to land reforms and other things.

5 P.M.

The Plan Document reminds me of a story that I used to read when I was a child. The story was that there was a porter who was asked by one of the merchants to carry a pitcher containing milk. On the way he bargained with the employer. He asked: 'How much are you going to give me?' The employer said: 'I am going to give you one rupee because you have to carry it five miles'. Then he had a lot of time to dream and in the dream he thought: 'As soon as I get one rupee, I will purchase a hen, then the hen would lay eggs and having got the eggs, I can sell them in the market after they are hatched and become grown-up hens and so I will get a lot of money and then I will purchase a goat and a cow and by selling milk I shall become a great monied man and when I would be sitting on my sofa in a very luxurious fashion, when my daughter would come to intimate me that the meals are ready, I would say that it is not yet time for the meals by nodding the head'. At once the pitcher fell down. The dream was smashed and the contents of the pitcher also and naturally what he got was not one rupee from the employer but probably a slap or two.

**SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI:** But we are not now children.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** It gets multiplied according to the number of years. When I think back of the story that I used to read in my childhood days I am delighted to find how suitably it fits the Plan Document. The Government not only dreamt for itself but it also made the people dream that the wages earned out of the carrying of the pitcher would ultimately make everybody become a monied man one day. In the meantime probably there was a nodding of the head by the Government and the pitcher fell and nothing came out. Of course this is just a story but it suits to

the occasion. Coming to the Plan itself, what I find is in the Third Plan the utilisation of the resources was much more than in the Second Plan. I do not have to go into the details. Everybody knows about it. The original estimate was, balance from current revenues Rs. 550 crores and the additional taxes Rs. 1,710 crores while the actuals came to minus 419 crores and Rs. 2,892 crores. Deficit financing was estimated at Rs. 550 crores while actuals were Rs. 1,133 crores. The aggregate came to Rs. 8,577 crores while the estimates were Rs. 7,500 crores. But in spite of the utilisation of this money what could we do? The national income rose, according to the Government figures, by 13.3 per cent. during the Plan but when you see the per capita income which has been generated as the real income, it remained stagnant. There was no change in it. God alone knows how the statistics are collected, or if they are collected by monopolists like Mr. Mahalanobis. I call him a monopolist because he eats away one crore from the public exchequer. He does not spend it. He has some office called the Statistical Institute in Calcutta. What he does God alone knows and how far his statistics are reliable I cannot say because they are all manufactured in his office in Calcutta city. I know they are manufactured, may be by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or by his satellites or fellow-travellers but I do not know how far I can depend on these figures but even depending on these figures, the real per capita income has remained stagnant. Further faulty utilisation of the money wasted all the additional effort. The optimistic estimates of capital output ratio of 2:1 and the one year time-lag between investment and generation of output have come to be only a dream, a figment of imagination as is being said many times from the Treasury Benches in regard to the Opposition allegations. Many of my friends who used to give their cheap applause when Pandit Nehru started speaking on the Plan, not knowing what he was going to say, even they have started realising that it was a mistake on their part to have relied on the Government so long. Facts have opened their eyes. I am very happy about it that even though it is belated, even though they were hypnotised for such a long time, it is good that their eyes have at least been opened now. It is a good indication if there is realisation in the

[Shri Lokanath Misra]

Congress Party that they were going in the wrong direction and that we have driven them to the right direction. That would be a great achievement to the country. It is the majority of the Congress Party that has kept up the Congress Government which has been going in the wrong direction for the last so many years in regard to the Plan. I hope now that this wisdom has dawned on the Congress Party, they would gear up the Government in the right direction rather than continue in the wrong direction in which they have been continuing for so many years.

Coming to the allocation this year, the public sector industries have again been allotted Rs. 3,055 crores. The performance of the public sector undertakings has been awful that no investor worth the name with any investment consciousness would have probably invested a pie in the public undertakings. What we need in the country is not implanting of ideology. If the implanting of ideology in the country produced grain and other things, I would have no objection. What we need is more production and through what process, we can produce more. That should be the headache of this administration. Instead of that, if you do not know how to correct your mistakes, if you do not gain from experience, then the country would never revive from the economic chaos that it is in. It would further deteriorate the economic situation. Therefore the public sector is not the place for investment. You want more food. You have been depending on foreign countries for food for the last so many years. You need many things for the industrial sector which you have not been able to produce still—may be there 500 items, but all the same there is absolutely no effort to find out which will produce things earlier and more.

The same ideology persists even now, and it persists only because some of the fellow-travellers and communists have got into the Congress party and they go on haranguing day in and day out that it must be public sector, that it must be public sector only. I think any human being with standard intelligence should be capable of understanding that public sector is a colossal failure. It is not going to yield a dividend. It is not going to

yield anything to make the country overcome the lack of production and lack of amenities. Therefore, whatever can produce earlier, what ever can produce more should be the sector that should get the investment. I am sorry it has not been possible yet because of friends like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and his comrades in the Congress Party. I am not the only person who is saving this. Even the preceptor of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta—I cannot correctly pronounce his name. It is a Russian name and Russian names are so difficult for me to pronounce correctly—even that preceptor, Mr. Skachkov of the USSR, who came to analyse the defects in our public sector undertakings . . .

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I know the pronunciation of this name.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Yes, you must be familiar because you are a fellow-traveller.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Am I?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Parliamentary jokes go on like this. This is the type of parliamentary jokes that go on in the House. Don't get worried about it.

Now, Sir, even he, after analysing the defects in the public sector undertakings, came to the conclusion and recommended it to this Government that concentration of authority and power in the hands of people like Messrs K. D. Malaviya and Company would not pay dividends, would not make a public sector concern a paying institution. Therefore, what has to be done is that power should be decentralised so that immediate decisions could be taken.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Mr. K. D. Malaviya is my friend and he belongs to our Congress Party.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That is your interpretation of Mr. K. D. Malaviya. Mr. K. D. Malaviya, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, Mr. Krishna Menon, they are people who ought to belong to Russia but who are wrongly born in India.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: They are misplaced?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That is right. Kindly do not interrupt me now in

what I have to say now. Afterwards you may kindly ask me questions.

**SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI** (Rajasthan): It was a compliment.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** Let me finish. The bell has rung already.

Now, Sir, I will touch only one or two more points. Then I will reply to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta on one point. I shall devote two minutes or three minutes for Orissa because I will be doing an injustice to Orissa if I did not mention matters pertaining to Orissa.

In order to boost up the public sector to the exclusion of the private sector, even the agricultural sector has been neglected for long. Even in this Plan the allocation for agriculture and irrigation is inadequate. I wish the Government realised that the time had come when, with a little more assistance to the farmer, he would seriously take to farming and produce three-fold. The experience in certain States has been that, after the introduction of the Tachung variety of paddy seeds—for which the Government ought to feel obliged to Mr. Dahyabhai Patel, my leader, but they did not do it; they have absolutely no sense of gratitude. Now I forgive them for that, because a man who loses his head does not have any sense at all—the production has gone up, almost two-fold. Therefore, a little incentive, a little assistance, somewhere an additional pump, somewhere an electric connection, would probably boost up the production in the agricultural sector immensely. But that is not going to be done. The Government still does not realise the mistakes committed by them. They perpetuate them. Now, Sir, the plan allocation in the Third Five-Year Plan for the agricultural and irrigation sector was 20.3 per cent. Now in the Fourth Five-Year Plan, instead of increasing the allocation they have brought it down to 19.9 per cent. What a wrong way of working!

Now I would give some suggestions. I do not know whether the Government is capable of understanding the suggestions at all, because Government's mind is a closed mind. (*Interruption*). With my friend, Mr. Krishan Kant, who is a fellow-traveller, and with people like him in the Congress Party, the entire atmosphere is

polluted in favour of the communists. Therefore I would like the Government to seriously go into these suggestions. I would like the Government to lay less emphasis on the public sector industry, more on the private sector, and make provision for infra-structures like power and transport. The consumer goods industry, on a larger scale, should be taken up. But huge establishments like Hindustan Steel, a white elephant, are eating away the public exchequer altogether. Foreign private investments, if they are necessary anywhere, should be encouraged. There should be discipline among industrial labour. But this is very much wanting now because of the fellow-travellers and the communists who are creating chaos and confusion. Now this reminds me of the Puranas, of Kunti in the Puranas who said, "I do not mind whether Arjun dies or Karna dies" because what remains in either case are five sons of Kunti. She said, "I do not mind either Arjuna dying or Karna dying. What I want to have are five sons. They remain whether this dies or that dies." Like that, Sir, the communists have the feeling that if the Plan succeeds then it will be a Russian type of Government that would be introduced in India. If the Plan fails then it would be chaos and confusion and a field day "for us, for our communism to spread." So either way they do not lose. But the Government loses. If this Government has any faith in democracy it should invest more money into these things and enforce discipline among industrial labour. They want chaos and confusion because that is the door through which they want to take over the Government.

Now, Sir, quick-yielding schemes should be taken up rather than schemes with long gestation periods. Labour-intensive schemes should get priority over everything else because, as everybody has indicated, there is already a huge back-log of unemployment. (*Time bell rings*) Two or three minutes more, Sir. As you have rung the bell, Sir, I shall not refer to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and the land reforms proposed by him. I now come to my own State. It is a very dismal picture so far as Orissa State is concerned, *vis-a-vis* the Fourth Five-Year Plan. Many projects, which the Orissa Government had proposed and seriously recommended have been

[Shri Lokanath Misra]

overlooked. Number one is the Vimalgarh-Falcher railway line. That would be the only alternative link between Northern India and Eastern India. In case of some difficulty in West Bengal, which is so frequent, that would be an alternative line to the east coast. Therefore it should get the priority which is necessary, and it also connects all the mining areas of Western Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and South Bihar to the port of Paradeep. Unless this line is laid, it would be uneconomic to take all the ore either *via* Visakhapatnam or *via* Kharagpur. So that is the only way out if you want to compete in the world market so far as iron ore, manganese ore and other ores are concerned.

Then the fertiliser project in Paradeep, Sir. The Government of Orissa made representations; all Members of Parliament irrespective of parties from Orissa met the Minister in charge and we were given a sort of assurance that it would receive serious attention but I am surprised not to find it in the Plan document. If the Plan document is worth anything it must contain the things that are recommended by the State Governments within the resources. And if you cannot do it in the public sector you must leave it to the private sector. You cannot stand in between saying that you will function like a dog in the manger. If you cannot do it you must allow others to do it, those who are prepared to boost up production and get you out of the mess in which you have landed yourself. But you would not listen to friends like them; you would only listen to enemies like Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and his comrades.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: They are enemies?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: They are enemies of the ruling Congress Party and of democracy. Are there any doubts in your mind?

SHRI RAJNARAIN: But you say they are friendly . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: They are not friends of the Congress Party, they are friends of a group in the Congress Party and may be in the Administration also but they are enemies of the country. Let me finish my points and after that you

can ask me questions and if the Chairman permits I will reply to all your questions.

Coming to my last point I raised last time a complaint about manganese ore and non ore. These ores are getting piled up at the pitheads and there is growing unemployment because the Ministry of Foreign Trade says that there is no market abroad for our ore. All the same they are giving licences to different parties who are suppliers. Those suppliers take advantage of the situation and they function as middle men and they eat up a lot of money from out of the bargain with the local mine owners. These middle men give the owners a very low price, *unworkable almost* and they get all the benefit from out of exports. We had suggested to the Ministry that they must somehow try to find a market. The MMIC Chairman after his appointment—probably he was appointed six months back—out of six months he had been abroad probably for five months and ten days and ultimately after his return from Japan he gives a statement to the press that he was not able to find a market for the ore. If he was not able to find a market what did he do all these five months and ten days abroad? We are short of foreign exchange. The mine owners themselves are groping in the dark as to how to find a market and here comes the boss, the Chairman of the MMIC, another public sector enterprise, who goes on a holiday, may be honeymooning—because I am told he is recently **married** . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Were you invited for the reception?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I am never invited to such receptions nor would I care to go to them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then how do you get the information?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: You know I am repository of information. So the country's foreign exchange is being depleted by this Chairman of the MMIC without his doing any job for the country or even for his institution. And if that be any indication of how the public sector undertakings are functioning then I feel that the entire House would get a fair idea of it and would urge upon their party leaders

and the Government to stop all further investment in the public sector.

**SHRI JOYCHIM ALVA** (Nominated). But you know the MMIC was able to strike a deal for the export of ore from Goa.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** The Goa deal was struck by the mine-owners of Goa and not by the MMIC. It is for your information.

**SHRI D. IHENGARI** (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, now that we are discussing the draft Fourth Plan I think it is necessary for us to have some introspection and see why the three previous Plans have admittedly failed to generate enthusiasm amongst the people. The reason was that they were not people's Plans. The Plans are being formulated in air-conditioned rooms and not being evolved from the bottom, that is, from the level of the people themselves. I think we are putting the cart before the horse while formulating these Plans because the right procedure would be that the various economic interests of the country should be properly organised. They should have mutual consultations. There should be a round table conference of all the organised as well as unorganised economic interests in which every economic interest should be allowed to state its difficulties, its aspirations, its pledge for contribution during the Plan period and thus by mutual consultation, through consensus the targets and other items in the Plan should be decided upon. We know, Sir, that in a small country like Israel they have successfully implemented this method. It is true that ours is a very vast country but still if we try to evolve this procedure I think there is no reason why we should not succeed. Now in this respect we see that there are certain organised sections; for example, labour, employees, administration, some sections of kisans, self-employed persons and so on. If instead of imposing any Plan from above the Planning Commission inspires each economic interest to have its own Plan and then tries to coordinate the various Plans of the different economic interests and thus evolves a national Plan on the fashion of Israel I think the people would accept that Plan as the people's Plan and then naturally enthusiasm would be generated amongst the people to imple-

ment the Plan and even to make sacrifices for its implementation. Now in this Plan we do not find anything that would inspire the poorer sections of the population. As a matter of fact it was expected that against the background of our experience of the three Plans at least now in this Fourth Plan there would be an endeavour to evolve a national income policy, a national price policy, a national productivity policy and a national employment policy. No such systematic efforts seems to have been made while drafting the Plan and therefore I again reiterate our original demand for a round table conference of different economic interests to evolve through consensus all these four national policies during the Fourth Plan period.

Only one more point. Much has been said about public sector undertakings. Certainly they are suffering from bureaucracy and the bureaucrats are not known for either business acumen on the one hand or for sufficient knowledge of industrial psychology on the other. In the present conditions it is a problem for us how to handle the public sector undertakings. I should like to suggest that taking some courage in both hands we should have some experiment at least in two or three of the public sector undertakings of automanagement, that is, experiment of workers managing their own undertakings with the help of the Government. Let us take the workers into confidence and give them a fair trial and see whether, if the same technical and financial aid which the Government would have given to any undertaking if it had been run by the bureaucrats is made available to the workers, the workers through their co-operative council could manage their own undertakings, and whether they could manage them in a better way, more efficiently and more profitably. That trial should be given to them.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL** (Gujarat): They will give trial only to Malaviyas, not to the workers.

**SHRI LOKANATH MISRA:** Malaviyas and Mahalanobises.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** To Himmatt Singh also.

**SHRI I. N. SINGH** (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have tried to go

[SHRI T. N. SINGH]  
through this volume, the Draft Fourth Five Year Plan, with some care and I am rather anxious to draw the attention of the House to certain aspects of the proposed planned programmes and their likely effect on the policies enunciated herein.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. BHENGARI)  
in the Chair]

I am not so much concerned with figures and statistics as with certain basic policies, to which we should give our thought. Now, as you know, in our earlier Plans, in the Second Plan particularly, we defined the objective of planning as the attainment of a socialistic pattern of society. Reference was also made in the Second Five Year Plan to the need for reducing inequalities. Then, in the Third Five Year Plan, while emphasising the objective of a socialist society, it was stated that the objective of the Plan was to provide the good things of life for all. That was the other objective which we enunciated. Now, in this Draft Fourth Five Year Plan the objectives as described are worth mentioning. It states:—

“The broad objectives of planning could thus be defined as rapid economic development accompanied by continuous progress towards equality and social justice and the establishment of a social and economic democracy.”

It is significant, except for quotations at pages 2 and 3, from the Second and Third Plan documents about a socialist society, there is no reference to socialism in the whole of this volume. Nowhere this volume refers to socialism or a socialist society, except as quotations. Those words, I repeat, do not occur in this volume except as quotations from the earlier Plans.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Simply they have referred to something or just quoted something from the earlier Plans.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Let me say, I think I can say it better than you.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I agree with you.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: So the broad objective as now defined is what I have

stated. I do not mind a country finding itself in certain economic and planning difficulties and changing its strategy from time to time. That is the essence of planning and of good, sound thinking. But I do mind it when we do not clearly and in a straight forward manner enunciate what we mean to do in the next five years and what is our social objective. This, I feel, is a grave departure, without the planners giving any explanation as to why this departure has been made, as to why this has happened. Nothing has been said about it. We do not want to be misled. We want to be told clearly. Look here, there are new problems and our objective has to be modified, I can understand.

I am in sympathy with the planners in regard to some of the problems that have arisen. Take, for instance, the various bottle necks, the various difficulties that are being experienced in the running of the public sector projects. That is a regrettable thing. I say the advocates of socialism and the advocates of the public sector have been the greatest critics and enemies of the public sector. All these years people from the other side of the House, have joined in a chorus of disapproval, condemnation and criticism, day in and day out, of the public sector projects. The result is that today public sector projects are all in disarray. The critics have little realised this. I think probably their intention was to bring about some change in the administration of public sector projects, but in that attempt, for political reasons, every effort has been made to denigrate the entire public sector. Today go to any place, in the bazars and in the villages people say that the public sector is a failure. Now, in a democracy can you carry on with a public sector programme in such an atmosphere? It will not work. We have lacked foresight in criticising the public sector in this manner. I want to emphasise this point. The time has come when we should stop this reckless criticism if we really want to rescue the public sector. Its image must be improved. Otherwise, I am telling you sitting here as one who all his life has fought for the public sector, as one who believes and calls himself a socialist that if this continues to be the image, if this is how the public sector is to be run, better not run it. I will not hesitate to say that. It is time both you

and I joined hands in improving the image of the public sector. That is much more important. Wherever we go we find that there have been large numbers of people employed in public sector projects. We find that the machines are damaged by faulty running. Durgapur is a living example of this kind. What has been done to the public sector? My heart weeps. I had been there. I have been to other public sector projects also. (*Interruptions*). Please, do not disturb me. I know what I am saying.

**SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE:** Why do you say that?

**SHRI P. N. SINGH:** I say, please go there. After all it is public money invested there, not money realised from big capitalists. It is the money of our poor countrymen. All that has gone into these projects. We are not there to play with it. Every-time we must load it with unwanted men? Must we be witnesses to the fact that people should work one hour less than the allotted time? Must we witness that all instructions regarding safety are openly flouted? What is the position today? If anyone wants to enforce discipline, he is said to be getting highhanded. This is the atmosphere. So, I beg of you in all sincerity let us do something about it. Let us all join hands to improve the position and image of the public sector. Otherwise, I am saying it here, I will be the first to attack the public sector. We cannot afford to throw away the poor people's money in this manner. I know what is happening in the public sector. I know how the hardearned money of the poor people, the tax payer, is being thrown away, and you and I abetting it. That is the most tragic part of it. Therefore, I appeal to you in all sincerity, for God's sake, let us call a truce to all criticisms. Let us join hands in improving the image of the public sector. Then something will happen, but not otherwise.

Now, I want to say a few words about certain other aspects of the Plan. I personally feel and I think the planners also feel that some of the main problems must be tackled and must be solved at the earliest. We must create: first, ample employment opportunities not only to do away with the backlog of unemployment, but also

create ample employment for people coming into the employment market year after year in this big country of ours. This document virtually has no solution to offer. Then, secondly, there is the problem of rising prices. The Planning Commission has been always exercised over it. In the Second Plan and in the Third Plan it has been repeatedly urged that if the prices were not stabilised, if prices continued to be erratic and rise, then the entire Plan would be distorted. That warning has been given by the Planning Commission time and again. The main reason for some of our failures has been that we have not been able to contain prices. Prices have continued to rise. I looked into this whole volume and just like the word 'socialism', there is hardly any mention about the measures to be taken for price stability or anything which can be called a price policy. Not a word appears in this volume. I think it is a sad commentary on the Commission, an organisation headed by a great economist of this country. The third point is the strategy of self-reliance. That was our objective. This document has hardly put forth as such strategy.

The fourth point which is complementary and supplementary to the idea of self-reliance is an expanding export programme. Larger and larger capacity to export our goods is the only way to meet our debt obligations and to be self-reliant in the future. No country can produce all that it wants; it will have to import certain things. In order to import certain things we will have to export. Increasing exports supported by competitiveness of our manufacturers are important aspects of a practical exports policy. I do not think anything much or new has been said about export strategy in this Plan document.

Then I come to the last objective, and that is reduction of the gap between the rich and the poor. People accuse the Government and our friends on the other side have repeatedly said that the gap between the rich and the poor has been growing. But this was anticipated. In the Second Plan document, if anyone has cared to see it, it is very clearly stated—I am talking of 1955-56, more than thirteen years ago—

"Economic development has in the past often been associated with growing inequalities of income and wealth, the gains

[Shri T. N. Singh]

of development accruing in the early stages to a small class of businessmen and manufacturers, whereas the immediate impact of the application of new techniques in agriculture and in traditional industry has often meant growing unemployment or under-employment among large numbers of people."

These eventualities were anticipated. So, I am not at all dejected by it. We need not be worried about it. I say when you launch on a programme of economic development in a democratic set-up and in a mixed economy, these things will happen. But what is more important and necessary is: Are we alert to the situation? Are we alive to the needs of the situation? Are we prepared to take action at the appropriate moment to see that these inequalities, the social injustices do not continue, do not persist? That is much more important. I personally have many times felt—I did refer to it occasionally and now I again submit as follows. It has been known to the House that it is stated in the Industrial Policy Resolution that wherever the know-how is such that we cannot get it except by foreign collaboration and participation, we have said that we should go ahead, and agree to foreign collaboration. Why? Because we have faith in our leaders that when the time comes, when such collaborations lead to concentration of wealth they will nationalise that organisation. That should be the policy. That is what we should never forget.

I crave your indulgence, Mr. Vice-Chairman, to continue and say some of the points that I want to say. To save time, I would rather hurriedly come to the next point, regarding some of the new proposals and strategy suggested in this document. The draft Plan document suggests 'area planning', while expressing concern about poverty and unemployment, etc., etc., and about the weaker sections of the community. They say area planning is necessary for agricultural development, we should reach electricity to various parts of the country. This will generate employment and create better economic conditions in those backward regions, etc. They suggest that steps should be taken so that these regional imbalances are rectified gradually or even now whatever and wherever they are they should be rectified. These are

some of the things they have stated. But what is the strategy? The strategy to be adopted is one of area planning. Let us examine what is area planning? You take a region you assess its resources its manpower, material resources, everything, have a full survey, then have an assessment as to what can be done, what should be done for economic development in various sectors, in agriculture, in roads, in transport, everything. Do you know what it takes to prepare such an area plan? I have personal experience of that. It takes 2½ to 3 years to work out a regular, first-class area plan. First, the decision has to be taken. This takes six months at least. Then somebody will set about providing for it in the next budget, the proposals for an area plan. Then only the survey will start. By the time you come to the end of the Fourth Plan these area plans will be ready on paper. Nothing will be on the ground. Do you think the problems of the country, of poverty and unemployment, can wait for such length of time? These academic exercises, this academic approach, must end. If this goes on, we will never be able to overcome the problems that are facing us everyday, rather the problems will overtake us all the time. Gandhiji was a very practical man. On the other side of the House those who now talk of socialism, Marxism and all kinds of things, perhaps think that Gandhiji was outdated. But he was a very practical man. If he started a particular movement, if he thought that this thing had to be done in the rural areas, he began in right earnest and did something about it. Not everything was put on paper, yet everything was on the ground. That was his strategy. It may be that all our ideas may not be correct, and some of the ideas may result in failures. But I ask you this. We started the community development movement and extension work after a great deal of thought. There were Enquiry Committees and other things. Lot of thinking went behind it. All these foreigners came to advise us. What is the result? Are we not giving up community development and extension work now? That programme was taken up after a great deal of consideration and thought. I say let us be practical. There are certain problems in our rural areas which cannot wait any longer. Therefore, we have got to take steps as practical men. I say there are people there and here who have lived in the

countryside, who know villages better, who know what is to be done. We know it. But as the Finance Minister said the other day:

समुझ सुनीति पुनीति रत, जागत ही रह सोय ।  
उपदेशि वो, जगाये वो, तुलसी उचित न होय ॥

"If one feigns sleep none can wake him up and if knowingly takes the wrong path none can put him on the straight path."

Our friends opposite understand the problems. They know what has to be done. But then there is politics, we must attack each other, criticise each other, run down each other and not help the poor, the unemployed in rural areas and slums. The country is much more important than your party or my party. That is what is to be looked after, first. Then mind you, are we so free from dangers? People on the borders are looking at us with inimical eyes. Can we wait? We have got to do something about it. Therefore, my suggestion is, here and now let us decide on a change of the old strategy. Take, for instance, the public sector. We know the limitations of the public sector. We know the limitations of the private sector. We know also what is happening in the rural areas. We talk of long loans to co-operatives. They are paraded as a panacea for everything. I say the co-operative movement is a failure in India. Let us not go on putting pathetic faith in the co-operative movement. It has not succeeded so far and it is not going to succeed, I am telling you. What is much more important is, let us all join together. The time has come for all of us to join together in a common endeavour instead of criticising each other. The man in the village is waiting for a sober, united leadership today. The man in the village is confused at the kind of talks we indulge in, at the criticisms we make of each other, and I am telling you the time is not far off when he will lose faith in all politicians, whether of this party or that party. I say as one who has seen life, who has struggled in the Congress movement, in the national movement, when you and I were in the Congress, we have seen ups and downs, and thanks to the greatness of one man we got Swaraj; he is a 'tapasi'. We have tried just to put him in the background

anywhere and everywhere. This is the position. Take, for instance, agriculture. Today the signs are most propitious. There is really a desire on the part of the cultivators, the farmers to do something really good, to achieve something. He has got an achievement complex today. He wants to do great things. Now, I suggest that we need to reach him the inputs in kind, not in cash. That is one thing. This is what has got to be done. This cash incentive has been a curse whether it is industry or agriculture. We resorted to cash incentives to industry. There is no competitiveness there. So, in agriculture we should try to provide services and inputs in kind. We should provide them with the necessary seeds, with the necessary fertilisers, with the necessary inputs and irrigation. That is very important. Let that be done. Let us all see to it that irrigation projects are put through quickly. There are tubewells sunk, but there is no power. You provide Rs. 1,000 or Rs. 2,000 crores for irrigation. Of what use is this amount? The tubewells will be there, yet they will not be energised. How am I going to be certain that your investment programme is going to yield the results that you anticipate. Our past experience is to the contrary. And if this happens, what will be the results? There will be more inflationary pressures. We shall not be able to contain the prices. And this is my fear. I have been pleading for a smaller Plan, not because I have not got grand ambition for my country, I want my country to grow rapidly. But I feel that we must do something in the first few years and see that we really get the benefit of every pie spent. Unless that happens, any ambitious investment programme is not going to solve our problems. The programmes will be there just on paper, only creating inflationary pressures all the time. That is what will happen.

I attach the greatest importance to agriculture because any amount spent on this sector, if it goes as input, is not at all inflationary. A crop is produced in six months or in three months, not even one year. So, investment there brings results very quickly. It can never be inflationary if it is properly administered. Therefore, what I suggest is, if you want to solve the problem of prices, meet the problem of poverty and also remove the inequalities to a certain extent at least in the lower

[Shri T. N. Singh.]

classes, then it is very important that we concentrate on agriculture and the largest amount of inputs should be provided for agriculture.

Having said that, I suggest that as far as industry in the public sector is concerned, the first task is to see that whatever are the existing projects, they run to capacity. One of the mistakes made was—I will tell you, Sir—that we planned these big steel projects and their rapid expansion programme. Every administrator would million tonnes and we launched an expansion programme. Every administrator would say—the Steel Ministry says also—that we should have an ambitious project otherwise, we shall be thought of as a small ministry. So, let us ask for more money. They ask for it. Even when the first million tonne stage has not been completed, they start on the second million tonne expansion programme. Construction and production simultaneously are very difficult of achievement. They do not go well together. That has been the problem all these years. We tried to do too many things at a time, knowing full well our own shortcomings in regard to management and other things. It is therefore that the problems that we are facing are there today.

So, I say that the first task is this. I would not permit any expansion unless the existing programme of production has been achieved. That is very important. If you start simultaneously in this manner, you are going to face ruination of the public sector. With my knowledge and experience, I would say that it will take one to two years to achieve this result of getting the maximum out of the investments that you have already made in the public sector; the question, then, is: what can he do in the remaining three years? Let us be practical. I will ask the planners: What can you do in three years, after that? You can have all the investment for that purpose. Everything will be provided. That should be the approach with regard to public sector industries.

In regard to the private sector, I am sorry that they think too much of foreign collaboration and they run after foreign collaboration because that brings quick money. And the result is that we are not

getting out of their clutches. One collaboration leads to another and it goes on. This vicious circle has to end.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): Kindly wind up.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I am sorry it is not possible for me within this short time at my disposal to explain my strategy, what I consider to be the right strategy for the Fourth Plan. There is need for a change. I would have served my purpose if this House can be convinced that there is need for a radical change in the strategy of planning and also in planned development. That should be conceded. And the social objectives with which we started should be re-emphasised; not only are they to be re-emphasised, but we have to have them as the real objectives which must be achieved within a certain stipulated time. Otherwise, I say that this population explosion in the country and the poverty of the millions of people are going to lead to a real revolution. It is inevitable, if we do not wake up to the situation.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA: With your permission, Sir, I just want to ask him a point of information. I do not want to interrupt him. He made an important observation—I suppose I heard him correctly because I could not hear him loud enough—that the Fourth Plan Draft does not have the word 'socialism'. What I want to ask the ex-Minister is this: If he had continued to be a member of the Planning Commission, would he have insisted on the word appearing there or would he have induced his colleagues to put that word or would he have resigned from the Planning Commission for the absence of that word?

SHRI T. N. SINGH: If I were a Minister, I would have said that such a hypothetical question could not have been answered.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we have just now heard words of wisdom from my colleague . . .

SHRI T. N. SINGH: You consider me so?

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: . . . who, at one time, was the framer of the Third Five Year Plan. We also know what happened to that Plan. I am very glad

that wisdom has dawned on my friend and that he has said some things which I do not think he had said when he was a member of the Planning Commission in charge of Industry, either in public or in private.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I have said so in both places.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: At least, not to my knowledge, the words of wisdom which I heard from his mouth today.

With this, I would now have a word about . . .

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: A man is generally wise after he quits office.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: I hope that you will also be wise one day.

We are told that planning is a continuous process. Has there been any kind of continuity even at least in regard to the preparation of the Fourth Plan? This is the question to which I will first address myself.

Let us look back for a moment. Certainly, there has been certainty in respect of the Second and Third Plans. For instance, the Third Plan was to commence in 1961. And, as the introduction to the Third Plan says, work on the Third Plan commenced towards the end of 1958, and was carried out in three stages; the final stage was reached when the National Development Council approved the Draft Report in the meetings on May 31 and June, 1961. In other words, two months after the end of the Second Plan period. Very very 6 P.M. commendable indeed. What does the introduction to the Draft Plan say? It claims that the preparation had four stages, unlike the three stages in the Third Plan. Is the increase in stages to correspond with the number of the Plan? It may be a fact, I mean the four stages, but it reveals the very cursory manner in which the preparation for the Fourth Plan has been undertaken. The introduction provides ample material to prove my point. The first Draft outline of the Fourth Plan, it is said, was

brought about in August 1966, that is, four months after the end of the Third Plan period. Why? No answer is given. We are, however, informed that the Planning Commission was reconstituted in September 1967. There is reference to the hostilities of 1962 and 1965, events that took place during the Third Plan period, and to the devaluation of the Rupee in June 1966, something that happened after the close of the Third Plan period. Again, the introduction goes on to say that there was steep fall in agricultural production in 1965-66 and 1966-67.

How are we to look upon these facts? Surely, they are not valid reasons for the postponement on the work or finalisation of the Fourth Plan. On the other hand, the two hostilities and fall in agricultural production should have provided for more intensive thinking on the premises of planning and quicker action to adopt policies to the changing situation.

The whole approach has been as uninspiring as the uninspiring prose of this document except the quotation on pages 2 and 3 of Chapter 1. And this quotation is regarding the term "Socialistic Pattern of Society", taken out from the Second Plan and which was also quoted in the Third Plan. This piece reads well because obviously the language is that of Jawaharlal Nehru.

I have referred to this delay in the preparatory work at some length because I am convinced that the problems which we have faced during the past few years have been mainly due to the fact that there were no broad perspectives or goals—good, bad or indifferent—against which problems as well as solutions could be judged and tested. In short, we have been living on the principle, "Evil unto the day, sufficient thereof".

I refuse to believe that the so-called annual plans which we have had could have any relationship even of the tenth degree removed to long term planning. They do not provide any continuity, and are not manifestations of the theory that planning is a continuous process.

Now when the Draft of the Fourth Plan has seen the light of the day after so many

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai:]

years of avoidable delay, I am afraid it is out-dated in approach and conclusions. As there is very short time at my disposal, I will only refer to the broad financial allocations that have been suggested in the Draft Fourth Plan to show how they fall short of the realities of today. It is, I think, necessary at this stage to clarify that my criticism, unlike those of the hon'ble Members from the Opposition, are intended to be helpful, not negative and obstructive.

A total outlay of Rs. 24,398 crores during 1969-74 is envisaged, Rs. 14,398 crores for the public sector and an estimated investment of Rs. 10,000 crores in the private sector. Of the Rs. 14,398 crores, the Central sector including centrally-sponsored schemes, amounts to Rs. 8,331.6 crores and Rs. 6,066 only for the State Plans. There are thus three broad allocations. Are the proportions realistic?

How can Planning Commission, reasonably expect the private sector to fulfil the estimated target of Rs. 10,000 crores when it simultaneously identifies the problem of resource mobilisation with a programme of taxation? The Commission is apparently oblivious to the fact that the heavy taxation policy which has been adopted has already lowered, and not increased the savings of the economy. I have no doubt in my mind if the tax policy is eased private sector will exceed not only financial, but, what is more important, higher physical targets that may be fixed. It is also necessary for the authorities to shed inhibitions concerning the size of units and the like. The less the inhibitions are the greater the chances for improving export competitiveness, import substitution programme, and a host of related matters for speedy economic development.

Going back to the public sector allocation between the Centre and the States, I suggest that here too the Planning Commission has followed the usual traditional policy. When the States now are expected to do more for the people, they are not given adequate funds. It is argued that the States can raise on their own more funds. This means each State is allowed to increase, say, sales tax without any one ensuring uniformity or rationalisation. This is the surest way of creating more tax anarchy. Why cannot the States, it be asked, get

more from land revenue? It is a reasonable question provided it is also reasonably accepted that the policy of land ceiling has to be abandoned. On the one hand land ceiling is advocated, and, on the other hand, more taxes from small farms are recommended. This is a patent contradiction.

Take the allocations for irrigation and electrification. A sum of Rs. 929 crores has been earmarked for irrigation in all the States while Maharashtra alone requires an investment of Rs. 2,000 crores over the next 15 years to achieve 30 per cent irrigation in that State. Rural electrification which is a vital programme related to agriculture has received a small outlay of Rs. 313 crores for all States.

Again, the Planning Commission must move purposively and bravely concern itself with the question of saving of expenditure on administration. This question is closely connected with resource mobilisation. The expenditure on administrative services is growing, and I suppose it is so in the case of Planning Commission itself. If, as in fact it is, agriculture, public health, education, community development, and social welfare are the primary responsibility of the States, why do we have such bleated Ministries at the Centre to deal with these subjects. Hon'ble Members will have only to see the Delhi Telephone Directory to be impressed with the kind of redundant activity that the Centre is undertaking with parallel machinery.

It was in 1951, the First Five Year Plan began. And I am afraid that much the larger part of the Indian population do not know whether since 1951 a planning era began, that percentage of the population who have heard about planning do not know what appreciable difference planning has done to the work-a-day life and how it has improved the quality of living; that sophisticated few who claim to know all about the techniques of planning do not appear to realise the simple fact that the test of good planning is to what extent it makes the best use of limited resources.

I, therefore, urge that the Fourth Plan has to be given a more concrete shape, and the allocation of resources to the different sections of the economy revised if the desirable tempo of development in conditions

of stability has to be achieved, if the local authorities are to fulfil their obligations, if the people who can produce are not to be thwarted, if the common man is to put his best in the interest of a higher standard of life for himself and increased prosperity for the nation as a whole.

Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman.

SHRIMATI SHAKI NTALA PARANJ-PYF (Nominated): Sir, there is a lot that one can say about this Fourth Plan Draft, but I am going to be very brief and restrict myself only to one or two points. When talking on another motion some time back I had maintained that the expenditure incurred for the family planning programme was top-heavy and exorbitant and that the personnel involved in the family planning programme alone was over one lakh. Having uttered those words, I had rather awkward feelings and a pricking conscience because I was not sure. I have seen those figures and I have been able to collect information since I made that speech and I find that I was more than correct. The personnel involved in the family planning programme alone is 1,13,000. So I was not wrong in saying that it was more than one lakh. Now, Sir, I could not work out the figures of salaries that are paid to this personnel, but supposing that an average pay of Rs. 200 or Rs. 300 is given to these 1,13,000 people, you will see that practically the entire budget that is assigned for the family planning programme is spent on salaries for these people, which I think is very unnecessary, as this personnel, as I have pointed out last time, is unnecessary and not the right type of personnel for this programme. I had, Sir, given all my notes to the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, whom I knew and who was very keen on this work of birth control, and he had promised to hand over those notes to the Member of the Planning Commission who was involved in this particular programme. However, I am very sorry to say—I wonder if it has read my notes—that the Planning Commission has not scrutinised the expenditure that is undertaken for this programme, because the old habit of हम जैसे थे, of going on in the merry way of spending, over-spending and excessive spending, still continues. As I said, they are not only employing excessive number of personnel but also the wrong

type of personnel, personnel which has very little contact with the masses, which cannot understand the language of the masses and all that they do just goes over the heads of everybody. This is unfortunate, I feel that this personnel should be reduced. Then the expenditure will come down and as my amendment has said, the expenditure should be reduced by half and the amount thus saved should be added on to Education which, I am afraid, is being allotted a very paltry sum, considering the vast territory Education has to cover. About reduction in personnel, as I have said last time, my State of Maharashtra has done it. It did it in one sweep and a little too much. It has absolutely abolished all the posts that were attached to the family planning centres. It overdid it. After a while, it saw its mistake and appointed a Co-ordinator, because as the centres did not function, when people came in for advice, there was nobody to talk to them, nobody to give advice to them; so they appointed one Co-ordinator. But that again, in my opinion, is not enough because for this programme a man and a woman are necessary and not all the eight people that are assigned for every centre at the moment—a lady doctor, a man doctor, a woman extension educator, a man extension educator, a woman field worker, a man field worker, an ayah and a clerk-cum storekeeper; this is quite redundant and unnecessary. But two persons are necessary and if these two persons are appointed, I think the work can be done much better and with much less fanfare.

The Deputy Minister while replying to the other debate said that the family planning programme was conducted by the States and the Centre did not have much choice. I beg to point out that that statement of the Minister was not entirely correct because though the States conduct the programme, the *modus operandi* is laid down by the Centre and the Maharashtra Government had to take special permission to disband all this staff that they did a year ago. Of course, if the other States want to do this, they will also have to take permission, and I think they would do well to follow in the steps of my State.

The services of a full-time man doctor and a lady doctor are not always necessary and if the family planning centre is

[Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye.]

attached to a health institute, the medical personnel working at this institute can be asked to give part-time attention to the family planning centres. In fact, every time I have been upon my feet I have stressed this point that the family planning programme should be completely integrated with the health programme. They should not work as separate departments, which entails a lot of multiplication of work and multiplication of personnel. This is quite unnecessary. If it was a part and parcel of the health programme, it could give us better results. Of course, there will have to be more people involved in the health programme because of this additional work, but not as many as there are now in the health programme and in the family planning programme. The propaganda workers that are needed for the family planning centres, as I have said many times, should be selected from amongst the masses who have benefited by this programme. One post-vasectomy man and one post-sterilisation woman would give excellent results. Now we have a huge panel to choose from and if the Government laid down that it was its policy that every centre should have one such man and one such woman who should travel all over that taluk, they would be able to contact all the people and the people will listen to them with more attention as they come from their own way of life.

Now, provision for training in family planning work is given in separate institutes. I want to know why it is so. Family planning is not such an intricate subject. If information as regards this subject were included in the syllabus of all the courses for doctors and nurses or other para-medical workers, will it not save a lot of expenditure and time? Why should this be a separate institute? It means so many more people working for it and so much more extra expenditure. Seven demographic centres and seven communication, action and research centres and eight centres for bio-medical aspects of family planning are functioning in the country. Can there be no reduction in their numbers? I have been some of them produce papers after papers. I feel they are trying to ape the opulent countries like the United States of America. I think this is not suited for our country. America is a country which has gadgets, which has developed so many labour-saving

devices that time is hanging on them and they have got to employ their time in some way. We are not in that stage. I think all these research centres and demographic centres which are employing a large staff should be cut down and the expenditure on personnel reduced. Then a Family Planning Institute is working in this country. If my memoir does not play me a trick, I think this Institute was promised and is receiving a large percentage of its expenses from foreign foundations. Now, this very fact when any institute or any project anywhere in India, not only in family planning, is offered a substantial percentage of its expenditure by a foreign foundation we somehow immediately accept it without making sure and without considering whether or not that particular institution is necessary for our needs, for our way of life.

The Plan has considered the development of other sectors as well and it is here that I feel it is necessary to keep an eye on population control while dealing with other sectors, whether it be agriculture, whether it be industry, whether it be irrigation, employment or unemployment, as my friend just now pointed out, because this problem of unemployment is assuming a gigantic proportion. Is it not necessary, Sir, therefore, to educate the labour potential that a disregard of the control of the size of one's family only enhances unemployment? That has been my point and many leaders have attacked me about it. I think the more the time passes, the more the water flows down the river. I think the problem will become more acute and it is very necessary to educate our industrial potential about this point. I have noticed with great satisfaction the positive steps taken by several private industrialists in this respect and it is high time that the Government woke up to the necessity of subjecting any aid or benefit given by it to the acceptance of planned parenthood. I am not advocating downright compulsion as my friend, Mr. Dharia, did some time ago. But I do feel that any aid-giving agency is perfectly justified in assuring itself that the aid given will render the beneficiary more self-supporting and self-reliant and not more improvident in his way of life.

There is one last point I want to make and it is a very important point. This is

the first time I am making it and it is this that when grants are given to different States, the main basis on which these grants are determined is that of population. This being the case, it is vital that the performance of the States regarding population control should be taken into consideration; otherwise, the States which do control their population, will stand to lose, and in fact, Tamil Nadu has been already complaining that because of the population control which it has effectively exercised, it has lost one or two seats in the Parliament.

Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): Honourable Members will kindly cooperate with the Chair. There are six names of those who are present and who want to speak now. If every Member restrains himself, I think we can finish the whole thing by 7-30. Now Mr. Arjun Arora

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, . . .

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: On a point of order, Mr. Vice Chairman. When we begin a debate you allow any amount of time in the beginning and you ask those who remain towards the fag end of the whole thing to cooperate with the Chair. You need not ask for their cooperation. You can ring your bell and make them sit. It is not proper and just. You must allow them to speak at least for 15 minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): I appreciate your feelings. I am only putting forth my difficulty.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, अगर कल जवाब हो तो इसमें हर्ज क्या है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत देगड़ी) : जवाब कल ही होगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : तो बाकी लोग कल ही बोल लेंगे ।

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI: The Honourable Member forgets that there is only one monopolist in this House and it is Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. He has taken 50 minutes.

SHRI D. THENGARI

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): I appreciate your feelings, Mr. Brahmananda Panda.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: We have got wholesalers here. But Members like us are only retailers and back-benchers whereas the wholesalers take the entire time of the House.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, there is much in what my friend has said. All the Members of the House are supposed to be equals. But it appears that some are more equal and the more equal get 50 minutes. The unfortunate ones like me are told right at the beginning that "you will not get more than five minutes". I think if I have to get five minutes for the Five Year Plan, I am expected to speak one minute for each year . . .

श्री राजनारायण : अरे आप बोलिये न । इसमें ही आपने दो मिनट लगा दिया ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): I have not specified any time limit.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Very kind of you not to specify any time for me . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One minute each year after a delay of three years.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The draft Plan has come after three years. Members in this House more than once spoke about the futility of the plan holiday. But the Government every time said that there was no plan holiday. I for one like to agree with the Opposition on the facts of the case. There has really been an unfortunate plan holiday for three years. The so-called annual Plans or the annual Plan outlay are a mockery of planning. During these three years no new projects of any importance were initiated in the country. Even the pending projects have not been speeded up. The result has been that these three years of plan holiday have been years of misery, increasing unemployment, lay-off of workers, and a recession all over the economic life. The only saving feature has been a good crop in one of these years mostly due to good monsoon, plenty of rain, well-phased out, well-distributed rain. Even now

we have only a draft Plan. According to the plan programme given by the Prime Minister in her speeches, it will take almost a year to finalise this Plan the draft of which we are discussing. Though we have the draft and we are given a time table, the Fifth Finance Commission's report, the report of the N.D.C., the reactions of the States, the reactions of the people, further discussion of the Plan, all this will take one year. Then the Plan will be finalised. But we are told that though the plan has not yet been finalised, somehow the Plan period has begun on the 1st April . . .

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: How?

श्री राजनारायण : हाऊ क्या ! सरकार की बेवकूफी है, बौद्धिक दिवालियापन है ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: That itself shows that there is no seriousness behind this planning. There is only the force of public opinion which has compelled the Government to come out with the Draft Plan and say that the Plan period has begun and the work on the Plan has begun . . .

श्री राजनारायण : मध्यावधि चुनाव के पहले भी कहा था ऐसा ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: If the Plan period has begun, if the Plan is not a draft, then, why are we discussing it now? Are we performing a ritual? The fact is that the Plan period has actually not begun on the 1st April. The Fourth Plan is still in the process of being formulated. There has not only been a plan holiday for three years but this is also a year of half holiday.

The objectives of planning were set out clearly in the Second Five Year Plan. One of the objectives was doubling of the real *per capita* income in the country by about 1970-71 and in any case not later than 1977. This doubling of the real *per capita* income was to bring about a noticeable improvement in the consumption standards. What we find is that the *per capita* income in the year 1967-68 which was a year of bumper harvest, was only about 25 per cent higher than what it was 20 years earlier. So instead of doubling all that has been achieved is a 25 per cent increase in the *per capita* income and this Draft which

we are considering gives us no hope that the miracle will be performed during the period which is said to have begun on 1st April 1969.

The other objective was reduction in the share of agriculture in the total working force from over 70 per cent in 1950-51 to 60 per cent by 1975-76. This is important because if the economy has to prosper, if the country has to become affluent there should be a reduction in the number of people employed in agriculture and an increase in the number of people employed in industries. Between these 20 years there has been hardly any reduction in the share of agriculture in the total working force and there is no significant indication that this will take place during the period of the Fourth Plan. Self-sufficiency in foodgrains was one of the objectives set out in the Second Plan. The scale of foodgrain imports has been growing and the country has been relying heavily on such imports even in the years of record domestic production such as 1960-61 and 1967-68.

Another objective was development of capital goods industry. Though between the period 1956-57 and 1963-64 considerable progress was made in the development of capital goods industry, a large part of the capacity built during that period at great cost remains unutilised to-day and there are no indications that they will be utilised during the coming years. What is the use of developing capital goods industry if you cannot fully utilise it and if you have no plan to fully utilise it. Another objective was—I quote from the Second Plan Document—to prevent shortage of foreign exchange acting as an absolute constraint on the development programme and to make the country less vulnerable to economic and political pressures from outside. Here again we depend on foreign aid to the extent of nearly 4 per cent of the national income annually. We are so vulnerable to foreign pressure that the devaluation of our currency was brought about not by the needs of our economy but because of foreign pressure.

Another objective of the planning which, to a trade union worker like me, is very important was reduction in the inequalities of income and wealth and in the concentration of economic power—to lessen the

social and political tensions associated with growth and to create conditions favourable to the development of a truly democratic system. Unfortunately inequalities in income and wealth are to-day greater than they were in the beginning of the period of planned development in 1950-51. This House has more than once heard of the story of the growth of monopoly and the growth of economic power of a few people who control the wealth of the nation and much of the industrial wealth of the country. Concentration of economic power continues to increase and with it the increase in the social and political tensions and these conditions are not at all favourable for the growth of a truly democratic system of Government. As a matter of fact our democracy is becoming what Mr. Bhupesh Gupta will call a bourgeois democracy, a democracy in which the capitalist class has the biggest power not only economic power but also power to influence the political faith of the country.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** It is a bourgeois democracy. Now it may become Bannanatha democracy.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** One of the objectives set out during the Second Plan was total cessation of reliance on foreign aid by 1965-66—to make further development of the economy truly self-sustaining. It is very interesting to find that the year 1966 which was to witness, according to the Second Plan Document, the cessation of reliance on foreign aid. That very year saw such preponderance of foreign influence and foreign pressure that our currency was subjected to devaluation which has ruined our economy, which has caused recession, which has caused all the difficulties and miseries for the people.

Such has been the achievement as compared to the objectives set out in the Second Plan.

This Draft which we are considering now is of course very cleverly done. It does not set out such objectives as were set out in the beginning of the Second Plan. So at the end of the five year period which has already begun, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Rajnarain will not be able to come and say that the objectives have not been fulfilled. . . . because this Draft Plan does not set out any ambitious objectives.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** It only quotes the Preamble to the Constitution and the Directive Principles of State Policy in the Constitution.

**SHRI ARJUN ARORA:** The reduction of unemployment . . .

*(Time bell rings)*

Yes, Sir, I will not take much time because I know that I have come at the tail end of the day and time is scarce.

The reduction of unemployment and provision of more avenues of employment was also an objective set out in the First, Second and the Third Five-Year Plans. Rapid industrialisation and insistence on self-reliance are the two methods of providing employment opportunities for the people. But somehow we find that at the moment about twelve million in the country are unemployed. It has been customary for the Plan documents to mention the back-log of unemployment. In the present Draft I find that the back-log of unemployed people has not been mentioned. At least I have not been able to find it mentioned anywhere. Are we to take it that this is an indication that the Planning Commission has given up the objective of reduction of unemployment? As a matter of fact, the educated unemployment is also increasing. There is so much talk of resources and lack of resources. Why do the planners and the Government not realise that the biggest resources of a nation are the hands that work, the men who are capable of working? Why could not the Planning Commission come out with an ambitious plan of digging canals, constructing roads and building houses? Digging canals, building houses and constructing roads, these do not require foreign exchange. They do not require sanction of the World Bank. They do not require support of the International Agencies. The country has the building material, the country has the ballast, the country has the man-power. Why cannot such employment-oriented schemes be made the bulwark of the Plan when we are short of other resources? Sir, no foreign exchange is required for these things. There are men willing to work. And if these employment-oriented schemes are really adopted, the whole countryside will be opened by roads, agricultural

[Shri Arjun Arora.]

production will increase, and at least an effort will have been made in providing housing for our people. Food, clothing and shelter are the essential requirements. The objective is to provide the essential requirements of the people. You cannot provide the essential requirements of the people unless you provide for such schemes in the Plan. I must submit that this aspect of planning has unfortunately been lost sight of by our planners. The Plan is only a Draft and it is likely to be finalised during the course of the year. This gives the planners an opportunity to come out with employment oriented schemes, which do not require foreign exchange and which rely on the real wealth of the nation, the men who are prepared to work.

Thank you.

**SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am thankful to you for giving me this opportunity. I will not take more than ten to twelve minutes. You need not worry me with your bell.

Sir, if a man is what his mind is, and if a collection of differing minds can sit together and come to some conclusion, it is that picture that is portrayed in this Fourth Five-Year Plan (Draft), this paper-cover volume sold at Rs. 4 in the market but freely supplied to us.

Sir, I read only two things out of this, only two aspects. In one portion is their confession of guilt, and in the other portion they try to say that in future they will behave properly. It is just like an adolescent being curious about something forbidden who, when caught, confesses his guilt and solemnly promises that in future he will behave properly. When I was reading about the Approach and Policy of the Plan, there they have agreed that there is unemployment. They have agreed that there is price rise. They have agreed that there is recession. They have agreed that they could not coordinate different sections to march forward harmoniously. Everything they have agreed to and the only thing they say is that in future everything will be all right. I shall read out not my words, their words, to justify what I say. In the Planning Commission the Prime Minister is there and the Deputy Prime Minister is also there and this is the Plan. What they

say about "Public Sector Operation" on page 27-

"Reference may be made to policy in relation to the operation of public sector enterprises. This is linked with action proposed in two separate directions. First is in the direction of much greater co-ordination and integration. Though investments in the public sector have been large and their composition varied, the different units within the sector do not act sufficiently in concert. It is suggested that this defect be removed by creating appropriate machinery for effective co-ordination. When this happens the plans of individual units will become more purposeful and their operations efficient; also the public sector as a whole will become more dominant and effective in the economy. Secondly, it is proposed that detailed decision-making in the individual units should be effectively decentralised. This is a specifically stated objective of Government policy which has yet to be attained."

I underline the portion in this passage "specifically stated objective of Government policy which has yet to be attained", because this is the Plan (Draft) with which the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister are concerned and they say that a specifically stated objective of Government policy has yet to be achieved. So this is how people, who are ruling this country, are treating the Five-Year Plans to be launched. I am not going to repeat what others have said but this is what I shall say. The planners are suffering from an inhibition. They are not clear about their mind. I rather admire the late Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel who, before India became independent, prophetically declared that India would be a capitalist India. Why are not these people, sitting on these benches, and those people who are sitting on the corner benches making up their mind to say, 'No, nothing about socialism business. India has to go as it is. Our commitment to a socialist pattern of society no longer holds good. It is only a fashionable slogan', so that, if they make a commitment like that, the polarisation of forces in the country will be much easier, and at least we can have some direction to take the people along. Mr. Vice-Chairman, in this Plan I do not see any future; rather

they are so shifty about things. In the other House some hon. Member has commented that this planning has developed senility. I would rather say this Plan of 18 years is an adolescent growing under the spell of a sinister spinster aunt called the private sector. Whenever the planners have to think of investing some money in the public sector always their minds work as to what the private sector people think of this. Otherwise they would not have allowed this amount of Rs. 10,000 crores for the private sector. This sort of thing would not have been done in the Fourth Plan after 18 years of planning by a Government and a party committed to form a socialist society. Even there they are very cautious; they do not utter the word 'socialism'. Either it is socialistic or socialistic pattern or something like that. I believe in socialism and I think that democracy is the political definition of socialism. If the Government is prepared to accept this, only then they can give some direction and there can be some way for the Plans to work; otherwise it will be completely purposeless.

I would not go into details, moreover you won't give me time also. I am also bored with waiting for the turn and I would rather finish now. I would only say a few words about Orissa. You know Orissa has been badly treated all along. There is no mention about it in the Fourth Plan. My partners in the coalition there, the Swatantra, may try to sail goody-goody with these people but unless some immediate things are done I warn this Government that there will be mass upheavals in Orissa. I come from Ganjam District. The Rishi kalva canal system is already drying up. Both the reservoirs are silted. Unless the river Patma is dammed and the Jonohara bhangi project is taken up, within a period of five years probably if there are no rains or less rains we may have to evacuate a city like Belpur. And there is no mention of this in this Plan. As my hon. friend, Mr. Arjun Arora, put it, it is only a draft and we do not know when it is going to take shape. So also the Talcher-Vinlagarh railway line, which is the life line for the Paradip Port. That is the only link with the Paradip Port and the collieries. About the coal based fertiliser factory at Talcher also there is no mention. Sir, you can know from certain behaviour and certain conduct how a party or a group thinks. When the

question of abolition of the Privy Purses was in the air forty Members of the Congress Parliamentary Party threatened defection but when the price of the post card is raised, when fertiliser is taxed there is not even a murmur and these are the persons who call themselves progressives and say that they are for a socialistic pattern of society.

SHRI S. K. VISHAMPAYEN (Maharashtra): We are awake.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: You can never be awake. You are finished. I tell you for a democracy to grow in health, in wealth and in wisdom Ministers should come and go and for a Ministry to be purposeful and dynamic Ministers should come and go. But what we have here is a mere reshuffling putting this man in that place and shifting someone to some other place. And when somebody is shuffled there are grouses.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN (Tamil Nadu): Democracy.

SHRI BRAHMANANDA PANDA: Democracy; you should be the ideal in the world.

Whatever the Plan is, it is meant to attain some objectives. Plan is there to reach some goals. Plan is there to put things in harmony which are in disarray. Here is a Plan in which from Gadgil to the anvil there is a big gap and I am confident that if the framers of the Plan and the ruling party were to launch it they can never cover that. This Plan is monopolistic. It is unfortunate that Mr. Babubhai Chinai is not here. I wish he had heard this from me. A capitalist is a very highly economic animal and he sucks wealth with sponge-like efficiency. Put him anywhere, he will suck it up. This is a Government morally supported by them and dependent on them. This Plan has been made in the name of the people to cheat the people and to say to the common man that he has no place under the sun, the Indian sun.

Thank you.

SHRI G. P. SOMASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to express my views on the Fourth Five Year Plan.

[Shri G. P. Somasundaram.]

It is a great surprise to me that the Fourth Plan document is being discussed after the Plan has been finalised. I do not understand why a discussion has been going on on this subject when the Government has already made up its mind regarding the developmental activities during the next five years. The Fourth Plan document is a *fait accompli* and it is only a waste of time and energy to discuss this matter at this stage. Unlike earlier Plans which were implemented successively, not successfully, without any break, the Government had given a holiday for planning during the last three years and if the Government had been sincere, useful discussions could have been held during this period and the implementation of the Fourth Plan could have been taken up vigorously and with the support of the people. I hope that the Government will be wise enough to have discussion on the Fifth Plan before it is finalised.

Once bitten, twice shy, is an English proverb applicable to all. But the Congress Government has been bitten thrice, but has not felt even once shy. The Government has implemented already three Plans and the Fourth one also is on the same lines. There is no indication as in the earlier Plans when our country will reach even the take-off stage. There is no indication when even the lowest strata of society will be assured of even the barest necessities of life. It appears that the Government has forgotten socialism, for excepting in the introductory chapter, the word 'socialism' does not find place in the draft Fourth Plan. Perhaps the Government remembers the word during the election only. The problem in the Plan in so far as the State of Tamil Nadu to which I am privileged to belong is concerned, is simple. The original Fourth Plan was set at Rs. 560 crores roughly and at that time, the Planning Commission and the Central Government promised an assistance of Rs. 250 crores out of the total pool of nearly Rs. 3500 crores. The State Government has now presented a Plan of Rs. 624 crores and in the present draft Fourth Plan only Rs. 201 crores has been given to our State while the total pool remains the same. The Government of Tamil Nadu has pleaded that the Central assistance to the State should not be cut down.

It is a fact that whereas in the First Plan the State received 10.7 per cent of the total

Central assistance, this percentage would be reduced to nearly 6 per cent. This is deplorably low and Tamil Nadu would consider it an insult to its intelligence if its allocation is not increased. The reduction in the allotment to the Tamil Nadu is attributed to a revised formula formulated for distribution among the States.

7 P.M.

According to this formula, the State of Tamil Nadu has been taken as a forward State, just because the average income is just above the national income. While I do not grudge the weaker States, which get the major portion of the Central assistance, it should not be at the cost of a State like Tamil Nadu, which is on the brink. I do not blame the statistical organisation of the Planning Commission or the Central Statistical Organisation, but the possibilities of a mistake of a minor nature cannot be ruled out absolutely. After all, such opinions are based on statistics which are dependent on so many factors. Therefore, placing the Tamil Nadu State at a place just above the average national income stage may not necessarily be correct. Our Constitution is federal in structure and each State is an equal partner with the Central Government in the reconstruction of our country.

It is a matter of regret that the Fourth Plan has not realised this basic principle. Had it been so, the State Governments would have been given more freedom in the formulation of the Plan. It is necessary as contemplated in our Constitution that a permanent Standing Council should be in existence for the purpose of discussing the financial matters and also examine the performance and accounts of both the Central and State Governments. The Central Government should realise that the parties other than the Congress which come to power in the States also give promises to the public and in order to fulfil the promises, resources will have to be found and this can be only the Central Government, which takes in the form of taxes the major portion of the revenue in a State. I hope the Central Government will take due steps to set up the permanent Council as soon as possible.

SHRI Y. ADINARAYANA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we

have got the Fourth Plan after three years of holiday. First, the preparation and then the implementation are the two most important aspects of planning. During its preparation we depend for statistics and information on the State Governments and other sources. The State Governments, in turn, depend for their information on the District Collectors, who in turn depend on the village officers. From personal experience I am saying this, mostly the District Collectors send a telegram saying: "Send this information in twenty-four hours." The village officer has to collect the information in twenty-four hours and most of the information that he sends is incorrect. It cannot be otherwise because in twenty-four hours he cannot gather correct information. If, on this basis, the State Governments formulate their plans, naturally the very Plan structure itself will not be correct. We live in a democratic country and we believe in a democratic way of life. It is for this reason that it is all the more necessary for us to plan our future and plan our economic development. No democracy can exist for long in the midst of want and poverty and inequality. Therefore, it is very essential that our Plan should be based on the welfare of the people and the welfare of the country. Mahatma Gandhi once said:—

"To a man with an empty stomach food is God. I am endeavouring to see God through service to humanity, for I know that God is neither in heaven nor down below but in everyone."

I feel that this saying of the Mahatma should be borne in mind when we prepare our Plans, with the main purpose of helping the poorer sections of the people.

In connection with statistics, I would like to say one word more. We may use our statistics in whatever manner we like, but we must get the facts first. I am saying 'facts' and not information. It must be correct facts and unless that is ensured from the bottom, no planning which is built on those statistics will be useful to the country.

Some friends, both on that side and on this side, have been saying that all the three Plans have not been useful to us. I for one cannot agree with them. I know

apart from the progress made in other sectors in the country, the progress made in the spheres of irrigation and power generation is considerable, though much remains to be done. In 1951, the area irrigated from all sources was 56 million acres and it rose to 86.6 million acres by March, 1968 and power rose from 7814 million kw in 1951 to 50,000 million kw in March 1968. Now, Sir, we are told that the energised pump-sets are proposed to be raised from 5 lakhs to 24 lakhs by the end of the Fourth Plan. This is not a small progress. We cannot say that we have not made any progress at all. But there is much to be done in the field of agriculture and power, as our country is a vast one. It is an admitted fact that the spreading of electric power to every nook and corner of our country will positively enrich our economy and minimise to a large extent the rural unemployment. Just now one friend here was saying that there is a lot of unemployment in the rural sector. Forty per cent of the people belong to the agricultural labour sector and they are all unemployed. For this I say that the spreading of electricity, without considering the cost, is very essential. Electricity not only gives employment but develops the agricultural economy. It also gives employment through the small scale and cottage industries which can be established in the villages. The Government pleads lack of resources for this. I would like to point out one thing. The hon. Member, Shrimati Shakuntala Paranjpye, was just talking about family planning. We are spending Rs. 300 crores on family planning in the Fourth Plan. My own knowledge of what is going on in the rural sector and the districts is that at least half of this amount goes waste. If Rs. 150 crores are diverted to electricity, I am sure that we can definitely solve the unemployment problem to a certain extent, at least in the rural areas.

Then, Sir, the main factor which has been mentioned by many Members is dependence on foreign aid. I quote: "The first lesson we must learn is self-help and self-reliance. If we assimilate this lesson we shall at once free ourselves from the disastrous dependence upon foreign countries and ultimate bankruptcy. We are a country of mighty rivers and a rich variety of agricultural land with inexhaustible cattle wealth. Relying on outside help will make

[Shri Y. Adinarayana Reddy.]

us still more dependent. All I say is that we must not go abegging. It demoralises. The slightest dependence on outside help is likely to deflect us from trying to the fullest extent our immense internal possibilities in the shape of utilising every inch of arable land for growing crops for daily food." These are not my words, Sir, but the words of the Father of our Nation, Mahatma Gandhi. We have ignored them for the past twenty years and have landed ourselves in many a crisis. Let us at least remember them now so that we can progress in the future at least.

In the Draft Fourth Five Year Plan I am glad to point out that the foreign aid component has been reduced to Rs. 2500 crores, in an outlay of Rs. 21,900 crores and we must strive further to see that this also disappears in the next Plan. A Plan envisaged for the good of the people must be progressive and be worked out efficiently and with selfless zeal. This is an important factor in implementing the Plan. In implementing the Plan more responsibility lies on the shoulders of the Service personnel. This is a very essential factor in the successful implementation of the Plan. To implement the plan successfully another important factor has to be borne in mind. Dishonesty, lethargy and red-tape have to be completely rooted out from amongst those who will be responsible for implementing the plan. I do not want to single out the Government servants alone in this respect. When I say this, I am not exempting any section of the people, including politicians, who are to be responsible for the implementation of the plan. This aspect needs greater attention not only of the Prime Minister and her Cabinet but also of all of us who are said to be the law-makers of the country.

Then, Sir, to implement the plan we have chosen the Panchayat Raj system. The Panchayat Raj system is a very good ideal in itself. But we have got to see that there is a uniform system all over the country. The main purpose of this system being to create a feeling of involvement of the people in the administration of the country, it is very essential that more non-official element is given powers and responsibilities in these institutions. In these matters it is essential that a uniform pattern

is set up in all the States. There seems to be some reluctance on the part of some of the State Governments to give more powers, to decentralise the powers through the Panchayat Raj institutions. The Panchayat Raj institutions, if properly guided, will be a real help to the masses in facing and tackling their day-to-day problems in the rural areas. One need not fight shy of giving power into the hands of the non-official elements in these Panchayat Raj institutions, as they will be the real base for the working of our democracy properly. We must accept that today there is a tremendous pace of change in human life. Therefore, we have to accept the concept of people's involvement in the country's affairs, and for this purpose we have to strengthen the Panchayat Raj institutions in spite of some of their failings, and widen the scope of their powers and responsibilities within their jurisdiction, thereby giving the non-official element a greater feeling of involvement in the affairs of the nation. In this context, the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt may well be quoted: 'The whole cornerstone of our democratic edifice was the principle that from the people and the people alone flows the authority of Government'.

Then again, Sir, while talking of the Panchayat Raj institutions and their powers, we must remember their responsibilities also and I cannot do better than quote that famous American President, J. F. Kennedy. "And so my fellow countrymen, ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country". The responsibilities of the non-officials in the Panchayat Raj institutions will be far greater in making our democracy a success.

In conclusion, I would only say and insist on one thing. Let us try to implement the good aspects of the Plan at least and in implementing it let us remember the words of great men like John F. Kennedy who said: "We are not here to curse in the darkness, but to light the candle that can guide us through that darkness to a safe and sane future".

श्री जगत नारायण (हमियाणा) :  
वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, हर मुल्क को  
मजबूत करने के लिये प्लानिंग निहायत  
जरूरी है और प्लान्ड डेवलपमेंट भी निहायत

जरूरी है। मगर मैं कोई इकोनामिस्ट नहीं, न ही कोई इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट हूँ, न ही कोई प्लानिंग का माहिर हूँ। एक मामूली अखबार नवीम हूँ। लोग हम से एक सवाल पूछते हैं कि पिछले 18 साल से यहाँ देश में प्लानिंग कमीशन काम कर रहा है, तुम हमें यह बताओ कि क्या बेरोजगारी बढ़ी है या कम हुई है। तो शायद जवाब यह है कि बेरोजगारी बढ़ी है। दूसरा सवाल यह पूछते हैं कि क्या गरीबी बढ़ी है या कम हुई है। तो जवाब है कि गरीबी बढ़ी है। तीसरा सवाल यह पूछते हैं कि क्या कहीं सर दकने के लिये मकान लोगों को मिल गये हैं। अगर बवई में जाये, कलकत्ते में जाय या दिल्ली में जाय तो देखते हैं कि लखों आदमी खुले आसमान के नीचे सो रहे हैं पहले में ज्यादा सो रहे हैं। इसी तरह से लोग पूछते हैं कि अनाज सस्ता हुआ है जवाब मिलता है कि अनाज सस्ता नहीं हुआ है। तो सवाल पैदा होता है कि आखिर इस प्लानिंग की जरूरत क्या है। मैं बहुत छोटा आदमी हूँ, बैंक बेचर हूँ मगर मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्लानिंग कमीशन को बिल्कुल स्कैप कर देना चाहिये। यह योजना भवन में आपने हजारों आदमी वहाँ बैठाये हुए हैं, जो ग्टायर होता है उस को 4000 रुपया तनख्वाह आप दे देते हैं। यह ठीक है कि उस में एज्केशनिस्ट और दूसरे लोग हैं लेकिन यह आप का प्लानिंग है। अगर स्टेट में एक प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर काम चला सकता है तो सेक्टर में भी एक प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर यह काम क्यों नहीं चला सकता। जब कि यह प्लानिंग बिल्कुल फेल हुई है, कहीं कोई भी चीज पूरी नहीं कर सकी है, तो इसे रखने की, चलाने की क्या जरूरत है। आप ने कहा कि हम आप को खाना देंगे। लेकिन आज क्या हालत है। थोड़ी थोड़ी जमीन है और उस से थोड़ी ही आमदनी है। इस बात को श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने भी यहाँ हाउस में स्वीकार किया है। अगर 18 साल की प्लानिंग के बाद आज देश की

यह हालत है कि एक रुपया एक इसान को एक दिन में मिलता है तो आप बताइये कि उस एक रुपये की आज कीमत क्या है। दस साल पहले, 18 साल पहले के मुताबिक उस की कीमत आज दो आना है। दो आने में एक आदमी क्या आज अपना पेट भर सकता है। तो मैं अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि—छोटे मुँह बड़ी बात कह रहा हूँ, मगर मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप इस प्लानिंग कमीशन को स्कैप कीजिये। ठीक है कि उस ने एक ड्राफ्ट बना कर आप को दे दिया, उस के बाद आप का प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर है, उस पर आप निर्भर कीजिये। जिस तरह से स्टेट में प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर काम करता है उसी तरह से काम करने की कोशिश कीजिये। इस के साथ ही मैं बड़े अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जी ने कल कहा यह अपना ड्राफ्ट पेश करते हुए कि यह स्वदेशी प्लान है। तो क्या हम एक समझे कि जिनने पहले प्लान थे वे सारे विदेशी प्लान थे। क्या वह बाहर के देशों से इम्प्यार्ड प्लान थे। अजीब हालत है कि वह कहती हैं कि यह हम ने स्वदेशी प्लान शुरू किया है। इस में स्वदेशी कौन सी बात है जो कि पहले प्लानों में नहीं थी। तो बात बड़ी सीधी है। आप, वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय कह सकते हैं कि मैं ने एक सख्त चीज कही कि प्लानिंग कमीशन को स्कैप कर देना चाहिये। मेरा अपना जाती नजुर्बा है और मैं इस लिये यह बात कह रहा हूँ। मैं 1952 में सचचर मिनिस्ट्री में ट्रांसपोर्ट मिनिस्टर था, एज्केशन मिनिस्टर था। तो उस समय मुझे वास्ता पड़ा प्लानिंग कमीशन से। वहाँ हम ने दो बातों का फैसला किया कि एक तो किताबों को नेशनलाइज कर देना चाहिये अप टु मैट्रिक और दूसरे यह कि ट्रांसपोर्ट को नेशनलाइज कर देना चाहिये। यह बात पंजाब में हम ने शुरू की और फिर प्लानिंग कमीशन के सामने यह मामला आया। मैं और चीफ मिनिस्टर, पंजाब यहाँ आये और हम पंडित नेहरू से मिले।

[श्री जगत नारायण]

उस समय चालिहा साहब ट्रांसपोर्ट के इंचार्ज थे। उन्होंने कहा कि आप यह क्या बात कर रहे हैं। क्या आप किताबों को नेशनलाइज करना चाहते हैं, आप ट्रांसपोर्ट को नेशनलाइज करना चाहते हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि यह नहीं हो सकता। तो मैं बड़ा परेशान हुआ। पंडित जी को मिला। उन्होंने कहा कि ठीक है, नेशनलाइज करना चाहिये, मगर प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर साथ साथ चलेगा। हमने कहा कि हमें कुछ तो करने दीजिये, पार्शियली करने दीजिये। जब हम वापस चले गये तो हमें प्लानिंग कमीशन ने हुक्म दिया कि आप किताबों का नेशनलाइजेशन नहीं कर सकते हैं। खैर, बाद में हम ने अपने तरीके से आठवी जमा तक किताबों का नेशनलाइजेशन कर दिया, पार्शियली ट्रांसपोर्ट को भी नेशनलाइज कर दिया और हम को पहले साल 3 लाख रुपया एक्सचेंजर में इस नेशनलाइजेशन से मिला, हालांकि वह भी वे नहीं करना चाहते थे। तो मैं समझता हूं कि प्लानिंग कमीशन के लोग बैठे हुए कोई काम नहीं करते। जो असली हालत होती है किसी एक स्टेट में वह उन को मालूम नहीं होती। ठीक है कि वे बड़े तजुबेंकार हैं, इकोनामिस्ट हैं, पढ़े लिखे होने हैं, लेकिन उन का सारा काम कागजी चलता है। तो मैं अदब से कहना चाहता हूं कि मैं किसी को जानता नहीं, मेरी किसी से वाकफियत नहीं, लेकिन मैं तो देशहित के लिये कहना चाहता हूं कि प्लानिंग कमीशन को बिल्कुल स्कैप किया जाय। आप प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर रखिये सेटर में और उस के साथ जिन व्यक्तियों की जरूरत हो उन को रखिये और अपना काम चलाइये। योजना भवन जिन लोगों से भरा हुआ है, और जिन रिटायर आदमियों को आप ने चार चार हजार रुपया तनख्वाह दे कर रखा हुआ है, उन से काम नहीं चल रहा है।

श्रीमती पराजपे ने कहा फैमली प्लानिंग

के बारे में। मैं उस समय उन की बात सुन रहा था कि वहां इतने आदमियों को बेकार रखा हुआ है। मैं भी हेल्थ मिनिस्टर रहा हूं पंजाब में। मैं भी तीन अस्पतालों का चेयरमैन हूं। मैं जानता हूं कि फैमली प्लानिंग में बिल्कुल रुपया जाया हो रहा है। मैं समझता हूं कि फैमली प्लानिंग के डिपार्टमेंट को ही स्कैप कर देना चाहिये ताकि यह एक लाख की फौज कम हो जाय। पिछले दस साल से फैमली प्लानिंग चल रही है। आप बताइये कि कितनी पापुलेशन कम हुई है।

मैंने यहां पर पिछले सेशन में मिनिस्टर साहब से एक सवाल किया था और उनसे पूछा था कि कितनी कमी हुई है और हमने कंसलटेटिव कमेटी में भी पूछा था कि कितनी कमी हुई है तो उन्होंने कहा कि अभी हमने यह आकड़े तैयार नहीं किये। मेरा कहना है कि कमी हुई नहीं है। शहरों में इसका प्रचार है और शहर वाले तो खुद नहीं चाहते कि बच्चे ज्यादा पैदा हों, न औरते चाहती हैं और न नौजवान चाहते हैं लेकिन जहां तक देहातों का ताल्लुक है वहां फैमिली प्लानिंग पहुंचा ही नहीं है और न उसको इससे रोक सकते हैं। तो फिर क्यों रुपया जाया करते हैं, यह 300 करोड़ रुपया बिजली में, पानी में खर्च कीजिये। देश को जरूरत है अनाज की और जब तक अनाज मस्ता नहीं होगा तब तक देश की गरीबी दूर नहीं हो सकती है।

मैंने तीन चार दिन हुये फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछा था कि क्या वजह है कि इस वक्त हमें 58 अरब रुपया कर्ज का देना है और अरबों रुपयों का खर्चा हमने तीन प्लानों में कर दिया है लेकिन पंजाब का जो बार्डर है जो कि पाकिस्तान के साथ बिल्कुल मिलता है, जहां कि खेत से खेत मिलते हैं, वहां आज पाकिस्तान में 17 रु० मन गन्धम बिक रही है और पंजाब में और सारे हिन्दुस्तान में 35 रुपये बिकती

है। वहां भी वही द्यूब बेल है, वही खेत है, वही चीजें हैं जो कि आपने लगाई है तो फिर क्या बजह है। इसका उन्होंने कोई जवाब नहीं दिया। मैं फिर प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा से पूछना चाहता हू कि यहां 35 रुपये मन गन्दम और वहां 17 रुपये मन गन्दम जो बिकता है उसकी बजह क्या है। वही खेत है, वही जमीन है, वही पानी है और हमने अरबों अरबों रुपयों का खर्चा प्लानिंग में कर दिया है। तो बात क्या है। बात यह है कि यहां पर जिस तरिके से प्लान किया जा रहा है वह उसकी बजह है। इसके मूतालिक मैंने अपने अखबार में छापा। जो रूसी ट्रैक्टर यहां पर 25 हजार रुपये में मिलता है वह पाकिस्तान में वही रूसी ट्रैक्टर साठे बारह हजार रुपये में मिलता है और जो पुर्जे या दूसरी चीजे ट्रैक्टर की यहां पर 20 रुपये में मिलती हैं वह पाकिस्तान में 5 रुपये में मिलती हैं और यहां पर रद्दी पुर्जे मिलता है। फिर रूसी ट्रैक्टर हिन्दुस्तान में ब्लैक में 40 हजार रुपये तक बिकता है। फाजिलका की मंडी से मुझे एक किसान ने लिखा कि मैंने 40 हजार रुपये में एक ट्रैक्टर 50 हार्स पावर का खरीद लिया है। कहा गया कि सरकार गरीबी दूर करना चाहती है और चाहती यह है कि जो अगला फाइव ईयर प्लान आ रहा है उसमें यहां का नक्शा बदल कर रख दे लेकिन मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हू कि जब तक अनाज की कीमत कम नहीं करेगे तब तक हिन्दुस्तान का नक्शा बदल नहीं सकता है।

फिर यहां पर कहा गया कि स्वदेशी प्लान है। मेरी बहन ने कहा। मैं आपकी नोटिस में एक बात लाना चाहता हू। आपने खुराना साहब का नाम सुना होगा जिनको नाबेल प्राइज मिली। वह पंजाबी था और साइंटिस्ट थे, उनकी यहां पर कद्र नहीं की गई और वह अमेरिका में रहे और उनको नाबेल प्राइज मिली। अब हम उनको ओन कर रहे हैं और डिग्रियां देते हैं। देखा जाय

कि एक पंजाबी नौजवान है जिसने कि रोटरी की एक मशीन तैयार की है। मेरा खयाल है कि मेम्बर साहबान के पास वह कागज पहुंचा होगा। श्रीमन्, उसके बारे में आल इंडिया रेडियो ने न्यूज़ ब्राडकास्ट की है। वह यह है :

‘A matriculate mechanic has produced India's first and fully indigenous rotary. His name is Mr. Gurdial Handa. He has a small workshop in Worli, Bombay.

“This machine costs Rs. 3,50,000, and every machine produced save our country Rs. 10 to 15 lacs in foreign exchange. Mr. Handa demonstrated the working of his rotary and explained the salient features to the Industries Minister of Maharashtra, Shri R. A. Patil.

यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूं, यह आल इंडिया रेडियो पर ब्राडकास्ट हुआ। उसके बाद यह है :

“Mr. Handa explained that all imported rotaries are of fixed size whereas his compact rotary is multipurpose and multi size. With minor changes, it can be made into most modern and economical newspaper rotary. Handa's rotary is very simple in design and can be easily operated by abundantly available non-skilled workers. Mr. Handa told AIR that his present capacity is to produce minimum 6 rotaries every year.”

अब अगर यह 6 रोटरिज मिलें तो कुछ नहीं तो कम से कम 2 करोड़ रुपये का फारेन एक्सचेंज बच जाता है और यहां के प्रेस वालों को, अखबार वालों को रोटरि मिल जाती है जब कि वह अगर बाहर से मंगाते हैं तो साल भर लग जाते हैं। अब इसके रास्ते में रुकावट क्या है ! उसने लिखा है कि रुकावट क्या है :

“But now suddenly Handa finds obstacles everywhere. It seems that some vested interests in the Government do not want his rotaries to be mass produced. HMT is turning a deaf ear and a blind eye towards a discovery which is the talk of the decade among technological circles.”

[श्री जगत नारायण]

वह यह कहता है कि हम हर एक के पास गये हैं और कोई उसे बनाने को तैयार नहीं है। अब उसको बाहर से आफर आने शुरू हो गये हैं। जिस वक्त डा० खुराना अमेरिका चले गये और वहां पर उन्हें नाबेल प्राइज मिली तो हिन्दुस्तान ने फख्र किया कि हमारे सार्डेंटिस्ट को मिली, उसी तरह अगर यही शख्स बाहर के मुल्कों को रोटरी बनाने को दे दे तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान को जो इंडस्ट्री मिलनी थी उससे वह वंचित रह जाता है। कहते तो यह हैं कि हमने अपना स्वदेशी प्लान बनाया है लेकिन इसमें स्वदेशी क्या है और अगर स्वदेशी है तो इस किसम की जो चीजें हैं उनको क्यों नहीं बनने देने, उनको क्यों नहीं बढ़ावा दिया जाता।

(Time bell rings)

वाइसचेयरमैन साहब, मैं सिर्फ एक बात कह कर खत्म करता हूं, मैं आपका बड़ा मशकूर हूं कि आपने टाइम दिया है। एक अर्ज और करना चाहता हूं। पंजाब हिन्दुस्तान की ग्रेनरी है लेकिन उसको यह बड़ी भारी शिकायत है कि गवर्नमेंट ने यहां फैसला किया कि एक ट्रैक्टर की इंडस्ट्री लगायेंगे, उसके लिये मौका देंगे लेकिन वह करते नहीं है। आज पंजाब के किसान को ट्रैक्टर की जरूरत है, अगर उसको ट्रैक्टर 3 या 4 या 5 हजार रुपये में मिल जाय तो आप देखियेगा कि वह इतना गन्दम पैदा कर सकता है कि कुछ नहीं तो कम से कम चार पांच सूबों को सप्लाई करता है। मगर यह बात सुनने को कोई तैयार नहीं है, जो असली चीज है उसकी तरफ ध्यान देने को तैयार नहीं है।

श्री राजनारायण : रेफ्रीजरेटर बनवा रहे हैं।

श्री जगत नारायण : तो पंजाब में ट्रैक्टर की इंडस्ट्री खोलिये और किसानों को मदद दीजिये, उनको सस्ते दाम पर ट्रैक्टर दीजिये, उनको सस्ते दाम पर दूसरे

पुर्जे दीजिये ताकि जो वह हिन्दुस्तान की ग्रेनरी है वह आगे और इसमें ज्यादा हो और वहां इससे ज्यादा अनाज पैदा करें ताकि वह सारे देश की सेवा कर सकें। मैं चाहता हूं कि आप इसकी तरफ ध्यान देने की कोशिश करें।

इसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि पाकिस्तान से लड़ाई के वक्त पंजाब ने वह पार्ट अदा किया कि जिसकी हर हिन्दुस्तानी ने तारिफ की, मगर आज उसकी क्या हालत है। आज वह पंजाब बहुत छोटा पंजाब रह गया है और उसकी तरफ आपकी कोई तवज्जह नहीं है, आप उसको कोई हैवी इंडस्ट्री देने को तैयार नहीं है, उसकी तरफ कोई ध्यान देने को तैयार नहीं है। मैं यह समझता हूं कि इस प्लान में कम से कम पंजाब के लिये आपको पूरी तवज्जह देनी चाहिये ताकि पंजाब और हरियाणा आपकी खिदमत कर सके। आपका बहुत बहुत शुक्रिया।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): There are two more speakers. I would request them both to confine themselves to five minutes each.

Mr. Vaishampayan.

SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, of course, being the last speaker, it is very difficult for me to deal with all the points which I wanted to with regard to this Draft Fourth Five Year Plan. However, I would say that I am one of those who consider that for a country like India planning is very essential and therefore, whatever the nature of the Plan that has been prepared as the Draft Fourth Five Year Plan, everybody in the country must welcome it. I am not one of those who consider that the Plan that has been prepared is a scrap of paper or is a sort of the dream of Sheikh Mohammad. It has some realistic basis; it has been prepared with certain definite objectives, even though, I for myself do not find some of the elements that are very necessary particularly after the three Five Year Plans.

I will restrict my observations, because the time is very short, to only those points—even after the three Five Year Plans and when we are on the threshold of the Fourth Five Year Plan, we have not brought in those ingredients which are very necessary, if we want really that this plan should serve the weaker sections of the people, the people of the backward areas. The approach and policy that has been formulated so far as the Draft of the Fourth Plan is concerned is certainly sound in respect of various sectors particularly the agricultural sector and the public undertaking sector. But so far as the sector of backward areas is concerned and so far as the sector of weaker sections of our society is concerned, I do not think that the planners have taken a very realistic approach. They have not taken a very realistic approach with regard to the landless labourers as such.

The outlays are no doubt in keeping with our needs and the resources. But with regard to the outlays that have been made for these sectors particularly, they are not very satisfactory from my point of view. I know the planners are aware of these two problems the problem of the underdeveloped or backward areas.

Since the Second Five Year Plan they have been making some special effort to remove the underdeveloped nature of these areas. They have taken certain steps which I know but I cannot go into details to show the awareness of the Planning Commission with regard to these problems. In their different reports, the Second Five Year Plan report, the Third Five Year Plan report, Memorandum on the Third Five Year Plan and even in this Draft of the Fourth Plan there are references no doubt about the need to do something for these backward areas. But they have only determined these backward areas according to certain indicators. But beyond that no positive and concrete steps have been taken up to now, nor have they been formulated schemes so far as the Draft of the Fourth Plan is concerned. That is my complaint with regard to the approach that has been made in this Fourth Plan. There are no concrete schemes or measures formulated under this Draft Fourth Plan so far as backward areas are concerned.

**श्री राजनारायण :** काहे वेलकम कर रहे हो इस प्लान को ?

**SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN :** I am welcoming the Plan in general. (*Interruption*) Because of the time-limit I cannot give my observations on that. I cannot give my observations and show some very redeeming features of this Plan. I cannot go into them.

**SHRI RAJNARAIN.** No time-limit. What does it mean? देखिये, टाइम लिमिट करना होगा तो हम अपना पौइन्ट आफ ऑर्डर रेंज करेंगे। टाइम लिमिट, हर पार्टी के कितने लोग बोले हैं उसके मुताबिक होना चाहिये। (*Interruption*) नहीं, मुनिये, हमने पहले ही जो यहाँ चेयर में थे उनसे कह दिया था कि देखिये हम दस मिनट बोलेगे और हर आदमी को टाइम लिमिट के ऊपर बोलना है। हमने अपने लिये पहले कह दिया था हम मनडे के लिये छोड़ रहे हैं। मडल जी को जान बूझ कर आखिर में डाला जा रहा है।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) :** राजनारायण जी, आपकी पार्टी का टाइम समाप्त हो गया।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आपकी पार्टी का भी टाइम लिमिट समाप्त हो गया था। आपको बोलकर वहाँ चेयर में जाना नहीं चाहिये था। समझ गये हैं कि नहीं।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI) :** Your time is already over. Still I am allowing five minutes.

**श्री राजनारायण :** हमारा टाइम ओवर नहीं हुआ। हो गया आपका। हमारे भाषण का टाइम ओवर हो सकता है, हमारा टाइम ओवर नहीं हुआ।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री दत्तोपंत ठेंगड़ी) :** बैठिये, बैठिये।

**श्री ओम् मेहता :** नहीं नहीं, हजार साल उमर हो आपकी।

**श्री राजनारायण :** हमे देखना पड़ेगा कौन लोग प्रेसाइड कर रहे है, कब प्रेसाइड कर रहे है। मैं धीरज खोकर बोलने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूं।

**SHRI S. K. VAISHAMPAYEN:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, what I was trying to point out was that the Planning Commission is certainly aware of the need to do something about these backward areas. They have tried to take certain steps and have given certain indicators on the basis of which the backward areas are to be determined. I have studied this question in different ways and I know there are ten States which have tried to determine these backward areas. Therefore, I do not find any difficulty in trying to formulate scheme for them. I do not know what are the difficulties with the Planning Commission to formulate schemes for the development of these backward areas. That is my difficulty with the whole Plan as such. In the previous Plans also there have not been schemes for the development of these underdeveloped areas. Neither the Planning Commission nor the State Governments have applied their mind to see that these underdeveloped areas come on par with the other progressive areas as such. So even though the recognition is there and even though the Prime Minister in her speech has also referred that some concrete steps would be taken in regard to the development of the backward areas. I do not know why the Government or the Planning Commission have to await for the report of the Wanchoo Committee when there could be definite schemes for the development of these areas. So I would submit some concrete suggestions with regard to this particular problem.

I feel, Sir, that in the whole Plan a confusion has been brought in by comparing these backward areas with the general backwardness that is there between one State and the other. This should be removed, and the backward areas should be only those which have been determined by the indicators of the Planning Commission. So this is the first thing which the Planning Commission and the Government must consider if they are at all sincere and serious to do something about the backward areas. They must remove the confusion that there are certain backward areas which have been

determined according to the indicators of the Planning Commission and there is backwardness between one State and the other. That confusion they must first remove and try to lay down for them a certain priority, say, to bring up these backward areas to a particular level of development within three or five years.

The third thing which I would like to suggest for the Planning Commission and the Government to consider is that they should undertake to build up an infrastructure within these areas. Without building up the infrastructure of development it is not possible for any Government or any Plan as such to see that these areas are covered. Unless there is the facility of water, unless there is facility of power, unless there is facility of roads and railway lines, how is it possible for industries to grow in these areas? So my submission is that the Government must formulate schemes for building the infrastructure within these particular areas. The Central Government and the State Governments must see that particularly public sector industries which are non resource based should be located in these backward areas as such on a priority basis.

Then the Central Government must ask the State Governments to evolve certain special machinery, for instance, an Industrial Development Corporation for helping the upcoming of industries in these areas.

Lastly, the Central Government must see that the State Governments give a weightage in the allocation of funds so far as these areas are concerned. I know the Planning Commission has made certain reservation of funds, 10 per cent for special problems of States. Instead of making it a very general statement they should lay down that this 10 per cent of the allocation that has been made should be spent as a weightage on allocation given for the backward areas as such. Therefore, I am submitting for the consideration of the Government and the Planning Commission some concrete suggestions with regard to the development of these backward areas.

With regard to the problem of landless labourers let me quote only a few figures. Today in our country, 65 per cent of the agricultural population are those farmers

who possess 5 acres or less of land or who are landless labourers.

These classes who constitute 65 per cent of our rural population have only 15 per cent of land in their possession. This is the position with regard to a bulk of our population. Out of this 65 per cent, 38 per cent are landless labourers in rural areas. So unless we apply ourselves seriously to their economic condition, to see that they are helped in every way and whosoever possesses land is given credit, unless we take very firm and concrete measures to help this particular class, I feel these sectors will grow very sensitive and it may result in serious dissatisfaction, even though we have this Fourth Five-Year Plan for the whole of the country as such. With these few words and with these few suggestions, I consider that a Plan of this nature was necessary, particularly when we have gone through a long period of recession, a long period of economic depression, a long period of drought; and it should be started as early as possible and we should see now, the Planners and the Government must see, that concrete steps are taken for these two sectors which are growing sensitive day after day.

**श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार) :** उप-सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप से मेरा यह निवेदन है कि पार्लियामेंट में एक रिसर्च डिपार्टमेंट रखा जाय इस शोध के लिए कि जब कोई सदस्य कोई संशोधन देता है तो उसको बोलने के लिए समय दिया जाता है या नहीं। देखने में यह आता है कि जो लोग कोई संशोधन नहीं देते हैं उन्हें पहले बोलने के लिए बुलवा लिया जाता और जो संशोधन देते हैं उन्हें नहीं बुलाया जाता है। ऐसी बात क्यों होती है, इस बात पर शोध होना चाहिये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** जिस समय कोई माननीय सदस्य बोलता हो उस समय किसी को चेयर के पास जाकर बातचीत नहीं करनी चाहिये। श्री ओम् मेहता को इस समय चेयर के साथ बात नहीं करनी चाहिये क्योंकि जब कोई माननीय सदस्य बोलता है तो चेयर को डिस्टर्ब नहीं किया जाना

चाहिये। अगर उन्हें डिस्टर्ब किया गया तो वे कैसे सुनेंगे। श्री मंडल जी ने जो सजेशन दिये हैं, क्या उन्हें चेयर ने सुना है। उन्होंने चेयर से रिवेस्ट किया है किसी बात के लिए। अगर इसी तरह की बात यहां पर चलती रही तो पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी एक मौकरी रह जायेगी। Democracy is not hypocrisy. There is great difference between democracy and hypocrisy.

**श्री ओम् मेहता** अब आप उन्हें बोलने दीजिये।

**श्री बी० एन० मंडल :** मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में तीन पंचवर्षीय योजना बीत चुकी है और उसका जो नतीजा निकला है वह सब को मालूम है। एक नतीजा यह निकला है कि हिन्दुस्तान के जो बड़े बड़े पूंजीपति हैं, जिनकी हैसियत करोड़ों में गिनी जाती थी प्लानों के पहले, अब उनकी हैसियत बढ़कर अरबों रूपयों में चली गई है। इस तरह से अरबों में उनकी हैसियत गिनी जाने लगी है। एक नतीजा तो यह निकला है जो पिछली योजनाएं हमारे देश में खत्म हो चुकी हैं।

दूसरा नतीजा यह निकला है कि हिन्दुस्तान के जो बड़े बड़े शहर हैं, चाहे वह दिल्ली हों, कलकत्ता हों, बम्बई हों, लखनऊ हों, पटना हों, यानी जितने भी बड़े बड़े शहर हैं, उनकी दशा में तरक्की हो गई है। यह चीज भी इन प्लानों से हुई है।

तीसरी बात यह देखने में आई है कि जो बड़े बड़े मिनिस्टर हैं, जो बड़े बड़े आफिसर हैं, उनके स्टैण्डर्ड आफ लिविंग में इन प्लानों की वजह से वृद्धि हुई है।

चौथी बात यह देखने में आई है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो बड़ी जाति के लोग हैं, पढ़े लिखे हैं, उन लोगों की संख्या गवर्नमेंट सर्विस में अत्यधिक हो गई है। यह भी

[श्री बी० एन० मडल]

प्लानों से देखने को मिला है। यह नतीजा सिर्फ इन्हीं प्लानों का नहीं है बल्कि समुचे एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में चाहे वह प्लान के लिए हो या किसी दूसरी चीज के लिए हो, सारे क्षेत्र में इस तरह की बात देखने में आई है। इस तरह की बात क्यों हुई है और क्यों इस तरह की बातें सम्भव होती हैं इसके कारणों पर जाने की जरूरत है। इसलिए प्लानिंग कमिशन का जो रिसर्च डिपार्टमेंट है, उसमें मेरा यह आग्रह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो ये सब घटनाएँ हुई हैं जिनका कि मैंने जिक्र किया है, उनके बारे में जांच करे कि ये बातें क्यों घड़ी और इन बातों के पीछे कोई ऐसा कारण है जिसकी वजह से इस तरह की चीजें हमारे देश में हुई हैं।

मेरा कहना यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो लोग एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन चला रहे हैं, उस एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को चलाने वालों में जा असरदार लोग हैं, उन्हीं लोगों की वजह से हमारे प्लान फेलियर हुए हैं। गरीब लोगों के लिए, साधारण लोगों के लिए, ये प्लान सफल नहीं हुए हैं बल्कि फेलियर रहे हैं। इसी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के जरिये जो दूसरे क्षेत्र हैं प्लान के अलावा, उन में भी इन्हीं लोगों की वजह से तरह-तरह की गड़बड़ियाँ की गई हैं। यही कारण है कि आज हम सारे शासन में गड़बड़ी ही देखते हैं। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि इस बात के बारे में रिसर्च होना चाहिये।

हमारी पार्टी साफ तौर से इस बात को कहती है कि हिन्दुस्तान में जो जाति व्यवस्था है वह बहुत पुरानी है और उसने सारे क्षेत्र में अपना प्रभाव डाल रखा है। आज क्या होता है। जो लोग बड़े हैं, जो सरकारी पदों पर आसीन हैं, उनके जो रिश्तेदार हैं, सब्धी हैं, जिस किसी से भी उनका अटैचमेंट है, जो किसी तरह से उनके रिश्तेदार हैं, उनकी जाति के हैं, सरकारी कार्यालयों में जो जगहें खाली

होती हैं उन्हें ये लोग जगहें दिला देने हैं और दूसरों को इस तरह की जगहें नहीं मिलती हैं। जो प्लान अब तक बने हैं वे सिर्फ इन्हीं तरह के लोगों के लिए बने और ज्यादातर इन्हीं लोगों को ही फायदा पहुंचा है जिन लोगों को फायदा पहुंचना था और जिन लोगों के नाम पर प्लान बनाये गये थे, उन्हें इन प्लानों से कोई फायदा नहीं पहुंचा है।

अगर आप परिस्थितियों का विश्लेषण करेंगे तो आप यह पायेंगे कि आज लोगों के जीवन में संघर्ष है। एक तरफ तो वे लोग हैं जो अपने को आदिवासी कहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ वे लोग हैं जो अपने को आर्यों की सन्तान या हिन्दू कहते हैं। इस तरह से दोनों के स्वार्थों में आपस में टक्कर है। इन्हीं संघर्षों के कारण हमारे देश में तरह-तरह की समस्याएँ हैं। इसलिए मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो यह शासन चलाने वाले लोग हैं उन्हें इस चीज को अच्छी तरह से समझ लेना चाहिये।

दूसरी समस्या क्या है। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जो हिन्दू हैं और उनमें भी जो विद्वज और शूद्र हैं, उनमें आपस में लड़ाई चल रही है। यह लड़ाई आज से नहीं है बल्कि शुरू से यह लड़ाई चली आ रही है। आज इस जनतंत्र में, इस प्रजातंत्र में उन्हीं लोगों को सहूलियतें मिल सकती हैं जो लोग यहां पर शासन चला रहे हैं और इस तरह से इस लड़ाई में उन्हीं लोगों को ज्यादा फायदा पहुंच रहा है। भारतीय जनतंत्र जिन लोगों से यह आशा की जाती थी कि वे और लोगों को भी इस लड़ाई में सहूलियतें देंगे, वह देखने में नहीं आई। इसी तरह से जो अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं और जो अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे नहीं हैं उनके स्वार्थों में टक्कर है। इस टक्कर में जो अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे लोग हैं, उन्हीं लोगों को हर तरह की सहूलियतें मिलती हैं। जो अंग्रेजी पढ़े लिखे नहीं हैं, ऐसे लोगों को अनेक तरह की

कठिनाइयों का सामना करना पड़ता है। इस तरह में पढ़े लिखे आदमी और बगैर पढ़े लिखे आदमियों के स्वार्थों में टक्कर है। पढ़े लिखे आदमी को बगैर पढ़े लिखे आदमी के मुकाबले में ज्यादा सहूलियतें आज इस शासन में मिल रही हैं। इस तरह से आज इस देश में दो गिरोहों के बीच में जीवन संघर्ष चल रहा है। इस लड़ाई के होते हुए हिन्दुस्तान का शासन अच्छी तरह से चल नहीं सकता है, यह मेरा निवेदन है। इन दो गिरोहों में से वह गिरोह जो पहले से दबा चला आ रहा है उसके ऊपर शासन नहीं किया जा सकता है, यह बात मैं नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जो गिरोह इन लोगों के ऊपर शासन करता है उनका दिमाग और हृदय जबतक इन लोगों के प्रति नहीं बदलेगा, जब तक वे उनके दुख दर्द को अपना नहीं समझेगे, तबतक वे उनकी भलाई नहीं कर सकते हैं और उन्हें सहूलियत नहीं दे सकते हैं। इसलिए इस तरह के लोगों को ट्रेनिंग देने की आवश्यकता है ताकि उनके दिमाग में जो अपना सकीर्ण स्वार्थ भरा है वह निकल जाय और इन लोगों की भलाई की तरफ भी उनका ध्यान जाय। इस के लिये उदार मस्तिष्क और विशाल हृदय की आवश्यकता है जिसका नितान्त अभाव है। सिर्फ उची शिक्षा से ही उदार मस्तिष्क और विशाल हृदय नहीं तैयार हो जाता है।

इस लिये उसके लिये स्पेशल ट्रेनिंग की जरूरत है। ये जो हिन्दुस्तान में प्लान बने हैं उन पर अरबों रुपया खर्च हो चुका है, लेकिन उसका कोई नतीजा नहीं निकला है। उसका नतीजा केवल कुछ लोगों के लिये निकला है जिन का जिक्र मैंने पहले किया है। लेकिन उन लोगों के लिये कोई उसका फल नहीं निकला है जिन के लिये फल निकलना जरूरी था। जिस समय राष्ट्रीय आंदोलन चल रहा था तो उन्हीं लोगों की दशा को दिखला करके और उन्हीं लोगों की दशा की वजह से वह आंदोलन चल

रहा था। लेकिन स्वराज्य होने के बाद आज यदि किसी की दशा को निगलेकट किया जाता है, किसी की अवज्ञा की जाती है तो उन्हीं लोगों की अवज्ञा की जाती है। हम लिये मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इस प्लान को बनाने वाला जो योजना आयोग है और यह जो गवर्नमेंट है, यह इन सारी चीजों में जाय।

हमारी पार्टी की नीति है कि सैकड़ा में कम से कम 60 जगहें उन लोगों को मिलनी चाहिये जो कि शुरू से शोषित हैं। जिन पर बराबर शासन और जिन का बराबर शोषण हुआ है वे जब तक इस डेमोक्रेसी में, जनतंत्र में, शासन में नहीं आवेंगे और उनका जो अपना कड़वा अनुभव है उस अनुभव को वे जब तक शासन का आधार नहीं बनावेंगे तब तक शासन में, योजना में और योजना की नीति में सुधार नहीं हो सकता है और हिन्दुस्तान का जो असली मर्ज है उसकी दवाई नहीं हो सकती है। इस लिये मेरा यह संज्ञेन है कि योजना आयोग इस दृष्टिकोण से और हिन्दुस्तान की परिस्थिति का विचार करते हुये इस योजना में सुधार लावे।

आज जो योजना हम लोगों के सामने आई है उस योजना का नतीजा निकलना है डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग अगर करभार और करभार में डाइरेक्ट करभार नहीं, इन-डाइरेक्ट करभार है जिस का नतीजा उन गरीबों को भोगना पड़ेगा जिन गरीबों के पास कोई साधन नहीं है और जिन की कोई कमाई नहीं है। आज हिन्दुस्तान में करीब 42 मिलियन आदमी ऐसे हैं जिन के लिये कोई काम नहीं है। 12 मिलियन के बारे में तो सभी कोई कहते हैं। लेकिन जो आधे बेरोजगार हैं जिन की संख्या करीब करीब 36 मिलियन है अगर उसका आधा कर दिया जाय अब बेरोजगारी की वजह से तो 18 मिलियन होता है और 18 मिलियन और 12 मिलियन मिल कर होता है 30 मिलियन उसके अलावा 14

[श्री बि० एन० मंडल]

मिलियन और नये लोग इस पंचवर्षीय योजना के अन्दर में आवेंगे काम के लिये। इस तरह से 42 मिलियन आदमियों को काम की जरूरत है। इस के लिये इस योजना आयोग ने क्या किया है। इसके लिये कोई खास योजना इन्होंने ने नहीं बनाई है। इस लिये मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में योजना के आधार को बदला जाय तो किस ढंग से बदला जाय। हर गांव में ग्राम पंचायतें हैं। उस ग्राम पंचायत के जरिये, हर गांव में जो ग्राम सभा होती है उस ग्राम सभा के जरिये हर परिवार वालों से बजट मांगा जाय कि तुम जो अपना जीवन चलाते हो उसका तुम बजट पेश करो कि क्या क्या तुम्हारी आमदनी है और क्या क्या तुम्हारा खर्च है और यदि खर्च से आमदनी कम है तो उसके लिये कौन सा उपाय हो सकता है जिस उपाय से तुम्हारी आमदनी पूरी हो सके। इस तरह से जो कमी रहेगी उन सारी कमियों को लेकर के ग्राम पंचायतें उसको कंसालीडेट करें, फिर वह ज़िले के पैमाने पर कंसालीडेट हो, उसके बाद प्रांत के पैमाने पर कंसालीडेट हो और फिर देश के पैमाने पर कंसालीडेट कर के जो प्लानिंग कमिशन है वह उसके अनुसार अपनी जो योजना है उसको बनावे।

एक बात मैं और भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि आज जो प्लान बनता है उस प्लान में, आज चूँकि इस देश में बहुत बेरोजगारी है और हमारे पास न आवश्यक साधन हैं, न पूंजी है और न ज़मीन है, इस लिये सारे लोगों के लिये हम अच्छी तरह से इंतज़ाम

नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि ऐसा कोई प्रबन्ध किया जाय जिस से दो हजार रुपये की आमदनी साल भर में हर परिवार के लिये हो जाय। इसके लिये क्या करना चाहिये। आज जो देहात का रहने वाला परिवार है अगर वह खेती करना चाहता है और उसके लिये कोई काम नहीं है तो निश्चित तरीके से दो बीघा ज़मीन उसको देना चाहिये। उसी तरह से शहर में जिस परिवार के पास कोई रोज़गार नहीं है और अगर वह रोज़गार चाहता है तो सरकार को चाहिये कि दो हजार रुपया सालाना आमदनी की जो इंडस्ट्री हो वह उसको दे दी जाय। इस के लिये जिन के पास पूंजी है उनसे पूंजी लेने की जरूरत पड़ेगी और जिन के पास ज़मीन है उनसे ज़मीन लेने की जरूरत पड़ेगी। मैं यह नहीं कहता हूँ कि आप किसी पर जुल्म कीजिये। लेकिन यह बात मैं कहता हूँ कि उनको काम देने के लिये जहां ज़मीन लेने की जरूरत हो वहां ज़मीन ली जाय और जहां पूंजी वालों से पूंजी लेने की जरूरत हो वहां पूंजी ली जाय और इस तरह उनके लिये दो हजार रुपया सालाना आमदनी का इन्तज़ाम कर दिया जाय। यही मेरा कहना है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI D. THENGARI): The Prime Minister will reply the first thing tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-six minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the 15th May, 1969.