

the natural calamity, in accordance with a system evolved for this purpose. The Government of India have already advanced a sum of Rs. 50 lakhs to the State Government and further amounts will be released as and when found necessary.

## STATEMENT

On the 9th October, 1967, a violent cyclone passed over the eastern coast of Cuttack district, the northern tip of Puri district and the southern tip of Balasore district, the area affected constituting a belt approximately 70 miles long and 20 miles wide, in the shape of an arc convex to the land side.

2. At the request of the State Government, a Team of officers from the Government of India visited Orissa from the 17th to 19th October, 1967 to study the situation caused by the cyclone and to estimate the likely requirement of funds for relief expenditure and repairs to public property.

3. The bulk of the affected area lies in Cuttack district. About 6 lakhs of persons availed themselves of the emergent relief provided to all persons who had been rendered homeless. Definite information was available at the time of the Team's visit of 315 deaths due to the cyclone. The loss of cattle reported was about 9500. Over one lakh of dwelling houses were reported to have been either damaged or destroyed. Considerable damage was also caused to Government buildings, godowns, educational institutions, banana and coconut plantations, bamboo clumps etc. Most of the boats and fishing gear of the fishermen of the area and a number of Government boats and barges were reported to have been lost or damaged. Sources of drinking water in several places were polluted by saline water, carcasses, sand, etc. Standing crops in about 10,000 acres were reported to have been affected. Considerable damage was also caused by falling trees to roads and irrigation works. Electric and telephone poles and wires were extensively damaged.

4. The State Government undertook relief operations like free supply of food, sanctioning of grants and loans for house-building and repairs, supply of seeds, loans to agriculturists and fishermen, etc.

5. After detailed discussions with the representatives of the State Government, the Team tentatively estimated the requirement of funds for relief measures, including loans to agriculturists etc., at Rs. 125 lakhs. Similarly, the Team placed the requirements on account of repairs to Government buildings, roads, irrigation works, etc. at Rs. 50 lakhs.

## CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED DECISION OF THE GOVERNMENT TO DEFER THE FOURTH FIVE-YEAR PLAN BY THREE YEARS

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa) : Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the reported decision of the Government to defer the Fourth Five-Year Plan by three years, i.e. up to 1969.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Mr. Chairman. Sir, Hon. Members will recall that the memorandum on the Fourth Five Year Plan was published in October, 1964, and presented to the National Development Council. The Council then proceeded to set up five Committees to consider various aspects of the Plan, including resources. These Committees met between January and July 1965. Their efforts culminated in a document, prepared by the Planning Commission, entitled "Fourth Five Year Plan—Resources, Outlays and Programmes". This document was submitted to the National Development Council in September 1965. Hon'ble Members will recall that this was the month of the Pakistani aggression. The National Development

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi] Council authorised the Prime Minister to make such changes in the proposals contained in the document as were considered necessary in the light of the situation which existed at that time. The Planning Commission were able to complete the Draft Outline of the Fourth Plan in September 1966 for the consideration of Parliament. An Annual Plan for 1966-67 was also prepared a few months earlier, keeping broadly within the framework of the Draft Outline.

It is no secret that the conflict of 1965 had many adverse economic consequences for the country. Following hostilities, foreign credits were suspended which meant curtailment and stringent control of imports essential for the continued growth of the economy.

There was further strain in the economy because of the altogether unexpected setback to our agricultural production even during 1966-67 after the failure of the previous year. The two droughts necessitated larger imports of foodgrains and raw materials, and greatly affected our capacity to export. Compared to the previous year, there was a further lowering in our foreign receipts in 1966-67. The setback in agricultural production also caused a retardation in the important sector of industries based on agricultural raw-material and those depending on consumption demand of agriculturist. The sharp rise in the prices of foodgrains which was inevitable in the situation of very large short fall of production, tended to reduce savings, and affected our capacity to make larger investments. This in turn affected certain other branches of industry such as the engineering industry. All this resulted in considerable erosion of resources for development. On the expenditure side, the defence burden, subsidies on food and increasing dearness allowance consequent on rise in prices also depleted our resources further.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, these were the circumstances which delayed the completion of the Fourth Five-Year Plan

and it was decided that the Annual Plan for 1967-68 should also be formulated in advance of the Fourth Plan in order to avoid a pause in the developmental process. The Annual Plan for 1967-68 was completed in June 1967 and submitted to Parliament.

At the time of the re-constitution of the Planning Commission in September, 1967, it was obvious that many of the assumptions and calculations incorporated in the Draft Outline were no longer valid and that, to a large extent, fresh exercises would have to be made before the Fourth Five Year Plan could be completed. Meanwhile, the work of the preparation of the Annual Plan for 1968-69 had to be taken up immediately. In order that proposals of the Annual Plan for 1968-69 should be effectively incorporated in the budgets for 1968-69, it was necessary for the Annual Plan to be ready by January 1968 to ensure that development outlays during the year 1968-69 were properly balanced and coordinated. The reconstituted Commission, therefore, decided to concentrate on the formulation of the Annual Plan in September, 1967 and is presently engaged in this work. It is proposed to undertake the work of the Fourth Five-Year Plan in January, 1968 after the completion of the Annual Plan for 1968-69.

Thus, the Annual Plans for 1966-67 and 1967-68 have already been brought out and the latter is being implemented. Although expectations of a good harvest have given hope of improvement in the economy, there are still elements of uncertainty and danger of inflationary pressures continuing unchecked. A number of corrective steps are required during 1968-69 to tighten economic discipline and to create conditions in which steady planned growth can take place in conditions of relative financial stability. The output levels in 1968-69 would be close to the target of the Third Plan and would be a reasonable base for setting out the tasks of the Fourth Plan. It is for these reasons that the years 1966-67,

1967-68 and 1968-69 are proposed to be excluded from the Fourth Plan. Such a Five Year Plan, to be operationally useful for providing guidance on the programmes and policies for the future should cover the period 1969-70 to 1973-74. The National Development Council at its meeting on 1st and 2nd December, 1967, has endorsed this.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I state very clearly that the Government has not given up planning, as the movers of the Calling Attention Notice have suggested. Far from it. The process of planning is being continued and vigorously pursued although the means and methods may have to be changed to take into account our changing economic situation. Indeed, even if the Fourth Five-Year Plan had been finalised before the end of 1966, the size and composition of outlays would have to take into account the exceptional features of the prevailing economic situation and there is no reason to believe that the outlays would have been any different.

I should like to emphasize that the Five Year Plans have assumed even greater urgency and importance for us. The effort is essential and must be made continuously and seriously. It is in that spirit that the Planning Commission is proceeding towards the formulation of the Fourth-Five Year Plan. With the gains of the current year's good harvest and with the economy stabilised, we should have laid the foundations for resuming the process of rapid development in the proposed next Five-Year Plan period.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: (West Bengal) : Sir, before clarifications are sought I would like to make a submission. A long statement on a very important subject, giving statistics, etc. and an analysis, has been made. I think it is fair to the House that we have time for a proper discussion. Every time, on the occasion of the Five-Year Plan, we had been given a chance of discussing it. Now of course

that is gone. At least let us get the chance of discussing for one or two days the statement that has been made so that, over such a serious failure on the part of the Government, Parliament can duly express its opinion. Therefore, Sir, I have already tabled a Motion—listening to the statement—for a comprehensive discussion on the subject. I hope hon. Members will agree that, after we ask for clarifications you, Sir, fix up some suitable day for a discussion on the subject.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Sir, I am giving a suggestion. I am of the same opinion and I have already tabled a Motion, long before, but I want to know from the Prime Minister only one thing, and if you permit, Sir, then I will ask questions. When Parliament has accepted this planned growth in this country, the Prime Minister owed a responsibility also to tell us before the Cabinet decided upon this deferment of the Plan. So they have treated us in a cavalier manner and decided to defer the Plan without taking into confidence Parliament itself. So it is but proper now that they declare that they will first discuss in Parliament this statement and after that only the Prime Minister or the Cabinet will decide whether the Plan will be deferred or not. It is virtually a Plan holiday that they have declared already.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order, Sir. I am very glad my friend has spoken. My point of order is this. In this House and the other House—this House is a continuous House and the other House comes and goes—we have adopted Resolutions with regard to the planning. Resolutions have been passed; I have been right from the beginning here; Resolutions have been passed; commitments have been made the planning would go on the basis of five-year periods, one five-year period after another. Now it is quite clear that scuttling has taken place behind the back of Parliament, without even reference to it. We are being given a fait accompli, which is of course a notorious public

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

fact. Therefore, Sir, I think the Government has clearly committed a solemn breach of privilege of this House, and I am not talking about the other House although I made passing reference to that House too. I put it here because this House is a permanent House. The other House may not take it up, but we, from the beginning, had been told and given assurances; pledges had been made and Resolutions had been passed with regard to the planning. But today we find that another set of ideas, another approach scuttling the Plan, wrecking it, well, has been brought here. Therefore, Sir, I think this matter also you should consider. You would kindly direct the Secretariat. . . .

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE (Maharashtra): I want to make a submission. There are already nineteen names in the list. . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : There will be two hundred names. I am very sorry that it is only nineteen names and is not one hundred and nineteen names. I add my name to it.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE: There are already nineteen names in the list and if each is given, say, five minutes, to speak, and then the reply is given, this alone will do; it will have been a sufficient discussion. There need not be discussion again on another day.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why nineteen alone? Others will come in to speak. Therefore, Sir, this is a very important point. Now, Sir, you direct the Secretariat to find out from the proceedings as to what commitment Government had made on former occasions, and whether what has happened now is a breach of privilege or not.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA (Bihar): May I make a submission in this connection, Sir? Now I completely agree with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta that there should be a full-fledged discussion on this subject in this House. Unless this

House gives its imprimatur, or approval, to the Plan, it does not become a national Plan. I had in fact suggested to the Prime Minister some time back that there should be a discussion of this kind held in this House, and she had readily agreed to it. But what I want to suggest is that this device of the Calling-Attention notice should not be lost at the present moment . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Certainly, I agree.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : ... and we should seek some information so that we can more fruitfully participate in the discussion to follow.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am a wholesaler in that.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I take it that the hon. the Prime Minister has no objection. As to on what date and at what time we should discuss it. I shall keep myself in touch with Mr. Hathi and then do it. We shall now go to the . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: We have to go ahead with the Calling-Attention notice, Sir.

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you have been responsible for this; you have killed this Calling Attention notice by your suggestions.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are going ahead with it. It is not fair; it is not right; we should go ahead with the Calling-Attention notice, Calling-Attention stands. The proposed discussion has nothing to do with this Calling-Attention. On the contrary, replies to this Calling-attention notice are very essential for consideration by the House as to how we should discuss this matter. Sir, replies to this Calling-Attention notice are very very essential in this particular case, because we do not have any papers to go by.

DR. ANUP SINGH (Punjab) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have to make a submission. In case you agree that we are going to have a full-fledged discussion on this, I do not think we should waste our time in asking questions and seeking clarifications.

HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is very wrong; this is very wrong, Sir.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : If on this Calling-Attention notice clarifications are allowed, certain answers would come up and they would be very valuable for us in taking an effective part in the discussion that is to follow. Unless this is allowed we will be deprived of getting these informations beforehand.

SHRI MULKA GOVIND A REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman. Sir. some important questions may be allowed to be put on this Calling-Attention notice, and when we take up the discussion on this Statement, the discussion should take place on a motion to be moved by Mr. Banka Behary Das. because he heads this list here.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI JAISUKH-LAL HATHI) : Sir, my submission is this. There was the Calling-Attention notice and in reply to that the Prime Minister has already made a statement. Now certain points for clarification may arise and they could be replied to provided we are not going to discuss this again. Now all the points that they want to raise can be raised in the debate and the clarifications can be made, and this would mean that we shall save the time of the House now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, from my experience—I am an old Member of this House since 1952—we have been associated with the planning. Every time the Prime Minister formed a committee with regard to the Five-Year Plan of the time, before its formulation. I had been a member of that. Always papers had been given to

us; volumes of papers had been given to us so that we could come and discuss even the question of the formulation on the basis of a draft plan or on the basis of these and other papers that had been given to us. Today we have got only a small statement here. Much more we need even to discuss this subject on the basis on which it has been suggested in the House. Therefore, Sir, that happened. I should tell you; that procedure was followed at the time of the First Five-Year Plan, the Second Five-Year Plan and the Third Five-Year Plan. Not only that; parliamentary committees were appointed, committees of the two Houses, to plead and discuss the matter threadbare. Today we have nothing of the kind. Therefore, answers to questions put on the basis of the Calling-Attention notice and the statement made in reply thereto, would be doing us only a small mercy. We want this thing. The Calling-Attention should be pursued and I say that it should be pursued till all of us are satisfied by asking clarifications where we need them in order to enable us to apply our minds on the subject and come prepared with information or to give our thoughts and ideas over this serious matter.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): One from each group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can allow fifteen minutes' time for clarification. It is not for making speeches or long statements.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But so many names are here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So many names need not be; I mean, I shall call them; I need not call every one who is here.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Each group should be called.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : My point is this. If you are going to discuss the Plan for one or two days on a later occasion, and if you allow now time to each one to put questions, it would now itself take about one

[Shri Lokanath Misra.] hour's time. And then again we shall discuss it for two hours later, which would mean nothing but a repetition of today's thing being taken up on another day. In view of that . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As far as the Swatantra Party is concerned, I can understand their stand.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It is not a question of the Swatantra Party; it is a question of the Five-Year Plan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I can understand you and your Swatantra Party. You have killed the Plan. They both should join now. Only the table divides them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI) : What the hon. Member referred to about the first three Plans was about the actual contents of the Plans. That we certainly discussed and information was asked for. It is a different matter. Here this is a different matter on which clarification is being sought. If there is going to be a two-hour discussion, then it is better for this purpose. (*Interruptions*). It may be one day, whatever the Chairman decides; it is not for me to say whether it is two hours or one day or two days or ten days, but I would certainly say that it should be only two hours.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would certainly say "two years".

(Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: May be Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's intelligence is limitless. I am not concerned with that. He has an unlimited vision before him, but I have a limited vision. I do not have a limitless vision. So he can speak of two years or twenty years or two hundred years. His imagination is running riot. But it is for the Chairman to say how much time should be allowed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But you yourself said two hours.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: Yes. I said two hours and I still say it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why do you say it? It is for the Chairman to say.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Nobody was with him. He was a completely deserted man.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Finance Minister has stated his view of the matter and you have said that it would require more than two hours. It is now a matter for me to decide. It may be left to me to decide.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Sir, a discussion of two hours will not be sufficient, I am quite clear in my mind that a subject of this nature cannot be discussed in two hours. We will be completely at sea if . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, I rise on a serious point . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is no question of any misunderstanding on this matter. You felt that it requires more time and you have a right to say it and the Finance Minister has stated his point of view and he has a right to state his point of view also, just as you have the right to state your point of view. Now you leave it to me to consider and decide.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Yes, we leave it to you, Sir. But you should not overlook this posture, this mentality of the Finance Minister. He wants this matter to be disposed of in just two hours. That is his mentality. That mentality we deeply deplore.

SHRI MORARJI R. DESAI: I may say there is no need for any discussion, but that need not be accepted. Let not my hon. friend get excited. Neither is there any need for my hon. friend

here to get excited. It is for the Chairman to decide what the discussion should be and for how long it should be. It is perfectly relevant for me to suggest that it may be two hours and my hon. friend is entitled to make his suggestion. But I do not know whether he is entitled to raise objection to my suggestion and to shout or do anything of that kind.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, can he say that I shouted? The hon. Minister is persisting in his irresponsibility in this matter. He should have actually invited a discussion on this subject. He should have said, let us have a reasonable discussion. Instead of that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not wish to proceed with this question whether it should be two hours or two days. The subject is to be discussed. Now we proceed to the next . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, you yourself said it will be for fifteen minutes now. So let us start.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is gone.

(Interruptions)

ANOTHER HON. MEMBER : Tomorrow.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Sir, without going into the details of the statement of the Prime Minister, I would like to know from her whether the Cabinet took the decision of deferring the Plan without consulting Parliament before hand. And secondly, may I know whether this deferment does not mean virtually surrendering to the political . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Das, please sit down. I have considered the matter carefully. First I thought that I might give fifteen minutes, for a little clarification here and there. But now my feeling is that it is not possible to do so. I will certainly give enough time for discussion of the

whole matter after giving proper notice. Therefore I would not like to proceed further with this discussion now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I beg of you to kindly reconsider. You are absolutely right and more reasonably right towards the Congress Party. Now, you see this has been included in the list of business for the day. We may scuttle the next Five Year Plan, but normally we do not kill the business of the House. Therefore, this agenda has to be gone through in a reasonable manner. I would say discussions arise in various ways. They arise from the debate, sometimes even from supplementary questions, sometimes from a question. Here this thing is arising from the agenda because the Prime Minister made a statement over this matter. So let the discussion be treated separately. Here extempore we have just heard it. We have not the genius of Shri Morarji Desai. We take some time to understand things. So we may now ask a few questions and we may be allowed some time to ask a few questions in order to help us to understand it. That way we may be ready tomorrow and after reading this long statement we will be prepared. Therefore, this decision about fifteen minutes, though we are not happy about it, we submit to it. We submit to you, Sir, but Shri Morarji Desai does not submit to you.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Sir, you had given your ruling after considerable deliberation, that it will be for fifteen minutes. Afterwards, having regard to the discussions that took place, you came to the conclusion that the discussion should be allowed for a longer time and . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But what is the . . .

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Let me finish. It is not the privilege or monopoly of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to be always speaking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. You are a "young Turk".

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: I am not an old Turk. I may be a young Turk. Mr. Chairman. Sir, you have now given this ruling. Sir, since yesterday I have been complaining and asking whether it is the privilege or authority of some individuals to take up the whole time of the House and to have their own privileges in this House. Sir, this should not be allowed here.

Sir, you gave the ruling yesterday that Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha would make his statement and then afterwards the Minister of Information and Broadcasting will have his say. May I know from the Chair whether Shri Ganga Sharan Sinha who has been waiting since yesterday will be allowed to have his say?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, already we have submitted to your ruling. I hope you will take our feelings into account and extend the time for discussion. The Prime Minister may not be in favour of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I agree. You sit down. No more discussion on this.

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I seek your permission to raise a matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes, yes. That is a different matter

RE. MEETING OF THE PRIME MINISTER WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE OPPOSITION PARTIES IN REGARD TO THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967.

श्री विमलकुमार भग्नलालजी चौरङ्गिया (मध्य प्रदेश) : श्रीमान, मुझे बड़े खेद के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि कल जब यहां पर श्री राजनारायण राजभाषा विधेयक पर संशोधन करने के बारे में चर्चा कर रहे

थे, तो उस समय प्रधान मंत्रीजी महोदया ने यह बताया था कि हम सदस्यों से चर्चा करेंगे और कल ही विरोधी दलों के, यहां राज्य सभा के लगभग सब दलों के, प्रतिनिधि बुलाये गये। मगर ऐसा लगता है कि जन संघ का दल अपनी सज्जनता की वजह से पनिश किया गया हो और उसकी एग्जि-सटेन्स इस सरकार ने महसूस न की हो। यह पता लगा कि इस बात का प्रयत्न किया गया शायद, कि भंडारी जी को बुलायेंगे। गोड़े मुराहरि जी भी यहां नहीं थे, भंडारी जी भी नहीं थे, जन संघ के लीडर भी नहीं थे और दूसरे लीडर भी नहीं थे। ऐसी स्थिति में दूसरे दल के प्रतिनिधि को बुलाया गया, मगर जन संघ के प्रतिनिधि को नहीं बुलाया गया; और इसका मूल कारण यह है कि हमारी सज्जनता का प्रतिफल हमको दिया गया।

माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से शासन से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि ऐसा कौन-सा विशेष कारण था कि हमारे साथ ऐसा व्यवहार हुआ, जब कि हम शासन की 'मरसी' पर यहां नहीं हैं, हम किसी की मरसी पर यहां नहीं हैं, हम किसी दल का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हुए आए हैं, हम भी अपना कोई पोइन्ट ऑफ व्यू रखते हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में क्या विशेष कारण था कि सरकार ने हमारी उपेक्षा की और उसमें हमारा प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिये किसी को नहीं बुलाया ?

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि हाथी साहब ने कल चार आदमियों को बुलाने में केवल यह ध्यान दिया कि विशेषतः जो हिन्दी वाले थे उनको कम से कम रखा जाय और जो "नान हिन्दी" वाले थे उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा रखा जाय। यह गवर्नमेंट ने षडयंत्र बना रखा है कि हिन्दी किसी प्रकार से न आए और अंग्रेजी इस देश में लादी जाय,