

MOTNON RE REPORT ON THE MID-TERM APPRAISAL OF THE THIRD FIVE YEAR PLAN—*continued*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to the further discussion of the Report on the Mid-Term Appraisal of the Third Plan. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, we are having a discussion on the Mid-Term Appraisal of the Third Plan, and I only wish that it was more of an appraisal and less of a recital. I say it is a recital because all we get, despite the rather melancholy experience with our planning, is a statement of the targets which have been fulfilled or which are in the process of being fulfilled or otherwise. We do not have an appraisal in the sense that the real difficulties and, problems should be located with a view to overcoming them. Appraisal would naturally require a self-critical approach in this matter and courageous thinking also. But I find that in this matter the whole thing is lacking. Let not the Government take any comfort in the fact that they have to offer to the House some of these performances which are much below the targets. How can they hide it? They cannot possibly hide it because they would be committing a serious perjury in such matters because they speak under an oath. Therefore, what they have done is they have revealed only what they are not in a position to conceal, and they have concealed what they think should not be revealed and which they are in a position to conceal. That is the appraisal which we have got here. Therefore, I would not congratulate the Ministry . . .

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Madras) : Are we to understand from the hon. Member that the Planning Commission make their reports under an oath?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Minister is giving the report, it is not the

Planning Commission. Here he has moved this thing, as you know. It is the document of the Government; we are not dealing with the Planning Commission, but there are the Treasury Benches. Anyhow, oaths we leave, they are broken oaths. That is not the point. Therefore, I do not find it at all satisfactory in this respect. That is my first complaint, and that is why I cannot congratulate the Government as some people seem to have done, because truth is so little forthcoming from the Treasury Benches that whatever little mercies are shown in this respect are at once somewhat lavishly congratulated from this or that side of the House—by that side I mean the back benches.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed about another thing. We find that with a lot of fanfare a new Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission has been appointed and the Congress Party seems to feel as if it is not partisan in such matters and has been going in for talent. I do not dispute the talent the present Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission possesses but I am disappointed by the approach he has brought, or is seeking to bring, into the Planning Commission. I should have thought that having functioned in the Opposition as the critic of the Government and also having studied economics and other matters, he would try to reorientate the very basic concepts of planning and would bring not only a new personality creating some confusion in the party to which he belongs no doubt, but also bring in some fresh ideas. He has brought in nothing of the kind and it seems that he is going on the beaten track, proceeding on the old lines.

For example, the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission more or less accepted that this is the right thing which is going on, and all that he has to do is to dot the 'i's and cross the 'v's. I say this is not the way to improve matters. He supports profits as the point of growth; that

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] is to say, he is idealising profit as something which is essential. That is exactly what big business wants to make out in the country. Yet, we know that in order to expedite planning and development, we have to come to grips with the high rate of profits which the capitalist class, and the monopolist in particular, is earning, and curb it. We should not make statements which go to defend the claims of these people. Therefore, his theoretical thesis, that profit motive is a growth point, is false in theory, dangerous in its perspective implication and unacceptable to democratic planning. Profit is not a growth point; the growth point is the labour of the working people; it is the creative labour power, which we seek to encourage and generate in the country. It is out of increased labour that production goes up and the country's economy looks better; profits are based on it. Therefore, it is entirely a wrong way of looking at things. For example, in 1950-51, the workers in the factories added a net value of Rs. 1,627 per worker. In 1959-60, they increased the additional net value per worker to Rs. 2,364, 45·3 per cent. rise. That is the position. Well, that is one side of it, and production went up, I mean industrial production, thanks to the labour and work of our people. Out of that, the private capitalist class made enormous profits which they had never known before. These things are stated here:

"A preliminary survey of industrial profits in 1962-63 made by 'The Economic Times' reveals that profits before tax increased by about 13 per cent, while capital employed in business showed a rise of about 8 per cent."

'Then—

"The paid-up capital of 183 companies increased from Rs 324 crores in 1961-62 to Rs. 342 crores in 1962-63, while the reserve and surplus increased from Rs. 280 crores to Rs. 320 crores."

This is the story of profiteering and exploitation, intensive and extensive, of our labour power. Now, everybody knows that it is going up.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Yet, our new Deputy Chairman would have us believe that profit is the growth point in our economy.

The second thing is that he is welcoming foreign investment and foreign private investment. That, again, is the position of big business in the country and of the reactionary elements. What we really want is to eliminate and reduce, to begin with, foreign private investment and reduce our dependence on it. Certainly in the public sector it should not be allowed to come but even in the private sector, we should be looking forward to the day when our private sector is rid of the foreign monopolists that exploit our resources. But, here again, he has taken the position which corresponds to that of big business both in this country and abroad. Therefore, that again is a wrong point.

Then, the third point he has made is about the taxes. We have to live with the taxes; in a developing economy taxes should be there. The issue is not whether there should or should not be taxes, the issue is who must pay the taxes. This is the main question.

Our planning must be orientated in such a direction that it becomes possible for us to raise more money, by way of taxation and other fiscal policies, from the possessing classes, from the exploiting classes, giving relief to the poorer sections of the community. And yet, from the reappraisal you will find that the target for additional taxation for the whole period of five years has been realised, more than realised, in three years' time. It is the only target in respect of which these hon. members of the Government or of the Planning Commission have shown distinction. When

It comes to the robbery of the people, fleecing the people, attacking the living standards of the people, we find that the Government not only fulfils but overfulfils the quota, we find that the Government is not only not behind the schedule but ahead of the schedule. But when it comes to the question of bringing about the requisite changes in industrial sector or in the structure of the economy or, if I may say so here, in the improvement in the living conditions of our people, whether it is wages or education or housing, we find that the Government is limping behind the targets in a precarious manner, to the detriment of the economy as a whole.

Now, the new Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission also does not see that. Not only that, he has also developed a thesis which, again, is dangerous, and I wish to strike a note of warning. He thinks that our trouble is there because we have not sufficiently attracted the members of the European Economic Community and the Western investors. That is exactly what he said. In the City of London and in Bonn, the monopolists would like us to do it. Today we are suffering because we have not sufficiently dealt with the problem of our industry keeping in view that it must be based on independent economic foundations. And if the Deputy Chairman wants the country's economy to be reorientated even in this Third Plan more and more towards foreign private capital and the investors of the West, imperialists, vested interests and monopolists, all I can say is that he is forgetting what he himself once said that if the economy is upside down, the planning will produce chaos and confusion, and will be disastrous to our economy. And certainly this is not the way to seek the co-operation of other people, the working people. Therefore, I take this opportunity to remind the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission that this should not be done.

1183 RSD—4.

What about his own Report, the Report of the Foodgrains Enquiry Committee which was appointed, of which he was the Chairman? Where is the suggestion about the implementation of some of the relatively good recommendations that were made? I know that he did not recommend the wholesale taking over of the trade in foodgrains. But neither did he support in that Report the private trading that exists today. A half-way house was suggested. Why don't you take any step in that direction? Well, I would like the wholesale trade in foodgrains to be taken over. Therefore, I am disappointed at the drama of the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. His first performance has been disappointing. If that is so, I would not like the curtain to be lifted again; I should like to be away from this drama. That is what I say. And having said it, I should now like to say that our Planning Commission needs bold thinking and it is to be shaken up to its very foundation. There is much that is conservative; there is a lot of inertia in it; there is a lot of cussedness and tardiness in it; there is refusal to see ahead; there is refusal to see the sign* of life and at the same time to overcome the pull of the dead past. That is the trouble with the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot be a pedestrian affair, the way it has been functioning today, but I regret to say, that I see no indication of a change coming about the Planning Commission even though a new incumbent has been found from the opposition benches. Having said it, Madam Deputy Chairman, I should like only to deal with a few aspects of our economy. The first thing is the rate of growth. Well, Mr. Chintaman Deshmukh told the House in 1950, the other House I mean—at that time it was the Provisional Parliament—and later on he repeated it here that from 1950, within twenty-five years, the national income would be doubled, and now we are nowhere. In the beginning of the First Plan the annual

increase in economic growth

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] •was targeted to be 5 per cent.. Bui we did not achieve it; we know it. Even in the Second Plan, it was less than 4 per cent; and today, in the first two years of the Third Plan, it has declined to 2.5 per cent, annually, at a time when after a decade of planning the tempo of development rfiould be much higher.

We do not nowadays talk about the so-called take-off of our economy, because we have got stuck up in the mud of the bad policies of the Government. Therefore take-off idea has been given up. All right; give it up if you like. Mr. Asoka Mehta was one of these who used to speak of take-off almost in every speech that he mad^ on economic matters. I would ask Mr. Asoka Mehta, what has happened to this take-off. Where has it gone and where is the failure? Is the pilot failing or the engine failing? That is what I would like our Planning Commission to answer here. But it is very alarming, Madam Deputy Chairman, that in the third year of this Plan, in the middle of it, our rate of growth is 2.5 per cent., not even the 5 per cent, which had been envisaged in the First Five Year Plan. What will be the result? The result will be that the standard of living will begin to fall; in fact, it has already started falling because the rate of growth has a very close and direct relation to the level of living, especially in a country where the population is increasing at the rate of 2.4 per cent, annually. Now, if the rate of population growth nue,s at that level, as it is going to continue, then, well, our rate of economic growth is not keeping abreast of even the population growth. The result will be a depression of the standard of living, that is to say, we would not be able to maintain the population at the present level of living. In fact, I remember, in one of the smaller committees the Prime Minister formed to seek the consultation of the representatives of the opposition parties while the Third

Plan wa, being prepared, he himself pointed 'out that we musk have the rate of growth stepped up to at least 6 to 7 per cent, even to maintain the population at the ex'sting level oi living. Today you see how it haa fallen, not 5 per cent, even, but 2.5 per cent. What does it mean? It means that in the next two years, the rate of growth has to be stepped up to 7 to 8 per cent, or so. Are we going to do it? Are there any indications today? Do the trends indicate? No, we are not going to make it up in the next two years in 'order to achieve even the Plan target of an overall increase of 25 to 30 per cent, in the five-year period. Therefore there would be a serious shortfall in the rate of growth and in the increase in national income, and this will naturally result, from the point of view of the people, in a decline in living standards, espec'ally of the working people and the peasantry and the lower middle income groups. On the other hand, it will have very serious repercussions on the country's investment because, unless the rate Vjf growth is stepped up, the investible surplus also, in quantum, will not be available. If you want to maintain your investment at the level of 14 per cent, or so in a declining rate of growth, you can only do s'o by fleecing the people, as indeed you are doing already, by cutting, in economic terms, the consumption of the masses. And that is what you are doing today; and you do so not only by higher taxes and levies on the consumers' food articles, but also by manipulating or allowing to manipulate your price policy in such a manner that the people are deprived of their necessities of life. That is how It is being done today.

This, I call, is the worst form of monopolistic exploitation and capitalistic exploitation in our economy, whereas in a developing economy you must have always social objectives in view. What happens to your social objectives when you allow the prices to have a runaway course? Only

this take-off, I find; it is flying at a very high altitude and that, Madam Deputy Chairman, is the price level. Well, Mr. Asoka Mehta can say he is on a supersonic journey flying at 65,000 feet altitude above the sea level like the U2 plane. I concede that point. But then the people are ground down. That is why you find today that the working people have taken the decision to resist this rise in prices, and it is being done all over the country. (Interruptions.) Mr. Pande may nod and shout, but the working people will certainly resist this rise in prices, come what may.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : I did not say anything; I agree with you in this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What else can they do when this Government with its taxes, and the monopolists and profiteers guided only by a huge profit motive want to fleece in this manner the starving working people, the employees, peasants and so on? Naturally they have to fight with back to the wall as indeed they are doing today. Therefore I raise that point. Madam Deputy Chairman, the *per capita* income in the first decade of planning under the two Plans was only 17 per cent., less than 2 per cent, *per capita* income rise I am talking about. Now, how can you assure even a decent living to the people, even maintain the existing level of living, which is dismal? Where colossal wealth exists side by side with abysmal poverty, where millions of our people do not have a square meal a day, in such a situation the *per capita* income declines, the rate of growth declines, the national income declines whereas the prices and the taxes, the indirect taxes on the people, are going up. You create economic injustice and oppression; you widen the social disparities, and you defeat the very objectives and purpose of planning, and I charge the Planning Commission of losing sight of these objectives of the Plan.

We are planning for whom? That question is again and again arising in the minds of our people. Are you

planning for the Tatas and Birlas, the I.O.M. Dalmias and Jains, the British and American monopolists and their favourites in this country? Or are you planning for uplifting by your hand the down-trodden millions who

have no decent life, a roof to live under, some little food to sustain them, the barest means for the education of their children, a little care of

their health and just a little social life in this unjust society? If you deny such things, Madam Deputy Chairman, you are in for very great trouble; this is an invitation to the people—objectively I say; you may not mean it; this is an invitation to the people that they should resist

some of the things. In fact, you are pulling the Plan in utter disrepute and thereby giving a handle to my friend Mr. Ruthnaswamy, who is sitting there, to take advantage of the bankruptcy in policy in order not to malign the mal-factors of planning, but to malign the Plan itself. He would like the baby to be thrown away, along with the bath-water. I want the dirty bathwater to go but the baby to be retained in hand, looked after, nursed, taken care of, placed in good health. That is the difference between me and the Swatantra Party. Therefore we are in such a situation today.

Agriculture; what has happened to your agriculture? Everybody now is talking about agriculture. The First Plan placed emphasis on agriculture, did very little but that was the first love of the Plan. Then the Second Plan forgot the love of agriculture; and when we came to the Third Plan, well, under pressure from the public and the compulsion of economic life they gave a certain importance to our agriculture. Chapter after chapter is written but our agriculture under the Third Plan is in the worst conceivable state. Who is responsible for it? Gods? You are a secular State. I suppose you

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] would not invoke God here. Who is responsible? Weather? I would show Madam Deputy Chairman, if I had time that whether the weather is good or bad, agriculture continues in a state of semi-stagnancy. Production does not go up except in one or two years? even when the weather is relatively good.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN (Kerala): Madam, agriculture failed in Russia and China also.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Let him finish his arguments. We are talking of agriculture in India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What question he has asked. I wish there were some Borstal schools in our country, which sometimes Members of Parliament should also visit.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh): It is an insult.

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN (Uttar Pradesh) : We will go and visit you when you are sent there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We shall go together and I shall leave you there. Now what has happened to agriculture? We have given this Rs. 641 crores of compensation to landlords. Not a bad amount even for Mr. Ruthnaswamy. It does not seem to be a niggardly amount. But then what happened in the last year of the Plan under review? During the last year production has gone down by 3 million tons. We are just walking around 77 million tons when the target should be 100 million tons at the end of the Third Plan period. May I know how you are going to attain that target? Will you ask the American bombers to lift you up to that level? No. What is happening? We had our P.L. 480 Agreement of 1958. Is it P.L. 480 or P.L. 420, I do not know. It should better be called 420 than 480. Anyhow, I do not make the American law. Under the P. L. 480

Agreement, we are getting 17 million tons of foodgrains on the basis of Rs. 600 crores worth of loans and grants from them. We are now discussing another P.L. Agreement for similar amount. We know that the food production is going to be worse in the next few years also. The prospects are grim. And do you know why it has happened? Or let the Planning Commission at least do some courageous thinking if the Government cannot deliver the goods. It has happened because the land has not gone to the tiller of the soil. He is not made the owner of the land. That is number one*.

The ceilings have not brought the result they were expected to produce. The concentration of land remains largely in the hands of undesirable elements. Here I will just give you only one example. Ten per cent, of the land owners own about 30 per cent, of the land. They generally usurp most of the Plan resources and pump them into rural economy. This is the position; Whereas at the other extreme, owners of the 80 per cent, of the holdings possessing 35 per cent, of the cultivated land are deprived of a fair price. They are burdened with taxes and so on. The Reserve Bank has pointed out that despite credit facilities and so on, the rural indebtedness is going up. The peasant family is indebted to the extent of Rs. 470. This is the position. Now, it would come to about 1,000 crores of rupees of peasant indebtedness, apart from what is already accumulated. Now, how can there be production—tell me—when there is no incentive to the tenants and the peasants? Therefore, the basic thing was to so conduct the land reforms that those, who are tilling the land, become the owners of the land and the ceilings should have been effectively enforced. Ceiling has been by-passed; hence very many fraudulent deals by the landholding class. Therefore, concentration of land remains in the hands of exploiting classes at the top. It not only impedes production, it leads to wastage of your resources in

the sense whatever you pump into the rural economy is appropriated by this section of the parasitic community, and the marketable surplus of foodgrains again falls into their hands by reason of their predominance in the economy and capacity to hold on. And with that marketable surplus in their hand, they indulge in profiteering and speculation, hoarding, etc., create artificial crisis in foodgrains where there should be none. That is how the whole thing happens.

Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, agrarian reform is the crux of the matter not only for improving the conditions of our rural economy and the peasantry but for helping the economic growth as a whole. Never can the rate of growth go up unless we look after our agrarian economy in such a manner that production goes up on the basis of the peasant-ownership of the land. But nothing is being done. In Kerala we passed, under the Communist Ministry, a very progressive Bill to which we did not get the assent of the President because of the advice of the Government for months and months perhaps. But when these gentlemen came to power, again they passed their own Kerala Agrarian Bill which sought to negate many of the good features. It has widened the scope for eviction and, perhaps, to raise land revenue. We have got in Andhra additional levies imposed on the peasantry against which agitation is going on. In the beginning of the emergency, 22½ per cent, surcharge on land was put in Uttar Pradesh. Therefore, I say the land question is a major question. It has to be frontally attacked in every aspect. No Planning Commission is worth the name, I tell you, Madam Deputy Chairman, if it does not come, after this bitter experience, to grips with the problem of agriculture and land. Agriculture needs to be reoriented and reorganised; otherwise we remain dependent on foreigners, spend a lot of money on freight charges for importing foodgrains, which we can easily save and invest in other more useful purposes.

Now, apart from that, as a result of the counterpart fund under P.L. 480 we have got here in American hand* so many crores of rupees. This is again creating imbalances in our economy. Our economy is being built on artificial supports and, therefore, there is every danger of its collapsing at any moment. Indications are there already in the Mid-term Appraisal.

Madam Deputy Chairman, about industry what shall I say? Well, much is made out of it. They do not tell you whether they have fulfilled their target. But then, the great capitalists, the class which seems to be having a very fine time, now with Mr. Krishnamachari, has failed to fulfil their targets. At page 125 of this report, you will find that progress in a number of industries in the private sector has not been satisfactory. There will be shortfalls in the achievements of their targets in several important industries such as alloy, tool and stainless steel, aluminium, steel castings, steel forgings, machine tools, winding wires, cement, fertilisers, sulphuric acid, soda ash, paper and paperboard, newsprint, rayon pulp and synthetic rubber. "The factors responsible for the slow progress in these industries are under study." Almost on a whole range of industrial production, this multimillionaire class has failed to produce the targeted results, and all that the Government tells is that they are under their study. Why can you not take over the banks? Why can you not take over some of the failing industries and run them better, if you can, in the public sector? But, at the same time, they are allowing hefty profits. And what is more they are entering into agreement with the United States of America for non-plan projects of the order of 225 million, 80 per cent, of which, Madam Deputy Chairman, will go to build up precisely some other industries in the private sector. That is to say, the monopolists have made such a wonderful performance to-day under your Third Plan that they come to

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] the Government, influence you to get loans from the U.S., underwrite these loans and make the State responsible for the payment and then to make over the money to them, so that they can play havoc with it.

Well, this is not planning. Here again, I give this information to the House that a special representative of the U.S. State Department along with a few business executives of the top U.S. monopolies is here in Delhi. They have been meeting Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari and the Secretaries of the economic Ministries of the Government of India regularly and have come to the understanding on the problems of U.S. economic aid for the remaining years of the Third Plan and for the Fourth Plan. Our Fourth Plan is being mortgaged to the American millionaires well in advance and that, too at a time when we are facing difficulties with our Third Plan. I should like a clear statement. Let them deny that these people are not here. Well, then we may consider finding out the whereabouts of them and see who is correct and who is not.

Therefore, this foreign collaboration question has to be gone into. Mr. Krishnamachari, I charge, has given an orientation of our planning towards not only the monopolists in our country but foreign monopolists. He is systematically negotiating with them in order to get them involved or participate even in our public sector, and Mr. Tata and others are declaring from the house-tops that it will be done. Mr. Krishnamachari is increasing the foreign collaboration agreements which are already in the neighbourhood of 2,000. You will say that we gain technical machines and so on. Well, temporarily you may have advanced this argument but may I point out to this House in all sincerity that the credit benefits, that you get as a result of such agreements, are more than offset by the remittances abroad, profits and other things they send, and also by various other factors including their import of com-

ponents, intermediate products and even in some cases raw materials? The monopolists abroad are trying to dovetail themselves into the planning in order to function and operate in a protected market and take advantage of our developing economy. Are we developing economy in our country to offer commodity market to the American millionaires whose five million people depend on their export trade and whose surplus stock needs to be sold in underdeveloped countries, creating imbalances in their economy? This is the plain question to-day. How are we developing the economy? Should we develop our economy in the direction of achieving economic independence, freeing ourselves from the world capitalist market and seeing things look up? Where is the answer? The Planning Commission's answer is: "We go the pedestrian way". We started in 1950.

I Basically we travel along the same lines, only sometimes we put on airs. That is not the way. I want a radical orientation in the other direction than the one which Mr. Krishnamachari is bringing about. I tell you, Mr Krishnamachari is spelling out danger to the country and it is regrettable i to-day that such a thing should have happened when the Prime Minister is not fully and wholly at his post.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: It is an insinuation of the worst type.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, because I know. You will never understand your Prime Minister.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: I understand him better than you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Prime Minister has understood you and what you are, and one good thing he has done. But +here is Rajya Sabha nomination. Are you retiring this time? No?

Now, the position is this. We were given this solemn assurance that the public sector will be public sector. The Industrial Policy Resolution made that commitment. The

Prime Minister gave that assurance. Now, Mr. Krishnamachari, not happy with the robbery and burglary that is taking place, said in Delhi: 'we are throwing the door wide open*.' "t all the American millionaires are iat people, no doubt, and you have thrown the door wide open. There fore their line is, taking advantage of India's foreign exchange crisis and shortage, allow these people to come in, and the Indian big business here is in collusion with them. What is your big business? Why they talk about such big things about big busi ness, I cannot understand. They stand exposed in the Vivian Bose Commission report which is typical not only of Mr. S. P. Jain but of that entire tribe of India's traducers in tthe economic field. It is unpatriotic, anti-social, money-grabbing, exploit ing—the high finance and big business. To-day it is banking which is responsi ble for the rise in prices. Speculation— fraud game—is given big incentives and opportunities when the whole country including Congressmen are demanding nationalisation. Are you not then on the reverse gear?

Is this the way to advance the cause of our economy? The planning is fa ling there.

The Industrial Policy should be recast and reorientated with a view to expanding the public se:ctor at a much faster speed not only by setting up new undertakings which must be done but also by nationalising such industries as coal-mines, especially banking in our country. Banking is the key to your success in this field. You control banking, and the Rs. 1200 crores and so on that is in their hands. Well, deposits you are controlling and many things. Dwarfs cannot ever fight. Economic and political drawrfs cannot ever rise to the heights, certainly not to the com manding height, of our economy. I say that the entire country wiH be with you. Partisan considerations will not be there, but for some reactionary howling creatures, should you not tak© measures in the direction of developing our industry much faster in the public sector, dealing severe

blows to the monopolists in our country? The monopolists are the source of our evil. They are the source of our corruption. At 3 P.M. we shall be meeting Mr. Nafidaji to discuss the problems of fighting corruption at the non-official level but may I tell you that if the mono-polists remain in an entrenched position unhampered and helped by the Government in this manner, corruption shall continue, because that is the fountain of corruption? That ls the source from which the Niagara Falls of this bribery or corruption come. Strike there. They are encouraging it.

As far as the working people are concerned, I do not wish to say very much. We say here that the D.A should be increased to cover the rising cost of living and there should be 25 per cent, increase in the wages. You are keeping your working people waiting on the sidelines of our public life, denying them, attacking them, using the emergency powers against them and so on, but you do not try to improve their living standards. What is the incentive? Who should get the incentive? This again is th* question. The priority should be fixed in the matter of giving incentives to the social classes. Which class should get the incentives—the producing classes or the exploiting classes? You are giving incentives to the exploiting classes. You are denying things to the producing classes. That is why we are opposed to this line of approach. Therefore all I can say is, we do not need this kind of miserable report as this. What we need today is some amount of collective bold re-thinking eo that we can improve matters where improvement is very, very urgent and essential. I have indicated some of the things—industrial things and others. The cottage and small industries have been neglected. These should be helped. Otherwise you cannot even tackle the unemployment problem. It is growing. Unemployment is growing every year, j ear after year, and there is more unemployment today than at any time and ther*

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] will be more unemployed at the end of the Plan. This is admitted by the Government and one notable feature is the middle-class unemployment. Educated unemployment is prevailing.

Well, I tell you, check it before it is too late.

1 P.M.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, your time is over.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, I will not say much about the unemployment problem. Others will have occasion to speak on that. I would only say that this has to be handled and it should be given priority. As far as prices are concerned, what I say is that complete change of policy is needed.

The regrettable part of all this is—and this I would like to say before I sit down—that all this miserable performance has taken place when this Parliament in good faith, may be, somewhat misled by the Government, invested the Government with the emergency powers. If you read the Defence of India Act and the Rules, you will find that many of the provisions there are for controlling our economy and so on. They were given a step up our economy, to build up our industries in a much better way, to increase agricultural production and to settle some of the economic problems favourably. But we find precisely the opposite here. In this period of emergency, when the Government has been empowered with these special powers and the Defence of India Rules, they have produced exactly the opposite results. Things have gone from bad to worse. Can I expect a better performance from the Government when this is their attitude, their policy, their line of thinking and their way of handling our economic and public matters? Therefore, I appeal to the House against before it is too late, that they should not treat this matter as a party issue. They should

consider the serious backlog and this stagnation or semi-stagnation in agriculture and the very serious condition that has arisen in all the sectors of our economy, in order to have a rethinking over this matter so that we can formulate a correct Plan by breaking from the past and looking to the future. Thank you.

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
महोदया, लोकतन्त्र के तरीकों से आर्थिक समृद्धि को लाने का एक महान् प्रयोग हम अपने देश में कर रहे हैं। इस प्रयोग की सफलता के लिये यह आवश्यक है कि आर्थिक प्रगति की मूलभूत बातों पर देश में एक मत हो और निर्माण के प्रयत्न सबके सहयोग से चलें। कल श्री खण्डूभाई देसाई ने कहा था कि हमें योजना को राष्ट्रीय योजना मानना चाहिये। बड़ा अच्छा होता यदि इस प्रकार की स्थिति हम देश में उत्पन्न कर सकते; लेकिन जब तक कांग्रेस पार्टी योजना को बनाने में और उसे अमल में लाने में विरोधी दलों का सहयोग प्राप्त करने की आवश्यकता अनुभव नहीं करेगी, योजना को राष्ट्रीय स्वरूप देना सम्भव नहीं होगा।

लोकतन्त्र कुछ मर्यादाएँ लगाता है और हम उन मर्यादाओं को तोड़ कर, चाहते हुये आर्थिक विकास की गति को नहीं बढ़ा सकते। हम अपनी जनता पर ऐसा भार नहीं डाल सकते जिससे जनता उठा नहीं सकती या जिसको उठाने के लिये उसे त्याग की परिश्रम की परीक्षा करना होगी। हर पांच साल बाद हमें उस जनता का दरवाजा खटखटाना है। इसके लिये एक ही रास्ता है कि हम नियोजन को राष्ट्रीय स्वरूप देने का प्रयत्न करें और जहाँ तक सम्भव हो सभी दलों का सहयोग प्राप्त करने की कोशिश की जाय और कांग्रेस पार्टी योजना से प्राप्त होने वाली समृद्धि के नाम पर चुनावों में बंट सांगना बन्द कर दे। अगर यह योजना राष्ट्रीय योजना

है तो इससे प्राप्त होने वाले फलों का एक ही दल दायेदार नहीं हो सकता और अगर एक ही दल दायेदार बनने का प्रयत्न करेगा तो अन्य दलों में स्वाभाविक रूप से नियोजन के प्रति आलोचना करने की प्रवृत्ति उत्पन्न होगी; फिर आलोचना चाहे रचनात्मक हो या ध्वंसात्मक हो और अधिकतर आलोचना ध्वंसात्मक होती है, रचनात्मक नहीं होती है और में विरोधी दलों को भी इस दोष से मुक्त नहीं कर सकता। लेकिन जब सबसे बड़ी पार्टी, सबसे पुरानी पार्टी इस संवत्काल में अपने दायित्व का पालन करने के लिये तैयार नहीं है तो छोटे दलों से इससे अधिक अपेक्षा नहीं की जानी चाहिये।

योजना की सफलता के लिये एक राज-नैतिक, आर्थिक अनुशासन की देश में आवश्यकता है जो हम पैदा नहीं कर सके हैं और जब तक वह अनुशासन हम पैदा नहीं कर सकेंगे, हमारे लक्ष्य प्राप्त नहीं होंगे और हम जनता का स्वेच्छा से मिलने वाला सहयोग प्राप्त नहीं कर सकेंगे। मुझे खुशी है कि श्री अशोक मेहता को योजना आयोग का उपाध्यक्ष नियुक्त किया गया है। इससे उनकी पार्टी में जो संकट पैदा हो गया है, उसमें मैं नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन श्री अशोक मेहता की नियुक्ति सही दिशा में एक कदम है। मेरी इच्छा है कि योजना आयोग में और भी ऐसे व्यक्ति लिये जायें जो आर्थिक मामलों के न केवल विशेषज्ञ हैं किन्तु जिनमें परिस्थिति को बदलने की एक बेवैनी है, जो नये समाज का रचना के लिये अपने को उत्सर्ग कर चुके हैं और जो अपने व्यक्तित्व से इस कार्य में जनता का स्वेच्छा से मिलने वाला सहयोग बना सकते हैं।

योजना आयोग में मन्त्रियों की संख्या कम होनी चाहिये। यदि गांधीवादी अर्थशास्त्री योजना आयोग में स्थान पा सकें तो नियोजन को आकाश की ऊँचाइयों से उतार कर पथार्थ-वाद की धरती पर लाने में सफलता मिलेगी।

लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में एक स्पष्टीकरण है। श्री अशोक मेहता योजना आयोग के उपाध्यक्ष नियुक्त हो गये, लेकिन वे अभी राजनैतिक पार्टी से अपना सम्बन्ध बनये हुये हैं। क्या योजना आयोग के अन्य सदस्यों के लिये यह छूट होगी? संसद् के सदस्य जो योजना आयोग के सदस्य नियुक्त किये गये, उन्हें संसद् से इस्तीफा देना पड़ा क्योंकि योजना आयोग की सदस्यता को अफिल्ट आफ़ प्राफिट माना गया है, लभ का पद [THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

माना गया है। यह नियम अगर सदस्यों पर लागू होगा तो क्या उपाध्यक्ष महोदय पर लागू नहीं होगा? यदि इसकी छूट देने का निर्णय कर लिया गया है तो मैं इसका स्वागत करूँगा, लेकिन इस समान रूप से लागू किया जाना चाहिये। किसी व्यक्ति विशेष को अपवाद बनाना ठीक नहीं होगा।

तीसरी योजना के हमने लक्ष्य रखे थे—

खाद्यान्न में स्वावलम्बन बुनियादी उद्योगों का विकास, देश की जनशक्ति का पूर्ण उपयोग, रोजगार में वृद्धि तथा आय में और अवसर में समानता, किन्तु दो वर्षों की जो कड़ानी है वह, उन उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति में हम सफल होंगे, इसकी गवाही नहीं देती। खाद्य के मोर्चे पर हम पूरी तरह विफल हुये हैं और मुझे आश्चर्य है कि अगले दो तीन वर्षों में परिस्थिति और भी गम्भीर होने वाली है। खेती की फसल पाले से नष्ट हो गई है। गेहूँ, चना और दालें पर्याप्त मात्रा में उत्पन्न नहीं होंगी। चीनी के उत्पादन के भी हमने जो लक्ष्य रखे हैं वे पूरे नहीं किये जा सकेंगे। चीनी की मिल अब बन्द हो रही है क्योंकि उन्हें मात्रा नहीं मिल रहा है। जब ये लक्ष्य पूरे नहीं होंगे तब क्या परिस्थिति उत्पन्न होगी, शासन को इसका विचार करना चाहिये। खाद्य तथा कृषि मन्त्रालय अनेक मन्त्रियों की प्रतिष्ठा की कब साबित हो चुका है। मोसम अगर साथ नहीं देगा तो इस मोर्चे पर हम कैंद आगे बढ़ेंगे, इसका विचार करना

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

चाहिये। देश में कुछ तत्व हैं जो इस खाद्यान्न के प्रश्न को लेकर गड़बड़ मचाता चाहते हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश के कई नगरों में अनाज की दुकानें बंद हो गई हैं। यह जनता का प्राकृतिक रोष प्रकट नहीं हुआ है, इसके पीछे योजना काम कर रही है। कानून और शान्ति बनाये रखने का प्रश्न भी जुड़ा हुआ है। यदि हम जो भी खाद्यान्न है उसके वितरण की उचित व्यवस्था नहीं कर सके तो परिस्थिति बिगड़ेगी और उसे काबू में रखना सरकार के लिये मुश्किल होगा। हमें उन तत्वों पर कड़ी नजर रखनी चाहिये जो संकटकाल का लाभ उठा कर जनता को अराजकता की ओर ले जाना चाहते हैं।

इसके सम्बन्ध में दो मत नहीं हो सकते कि जब तक खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ेगा तब तक हमारी समस्या हल नहीं होगी लेकिन उत्पादन क्यों नहीं बढ़ रहा? इसके सम्बन्ध में भलग भलग राये हैं। यदि हम चाहते हैं कि उत्पादन बढ़े तो केवल केन्द्र में एक एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन बोर्ड बनाना या राज्यों में मन्त्रिमण्डलों की उपसमिति कायम करना या एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन कमिशनर की नियुक्ति करना इतना ही काफी नहीं है। ये काम होने चाहिये क्योंकि ये समन्वय के काम हैं लेकिन असली समस्या यह है कि हम किसानों को अधिक उत्पादन करने के लिये किस प्रकार प्रेरित करें। प्लानिंग कमीशन की ओर से एक नोट सदस्यों को भेजा गया है जिसमें कहा गया है कि हम खेती के लिये सीमेंट देने, सिंचाई की सुविधायें बढ़ाने, ट्रैक्टर तैयार करने, बिजली की दर घटाने और अच्छे बीज की व्यवस्था करने का प्रबन्ध कर रहे हैं। इसके साथ ही कर्ज की समस्या है। सहकारी समितियाँ ऋण देती हैं अगर ऋण के बदले में कुछ जमानत मांगती हैं। हर एक किसान के लिये जमानत देना सम्भव नहीं है। बड़े किसान ही जमानत दे सकते हैं। बड़े

किसान ही ऋण पाते हैं जबकि हम देखते हैं कि अगर खेती बढ़ानी है तो यह जरूरी है कि हर एक छोटे किसान को अधिक पूंजी लगाने, अधिक मेहनत करने और अपनी मेहनत का पूरा उपभोग करने का अवसर मिले और इस प्रकार का उसमें विश्वास जगाने की आवश्यकता है। यह काम सरकार नहीं कर सकती है। यदि भविष्य में भी हम यह काम नहीं कर सके तो हमारी खेती के मोर्चे पर विफलता समाप्त नहीं होगी। अगर हम ग्राम-सेवक को खाद्यान्न का उत्पादन बढ़ाने में पूरी तरह से लगा सकें तो बड़ा लाभ होगा। लेकिन ग्राम-सेवक दलबन्दी में फंसे हैं। खेती को छोड़ कर वह और सब काम करते हैं। नीचे के स्तर पर राजनीति इतनी गन्दी है कि उत्पादन बढ़ाने का लक्ष्य पीछे हट जाता है इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि योजना के लक्ष्यों को पूरा करने के लिये केवल केन्द्र में ही नहीं किन्तु हर एक स्तर पर, गांव की सतह पर भी, सब का सहयोग लेकर कैसे आगे बढ़ा जाय—यह हमारी सफलता की कुंजी है। यदि इस यक्ष-प्रश्न का हम उत्तर नहीं दे सकते तो हम लोकतन्त्र में आर्थिक नियोजन सफल करने का जो महान् प्रयोग कर रहे हैं उसे शायद कामयाब नहीं बना सकेंगे। स्पष्ट है कि हमारी आर्थिक विकास की गति बढ़नी चाहिये, उसके लिये हम जब तक जो इन्वेस्टमेंट की दर है, खपत लगाने की दर है उसे नहीं बढ़ा सकेंगे तब तक आर्थिक विकास की गति नहीं बढ़ेगी। इसके लिये विदेशी सहायता लेने में संकोच नहीं होना चाहिये। (Time bel 1 rings) मुझे आश्चर्य है...

मुझे कितने मिनट दिये गये हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : १५ मिनट।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : अभी तो १५ मिनट नहीं हुए हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आपके १५ मिनट हो गये हैं ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : ताज्जुब है, मैंने १ बज कर ५ मिनट पर बोलना शुरू किया है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आपने १ बजे शुरू किया था ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : अगर आपकी इच्छा हो तो मैं बैठ जाऊँ । अलग-अलग सदस्यों के लिये अलग-अलग नियम हैं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आप खत्म कर लें ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मैं ऐसे कैसे खत्म कर सकता हूँ । मैंने अभी बोलना शुरू किया है । आर्थिक नियोजन पर बोलने के समय यह समय की मर्यादा मेरे सम्बन्ध में इतनी दृढ़ होनी है तो मैं नहीं बोलूंगा ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : यह तो आपकी इच्छा है लेकिन आप खत्म कर लें ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : सभी आपके सामने एक सदस्य बोल कर गये हैं, उनके बोल को कितना समय मिला, उनको कितना समय मिला, कितनी बार घंटियाँ बजीं और वह बोलते रहे । मैं वह दृश्य उपस्थित नहीं करना चाहता । मैं ऐसा सदस्य हूँ कि एक बार पंटी बजे तो बैठ जाता चाहूंगा । अगर आप यही इंग चाहते हैं तो मुझे कुछ बोलना नहीं है । कमाल है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आप खत्म कर लीजिये । १५ मिनट के बाद मैंने कहा कि १५ मिनट हो गये । आप अपना भाषण खत्म कर लीजिये ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : मेरे विचारों की संख्या टूट गई ।

महोदय, मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि अगर आर्थिक विकास की गति तीव्र करनी है तो हमें अधिक रुपया लगाना होगा और उस स्थिति में हम विदेशी सहायता से अपने को वंचित नहीं कर सकते । मुझे खेद है, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ऐसे सुझाव देती है जो परस्पर विरोधी हैं । वह आर्थिक विकास की गति भी बढ़ाना चाहती है और आर्थिक विकास की गति बढ़ाने के लिये जहाँ से पूंजी प्राप्त होना सम्भव है उस मार्ग में भी बाधा डालना चाहती है ।

राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात गूँधी जाती है, तेल कम्पनियों के राष्ट्रीयकरण की भी आवाज उठाई जा रही है । यदि हम तेल कम्पनियों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करें तो विदेशी पूंजी प्राप्त नहीं होगी और विदेशी पूंजी प्राप्त नहीं होगी तो क्या हम लोकतन्त्र में अपनी जनता पर इतना भार डाल सकते हैं कि वह उसे उठा न सके फिर भी हम आर्थिक प्रगति में उसका उपयोग कर सकें ? इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन है कि सरकार जिसे पब्लिक सेक्टर कहते हैं, जो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र है, उसको अधिक बढ़ाने के बजाय जो कल और कारखाने सरकार ने अपने हाथ में ले लिये हैं उन्हीं को अच्छी तरह से चला कर दिखाये ।

हमारे पास प्रशिक्षित व्यक्तियों की कमी है । जो कारखाने हम चला रहे हैं कुछ अपवादों को छोड़ कर वह ठीक तरह से नहीं चल रहे हैं । एक एकानामिक टेक्निकल सर्विस हो छोड़ और प्रशिक्षित व्यक्ति हों जो कारखानों को चला सकें, उनमें लाभ दिखा सकें तो फिर पब्लिक सेक्टर के सम्बन्ध में जो गलतफहमी पैदा हो गई है वह दूर हो जायगी । पब्लिक सेक्टर का विकास करने का कोई विरोधी नहीं है, होना भी नहीं चाहिये, लेकिन जो काम व्यक्तिगत प्रयत्नों से अच्छी तरह से हो सकता है उसे सरकार अपने हाथ में लेने का प्रयत्न करे तो क्या होता है इस सम्बन्ध में मैं एक उदाहरण का उल्लेख करके खत्म कर दूंगा । रांची में एक हैवी इंजीनियरिंग कार्रिगेशन है उसके हैवी मशीन बिल्डिंग प्लान्ट में आग

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

लग गई। मन्त्री महोदय का अनुमान है कि ४५ लाख रुपये का नुकसान हुआ है। गैर-सरकारी अनुमान यह है कि १ करोड़ रुपये की सम्पत्ति का नुकसान हुआ है। सबसे प्राग्जन्य की बात यह है कि जब आग लगी तो बुरा टेलेफोन एक्सचेंज के आपरेटर ने कार्पोरेशन के डाइरेक्टर को फोन किया कि आग लग गई है, क्या इंजाम होना चाहिए। डाइरेक्टर ने कहा कि आग लगने जैसी छोटी घटनाओं के बारे में कार्पोरेशन के चेयरमैन को या डाइरेक्टर को परेशान करने की जरूरत नहीं है। यह बात टेलेफोन आपरेटर ने अपनी लाग-बुक में लिखी है। वह लाग-बुक पुलिस ने अपने कब्जे में ले ली है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस भाग की घटना की अदासती जांच की जाय। इसे हम वहाँ के डाइरेक्टर या यहाँ के चेयरमैन के भरोसे नहीं छोड़ सकते। उन्होंने वहाँ करोड़ों की सम्पत्ति खुले आकाश के नीचे फेंक कर रखी है। यह सार्वजनिक धन का दुर्हयोग है। अगर हम पब्लिक प्राजेक्ट्स में सार्वजनिक धन का इस तरह से दुर्हयोग करेंगे तो फिर हम पब्लिक प्राजेक्ट्स के बारे में जनता में सहानुभूति पैदा नहीं कर सकते। आखिर जनता पर टैक्स लगा कर ही सरकार पब्लिक प्राजेक्ट्स के लिये रुपया उगाहती है और जनता चाहेगी कि उसका रुपया ठीक तरह से लगाया जाय और उसके बदले में जनता को अच्छा लाभ दिखाया जाय। यह एक उदाहरण है जो यह बताता है कि हमारे पब्लिक प्राजेक्ट्स में कहीं न कहीं पर गड़बड़ी जरूर है और इसलिये हम जो उनसे मुनाफा करना चाहते हैं वह नहीं कर पाते हैं। तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में ४५० करोड़ रुपये के मुनाफे का अनुमान आप पब्लिक प्राजेक्ट्स से करते हैं, यह मुनाफा कैसे मिलेगा अगर पब्लिक प्राजेक्ट्स इस तरह से चलाये जायेंगे? मुझे विश्वास है कि इस सम्बन्ध में मन्त्री महोदय विचार करेंगे।

जो सबसे बड़ी बात है उसको मैं फिर कहता हूँ कि आर्थिक नियोजन की सफलता

के लिये देश में आर्थिक और राजनैतिक अनुशासन आवश्यक है, यह अनुशासन आज है नहीं। अगर सरकार, आयोजित आयोज यह अनुशासन पैदा कर सके तो हम दुनिया के सामने ऐसा उदाहरण रखेंगे जो उदाहरण आज तक रखा नहीं गया। वह उदाहरण यह होगा कि जनता की राय से हम विषमता को मिटा कर आर्थिक समृद्धि ले आयेंगे और उसके लिये व्यक्तिगत स्वाधीनता को समाप्त करने की आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ेगी। धन्यवाद।

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I tried to go through this Report very carefully and I am constrained to say that this Report is rather sketchy. It has touched upon nearly 200 items in its review and no item has been exhaustively and satisfactorily dealt with. Three to four lines have been used for dealing with big items which are very vital for the development of the nation. But in these two pages which Mr. Bhagat has introduced in this Report, I think this Report does not give you any inkling of what is happening. But these two pages are very significant and they illustrate the development that has been made under the aegis of the Planning Commission. My submission is that after seeing the results or after seeing the stagnation for the last two or three years we have come to a point when we must revise our opinion and we must change the whole scheme of things as far as the Planning Commission is concerned.

Now, I am very emphatic about one thing. The authority and the scope of action of the Planning Commission, as it is today, should be curtailed drastically. As I said, there are 200 items that are reviewed in this small Report. In the same way there are hundred or a few things that the Planning Commission has taken control of or is dealing with. The result is that it cannot deal with every item of national life and be successful. It would be much better if the

ning Commission restricts its activities to about twenty items of heavy-industry, that are essential and that cannot be done by any private agencies and for which the State must take up the responsibility. Twenty big items like power projects or dams, housing and so on; these are the spheres where the Planning Commission should enter, make a plan and execute it. And execute it in what manner? It is not enough to say that this percentage of the target has been achieved. This is good so far as it goes. But there are three sides to targets of a plan. One is when you say 15 million tons of cement or something will be produced but within what time. The time target is more important than the target of quantity. Equally important target is the target of finance involved in the execution of that target. For example, the Planning Commission promised to this country to produce 6 million tons of finished steel at a cost of Rs. 400 crores. Now, experience has shown that this target has not been achieved. The time taken is about three or four years longer than what was given out and similarly the finances also jumped from Rs. 350 crores to almost Rs. 500 crores. Now, it won't do if the same target is achieved in a longer time. Time is more important in the sense that time is money. If Rs. 300 crores are lying idle for seven years instead of five years then there is a great deal of loss to the nation.

So, as I was saying, the Planning Commission has come to a stage when its composition, its authority and the scope of its activities should be curtailed. I believe that the Planning Commission has assumed power over the Government. Today either in the Central Government or in the State Governments, there is no initiative. Whenever I approach some Minister in the U.P.—the Minister of Irrigation or the P.W.D. Minister—for the construction of a small bit of a road, he says. *Well, Dr. Pande, I would have

very much liked to entertain your request for the construction of this small road but the Planning Commission has not included it in the Plan'. I ask this question. Was there no road built in this country when there was no planning? Should you give every bit of development in the country to the control of the Planning Commission? Planning should be only for such things which are of a national character and which cannot be handled by Governments single-handed. As Dr. K. L. Rao was saying this morning, in the case of irrigation projects there are projects which involve an expenditure of less than Rs. 50 crores and I say those projects should never go to the Planning Commission. That way their work will be reduced and they will be in a position to devote more time to bigger schemes like the Bhakra-Nangal or Nagarjunasagar, D.V.C., Chambal Valley project, Gandak Valley project or Ramganga project, because these are the projects which are your responsibility. Now you allot the funds and you depend upon the Governments either in the States or at the Centre to execute your plan. If they do not do it properly you have no authority. Therefore the Planning Commission should make it a point to restrict its activities. Therefore, I would say that it should not be over the head of the Government of India and the Government of India also should not take shelter by saying that the Planning Commission has not approved it. The Government of India is higher in authority and it should only take the advice of the Planning Commission, not the orders of the Planning Commission.

THE MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): The planning Commission does not give orders; it only advises.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: But the moment it suggests something, the Government of India is in the habit of saying that it has been approved by

[Shri C. D. Pande.] the Planning Commission. Is there a single Minister in the Government of India who says, 'Planning Commission or no Planning Commission, I will do this'? It is not so. Experience has shown that the country is taking orders from the Planning Commission. For that it is also necessary that the Ministers of the Central Government should be members of the Planning Commission. If the Prime Minister is the Chairman and there are four or five very important Ministers in the Planning Commission and if they deliberate and suggest something, is it possible for any other Minister who is not a member of the Planning Commission to come and say that he would not take that advice, as my friend here says it is an advice and not an order? Therefore, the Planning Commission should only have an advisory capacity and its activities should be restricted—I do not say restrained—to specific big projects and schemes of industry and also housing. Housing is also a big thing which no single Government can control.

As far as the targets are concerned, this gives a clear picture. There is not a single item of importance which is not lagging from 15 to 35 per cent. I will not repeat the list; the list is there. There is no important material for the building of the nation, the target of which has been fulfilled in its entirety, in food, in cloth. Now, many people have spoken about food. Food is a very important subject and therefore it has captured the attention of the nation and that is why many people have dealt with that subject. I say cloth is also equally important. In cloth, when planning was being discussed in 1953, the idea was to provide 20 yards of cloth per head. Today after ten or eleven years of planning, thirteen yards of planning, I think we should have provided if not twenty, at least eighteen or nineteen yards of cloth per head. But we are producing only

7200 million yards. Of course, we have made some progress in the handloom cloth production but as far as textiles from the mills are concerned, we are going down from year to year. In 1956, production of mill cloth was the highest when we touched 5600 million yards and last year it was only 4900 million yards. That means instead of going up by six or seven million yards every year, we are descending down from 5600 million to 4900 million yards.

Next comes power. Power is also short of the target. Then, there is coal. Of course today temporarily coal position is a little easy because there is not that demand for coal. But this is a temporary phase and you should not slacken your efforts. It may be that it is only for a short while that coal has not got a market. A similar thing happened about cement some years back. There was some temporary lack of demand and the Government of India thought that cement production was in excess, and therefore they slowed it down. Within six months it looked up and even now you have not been able to revive your production and if you are able to revive it, it is only with a slow speed. In the Second Plan the cement target was 14 million tons and now you have put it at 15 million and you expect only 13 million tons. So you have not been able to make it up. After three years of the Plan, the production is only 12 million tons.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARSAVA): Dr. Pande, you might continue after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at half-past one of the clock.

The House reassembled- after lunch at half-past two of the clock, The Vice-Chairman (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Sir, before lunch hour I was speaking about the shortfalls in the various targets, in the industrial and agricultural sectors. All the speakers have naturally dwelt on these points. Therefore, it will not be profitable if I go on repeating the same thing because there is shortfall in almost every sector.

Now, I want to say something about the manner in which the money raised has been spent. It is a matter of great satisfaction that the people of this country have liberally contributed to the Plan. Nobody in 1951 or 1952 could believe that this country could raise Rs. 6,000 crores or could think of spending Rs. 10,000 crores. We thought at that time that even Rs. 2,000 crores was a big amount. Seeing the desire of the people in the country to raise their standard of living and improve the condition; of living they contributed liberally. I have no complaint against our taxpayers, big or small. They have all contributed lavishly and freely and even now they are ready to do so. And so have our friends abroad. They have also played their part liberally and unstintingly. Wherever the friendly countries are, whether they are in the West or in the East, they have contributed liberally. We are grateful to them. But the amounts we have raised, I believe, have not been usefully—I do not say properly—spent. The reason again, is the same. We have taken within our purview the whole range of human life, the whole society, iron (palm/gur to the petroleum industry. We believe that nothing should be left. If planning does not touch this thing, if palm gur is not raised, it is not as if the heavens will fall. Palm gur prepared from 'Neera' may be a very nice thing. You are wedded to prohibition

and, therefore, palm gur should be made. But it is not a national item of development that you should spend so much money on it. Spend money where good results are possible. In the same way—of course, many people will differ from me, from all sides of the House—money is spent on khadi and village industries. I do not object to village industries and khadi, but the amount of money spent and the results achieved are not commensurate and do not tally with their return.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): That is meant to keep your Party-men alive.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Am I against my Party? That you can believe. A sum of Rs. 20 crores has been lent to the Khadi Commission. The Khadi Commission, according to the latest figures, made 72 million yards of khadi. Out of Rs. 20 crores, half the amount is for gur and other things. Thus, Rs 10 crores are being spent or have been spent and the result is that you have been able to produce 72 million yards of khadi. Already 50 million yards were being produced before the Plan and you have added 22 million yards. What I am saying is that these amounts should be judiciously spent. Khadi is a nice thing. Mahatmaji worked on it and took his vow when there was no Government support. He could raise it to a certain level. We are now in our era giving Rs. 20 crores and we have not moved much in that direction. We are counting too much on these things and we should give up that attitude.

Similarly, there is the expenditure on social welfare. The work was being done by non-official agencies in the old days and now it is being done by official agencies. There is now no non-official agency worth the name doing it. Because there is a surfeit of money at our disposal, we are spending it. If I may be permitted to say so, it is squandered. Or, what shall I say, in Germany they say, wander

[Shri C. D. Pande.]
lust. Those who walk, those who move 'bout, are called people suffering from wander lust. In this country we are suffering from squander lust. A huge lot of money is being spent on such things which are of no importance, or they are of importance but they are not of such national importance.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: That is the only money well spent, on social welfare.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: No. I tell you what happens. Social work was being done earlier. That was being done by non-official agencies without any remuneration from the State. Today the official agencies are there. You cannot move about unless you have an office, unless you have a telephone installed in your house, unless you have jeeps, etc., because others are doing the same. If that is not so, you let me know.

Not only that. Come to Yoga Ashram. Formerly *yoga* and such things were all part of religion. Religious-minded people came forward and contributed liberally for it. Today, if you want *yoga*, you must give Rs. 5 lakhs to this Yoga Ashram or Rs. 5 lakhs to that Yoga Ashram. Then, there is "Sanyukta Sadachar Samiti". That means spreading morals to the society. Such things should not be included within the purview of the Plan Money spent on these things will not show any results . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : May I remind the hon. Member that "Sanyukta Sadachar Samiti" has not yet come into being? The Home Minister has only announced his intention of establishing it. So, why should you include that among the squander lust?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: I said it to give an illustration. I put a question

to the Home Minister. He said whenever there was need, the Government would help them with money. He said it only seven days ago.

Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has come. He spoke earlier in this House condemning certain features of this Plan. I believe that he was rather hard and excessive in his criticism. His words were hyperbolic type. I want to take up only two points raised by him, because it is very nice of him to have come here to listen to my reply. He dwelt on one thing, that is, we should not import foodgrains now and that also under PL 480 . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say that. I said you should not depend too much on it.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Unless he is fishing for trouble in this country, can he say to the Food Minister today; Do not import 17 million tons of foodgrains and be at the mercy of the masses. He goes to West Bengal and sends telegrams to him to send two million tons of rice or 3 million tons of wheat—wherefrom? We have not got any store.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Kerala): After sixteen years of independence, what is the meaning of your importing food?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: I am not yielding. I tell you that we cannot afford to do so.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. M. THOMAS): Why is the Soviet Union importing?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That is their look out.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: That is their lookout

SHRI C. D. PANDE: This is our lookout and more so of yours. They have resources. We could not blame them. We have not got resources.

Our needs are great. They are also 1
complacent. We are also complacent. They have
failed in their planning. We have also failed in
our planning. We have not been able to produce
93 million tons or 100 million tons of
foodgrains. We are aiming at it. We have
produced 80 million tons or 93 million tons.
Therefore, the urgency for the purchase is there.
Now, should we purchase it or not? If he thinks
let there be chaos in this country so that his
party might prosper at our discomfiture, it is up
to him, because he is working from that angle.
But we and the Government cannot take risk.
They «mst feed the population in this country,
especially at this juncture when there is
starvation, when prices are rising to the extent
of Rs. 30 per maund of wheat in Delhi. The
Minister of Food will be really unwise if he
stops it because Mr. Bhupesh Gupta says: Do
not import. People become complacent and no
production will be made.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have never
said all these things.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: You said that PL 480
is 420, as if the Americans are creating harm
to us by lending us food at that price. I tell
you it is a dignified way of doing things.
(*Interruption*) They are not asking for that
money. All the money is at our disposal. The
money is as good as the Government's. If Rs.
100 crores are there, it is our money. America
are not going to take it, except a small sum
that may be used for their Embassy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now, an
interruption, if you will kindly yield.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI
KHAN): He has limited time at his disposal.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Then, I put it to the
House: Can we dispense with the import of
foodgrains at this juncture? Can any sane
man or any wise man, who has got the in-
483 RS—5.

terests of the country and of law and order in
the country, at heart, remain without feeding
the people, keeping the price in mind? If he
says that the Food Minister should be forced
to discontinue the imports, I say that Mr.
Bhupesh Gupta, as the leader of the
Communist Party, can do so. Nobody else can
subscribe to it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will you kindly
yield a little? All I said was that our
agriculture should not be so dependent, that it
should attain self-sufficiency. Your Prime
Minister said that.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: It could not be done,
we are sorry for our mistake which could not
be helped. But can we commit "harakiri" by
not being successful in one direction, and
therefore nothing should be done?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: May I suggest a
compromise?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: I do not want any
compromise from you. There is another point.
What he said was: "Do not take any aid for
the development of your industries".

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI
KHAN): That was about the private sector.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Private sector or public
sector. What he is afraid of perhaps is that the
foreign capital will come here and dominate
our economy and will ultimately exploit us.
But he is an economist, he is a student of
world movements, and may I ask him how
many countries, who have taken help from
others for the development of their industries,
have been enslaved? Let us know that. France
took the biggest amount in Marshall Aid,
almost \$800 crores. So did Italy, so did
Germany, so did England. Can you tell me
that President de Gaulle is in duty bound to
Mr. Kennedy or to Mr. Johnson? Is he being
goaded by Mr. Johnson to follow him? I may
tell Mr. Bhup-

[Shri C. D. Pande.] pesh Gupta that ideological ropes are more to be feared than financial strings. The strings can be snapped at convenience. The world has ceased to be grateful for the benefits given. Therefore, if we take help, aid, grant, anything from the Western countries or from Moscow, what is there to it? We take a lot of help from America and also from Russia, we are grateful to them, but I am never under the impression that because Moscow gives something we are therefore getting tied to them. The real factor to be considered is that humanity cannot afford to see that one part of the world should remain poor. Therefore, Russians are helping us and Americans are helping us. To ask us to take help from Moscow and not from the United States is a leglc which we cannot follow. We can take help from wherever it comes. History knows that financial aid at this point or that point will never bind a country perpetually to political •"emulation because that has been thown by France. France took the biggest amount from the United States. So did Italy. Therefore, the fear that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari is changing his policy overnight is unfounded

I will take only one more minute to ay a few words about the illness of the Prime Minister. I may tell you, Sir, that I am not always praising the Government very much. Government fe not taking any advantage out of the Illness of the Prime Minister. It is very unfair, it is in bad taste, it does not look nice to say that Government & changing its policy because the Prime Minister is ill. The Prime Minister is still in good control of affairs. He is on the saddle, he directs. Everyday he meets Ambassadors and foreign dignitaries. He meets Presidents and Prime Ministers and Secretaries of other countries. They come and meet him and talk to him effectively. Do you think that they are coming to see him about his illness? Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari has not done anything by revolting

against the Prime Minister. Whatever is being done by the Government may not be yielding enough fruit. It may be mistaken here and there, but it is Government's policy, it is Prime Minister Nehru's policy that is being followed, and we support that policy whatever may be our differences here and there.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are not only discussing the Mid-term Appraisal of the Third Plan but in fact we have reached tha mid point of our long-term plan of 25 years. So we must see the Report in its proper perspective and in a balanced way. Have we failed? Yes, to some extent we have failed. But have we failed cent per cent? No, we are successful in some respects. So also, Sir, in our family we plan for five years, ten years, twenty-five years and so on, and we come across some unforeseen and unavoidable calamitiea and difficulties, and then we say that man proposes and God disposes. So this nation's plan is also like a big family's plan, and from that point of view I saj that we must see it in the proper perspective and in a balanced way.

I join my hon. friend, Mrs. Bharathi, in congratulating the Government They have boldly confessed their shortcomings and we must appreciate it. Many of the hon. Members have only criticised the Government. I say, are we not a party to it? The Parliament has discussed these Pl^na in both the Houses, and we have discussed them at the State level and at the district level; and even in some parts of the country we have discussed them at the Tahsil level or what we call the Taluka. These Plans were discussed all over the country and we are a party to it. We should not forget that if it has failed in principle, we are a party to it. But it has not failed in principles and policy. If it has failed in the implementation of it. then also we are a party to it because we call ourselves and we are the representatives of the

people. ^ The Members of the Lok Sabha represent three crores to four crores of voters, and we elders as we are called, represent our States. When we represent our States, it is our duty to go to the public and let them know the plans. Some of the Members said that the Plan did not reach up to the people. But it was our duty and if the people have not co-operated, it is the fault of ours who are the representatives of the people. So we should think over this Plan in that respect.

What I find is that in the last 12½ years we have travelled a long distance. In the olden days, we were not able to manufacture even a needle, and now so many industries are there and we are able to manufacture so many goods in the public sector as well as in the private sector. The agricultural products are increasing, and unfortunately we have increased on the population front also. We have increased our population by 8 crores, and we failed to plan that thing in the beginning of our Plan. Sir, there are, of course, many difficulties which are unforeseen, not seen or unseen, which are natural, which are not man-made. There are so many calamities like famine, floods, pests, earthquakes, cyclones, etc., which are natural calamities, which are God-made. Those that are man-made are Chinese aggression, Pakistan's attitude and inflow of refugees, riots, and so on, which are beyond our control and which are to some extent in our control also. But we have to face all these calamities.

Many of the hon. Members have criticised the exporting sugar when the other nations need it. Government machinery. To some extent, I too. It is not that whenever we like. We should agree with them because there are instances of export it, whenever the other nations require the old bureaucratic attitude in the administrative machinery of ours. But we cannot blame them totally. So I suggest to the Government if we minimise a little consumption of our that wherever the Plan fails, the authority who is responsible, who is in charge of that part, of that more sugar. section, should be taken as responsible for the failure of that part of the Plan. There are I

many officers and Government employees who are very honest and sincere in their work. So we must appreciate their work also. Sir, I came across some of the Government officers, Classes I, II, III and IV, and they feel: "Why should we do our job? We will only go to our office and come back because there is no reward given for sincerity and honesty." So, regarding those, who are honest and sincere, we should appreciate their work.

Sir, the reason why we are discussing this Plan is because we should give some suggestions in order to make our plans more successful. Criming to the international trade, I would like to bring to your notice the position about the export of sugar—page 45. Export of sugar in 1960-61 amounted to Rs. 2-5 crores; in 1961-62, it jumped to Rs. 14-6 crores. And then in 1962-63—this Report has come out in November, 1963—it amounted to Rs. 17-0 crores. Even according to the latest figures, it is Rs. 25,19,00,000. And molasses worth Rs. 84 lakhs . . .

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: Rs. 30 crores.

SHRIMATI TARA RAMCHANDRA SATHE: I am very glad to hear that it is more than Rs. 30 crores. So, I would like to congratulate the Ministry of International Trade and the Ministry of Agriculture also, because the Ministry of Agriculture has given seeds and manures and all sorts of advice to the sugarcane growers. 'So, this was possible. I wish that the Government should continue this policy of

Another thing is this. Some of the States are beginning to increase the number of the mills, and I do not

[Shrimati Tara Ramchandra Sathe.] understand why the Government is not willing to give them permission. I would like to bring to your notice that from Maharashtra they have applied for permission to open 19 sugar mills but, unfortunately, those applications have been lying with the Ministry of Industry for the last twelve months. You, Sir, know, and the House knows, that Maharashtra State and some parts of Mysore State are bestowed by nature with a favourable soil and favourable climatic conditions which are very essential for the growth of sugar-cane. Now, as far as the per acre yield of sugarcane and the ref of sugar per ton of sugar-cane are concerned, these factors satisfy very well, and these areas stand in the world as the second best. So, these applications should not be lying there unattended to. Twelve months have gone and I can say that we have lost sugar worth Rs. 100 crores because of this type of red-tapism in the Ministry of Industry, if I can be permitted to say so. So, I request the M'nistry, through you, Sir, to hurry up the matter and do the needful. And I want to add one thing more. These factories are run on a co-operative basis.

And coming to another factor, that of spinning mills, when we are saying that we want the mills to be started on a co-operative basis, there are some applications lying pending from my State, Maharashtra. Instead of giving them permission, I am very sorry to note that the Government has given permission to private mills to increase their spindleage. So, such things should be noted here.

I join with hon'ble Member, Shri Khandubhai Desai, who said that we should start more fair price shops. I too agree with him but some more essential commodities should be included in the list of articles sold, for example, soap, match box, some cereals, chilli, oil, etc. This is the only way by which we can help the people who are already feeling the heavy burden of taxation. If we give them

this type of fair price shops, they may not be feeling the burden of taxation, because the prices are rising. If we increase the dearness allowances, the purchasing power is increased and again further inflation goes on. So, to provide more articles at a lower price is the only way to solve the problem.

Again, coming to exports and imports from the Report under consideration, on page 44 it is said that "a number of measures were taken to discourage the smuggling of gold and other banned articles". I am very sorry to note that there are some banned articles which come into India, articles such as transistors, motor-cars, wrist-watches, etc., and they are sold by the Government at a very low price. And there is public criticism that these articles are purchased by Ministers and by Government officials and their relations. So, I would request the Government to look into the matter and not allow such things. In fact, the articles which are confiscated by the Customs should be sold in the market at not less than the price which people would have to pay, paying the Customs duty.

I am sorry to note that there is no mention at all made about the rehabilitation of the refugees and about the development of Dandakaranya in this Report. In Dandakaranya, six thousand refugees are rehabilitated, and again, there are 5,000 Government employees there. Really, I was shocked to hear this proportion. I heard that those who are transferred there get somewhat more allowance, worth half their pay, and so, everybody is keen on going there. So, this matter should be looked into. Again, there are refugees, hundreds and thousands of them, coming by whatever way they like, by boats, steamers, road and rail and with or without migration certificates. We should look after this overwhelming number of people who are coming, and we should take steps to make proper arrangements to receive them and give shelter to this uprooted humanity seeking refuge

and peace in the land of ours to which they would also have equal rights, had there not been an arbitrary partition of the country by Indian Government causing death and misery to thousands? So, we must see to their convenience. The State Governments are giving their helping hand; that is their duty, of course—the Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and Maharashtra. The Central Government should ask them to open relief camps on their borders when they come there. Government has to put them up first in transit camps and then they are again shifted elsewhere. Thereby they feel insecure and sore. The present Ministry is not competent as it has neither the manpower nor the machinery to tackle this problem. So, I request the Government, through you, Sir, that this problem should get top-priority attention and the Minister without Portfolio, hon'ble Shri Shastriji, should take up this urgent matter because this is a most important matter and if this matter is not tackled properly with great care and urgency, it is bound to cause a problem of law and order. And already in the border States, I think, peace is disturbed to some extent. So, we must be more cautious, and these refugees should be taken care of and this problem should be dealt with at a higher level, at the Cabinet level.

Thank you.

श्री भगवत नारायण भागंब (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, नियोजन के उद्देश्य कई हैं, जैसा कि योजना आयोग की रिपोर्ट में बताया गया है। परन्तु सबसे मुख्य उद्देश्य जिसको कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी कई बार अपने भाषणों में दोहरा चुके हैं वह यह है कि भारत के प्रत्येक मनुष्य को खाना, कपड़ा और मकान मिले। अब एक तीन पंचवर्षीय योजनाएं पूरी होने जा रही हैं लेकिन इस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति निकट भविष्य में हो सकेगी इसकी मुझे आशा भी नहीं है, यह देखते हुए कि किस प्रकार से प्रगति हो रही है। गवर्नमेंट अपनी नीति

के अनुसार ऐसा सर्वेक्षण कराए जिससे पता चलेगा कि कितने आदमी ऐसे हैं जिनको २४ घंटे में एक समय भी पेट भर भोजन नहीं मिलता, कितने ऐसे आदमी हैं जिनके पास तन ढंकने के लिये और स्त्रियों को शरम बचाने तक के लिये एक दो घांतियां नहीं हैं, झोड़ने, बिछाने और पहनने को कपड़े नहीं हैं, कितने ऐसे लोग हैं जो दरख्तों के नीचे सोते हैं, खेतों में सोते हैं, एक झोंपड़ी तक में रहने की व्यवस्था जिनके पास नहीं है, जो ठंड के दिनों में अपना शरीर केवल वृक्ष की छाल से ढंक्ते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ, इस प्रकार का सर्वेक्षण बहुत ही आवश्यक है। या तो प्लानिंग कमीशन इस संबंध में योजना बनाए या हमारा केन्द्रीय सरकार बनाए जिससे कि देश की असली स्थिति का पता चल सके। यह कहना कि पर कैपिटल इनकम इतनी थी, इतनी हो गई यह तो एक तरह की धोखे की टट्टी है। पर कैपिटल इनकम तो बढ़ी है लखपति, करोड़पति और अरबपतियों की आमदनी से, लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि डेबर भाई ने जो बात कही थी, कि एक तरह का प्रावर्ध हो गया है कि अमीर आदमी और अमीर हो रहा है, गरीब आदमी और गरीब हो रहा है, तो उनके इस कथन में पूर्ण सत्यता है। लेकिन स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की रिपोर्ट्स से इस बात का पता नहीं चल सकता जब तक वास्तव में इन बातों का एक सर्वेक्षण न कराया जाय। जनगणना दस वर्ष में होती है लेकिन उसमें ये सब बातें नहीं आती। इस पुस्तक में भी, मिड टर्म एग्जैम में भी, इस बात को माना है—नेशनल डेवलपमेंट काउन्सिल ने माना है—कि प्रगति ठीक नहीं हो रही है, अधिक उन्नति बहुत धीमी हुई है। इस बात को स्वीकार किया गया है।

मैं तो समझता हूँ कि जो प्रगति नहीं हो रही है, जो साधारण जनता की उन्नति नहीं हो रही है, उसके दो कारण हैं। मेरी समझ में सबसे पहला और मुख्य कारण यह है कि—मैं समझता हूँ गवर्नमेंट इसको

[श्री भगवत नारायण भार्गव]

पसन्द नहीं करेंगे—कि प्लानिंग कमिशन सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट में सहयोग नहीं है। कहा जायेगा कि सहयोग तो वे देते हैं। परन्तु मैं कहता हूँ कि कितने ही उदाहरण इसके दिये जा सकते हैं। इस सदन में जो प्रश्न होते हैं उनसे पता चलता है कि उनमें आपस में सहयोग नहीं है। उसे कहा जाय कि सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट को यह नति हो, यह आयोजन था, तो अगर वह पूरा नहीं हुआ, तो कहा जायेगा कि राज्य सरकारों ने यह बात नहीं की है, हम राज्य सरकारों पर जोर दे रहे हैं। राज्य सरकारों से कहें तो वे कहेंगे कि केन्द्र के शासन ने हमको इसमें सहायता नहीं दी, हमारी इन बातों पर ध्यान नहीं दिया। तो एक दूसरे पर सब बातें टालते हैं। ग्रामीणों के प्रश्न या भूमि संरक्षण के संबंध में और आज भी मेरा प्रश्न था औद्योगिक वस्तियों के संबंध में। तो उनके उत्तर से स्पष्ट होता है कि वे सारा दोष राज्यों के ऊपर डाल रहे हैं—केन्द्रीय सरकार का कोई दोष नहीं है, वह तो निर्दोष है। आज भारत के दस राज्यों में एक भी इन्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट पांच हजार या उससे कम की आबादी के ग्रामों में नहीं है, जैसा कि उनके ही स्टेटमेंट में दिया है। तो यह कितनी शर्म की बात है ?

3 P.M.

जितने राज्य देश में हैं उनमें से दस राज्य ऐसे हैं जहां कोई औद्योगिक वस्ती इन ग्रामों में आज तक नहीं बन सकी। वे कहते हैं कि इसका कारण यह है कि हमें राज्यों से सहयोग लेना पड़ता है और वहां इन्टेग्रेशन की कमी है, रां मैटीरियल नहीं है, बिजली उपलब्ध नहीं है। अगर जवाब यही है तो यह कसूर किसका है, यह दोष किस का है ? इतने वर्ष हो गये और आज तक इस बात की फिक्र नहीं की गई कि देहातों में बिजली होनी चाहिये, देहातों में रां मैटीरियल प्राप्त होना चाहिये और देहातों में ऐसे लोगों को हमें अपने साथ लेना चाहिये जो इस काम को

संभाल सकें। देहात के रहने वाले इसके लिये उतावले बैठे हुये हैं, उधार खाये बैठे हुये हैं कि कोई काम उनको दिया जाय। देहात में खेती के लिये इतनी भूमि नहीं है कि वहां के लोग केवल खेती से अपना जीवन व्यतीत कर सकें। कोई उद्योग धंधे वहां पर नहीं हैं जिनके द्वारा वे अपना पेट भर सकें। जब देहातों की ऐसी दशा है तब भी इस और कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है। हमारे श्री नित्यानन्द कानूनगो साहब ने यह कहा कि हमारी नीति तो यह है कि ७५ फीसदी इन्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट्स देहातों में हों, मगर वे क्या करें ? उनके हाथ में कोई शक्ति नहीं है, उनके हाथ में कोई साधन नहीं है और उनकी कोई सुनता नहीं है। यही कारण है कि १० परसेंट भी देहातों में इन्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट्स नहीं बन पाई हैं और जो आगे बनने वाली हैं उनका भी यही हाल है। कहीं किसी प्रांत के ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में एक इन्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट है, किसी में दो हैं और किसी में कोई है ही नहीं। तो मेरा निवेदन यह है कि जो मैंने पहले अर्ज किया कि इन तीनों संस्थाओं प्लानिंग कमिशन, सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स में कोई सहयोग नहीं है। इस पर गम्भीर विचार होना चाहिए।

दूसरा कारण जो तरक्की न होने का है वह यह है कि जनता को विश्वास में नहीं लिया जाता है। नियोजन के लिये जब योजनायें बनाई जाती हैं, अगर उस वक्त आप जा करके देहात वालों से पूछें कि क्या-क्या योजनायें आप लोग बना रहे हैं, ग्राम पंचायतों के सदस्यों से पूछें या ग्राम समाजों के सदस्यों से पूछें, तो वे यही कहेंगे कि हम तो कुछ नहीं कर रहे हैं, बी० डी० ओ० साहब ने मीटिंग में यह बताया है और हम भी मीटिंग में गये थे। महात्मा गांधी इस बात को कहते थे कि असली स्वराज्य तब होगा जब भारत का प्रत्येक पुरुष और प्रत्येक स्त्री इस बात का अनुभव करे कि हमारा हाथ भी शासन में है और शासन की बागडोर को हम भी पकड़े हुये

हैं। यह भावना हमारे देश में होनी चाहिये। ऊपर से इन्स्ट्रक्शन जाते हैं, हिदायतें होती हैं कि गांव वालों की मर्जी से डिस्ट्रिक्ट में प्लान बनाया जाय, लेकिन वास्तव में यह होता नहीं है। ग्रामोद्योगों के ऊपर, स्माल स्केल इन्डस्ट्रीज के ऊपर या विलेज इन्डस्ट्रीज के ऊपर अगर ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है तो देहातों की दशा सुधर नहीं सकती है।

अब आप देखिये कि जो तनख्वाह पाने वाले लोग हैं, चाहे वे गवर्नमेंट सर्विस में हों या सेमीगवर्नमेंट सर्विस में हों, उनकी दशा क्या है। ऊंची तनख्वाह वालों को जाने दीजिये। मैं कहता हूँ कि जो ४०० रुपये या ५०० रुपये महीना पाते हैं, वे भी आजकल अपना पेट अच्छी तरह से नहीं भर सकते हैं। हम लोग इसकी रोज रोज चर्चा करते हैं कि मंहगाई इतनी अधिक हो गई है कि वे अपने बाल बच्चों का पेट नहीं भर सकते हैं। मकानों की यह हालत है कि १०-१० और १२-१२ फुट वाले कमरे में आठ आठ और दस-दस आदमी रहते हैं। गवर्नमेंट की ओर से उनको मकान भलाट किये जाते हैं, लेकिन फिर भी दशा यह है कि वह लोग यह कहते हैं कि हमारे बीबी, बच्चे और हमारे भाई भतीजे सब भेड़ बकरियों की तरह से एक कमरे में रहते हैं। मैंने अपनी आंखों से देखा है कि अगर कहीं उनको मोटर गैरेज किराये पर मिल गया तो उसको ले लिया। गरमी के दिनों में भी मैंने देखा है कि उस मोटर गैरेज के टीन के किवाड़ को बन्द करके स्त्री, पुरुष, बच्चे उसके अन्दर पड़े रहते हैं। सुबह जब वे किवाड़ खोलते हैं तो उनको देख करके मैं आश्चर्यचकित रह जाता हूँ कि ऐसे कमरे में जहाँ एक छिद्र भी नहीं है हवा जाने के लिये, उसमें कैसे ये लोग गरमी में रात भर पड़े रहते हैं। तो ये छोटी, छोटी बातें नहीं हैं जो मैं कह रहा हूँ। ये बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण बातें हैं। वास्तव में हमारे भाई जो गरीब हैं या जो थोड़ी तनख्वाह पाने वाले हैं

या जिनके पास न कोई उद्योग-धंधे हैं और न खेती है, उनकी दशा सुधारने का जब तक कोई उपाय नहीं होगा तब तक कोई सुधार हो नहीं सकता। देहात वालों को जब तक प्लानिंग से वास्तविक फायदा नहीं होता है, वे समझते हैं कि यह सब तमाशा हो रहा है। देहात वाले कहते हैं कि 'प्लानिंग के तीन काम, मीटिंग, नक्शा और सलाम'। तमाम लोग ऐसा कहते फिरते हैं कि प्लानिंग का तो यह काम है कि मीटिंगें कर लीं, एक महीने में दो मीटिंग कर लीं या तीन, चार कर लीं और बड़े-बड़े नक्शे बना कर के भेज दिये कि इतना इतना काम हुआ, और साहबों को सलाम कर आये। बस प्लानिंग में वहां यही काम होता है।

प्लानिंग कमिशन ने प्रौढ़ शिक्षा के सम्बन्ध में क्या विचार किया मुझे तो पता नहीं है। परन्तु यह जो रिपोर्ट है, इसके देखने से यह पता चलता है कि सन् १९५१ से सन् १९६१ तक केवल ७ परसेंट साक्षरता बढ़ी है। अगर यही हाल रहा और इसी प्रकार की योजनाएँ रहें तो मैं समझता हूँ कि ११० वर्ष में भारत के लोग साक्षर हो जायेंगे। वास्तव में भारत वर्ष ने सारे संसार में निरक्षरता में बाजी मार दी है। कोई ऐसा देश नहीं है जहाँ पर इतनी घोर निरक्षरता हो। अगर हम इस बात पर ही ध्यान दें कि जितने गवर्नमेंट आर्गेनाइजेशन हैं, सेमीगवर्नमेंट आर्गेनाइजेशन हैं, उनमें चतुर्थ श्रेणी के जो चपरासी बसैरहें हैं उनमें बहुत ज़े बपड़े लिखे होते हैं, उनके लिये अगर यह अनिवार्य कर दिया जाय कि उनके सम्बन्धित विभाग उनको पढ़ावें और उनको शिक्षित करें और ऐसी कोई योजना बनाई जाय, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत बड़ी संख्या में निरक्षरता दूर हो सकती है, परन्तु इसके ऊपर अभी तक ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है। और अनेकों प्रकार के उपाय रखे गये हैं जिन से निरक्षरता दूर हो पर वे सफल नहीं हुए। मेरे एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में, जब डाक्टर श्रीमाली शिक्षा मंत्री थे तो उन्होंने दो सप्ताह में तमाम सुविधायें बताईं

[श्री जगजित नारायण भागवत]

की कि यह किया गया है, वह किया गया है, परन्तु नतीजा कुछ नहीं हुआ ।

एक बात मैं और भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि प्लानिंग कमीशन कुछ कहता है तो उसके ऊपर ध्यान कहां तक दिया जाता है । प्लानिंग कमीशन ने अपनी तृतीय पंचवर्षीय योजना की रिपोर्ट में तीन बार इस बात को दोहराया कि भिन्न भिन्न राज्यों में बहुत से पिछड़े हुए प्रदेश हैं और उन पर विशेष ध्यान दिया जावे । परन्तु न केन्द्रीय सरकार की तरफ से ध्यान दिया जाता है और न राज्य सरकार की तरफ से ध्यान दिया जाता है । वह जो रिपोर्ट है इसमें भी उन्होंने "Development of the more backward regions in different States" पर जोर दिया है । इनकी बड़ी अनसुटिस-फैक्ट्री कन्डीशन है और इनका हमें सुधार करना है । यह नेशनल डेवलपमेंट काउंसिल ने भी कहा है :

"Relatively less developed regions in different States present special problems and call for sustained and integrated development."

एक-एक राज्य में तीन-तीन, चार-चार क्षेत्र ऐसे हैं जो पिछड़े हुए हैं । अगर उन पर ध्यान नहीं दिया जाता है तो इसका मतलब यह है कि हम सारे देश को एक साथ ले करके चलना नहीं चाहते हैं और हम सारे देश की उन्नति नहीं चाहते हैं । अगर सारे राष्ट्र की समृद्धि के लिये कोई राज्य सरकार सहयोग नहीं करती है तो हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास कोई शक्ति ऐसी होनी चाहिये जिससे कि वह राष्ट्र समृद्धि के लिए राज्यों को विवश कर सके । अगर इसके लिये संविधान में संशोधन भी करना पड़े तो वह भी करना चाहिये ।

उत्तर प्रदेश में तीन पिछड़े हुए प्रदेश योजना कमीशन ने बताये हैं—पहाड़ी जिले, पूर्वी जिले और बुन्देलखंड । पूर्वी जिले के लोग विशेष रूप से प्रधान मंत्री जी से मिले

और उन्होंने आन्दोलन किया तो उनकी तरफ प्लानिंग कमीशन का ध्यान गया और उन्होंने एक अध्ययन दल बनाया । अभी पता नहीं है कि उसके अनुसार क्या किया जा रहा है । पहाड़ी जिलों की ओर अधिक ध्यान राज्य का भी नहीं गया है और केन्द्रीय सरकार का भी नहीं गया है । पहाड़ी इतने गरीब होते हैं, उनके इतने छोटे-छोटे खेत हैं, उनके पास तीन हाथ लम्बे चौड़े खेत होते हैं, तो फिर वह क्या खेती कर सकते हैं । वहां पर खेती ही नहीं, उद्योगों को बढ़ाने की आवश्यकता है ।

अब, उत्तर प्रदेश के बुन्देलखंड क्षेत्र की, जो हर प्रकार बिछड़ा हुआ है, तो ऐसी उपेक्षा हो रही है कि कुछ कहा ही नहीं जा सकता । जब कभी उत्तर प्रदेश के पिछड़ेपन की चर्चा वहां के गवर्नर या चीफ मिनिस्टर कहीं भाषणों में, उद्घाटनों के समय जो भाषण करते हैं उनमें, करते हैं तो बुन्देलखंड को बिल्कुल भूल जाते हैं । वे बतायेंगे कि मेरठ में, बिजनौर में यह यह पिछड़ापन है मगर बुन्देलखंड को वे बिल्कुल भूले हुए हैं । मानो उत्तर प्रदेश में बुन्देलखंड ही नहीं । अभी परसों मेरा एक प्रश्न था उससे मालूम हुआ कि ऊबड़ खाबड़ जमीन की उन्नति के लिये उत्तर प्रदेश को जो रुपया दिया गया था उसमें से उसने एक कोड़ी भी खर्च नहीं किया, वहां कुछ काम नहीं हुआ । यह ऐसी जमीन है जो कि खेती के योग्य नहीं है लेकिन अगर उसको खेती के योग्य बनाया जाय तो इससे उत्पादन बहुत बढ़ सकता है । परन्तु इसी सदन में डा० राम सुभग सिंह ने मेरे एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में कहा था कि ऊबड़-खाबड़ जमीन को तोड़ने से कोई तरक्की नहीं हो सकती, कोई उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ सकता । मैं कहता हूँ कि उनका यह कथन बिल्कुल निराधार है । जितनी अधिक जमीन खेती के लिये होगी उतना ही उत्पादन बढ़ सकता है ।

(Time bell rings.)

मेरा निवेदन है कि जो प्लानिंग कमीशन की सिफारिश पिछड़े क्षेत्रों के लिए है उसके

ऊपर केन्द्रीय सरकार को त्वरित और विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये और राज्य सरकारों का भी ध्यान विशेष रूप से इसकी ओर दिलाया जावे ।

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there cannot be two opinions about the fact that the basic objective of the Plan is to afford to the people a decent life. But the immediate need of the people is to make available to them the minimum necessities of life like food, shelter and clothing at a price which they can conveniently pay, along with other minimum welfare necessities like medical aid, education and sanitation. But, Sir, after 14 years of planning, what come to our notice in this House this morning during the Question Hour is extremely discreditable to the Government. The Minister here does not know as to how many people died in the capital city without shelter, without food and without medical aid. Even if what the hon. Health Minister said is justified, namely that it could not be accounted for as to how many were due to exposure and how many due to disease, that also is discreditable.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: We never plan for dying.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It seems you plan only for dying and for nothing else. After these immediate needs are satisfied, the people would naturally expect a better standard of living, some comfort and some leisure. But how is this all possible? This could be only possible if there were an expanded employment opportunity which can only be created by way of higher rate of economic growth. But in the present circumstances what we see is that there is no balance between the development of agriculture and industry. There is too much of concentration, as is admitted by the Planning Commission, on land. I do not really understand what they mean by this concentration. There is plenty

of land in this country which is not being reclaimed. If they reclaim this land and give some incentive to the farmer, there would be plenty of people coming forward to till the lands and make use of them. But in spite of all our planning for fourteen years, that has not been done. But the fact remains that the progress we make in the agricultural sector would determine our economic growth in the country because the main dependence till today is on agriculture. Now time has come when greater emphasis should be laid on expansion of industries and the surplus population, if any, in the agricultural sector could be absorbed in the expanded industry.

Agricultural land in our country is the largest natural resource. It constitutes the very basis of India's economy. Out of 40 odd crores of population, more than 70 per cent, depend on agriculture for their occupation and livelihood. All the same, income from agriculture and allied sectors constitutes only 50 per cent, of India's national income. We have spent during the first two Plans more than Rs. 2 000 crores in the agricultural sector. I shall quote, Sir, some figures which would give you the comparative position in a planned economy *vis-a-vis* countries which have no plan. The source is no other than the United Nations Organisation:

	1956-57	1960-61
India	108	119
Malaya	108	129
Japan	110	125
U.A.R.	107	123
Israel	124	163
Turkey	107	124

These figures amply prove that we have failed in the agricultural sector. The Plan has carried us nowhere. We have wasted the money. We have poured in a colossal sum of Rs. 2,000 crores into agriculture, and the net result is much less compared to countries which did not proceed with a plan.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Is the Plan responsible for it?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Definitely. Who else should be responsible for having sabotaged it—of course, if it is not you?

In the sphere of industry, we see the same lopsided planning. There is overemphasis on basic industries at the expense of consumer goods industries. This is because our Plan has been communist-oriented. We have Russia as our ideal. But the basic difference is not probably realised. While there is a totalitarian Government which does not have to look to the needs of the people, in India we have a democratic Government. That is the basic fact which has to be taken into consideration. We want people's co-operation. We have to meet the needs of the people and in a democracy, unless people's co-operation is available, the Plan can succeed. We have to inspire the people that only they have to carry forward the Plan. The Government cannot do it unless the people themselves are enthused and in a democracy like India, we have not tried to do it.

What is more, the basic industries in themselves cannot cater to the needs of the masses. They will cater to the needs of the small industries, to the consumer goods industries and unless we have plenty of consumer goods industries in the country, what would we do with the production of the basic industries? So I say it has been lopsided but I am happy that the Midterm appraisal admits of its failure and it has also admitted that it has not been possible to have any impact on the economy, the living standards of the people and on employment. I shall deal with employment later on, but on the other side what has happened? It has acted as a vampire sucking the blood and vitals of the people by higher taxation and by higher prices and anti-peasant laws. It is said that the anti-peasant laws would go a long way in improving

agriculture in the country but what has been our experience? Unless the peasant is given the assurance that he is going to own his lands, who would put in his money or toil? Naturally, it will be a colossal failure again if we try this way. This is a wrong way of doing things.

The Planning Commission in their report have appreciated the contribution made by the private sector, but they have also added that the private sector has been unable to utilise effectively the capacity licensed in a number of important industries. With out going into the reasons for the failure of the private sector, they have made these remarks. They know it perfectly well that what little has been the failure in the private sector is mainly due to the Government. In the case of raw materials, in the case of transport, in the case of other facilities, the top priority goes to the public sector. It is only a stepmotherly treatment under which the private sector is trying to push ahead. In spite of all difficulties or hurdles put on its way, it has succeeded.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: It has failed.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It may appear to have failed for the protagonists who take up the cause of the public sector alone, who do not see, who have a coloured glass and who refuse to see that the private sector exists and will exist.

What have we achieved during these 14 years of planning? It has been a colossal failure. In the field of employment, we started with a backlog at the beginning of the First Plan of 4 million and by the Second Plan it has come to 9 million and by the end of the Third Plan we shall attain a huge figure of 14 million. So in spite of the Plans, we are going on adding to our unemployment.

Second is the question of prices. I do not have to say that the prices have gone up, because each hon. Member in this House has realised it and pleaded that the prices be arrested and

brought down. Third is foodgrains. I have dealt with the point that we have failed in agriculture.

Fourth is exports. The export happens to be the main foreign exchange earner for India. All the same we have failed i.e. that sector. The First Plan annual average was Rs. 609 crores per year. The Second Plan figure -was Rs. 614 crores per year; and during 1962-63 it was Rs. 694 crores while the target fixed was Rs. 720 crores. So even in this we have a shortfall and we have not been able to earn as much foreign exchange as we could have. That is because items like cotton textiles, coffee, and leather have recorded a sharp decline. What is more, our Government does not believe in a low-cost economy. They have introduced in this country a high-cost economy. A high-cost economy can manage itself in a totalitarian country but it cannot manage itself in a democratic country where you have to stand competition. Naturally, we have to bring down the prices of commodities that we manufacture, or else we do not stand in the open market in the world.

Regarding population control, we have also miserably failed. Some hon. Member made a reference to the Social Welfare Board and organisations like the Bharat Sewak Samaj, Bharat Sadhu Samaj or some other Samaj which are being financed by the Government for doing this work. What they are doing is to go on appointing people who belong to the Congress organisation, who run the election machinery during the election time and sit tight at home and get pension for the rest of the time. That is what is going on or else, what is the reason as to why we have not been able to inspire the people yet that we do not need so much of growing population? In my opinion, we do not have too great a population yet for India but all the same if the Government feel that India is over-populated, what is required is to make these people go round the country and explain to the people that we do not need more

population and that something must be done. They have not been able to do it within the 14 years of planning and so there must be something wrong.

Now the Planning Commission—naturally they are very efficient people otherwise—have tried to put the entire blame on the implementation and have tried to get away. I cannot allow them to get away like that. They are a party to this failure. They put all the blame on their juniors, who would try to oblige them just to retain their posts. That is very unjust on their part. One party making an allegation against another party and getting away with it is all wrong. We are the people who have to judge it. They are not the people who are to judge it. They cannot say that the implementation is wrong. It may be that the planning itself is wrong. It is for others to say who is wrong and who is right. They should not have made that aspersion on their juniors which is very wrong of them.

Now, instead of using this entire machinery for planning, what is being done is that it is being used for party purposes. That is what I have seen in Orissa. During the Bhubaneswar Session what was done was that one hundred jeeps from the Community Development Centres were brought just to carry either vegetables or fruit or fish or some other items for catering to hon. Members, distinguished Members of the Congress Party who went there as the guests of the Government of Orissa. If that happens, how do you expect the officers to honestly work for planning? If he knows that by going over to Bhubaneswar for two or three days he can placate the Minister or the person in charge of Planning and get back to his place and sit tight at his residence without doing anything, why should he take the trouble of moving over his fields and inspiring the people towards the Plans? And the great Congress Party is talking from housetops that they are going to eradicate dishonesty, malpractices and corrup-

[Shri Lokanath Misra.] tion within two years. It is all ridiculous. Previously we were hearing about the "socialist pattern of society" and now it seems we have come to the second stage and I am happy about it that they have dropped the "pattern" now. They have now dropped the "pattern" and have now got the "mould" ready. And the great Bijoynanda Patnaik of Orissa, the over-night capitalist, he sponsors that resolution. I was really surprised when I read in the papers that this over-night capitalist was sponsoring the resolution on socialism at that session of the Congress.

AN HON. MEMBER: Democratic socialism.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Now that he has got the mould, he would start producing socialism and go about distributing it to the entire country. I suppose. This mystery man of Indian politics, of Indian commercial underworld . . .

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Under-world?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Yes.

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: Sir, it is quite unfair to a person who is not in the House and who has nobody to defend him.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: If you interrupt, then I will have to explain why I have referred to him as belonging to the under-world.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I think you can use some other word.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Underworld is not unparliamentary, Sir.

SHRI A. M. THOMAS: May I submit, Sir, that it is not a question of using another word. Is it fair or proper on the part of the hon. Member to refer to a person who is not in the House and who is not represented here? He is not in the Government of India. What is this?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: He sponsored that resolution and anyone in Indian politics exposes himself to criticism.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is public life.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Kindly do not interrupt me, for I have so many things to say and there is not much time. One of those over-night capitalists is the Chairman of the Planning Board in Orissa, the other is the Chief Minister of Orissa. They are planning and that is why I refer to them.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Are there two?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No question, Mr. Pande.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: There is only one Chairman of the State Planning Board in Orissa and only one Chief Minister in Orissa. There cannot be two of them each.

Next, I would like to refer to a colossal fraud that has been attempted on the people of Orissa. The other day, Sir, I presume you may remember, I had put a question to the Minister in charge of Irrigation and Power on the matter and I had subsequently written a letter to the hon. Minister in charge of Planning on the same matter. He, I thought, knew about the parliamentary procedure of writing back replies to letters from Members of Parliament; but I find that he has not yet picked up that practice, in spite of his association with the Cabinet and being in the Government for so long a time, for so many years, and he has not written a reply to me. Therefore, I have to take it that my information is correct.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He may be enquiring and he will reply to you.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: There is nothing to enquire about. It was only his opinion that I sought. Sir, Tikerpara . . .

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: The hon. Member should not be impatient. He will get the reply. He has written very rece

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: By the time I get it, this debate on the Plan would be over and the occasion would be over. Probably he preferred not to write to me earlier so that .I may not use it during this debate 0:3 the Plan.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: What was that dam?

, SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I will explain it.

SHRI JOSEPH MATHEN: .It is a damned thing.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Naturally, for a man from Kerala it should be a damned thing. This dam, the Tikerpara Dam was blessed by our hon. Prime Minister and I do not have to testify it. The Governor of Orissa in his inaugural address to the Orissa Assembly said that he had given his blessings to go on with that project. Here in reply to me, question, the hon. Minister for Irrigation and Power said that the Prime Minister did not lay the foundation stone in Orissa, that It was only a commemoration stone And the survey was not complete yet.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Commemoration of what?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I don't know what—whether it was a commemoration of his visit or the Planning Board Chairman's visit or the visit of the Chief Minister. But what does it signify? It must be signifying something. Or else the Governor of Orissa would not have gone to the length of assuring the people of Orissa that it is coming up. Now, as you know, we were always being blamed, we the Members of the Swatantra Party, that we were making allegations against the Planning Commission and saying that it is superfluous. But here I find the Chairman of the Planning

Commission, the Prime Minister of India, has reduced the position of the Planning Commission. He goes round the entire country giving blessings, distributing blessings and laying commemoration stones and foundation stones and so many other stones, the names for which will be found out later; and subsequently those things have got to be regularised by the Planning Commission, because there is no force in India, no power in India which can stand against the Prime Minister's blessings.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Hear, hear.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Thank you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: So you admit the weakness of the Swatantra Party.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Please have patience. You must have patience. Just listen to me. There is no power in the Government, I say- So once he has distributed his blessings, once he has laid the foundation stone or commemoration stone or whatever it is, the Planning Commission is reduced to the status of a secretariat and it has to regularise it and it has got to be put into some mould. Then what was wrong in the Swatantra Party saying that the Planning Commission is superfluous? Now it has been certified by the Chairman of the Planning Commission and the Prime Minister himself. What else is required to justify our stand? So it is he who has brought it down, and the Swatantra Party only made it public.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Are you opposed to the Tikerpara dam? Is it a mistake to have that dam?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That is a different matter and it is purely a local issue. Whether I am in favour of it or against it, I will tell the people. Why are you interested in it?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: I am interested in the whole of India.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Now I may just refer to a sub-leader written in The Statesman. It is like this:

The leader of the Opposition, Mr. R N. Singh Deo, inquired why the Prime Minister has been persuaded to lay the foundation stone of the Tikerpara dam when the project had not even received the sanction of the Planning Commission. Chief Minister no more, but chairman still of the State's Planning Board,"

And then there is some reference to Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed in Kashmir, and then it goes on:

"Mr. Biju Patnaik replied that such 'manoeuvre' was necessary because there was terrible competition among the States to get funds from, the Centre for regional development."

Is this the position where we stand? Is it some booty or the gain of some loot that we are dividing? We have a federal government and we have the various States. We persuade the Centre in our favour if there is a strong case in our favour and the Centre listens to us, if they are bent upon having a methodical planning. But what is this manoeuvre? With whom or before whom are we manoeuvring? With the Centre? Are you having a stepmotherly treatment from the Centre? Then resign from the Congress Party and get away. Tell them that they are not honest people, not the sort of people you would like to deal with.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Have the- straightforwordness? What is this manoeuvre going on, and manoeuvre with whom? This is something very surprising, if he has said this. He probably does not understand the federal system of Government.

Next, I would take up the question of Paradeep, a port to be built in Orissa. The Centre had not sanctioned it.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: You are all against Orissa.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I want Paradeep as badly as any other Oriya wants it but what we need is the sanction of the Centre. What is the reason why the Centre has not sanctioned this port? It sanctioned the construction of Haldia port in West Bengal. Then why not sanction the construction of Paradeep port? Orissa has abundant ores and minerals which could conveniently be exported from Paradeep. In his overenthusiasm for vote catching without getting the sanction of the Centre and the Planning Commission, our Chairman of the Planning Board has gone ahead with the project and whatever money we are getting for other projects in Orissa is being diverted to the Paradeep port because we do not get any money from the Centre for this project. Therefore, we are slow in our progress in all the other sectors. The money is diverted for an entirely different purpose. Here also, in the Mid-term Appraisal, when Paradeep is mentioned, the Planning Commission says that the development of Paradeep as an all-weather port is being undertaken by the Government of Orissa, while everything else is being done by the Government of India. What is wrong with Orissa alone?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY: Patnaik.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The Chairman of the Planning Board should have tried his level best; if he has any influence in the Centre, he should have exerted his influence to get this port constructed by the Centre or get the money from the Centre and use it instead of diverting money now allotted to Orissa for other development works. Even now I demand for Central financial sanction for Paradeep. With these words, Madam, I thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mohanlal Saksena. There are a number of names before me. Kindly restrict your speeches to fifteen minutes each.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA (Nominated) : Madam Deputy Chairman, at this fag end of the debate, I rise to make a few observations some pertinent remarks and a few suggestions. I should say that this mid-term appraisal is a dismal document which reveals a sorry state of affairs. It is a sad commentary on the performance of the planners during the last fourteen years. It not only reveals the shortfalls of the Third Five Year Plan but it also reveals to some extent people's pitiable plight and planners' predicament. Credit has been given to the framers of the Report for being frank and bold in revealing true facts. I do not know why credit should be given. How long could they be concealed? How long could the people be fooled? Even now, since the Report was presented, the prospects of the Plan have become more bleak. As the Minister for Planning himself admitted, the prospects of agricultural production, even for the ensuing year, are poor. Have we not heard during the past three or four months, after the presentation of the Appraisal, that men and women have died of exposure? Only this morning this question was raised in this House and I was sorry to hear what fell from the mouth of the Minister who was a close associate of Mahatma Gandhi. I was reminded of what Mahatma Gandhi said in Noakhali during the winter days when warm water was given to him for washing his hands and feet. He became angry and said that while people did not have the necessary fuel to keep themselves warm, giving him warm water for washing his hands and feet was not proper. His taking bath in warm water itself was a luxury. This is how he thought but now we find, not only in Delhi but in the whole of the country, many people have lost their lives because of exposure to cold. What has so far been done in this respect?

So far as this mid-term appraisal is concerned, I am not surprised at the shortfalls because they could have been seen to beforehand and should have been seen to beforehand. As a matter of fact, I

might remind this House that even at the time of the formulation of the Second Plan and at the time of the formulation of the Third Plan I had warned the planners that their schemes were not likely to yield the desired results but this warning fell on deaf ears. This was dismissed. It was not even considered. But today I find myself in good company because it has been said that if we put up a number of plants and yet if people continue to starve, remain miserable and do not have houses to live in, then it means that we have failed. Although we may have done a big thing in putting up these plants. These are not my words but this is what the Chairman of the Planning Commission himself had observed when the midterm appraisal was put up before the National Development Council.

Whether you take the question of unemployment or of corruption or whether you take the other burning questions—I do not want to give figures because they have already been given by more than one Member—you find the same story. I want to tell the House that there is something radically wrong with the approach of the Planning Commission and unless that approach is changed, I am sure we can never have the desired results. Things will become worse and worse. The House will remember that when the Prime Minister presented the Second Plan, he asked us to take it as an act of faith; when he had presented the Third Plan for the consideration of the House, he had observed that he felt thrilled at the rhythm of the performance of the two Plans but what does he say now? Even then I had told him and the House that, while he felt thrilled by the performance of the two Plans, I was distressed to listen to the groans of the unemployed. For me, a person who is prepared to work and cannot be given work, whether in the towns or in the villages, is the biggest challenge to all of us, planners, administrators and other public men. What is the position now? The number of the unemployed persons has gone up and up. It was a crore

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena.] and more and now it is rising every year by a few millions. Gandhiji used to say that so long as there was one man without work or food, you should know no rest, you should be ashamed to have a square meal, and yet we are not only having square meals but even tea; and our expenses on the entertainment etc. are increasing and have gone up to more than a crore during these fourteen years. This is how we are spending money. Mahatma Gandhi had warned us against these dinner parties and receptions and yet this is what is going on while people may be dying of exposure to cold or due to hunger or any thing else.

Not only this, Madam, my submission is that the Plans have come to grief because we have taken to a course contrary to the views and warnings of Mahatma Gandhi. I was reading the speech of the Prime Minister made in the other House while intervening on the discussion on this mid-term appraisal. In that I found one pertinent observation made by him. While he was criticising Mr. M. R. Masani for his attack on the Plan and planning, Mr. Mahavir Tyagi had reminded him that he was his own disciple. And thereupon he observed—4 P.M. ed, yes; the tragedy of it is that a pupil can go astray even with the best tuition. And that has reminded me of something else, of a bigger tragedy, with far-reaching and dire consequences in the country. I mean we who profess to be pupils of Mahatma Gandhi, we who swear by his name, we who continue to bask in his reflected glory, what have we done? Are we not, notwithstanding his views and warning, trying to do something against which he had definitely warned us? Did he not warn us against industrialisation? As a matter of fact the other day Mr. Vijay Singh referred to the book of Mr. Pyare Lal, 'Last Phase' and he gave some extracts of the letter that he had written to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I would refer to it now. I have inserted all the quotations here. I would have given extracts from speeches made in I

the course of the formulation of the Second Five Year Plan and even the quotations of Mahatma Gandhi. I have no time to refer to them. But he had definitely warned us against industrialisation. He had said that Jawaharlal believes that industrialisation will cease to be evil once it is socialised. But he warned us and said, 'so far as I am concerned I think it has got its inherent evils and even socialism will not make it good for this country'. Not only that; he said, God forbid that India should ever take to industrialisation' and his reason was that if a small island like Great Britain because of this industrialisation had to enslave so many countries, then if India took to industrialisation, it will mean disaster for the whole world. He also said . . .

SHRI AKBAR, ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): But how can we defend ourselves without industrialisation?

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA: I do not know. When you swear by Mahatma Gandhi you ought to follow him. Of course, he knew what he was talking about. These were his words. He said there are two approaches to planning. One was planning for prestige and power and the other was planning for peace and plenty. What he had objected to was planning for prestige and power. Against this he had definitely warned us. He said that the national planning or centralised planning to which we are taking will lead us nowhere; it will not at any rate improve the lot of the people. He had said so in so many words to which I have referred on another occasion too. Whatever the Plan might be, if it exploits only the natural resources and leaves the manpower or the human resources alone, it is a lop-sided plan. Whatever else it may bring about it can never bring about equality.

And that is what has happened today. A Committee called the Mahalanobis Committee has been appointed and it has been working for three or four years now. Even during the

discussions on the Third Five Year Plan there was a reference to this Committee and it has not been able to complete its job and submit its finding. The rich have become richer and the poor have become poorer and we are still looking up for the causes that have led to this. Did not Gandhiji tell us that the way we were proceeding, it will lead us to this sort of a crisis?

Now, what are you going to do with the unemployed? Anybody else can wait for the result of our Plans but not the unemployed. How long can they wait? And this means so much national loss, moral and material for the country. What does it come to when there are crores of persons who are not doing any work? Even if they could, be made to do work for 200 days a year and if their out-turn is valued at twelve annas a day, that will come to a very huge figure, some Rs. 150 crores or more. And that shows how much money has been lost.

Apart from the material loss, there is the moral loss. A person who is forced to remain idle becomes a danger to the society. As the proverb goes, Devil tempts man but the idle mind tempts Devil. An idle mind is the Devil's workshop. I am one of those who believe that even forced labour, *begar*, is better than enforced idleness, because that at least keeps your limbs moving. If you do not move your hands and feet for a long time they will get paralysed. Similarly if you have a large number of people living from day to day without any hope of work what will it lead to? Surely, they cannot wait till the end of the Fifth or the Sixth Plan. What has been the result of the three plans, it is before us. If one of the members of the family is idle, you always try to find out some work for him. That is what we should do. I personally feel that work could have been and should have been found for the unemployed people*.

Now, we have taken to large-scale planning. I had referred to Tunga-

bhadra dam in the State Mr. Akbar Ali Khan hails from. Now that dam has been built in stone masonry, not in cement and steel. Why? Because the Nizam's Government was opposed to building it with cement and steel. And the reason was that whatever money you spend on constructing this dam with stone masonry will go to the villagers, the persons who are going to be deprived of their land and that would help them to carry on for some time. Not only that; when you build a dam, a lot of land is submerged. If you build a dam with stone masonry at least some land will be reclaimed and that reclaimed land can be utilised for the farmers who are to be deprived of their land. And the third reason was that a dam built of cement and steel may have a life of say a hundred years or so. And we know how there is leakage etc. and how its life is reduced. We know what happened to a dam in Maharashtra. But if you build a stone dam, it does not require much repairs. After some time the grass grows there; trees grow there and the dam becomes as good as a mountain. These are the three arguments in favour of building a dam with stone masonry. The Madras Government had advocated constructing the Tungbhadra dam with cement and steel because the construction would be greatly expedited and there would be saving of interest. But the foreign experts, to whom the question was referred, agreed with the views of the Nizam's Government notwithstanding the delay in construction of the dam in stone. Besides considerable savings in foreign exchange, it provided so much employment. I had been pressing upon the Prime Minister again and again that instead of building these dams* with cement and steel—and now every state wants to have dams—we should build them with stone masonry. One day he told me, Mohanlal you have been writing to me about this. I have consulted my experts and they say that our dams are higher than the Tungbhadra Dam and therefore they could not be built in stone'. He was surprised on my asking if that was the only objec-

[Shri Mohan Lal Saksena.] tion. I said that it was not a valid argument, for the dams could be built of stone masonry up to the height of the Tungabhadra Dam and after that they could use cement and steel. And that way we could have got all the three advantages that I mentioned earlier; that is, you will be providing employment, you will be reclaiming some land and you will not be required to spend on repairs. But the Planning Commission goes on in its own way.

Now, no one has referred to the increase in the frequency of floods. Why have they increased? Apart from the natural causes, it is mainly because we have been building these dams. I have read a great deal of literature on the frequency of floods in America and there the engineers have come to the conclusion that the construction of dams leads to increased frequency of floods. And their reasoning is very simple; at least it appeared to me to be very simple. There is so much of sub-soil water in the country. If you take out that water for agricultural purposes, it is all right. If it is not taken out, the sub-soil water level rises as it has risen in Delhi. By building dam, instead of drawing water from underground, you are pouring water over it. That means the seeping capacity of the soil gets reduced and the rivers get flooded because in the capacity of the rivers to take in water is reduced. And therefore there is an increase in the frequency of floods. I do not know how far it is correct. It is for the engineers to examine it. But I know it for a fact that the frequency of floods has increased and has caused damage to the extent of hundreds of crores. It is not my estimate. The figures are given out by the Government. Now, I would submit that the tragedy has been that we have ignored the advice, the considered judgment of Mahatma Gandhi. We have taken a different course, a course which was contrary to his warning.

I will refer to only two or three points. One is that he said that he

was convinced, it was his firm conviction, that mass production all over the world was responsible for the present world crisis. And we are after mass production.

Now, so much is said about population control. We have not so far succeeded in our efforts to reduce the rate of growth of population. But we propose to spend Rs. 150 crores more. Here I have got a statement before me where Gandhiji says, with a proper land system, even with the present system of subsistence agriculture, we could with our own resources feed the people, notwithstanding the growing increase in population. I submit that we must not try to find an alibi that the population has increased. What about the population that existed even before you started planning? Have you been able to find sufficient work for them, sufficient food for them? You have not.

Then, again, we have not heeded the warning which Mahatma Gandhi gave and we are ignoring it. He said: For India to import food from abroad will lead to dependence worse than slavery and bankruptcy. That is what we are doing, instead of solving the problem. He has given a definite scheme. He said: Follow it for two years. Let every leader in the country go about stressing that we should eke out existence from whatever we have in the country but we should not import anything, whatever may happen. He was so positive. During the last few months before his death he had written so much about food production and about the dangers of importing food from other countries. America has only nine per cent, of its population engaged on agriculture and they are producing double the quantity of food that is required for their own purposes. So, they are able to export food.

My last submission is that the Planning Commission as well as the policy, requires overhauling. I am sorry the Prime Minister became the Chairman of the Planning Commission and it is

because of his prestige that undue advantage has been taken. Schemes have been passed without going into the details thereof. The other day Mr. Santhanam said that the Planning Commission had not been working as a committee of experts deciding on policies. They have become a Cabinet, sitting in the Yojana Bhavan. They plan when the people are starving and they are not having even adequate supply of drinking water. There has been reference to the basic needs and essential requirements of the people, but the most essential requirements are adequate supply of water. The highest priority was given to it even in the First Plan. But even in the Mid-Term Appraisal, we find that adequate water supply has not been made available. What does it lead to? I will just refer to one incident again from Mahatma Gandhi's life. Lord Lothian, who had later become the British Ambassador to the U.S.A., had come to Bombay. He wanted to see Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhiji wrote to him saying that he would like to see him at the Sevagram Ashram. He went and saw him there. Later on some friends had enquired from Mahatma Gandhi — when both of them were in Bombay why he had asked him to come and see him at Sevashram. He said: "Well, I would not have been able to get the language that I wanted to use, while living in Birla House. Still more, Lord Lothian could not have understood that language even if I would have used in the surroundings there." So, if Mahatma Gandhi could not visualise things in terms of these starving millions while sitting in Birla House, how can we expect these persons, who work here in the Yojana Bhavan, to visualise them? The staff has grown. They are spending about a crore and it may be even more. If there are shortfalls, they send out. There are these Working Groups. I would like some of them to go and stay in the villages, where there is no adequate supply of drinking water. We are leading artificial lives today. Just think of the man who has to drink water from the pond where men bathe and the cattle

wallow and drink. They have to drink such water. Can you stay there even for a few days? If you go there, then you will realise what are the basic needs of the people. Now, even in the First Plan you gave first priority to adequate supply of water. Even now, in this Mid-Term Appraisal you have said that you are going to make a survey. After fourteen years, after giving top priority in the First Plan, you say that and who is to be blamed for it? How many people must have died for want of proper and adequate supply of water?

With these words, I hope that you will take note of it. Valuable time has been wasted and naturally the question comes up: Is that to be the end of our lives labour? I often think of it. I will end by quoting two couplets: —

“बहुत दिनों तुम्हें अब जीना नहीं है,
बहुत काम करना है मरने के पहले;
उठती है अपने दिल में यह हूक जब कभी,
तभी सुनता हूँ आवाज बापू की सी;
‘हारो न हिम्मत बिसारो न रात्र,
करे जाओ कोशिश, किये जाओ काम ॥’

"You have not to live long and so much work has yet to be done before you pass away. Whenever I have such a feeling of anguish, I hear a voice like Bapu's saying, "Do not lose courage, do not forget God, make every effort and go on working."

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora, You will have to be brief.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Madam, I will be very brief and I will confine my remarks to employment and labour policy, a subject of vital importance, which appears to have been neglected during this discussion. There is in this country a great deal of absence of statistics about employment. And this Mid-Term Appraisal admits that a complete statistical picture of employment changes in the

[Shri Arjun Arora.] period is not available. That, I must submit, is highly deplorable, because employment particularly industrial employment, is a subject on which statistics are readily available. Anyhow, the Appraisal admits a shortfall in employment at the end of the Third Five Year Plan. They envisage a shortfall at the end and say: It appears that additional employment generated during the Third Plan period is likely to fall somewhat short of the original target of 14 millions. This position has arisen because instead of sanctioning labour-intensive projects and labour-intensive methods in industry, there has been a mad rush for sanctioning capital-intensive projects. These capital-intensive projects also imply a large amount of expenditure on foreign exchange. On the one hand, we find the Finance Minister and the Planning Commission lamenting the absence of adequate foreign exchange and on the other hand, we find them sanctioning, approving and allowing capital-intensive projects. That also should be given up and in accordance with the needs of the situation in the country, we should have labour-intensive methods which will give more employment and also save us from dependence on foreign donors.

One good thing done by the Government for labour during the last five years is to pursue the idea of workers' participation in management. But I am sorry that this scheme has remained confined to 60 units, 20 in the public sector and 40 in the private sector. The Government, particularly the Labour Ministry, express their great hopes from this scheme, but it still remains an experimental scheme confined to 60 units. I want to know for how long this scheme workers' participation in management will remain confined to a mere experiment. What is there which prevents its universal application at least in the public sector? I am a great supporter of the public sector and I want the public sector to grow, but I am not at all happy with the industrial relations in

the public sector. I am connected with a few unions of electric supply industries and Government presses, and I find . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Then you are supporting a wrong cause.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I find that the bureaucracy, which has come to occupy managerial positions, resists all possible demands of the workers; even the simplest and the most human demand of the workers are resisted by the wooden bureaucracy which has correctly been accused of squander-mania by my hon. friend, Mr. C. D. Pande. It is time that the public sector was given a democratic management and the wooden bureaucracy was not allowed to jeopardise the smooth running of the public sector industrial undertakings.

Madam, the scheme of workers' participation in management was enunciated by the Labour Minister as early as 1957. It is six years since it has been an experiment and it is time that Government accepted it and made it universally applicable to all public sector undertakings. The Government has so far given very little thought to the wage policy. All that it has done is to appoint a few Wage Boards. Nine Wage Boards have so far been appointed. The reports of four of these Wage Boards are available and they have been welcomed by all concerned. But these Wage Boards have accomplished only one thing. They have produced unanimous reports. But producing unanimous reports on wages is no substitute for a wage policy. As early as 1949 the concept of fair wages was accepted by the Government and it was also accepted by the tripartite Indian Labour Conference. In 1957, the concept of a fair minimum wage was accepted and certain norms were laid down by the Indian Labour Conference. These acceptances in theory have remained only acceptances of principle and they have not been implemented, and the mere setting up of nine Wage Boards for nine industries has given the workers of the

country very little. There are industries like water supply, electricity supply, engineering, and so on, which have grown phenomenally during the last fourteen years, whose capacity to pay has increased phenomenally during the periods of these three Plans, particularly in the case of engineering and electricity supply. But the workers are denied any 'fair share of the increased prosperity. Even Wage Boards have not been appointed for electricity supply, water supply and engineering industries.

The Government is thinking of appointing a second Wage Board for cotton textiles because it feels that after a lapse of five years cotton textile workers are entitled to a wage revision. Madam, is it not fair to ask Government what is its attitude about the workers engaged in electricity generation and distribution? They have not been given a Wage Board. When the textile workers are being given a second Wage Board and a second wage revision, it is only fair that the workers in other industries should be given at least one wage revision. The Government should have a wage policy and it should not merely appoint a Wage Board which invariably gives an *ad hoc* wage increase. An *ad hoc* wage increase, as has correctly been pointed out, is eaten away by the rising spiral of prices. We should have a wage policy. The wages should be linked to the cost of living. The wages should be need-based. These concepts have been accepted by the tripartite organisations but not given effect to by the Government. The result is that in some of the vital industries like electricity generation there is great discontent amongst workers all over the country. It is very good of the workers of these public utility undertakings that they have not resorted to strikes, but I do not know how long they will continue to 'face this sense of irresponsibility and callousness on the part of the Government.

The Government has taken some useful steps pertaining to social secu-

rity, and one of them is the Employees Provident Fund scheme which has given the Government during the last nine years Rs. 430 crores in deposits. But this figure of Rs. 430 crores would have been a much higher one if the Government was not hesitant in applying the scheme to more and more industries. When the scheme began, it was applied to six industries, and for a number of years it remained confined to six major industries. Now of course 23 additional industries have been covered by this Employees' Provident Fund scheme. But when the workers demand that the rate of provident fund should be increased, the Government is hesitant and it takes too great a sympathetic attitude towards the employers. While I find and every one finds, Madam, that the Government spends a large amount of money on propaganda and publicity pertaining to small savings, here are small wage-earners who want that the rate of provident fund in all industries should be 8 per cent, of the wages. But the Government does not make the thing applicable to all industries. In the case of four or five industries, the rate of provident fund has been increased from 6 per cent, to 8 per cent. The workers want to deposit more. They want to save more, but the Government is unwilling to encourage them. That is a deplorable state of affairs.

I will take one more minute, Madam. With regard to productivity, the need for greater productivity is recognised by all concerned. The wealth of the country is bound to grow if the output is greater with the increasing input. And the Government have been emphasising the need for great productivity. But I find that there is lack of co-ordination even in spite of the desire for greater productivity. The National Productivity Council is a body controlled by the Industry Ministry, and I find that each Ministry in the Government is an empire in itself, and the Labour Ministry appears to have nothing to do with the National Productivity Council. It has its own Productivity Centre at Bombay. That Centre is doing good work but the

[Shri Arjan Arora.]

National Productivity Council is also doing good work. Why cannot these efforts *eti* the two Ministries of the same Government be combined and greater productivity achieved? Greater productivity cannot be achieved merely by having better management; for greater productivity, it is necessary that labour should realise the worth of greater productivity. For that, it is necessary that incentive schemes should be made applicable to all industries. That is, not being done. The National Productivity Council had sponsored a couple of teams to go round this country and other countries to study the methods which give labour greater incentive to produce more and to add to productivity. These reports have remained a dead letter and they have not been applied to industry in any part of the country, with the result that productivity in the country, far from increasing, is falling. That is hardly a satisfactory state of affairs.

Thank you.

श्री चन्द्र शेखर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदय, किसी भी पिछड़े देश में और खास तौर से भारत ऐसे पिछड़े देश में जहाँ जनता को राजनैतिक अधिकार मिले हुए हैं आर्थिक विकास के लिये किसी योजना का चलाना बड़ा कठिन काम होता है। आजादी आने के बाद स्वाभाविक रूप से देश में रहने वाले लोगों की आकांक्षाएँ उभरती हैं और वे ऐसा समझते हैं कि उनकी सुख और समृद्धि के लिये सब कुछ किया जाना चाहिये। तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना की जो भूमिका लिखी गई उसके प्रारम्भ में ही यह कहा गया कि इस योजना का केवल एक मन्तव्य कि इस देश के लोग क्रमिक रूप से, धीरे धीरे, समृद्धि की ओर, विकास की ओर अग्रसर हो सके। लेकिन इतने बड़े देश में जहाँ पर सैकड़ों वर्षों तक गुलामी के दिनों में देश के विकास के लिये, आर्थिक उत्थान के लिये, कुछ न किया गया हो जब अचानक यह जिम्मेदारी आ पड़े और साथ ही देश में सारे जन समूह

को नागरिक अधिकार, राजनैतिक अधिकार, मिले हुए हों तो हमारा हर एक काम बड़े संतुलित ढंग से होना चाहिये। अगर हमारा एक भी कदम गलत होता है तो उसका परिणाम भयावह होता है। आपके जरिये से मैं हुकूमत से यह निवेदन करना चाहूँगा कि मैं महसूस करता हूँ, मानता हूँ कि आर्थिक विकास में अनेक कठिनाइयाँ हो सकती हैं और उन कठिनाइयों का खयाल सरकारी पार्टी को होना चाहिये और विरोधी दलों को होना चाहिये, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ यदि सरकार की तरफ से कोई भूलें होती हैं, कोई गलतियाँ होती हैं, तो उनको सुधारने का काम भी सरकार की ओर से होना चाहिये।

आज दो तरह के तत्व हमारे देश में काम कर रहे हैं। कुछ लोग आर्थिक नियोजन के बीच में जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं उनका फायदा उठा कर सारी योजना को ही निर्मूल बनाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, कुछ लोग इस बात के ऊपर बार बार जोर दे रहे हैं कि नियोजित अर्थ प्रणाली व्यर्थ सिद्ध हो चुकी है इसलिये आज के समाज में इसका कोई स्थान नहीं दूसरी तरफ हुकूमत में जो लोग हैं वह आज अपनी भूलों को मान करके उसे सुधारने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। चाहे मंशा दो हों लेकिन नतीजा एक ही निकलता है। माननीय बलोराम भगत जी ईमानदारी से चाहते होंगे कि इस देश का आर्थिक विकास हो लेकिन उनकी हुकूमत के जरिये से जो काम होता है उसका यह नतीजा निकलता है कि योजनाओं के प्रति जनता का विश्वास टूटता जा रहा है। हमारे माननीय मित्र श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र जी के विचार दूसरे हो सकते हैं लेकिन उनके कहने का भी परिणाम यही है कि आर्थिक नियोजन के प्रति देश की जनता की आस्था टूटती है।

अब, अगर देश में समृद्धि लानी है तो उसके लिए क्या करना पड़ेगा? यह सत्य है कि मनुष्य की मौलिक मांग यह होती है कि उसको खाना मिलना चाहिये और इस देश

में जब तक अधिक अनाज पैदा नहीं होता तब तक और कोई तरीका नहीं है कि इस देश के लोगों को खाना दिया जा सके। हो सकता है कि हुकूमत दो, चार, दस, बीस वर्ष तक और बाहर की मदद से देश को खाना देती रहे लेकिन जब तक यहाँ की शस्य श्यामला धरती से अधिक अनाज पैदा नहीं होगा तब तक इस देश को बढ़ती हुई आबादी को खाना देना, भोजन देना, सम्भव नहीं हो पायेगा। अगर यहाँ पर अधिक अनाज पैदा करना है तो क्या करना होगा उसके लिये, अनाज पैदा करने के लिये और कोई उपाय नहीं है। चाहे पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जो भाषण दें चाहे हम लोग भाषण दें, इन भाषणों से कोई अनाज पैदा होने वाला नहीं है। मनुष्य की आवश्यकताओं को पूरा करने के लिये जितनी वस्तुओं की आवश्यकता है उनका उत्पादन करने का एक ही तरीका है—प्रकृति ने हमको कुछ वस्तुयें प्रदान की हैं और मनुष्य की जब उसमें ताकत लगती है तब उससे हमारी आवश्यकता की वस्तुयें निकलती हैं, इस धरती के ऊपर जब किसान अपनी बाढ़ें लगाता है, अपनी ताकत को लगाता है तब उससे अनाज पैदा होता है। आज नहीं, १७-१८ वर्षों से हमारी पार्टी ने बार बार कहा कि जमीन उनके हाथों में दो जो जमीन के ऊपर मेहनत करके सकते हों, आजादी आने के बाद हमारी मांग हुई कि जमीन को खेतिहर मजदूरों के हाथों में दो, उन लोगों के हाथों में दो जो कि इसके ऊपर खेती कर सकें लेकिन आज १७ वर्ष बाद भी क्या हालत है? आज भी मिड-टर्म एप्रैजल में कहा जाता कि भूमि सुधार होना चाहिये। आज इस देश में जिसके हाथों में ताकत है उसके पास जमीन नहीं कि वह अपनी ताकत की आजमाइश कर सके और दूसरी तरफ जिनके पास जमीन है, जिनके पास हजारों एकड़ के फार्म हैं, उनके हाथों में ताकत नहीं, मनुष्य नहीं, जोर नहीं, कि उस जमीन से अनाज पैदा कर सकें।

यह विषमता है, यह उल्टी गंगा है जो कि इस देश में बह रही है। इसके लिये जिम्मेदारी इस हुकूमत को लेनी चाहिये। क्या कहा जाता है तीन चार वर्ष पहले कहा गया कि भूमि सुधार होना चाहिये, सारी राज्य सरकारों को भूमि सुधार के लिये कहा गया। योजना आयोग ने कहा, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कहा लेकिन उसके बाद क्या हुआ? कहीं पर भी इस तरह से भूमि सुधार नहीं हुआ, जोत की हदबन्दी इस तरीके से नहीं हुई कि जमीन सही मानों में खेतिहर मजदूरों के हाथ में जा सके। चार वर्ष तक हुकूमत की ओर से प्रचार होता रहा कि जमीन के ऊपर हदबन्दी लगाई जायगी और जब सारी जमीन लोग गलत तरीके से कानूनी दावपेंच के जरिये से बांट लेते हैं तब उसके बाद एक ढोंग, एक स्वांग, एक नाटक रचा जाता है कि जोत के ऊपर हदबन्दी लगाई जा रही है। हुकूमत से मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर अधिक अनाज पैदा करना है, अगर भारत को खाने पीने के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर बनाना है तो पहला काम यह होना चाहिये कि जितने भूमि सुधार के कानून हैं वे सही मानों में, नियोजित ढंग से इस तरह लागू किये जायें कि जमीन का मालिक वह हो, जमीन उसके हाथों में हो जिसके हाथों में ताकत है कि इस धरती से अनाज पैदा कर सके। हुकूमत इस काम को करने में नाकामयाब रही है। प्लानिंग कमीशन के, योजना आयोग के दिल व दिमाग में यह बात रही हो लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि उस बात को कार्य रूप में परिणत करने में योजना आयोग विफल रहा, नाकामयाब रहा और मरकजी हुकूमत सूबाई हुकूमतों को इस बात के लिये मजबूर नहीं कर सकी। हमारे किसी भित्त ने कहा कि कुछ काम लेने चाहिये जिनको कराने का हुकूमत, योजना कमीशन, योजना आयोग एक अह्द करें, प्रतिज्ञा करें। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि अगर सही मानों में समाजवादी समाज की आप कल्पना करते हैं— समाजवादी समाज की बात छोड़िये—अगर

[श्री चन्द्र शेखर]

इस भारत के अर्थतन्त्र को चलाना है, अगर देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था को ठीक करना है तो पहला कदम भूमि सुधार का आपको उठाना चाहिये।

दूसरी बात, तीसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना को बनाते समय यह कहा गया था कि जितनी पब्लिक सेक्टर इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, जितने उद्योग राज्य की ओर से चलाये जाते हैं उनकी देख-रेख के लिये कुछ काम करना चाहिये। उनका ऐसा नियंत्रण होना चाहिये कि इनकी व्यवस्था ठीक तरह से हो सके। लेकिन आज तीन वर्षों के बाद भी फिर वही रोना रोया जाता है कि यह नहीं हो सका। आज नहीं, पिछले चार-छः महीनों में यह बहस चली कि इन पब्लिक अन्डर टेकिंग्स को सुपरवाइज करने के लिये एक पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी बैठाई जाय। उस समय यह कहा गया कि जल्दी यह कमेटी बनने वाली है, नहीं बन पायी। हम नहीं समझते इसका क्या मतलब होता है। क्यों नहीं बन सकती? योजना आयोग और हमारे मंत्री महोदय यह सोचें कि आखिर इस प्रजातन्त्र में जो राजकीय उद्योग चल रहे हैं उनके बारे में जन मानस में आप क्या विचार पैदा करना चाहते हैं? क्या आप लोगों को इस बात के लिये मजबूर करना चाहते हैं कि वे श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र की बात को मान कर या अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी की बात मानकर कहें कि यह राष्ट्रीयकरण बेमानी है, सारे उद्योग व्यक्तिगत पूंजीपतियों के हाथ में जाने चाहिये। यह अफसोस है कि हमारा योजना आयोग सरकार को सही कदम उठाने के लिये मजबूर नहीं कर सका।

अभी माननीय अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने जो इशारा किया, मैं समझता हूँ कि जो निजी उद्योगपति हैं उनके और श्रमिकों के बीच में कोई तनाव रहे, मनमुटाव रहे, उनके साथ ब्याबती हो रही हो, उनके साथ न्याय नहीं

किया जाता, तो फिर इसका क्या नतीजा निकलने वाला है। मुझे आश्चर्य होता है जब कांग्रेस पार्टी के प्रवक्ता एक महोदय पहले समाजवादी समाज की कल्पना से ओतप्रोत होकर भुवनेश्वर से दिल्ली आते हैं और पार्लियामेंट में आकर एक नयी समाजवाद की रूपरेखा हमारे सामने रखना चाहते हैं। मेरा इशारा है माननीय के० के० शाह की ओर। उन्होंने भाषण किया कि अगर मजदूरों को लाभ में हिस्सा दिया जाय तो उस लाभ में हिस्सा देने से धीरे धीरे मजदूर इस हालत में हो जायेगा कि उद्योग मजदूर के कब्जे में हो जाएगा और राष्ट्रीयकरण की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी। मैं बड़े अदब से कहना चाहूंगा कि समाजवाद कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था नहीं है, कोई ऐसी कल्पना नहीं है कि जिसको धीरे धीरे किसी बनिफ के हिसाब किताब से लाकर देश में प्रतिष्ठापित कर दिया जाय। समाजवाद एक नयी व्यवस्था है, जिन्दगी का नया तर्जोअमल है, जिसमें आज के सामाजिक ढांचे में आमूल परिवर्तन करना होगा।

हमारे प्रोफेसर वाडिया ने कहा कि लोगों को प्रेरणा मिलनी चाहिये विकास के लिये। मैं एक बार पहले भी कह चुका हूँ—प्रेरणा किसको मिलनी चाहिये? क्या प्रेरणा चंद पूंजीपतियों को, चंद सरमायादारों को देनी चाहिये, जिसके लिये प्रोफेसर वाडिया साहब परेशान हैं, जिसके लिये हमारे माननीय मिश्र जी परेशान हैं? प्रेरणा देश के करोड़ों लोगों जो जा आज भूख से मर रहे हैं, परेशान हो रहे हैं, उनको मिलनी चाहिये। जिस दिन उनके दिल और दिमाग साफ हो जायेंगे, जिस दिन वे समझने लगेंगे फिर क्या होने वाला है इस सारे प्रजातन्त्र का—मैं जब यह बात कहता हूँ तो कोई भावावेश में आकर, कोई भावना में आकर नहीं कहता हूँ। मैं इस लिये कहता हूँ कि इस देश का गरीब जब तक नहीं समझेगा कि उसकी आकांक्षाओं की ओर आशाओं की पूर्ति के लिये इस देश

में, समाज में, कुछ किया जा रहा है तब तक संभव नहीं है कि प्रजातांत्रिक जमाने में प्रजातांत्रिक तरीके से इस योजना को कामयाब किया जा सके।

महोदया, आज प्रातः काल जब मैंने माननीया स्वास्थ्य मंत्री जी का एक भाषण सुना प्रश्नोत्तर काल में तो मैं हैरान रह गया और मुझे इससे अधिक आश्चर्य शायद कभी नहीं हुआ कि महात्मा गांधी के चरणों में रहने वाली डा० सुशीला नायर कहें कि यह हुकूमत यह नहीं कह सकती कि 'एक्सपोजर' से लोग मर गए या डिसेन्ट्री से मर गये। मैंने कहा, मनुष्य का मष्तिष्क केवल विज्ञान के तरीके से नहीं चलता। महात्मा गांधी की उस बात की मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कांग्रेस के मित्रों को और खासकर डा० सुशीला नायर को—उन्होंने कहा था कि सियासत दिल और दिमाग दोनों से होती है, जो केवल दिल से सियासत करता है वह गलत रास्ते पर चला जाता है और जो केवल दिमाग से करता है वह मानव का कल्याण नहीं कर सकता। जहाँ ऐसा सवाल उठे कि एक्सपोजर से लोग मर जायें, ठंड से मर जायें, तो हुकूमत को शर्म होनी चाहिये और गलती को स्वीकार करना चाहिए। एक प्रजातांत्रिक देश में अखबार में कोई खबर छपे और मिनिस्टर यह कहे कि हमने उस पर इन्वयरी नहीं की, तो इससे अधिक अप्रजातांत्रिक मनोवृत्ति और कोई नहीं है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि उन गरीब लोगों के प्रति हमारे दिल में और हमारे दिमाग में एक नयी भावना, एक नया जज्बा, एक नयी प्रेरणा पैदा करनी पड़ेगी। जब तक यह नहीं किया जाता है तब तक कोई उपाय नहीं है कि इस देश का प्रजातांत्रिक तरीके से उत्थान किया जा सके।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि हमारी रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि सामाजिक कल्याण का जो काम हुआ, उसको भी हम

पूरी तरह से नहीं कर सके। जो पिछड़ी जातियों के लोग हैं, शिड्यूलड ट्राइब्स के लोग हैं उनकी शिक्षा के लिये जो रुपये दिया गया उसका १७ फी सदी पिछले तीन वर्षों में खर्च किया जा सका है। रोज इस पार्लियामेंट में सवाल पूछे जाते हैं। जवाब क्या मिलता है मंत्रियों से कि स्टेट गवर्नमेण्ट्स उसको पूरा नहीं कर रही हैं। स्टेट गवर्नमेण्ट अगर पूरा नहीं कर रही हैं तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी किसकी है? और आज कांग्रेस के हाथ में जो ताकत है, उस ताकत को रख कर कांग्रेस के लोग यह कह कर अलग नहीं हो सकते। अगर आज एक जगह एक चीफ मिनिस्टर को हटा कर दूसरा चीफ मिनिस्टर बनाया जा सकता है तो क्या कांग्रेस पार्टी, क्या प० जवाहरलाल नेहरू अपनी शक्ति का उपयोग इस बात के लिये नहीं कर सकते कि जो हुकूमत सामाजिक सेवाओं के लिए दिये गये रुपये को खर्च नहीं कर सकती, वहाँ के चीफ मिनिस्टर को, वहाँ की कैबिनेट को एक मिनट भी रहने का अधिकार नहीं। मैं आपको अपने सूबे उत्तर प्रदेश की बात बताता हूँ जिसकी सब से अधिक दुर्दशा है, जो बीमारी में सब से आगे, अशिक्षा में सब से आगे और आर्थिक विकास की दृष्टि से जहाँ देश में पांचवें या तीसरे नम्बर पर था, वह अब पीछे होता जा रहा है। रोज अगड़े हो रहे हैं वहाँ पर। यह सब क्यों होता है? कांग्रेस पार्टी उसको हल करने में नाकामयाब है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले जब इसी सदन में शिड्यूलड कास्ट और शिड्यूलड ट्राइब्स की रिपोर्ट के ऊपर बहस हो रही थी तब हमारे एक हरिजन भाई ने यहाँ पर यह सवाल उठाया कि आज भी माताएं और बहिनें सिर पर पाखाना लेकर सबेरे गलियों में निकलती हैं तो हमारे कुछ कांग्रेस के दोस्तों ने कहा कि तुम अविश्वास पैदा कर रहे हो, तुम घृणा पैदा कर रहे हो। मैं माननीय नियोजन मंत्री से जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या उन की नियोजन वाली परम्परा में, सत्रह वर्ष की आजादी के बाद, हिन्दुस्तान के

[श्री चन्द्र शेखर]

नर नारी सिर पर पाखाना लेकर सवेरे गलियों में निकलते हैं ? अगर यह है हमारा नजरिया सारे नियोजन के बारे में तो मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि आपका प्रज्ञानत्र चलने वाला नहीं है, चाहे आप इस के लिए कुछ करें। सामाजिक सेवाओं में जहां शिक्षा देनी जरूरी है, वहां उनका सामुदायिक विकास होना आवश्यक है, वहां क्या योजना आयोग और योजना मंत्री इस मदन को विश्वास दिला सकते हैं कि एक साल के भंडार—उसमें बड़े पैमाने की जरूरत नहीं है, केवल मनोवृत्ति की जरूरत है—एक साल के भंडार ऐसी व्यवस्था की जायगी हर एक म्यूनिसिपैलिटी को, हर एक कारपोरेशन को इतना खर्चा दिया जायगा कि कोई भी स्त्री पुरुष इस राष्ट्र में इस बात के लिये मजबूर न हो कि पाखाना ले कर अपनी रोटी कमाने के लिए, अपनी आजीविका कमाने के लिये सवेरे सवेरे हमारी सड़कों से ऊपर परेड करे।

मैं इन सवालों के साथ एक दूसरे सवाल के ऊपर कुछ जिक्र करना चाहूंगा, जिसका बड़ा जिक्र किया गया है क्योंकि मेरे पास समय कम है। अभी पिछले दो, तीन दिनों से इस योजना आयोग के बारे में भाषण करते हुए—मैं नहीं समझता क्या प्रयोजन था हमारे मित्रों का प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की परेशानी से कि वे बहुत परेशान नजर आते हैं, और खास कर हमारे कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के दो प्रवक्ता माननीय असवपुर्नैरा साहब और भूपेश गुप्त जी को बड़ी परेशानी है। मैं यह समझता हूं कि कोई भी विरोधी दल या कोई भी राजनैतिक दल अगर किसी की गलतियों की ओर इशारा करे तो हमें कोई उससे शिकायत नहीं होती, लेकिन अगर कोई विरोधी दल किसी के वक्तव्यों को तोड़ मरोड़ कर रखे तो मुझे नहीं मालूम होता कि आखिर उसमें मंशा क्या है। चूंकि माननीय भूपेश गुप्त यहां हैं इसलिये उनका कुछ जिक्र करना चाहूंगा। उनको इस बात पर ऐतराज है कि श्री अशोक मेहता ने योजना आयोग का उपाध्यक्ष होने के बाद यह कहा कि विदेशी पूंजी को इस देश में आना

चाहिये और वह ठीक तरह से काम कर सके इस के लिए प्रेरणा मिलनी चाहिये। उनको बड़ा ऐतराज है कि शायद विदेशी पूंजीपतियों का यहीं पर आधिपत्य कायम हो जायेगा। मैं नहीं जानता कि भूपेश गुप्त जी बड़े समाजवादी हैं या लेनिन बड़े समाजवादी थे। मैं माननीय भूपेश गुप्त से जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या सोवियट रूस में जब आर्थिक विकास की परम्परा शुरू हुई थी तो क्या उस जमाने में सोवियट यूनियन ने और उसके महान् नेता लेनिन ने दूसरे देशों से मदद नहीं ली थी ? अगर वह मदद लेना रूस के लिये उचित थी, अगर वह मदद लेना आंतिकारी परम्परा का एक अंग था तो मैं नहीं समझता कि भारतवर्ष के लिए वह परम्परा क्यों नहीं कायम हो सकती। श्री अशोक मेहता ने यह भी नहीं कहा था कि केवल अमेरिका और ब्रिटेन से ही पूंजी लाई जा सकेगी, बल्कि उन का मतलब यह था पूर्व यूरोप के देशों से और रूस से भी पूंजी हमारे यहां लग सकती है। वह आज भी लग रही है, आगे भी लगेगी। क्या यह सही नहीं है कि कम्युनिस्ट देशों की पूंजी हमारे आर्थिक विकास के काम में उपयोग में लाई जा रही है ? अगर दिक्कत यह है कि कम्युनिस्ट देश पूंजी नहीं दे सकते तो इसके लिये जरूरत नहीं है कि हम अपना सारा आर्थिक विकास हमेशा के लिए छोड़ दें।

दूसरी बात उन्होंने कही—करो का समर्थन किया, टैक्सों का श्री अशोक मेहता ने समर्थन किया। इस मिलसिले में, मैं जिक्र कर दूं कि उन्होंने कहा कि अशोक मेहता जी ने कहा है कि १० परसेंट लाभ कम से कम होना चाहिये। अगर उन्होंने उन का वक्तव्य ठीक ढंग से पढ़ा होता तो उन्हें मालूम होता कि उन्होंने यह कहा कि जहां निजी उद्योगों में यह लाभ होना चाहिये वहां पर सरकारी उद्योगों में भी इसी जहानियत से काम होना चाहिये। मैं माननीय भूपेश गुप्त का ध्यान ब्रिस्बे के उस बयान की ओर ले जाना चाहूंगा जिसमें ब्रिस्बेव साहब ने यह

कहा था कि कैपिटलिस्ट सिस्टम, पूँजीवादी सिस्टम से, हम को एक बात सीखनी चाहिये कि जो हमारे उद्योग चले हैं उन्हें वांछनीय रूप देने का ढंग है, वह इस पैराये पर हो कि उससे अधिक से अधिक लाभ हो सके और फिर उस लाभ को देश के विकास में लगाया जा सके। अगर हाथचैव यह कहते हैं तो यह समाजवादी है, अगर हाथचैव यह कहते हैं तो यह कान्तिकारी परम्परा है। अगर माननीय अशोक मेहताजी उसी बात को भारत के विकास के लिए कहते हैं तो यह प्रतिगामी कदम हो जाता है। केवल कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के महान नेता ही इस तरह की व्याख्या करने में पटु हैं।

दूसरी बात जो उन्होंने करों के सम्बन्ध में कही वह भी बिल्कुल सार्थक थी। अशोक मेहता जी ने चैम्बर आफ़ कामर्स के अपने भाषण में यह कहा था कि टैक्स उनके ऊपर लगाना चाहिये जो टैक्स देने लायक हैं। टैक्स उन्हीं पर लगाया जाय जो टैक्स देने लायक हों और तब ही वह व्यावसायिक टैक्स होगा। इस सिलसिले में अशोक मेहता जी के भाषण को उन्हें पढ़ना चाहिये। उन्होंने जो १० फीसदी लाभ की बात कही है, वहाँ यह भी कहा कि १० फीसदी लाभ कमाने वाले लोगों के ऊपर टैक्स लगाना चाहिये और इन लोगों को टैक्स देने के लिए तैयार रहना चाहिये। बदकिस्मती या खुशकिस्मती ने भारत देश को जो संविधान बना हुआ है, जो मौलिक अधिकार मिले हुए हैं, उसमें हम परिवर्तन नहीं कर सकते हैं और उनके रहते हुए अगर अशोक मेहता जी यह कहते हैं कि १० पर्सेंट मुनाफ़ा कमाने वालों को अधिक टैक्स लगाओ और वह टैक्स, वह मुनाफ़ा समाज के कल्याण के लिए, समाज के विकास के लिए लगाया जाय, तो इसमें कौन सी गलती है? यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है?

मुझे अफसोस है कि जब कोई एक कदम उठाया जाता है तो यह कहा जाता है कि विरोधी दल की ओर से आक्षेप होता है किन्तु

कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोग यह कहने के लिए मुझे माफ़ करेंगे, वे भी एक कदम आगे बढ़ाकर पीछे हटने की कोशिश करते हैं। जिस समय अशोक मेहता जी को श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने प्लानिंग कमीशन के मेम्बरों का परिचय कराया था तो क्या कहा था? उन्होंने कहा था कि सारे देश के निश्चित में एक सड़न आ गई है और उस सड़न को दूर करने के लिए, गतिशीलता लाने के लिए, अशोक मेहता जी जैसे व्यक्ति को हम ने नियुक्त किया है मुझे अफसोस होता है कि कुछ कांग्रेस के मेम्बरों ने मुझ से कहा था कि तुम्हारे एक आदमी को हम ने योजना आयोग का उपाध्यक्ष बना दिया है तुम को हमारा शुक्रगुजार होना चाहिये। अगर ऐसे संकीर्ण दायरे के अन्दर आप इस देश की राजनीति को चलाना चाहते हैं तो इस देश के लिए कोई भविष्य नहीं है। जब आक्षेप कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की ओर से होता है, जब आक्षेप दूसरे लोगों की ओर से होता है, अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी कह सकते हैं—तो मुझे अफसोस है कि माननीय नियोजन मंत्री जी इस बात को नहीं कह सकते कि अशोक मेहता जी देश की राजनीति में अकेले आदमी हैं जिन्होंने संकीर्ण राजनीति की दलबन्दी से आगे निकलकर देश के आर्थिक विकास के लिए देश की समृद्धि के लिए और देश को उत्कर्ष पर पहुँचाने के लिए अपनी राजनीतिक प्रतिष्ठा की परवाह नहीं की। हम मानते हैं कि हमारे पार्टी में इस पर मतभेद है लेकिन कांग्रेस के लोगों ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या किया? विरोधी दल में, मैं माननीय भूपेश गुप्त की बात समझ सकता हूँ जिन्हें जनतंत्र में विश्वास नहीं है। मैं श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र की बात समझ सकता हूँ जिनका आर्थिक नियोजन में विश्वास नहीं है, लेकिन कांग्रेस के लोग जो समाजवादी हैं उनका क्या हाल है?

माननीय महोदया, मैं एक बात कह कर खत्म कर दूंगा। पुराणों में एक कथा है। रावण का सब लोगों ने नाम सुना होगा। रावण को एक बार यह आभास हुआ कि

[श्री चन्द्र शेखर]

मैं इतना बड़ा तपस्वी हूँ, सारे ऐश्वर्य, सारे वैभव, मैं अपने तप से प्राप्त कर सकता हूँ तो फिर क्यों लड़ाई लड़े राम से। मैं ही क्यों न हो जाऊँ राम, अपनी तपस्या से। रावण ने यह फैसला करके तपस्या करना शुरू किया। लेकिन जिस समय तपस्या करना शुरू किया उसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि उसमें जितनी राक्षसी वृत्तियाँ थीं, वे एक एक करके टूटने लगीं, गिरने लगीं। उसको यह मालूम होने लगा कि उसकी जो ताकत है वह कम होने लगी है और वह अपने से घबरा गया। घबरा कर उसने कहा कि नहीं उसको राक्षस ही रहना मंजूर है। कांग्रेस पार्टी का भी वही हाल है। कांग्रेस पार्टी एक समय सोचती है कि क्यों न वह प्रजातांत्रिक समाजवादी हो जाय। प्रजातांत्रिक समाजवादी होने का फैसला करते हुए वह सही रास्ते में एक कदम उठाती है। लेकिन जब पुरानी शृंखलाएँ, परम्पराएँ, जो स्रोत शक्ति के हैं, वे टूटते नज़र आते हैं तो सोचने लगती है कि क्यों न मोरारजी का सहयोग लिया जाय, क्यों न एस० के० पाटिल का सहयोग लिया जाय, टाटा विरला के गोद से क्यों अलग हों। इस तरह से वह टूटकर बिखरकर, हिम्मत हारकर फिर सड़ान में पड़ी रहना पसन्द करती है। आज भारतीय राजनीति में और देश के आर्थिक विकास में कांग्रेस पार्टी के लिए और सारे प्रजातांत्रिक समाजवादियों के लिए एक मौका आया है कि वे सोचें कि क्या जो राक्षस है वह राक्षस रहना चाहता है या फिर राक्षसी वृत्ति को छोड़कर, अपनी ताकत को थोड़े समय के लिए कम करके भी एक ऐश्वर्ययुक्त समाजवादी रहना चाहता है जो नये समाज की कल्पना कर सके, जो नये हिन्दुस्तान का निर्माण कर सके।

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI (Gujarat):
Madam Deputy Chairman, the Midterm Appraisal document which is before the House is a very frank statement of the achievements and failures of our economy. The hon.

Members who have preceded me have drawn various conclusions from this document. While some Members have said that planning has completely failed and it should be given up, others have stated that our economy is at a stagnant stage. To my mind, Madam, the correct interpretation is that in certain sectors of our economy only our targets have not been achieved. And that is why we have not been able to accelerate the growth of our national income as desired. The growth of national income was envisaged to be 5 per cent, but it is, unfortunately, in the first two years of the Plan only 2-5 per cent. But there are very cogent reasons for it. And that is why we have not been able to achieve the target.

Madam, before I deal with these reasons, I would refer to one **fact**. There are certain factors about our planning which we have to keep in view. Ours is a democratic planning. And democratic planning has got its own inherent difficulties. For instance, in a totalitarian planning labour can be asked to go wherever they like. They can sell goods to whatever foreign countries they like at whatever price. They can earn foreign exchange. They can purchase goods of foreign countries. Also they can concentrate on certain heavy industries. It is possible only because even if the people are denied certain consumer goods there is nobody to complain in a totalitarian economy. Then, they can control the prices as they like. These are some of the advantages of a totalitarian planning which is confined to Communist countries. But ours is democratic planning and in this planning we have our inherent difficulties to face. That is why our rate of progress at times is slow. But, after all, democratic planning is something to which we are wedded.

Then, Madam, we have got to reconcile our democratic planning with the socialist ideals also. For instance, we believe in public ownership and

we have to develop our public sector. There has been a lot of criticism about the public sector from certain quarters. For instance, all the public sector industries are heavy industries. They are not profit-earning consumer industries. They take a gestation period of, say, ten years. Ten years is not a long time for heavy industries to develop.

Then there is also the question of lack of technically trained personnel at the highest level for our public sector also. In the private sector, people grow with the industry from father to son. But in the public sector it is not so. At the highest level we have a dearth of technically trained personnel of the right type. Now we are coming up. Within ten years people have been trained and in another ten years' time, people will be trained further and the public sector will also begin to show results in the next few years.

Then the other thing which we have to reconcile with our planning is that we are not merely developing our industries and agriculture only but we have got our social objectives also. For instance our educational institutions have spread far and wide in the country. Technical education is also prevalent and is being given to more and more students. Then medical care, hospital care is also being extended to more and more people. The workers' benefits are also given. Provident Fund, insurance, bonus, dearness allowance—all these are given to the workers also. So all these social objectives are also met along with our planning and that is why a certain amount of our allocation for planning has to be set aside for our social objectives also. It is not that we merely develop our industries and agriculture only. If we take all the problems in our proper perspective, we have progressed much in the last 13 years of planning. Our achievements are not small. It is only at certain quarters we find that there is a tendency to belittle our achievements, but I may say that in all the countries of Asia, newly independent countries

of Asia and in all the newly independent countries of Africa, our record of progress, economic progress is the best one. This is not a mean achievement if we consider all the developing countries together. At times people point to or we finger at certain sections of it and begin to damn the whole thing. It is better to take the whole picture, a comprehensive view of the whole of our economy and our social objectives and then only we can find out up to what limit we have progressed.

Coming to the reason the slow growth of our economy, there have been shortfalls in agricultural production. Agricultural production in 1960-61 was 81 per cent.—annual rate of growth. In 1961-62 it was 1.6 per cent, while our annual target was 6 per cent. A number of things have been said about betterment of agriculture and I will not take the time of the House further in enumerating that good seeds should be available or fertilizer or water should be available or more irrigation facilities should be made available. I will stress only one point that we would require better leadership in the agricultural sector also. The people who manage our Extension Services and Community Development Projects do not provide that kind of leadership and that kind of talent which is very necessary if we want to bring up our agricultural sector. The farmer has to take to modern methods of cultivation and for that the proper leadership must be provided for by our Community Development Projects and Extension Services.

Coming¹ to industries, the 1961-92 rate of growth was 6.6 per cent, while in 1962-63 the rate was 11 per cent. That is also a shortfall because our targeted rate of growth was 11.1 per cent. But we have to face a number of difficulties about foreign exchange also. The idle capacity in our various industries is about 20 per cent, on an average and in some it is as much as 50 per cent. This idle capacity is there simply because we have not been able to provide foreign exchange for com-

TS. Shri Suresh J. Desai.] ponents, spare parts and for technical advice even and in some cases even for raw materials, because we have not been able to secure foreign exchange. That is why this idle capacity is there in the industry.

Another thing is, the investment climate has to be fostered. Because of our difficulties with China and because of so many other factors also the investment climate was not as it should have been and because of these factors which are beyond our control and because of the aggression of China and all these things, the investment climate in this country suffered and the foreign collaborator who would have easily come, was not willing last year to come forward with participation in our industries. The additional capacity licensed but remaining uncovered by foreign exchange is something like 53·6 per cent, in alloy and special steel industries, 60 per cent, in pig iron, 90 per cent, in tin plate, 47·5 per cent, in steel casting, 65 per cent, in nitrogenous fertilisers, 80·9 per cent, in aluminium and 57·5 per cent, in cement. This is quite a significant figure. Simply because we have not been able to get foreign participation on account of a number of factors—I need not go into that—we have not been able to cover this with enough foreign collaboration. It is very necessary therefore that foreign collaboration should be properly encouraged and a climate for investment should be created in this country.

This morning Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to the question of foreign participation in the public sector and also in the private sector and he also made an insinuation that perhaps because the Prime Minister is ill, that is why something is happening behind his back. There is nothing like that. In Oil India there is foreign participation—private participation—minority participation. In Oil India, which is a Government concern, 51 per cent, is of Government since long before. In Cochin Refineries also 51 per cent, is Government participation, 25 per

cent, participation is of Philips Oil Company, 2 per cent. Duncan Brothers and 23 per cent, will be Indian participation. So it is not exactly that because the Prime Minister is ill, certain decisions are taken. In fact, it was I who suggested to the Finance Minister in one of our Finance Committee meetings that this is a thing which should be explored further and more and more private participation should come both in the public and private sector. If the Government owns 51 per cent, of capital there is nothing to be afraid of because after all, in the Fourth Plan also the foreign aid which will be coming to our country will be something like Rs. 500 crores only. It is not going to be more. If we want more aid, then naturally we have to invite foreign participation.

Now, on this point Mr. Gupta criticised Shri Asoka Mehta also, who has been appointed as Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. I should say that nobody would doubt the *bona fides* of Mr. Asoka Mehta. He is considered to be one of the foremost exponents of Socialism not only in our country but in foreign countries also. Mr. Gupta criticised him on this point. On this point there is a clear agreement that after all, if we cannot expect more than Rs. 500 crores, we have got to invite on a massive scale as much foreign aid as we require; otherwise our rate of growth will lag behind.

Mr. Gupta criticised Mr. Asoka Mehta on another matter, on the profit incentives also. About profit incentive, there is nothing wrong. Profit incentive is recognised as a genuine incentive even by the Social Democratic Party of West Germany, even by the Labour Party of Great Britain. They recognise it. The profit incentive has been recognised by all. It is a genuine incentive. After all in a mixed economy people do not work for philanthropy. People work for profit motives. What is bad is profiteering. Profiteering is bad but in profit incentives there is nothing bad.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Desai, you have only three minutes. Please wind up.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: Only two minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: She has given you three minutes.

ISHRI SURESH J. DESAI: The third point on which Shri Gupta criticised Mr. Mehta was about the taxes, whether the taxes would continue or not. The Planning Commission in their Mid-term Appraisal have given a very clear picture as to what will be "the overall position at the end of the Five Year Plan. It is stated that the balance from current revenues will be substantially lower. Even though the receipts have been larger this year, the balance from current revenues will be substantially lower. The miscellaneous capital receipts may show some increase. Steel Equalisation Fund and surplus of public enterprises other than the Railways may show a substantial shortfall. The market loans and Provident Fund may show improvement. The Railway contribution may show improvement but the non-Plan expenditure, if it will not go up, then the overall financial position will show only a marginal improvement. That is what the Planning Commission themselves have said. After all what is

that? The taxes must continue and will continue because our defence requirements are large, because our non-Plan expenditure is also growing and so the taxes will continue. There is nothing wrong in his saying that the taxes will continue, and to criticise him is wrong.

My last point is, we have been able to make much progress in the last 13 years of planning. Our achievements are no mean achievements. If we compare ourselves with other countries, we have achievements to our credit which are certainly great and at the same time we have not to be complacent about these matters. We have to improve further and certainly our hon. Finance Minister and our Minister of Planning, Shri B. R. Bhagat, are paying proper attention to these matters and more and more progress we hope to make in a short time.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister will reply tomorrow.

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

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Thursday, the-27th February, 1964.