

THE MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE: (SHRI A. P. JAIN): (a) 21 (including Pondicherry, Andamans and Nicobar and North East Frontire Agency).

(b) It is proposed to organise 12 Central Land Mortgage Banks during the second Five Year Plan after the reorganisation of States.

वन विज्ञान आयोग की स्थापना

२७८. श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : क्या खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री ८ सितम्बर, १९५५ को राज्य-सभा में दिये गये तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या ३७८ के उत्तर को देखेंगे और यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि वन विज्ञान आयोग कब तक स्थापित हो जायेगा ?

†[SETTING UP OF FORESTRY COMMISSION]

278. SHRI NAWAB SINGH CHAUHAN: Will the Minister for FOOD AND AGRICULTURE be pleased to refer to the answer given to Starred Question No. 378 in the Rajya Sabha on the 8th September 1955 and state the time by which the Forestry Commission will be set up?

खाद्य तथा कृषि मंत्री : (श्री अजित प्रसाद जैन) : आयोग सम्बन्धी संगठन की रचना के व्योरे, जिनमें वित्तीय प्रभाव भी शामिल है, अब भी विचाराधीन हैं। आशा है कि आयोग के स्थापन की घोषणा शीघ्र कर दी जायगी।

†[THE MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI A. P. JAIN): Details of the organisational set up including the financial implications of the proposal, are still under consideration. It is hoped that the setting up of the Commission will be announced shortly.]

12 NOON

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIFTEEN SESSION OF THE STANDING LABOUR COMMITTEE

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR LABOUR (SHRI ABID ALI): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Summary of Proceedings of the Fifteenth

Session of the Standing Labour Committee held in New Delhi in April 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. S-368/56.]

NOTIFICATIONS PUBLISHING AMENDMENTS TO THE DELHI (CONTROL OF BUILDING OPERATIONS) REGULATIONS

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (RAJKUMARI AMRIT KAUR): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 19 of the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Act, 1955, a copy each of the following Notifications of the Delhi Development Provisional Authority, publishing amendments to the Delhi (Control of Building Operations) Regulations:—

(i) Notification No. F.I.(4)/55-Admn., dated 8th February 1956.

(ii) Notification No. F.I.(6)/55-Admn., dated the 5th June 1956.

(iii) Notification No. F.I.(37)/56-Admn., dated the 19th June 1956.

[Placed in Library. See No. S-367/56 for (i) to (iii).]

RESOLUTION RE SECOND FIVE YEAR PLAN —continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will resume discussion of the Planning Commission Resolution. Eighteen speakers have already had their say. If necessary, we may carry on till tomorrow evening. Ten hours more you will get. Mr. Nanda.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, would it not be better to take up the Resolution on Travancore-Cochin? We got notice that this will be taken up only today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will be after this motion is disposed of.

THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA): Sir, I am intervening at this stage. On the 25th May the Prime Minister moved the Resolution in this House asking the House to record its general approval of the principles, objectives and programme of development contained in the second Five Year Plan as prepared by the Planning Commission. This was discussed for another day and then the consideration of this Resolution was adjourned. At that stage the scope of the discussion was confined to broad aspects of the

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.]

Plan—approach, organisation, resources, etc. Arrangements were made then so that there could be close and intimate discussion of the Plan by groups of Members of Parliament of both Houses. Four Committees were appointed. They have completed their work. I take this opportunity of expressing my deep appreciation of the work of these Committees. The Members took very keen interest in the principles as well as the details and made numerous valuable and useful suggestions.

I shall endeavour, at this stage, to deal with the ground that has been covered and initiate the further stage of discussion. It is gratifying that the direction of advance and the main goals that have been accepted in the Plan are also accepted in this House on the basis of general agreement. This agreement is also true of the people of the country as a whole. Sir, I regard it as a very precious asset of the Plan. It will be a source of great strength to all those who in different capacities in the country are going to work out this Plan, implement its various programmes. This has its particular significance in a democracy. If there is no broad agreement regarding objectives, our energies would be frittered away. Since there is that agreement regarding objectives, we have, I believe, made a big step towards the successful implementation of the Plan.

Questions and doubts arose in the course of the discussion and I shall try to elucidate the points which were raised. There was consensus of opinion that the Plan was not too big in size considering the present needs of the nation. However, the capacity of the country to raise resources to an adequate extent was questioned and especially concern was expressed regarding the gap in respect of our foreign exchange resources. And in the same context, there was a lengthy discussion about the trained personnel for the successful execution of the plan. Members felt apprehensive that the deficiencies which were disclosed in the working of the first Five Year Plan would also haunt in the second Plan, that we have not improved our position very much in that respect. Also, there was a certain amount of discussion regarding priorities, and a special point was made that while we are according a higher priority to industry in the second Five Year Plan, the provision is not adequate specially in respect of heavy industries. Further,

it was stated that the provision for transport is out of step with the requirements of traffic which will be generated in the course of the implementation of the Plan. I found there was a very great intensity of feeling in the House regarding unequal development in different areas and the feeling was expressed that adequate measures were not being taken to redress this imbalance. The position, according to some Members, was the same in respect of the question of rural areas *vis-a-vis* urban areas. So, this is the ground.

Before I take up these questions, I would, if you would permit me, Sir, like to say something about the first Five Year Plan and incidentally about our approach to the entire problem of economic development. This question of first Five Year Plan figured fairly prominently in the discussion in the House. Members offered their own assessment of the achievements of the Plan and of its failures. No claim is made that those achievements were very spectacular. In fact, as one hon. Member pointed out, the Report itself does not make any exaggerated claims. In fact, no magic formula is available for quickening the economic development in a country, particularly in an underdeveloped country. The difficulties, as pointed out, are more in the case of a country which is just trying to emerge from the stage of underdevelopment, and particularly so when this experiment of quickening the tempo of development is being carried out in the context of a democracy. For the same reason, we should be prepared to pay the price that has to be paid for this. That price may be somewhat heavy in the beginning and that price is in terms of hard work for all of us, in terms of concerted effort. It is in terms of discipline, of self-restraint, of sacrifices. Let us be clear about that, because after all what is the prospect before us? We are trying to acquire a new status. We are trying to lift ourselves to a new plane of existence, in terms of economic life. We want to qualify for being placed in the category of a developed country, to give up our status as an under-developed country, and for that certainly the greatest effort has to be applied to this big task, and this effort is not necessarily confined to the economic sphere. We want to see that our economy which has been static so long acquires a new dynamic power. But this dynamism cannot be confined to the economic sphere only. There will

have to be big changes, social and institutional. There has to be a change in our outlook suited to this new horizon. Our habits of thought and action will have to be changed in individuals and groups. We have to start thinking in new terms. I have in mind a number of things that are happening, distractions that are created, small things which engross our minds. These are not the conditions which are compatible with this quick advance. The conditions that have to be created are different. We have to do that, and it is, Sir, in that context that the various requirements of the Plan have to be considered. And, Sir, one more thing in this context which is special. We will have to think in terms, not of a region, not of a section of the community, but of the nation. That is an essential condition for the success of the Plan and for the quick economic development of the country. That can be explained at great length. It is not necessary to do so, but that is an essential and inescapable condition, particularly so in the context of a democracy. This is what I have been pointing out—the need for an inner transformation. In a dictatorship other sanctions are at work; there are other ways of getting results. In a democracy it is only through inner sanction that results can be achieved. Therefore, I have taken a little time to stress this aspect.

Regarding the first Five Year Plan, I believe, Sir, that the first big step has been taken. It may be said that we have not achieved this, we have not achieved that, we have fallen short here and there. We must realise that there has to be a time factor. We cannot achieve all things at the same time to the full extent of the expectations of all the people. There has to be a certain discrimination as to what is more important and what is less to complete our objectives, and it is in that context that we have to see the deficiencies in one direction or another. As I said, we have taken the first big step and I am very sure in my own mind that without this recourse to planning we would not have been able to achieve what has been accomplished. Actually the achievements would have been very far less. So, Sir, what we have seen during this period and our own experience regarding this first Five Year Plan should confirm our faith in planning and in the possibilities of planning in a democracy.

Sir, I come to the question raised in the course of the discussion that the

targets of the Plan have not been fulfilled sufficiently and that they have been fulfilled partially in certain cases. A certain amount of dissatisfaction was expressed. Now, we are quite familiar with the figures of the various targets and I do not want to take up the time of the House by repeating those figures. But I can state with confidence that over the larger area of the programmes, the implementation has been either full or a little more than full. It is also true that there have been shortfalls in certain directions. For example, the targets have been exceeded in the case of foodgrains, irrigation, bicycles, locomotives and in certain other directions. The targets were realised in the case of industrial production, oil-seeds, electricity, national highways and shipping. There have been shortfalls in the case of sugarcane, finished steel, cement, ammonium sulphate, galvanised iron pipes and other pipes. I shall not go into further details regarding these, but, as I said, nobody could make the assertion that everything that was attempted to be done had been done. But there is one way of testing the overall degree of implementation. That can be done by roughly comparing the expenditure in relation to the allocations. The original Plan was Rs. 2,069 crores. Later it was revised to the level of Rs. 2,356 crores. At the moment on the basis of the revised estimate for the last year we see the position like this. About Rs. 2,000 crores will have been applied towards the programmes of the Plan, which means in terms of the original Plan about 96·6 per cent.; in terms of the revised figures it is 94·4 per cent. A significant point was made in regard to both the achievement of the first Plan and what has been visualised in the second Plan, and that was the question of the ratio of the population which depends on agriculture for its livelihood as against industry and trade, the industrial sector. I think it was rightly pointed out that this was a reliable index of progress—how far we are able to transfer the population, absolutely later on but relatively now, from agriculture to these other occupations. There has been a static position for several decades in this respect, and I regret to say that we have not been able to make a considerable dent on this problem during the period of the first Plan. But as I said earlier, this process of transition, this emergence from a stagnant economy to a dynamic phase requires very great effort, requires the accomplishment of

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.]

certain prerequisites, and then a stage arrives when the things move on and get their own momentum. Sir, we have made certain calculations that, not by 1960, but by about 1970, the factors which have been introduced into the development of this country are likely to lead to a position in which the present figure of 68 or 70 per cent. will become 60; that is, the population dependent on agriculture may be reduced like that.

Sir, I now come to the question of resources for the Plan, which has been exercising the minds of this House and of the other people very much. We are told that the Plan is shaky because of the uncertainty of our resources. We are told that we have made optimistic estimates in the Plan. And then regarding savings, I can show that we have been stepping them up. We are told that since large numbers of people are living on a very marginal subsistence, we cannot expect from them anything. Sir, a horrible picture has been painted. It has been said that by resorting to deficit financing we are paving the way for inflation. It has also been said that we are going to accentuate the hardship of so many people in this country, who are already poor.

Sir, I am not going to make any dogmatic assertion about the scale on which the resources are going to be raised. But I can say this much that it is our duty to carry out the Plan up to the maximum possible limit. If we do less than that, then we are not planning at all. I realise also that it is our responsibility not to create any unreal situation and not to go beyond the real and actual capacity of the people. Now, Sir, in that respect, I believe, we are on very safe ground. After all, the problem is one of securing from the national income a portion for investment, and the test is how big that portion is going to be. We have also to see whether it is going to cause too great a strain on the masses. I have got the figures with me, Sir. We find that the investment position was this. In 1950-51, as a percentage of national income it was 4.95; in 1955-56, it became 7.31, and in 1960-61 it is going to become 10.68. We have to see who is going to bear the brunt. What are going to be the consequences? Are we going to reduce the existing consumption levels? No, Sir. We find that in due course of time, the consumption index is going to be raised from 100,

which was the figure in 1950-51, to 109 in the year 1955-56, and to 140 in 1960-61. Now, this is an answer to the question whether what we are doing exceeds the capacity of the people. We have to perform a very important task.

There is another way of looking at it, Sir. Let us compare what is happening in other countries. Some hon. Members here made a reference to the ECAFE countries and they told us what was the rate of capital formation there. We have taken 37 countries for this purpose, Sir. I find that there are six countries where this ratio of investment goes up to 10 per cent. There are another eighteen countries where the ratio is between 10 per cent. and 15 per cent. And there are another 13 countries where it exceeds 15 per cent. In some cases it is 22 and more and even 26. The figure for Japan is 20.8 per cent. So, not only we are not causing any particular hardship to the people in terms of their consumption standards, but also the effort at the moment in other countries is very much higher than what we are going to do here. There is another calculation also. Sir, this is the beginning of the second Five Year Plan period. We are investing 18.2 per cent. of the additional income and 68.82 per cent. of the additional consumption, and since in the second Five Year Plan period the investment effort is going to be raised, the position will be 27 per cent. investment and 73 per cent. consumption. Now, Sir, it is in the face of these basic facts that I request the hon. Members to think over the matter and say whether it is at all right or proper to talk in the language of pessimism about the possibilities of this country carrying out the Plan. And then, Sir, what is the alternative?

If we are going to reduce the Plan, what are going to be its consequences? We will have to put off the day when we can offer satisfaction to large numbers of people who have got not enough food and clothing and other necessities of life. We will have to postpone the day when we can tell the people that unemployment is going to be removed. On the other hand, Sir, we have got to think of the social services about which there was so much talk on the other day. It was said that "We have not got enough educational institutions, enough hospitals, enough roads, and all that." And this want of all these things, I believe, the people are not going to put

up with. And I believe there is some preparedness, so far as the people are concerned, to pay the price for what is going to come to them in a few years' time. It is not going to take a long time. It is a matter of a few years only. In order to realise this much, we may have to change the whole pattern of the mobilisation of our resources. We may have to make many new institutional arrangements and we may have to adopt many new ways of doing things. For all that is necessary, it will have to be done. The only condition is, and the only limitation is, that we shall continue to function within the framework of our democracy. And nobody can say that democracy is incompatible with development; even at this rate, it should be possible for us to develop ourselves. I can also inform the hon. Members that during the discussion which we had, not even one Member said "Reduce the Plan in this respect, have less roads and less education etc." In fact, everybody wanted more and more of these things. Somebody laid stress on education, and somebody else on other things.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of deficit financing. That is a question which worries us all. There have been indications that there is an upward trend in prices. We are concerned about it and we are quite aware of the dangers inherent in deficit financing, if it is not kept under proper control. We have to see that we safeguard ourselves against all those consequences, of which we are fully aware. In the interests of the poorer sections of the people, we have to be vigilant about all these things. Sir, no rigid figure can be given in advance with regard to what exactly is going to be the extent of deficit financing. Even the figure which is there in the Plan flows from certain assumptions, for example, there will be a certain amount of increase in the production, and the purchasing power which is going to flow into the hands of the people as a result of all these development programmes will be mopped up, and so on and so forth. Sir, if those conditions are fulfilled, I am quite sure that the deficit financing, even at that level, will be quite feasible. But if those conditions are not fulfilled, then deficit financing alone is not going to help matters, and in that case it will certainly hurt. After all, Sir, to switch over from the status of an under-developed country to that of a developed country is a difficult process, and, therefore, we have to attend

to all these things. The essential thing is to increase the production, especially the agricultural production, because without that other things cannot succeed, and all our industrial programmes etc. will cease to become real. If the very agricultural base is weak, other things cannot be fulfilled. Therefore, we are presently giving a great deal of thought to the question of agricultural production. And it will take me some time to explain why the targets were originally low and how we are trying to raise them, and why this thing is happening overnight. In fact, it is not happening overnight, because certain things had to be given further consideration—the National Extension Service and other things. Calculations will have to be made. All that is being done, and I am quite sure that the actual results in terms of agricultural production are going to be somewhat higher than what we have thought of so far. Therefore, all these things will have to be done by the Government—fiscal and monetary measures and also any apparatus that has to be set up for the purpose of controlling and curbing the inflationary tendencies. While that will have to be done, there is a duty on the people also. Development at this rate means necessarily that more money is going to be put in the hands of the people, but all that money should not be spent. If that money is completely spent, there cannot be any saving, and if there is no saving, there cannot be further investment, and if there is no further investment, there cannot be further development, and without further development, there won't be any additional income to be distributed. Therefore, restraints have to be there. They will have to be either voluntary or democracy will have to impose restraints on itself in a different way. We will have to carry the message to the people not that they should tighten their belt, but let them have some restraint for the time being so far as increased consumption is concerned. Then, there is the question of the anti-social elements. Here again, it is possible to educate public opinion to deal with them in a social way, apart from what the Government can do about it. Government may not be able to do very much, but people can do that. It is on these lines that we have to face these problems of the economic development of the country.

Suggestions were made about resources, ways in which we can increase our resources. Reference was made to the suggestions of Prof. Kaldor. All these

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.]

things are before us—the various ways to increase, enhance, our resources in a manner that other harmful consequences do not follow as a result of the pattern that we want to develop, that people do not suffer. That is, it should be a just pattern, an equitable pattern. There are various suggestions, but I do not want to go into them. Maybe in the form in which they were presented we may not be able to follow them, but there may be other ways of getting the same results, and they are going to be tried.

Then, there is this special important aspect of foreign exchange resources. Here too, the stress laid by hon. Members on this aspect is very helpful. There is no doubt that in various ways non-essential imports will have to be cut down. Chiefly, the way to solve this problem is to expand our exports, therefore to expand the production of exportable commodities. These are the two ways in which this can be done. These questions are being studied. I have in a hurried way dealt with the question of resources.

Then, another thing which I would like to refer to at this stage is about regional disparities. There is a good deal of feeling about it, and I share that feeling myself, and I acknowledge the fact here that it cannot be said that there is not a great deal of inequality in the degree of development in different areas. It is true that this country suffers from retarded development as a whole, but even taking the average development of the country, there are areas which stand far below the average. Maybe, it is a product of historical circumstances. Probably, it is also explained by the natural conditions in the various areas. Probably, they are responsible for some variations. It is true, as one hon. Member said, that when you introduce some element of development and create some basic facilities in some areas, that tends to attract further and fresh development in the same areas. Therefore, I think it is one of the most important functions of the Planning Commission to see to it that no grievance remarks on this score of inadequate development of backward areas. There are certain conditions which cannot be helped. You cannot have a steel plant everywhere, but even with these limitations, a good deal can be done to decentralise industries which are capable

of being decentralised and in the location of various industries in places where the factor of advantage or disadvantage so far as location is concerned is not very high. The question of the mobility of labour, the pressure of population, natural resources—all these things have to be considered in determining the investment that we make in different areas. The *per capita* investment, the total investment, investment in industries and all things which are of great moment in accelerating the process of development have to be considered. I can tell the House that this question is occupying the attention of the Planning Commission very much. Close studies are being made of the conditions of various areas and zones, and criteria are being developed for judging the relative advance or backwardness in respect of the various areas. It may be that some time later it will be possible to place some information regarding that before the House, and whatever we have, since it is of a rough character, I do not want to present to the House now. Even so, some regions are very much backward and more attention will have to be paid to them. Even if you take a zone or take a State, even within it, it is not that all the people are altogether happy about the various areas. In the same State, there are some areas which are very much backward and people complain. I do not know who is going to settle this problem. I believe the Planning Commission will have to do something about this. These disparities have to be dealt with effectively and properly because otherwise, there would be a sense of injustice. I asked you in the beginning to take a national view of these problems, because any sectional view will militate against our whole approach, but conditions should be created in which a national view is possible. For that, there should be an equitable development of all areas, so that this sense of injustice lurking in the minds of the people will be removed. I would not dilate on this much, because that means that I may have to go into further details regarding this.

Regarding another aspect of the same problem—the question of rural *v.* urban—there is unequal development there also. It is also a product of the past.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

It is not that we are unmindful of the need for the development of the rural areas socially and economically. We will

have to deal with them and we will have to study the manner in which the rural areas can be brought up. I believe I have given certain figures to show that it is not that this matter is escaping our attention now. Considerable attention is being paid to this question. I have some more figures also. There is a planned development to seek a balance between those programmes which are intended to develop the economy as a whole, such as industries, transport, mineral resources, programmes designed specially to increase production and raise the living standard in rural areas, and the programmes or measures the direct effects of which are likely to be felt in urban areas, that is, some developments which may not occur in the villages which may occur far away, but they are going to help them. Without that, their progress also is going to be retarded. If one considers the allocation in the second Plan, he will find that out of Rs. 4800 crores, half the outlay is for programmes in the first group, that is, those which are intended to develop the national economy as a whole. About Rs. 1600 crores will be spent primarily for rural areas and one-sixth of the total amount or Rs. 800 crores on programmes which benefit mainly the urban areas. I have been making a plea not to think in terms of any permanent conflict between rural and urban areas. They are complimentary and they are needed for the national strength and, therefore, it is all an integrated programme of development which we have to visualise, which will do justice to both the rural areas and the urban areas.

I had mentioned in the beginning the question of trained personnel, and this is very important. There are other things which are important too, like resources, administration, public co-operation, research etc. but I put trained personnel at the top of all these because, if we have the requisite strength of trained personnel, all other things will flow from it. Therefore, the emphasis on trained personnel, which was laid by Members in this House, was very appropriate. I acknowledge the fact that there were deficiencies in the matter of trained personnel in the first Plan. Those were known to us in the course of the Plan and by the middle of 1953 we started taking steps to remedy those defects. Some things could not be remedied quickly. Where a course of training takes 5 or 6 years, the handicap could not be helped but in the case

of overseers, for example, in the engineering works or the river valley projects, we found that the chief bottleneck was at the lower or middle grade and that it would take about a year or so to provide them the personnel. So, we started or rather increased those courses and thus made up those deficiencies. It applies to other fields also.

In connection with the second Plan "we have been thinking" as has been stated in some speeches and also appeared in some papers. Of course, we cannot think of personnel for the second Plan, and what we now think of is going to help us in the third Plan and not in the second Plan. Very obviously, it is so. It is in relation to the needs of the second Plan that I am saying that for the last 2 or 3 years thought has been given to this matter. Various committees were appointed and the requirements, say, of river valley projects or other projects, have been calculated on the basis of phased programmes. This process has not been completed. It is in progress but not waiting for the results of all these enquiries, action has been started. The Engineering Personnel Committee gave us a fairly full view of our position and of the further requirements, and action is being taken on those lines. Similarly, in other directions also action is being taken. Here also I should say that I have plenty of figures with me. I don't want to tire the House with all that. We have a view of what the engineering requirements will be at the end of the Plan, how much training programmes are already in hand, what more we should do and, since it has been revealed that these programmes are not adequate, what more has to be done. I have all these figures and if at any later stage this question requires to be discussed in detail, I shall give then additional information.

There are one or two small matters to refer to. In connection with the whole question of incentives for increased production, mention was made of the fact that our land reforms are not adequate, that is, there has not been full implementation of whatever programme we had incorporated in the first Plan and also—and that was a rather sore point with some of the Members—that the Panel on Land Reforms having considered this matter very closely, arrived at certain conclusions and there was a sense of the Members of the Panel in favour of a certain course

[Shri Gulzarilal Nanda.] and certain recommendations emerged from those and that we have not adopted them, and that we have changed them and we have diluted them. I have looked into this matter also and I find that this feeling is groundless. It is not well-founded. While those recommendations have been kept intact, some changes have been made. They don't touch the heart of the matter. Changes have been made in order to make it possible for adaptations on the basis of the varying conditions in the different areas so that we may not have too rigid a formula to be applied which in practice may not yield any good fruit. And in the same breath, we are told that our implementation is poor and then we are asked to do things which, we feel, may possibly not be implemented successfully in this short period, not that those things will not be done later on. Therefore, there is the time factor here. We don't want to do things which are not meant to be done. So, some variations were made, for example, regarding rent. They wanted to reduce that to one-sixth but we found that today we are having legislations passed in some parts of the country where it has not come down to the basis which we adopted in the first Plan, namely one-third and one-fourth. In the face of those circumstances, the one-sixth rent as a maximum level will be very unrealistic. Then I will be asked as to what we are doing. We are doing something about it. Where it has not come down to one-third or one-fourth, I am sure that it is going to come down—maybe it will take a little time.

Another change was made regarding the question of ceiling. Ceilings were originally tentatively put in terms of a certain income. It was found that that would not be a very satisfactory basis. It has been put in alternative terms without calculating the figure of income in any rigid way. So, this feeling that we have somehow emasculated this programme of land reforms is not correct.

We shall now start taking up the programmes and various other questions—so many of them—for discussion in the House. The work of this House and the other House has been greatly facilitated by the labours of the Committees, which have applied themselves to the task with great zeal, and a great deal of labour has been expended on that. I believe that those results are already made available to the Members and now we have got the basis on which we can further

proceed. As we proceed, I have only again to go back to the plea that I put forward here that we shall proceed in the same spirit, with the determination that these programmes are going to be made successful. Anything that is found which is likely to hamper the successful execution of these programmes should be pointed out and the Administration should not be spared. It is only in that light that I hope and expect that the discussions will proceed. If it is found that the Administration has not adequate machinery or has not shown to the satisfaction of the House that it has provided all the conditions for the successful implementation of the Plan, then it should be told so and asked to set matters right.

Again, this task is not for a party. It is for the whole nation. It is only when the whole nation unites in carrying out the programme that it will succeed, and I do hope that the Plan itself will become the focus of unity in this country.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): May I know how the Planning Commission view the suggestions made by these four Committees?

SHRI GULZARILAL NANDA: They are already being reviewed, discussed, examined and deliberated upon

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य भारत) : उपसभा-पति महोदय, द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के सम्बन्ध में मुझ कुछ थोड़ा सा निवेदन करना है। यह पंचवर्षीय योजना इस प्रकार से बनी है कि हमारा देश के विद्वानों ने और एक्सपर्ट्स ने इसमें अपने देश की जरूरतों का जिस प्रकार से समावेश किया है उसका केवल अपने देश में ही स्वागत हो रहा हो ऐसा नहीं, वरन् मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि विदेश के लोग भी इससे कुछ नसीहत ग्रहण कर रहे हैं। प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना में जहाँ कृषि को प्रधानता दी गई थी, वहाँ इस द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में इंडस्ट्रीज को प्रधानता दी गई है। प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना का हमारा जो बजट था उससे इस वक्त करीब-करीब दुगुने से ज्यादा बजट है और हमें यह आशा है कि जितनी प्रोग्रेस हमने पहली योजना में की है, उससे कहीं ज्यादा प्रोग्रेस हम इसमें कर सकेंगे। इस योजना में जहाँ हमें कृषि की ओर तो ध्यान देना ही है, वहाँ इंडस्ट्रीज की तरफ भी हमें खास तौर पर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है।

इस योजना के सम्बन्ध में विचारणीय प्रश्न यह है कि कहा जाता है कि हमारी जो आबादी है, हमारी जो जनसंख्या है, वह बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ रही है और इस वजह से एक बड़ी कठिन समस्या सामने है। हम प्रथम योजना में काफी उन्नति कर सके हैं यानी नेशनल इन्कम में १८ प्रतिशत की बढ़ोतरी हुई है, २० प्रतिशत की बढ़ोतरी अनाज में हुई है, ४५ प्रतिशत की रई में हुई है, ८ प्रतिशत की तिलहन में हुई है और ६० लाख एकड़ भूमि में हम मेजर प्रांजेक्ट्स के जरिये से आबपाशी कर सके हैं और करीब १ करोड़ एकड़ भूमि में छोटी योजनाओं के जरिये से आबपाशी कर सके हैं; लेकिन फिर भी परिस्थिति यह है कि हमारे देश के लोगों के लिये पर्याप्त पौष्टिक भोजन नहीं है और बाज़ हिस्सों में जैसे कि ट्राइबल एरियाज़ में यह हालत है कि वहां भोजन की मात्रा भी इतनी नहीं है कि लोग अच्छी तरह से अपनी गुजर कर सकें। इतना सब होते हुए भी किन बातों पर हमें अपना लक्ष्य रखना होगा यह बात खास तौर पर विचारणीय है। अभी हालत यह है कि अन्य देशों की तुलना में हमारा स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग कम है, भोजन साधारणतया पौष्टिक नहीं है, रहने के लिये मकान भी पर्याप्त नहीं है और पहिन्ने के लिये कपड़े भी पर्याप्त नहीं है। कहा जाता है कि इन सभी चीजों की कमी किस प्रकार से पूरी होगी जब कि जनसंख्या बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ती जा रही है। कहा यह जाता है कि जनसंख्या की बढ़ोतरी को कृत्रिम उपायों से रोका जाय। इसके बारे में मेरा यह निवेदन है कि हमारी जो संस्कृति है, हमारी जो शिक्षा है, हमें यह नहीं सिखाती है कि हम किन्हीं कृत्रिम उपायों से अपनी जनसंख्या को रोकें। मेरा तो मत यह है कि हमारी प्राचीन संस्कृति यह है कि हम ब्रह्मचर्य इत्यादि से और जो बहुत सी ब्रह्मचर्य से सम्बन्धित बातें हैं उनसे जनसंख्या को कंट्रोल करें और निश्चय ही हमें करना चाहिये। जब तक कि हमारा मॉरल ऊंचा नहीं होगा और हम अपनी पुरानी संस्कृति को ध्यान में रखते हुए देश की सारी व्यवस्था नहीं करेंगे, तब तक हम अपने देश की उन्नति नहीं कर सकते हैं। मनुष्य जब पैदा होता है तब वह एक मुह और दो हाथ लेकर आता है। इसके माने यह है कि उसमें जो खाने की शक्ति है उससे कहीं ज्यादा उत्पादन करने की शक्ति है। आबादी बढ़ने से हमारी शक्ति बढ़ती है और यह ख्याल करना कि जनसंख्या से हमारी उन्नति में कुछ रुकावट पैदा होती है, मनामिब नहीं है। हमें देखना तो यह है कि हम किस तरह से अपने देश के तमाम लोगों को कार्य में लगा सकते हैं, किस तरह से उनकी बेरोज-

गारी को दूर कर सकते हैं। यह देखना हमारी गवर्नमेंट का कर्तव्य है और उसमें सब देशवासियों के सहयोग की आवश्यकता है। वे इस प्रकार से सहयोग दें कि जो बेरोजगारी की समस्या है, उसका हल आसानी से हो सके। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा निवेदन यह है कि हम थोड़ा सा भी इस बारे में विचार कर के काम करेंगे तो अवश्य ही इसमें सफल होंगे। आप इस बात पर गौर करें कि यहां की क्या पापुलेशन है और यहां का क्या एरिया है और इसका हम दूसरे देशों से मुकाबिला करें। मान लीजिये कि हम इंग्लैंड से मुकाबिला करें तो इंग्लैंड की आबादी से यहां की आबादी करीब-करीब नौगुनी है और एरिया करीब पचीस गुना है, इसी तरह से हम अगर जर्मनी से मुकाबिला करें तो जर्मनी की आबादी से यहां की आबादी करीब-करीब पांच गुनी है और एरिया १० गुना है। आप देखें हमारे पास कितना बड़ा एरिया है। कहा जाता है कि हमारे पास मिनरल्स और दूसरे रिसोर्सेज भी बहुत ज्यादा है और वास्तव में हैं भी। तो जब ये सब बातें हैं, तब हम कृत्रिम उपायों से अपनी जनसंख्या को कम करने की बातें सोचना उचित नहीं है। दूसरे देशों में जिस प्रकार से इंडस्ट्रीज़ डेवेलप हुई हैं उसी प्रकार से यदि हम अपनी इंडस्ट्रीज़ को डेवेलप कर सकें तो यकीनन हम अपनी बेरोजगारी की समस्या को और बढ़ती हुई आबादी की समस्या को अच्छी प्रकार से हल कर सकेंगे।

एग्रीकल्चर के सम्बन्ध में मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि काश्तकारों के पास जो जमीनें ह, उनके सम्बन्ध में सीलिंग की बात कही जाती है। कहा जाता है कि उन पर सीलिंग फिक्स होनी चाहिये। मैं भी इस बात को मानता हूं कि यकीनन सीलिंग फिक्स होनी चाहिये, लेकिन जब हम एक तरफ एक फेमिली में सीलिंग फिक्स करने की बात करते हैं तब हम दूसरी तरफ यह भी देखते हैं कि उसी फेमिली में थोड़े दिनों बाद ही कुछ ज्यादा आदमी बढ़ जाने वाले हैं, तो फिर सीलिंग का क्या उपयोग होने वाला है? कई स्टेट्स ने सीलिंग के बारे में कानून बनाये हैं, जिससे कि भविष्य में जो काश्तकार हैं उनके पास जमीन नहीं बढ़ सकेंगी। किसी ने ३० एकड़ और किसी ने ५० एकड़ का एरिया मुकर्रर करके सीलिंग को फिक्स किया है। मेरा तो यह निश्चित मत है कि १० साल के अन्दर ही सबके पास जितनी कि हम सीलिंग फिक्स करना चाहते हैं, उतनी जमीन अपने आप रह जाने वाली है। जागीरदारी और जमींदारी एवालिशन के बाद जो जमीनें काश्तकारों के पास या साविक जमींदारों या साविक जागीर-

[श्री राम सहाय]

दारों के पास रहेंगी उन सब प्रदेशों के लिये इसी वक्त सीलिंग फिक्स करने से हम कोई एक सा फार्मूला नहीं बना सकते हैं। प्लानिंग कमीशन ने जो पैनल नियुक्त किया था उसने भी इस बात को माना कि हर एक प्रदेश में कोई एक प्रकार की

सीलिंग नहीं हो सकती है। जो

1 P. M.

सीलिंग बाज बाज जगह मुकर्रर की गई है वह उस प्रकार से मुकर्रर की गई है कि काश्तकार के पास इतनी आराजी रहे, जिससे २,००० से लेकर १०,००० रु० तक आमदनी हो सके।

मे दूसरे प्रदेश की तो नहीं कह सकता लेकिन मध्य भारत का तो मेरा अनुभव है कि अगर हम किसी काश्तकार की आमदनी २,००० से लेकर १०,००० रु० तक किन्हीं कारणों से मुकर्रर करना उचित समझें, तो फिर सीलिंग की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं रह जाती, क्योंकि हमारे यहां काश्तकार की जो आमदनी होती है एक हल पर, वह ३०-४० रु० महीने से ज्यादा नहीं हो सकती या साल में ५०० रु० की ज्यादा से ज्यादा आमदनी हो सकती है। जब यह परिस्थिति है तो फिर सीलिंग का क्या उपयोग हो सकता है? अगर वैसे भी हम देखें तो सीलिंग को तीन फ्रेमिली होल्डिगज और बाज हालात में छः फ्रेमिली होल्डिगज तक हमने माना है। यदि फ्रेमिली में पांच आदमी हों तो हम तीन फ्रेमिली होल्डिगज तक उसकी जमीन छोड़ सकते हैं और अगर पांच से ज्यादा हों, तो छः फ्रेमिली होल्डिगज तक छोड़ सकते हैं। जब हम इस प्रकार से छोड़ते हैं, तब फिर सीलिंग का कोई महत्व नहीं रह जाता।

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Is there going to be lunch adjournment for today or not? Surely, it is past one.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it the intention of the House that we should adjourn for lunch?

PROF. HUMAYUN KABIR (West Bengal): Yes, Sir.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I think everybody wants it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right Mr. Sahai, you can continue after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

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

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

श्री राम सहाय: उपसभापतिमहोदय, मैं सीलिंग के बारे में अजें कर रहा था। जैसा कि मैंने पहले निवेदन किया कि मैं सीलिंग के पक्ष में ही हूँ, लेकिन मैं केवल उसके तरीके से मतभेद रखता हूँ सीलिंग दो प्रकार से किया जाना मकसूद है, एक तो फ्यूचर एक्विजिशन और दूसरा एक्जिस्टिंग होल्डिगज पर। फ्यूचर एक्विजिशन के सम्बन्ध में दिल्ली, उत्तर प्रदेश वेस्ट बंगाल, हैदराबाद, मराठवाड़ा, बम्बई और मध्य भारत में कानून बन चुके हैं। मेरा आपसे यह निवेदन है कि जो बाकी प्रदेश रह जाते हैं उनमें भी फ्यूचर एक्विजिशन के सम्बन्ध में कानून बनाना नितान्त आवश्यक है। उसके बाद फिर हमें एक्जिस्टिंग होल्डिगज को लेना चाहिये। एक्जिस्टिंग होल्डिगज के सम्बन्ध में मेरा यह निवेदन है कि जब तक हम आबपाशी के साधन पूरी तरह न जुटा दें, खाद इत्यादि का पूरा प्रबंध नहीं कर देते हैं, तब तक हमको एक्जिस्टिंग होल्डिगज को नहीं छूना चाहिये। कारण इसका यह है कि ऐसे होल्डिगजकी तादाद बहुत कम है, रकबा भी इनका बहुत ज्यादा नहीं है। आज भी उनकी मौजूदा फेमिली में अगर उनका बंटवारा कर दिया जाय, तो उनके रकबे की तादाद बहुत कम हो जाती है। इसलिये इस ओर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। इस समय शीघ्रातिशीघ्र जहाँ फ्यूचर एक्विजिशन के सम्बन्ध में कानून नहीं हैं, वहाँ कानून बनाये जायें। और जैसा कि मैंने निवेदन किया है, आबपाशी के साधन जल्द से जल्द जुटाये जायें।

मध्य भारत के बारे में तो मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ लोगों के पास जो कुछ ज्यादा रकबा है, वे स्वतः ही अपने आप छोड़ देंगे। कारण यह है कि आबपाशी के साधन होने के बाद वे इतने बड़े रकबे को मैनटेन नहीं कर सकेंगे। आजकल जो पाबन्दियाँ लगाई गई हैं कि उनके आधार पर काश्तकार ज्यादा रकबा अपने पास नहीं रख सकते हैं और मजदूर भी काफी तादाद में काम करने के लिये नहीं मिलते हैं। मजदूर न मिलने का कारण यह न समझ लिया जाय कि वहाँ पर किसी तरह का अनइम्प्लायमेंट नहीं है बल्कि असल बात यह है कि काश्तकारी के मजदूरों की जो मजदूरी है वह इतनी कम है कि उससे उनका गुजाग नही होता है। यही कारण है कि वहाँ का जो एग्रीकल्चर लेबर है वह अपने काम को छोड़ कर दूसरे धन्धे अख्तियार करना जा

रहा है। जिस समय हमारे यहां इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट होगा, उस समय लेबर की और कमी हो जायेगी और उस वक्त हमें मेकनाइज्ड फार्मिंग की आवश्यकता होगी।

उपसभापति महोदय, रूस में करीब ६४ हजार कलेक्टिव फार्म हैं, दो लाख ७६ हजार कम्बाइन्ड फार्म हैं और ४,७०० स्टेट फार्म हैं। इन फार्मों में ६ हजार ट्रेक्टर स्टेशन हैं जिनमें १० लाख के करीब ट्रेक्टर काम करते हैं। हमारे यहां भी सेन्ट्रल ट्रेक्टर आर्गनाइजेशन की ओर से यानी एग्रीकल्चर डिपार्टमेंट की ओर से कुछ काम शुरू किया गया था, लेकिन मुझे ऐसा मालूम हुआ कि वह शायद बन्द होने जा रहा है। जिस समय हमें इसकी आवश्यकता है, उस समय वह बन्द होने जा रहा है। देश की उन्नति इस बात पर निर्भर करेगी कि उसके लोग इंडस्ट्री में लगे और मेकनाइज्ड फार्मिंग की ओर रुझान हो। इस वक्त देश के लोगों का ध्यान इस बात की ओर जा रहा है तो फिर सेन्ट्रल ट्रेक्टर आर्गनाइजेशन क्यों बंद किया जा रहा है? हालत यह हो रही है कि उसमें जो अपव्यय था, मिसमैनेजमेंट था, उसको दूर करने के बजाय, उसको बिलकुल बन्द कर देने की बात सोची जा रही है। मेरे अर्ज करने का मतलब यह है कि माननीय एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टर साहब इस ओर अपना ध्यान दें क्योंकि आज नहीं तो कल उस बात की तरफ हमें फिर ध्यान देना होगा। जैसा मैंने पहले अर्ज किया कि हमारे देश की हालत कैसे सुधरे, तो उस के बारे में मुझे निवेदन करना है कि हमारे देश में जो तीन स्टील प्लांट भिलाई, दुर्गापुर और रुर्केला में बनने जा रहे हैं, उनके कारण हमारे देश की आर्थिक अवस्था अवश्य ही सुधरेगी और जब अच्छा लोहा मिलने लगेगा, तो हमारी जो बेसिक इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, वे सफलतापूर्वक चल सकेंगी, इसमें मुझे शुबहा नहीं है।

मैंने आपके सामने आंकड़े पेश किये कि जर्मनी और इंग्लैंड में जो हालत रही, जिस तरह उस देश ने अपने यहां का इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट किया, उन्हीं लाइन्स पर अगर हमारे यहां भी इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट किया जायेगा, तो हमारे देश का भविष्य निश्चय ही उज्ज्वल होगा, इसमें मुझे कोई संदेह नहीं है।

एक बात मुझे यह अर्ज करनी है कि हमको इस बात पर तबज्जो देनी होगी कि हम जो कुछ भी काम हाथ में लें, उसमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा मेन पावर का उपयोग करें। मिसाल के तरीके पर अर्ज करूं कि आजकल जितनी भी सरकारी

इमारतें बनती हैं उनमें सीमेंट और लोहा का ज्यादा उपयोग किया जाता है और वह भी वैसा लोहा और सीमेंट जो कि अक्सर बाहर से मंगाया जाता है। हमारे सामने जो पार्लियामेंट की इमारत है, मैं समझता हूं उसमें बहुत ही कम इस तरह की चीजों का उपयोग किया गया है। इसका कारण यह है कि पहले लोग सीमेंट और लोहे का उपयोग कम करते थे। मेरा सरकार से यह निवेदन है कि जितनी भी सरकारी इमारतें बनाई जायें उनमें चूना, पत्थर और ईंट का ज्यादा से ज्यादा उपयोग किया जाय, तो बहुत ही अच्छा हो क्योंकि देश में इस समय सीमेंट और लोहे की बहुत कमी है। इतनी कमी होने पर भी सरकार अपनी सरकारी इमारतों के लिये लोहा और सीमेंट हासिल कर लेती है। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि देश में १० लोग मकान बनाने में इन वस्तुओं का प्रयोग करना चाहते हैं व नहीं कर पाते और इसलिये नये मकान १० नहीं बन पाते। हमारे देश में मकानों की बहुत कमी है, अगर सरकार बगैर सीमेंट और लोहे के सरकारी इमारतों की बनाना शुरू कर दे, तो देश के लोगों का ध्यान इस ओर जायेगा और वे भी इस तरीके से मकान आदि बनाना शुरू कर देंगे और मन पावर का अधिक उपयोग होगा। मेरा निवेदन सरकार से यह है कि वह इस ओर विशेष ध्यान देगी।

इन सब बातों के साथ साथ मेरा यह भी निवेदन है कि हमें मितव्ययता की तरफ विशेष रूप से ध्यान देना है और फिजूलखर्ची को रोकना है। “एट दी कास्ट आफ एफिशियेंसी” मैं मितव्ययता की बात नहीं करता। एफिशियेंसी रखते हुए भी, अच्छी तरह काम करते हुए भी, और किसी काम में देर न लगाते हुए भी हम बहुत अच्छी तरह से मितव्ययता कर सकते हैं। आज जब हम प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना के मुकाबिले में दुगुना खर्च करने जा रहे हैं, तब तो इस बात की ओर भी आवश्यकता हो जाती है कि हम मितव्ययता की ओर विशेष रूप से ध्यान दें। इससे हम डेफिमिट फाइनेंस को भी किसी न किसी हद तक पूरा कर सकेंगे। इस बारे में प्लानिंग कमीशन ने और गवर्नमेंट ने कमेटियां मुकर्रर की हैं, और वे अपना कार्य कर रही हैं। फिर भी मेरा यह निवेदन है कि अगर इस ओर अधिक ध्यान दिया जाय, तो हम और ज्यादा सुधार कर सकते हैं। बस इतना ही मुझे कहना है।

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am somewhat surprised that I have been called upon to speak just now.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Lucky.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: But, I shall try to do justice to this subject.

Sir, I will begin by referring to the remarks of Mr. Appleby. He says that irresponsible criticism is, on the whole, very very ruinous and it damages the cause which we have at heart. Therefore, I shall be very brief in my criticism and I shall try to be as constructive as possible, Sir, after all, I belong to a party, the Congress Party, and this Government is Congress Government. If I do criticise certain aspects of this Plan it may not be taken to mean that I wish to detract from the very many merits of the Plan. After all, if we ignore the Government, if we do not criticise the Government, it may just be said that this Government is beneath criticism and that it is not being criticised. On the other hand, it is not above criticism either. It deserves criticism; that is to say, we expect some results from this Government and that is why we want to criticise and make constructive suggestions.

Now, if you will kindly turn to this second Five Year Plan you will find that one of the objectives of the Plan is to rebuild rural India. At page 3 in paragraph 10 it is said:

“Our second Five Year Plan seeks to rebuild rural India, to lay the foundations of industrial progress, and to secure to the greatest extent feasible opportunities for weaker and under-privileged sections of our people and the balanced development of all parts of the country.”

If this is the case, if we want to have a balanced economy, if we want to maintain some sort of a balance between rural development and urban development, then it should follow that normally there should be no going over of population from the rural areas to the urban areas. But I am told—and I am substantiated in this by the Reports which have been published on behalf of the Planning Commission itself—that there is a tendency of the rural people going over to the urban areas. If this is the case, we have to investigate why this should be so. So far as the rural areas are concerned. If they get all the amenities of

life, if there is nothing wanting in rural areas, then there is no reason on earth why there should be a tendency to go over to urban areas. The other day I had occasion to attend one of the conferences which was organised on behalf of the ECAFE. There not only did I attend but there were certain others who attended the conference and who were supposed to be experts in the Planning Commission. They told us that the most important forces that existed in India today were the push forces so far as rural India was concerned. They distinguished between pull forces and push forces. Pull forces were forces which existed in urban areas and which, so to speak, pulled out the population from the rural areas and push forces were forces which were concentrated in rural areas and which tended to push out the population from the rural to urban areas. Now, they told us that the push forces were more powerful than the pull forces.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: They would cancel themselves each other.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: There is no question of one cancelling the other. They are added one to the other. If this is the case and if I am right in saying that the push forces are greater, then I believe that it is a bad symptom and it has got to be properly remedied. What it means is this. Firstly, it means that there is an overgrowth of population in the rural areas, and that is not my view, mind you; it is the view of the experts of the Planning Commission itself. Secondly, it means that so far as a person in the rural area is concerned, he is, so to speak, de-industrialised. If that is the case, it does not augur well for our country. I am not suggesting for one moment that no part of the tremendous amount of money that we are spending on the Five Year Plan is being spent on rural areas. I am not suggesting anything of that kind. I am just indicating that if, in spite of this tremendous expenditure that we are incurring on rural areas, there still exist the push forces which drive away the population from the rural areas to urban areas, then there is something wrong with the principles on which the Plan is based. In this connection I wish to say that we have to learn something from what Japan has done. I want to read out certain portions from a paper prepared by the ECAFE and, as I said, I feel that we have to learn quite a lot, from the example of Japan:

"If urban growth, described as the best general test of industrialisation, is studied in the Asian countries it is only in Japan that the economic character based upon industrial specialisation and exchange is observed to be relatively more prominent. The reason for this appears to be that some of the basic foundations for industrial development have not been confined to large cities but have also been effectively built up on a limited scale in a number of towns of moderate size. However, the cost of industrialisation has been cheapened by avoiding excessive urbanisation with its heavy overhead provision of urban housing, transport, water supply and other services, by developing industries which relatively require less capital and which do not heavily draw on public utility services and by applying a labour intensive technology which keeps the available manpower fully employed. In Japan, the urban areas (with a population of over ten thousand people) have developed industrial and commercial activity so successfully that they have absorbed almost the entire population increase since 1900. The drift of population from rural to urban areas of different sizes, however, has not been uniform; the bigger cities have grown more rapidly."

And this is very important—

"In Japan, while labour moved to the urban areas technology, organisation, capital and *entrepreneurship* were carried to the rural sector of the economy. The traditional industries in the countryside reacted to the growing factory competition by developing economics through large-scale organisation for marketing arrangements, cheap credit and electric power. Small industries with lower overhead costs possessed greater flexibility, were able to change their lines of production with greater resilience especially during the depression years. A natural demarcation of the spheres of production has developed with the large units concentrating on a few major lines and specialising in the production of semi-processed standardized material which is worked into a variety of finished goods by small units."

This is a very important commentary on what Japan has been doing in the matter of industrialisation of that coun-

try and I feel that we in this country have got to learn a lesson from what Japan has been doing.

Then, Sir, I want to take another point, the point of public co-operation in the Five Year Plan. After all, this Five Year Plan cannot be equated merely with a five years Budget. That is to say, this Plan is a national Plan. It involves the marshalling of all the various resources of the country and marshalling them, so to speak, on a creative basis. Now, I must pay my respectful and humble tribute to Mr. Nanda, the Minister for Planning, who, if I may say so, is a 'seer' in this respect. He had been emphasising time and again that, after all, if the Plan is to be a success, then public co-operation is the most important thing. I am glad that he is most conscious of this fact. And yet I feel with all respect to him that co-operation is not forthcoming from the people in the same degree as it might have done. One of the reasons for it is this. It seems to me that, despite all the efforts that the Bharat Sevak Samaj and Shri Nanda have made in this connection, people do not yet know in what ways the Government expects co-operation from them. Sir, the other day in the Bharat Sevak Samaj I suggested that we should hold an exhibition which will show to the people in what ways co-operation is expected from the people by the Government and I have even suggested a name for the exhibition. I suggested "you and the Plan" or "I and the Five Year Plan". What am I expected to do? Everybody ought to ask himself the question as to what is expected of him by the Government in relation to the Five Year Plan. That would be a very important thing to do. Unfortunately, so far as I can see, nothing is being done in that connection, I feel this and I say it specifically. Several exhibitions, for instance, have been arranged and they are all very good exhibitions. Now, if you went to these exhibitions—for instance there was that industrial exhibition which was organised in Delhi last year—I can assure you that there was a lot to learn from it so far as the experts and the technicians in industry were concerned. But so far as the common man was concerned he could learn nothing at all from that exhibition. There were the cycles and motor cars and all the rest of them. Of course, he has seen all those cycles and motor cars even in the streets. There was nothing for the

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.]

common man to learn so far as that particular exhibition was concerned. If you see, for instance, the exhibition of the Five Year Plan it will only tell you what the Government has been doing; that Government has been spending so much on irrigation, so much on agriculture, so much on food production and all the rest of it. It will tell you all that. But it will never tell you what the ordinary man, the common man in the street is expected to do in respect of the Five Year Plan. Now, this is a very important point. That shows lack of imagination both on the part of the people and on the part of—which is a more important thing—the officials concerned. I am not criticising the officials adversely. I must tell you that I do not want to make any irresponsible criticism. But then I have found this by experience. When, for instance, I went to certain very important officials on behalf of the Bharat Sevak Samaj and asked them as to what we should do—not that I do not know what I should do in the matter—"what do you expect from us, tell us," they said, "Gentlemen, so far as you are concerned you have no function whatever to perform. We will do what we can and you sit quietly at home and sleep quietly." That is the kind of answer that I got not once, but twice, thrice, a hundred times. And I say all this with a sense of responsibility. That is not the correct attitude on the part of the Government officials. After all, where does the responsibility lie? The Government officials, being the more important element of the two, namely, Government on the one hand and the public on the other, it is expected that the officials shall take the initiative in the matter and tell the ignorant people as to what is expected from them. They do not do it.

Then, Sir, I want to mention a third point and that is about our basic values in life. After all when would you say that a Plan is successful? You would say that a Plan is successful when the traditional values are changed and they give place to an order of new social values which from an ethical and other points of view are the kinds of values

3 P.M. which ought to be our objective. Now, Sir, I say with all respect that if there is one aspect where the Plan has not really succeeded, the old Plan and probably the second Five Year Plan

also, it is in respect of the problem of fundamental human values. Take the case of sweepers. Suppose, for instance, a sweeper comes to your house. I was mentioning this in one of the meetings of the Bharat Sevak Samaj the other day. Suppose your peon comes to your house, suppose a menial comes to your house. How do you treat him? I have seen it for myself. If, for instance, one of the Members of Parliament comes to me, I will offer him a chair, I will tell him all nice things, I will offer him perhaps a cup of tea, and all that. Suppose a sweeper comes to me. What would I do? I am speaking for myself, and I suppose it is true not only of myself but of most of us—I will say, *अरे तू क्या करता है ?* I will begin immediately by saying *अरे तू क्या करता है, कितना बेवकूफ है।* So far as the other people are concerned I will use the term "जी" So far as the poor people are concerned it will be "अरे" and all the rest of it. This by itself is not very important. You say that probably to your own child, but it is significant and it betrays the kind of attitude that you have towards your own fellowmen. Now, this is a question of fundamental values. Sir, I say that so far as the sweepers are concerned and also others, for instance the backward classes, we have not been doing them real justice. Now, I take the question of sweepers because that is an index of what we do with regard to the other classes. Should not we be conscious of the fact that so far as the sweepers are concerned we have been treating them more or less as slaves? Take any municipal area. Suppose there is a sweepers' strike. What do we do? Do we not in certain circumstances compel them to do the scavenging service? If this is not a piece of slavery, what is it? If this is to be avoided, Sir, then certain very important things have got to be done.

The other day one of our delegation went to China, and there they came to the very important conclusion that so far as the technique, the methodology of agriculture in this country was concerned, that was far inferior to the technique which was being observed in China. And why? That was the delegation led by Mr. Thapar, and what did they say? They said that so far as China was concerned, they used the night-soil manure profusely, while in India we did not do it. Now it required a delegation to go to

China—it is such a simple matter, it is almost axiomatic—it required a delegation to tell us all these things. Is not that extraordinary? We have been crying hoarse, and as great a person as Mahatma Gandhi himself had been crying hoarse about this, but we did not want to do it, and we wanted to send somebody to learn this from China, not from Mahatma Gandhi, but from China. Is not that extraordinary? But whether it is extraordinary or not, Sir, the point that I was making was that that was a very important matter from the point of view of social values. If there is a proper system of drainage in this country, if there is a proper sanitation system and underground sewerage, if there is proper disposal of night-soil and all the rest of it—this is not merely important for the sake of some superficial values like cleanliness, it goes much deeper than that because it alters the very structure of our society. If you devote proper attention to this problem of disposal of the night-soil, than with one stroke of the pen you can solve two different problems, namely the problem of food production in this country and the problem of sanitation, and also, if I may say so, the problem of the fundamental social values in this country.

Now, so far as food production is concerned, we are told that food production in this country has increased by about 20 per cent. That is quite all right. That is a matter for congratulation. But none-the-less if we analyse the various factors which contribute to this increased food production of 20 per cent., we will find that this 20 per cent. increase cannot be equated with the 20 per cent. increase in productivity per acre of the land. The productivity of the land has not increased by 20 per cent. There are other factors which have led to this 20 per cent. increase in food production. If, on the other hand, the per acre productivity had gone up by 20 per cent. then that would have been a matter of greater congratulation. Why have we not done so? If I may say so with all respect to our very able and very efficient Ministers, some of the people who are occupying the honoured benches there do not know what is going on at Kora near Bombay, what is being done with regard to the disposal of night-soil in one of the very important centres organised on behalf of the Gandhi Memorial Fund. I am referring to the centre which has been organised by as important a person as Vithalbhai Jera-jeni. There not only did they devise a

proper method of disposal of the night-soil, they have invented a sort of machine the kind of which I have seen at Bombay. It is called *Grāmālakshmi*. There the night-soil can be digested. It can digest also the droppings of the cattle and all other wastes and very easily it can turn all the droppings and all this waste into methane gas which can be used for several purposes, and whatever remains can be utilised as very good manure for purposes of food production. Why cannot experiments be made on this matter? This has never been done. As a matter of fact we have been consistently ignoring this one great thing, namely the question of public health engineering. The other day—I ought to mention this as a fact—I happened to read a report which has been published on behalf of the Government of India, a report concerning engineering personnel. The committee was presided over by Mr. Y. N. Sukthankar. Now, Sir, I went through that report, and I believe I am right in saying that it does not mention anything about public health engineering. It has nothing to do with public health engineering at all. That shows that we are not yet conscious of the fundamental values that ought to inspire us whenever we make a proper plan for our country. After all, Sir, what is a Plan to me as an individual? A plan must make some difference to my own personal life. Now, suppose there is a big factory, a big industrial organisation, say, at Bhilai or a big steel plant, say, at Durgapur or somewhere else. Of course, it is all a very good thing, and there can be no question of criticising it. It is a very good thing. But then I will measure the effect of this plant or any other industrial organisation, in so far as it affects my own personal life. I will measure it by that. Now what is the second Five Year Plan going to do, so far as my personal life in the village is concerned? Has it ever given me cement for having proper bathrooms or latrines? On the other hand, Sir, so far as the urban areas are concerned, you have increased the standard of the houses there. The Improvement Trust says, "You must build your house in this way or that way. You must use cement, and you must use so much iron and steel, and all that." Now instead of that, why can't that cement be given to the rural areas in order that the bathrooms and the latrines there may be constructed in a proper way? I have never been able to understand that. And so much of

[Dr. W. S. Barlingay.]

cement is being wasted, and at the same time there is so much shortage of cement. We haven't got enough cement in this country.

Sir, that leads me on to another point, which is a very unimportant point, with regard to the problem of domestic servants. Now, that is a point which I really want to drive home here. Sir, we the M.Ps. for instance have got servants' quarters. Now, Sir, is it really a good thing to have servants in our homes? That really shows a wrong type of mentality. Now, suppose, for instance, the servants tomorrow clamour that they must have servants in their homes, the problem will go on *ad infinitum*. And what sort of a society will that be? Is that the type of society that you want to create in this country? Sir, so far as the institution of domestic servants is concerned, I want to say that this is a survival of that old institution of slavery. Only we do not purchase these servants and only we do not restrict their movements, which is entirely a different matter.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad): But there will be more unemployment.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Sir, my friend is talking of unemployment. You might as well talk of unemployment, if for instance you ban rickshaws. Sir, this is not a problem of unemployment at all. This is a problem of fundamental values which ought to be respected in any democracy in the world.

The other day, I remember, one of the most important Members here was asked a question as to what he was going to do with the rickshaw problem. He said "Well, I am not in favour of rickshaws at all, but what are we going to do with the rickshaws and the rickshaw-pullers? We will have to find for them some alternative employment." Yes, of course, you will have to find for them some alternative employment.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI (Madras): Do you not believe in division of labour at all?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Madam, if I may say so, this is exactly the crux of the whole problem. You have asked really a very fundamental question. Is the institution of domestic servants a case of division of labour? I say 'definitely not'. It is really a vestige of slavery.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: No-body compels you to have any servants at all?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: What I am suggesting is that all your institutions and all your houses are organised in such a manner that you cannot do without domestic servants.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: Do you consider a woman, who runs her household and does her household job efficiently, to be an enslaved woman?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I agree with my hon. lady friend.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: It is home rule.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. There is a large number of speakers.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: Sir, I will take only five minutes. I entirely agree with my hon. lady friend over there. I was going to say that even up till now, so far as the women of this country are concerned, they were really a species of slaves, and nothing else.

SHRIMATI T. NALLAMUTHU RAMAMURTI: I want to run my household efficiently. I take pride in running my household, and every woman takes pride in running her household. She does not consider herself a slave.

DR. R. P. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): He has been under a misapprehension.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: I am sorry, Sir, I have not been able to follow my friend. Since I have not been able to catch the point, I am unable to give a reply.

I am now referring to a very important question, the question of health in this country. Now, Sir, so far as the question of health is concerned, and so far as the Government expenditure is concerned, the Government ought to be primarily concerned with public health. But I feel, Sir, that more and more money is being spent today not on public health or on environmental hygiene, but on hospitalisation and on medical services. Now, this is an absolutely wrong approach to the whole problem. The most important problem before the Government ought not to be that of individual health. Of course, that is also

important enough. But so far as the public exchequer is concerned, the proper way is not to spend the money on hospitalisation or on medical services, but on public health and on environmental hygiene. That is the proper problem which ought to be tackled by the Government in this country.

Then, Sir, so far as medicine is concerned, I wish to say that the policy which is being consistently followed in this country by this Government and by the State Governments, if I may say so with all respect for the individuals concerned, is, to say the least, discriminative. You have been consistently ignoring the claims of *ayurvedic* and homoeopathic systems of medicine.

(Interruption).

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): May I know what was your approach when you were Minister for Health in Madhya Pradesh?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY: If I may inform the hon. Member, so far as I was concerned, I held the scales absolutely even as between the three systems. You must give all these various systems of medicine a proper opportunity to grow in a free manner. This is all that is required. I am not suggesting that there is truth in one system and no truth in any other system, but so far as the Government is concerned, it ought to be impartial as between the various systems. It ought not to be partial to one as against another.

In this connection, I want to mention one thing, viz., that so far as *ayurveda* is concerned, it is not only a system of medicine; it is a system of dietetics. Dietetics is the basis of all health. If you do not eat properly, if you do not have a proper system of diet in the country, then all kinds of diseases will grow in the country.

I do not want to take more time of the House. I had some other points which I might have touched upon with profit. As I said, if in this country we can evolve a proper health standard, even that will be an achievement. I am convinced that for proper health standards in the country, you have to follow a correct health policy. I am sorry to say that is not being done in this country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before I call the next speaker, I have to inform hon. Members that I have got ten more names for today and there are 12 more names for tomorrow. Necessarily time will have to be restricted. I would request hon. Members not to take....

SHRI B. B. SHARMA (Uttar Pradesh): That should be from the very beginning.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is why I am saying not more than 15 to 20 minutes each. At 5 o'clock, the hon. the Railway Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, is making a statement, and the House will sit till 6 o'clock today.

श्री त्रि० दा० पुस्तके (मध्य भारत) : उप-सभापति महोदय, मैं आरम्भ में ही यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्लान का मैं पूरी तरह से समर्थन कर रहा हूँ।

इस प्लान की तैयारी में इस प्लान को तैयार करने वालों ने काफी समय दिया है, काफी विचार किया है और काफी मेहनत की है। देश ने भी इस पर सब तरह से सोचा है, समझा है और काफी हिस्सा लिया है। इसमें कुछ त्रुटियाँ हो सकती हैं। त्रुटियाँ तो हर काम में होंगी और वे उसके अमल में लाते वक्त ही अच्छी तरह से सामने आ सकती हैं और दूर भी की जा सकती हैं, इसीलिए इसका समर्थन करते हुए मैं कुछ ऐसी सूचनायें देना चाहता हूँ जिनका इस प्लान पर अमल करते हुए हमारी सरकार को ध्यान रखना आवश्यक है।

पहली बात जो मैं सावधानी के तौर पर अज्ञ करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि हमारे प्लान में मैंने अपनी रियासत में भी देखा है, फिजूलखर्ची बहुत होती है और वह फिजूलखर्ची जब काम हो जाता है उसके बाद हमारे सामने आती है और फिर हम उसका पोस्टमार्टम करने बैठते हैं। अच्छा हो कि कोई काम शुरू होने के साथ साथ उसके खर्च की तरफ भी ध्यान देने के लिये कोई एजेंसी हम कायम कर दें।

दूसरी बात जो इसके ध्यान में रखने लायक है, वह यह है कि अलग अलग डिपार्टमेंट्स का आपस में सहयोग होना चाहिये। हम यह देखते हैं कि हमारे यहां के कई डिपार्टमेंट्स एक तरह से अपने अपने तौर पर दुर्ग हो गये हैं, फोर्ट हो गये हैं, और इस तरह उनके काम का क्या असर होने वाला है यह वे नहीं देखते। हमारे प्लानिंग

[श्री त्रि० दा० पुस्तके]

कमीशन ने इस बात को कबूल किया है कि हमारे देश की बेकारी को दूर करने के लिये खादी व ग्रामोद्योग एक बहुत बड़ा साधन है। लेकिन हम उसके अमल में क्या देखते हैं? एक तरफ तो अम्बर चर्खे को बढ़ावा दिये जाने की बात सोची जा रही है और दूसरी तरफ पावरलूम की भी बात सोची जा रही है। इस तरह से हो सकता है कि कुछ और ऐसी बातें हों जिनकी ओर ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता हो। जब कोई भी नई बात शुरू की जायेगी, तो उसमें कुछ अड़चनें जरूर पैदा होंगी, मगर अड़चनें पैदा होते ही हम अपना असल उद्देश्य छोड़ दें, यह ठीक नहीं होगा और इस तरह से हम अपने उद्देश्य को भी नहीं पा सकेंगे। हमको अगर देश की बेकारी दूर करनी है—हम यह जानते हैं और हम यह मानते हैं कि काटेज इंडस्ट्री, ग्रामोद्योग, खादी से हमारी बेकारी बहुत कुछ दूर हो सकती है—तो हमें कुछ अड़चनें सहते हुए और इसी बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए अपनी पालिसी कायम करनी चाहिये और सब डिपार्टमेंट, जो प्लानिंग में शामिल हैं या हिस्सा ले रहे हैं, उनको इस बात को ध्यान में रखना चाहिये।

तीसरी बात में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हम यह देखते हैं कि हर जगह यह कहा जा रहा है कि एजुकेशन में तब्दीली होनी चाहिये। आज हम यह मानते हैं कि एजुकेशन में तब्दीली होनी चाहिये क्योंकि आज की एजुकेशन पद्धति हमारे देश के लिये ठीक नहीं है, लेकिन हम इसके साथ साथ उसका अमल क्या देख रहे हैं? कल ही एक रिपोर्ट मैंने पढ़ी है कि सब रियासतों के एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर्स एक जगह इकट्ठा हुए और उन्होंने वहाँ यह फसला किया है कि अंग्रेजी हमारे देश के लिये बहुत आवश्यक है और अंग्रेजी के जरिये ही हमारी तालीम होनी चाहिये। गांधीजी से लेकर और उनके पहले से भी यह बार बार कहा जा रहा है कि अंग्रेजी हमारी शिक्षण पद्धति के लिये अनावश्यक और घातक है। यह मानते हुए और यह जानते हुए भी हम फैसला क्या करते हैं? अमल करते वक्त हम फैसला यह करते हैं कि यूनिवर्सिटी में ही नहीं, सेकेंडरी स्कूल में ही नहीं, बेसिक एजुकेशन में भी हमको अंग्रेजी कम्पलसरी कर देनी चाहिये। इस तरह से हमारा निर्णय एक डिपार्टमेंट का दूसरे डिपार्टमेंट के साथ कोऑर्डिनेशन का नहीं है। हमारा उद्देश्य जो है हम उसकी तरफ जा रहे हैं या नहीं, हम उसको उसी ढंग से इम्प्लीमेंट कर रहे हैं या नहीं, यह हम नहीं देख रहे हैं। क्या हम इस

तरह से कभी भी हिन्दी को राष्ट्र-भाषा बना सकेंगे?

हम यह कई दफा कहते हुये सुनते हैं कि "A sound mind in a sound body." हमारे माननीय पंडितजी ने एक दफा एक फिजिकल कांफ्रेस के लिये एक सन्देश भेजते हुए यह कहा था कि फिजिकल एजुकेशन को हमारे देशमें तरक्की देनी चाहिये। फिजिकल एजुकेशन को तरक्की देने का काम किसका है? यह काम एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री के सुपुर्द है। एजुकेशन मिनिस्ट्री में इसके बारेमें क्या हो रहा है? कुछ नहीं। वहाँ कोई स्कीम नहीं है। फिजिकल एजुकेशन को तरक्की देने के लिये एक कमेटी बना दी गई है। शायद साल में एक आध दफा वह बैठती है। मालूम नहीं उसके क्या फैसले होते हैं। उसके लिये कोई नियम नहीं है। जब प्लानिंग कमीशन यह फैसला करता है कि हमारे देश में फिजिकल एजुकेशन को तरक्की दी जानी चाहिये और प्लानिंग कमीशन इसके लिये रकम रखता है तो हमारे एजुकेशन डिपार्टमेंट का यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि प्लानिंग कमीशन इस बात को अमल में लाने के लिए इसी ढंग से अपनी पालिसी तैयार करे। इस तरह की मैं और कई मिसाल दे सकता हूँ, लेकिन मैं अपनी स्पीच को और फैलाना नहीं चाहता। मैं तो इसके लिए एक ही बात अखिर में अर्ज कर देना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि जैसा मैंने प्लानिंग की "बी" कमेटी में कहा था, गवर्नमेंट को एक कोई ऐसी एजेंसी बनानी चाहिये जो यह देखे कि हमारे प्लान पर ठीक ढंग से अमल सब जगह हो रहा है या नहीं। कई जगह हम देखते हैं, अपनी रियासतों में हम देखते हैं कि बेसिक प्लान बनने के बाद उस पर जब अमल शुरू हुआ तो जो पिछड़े हुए इलाके हैं वे वैसे के वैसे रह गये। उनका प्लानिंग का हिस्सा पोलिटिकल कांसिडरेशन से या किसी और कांसिडरेशन से दूसरी तरफ ले लिया जाता है और वह पिछड़ा हुआ हिस्सा जैसे पहले था वैसे ही बाद में रहता है। हो सकता है कि आगे भी ऐसा हो। इसलिये हर प्लान के अमल में, हर राज्य के प्लान के अमल में, हम इस बात की जांच करते रहें कि जिस काम के लिये, जिस जगह के लिये प्लान में जो रकम मुकर्रर की गई है वह उसी जगह और उसी काम में खर्च हो रही है या नहीं; और इसके लिये सेंटर में कोई एक एजेंसी मुकर्रर होनी चाहिये।

मुझे इसके सिवाय और कुछ अर्ज करना नहीं है।

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I join with my other

hon. friends in offering my congratulations to the Planning Commission for having brought to bear on this subject a vast amount of intelligent and co-ordinated labour which, but for it, I am afraid would have been impossible. I do not say that Governments cannot function without Planning Commissions. In fact this is a later idea. At any rate so far as democracies are concerned, this probably is the first great effort on the part of a democracy to think of developing the economy of a whole nation on a planned basis. In this Second Five Year Plan there is enough demonstrable evidence to show that the experience that was gained during the first plan period has been made ample use of. I do not think I should give any specific instances because they could be multiplied to any extent. One thing which I have noticed is that the First Plan which had certain specific problems to tackle, primarily that of food production, laid considerable emphasis on the multipurpose projects and agricultural production. In fact to many of us, it did seem that there was not sufficient emphasis in the First Plan on the development of industries. Now, India is primarily an agricultural country and any planning as such should have tried to make up this great leeway in the matter of industrial development but yet the first Plan hardly tackled this great question. I am not saying it with a view to criticising the First Plan. As I have already said, there was enough justification for that but what I am saying is that that great lacuna has been made up to a great extent under the Second Plan. I think that is a feature which everybody must appreciate. Likewise the question of transport has received a fairly adequate attention. The hon. the Minister for Planning, Shri Nandaji, was saying that this Plan had met with a large measure of support and agreement, and that where they differed was that each one, who had, of course, his own special subject of interest was saying that not more was provided for that particular economic activity. Barring that, on the whole it received a large measure of support. There is no doubt about that. So I feel that the Planning Commission deserves our heartiest congratulations on this great production.

I do not want to traverse the whole field of the Plan. I would more or less confine myself to the social services and certain aspects of the same, like educa-

tion, housing and so on. I had the great privilege of serving as the Chairman of the 'D' Committee and there, as Chairman, I had hardly any occasion to air my own views, but all the same the report is here and I don't want to traverse the same ground. I hope the Planning Commission will find the various suggestions there helpful, constructive and, I am sure, they will merit due attention on the part of the Commission. But before that I must say that so far as industrial development is concerned, I am not for separation of these two sectors—public and private—to any market extent. I would say that there should be no phase of industrial activity in the land which should not be open to the public sector. It should not mean that the private sector should be prevented from having its own operations. That is not my idea but my idea is that quite apart from the reserved field of which we have enough notice, even with regard to the other field which is normally understood to belong to the private sector, I would say that the Government, whether at the Centre or at the State level, should not hesitate to build up those industries in the private sector which the private sector is unwilling to come forward to take up—it may be for lack of enterprise, it may be for lack of finance, it may be because of lack of technical know-how, it may be because of difficulties in the way of sponsoring those industries—merely on the ground that they belong to the private sector. In those cases also, it should be the duty of the Governments, whether at the Centre or the State—to take up those industries. Otherwise it will not be possible for us to build up the industries in the land to any reasonable extent.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): What about the National Development Corporation?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: About the National Development Corporation, I would like to wait and see what they are going to achieve.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: It is a duty assigned to it.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I doubt very much whether they have got the desire or the ability to take the initiative in all such matters and build up those industries. I would very much like them

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

to do it. I am not saying that they should not tackle them but my own fear is there is not the same interest. I would much rather like the State Governments to build up these productive assets by which they not only help increased production in the land but also lessen the amount of taxation that might fall on the people. The more the productive assets, the more the income, the less the burden of taxation on the people. This is how we must build up the economy of the land and I am sure, then the financial resources for not merely the Second Plan but for the future Plans that we may have, will be forthcoming through these various productive assets. I don't want to elaborate this point because you have fixed a time-limit for me.

Next, I would like to deal with the question of this being a peoples' Plan. I see right from the beginning very fine, lovely, sentiments expressed on this aspect of the Plan that even months before they set about their task of drafting the Plan they called upon the various State Governments to really make this a people's Plan which is as much as to say that almost every village ought to feel the effect of the Plan, the benefits of the Plan, so that it would not only mean some real benefit to the village but also ensure their fullest and whole-hearted co-operation in the Plan, but somehow, as things have developed later on, I am afraid this objective has not been wholly kept in view because I don't see a clear indication of that. It is a very welcome thing that by the end of this period we will have the whole of the rural part of our country studded over with both Community Projects and National Extension Service schemes. I suppose the Community Projects will cover about 40 per cent. and the rest will be covered by the National Extension Services by the end of the Plan period. That is very good. But my fear is that it will take even this long period of five years for providing the ordinary amenities in the villages where you have these National Extension Services. Would it not have been better for such of the five lakh villages in the land as have not had the benefit of Community Projects or the National Extension Services to be given, each one of such villages to be given some amount, may be on a *per capita* basis, and told not to utilise it for any of the purposes which you and I want, which the Planning Commission want, which the State Government want, which

any Collector or somebody else wants, but to utilise it on something that the villagers themselves want? If you do that, then they would feel that here was the benefit of freedom. But I do not see it is too late for us to think in terms of this, namely, that where certain village groups have not had any benefit under the Community Projects or the National Extension Service, they should be provided with certain *ad hoc* amounts, just to enable them to feel the glow of freedom.

Another important point is that with reference to these Community Projects and the National Extension Service Schemes, we seem to be working with a personnel that is not drawn from the soil. It is as much as to say that there is some idea of spoon-feeding, no doubt for the benefit of the people. And it is also true that there is a large measure of public co-operation forthcoming. But how is this to be perpetuated? We have our oldest national institutions by way of our village *panchayats*. Is it not better that we activate these old institutions and make them the chief instruments for carrying out the work that we have in view, namely, the objectives of the Community Projects and the National Extension Services? There must be some attempt to integrate and activate all the village *panchayats* with all the development work that we have. We have now the Act dealing with agricultural development and warehousing. That is going to vitally touch the lives of the people and to make them all the better. Unless we have these local village institutions functioning efficiently, how difficult will it be for us to carry the benefits of these fine measures to the real people of the soil? I therefore, think that there should be a good attempt made to integrate the whole activity round about the villages with the natural institutions that have been there for ages, namely these village *panchayats*.

I would then like to say a few words on education. Well, there was a special Sub-Committee of the 'D' Committee, and I would just like to briefly say what provisions have been made for education. The provision in the First Plan was Rs. 169 crores. In the Second Plan it is Rs. 307 crores. It is true that the Education Ministry demanded for more but for some reason or the other, taking the demands of the various other Ministries into consideration, they have

not been able to provide more than Rs. 307 crores. But how should this amount have been allocated? I am not now complaining that the Planning Commission or the Finance Ministry had not provided more for education. But *inter se*, the amount being Rs. 307 crores, how should they have allotted this sum between the different heads? This is how it has happened. For elementary education, in the First Plan, when the total allotment was only Rs. 169 crores, they had given Rs. 93 crores which is more than 55 per cent. or so. This much was given to elementary education. But now with the enhanced grant of Rs. 307 crores, elementary education gets only Rs. 89 crores. Of course, I am given to understand that under certain other heads like Community Projects and so on, there are certain additional allotments. For instance under Community Projects and National Extension Services, they have allotted about Rs. 12 crores and so on and I believe to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and backward classes there are certain other amounts allotted. But how much of all this will go really for the expansion of elementary education and how much for buildings and so on, we do not know. I was on the Committee and I know these things and it will be wrong for me to say that certain allotments under certain other Ministries will not also mean certain benefit by way of expansion of elementary education. But I say that to make an allotment in the Second Plan which is proportionately less than what was made in the First Plan is a thing which surprises me. I do not want to give the figures here to show what a small percentage of the school-going population is now going to have the benefit of education. I do not want to give the figures. I do not envisage—in fact, I cannot envisage—when exactly we will be able to provide education to all the school-going population in our land. That is in the womb of the future. We may say that at this rate we may reach that goal in 15 or 20 years and so on. But what I say is that this constitutional obligation about which the Dⁿ Committee commended, the Sub-Committee particularly, the constitutional obligation of providing free education for all the children of the land, is a thing which has not been fully taken note of and that that is not doing justice by the country. How is it that a large section of the people, those who pay the taxes to the coffers of the State, both at the Centre and the States, get

no benefit whatsoever while the other people get so much benefit? It seems to me extremely unfair that there should be this distinction which becomes invidious in the eyes of those people who are the sufferers

I may just point out this. For administrative and miscellaneous expenditure we had Rs. 11 crores out of Rs. 169 crores. Today it is Rs. 57 crores. There is a tremendous tendency on the part of the Central Ministries to increase their administrative and miscellaneous charges, and that I think, is something which ought to be checked. In this respect, I am not referring only to the Education Ministry by any means. There is such a craze for these central institutes which we can well go without many of them. Or rather we could wait for their natural development in course of time. For instance, we have the Kharagpur Technological Institute. Not that I am against it, but as Prof. Malkani was saying, there were only two subjects taught there and today right-away, you have got about a series of ten or twelve important subjects to be taken up. And they want to make a Massachusetts Institute of Technology out of it. I know something of the M.I.T. in America. It is a natural growth. It is not something which the Government overnight decided to start; it was just started. The M.I.T. is endowed by various business interests, not by the Government only. Probably, the contribution by the Government of the United States comes to a very small fraction of the total cost of the M.I.T. It is the various industrial houses and others, like the General Electric, Westinghouse and big firms like that, who endow these Chairs. That is how it has a long history but it is very wrong for us to spend several crores of rupees on this Institution by merely drawing the money from the State coffers instead of allowing certain natural developments to take place. (*Time bell rings.*) How many minutes more, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Twenty minutes are over.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am sorry, Sir.

That, in brief, is my comment so far as elementary education is concerned.

There are so many other points but I would like to deal with housing. This also is a subject which received a large

[Shri H. C. Dasappa.]

amount of attention in the Committee and that is why I am trying to spotlight these subjects. This is also a question wherein you will find certain marked differences in the matter of allotment. You will find that out of Rs. 120 crores, subsidised industrial housing takes Rs. 45 crores, the low income group takes Rs. 40 crores, slum clearance and sweepers' housing Rs. 20 crores, rural housing takes Rs. 10 crores, plantation group takes Rs. 2 crores and the big income group takes Rs. 3 crores. The fault is not mine but is in the presentation of the figures in the Plan itself. We find that there are various other Ministries which are spending, for example, the National Extension Service people, the Railways, the Rehabilitation Ministry, the Production Ministry and so on. Some of the housing, I am sure, will be in rural areas but what I say is that there is this marked difference. We have 54 million houses in the rural areas out of which, they say, 80 per cent. are houses which have got to be renovated but the provision is Rs. 10 crores. Now, Sir, that is one aspect that I want to emphasise. If the rural people had the ordering of the allotment, the whole order of allotment would have been reversed and instead of rural housing getting Rs. 10 crores, Rs. 110 crores would probably have been allotted for the rural areas and the urban areas would have got about Rs. 10 crores. How are they going to spend even this ten crores of rupees. I gather—I have taken some trouble in the matter—that this sum of Rs. 10 crores is going to be spent on 625 pilot housing projects. Now, Sir, out of a total number of five lakhs and above villages, if we just take up 625 pilot housing projects, is it a serious way of tackling the rural housing problem? Every year, we have got to provide additional six lakhs of houses for the growing population whether we will it or not. The growth of population is about thirty lakhs and we have to provide six lakhs of houses. I do not know how much they provided last year. So far as rural housing is concerned, they have provided for 436 houses and, to be renovated during the whole of the Plan, 10,000 or 15,000 houses. I say, Sir, that this is not a fair way of dealing with these people who are dumb. The Congress idea has been to do everything for the villages; we dream, we talk on the platform and we write on paper that everything should be for the villages and the result is this grand

sum of ten crores of rupees to be spent on 625 pilot housing projects!

I will wind up only with this, Sir, that after all, the success of this depends upon public co-operation no doubt but the co-operation of the States is also necessary. The Planning Commission must devise a proper machinery to see that the State Governments utilise the Plan. I do not know whether there funds to the best advantage and as per is any such machinery. So, Sir, the main thing is to see that the amounts are properly utilised. They themselves have admitted in the Plan that there is likely to be wastage and so much of wastage should be avoided if possible. I feel that if there is proper utilisation of the amounts and all this wastage is avoided, then a great deal more could be achieved than what we have done so far.

There is only one thing more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken five minutes.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Only one sentence, Sir.

The hon. Minister referred to the sacrifices of the people. May I humbly submit that it depends upon the kind of austerity that our Governments exhibit in all their various phases of activity but is it in evidence today? I leave the matter to the House whether the Government either at the Centre or at the States do exhibit that life of austerity which can make them demand from the people that sacrifice to which the hon. Minister referred.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO (Andhra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I shall confine my remarks mainly to two aspects of the Plan. I think they are the two fundamental aspects also; one is the attitude of the Plan framers towards labour and how they envisage the amelioration of the condition of the working class in the chapter on labour policy and programme. Sir, the success of the Plan and the success of the many projects envisaged depends mostly on the enthusiastic co-operation of the working class. Such enthusiasm could be generated only when the legitimate demands of the working class are met; rather, I should say, when the legitimate grievances of the working class are met. In principle, it has been agreed in the Plan by the Plan framers that in India, due to the multiplicity of trade-unions, the working class is not able to put up a

united demand; the Plan framers have said that there are many unions, that there are political rivalries, lack of resources, disunity, etc., which are all responsible for this state of affairs. I am thankful to them for the generalisation but I am only surprised that the great Plan framers have no solution to offer. No one will dispute this fact that there are multiple trade unions, but I would like to ask the Minister for Planning, who was himself a great labour leader once, as to why he did not straightaway suggest some method whereby this multiplicity could be avoided and unity could be brought about. Unfortunately, we do not find any such suggestions here; on the other hand, unity is sought to be achieved or rather united trade union organisations are sought to be achieved by other means which are well-known, namely, on the lines suggested in the Bombay Industrial Disputes Act, the father of which is the Planning Minister himself. Sir, I do not want to go beyond this but will only say that until and unless the Plan framers recognise the principle that the trade unions should have the right of collective bargaining and until and unless the principle of compulsory recognition of trade unions is accepted, until and unless the employers are made to realise that only when they accept the principle of collective bargaining can there be peace in industry. till then I think we will not make any headway, what I feel strongly is that the Government, though it accepts this in principle, yet when it is a question of practice, adopts a partisan attitude. In this connection, I would like to bring to the notice of Government the suggestions put forward by an eminent labour leader who is no other than the ex-labour Minister. I wonder why the Government is hesitating to take up that principle and implement it, namely, that the workers be given the right to choose their own trade unions. A Government which trusts the ballot box to rule the country does not trust the ballot box when it is a question of allowing the workers to choose their own unions! This is a simple and straight question which, I hope, the Government will be kind enough to answer.

Secondly, I come to the question of the major issues that face the working class. Almost all the central organisations of the trade unions have brought to the notice of the Government through

various resolutions and through various memoranda and through speeches in both Houses of Parliament that the wages of the workers have not increased commensurate with the increase in production. The figures that are given by the Planning Commission themselves show that there is an increase in production to the tune of 43 per cent but I find that according to the figures given by the same Planning Commission the wages have increased only by 11 or 13 per cent. Why is this disparity? My friend Mr. Parikh may argue that the increase in production is due to increase in industrial undertakings. But I, respectfully, submit that that is not the case. Sir, in a paper submitted to the Planning Commission, one of the leading economists of the country has stated that though there is increase in production the increase in employment in major industries is not there but on the contrary it is decreasing though in all those industries there is a definite increase in output. It is said that the national income has gone up. What percentage of the increased wealth has gone to the share of the working class? If we see the figures, the percentage of the wage bill has come down from nearly 35 per cent to 30 per cent or so, whereas profits have gone up by nearly 40 or 42 per cent. My friend, Shri Tripathi has made a good case of it both at the consultative committee meetings and also in the other House and my other friends from other trade union organisations have also made out a similar case. But I wonder why the Government feels shy of declaring straightaway that, in view of the increase in production, in view of the increase in the net income of these industries, the working class is justified to get straight wage increase of 25 per cent initially. But comes the answer from my friends, the Ministry, that austerity should be observed and that if we increase the wages, there will be inflationary tendency and so on. All these things come up only when it is a question of giving a little larger piece of bread or something like that to the working class.

Sir, I have got my complaint against certain other observations that are made in that chapter on labour policy and programme. In that it is said that the workers will have a share in the management also. Management councils, they say, will be set up later on. I am in favour of that, but I am against the principal of the management choosing

[Shri J. V. K. Vallabharao.]

the workers' representatives. Who will choose the workers' representative on the management councils? If the management is to select the workers' representative, what type of workers' participation will there be? What is the democratic machinery you envisage for the selection of workers' representatives for these management councils? That is not made clear.

Next, I come to the question of enforcement of awards and agreements. When it is a question of enforcing an award or an agreement which is advantageous to the employers, the Government swoops down with all the force at its command to implement it but when it is a question of the award going in favour of the workers or the trade union, the Government keeps mum. I can quote many instances.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

Where a court has ordered the reinstatement of a worker or where a court has annulled the dismissal order of a State enterprise or where a court has ordered the payment of back wages to the workers, the Government keeps mum and it says, "You all go to the court to get it implemented." There are cases where even the minimum labour laws that are necessary for just carrying on the work are not implemented. For example, the Payment of Wages Act, and the law relating to the maximum hours of work that a labourer has to put in, all these are violated by the employers but the Government has got nothing to say about it. So, I feel that the Government has to find out a way; not only that, they have to find out a machinery to implement the various Acts that are passed and to ensure their implementation.

I now come to the various questions that were raised regarding social security measures. Here the Government is extending these social security measures to 13 more industries. We welcome this extension but for all these social security measures a month's salary is being deducted per year from the worker. If you take into account all the little cuts that are made from the worker for all these so-called ameliorative measures, it comes to about a month's wage per year. I would ask a straight question. Is it not a great burden on the worker whose wages are only Rs. 2 per day? And the majority of the workers in India get a wage of less than Rs. 2 per day

and all of them have to pay for all these social security schemes. So, I would suggest to the Government that they should exempt the workers whose pay is below Rs. 100 for this purpose and also make some collection from the employers for the social security measures. Though the employers may object very naively, I think they will not agitate because they know only too well that maximum production and maximum results are obtained through these workers who get below Rs. 2. I will illustrate this. Take the jute industry. If there are 500 looms in a jute mill the number of workers who get more than Rs. 2 per day in that mill with a complement of 3,000 workers will not be more than 400. The rest of them get less than Rs. 2. And the huge amount of profit, the dividends that the shareholders get and all these come from whom? It is from those workers who get daily two rupees. And why not the Government straightaway ask these employers to shell out something from their reserves and meet the cost of the social security schemes? I do not want them to be generous to the worker who gets Rs. 150 or Rs. 200. At least let them be generous to the low paid ones.

Then, there is the question of recognition of trade unions. Here again, I am not in agreement with the Government scheme. In a kind of a suggestive way it has been said that the trade unions can be encouraged and such of the trade unions which are prepared to co-operate may be recognized. This is really obnoxious. To put conditions for recognition of trade unions goes against the fundamental rights of any citizen, much more so of the worker. In this connection, we would be very glad if the Government come out and tell us why they choose to recognise certain unions. Is it because those unions which the Government recognize are not recognised by the workers or is it because those unions which the employers recognise do not voice the just demands of the workers? In the majority of cases I can say unions belonging not only to the AITUC or HMS but even to the INTUC are not recognized simply because they happen to voice the legitimate demands of the workers. In this context the works committees in the industries also come. The various employers have made a farce of these works committees. They recognize a union. They say the members of that union have got the right to be represented on the

works committees. The works committees never meet. The workers' demands are never discussed. The employer just notes down the minutes. They have become a farce, with the result that every day we see reports of a strike here and an unrest there or some anarchical act somewhere. If the Government are serious in maintaining industrial peace, why not the Government accept the same principle, namely, let all the workers in a particular industry—industry-wise or mill-wise, first start with mill-wise in a particular industrial unit—decide whom they want, which union they want? That union which has the confidence of the workers can be recognized and all the agreements that are entered into by that union with the employers shall be binding, provided the workers give a sanction for all those agreements by a majority vote. This democratic principle which we have got here in this House and also there in the other House, why not we extend it to the workers? The worker does not know what is done behind his back. The union leader enters into an agreement in Bombay and asks the workers in Vizag to agree; or the union enters into an agreement in Calcutta and asks the workers to agree in Jamshedpur or in Coimbatore or somewhere. This gives rise to serious misgivings and is mainly responsible for friction. (*Time bell rings.*) Only two minutes more.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI SHARDA BHARGAVA): You have taken twenty minutes.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: Lastly, I have got one word to say on the question of wages for the agricultural labour. I am very glad that the Government have thought over the question and in the Plan they have said that there should be no further delay in this. But I would like to ask what is the machinery you envisage for the implementation of the Minimum Wages Act in respect of agricultural labour? In the absence of any machinery for the fixation of minimum wages for agricultural labour it will remain only an Act on paper and will never be implemented. In this connection, I humbly submit that the agricultural labour will get a fair deal if the implementation is given to the local *panchayats*. I know why my friend winces. It is because the local *panchayats* are also elected. Instead of the tehsildar or deputy collector, who never goes to the village, just trying to implement it, the local *panchayat* may be given the

right to implement the Minimum Wages Act so far as the agricultural labour is concerned.

(*Time bell rings.*)

SHRI VIJAY SINGH (Rajasthan): Madam Vice-Chairman, the Prime Minister has said at one place that the second Five Year Plan is an exciting reading. If I may say so, it is also an inspiring adventure, because if you look into the past history of many countries of the world, you will be at once struck by the fact that nowhere else have any people attempted planning on such a gigantic scale in a democratic way. This is the chief characteristic feature of the Plan that we have launched in India. And in all the criticisms and various comparisons that we make about it, we must keep this fundamental aspect before us. Recently a very eminent public man, Dean Appleby, visited India, and in submitting his report he has expressed himself about this aspect of the Plan. This is what he says:—

“India has been both building and serving democratic values while at the same time engaging in a monumental programme of economic development.”

Madam, in the short time that is at my disposal, it is not possible to deal with the various aspects of the Plan. Indeed, if I may say so, if we have to deal even with one aspect of the Plan exhaustively, we cannot do so in the time span of twenty minutes that have been allotted to the speakers. I would, therefore, in the short time that is at my disposal, like to deal with two aspects of the Plan, namely, agricultural sector, and the problem of regional development. Now, as I have just said, it is not possible to deal exhaustively with any of these subjects. I therefore, will only mention a few points for the consideration of the Government on these two aspects. While voicing my criticism about some of the policies, it does not detract from the general approval of and the wholehearted support I extend to the Plan and to the policies of the Government. The few complaints that I am making are simply to bring to the notice of the Government the salient features and the specific points that have struck me. In my opinion, Madam, the agricultural sector is the most important sector. 25 crores of our people depend upon agriculture. In fact as the hon. Minister was saying this morning, our economic progress will depend mainly upon how we are going to solve the

[Shri Vijay Singh.]

problem of our agricultural development, because the agricultural problem is the root problem of India. In this connection, if I may so observe, this problem of agriculture has not received as much attention as it ought to. At least it is my impression that it has not received as much attention as it ought to. Recently, there was a meeting of Agriculture Ministers at Mussoorie, and there Shri Ajit Prasad Jain who is the Union Minister for Food and Agriculture had remarked like this:

"Agricultural incomes all over the world lagged behind urban and industrial incomes. In India as against an average *per capita* income of Rs. 967 of the factory workers in 1950, the income of the agricultural labourers in 1950-51 worked out to an average of about Rs. 200 only. The Second Plan provides for an increase in national production of 25 per cent, whereas the increase in the agricultural sector is only 18 per cent. The disparity in the incomes of the industrial sector and the agricultural sector at the end of the second Five Year Plan will therefore be, if anything, greater than at present."

This, in my humble opinion, Madam, is the fundamental fact which we should bear in mind. How are we going to tolerate the sub-human state of affairs that is prevailing in the agricultural sector? If, therefore, there is some sort of discontent in the villages and among the agriculturists, I think we can ignore that only at our peril. Madam, we have provided in the Plan that there should be 15 per cent increase in our agricultural production. Now recently when the Food Ministers met at Mussoorie, they suggested that we should increase this target to 40 per cent. This is a big increase from 15 to 40 per cent. When the various State Ministers were asked as to what they would require in terms of money to achieve this target, they suggested a fantastic figure of Rs. 8,743.9 lakhs. Now, I fail to understand from where we are going to get such a tremendous amount of money when there is already a talk of finding adequate resources to make a success of our second Five Year Plan. In this connection I am at once reminded that there needs to be some fundamental change in our conception of agricultural development. We are at present laying too much stress on money incentive, and if

we only lay our stress on money incentive, then of course the figures are going to be fantastic and they are going to create all sorts of complications.

In this respect we should learn something from our neighbour country, China. The Government of India did a very wise thing in sending a delegation there to study the problems of agriculture, and some of the observations that the members of that delegation have made are worth considering. I will enumerate a few points and would like to point out how they can be made applicable to the conditions as they exist in India today. For example, at one place the members who have gone there have found that if a cultivator applies for a loan, he can get it in three days. In India, I tell you from my personal experience, because I come from a village, a man may not get an agricultural loan even in three years—leaving aside that aspect of what he has to give by way of bribery and all that, that is a thing which we should not discuss. Therefore, that is one thing which we must certainly take note of.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): In China they do not use tractors. They do not practise mechanised agriculture.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Please hear me. I am not going to come to that thing, tractors. I am going to make a few observations for your consideration. Having tractors does not mean that you should not get the loan.

Another thing that I want to bring to the notice of the House is that the Chinese use a considerable amount of fertilisers. That also is an aspect which we must seriously consider—availability of fertilisers, distribution of fertilisers, etc. etc.

Then, one of the most important things that the Chinese peasants have got is that there is price fixation. Price is fixed in advance and the agriculturist is assured that he is going to get so much price when his produce is ready. We just recently read that the prices fixed there are sufficiently high. In the case of millet, if we translate it in terms of the Indian currency, the price fixed is Rs. 14/8. Now the price of Rs. 14/8 for millet is quite a high price in terms of the Indian currency.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): Here it is maximum but not minimum.

SHRI VIJAY SINGH: Now what happens is this that the cultivator gets the proper incentive to produce more. We are not providing that sort of incentive in India and we are not doing what our Chinese neighbours are doing.

Another thing that the Chinese have been able to do is that they have eliminated the profits of the middlemen. That also is an important thing and that taxes our agriculturists to a very great extent. Then they have been able to have co-operatives, and the co-operatives are also a great success there.

Lastly what the Chinese have done—and we in India should do that—is that they have eliminated the distinction between landed property and other kinds of property. Here we are always talking of fixing a ceiling on agricultural property without thinking of fixing a ceiling on other types of property. This is the statement of the delegation that has just visited China and they have said that there is absolutely no difference in the treatment that the Government accords to the various types of property. If the fields are nationalised, then the factories are also nationalised. This has removed the sense of discrimination in the hearts of agriculturists that their property only was going to be nationalised, and that the same treatment is not being accorded to all other types of property. This is also a very essential thing.

[**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.]

Now, I would like to make three suggestions so far as the agricultural sector is concerned. If we want really to reach the target of production that we have set for agriculture, then we must make the agricultural industry attractive enough for genuine educated farmers to go and settle in the villages. At this time what is happening is that people who are educated and who can really employ their scientific knowledge to make agriculture attractive and produce more, do not find the proper incentive to remain in the villages and they drift towards the cities. Unless and until the Government provides the conditions whereby the educated people will go and take to agriculture, we will not be able to effect any improvement in agriculture however much we may talk. The second thing that I would like to say is that we should also create conditions for the availability of easy credit which

is most essential. Now, people do not get credit, and, therefore, much of the improvement that the agriculturists want to make suffers. Then, I want to suggest that there should not be any distinction between landed property and other property. These are the things that I would like to submit in all humility before the Government for their consideration.

Now I would like to say something about the Conference of the Food Ministers. They have suggested a provision of Rs. 8,743 lakhs for increasing food production. The majority of that relates to cotton, jute, etc. This is not enough. I think we are missing the fundamental conception, and that is that the food that we produce is really meant not to get money but to increase our health. It is a well-known fact that the calorific value of the average Indian diet is only 1800, whereas we ought to have a calorific value of 3000. In order to have this calorific value, you must produce meat, you must produce fish, you must produce milk, etc., and there is no provision in the resolution that was passed at the Mussoorie Conference for these products. Therefore, I also draw the attention of the Government to this basic fact, and I hope they will surely do some thing in this connection.

Now, Sir, I will come to the question of regional planning. This is a very important aspect. You will excuse me, Mr. Deputy Chairman, if I say, that those of us who come from the backward areas of a State like Rajasthan surely feel that there is no socialistic pattern so far as the redistribution of the territories of the Indian States is concerned. In the redrawing of the map of India Bombay which was the richest State in the beginning still continues to be so. Sir, States like Rajasthan have got nothing so far as the industrial development is concerned. We have been provided with a big volume wherein all the various industrial programmes of the Government of India are tabled. If you will go through that volume, you will find, Sir, that there is not a single heavy industry that has been allotted to Rajasthan. Now, it can just be argued by someone that the conditions in Rajasthan are not favourable for starting any heavy industry. Therefore, I would just like to place before the House the actual conditions obtaining in Rajasthan and what sort of heavy industries can be established there. I may be considered parochial, but this I do, because I feel

[Shri Vijay Singh.]

that the case of backward States like Rajasthan is not receiving due attention at the hands of the Government of India.

Sir, next to iron, copper, lead and zinc are the most important metals that are mostly used. Now, Sir, Rajasthan is rich in copper, lead and zinc. We get lead and zinc in the Jawar mines in Udaipur division, and we get copper in the Khetri mines in Jaipur division. Now, Sir, so far as the production of zinc is concerned, Rajasthan tops the list in India. Recently, Sir, this question was examined by a team of Russian experts who went round the country and toured the area. Their observations are also worth recording, and I will put these observations before the House. But before I do so, I would just like to give a case history of these mineral developments of Rajasthan.

The Jawar mine, as we know, was being worked in the fourteenth century. In fact, the income from the Jawar mine was the main source for the Maharanas when they were fighting against the Moghuls. The Jawar mine is situated in the mountains. When the armies of Emperor Akbar raided the plains of Mewar, the Maharanas went to the hills, and the main source of revenue available to them was the Jawar mine. This Jawar mine remained unused for the last 100 years. It is now being worked, since 1942, and the Indian Metal Corporation is working this mine at present. Now, Sir, with regard to this Indian Metal Corporation, a Committee was appointed by the Government of India, and that Committee has reported that in view of the developments that we have to make in the country, this Metal Corporation is not in a position to utilise the resources that are there. Now, Sir, the zinc that we get in Udaipur is exported to Bihar, because the Indian Metal Corporation have established their smelting plant at Bihar. Now this zinc and lead goes from Rajasthan to Bihar for being smelted there. What I wish to emphasise is that the conditions in Rajasthan permit all these things to be done there itself. We are now getting electricity from Chambal, and we have got enough water resources there. Also, Sir, there is now a plan to link up this area through the railway. If, therefore, this lead-smelting industry is established in Rajasthan, it will go a long way to solve the problem of Rajasthan, and it will also solve the problem of industrialisation.

Then, Sir, there is another aspect of it. We send zinc from India to Japan for being smelted there, because there is no plant in India to smelt zinc. The Russian experts who visited this place had a very important observation to make, and I crave the indulgence of the House in order to read this full paragraph from that important Report, which had been submitted in March, 1956. That Report at page 17 states as follows:

"It is very expensive to transport the zinc concentrate to Japan and retransport the metal back to India. The cost of transport and treatment in Japan is 450 rupees. According to the terms of agreement with the Japanese plant the recovery of zinc from concentrate, concerning the mine, is 85%. Cadmium and silver are not sent back to India from Japan. At present the production is small but when it will be even 500 tons per day, the amounts of cadmium and silver will be considerable being 3,500 tons and 225 tons, respectively, per year. If a zinc smelter will be constructed near the lead smelter, the cost of treatment of one ton of concentrate will be about 200 rupees in their proposed zone smelter with a capacity of 10,000 tons of metal per year. The total cost of construction of the proposed smelter is estimated at about 20 million rupees. So the Russian Experts are of the opinion that zinc should be smelted in India."

So, Sir, we are paying to Japan Rs. 450 at this time, and if we construct such a thing in India, it may cost only Rs. 200, a net saving of Rs. 250. Therefore, Sir, if the Government seriously considers this matter, such an industry can well be established in Rajasthan, and it will solve the problem of backwardness of Rajasthan and at the same time it will also help the growth of Indian economy.

And now, Sir, I would like to say a few things with regard to copper. The production of copper in the Khetri mines can be estimated at 18,000 to 20,000 tons. Therefore, we can also have a copper-smelting plant in Rajasthan. The Khetri mines are in Jaipur division where we shall have power from Bhakra and Chambal. Therefore, there will be absolutely no difficulty so far as power is concerned. Now, Sir, along

with copper we also get some amount of gold, and that also will be an additional advantage. Again, Sir, copper and zinc are the two metals, the compound of which is brass, and we know that the brass industry of Jaipur is quite famous. Therefore, if we have smelting industry for copper and zinc, then simultaneously we can also have a brass industry. We all know, Sir, that the consumption of brass in India is the highest in the whole world. We use too many brass utensils and articles. Therefore, if we establish such an industry in Rajasthan, that will also solve the problem of Rajasthan and that will also be of help to India.

Then, Sir, I come to another aspect of it. That is about the by-product of copper and zinc. In the process of smelting copper and zinc, sulphur is produced and that can be used for the production of fertilisers, and, therefore, Sir, we can have a fertiliser factory also in Rajasthan. Recently, Sir, we requested the Government of India for setting up a fertiliser factory in Rajasthan, but unfortunately our request was not conceded. I am sure, Sir, that all these allied industries, if they are established and located in Rajasthan, will go a long way to help in the development of the country. These are some of the things that I want to mention simply to show that there is a great possibility of having industrial development in Rajasthan. But nothing has been done so far in that direction, and it only leads me to one conclusion that a backward State like Rajasthan is not at all cared for by the Central Government as it ought to be.

Apart from all these things, Sir, I may also inform this House that recently rich iron-ore deposits have also been discovered in Rajasthan. Rajasthan, therefore, is quite rich in minerals, which ought to be properly surveyed. (*Time bell rings.*) With your permission, Sir, I will take only one or two minutes more.

Sir, we have got very eminent sons of Rajasthan who have established various industries outside Rajasthan. I do not want to go into all the details why they were not able to do so in Rajasthan, but I will only say that when we are trying to set up a socialist pattern of society in this country, it is the duty of the Centre to do all that has been neglected so far by the people of Rajasthan.

These are some of the few remarks that I wanted to place before the House. I do hope that whatever I have placed before the House will receive due consideration not only in the interests of Rajasthan, but also in the interests of the country as a whole and in the interests of our economy and the success of our Second Plan and the Third Plan and so on, because planning is a continuous process, as we all know. Thank you.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Plan covers the Budgets of the next five years, and therefore, it is very important with regard to the resources proposals as well as the expenditure proposals. As regards the resources of Rs. 4,800 crores, the more I go into it, the more I find that we will be able to get these resources. Many persons in India and outside have said that the Plan is ambitious and may not be carried out. I may say that with regard to the resources we will not fail, but with regard to our administrative personnel organisation and with regard to our capacity to make sacrifices, we may fail. Therefore, we have to look to these things; first of all, secure the resources and then look to our manpower and the administrative and organisational apparatus.

With regard to resources, I may point out that public loans and small savings would amount to about Rs. 1,200 crores. These will be available at the rate of interest at which Government is prepared to borrow. Government cannot borrow at more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. or 4 per cent. They can get more if they pay a higher rate of interest, but it is not advisable, and, therefore, this borrowing is limited to Rs. 1,200 crores by way of public loans and small savings. Mr. Dasappa said that if we wanted to expand the public sector, we would have to get more resources. We can get more resources only by paying inflated rates of interest. It is not in the interests of the country.

With regard to Railways, their contribution is Rs. 150 crores and Provident Funds and other deposit heads come to Rs. 250 crores. With regard to foreign aid, it is said that we may not be able to get it. With regard to foreign aid, we have already got, including the American aid which was announced only last week, Rs. 350 crores including our balances for 1956. By way of foreign

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

aid, Rs. 450 crores remain, and that is not a very ambitious sum to get in the next five years. If you issue debentures and get loans from foreign countries, this figure may actually be exceeded.

With regard to taxation, it is mentioned that at existing rates of taxation, we can get Rs. 350 crores, and by additional taxation Rs. 450 crores. Out of these Rs. 450 crores, Rs. 225 crores are to be raised by the Centre and Rs. 225 crores by the State Governments. With regard to securing Rs. 225 crores by the Centre, we have already secured Rs. 325 crores by the levies that we put in the month of March and the levies which we put just now in August on cloth, at the rate of Rs. 65 crores a year. This figure of Rs. 450 crores was prepared in January, and we have already got additional taxation of Rs. 225 crores plus Rs. 100 crores. There is a gap of Rs. 400 crores, which has to be met by taxation as well as by profits of public enterprises, Rs. 200 crores from taxation and Rs. 200 crores from profits of public enterprises. Out of that gap, we have already secured Rs. 100 crores. These facts cannot be denied. We have now to secure by way of taxation another Rs. 100 crores in the next five years. I think that the Planning Commission should make it very clear that they will not now have additional taxation exceeding Rs. 100 crores in the next five years. I think the private sector, the industrialists and others engaged in trade and commerce, are entitled to know how much taxation they can expect. Out of the gap of Rs. 450 crores, only Rs. 100 crores remain to be covered by taxation. I think the Government should make this very clear.

With regard to deficit financing, it is about Rs. 1,200 crores. That deficit financing has to be launched in a very judicious and cautious manner, because inflationary tendencies should not develop. Inflationary tendencies should not develop especially in the matter of food and in the matter of cloth. These are the essential articles which account for nearly 60 per cent. of the working cost of living index in the country. These prices should not be allowed to rise. I think that food production is going to be raised from 18 per cent. to 25 per cent. even by the present investment. It should be raised in my opinion to 40 per cent. I think that the estimate of a rise in food production of 18 per cent.

is really conservative. The proper significance of the benefits of irrigation and distribution of fertilisers and manure has not properly been assessed in getting this figure of additional 10 million tons of foodgrains. I am quite sure that with our irrigation projects being fulfilled in time we shall be able to increase our agricultural production by 30 per cent. in the next five years. We have to think of the yield per acre and also the return per acre. Both these are important to the agriculturists. The yield per acre and the return per acre can be well increased by implementing the recommendations of the Rural Credit Survey Committee and without tinkering with the proposals that they have made. Co-operative credit and crop loans are mentioned by them. If these two principles are adhered to, I am quite sure that agricultural production will go up from 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. in the next five years, and that is very important for us.

Then, a word about buffer stocks. Buffer stocks are very necessary in order to keep the prices at a minimum as well as a maximum level. In matters of agricultural products, no forward market should be allowed. Only non-transferable delivery contracts should be allowed in certain agricultural commodities. Forward markets should be completely banned in this country in my opinion in these products, if we want to keep the prices at a maximum and minimum level.

Then, with regard to cloth, there must be adequacy as well as reasonable prices and I think there is no prospect for them owing to the measures that are being taken at present. First of all, we will get the additional spindlage after some time. We will get the Ambar Charkha programme implemented after some time. So, we are keeping off production in this way. Therefore, it is necessary in the next year or during this interim period, to get additional production by working a third shift. How can that be done? We must give incentive for working a third shift. How can we give it? There must be a levy for the first and second shifts on the spindles worked, and there should be no levies on the third shift. This will automatically increase the number of third shifts and more yarn will be available. Then in order that we may get yarn to the full quantity necessary, we should also take some other steps. There are

some units which are working inefficiently. Some units with the same machinery are giving 5 oz., 4 oz. and even 3 oz. Production varies so much. If the production is below average those units must be penalised by a certain rate of taxation. That is very necessary and that method should be adopted in order to have average efficiency in each industry. These two items—food and cloth—should be looked after with care.

The question of balance of trade is a dangerous thing, because we have a deficit of Rs. 1,100 crores in the balance of trade. What are our exportable commodities? They are jute manufactures, tea and textiles. With regard to jute manufactures, the condition of the industry is not so good as could be desired. A lot will have to be done. Unless we improve the purchase system of raw jute and the management of jute mills and the condition of a machinery in jute mills; I think the exports will not be maintained in competition, and, for that, special steps should be taken not by the Export Promotion Council but by the Government.

With regard to textiles also, at present as long as the high prices are prevailing in the domestic market, the export market will be retarded. The Finance Minister has said in his statement that the cloth prices have arisen by about 10 to 15 per cent. When the domestic market gives them 15 per cent. more, why will they prefer to export? Therefore, there must be a power to requisition cloth at the Tariff Board price in order to meet our full quota of exports. That is very necessary. If we don't do it today, I think we shall have to do it very soon, because we want to maintain our exports of jute, cotton and tea. Unless we do that, our whole problem of getting machinery imports will not be realized because these three are the principal commodities on which we will have to concentrate and adopt drastic measures for getting such quota of exports which we contemplate and think necessary.

Then I come to industrial expansion. The industrial expansion envisaged is to the extent of Rs. 690 crores in large scale industries in the public sector. That will be easy because most of it or more than half of it is iron and steel plants. In the private sector Rs. 550 crores are for industries to be newly started and erected and to come into operation and

Rs. 150 crores are for renovation. This renovation and reconditioning of machinery is left to individual concerns. I think the renovation and reconditioning are not taken up by the individual concerns in a way in which they should. So, I say in order that the depreciation that we allow on a large scale may be well utilized, it is necessary that improved efficiency should also be secured and that can be done by a technical survey of all the important units in the country. If we have a technical survey of all the important units in the country engaged in the principal industries, then we shall be able to know how to get average efficiency of each concern. If some concerns are very good, why should not others or the marginal concerns come up to the average? Then I come to the principle of equity capital. Whenever Government advances loans to the private sector, if that sector is making profits, Government should participate only in the equity capital and not by way of debentures or loans. Then how this system of industrial development is retarded is to be noted. Licences are issued for import of goods as well as for establishing new undertakings. Now there is a regular traffic in getting these licences because certain people get licences for a number of factories to be erected in the country and there is no time-limit given for the erection of those factories. The licences are renewed from year to year on one pretext or the other and they are managing that somehow with the Government. That must stop. If the licence is given, then a certain deposit—and I will put it to the extent of one per cent. of the cost of machinery and buildings—should be made with the Government. That deposit will be forfeited if that concern does not come into operation within a certain time. At present people are playing with the licences. People who have no means are getting licences and people are having a dozen licences in their pockets and they secure these with the influence or favour of certain people, into which I need not go here. If the system of deposit is there, and if there is forfeiture of that deposit if that machinery is not booked within three months or within a stipulated time, things will improve. Some such condition should be laid down in order that these licences materialise. Then the full installed capacity of each industry should be utilized. For that a technical survey is very important and without that we cannot progress.

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

Then comes the production of some essential industries which should not go down. What are those industries? They are textiles, cement, fertilizers, electric motors and sugar. Now, for some of these industries there are number of licences still pending in the country and no efforts are made for erecting those factories. Therefore, we will be short of requirements owing to want of these factories coming into being. For this, another factor that is necessary is that of manpower. A technical and economic service should be established in the country in order to manage the concerns in the public and private sectors with better efficiency, than what is now prevailing and that is very important. Because unless we get persons trained to do the work which is assigned to them, we shall not succeed. I may again point out here that if you get a technical person who is quite competent and capable, then there are chances of reducing the cost of production by 5 to 10 per cent. Suppose the total value of the products of a factory is Rs. 1 crore, a technical man is likely to make a saving of Rs. 5 to 10 lakhs if he is capable and efficient. There are instances of that nature. Many concerns have changed hands and many have prospered under different hands. Therefore, I consider that an economic and technical service is very important.

While making the above suggestions it must be borne in mind that all solvent units in the country should be supplied with adequate finance by the State and no solvent unit should suffer for want of finances and the State Bank should be authorised to give such finances for industrial development.

Then I come to labour relations which are very important. We have been able to make good progress on account of no strikes during the last five years or due to reduction in the number of strikes. That is very important. The management must co-operate with the labour and if we give more rights to the labour with regard to Joint Committees or management and the like, it will be better, and then the production will naturally increase.

In the administration of public enterprise there is at present some inefficiency because they are managed by I.C.S. people. They are not well managed and I think a lot may be said in favour of giving the management to the

technical and economic hands. Thereby we will save much. Therefore, technical personnel trained with economic knowledge are required and they should get these posts and the salaries that befit those posts. If we tinker with the salaries, then we will not succeed. If we tinker with the salaries and say only Rs. 4,000 and no more, we shall be losing Rs. 10 to 20 lakhs. You may get a production worth about Rs. 40 lakhs by paying say, Rs. 12,000 more.

About regional disparities a lot has been said. Unless we have proper industrial development according to the region, we shall not be able to succeed, and we will be increasing the discontent and resentment which are prevailing in these under-developed States. We cannot have lop-sided development in our country. Certain States are woefully lacking in industrial development and efforts should be made to develop those States and bring them on an average with the other States.

With regard to transport, whatever success we may achieve in our plans, unless we invest Rs. 200 crores more on transport, we shall not succeed and all our plans of industrial and agricultural development will fail and higher prices will prevail in the country for want of adequate transport. I have no time to speak on that but that is very material and we shall have to allocate another Rs. 200 crores for transport.

5 P.M.

One more point and that is about employment. That is a very material point because whatever our Plan may say, about fifty lakh people will be unemployed in the country and if that persists, then all our agricultural and industrial developments and all our desire to increase the average income and raise the standard of life of the people will be of no avail. They will fall flat on the country if we do not have full employment guaranteed to those who are unemployed at present. At least there should be no person in the country who is unemployed. If he demands work, it is the bounden duty of the Government to give him work. Every man has the right to work and it is the duty of the Government to give him work, work that will give him at least 12 annas a day. That can be done by having small-scale cottage industries, I know. But they are not sufficient to meet all our needs to remove unemployment of 15 million persons. Only the Ambar Charkha can

give work to all these people to the degree that we desire. Work will be provided to 30 lakh persons only by the Ambar Charkha. But we seem to tinkering with the success of the Ambar Charkha. We are tinkering with the problem of unemployment and we are not allowing the Ambar Charkha full scope though that is the only way of solving this unemployment problem. I am not talking of those people who want a certain type of work. I am talking of people who have no work at all, who want any kind of work, work that will give them at least 12 annas a day. This we must give and the sooner we realise this fact the better it is for the country. Our whole democracy is sustained by one man—Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. But I think his influence as regards unemployment will be limited when 50 lakh people continue to remain unemployed in the country over and above many more who are under-employed. We should remember this, when we speak of giving the people a better standard of life or our *per capita* income going up from Rs. 330. The sooner we realise the magnitude of this problem the better. How can we solve it? What should be done? We are putting up the excises. We are putting a ceiling on production. But we are not doing all this in the proper way, in the way in which it will be effective. First of all we must have greater production in the cottage sector and the excise should be levied according to the volume of production. The higher the volume of production of a factory the less is the cost of production. Therefore, a factory which produces more, which has greater output, that factory should bear a higher rate of excise duty. I do not know why the Planning Commission is not alive to this fact. Where they have less cost of production and they have also greater output, they get benefit, and part of that benefit should go to the State as long as unemployment prevails in this land. I again submit that unless we solve the unemployment problem, all our efforts at increasing the *per capita* income, at raising the standard of living and all that, will fall flat. That is very important especially when we remember that according to the Sample Survey Report, about 20 per cent of our rural population have an average family income of only Rs. 600 or less. Their family income ranges from Rs. 120 to Rs. 600. How are you going to increase this income? Are your schemes for agricultural production, your schemes for

industrial production going to benefit these people? Are these people going to get 8 hours full work? That is what is needed. Unless you give them 8 hours work the family income will not go above Rs. 600. Again 30 per cent of the population have a family income below Rs. 1,200. It will be seen that as much as 50 per cent of our population live below subsistence level. We must remove this unemployment and the Ambar Charkha can give employment to 30 lakhs. Unless we give them employment I think all our industrial or agricultural development programmes will not bear fruit and there will be discontent and resentment in the country which we will not be able to face. Even our best leaders will not be able to face that situation. Therefore the sooner we realise this fact the better. It is no use criticising the Ambar Charkha. There are several ways of using it. As many as 20 spindles can be worked with an improved electric driven *charkha*. Let them only put it into practice. But we are now going in for power-looms. When even hand-looms have not got adequate work, what is the use of going in for power-looms? It passes my imagination and I do not know how they are going to solve the unemployment problem in this manner.

Lastly, I want to submit there are many major industries here which are manufacturing component parts. I think, this work should be decentralised. One factory manufactures as many as forty component spare parts. These should be decentralised and allotted to other smaller industrial units where the parts could be manufactured. They could then be assembled in one factory. In this and other ways, we must find out methods of giving greater employment. If the family income is greater, it will not matter if we levy an excise burden of, say Rs. 20 on the family. If you give the family employment and raise the income by another Rs. 300 or so, then they will be prepared to bear such additional burden. Our inflation will be borne by the people only if there is more and full employment in the land. I am not talking of the under-employed. There is actual unemployment, because there is work in the country side only for four months in a year and for the remaining eight months the man does not get even 10 annas or even 6 annas a day. That is the unfortunate position.

I want to point out that even now there is a lot of technical skill in the

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

country which is unutilised. There are so many engineers without work. What is the reason for this? The reason is this. The man cannot be fitted to the job that is required to be done. Therefore, in order that all such persons, who have imperfect technical training or those who possess diplomas and degrees, may find work and assist in national development, you should give them refresher training for a year or so in a factory. After that training, they will be capable of doing the work that we expect of them. There are a number of such persons who are still unemployed. During this training period they may be given a stipend. We require so many of them and every year our requirements are growing. Unless we utilise the manpower available in the country, especially this idle technical manpower, in the proper way, we will not succeed in our programmes. In our technical institutions we are turning out graduates with theoretical knowledge. That training taken alone is useless. Every graduate and even post-graduate must have factory training at least for eighteen months. Unless there is this factory training, he will be of no use. He will not be of any use in practical operation. How to give these people this kind of practical training? This can only be done by compulsorily asking the factories to absorb these persons for apprenticeship training. This has got to be done. I do not know why it is not done. May be that the factory-owners would say that these people cannot do a particular kind of work. But that is no excuse. I may give the example of America where they are training our students in their factories out of their regard for an international spirit of co-operation. Young students who have had training as engineers in colleges are given training in foreign countries in technology and management in factories in order to have better international understanding and co-operation. When that is done, can we not impose such a thing here in our own country, that our factory-owners should take up our technical men for being trained for a period of about 18 months in all departments of the factory? If the trainee finds that the training is not properly given there should be a committee which could be approached and the management brought to account. That is the only way in which we can give this practical training to our technical men.

Lastly, I will say a few words about our national income. Our national income which is now Rs. 10,800 crores is going to be increased by Rs. 2,600 crores. Agriculture is to increase to Rs. 940 crores. I think this rise can certainly be achieved and I even feel that we will be able to raise it to Rs. 1,800 crores, if proper efforts are there. In industries there is to be a rise of Rs. 840 crores and this is a fair target. With regard to commerce, communications and transport the increase is to be Rs. 420 crores. I think that a further increase can be achieved if there is greater agricultural and industrial production. Therefore, we have to see that our installed capacity is fully utilised and production efficiency is brought up to the necessary standards. The professional services will also contribute about Rs. 400 crores. They will also get more employment. This also depends on our agricultural and industrial productions rising and coming up to the standards desired.

With these remarks I support the motion.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I extend my general support to the Plan frame and to the Plan's approach.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Advisedly used.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: My colleague sitting to my right here, says I used the words "general support" advisedly. I may assure the House that I use them in the sense in which they are meant. I am not prepared to consider this Plan in isolation and I am considering this Plan as a continuation of the First Plan.

It stands to the credit of the country and it stands to the credit of the Government that we have remarkably succeeded in implementing our programme in the first Five Year Plan. In certain quarters, there are doubts whether the same amount of success can be achieved during the working of the Second Five Year Plan. These matters have been referred to by a number of speakers and I do not propose to repeat the arguments or consider several subjects, but I propose to confine my remarks only to a few of them.

My criticism of the Plan mainly is that this Plan is overweighted in favour of industry and the agriculture sector has been totally ignored or at least sufficient attention has not been given so far

as agriculture is concerned. Now, the agriculturists are merely taken as a servile class of people who are there just to serve the industrial needs. That seems to be the basic approach of the Plan. We are told that during the working of the Plan there must be stability of prices so far as agriculture is concerned. Quite right. No plan can succeed unless there is stability of prices but if you merely confine your attention to the stability of prices for agricultural produce alone and ignore the entire field in other respects, I am sure you are not only ruining the agriculturists but also ruining the country in turn because after all, this country consists of 70 per cent. of agriculturists and hardly 30 per cent. or even less are non-agriculturists. With a view to stabilising the prices, you are importing a large amount of foodgrains from other countries.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wait, Mr. Hegde. Mr. Lal Bahadur will make a statement now.

STATEMENT RE RAILWAY ACCIDENT BETWEEN JADCHARLA AND MAHBUBNAGAR

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI LAL BAHADUR): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I can very well realise the feelings of the hon. Members of this House over the tragic railway accident that took place near Hyderabad the other day. This being the second accident in that State, it has naturally caused much concern and I am in entire agreement with the House that a full and thorough enquiry should be made and, as the Prime Minister has rightly said, all steps be taken to prevent such happenings.

Many of the details of the accident have already been given to this House by the Deputy Minister on the 3rd and I need not cover the same ground. I have visited the site and I must say that I was amazed to see how a small rivulet could lead to this great disaster. It is so difficult to believe that a small stream which normally carries a few feet of water should rise so suddenly within a few, perhaps 2 to 3 hours. And it is only by sheer chance that, except for the two third class and one upper class bogies, the remaining carriages were saved without even being derailed. The

two bogies were, however, completely smashed and the third one still stands dipping into the river. Destiny, seems to have played its own part.

I now wish to report certain further details of this accident to supplement the information already given by the Deputy Minister.

A month prior to this accident, the approaches of this bridge had been breached on the 1st August, 1956, due to a heavy rush of water caused by the bursting of the Pochani-Kunta tank situated about 1½ miles up-stream of this bridge. The breaches in the railway bank were repaired and traffic was restored on the 2nd August 1956 after the bridge and its approaches had been inspected and certified as safe by the Divisional Engineer.

The records scrutinised so far show that this bridge had stood well since construction and no abnormal flow of water through the bridge nor any serious damage to the structure or even to the approaches seems to have occurred prior to the 1st of August 1956.

The breaches on the 1st August 1956 gave an opportunity to the engineers to make a thorough inspection of the bridge structure including the back of the abutments and wing walls and they found that the main parts of the structure, namely the foundations, the abutments, the wing walls and the girders had suffered no damage and were in good condition.

From the 2nd August 1956, when the traffic was restored, up to the 9th August 1956, all trains were required to stop at the bridge and then proceed at a speed of 5 miles per hour. Thereafter, the speed of the trains was raised to 10 miles per hour and this was further relaxed to 20 miles per hour on 13th August 1956. Finally, on the 21st August, 1956, the speed restriction was completely removed. It will thus be seen that after the breaches on the 1st August 1956, the speed restriction for the movement of trains over the bridge had been relaxed by stages with the progressive consolidation of the repaired portions. From the 21st August 1956, up to the date of the accident, trains continued to run at normal speeds and no untoward report had been received from any running staff during this period.