

**RAJYA SABHA***Saturday, 26th May. 1956*

The House met at eleven of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

**PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE**

**NOTIFICATION PUBLISHING FURTHER  
AMENDMENTS TO DISPLACED PERSONS  
{COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION}  
RULES, 1955**

THE MINISTER FOR PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA) : Sir, with your permission, on behalf of Shri Mehr Chand Khanna (Minister for Rehabilitation). I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (3) of section 40 'of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, a copy of the Ministry of Rehabilitation Notification S.R.O. No.' 1161/R. Amdt. V, dated the 30th April 1956, publishing further amendments to the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955. [Placed in the Library. See No. S-195/56.]

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Sir, may I ask which particular rules are sought to be amended?

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: Sir, the hon. Member must realise that I am answering on behalf of my friend, and I cannot tell him anything from this piece of paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What he means is that when you are answering on his behalf, you must know a little more about it.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO KUN-  
WARANI VIJAYA RAJE**

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the Members that the following letter dated the 21st May 1956, has been received from Kunwarani Vijaya Raje:—

"This is to request you to kindly allow me leave of absence from attending the current session of the  
49 R.S.D.—1.

Rajya Sabha on account of the indisposed health of both my son and my husband. I was expecting to attend the session even before it adjourned, but I am afraid this is also not possible as the treatment is still continuing."

Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to Kunwarani Vijaya Raje for remaining absent from all the meetings of the House during the current session?

(No hon. Member *dissented*.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

**RESOLUTION RE SECOND FIVE  
YEAR PLAN—continued**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, yesterday, I was telling this House\_\_\_\_\_

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, may we know whether the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs is deputising for the Planning Minister also?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Where are the Ministers?

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs deputises for everybody, we know that, but I just draw your attention that it is not fair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have said that. I have asked him to get the Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They would probably get the Minister for Defence or somebody.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA (Mysore): They are busy in the other House, I think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please get someone.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I have already lost three minutes.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Sir, I was dealing with the question of nationalisation yesterday, particularly because the hon. Prime Minister thinks that to ask for nationalisation is to advocate primitivism. How is it that the hon. Prime Minister himself visualises that in some distant future there will be no private sector, and that the private sector will ultimately disappear? I am glad to find that the Prime Minister is looking forward to primitivism. Is that not so? This is the question that I would like to ask him. Sir, this is a serious matter. In our view, nationalisation is very important for two reasons. Firstly, it would augment the resources of the State which are so necessary for the development of our economy. Secondly, Sir, it would enable the State to secure a better control and an effective control of our economy as a whole, and the State would be in a position to direct the economic development in the country much better than it can do now. Therefore, Sir, in order to augment the resources for national reconstruction, certain industries or undertakings should be nationalised. To begin with, we would suggest that banking, general insurance, coal-mining as a whole, aluminium, manganese, copper, iron, gold-mining, as well as the British-controlled jute mills and plantations, should be immediately nationalised. This is one of the suggestions that we would like to make to the Government. Now, Sir, this policy has been accepted by the Government, and the Government itself has nationalised certain things. We would like the Government to go forward in this direction.

Sir, another point that is made is that it would lead to frittering away of the resources in the country, because we have to pay compensation. Well, we have our views with regard to compensation. We need not go into any details with regard to that. But, Sir, the compensation can be so fixed and the payments can be so arranged that it would not lead to the frittering away of the resources of

the country. We can so arrange the terms of compensation that the persons to be compensated would find it much more profitable to invest in Government securities than in any other way. You have got the Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Act at your disposal, and I think the time has come to make a little use of it. We find that that measure was not used in respect of insurance, and there is a proposal to pay a very high compensation, of the order of Rs. 4,50,00,000 to the life insurance concerns. Therefore, it is no use telling us that the resources will be frittered away. On the contrary, the resources will be augmented, because the profits of these concerns will be available to the State exchequer. Have we suffered by way of nationalisation of the Railways in this country? Have we not added to the resources of the country? Sir, that is the question which I would like to put to the Government.

Then, Sir, in order to ensure rapid industrialisation, it is necessary to have a democratic labour policy. One should have thought that the discredited labour policy under the First Plan would undergo some change under the Second. But to our great regret, there has been no such change. Under the First Plan, the Government of India and the State Governments all along opposed the inclusion of the living standard of even the most badly-paid workers in the most profitable industries. The State collieries, for example, opposed the proposal to increase wages of the miners-before the Coal Tribunal. Dilatory tactics have been adopted by the Government even in respect of the-wages of the working journalists, which suits only the employers. Trade union and democratic rights have been trampled under foot. This has been done with particular ferocity in the State undertakings. We are getting a demonstration of this today in Kharagpur, where the railwaymen's colony has been taken-possession of by the police, and already

150 workers and employees have been put under arrest. Instead of encouraging trade unions and trade union unity on the basis of trade union democracy, the Government and the employers have encouraged the splitting of the trade union movement in order to create regimental trade unions. The Second Plan perpetuates this policy to our great regret, and this is surely not the way to promote labour enthusiasm in our industries, without which industrialisation cannot progress apace. This is what we would like to tell the Government.

Sir, now I would like to say why we are in such a bad situation with regard to our industries. Inadequate outlay for industries in public sector, impermissible neglect of machine-making industries, refusal to nationalise those industries whose nationalisation is urgently needed, unbecoming solicitude for, and heavy concessions to, monopolists in the private sector, hostile attitude towards workers and their legitimate demands, all these stand in the way of rapid industrial advance, and all these come into conflict with the declared objective of 'rapid industrialisation'.

It is not accidental that even at the end of the Second Plan, the share of factory establishments in the national output is expected to go up from 9 per cent to 11 per cent only. There will be practically no change in the structure of our economy. It will be realised that a country cannot raise its national income at a higher rate, unless the industry expands rapidly and yields greater and greater share\* in the total national output. Now, Sir, the national income has to be increased at a much faster rate than is the case at present. Yesterday, Sir, I was reading something from the book "The Discovery of India" in order to show how the Prime Minister was thinking of increasing the\* national income by 200 to 300 per cent within ten years. But today, he is satisfied with only 50 per cent in ten years. Progress is rather slow. Sir, we would demand a modification of the Plan to overcome these limita-

tions and to ensure rapid industrialisation. Our suggestions are:

- (i) increase the outlay for industries in the public sector;
- (ii) launch projects for machine-making industries here and now on a big scale under topmost priority;
- (iii) adopt a vigorously active policy for expanding public sector by starting new units, as well as by adopting the policy of nationalisation;
- (iv) reduce allocation at large-scale industries in the private sector and effectively regulate their investments;
- (v) prohibit investment for rationalisations;
- (vi) divert capital resources from the private sector to the public sector by fiscal and other measures such as compulsory loans;
- (vii) distribute new industries among States with a view to helping industries in the industrially backward States as in the South to come up;
- (viii) abandon the present labour policy and replace it by a policy which would ensure higher living standards to the workers, with an immediate 25 per cent increase in wages, as well as their democratic and trade union rights;
- (ix) encourage the trade union movement developing in the country on the basis of trade union democracy. Such is the line of advance towards rapid industrialisation.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Are they the ten commandments of Moses, I ask.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's suggestions.

SHRr BHUPESH GUPTA: I can give more suggestions if you give me more time.

Let me now come to the question of land. After the bitter experience under the First Five Year Plan, we expected some concrete and effective proposals of land reforms. The recommendations of the Land Reform Panel provided the basis for this, but the Plan not only whittles them down, but goes back upon even what was said in the Draft Outline published in February.

The Panel said that rent should be reduced to one-sixth of the gross output; the Draft Outline put it at between one-fifth and one-sixth. Now the Plan says that it should be between one-fourth and one-fifth. And it moreover leaves the matter to the States. We know how the States will fix it at the highest possible level. The Panel's recommendations should be accepted and steps should be taken to see that they are implemented by the States. I am saying something on which a broad measure of agreement was reached among the various parties and the representatives of the various parties in the Land Reform Panel. You should not scuttle it when you work out the Plan. You do not achieve any progress by scuttling things at every stage.

The resumption of personal cultivation is another point. Here again, the Plan makes a modification in favour of the landlords enabling them to grab more and more land. The Outline fixed it at one family holding. The Plan makes it three family holdings.

Ceiling: The Draft Outline fixed it at three times the family holding and also defined the family holding. The Plan leaves it to the States instead of taking a firm decision and getting the States to implement it. We know that when the Prime Minister was speaking against evictions in the country, all over the land there took place mass-scale evictions. Today the time has come for taking a firm decision on this question and to see that

the ceiling is enforced at a level which would enable the Government to get the maximum possible land for distribution among the peasants, specially agricultural labourers, for after all the crux of the land reform question lies in the distribution of land to these sections and with the kind of ceiling you have fixed, you cannot solve the problem. The Prime Minister sees revolution in the countryside. I do not see that; may be my eyes are somewhat wrong. I would like to know from the hon. Members of this House where they see revolution in the countryside. Do they see it in the long queues of starving people? Do they see it in the evicted peasants? Do they see it among the distressed who are yearning for a little bit of food or a little bit of clothing? That is not revolution. I agree that certain advantages are being created; certain material benefits are being created in the Community Projects and National Extension Services. We welcome them. We do not deny that, but let us not draw a picture of exaggeration because that leads to wrong conclusions and what is worse, to wrong proposals and practices, as we get in this document.

Then, Sir, I will come to the question of unemployment. At the end of the Second Plan 7 million would have been still left without jobs, of which half a million would be educated persons. Now, when we started the Plan in March 1951, the figures of unemployment as shown in the registers of the various Employment Exchanges was 3,37,000. In 1956 in the same month, March, we get the figure of 7,05,000, more than double, but this is an under-estimation, as you know, and we have the statement in the Plan itself that the existing unemployment, taking the country as a whole, would be about five million. This is the picture that we get, and the Second Five Year Plan does not offer any solution to the problem, because there is no proposal for rapid industrialisation truly speaking, and there is no proposal for land reform which alone can provide rural employment and relieve rural unemployment-

ment. Therefore, these are the two factors which have to be taken into account, when you are dealing with the question of unemployment.

Now, about the resources part of the Plan, which is a very weak part of the Plan in so many ways. Now, we know that our resources are limited, financially speaking, but are we doing all that is possible to do? The Prime Minister spoke about the difficulties in the matter of foreign exchange. I understand those difficulties. We offer this suggestion. You can seize the huge amount of gold that lies with the princes and the other rich classes and you can meet your foreign exchange obligations with this gold and by carrying on your trade on the basis of this gold. Is it not possible for us to do that? When you have that gold, you can meet your foreign trade and foreign exchange obligations by, if necessary, exporting that gold in return for the commodities that you may import.

Then, why can't we impose a capital gains tax? It has been estimated by Professor Kaldor that properties appreciating in value would come to about Rs. 1500 crores or so, of which share<sup>4</sup> would account for Rs. 1000 crores. If you impose a capital gains tax, anything between Rs. 15 and Rs. 45 crores could be gathered. Why can't you impose a capital gains tax at once?

Then, about income-tax. You can tighten the income-tax administration and collect more. We find the statement by Prof. Kaldor that every year there is tax evasion to the order of Rs. 200 to Rs. 300 crores. It may be a little exaggerated, I do not know. It may be right or it may be wrong, but there is no doubt that there is substantial evasion of tax. That money could be collected. I say that only after adequately taxing the rich, will you be justified, in approaching the poor people for financing the Plan.

About deficit financing, we are apprehensive about it, because it may set in motion inflationary pressures

and upset the whole scheme and the financial structure of the entire Plan, and the burden of such financing will inevitably fall on the poor. Then you think of getting foreign assistance. I say that we should not so heavily rely on foreign assistance. We must try to get all the resources that we need from our own resources. It would not speak well of planning when it \* so heavily relies on such uncertain factors as foreign assistance, factors that are beyond our control. I do not think that you are going to get it at the rate of Rs. 160 crores as envisaged in this Plan as against the Rs. 40 crores that you got every year in the First Plan. You are not going to get it. Where is the protection? How do we cover it? By taxing the people? I protest against the proposals for raising Rs. 800 crores of additional taxes. I would like the rich to be taxed more, but taxes on the poor should not be imposed. On the contrary, they should be given tax relief. I would appeal to the Government that the people should not be turned into some sort of machines for the Plan. They are after all human beings. They should not be treated merely as drawers of water and hewers of wood for the purposes of your planning. It is they who are the architects of new India and it is they who should be placed in their proper role and position.

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण (बम्बई) :**

आदरणीय सभापति जी, इस पंचवार्षिक योजना की ओर कई दृष्टियों से देखा जा सकता है। मैं कोई अर्थशास्त्री तो हूँ नहीं, एक मामूली कार्यकर्त्ता हूँ, और आम जनता की निगाह से इस योजना की ओर देखने की कोशिश मैं करूँगा।

प्रथम पंचवार्षिक योजना की समाप्ति होने के बाद हमें यह देखना चाहिये कि प्रथम योजना से आम जनता को क्या लाभ पहुँचा। काफी कामयाबी प्रथम योजना के कार्य में हुई है, यह तो आप सब जानते हैं, और कम या ज्यादा अनुभव आप सबने अपने अपने विभाग में इसका लिया हुआ है। आपको पता है कि

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

गत पांच वर्षों में हमारी नेशनल इन्कम १८ टका बढ़ी है। पर कैपिटल इन्कम भी २८१ तक पहुँच गई है। परन्तु आज तक जो रिपोर्टें शायद हुई ह, उनमें से किसी को उठा कर देख लीजिये, किसी ने यह पता नहीं चलता कि ग्राम जनता जो कि देहातों में रहती है, जो गरीब है, दरिद्री हैं और जिनकी रोजाना कमाई ४ आना, ६ आना और १० आना है, उनकी इन पांच वर्षों में क्या प्रगति हुई है। कहा जाता है, और अर्थ मंत्री जी ने ठीक ही अपने बजट के भाषण में कहा था, कि पर कैपिटल इन्कम से हमारे देश की ग्राम जनता की प्रगति कितनी है इसका पता नहीं चलता। हमारे देश के लोएस्ट स्टेट्स, यानी निम्न श्रेणी के जो लोग हैं, उनकी आय कितनी बढ़ी उसमें हमें पता चलेगा कि हमारा देश उन्नति पर है या नहीं, और इस निगाह से देखा जाय तो दुःख के साथ कहना होगा कि हमारे मुल्क की गरीबी में कोई खास कमी हुई, ऐसी बात नहीं है। बेरोजगारी हमारी कम हुई, यह भी कोई बात नहीं कही जा सकती। यह बात तो हमारे माननीय मंत्री, प्लानिंग ने भी मंजूर कर ली है कि अनइम्प्लॉयमेंट में कोई खास कमी नहीं हुई है।

हमारे सामने जो द्वितीय योजना आई है उसमें भी हम देख रहे हैं कि ७२ अरब रुपया खर्च होने को है, ४८ अरब रुपया पब्लिक सेक्टर में और २४ अरब रुपया प्राइवेट सेक्टर में। इसके पूरा होने पर हमारी नेशनल इन्कम १३,४८० करोड़ रुपया होने को है और पर कैपिटल इन्कम ३३१ रुपया। परन्तु मैंने यह सारी किताब बहुत गहरी नज़र से तो नहीं पर ऊपरी तौर से काफी देखी, लेकिन मुझे ऐसा दर्शन कहीं नहीं मिला, जिस दर्शन से मुझे पता चलता कि हमारे पांच लाख देहातों में जो २६ करोड़ लोग रहते हैं, उनकी पांच वर्ष में किस तरह से कहां तक हालत सुधरने को है। खुद हमारे प्लानिंग कमीशन के निर्माता कहते हैं कि ऐसी कोई हालत पैदा होने वाली नहीं है जो ग्राम जनता की निगाह

में आ सकेगी। हम देखते हैं कि ग्राम जनता को आज पहली ज़रूरत अन्न की है, दूसरी ज़रूरत कपड़े की है और तीसरी ज़रूरत है घर की। इनसे भी ज्यादा ज़रूरत है रोजी दिलाने की। सबसे अच्छा प्लान वही हो सकता है जिसमें काम करने योग्य हर एक मनुष्य को काम दिया जा सकता हो, जैसा कि महात्मा गांधी ने एक जगह पर कहा है, वही एक रीयल प्लान हो सकता है जिसमें कि **Best utilization of the whole manpower of India** हो। परन्तु हम देखते हैं कि खुद इस प्लान को बनाने वाले इस बात को मंजूर करते हैं कि इससे बेरोजगारी की समस्या में कोई खास कमी होने वाली नहीं है। ये यह भी मंजूर करते हैं कि प्रथम पंचवर्षीय योजना के आखीर में चार साढ़े चार मिलियन आदमियों को काम तो मिला परन्तु जो हालत शुरू में बेरोजगारी की थी वही करीब करीब आज भी बनी हुई है। योजना को देखते हुए आखीर में उन्होंने वह भी मंजूर किया है कि :

"These conclusions suggest that in spite of concerted efforts for the mobilisation of available resources and their optimum utilisation as proposed in the second plan, the impact on the two-fold problem of unemployment and under-employment will not be as large as the situation demands."

यानी उन्होंने यह बात मंजूर कर ली है कि द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के आखीर में भी बेरोजगारी का जो जटिल मसला है वह बहुत कुछ कम होने वाला नहीं है। आज जिस तरह से यह मसला जटिल बना हुआ है पांच वर्ष के बाद भी वह कम होने वाला नहीं है। इसके बाद, किस हद तक हमारा स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग दुरुस्त होगा, इसके विषय में प्लानिंग कमीशन की जो राय है वह मैं आपके सामने पढ़कर सुना देता चाहता हूँ :

"The current levels of living in India are very low. Production is insufficient even for satisfying the minimum essential needs of the

population, and a large leeway has to be made before the services and amenities required for healthy living can be brought within the reach of any significant proportion of the population."

यानी इसमें भी आम जनता को कोई आशादायक चित्र नहीं बतलाया जा रहा है। द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के बारे में हमें जो उद्देश्य बतलाये हैं उनमें से एक यह है :

"Reduction of inequality in income and wealth and a more even distribution of economic power."

आगे इस मिनिसिले में और यह कहा गया है :

"must raise income at the lowest levels simultaneously reduce income at the top."

परन्तु इस प्लान में कहीं भी मुझे इस बात का पता नहीं चलता कि नीचे वाले आदमियों की इंकम कैसे बढ़ेगी और ऊँचे वालों की कैसे नीचे आयेगी। क्योंकि सीलिंग इंकम की बात तो एक तरह से उन्होंने टाल दी, और दूसरा कोई रास्ता नहीं दिखलाया जिसमें कि ऊँचे वालों को नीचे लाया जा सके।

बेरोजगारी का जो सवाल है वह दिनों-दिन बढ़ रहा है। प्लान में यह बात कही गई है कि १ करोड़ ५३ लाख बेरोजगार होंगे, जिसमें २० लाख हर साल बढ़ते रहेंगे और करीब ५३ लाख पुराने हैं। तीन किस्म के बेरोजगार हैं। एक जो आज मौजूद है, दूसरे जो हर साल पैदा होने वाले हैं और तीसरे देहातों में, जो ग्रन्डर इम्प्लाईड और अन-इम्प्लाईड हैं। इन तीन किस्म के बेरोजगारों को एक तहरीक प्लान में बतलाई गई है और आखीर में यह कहा गया है कि हम पांच वर्षों में ज्यादा से ज्यादा ८० लाख लोगों को काम दे सकेंगे, यानी ७० या ७३ लाख फिर भी बेकार रह जायेंगे। वे आगे इतना ही कहते हैं :

"In determining the programme for the next five years the prime consideration is that at least the deterioration in the unemployment situation should be arrested."

यानी वह कहना चाहते हैं कि बेरोजगारी की स्थिति ज्यादा बिगड़ने नहीं दी जायेगी, उसे 'एरेस्ट' कर लिया जायेगा, जहाँ है वहीं रोक लिया जायेगा। इस तरह का बेरोजगारी का सवाल है, यानी बेरोजगारी को दूर करने के लिये इतनी आशा भर उनको रह गई है कि हम इसको बढ़ने नहीं देना चाहते और रोकने की कोशिश करेंगे। और आगे चलके वे यह कहते हैं :

"The volume of rural unemployment during the operation of the first plan has not materially changed."

यानी देहातों में अनएम्प्लायमेंट कुछ कम नहीं हुआ और जो अनएम्प्लायमेंट है उसमें कमी होने की कोई आशा नहीं। जिसे रोजगार न हो, खाने को दो वक्त निश्चित से मिलता न हो, पहनने को कपड़ा न हो, रहने को घर न हो, वह बतलाइये किस तरह से खुश हो सकता है यानी खुद को सुखी मान सकता है और यह समझ सकता है कि हमारे यहाँ पंच वर्षीय योजना चल रही है जिसमें ७ हजार २ सौ करोड़ रुपये खर्च होने को है।

आगे आप रूरल देहाती जनता को ले लीजिये। देहात में आप जानते हैं कि २९ करोड़ जनता रहती है जिसमें ५ करोड़ ऐसी जनता है जो मजदूरी पेशा है, खेती की मजदूरी करती है। ५ करोड़ में खास करके अधिक संख्या में हमारे दक्षिण में हैं। ५ करोड़ में से ५५ फीसदी दक्षिण में हैं। दक्षिण में रूरल लेबर उत्तर की निस्बत बहुत ज्यादा है। आम कुटुम्ब जो देहात में है उसमें ३०.४ सैकड़ा रूरल मजदूर फैमलीज हैं। अब देखियेगा कि इनकी हालत क्या है। यह जो ५ करोड़ आम जनता है और जो खेती पर मजदूरी करके ही अपना पेट भरती है, उनमें से ८५ टका ऐसे हैं जो कि कैजुअल वर्क करते हैं यानी सीजनल वर्क उन्हें मिलता है। और इस सीजनल वर्क का जो हिसाब आपने इस प्लान में दिया है वह यह है कि सालाना ज्यादा से ज्यादा दो सौ दिन इन मजदूरों को काम मिल सकता है

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

यानी १६० दिन जबरन बिचारे उस मजदूर को, खेती के रूरल लेबर को बेकार बैठना होता है और दो सौ रोज की कमाई २६० दिन सारे कुटुम्ब को खिलानी होती है। उसकी पर कैपिटा इंकम क्या होती है। अब यहां फर्क देख लीजिये। देश की पर कैपिटा इंकम है २८० रु० और हमारे इस मजदूर की, रूरल एरिया में रहने वाले मजदूर की है १०४ रु०। यहीं पर पर कैपिटा में कितना फर्क हो गया, यह आप देख सकते हैं। २०० दिन काम और उसमें भी आज हालत यह है कि :

"Sixteen per cent. of agricultural workers had no wage-earning employment at all during the year."

यह मैं जो कुछ कह रहा हूं इस प्लान में की बातें हैं, मेरे बगल की बातें नहीं हैं यानी :

"Sixteen per cent. of these workers have not got any work throughout the year."

यह समस्या जब आपके सामने है तब आपको इस तरह से इस सबाल को सोचना चाहिये कि जिससे हमारे देहातों को पूरा उद्योग मिले। कहा जाता है कि यह कोशिश हो रही है, परन्तु हमें कहीं यह कोशिश दिखाई नहीं देती। हमारे जो उद्योग हैं, बड़ी बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज हैं और जो बनने को हैं और जिन पर सैकड़ों करोड़ों रुपया खर्च होगा, उनके बारे में भी आप एक जगह कहते हैं :

"Transport and heavy industries have, in the short-term, relatively smaller employment content."

यानी हेवी इंडस्ट्रीज का परिणाम बेरोजगारी की निगाह से क्या होगा :

".....relatively smaller employment content."

करीब करीब यह कहा जाता है कि इन इंडस्ट्रीज में ११ या १२ हजार की आदमी पूंजी के बाद एक आदमी को काम मिलेगा जो कि ये हेवी इंडस्ट्रीज और बड़े बड़े ट्रांसपोर्ट के काम होने वाले हैं। ऐसी हालत में किस

तरह से आप जनता को, आम जनता को उत्साहित कर सकते हैं कि वह उत्साह से इस योजना में आपकी सहायता करे। इसके लिये एक जरिया बताया जाता है कि गांवों में ग्रामोद्योग शुरू किये जायें। जब मैं ग्रामोद्योग की बात इस सदन में करने को खड़ा होता हूं तो कुछ लोग कीतुहल का दृष्टि से मेरी ओर देखने लगते हैं। परन्तु मैं आपसे कहना चाहूंगा कि यहाँ एकमात्र जरिया है कि जिसकी माफत आप करोड़ों को उद्योग दे सकते हैं। हर्ष की बात है कि माननीय नन्दा जी यहाँ पर मौजूद हैं। हालांकि प्लानिंग कमीशन ने इस बात को मान लिया है कि हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोगों को ग्रामोद्योग के जरिये काम दिया जा सकता है, तब भी जो कुछ आज तक देखा गया है उससे मैं नम्रता पूर्वक कहना चाहता हूं कि इस बारे में गवर्नमेंट का ट्रीटमेंट स्टेप मदरली ट्रीटमेंट है। एक साधारण बात में कहना चाहता हूं कि गत पंच वर्षीय योजना में बहुत से मुझाव हमारे कमीशन ने किये थे। उनमें से कितने मुझाव गत पांच वर्षों में व्यवहार में आये यह देखने योग्य बात है। उस वक्त ग्रामोद्योगों के बारे में तीन उद्देश्य रखे गये थे :

- (1) Reservation or demarcation of spheres of production.
- (2) Non-expansion of the capacity of large-scale industries.
- (3) The imposition of a cess on all large-scale industries.

अब पहले को देखिये :

"Reservation of demarcation of spheres of production."

इस बारे में गत पांच वर्षों में क्या हुआ। यदि कुछ हुआ हो और हम लोगों की निगाह से निकल गया हो तो माननीय मंत्री जी आप भाषण में जरूर बतलायें, पर जहां तक मुझे पता है कुछ नहीं हुआ है। दूसरा था :

"Non-expansion of the capacity of large-scale industries."



इस बारे में भी कुछ नहीं हुआ है। कुछ कमेटीयों कायम हुई और कमेटीयों की रिपोर्ट हुई। कावें कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आप जानते हैं कि कावें कमेटी ने यह फैसला किया था कि रिफ़िनिंग मिल्स में रिफ़िंडल्स न बढ़ाये जायें। परन्तु जिस दिन से कावें कमेटी की रिपोर्ट दाखिल हुई उस दिन से आज तक रिफ़िंडल्स के लाइसेंस दिये जा रहे हैं और उनमें कोई कमी नहीं हो रही है।

एक बात और आपने प्रथम पंच वर्षीय योजना में कही थी। मैं माननीय नन्दा जी को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने यह कहा था:

"Rice huller machines should be banned and no other licences for more rice mills should be given hereafter."

यह सिफारिश आज तक वैसी ही पड़ी है और आज तक वही पुराना ठर्रा चल रहा है और वही काम हो रहा है। बाद में इसके लिये भी एक कमेटी कायम हुई और उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को भी दिये कई महीने हो गये। परन्तु अभी तक उसके ऊपर कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई। इसी तरह टेक्सटाइल कमेटी कायम हुई और उसकी सिफारिशों का क्या हुआ कुछ पता नहीं। आयल कमेटी कायम हुई परन्तु उसका भी कोई पता नहीं। आज फिर मैं देख रहा हूँ कि इस द्वितीय पंच वर्षीय योजना में सिफारिश की जा रही है कि :

"Licensing of industries should be extended to the field of agricultural processing, especially of rice mills. Appropriate legislation for this purpose should be enacted. No new rice mills, no new oil mills should be allowed hereafter."

यह द्वितीय पंच वर्षीय योजना की सिफारिश है। मैं माननीय नन्दा जी से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि जब आपकी सिफारिशें कामयाब हों तभी ऐसी बात कहियेगा और भरोसा दिलाइयेगा कि य जो हमने सिफारिशें की हैं ये मान ली जायेंगी।

इसके बाद अब आप आयल इंडस्ट्री को ले लीजिये। आप कहते हैं कि आयल मिल्स को अब आगे लाइसेंस न दिये जायें। आज आयल की क्या दशा है। हमारे देश में टोटल प्रोडक्शन जो अपेक्षित है सन् १९६०-६१ के लिये वह है २१२४ हजार टन और उसमें से जो तेल खाने के उपयोग में लिया जायगा वह है ११३६ हजार टन, यानी करीब ५० पर सेंट बनस्पति को ४३० हजार टन दिया जायगा। और इंडस्ट्रियल परपज के लिये २७८ हजार टन दिया जायगा और २१४ हजार टन निर्यात किया जायगा। मैं पूछता हूँ कि आप बनस्पति को क्यों देते हैं, इंडस्ट्रियल परपज के लिये क्यों देते हैं और निर्यात क्यों करते हैं जब कि हिन्दुस्तान के फी आदमी को पौना तोला भी तेल नहीं मिलता है। आरोग्य शास्त्रियों का यह कहना है कि हर एक मनुष्य को कम से कम पांच तोला तेल खाने को मिलना चाहिये। जब कि मनुष्य को पांच तोला तेल की आवश्यकता है तब आप उसको पौना तोला तेल दे रहे हैं। आज गरीबों को तेल तक मिलना मुश्किल है और ऐसी हालत में भी आप आधा तेल बनस्पति इंडस्ट्रीज के लिये और निर्यात के लिये रखते हैं। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि जब घर का आदमी भूखा मरता हो तब आप बाहर वाले को खुश कर की क्यों कोशिश करते हैं और बाहर का व्यापार क्यों चलाते हैं।

यह तो तेल की हालत हुई। अब आप दूध को लीजिये। आपने कभी पूछा कि हिन्दुस्तान के कितने बच्चों को आज दूध मिलता है? आपने यह तलाश किया कि हिन्दुस्तान में फी आदमी कितने दूध की खपत है? हमारे यहाँ पर कैपिटल पांच औंस दूध मिलता है और वह तब जब कि लाखों और करोड़ों गरीबों को एक तोला के हिसाब से भी नहीं मिलता होगा। डाक्टरों का कहना है कि फी आदमी कम से कम १५ औंस दूध मिलना चाहिये। तो १५ औंस मिलना चाहिये ५ औंस और फिर इस दूध

**[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]**

का होता क्या है ? वह सहरों में जाता है वहाँ भी बनता है, मावा बनता है, मिठाइयाँ बनती हैं और जो पैदा करते हैं, जिनके घर में गाय है, भैंस है, उन किसानों के बच्चों के लिये दूध नहीं रहता है। हमने पैसे की माया इस तरह की बना दी है कि घर में पैदा होने वाली चीज हम अपने पेट के बच्चे को नहीं देते हैं और उसको बाजार में जा कर बेचते हैं।

प्लान में कहा गया है हम देहातों में फल और तरकारी बढ़ायेंगे और उसके लिये इसमें ८ करोड़ की व्यवस्था भी रखी गई है। मैं अभी किसी काम से बम्बई गया था और आप जानते हैं कि बम्बई से ३०, ३५ मील पर बहुत काफी बाग बगीचे हैं और वहीं मे बम्बई को तरकारी आती है। तो मैं एक ऐसे गांव में पहुँचा जहाँ से कि रोजाना एक बैगन तरकारी बम्बई को जाती है और वहाँ जिनके खुद के बगीचे नहीं हैं उनसे मन पूछा तो उन्होंने कहा कि, साहब, हमें गांव में तरकारी नहीं मिलती है, हमें बम्बई से लानी होती है। आज यह हालत है कि पैसे का लोभ और "से की माया इतनी फैल गई है कि जिस चीज की हमें खुद जरूरत है उसको हम अपने इर्दगिर्द में भी नहीं बेचते हैं बल्कि पैसे के लाभ के लिये उसको दूर सहरों में ले जाते हैं। तो आप भले ही इन चीजों को बढ़ाते जाइये परन्तु जब तक आप यह रुकावट नहीं लायें कि जहाँ जो चीज पैदा होता है वह चीज वहाँ की आवश्यकता पूर्ति के बाद ही बाहर जा सकती है वहाँ की आवश्यकता की पूर्ति से पहले बाहर नहीं जा सकती है तब तक देहातियों को कोई लाभ नहीं होगा। आपको पता होगा कि मेरे जिले में करोड़ों रुपयों का केला पैदा होता है, कीब ४ करोड़ रुपये का केला मेरे एक जिले से बाहर जाता है परन्तु मैं देखा है कि वहाँ की जनता को केला नहीं मिलता है, जिस भाव से दिल्ली में केला बिकता है उसी भाव से करीब वहाँ बिकता है। और वहाँ अधिक केला

मिलता है कब ? जब कि रेल मिनिस्टर साहब की या रेलवे डिपार्टमेंट की कृपा से हमें वक्त पर बैग्स नहीं मिलते हैं तब वहाँ १ आना या २ आने दर्जन केला बिकता है। यह आज की हालत है। इसलिये मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह कहूँगा कि आप इन चीजों को जरूर बढ़ायें परन्तु उसके साथ साथ यह कोशिश होनी चाहिये कि जो चीज देहात में पैदा हो उसका पूरा फल देहात को मिले और जो बचत हो वही देहात से बाहर जाय।

**श्री ह० प्र० सक्सेना (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** हम तो अपना खरबूजा हिन्दुस्तान भर में भेजते हैं।

**श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण :** बड़ी अच्छी बात है।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है कि वह यह है कि इस प्लान में प्राथमिक शिक्षा की ओर जितनी निगाह देनी चाहिये उतनी नहीं दी गई है। आप जानते हैं कि विधान में यह लिखा है कि इस देश में १० वर्ष में ६ से १४ वर्ष तक की आयु के लड़के लड़कियों के लिये प्राथमिक शिक्षा फ्री और कम्पलसरी कर दी जायगी। तो इस सेकेंड फाइव ईयर प्लान के खत्म होते ही वह १० वर्ष खत्म हो जाँगे और तब तक सिर्फ ५० फीसदी ६ से १४ वर्ष तक की आयु के लड़के लड़कियों को प्राथमिक शिक्षा मिल सकेगी यानी जो हमारा बनाया हुआ विधान है और विधान में जो हमारा लिखा हुआ डाइरेक्टिव है वह हमसे पाला नहीं जाता है। इसका हमें कुछ खेद होना चाहिये और देखना चाहिये कि यह क्यों हो रहा है। मामूली बात है। आप जनता की जो आवश्यकता है उसको आप पहले पूरी कीजिये और मुठ्ठी भर लोगों की आवश्यकता की ओर आप फिर बाद में देखियेगा। जब तक आप आम जनता की मामूली आवश्यकताओं को पूरी नहीं कर सकते तब तक अगर आप मुठ्ठी भर लोगों की किसी भी आवश्यकता को पूरी करने की कोशिश करेंगे

तो फिर इस देश में समाजवादी समाज रचना कभी पैदा होने वाली नहीं है। आप देखिये कि ऐनीमैरी एजुकेशन के लिये फस्ट फाइव ईयर प्लान में ६३ करोड़ रुपया रखा गया था और अब इस प्लान में ८६ करोड़ रुपया रखा है, ४ करोड़ रुपया कम कर दिया गया है। क्यों कम किया गया यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। आपको पता ही है कि प्राथमिक शिक्षा की नितांत आवश्यकता है और इसको हमने मान भी लिया है। लेकिन बहुत से राज्यों में आज प्राथमिक शिक्षा फ्री और कम्पलसरी क्यों नहीं की जाती है? इसलिये कि उनके पास पैसा नहीं है और सेंटर से उनको मदद मिलती है तो वहां इसके लिये पूरी तरह से कोशिश हो सकती है लेकिन इस योजना में मैं देखता हूं कि सिर्फ ८६ करोड़ रुपये रखे गये हैं, जब कि पहली योजना में ६३ करोड़ था, यानी ४ करोड़ रुपये को कमी कर दी गई है हालांकि बहुत बढ़ाया था। इसके बाद अब आप देखिये कि आज प्राथमिक पाठशालाओं में जितने लड़के पढ़ते हैं उसके दसांश, यानी सौ में दस, सैकेंडरी स्कूल में पढ़ते हैं, परन्तु उसके लिये आपने ५१ करोड़ रुपये रखे हैं। इस हिसाब से देखा जाय कि १० टका के लिये ५१ करोड़, तो सौ टका के लिये कम से कम ५०० करोड़ तो प्राथमिक शिक्षा के लिये होना ही चाहिये था परन्तु वहां आपने ८९ करोड़ रखा है। उसके बाद आप देखें कि युनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन के लिये ५७ करोड़ रुपया रखा है। तो जब मैं इन अंकों को पढ़ता हूं तब मुझे याद आ जाता है कि "धनवानों की दुनिया है यह, निर्धन के भगवान।" जो ऊंची पढ़ाई करना चाहते हैं उनको खुद खर्च करना चाहिये।

(Time bell rings.)

Give me a few minutes more, Sir.

महात्मा जी ने कहा था कि स्टेट को, राज्य को, अपने ऊपर सिर्फ प्राथमिक शिक्षा की जिम्मेदारी लेनी चाहिये और सब बच्चों को प्राथमिक शिक्षा फ्री एण्ड कम्पलसरी देनी

चाहिये। सैकेंडरी और युनिवर्सिटी या टेकनिकल एजुकेशन को जिम्मेदारी उनको लेनी चाहिये जिनको कि उसकी आवश्यकता हो और उनको उसके लिये खर्च करना चाहिये। जहां सरकार को विशेषज्ञों की जरूरत हो सरकार खर्च करे और जहां श्रीमानों को, उद्योगपतियों को, जरूरत हो वहां श्रीमानों को और उद्योगपतियों को खर्च करना चाहिये। सरकार का सबसे पहला कर्त्तव्य यह है कि वह प्राथमिक शिक्षा के लिये ही खर्च करे और दूसरी किसी शिक्षा के लिये तब तक खर्च न करे जब तक कि ग्राम लड़के लड़कियों की प्राथमिक शिक्षा पूरी न हो जाय। आज हमारी प्राथमिक शिक्षा की क्या हालत है। आप जरा देहातों में जाइयें और प्राथमिक शिक्षा-शालाओं की दशा को देखिये। झाड़ के नीचे बच्चे बैठे हुये हैं या गिरे हुये मकानों में वे पढ़ रहे हैं। उनके लिये बिलडिंग की बात की जा रही है? परन्तु इसके निस्वत हमारे प्लान में जो लिखा है उसको सुन लीजिये। लिखा है : "Austere standard should be adopted." देहातों के लिये कहते हैं : Austere standard should be adopted. And why should not that Austere standard be adopted for Delhi and other cities, यहां २० लाख रुपये का एक पब्लिक स्कूल बनाने को है जिस रकम में कि देहात के सैकड़ों मदरसे बन सकते हैं मगर देहात के गरीबों के लिय कहते हैं : Austere standard of building? Austere standard should be adopted? मैं कुछ कह नहीं सकता हूं, परन्तु यह तो जले के ऊपर नमक छिड़कना जैसा है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two minutes over.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I shall just finish. Let me conclude it, Sir.

आखीरी बात मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आपने एजुकेशन सेस की बात कही है कि लोकल अथॉरिटीज, पंचायतें और म्युनिसिपैलिटीज सेस लगाय। पहले ही ग्राम

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

पंचायतों के पास म्युनिसिपैलिटियों के पास गरीबी के कारण पैसा नहीं है। मैं कहूंगा कि आप अगर सेस लगाना चाहते हैं तो आप एजुकेटेड लोगों के ऊपर सेस लगाइये। जो आज सविस में हैं, जो डाक्टरों करते हैं, जो बकालत करने हैं, जो पट्टाई की कमाई खाते हैं उनके ऊपर लगाइये। गरीबों की प्राथमिक शिक्षा के लिये इनके ऊपर सेस लगाइये। जो बात ठीक हो बड़ी आपको करनी होगी।

आखिरी प्रार्थना मेरी यही है कि हिन्दुस्तान का यह प्लान 'गांव यूनिट' के ही आधार पर होना चाहिये। बड़ी प्लान सफल हो सकता है जिसका आधार गांव है। समय आ गया है कि हमें यह देखना चाहिये :

We have to make a choice between the India of the villages that are as ancient as herself and India of the cities which are the creation of foreign domination. Today the cities dominate and drain the villages so that they are crumbling into ruin. My *khadi* mentality tells me that the cities must subserve the villages when that domination goes. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI S. MAHANTY (Orissa): Mr. Chairman, Sir, my observations on the Second Five Year Plan will be mainly confined to one aspect of the problem of the Plan, namely, the regional disparity, but before I proceed to do so I think a *post-mortem* probe into the achievements of the First Five Year Plan will not be out of place. Sir, the First Five Year Plan should rightly be called, a three Year Plan; it is a misnomer to call our First Plan as the First Five Year Plan because the developmental expenditure was stepped up only from the third year. In the first two years we did nothing as a result of which the First Five Year Plan in spite of its professions could not expand the employment potentialities as a result of which on the eve of the Second Five Year Plan we find the unemployment spiral rising. Then, Sir, at the end of the First Plan period our average intake of food is much

below the accepted nutritional standard. Our consumption of cloth is about 16 yards per capita which is below the pre-war level. Half the children of the age group of 6 to 11 years do not get any educational facilities and only one-fifth of the children of school-going age between 11 to 14 years get schooling facilities. This has been admitted by this Report. Then half of our population get only Rs. 13 per month to spend on consumer goods and if we look at the picture of unemployment we find that in the year 1954 during the period between August to October the unemployed persons on the live registers of Employment Exchanges numbered 5.86 lakhs and during the corresponding period of the year 1955 they recorded an increase by more than 1.10 lakhs. Sir, the prices have recorded a sharp increase; the living, index has gone up. All these have been admitted by the Second Five Year Plan Report. When we come to the economic aspect we find that the rate of investment in 1951-52 was 7 per cent of the national income but in subsequent two years it fell back to five per cent and the average rate of investment for the whole of the Plan period works out at six per cent. Yet our planners would ask us to believe that the national income has recorded an 18 per cent increase and the per capita income an increase of 11 per cent. Sir, not only this House but the country is entitled to know what are the real achievements of the First Five Year Plan. Yet if we dare to raise our voice in protest against this shortfall, if this Parliament dares to make a probe into them the hon. the Prime Minister would charge us of nagging.

Now, let us see the other achievements *Tgfa* the First Five Year Plan^ It is a promise belied. If you look at the public sector it was stipulated that an iron and steel plant would be set up in the public sector and the year of completion was 1957-58 and it was estimated that 3.5 lakh tons of pig iron will be produced by 1955-56. There was no dearth of money; there was no

dearth of resources; there was no dearth of raw materials; yet we do not know why that iron and steel plant in the public sector has not yet gone up. We do not know when that plant will go into production.

Then there is the machine tool factory. We heard a great deal yesterday from the hon. the Prime Minister that henceforth our emphasis should be more on producer industries; we must produce more machines to produce machines. Under the First Five Year Plan a machine tool factory was scheduled to go into production and the date of completion was 1953-54 and it was estimated that 1,600 units will be produced every year out of that machine tool factory. I would like to know from the hon. Minister what is the present rate of output of that machine tool factory. I have no time to go on enlarging this catalogue of inefficiency of the Government nor is it my intention but we would like to know why the targets of the First Five Year Plan have not been fulfilled, at least why no effective step has been taken towards the fulfilment of those targets.

Then, Sir, yesterday the hon. the Prime Minister was at great pains to defend the public sector. Sir, you were not there but I would request you to go through his speech. He charged the Parliament that here in "Parliament only speeches are produced and by making speeches we are not going to build the country; by nagging we cannot build the country; that is what he said. He said that we discourage the public sector, the corporations and their functions and he even went to the length of suggesting that that was one of the reasons why the corporations did not feel encouraged to fulfil their portion of work. Sir. I am in no mood to accept.

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): That is not what he said. He said that it merely paralysed the initiative.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Thank you; it merely paralysed the initiative. I will now present before the House the

record of our public sector even though Parliament did not paralyse their initiative by putting questions or by probing into them as to how they are functioning. Sir, we all know about the debacle of the Housing Factory. I would like to know whether and to what extent Parliament interfered in the activities of the Housing Factory as a result of which that ended in a fiasco and resulted in a huge waste of money. Then again take the case of the D.D.T. Factory. It has now been calculated that the cost has gone up by 50 per cent. Sir, was there ever a single question discussed on the floor of this House or in the Public Accounts Committee about this D.D.T. factory? No. Even though the cost has gone up by more than 50 per cent, now the 27th Report of the Estimates Committee points out that due to defective planning production difficulties are being experienced. Goodness knows if those production difficulties will ever be removed or not. Then there is the Hindusthan Antibiotics Ltd. I would ask whether this question was ever discussed in this House. No; nobody has ever probed into this matter. Yet, what is the record of the Hindusthan Antibiotics? It was planned that we will be producing Streptomycin in this country. After all, our poor people cannot afford to go in for these imported drugs of high efficacy but the production of Streptomycin has now been deferred to the second phase of that project.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): What is my hon. friend suggesting? Is it that he does not want public sector? What is his suggestion?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, you assure me to give time for interruptions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not interruption.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, my hon. friend is too intelligent to guess what I am suggesting. So, this is the record of our public sector and here the hon. the Prime Minister comes to

[Shri S. Mahanty.] the House and says that Parliament should have nothing to do with these corporations and the public sector.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No; no.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Hyderabad) : He has not said so.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: If he has not said so, I am very much thankful. But here is his speech and any hon. Member can go through it. I would only beg of them not to outrun their discretion in their enthusiasm. I yield to none in my respect for the Prime Minister.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore) : You were not wide awake when he was speaking.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: At least I have gone through his speech. I deplore this attitude. If you want that the Parliament should have nothing to do with these public sectors, if crores of public money will be wasted over maintaining these costly institutions, then, of course, I am out of court. I am perfectly in agreement with what the hon. Prime Minister has said or what the hon. Members of the Congress benches have said. But you have to take into consideration the fact that crores of money are being raised from the taxpayers who are already pauperised. They are paying through the nose for all these kinds of corporations and now if any one suggests that Parliament should have nothing to do in this matter, then I beg to differ from him. I beg to differ very emphatically. If that is the intention, amend the Constitution. Do away with the Public Accounts Committee. Sir, you have the right to disallow any kind of question which may be given notice of,—you can do all those things—but you have no right to charge Parliament with nagging. After all this is the Sovereign body with Supreme authority.

Now, Sir, I will not go any more into those aspects. My time is limited. I will now come to the main theme, namely, regional disparity. Now, the

Second Plan seeks to achieve a 25 per cent increase in national income at the end of the Second Plan period. It is all very good. We all welcome it. But what we are concerned with, is not increased production on which the hon. Prime Minister was so insistent yesterday. We are not concerned with the increase of national income though it is very important, but what we are concerned with is primarily equitable distribution of that increased national income. Now, I will present before this House the story of these comparatively undeveloped and backward areas in the Indian Union. Let us take the case of Orissa. I am in a better position to talk about Orissa because I am more conversant with its problems. There are other such areas like Assam, Madhya Pradesh and so on, but I will confine my remarks only to Orissa. Now our per capita income at the end of the First Five Year Plan period is computed at Rs. 285 a year....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Rs. 281.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sorry, Rs. 28L per year. Now, it is a matter of common knowledge that 80 per cent of the population of Orissa have to depend on agriculture. And what is the agricultural income of these people? For that, we shall have to go to the Agricultural Income Committee Report. That report points out that in Orissa the *per capita* annual income of an agricultural labourer is Rs. 79. Therefore, the *per capita* income of Orissa should be computed at Rs. 79, because more than 80 per cent of its population depend on agriculture and the income that a man derives from agriculture in Orissa is Rs. 79. Mark the hiatus between Rs. 281, the per capita national income, and the *per capita* income in Orissa of Rs. 79. The industrial income in Orissa is Rs. 145, even though the *per capita* national income is Rs. 281. This hiatus, this difference is very important to bear in mind, if we are going to properly appreciate what I suggest. Gandhiji rightly said Orissa was the epitome of India's poverty. Orissa is a challenge not alone to the state-man—

ship of the Government, but also to the ingenuity of planning of her planners. What have you done during all these years to lift these people from the morass of poverty, and of increasing frustration and to give them the beneficial touch of your planning? You have done nothing.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Hirakud.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: My hon. friend is not yet informed on it. For Hirakud we are incurring loans for which we are to pay you at the rate of 3.4 per cent compound interest which no Kabuliwalla charges. My hon. friend should have known better than talk about....

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Rourkela.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: You know it has still to grow, still to go into production. So, nothing was done in the First Five Year Plan. I am not making a sweeping observation. I will quote you some figures. The hon. Prime Minister said that diminishing regional disparity is not a new concept. It was there even during the First Five Year Plan period. Now, let us see what was the allocation among the different Part 'A' States during the First Five Year Plan. It was: Assam Rs. 17.49 crores; Bihar Rs. 57.29 crores; Bombay Rs. 145.44 crores; Madras Rs. 140' 84 crores; Madhya Pradesh Rs. 43-08 crores; Punjab Rs. 20.21 crores; U.P. Rs. 97.83 crores; West Bengal Rs. 69' 10 crores; and, Sir, what was Orissa's share? It was less than Assam, less than 17'49 crores. Therefore, you cannot say in one breath, that you are giving more emphasis on these regionally backward areas, undeveloped areas and yet make this kind of beggarly allotment to the undeveloped States. Even though your investment, your outlay on highly industrialised areas like Bombay and Madras is in three digits and in West Bengal it is Rs. 69-12 crores, for Orissa it is only 17 crores.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): What is the population of Madras and what is the population of Orissa?

I SHRI S. MAHANTY: The population of Orissa is one crore and forty six lakhs; for Madras you better work out. Why are you interrupting?

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: It is three times.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: You go on working it out. What I am stressing is that if you examine this *per capita* investment, you will find it much lower.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the chair.]

Now, my friend has asked about *per capita* investment. I shall quote facts and figures. This is from the research and reference section of Parliament. Therefore, I hope my friend will not question the source. He has asked me a particular question. I am answering him. He is now bringing in another question. He must hold his soul in patience. Now, the *per capita* expenditure in the Part 'A' States during the First Five Year Plan period is: Bombay Rs. 44.8; Madras Rs. 25; West Bengal Rs. 31.3; Punjab Rs. 27.8; Orissa Rs. 13.1 which is the lowest. That is after all your record *per capita* expenditure during the First Five Year Plan period. So, what I was going to say before I was interrupted unfortunately by my friend was that even though the Government profess that the question of these backward areas, these undeveloped areas which are uppermost in their minds, they have taken no step whatsoever to bring those areas on a par with those comparatively industrialised areas.

The hon. Prime Minister said yesterday that there were limiting factors. I have gone through his speech very carefully.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It has been mentioned in the papers.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: The limitations enumerated by the Prime Minister were three-fold. Firstly, the availability of coal and other natural resources and secondly, climate. Mainly these were the two limitations.

[Shri S. Mahanty.] There was transport also. May I ask him if there is any lack of natural resources in Orissa? Anyone who goes through the report of the Geological Survey will find how Orissa is full of natural resources, all kinds of minerals which the Congress Government there is leasing out to private industrialists who are taking the lease for a song. Now, the Industrial Policy which the Prime Minister has formulated also does not give the right to the State Government to take them into the public sector. So, there is no dearth of these natural resources nor is there any dearth of power. As you know, thanks to Shri G. V. Nanda, from Hirakud we will be producing as much electric energy as we require. How are you going to utilise this energy for Orissa? It has incurred a loan of Rs. 100 crores from the Government of India for which interest will have to be paid at the rate of 3.4 per cent compound interest.

THE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI G. V. NANDA) : That power is fully booked.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Fully booked on paper, Sir. According to the power Load Survey Report, an aluminium plant was to have gone into production. But even now the authorities here are fiddling with that aluminium plant. The Canadians have not made up their minds as to when they are going to -----

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: May I rise on a point of order, Sir? We are now discussing the general principles and it was definitely understood that...

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Is it a point of order, Sir?

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: We are not going to discuss.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I am not going to yield to him.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: On a point of order, he must yield. I want a ruling whether we can take up the individual State allocations during this

general discussion because there will be no end to this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are discussing only the principles of planning.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): He has given notice of an amendment which has been admitted, and he is now speaking for that amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: An hon. Member may raise in his speech.....

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want to give a very effective reply to Mr. Dasappa. My friend, Shri Dasappa, was doing something in Hyderabad. If only he cares to go through this Resolution which has been moved by the Prime Minister, he will find that it states: "This House records its general approval of the principles, objectives and programme of development.." My remarks are confined to the programme of development.

So, I was saying that these were the limitations which were pointed out by the Prime Minister. I would like to ask him in all seriousness: Are these immutable concepts? Are these limitations insuperable? Now, let us look at those areas which were known as Wild West of America—Los Angeles and San Francisco. Today, they are pulsating with industrial activity. Look at the northern tip of Australia—Port Darwin as its centre—which was once considered to be a barren desert area. What do you find there? Those areas are pulsating with industrial and commercial activities.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Take Palestine.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Why should these retrograde concepts of limitations, be brought in here? The Government or the Prime Minister who talks of atomic energy in this country, who never accepts or is prepared to accept the human limitations, should not have cited these limitations in this context.



That is so far as the First Five Year Plan goes. Now I come to the Second Five Year Plan. It has been said— it has been at least thrice reiterated in the Second Five Year Plan—that more attention should be given for removing regional disparity. How can this be removed? I am prepared to accept that this cannot be achieved by the trick of a magician. For this, the first step will be to change the occupational structure in those areas. The Prime Minister has stated in this Five Year Plan Report it has been stated also that at least within the next ten years there is not going to be any appreciable change in the occupational structure of this country. That means, more than 80 per cent people will still have to rely on agriculture. Let us see what allocations they make in the industrial sphere so that the pressure of agricultural labour on land will be eased to an appreciable extent. In the Second Five Year Plan, we find the industrial allocation for large and medium scale industries for Bombay is Rs. 83.07 lakhs; West Bengal Rs. 190 lakhs; for Orissa Rs. 47 lakhs.

Sir, the Orissa Government's Second Five Year Plan is ridiculous. Their total allocation for industries is only Rs. 7 crores. With this sum how can you bring about an appreciable change in the occupational structure to relieve this pressure of agricultural labour on land to any appreciable extent, and bring about the much talked of diminution of regional disparity between States?

It is said that there will be certain States which will produce raw materials, which will produce foodgrains and which will be subjected to a kind of colonial economy, even though that word 'colonial economy' is quite repugnant to our sense of nationalism.

Now we can also raise the per capita income in such States through agriculture. But have we taken any steps in that direction? Now, the hon. Minister may say, "Through the Hirakud Dam and other river valley projects, we are going to provide irrigation facilities." But he knows it better.

49 R.S.D.—2.

According to the Progress Report of the First Five Year Plan, more lands have been irrigated through small scale irrigation systems than through big river valley projects. But during the First Five Year Plan, the emphasis was more on big river valley projects than on small scale irrigation. As a result of this, lands which were producing golden corn are now thirsting for water. Ploughs cannot be moved. peasants go hungry. If only he cares to visit Orissa, he will find there hunger, starvation and all kind of diseases stalking. From this, I am convinced that these underdeveloped areas had no prospects during the First Five Year Plan nor can they hope to get anything during the Second Five Year Plan period in view of the fact that the whole bias of the Second Five Year Plan is in favour of urban areas, is in favour of industrial areas, rather than rural areas.

I have got one or two more points to make.

Now, Sir, let us see how much has been provided for with regard to small-scale and cottage industries. I would have been prepared. (*Time bell rings.*) How many minutes more?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I have to speak for 35 minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You began at 11-45.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, do not grudge me a few minutes more. I am not speaking for the fun of it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, two or three minutes more.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Sir, make it five minutes.

Sir, I would have been prepared to accept the *bona fides* of the Second Five Year Plan, if I had been convinced myself that in the matter of small and cottage industries, such un-

[Shri S. Mahanty.]

developed States like Orissa or Assam or Madhya Pradesh had more outlay than the highly industrialised States like Bombay and West Bengal. But what do we find, Sir? We find that for Bombay, which is already highly industrialised, the allocation is Rs. 816.03 lakhs. For West Bengal it is Rs. 757.99 lakhs. And what is the allocation for Orissa? It is only Rs. 628.90 lakhs. And for Madhya Pradesh, another huge and sprawling area teeming with millions of unemployed, what do we get? It is Rs. 630 • 70 lakhs. In the face of all these things, Sir, how dare you can say that you have been taking effective steps for the diminution of the disparity between a State and a State? Is it being suggested that we will be the hewers of wood and drawers of water in the socialist State of India? You are now asking us to increase the production. In 20 years the per *capita* income will be doubled. But even then this hiatus will remain there, and some of the highly industrialised areas will have their per capita income doubled, whereas others will have to wallow in the morass of poverty and frustration. Therefore, Sir, I have ventured to move this amendment, not for any chauvinistic purpose, nor for the fun of it, but for inviting the attention of the Government to this problem, which still requires to be solved. Sir, it is not that this is being brought to the notice of the Government for the first time. Here, I have in my hands the Report of the Finance Commission for the year 1952, and there is an extremely well-written minute of dissent by Shri Koshalandra Rao. This fact was brought to the notice of the Government by him also. He developed the thesis that the so-called highly developed areas and comparatively backward areas are mere accidents of history. When the Britishers came to India, they had three factories around which grew three Presidencies, the Presidency of Bombay, the Presidency of Calcutta, and the Presidency of Madras. Therefore, those areas became the centres of commercial and industrial expansion, and the other areas were being

exploited as the hinterland. In other countries, Sir, so many Commissions have been appointed to go into this question of regional disparities. I can give the names here. In Australia, there was the Commonwealth Grants Commission which went into this question of disparities between States. In Canada, there was the Royal-Sirois Commission which went into this question. And even though, our Finance Commission has also brought to light these regional disparities in another context, nothing has been done by this Government, and the Second Five Year Plan holds out no hope or no promise to us. Sir, are we going to be like jews wandering for twelve hundred years in search of the promised land? We therefore once again urge that the Government should see its way to accept this amendment. After all, Sir, it is a very innocuous amendment. It is not asking for the moon. It is only going to re-emphasise the policy that has been accepted in the Second Five-year Plan. With these remarks, Sir, I resume my seat.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I stand to support wholeheartedly the Resolution moved by the hon. Prime Minister, and, incidentally also to oppose the amendment that has been moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Mahanty.

Sir, in so far as the plan is concerned, its main principles and objectives are. I believe, acceptable almost unanimously to all the sections of this House. The main objective is that we must bring in a socialist society, and not merely say what a socialist society is. And the Plan has defined what its main objective or its main purpose in having a socialist society is. The main purpose is that whatever development we are going to do in this country, the main object should be the socio-economic gain of the community as a whole in place of private profit. And secondly, Sir, the whole pattern of development and the structure of the socio-economic relations should be so-planned that they result not only in increasing the national income and the employment opportunities, but

there should also be greater and greater equality in incomes.

Sir, the other day, a private Member's Resolution was being discussed in this House, with regard to the fixation of a ceiling on incomes, and the hon. Prime Minister happened to be present at that time. And he very clearly defined what the object of such a move would be. The whole idea is that we must level up the society, that is to say, we must raise the income at the lowest level, so that the disparities disappear. Of course, we must also bring about a reduction in those big incomes which are at the top, but that alone will not solve the problem at all. It has not solved the problem in any country at all. The most conspicuous example in this respect is the United States of America. I believe, in the recorded history of mankind, there is no country which has succeeded so amply in practically abolishing the exploited labour class. Today, there is no such exploited labour class in the country. The whole population from the very bottom has been elevated to a sort of middle class. I was told that even the cook in an Indian embassy comes in his car to do the work, and then goes back in his own car. Here even Members of Parliament cannot come in their own cars. Even a sweeper comes in a car. That is the object which we should have. In merely getting rid of the few people at the top, we are not going to solve that problem. If we distribute what they have, it would not last for more than a day or two. In any case, it can satisfy our little anger, or, if I may say so, our malice, but that cannot solve the economic problem of the nation as a whole. Therefore, Sir, the main purpose is that we must raise the level of income at the lowest level of the community. That is the aim of this Plan. We must raise the living standards of our people, and we must enlarge the opportunities of employment. We know, Sir, that both in the countryside, in the rural areas, as well as in the urban areas, there is not only unemployment but there is also underemployment on a very large scale, which is one of the main causes of our

poverty. And if the Plan succeeds in enlarging these opportunities of employment, it will have attained a very great object.

Then, Sir, another object and the principle is to promote enterprise among the different classes. Now, Sir, the whole nation is not just on one level, as it is in the case of France, Germany or England. Here we are, if I may say so, a sort of multi-national people. All sorts of communities are there. We have got the backward areas, we have got the Scheduled Tribes, we have got the Scheduled Castes. And certain communities have got an advantage over other communities, maybe for any reason, or maybe due to the British period. For instance, our friends of the *baniya* community have got such a big hold, rather a disproportionate hold, over the industries in the country. There is for instance the Parsi community or the Marwari community, whereas there are large sections of the people who have got no hand in the industries at all, who merely live on agriculture, and are therefore on a very poor level. Therefore, our aim is to plan investments in such a way as would lead to the promotion of industrial enterprises among the disadvantaged classes, so that every section of the community, every caste in the community, may have an equal opportunity for all the good things of life, because merely calculating that our per capita income will be so much or our national income will be so much will not solve our problems. What we want is that all the communities which have been at a disadvantage so far, for whatever may have been the historical reasons, should have equal opportunity to advance and better their conditions of life. Then all the jealousies between region and region, between class and class, and between caste and caste, will go and then we shall begin to feel that this commonwealth is a co-operative commonwealth in which all have a share, an equal share, in these opportunities.

Then, the object is that we must industrialise the country as quickly as possible with a great emphasis on

[Shri J. S. Bisht.] heavy industries. To that end, the Government of India has pronounced a new industrial policy revising the policy that was laid down in 1948, and this new policy lays down that the public sector has to be enlarged so as to include all industries of basic and strategic importance or in the nature of public utility services. This is all very nice. They have given schedules more or less on the lines of the schedules attached to the Indian Constitution, viz. (a) those that should be exclusively State concerns; (b) concerns in which there would be a sort of concurrent jurisdiction, where the primary initiative will be with the State enterprises but private enterprise is welcome to come in and supplement the State enterprise; and lastly (c) all other fields which are left entirely to private enterprise. In a mixed economy, this is as it should be. The Prime Minister was at great pains yesterday to explain with which all reasonably-minded people will agree, that the private sector should be allowed and encouraged to play its full part, so that the productive machinery or the production apparatus does not suffer any diminution in the volume or quantum of production. In this policy it is also laid down that it is our aim to promote co-operative form of production wherever possible and eliminate the functionless rent receivers and to substitute usurious private credit by institutional credit. Only the other day this House passed a Bill called the Agricultural Produce (Development and Warehousing) Corporations Bill, which will in due course substitute co-operative credit in the place of the usurious private credit of the village money-lenders. With these objectives I have no doubt that all sections of this House and all parties are in full agreement.

Now, there are certain suggestions which I have to make. The total developmental expenditure in the public sector envisaged in this Plan is of the order of Rs. 4,800 crores. Of this the Centre's share is Rs. 2,550 crores, and the share of the States is

Rs. 2,241 crores, and the further break-up is that the share of agriculture will be Rs. 568 crores, irrigation and power Rs. 913 crores, industry and mining Rs. 890 crores, transport and communications Rs. 1,385 crores, social services Rs. 945 crores and miscellaneous Rs. 99 crores, making a total of Rs. 4,800 crores. Now, what we have to examine very carefully is the resources, the real resources, the financial resources, that are available in order to meet this large demand, because, as the Prime Minister very rightly said yesterday, unless you can support your plan by adequate resources, the plan is merely wishful thinking, merely a dream, and the Labour leader of England, Mr. Bevan, said, planning boils down to a question of priorities. We want so many things, but we cannot do them all at once. We are therefore forced by circumstance to pick and choose, and we must pick up those things which are very vital and necessary. It is therefore right that heavy industries have been taken as the most important necessity, and at the same time agricultural production also is being stepped up, and also transport to meet the requirements of industry as well as agriculture. The Plan says that the resources available to the Government are only Rs. 2,400 crores as against the planned expenditure in the public sector of Rs. 4,800 crores. How is this balance to be met? They say that the Central and State revenues would come to about Rs. 5,000 crores in five years, and then non-development expenditure like the routine police administration, Defence services, etc. will come to about Rs. 4,650 crores, leaving only a balance of Rs. 350 crores. That is, out of current income only a saving both at the Centre and in the States of only Rs. 350 crores will be available. If we add the contributions from the Railways, i.e., Rs. 150 crores, then we have about Rs. 500 crores which we can subscribe to the developmental-expenditure. Then it is said there will have to be additional taxation of the order of Rs. 480 crores.

The centre is expected to raise Rs. 225 crores, and the States a like amount. About this, we have very grave doubts. Recently, the Government of Uttar Pradesh imposed sales tax on various articles, and it was expected that these new sales taxes would bring in an additional revenue of Rs. 5J crores a year, *i.e.*, Rs. 27J crores in five years. We saw hartals and agitation in all the cities of U. P. the like of which we had never seen before. Shops in cities like Kanpur, Lucknow, Allahabad, Agra, Meerut, etc. were closed for a whole week. Why should people do this, unless there was really some hardship? The Government was forced to give concessions to the tune of nearly Rs. 3 crores, and the revenue now expected is only about Rs. 2i crores, as against the Rs. 5i crores that was anticipated when the Ordinance was passed. That shows which way the wind blows. That experiment will also be repeated in other States. I am inviting the attention of the Government to the fact that there is a limit for taxation. We have now reached the saturation point, and you cannot go in for fresh taxation. I do not think that we will be able to raise Rs. 450 crores, *i.e.*, nearly Rs. 110 crores every year by way of additional taxation from the Centre and the States. It is very doubtful. In any case, even if you expect to get this Rs. 450 crores of additional taxation and add to that Rs. 350 crores, that is our savings from revenues and adding the Railway contribution of Rs. 150 crores, you get only Rs. 950 crores. With this Rs. 950 crores, if you can get about Rs. 800 crores as external aid of which, I think that Rs. 400 crores is expected and another Rs. 200 crores may come, but even assuming you get that Rs. 800 crores in full, and borrowing from the public amount to Rs. 1,200 crores, then you get Rs. 2,950 crores. Even then, you are left with a very large unfilled gap which makes it very difficult. The difficulty here is that we expect to fill up this gap with

Rs. 1,200 crores of deficit financing and about Rs. 250 crores from provident fund and other deposit heads and

Rs. 400 crores is left completely unfilled. In other words, the Planning Commission has very rightly said, that out of Rs. 4,800 crores you require Rs. 3,850 crores for carrying, through the investment outlay and this is to be got only by the transfer of private savings to the public sector apart from the fact that the private sector is also to be fed from the private savings. With regard to Rs. 1,200 crores of deficit financing, I would not repeat the arguments which I advanced before in my speech on the 7th March 1956 while discussing the annual budget and again on the 19th May 1956 when we were meeting in Committee 'A' for discussing this whole Plan. I have given the authorities from the Burnstein Commission's Report to the Report of the Board of Directors of the Reserve Bank 1955 and also the report of the Economists Panel which considered this Plan and its financial implications. I will not repeat them. But I feel strongly that we must not take too big a gamble in the matter of deficit financing. I am told that Prof. Kaldor himself has recommended that Rs. 800 cores would be the utmost limit. We have not received the report. We are told that the report will be in the hands of the Parliament in a couple of days. That is merely a surmise got from the daily papers that he has recommended that the utmost safe limit is Rs. 800 crores. Be that as it may, it requires very careful handling. The reason is very simple. This generation has, in particular, suffered twice or thrice from the evil consequences of inflation. It suffered first in the first War of 1914-18 and the effects thereof, then again during the second World War and the effects thereof and I think this Parliament has not forgotten that terrible Bengal famine which cost nearly two million lives—that was the price that this country had to pay for unrestricted inflation which occurred during the war and after the war.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): It was due to the political machinations of the Britishers in East Bengal and West Bengal.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: I am afraid my friend merely jumps at some conclusions. We are dealing with some economic facts—not with fancies. These things are the results. Large sections of our people live on a margin of subsistence. Its purchasing power is very low. The moment prices go up, the foodstuffs are beyond their reach and they cannot buy. Therefore you must guard against any possibility of such a famine again repeating itself in this country. We all want that there should be development and very quick development but in our anxiety or impatience, let us not over-step the mark so that some terrible consequences may flow. Because it is the experience of all the countries in the world—France, Germany, England and India that once inflation really begins, then it is not easy to control. In fact, the Planning Commission itself has recommended various ways. It says that you must build up very large stocks of grains and essential commodities. It says prices of food and cloth hold a strategic position and they must be controlled and it says that physical control including rationing and allocations to prevent consumption beyond a particular level must be enforced and it also says that taxation should be used to prevent excessive increase in consumption. That is all right. But I put down a simple test before the Government and it is that our Food Minister—the late Mr. Rafi Ahmed Kidwai—once, on the floor of the House, said that in his opinion the agriculturist should be given a price level of Rs. 10 a maund for wheat and rice. I think he was right because prices were falling at that time. Because, below that, the agriculturist suffers and we don't want that this large section of our community—nearly 70 per cent.—should suffer. We say that they should get Rs. 10 a maund. At the other end, the consumer should not have to pay more than one rupee for three seers and if the Government can hold that price level, namely, between 3 seers for the consumer and 4 seers for the agriculturists, if they can firmly hold that price level and the same for cloth also, then they can

go in for any amount of deficit financing. But once that price line sags and the price level rises, then it will be too dangerous to go in for this. In the interest of planning or development itself it is essential that the price level should be firmly maintained and the rupee value should be stable and reputable. Because once the prices rise, you cannot prevent a wage rise and then the cost will rise and then your plan of Rs. 4,800 will come to Rs. 8,800 and it will defeat the very object we have in view. Therefore I submit that the Government will take very great care in handling this. I am constrained to say this because in the very first year of this Plan, in this year's budget, the Finance Minister has budgeted for Rs. 390 crores of deficit financing, although the Commission and the Economists themselves have laid down and said that Rs. 200 crores a year would be too much and Rs. 200 crores for a long time is bound to bring in inflationary pressure. Therefore all the caution that is necessary, should be exercised for that. They have also said that there is a very large gap in the foreign exchange also. The gap extends to the extent of nearly Rs. 1,100 crores.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Rs. 1,300 crores.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Nearly Rs. 224 crores a year and they say that if they get some Rs. 94 crores from past authorisations and there will be about Rs. 76 crores, which is to be accounted for in the Bhilai project etc., still there will be about Rs. 630 crores gap of foreign exchange. With all that, it is necessary therefore that we should be very careful in this matter of deficit financing. We must go on for development only to the extent that we have resources available. If you will permit me, only one or two points more I have to make, and that is on the administrative question. I have been a Member of the District Development Committee in my district, as I think all Members of Parliament are. I have seen its working. The difficulty there is, we have already

got district boards and municipal board and the Government has created another body like the District Development Council and which seems to be developing also its own Department, its own officers and its own engineers and technicians. We don't know exactly where this thing is going to land. The Government should make the position very clear, whether this is going to be a new sort of local authority to implement all these plans. I would submit that the District Development Council should be only a coordinating body consisting of all the Panchayats, the district boards, the municipal boards, the town areas and the notified areas with the collector of the district as the Chief Executive Officer and unless you do this, there is going to be a lot of overlapping. The District Board is making a road or building a school or building a hospital and your District Development Committee comes in and also build and the villagers run from this body to the other and so much of wastage and overlapping and duplication of staff are there. This should be eliminated. Which body should carry out this work? With these words, I support the Resolution.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Sir, the Second Five Year Plan has meant stupendous work to the Planning Commission. Just as this volume is formidable, so also the work has been very onerous.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before you continue, I have to inform the House that the House will sit through the lunch hour.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: As far as the objectives of this Plan are concerned, nobody can differ from them. In my opinion, they are correctly conceived and the general framework is sound. Of course, one may differ with regard to the details of the allocations with regard to the quantum of allocations and with regard to the emphasis given to a topic here and there but one finds no room to differ with regard to the objectives of the Plan. Therefore, I congratulate the Planning

Commission on having brought this report and put into this Report very heavy labour. They have considered the overall needs of the country and provided a plan which answers the overall requirements.

I, however, differ from some of the principles which they have taken for granted and which they have assumed and with regard to some of the methods by which they want to achieve those ends and also with regard to some of their allocations.

First of all, I would like to make a few observations on the allocations made for agriculture. Of course, this is not the proper time to go into the details of these allocations. But I only wish to point out and to dwell upon the general emphasis which the Planning Commission should have given, the place it should have given to this vocation which is followed by at least 80 per cent, of the people of this country. There has been, in my opinion, a very great want in the Planning Commission's approach towards agriculture. When I say that, I do not forget that they have appreciated the part that agriculture has to play, at least in respect of the production of food grains the importance which it should for this reason receive. But my difference is about the general position of agriculture as related to other vocations in the country and the measure of social welfare which the Planning Commission visualises for the agriculturist in comparison to the degree of welfare they have visualised for other classes of people in this country. The want which I wish to point out is this. The Planning Commission suffers from want of vision in their approach to agriculture and that is because they do not have on the Planning Commission anybody to represent agriculture. Of course, I do not mean to say that on the Planning Commission there should be functional representation. But inasmuch as this profession takes in from 70 to 80 per cent, of the people in the country, and inasmuch as the general social welfare of this country depends to a very

{Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] large extent on this profession and on those engaged in this profession, I do believe that they should have had somebody on the Planning Commission to speak for these people, somebody who had intimate knowledge of agriculture, somebody who had real knowledge of the villages, somebody who had moved among the masses and lived with them, somebody who had realised and felt the aspirations and the problems of the masses. I leave aside, of course, the Prime Minister, because he is one who is quite capable of visualising these problems. But as everybody can see, he has not the time to spare and it is the other Members of the Planning Commission who have to fill up the details and draw up the framework. He can only very broadly visualise the position. Therefore, I do not mean any reflection on him. But I do say that the Planning Commission suffers from this defect inasmuch as it has lost sight of the relative importance of the problem of these 80 per cent, of our people. Let me give one instance to illustrate my point. One way in which we can take the masses with us in working out these plans is to engage their attention and to make them feel that they derive some concrete benefit. Well, the one aspect with which every agriculturist, every villager can be taken into active participation in working out the Plan by which he can be made to enter into the actual spirit of the Plan and to work it whole-heartedly is to see that every village in the taluka or district is not only associated with the work of implementing the Plan but also to see that he gets something from it. As far as the village development is concerned, you will notice that the allocation made here is very poor. Rs. 15 crores has been allotted for the whole of India, for all the villages in this land, for all the village development works. That is to say, 0.6 per cent, has been the allocation made for this work in the Plan. I ask the Commission whether they had a true vision in making this small allocation? I am of course, glad

that they have at least made this small provision. But I ask the Planning Commission whether they would not have at once evoked the wholehearted co-operation of all the villagers if they had provided a large slice for this village development work, works with which villagers are directly and very intimately connected?

The other problem is that of rural credit. Everybody knows that the agriculturist's back is bent, that his backbone is broken by his indebtedness. I am glad that the Government have accepted most of the recommendations of the Rural Credit Survey Committee and they have made provisions also in this regard. But how far do these provisions go? For the long-term loans they have provided for a corporation, that is to say, for the floatation of a fund for the National Agricultural Development Credit-Fund with a capital of Rs. 10 crores to start with. That is expected to have a capital of Rs. 35 crores by the end of 1960-61. This fund is not meant to be loaned out to be agriculturists directly. It is meant to be loaned out to the States and the States can buy shares in the co-operatives by this loan. This is the idea. But as for the credit that these societies can give to the villagers, to the peasantry, nothing is said. I submit that when the Centre itself can give only Rs. 10 crores to begin with which has to reach the figure of Rs. 35 crores by the end of the Second Five Year Plan, one can easily visualise what chance these societies have of relieving rural indebtedness in any adequate manner.

One of the ways in which they can build up society—agricultural society, which is always faced with uncertainties and which has not even three months peaceful time, three months without any worry in the course of the year, without any trouble—is to bring about parity of prices. But this question has not been tackled yet. Sir, the agriculturist and rural society in general suffers, as everyone knows from serious handicaps. They are far removed from the urban markets—



Every article of consumption that the villager has to get from the urban area costs him more, because of the existence of several middlemen who handle them before the article reaches him. It is also made more costly because of the cost of transport. Therefore he is at a disadvantage as compared to the townsman. On the other hand, whatever he produces will have to go to the market which is distant. And on the top of that he has difficulties with the usurious moneylenders. The merchants in the market creates more difficulties and the agriculturist cannot get a proper price for his produce. As far as monetary assistance is concerned, he is not in a position to get it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If I may interrupt for a minute, Mr. Hathi will now lay some papers on the Table of the House.

**PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE**

**STATISTICAL INFORMATION *re* THE  
WORKING OF PREVENTIVE DETENTION ACT,  
1950**

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI J. S. L. HATHI): Sir, on behalf of Shri Govind Ballabh Pant, I lay on the Table a copy of the statistical information in the form of statements regarding the working of the Preventive Detention Act, 1950, during the period 31st December, 1955 to 31st March, 1956. [Placed in the Library. See No. S-197/56.]

**RESOLUTION RE SECOND FIVE  
YEAR PLAN—*continued***

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Although I am grateful to the Government for establishing the Warehousing Corporations by the Bill which we have discussed and which we have passed, as Members here have pointed out, the capacity of these warehousing corporations to assist is very little when compared to the pressing needs. I mean to say that the agriculturists' welfare must have been visualised in its proper perspective. They must have planned it on a functional basis

and then adjusted the economy in a manner so as not to at least handicap the agriculturists. Well, that has not been done.

Then, Sir, I go on to another topic, the question of Services. The Planning Commission have been very alive to the shortage of the personnel in all fields. In the matter of administration they are short of a good deal of personnel. They need 386 additional administrative officers; 225 persons in the junior scale they have to recruit and then, Sir, in the matter of technical personnel they are too short. In the matter of agricultural personnel 6,500 agricultural graduates are required for the Second Plan and a deficit of 1,000 graduates is expected. In the matter of village level workers we are short of 38,000. Then, Sir, we want group-level workers and the demand is for 11,400 group level workers. We want 25,000 trained co-operators, 70,000 medical practitioners, 7,800 additional doctors to attend to the industrial sectors and so on and so forth—I have a big list here. I am glad that they are alive to the need but, Sir, what is the method that they have proposed? They refer in the Planning Commission Report to the Committee on plan and projects which the National Development Council have established and also the Organisation and Methods Directorate, which is functioning, in the Central Cabinet and they do not count on training personnel for the management of industrial enterprises and for improving the efficiency of the personnel. The Engineering Personnel Committee have submitted their recommendations and all these reports and recommendations and the Planning Commission's proposals go only to suggest an increase of training facilities which we have today, increase of educational capacities and training facilities which we have today. I would like to put a question to the Commission. Would you, by the method you have suggested, by the expansion you have suggested, be able to furnish to the country the required personnel? I dare say nobody can say 'Yes' by merely providing expansion facilities or starting new institutions